International relations as a discipline is relatively new. After the end of the First World War, it was emerged seriously as a branch of study. The discipline developed during the 1930’s, as a predominantly idealistic spectrum, that is, many practitioners were explicitly working along the lines which assumed the world peace would be preserved by strengthening the League of Nations and collective security. However, with the break of Second World War some of the eminent thinkers like E. H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau emerged in the scene, who were popularly known as the realists. Morgenthau’s path breaking work “Politics among Nations” (1948) took the centre stage arguing that the struggle for power was the dominant feature of international politics. The substantive arguments were immensely important, relating to a world which looked as though it might well destroy itself, and it is not surprising that some of the central scholars in the discipline did not interest themselves directly in methodological questions. Around the middle of the 1950’s, when cold war fully established, a group of scholars arose who, impressed by the apparent success of other disciplines such as economics, etc. began to apply the techniques of social sciences to its study.

However, writers on international relations agree that the structure of international society is becoming increasingly complex, but they disagree violently about the most helpful way of looking at it. The traditional way was to concentrate upon the states as the historically prominent units and to ignore other agents which lack the basic character of states - their sovereignty and territoriality. The influence of post-war evolution of the behavioural sciences has led to a greater or lesser acceptance of a behavioural analysis of international system as consisting of numerous, more or less, autonomous interacting actors.

It is very important why theories are required to understand international relations. Theories are interesting less for the substantive explanations they offer about political conditions in the modern world than as expressions of the limits of the contemporary political imagination when confronted with persistent claims about and evidence of fundamental historical and structural transformations. They can be read as - expressions of an historically specific understanding of the character and location of political life in general. Theories of international relations are more interesting as aspects of contemporary world politics that need to be explained than as explanations of contemporary world politics. As such they may be read as characteristic discourse of the modern state (Walker, 1993, Inside/Outside: IR as Political Theory, Cambridge: CUP). Let us now discuss the different approaches to understand international relations among the different cooperating and conflicting nation-states. They can be broadly categorized as: Classical Realism, Neo-Realism, Neo-Liberalism, Structural Approaches.

**Classical Realism: Hans Morgenthau**

Realism as an approach to international relations very much contrasts to other approaches like idealism, liberalism, and Marxism. Realism simply connotes the idea that since the time of classical antiquity it has served as a tool to understand, examine and evaluate the relations among nations. A brief look at its history, realism owes its origin to Greek classical period. Thucydides is the classical exponent of realism in classical antiquity. With the progress of civilization Machiavelli toward the end of the medieval period, Hobbes and Rousseau in seventeenth and eighteenth centuries popularized the idea in their thought process. What does realism mean? It claims that ‘on the apparent durability of power politics as a feature of human civilization.’
However, Walker doubts that does this view include the coherent intellectual traditions (Walker, 1987). The growth of the concept took place vehemently in post Second World War period.

Realism is more or less considered as an Anglo-American baggage in international relations theory. The emergence of the First World War provoked the study of realism centrally pointing toward the causes of war and the failure of collective security of the civilization. At the genesis of the idea at this phase solely concentrated on the origin of the causes of the war as well as its prevention from further recurrence. This phase of realism reached at its failure after the catastrophes of 1930 and 1940’s and the failure of the collective security system prescribed by the League of Nations.

After the unsuccessful orientation of the first phase, post-war realism developed in response to the practical and intellectual failures of the inter-war period, and the experiences of cold war. It was concerned to rebalance the approaches of the inter-war idealists by giving the priority to the need to study the international system as it was, rather than as one might like it to be. The writings of the thinkers like Morgenthau, E. H. Carr and John Herz following the Second World War period suggest a new mode in realist thought primarily focusing on power politics among states as the key to understanding the operation of the world system. Morgenthau advocated for a world government as a solution to occurring wars at world levels. Realism at this phase accompanied by strategic studies concentrates on developing theories of nuclear deterrence. The strategic studies developed during this period try to analyse the rapid growth of unilaterism.

The methodological behavioralists argued that the work of the classical realists did not satisfy the principles of scientific investigation. There are two kinds of attack set forth here. One is a frontal attack coming from those concerned with interdependence, political economy and transnational relations. This included not only fundamental questioning about the centrality of state and military powering realist thinking but also an accusation that realism was unable to deal with either the issues or the character of international politics in an interdependent world and a denunciation of the logic and the morality of relativism and normative bias towards conflictual assumptions.

The second attack came from the English School, whose main writers were Martin Wright (1977) and Hedley Bull (1977). It did not question the primacy of the state or power politics, but developed the concept of international society as a way of norm-based order, into the understanding of international relations.

The classical realism’s most important exponent is Hans Morgenthau and he also known as the father of post war realism and arguable the most influential theorist of international relations in his generation (Richard Ned Lebow, 2003, The Tragic Vision of Politics: Ethics, Interests and Orders, CUP). Morgenthau’s work influenced the domain of international politics and the idea of relativism became a dominant paradigm in the field and maintained this position throughout the cold war. However, in 1980’s neorealism gained currency, and Kenneth Waltz became an important thinker in this era.

The classical realists have holistic understandings of politics that stresses the similarities, not the difference between domestic and international politics, and the role of the community in promoting stability in both. They recognize that communal bonds are fragile and easily undermined by the unrestrained pursuit of unilateral advantage by individuals, factions, and states. Classical realists think of political systems in terms of the principles of order, and the ways in which they shape the identities of actors and the discourses they use to frame their interests. For classical realists the changes in identities and discourses are associated with
modernization and hegemonic war and more often a consequence than a cause of such a transformation. This different understanding of cause and effect has important implications for the kinds of strategies classical realists envisage as efficacious in maintaining or restoring order. While recognizing the importance of power, they put more weight on values and ideas.

Thucydides constructed no theories in modern sense of the term, but he is widely regarded as the first theorist of international relations. Clausewitz and Morgenthau are explicitly theoretical. All the classical realists are, however, united in their belief that theoretical knowledge is not an end in itself, but a starting point for actors to work their way through contemporary problems and, in the process, come to deeper forms of understanding. Classical realism can be thematically designed in the following ways: (a) order and stability, (b) balance of power, (c) interest and justice, (d) modernization, (e) restoring order.

Order and Stability


For classical realists, all politics is an expression of the same human drivers and subject to the same pathologies. They see more variations in order and stability within domestic political order and international systems than they do between them. They explain this variation with reference to the cohesiveness of society, domestic or international, and channels into which it directs human drives.

Morgenthau’s understanding of the relationship between domestic and international politics mirrors that of Thucydides and Clausewitz. At the outset of ‘international politics among nations’, he introduces a sharp distinction between domestic and international politics, which he then systematically undermine. All politics he insists is a struggle for power into ritualized and socially acceptable channels. In international arena, the struggle can not so readily be tamed (Morgenthau: Politics among Nations, p-172, and ‘The Decline of Democratic Politics (1958: 80, Chicago: Chicago University Press). The character of international relations nevertheless displays remarkable variation across historical epochs. In the eighteenth century, Europe was one great republic with common standards of politeness and cultivation, and a common system of arts, and laws and manners.

Balance of Power

Contemporary realists consider military capability and alliances as the very foundation of security. They regard the balance of power as universally applicable mechanism, although most effective in a multipolar system. For Morgenthau, the universality of power drive meant that ‘the balance of power was a general social phenomenon to be found on all levels of social interaction (Decline of Democratic Politics, p-49, 81).

Individuals, groups and states inevitably combined to protect themselves from predators. At the international level the balance of power had contradictory implications for peace. It might deter ear if status quo powers outgunned imperialist challengers and demonstrated their resolute to go to war in defence of the status quo. Balancing could also intensify tension and make war more
likely because of the impossibility of assessing with any certainty the motives, capability and the resolve of others. Leaders understandably aim to achieve a margin of safety, and when multiple state or opposing alliances act this way, they ratchet up international tensions. In this situation, rising powers may be tempted to go to war when they think they have an advantage, and status quo powers to launch preventive against rising challengers. Even when the balance of power failed to prevent war, Morgenthau reasoned, it might still limit its consequences and preserve the existence of states, small and large, that constitute the political system. Like Clausewitz, Morgenthau credited the balance with having served these ends for much of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (Politics among Nations, pp-155-59, 162-66, 177, and Decline of Politics, p-80).

For Morgenthau, the success of balance of power for the better part of two centuries was less a function of the distribution of capabilities than it was of the existence and strength of international society that bound together the most important actors in the system. When that society broke down, as it did from the first partition of Poland through the Napoleonic wars, the balance of power no longer functioned to preserve the peace or the existence of the members of the system.

International society was even weaker in twentieth century and its decline was an underlaying cause of both world wars. Morgenthau worried that its continuing absence in the immediate post war period had removed all constraints on super power competition. By the 1070’s he had become more optimistic about the prospects for peace. Détente, explicit recognition of territorial status quo in Europe a corresponding decline in the ideological confrontation, the emergence of Japan, China and West Germany as possible third forces and the effects of Vietnam on American power had made both superpowers more cautious and tolerant of the status quo. But perhaps most importantly, their daily contacts, negotiations, and occasional agreements had gone some way toward normalizing their relations and creating the basis for renewed sense of international community.

For Morgenthau, as it was for Thucydides and Clausewitz, politics as a struggle for power and unilateral advantage. The differences between domestic and international politics were merely differences of degree. Military capability and alliances were necessary safeguards in the rough and tumbled worlds of international relations, but could not be counted on to preserve the peace or independence of actors. Order, domestic and international, ultimately rested on the strength of the community. When states and their rulers were bound by common culture, by convention and personal ties, competition for power was restrained in its end and its means. Under such conditions, a balance of power might prevent some wars and limit the severity of others. In the absence of a community, military capability and alliances were no guarantee of security and could provoke wars they were intended to prevent.

For classical realists order is the result of identities and international constraints they generate both directly on behaviour, and indirectly by the manners in which identities shape interests. Order is only secondary attributable to the external constraints imposed by governments alliances and superior military capabilities. International society, conceived of as community at the interanational level is of crucial importance to classical realists.

**Interest and Justice**

Morgenthau tackles the questions of justice and interest importantly. In ‘Politics among Nations’ the concept of interests is defined in terms of power, sets politics apart as an autonomous sphere of action; and in turn makes a theory of politics possible. Morgenthau goes on to subvert this formulation to develop a more nuanced understanding of the relationship
between interest and power. These contradictions can be reconciled if we recognize that Morgenthau, Like Clausewitz, distinguished between the realm of theory and practice. The former aspires to create an abstract ration ideal based on the underlying dynamics of international politics. Such a theory represented the crudest of templates. Policy and its analysis were concrete, not always rational, and had to take into account many considerations outside the spheres of politics.

The contrast between theory and practice is equally apparent in Morgenthau’s conceptualization of power. He thought of power, as an intelligible quality with many diverse components, which he catalogs to some length. But in the real world, the strategies and tactics leaders use to transform the raw attributes of power into political influence were just as important as the attributes themselves. Because influence as psychological relationship leaders need to know not only what buttons are at the disposal but which ones to push in any circumstance. There were no absolute measures of state power, because it was always relative and situation specific. The successful exercise of power required a sophisticated understanding of goods, strengths and weaknesses of allies, adversaries and third parties. But above all it demanded psychological sensitivity to others needs for self-esteem.

People seek domination but most often end up subordination to others (Morgenthau, Scientific Man Vs Power Politics, p-145). They try to repress this unpleasant truth, and those who exercise power effectively employ justifications and ideologies that facilitate this process. Whenever possible, they attempt to conceive those who must submit to their will that they are acting in their interests or those if the wider community (Morgenthau, “the Decline of Politics”, p-59). What is required of mastery of international politics, Morgenthau insisted, ‘is not the rationality of the engineer but the wisdom and moral strength of the statesman (Morgenthau, ‘Politics among Nations’, p-172).

For Morgenthau, adherence to ethical norms was just as much in the interests of those who wielded power as it was for those over whom it was exercised. He made this point in his critique of American intervention in Indochina, where he argued that intervention would fail and erode America’s influence in the world because the ends and means of the American Policy violated the morality of the age. There was a certain irony to Morgenthau’s opposition. In his ‘Politics among Nations’, Morgenthau marked to disabuse an influential segment of the American elite if its naïve belief that ethics was an appropriate guide for foreign policy and that international conflicts could be resolved through the application of law. Morgenthau was adamant that morality defined in terms of the conventions of the epoch, implies limits on the ends that power seeks and the means employed to achieve them (Morgenthau, Scientific Man Vs Power Politics, p-151-68).

Modernization

Modern realists differentiate systems on the basis of their polarity: unipolar and multipolar (Morgenthau, Scientific Man Vs Power Politics, p-145 polar (Randal L. Schweller, 1998, Deadly Imbalances: Hitler's Tripolarity and strategy of World Conquest, New York: Columbia University Pres). System change occurs when the number of poles changes. This is often the result of hegemonic wars, brought on in turn by shifts in the balance of material capabilities.

For classical realists, transformation is a much broader concept, and they associate with processes that we have come to describe as modernization. Modernization brings about shifts in identities and discourses and, with them, changing conceptions of security. Morgenthau’s understanding of modernization recapitulates another aspect of Thucydides. Modernization led to
misplaced faith in reason, undermined the values and norms that had restrained individual and state behaviour. Morgenthau drew more directly on Hegel and Freud. Hegel warned of the dangers of the homogenization of society arising equality and universal participation in society. It would under traditional communities and individual ties to them without providing alternative source of identity. Hegel wrote on the eve of the industrial revolution and did not envisage the modern industrial state with its large bureaucracies and modern means of communication. These developments Morgenthau argued, allowed the power of the state to feed on itself through a process of psychological transference that made it the most exalted object of loyalty.

**Neo-Realism: Kenneth Waltz**

The realist thinking was revived by Kenneth Waltz in the 1970’s. Those who believed in Waltz’s vision are guided by the term structural realism combined with the work of liberal tradition that focuses on economic relations, regimes and international society (Buzan, Jones and Little, 1993), though the identity was not settled in the times of writing.

Neo-realism was the counter attack in this intellectual joust. It abandoned the conservative assumptions about human nature that underpinned classical realism and reasserted the logic of power politics in the firmer foundation of anarchic structure. It defended the centrality of the state, and especially of great powers, exposing the partiality of some interdependence views of international relations, and reaffirming the primacy of American power in the international system.

**Neorealist Parsimony: Waltz and the Passive - adaptive state under socializing anarchy**

We have common sense thought that describes that neorealism has a paradox: it insists on the absolute centrality of the autonomous state on international politics, and yet denies the possibility of a theory of state John M. Hobson, 2000, The State and International Relations, CUP, P-19). For Waltz, the state in international politics is exclusively derived from the systemic reproduction requirements of the anarchical state system. At the international structure, the state is derived international agential power either to shape the international political structure or to back its constraining logic.

Waltz in his ‘Theory of international politics’ (1979) starts with the continuity assumption. This remains a problem for Waltz. It was the high degree of continuity of outcomes that allegedly marked international politics through the millennia. He says ‘the texture of international politics remains highly constant, patterns recur and events repeat themselves endlessly. The relations that prevail inferentially seldom shift rapidly in type or in quality. They are marked by a dismaying persistence (Waltz, 1979, pp-66). Waltz believes strongly that international politics is, and always has been empires, city-states or nation-states. This is explained by Waltz to construct a theory on which there are a minimum of explanatory variables, which themselves are subject to little change or transformation.

This is why parsimony or elegance is fundamental to Waltzian neorealism (Waltz, 1979, Chapter- I). To have a parsimonious (narrow) theory, Waltz insists that empirical complexity or reality) must be simplified and reduced down to one key factor. He singles out the international political structure as the sole determining variable of international politics, in turn producing a positivistic theory which seeks to uncover the essential laws of motion of international politics. Waltz views that the problem with previous international political theory was dealt with its reductionist methodology. He defines reductionism unintentionally as a theory in which the whole (international theory) is understood or explained by its parts, i.e, the units (Waltz, 1979:
Reductionism (associated with a second image approach which focuses on the national level variable, as well as first image theory which focuses on the individual) is avoided through a third image approach, which relies on the international political structure as the independent variable (Waltz, 1959). The vital move is to define the international political structure in highly parsimonious terms which requires that unit-force (domestic force) variables be omitted (Waltz, 1979, Chapter-5).

Because at the domestic level there are an indefinite number of variables –economic, political, sociological, technological, etc. which are constantly changing and yet, for Waltz, international relations has not changed but has always remained the same. If changes in international outcomes are linked directly to changes in actors, how can one account for similarities of (international) outcomes that persist or recur even as actors vary? (Waltz, 1979: 65). So to avoid reductionism and preserve parsimony, in order to explain continuity, it is crucial to ensure that the international political structure is defined only in systemic ways, with a rigid exclusion of non-systemic, unit-force/ national variables.

**Waltz’s definition of International Political System**

There are three basic features or tiers of domestic political structures, though only two for international political system: (1) the ordering principle, or the deep structure – a phrase coined by Ruggi (1986:135), (2) the character or the differentiation of the units, (3) the distribution of capabilities, or the surface structure. However, the deep structure provides the key.

**The Ordering Principle (Deep Structure)**

There are two types of ordering principle: anarchy and hierarchy. Hierarchy characterizes domestic political structures, while anarchy characterizes international systems. Under (domestic) hierarchy, the units, (individuals) specialize in producing cars, others houses, others vegetables, etc. Because they specialize, they come to rely on others for goods that they need but do not themselves produce – hence, entailing cooperation and interdependence. Such harmony and interdependence is possible only because the problem of security has already been solved by the state. By contrast, in anarchical international systems, the units (i.e., the states) must adaptive self-help because there is no higher authority (world state) which can solve the security problem. They can not specialize vulnerability. Why does the absence of a world government lead to self-help and competition?

Waltz draws on the domestic analogy, which is based on the argument made by Thomas Hobbes in his Leviathan (1651). Hobbes argued that before the advent of the modern state – in what is known as the state of nature – there was a war of all against all. Thus men were free but highly insecure, since there was no higher authority which could have prevented from prying on each other. Hobbes solution was the construction of a state or higher coercive authority, known as ‘Leviathan’ through the social contract, whereby all individuals agreed to surrender their freedom to the state in order to gain security.

Applying this framework to international relations (the domestic analogy), Waltz assumes that state in the inter-state system are like Hobbes individuals within the state of nature, even though ironically. Hobbes denied, or at least heavily qualified, such an assumption by arguing that the international state of nature was in fact less intolerable to men than was the pure (domestic) state of nature (Walker, 1987: 73). Just as individuals compete with each other in pursuit of their own interests in Hobbes domestic state of nature so , for Waltz, individual states compete with each other in the anarchic realm if international politics : among states, the state of nature is the state of war..... Among men in the state of nature as among states, anarchy, or the
absence of government, as associated with the occurrence of violence (Waltz, 1979:102). And precisely because there is no world Leviathan or world state there is nothing to prevent interstate conflict from recurring. In short, order is possible only if there exists a higher coercive authority. States are free to pursue their own national interest but are for ever, insecure, because war can break out at any time. Accordingly, if states are to survive, they must cooperate in favour of self-help. Cooperation is ultimately dangerous because, in lowering their guard states become vulnerable to predators.

Because the ordering of principle is so important but is invisible or as Waltz put it the problem: How to conceive of an order without … (a visible) (Waltz, 1979:89? Waltz draws on macro economic theory by of analogy in order to understand the nature or power of anarchy. Drawing on Adam Smith’s discussion of the market, Waltz claims that just as the market emerges as a result of the spontaneous actions of the individuals and firms and so the international political structures emerges out of the spontaneous actions self-interested states pursuing their own selfish national interests. But once formed the international system constrains the actors (i.e., the states). For Smith, It was the structure of the market system the determined the self-help and adaptive behaviour of individuals (and firms) just as for Waltz the anarchic system determines the adaptive behaviour of states. Smith’s famous claim was that through the competition of selfish individuals, an invisible hand of market competition ensued the reproduction of society overall (Smith, 1776:423).Similarly for Waltz, the competition of selfish states, the invisible hand of anarchy ensures the reproduction of anarchic state. And Just as for Smith the market selects appropriate behaviour for survival by rewarding those who confirm to the logic of the market with high profits and those who do not with bankruptcy, so for Waltz, the international political structure selects out states according to whether their behaviour conforms to anarchy rewarding those who confirm with survival or even great power, and those who do not with decline, defeat or extinction (Waltz, 1979: 89-93).

Character of the Units

In a hierarchy (i.e. in domestic structure) the units are differentiated according to functions: all units are unlike and specialize in different functions, and accordingly enter into an interdependent system of mutual cooperation. But under international anarchy, states are like units and are minimally differentiated in terms of functions. Thus, while they differ greatly in terms of capability, functionally they are all alike – that is they are all sovereign, having a centralized political system with a legitimate monopoly of violence and rule making, and are not subject to higher political authority either domestically or internationally (Waltz 1979: 95). The reason why they are all the same derives from the socializing logic of anarchy. Failure to emulate the successful practices of the leading states (i.e. to conform the logic of anarchic competition) leads to the opening up of a relative power gap and therefore, heightened vulnerability or even extinction. Survival dictates convergence or functional homogeneity. Waltz’s fundamental argument is that the second (tier) is not needed on defining international political structure, because so long as anarchy endures, states remain like units (Waltz, 1979: 93, 103).s

Waltz effectively ‘black-boxes’ the state – that is, unit forces are held constant. It is the manoeuvre that informs the billiard-ball metaphor. States are like billiard-balls, not simply because they constantly clash, but billiard-balls are solid such that their internal properties do not vary and above all, do not affect their external behaviour. Here in lies the crux of Waltz’s understanding of the state: that because states are like units ( due to the socializing effects of anarchy), their partial attributes cannot enter into the definition of international political structure as an independent (i.e. determining) variable, precisely because their internal attributes do not
vary. Of course, they differ greatly in terms of regime form, ideology, etc. but, as we have seen these have purposefully been ignored. The fact that states (e.g. liberal/authoritarian, capitalist/socialist) have fought wars irrespective of their type or form suggests that unit forces are not relevant (Waltz, 1979: 66). In short Waltz accords the state no determining agential power or influence in international politics. Accordingly the state must be dropped as an independent causal variable in international politics. It is for this reason that Waltz argues that we do not need a theory of the state.

**Distribution of Capabilities**

While states are all functionally alike, nevertheless they are differentiated in terms of power capability (i.e. power differentiation). Here Waltz refers to strong and weak states. Strong states as great powers are in effect power-makers; they can change the behaviour of other states, where as weak state in effect power-takers, having no choice but to follow the great powers. Under anarchy, power differentiation ensures that all states must follow self-help or decline or perish. But does not the inclusion of capability allow forces back into the definition, as is sometimes charged by his critics (e.g. Gabriel, 1994: 85). No, Waltz answers, because having abstracted every aspect of the state except power, what emerges is a positional picture, in which states are understood by their placement in the system as opposed to their individual attributes (Waltz, 1979: 99).

**Waltz’s minimalist or functionalist definition of the state: the passive military-adaptive state**

We now reached at this point that Waltz followed systemic approach to international politics. It is because the state resides within an independent and self-determining anarchical international system. It can be granted no serious ontological status or international agential power. Although the states are very much the key units of the system, they have no determining influence. Thus no formal theory of the state is required. Nevertheless Waltz has a minimalist definition of the state: what we term the theory of the passive military adaptive state (Hobson, p-24). The core aspects of this state have an institutional foundation.

**The institutional means of adoption: high/ absolute agential state power**

The most fundamental institutional means that underpins adaptive behavior of the sovereignty of the state, in which, that state has high or absolute domestic agential power. This does not imply that the state can do simply as it pleases, but morally that the state is free of external or internal interference (by non-state actors) to decide for itself how it will cope with external challenges. States develop their own (adoptive) strategies … It is no more contradictory to say that sovereign states are always constrained (by the system) and often tightly so than it to say that free individuals often make decisions under the heavy pressure of events (Waltz, 1979; 96). In short, the state is granted high (absolute) domestic agential power and can operate wholly independently of domestic (and international) social forces.

**Neo-Liberalism: Complex Interdependence – Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye**

Robert Keohane’s pioneering book ‘After Hegemony (1984)’ brought the neoliberal institutionalist theory to the forefront of the international research agenda. Through a ‘creative dialogue’ with neorealism, Keohane sought to go beyond liberal institutionalism by synthesizing it with neorealism in order to develop a non-realist theory of cooperation in world politics. Recognizing that neorealists could dismiss liberal institutionalism by simply rejecting their
premises of state actions that the approach posited, Keohane sought to close this avenue off from realist attack (Keohane, 1984: 67-7). To achieve this, he explicitly borrowed three basic assumptions of state behaviour from neorealism.

First, in contrast to liberal institutionalism he argued that states are not motivated by self-abnegation and other-regarding idealist motivations, but are rational egoists which generally seek to maximize their utility gains. Though the latter relaxed the crucial point that he sought to establish was that regimes were effective even under conditions of utility maximizing rationality. Secondly, he sought to further expose the idealistic and normative basis of liberal institutionalism by insisting that world politics is not dominated by harmony and cooperation, but that discord frequently prevails, as neorealists insist. In fact discord is extremely important in his theory because it is this that creates the need for regimes in the first place. Without the spectre of conflict, there is no need to cooperate (Keohane, 1984: 54). Thirdly, Keohane supposedly adopted a systematic approach and black-boxed (i.e. Held constant) the state, such that domestic state-society relations and non-state actors were excluded from the explanatory model, given the premise that non-state actors continue to be subordinate to states (1989: 8). This led him to develop a state-centric approach, in which sovereign states are the principal actors in the world politics.

The Rationalistic Choice/ Functionalist Theory of Regimes and Cooperation

Having allegedly borrowed neorealism’s premises of state rationality, Keohane proceeded to make three basic amendments to neorealism. In this process he rejected classical liberalism’s spontaneity thesis by arguing that cooperation would not naturally occur - it had to be creatively engineered through the construction of international regimes.

*Regimes are absolutely autonomous of anarchy and the distribution of power, but only relatively autonomous from state*

Fundamental to neorealism is the collective action problem, where anarchy ensures that states eschew or defect from cooperation in favour of adaptive competitive self-help. Hegemonic stability theory argues that the collective action problem can be overcome by hegemony, though only in the short term. Neorealism retains the integrity of its assumption that states do not voluntarily and spontaneously cooperate, because it is only the pressure and coercion of a powerful hegemon that can promote regimes and enforce cooperation among states. Thus cooperation is never spontaneous but is always imposed (Young, Oran, 1983, *Regime Dynamics: The Rise and Fall of International Regimes* in S. D. Krasner (ed) *International Regimes*, Ithaca, p: 100-1) nor does cooperation last long. For as hegemony inevitably declines so, too, do regimes. That is regimes do not have a full autonomy from the distribution of power.

In contrast, Keohane argues that while hegemony and a unipolar distribution of power can be important in initially setting up international regimes and institutions, it is not a sufficient variable. States and agents can negotiate or voluntarily agree to set up and maintain institutions, because they value the long run gains that such regimes provide. In turn regimes empower states to overcome the collective action problem under anarchy. The key move here is to endow regimes with a full autonomy from anarchy and the distribution of power, and to thereby conceptually delink regimes from hegemony. This has two fundamental consequences. First, that neoliberalism is able unlike neorealism to explain the persistence of regimes after US hegemony, and secondly, regimes are much more resilient or robust for neoliberals than neorealists. By conceptually delinking regimes from hegemony and embedding them in state power, neoliberals are able to ascribe much greater resilience to regimes.
However, regimes do not have a full autonomy from states. Regimes have only a relative autonomy from states, since it is states that intentionally create regimes in order to avoid conforming to the logic of short term relative gains (associate with anarchy) so that they can enhance their long term absolute gains. In this crucial respect, regimes are only intervening variables that lie between states, on the other hand and international outcomes on the other.

**Cooperation is fundamental to the long term utility maximizing interest of states**

A fundamental aspect to new liberalism is its use of prisoner’s dilemma (PD), in which two actors can either cooperate or defect (i.e. go it alone). In a single play PD, as neorealists argue, the dominant strategy among rational egoists is to defect and doubt the other, hence cooperation is avoided. But the very point is that in repeated PD games through tit-for-tat, the two players learn to cooperate since this provides greater long run pay-offs than defecting.

Against neorealism, Keohane argues that world politics is better characterized by iterated PD games, because over time states constantly come to reciprocal contact with each together. Accordingly cooperation ensues not because a morality or idealistic motivation, but because it satisfies the long term interests of power maximizing rational egoistic states (Keohane, 184, Chapter-5).

Regimes or institutions prevent defective and cheating by lengthening the shadow of the future (Keohane, 1993). This is achieved in a number of ways. First, the process of retaliation and reciprocity, or tit-for-tat provides a major disincentive to defect. The essence of iterated PD games is that though time, both players learn to cooperate. That is, they learn but defection is punished with retaliation and cooperation rewarded with reciprocity. This leads states to think in terms of future (absolute) cooperation gains rather than following short term relative gains through defection.

The more future pay-offs are valued relative to current pay-offs, the less the incentives to defect today, since the other side is likely to retaliate tomorrow. Paradoxically, the possibility of future retaliation is crucial to the effective functioning of regimes, paradoxically because it is retaliation that provides the basic reasoning behind neorealism rejection of the efficacy of international regimes in the first place.

Secondly, the notion of issue-linkages also prevents defection. Regimes are nested or embedded within a multitude of policy arenas – in security trade, finance, etc. (Keohane, 1984: 89), Thus under the post-1945 liberal trade regimes a state might come under pressure from a domestic manufacture to impose import quotas. But the state might resist such domestic rent seeking pressure because from of the negative consequences that this might have for other areas of trade or because it does not wish to face foreign retaliations form other governments.

**Defining anarchy in term of an asymmetrical distribution of information**

Keohane accepts that anarchy promotes uncertainty as to whether states will keep their commitments. But for Keohane, anarchy gives rise to the collective action problem not because of the unequal distribution of power (as in neorealism) but because of the symmetrical distribution of information or the lack of information. It is this that promotes defection and cheating because states do not know, and therefore, do not trust, the interests of others. Accordingly states created international regimes in order to enhance the destiny and spread of information, which reduces the tendency for defection and cheating, in this way, regimes can reduce the transaction costs of agreements since they reduce the need for states to monitor whether agreements are compiled with by others, thereby promoting trust and cooperation.
The Neoliberal/Neorealist Debate in the Second State Debate

It is to the most of the thinkers in the IR quote Keohane as a neorealist, or more accurately, as a modified neorealist. It is according to Hobson, a flamed view. The design of Keohane’s project was potentially ingenious. By using realists’ premises about state motivations, he hoped to insulate himself form neorealist attack. But the problem here is that he failed actually to adopt neorealist premises in the first place. Hobson argues that Keohane produced a non-realist theory of the state which was encapsulated within a non-systemic approach.

Structural Approaches: (a) World Systems Approach: Immanuel Wallerstein

Before giving a detailed description of world systems approach it is very essential to have a common understanding about systems theory. The systems theory, or otherwise known as, general system theory is the result of the behavioural revolution in social science. A system is defined as ‘a set of elements standing in interaction; another view suggests: a set of objects together with relationship between the objects and between their attributes. There are two view points regarding the basic nature of the general system theory. One, it is an integrated and generalized set of concepts, hypotheses, and validated propositions. In this sense the general system theory can be meant a body of high level theoretical principles which could be applied to important phenomena in a wide range of disciplines. The other view is that the general system theory is a set of techniques which could be utilized in a systematic analysis. The utility of the system theory is measured in terms of its capacity to facilitate the conceptual enrichment rather than in terms of its potentiality to evolve any set of principles if general validity. There are three major usages of the term system. First, system means such an arrangement of international actors in which interactions are identifiable. Second, system refers to a particular arrangement itself is considered the most important variable in explaining the behaviour of states. And third, system is the application of special types of approaches top the study of international politics.

It is very appropriate to discuss here Morton Kaplan’s system theory. Kaplan believes that a system is most inclusive if it has such recognizable interests as are neither completely identical nor necessarily opposed to each other. A political system is distinguishable by the fact that its rules specify the areas of jurisdiction and provide methods for settling conflicts of jurisdiction. Kaplan holds that physical force is necessary, at least at the last resort, to keep the political system intact. He also believes that most important system is international system.

Kaplan treats six models of international systems: the balance of power system, the loose bipolar system, the tight bipolar system, the universal actor system, the hierarchical international system, and the unit veto system. The balance of power system corresponds to that which prevailed in the western world in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The operation of balance of power system has six important rules according to Kaplan. (1) Each essential actor should increase its capabilities but this should be some through negotiation and not through war; (2) the primary obligations of each national actor must be to itself, which implies that unless national actor is capable of protecting its own interests, those interests are unlikely to be achieved, and therefore, capabilities are to be increased even at the risk of war, if necessary; one should stop fighting rather than eliminate an essential national power; (4) the national actor should oppose any coalition of actors which tends to assume a position of predominance in relation to the rest of the system; (5) the national actor should prevent other actors from subscribing to supranational principles; and (6) defeated or constrained essential national actors should be acceptable as role models.
The loose bipolar system is that which corresponds to what we have, in which two super powers are surrounded by a group and smaller powers and non-aligned states and in which the existence of non-aligned states makes the power of the two major actors loose. On the other hand, the tight bipolar system is one in which non-aligned states will have disappeared and the system will operate only around the two super blocs. The universal actor system could develop as a result of the extension of the functions of essential actors in a loose bipolar system. In this system the universal actor (UN) is sufficiently powerful to prevent war among national actors but national actors retain their individuality and try for more and more power. The universal international system will be an integrated system. It will possess integrated mechanism and will perform judicial, economic, political and administrative functions. The hierarchical international system is the one in which a universal actor absorbs practically the whole world and only one nation is left out. Lastly the unit veto system in which the weapons that exist are of such a nature that any national actor can destroy any other before being destroyed itself.

The scholars of IR assume that World-System Theory (WST), often referred as structuralism, represents the Marxist theory of IR. Hobson says that there are two variants of WST: classical and neoclassical. The fundamentalist vision is embedded in classical form. The classical WST shares two major similarities with Waltzerian neorelaism. First, both are strong third-image theories of IR, and accordingly therefore, second, both deny the state any agential power to shape or determine any international system. The key difference, however, is that for Wallerstein, IR and state behaviour is determined by the structure of the capitalist world-economy (CWE) rather than the structure of the inter-state political structure. Classical WST to IR has three main aspects: a focus on dependency within the world economy, a historical-sociological theory of the rise of the capitalist world economy, and inter-state system and a historical sociological theory of the rise and decline of hegemonies.

Wallerstein’s basic Theoretical Scheme

Wallerstein implicitly specifies three types or levels to the international economic system. The first tyre that is known as deep structure is the ordering principle of the world economy, which is capitalist, and describes that states must follow economic self-help and seeks to enhance the economic interests of their rational bourgeoisie. The third type – the distribution of capitalism suggests that states will be strong or weak depending on where they are situated within the CWE: strong states reside in the core, weak sates in the periphery. The world-economy is separated or divided into regions; core (the advanced first world), the periphery (the backward third world) and the semi-periphery which lies part way between the other two regions (and acts as political buffer between the core and periphery). This sometimes referred to as the layer-cake model.

The Inter-State Structure of the Modern World-System Theory

From the perspective of world-systems analysis in inter-state structure if the modern world system is merely one institutional structure or plane of analysis among a number that altogether make up the integrated framework of the modern world-system. This world-system like all world-systems is an historical system governed by a singular logic and set of rules within and through which persons and groups struggle with each other on pursuit of their interests and in accord with their values. Pertinent analysis of geopolitics in this perspective can only be done within the context of the functioning of the modern world-system as a whole and in the light of its particular historical trajectory.
The Modern World-System

The modern world-system is not the only world-system that has existed, there are many others. It is, however, the first one that was organized and able to consolidate itself as a capitalist world-economy. It was initially formed in part in Europe. Its inner logic propelled to seek the expansion of its outer boundaries. Over some four centuries it proved durable repeatedly of incorporating new areas and hopes within its division of labour until by the 19th century, its organization or integrated labour process effectively concerned the entire globe, the first world-system to achieve this.

The capitalist world-economy is a system socially constructed by an integrated axial division of labour, whose guiding principle is the ceaseless accumulation of capital. The key mechanism to realize this principle has been the construction that crosses multiple political boundaries. The chains consist, conceptually and historically, of series of operations that are meaningful as nodes of chain. The condition prevailing within the many nodes of each chain vary over time of course, as do the conditions of any one node from that of other nodes. Some nodes have contained multiple producers in multiple countries; others have been relatively monopolized by a very few producers. In some nodes the labour force has been recruited primarily by paying wages. In others, employers have utilized a variety of more coercive and less costly modes of controlling labour. Profit is usually made at all the nodes along a chain, but the greater profit is the consequence if a higher degree of monopolization at a particular node.

The activities of the more profitable nodes have tended to be geographically concentrated in a few, relatively small areas of the world economy, which we may call collectively the core zone. The less profitable nodes tend to have their units of economic activity more geographically disposed, most of these units being located in much larger area we may call the peripheral zone. But while core and periphery are terms of geographical origin and geographic consequences, they not used here as primarily spatial terms but rather as relational terms. A core-periphery relation is the relation between the more monopolized sectors of production on the one hand and more competitive on the other and therefore, the relation between high-profit (low wage) production activities. It is the relation between world capital; and world labour, but it is also a relation between stronger capitalists and weaker capitalists. The major consequences of integrating the two kinds of activities is the transfer surplus-value from the peripheral sector to the core sector, that is not merely from the workers to the owners but from the owners (or controllers) of the peripheral productive activities to the owners of the core activities the big capitalists.

Coreness and peripherality being rational are not necessarily or always geographically separated. The two kinds of activity may well coexist within the same square mile. But there are a number of good reasons why, in practice, there has tended to be a high degree of spatial segregation, with a heavy concentration of core activities in few places with others housing primarily peripheral activities. Nor do coreness or peripherality have anything inherently to do the particular kinds of economic activity. It matters little whether the activity is transformational (agricultural, industrial) or service (merchandising, informational, transport, financial). At given times, and under conditions any of these activities may be core like or peripheral, high-profit or low-profit. What matters first and foremost in the degree to which the activity is (can be) relatively monopolized at given point in time. The successful entrepreneurs discern which kinds of economic activities have the possibility in the short run of a high degree of monopolization, and whose products have or can be induced to have a considerable demand. A successful capitalist has no intrinsic commitment to product, to place, to contrary or to type of economic activity.
activity. The commitment is to the accumulation of capital. Therefore, the capitalist will shift locus of economic engagement) product, place, country, type of activity as shift occur in the opportunities to maximize revenues from undertakings.

This means that a capitalist market by definition can never be either an entirely free market or an entirely closed administered market. The ceaseless accumulation of capital precisely requires something inn between: a partially free market. This kind of market is the constructed result of the efforts on the one hand of some powerful economic actors to achieve relative efficiencies and political influence and the contrary efforts of other actors to break or dilute these monopolies by combining alternative productive efficiencies and political influence. Monopolies are thus constantly being created and constantly being diluted. Nonetheless, at all points in time, some monopolies exist, and hence the world market has never been nor can it ever be more than partially free. If it were otherwise, high profit rates could not exist, and in this case the ceaseless accumulation of capital would no longer possible.

Only the modern world-system (the capitalist world economy) has evolved a political structure composed of states, each of which claims to exercise sovereignty in a delimited geographical area, and which collectively are bound together in an inter-state system. Such a political structure is in fact the only kind of structure that can guarantee the persistence if the partially free market which is the key requirements of system based on the ceaseless accumulation of capital. Capitalism and the modern state system were not two separate historical inventions (or conception) that had to be fitted together or articulated with each other. They were obverse sides of a single coin. They are both part of a seamless whole. Neither is imaginable without the other. They were simultaneously developed and neither could continue to exist without the other.

The Inter-State System

The normal functioning of any historical system is simultaneously cyclical and secular both systemic and historical. The key cyclical rhythm in terms of world production system is the so-called Kondratieff cycle (50-69 years in average length) which expresses the process of creating the major monopolies and undergoing them as a result of excessive entry into the market by new suppliers.

The inter-state structure, however, are governed by a longer cyclical process we may call the hegemonic cycle. Just as capital accumulation is maximized in the modern world system when it operates in the via media of a partially free market and within a value system governed by a tension between universalism and sexism – racism, so it is the case that capital accumulation is maximized when inter-state structures veer neither towards the extreme of world empire (a single overarching political structure) nor towards the extreme of the relative anarchy that derives from a situation in which there are multiple great powers all of some what equal overall strength (military/political/economic/social). The ideal situation in terms of capital accumulation for the system as a whole is the existence of a hegemonic power, strong enough to define the rules of the game and to see that they are followed almost all of the time. When rivalry is replaced by hegemony as systematic condition, it does not mean that the hegemonic powers can do anything; but it does not mean that it can prevent others from doing things that will significantly alter the rules.

The search for hegemony in the inter-state system is analogous to the search for monopoly in the world production system. It is a search for advantage never quite totally achieved. We can therefore ask three questions about hegemony. How does a given state achieve a position strong enough vis-à-vis other strong powers such that we may call it hegemonic? What
kinds of policies do hegemonic powers pursue? Why does a hegemonic power lose its
hegemony? The history of the international relations of the modern world-system offers answers
to each question.

What is needed for a given state to have pretensions to hegemony in the modern world-

system? Strangely enough, the primary requirement at the outset is not military strength although
the acquisition of the military strength is a crucial achievement in the process. There have been
only three hegemonic powers in the history of the modern world-system: the United Provinces in
mid-seventeenth century, The United Kingdom in the mid-nineteenth century, and the United
States in mid-twentieth century. Each was hegemonic only briefly. The most significant
achievement for each on the road to hegemony was primary in production efficiency within the
world-economy. One of the reasons each was able to achieve this superiority was the fact that it
had not invested heavily during this period creating a large army. However, each had created a
large merchant marine which in addition to its obvious economic function supported the ability
of this state to sustain a large naval force. It is indeed probably the case that a key factor in the
ability of the state that own out in the struggle to achieve hegemony (own out against its major
rival) was the fact that it had not invested in a large army.

Productive efficiency historically made possible commercial efficiencies, which in turn
supported the achievement of financial efficiency. While the rise in relative efficiencies partially
a direct product of market transactions, it was never that alone. It always required the use of state
power to create non-market generated advantages, and turning them into a structurally privileged
position. In fact in every case, the final phase of the struggle for hegemony involved a major
military encounter, which we may call generically a thirty years war. Such a war is different
from the frequent localized, usually two-power wars or the wars of strong states with very weak
ones (wars of conquest or quasi-conquest). The thirty years war involves overtime all the major
military powers, and involves massive physical destruction.

Each of three such wars we have had- the original thirty years war (1618-48), the
revolutionary and Napoleonic wars (1792-1815), the First and Second World Wars (1914-1945)
were sporadic rather than continuous, saw states charge sides in the middle belying their asserted
ideological commitments and ended in the definitive victory of the one of the two contenders. In
each case the sea (or air) power defeated the land based power. In each case the power
committed to maintaining the basic structure of a capitalistic economy won out against the power
that was pushing in the direction of transforming system into a world empire. In each case the
thirty years war itself was the decisive factor in achieving the necessary marked superiority of
productive efficiency within the world economy as a whole and in particular to the main rival. In
each case the war itself increased enormously the military strength of the putative hegemonic
power. And in each case, the drive to achieve hegemonic states had been a very long process,
stretching over many decades at least.

The end of each thirty years war marked a significant stage in the construction of the
Each time the hegemonic power sought to create an order in the system that would guarantee its
economic advantage over the long run. The dilemma for the hegemonic power was very simple.
Because of their efficiencies, the producers of the hegemonic power benefited in the short run
from a maximally to persuade the cadres and population of allied countries to consider the pulses
of an alliances for grater than its minuses, and even to create doubts among the victims of the
system as to the acceptability of their complaints. Successive hegemonic powers have been
increasingly successful in this ideological task.
But despite the relative success, the very policies of the hegemonic power which prolong economic advantages via political leadership are in fact the eventual cause of the decline of hegemony. Force needs to be used in occasion, and the use of force delegitimizes the user even when it succeeds. Force had further more a price for the user and each time it is paid reluctance to pay it grows. Strengthening allies allows allies to stronger vis-à-vis the hegemonic power itself. And ideological justifications of leadership, inevitably specious, tend to wear thin. For all these reasons, there comes a moment when leadership is no longer automatic, when persuasion becomes very difficult, and perhaps most important when the hegemonic power can no longer demonstrate greater productive efficiency than its rivals.

The decline of hegemony is perceived simultaneously as very slow and quite rapid. On the one hand, suddenly, everyone seems to notice that the authority of the hegemonic power is under serious challenge and that the achievement of its political will is no longer automatic. The hegemonic power seems to be in some economic trouble, after a long period of unquestioned prosperity. And of course the very perception free world market. But since production efficiency can be eventually matched, any advantages that its enterprises had in terms of productive efficiencies were vulnerable in the middle run in so far as the world market was truly free. A hegemonic power can maintain its hegemony over a middle run only as long as it can impose institutional constraints on the freedom of the world market that would work in its favour. Such constraints may include forcing open the markets of the other countries to the products of the hegemonic power, while keeping its own market relatively closed when necessary. Arrangements to funnel commercial and financial transactions via loci in the hegemonic power is another such constraint. The imposition of a currency of world transactions and last resort is still another. And the political demand to be involved in all decisions through out the world-system without a reciprocal right for other power is yet another.

The imposition of institutional constraints requires the judiciously combined use of force, bribery and ideological persuasion. It is yet this point that military supremacy is essential. The force must be sufficient such that, in most cases, it is not necessary to use it; most of the time the mere treat must suffice. The efficiency of force when actively and repeatedly challenged, diminishes over time, by virtue of the challenges, even if they are unsuccessful. The bribery involves the trade-off of rewarding allies against their contribution to the effective force, as well as their overall political support of course. And the ideological persuasion is a key element in persuading the populations of the hegemonic power to pay the price of military supremacy of these markets increases them, since others are then ready to act in the inter-state arena in ways that are markedly different from the ways in which they acted during the hey day of the hegemonic power. On the other hand, decline seems very slow. The hegemonic power even when it begins to decline, is clearly still the strongest power. It does not get automatically gets its way, it remains hard for anyone to do things against its will: If its economic lead is cut, it still seems (and is) very wealthy.

Much of the debate about how long hegemony lasts, often phrased as the debate over whether or not a given power is in decline, results from the ambiguity of the early stages of decline. It is the old question whether the glass is half empty or half full. It is many ways a semantic debate. The fact is that it takes a long time for a given state to become a hegemonic power. Once it gets there, it’s power is at a height and on a sort of plateau. Then its power begins to wane as it does to achieve the power fully in the first place.

Analytically, it seems useful to distinguish between the period of the plateau and that of the decline. If this essay, use of hegemony is restricted to the period of plateau, considering that such a usage is clearer. But clearly many of the mechanisms that the hegemonic power has put in
place during its peak period survive in the period of decline, if with diminishing efficiency. That was always the hope and expectation of the hegemonic power. The mechanisms are the ways of slowing the inevitable decline, and they do indeed slow it down. On the other hand, we think it is important to underline how brief is the period of the plateau. The system of hegemonic cycle works such that true hegemony exists at most a quarter of the time. The statistically normal phenomenon is the existence of multiple rival great powers – with however, the proviso, that there are always two at least who are making strenuous efforts to become the successful hegemonic power.

We also restrict the use of hegemony only to one power at a time and in relation to the world-system as a whole. Thus we do not term regional strengths ‘local hegemonies’ since that misses the point that the hegemonic power, of there is one, sets the rules of how regional blocs mark as well. In the early nineteenth century, Metternich was dismayed by the capacity of British to limit Austria’s ability to impose its will on neighbours who defied the principles of Holy Alliance. And in the posr-1945 world, the USSR found itself effectively constrained by the rules of the Yalta World-Order. And a system that never saw the emergence of hegemonic power would not have had the possibility of creating the stable interim orders needed to maximize accumulation. If the length of the hegemonic cycle has been far greater than that of Kondratieff cycle, it is that the complexity of the hegemonic order is far greater than the monopoly of a leading sector. But the rhythm of the cycle has been crucial for the collective psychic energy we call the social cohesion of the system as a whole.

The modern world system, nonetheless, like all systems have secular trends which are moving it far from equilibrium, and therefore, towards a true crises, in which there will be a bifurcation. The present system will come to an end, to be replaced by one or more successor systems. There are several reasons to believe that we have already entered that phase, and that it is consequently unlikely that there will be another hegemonic cycle in the further history of this system.

The functioning of the modern world-system has been dependent on three international phenomena: a relatively stable inter-state system, of which the system of hegemonic cycles has been the motor, a highly profitable world productive system, of which the monopoly cycle have been the motor; and the social cohesion of the sovereign states especially those which are in the core zone. What has made this social cohesion possible has been the establishing of liberal states, offering suffrage, welfare and sense of racial or national superiority of its citizenry. Tying this all together has been a geo culture, founded on the illusion of universal development and the expectation of general prosperity and democratic equality on the horizon of every one.

**Dependency School: Andrew Gunder Frank**

Andre Gunder Frank suggested that formulation of an adequate development theory and policy for the majority of the population of the world who suffer from underdevelopment without first learning how their past economic and social history gave rise to their present underdevelopment. However, most of the historians only study developed metropolitan countries and pay scant attention to the colonial and underdeveloped countries. For this reason, to him, most of our theoretical categories and guides to development policy have been distilled exclusively from the historical experience of the European and North American capitalist nations.

Since the historical experience of the colonial and underdeveloped countries has demonstrably been quite different, existing theory therefore fails to reflect the past of the
underdeveloped part of the world entirely, and reflects the past of the world as a whole only in part. More important, our ignorance of the underdeveloped countries’ history leads thus to assume that their past and indeed their present resembles earlier stages of the history of the now developed countries. This ignorance and this assumption lead us into serious misconception about contemporary underdevelopment and development. Further most studies of development and underdevelopment fail to take account of the economic and other relations between the metropolis and its economic colonies throughout the history of the world-wide expansion and development of the mercantilist and capitalist system. Consequently, most of our theory fails to explain the structure and development of the capitalist system as a whole and to account for its simultaneous generation of underdevelopment in some of its parts and of economic development in others.

It is generally held that economic development occurs in a succession of capitalist stages and that today’s underdeveloped countries are still in a stage, sometimes depicted as an original stage of history, through which now developed countries passed long ago. Yet even a modest acquaintance with history shows that underdevelopment is not original or traditional and that neither the past nor the present of the underdeveloped countries resembles in any important respect of the now developed countries. The now developed countries were never underdeveloped, though they may have been underdeveloped. It is also widely believed that the contemporary underdevelopment of a country can be understood as the product of its own economic, political, social or cultural characteristics or structure. Yet historical research suggests that contemporary underdevelopment is in large part the historical product of the past and continuing economic and other relations between the satellite underdeveloped and the now developed metropolitan countries.

Furthermore, these relations are an essential part of the structure and development of the capitalist system on a world scale as a whole. A related also largely erroneous view is that the development of these undeveloped countries and, within them of their most underdeveloped domestic areas, must and will be generated or simultaneously by diffusion capital, institutions, values, etc. to them international and national capitalist metropoles. Historical perspective based on the underdeveloped countries’ past experience suggests that on the contrary in the undeveloped countries economic development can now occur only independently of most of these relations of diffusion.

Evident inequalities of income and difference in culture have led many observers to see dual societies and economies in the underdeveloped countries. Each of the two parts is supposed to have a history of its own, a structure, and a contemporary dynamic largely independent of the other. Supposed, only one part of the economy and society has been importantly affected by intimate economic relations with the outside capitalist world; and that part, it is held, became modern, capitalist and relatively developed precisely because of this contact. The other part is widely regarded as variously isolated, subsistence based, feudal, or precapitalist, and therefore more underdeveloped.

Andre Gunder Frank on the contrary believes that the entire ‘dual society’ thesis is false and that the policy recommendations to which it leads will, if acted upon, serve only to intensify and perpetuate the very conditions of underdevelopment they are supposedly designed to remedy.

A mounting body of evidence suggests that the expansion of the capitalist system over the past centuries effectively and entirely penetrated even the apparently most isolated sectors of the undeveloped world. It is now to conclude that underdevelopment is not due to the survival of the archaic institutions and the existence of the capitalist shortage on regions that have remained
isolated from the stream of world history. On the contrary, underdevelopment was and still is generated by the same historical process which also generated economic development; the development of capitalism itself.

**Conclusion**

It is on the part of all international political theorists had been to focus into the different dimensions of relations among nations so as to keep cooperation and conflict to continue in the international system. The tragic wars in the last century have really devastated the peace and prosperity of the nations. It is seriously suggested that the different interests of the modern states should be taken up in a balanced way so as to maintain international order and security. The different approaches discussed above present a wider analysis of how modern nation-states have to undertake their relations with each other so as to maintain their autonomy and security.
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A new international system emerged after the Second World War that was characterized by domination of two super powers – the United States and Soviet Union-and the rise of newly independent states as result of rapid decolonialization. These two super powers divided the world into two blocs. East consisted of Communist nations in general, specially the Soviet Union and its political and military allies in Eastern Europe. West comprised non-Communist nations lead by United States, whose principal partners are advanced industrial societies of Western Europe, Japan, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The division of world into rival blocs i.e. East and West refereed to as Bipolar World in international relations’ terminology. This bipolarization had led to a situation of cold war. The very formation of two factions has given rise to war tensions and this situation was named as cold war.

MEANING AND NATURE

Relations between the United States and the USSR were no doubt strained and hostile even prior to the beginning of World War II yet they were characterized as cold war around 1947. The term cold war was first coined by Bernard Baruch, Carolina, on April 16, 1947, a month after the declaration of the ‘Truman Doctrine, had said: ‘Let us not be deceived-today we are in the midst of cold war’. The term popularized by Walter Lippmann to describe the tension and conflict in bilateral relationship of US and the USSR in post-World War II period.

In international relations cold war indicates a states of constant conflict and strife, suspicion and mistrust, antagonism and hostility maintained and perpetuated without a direct armed confrontation between the adversaries. Cold war is not a state of armed struggle, but such a state in which the rivals, while keeping their peace-time diplomatic relations intact, continue their hostility. Both the antagonist adopts all means other than the war to weaken each other. It is not an armed war but a diplomatic and an ideological war. It is fought by means of political propaganda, which is called ‘propaganda war’. The cold war is not an actual war but the danger of such a ‘hot war’ is always imminent. In short, it can be defined as a state of intense diplomatic, political, economic and ideological struggle short of armed belligerency and clash.

Cold war is called a diplomatic struggle between the two super powers after the Second World War for world supremacy or an expression of two incompatible ways of life-those of democracy and totalitarian communism. It is the existence of tense atmosphere of division, distrust and suspicion between that two power blocs in general and between the two super powers in particular. In other words, the tense and hostile relations that developed between the capitalist countries led by the United States and Communist nations headed by the Soviet Union in the years after the Second World War came to be popularly known as cold war.

The Cold War was focused mainly on political controversies, in particular on the military and national security issues that divided east and west into contending factions. In the words of Kegley and Wittkopf, ‘The East-West conflict is essentially a struggle among those at the top of the international hierarchy for pre-eminent status, which side seeking to protect its own position while gaining advantage in its relations with, and often at the expense of, the other’.
Regarding the origin of Cold war there are different opinions. First, the seeds of cold war were sown with the Bolshevik revolution in 1917 in the Soviet Russia. Second, the Cold war had shown its earlier signs a little before the end of World War II. The third and widely prevalent version is that it started soon after the end of Second World War. It is difficult to accept any one view in it’s entirely because each has some element of truth. All the three views are being discussed below in detail.

**Origin With Growth of Authoritarianism**

After the First World War, the future of Europe and the world was defined by the treaty of Versailles (1919). The victorious allies imposed serious penalties on Germany. The Second World War was a fierce and complicated struggle for power. It pitted a fascist coalition striving for world supremacy—the Axis trio of Germany, Japan and Italy—against an unlikely Grand Alliance of four great powers, who united despite their incompatible ideologies—Communism in Soviet Union and Capitalist Britain, France and the United States. Hitler invaded and annexed Austria in what was termed the *Anschluss* in March 1938, and then turned his attention to Czechoslovakia and demanded the Sudetenland (an area containing three million Germans), which was refused by Czechs.

This event prompted Britain (especially Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain who was anxious to avoid war at any costs) to a Conference in Munich in September 1938, where it was agreed that Germany may annex Sudetenland but be allowed no more rights over the rest of Czechoslovakia. But, by early 1939, Hitler sends his troops to occupy Prague, the Czech capital. Britain and France reacted, albeit belatedly, by joining in an alliance to protect the next likely targeted Poland. Germany, after signing a non-aggression pact with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in August 1939, invaded Poland on 1 September 1939. However, the Britain and the France accordingly declared war on Germany—the Second World War had thus begun.

The war expanded rapidly as Hitler moved his forces to the Balkans North-Africa and westward. The powerful, German Army lunched a surprised attack on Soviet Russia. It was followed by Japanese attack on the United States of Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941. Then America has decided to leave its aloofness or prolonged isolationism from world politics. It tried to save the world from the ‘evil’ authoritarianism propelled by Italy and Germany. The president Franklin Roosevelt decided to form a coalition with Britain, France named—the Axis powers. The Attack of Hitler on Soviet Union (communist) added another ideologically different ally to the Axis powers. However, the enormous power and resources of United States and the Soviet Union combined with Britain liberated France, Belgium and Netherlands from Allied powers. In the east, the Russians drove the Germans out and advanced on Berlin via Poland. The Germany surrendered in May 1945 and Japan in August 1945, after the Americans had dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki on 6 and 9th August respectively.

It is still been debated that the end of Second World War created a suspicion among United States of America and Soviet Russia being war allied US was supposed to inform USSR about the use of nuclear weapon. Consequently, the Japan surrendered to US. This had created a misunderstanding between two powers.
Origin With Bolshevik Revolution

The roots of the strained relations between Soviet Russia and the West go back to the very hour of birth of former in 1917, when the Western nations including the USA, intervened in the civil war in Russia in the bud. The United States had not even extended diplomatic recognition to the Soviets until 1933. Though workable relations between them were gradually established, their mutual suspicion deterred both from coming together against their common enemy-Nazi Germany at the outbreak of the Second World War, and indeed, shortly before Hitler’s attack on Poland, a non-aggression pact was signed between Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany. Hitler’s sudden attack on Russia in June 1941 compelled it to come to the side of the West. Communist Russia’s heroic sacrifices, which paved the way for the Allied victory, seemed to inspire in Allies a feeling of genuine admiration and sympathy towards her and usher a new era of co-operation between East and West. But all these wishes gone in vain the world was divided into two distinct political entities, and thus cold war and bipolarization became an accomplished fact. Thus, notwithstanding the co-operation between the two forced by the World War, traditional suspicion and old enmity revamped and repeated in the immediate post war period as predominant power of the two super states fuelled their suspicion of each other.

Origin With Atomic Supremacy

Another view of the recent origin maintains that cold war began on the eve of end of the Second World War. According to this view, cold war was caused by atomic diplomacy during last year of the World War. As it became clear that the Allied side would win the Axis powers would be defeated, the common enemy, the common interest keeping the Allied powers together began to weaken and old suspicion between them resurfaced. The Western powers—the US, Britain and France had combined with the Soviet Union with an aim to defeat the common enemy, he Nazis and Fascists. Once it became clear to them that the defeat of enemy was inevitable, their old enmity was with the Soviet Union reappeared, although they did not terminate the alliance with it before the final surrender of the enemy.

During the course of war, the US was busy developing nuclear bomb in cooperation with Britain. Even though Russia was their war time ally, they kept it secret from Moscow. The US failure to take the Soviet Union into confidence about its nuclear project, made Moscow distrust of the ulterior motives and design of the US and its Capitalist allies. Its traditional suspicion about them was regenerated.

The dropping of atom bombs by the US on Japan in August 1945 further strengthened this revived old suspicion. After the defeat of Germany the war in Europe was almost over and the whole attention of the Allied powers was directed at Japan which was still fighting in the East. So Allied side prepared the war strategy against Japan and a date was fixed when the US and USSR would attack Japan from South and North respectively. But before the reaching of Soviet forces in Japan, the US, in violation of above agreed strategy with Russia, dropped two bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki and forced the Japanese government to surrender. Thus the war against Japan was over before the US forces and not before the USSR. The US became its sole conqueror and administered it for some years. The Russian felt that they were betrayed by the US. Moscow interpreted that the US action in Japan was not done by the need of ending the war swiftly; it was perhaps a part of the conspiracy of the capitalist countries against the Communist world.
Origin After The World War I

Those who believe that the cold war a post-war phenomenon, trace its origin to the secret indication of George F Kennan, the US Ambassador to Soviet Union, to the Department of State in February, 1946. Here Kennan pleaded for a stronger attitude towards the Soviet Union. Based on this important indication, the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, formulated a new policy of containment (It was a US policy unifying military, economic, and diplomatic strategies to limit the spread of Communism, enhance America’s security and influence abroad, and prevent a “domino effect”. A component of the Cold War, the policy was a response to a series of moves by the Soviet Union to expand communist influence in Eastern Europe, China, and Korea) with regard to the Soviet Union which was followed by the US in the post-war period. Simultaneously Kennan was recalled to Washington to head the Department of State’s Policy Planning Staff in order to provide an intellectual frame work for new American Foreign policy.

Causes of Cold War

Regarding the causes of the cold war scholars and historians are not unanimous. These causes are broadly divided into two groups’ i.e. orthodox and revisionist. According to orthodox view Soviet Union is surely responsible for the initiation of cold war as it forcibly established communist regime in East European countries in post World War II period in violation of its agreement with the Western Allied powers. Where as revisionists argue that the United States that emerged as superpower among the Western nations was responsible for the Cold War. Besides these broad groups there are many other factors accounting for the Cold War. All these are explained below.

The USSR Responsibility

There are some activities of USSR which annoyed the US and Western powers are enumerated as under:

a) Russian unwillingness to allow democratic elections in the territories liberated from the Nazis and superimposing communist governments there especially in Poland, Cezchoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Albania and East Germany.

b) Russia’s refusal to withdraw her forces from Iran whereas Britain and the USA withdrew her forces from Iran whereas Britain and the USA withdrew their forces.

c) Soviet Union’s pressure on Greece and Turkey by supporting subversive activities of communists there.

d) The Soviet Union destroyed German industries and transferred costly German machines to Russia as reparation, adversely affecting already ruined Germany economy. Britain and the USA had to spend huge amount for the recovery of German economy refusal by Soviet leaders to help in post-war reconstruction in regions outside Soviet control.

e) Perhaps most acceptable for the US, their anti-American propaganda and propagating of Communist ideology which promised to destroy the American type of economic and political system.

f) The orthodox argued that the predecessors of the Bolsheviks were also expansionist. As a result they were able to build a huge empire of Russia. Therefore, they believe that Russians are by nature are war-mongers. This argument was strengthened by the unwillingness of the
Soviets to withdraw the Red army from eastern and Central Europe after the Second World War.

**The USA Responsibility**

Revisionist school of thought accuses America more than the USSR. Various actions of USA displeased the Soviet Union.

a) The American military intervention in Russia in 1918-19 which was aimed at overthrowing of Bolshevik Revolution was still fresh in memory of Soviets. They were also suspicious that the US did not recognize communist regime until 1933.

b) During the war the Soviet Union had been getting American aid under the Lend-Lease Act but after the defeat of Germany, President Trumann abruptly cancelled the aid, when most needed by war-ravaged economy of Russia. The western power had also been opposing the Soviet demand of reparations. This confirmed the Soviet view that the West never wanted Russia to be stronger.

c) The contention held by orthodox that Russia was imposing communist government in East European countries as a part of his policy of expansion can also be repudiated on certain accounts. First, East European countries never have had before democratic governments therefore to say that Russia acted against democracy was baseless. It adds fun to orthodox view which claims America as upholder of democracy in the world. For several times the US helped the dictatorial regimes in Spain, coup in Chile, undemocratic government of General Lon No of Cambodia, military dictators (Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan, and Zia-ul Haq) in Pakistan, monarchical government in Saudi Arabia.

**Implication of Cold War**

The Cold War had far-reaching implications in the international affairs. In the first instance it gave rise to fear psychosis which resulted in mad race for the manufacture of more sophisticated armaments. Both the power blocs tried to acquire more and more sophisticated weapons.

Second, cold war led to the formation of various alliances during peace times. Both the blocs formed alliances and counter alliances to counter balance the growing power of the opponent. Some of the alliances which were thus formed include NATO, SEATO, CENTO, Warsaw Pact etc. The existence of these alliances added to world tension.

Third, a large number of nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America after attainment of independence decided to keep away from the military alliances sponsored and supported by two superpowers. Instead they preferred to follow policy of non-alignment. Thus, it can be said that the emergence of policy of non-alignment is also the direct outcome of cold war.

Fourth, cold war has greatly undermined the chances of attainment of one world. On account of mutual rivalry the two super powers were not willing to trust each other and often took opposite stands at United Nations. It is well known that the United Nations did not permit People’s Republic of China to take its seat in the United Nations only because China was a camp follower of Soviet Union. This prevented the United Nations from attaining universal character and jeopardized the chances of evolving one world.
Fifth, and last, the mad race for armament which was the logical outcome of the prevailing cold war between two power blocs resulted in diversion of enormous amounts to acquisition of sophisticated weapons. This adversely affected the development of states and prevented improvement in the living standards of people. Now it is indicating the deep rooted source of terrorism and Talibanism.

The Evolution of Cold War

Preponderance of the cold war characterizes the international relations in the post-world war II period. The evolution of Cold War in this period has not proceeded in consistent manner. It has been marked by varying degrees of intensity. Phases of high conflict alternated with mix of conflict and adjustment. The characterization of Cold War into different phases is far from being scientific, but it gives an easy understanding about the events. This rightly describe how the two super powers acted and reacted to each other during the cold war.

Cautious Friendship and Breaking Alliance, 1945-46

The end of World War II was characterized by suspicion on the part of each former ally about the others’ intentions. Part of this period exhibited the optimism that Soviets and Americans would cooperate to protect world peace. At San Francisco conference in the spring of 1945, both worked in this direction by agreeing to setting up of the United Nations.

But in this very period, the Soviet Union imposed communist regimes in the East European countries of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary and Yugoslavia and adopted a policy of liquidating the democratic political parties and crushing democratic institutions. Again, the Soviet Union violated the Balkan Agreement (concluded between Churchill and Stalin in 1944) regarding the joint sphere of influence of the Soviet Union and Britain over Hungary and Yugoslavia. By military intervention the Soviet Union established communist government throughout the Balkan region after the close of war. After putting the Eastern Europe behind the iron Curtain, the Soviet Union attempted at spreading its communist tentacles in the west Europe. America could not afford to be a silent spectator to the growing Soviet influence and expansion.

Mutual Hostility and Intense Conflict, 1946-1953

In this phase cold war took its complete shape and there was always a danger of its becoming hot. It was an era of intense hostility and conflict. During this phase the cold war was largely based upon George F. Kennan’s idea of containment. He was of the opinion that the Soviet strength was on decline. If a strong external force could organized the Red regime would fall like a house of cards. Each side misinterpreted the words and deeds of other. In February 1946, Stalin gave a speech in which he ‘spoke of the inevitability of conflict with the capitalist powers. He urged that the Soviet people not to be deluded that the end of war meant that the nation could relax. Rather, intensified efforts were needed to strengthen and defend the homeland’.

Immediately after this, Kennan, American diplomat in Moscow sent to Washington his famous ‘long telegram’ assessing the motivations of the Soviet leadership. Thus Kennan made what eventually became an oft-repeated and accepted view: ‘In these circumstances it is clear that the main element of any United States policy towards the Soviet Union must be that of long-
term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expensive tendencies’. In this way, the policy of containment was formulated in the US. It asserted that the Soviet Union should not be given any more opportunity for expansion. The American atomic monopoly offered the military logic for this line of thought.

The policy of Containment was enforced by direct military and economic intervention to save threatened American allies-Greece and Turkey-through Truman Doctrine of March 12, 1947; and by the economic integration and regionalization of the West European Powers by the Marshall Plan of June 5, 1947. Economically, the West European Powers were securely rehabilitated through the generous Marshall Aid. Anti-communist hysteria was deliberately fostered throughout the world. Containment policy or myth remained one of the guiding principles on which American foreign policy. The Soviet refusal to withdraw troops from Iran, the Communist *coup d’état* in Czechoslovakia, the Berlin Blockade in 1948, the formation of NATO in 1949 and most importantly, the acquisition of power by Communist China, made the whole world little apprehensive about the peaceful co-existence. The security treaty between Australia, New Zealand and the United States (ANZUS) (September 1, 1951), the Japanese Peace Treaty entered into this period. Thus, the US intensified her ideological offensive, sponsored many military alliances and encouraged arms race during this period.

In 1950, the cold war also reached from Europe to Asia. *The Korean War* (1950-53) was, in fact, a direct conflict between the Super powers. North Korea was fighting with Soviet weapons and Chinese troops, while the USA in the name of the UN force was fighting on behalf of South Korea. This war certainly contained the seed of Third World war, but it was terminated through an armistice. Hence, the relationship between the two powers was not merely cold but it was one of overt hostility and confrontation.

**Apparent Conflict, Actual Adjustment, 1953-62**

This phase is to be studied in the context of the fact that by 1949 the Soviet Union had succeeded in making atom bomb and thereby ending America’s atomic monopoly. In 1953 Stalin passed away and with his demise an important force aggravating cold war was removed. Khrushchev the new premier adopted a policy of peaceful co-existence. Both sides, particularly the United States, talked as if war was imminent but in deeds both acted with increasing caution and restraint and scrupulously avoided the hot war and armed clashes.

During this period, the US organized the South East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) in September 8, 1954 and the Middle East Defence Organization in February 24, 1955. Again through the Eisenhower Doctrine of 1954; she expanded the Truman Doctrine to cover the entire Middle East. The US became a party to Defence treaties with 43 states, involving over a third of the world’s population. She established a network of about 3,300 military bases to surround the Soviet territory. This period also witnessed the beginning of Vietnam crisis (1955) involving both the powers especially America. This crisis lasted till 1975.

During this period, the Soviet Union did not lag behind in strengthening her political and military might. The Soviet Union concluded the Warsaw Treaty with East European communist states on May 14, 1955. The Warsaw pact was a befitting reply to NATO’s inclusion of West German. The Soviet Union entered into defense treaties with 12 states. It also frustrated the American attempt to provoke counter-revolution in Hungary in 1956. To promote economic
integration of East Europe formed the Council of Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON) or CEMA on December 14, 1959.

Obviously under the US instructions, the Western powers, established a fully sovereign Federal Republic of Germany on May 5, 1955. The Postdam restrictions on arms were removed from West Germany. The Soviet answer was the formation of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) in October, and 1955. In this way, Germany was partitioned into two sovereign states due to the cold war. The Berlin blockade, The closing of entry to Berlin from the west by Soviet Forces from June 1948 to May 1949. It was an attempt to prevent the other Allies (the USA, France, and the UK) unifying the western part of Germany. The British and US forces responded by sending supplies to the city by air for over a year (the Berlin airlift). In May 1949 the blockade was lifted; the airlift continued until September. The blockade marked the formal division of the city into Eastern and Western sectors. In 1961 East Berlin was sealed off with the construction of the Berlin Wall. Again the Cuban Missile crisis, According to Nikita Khrushchev’s memoirs, in May 1962 he conceived the idea of placing intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Cuba as a means of countering an emerging lead of the United States in developing and deploying strategic missiles. He also presented the scheme as a means of protecting Cuba from another United States-sponsored invasion, such as the failed attempt at the Bay of Pigs in 1961.

After obtaining Fidel Castro’s approval, the Soviet Union worked quickly and secretly to build missile installations in Cuba. On October 16, President John Kennedy was shown reconnaissance photographs of Soviet missile installations under construction in Cuba. After seven days of guarded and intense debate in the United States administration, during which Soviet diplomats denied that installations for offensive missiles were being built in Cuba, President Kennedy, in a televised address on October 22, announced the discovery of the installations and proclaimed that any nuclear missile attack from Cuba would be regarded as an attack by the Soviet Union and would be responded to accordingly. He also imposed a naval quarantine on Cuba to prevent further Soviet shipments of offensive military weapons from arriving there.

During the crisis, the two sides exchanged many letters and other communications, both formal and ‘back channel’. Khrushchev sent letters to Kennedy on October 23 and 24 indicating the deterrent nature of the missiles in Cuba and the peaceful intentions of the Soviet Union. On October 26, Khrushchev sent Kennedy a long rambling letter seemingly proposing that the missile installations would be dismantled and personnel removed in exchange for United States assurances that it or its proxies would not invade Cuba. On October 27, another letter to Kennedy arrived from Khrushchev, suggesting that missile installations in Cuba would be dismantled if the United States dismantled its missile installations in Turkey. The American administration decided to ignore this second letter and to accept the offer outlined in the letter of October 26. Khrushchev then announced on October 28 that he would dismantle the installations and return them to the Soviet Union, expressing his trust that the United States would not invade Cuba. Further negotiations were held to implement the October 28 agreement, including a United States demand that Soviet light bombers also be removed from Cuba, and to specify the exact form and conditions of United States assurances not to invade Cuba. This event brought both the superpowers at the threshold of war. However, the mankind was saved from destruction of nuclear war following an agreement between Khrushchev and Kennedy by which USSR agreed to withdraw the missile base in exchange for the American guarantee for not invading Cuba.
Thaw in Cold War, 1963-68

During this phase United States accepted the division of Germany and Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe. The precedent for communication established at Geneva and later at the 1959 Camp David meeting was followed by the installation of the ‘hot line’ in 1963 linking the White House and Kremlin with a direct communication line; the Glassboro summit meeting (1967), and negotiated agreements, such as the Partial Test Ban Treaty (1963), the Outer Space Treaty (1967), and the Nuclear Non-proliferation treaty (1968).

At the American University in 1963, President Kennedy hinted the need for bringing down tension:

…today, should total war ever break out again-no matter how-our two countries would become the primary targets. It is an ironical but accurate fact that the two strongest powers are the two in the most danger of devastation… We are both caught up in a vicious and dangerous cycle in which suspicion on one side breeds suspicion on the other and new weapons beget counter weapons. In shorts, both the United States and its allies, and the Soviet Union and its allies, have a mutually deep interest in just and genuine peace and in halting the arms race…So let us not be blind to our differences, but let us also direct attention to our common interests and to the means by which those differences can be resolved. And if we cannot end now our differences, at least we can help make the world safe for diversity (Molhotra, 1997: 261).

A major change in Soviet-American relations was not initiated by Kennedy but this much he surely indicated that there was a shift in America’s attitude towards its opponent. As against it the Soviet Union also harped upon the policy of peaceful co-existence between capitalism and socialism. Kegely and Wittkopf rightly observed: ‘Admittedly those token moves were a far cry from sustained cooperation between the ideological antagonists, but they did signal a departure from the posture of confrontation that had previously typified Soviet-American relations. The co-operative behavior was evident, however, intermittent and fleeting, amidst a pattern of continued competition for advantage and influence’ (ibid: 262).

Détente, 1969-1978

This phase was marked by the decline of cold war and rise of detente. Relations between the USA and the USSR became quite normal and visits, cultural exchanges, trade agreements and cooperative technological venture replaced threats, warning and confrontation. This could have been possible only with coming to power of President Nixon and his national security adviser, Henry A. Kissinger. Their policy towards Soviet-America relations was officially termed as détente in 1969. The Soviets also embraced the terms to describe their attitude towards the United States.

Between 1969 and 1975 the USA was facing serious economic crisis due to failure in Vietnam War [The Vietnam War occurred in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia from 1959 to April 30, 1975]. The war was fought between the communist North Vietnam, supported by its communist allies, and the government of South Vietnam, supported by the United States and other member nations of the South Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO).
The Vietcong, the lightly armed South Vietnamese Communist insurgency, largely fought a Guerilla war against anti-communist forces in the region. The North Vietnamese Army engaged in a more conventional war, at times committing large-sized units into battle. U.S. and South Vietnamese forces relied on air superiority and overwhelming firepower to conduct search and destroy operation operations, involving groundforces, and air strikes.

The United States entered the war to prevent a communist takeover of South Vietnam as part of their wider strategy of containment. Military advisor arrived beginning in 1950. U.S. involvement escalated in the early 1960s and combat units were deployed beginning in 1965. Despite a peace treaty signed by all parties in January 1973, fighting continued. In April 1975, North Vietnam captures Saigon. North and South Vietnam were reunified the following year. During this period the value of dollar was failing, and a deteriorating balance of payment of situation rose. In the same context Soviet Union was also suffering from economic set backs and trying to technologically update itself. So during this period efforts were made by the rival super powers to reduce tension, diminish distrust and increase accommodation of common interest.

The major important events contributing to the stabilizing relations were: signing of Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) in 1972; holding of 35-Nation European security conference in Helsinki in July 1973 and organizing of Review Conference on European Security Conference in Belgrade in 1977. However, certain irritation still persisted between two power blocs. For example, the US favored armed building up in Iran to counteract growing influence of Russia in Middle East. It also moved to convert Diego Gracia into military base. During Bangladesh crisis the US sided with Pakistan and Russia with India. Similarly in 1973 Egypt-Israel war, the USSR sided with Egypt and the USA with Israel. But both the super powers avoided to militarily involving themselves in these confrontations.

New Cold War, 1979-1987

Between 1975 and 1979, the balance of power in Cold War moved steadily in favor of the Soviet Union. The Soviets established their influence in large parts of Africa. At the same time American prestige suffered a further blow in Iran during 1979-80. The Shah of Iran, whom the Americans had regarded as safe ally was suddenly overthrown in 1979 by the fiercely anti-American Ayatollah Khomeini after the Islamic Revolution.

However, the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979 was the fatal blows to détente. The Soviet leaders were confident that military operations would be short and that foreign operations would be limited and temporary. However, they were wrong on both fronts. The military campaign was to last for over nine years, and foreign reactions were sever and long-standing. The Americans reacted with surprising speed and rigidity. By December 1979, President Carter used the hotline to Moscow to warn the Soviet leaders that unless they withdrew from Afghanistan they would jeopardize the whole world field of Soviet-American relations. In 1980, within a year from the start of invasion, the US imposed a partial embargo on the export of cereals and high technology to the Soviet Union; refused to ratify the SALT II and boycotted the Olympic Games held in Moscow in 1980. This apart, as early as 3 January 1980, the General Assembly of the United Nations passed a resolution condemning the Soviet invasion. Thus, international opinion as expressed through the UN turned strongly against the Soviet Union.
Afghanistan Crisis

In the 19th century, Afghanistan became a battleground in the rivalry between Imperial Britain and Tsarist Russia for control of Central Asia. Three Anglo-Afghan wars (1839-1878-1880, and 1919) were fought and ended inconclusively. In 1893 Britain established an unofficial border, the Durand Line, separating Afghanistan from British India. In 1919 London granted full independence to Afghanistan. Abdur Rahman Khan (also called the Iron Amir) founded and consolidated the modern state in Afghanistan. Later, Emir Amanullah founded an Afghan monarchy in 1926.

During the Cold War, King Mohammed Zahir Shah developed close ties with the Soviet Union by accepting extensive economic assistance from Moscow. He was deposed in 1973 by his cousin Mohammed Daoud, who proclaimed a Republic. Daoud was killed in a coup in 1978. Then Noor Taraki took over by setting up a Marxist regime. He, in turn, was executed in September 1979, and Hafizullah Amin became President. Hafizullah Amin was killed in December 1979, as the Soviets launched a full scale invasion of Afghanistan and installed Barak Karmal as president.

The Soviets and the Soviet –backed Afghan government were met with fierce popular resistance. Guerrilla forces calling themselves ‘Mujahideen’ pledged a jihad or holy war to expel the invaders. Initially the Mujahideen forces were armed with outdated weapons. Later, it gained the attention of United States’ cold war strategy against the Soviet Union. With the help of Pakistan, Washington began funneling sophisticated arms to the Mujahideen resistance. Moscow’s troops were soon bogged down by determined Afghan fighters. The conflict largely settled into a stalemate, with Soviet forces controlling the urban areas, and the Afghan Mujahideen guerrillas operating fairly freely in mountainous rural regions. In 1986, Karmal resigned and was replaced by Mohammad Najibullah. In April 1988 the Soviet Union, the United States, Afghanistan and Pakistan signed accords calling for an end to outside aid to the warring factions. In return, in February 1988, President Mikhail Gorbachev announced the withdrawal of Soviet troops, which was completed one year later. The disparate guerrilla forces that had triumphed earlier now proved unable to unite, and Afghanistan became divided into several spheres of control. These political divisions set the stage for the rise of the Taliban later in decade.

Détente II

Détente gathered momentum again, thanks to the determination of the new Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev. He had summit meetings with US president Ronald Reagan and proposed a 15-year timetable for a step-by-step process of elimination of nuclear weapons from Earth. The American responded to some extent, though they were not go as far as Gorbachev, in Washington in 1987. Nevertheless, the INF treaty was an important turning point in nuclear arms race, since it was for the first time that any nuclear weapons were destroyed.

When Gorbachev took office, he rapidly decided to reduce Soviet commitments abroad, and by October 1985, he had decided in principle to pull out of Afghanistan. Gorbachev and Reagan held four summit meeting’s which Afghanistan, Gorbachev and Reagan held four summit meeting which drew world wide publicity. The two countries also pledged to strive for a Treaty of Strategic Arms Reduction (START) and agreed to give advance notice about the launching of
inter-continental range sea and ground missile tests and hold joint verification of the testing of nuclear weapons.

Further the progress was made at Washington Summit of 1990 between President Bush and President Gorbachev and two powers concluded a number of agreements on nuclear, chemical and conventional arms. They also agreed on certain principles of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), which was finally signed on 31 July 1991. Under this treaty the two super powers agreed to effect reduction in defined strategic offensive arms over a period of seven years. They also agreed on complex certification procedure, including on site inspection, short notice inspections and suspect site inspection.

Thus, gradually the traditional tension between Soviet Union and United States gave way to co-operation and ideological and social differences between the two tended to disappear. By this time, Soviet Union came to realize that preservation of any kind of closed societies was not possible when the world economy was becoming a single organism and no state, whatever its social system or economic status, could develop outside it.

The End of Cold War, 1989-90

By the time the comparatively youthful Gorbachev became General secretary in 1985, the Soviet economy was stagnant and faced a sharp fall in foreign currency earnings as a result of the downward slide in oil prices in the 1980s. These issues prompted Gorbachev to investigate measures to revive the ailing state. An ineffectual start led to the conclusion that deeper structural changes were necessary and in June 1987 Gorbachev announced an agenda of economic reform called Perestroika or restructurign. Perestroika relaxed the production quota system, allowed private ownership of businesses and paved the way for foreign investment. These measures were intended to redirect the country’s resources from costly Cold War military commitments to more profitable areas in the civilian sector. Despite initial skepticism in the West, the new Soviet leader proved to be committed to reversing the Soviet Union’s deteriorating economic condition instead of continuing the arms race with the West. Partly as a way to fight off internal opposition from party cliques to his reforms, Gorbachev simultaneously introduced Glasnost or openness, which increased freedom of the press and the transparency of state institutions. Glasnost was intended to reduce the corruption at the top of the Communist Party and moderate the abuse of power in the Central Committee. Glasnost also enabled increased contact between Soviet citizens and the western world, particularly with the United States, contributing to the accelerating Détente between the two nations.

In response to the Kremlin’s military and political concessions, Reagan agreed to renew talks on economic issues and the scaling-back of the arms race. The first was held in November 1985 in Geneva, Switzerland. At one stage the two men, accompanied only by a translator, agreed in principle to reduce each country’s nuclear arsenal by a second Reykjavik Summit was held in Iceland. Talks went well until the focus shifted to Reagan's proposed Strategic Defense Initiative, which Gorbachev wanted eliminated: Reagan refused. The negotiations failed, but the third summit in 1987 led to a breakthrough with the signing of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF). The INF treaty eliminated all nuclear-armed, ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges between 500 and 5,500 kilometers (300 to 3,400 miles) and their infrastructure.
The East–West tensions rapidly subsided through the mid-to-late 1980s, culminating with the final summit in Moscow in 1989, when Gorbachev and Bush (senior) signed the START arms control treaty. During the following year it became apparent to the Soviets that oil and gas subsidies, along with the cost of maintaining massive troop’s levels, represented a substantial economic drain. In addition, the security advantage of a buffer zone was recognized as irrelevant and the Soviets officially declared that they would no longer intervene in the affairs of allied states in Eastern Europe. In 1989, Soviet forces withdrew from Afghanistan and by 1990 Gorbachev given green signal to German unification. When the Berlin Wall came down, Gorbachev’s ‘Common European House’ concept began to take shape. On December 3, 1989, Gorbachev and Reagan’s successor, George W. Bush, had declared the Cold War over.

Consequently, the process of perestroika had increased the freedom of dissident movement— and brought forward the ‘nationalist’ question to the forefront of Gorbachev government. The 1989 revolutions that swept across Central and Eastern Europe overthrew the Soviet-style communist states, such as Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, Romania being the only Eastern-bloc country to topple its communist regime violently and execute its head of state. By 1989, the Soviet alliance system was on the brink of collapse, and, deprived of Soviet military support, the Communist leaders of the Warsaw pact states were losing their power hold. In the USSR itself, glasnost weakened the bonds that held the Soviet Union together. By February 1990, the USSR broke down; the Communist Party was forced to surrender its 73-year-old monopoly on state power.

The proposal of NATO powers to expand NATO into Eastern Europe by considering admission of Poland, Hungary and Czech Republic as members and willingness to offer associate status to other Eastern European countries, gave rise to apprehensions in the minds of Russia and she strongly opposed the expansion of NATO. However, these misgivings gradually subsided and on 27 May 1997, Russia signed a security agreement with 16 NATO allies, which offered the prospects of unified Europe after more than half a century bitter division. This virtually led to joint Council of NATO-Russia, which will be consulted on all security issues concerning her. However, this does not prevent NATO or Russia from taking independent decision or action.

The emergence of US as the only super power brought the former Socialist rivals China and Russia closer. Now both of them are urging for a multi-polar world. However, the presence of USA as hegemonic and only super power is very well marked by its post 9/11 events. The war on Iraq or the execution of Bath Party head Saddam Hussein; then the war against terrorism in Afghanistan reflects that USA — the legend of world peace and democracy. Nevertheless, its role is merely questioned with the relation with Pakistan.

Other Center of Power

A superpower is a state with a leading position in the international system and the ability to influence events and its own interests and project power on a worldwide scale to protect those interests, it is traditionally considered to be one step higher than a great power. The term is first applied in 1949 to the United States, the Soviet Union and the United States, generally came to be regarded as the only two superpower, and confronted each other in the cold war.

The first way the United States maintains its superpower status is by way of four major spheres of influence. Utilizing the Monroe Doctrine, the North American Free Trade Agreement
Through NATO and numerous investments and bases, the United States enjoys a third sphere of influence in Western Europe and, with the expansion of NATO upon U.S. insistence, in Eastern Europe to the borders of Russia. The United States further enjoys a fourth sphere encompassing the Middle East, where it has troops or military alliances stretching from Bosnia, Turkey, and Greece to Egypt, Saudi Arabia, and some of the Gulf emirates—with Israel the pivotal ally. In addition, the United States exercises overwhelming financial influence abroad through American investments and in international policy-setting agencies, including the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the World Trade Organization.

The third major facet of the United States’ status as the world’s leading superpower is its uncontested control of outer space through the U.S. Space Command and the two largest intelligence agencies: the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) and the National Security Agency (NSA). The United States is now the sole proprietor of a twenty-four-hour global reconnaissance network, with headquarters in Colorado: at the Aerospace Data Facility at Buckley Field in Aurora, at Peterson Air Force Base in Colorado Springs, and at Falcon Air Force Base near Colorado Springs. Subsidiary bases exist in England, Germany, Japan, and elsewhere. Other known bases are in San Antonio, Texas, and Fort Gordon, Georgia.

After the Cold War, the most common belief held that only the United States fulfilled the criteria to be considered a superpower, although it is a matter of debate whether it is a hegemonic or it is loosing its superpowers status. Countries like China, Russia, the European Union and Japan are also keeping the potential of Achieving superpower status. Others doubt the existence of superpowers in post cold war era altogether, stating that the rising interdependency between the world’s nations has made the concept invalid. So, the post cold war era is heading towards multipolar world with headed by —the hegemonic power US.

The European Union (EU)

The evolution of the European Union from regional economic agreement among six neighboring states in 1951 to today’s supranational organization of 27 countries across the European continent stands as a landmark event in the bipolar power division of the world. The formation of the EU can be traced back to post- Second World War phase. When the post cold war recovery was stimulated by the Marshall Plan, the idea of a united Europe was held up as the basis for European strength and security. In 1950, Robert Schumann, France’s foreign Minister proposed for the coal and steel industries of France and West Germany to be coordinated under a single supranational authority. France and West Germany were soon joined by four other countries-Belgium, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, and Italy—in forming the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) in 1952. In 1957, the Treaty of Rome created the European Economic Community (EEC) and the six member states undertook to eliminate trade barriers among themselves by forming a common market. In 1967, the institutions of all three treaties were formally merged into the European community (EC), creating a single European Commission, a single Council of Ministers, and the European Parliament.
In 1973, the first enlargement of EC took place with the joining of Denmark, Ireland, and the United Kingdom. The 1980s show further membership expansion with Greece joining in 1981 and Spain and Portugal in 1986. The 1992 Treaty of Maastricht laid the basis for further forms of cooperation in foreign and defense policies, in judicial and internal affairs, and in the creation of an economic and monetary union—including a common currency, the Euro. The new currency, the Euro, was launched in the world money market on 1 January 1999; it became the unit of exchange for all of the EU states except the United Kingdom, Sweden, and Denmark. In 2002, citizens of 12 Euro-Zone countries began using the Euro banknotes and coins. During recent days the Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia—bringing the membership to 25. On first January 2007, Bulgaria and Romania joined the EU to bring the total membership to the present 27 states.

The European Union contains the former world powers United Kingdom, Germany and France as its leading members. If counted as a single unit, the EU would have the largest economy in the world, as well as formidable military potential. Thanks to its highly developed economies, Europe is a leading destination for investment, and science and technology.

Russia

Since its independence after the collapse of the Soviet Union at the end of 1991, Russia, formally the Russian Federation has been facing serious challenges in its efforts to forge a viable political system. For instance, leading figures in the legislative and executive branches have put forth opposing views of Russia’s political direction and the governmental instruments that should be used to follow it. This conflict reached its climax in September and October 1993, when President Boris Yeltsin used military force to dissolve the Parliament and called for fresh legislative election. Then a new constitution has promulgated which created a strong presidency.

The situation in Russia, in the post-USSR phase was always to be extremely challenging. With over seventy years of Communist experience, an imperial czarist past, a cold war super power, a military giant and above all a technologically supreme state has failed to establish any democratic regime. During the courses of its thousand year history, Russia has repeatedly experienced collapses but has emerged as a strong power from each crisis. Past and Future greatness is above all derived from the countries huge geographical dimensions and its vast natural resources.

The Russian Federation of 1991 is still the biggest country in the world in terms of geographical area. It is not coincidence that term that has focus of Russian discussion since 1992 is of multi-polarization of world politics. Since then Russia is attempting to construct multipolarity based on collective security and through politics of inclusion. It is opposing any one single ideology—thus for example, liberal market and state-guided ideologies are equally acceptable to it—whereas the unipolar vision argues for only the primacy of market. Its multipolar vision do emphasizes non-military solutions to international problems; it argues for the inclusion of states. Thus, Iran participated as an observer at the meeting of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), rather than being isolated as an outcast. The powers that advocate a multipolar vision—Russia, India, China and Others—can engage seriously with the US and all other powers and seek to strengthen that relationship while maintaining an independent foreign policy.
China

In recent years, China’s rapid development has attracted worldwide attention. The implications of various aspects of China’s rise, its expanding economic influence, and its military muscle are bring hotly debated in the international community. Correctly understanding China’s achievements and its path towards greater development is thus crucial. However, the international relations of the people’s republic of China (PRC) are saga of isolation-alienation-socialization of China’s integration in international society since 1949. This is the year China emerged as a communist country in Asia.

Japan’s surrender to the Western Allies in 1945 touched off civil war between the Kuomintang forces under Chiang and Communists led by Mao Zedong, who had been battling since the 1930s for control of China. Despite U.S. aid, the Kuomintang was overcome by the Soviet-supported Communists, and Chiang and his followers were forced to flee the mainland, establishing a government-in-exile on the island of Formosa (Taiwan). The Mao regime proclaimed the People’s Republic of China on Oct. 1, 1949, with Beijing as the new capital and Zhou Enlai as premier.

After the Korean War began in June 1950, China led the Communist bloc in supporting North Korea, and on Nov. 26, 1950, the Mao regime sent troops to assist the North in its efforts to capture the South. In early state of formation China’s communist regime was vehemently supported by Soviet Russia. In an attempt to restructure China's primarily agrarian economy, Mao undertook the “Great Leap Forward” campaign in 1958, a disastrous program that aimed to combine the establishment of rural communes with a crash program of village industrialization. The Great Leap forced the abandonment of farming activities, leading to widespread famine in which more than 20 million people died of malnutrition.

Anxious to exploit the Sino-Soviet rift, the Nixon administration made a dramatic announcement in July 1971 that National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger had secretly visited Beijing and reached an agreement whereby Nixon would visit China. The movement toward reconciliation, which signaled the end of the U.S. containment policy toward China, provided momentum for China's admission to the UN. Despite U.S. opposition to expelling Taiwan (Nationalist China), the world body overwhelmingly voted to oust Taiwan in favor of Beijing's Communist government.

President Nixon went to Beijing for a week early in 1972, meeting Mao as well as Zhou. The summit ended with a historic communiqué on Feb. 28, in which both nations promised to work toward improved relations. Full diplomatic relations were barred by China as long as the U.S. continued to recognize the legitimacy of Nationalist China. Following Zhou’s death on Jan. 8, 1976, his successor, Vice Premier Deng Xiaoping, was supplanted within a month by Hua Guofeng, former minister of public security. Hua became permanent premier in April. In Oct. he was named successor to Mao as chairman of the Communist Party. But Mao’s death on Sept. 10 unleashed the bitter intra party rivalries that had been suppressed since the Cultural Revolution. Old opponents of Mao launched a campaign against his widow, Jiang Qing, and three of her ‘radical’ colleagues. The so-called Gang of Four was denounced for having undermined the party, the government, and the economy. They were tried and convicted in 1981. Meanwhile, in 1977, Deng Xiaoping was reinstated as deputy premier, chief of staff of the army, and member of the Central Committee of the Politburo.
Beijing and Washington announced full diplomatic relations on Jan. 1, 1979, and the Carter administration abrogated the Taiwan defense treaty. Deputy Premier Deng sealed the agreement with a visit to the U.S. that coincided with the opening of embassies in both capitals on March 1. On Deng’s return from the U.S., Chinese troops invaded and briefly occupied an area along Vietnam’s northern border. The action was seen as a response to Vietnam’s invasion of Cambodia and ouster of the Khmer Rouge government, which China had supported.

Under Deng Xiaoping’s leadership, meanwhile, China’s Communist ideology went through a massive reinterpretation, and sweeping economic changes were set in motion in the early 1980s. The Chinese scrapped the personality cult that idolized Mao Zedong, muted Mao’s old call for class struggle and exportation of the Communist revolution, and imported Western technology and management techniques to replace the Marxist tenets that had slowed modernization.

Student Demonstrators are Killed at Tiananmen Square: The removal of Hu Yaobang as party chairman in Jan. 1987 signaled a hard-line resurgence within the party. Hu—who had become a hero to many reform-minded Chinese—was replaced by former premier Zhao Ziyang. With the death of Hu in April 1989, the ideological struggle spilled into the streets of the capital, as student demonstrators occupied Beijing’s Tiananmen Square in May, calling for democratic reforms. Less than a month later, the demonstrations were crushed in a bloody crackdown as troops and tanks moved into the square and fired on protesters, killing several hundred.

In annual sessions of the rubber-stamp National People’s Congress in 1992 and 1993, the government called for accelerating the drive for economic reform, but the sessions were widely seen as an effort to maintain China’s moves toward a market economy while retaining political authoritarianism. At the session in 1993, Communist Party leader Jiang Zemin was elected president, while hard-liner Li Peng was reelected to another five-year term as prime minister. Since 1993, the Chinese economy has continued to grow rapidly.

China Becomes an Economic Power, but Continues to Suppress Personal Liberties. Deng Xiaoping’s death in February 1997 left a younger generation in charge of managing the enormous country. In 1998, Prime Minister Zhu Rongji introduced a sweeping program to privatize state-run businesses and further liberalize the nation’s economy, a move lauded by Western economists. On July 1, 1997, when Britain’s lease on the New Territories expired, Hong Kong returned to Chinese sovereignty, and in 1999, the Portuguese colony of Macao also was returned to Chinese rule.

Anyway China’s entry into World Trade Organisation (WTO) and its openness in economic sphere has brought a many turns in the international relation. The successful management of the Olympic in 2008 has changed the prospect throughout the world. The growing market, technologically updated manpower, as being a UN Security Council member, it is reemerging as next to USA hegemony.

Japan

At the Washington Conference of 1921–1922, Japan agreed to respect Chinese national integrity, but, in 1931, it invaded Manchuria. The following year, Japan set up this area as a puppet state, ‘Manchukuo’, under Emperor Henry Pu-Yi, the last of China’s Manchu dynasty. On Nov. 25, 1936, Japan joined the Axis. The invasion of China came the next year, followed by the
Pearl Harbor attack on the U.S. on Dec. 7, 1941. Japan won its first military engagements during the war, extending its power over a vast area of the Pacific. Yet, after 1942, the Japanese were forced to retreat, island by island, to their own country. The dropping of atomic bombs on the cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in 1945 by the United States finally brought the government to admit defeat. Japan surrendered formally on Sept. 2, 1945, aboard the battleship *Missouri* in Tokyo Bay. Southern Sakhalin and the Kuril Islands reverted to the USSR, and Formosa (Taiwan) and Manchuria to China. The Pacific islands remained under U.S. occupation.

Gen. Douglas Mac Arthur was appointed supreme commander of the U.S. occupation of postwar Japan (1945–1952). In 1947, a new constitution took effect. The emperor became largely a symbolic head of state. The U.S. and Japan signed a security treaty in 1951, allowing for U.S. troops to be stationed in Japan. In 1952, Japan regained full sovereignty, and in 1972, the U.S. returned to Japan the Ryuku Islands, including Okinawa.

Japan’s postwar economic recovery was nothing short of remarkable. New technologies and manufacturing were undertaken with great success. A shrewed trade policy (middlemanship) gave Japan larger shares in many Western markets, an imbalance that caused some tensions with the U.S. The close involvement of Japanese government in the country's banking and industry produced accusations of protectionism. Yet economic growth continued through the 1970s and 1980s, eventually making Japan the world's second-largest economy (after the U.S.).

During the 1990s, Japan suffered an economic downturn prompted by scandals involving government officials, bankers and leaders of industry. Japan succumbed to the Asian economic crisis in 1998, experiencing its worst recession since World War II. These setbacks led to the resignation of Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto in July 1998. He was replaced by Keizo Obuchi. In 1999, Japan seemed to make slight progress in an economic recovery. Prime Minister Obuchi died of a stroke in May 2000 and was succeeded by Yoshiro Mori, whose administration was dogged by scandal and blunders from the outset.

Japan is the world's second-largest economy and a major economic power both in Asia and globally. Japan has diplomatic relations with nearly all independent nations and has been an active member of the United Nations since 1956. Japanese foreign policy has aimed to promote peace and prosperity for the Japanese people by working closely with the West and supporting the United Nations.

In recent years, the Japanese public has shown a substantially greater awareness of security issues and increasing support for the Self Defense Forces. This is in part due to the Self Defense Forces success in disaster relief efforts at home, and its participation in peacekeeping operations such as in Cambodia in the early 1990s and Iraq in 2005-2006. However, there are still significant political and psychological constraints on strengthening Japan's security profile. Although a military role for Japan in international affairs is highly constrained by its constitution and government policy, Japanese cooperation with the United States through the 1960 U.S.-Japan Security Treaty has been important to the peace and stability of East Asia. Currently, there are domestic discussions about possible reinterpretation or revision of Article 9 of the Japanese constitution. Prime Minister Abe has made revising or reinterpreting the Japanese constitution a priority of his administration. All postwar Japanese governments have relied on a close relationship with the United States as the foundation of their foreign policy and have depended on the Mutual Security Treaty for strategic protection.
While maintaining its relationship with the United States, Japan has diversified and expanded its ties with other nations. Good relations with its neighbors continue to be of vital interest. After the signing of a peace and friendship treaty with China in 1978, ties between the two countries developed rapidly. Japan extended significant economic assistance to the Chinese in various modernization projects and supported Chinese membership in the World Trade Organization (WTO). Japan's economic assistance to China is now declining. In recent years, however, Chinese exploitation of gas fields in the East China Sea has raised Japanese concerns given disagreement over the demarcation of their maritime boundary. Prime Minister Abe's October 2006 visits to Beijing and Seoul helped improve relations with China and South Korea that had been strained following Prime Minister Koizumi's visits to Yasukuni Shrine. At the same time, Japan maintains economic and cultural but not diplomatic relations with Taiwan, with which a strong bilateral trade relationship thrives.

The territorial disputes and historical animosities continue to strain Japan’s political relations with South Korea despite growing economic and cultural ties. Japan has limited economic and commercial ties with North Korea. A surprise visit by Prime Minister Koizumi to Pyongyang on September 17, 2002, resulted in renewed discussions on contentious bilateral issues—especially which of abductions to North Korea of Japanese citizens—and Japan's agreement to resume normalization talks in the near future. In October 2002, five abductees returned to Japan, but soon after negotiations reached a stalemate over the fate of abductees' families in North Korea. Japan strongly supported the United States in its efforts to encourage Pyongyang to abide by the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and its agreements with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). Japan responded to North Korea's missile launches and nuclear tests by imposing sanctions and working with the United Nations Security Council. The U.S., Japan, and South Korea closely coordinate and consult trilaterally on policy toward North Korea, and Japan participates in the Six-Party Talks to end North Korea's nuclear arms ambitions.

Japan's relations with Russia are hampered by the two sides' inability to resolve their territorial dispute over the islands that make up the Northern Territories (Southern Kuriles island) seized by the U.S.S.R. at the end of World War II. In August 2006, a Russian patrol shot at a Japanese fishing vessel, claiming the vessel was in Russian waters, killing one crewmember and taking three seamen into custody. The stalemate over territorial issues has prevented conclusion of a peace treaty formally ending the war between Japan and Russia. The United States supports Japan on the Northern Territories issue and recognizes Japanese sovereignty over the islands. Despite the lack of progress in resolving the Northern Territories dispute, however, Japan and Russia have made progress in developing other aspects of the relationship.

The Japan has pursued a more active foreign policy in recent years, recognizing the responsibility that accompanies its economic strength. It has expanded ties with the Middle East, which provides most of its oil, and has been the second-largest assistance donor (behind the U.S.) to Iraq and Afghanistan. Japan's Ground Self Defense Force completed a successful two-year mission in Iraq in 2006 and the Diet in October extended the Anti-Terrorism Special Measures Law which allowed for Japan's Maritime Self Defense Force refueling activities in support of Operation Enduring Freedom in the Indian Ocean. On July 10, 2007 the Japanese Government decided to extend the Air Self-Defense Force’s (ASDF) airlift support mission in Iraq to July 31, 2008. Under the Iraq Special Measures Law a wing of the ASDF's C-130 transport planes, based in Kuwait, will continue to carry personnel and supplies for the U.S.-led
multinational forces and the United Nations in Iraq. The law has been extended to July 31, 2009 and will be voted on again in 2008.

Japan increasingly is active in Africa and Latin America—recently concluding negotiations with Mexico and Chile on an Economic Partnership Agreement (EPA)—and has extended significant support to development projects in both regions. A Japanese-conceived peace plan became the foundation for nationwide elections in Cambodia in 1998. Japan's economic engagement with its neighbors is increasing, as evidenced by the conclusion of an EPA with Singapore and the Philippines, and its ongoing negotiations for EPAs with Thailand and Malaysia.

In May 2007, just prior to the G8 Summit in Heiligendamm, Prime Minister Abe announced an initiative to address greenhouse gas emissions and seek to mitigate the impact of energy consumption on climate. Japan will host the G8 Summit in 2008.

**Germany**

Adolf Hitler, an Austrian war veteran and a fanatical nationalist, fanned discontent by promising a Greater Germany, abrogation of the Treaty of Versailles, restoration of Germany's lost colonies, and the destruction of the Jews, whom he scapegoated as the reason for Germany's downfall and depressed economy. When the Social Democrats and the Communists refused to combine against the Nazi threat, President von Hindenburg made Hitler the chancellor on Jan. 30, 1933. With the death of von Hindenburg on Aug. 2, 1934, Hitler repudiated the Treaty of Versailles and began full-scale rearmament. In 1935, he withdrew Germany from the League of Nations, and the next year he reoccupied the Rhineland and signed the Anti-Comintern pact with Japan, at the same time strengthening relations with Italy. Austria was annexed in March 1938. By the Munich agreement in Sept. 1938, he gained the Czech Sudetenland, and in violation of this agreement he completed the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia in March 1939. His invasion of Poland on Sept. 1, 1939, precipitated World War II.

Hitler established death camps to carry out “the final solution to the Jewish question.” By the end of the war, Hitler's Holocaust had killed 6 million Jews, as well as Gypsies, homosexuals, Communists, the handicapped, and others not fitting the Aryan ideal. After some dazzling initial successes in 1939–1942, Germany surrendered unconditionally to Allied and Soviet military commanders on May 8, 1945. On June 5 the four-nation Allied Control Council became the de facto government of Germany. After the Potsdam conference Germany was divided in two blocs.

On the night of Nov. 9, 1989, the Berlin Wall was dismantled, making reunification all but inevitable. In July 1990, Kohl asked Soviet leader Gorbachev to drop his objections in exchange for financial aid from (West) Germany. Gorbachev agreed, and on Oct. 3, 1990, the German Democratic Republic acceded to the Federal Republic, and Germany became a united and sovereign state for the first time since 1945.

A reunited Berlin serves as the official capital of unified Germany, although the government continued to have administrative functions in Bonn during the 12-year transition period. The issues of the cost of reunification and the modernization of the former East Germany were serious considerations facing the reunified nation. Together with France and other EU states, the new Germany has played the leading role in the European Union. Germany (especially under Chancellor Helmut Kohl) was one of the main supporters of the wish of many East European countries to join the EU.

Germany is at the forefront of European states seeking to exploit the momentum of monetary union to advance the creation of a more unified and capable European political,
defense and security apparatus. This is how post Cold War Germany is revolving as new source of power. It is acting as the power center in European Union’s decision making process. After accepting as Euro as their common currency they are invisibly challenging the monopoly of US dollars in the world market.

Concluding Remarks

To conclude and estimate the basic nature of post cold war world order one can access that US is the only super power left who is committed to democracy and rule of law. The Gulf crisis was seen as a reminder that the U.S. must continue to lead, and that military strength does matter, but that the resulting new world order should make military force less important in the future. The recent involvement of US in Iraq, Afghanistan and recently in Taliban shows that US is sole protector democracy.

However, this occasionally challenged by the reemerging powers of Russia, European Union and China. In the same time, Soviet-American partnership in cooperation toward making the world safe for democracy, making possible the goals of the UN for the first time since its inception. It is clear that the future cleavages were to be economic, not ideological, with the First and Second world cooperating to contain regional instability in the Third World. Russia could become an ally against economic assaults from Asia, Islamic terrorism, and drugs from Latin America Soviet integration into world economic institutions, such as the G-7, and establishment of ties with the European Community. Russia is reasserting its potential through cutting off of oil pipe line to Ukraine and the attack on Georgia. The powers like America and Europe are keeping stunning silence on these issues. In the last occasion, the reemergence of Germany and Japan as members of the great powers, and concomitant reform of the UN Security Council was seen as necessary for great power cooperation than earlier confrontation.
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In 1947 India won independence and joined comity of sovereign states and thereby qualified to participate as an actor in international politics and relations. Pundit Nehru, the first Prime Minister of India left a deep impact on the foreign policy of independent India. The basic principles of foreign policy enunciated by him continue to serve as the guiding principles for all subsequent governments and Prime ministers after him. The basic foreign policy has remained consistently through out the century but minor adjustment has taken place according to the requirement of time and changing world wide circumstances.

Accordingly, the national interest has been the first and foremost consideration, as is the case with the foreign policies of every government. The foreign policy of each country is determined essentially by the men or women in power and authority, i.e., by the ruling party and the governments of the day. The main factors that help determine India’s foreign policy are: the geographical situation, the economic requirements and resources, the defence needs and strategy, the existing alliances and understandings, tacit oral or written, with other states, and of course, the recent past, contemporary world events, the ideology and the political system. The basic aims, principles and parameters of India’s foreign policy were outlined by Jawaharlal Nehru. These have not changed much even after the death of Nehru and the adoption of liberal economic restructuring after 1990s. Even the policy makers of Vajpayee era also continued the historical legacy of IF while dealing with major contentious neighbours like-Pakistan and China.

The circumstances that forced it to adjust itself can well be described below as turning points in the foreign policy making of India. In 1954-55, US military pacts with Pakistan had forced Nehru to lean towards Soviet Union. In 1962 Chinese aggression taught our leaders to become more pragmatic and realistic in relation to our ‘national interest’. The Bangladesh’s liberation struggle and Nixon-Kissinger hostility in 1971 led to treaty with Moscow. In 1991, end of Communism as well as power and new economic groups has changed global equations. In 1998, India and Pakistan declared themselves as nuclear power. In the year, 2001, in the day 9/11 US twin tower were blown by terrorist attack and the Indian national interest to fight against terrorism became legitimate aim of US. The relation between two democratic nations culminated in Indo-US civilian nuclear deal.

**Basic Determinant of Indian Foreign Policy Geo–Strategic Locations**

Geography includes locations, size, topography, state boundaries, population, climate, and hydrography. All these elements are important in varying degrees for Indian national politics and foreign policy. The history of international relations shows that location has always been an important determinant of foreign policy of a state. The strategic location of Britain has helped her to rule over the waves in terms of both trade and naval power. The geographical position of the USA helped her in the past to follow isolationist foreign policy under the Monroe Doctrine. The location of Japan has helped her to become one of the leading trading and shipbuilding nation of world.

In Indian context, its, locations, size and her three state boundaries, namely the Himalayan frontier, the Indian Ocean and Indo-Pak frontier are important for shaping our foreign policy. Despite considerable political effort, India has not yet succeeded in obtaining defined and mutually accepted frontier either with China and Pakistan. Today the strategic location of India gives a central position in Asia and world politics. But, the confrontation particularly in the
mountainous region of LoC (international boundary between India and Pakistan) and Macmillan line (International boundary between China and India) are proved unhealthy for the region. However, the Indian Ocean is an indispensable link in world trade and commercial intercourse. India is in the sense a major connecting link among geographical areas called West Asia, Southeast Asia, and East Asia. According to Nehru, India is kind of bridge between the East and West, and becomes inevitably involved in major global issues. That is the main reason why both the superpowers USA and USSR have kept strategic relation. It displays a key role in many Cold war issues, non-alignment movement and north-south conflict.

In another point, independent India is the seventh largest state in the world. But the soil and sub-soil are usually barren having large stock of natural resources. Both China and India plays independent and influential role in world affairs due to their vast size. Secondly, the vastness of Indian Territory has an important bearing on her external security. It is very difficult to occupy the whole country. One of the important reasons why Napoleon or Hitler could not conquer Russia is the vastness of its territory. This is the reason why China and Pakistan can not challenge the India. India also shares borders with all the members of SAARC nations except Afghanistan and enjoys unique position among the neighbour.

In many ways the Himalayans and Karakorum do constitute a great natural barrier on northern frontier of the Indo-Pak subcontinent. It is effective against any great flow of trade and commerce. But due to a large number of major and minor openings militarily discontent it creates difficulty in bilateral relations. For India it is very important to keep a good relation with Pakistan because we share the longest common line of border—named Line of Control (LoC).

Indian Ocean is vital to our external political and economic relations and national existence. In ancient and medieval times the Indian Ocean witnessed a vast commercial traffic between India and Arab countries. During British ruling period it called as ‘British lake’. After the independence, our entire foreign trade and costal trade depended on the freedom of Indian Ocean. Our economic development is therefore, heavily dependant on this ocean. It offers the easiest and most effective means of communication between India and most of neighbouring countries.

The central and dominant location of India in Indian Ocean helps her to play politically important role in the world. It is connecting Atlantic and Pacific Ocean which powerfully influence the foreign policy of USA and European states. The problem of security of Indian Ocean is the most vital problem of India. It is the only commercial route of oil exploring counties of Japan and West Europe’s naval force is present permanently in Indian Ocean. Diego Garcia is the permanent naval centre of USA in Indian Ocean. But USSR has no permanent naval or military base in the Indian Ocean area. India is protesting against it, and claiming to make ‘India Ocean into Peace Zone’.

India is quite capable of guarding her land frontiers with Pakistan in purely military terms. The presence of China in Coco Island and USA’s naval base in Indian Ocean making the issue complicated. In the next point Pakistan’s alliance with USA and China creating major geostrategic threat to India. Arms race is started from this frontier’s security from both Pakistan and China. Last but not least, India has a unique position among the countries of the world, as it is the largest democracy, seventh largest country in area.

**Economic Development**

In terms of total industrial production India occupies the ninth position in the world. Her technological manpower is third largest in the world, next to USA and China. Immediately after independence, India tried to keep away from Cold war politics to concentrate on its economic
development with a socialist framework in policy making. In the post-Cold war environment, India realised the need to develop a pragmatic and wide-ranging international relationship to accelerate economic development. Reforms in India have changed the face of Indian economy and now India is being recognised as potential market in making.

Many a time our vast and rapidly growing population profoundly affects our foreign policy. It slows down our rate of economic growth and makes us heavily dependent on foreign aid. India is at a great disadvantage as compared with the Russia and USA. They have more per capita land and resources than India. So, it is very difficult to invest money in security and military sector. In purely military point of view, a large population is not necessarily an asset but liability. In nuclear war age population becomes an irrelevant factor. Without high technological equipment for military, the state can not combat technologically advanced enemy. So, population has made India dependent on big powers for foreign capital, technical know-how and military hardware.

The advancement in technology affects the military and economic capabilities of state. Consequently, the technology influences the foreign policy in an indirect manner. It has been observed that countries which possess advance technology are able to provide technical know-how to less developed and developing nation and influence their domestic and foreign policy. The countries like France, China, Germany and Japan who played a dominant role in today’s world politics is largely due to their technological development.

Natural resources create richness and self-sufficiency in state also make economically and military capable. USA and Russia are naturally rich in resources. India has vast amount of natural resources like mineral, metal, coal and water. But they are not properly utilised by the government or state. We have to make our natural resources into national power. To do so we need advance technology. This is why we are depending on the technical know how of Russia, USA or German. Hence, the development of natural resources is the part and process of economic development.

India has accepted independent non-aligned foreign policy to get foreign aid from both bloc-USA and USSR. It is an elementary principle of the science of International relations that aid-giving states act largely in their own interest. For the preservation of external sovereignty we need diverse source of foreign aid. In reference to Nehru-‘India need not to put all her egg in one basket’. In cold war era it was very difficult for India to maintain its foreign policy with Mix economy ideology. Both the superpowers were displeased, suspicious towards India’s planned economy vis-a-vis private economy. Now after the end of cold war, India has changed its perspective towards economic planning. It has opened up its market and tried to strengthen its economy by channelizing resources from International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization and World Bank as far as practicable.

**INDIAN TRADITIONS**

India’s commitment to world peace, anti-colonial struggle, opposition to racism, commitment to democracy, secularism and peaceful coexistence etc. are certain philosophical values that emerged during the freedom movement. India’s relations with world have evolved considerable since British colonial period, when a foreign power monopolised external and defence relations. At independence in1947, few Indians had the experience of making or conducting foreign policy. However, the country’s oldest political party, the Indian National Congress (INC) had established a small foreign department in1925.Jawaharlal Nehru articulated India’s approach to the world.
From the very beginning India is against all kinds of discriminations based on race and culture etc. It was pioneer in highlighting the problem of racial discrimination at the international level and severely criticized the policy of racial segregation being pursued by the government of South Africa and Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe). In 1952, India along with twelve other Afro-Asian states, raised the question of apartheid at the U.N. They asserted that its practice not only constituted a major violation of the UN charter and the declaration of Human Rights, and also constituted a serious threat to world peace. In subsequent years, it took up the cause of the Negroes in America and blacks of South Africa. It played its role in the Freedom of Zimbabwe and Namibia from White domination. In brief, it can be pointed out that India has always worked against racial discrimination wherever it was being practised.

Faith in the U.N. India is an original member of the UN since its inception in October 1945. It has expressed full faith in its objectives and principles. It actively supports all efforts of UN aimed at maintaining peace throughout the world. Being a founder member of the UN, India has been firmly committed to the purposes and principle of the UN and its peace-keeping missions. In recent days Indian Policy makers are making efforts to increase the membership of UN Security Council and for a permanent membership in it.

India’s relations with Asian Countries are also very soothing in both economic and political matters. No doubt, India is for cooperation among all countries of the world yet a special bias for the countries of Asia in its foreign policy is evident. It endeavoured to develop very close relations with countries of Asia, and tried to promote unity among them by organising a number of conferences especially during late forties and fifties. Its intentions were not to create a separate Asian bloc but to promote cooperation among the countries of Asia. Under this very principle India played active role in the formation of South Asian Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC) and continues to be its active and significant member. However, it could not muster enough response from Asian countries. Rather it earned the name of ‘big brother’ from many neighbouring nations.

Indian foreign policy is still determined by its age old policy of Panchsheel. It is the most important principle of India’s foreign policy to coexistence and cooperation among neighbouring nations. Like other features it is also the outcome of contemporary world situation and India’s national interests. As the alternative of coexistence is co-destruction, such a policy becomes all the more relevant. The principle of co-existence has been enshrined in the ‘Panchsheel’- the five principles of conduct. The principles were first stipulated in a treaty signed by India and China on the issue of Tibet on May 29, 1954.

The principles were: (i) Mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty, (ii) non-aggression, (iii) non interference in each other’s internal affairs, (iv) equality and mutual benefit, and (v) peaceful co-existence. The Panchsheel became very popular among sovereign sates of the world as a number of them—the erstwhile Soviet Union, Indonesia, Burma, Afghanistan, Yugoslavia, Poland, Saudi Arabia, Laos; Vietnam etc. accepted these principles of international conduct. Panchsheel was India’s great contribution to international relations India’s foreign policy has persistently opposed all forms of colonialism and imperialism. India expressed her solidarity with the people of Asia and Africa in their fight against imperialism and colonialism. Now she is showing her concern against the rise of neo-colonialism in all its manifestations.

In this manner India has seen as the torchbearer of anti-colonialist, anti-imperialist and nation of peaceful coexistence. Indeed, India’s independence itself played the role of a catalyst in removing the vestiges of Colonialism in other parts of the developing world, particularly in Africa. India was the first country to raise the question of racial discrimination in South Africa in
1946. It was at India’s initiatives that the AFRICA (Action for Resistance to Invasion, Colonialism and Apartheid) Fund was set up at the 8th NAM Summit in Harare in 1986.

**Political Organisations**

The political structure and the form of government have an important influence on its approach to international relations. Being the largest democracy of the world it allows some amount of openness in foreign policy making. India being the democratic, parliamentary government all policy matters is accountable to parliament means to the people. Internationally important issues are well debated among political parties and through media. For example, the recent debates on US-India Civilian Nuclear Deals are also debated open among opposition leaders, civil society, and intellectuals. The views expressed by intellectuals and think tanks in various matters are welcomed by respective ruling governments.

The liberal economic policy of India after 1990s also encouraging very friendly atmosphere to the global market. The successful economic reforms and the transformation of public sectors to private sector are also facilitating Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) flow very easy. The change in legal structure and transparency in policy making has made the India an investment hub. The potential market of more than one billion people has made the investor more interested to Indian market.

In the midst of it, Indian constitution adhere the basic principles of human right and democracy. From the time inspection India has supported the democratic movements across world. India has supported the South African independence movement in 1990s. India also supported Tamil minority right in Sri Lanka; the democratic movement in Indonesia and Malaysia. The Indian government has worked as political mediator to restore democracy in Fiji, Trinidad, former Yugoslavia, and Cambodia. India’s support for the establishment of democratic and human right remained the very basic of its foreign policy.

**Strategic Issues**

The growth of International law and organisation, not only impact on international relations but, many time pursue states to protect national interest at any cost. By the end of Second World War foreign policy was largely a matter of military strength and alliances, The Bipolarization of world, the western Bloc headed by USA and communist world headed by USSR. They both of the power blocs indulged in alliance making like, NATO, SEATO, Warsaw pact and Baghdad pact .During this period the whole world was divided into two military blocs. In 1960s many Afro-Asian countries got their independence but they tried to keep independent foreign policy different from bloc politics. India is one of those countries which tried to concentrate on domestic economic development and state-building.

During 1960s the Soviet Union, withdrawn the economic and technical-aid from China. This consequently, led to corresponding increase in aid to India from USSR. This was one of the major reasons for the apparently deliberate escalation of the Sino-Indian border dispute by China during 1959-1962. At the same time the strategic situation created by the Sino-Soviet conflict was utilized by USA to improve its relations with China.

The whole range of Indian foreign policy during this period including the border war with China in 1962, the war with Pakistan 1965 and the Tashkent Agreement of 1966, the Indo-Soviet Treaty of 1971, and India’s role in the emergence of Bangladesh, can be understood and assessed in the light of changing international milieu (i.e. of impact of Cold War). However, in every issue the role of India as regional super power has increased. But India had kept its independence of foreign policy decisions.
The détente which started between USA and USSR after the Cuban missile Crisis of 1962, which not removing the polycentric character of the international milieu, has gradually brought into existence of new pattern of politico-strategic co-operation between two superpowers. Peripheral competition between them still remains in the Indian Ocean and in South Asian politics in general. The former alliances like SENTO and CENTO has lost their significance in Asian strategy of Superpower. So, India’s external security, enabled her to pay more attention than before to the improvement of her bilateral relations with neighbouring countries. During the Cold War time the foreign policy of India evolved as more pragmatic and positive in many manners (Specially after the Sino-India war of 1962). Now India has very good relation with USA and other neighbouring countries like China and Sri Lanka.

In context to the nuclear weapon India has never opted for nuclear proliferation. Our tradition and national ethos is to practise disarmament, peace and sovereign equality of nation. So, India supported UN disarmament programme with the clauses sovereign equality of nations. Indian nuclear programme in 1974 and 1998 is only done for strategic purpose. It has decided not to use nuclear power in ‘offensive purpose’ and would ‘never use against any non-nuclear state’. In recent days Indo-US civilian nuclear deal is a benchmark progress in Indian Foreign Policy. It not only gives India a worldwide reorganisation as—emerging superpower but promises the future citizen with ‘an energy sufficient India’.

**Features of Indian Foreign Policy**

The advent of global liberal phenomenon and the emergence of technologically hi-speed atmosphere have made the world as ‘global village’. The complex and inter-mingled nature of world has direct impact on foreign policy making of every state. In such environment, India has adopted a foreign policy with greater pragmatic manner. However, the foreign policy of India emphasise on anti-imperialism, the Non-Alignment Movement (NAM), nuclear non-proliferation, reliance on the ethos of United Nations (UN) and the age old principles of peace and secularism.

**Anti-Colonialism and Anti-Imperialism**

Anti-imperialism or colonialism as an aspect of Indian foreign policy developed out of India’s own experience under British imperialism. In first stance it was not an international idea. However, after the First World War the Indian leaders started opposing imperialism everywhere. They not only marked out the financial burdens but their freedom to make decision as independent nation. To the leaders like Nehru, Gandhi, end of imperialism was basic precondition for the freedom and equality of nations and world peace.

When India achieved independence in 1947, it extended its helping hand to liberate other colonies from the British, Portugal and German. During 1950s many of the Afro-Asian counties got their independence due to the advocacy of India in International scenario. It not only approached international organisations like UN but gathered support from the liberal minded states like US. By opposing imperialism it tried to finish, the racial segregation, East- West division and north-south economic disparity. Through the non-alignment movement India tried to establish a union of nation based on equality, brotherhood and peace. The ethos of anti-colonialism or anti-imperialism is the founding stone of Non-Alignment Movement of 1950s.

**Emergence of Nam And Its Summits**

The term ‘Non-Alignment’ itself was coined by Indian Prime Minister Nehru during his speech in 1954 in Colombo, Sri Lanka. In this speech, Nehru described the five pillars to be used
as a guide for Sino-Indian relation, who were first put forth by Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai called Panchasheel (five restraints), these principles would later serve as the basis of the Non-Aligned Movement. The five principles were:

- Mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty
- Mutual non-aggression
- Mutual non-interference in domestic affairs
- Equality and mutual benefit
- Peaceful co-existence

A significant milestone in the development of the Non-aligned movement was the 1955 Bandung Conference a conference of Asian and African states hosted by Indonesian president Sukarno. The attending nations declared their desire not to become involved in the Cold War and adopted a ‘declaration on promotion of world peace and cooperation’, which included Nehru’s five principles. Six years after Bandung, an initiative of Yugoslav president Tito led to the first official Non-Aligned Movement Summit, which was held in September 1961 in Belgrade.

At the Lusaka Conference in September 1970, the member nations added peaceful resolution of disputes and abstention from the big power military alliances and pacts as the aim of the movement. Opposition to stationing of military bases in foreign countries was also added as the movement’s aim.

Organizational structure & membership

While the NAM is an organization of united countries, much like the United Nations (UN) or NATO, it is unique to some of these organizations in its organization and structure. First, it considers itself to be non-hierarchal in nature in that there are no countries that contain veto power or have special privileges in certain areas. The chair is rotated officially at each summit. The administration of the organization falls to the responsibility of a rotating chair (currently Cuba) and the rotation is consistent and fair. Secondly, the organization does not have any sort of constitution as many similar organizations do. This was done out of recognition that with so many countries having so many varying viewpoints and priorities, any formal sort of administrative structure would increase divisiveness and eventually lead to the collapse of the organization.

Membership in the organization has changed from the original requirements as well. As the organization has matured and international political circumstances have changed, so too have the requirements. There is an obvious attempt to integrate the requirements of the NAM with the key beliefs of the United Nations. The latest requirements are now that the candidate country has displayed practices in accordance with:

- Respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.
- Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.
- Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations, large and small.
- Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country.
- Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself singly or collectively, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
• Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.
• Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
• Promotion of mutual interests and co-operation.
• Respect for justice and international obligations.

The NAM has espoused a commitment to world peace and security. At the seventh summit held in New Delhi in March 1983, the movement described itself as the ‘history’s biggest peace movement’. The movement places equal emphasis on disarmament NAM's commitment to peace pre-dates its formal institutionalization in 1961. The Brioni meeting between heads of governments of India, Egypt and Yugoslavia in 1956 recognized that there exists a vital link between struggle for peace and endeavors for disarmament.

From the 1960s onwards, critics came to see the movement as unduly dominated by states allied to the Soviet Union. Many questioned how countries in close alliance with the Soviet Union, such as Cuba, could claim to be non-aligned. The movement divided against itself over the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979. This division was an indication that the NAM was indeed aligned, and it is possible that an organization of this nature can never be fully non-aligned.

In contrast, The Non-aligned movement believes in policies and practices of cooperation, especially those that are multilateral and provide mutual benefit to all those involved. Many of the members of the NAM are also members of the United Nations and both organizations have a stated policy of peaceful cooperation, yet successes that the NAM has had in multilateral agreements tends to be ignored by the larger, western and developed nation dominated UN. African concerns about apartheid were linked with Arab-Asian concerns about Palestine and success of multilateral cooperation in these areas has been a stamp of moderate success for the NAM. The NAM has played a major role in various ideological conflicts throughout its existence, including extreme opposition to apartheid regimes and support of liberation movements in various locations including Zimbabwe and South Africa. The support of these sorts of movements stems from a belief that every state has the right to base policies and practices with national interests in mind and not as a result of relations to a particular power bloc. The Non-aligned movement has become a voice of support for issues facing developing nations and is still contains ideals that are legitimate within this context.

Summits

• First Conference - Belgrade, September 1-6, 1961
• Second Conference - Cairo, October 5-10, 1964
• Third Conference - Lusaka, September 8-10, 1970
• Fourth Conference - Algiers, September 5-9, 1973
• Fifth Conference - Colombo, August 16-19, 1976
• Sixth Conference - Havana, September 3-9, 1979
• Seventh Conference - New Delhi (originally planned for Baghdad), march 7-12, 1983
• Eighth Conference - Harare, September 1-6, 1986
• Ninth Conference - Belgrade, September 4-7, 1989
• Tenth Conference - Jakarta, September 1-7, 1992
• Eleventh Conference - Cartagena de Indias (Colombia), October 18-20, 1995
Relevance of NAM

Some critics have alleged that in the present context of international developments—the end of cold war, dismantling of blocs, collapse of Soviet Unions and erosions of super power status—Nonalignment has lost all relevance and non aligned developing countries should redefine their international position in the new world order. This view largely rests on the assumption that non alignment was mainly the product of the cold war. It is true that the cold war did influence the shaping of non alignment as a foreign policy. But it is certainly wrong to assume that non alignment is mere response to cold war. Cold War was by no means the cause of emergence of non-alignment.

In fact non alignment as foreign policy is committed to universal problems of peace and freedom and hence has relevance both in cold war period as well as non-cold war periods. It is true that non alignment emerged at a time when cold war and bloc politics were dominant feature of international politics, but its main objectives was to protect and preserve the newly attained independence of the member states and promote their economic and political development. Though the countries of third world at present do not face the challenges of bloc politics, they are confronted with several other challenges like proliferation of weapon of mass destruction, cross border terrorism, natural disaster and environmental degradation. All these factors pose a serious threat to peace and democracy.

Hence at present non-alignment is confronted with the problem of creation of anew world based on rational, democratic, equitable and non exploitative inter-state relations. Non-alignment shall continue to be relevant as long as there is exploitation, war, destruction, hunger, poverty and disease on the earth.

It remains relevant to the changing world scenario, irrespective of fact whether the world is bi polar or unipolar. It can help in promoting greater economic and political cooperation between the developing and developed countries on fair and equitable basis and ensure respect for political independence of developing third world countries. But probably the most important role which non-alignment can play in the changing context is to protect the economic interest of third world countries by acting against discriminatory trade concepts of preferential trade practices. The other important issues on the agenda of the NAM are democratization of the United Nations and economic development. In short, the movement still have a vital role to play.

The 22-page Declaration issued after the latest meeting of NAM foreign ministers, held at Accra in September 1991, entitled ‘A world in Transition : From Diminishing Confrontation Towards Increasing Co-operation’ emphasized that NAM’s new focus must be on eradicating poverty, hunger, malnutrition and illiteracy and to called on the international community to help. NAM supported the present efforts at strengthening the UN so as to render it more democratic, effective and efficient.

Current activities and positions of NAM

Criticism of global hegemony

In recent years the US has become a target of the organization. The US invasion of Iraq and the War on Terrorism, its attempts to stifle Iran and North Korea’s nuclear plans, and its
other actions have been denounced as Human right violations and attempts to crush over the sovereignty of smaller nations. The movement’s leaders have also criticized the American control over the United Nations and other international structures. While the organization has rejected terrorism, it condemns the association of terrorism with a particular religion, nationality, or ethnicity, and recognizes the rights of those struggling against colonialism and foreign occupation.

Anti-Zionism

NAM’s Havana Declaration of 1979 adopted anti-Zionism as part of the movement’s agenda. The movement has denounced Israel’s occupation of the West Bank and Gaza Strip. It has called upon Israel to halt its settlement activities, open up border crossings, and cease the use of force and violence against civilians. The UN has also been asked to pressure Israel and to do more to prevent human right abuse. The protection of human right and establishment peace and democracy through the leadership of United Nations organization stayed as the main motto of NAM these days. Especially, NAM criticizes any unipolar action against bipolar, peaceful initiatives.

Sustainable development

The movement is publicly committed to the tenets of sustainable development and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals but it believes that the international community has not created conditions conducive to development and has infringed upon the right to sovereign development by each member state. Issues such as globalization, the debt burden, unfair trade practices, the decline in foreign aid and the lack of democracy in international financial decision-making are cited as factors inhibiting development. This is why NAM always promotes South-south cooperation which aims to share the technological inventions, sharing of knowledge in medicine, research and combat terrorism(regarding information) etc.

Reforms of the UN

The Non-Aligned Movement has been quite outspoken in its criticism of current UN structures and power dynamics, mostly in how the organization has been utilized by powerful states in ways that violate the movement’s principles. It has made a number of recommendations that would strengthen the representation and power of ‘non-aligned’ states. The proposed reforms are also aimed at improving the transparency and democracy of UN decision-making. The UN Security Council is the element considered the most distorted, undemocratic, and in need of reshaping.

South-south cooperation

Lately the Non-Aligned Movement has collaborated with other organizations of the developing world, primarily the Group 77 forming a number of joint committees and releasing statements and document representing the shared interests of both groups. This dialogue and cooperation can be taken as an effort to increase the global awareness about the organization and bolster its political clout. The Special Unit for South-South Cooperation (SU/SSC) was established by the United Nations General Assembly in 1978. Hosted in UNDP, its primary mandate is to promote, coordinate and support South-South and triangular cooperation on a Global and United Nations system-wide basis.
Cultural diversity and human rights

The movement accepts the universality of Human Rights and social justice, but fiercely resists cultural homogenization. In line with its views on sovereignty, the organization appeals for the protection of cultural diversity, and the tolerance of the religious, socio-cultural, and historical particularities that define human rights in a specific region. There are many committees to update the motto of NAM. Times to time these committees are recruited to study or monitor important issues and submitted their reports. These are like-

Working groups, task forces, committees

- High-Level Working Group for the Restructuring of the United Nations
- Working Group on Human Rights
- Working Group on Peace-Keeping Operations
- Working Group on Disarmament
- Committee on Palestine
- Task Force on Somalia
- Non-Aligned Security Caucus
- Standing Ministerial Committee for Economic Cooperation
- Joint Coordinating Committee (chaired by Chairman of G-77 and Chairman of NAM)

Indian Policy of Non-alignment

India’s Non-alignment Doctrine as a foreign policy precept was formulated by India’s first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru. He continued as India’s Prime Minister from its independence in 1947 until his death in 1964, a long spell of seventeen long years. He dominated India’s political scene as the indisputable leader of the ruling Congress Party and in the process established India’s ruling political dynasty which extends till today. The aura which he acquired as the more visible face of the Congress freedom struggle led to the endowment of a political charisma on him as the Prime Minister of the Congress Party which began governing India in 1947. As a consequence his political decisions became unquestionable including those in the foreign policy field. Foreign policy formulation became personalized in the person of the Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru and continued as such even in the tenures of his dynastic successors, namely his daughter Indira Gandhi and his grandson, Rajiv Gandhi.

India’s Non-alignment Doctrine was formulated by Nehru as the hallmark of new India’s foreign policy and Nehru depicted India in the international community accordingly. Nehru’s passionate obsession to non-alignment led him to establish the Non-Alignment Movement (NAM) which he did in the company of leaders like President Tito of Yugoslavia, President Nasser of Egypt, President Sukarno of Indonesia and President Nkrumah of Ghana. They all were leaders of newly independent countries that emerged in the wake of the end of the Second World War and the shake–off of colonial rule of the European powers. But this did not deflect the first major criticism of international observers, and especially Western leaders that Nehru as a highly professed democrat had to rely on the dubious company of military dictators and civil autocrats as founding fathers of the NAM. This criticism grew over the years as NAM expanded and most of the members that were added to ultimately reach a figure of over seventy had similar backgrounds, more or less. It also included countries that were openly allied with the Soviet bloc like Cuba.
To Nehru, it seems was attempting to craft a Third World Bloc in the bipolar structure of the Cold War era with idealistic hopes that the newly independent under-developed countries as a bloc could emerge as a group in international affairs and extract maximum concessions from the Big Powers. Also, it was hoped that NAM and India in particular, would be able to stay clear of Cold War entanglement and conflicts. In the process, Nehru revelled in occupying the centre-stage of global politics with his high flown idealistic moral posturing. India gradually started losing international relevance in USA and the Western group of advanced industrialized countries as India’s moral hassle grew and India began adopting double standards in the Cold War standards. The end of the Cold War and the new international realities that emerged forced India to recognize that non-alignment without political, economic and military muscle was not a workable concept and that if India was to actualize its latent great power potential, it had to shed its ideological obsession with non-alignment and join the international power game in the spirit of the REALISM school of political thought.

This was a total turnaround from the Nehruvian Doctrine of Non-Alignment and obviously had to be taken by a Prime Minister from outside the fold of the Nehru-Gandhi political dynasty. The man of the moment for this bold reversal of Indian foreign policy was P V Narasimha Rao. Subsequently, the BJP Govt under Vajpayee enlarged and added new horizons to India’s foreign policy including the defining moment of the 1998 nuclear weapons tests. This has catapulted India into the Big Power league and has made Indian foreign policy trends so initiated as irreversible. So much so that the current Congress Government despite the Nehruvian Foreign Minister (since sacked over the Volcker Report) and Leftists pressure has found it prudent to stay the course set by the BJP Govt.

India today is being widely accepted as an emerging key global player and figuring in the strategic calculus of USA, Russia, China and the EU as a force to reckon with. It has achieved this only after discarding the outdated concept of Non-Alignment that it obsessively followed for four decades. Indians of the current generation who would be moving India to its rightful future would naturally question India’s losses as a result of the Non-Alignment Doctrine of India’s foreign policy.

**Policy on Disarmament**

A remarkable ethos of Indian foreign policy is creating a world safe from armament race. The Indian leadership, over the years, has been deeply conscious of the dangers posed by nuclear armament. Elaborating on policies towards nuclear issues, one Nehru stated in parliament in 1954: ‘It is perfectly clear that atomic energy can be used for peaceful purposes to the immense advantage of humanity. It may take some years before it can be used more or less economically. I would like the House to remember that use of technology for peaceful purposes is far more important for a country like India whose power resources are limited than for a country like France, an industrially advanced country’ (Dixit, 2003:281). In the period between 1954 and 1963, India developed the required infrastructure, trained manpower resources and external inputs, particularly from US, to create programmes for peaceful uses of atomic energy (*ibid*). The successful establishment and operation of nuclear research reactor at Trombay and later commissioning of the Tarapore atomic power acknowledged India as country involved in research. So, India later proposed and agreed to allow foreign assistance for safeguards and inspection by international community headed by—International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA).

During 1970s in the leadership of Indira Gandhi, India tested its first nuclear weapon—Pokhran-I. The 1974 Pokhran was peaceful nuclear explosion (PNE). The regional scenario was prompted policy maker to take such drastic step. Because the war with China, China’s test in
1964, Indo-Pakistan war 1965 and 1971 was made the test vital for the national interest. However, the test was created a competition between India and Pakistan. By 1987, there was confirmed information about Pakistan having acquired nuclear weapons capacities. In the context of continuing trends of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, Rajiv Gandhi had proposed a time-bound programme for disarmament at special session of United Nations General Assembly in 1988. But he proposed for a non-discriminating plan unlike Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) and Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT). Because these treaties between old nuclear powers like US, Russia, China against newly acquired countries like India and Pakistan.

The period from 1990 to 1997 has generated critical pressures on India, with regard to disarmament and related to technologies. The break down of USSR and end of cold war prompted US to take cautious measures any nuclear negligence. Then only newly independent former Soviet Union provinces were also inherited nuclear power with them. However, in May 1998 India conducted its second nuclear test. The test came as a serious set back to Indian foreign policy by financial sanctions from International community, especially US. But India acquired a sophisticated defence capacity against its neighbouring enemies—who usually treat with terrorism, internal insurgency etc. This raised the Indian perception on disarmament. Which has cleared by the policy makers that India will not use its weapon as defensive measure— added clause like, ‘no-first-use’.

However, the basic principle of Indian policy has not been changed even after Indo-US nuclear deal. India has created an image of peaceful nation, and have requirement for the civilian purpose. Hence, the deal has clauses which agree all the safeguard measures pronounced by IAEA.

**Indo-USA Nuclear Deal**

The *Indo-U.S. civilian nuclear agreement*, known also as the Indo-U.S. nuclear deal, refers to a bilateral accord on civil nuclear cooperation between the United States of America and the Republic of India. The framework for this agreement was a July 18, 2005 joint statement by India Prime Minister Monmohan Singh and USA President Bush, under which India agreed to separate its civil and military nuclear facilities and place all its civil nuclear facilities under International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards, and, in exchange, the United States agreed to work toward full civil nuclear cooperation with India.

This U.S.-India deal took more than three years to come to fruition as it had to go through several complex stages, including amendment of U.S. domestic law, a civil-military nuclear Separation Plan in India, an India-IAEA safeguards (inspections) agreement and the grant of an exemption for India by the Nuclear Supplier Group, an export-control cartel that had been formed mainly in response to India's first nuclear test in 1974. In its final shape, the deal places under permanent safeguards those nuclear facilities that India has identified as ‘civil’ and permits broad civil nuclear cooperation, while excluding the transfer of ‘sensitive’ or military equipment and technologies, including civil enrichment and reprocessing items even under IAEA safeguards. On August 18, 2008 the IAEA Board of Governors approved, and on February 2, 2009, India signed an India-specific safeguards agreement with the IAEA. Once India brings this agreement into force, inspections will begin in a phased manner on the 35 civilian nuclear installations India has identified in its Separation Plan.

The nuclear deal was widely seen as a legacy-building effort by President Bush and Prime Minister Singh. But while the deal had to pass meet with the U.S. Congress twice (once when the Hyde Act was passed in late 2006 to amend U.S. domestic law and then when the final deal-related package was approved in October 2008), Singh blocked the Indian Parliament from
scrutinizing the deal. The deal proved very contentious in India and threatened at one time to topple Singh’s government, which survived a confidence vote in Parliament in July 2008 by roping in a regional party as a coalition partner in place of the leftist bloc that had bolted.

Through its denial of civil enrichment and reprocessing technology and equipment, the final deal does not offer India the ‘full co-operation’ the original agreement-in-principle had promised. Also, another original plank — ‘that India would assume the same responsibilities and practices and acquire the same benefits and advantages as other leading countries with advanced nuclear technology like the United States’—have proven to be a rhetorical one.

On August 1, 2008, the IAEA approved the safeguards agreement with India, after which the United States approached the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) to grant a waiver to India to commence civilian nuclear trade. The 45-nation NSG granted the waiver to India on September 6, 2008 allowing it to access civilian nuclear technology and fuel from other countries. The implementation of this waiver makes India the only known country with nuclear weapon which is not a party to the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) but is still allowed to carry out nuclear commerce with the rest of the world.

The US House of Representative passed the bill on 28 September 2008. Two days later, India and France inked a similar nuclear pact making France the first country to have such an agreement with India. On October 1, 2008 the US Senate also approved the civilian nuclear agreement allowing India to purchase nuclear fuel and technology from the United States. U.S. President, George W. Bush, signed the legislation on the Indo-US nuclear deal, approved by the US Congress, into law, now called the United States-India Nuclear Cooperation Approval and Non-proliferation Enhancement Act, on October 8, 2008. The agreement was signed by Indian External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukharjee and his counterpart Secretary of State Condolezza Rice.

**Political opposition in India**

The Indo-US civilian nuclear agreement was met with stiff opposition by some political parties and activists in India. Although many mainstream political parties including the Congress-I supported the deal along with regional parties like DMK and Rastriya Janta Dal its realization has run into difficulties in the face of stiff political opposition in India. Also, in November 2007, former Indian Military chiefs, bureaucrats and scientists drafted a letter to Members of Parliament expressing their support for the deal. However, opposition and criticism continued at political levels. The Samawadi Party (SP) which was with the Left Front in opposing the deal changed its stand after discussing with ex-president of India and scientist. Dr. A.P.J Abulla Kalam. Now the SP is in support of the government and the deal. The Indian Government survived a vote of confidence by 275–256 after the Left Front withdrew their support to the government over this dispute. There were heavy accusations against Congress regarding ‘buying’ up of MP’s, reportedly for Rs.250 million, to vote in the favour of them in the vote of confidence motion. MP’s flashed currency notes of 1000 rupees that they alleged were offered to them by the Congress party in the same parliamentary proceedings in which the vote was to take place. Incidentally, results showed ten MP’s belonging to the opposing BJP party cross-voting in the favour of the government.

As details are revealed about serious inconsistencies between what the Indian parliament was told about the deal, and the actual facts about the agreement that were presented by the Bush administration to the US Congress, opposition is growing in India to the deal.
In particular, portions of the agreement dealing with guaranteeing India a fuel supply or allowing India to maintain a strategic reserve of nuclear fuel appear to be diametrically opposed to what the Indian parliament was led to expect from the agreement: Prime Minister Manmohan Singh’s statement in parliament is totally at difference with the Bush Administration’s communication to the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which says India will not be allowed to stockpile such nuclear fuel stocks as to undercut American leverage to re-impose sanctions. To drive home this point, it says the 123 Agreement is not inconsistent with the Hyde Act’s stipulation –the little-known ‘Barack Obama Amendment’ — that the supply of nuclear fuel should be ‘commensurate with reasonable operating requirements’. The ‘strategic reserve’ that is crucial to India’s nuclear program is, therefore, a non-starter. Furthermore, the agreement, as a result of its compliance with the Hyde Act, contains a direct linkage between shutting down US nuclear trade with India and any potential future Indian nuclear weapons test. A point that is factually inconsistent with explicit reassurances made on this subject by Prime Minister, Manmohan Singh, during final parliamentary debate on the nuclear deal.

**India and its Neighbouring Geo-Political Status**

Several factors have been instrumental in shaping India’s foreign policy. Many of them are inherited from our struggle for independence and British administrative malaises. Especially the division between the states in post-British era is creating year long difference neighbours. The major discontents between many of the Indian neighbour take place due to border or illegal immigrations. These problems usually re-emerge with new issues to the forefront. However, the disagreement between China and Pakistan were marked as landmark of Indian foreign policy making. In equal manner the migration problem is the most difficult issue want to be addressed by policy makers in future. The Bangladeshi, Nepali, Sri Lankan Tamils not only threat international understandings but becoming burden on a country which is already over populated. So, in this scenario we will discuss the major geo-strategic issues among South Asian neighbour.

**Indo-China Relationships**

India and China are the two giants of Asia sharing along mountainous border. India and China do have common economic interests, but their political systems have little in common, as China is a communist country and India is democracy. In April 1954, India and China signed an eight year agreement on Tibet that set forth the basis of their relationship in the form of Panchasheel. Thus, the catch phrase of India’s diplomacy with China in 1950s was Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai. Up to 1959, despite border skirmishes and discrepancies between India and Chinese maps, Chinese leaders amicably had assured India that there was no territorial controversy on the border (Biswal eds., 2009:162).

Chinese forces attacked India on October 20 1962; pushed the unprepared, ill-equipped, and inadequately led Indian forces to within forty-eight kilometres of the Assam plains in the Northeast and having occupied strategic points in Ladak, China declared a unilateral cease-fire on November 21 and withdrew twenty kilometres behind its new line of control. The unexpected war from China was a really traumatic experience for India which had along term impact on relations between two countries. This has known to be the one of the dynamic incident which reversed the idealist experience of India foreign policy to realist.

During the Rajiv Gandhi’s period the bilateral agreements on science and technology cooperation, on civil aviation to establish direct air links, and on cultural exchange. Two side also agreed to hold annual diplomatic consultations between foreign ministers, and set up a joint ministerial committee on economic and scientific cooperation and joint working group on boundary issue. Tibet and the border dispute are the perennial issue between the two countries.
China has been opposing Indian support for the Dalai Lama and his followers who are demanding independence for Tibet. India had long-standing, traditional, cultural and regional ties with Tibet. When the Chinese military occupied Tibet, India offered shelter to the exiled Tibetans which had a highly negative impact on relations between the two countries. Besides, India’s close proximity to erstwhile Soviet Russia and China abundant support to Pakistan also deteriorated each other’s relations (ibid: 162).

The Sino-Indian relations received setback in May 1998 when India justified its nuclear tests by citing potential threats from China. Even the then Indian Defence Minister George Fernades cited China as the number one threat to India. However, in June 1999, during the Kargil crisis, external Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh visited Beijing and stated that India did not consider China as threat. Continuing the trend of friendly relations, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao invited Prime Minister Vajpayee to visit China in June 2003. They recognised the common goals of both countries and made the commitment to build a ‘long term constructive and co-operative partnership’ to peacefully promote their mutual political and economic goals without encroaching upon their good relations with other countries. In Beijing, Prime Minister Vajpayee proposed the designation of special representatives to discuss the border dispute at political level, a process that is still underway. In 2003, India formally recognised Tibet as part of China, and China recognised Sikkim as a formal part of India in 2004.

But now the Sino-Indian relations have been changed according to global context (more pragmatic manner). Now both are recognised as world’s booming economy and foreign investment hub. Today, India China is engaged in bilateral, regional and multilateral problems. The simultaneous emergence of India and China as Asian and global power in fact, makes it imperative for them to be sensitive to each other’s interest and aspirations. The demands from the two countries that they work together to mutually support their rightful place in the comity of nations (ibid: 164).

**Indo-Pakistan Relations**

India and Pakistan, two nations united by history but divided by destiny, has travelled a long way in an attempt to bring peace to the highly volatile valley. Peace is still a ‘far sighted dream’ which every Kashmiri nurtures in their minds. An eye for an eye and tooth for a tooth policy, has transformed Kashmir valley, once an epitome of romance and beauty to a land with painful tales of human suffering and mayhem. The picturesque scenes of blissful beauty blessed by the heavens are stained by human beings in a battle to defend or expand their territorial ambitions. The word occasional ‘WARS’ brought with it death and misery to both of the states.

**Conflict over Kashmir**

The Partition of India in 1947 created two large countries independent from Britain: Pakistan as two wings in the East and West separated by India in the middle. Soon, after independence, India and Pakistan established diplomatic relations with each other. Subsequent years were marked by bitter periodic conflict, and the nations went to war four times. The war in 1971 ended in defeat and another partition of Pakistan. The eastern wing split off as a new country named Bangladesh, while the western wing continued as Pakistan.

Kashmir was a princely state, ruled by a Hindu, Hari Singh. The Maharaja of Kashmir was equally hesitant to join either India,—because he knew his Muslim subjects would not like to join a Hindu-based or Pakistan — which as a Hindu he was personally averse to both the ideas. Pakistan coveted the Himalayan kingdom, while Indian leader Mahatama Gandhi and Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru hoped that the kingdom would join India. Hari Singh signed a
Standstill Agreement (preserving status quo) with Pakistan, but did not make his decision by August 15, 1947.

Rumours spread in Pakistan that Hari Singh was trying to accede Kashmir to India. Alarmed by this threat, a team of Pakistani forces were dispatched into Kashmir, fearing an Indian invasion of the region. Backed by Pakistani paramilitary forces, Pakistani tribal warlords invaded Kashmir in September 1947. Kashmir’s security forces were too weak and ill-equipped to fight against Pakistan. Troubled by the deteriorating political pressure that was being applied to Hari Singh and his governance, the Maharaja asked for India's help. In 1957, north-western Kashmir was fully integrated into Pakistan, becoming Free Kashmir (Pakistan-administered Kashmir), while the other portion was acceded to Indian control, and the state of Jammu and Kashmir (Indian-administered Kashmir) was created. In 1962, China occupied Aksai Chin, the northeastern region bordering Ladak. In 1984, India launched Operation Meghdoot and captured more than 80 per cent of the Siachin Glacier.

Pakistan maintains Kashmir’s rights to self-determination through a plebiscite in accordance with an earlier Indian statement and a UN Resolution. Pakistan also points to India’s failure of not understanding its own political logic and applying it to Kashmir, by taking their opinion on the case of the accession of Junagadh as an example (that the Hindu majority state should have gone to India even though it had a Muslim ruler), that Kashmir should also rightfully and legally have become a part of Pakistan since majority of the people were Muslim, even though they had a Hindu ruler. Pakistan also states that at the very least, the promised plebiscite should be allowed to decide the fate of the Kashmiri people.

India on the other hand asserts that the Maharaja’s decision, which was the norm for every other princely state at the time of independence, and subsequent elections, for over 40 years, on Kashmir has made it an integral part of India. This opinion has often become controversial, as Pakistan asserts that the decision of the ruler of Junagadh also adhered to Pakistan. Due to all such political differences, this dispute has also been the subject of wars between the two countries in 1947 and 1965, and a limited conflict in 1999. The state/province remains divided between the two countries by the Line of Control (LoC), which demarcates the ceasefire line agreed upon in the 1947 conflict.

**China -Pakistan Friendship**

Sino-Pakistani relations began in 1950 when Pakistan was among the first countries to break relations with the Republic of China on Taiwan and recognize the People’s Republic of China. Following the Sino-Indian hostilities of 1962, Pakistan’s relations with the PRC became stronger; since then, the two countries have regularly exchanged high-level visits resulting in a variety of agreements. The PRC has provided economic and military, and technical assistance to Pakistan. The alliance remains strong.

Favorable relations with China have been a pillar of Pakistann’s foreign policy. China strongly supported Pakistan’s opposition to Soviet involvement in Afghanistan and was perceived by Pakistan as a regional counterweight to India and the Soviet Union. The PRC and Pakistan also share a close military relation, with China supplying a range of modern armaments to the Pakistani defence forces. Lately, military cooperation has deepened with joint projects producing armaments ranging from fighter jets to guided missile frigates. Chinese cooperation with Pakistan has reached high economic points with substantial investment from China in Pakistani infrastructural expansion, including the noted project in the Pakistani port in Gawder.
Creation of Bangladesh

Pakistan, since independence, was geo-politically divided into two major regions, West Pakistan and East Pakistan. East Pakistan was occupied mostly by Bengali speaking Muslims. In December 1971, following a political crisis in East Pakistan, the situation soon spiraled out of control in East Pakistan and India intervened in favor of the rebelling Bengali populace. The conflict, a brief but bloody war, resulted in an independence of East Pakistan. In the war, the Pakistani army swiftly fell to India, forcing the independence of East Pakistan, which separated and became Bangladesh. The Pakistani military, being a thousand miles from its base and surrounded by enemies, was forced to give in. In this matter Pakistan blamed India’s intervention in internal matter and relation has gone down between two states.

Shimla Agreement

The liberation of Bangladesh led to the fall of Yahaya Khan in Pakistan and President Zulfikar Ali Bhutto assumed Power. Soon he showed willingness to improve relation with India and agree to take part in a summit meeting at Shimla. The meeting was actually held from 28th June to 2nd July 1972, which resulted in the conclusion of Shimla agreement. Under this agreement both India and Pakistan agreed to settle their difference through bilateral negotiation in a peaceful manner. The two countries expressed faith on the principles of peaceful co-existence and non-intervention in each others internal matters are approved. In short Shimla agreement expressed the hope that in future the relations of two countries would takes a normal course and the tension of past year would end.

Indo-Pak Relationship after 1998

The then Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif pledged in election manifesto to restore peace and unity with India. But aftermath nuclear explosions at Chaggai and Pokharan created fresh tension between the two countries. The critical involvement of china to provide nuclear know how to Pakistan has made our relation little bitter. Anyway both of the counties decided no-first use of nuclear weapon. But recent days the capturing of power by fundamentalist force (Taliban) in Pakistan created a worldwide concern for the use nuclear weapon. The strained relation has been culminated in Kargil war in 1999.

Agra Summit

After the Kargil war Pakistan internal government attempted a military coup. President Pervez Muszhraf came as the state head. The world including US and India denounced the undemocratic and military government. But India again tired to reestablish the normal relation with Pakistan. India and Pakistan talk started in historic city of Agra. However, the summit collapsed after two days and no formal agreement could be attained. The two sides remained inflexible on the core issue of Kashmir, despite five long and arduous one-to-one rounds between the two leaders and hours of discussion between the two delegations. Despite the failure of the talks, General Pervez Muszhraf joined Vajpayee to call on the two countries to bury their past. He also invited the Indian Prime Minister to visit Pakistan as he felt that the issues between Pakistan and India were much more complicated and could not be resolved in a short time. Many initiatives were taken by Indian government to keep normal relation with Pakistan. But rise of fundamentalist activities in both the side of border is making the issue complicated day-by-day. The peace activities like, Samjhota express connecting two states, Delhi-Lahore bus service, Thar express are gone in vain due to the recent infiltration in border area and terrorist attacks.
Indo-Bangladesh relations

Both Bangladesh and India are part of what is known as the Indian Subcontinent and have had a long common cultural, economic and political history. To most outsiders the people of the two countries are largely indistinguishable. The cultures of the two countries are similar; in particular Bangladesh and India's state West Bengal are both Bengali-speaking. However, since the partition of the Indian sub-continent in 1947, India emerged as an independent state and Bangladesh (as East Pakistan) was allocated as a part of Pakistan. Following the bloody Liberation War, Mujihhur Rehman during 1971, and Bangladesh gained her independence and established relations with India. The political relationship between India and Bangladesh has passed through cycles of hiccups. India has been described as a 'difficult neighbor' by many Bangladeshies. The relationship typically becomes favorable for Bangladesh during periods of Awami Leauge government.

During the Partition of India after independence in 1947, the Bengal region was divided into two: East Bengal (present-day Bangladesh) and West Bengal. East Bengal was made a part of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan due to the fact that both regions had an overwhelmingly large Muslim population, more than 85 per cent. In 1955, the government of Pakistan changed its name from East Bengal to East Pakistan.

Historical knot between India-Bangladesh

There were some confrontations between the two regions though. Firstly, in 1948, Muhammad Ali Jinnah declared that only Urdu would be the official language of the entire nation, though more than 95% of the East Bengali population spoke Bengali. And when protests broke out in Bangladesh on Feb 21, 1952, Pakistani police fired on the protesters, killing hundreds. Secondly, East Bengal/East Pakistan was allotted only a small amount of revenue for its development out of the Pakistani national budget. Therefore, a separatist movement started to grow in the isolated province. When the main separatist party the Awami League, headed by Mujihhur Rehman, won 167 of 169 seats up for grabs in the 1970 elections and got the right to form the government, the Pakistan president under Yahaya Khan refused to recognize the election results and arrested Sheikh Mujibur Rahman. This led to widespread protests in East Pakistan and in 1971, the Liberation war, followed by the declaration (by Sheikh Mujibur Rahman on 7 March 1971) of the independent state of Bangladesh.

India under Indira Gandhi fully supported the cause of the Bangladeshis and its troops and equipment were used to fight the Pakistani forces. The Indian Army also gave full support to the main Bangladeshi guerrilla force, the Mukti Bahini. Finally, on 26 March, 1971, Bangladesh emerged as an independent state. Since then, there have been several issues of agreement as well as of dispute.

India played a central role in the independence of Bangladesh. About 250,000 Indian soldiers fought for, and 20,000 losing their lives for the cause of an independent Bangladesh. India sheltered over 10 million refugees who were fleeing the atrocities of the occupying West Pakistan Army. India and its ally Bhutan were the first countries to recognize Bangladesh as an independent nation. Bangladeshis have some awareness of their obligation and gratitude towards India. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman’s first foreign visit as Prime Minister and the Founding Father of the newly born nation was to India and it was then decided Indo-Bangladesh relations would be guided by principles of democracy, socialism, nonalignment and opposition to colonialism and racism. Indira Gandhi too visited Bangladesh in 1972 and assured that India would never interfere in the internal affairs of the country. In 1972, both the countries signed a 'Treaty of
Friendship and Peace’. An Indo-Bangladesh Trade Pact was also signed. The mainstream party Awami League is generally considered to be friendly towards India.

**Contentious issues**

A major area of contention has been the construction and operation of the Frakka Barrage by India to increase water supply in the river Hoogly. Bangladesh insists that it does not receive a fair share of the Ganga waters during the drier seasons, and gets flooded during the monsoons when India releases excess waters. There have also been disputes regarding the transfer of Teen Bigha Corridors to Bangladesh. Part of Bangladesh is surrounded by the Indian state of West Bengal. On 26 June, 1992, India leased teen Bigha lands to Bangladesh to connect this enclave with mainland Bangladesh. There is dispute regarding the indefinite nature of the lease. Indian border force’s killing of people while crossing the border has been the topic of disputes. In August 2008, Indian Border Security Froce officials said that they killed 59 smugglers and illegal immigrants (34 Bangladeshis and 21 Indians) who were trying to cross the border between India and Bangladesh during a 6 month period. On November 16, 2008, 3 people including a women and her child were shot dead in a Bangladeshi village by a drunken BSF soldier before he was apprehended. Terrorist activities carried out by outfits based in both countries, like Banga Sena and Harkat-ul-Jihad-al Islami. Recently India and Bangladesh had agreed to jointly fight terrorism.

**India-Sri Lanka Relations**

The two major factors influencing India’s relations with Sri Lanka have been security and the shared ethnicity of Tamils living in southern India and in northern and eastern Sri Lanka. In the mid-1950s, and coinciding with the withdrawal of Britain’s military presence in the Indian Ocean, India and Sri Lanka increasingly came to share regional security interests. In the 1970s, New Delhi and Colombo enjoyed close ties on the strength of relationship between Mrs Indira Gandhi and Sri Lanka’s prime minister, Mrs Sirimavo Ratwatte Dias Bandaranaike. India fully approved Sri Lanka’s desire to replace the British security umbrella with an Indian one, and both sides pursued a policy of non-alignment and cooperated to minimize Western influence in the Indian Ocean.

In the 1980s, the ethnic conflict between Sri Lanka Sinhalese in the south and Sri Lankan Tamils in the north escalated, and Tamil separatists established bases and received funding, weapons, and reportedly, training in India. The secret assistance came from private sources and, according to some observers, the state government of Tamil Nadu, and was tolerated by the central Government until 1987. Anti-Tamil violence in Colombo in July 1983 prompted India to intervene in the Tamil-Sinhalese conflict, but mediatory efforts failed to prevent the deterioration of situation. In May 1987, after the Sri Lankan government attempted to regain control of Jaffna region in the extreme northern area of island by means of an economic blockade and military action, India supplied food and medicine by air and sea to region. On 29 July 1987, Indian Prime minister Rajiv Gandhi and Sri Lankan President Junius Richard Jayawardene signed an accord to settle the conflict by sending the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) to establish order, disarm Tamil separatists to establish new administrative bodies, hold elections to accommodate Tamil demands for autonomy, and to repatriate Tamil refugees in India and Sri Lanka. The LTTE refused to disarm, and Indian troops sustained heavy casualties while failing to destroy the LTTE. In June 1989, the newly elected Sri Lankan president Ranasinghe Premadasa demanded the withdrawal of IPKF. Despite the tensions between the two countries created by this request, New Delhi completed the withdrawal in March 1990.
Bilateral relations improved somewhat in early 1990s, as the government attempted to expand economic, scientific, and cultural cooperation. The May 1991 assassination of Rajiv Gandhi, allegedly by LTTE, forced New Delhi to crack down on the LTTE presence in Tamil Nadu and institute naval patrols in Palk Straits to prohibit LTTE movements to India. Since 2000, the two countries are working towards strengthening bilateral relations in all fields of mutual interest, especially in the economic sector. In September 2002, Sri Lanka started negotiating with LTTE for a peaceful settlement. India was taken into confidence. In joint statements, India and Sri Lanka had agreed that global terrorism is a threat to international peace and security. They agree that terrorists’ acts cannot be justified on political, ethnic, religious, social and economic grounds. The visit of newly elected President of Sri Lanka, Mahinda Rajapakse, to India from 27-30 December 2005, reinforced the close bilateral relationship that two countries already share. (Biswal eds., 2009:169–70)

India-Nepal Relations

Relations between India and Nepal are close yet fraught with difficulties stemming from geography, economics, the problems inherent in big power-small power relations, and common ethnic, linguistic and cultural identities that overlap the two countries’ borders. New Delhi and Kathmandu initiated their intertwined relationship with the 1950 Indo-Nepal Treaty of Peace and Friendship and accompanying letters that defined security relations between the two countries, and an agreement governing both bilateral trade and trade transiting Indian soil. The 1950 treaty and letters stated that ‘neither government shall tolerate any threat to the security of the other by a foreign aggressor’ and obligated both sides ‘to inform each other of any serious friction or misunderstanding with any neighboring state likely to cause any breach in the friendly relations subsisting between the two governments’. These accords cemented a ‘special relationship’ between India and Nepal that granted Nepal preferential economic treatment and provided Nepalese in India the same economic and educational opportunities as Indian citizens.

In the 1950s, Nepal welcomed close relations with India, but as the number of Nepalese living and working in India increased and the involvement of India in Nepal's economy deepened in the 1960s and after, so too did Nepalese discomfort with the special relationship. Tensions came to a head in the mid-1970s, when Nepal pressed for substantial amendments in its favor in the trade and transit treaty and openly criticized India’s 1975 annexation of Sikkim as an Indian state. In 1975 King Bir Bikram Dev proposed that Nepal be recognized internationally as a zone of peace; he received support from China and Pakistan. In New Delhi’s view, if the king’s proposal did not contradict the 1950 treaty and was merely an extension of nonalignment, it was unnecessary; if it was a repudiation of the special relationship, it represented a possible threat to India’s security and could not be endorsed. In 1984 Nepal repeated the proposal, but there was no reaction from India. Nepal continually promoted the proposal in international forums, with Chinese support; by 1990 it had won the support of 112 countries.

In 1978 India agreed to separate trade and transit treaties, satisfying a long-term Nepalese demand. In 1988, when the two treaties were up for renewal, Nepal's refusal to accommodate India's wishes on the transit treaty caused India to call for a single trade and transit treaty. Thereafter, Nepal took a hard-line position that led to a serious crisis in India-Nepal relations. After two extensions, the two treaties expired on March 23, 1989, resulting in a virtual Indian economic blockade of Nepal that lasted until late April 1990. Although economic issues were a major factor in the two countries’ confrontation, Indian dissatisfaction with Nepal's 1988 acquisition of Chinese weaponry played an important role. New Delhi perceived the arms purchase as an indication of Katmandu’s intent to build a military relationship with Beijing, in violation of the 1950 treaty and letters exchanged in 1959 and 1965, which included Nepal in
India’s security zone and precluded arms purchases without India’s approval. India linked security with economic relations and insisted on reviewing India-Nepal relations as a whole. Nepal had to back down after worsening economic conditions led to a change in Nepal’s political system, in which the king was forced to institute a parliamentary democracy. The new government sought quick restoration of amicable relations with India.

The special security relationship between New Delhi and Kathmandu was reestablished during the June 1990 New Delhi meeting of Nepal's Prime Minister Krishna Prasad Bhattarai and Indian Prime Minister V.P Singh. During the December 1991 visit to India by Nepalese Prime Minister Girija Prasad Koirala, the two countries signed new, separate trade and transit treaties and other economic agreements designed to provide Nepal additional economic benefits.

In 2005, after King Gyanedra took over, Nepalese relations with India soured. However, after the restoration of democracy, in 2008, Prachanda, the Prime Minister of Nepal, visited India, in September 2008. He spoke about a new dawn, in the bilateral relations, between the two countries. He spoke about a new dawn, in their relations. He said, ‘I am going back to Nepal as a satisfied person. I will tell Nepali citizens back home that a new era has dawned. Time has come to effect a revolutionary change in bilateral relations. On behalf of the new government, I assure you that we are committed to make a fresh start’. He met Indian Prime minister, Manmohan Singh and Foreign Minister, Pranab Mukharjee. He asked India to help Nepal frame a new constitution, and to invest in Nepal’s infrastructure, and its tourism industry.

In 2008, Indo-Nepali ties got a further boost with an agreement to resume water talks after a year disagreement. The Nepalese Water Resources Secretary Shanker Prasad Koirala said the Nepal-India Joint Committee on Water Resources meet decided to start the reconstruction of breached Kosi embankment after the water level goes down. During the Nepal PM’s visit to New Delhi in September the two Prime Ministers expressed satisfaction at the age-old close, cordial and extensive relationships between their states and expressed their support and cooperation to further consolidate the relationship.

The two issued a 22-point statement highlighting the need to review, adjust and update the 1950 Treaty of Peace and Friendship, amongst other agreements. India would also provide a credit line of up to 150 crore rupees to Nepal to ensure uninterrupted supplies of petroleum products, as well as lift bans on the export of rice, wheat, maize, sugar and sucrose for quantities agreed to with Nepal. India would also provide 20 crore as immediate flood relief. In return, Nepal will take measures for the ‘promotion of investor friendly, enabling business environment to encourage Indian investments in Nepal’. Furthermore, a three-tier mechanism at the level of ministerial, secretary and technical levels will be built to push forward discussions on the development of water resources between the two sides. Politically, India acknowledged a willingness to promote democracy and a constitutional government to establish there.

**Indo-Bhutan Relations**

Bhutan was a protectorate state for British Raj which was guiding its foreign and trade policies till 1949. On August 8 1949 Bhutan and India signed the Treaty of Friendship, calling for peace between the two nations and non-interference in each other’s internal affairs. However, Bhutan agreed to let India ‘guide’ its foreign policy and both nations would consult each other closely on foreign and defence affairs. The treaty also established free trade and extradition protocols.

India also provided Bhutan with developmental assistance and cooperation in infrastructure, telecommunications, industry, energy, medicine, and animal husbandry. Since joining the UN in 1971, Bhutan has increasingly established its international status in a concerted
effort to avoid the fate of Sikkim’s absorption into India following the reduction of Sikkim’s indigenous people to minority status. His Majesty the king of Bhutan, Jigme Singye Wangchuck visited India from 1–4 August 2005. Bilateral cooperation in several sectors, including hydropower, health, education, human resource development, information technology and infrastructure was further strengthened during the year (Biswal eds., 2009:173–74).

**Indo-Myanmar Relations**

India has a 1670 kilometers of long land border with Myanmar along the strategic eastern frontier. Relations between India and Myanmar date back to the third century BC, when Buddhism reached Myanmar from India. During British colonial era for a period of over 50 years Myanmar was under the administrative control of British India. The struggle against colonial rule brought the national leaders of the two countries together. Till Gen Ne Win seized power India and Myanmar shared the common ethos of nonalignment. Strategically for India’s national security, a friendly regime in Myanmar is vital importance. However, with the rise of Myanmar’s military regime, the two countries fell apart. In the meanwhile China is cultivating a strong relationship with it since early 70s.

The pro democratic uprising in Myanmar in the leadership of Aung San Suu Kyi has created another bolt against the Indo-Myanmar relations. India’s moral support to the struggle for democracy under the leadership led to further souring between the two countries. The Indian government awarded the Jawaharlal Nehru Peace Prize in 1995 to Aung San Suu Kyi as a token of its appreciation of her contribution to democracy in Myanmar. Jaswant Singh, the then foreign minister of Vajpayee government in 1998, was the architect of realism in seeing Myanmar as a land and sea bridge towards the Asian region. During this phase (which continues to date), there have been military to military dialogues and political rapprochement. The stakes have also included management of the security situation in the North-east. Initiatives like BIMSTEC also took off during this period also continuing till now. In recent years India is enhancing its relation with ASEAN (in which Myanmar is a member) in search of better economic and security prospect.

**Regional Cooperations**

The improvement of relations with neighbouring nations is the one of the major aim of Indian foreign policy. India has made a number of attempts to ensure peace in the region. The active involvement of which brought serious threat to its internal policy process- the terrorist activities are always made against it. With this scenario India fought many wars with its neighbour. But the emergence of South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) is one of the measure attempt made by India to establish peace instead of bloodshed.

In December 1985 the heads of states and government of seven South Asian countries viz, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka held a summit meeting at Dhaka. After due declarations they unanimously decided to set up a Secretariat and the inception of the SAARC came into existence. The Declaration stated the objective of association as promotion of welfare of people, improvement in the quality of life of people, acceleration of economic growth; promotion of collective self-reliance; promotion of mutual trust and strengthening regional cooperation in these bases.

The formation of SAARC was welcomed and a hope was expressed that it would contribute to the economic development of the region as a whole regardless of size and geographical location. The 14th SAARC summit Afghanistan is admitted as eight member of it. Along with it China, Japan European Union (EU), Republic of Korea and the US invited as observer. The summit tried to strengthen, the intra-regional connectivity, particularly physical;
and economic and people-to-people relation for the smooth flow of goods, services, technologies, culture, capital, and ideas in the region. Member states decided to earmark one rural community as SAARC village in each member state to showcase innovative models.

Member states called for an extension of SAARC Regional Multimodal Transport Study (SRMTS) to include Afghanistan as well. They noted the offer of India to conduct the meet in New Delhi. All of the members agreed to bring concrete benefits by the SAARC Development Fund (SDF). They acknowledged the need of expediting development of conventional sources of energy development such as in hydropower, bio fuel, solar and wind. They appreciated the first ever discussion named—South Asia Energy Dialogue. They reiterated their deep concern at continued degradation of environment and reaffirmed the strengthening of cooperation in relation to conservation and protection of environment. They expressed deep concern over global climate change and the sea level rising.

Now with the changing global scenario member states decided to strengthen their cooperation in the field of information and communication technology. They wanted to create strong ties to realize the free trade agreement (SAFTA) under SAARC, which was ratified. They acknowledged the importance of intra-regional trade, tourism, cultural exchange of student, civil society and policy makers. To increase the people-to-people programme, they come up with the idea to establishing SAARC University in New Delhi. SAARC member countries also added emphasize on the poverty alleviation and disaster management issues. SAARC Food Bank was created to eradicate food shortage in the region. After that member countries tried to exchange their knowledge to improve agriculture sector, research in farm and develop farmers’ linkage in the region. Additional efforts were made to combat terrorism and separatist movement in the region.

**India And South East Asia**

India’s trade, security and energy ties with East Asia and the Pacific region is set to grow rapidly in the coming years. Southeast Asia and China are already two of our largest trading partners in this region, and Korea and Japan among the leading investors in our country. These ties will grow manifold in the coming years and would need sustained political, economic and security dialogue mechanisms for institutionalized support. The EAS, ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF) and BIMSTEC (Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and Economic Cooperation, member countries agrees to focus on specific areas of cooperation, including but not limited to trade & investment, transport & communications, tourism, energy, human resources development, agriculture, fisheries, science & technology and people-to-people contact.) and emerging strategic partnerships are elements of India’s engagement with East and Southeast Asia, the core of its ‘Look East Policy’.

Singapore is today an important investment and trading partner and also provides the base for other East Asian countries to invest in India. It is our hope that the full implementation of the Comprehensive Economic Cooperation Agreement (CECA) signed with Singapore in 2005 - the first of its kind for India - will further generate economic integration between India and Singapore, and provide the base for new and wider opportunities for trade, investment, energy and defence ties with all of ASEAN. New areas of defence cooperation including joint training facilities are emerging and supplementing existing cooperation between India and Singapore in the naval, maritime and counter-terrorism spheres.

Though India has been engaging ASEAN since 1992, the level of its engagement is still much less than that of other powers like China. Because Beijing recently announced a $10-billion China-ASEAN Fund Investment Cooperation and $15 billion worth of commercial credit
to support infrastructure development in this region. And in November, the US will hold a long-awaited summit with the grouping, close on the heels of its accession to ASEAN’s Treaty of Amity and Cooperation. Despite less interactions between ASEAN members in recent meeting Prime Minister offered a proposal to host the 10th summit of South-east Asian grouping of 2012 (Hindu, 25 October, 2009).

India welcomes the three-nation initiative on monitoring shipping through Compulsory Pilot age project of Indonesia, Malaysia and Singapore. Subject to the desire of the littoral states, as a major user-state, India would be willing to assist the project in whatever capacity is deemed suitable. India has developed capabilities in various aspects of maritime security and would be most willing to share its expertise with countries of the region. India is taking steps to join the Container Security Initiative and has identified the Nava Sheva port for purposes of executing this initiative. The Indian Navy has initiated several maritime security and capacity building measures such as countering piracy by joint exercises (specifically with Indonesia); it returned the Allondra Rainbow ship (The capture of the MV Alondra Rainbow in October 1999 in a coordinated action by the Indian Coast Guard and the Indian Navy was hailed as a path breaking and a very well coordinated effort by the Security Forces who were able to apprehend the Vessel as well as capture the Pirates. The maritime community all over the world acclaimed it as a great action that has long term impact in the manner Nations would react to such acts of terrorism at sea). To the Japanese authorities from pirates and participated in Tsunami relief measures in Sri Lanka, Indonesia and Maldives. The establishment of a Regional Marine Training centre has been discussed at the ARF Workshop and the ARF Senior Officers Meeting. Such a Centre would go a long way in establishing common understanding and common procedures. India would be happy to be associated with this initiative. Consistent with their global strategic partnership and the new framework for our defence relationship, India and the United States have committed themselves to a comprehensive cooperation in ensuring a secure maritime domain. Similar initiatives have been taken with other maritime partners also.

India and United Nations

India was one of the founding members of UN at the end of the Second World War. India adheres completely and absolutely to the principles and the purposes of the United Nations Charter. The Indian contribution to the world peace has time to time revitalized by its contribution to various peace keeping missions. However, India’s role in disarmament and respect for human right also embark the ethos of UN.

Major landmarks of India’s involvement in United Nations activities are many. India basically played a non-combative, yet effective role in Korea. It sent a medical battalion as part of United Nations forces during the Korean War. India’s political creditability as an impartial and firm advocate of peace, and as a non-participant in the Cold War was very high So, Indian armed forces were invited to form the major element of United Nations peace-keeping operations in Congo, Gaza, Lebanon, Cyprus and other conflicting region in Middle East. India in 1990s also contributed peace-keeping forces to Cambodia, Mozambique, Angola, Sudan and Rwanda. The professional competence and impartiality of Indian commanders were acknowledged by the United Nations with some of our senior officers like General Thimayya, General Prem Chand, General Rikhye and General Satish Nambiar being chosen by the United Nations’ Secretaries-General to command the UN peace-keeping forces at different points of time from the 1950s to 1992-93 (Dixit,2003:260).

India’s deep interest in the collective prosperity of developing nations resulted in its leading role to establish United Nations Commissions for Trade and Development (UNCTAD), the G-77 and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and many specialised agencies of the
UN. India has always made significant effort to bridge the gap between economically, technically efficient north bloc with poor, less efficient south bloc.

India is also a leading country which promotes non-discriminatory, non-proliferation and mass destruction. After the end of Cold War, the reform proposal for United Nations Security Council (UNSC) came to inception. But India failed to come up with any concrete proposal outlines. The major issue was that the present members of UNSC were from Europe and America. They have their veto power which plays decisive role in UN decision making process. China is the only Asian country, so, expansion of membership may bring new nations who are playing significant role in world politics. In this manner, India wants to establish an equal, multi-polar world—different than the present one.

India And Commonwealth

The commonwealth is a voluntary association of independent states united by common purposes, and functions with a common language, English. It has a staff of about 280 in London and a budget of about 35 millions of Pound Sterling, in a year. The member countries provide various services covering political and economic consensus; trade, debt; investment and technological aid. Initially, there was a considerable opinion against the Commonwealth, then known as the British Commonwealth, as relic of the colonial days. But after 1950 India became republic state i.e. defines India denied its colonial connection with British monarchy. During 1950s the membership of Commonwealth was static. After 1957 the new independent states of African countries joined the organization. Consequently the African issues dominated the association.

The leaders like Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi initiated many measures for the success of it. The Rhodesian problem had been resolved in the Commonwealth by the year 1980s. Abolition of the policy of apartheid towards South Africa, dominated the organization’s primary aim till 1990. In the year 1994 South Africa got its independence from white rulers.

As a founding member of the modern Commonwealth and with 60 per cent of the organization’s total population, India always exercise great leverage to influence Commonwealth’s decision making. India is attached to the Commonwealth for several reasons. It is not an association with deals in bilateral disputes between member countries and there are several examples of these— India and Pakistan, Namibia and Botswana, Solomon Islands and Papua New Guinea, Nigeria and Cameroon. In reference to it there is a convention that there is no exercise of Commonwealth mediation or ‘good offices’ without the specific agreement of parties concerned. This is very much in the line of Indian spirit of non indulgence of— third party.

In the past decades, the Commonwealth has played definite role in Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, Zimbabwe, and Papua New Guinea; in the Solomon Island. India has played significant role in the summit level conferences of the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meeting (CHOGM). In recent developments India is hosting next Commonwealth Game in its capital Delhi. Now the meeting of CHOGM is supposed to take place in Trinidad and Tobago, November 2009. Many issues related to the global food crisis, climate change and environmental sustainability, eradication of are to be discussed. It’s clear that the issues raised are of important for India to tackle in its region. So, the cooperation between the nations is need of the hour.

India: An Emerging Power

The tremendous changes have overtaken India and rest of the world in the course of last 58 years since its Independence. Everyone knows that in the global village that the world has become today, nobody and no nation can afford to stay in splendid isolation. At the dawn of
independence, we had the supreme privilege of inheriting a legacy, which many other nations that become Independent around the same time did not have. Leaders with foresight, high ideals, spirit of tolerance steered India to the vanguard of nations that have achieved a high degree of solidarity, making this country a power to reckon with the global affairs.

India is stable democratic polity. It has a constitutional system of government which has been working efficiently even after 60 years of independence. Despite the undemocratic developments happening in Pakistan, Myanmar and occasionally in Bangladesh have surprised world. The unpredictable fate of democracy in most of the African countries also became unhealthy atmosphere to adjust. During 1950s, Indian freedom struggle through the non-violent ways has caught the attention of great leaders across the world. Jawaharlal Nehru, the first prime minister of India had a basic grounding of world affairs which many other world leaders did not have. Till the time he was at the helm of affairs, he did not see any virtue to align himself with a world divided by Cold War. And there were many countries in Asia, Africa and the Pacific who saw indisputable logic in India’s stand to stay nonaligned with.

Together with President Nasser of Egypt and Tito of Yugoslavia, Nehru evolved the concept of Non-Alignment. For years to come of Non-Alignment Movement become a powerful force in world affairs. The Brioni meeting of Nehru, Tito and Nasser was followed by the Bandung Conference. India’s unique strength of positive neutrality helped find a solution to the Korean War, the Suez Canal crisis and other major international crises. Great Indians struck a chord in great minds like Martin Luther King and US President John F Kennedy. Martin Luther King followed in the footsteps of Gandhiji and become a victim in the cause of racial equality. In recent days India is the one of the youngest democratic nation in the world which as liberal economy next to USA.

With the collapse of the Soviet empire the concept of balance of power was gone forever. The epoch-making demise of USSR, and the emergence of Russia and other states in their new avatar, brought USA to the top in the world affairs as a unilateral power. The world was in for a cataclysmic change in terms of new alignments and new thrust in international trade. It was around this time that the reins of power were held by PV Narasimha Rao. Early in 1991, together with Manmohan Singh, India’s than finance minister launched economic liberalization. We now left behind the days of state control and ‘permit-control raj’.

While dealing a deadly blow to the machinery of red tape, globalization or liberalization encouraged private initiative in the economic development. Globalization becomes the new ‘mantra’ around the world and no nation could afford to remain detached from these winds of change. The days of India’s white elephants – Public Sector Undertakings (PSUs)—were now numbered. The country is now effectively run by liberal minded elite who are fiercely committed to democracy and human rights. The democratic nature of the state building is now created a robust environment based on law and order; i.e. the rule of law. This environment provides a very attractive roadway to Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) to flow in.

After 1990 India has changed its political commitment to more practical and realistic manner. This change has ushered an unprecedented expansion in the area of foreign policy expansion. A new priority area has emerged where India is building cooperation with countries like Japan, Brazil, Singapore, South Korea, Canada, Saudi Arabia and number of European countries. The idea of greater co-operation between India on the one hand and Brazil and South Africa on the other is already on the anvil. The idea that economic cooperation would lead to greater and more fruitful political cooperation is gaining ground. In the unipolar world, the
concept of non-alignment has become redundant. Even relatively powerful countries like China, Russia, France and Germany are very circumspect in their dealings with the sole superpower. All of them flow the policy of real politick. We have seen that this policy was virtually adopted by every country during the US–Iraq war. The increased interface with USA has ensured that USA is no longer seen as an adversarial power. Our cooperation with USA in Afghanistan and Nepal, and indeed in many peacekeeping missions across the world, are example of change in the foreign policy priorities. India is engaged in providing moral and material support to political reconstruction of democratic Nepal.

India’s role is crucial for ensuring and maintaining long-term peace, stable balance of power, economic growth and security in Asia. It is a core state whose role is crucial for the economic well-being, institution building, collective and cooperative security, economic integration and trade expansion and political and civilizational dialogue, essential for a growing Asia. It includes the land and maritime spaces between East and West, and provides potential energy and trade corridors to Central Asia and the Indian Ocean region. Responding to the challenges of globalization is one of the key issues faced by all nations today. As a pluralistic, democratic and English-speaking society, India is well placed to respond. India is playing a detrimental role in economic cooperation in BIMSTEC and SAFTA. India also entered into free trade area agreement with Sri Lanka and Bangladesh.

Regardless, India has a clear responsibility to share its newfound economic prosperity with its neighbours in South Asia. Bilateral economic cooperation with Bhutan, particularly in the power sector, is a clear example of what such cooperation can do to transform the economy of a small country. The possibility of economic cooperation with China, Iran, Saudi Arabia and Pakistan, holds tremendous promises but the success of such partnership is uncertain on account of existing territorial disputes with Pakistan and China. China is India’s largest neighbour and, therefore, developing friendly cooperation with China is one of the priorities of our foreign policy. With frequent high-level exchanges including Foreign Minister’s recent visit to China, the process of building trust and understanding has gained momentum and our relations have diversified across a wide range of areas. Our ties with China have reached a certain degree of maturity where we are determined to build upon our existing commonalities and identify newer areas of mutually beneficial cooperation. At the same time we are striving to address our differences in a proactive and purposive manner, without allowing them to affect the comprehensive development of our relationship.

The fact that India is already is the fourth largest economy next to China. In term of gross domestic product, calculated on purchasing power parity (PPP) basis, India is among the five largest economies, ahead of French and Britain. The confidence in Indian economy is likely to become an increasingly important instrument of India’s foreign policy in these years to come. Second to it, the demand for Indian software personnel in key economies of the world is growing, as is the appreciation for their contribution to the growth of new technologies in countries like United States of America.

As a founding member of the United Nations, India has been firmly committed to the principles and purposes of the United Nations and has consistently and significantly contributed to all aspects of its functioning. India has a long and illustrious history as one of the longest serving and largest troop contributors to the UN peacekeeping operations. India has also played a great role in seeking to address the deficiencies, inequities and problems in the existing global institutional arrangements. As we observe the 60th anniversary of the United Nations, there is unanimity among the member states that the United Nations is in need of urgent and comprehensive reform, in order to deal with numberless challenges of today’s world more
effectively. We believe that the reform and expansion of the United Nations Security Council, in both permanent and non-permanent categories, is central to the process of UN reform. The representation of developing countries from Africa, Asia and other regions, as permanent members of the Security Council is essential in this context. In this framework, India is pursuing its candidature for permanent membership of the Security Council.

However, India’s political and economic relations with existing major powers and emerging powers will have a major impact on future global political and economic governance. The assessment of Indian foreign policy shows that it seeks to enhance its power and influence by enhancing bilateral cooperation with the US, the EU, China and Russia. In the mean time, India also engaging itself to strengthen regional arrangements likes ASEAN, SAARC, G-20 and G-8 etc. India’s growing cooperation with Israel and US especially in the military field and continued growth of relation with Arab world showcase the deepening concern for our security and power. With this sustained effort for economic growth, the energy security, with modernization of Indian defense forces and with an emerging intelligent population India can establish itself as global power by the year 2020.
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What is globalization?

Globalization is commonly applied to the economy of international markets and the various impacts it has on social and cultural life. The IMF describes globalization as “the growing economic interdependence of countries world wide through its increasing volume and variety of cross border transactions in goods and services and international flows and also through the more rapid and wide spread diffusion of technology (cited in Martin Wolf, 2000, Why this Hatred of the Market?, in ‘The Globalization Reader’ ed. by Lechner and Boli, Blackwell). The basis of globalization is the emergence of a single social system characterized by world wide net work of economic, political and social relationships (Dasgutpta, 2004). The idea of globalization is a future world with a single economy based on the capitalist market principles and ultimately beneficial to all consumers and workers. Manfred B. Steger advocates “globalization is confined to a set of complex and sometimes contradictory social processes that are changing our current social condition based on modern system of independent nation-state (2006: 118).” Indeed most of the scholars of globalization have defined their key concept along those lines as a multi-dimensional set of social process that create, multiply, stretch and intensify world wide social interdependencies and exchanges, while at the same time fostering in people a growing awareness of deepening connections between the local and the distant (Harvey, 1989; Giddens, 1990; Robertson, 1992; Held and Mc Grew, 1999; Schulte, 2000). Castells suggests that globalization at its core is about the unprecedented compression of time and space as a result of political, economic and cultural changes as well as powerful technological changes (1996, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, 3Vols, Oxford: Blackwell). However, this process of globalization is not an all inclusive phenomenon. Robyn B. Driskell suggests that ‘the process of globalization usually describes the changes of the overall society or nation-state but rarely addresses the impacts on the local communities (2006:241).’ The world systems theory conceives of globalization as the extension of capitalism yet every one does not ultimately benefit. Immanuel Wallerstein (1979) says that the global system is a hierarchy of power in the international system: core, periphery and semi-periphery. The system of hierarchy is based on inequalities between the rich and poor nations. The idea of globalization can be better understood by its approaches.

Does globalization undermine the autonomy of nation-state?

Horsman and Marshall, (1995, ix) criticizing globalization said that the autonomy of the nation-state has definitely undergone change due to the international economic order. The traditional nation-state is under threat because economic internationalization is seen to undermine national sovereignty and weaken the nation-state's economic decision making power. National security of economic activity in this process is directly linked to internationalization of market rather than to so-called old fashioned nation-states. The changes that have occurred due to the interconnectivity among the national boundaries have made the bounded political communities and national sovereignties as redundant. There is, due to this changing notion, existing a tension between traditional forms of social and political membership and the interdependence the contemporary world has brought in. In this context citizenship has to part company with the nation-state and accompanying the notions of nation-state sovereignty. The restrictive rights of citizenship confined within the boundaries of the nation state have to given up in favour of membership in the world community and the universal rights. The other strand
has made it clear to take of different rights and differentiated citizenship for members of cultural communities.

Market became supreme in the sense that global economic flows permeate to every part of the world without any barrier by which act nation-states have been borderless. In this way the earlier established autonomy of the state gets deteriorated. The supra-national political institutions would replace the traditional institutions of nation- states. The role of the legislature, executive as well as other institutions of representation would be influenced by supra-national political institutions like WTO, World Bank, And IMF.

In addition, the globalists argue that the sheer quantity of money transacted daily on foreign exchange across the world renders the nation-state incapable of even controlling its own currency. With the speed and volume of transactions in global capital market, national governments cannot control exchange rates or protect their currencies, and potential leaders increasingly find themselves at the mercy of people and institutions making economic choices over which they have no control (K. Ohmae, 1995, Putting Global Logic First, Harvard Business Review: Jan-Feb, p-119)

Broadly speaking there are three approaches to globalization: hyper-globalists, skeptics and transformationalist (Held, et al. 1999). The hyper-globalists emphasize on the increasing level of interactions across the states that has led to a complex web of political, social and economic relations in today’s world. National boundaries are no longer act as water tight containers of the production process. Today fewer and fewer activities are oriented towards local or even national markets. And because of the increasingly complex ways in which production is organized across national boundaries rather than contained within them, the actual origin of human products is very difficult to determine. In the economic realm it is argued that two trends are apparent as a result of this.

First, the volume of international finance, trade and production has increased to such an extent that these activities are said to now cut across the borders of nations such that a truly integrate economy has emerged. Equally importantly, the manufacturing process itself now encompasses a plethora of production sites integrated against the world consisting of ‘producer-driven commodity chains (in industries, such as automobiles, computers, aircraft, electrical machinery), and buyer-driven commodity chains (in industries, such as, garment, footwear, toys, housewears). What is fundamental in this web-like industrial structure is that it is territorially spread through out the world, and its geometry keep changing. From the globlists point of view the spatial configuration of the production process has altered radically. Gone are the days of national production geared towards the local needs of the population, the contemporary world is one based on production chains and networks configured at a multiplicity of geographical scales from the local through to the global. Such networks are the structures through which different parts of the world are connected together through flows of material and non-material phenomena in a system of different power relationships.

Second, it is argued that this has impacted upon the autonomy of the state itself, drastically reducing its ability to control such economic flows. Globalists point to the increasing economic wherewithal of companies compared to the overall economic activity occurring within states.

The skeptics, however, antagonize the views led by globalists. They present an alternative view of the world, in which levels of international trade, production and finance of much earlier periods are compatible to today’s level of integration. In particular they also challenge the globalists vision of relatively unfettered trade across borders and their claim that
today’s multinational companies are footloose and fancy-free, regularly relocating their production facilities to wherever the operating costs are lowest. If this were so, they argue, we should also experience convergence in both the price of products and also wage levels. This patently is not the case, they argue, because if it were, ‘then how do we explain that German workers continue to earn almost double in the South or eleven times that in Thailand? Why does there continue to be such large variation among national economies not only the rewards to labour, but in profit margin as well? Additionally, they point to the fact that the prices of goods vary considerably across the world. If unfettered trade really existed, then local companies would be forced to compete with their international counterparts; therefore, we would expect greater price convergence between states than is currently observed.

In offering this alternative analysis, the sceptics call into question the globalists’ assumption that the power of the state is waning. If one believes that today’s corporations are really influential than most states and that they are truly footloose entities that are free to move from state to state, then political fatalism may follow. As Hirst and Thompson argue ‘one effect of the concept of globalization has been to paralyze radical reforming national strategies to see them as unfeasible in the face of the judgement and sanction of international markets… Globalization is a myth suitable for world without illusions, but it is also now that robs us hope.’ The sceptics argue that state continue to be significant actors on the world stage, with the means to control the activities within and across their borders.

Moreover, they argue, the core industrialized states have been active participants and the key architects behind economic globalization. For example, the OECD code of liberalization of capital movements has been instrumental in promoting the free flow of investments between these states. Sceptics also point to the continuing importance of states involvement in the management if the financial and monetary system. This is not to say that they do not recognize the changing nature of such regimes.

The third group, the transformationalists, however, occupies the middle ground between the gloablists and sceptics. Although they do not believe that we are currently living in a globalized world, they do believe that the world is more integrated and that the level of interactions, particularly of the economic kind between a variety of units (states, corporations, multilateral organizations, etc.) are unprecedented - Global economic activity is significantly greater relative to domestically-based activity than in previous historical periods and impinges directly or indirectly on a greater proportion on national economic activity than ever before.

**Economic Globalization**

The current phase of the economic internationalization in historical context, we do need to recognize the massive socio-economic transformations that occurred in the second half of the twentieth century. The golden age of capitalism stretching from 1950 to around 1973 saw a remarkable flourishing of productivity and gradual move toward a genuinely global free trade order. The Bretton Woods international financial order agreed by the main powers after the Second World War was premised on fixed exchange rates and closed capital accounts. This provided the legal underpinnings for the multilateral trade order and a long era of stability and legitimacy ensued. While this trading regime was clearly stratified and incorporation into it was uneven, it did set the basis for expanded capitalist incorporation into it was uneven; it did set the basis for expanded capitalist production across the globe.

From 1945 to 1985 global **free trade** predominated among the rich OECD (Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development) countries. Following the debt crisis of the 1980’s most of the developing countries of South followed suit and dismantled protection barriers. Then
in 1990’s they were joined by the once communist countries in the East that had too varying degrees been isolated from the capitalist market. A global market on this scale was simply unprecedented and signaled a massive expansion of capitalist relations and commodification across the globe. It was found that in 1950’ the intensity of trade links was 64 percent, but in 1990, trade intensity was measured at 95 percent (Held et al. 1995:167). So we can see that not only has the trade been much more extensive than in the past involving more countries and regions but it is also much more intensive than in the past involving more countries and regions, but it has also much more intensive as foreign trade because a more important component of most countries’ economic activity.

The growth of trade reached an unprecedented level in the post war period. Trade is higher relative to output than during the classical gold standard period. This merchandise trade points to structural breaks in many countries trade-GDP ratio in the 1970’s. However, in addition to merchandise trade, trade in services are recently available that also shows an upward trend. Trade in goods and services grow more rapidly than GDP over the 1990’s and is now equivalent to about 29 percent of world GDP from around 19 percent in 1990 (WTO, 2001:1).

Firms are increasingly able to divide the production process into different stages and locate them accordingly to comparative advantage – variously reformed to by different authors as ‘commodity chains, fragmentation, global production networks slicing up the value chain (Feenstra, 1998, Integration of Trade and disintegration of Production in the Global Economy, Journal of Economic Perspectives 122/4: 31-50; Kugman, 1995, Growing World Trade: Causes and Consequences, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, NO.1: 327-62, cited in Jonathan Perraton (2003) The Scope and Implication of Globalization in ‘A Handbook of Globalization, Cheltanhan: Edward Elgar) thus increasing trade in inputs and semi finished manufacturers. This has significantly increased the import content of manufactured goods in developed countries (except Japan) leading to the development of interdependent production process across countries.

Transportation costs and protectionist barriers are reduced in post war period and it helped the process to trade to excel. The command economies like China and Vietnam abandoned the protectionist policies and enter into the world trading system. An extensive trading system has developed since World War II. These extensive trading systems include regional patterns of trade, inter-regional trade and intraregional trade. Regional trading arrangements generally appear to be reducing rather than increasing global barriers to trade. The result of this is that trade has led to national markets for goods and services becoming increasingly enmeshed and to global ones emerging.

How has this trade grown up in post World War period? It is, partly, because of the growth of intra-industry trade as developed countries’ market for manufactures became increasingly enmeshed. However, since the mid-1980’s developing countries share of world trade has rises continuously largely due to increased manufactured exports. They share 30 percent of the merchandise exports, 27 percent of the manufactured exports, up from 17 percent in 1990 and 10 percent in 1980 (WTO, 2001: 3-4).

Export growth through their incorporation into the world economy has been central to the development of these newly industrializing economies (NIEs). The growth of these NIEs has led to increased differentiation between developing countries in terms of income levels, wages and the products they export. This growth has been highly concentrated on a small number of courtiers and markets for primary commodities, which still predominate in the least developed countries and markets for manufactured exports are limited and it is questionable how far the export performance of the NIEs could be emulated by developing countries on a wide scale without leading to falling terms of trade (Rowthorn, R. 2001, ‘Replicating the Experiences of
With increased national enmeshment within global trading order came a need to regulate and institutionalize that regime. The GATT (General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs) was a central element in creating a stable international trading following the Second World War, in spite of its weakness. With trade tariffs already reduced to a minimum by 1990’s, interest shifted for the more powerful nations to the question of democratic regulations governing competition. This led to the creation of WTO (World Trade Organization) in 1995, changed with harmonizing competition and business rules across nations to promote global free trade in ever more sectors. The WTO is considerably more powerful than GATT was, and it has various sanctions it can apply. While the WTO failed to reach agreement on an agenda for future trade talks in Seattle in 1999, it has since moved forward, albeit conflictually at times to ensure rules based intensification of trade liberalization for its 132 member countries.

Along the extension of trade went an enormous leap in production-level integration at a global level based on FDI (Foreign Direct Investment) in particular. Perhaps the major characteristic of the post war period was the rise of the MNCs (Multinational Corporations) that now account for the majority of the world’s exports. Already in 1970’s a new international division of labour had emerged with many developing countries achieving significant levels of industrialization. However, by 1990’s, there was a much more marked global production (and distribution) system emerging based on the 65,000 MNCs and their 850,000 officials across the globe (World Commission on the Social Dimension of Globalization, 2003: 154/40). With foreign investment regulations a thing of the past, the main issue now was how to attract and retain FDI, usually through national governments offering increasing concessions. The MNCs have shifted from their 1970’s concern with natural resources and labour costs to an emphasis on efficiency and strategic asset seeking. As Dunning explains, “the strategic response of MNCs to the increasing global economy has been increasing to integrate their sourcing, value added and marketing activities, and to harness their resources and capabilities from through out the world (New Geography of Foreign Direct Investment’, edited by Nagraie Woods, 2000:48, Palgrave).

Globalization of production can be assessed in terms of increasing FDI flows and the growing importance of the MNCs in global production. It goes further, though in so far as the global production networks are keys to technological drivers of capitalist development. The majority of these world wide networks of innovation, production and distribution reaches deep into domestic economies, right down to the local level. It is estimated that the MNCs today account for nearly one-third of world output and appropriately three quarters of the total world trade (UNCTAF, 1995).

Globalization of finance

The economic globalization is seriously strengthened by financial flows across the national territories. The empirical fact suggests, for example, in 1970’s the ratio of foreign exchange trading to world trade was around 2:1, by the early 1990’s this ratio has risen to 50:1 and is around 70:1 in 2000 (Eatwell, J. and L. Taylor, 2000, global Finance at Risk: the Case for International Regulation, Cambridge: Polity Press). The international financial flows carry its operation in international markets has four dimensions: foreign exchange, bank lending, financial assets, and government bonds (Nayar, D. 2000. ‘Globalization: The Game, the Players, and the Rules’ in Baldev Raj Nayar (ed.) Globalization and Politics in India, Delhi: OUP). Let us discuss very briefly each of these in the following manner.
Foreign exchange markets show that it is $15 billion per day in 1973, and rises to $60 billion in 19983, and it absolutely jumped to $900 billion per day in 1992 (ibid.) Consequently the ratio of world wide transactions in foreign exchange to world trade rose from 9:1 in 1973 to 12:1 in 19983 and 90:1 in 1992 (Calculated from BIS data on trading in foreign exchange markets and United Nations data on world trade). In 1992 world GDP was $64 billion per day while world exports were $10 billion per day compared with global foreign exchange transactions of $900 billion per day. It is also very important to note that the daily foreign exchange transactions in the world economy were larger than the foreign exchange reserves of all central banks put together which were $693 billion in 1992 (IMF, 1993).

The expansion of international banking is also remarkable. As a proportion of world output net international bank loans rose from 0.7 percent in 1964 to 8.0 percent in 1980 and 16.3 percent in 1991. As a proportion of world trade, net international bank loans rose from 7.5 percent in 1964 to 42.6 percent in 1980, and 104.6 percent in 1991. As proportion of world gross fixed domestic investment, net international bank loans rose from 6.2 percent in 1964 to 51.1 percent in 1980, and 131.4 percent in 1991 (UNCTAD, World Investment Report, 1994: 128, cited in Nayyar, 2007). The gross size international banking market was roughly twice that of net international banking lending. Cross-border inter-banking rose from a modest $455 billion in 1970 to $5560 billion in 1990 (Ibid.).

The international market for financial assets experienced a similar growth starting somehow latter. During 1980-1993 gross sales and purchases of bonds and equities transacted between domestic and foreign residents rose from less than 10 percent of GDP in the US, Germany, and Japan to 135 percent of GDP in US, 170 percent GDP in Germany, and 80 percent of GDP in Japan (The Economist, 7th October, 1995).

The share of foreign trade and equities in pension fund assets rose from 10 percent to 20 percent in the UK in between 1980 and 1993 and in US from 0.7 percent to 6 percent and in Japan from 0.5 percent to 9 percent. IMF estimates suggests that total gross-border outsourcing of tradable securities was $2500 billion in 1992.

Government debt has also become tradable in global market for financial assets. This market has been growing continuously between1980-1992; the proportion of government bonds held by foreigners rose from 1 percent in UK and from 10-27 percent in Germany and it remained 20 percent in the US (Ibid.).

Apart from trade and production it is, of course, the development of global financial market that best symbolizes the advent of globalization. Financial deregulation in 1980’s was accompanied by the growth of private international banks. The classical gold standard era (1870-1914) had already seen that the emergence of an international financial order, but this was largely confined to Europe. The post- 1945 Bretton Woods era then saw a veritable reinvention of a global financial order. Consistent with national Keynesian economic policies, this financial order was not designs not to interfere with domestic economic objectives such as full employment. However, this system collapsed following the US decision in 1971 to no longer allow the US dollar to be freely convertible into gold, thus undermining the system of fixed exchange rates.

Global financial flows increased dramatically in 1990’s in both their extension across the world and in their intensity. In the mid 1980’s some US $200 million per day followed across the globe, by the late 1990’s the figure had risen to a staggering US $1.5 trillion. Deregulation of national financial markets and the removal of capital controls in the monetarist 1980’s facilitated the move toward greater financial fluidity. Unlike the situation that prevailed during the early
Bretton woods era, it was now the international financial order that would take precedence over domestic economic policies. For many commentators, as Garret puts it, “the potential for massive capital flight acts as the ultimate discipline in governments that may want to pursue autonomous economic policies (Globalization and National Autonomy, inNaigre Woods (ed.) The Political Economy of Globalization, 2000:111, Palgrave). Financial capital is fluid and mobile increasingly removed from any form of control despite the volatility, and potential for disorder inherent in today’s global financial order dubbed casino capitalism (Susan Strange, 1986, Casino Capitalism, Oxford: Blackwell).

The question now we need to ask is whether the combined impact of trade, production and financial internationalization adds up to a qualitatively new era of capitalism we can call globalization. The globalizers who referred to new “borderless world” (Ohmae, 1990) and the “death of the nation-state” (Ohmae, 1995) were undoubtedly conflicting tendencies with reality. Economic internationalization, in particular has achieved a depth and extension that is simply unprecedented. Does this mean globalization is inevitable?

Certainly there is nothing inevitable about economic internationalization and we need to avoid technological interpretation that sees it moving toward a predefined end whether benign or opposite. It is not an act of God or a natural event we have been describing but rather a process driven by social groups that are clearly defined. Globalization does not just happen. It is a strategy for capitalist expansion on a global scale that began under the Thatcher (UK) and Reagan (US) regimes. As Polanyi wrote in relation to first great transformation, “the market has been the outcome of a conscious and often violent intervention on the part of government which imposed the market organization on society for non-economic ends (Polnyi, 1995:258).”

Global integration is today driven by powerful governments and corporations that think, design, and manage the new global order. These managers of globalization are now quite aware that free market economics has very definite social and political limits and that it exacerbates risks, even for those who benefit from its unprecedented productivity. A degree of social regulation is thus increasingly seen as necessary if the free market approach is not to end up in a state of social anarchy. This was called the Polanyi problem, who was writing toward the end of the Second World War saw the growing gulf between the ‘unparalleled momentum to the mechanisms of markets’ and the need for ‘society to protect itself against the perils inherent in a self-regulating market system (1957:76).

Globalization and its impact on Current Economic Crisis

The important factors contributing to the present financial crisis had the stimulus with free market fundamentalism and deregulation that was the hallmark of the core thinking during the Thatcher-Reagan years. There are two factors contributing to the ascendancy of free market conservatism. One, the protracted period of cold war, from the 1950’s through the 1970’s, was drawing to a close even deeper fissure were surfacing in the workings of the economic arrangement in the command economies of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. The logical culmination of this process was the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 and the disintegration of Soviet Empire. Forces of free market capitalism appeared very much by endorsing the notion of ‘the end of history’. Second, after a quarter century of steady unprecedented rise in living standard in the US, Western Europe and Japan, the capitalist world was confronted with the oil crisis in after math of Arab-Israel war of 1973.
Arvind Subramanian and John Williamson have pointed out that there are three factors behind the crisis are; over-large banks, excessively expansionary policies, and a misguided system of regulation (The World Crisis; Reforms to Prevent a Recurrence. March, 28, 2009, Economic and Political Weekly). It is said, ‘some financial institutions are too big to fall.’ It became difficult for saving big banks and their existence. Martin Wolff put in the ‘Financial Times (4th March, 2009): We are painfully learning that the world’s mega-banks are too complex to manage, too big to fail and too hard to restructure. Nobody would wish to start from here. But as worries in the stock market show, banks must be fixed in an orderly and systematic way.’

Second, it seems to be generally agreed that monetary policy in US and to a lesser extent also elsewhere remained too expansionary for too long. But while this may be agreed the antidote is also agreed. Third, there is lot to be said about inadequacies of the regulatory regime.

Arun Kumar argued that not in demand slow sown but a financial crisis which triggered a crisis of trust between borrowers and lenders and therefore a fall in asset price (Tracking the Global Economic and Financial Crisis: Beyond Demand Management March, 28, 2009, Economic and Political Weekly). This led to massive bankruptcies in various financial and production units. This is a crisis created in the supply side. Subsequently, it has also manifested itself as a demand-side problem with unemployment and housing foreclosures rising in the US.

It is generally argued that the crisis originated in the financial sector sue to the failure of sub-prime assets especially in the housing mortgage market. Consequently the financial bungling also to a lot extent contributed to the crisis. Arun Kumar (2009) also argued that the present crisis originated in the introduction between the real and financial sectors and that it is linked to the architecture of the financial sector and the world economy. It is argued that for last three decades, disparities in a large number of countries had risen and led to a tendency for overproduction.

In the US economy, this was countered by increased demand because of the wealth effect created by massive amounts of capital gains in the financial markets. Consequently, the savings rate dollarization of the world economy and the willingness of the world to hold surplus dollars and give loans to it. Growing deregulation of the financial markets resulted in run away speculation in financial assets and the build-up of financial bubble through very high degrees of leveraging.

**Political Globalization**

Political globalization is another dimension in the process of globalization that offers to certain changes by which it is understood simply as shifting reach of political power, authority and forms of rule. The distinctiveness of this change in this in contemporary period is captured by the notion of global politics – the increasingly extensive or structured form of political power relations and political activity (Held and McGrew, p-557).

What actually happens in this process of political globalization is that the action taken in one part of the globe affects in another part through rapid communication into complex networks of decision making and political interaction. This globalization of politics has further consequences for nation-states at the different areas like economic, cultural, social and environmental as well.

The idea of global politics however challenges the traditional notions domestic or national politics. The boundary and the scope of national or domestic politics had well set in the context of Westphalian Structure. It allowed each and every independent nation-state to pursue its own course of action by establishing good neighbourly relations. It does so by respecting the
internal sovereignty of another nation-state. However, the contemporary trend of global politics displays the deeprootedness and complexities of the interconnections which transcend states and societies in the global order. The states and governments no doubt hold sovereignty power, however, the shift of power is also witnessed. The global era is also enmeshed with other agencies and organizations simultaneously with nation states. The state is confronted by enormous number of intergovernmental organizations, international agencies and regimes and quasi super-national institutions like European Union. New state actors such as multinational corporations, transnational pressure groups, transnational professional associations, social movements, and so on, also participate intensely in global politics. At the same time, it is also observed that many sub-national actors and national pressure groups, whose actions often spill over into the international arena.

The scope of global politics is just limited to geopolitics rather it spreads to different other areas such as economic, environmental and social. The most pressing issues like pollution, drugs, human rights, terrorism need urgent attention at global level. These issues can not just be simply addressed by state governments not because of their prerogative but because of the largeness of its size and consequence. The defence and security issues no longer dominate the global agenda or even the political agendas of many national governments. These developments challenge the conventional Westphalian (and realist) principles of world politics.

Global politics is becoming possible day by day for the reason that forms of communication and media are propelling people and organizations and nations to set the trend at the global level. The innovation in technology in information and computer has made things very easy. Together with information technology, telephone, television, cable, satellite and jet transportation have severely altered the nature of political communication. These new forms of communication have drastically enabled people, groups and organizations to overcome geographical barriers which earlier had prevented contact. These experiences open up avenues to a range of social and political happenings at global level to which they were earlier deprived of to be directly engaged with (Giddens, 1991, Modernity and Self Identity, Cambridge University Press).

The intimate connection between physical setting, social situation and political which has distinguished most political associations from pre-modern to modern time has been ruptured; the new communication systems create new experiences, new modes of understanding and frames of political reference independently of direct contact with particular peoples or issues. At the same time, unequal access to these new modes of communication has created new patterns of political inclusion and exclusion in global politics. The development of new communication systems generates world in which the particularities of place and individuality are constantly represented and reinterpreted by regional and global communication networks. But the relevance of these systems goes far beyond this, for they are fundamental to the possibility of organizing political action and exercising political power across vast distances. For example, the expansion of international and transnational organizations, and extension of international rules and legal mechanisms – their construction and monitoring have all received an impetus from the new communication systems and all depend on a means to further their aims. The present era of global politics marks a shift towards a system of multilayered global and regional governances. Although it by no means replaces the sedimentation of political rule into state structures, this system is marked by the internationalization and transnationalization of politics, the development of regional and global organization and institutions, and the emergence of regional and global law.
States are increasingly enmeshed in novel forms of international legal and juridical regimes. As Crawford and Marks remark, “international law with its enlarging normative scope extending writ and growing institutionalization exemplifies the phenomena of globalization (Global Democracy Deficit: An Essay on International Law and its Limits’ in Archibugi, et al. (ed) Reimagining Political Community, CUP).

Cultural Globalization

Cultural globalization is manifested by the increasing growth of American popular cultural products and forms. It is a kind of American cultural-political hegemony. This is predictable that the dominance of western culture wedded to political economic power came to dominate the discussion of cultural globalization. However, Understanding cultural globalization in reference to cultural imperialism at the first hand is confusion and also misleading.

The challenge to a theory of cultural globalization is to generate interpretations and understandings of this process at a sufficient level of analysis to do justice to it. And this may mean standing back somewhat from the most immediate manifestations of the process – that is to say from particular context of cultural-political power relations, even from questions of where cultural-economic-political power happens to be concentrated in the world at present in order to try to understanding things. These are two broad approaches to understand this whole issue. First is back the drawing board approach. This involves sociological understanding of globalization. Ulrich Beck is involved with a systemic re-visioning of fundamental sociological concepts interrogating the relevance of the concept of class, the nature of power, the category of modernity and so forth from the perspective of globality.

John Urry, by contrast, responds at a meta-theoretical level, by confronting the inherent complexity and fluidity of global interconnectedness and complexity derived from physical sciences to understand a social order which is now always on the edge of chaos.

The second approach is related to the institutionalities and fluidities of the global order more modestly. Instead of insisting on wholesale theoretical revision, it tries to generate concepts and descriptive categories and analytic strategies adequate to the immediate state of affairs that complex connectivity presents us with.

This response is recognizable most obviously in the hermeneutic tradition of cultural analysis which attempts to interpret and contextually understand rather than systematically to explain the social world. Such an approach operates closer to the cultural and phenomenological data of everyday experience and more heuristically inclines less given to theoretical system building (or dismantling). Its empirical project in close to the Greezian / Rylian style of “thick description” and its theoretical aims might be described as middle-order ones- to generate sets of conceptual categories capable of grasping and interpreting new orders of experience.

Tomlinson follows this second approach for its broad cultural agenda of globalization. To think about the complex connectivity of globalization in its cultural dimension there are two fundamental theoretical issues in relation to culture can be discussed. First, is the consequentiality of culture and second, is uprooting culture. The consequentiality of culture is a general perception that globalization is a multidimensional process, taking place simultaneously within the spheres of economy, of politics, of the environment, or the institutionalization of technology and of culture. These various dimensions of globalization have interlinked relations to each other. But the chief among these assumptions is that it is the economic sphere, the institution of the global capitalist market that is the crucial element, the sine qua none global connectivity.
The validity of this assumption is not, in fact, that easily determined, because we are not dealing here with straightforward empirical judgements, but also with questions of constitution of categories: to what extent are economic practices also intrinsically, cultural ones?

But it is the force of the assumption on the way in which cultural globalization is perceived that is the issue. One major reason why it seems natural to speak of globalization’s impact on culture is that global market processes – say, the distribution of consumer goods – are relatively easy to understand as having a potential influence on peoples’ cultural experience. This indeed is the core of the interpretation of cultural globalization as Americanization or Westernization or as the spread of global capitalist monoculture (Tomlinson, 1997). In such readings culture seems to be peculiarly inert category. Much of the literature on culture is approached from the semiotic-hermeneutic culture, in response to this, demonstrating the active transformative nature of the appropriation of cultural goods. But despite this critique, the idea of culture as being intrinsically constitutive of globalization as being a dimension which has consequences for other domains remains relatively obscure.

Cultural process primarily oriented towards the construction of socially shared meanings. Meaning is, as it were, an end in itself for culture. In this culture is typically studied as representation, as lived experience, as text and context. Culture is consequential in the sense that the processes of meaning construction inform, inspire and direct individual and collective actions which are themselves consequential. Culture is thus not only ‘a context in which (events) may be meaningfully interpreted (Greetz, 1973), it is the context in which agency arises and takes place.’ Cultural signification and interpretation constantly orients people, individually and collectively towards particular actions.

One way to think of consequentiality of culture for globalization is to grasp how culturally informed local action can have globalizing consequences. The complex connectivity of globalization id not just the ever tighter integration of social institutions is at the same time the integration of individual agency into workings of institutions. Thus, cultural connectivity discloses the increasing reflexivity of global modern life (Giddens).

**Uprooting Culture**

Culture has long held connotations tying it the idea of a fixed locality. The idea of a culture implicitly connects meaning construction with particularity and location. In the sociological treatment of culture, particularly in functionalist tradition where collective meaning construction was seen largely ad serving the purposes of social integration, there has been a tacit assumption that culture is a spatially bounded entity. The notion of sub-cultures – even where these are ethnically defined – in fact does nothing to disturb this identification of culture with territory. Culture in this understanding either binds individual meaning construction into the circumscribed social, political space of the nation-state, or places of obstacles – in the form of completing territorially defined attachments – in the way of this integrative process.

James Clifford’s “Travelling Cultures (1992) has focused on pricing culture apart from location. Clifford challenges the traditional anthropological field work that ‘authentic social existence is, or should be, centred in circumscribed places – like the gardens where the word culture derived its European meaning (1997).

Clifford’s challenge to this tradition is to think of culture as mobile rather than static to that practice of displacement, as constitutive of cultural meanings, to pay more attention to routes than to roots. This is close to the conceptual challenge globalization makes to culture. However, it is not, as Clifford allows, that we have, to reverse the priority between roots and routes, insisting on the essence of culture as restless nomadic movement. Rather globalization changes
the texture of lived experience both in mobility and dwelling. Though it promotes much more physical mobility than ever before, the key to globalization’s cultural dimension is not primarily grasped in the trope of travel but in the transformation of localities themselves.

**Deterritorialization**

If globalization is proliferation of complex connectedness across distance, then deterritorialization refers to the reach of the connectivity into the localities in which everyday life is conducted and experienced. This is at once perplexing and disruptive and an exhilarating and empowering phenomenon involving the simultaneous penetration of local worlds by distant forces; and the dislodging of the everyday meanings from their authors in the local government. It is also undoubtedly an uneven and often contradictory business, involving winners and loosers, felt more forcibly in some place than others, and often met by countervailing tendencies to reestablish the power of the locality (Castells, 1997). But deterritorialization, for all its various ambiguous entailments, is surely a feature of all societies in the 21st century, and without doubt, a phenomenon of the greatest consequences for both cultural practices and experiences.

Today, we all live in places that retain a high degree of distinctiveness. This applies not only to remote corners and backwaters, but to capital cities and great metropolitan centres. Globalized culture is less determined by location because it is increasingly penetrated by distance – by the integration of structures of global connectivity. So, deterritorialization is more a question of the attention of the hold that local particularities have on our cultures, combined with the increasing significance of distance of distant places, processes and events on our lives. Culture in this understanding either binds individual meaning constructions into the circumscribed social, political space of the nation-state or places of obstacles – in the form of competing territoriality defined attachments – in the way of this integrative process.

**Deterritorialization and dystopia**

It follows from this that deterritorialization should not be confused with those dystopian visions which predict the end of local culture and its replacement by an undifferentiated homogenized global culture. If deterritorialization does not signal the end of locality on account of a creeping cultural uniformity, neither does it imply the loss of local determinations must in a more generally diminished culture. Marc Auge’s otherwise suggests anthropology of the non-places of the late twentieth century provides just such a pessimistic account of the transformation of localities (Auge. M, 1995, *Non-Places: Introduction to the Anthropology of Supermodernity*, London; Verso).

Non-places are the bleak archetypal locales of contemporary modernity - places of silence, transience, instrumentality and contractual interactions - the apotheosis of *Gesellschaft* – lifted out of organic relation with communal dwelling extended in time. Non-places – hypermarkets, petrol filling stations, shopping malls, airports, multiplex cinemas, bank lobbies filled with automatic cash dispensers. These all at first glance particularly with the passing glance of the consumer in transit, suggests a level of abstraction, impersonality and even alienation.

The upwelling flow of interaction into newly created locales is not the main criticism to be made if the notion of non-places. Indeed, if this is taken to suggest that nothing has changed, that is traditional cultural business as usual, this is even more misleading. No, the point is that deterritorialization means we cannot maintain a clear distinction non-places and anthropological places, because even the locales which appear on the surface to retain local cultural thickness – the ‘real places’ of a supposed undisturbed locality – in fact penetrated and transformed by globalization. All locales – our workplaces, ‘local’ bars and restaurants, schools, shops,
marketplaces, community centres and village halls – even the most intimate recesses of pour private homes – now to varying degrees conjoin the local and the distant in new – and not necessarily abstract, culturally thin, or alienating – ways. Deterritorialized localities have their own sort of cultural texture. To be sure, they may lack something of the existential security – what Heidegger might have called the ‘thereness’ – of pre-modern locales; they may depend on systems of expertise and abstractions which lift the control of experience out of local relations of presence. And this may introduce new problems of cultural identity, new uncertainties and new ambiguities to life – What Bauman (2000) called it as new ‘liquidity’ of culture. But these perplexities are also mixed with benefits and exhilarations- from the enormously expanded flow of commodities and cultural experiences afforded by the global capitalist market, to the expansion of cultural horizon – a great everyday ‘openness to the world’ – made possible by wither physical or electronically mediated mobility.

The cultural analysis of deterritorialization, then, is primarily concerned with how life is lived in these transformed, connected and penetrated localities of everyday life. It attempts to understand how we construct meaning in places that we are linked to in respect of routine life in which the elements of a fixed locality have ceased to be the definitive mark of our experience.

**Situatedness and mobility**

It might be objected that this view of deterritorialization is rather conservative in continuing to focus on life as it is lived in localities. Has not everyday life become so much more inherently mobile that in some senses now transcends locality? Is a deterritorialized culture better regarded as a culture inherently on the move? t is involved here can be encapsulated in James Clifford’s phrase ‘dwelling-in-travel’. Clifford means it to take this phrase a general cultural statement, as a view of human location as constituted by displacement as much as by stasis. Everyone on the move and has been for centuries (1997; 2). But might not the idea of ‘dwelling-in-travel’ be the more radical focus of a cultural sociology of deterritorialization? At stake is sense in which our specifically global-modern forms of human mobility alter the centrality of sedentary dwelling to cultural meaning. This question has two responses.

First, it is a conservative one. It is to defend the continuing relevance of locality. There are some obvious demographic and material factors to be considered here. In the first place, physical translocation - on either a permanent or an extended basis – is still a comparatively rare case of human population as a whole. The current trend shows that less than three percent of people live outside their place of birth. Moreover, even where deterritorialization does refer to actual physical displacement, localities continues to exercise its influence in cultural imagination. Either seen as the hope for a new settlement, or remembered as the uninterrogated anchor or alter ego of all this ‘hyper-mobility’.

Second, the human condition, and the forces of material circumstances keep most of us, most of time locally situated. The sheer biological constitution of human beings dictates that some form of local dwelling necessarily persists as the norm of globalized everyday life. As embodied creatures we dwell for shelter, for security, and for all the routines of the everyday material existence. These necessities no doubt established the primordial cultural attachments to localities – to land, to home and homeland – that deterritorialization is now breaking down. The trajectory of culture may be changing but material – indeed the existential – condition, it might be argued remains.

However, notwithstanding these basic material-existential considerations, a second response must be to recognize that the massive increase in everyday mobility has indeed changed
the cultural environment for most people at the beginning of the twenty-first century. How to conceptualize these changes?

One important step is to acknowledge that mobilities to a great extent now integrate with local dwelling. There is deep-sealed cultural dualism to be overcome here between notions on the one hand, of the authenticity of settlement and sedentary habitation, and, on the other, of the emancipations of movement, of cultural detachment, of nomadism. However, the contemporary forms of dwelling almost always involve diverse forms of mobility (Urry, 2000). Mundane mobility – long and short distance commuting, shopping, leisure pursuits, family visits – combine with an ever increasing degree of routine overseas in altering the experience of local dwelling for steadily growing numbers in developed societies.

**Telemediatization and the culture of immediacy**

By telemediatization we mean the increasing implication of electronic communications and media system in both the reach of global connectivity into everyday experience, and the ‘accessing of the world’ by locally situated individuals. This is to understand the primary role of media and communication systems as modes – both technologies and institutions – of time-space bridging. Telemediatization can thus be considered as distinct mode of deterritorialization – of lifting cultural experience out of its anchoring in localities. Often this distinction is described in terms of a peculiar form of mobility that does not involve corporal mobility. Typically the use of the internet and even to some degree of television is described as a form of ‘virtual travel’ and popular expressions often employ metaphors of mobility (surfing, channel hopping, going online, navigating, and so on). While there is some force on these metaphors, there are also some obvious obscurities involved. In fact it seems more useful to think of telemediatization, not as a form of mobility, but rather, on its own terms, as a specific phenomenological mode. Telemediated practices and experiences – watching television, typing, scrolling, clicking and browsing at the computer screen, talking, texting or sending or receiving pictures on a mobile phone – are best regarded as unique cultural practices and ways in which experience within the individual’s life world that is distinct, yet integrated with face-to-face interaction of physical proximity. And indeed they are increasingly integrated with the sort of experiences afforded by actual travel – the routine corporeal mobility of modern cultures.

One significant feature of mediated connectivity to be considered here is the pretty universal assumption that the speed of communication is both an unremarkably regularity of modern societies and an undisputed good. This quintessentially modern cultural assumption that all sorts of communication should be delivered as fast as possible defines a trajectory of increasing acceleration in media technologies, reaching back to the telegraph and forwards through computer mediated convergences, particularly those linking mobile phones with the Internet. If we add to these technological developments innovations in media institutions themselves – for instance 24-hour television, online news services media convergence made possible via domestic broadband provision – there emerges the sense of a broad communication principle of ‘instant access’ is, moreover, easily extended to grasp broader consumption practices, entertainment, or simply to each other. Assemble all these elements together and we may begin to see contemporary culture as dominated by a technology-driven obsession with speed, ubiquitous availability and instant gratification.

However, a more subtle analysis may be called for. It may be that we are witnessing, in the emergence of immediacy, a cultural sensibility that is quite new, not easily accommodated to the traditional understanding of the speed of events and processes, and thus not yielding to interpretation and critique in terms of values derived from these traditions. For example, speed
seems to connote some of the informing values of industrial modernity, in particular, functional rationality, regulation and the heroic nature of technique, machine power and human labour - particularly of concerted effort in the overcoming of distance. Immediacy, by contrast, grasps a much more a insouciant stance towards technology, something of the lightness and effortlessness of what Bauman elegantly calls ‘liquid modernity’. The technologies of communication with and trough which we now routinely interact create the impression of a general effortlessness and ubiquity of contact which seems to be quite distinct firm the purposiveness of mechanically accomplished speed. In the era of immediacy, it is as if the gap between departure and arrival, here and elsewhere, now and later, indeed, a certain order of desire and its fulfillment, has been closed by sort of technological legerdemain.

A sociology of deterritorialization then should include, at its core, analysis of the telemediatization of culture, of which the sensibility of immediacy comprises a central feature. Such an analysis might reveal something beyond the idea of a broad acceleration in interactions or the closing of physical distance rather inadequately grasped in the idea of virtuality. It might, for example, interpret the eclipse of certain older cultural values like patience or forbearance, while uncovering new values – perhaps the capacity to form trust relations and senses of moral obligation beyond the confines of physical locale.

Technological Globalization

One change that is most commonly associated with globalization is the revolution in technology. The impact has been so great, many now refer to the microprocessor technology that enables these changes as the ‘third revolution’, thereby implying that the microchip will have as deep an impact on our societies as harnessing of steam and electricity did for industrial purposes (J. Allen, ‘Post-Industrialism and Post- Fordism’, in S. Hall, D. Held, and T. McGrew (eds.) Modernity and its Futures, Oxford; Blackwell, 1999, p: 170-203). Yet the seeds of ‘third revolution’ were planted in earlier decades. The replacement of vacuum tubes by the semiconductor transistor at the Bell Laboratories in 1947 paved the way for the huge advances in the miniaturization of electronic devices that we are still witnessing today. By 1965, progress in miniaturization was such that it led the co-founder of Intel, Gordon Moore, to speculate that computing capacity would double every 18 months or so. This guess time has proven to be relatively accurate over time and thus what was a rough and ready rule of thumb has become known as Moore’s law. The late sixties witnessed a further breakthrough, as much conceptual as technological, with the invention of the microprocessor. Rather than designing several physically separate devices, the microprocessor brought them together in one integrated circuit. Although the first project using a microprocessor was started in 1968 to be used in the F-14A Tomcat, it was the mass production of such devices by Intel in 1971 that eventually lead to the development of IBM’s personal computer range first launched in August 1981.

Similarly the Internet has its origins in US Defence Department’s desire in the sixties to establish a digital communications network that would survive a Soviet nuclear attack. By 1969 the Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) had created the Advanced Research Project Agency Network (ARPANET) which would eventually evolve into the internet. Even by the mid-eighties the use of this network was limited to a privileged few – the military, scientists, librarians, engineers, etc. However, the creation of the World Wide Web by a team at CERN in Switzerland and its eventual release in 1991 led to the easy use, publicly available Internet that we know now.

Castells (2000, Materials for an explanatory theory of the network society, British Journal of Sociology, 51: 5-24) argues that there are various technological paradigms, a cluster
of interrelated technical, organization innovations. Their advantages lie in their superior productivity in accomplishing assigned goals through synergy between their components. Each paradigm is constructed around a fundamental set of technologies, specific to the paradigm, and whose coming-together into a synergistic set establishes the paradigm.

Castells views information/communication technologies (including genetic engineering) as the basis of the new paradigm that developed within specially North America during 1970’s and 1980’s. The main properties of this new informational paradigm are that the building blocks are bits of electronically transmitted information. Such technologies are pervasive, since information has become integral to almost all forms of human practice. Complex and temporally unpredictable patterns of informational development occur in a distributed fashion on very specific localities. Technologies are organized through loosely based and flexibly changing networks. These different technologies gradually converge into integrated informational systems, especially the once-separate biological and microelectronic technologies. Such systems permit organizations to work in real time ‘on a planetary scale’. These instantaneous electronic impulses produce a ‘timeless time’ and provide material support fort the development of new scapes, with the instantaneous flows if information being the precondition for the growth of global relations.

The new informational paradigm is characterized by the network enterprise (Castells, 1996, 2000, 2001). This is a network made from the firms or segments of firms, and/or from internal segmentation of firms. Large corporations are internally decentralized as networks. Small and medium businesses are connected in networks. These networks connect among themselves on specific business projects, and switch to another network when the project is finished. Major corporations work in strategy of changing alliances and partnerships, specific to a given project, process, time and space. Furthermore, these cooperations are increasingly based on the sharing of information. These are information networks, which, in the limit, link up supplies and customers through one firm, with its firm being essentially an intermediary of supply and demand. The unit of this production process is the business project.

What is important therefore not structures which imply a centre, a concentration of power, vertical hierarchy and a formal or informal constitution. Rather, networks constitute the new social morphology of our societies, and the diffusion of the networking logic substantially modifies the operation and outcomes in processes of production, experience, power and culture....the network society, characterized by the preeminence of social morphology over social action (Castells, 1996: 469). A network is a set of interconnected nodes, the distance between social positions being shorter where there such positions constitute nodes within a network as opposed to those lying outside the particular network. Networks are dynamic open structures so long as they continue to effect communication with new nodes (Castells, 1996: 470-1). Networks decentre performance and share decision making. What is the network is useful and necessary for its existence.

What is not in the network will be either ignored if it is not relevant to the network’s task, or eliminated if it is competing in goals or in performance. If a node in the network ceases to perform a useful function, it is phased out from the network, and the network rearranges itself. Some nodes are more important than others, but they all need each other as long as they remain within the network. Nodes increase their importance by absorbing more information and processing it more efficiently. If they decline their performance, other nodes take over their tasks. Thus the relevance and relative weight of nodes come not from their specific features, but from their ability to be trusted by the rest of the network. In this sense, the main nodes are not centres, but switchers that follow a network logic rather than a command logic, in their function vis-à-vis the overall structure.
Networks generate complex and enduring connections stretching across time and space between peoples and things (Murdoch, 1995:745) “Actor-networks and the evolution of economic forms: Combining description and explanation in theories of regulation, flexible specialization, and networks” Environment and Planning A, 27: 731-57). Networks spread across time and space, which is advantageous, because left to their own devices human actions and words do not spread very far at all (Law, 1994:24, “Organizing Modernity”, Oxford: Blackwell). Different networks process different abilities to bring home to certain nodes distant events, places or people, to overcome the friction of space within appropriate periods of time. According to Castells, there are now many very varied phenomena organized through networks, including network enterprises (such as European Union) and many networks within civil society (such as NGOs resisting globalization or international terrorists).

Castells’ network analysis is of major importance, because it breaks with the idea that the global is a finished and completed totality. And he uses various leads that prefigure a complexity approach to global phenomena (1996:64-5). This analysis of networks emphasizes contingency, openness, and unpredictability, suggesting analogies with how the web of life consists of networks within networks. Castells also emphasizes how networks of power produce networks of resistance. Many social practices are drawn to what could be called in complexity terms the “power resistance attractor” (Castells, 1997: 362). He also argues that that the strength of networks results from their self-organizing and often short-term character and not from centralized hierarchical direction, as with older style rational-legal bureaucracies of the sort famously examined by Weber.

Conclusion

Globalization as a process although seen in the historical development, however, it has caught the attention of social scientists in recent years for its phenomenal development. As it is seen above from different dimensions: economic, political, cultural and technological, it suggests that it has become a part and parcel of every day life in contemporary period. However, the process has not reached its full circle. It is continued and vigorous in its rapid stride to reach its destination. Although it has created massive inequality in economic spheres, the demand from various agents still persistent to achieve some sorts of equality in the process. Political, cultural and technological aspects of globalization also need to maintain the rhythm with economic pace so as to attain its complete full circle.
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UNITED NATIONS: POLITICAL STRENGTHS
AND WEAKNESSES

Tarun Kanti Bose

The economic and political instability of the interwar period and the rise of totalitarian powers were often seen as extensions of World War I and the Great Depression. The League of Nations, in turn, was usually seen as an organisation that failed to act adequately during the various political crises of the period, beginning with the Japanese aggression in Manchuria.

The League of Nations failed to achieve widespread disarmament, its most fundamental goal. Its failures could be summarised in the following manner:

✓ The League of Nations was an imperfect instrument for achieving disarmament;
✓ The League was not universal;
✓ The League failed due to the confrontation between Great Britain and France;
✓ It failed as there were domestic forces inside the countries hostile to disarmament;
✓ The Disarmament Conference was convened too late, under hostile conditions;
✓ The confrontation between France and Germany at the Disarmament Conference;
✓ It failed due to overly ambitious aims and the practical problems involved in the reduction of armaments.

In the early 1920s it became clearly evident that individual states regardless of their commitment to the League framework would not disarm unless they felt secure. This for most states meant some type of a framework of collective security guarantees. Within the League of Nations, the member states attempted to achieve disarmament measures in earnest at least until the mid-1930s. The first plans right after the war was merely aimed at containing the military spending levels or preferably reducing them.

All of these efforts failed due to one reason or another due to different conceptions of disarmament among the former Allied Powers. Mostly these efforts took place between diplomats within the various committees in the League of Nations’ political machinery. One of the many difficulties with achieving concrete results was the heterogeneous nature of the participants and their different expectations. As the Geneva Protocol of 1924, this advocated principles such as denouncing of war, agreement on sanctions against aggressor(s), and the convening of disarmament.

Yet, when did the League’s impotence in the task of maintaining the world peace become apparent to all of its members? In fact, it was the weaknesses that were contained in the League framework and the foreign policy stances of the members that made it impossible for the system to work. The real test of the covenants first came with the surprising Japanese aggression in Manchuria. This turned out to be quite a shock for the League members, since Japan, a permanent member of the Council, had been conciliatory in its foreign policy in the 1920s, even during the naval disarmament conference of 1930. The long slide into war in Manchuria began on September 18, 1931, when local Japanese army attacked the city of Mukden without the knowledge and the wishes of the government in Tokyo. The government was forced to follow
the military’s lead in the matter, and the incident developed into an international conflict as the Japanese made considerable headway against the inferior Chinese forces. This prompted extensive debate in the Council, yet it was not willing to put heavy pressure against Japan. Further Japanese military action in Shanghai on January 28, 1932, finally triggered a more unitary collective response, which, despite being quite cautious, got Japanese troops out of Shanghai. When a special report condemning Japan was approved on February 24, 1933, the Japanese delegation walked out of the Assembly. Japan announced her formal withdrawal from the League on March 27, 1933.

The “Manchurian Incident”, as it was called, was just the first of many deadly blows to come at the League of Nations. The Soviet Union’s joining of the League in 1934 at first provided a signal of hope for peace. Hitler’s ascendency to power in 1933 and his revisionist ideas soon came to fore in European politics. Germany’s withdrawal from the League (admitted to the League in 1926) and its fevered rearmament from 1935 onwards certainly cast doubts on the League’s and Europe’s future. Equally, the process of “peaceful” conquests started by the remilitarization of Rhineland in March 1936, leading up to the Second World, were certainly among the death blows to the League’s credibility.

Yet, inability of the League to halt Italian (another member of the League’s Council) aggression in Abyssinia in 1935-1936 turned out to be its most decisive fiasco. Mussolini, in essence, was able to achieve his illicit conquest despite the protestations of the other European and world powers. Especially the British, who initially were the prominent force behind them, were against the continuation of the sanctions put in place under Article 16 initially, and thus even the sanctions were removed in July 1936. This merely acknowledged the prevailing situation: the Great Powers were not ready to initiate aggression against Italy due to this conflict, and that Mussolini’s victory in Abyssinia had already been sealed months before. Hitler, this meant that the League was truly unable to stand in the way of the redrawing of the map of Europe and the destruction of the status quo created at Versailles.

Moreover, the American isolationism, however inadequate as the term may be, left the European and even the “world” power relations in the hands of Great Britain and France. They were reluctant leaders in their own right, with their own interests displayed in their actions for example in the League of Nations functions. Germany and Russia had been defeated in the First World War, thus leaving room for these traditional Great Powers to re-emerge in European politics. There were obvious disagreements in the goals valued by the British and the French. The British, like the Americans, were less and less interested in the goal that France valued the most: keeping Germany in check. Additionally, Great Britain was more pre-occupied by extra-European problems, namely keeping the vast Empire from disintegrating. At the beginning of the 1930s France seemed to be the leading nation in the European scene. Its economic performance in the 1930s, however, proved to be poor in comparison with the other European Great Powers. Thus, the European stage created a sort of “power vacuum” Thus, the European stage created a sort of “power vacuum” during the 1930s, which seemed to invite hegemonic competition for leadership.

The failure of the League to include all the important world powers was of course in itself of paramount importance for its effectiveness. The isolationism of the United States; the distrust of the Soviet Union towards the League; Germany’s at first externally imposed exclusion in the 1920s and then its own decision to abandon the League in the mid-1930s; and Japan’s exit from the League on the heels of the Manchurian Incident were all huge blows to the collective peace
aspirations. After all, a key idea in the League structure was, contrary to the wishes of France and Eastern European states, that the enforcement of peace should be left to the hands of the members themselves.

Ultimately, the League of Nations failed to achieve widespread disarmament, its most fundamental goal. The absence of the United States, failure to resolve the inherent problems between France and Great Britain and France and Germany respectively, as well as smaller failures incurred in the handling of the disarmament process. The international environment was not very conducive for breakthroughs in the disarmament sphere due to the uncertain economic environment, which lacked the basis for international cooperation. The so-called weak states, in addition to French and British policy divisions, were not as constructive in the negotiations as it was often depicted, and domestic economic interest groups were often hostile to any significant arms production and trade limitations. Thus, the member states tended to pursue their own interests, which were not the same for each state nor were the means that they were ready to use to achieve their aims.

Even though the League was not *de jure* meant to be a military alliance but its foundations suggested this as a *de facto* goal of the organisation. And as an alliance, it failed to provide adequate security guarantees for its members. Thus the individual countries pursued their own military spending and naval strategies, undermining the viability of the League from the very beginning. Coupled with the unsettled international economic and political system, various shocks such as the Great Depression and the broadly different, often opposing negotiation stances of the various states, this organisation was doomed to fail. Its impotence in the 1930s when faced with numerous crises and challenges was merely the outcome of its failure to become a credible “alliance”.

The Covenant of the League, in its two decades of active life, was interpreted, developed, ignored and stretched as the new organisation and its principal institutional instruments came to broach the real world. As a result, practices emerged of which due account was taken when the time came to draft the Charter of the UN. The learning process devised the principal organs of the UN Charter deriving from the Covenant of the League of Nations and its experiences in practice.

However, despite the distinct lineage drawn from the Covenant, the formation of the UN in itself was a long-drawn and circumstantial affair in which the initial forays were made by the Britain and the United States and later joined by the Soviet Union. The niceties of the Charter were finalised at the periodic war-time summits and conferences held to discuss the proceedings of the war on the one hand and the shape of the world body in future, on the other.

**Emergence of the United Nation**

In August 1941, the then US President Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Churchill met and put forth the Atlantic Charter. The British Prime Minister desire was to set up an effective international organisation and the US President was keen only to espouse the notion of a wider and permanent system of general security as he was fearful of the isolationist sentiments in the US. The ideals of the Atlantic Charter were still furthered when on 1 January 1942, the United Nations Declaration was signed not only by Churchill and Roosevelt but also by the representatives of the Soviet Union and China. Thus, for the first time, the nomenclature United Nations was prominently used to denote the states that were united in the pursuit of peace, based
on the principles enshrined in the Atlantic Charter. The Charter became an ideological and political basis on which the allied powers counted to not only prosecute the war but also contemplate a post-war period. The real impetus to the finalisation of the shape of the United Nations was given, with a Declaration on 30 October 1943 in Moscow, by the foreign ministers of the Soviet Union, Britain and the United States, along with the Ambassador of China in Moscow.

Post to the meeting of big three, United Nations Organisation was formed, which aimed at setting up a decentralised UN system with a range of what were to become the specialised agencies. The Conference in May 1943 at Hot Springs paved the way for the formation of the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO), and in the same year, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration was established. In a meeting in Chicago it led to the formation of the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), and the Bretton Woods conference in July 1944, resulted in the foundation of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD).

A major conference of the big three, together with China, was held in Dumbarton Oaks, near Washington, in 1944, to delineate the basic principles to underlie and infuse the future United Nations. At the centre of the whole system was to be a Security Council with five permanent members who would be veto-holding powers. In addition, three other major organs were also visualised, namely, the General Assembly, the Secretariat and the International Court of Justice. The idea of Trusteeship Council and the appropriate position of the Social and Economic Council in the UN system were still not obvious in the minds of the leaders.

Despite the broad agreements on the issue of the General Assembly and the Security Council, a number of unsettled questions kept on engaging the attention of the representatives of the big three. The provision of veto, as proposed by the Soviet Union, was still hanging in a balance, as others were inclined to be more flexible on the issues the veto would cover. Soviet Union’s insistence on the membership to its constituent republics on the lines of India and Philippines was not acceptable to all. The position, power and functions of the Economic and Social Council were still not agreed upon by the important countries. The other contentious issues included the shape of the International Court of Justice, and question of transition from the League of Nations to the United Nations.

**Failure of the league of Nations:**

In order to understand the philosophy of the emergence of the U.N. , it is essential to know the events that led to the failure of the league of nations.

**United Nations:**

The League of Nations was wound up after the Second World War and replaced by United Nations (UN), the foundations it laid were utilised by the framers of Charter at San Francisco to erect the edifice of UN, albeit with certain substantive innovations and modifications.

To give the final touches to the shape of the United Nations, a meeting between the then British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, US President Roosevelt and General Secretary of Communist Party of Soviet Union Joseph Stalin were called at Yalta for a week in February 1945. All the big three respected the wishes of each other and reached a consensus on the finality
of the United Nations. On 25 April 1945, the San Francisco Conference was called to reflect and endorse the proposals of Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta. Representatives drawn from 50 member states participating in the San Francisco Conference adopted the Charter of the United Nations. In the conference, small states played a constructive role by accepting the superiority of the powerful five as the custodians of international peace and security. The vision of putting in place a viable international organisation, to ensure not only the maintenance of the international peace and security on the lasting basis but also a fair degree of socio-economic development in all parts of the world, was, thus translated into reality on 26 June 1945, with the adoption of the United Nations Charter.

The adoption of the Charter, led to the inauguration of the UN on 10th January 1946, when the first session of the General Assembly took place in Westminster Central Hall in London. It was truly an extraordinary achievement amidst the ups and downs caused by the war, with uncertainty regarding the form of its outcome and the sheer realist perspectives of the big three regarding the future of the international relations they were able to arrive at the common minimum denominator of the prospective international organisation. Though the charter did not come out to be a perfect document, it reflected the innate wisdom of the saner elements in the world who were able to lift their eyes above the battlefield and to envisage the possibility of working future, which would not only aspire to a system of international peace and security but also develop social and economic ties and promote human rights.

Structure of the United Nations

The Charter adopted on 26th June 1945, established six principal organs of the United Nations:

1. General Assembly
2. Security Council
3. Economic and Social Council
4. Trusteeship Council
5. International Court of Justice
6. Secretariat

Of the six principal organs- the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the Secretariat- the two organs that form the nucleus of the UN are the General Assembly and the Security Council. The two may be compared to the legislative and the executive wings of a national government; with their positioning in the UN system is so envisioned that, acting in tandem, their cooperative and effective functioning would only ensure the attainment of the primary objectives of the UN.

General Assembly:

The General Assembly, largest of the six basic organs, is the main deliberative organ. It is linked up with all the other organs and it elects part or all of their membership. It may discuss any subject within the scope of the charter, except those disputes that are being dealt with by the Security Council. After voting, it may pass on its recommendations to other organs or to member governments. It is composed of representatives of all Member States, each of which has one vote. Decisions on important questions (listed in the charter), such as recommendations on peace and security admission of new Members and budgetary matters, require a two-thirds majority. Decisions on other questions are reached by a simple majority of those voting.
The idea behind the formation of General Assembly was to develop it as the plenary organ of the UN where all the member-states, irrespective of their size, population, socio-economic development, and military and financial prowess, were represented, with the entitlement for one vote. The extent of its powers and functions, as described in UN Charter Article 10 includes discussing, ‘any question or any matter, within the scope of the present Charter...’ In addition to acting as a platform where all the issues can be debated, with participation from all the member-states of the UN, the General Assembly also happens to be the mother-organ for the other major organs like the ECOSOC and the Trusteeship Council in total, and the Security Council and the Secretariat in part, by electing the members of these bodies, along with the Secretary General. This position is further reinforced with the General Assembly receiving and considering the annual and special reports from these organs. Significantly, in the wake of the reforms initiated in the UN, the position of the General Assembly is proposed to be converted into that of General Assembly Parliamentary Forum, according to the proposals mooted in 2005.

**Functions and powers:**

Under the Charter, the functions and powers of the General Assembly include the following:

To consider and make recommendations on the principles of co-operation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments;

To discuss any question relating to international peace and security and, except where a dispute or situation is currently being discussed by the Security Council, to make recommendations on it;

To discuss and, with the same exception, make recommendations on any question within the scope of the Charter or affecting the powers and functions of any organ of the United Nations;

To initiate studies and make recommendations to promote international political co-operation, the development and codification of international law; the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all and international collaboration in the economic, social, cultural, educational and health fields;

To make recommendations for the peaceful settlement of any situation, regardless of origin, which might impair friendly relations among nations;

To receive and consider reports from the Security Council and other United Nations organs:

To consider and approve the United Nations budget and to apportion the contributions among Members;

To elect the non-permanent members of the Security Council, the members of the Economic and Social Council and those members of the Trusteeship Council that are elected: to elect jointly with the Security Council the Judges of the International Court of Justice; and, on the recommendation of the Security Council, to appoint the Secretary-General.

Sessions: The General Assembly’s regular session begins each year on the third Tuesday in September and continues till mid-December. At the start of each regular session, the Assembly
elects a new President, 21 Vice-Presidents and the Chairpersons of the Assembly's seven main Committees. To ensure equitable geographical representation, the presidency of the Assembly rotates each year among five groups of States: Africa, Asia, East Europe, South America and West Europe and other States.

In addition to its regular sessions, the General Assembly meets in special sessions at the request of the Security Council, approved by majority of UN Members. Emergency special sessions may be called within 24 hours of a request by the Security Council on the vote of any nine members of the Council, or by a majority of the United Nations Members, or by one Member if the majority of Members concurs.

At the beginning of each regular session, the Assembly holds a general debate, in which Member States express their views on a wide range of matters of international concern. As great number of questions which the Assembly is called upon to consider, the General Assembly allocates most questions to its seven main Committees:

- First Committee (disarmament and related international security matters);
- Special Political Committee;
- Second Committee (economic and financial matters);
- Third Committee (social, humanitarian and cultural matters);
- Fourth Committee (decolonisation matters);
- Fifth Committee (administrative and budgetary matters);
- Sixth Committee (legal matters).

While the decisions of the General Assembly have no legally binding force for Governments, they carry the weight of world opinion on major international issues, as well as the moral authority of the world community.

**Security Council:**

The Security Council is undoubtedly, considered the most critical organ of the UN, created to function on a permanent basis discharge its primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. Designed to work in accordance with doctrine of collective security, the structure of Security Council is so provided as to reflect the real situation of world politics, while providing a fair share of representation to all countries.

The Security Council has 15 members. United Kingdom, China, France, Russian Federation and the United States are its permanent members. Of the other ten, five are elected each year by the General Assembly for two-year terms and five retire each year. Each member has one vote. On all routine procedural matters, approval requires nine "yes" votes. On all other matters, the nine "yes" votes must include the votes of all five permanent members.

The crux of Security Council’s functioning lies in the assumption of ‘great power unity’ often referred to as the "veto"power. As this has not bee forthcoming, the Security Council has proved to be dysfunctional organ of the UN, resulting into the decline in its stature and role.
However, any state, even if it is not a member of the United Nations, may bring a dispute to which it is a party to the notice of the Security Council. If the council finds there is a real threat to peace, or an actual act of aggression, it may call upon the members of the United Nations to cut communications with the countries concerned or break off trade relations (economic sanctions). If these methods prove inadequate, the charter states that the Council may take military action against the offending nation by air, sea, and land forces of the United Nations.

Every member of the United Nations was pledged by Article 43 to supply the Council with armed forces on its call. These forces were to be directed by a Military Staff Committee, consisting of the chiefs of staff (or their representatives) of the five permanent members.

The Security Council has markedly been accorded a superior position in terms of taking binding decisions, the dynamics of the Cold War for a fairly long period of time had rendered it as a deadwood. Even in present times, the Security Council has not been able to act as a formidable apparatus for the maintenance of international peace and security. Thus, in the face of the limited functional vibrancy of the Security Council, sometimes the onus of responsibility to pronounce the opinion of the global humanity and persuade the parties to the dispute to maintain peace falls on the General Assembly. The Uniting for Peace Resolution, 1950, passed to tide over the difficulties that arose due to the Big Power veto in the Security Council, is one such example, which enabled the General Assembly to deal with a situation which could not be resolved by the Security Council owing to the parochial-interest driven misuse of the veto.

Functions and powers:

Under the Charter, the functions and powers of the Security Council are:

To maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations:

To investigate any dispute or situation which might lead to international friction;

To recommend methods of adjusting such disputes or the terms of settlement;

To formulate plans for the establishment of a system to regulate armaments;

To determine the existence of a threat to the peace or act of aggression and to recommend what action should be taken;

To call on Members to apply economic sanctions and other measures not involving the use of force in order to prevent or stop aggression;

To take military action against an aggressor;

To recommend the admission of new Members and the terms on which States may become parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice:

To exercise the trusteeship functions of the United Nations in "strategic areas";

To recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of the Secretary-General and, together with the Assembly to elect the Judges of the International Court of Justice.
When a complaint concerning a threat to peace is brought before it, the Security Council's first action is usually to recommend that the parties try to reach agreement by peaceful means. In some cases, the Council itself undertakes an investigation and mediation. It appoints special representatives or requests the Secretary-General to do so, or to use his good offices. In some cases, it may set forth principles for a peaceful settlement.

When a dispute leads to fighting, the Council's first concern is to bring it to an end as soon as possible. On many occasions since the United Nations was founded, the Security Council issues cease-fire directives, which have been instrumental in preventing wider hostilities. It also sends United Nations peacekeeping forces to help reduce tensions in troubled areas keep opposing forces apart and create conditions of calm in which peaceful settlements may be sought. The Council may decide on enforcement measures, economic sanctions (such as trade embargoes) or collective military action.

A Member State against, which preventive or enforcement action has been taken by the Security Council might face suspension from the exercise of the rights and privileges of membership by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. A Member State, which persistently violates as per the principles contained in the Charter might face expulsion from the United Nations by the General Assembly on the Council's recommendation.

In the post Cold War scenario, the Security Council has been assiduously trying to salvage its image of a deadwood. Nevertheless, the success on this front is limited owing to the persistence of the Cold-War mindset amongst the big five on the one hand and their failure to reform the Security Council to reflect the realities of the new millennium on the other.

Economic and Social Council:

The creation of Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) underlined the realisation amongst the members of the UN that lasting peace and security in all parts of the world is not secured by only political and military stability but also includes high standards of living, full employment, and the conditions of economic and social progress and development. Consisting of members, presently 54 elected by the General Assembly for a term of 3 years, the ECOSOC is responsible for the conditions of stability and well being, which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, by seeking solutions of international economic, social, health and other humanitarian problems, in addition to, promoting universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms. Functioning under the authority of, and responsible to, the General Assembly, the ECOSOC’s fundamental duty is to co-ordinate the activities of various specialised agencies, engaged in numerous fields to uplift the socio-economic conditions of the masses in all parts of the world.

The modus operandi of the ECOSOC lies in making or initiating studies and reporting with respect to international economic, social, cultural, educational, health and related matters and making recommendations to the General Assembly. In order to expend its reach, both spatially and sectorally, a number of commissions, known as regional and functional commissions, have been established under the authority of the ECOSOC, the most important of which include Economic, Employment and Development Commission, Population Commission, Commission on Human Rights, and Commission of Status of Women; as well as the Economic Commission for Asia and Far East and Economic Commission for Latin America. In the end, the ECOSOC is also tasked with co-ordinating the activities of numerous specialised agencies and Non Governmental Organisations working in different fields of socio-economic development.
**Functions and powers:**

The functions and powers of the Economic and Social Council are:

To serve as the central forum for the discussion of international economic and social issues of a global or interdisciplinary nature and the formulation of policy recommendations on those issues addressed to Member States and to the United Nations system as a whole;

To make or initiate studies and reports and make recommendations on international economic, social, cultural, educational, health and related matters;

To promote respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all;

To call international conferences and prepare draft conventions for submission to the General Assembly on matters falling within its competence;

To negotiate agreements with the specialised agencies defining their relationship with the United Nations;

To co-ordinate the activities of the specialised agencies by means of consultations with and recommendations to them and by means of recommendations to the General Assembly and the Members of the United Nations;

To perform services, approved by the Assembly for Members of the United Nations and, upon request, for the specialized agencies;

To consult with non-governmental organizations concerned with matters with which the Council deals.

**Sessions:** The Economic and Social Council generally holds two month-long sessions each year, one in New York and the other at Geneva. The year-round work of the Council is carried out in its subsidiary bodies-commissions and committees-which meet at regular intervals and report back to the Council.

**Trusteeship Council**

In setting up an International Trusteeship System, the Charter established the Trusteeship Council as one of the main organs of the United Nations and assigned to it the task of supervising the administration of Trust territories placed under the Trusteeship system. Major goals of the system are to promote the advancement of the inhabitants of trust territories and their progressive development towards self-governance or independence.

The Trusteeship Council seeks to protect the interests of people who live in trust territories and to lead them toward self-government. It receives reports from the administering authorities, examines petitions, and sends out visiting missions. Its members are elected by the General Assembly.

The Trusteeship Council acts under the authority of the General Assembly or, in the case of a "strategic area" under the authority of the Security Council.

Under the Charter, the total number of members of the Council is to be equally divided between those members which administer Trust territories and those which do not, a parity which is not currently maintained.
Functions and powers:

The Trusteeship Council is authorised to examine and discuss reports from the Administering Authority on the political, economic, social and educational advancement of the peoples of Trust territories and in consultation with the Administering Authority, to examine petitions from and undertake periodic and other special missions to Trust territories.

However, the Trusteeship Council now lays dormant and awaits termination. The successful demise of the Trusteeship Council, may arguably, be taken as one of the few success stories of the UN, for, the credit should be given to the Council for facilitating the gradual and smooth completion of the process of Decolonisation, resulting in the independence of most of the colonies in Asia and Africa.

International Court of Justice:

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is the "Supreme Court" of the United Nations. Its permanent seat is at The Hague in Netherlands. The ICJ consists of 15 judges, not two from one nation, elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council. The judges serve for nine years, five retire every third year, and they may be reelected. Nine judges make a quorum and questions are decided by a majority vote.

Any states--even non-members--may bring disputes to the court for judgment. Both parties must first agree to allow the court to try the case. Should one of them fail to accept the judgment of the court, the other may appeal to the Security Council for enforcement. The court serves also as the legal adviser to the General Assembly, Security Council, and other United Nations organs.

The Court is open to the parties to its Statute, which automatically includes all Members of the United Nations. A State which is not a Member of the United Nations may become a party to the Statute on conditions determined in each case by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

All countries which are parties to the Statute of the Court can be parties to cases before it. Other States can refer cases to it under conditions laid down by the Security Council. In addition, the Security Council may recommend that a legal dispute be referred to the Court.

Both the General Assembly and the Security Council can ask the Court for an advisory opinion on any legal question. Other organs of the United Nations and the specialized agencies, when authorised by the General Assembly, can ask for advisory opinions on legal questions within the scope of their activities.

The jurisdiction of the Court covers all questions which States refer to it, and all matters provided for in the United Nations Charter or in treaties or conventions in force. States may bind themselves in advance to accept the jurisdiction of the Court in special cases, either by signing a treaty or convention which provides for referral to the Court or by making a special declaration to that effect. Such declarations accepting compulsory jurisdiction may exclude certain classes of cases.

In accordance with Article 38 of its Statute, the Court, in deciding disputes submitted to it, applies:
• International conventions establishing rules recognised by the contesting States;
• International custom as evidence of a general practice accepted as law;
• The general principles of law recognised by nations; and
• Judicial decisions and the teachings of the most highly qualified publicists of the various nations, as a subsidiary means for determining the rules of law.

However, the ICJ has been a victim of the reluctance of the member states to subject themselves to the jurisdiction of the Court often under the garb of the issues within their domestic jurisdiction. This has been shocking betrayal of the aspirations of the framers of the Charter, who wished the ICJ to be vibrant and functional organ of the UN and become the mainstay of settling international disputes through judicial means.

**Secretariat:**

The Secretariat services the other organs of the United Nations and administers the programmes and policies laid down by them. At its head is the Secretary-General, who is appointed by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council.

The Secretariat carries on the day-to-day business of the United Nations and assists all the other organs. The Secretariat has been by and large able to discharge the functions of being the administrative hub of the UN, with Secretary General, acting as the Chief Administrative Officer of the organisation. The Secretary General is appointed by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council.

The Secretariat, an international staff of more than 25,000 men and women from over 150 countries, carries out the day-to-day work of the United Nations both at Headquarters in New York and in offices and centres around the world. These international civil servants take an oath not to seek or receive instructions from any Government or outside authority.

However, the Trusteeship Council, the ICJ and the Secretariat have either been not allowed to gain prominence by the member states or ceased to remain prominent due to non-accomplishment of the tasks in hand, with the exception of the position of the Secretary General. The Secretary General, though remaining an irritant in the eyes of the Super power or other during the Cold War years and to some extent in the post-Cold War years as well, has remained conscience-keeper of the common man.

**Principles of UN functioning:**

The basic principles of UN functioning has been the maintenance of international peace and security. The UN Security Council sought to establish the system of collective security, peaceful settlement of international disputes, peace-keeping operations and conflict resolution.

The cardinal principle remains that of collective security, which is commonly understood as formation of a broad alliance of most major actors with a purpose to jointly oppose aggression by any actor. It’s rooted in the recognition of sovereign equality of all the states and their voluntary willingness to stand united in the face of all aggressions. The notion of collective security is considered to be the only viable system of maintaining international peace and security.
Under the UN Charter, the mechanism of collective security is positioned in the Security Council, which is authorised to take binding decisions, if any breach of international peace and security takes place. Within the ambit of provisions for resolving international disputes, the Charter, in chapter 6, first of all, envisages the resolution of the dispute without using force against the aggressor.

However, the peaceful means fail to restore order and secure international peace and security. Despite of theoretical infallibility, the provisions pertaining to coercive measures, as given in the Charter, have fallen prey to the tactics of the super powers and almost rendered redundant. Due to the overuse of the veto by one big power or the other, the UN could not effectively stop any aggression, perpetrated or supported by a big power. Only occasion when the UN Security Council used the provisions on coercive action during the Cold War was the Korean crisis when the former Soviet Union was boycotting its proceedings on the issue of the Communist China’s representation in the Security Council in place of Taiwan.

In the post-Cold War era, the classic case has been when all the members of the Security Council voted to authorise the use of force as when Iraq invaded Kuwait in 1990. In the face of the US hegemonistic designs, notably in the case of Iran and Iraq, the coalescence of interests amongst the Big Five, again, appeared to be withering away. It creates ground for the relegation of the principle of collective security pushing it to the background.

The provisions for coercive military action, as envisaged in Chapter 7 of the Charter, have been assumed to be the methods of last resort. Realising that the military actions are fraught with many portent repercussions, elaborate provisions have been made in Chapter 6 of the Charter, providing for the peaceful methods of settling international disputes. Delineating the broad contours of the ways and means to settle the disputes amicably, Article 33 of the Charter lays down that ‘the parties to any dispute…shall, first of all, seek a solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their choice’.

The primary responsibility in this regard also rests with the Security Council, which has been authorised to investigate any dispute, or any situation which might lead to the breach of international peace and security, and recommend appropriate procedures or methods for the resolution of the dispute.

Interestingly, the recommendations of the Security Council, under the provisions of Chapter 6, are only advisory, not binding on the parties to the dispute. Nevertheless, caught in the vicious dynamics of the Cold War, the Security Council, during most of the times of its existence, has been, more often than not, pushing for the peaceful settlement of disputes, with a track record of a mixed bag of successes and failures.

While the provisions regarding collective security through the means of, either coercive military action or the peaceful settlement of disputes are mandated by the Charter, a few functional innovations have been devised to attain the objective of maintaining international peace and security, the most important of which appears to be the peace-keeping operations.

The cardinal principle upon which depends the successful functioning, if not the sheer survival, of the UN, may arguably be taken to be that of conflict resolution. Indeed, it is the prerequisite for the UN to resolve the conflicts between the states amicably if it wants to remain
in the reckoning to be acknowledged as the last hope of humanity to save the world from the sinful acts of war and violence.

Though the notion of conflict resolution apparently looks akin to the concept of peaceful settlement of disputes, there exists a finer distinction between the two concepts, in the sense that while the former applies to the situations witnessing the onset of violent clashes between the warring parties to the disputes, the latter is taken recourse to in cases where the dispute simmers with the potential of armed conflict but the real time violent conflict has still not taken place.

The modus operandi of the UN to resolve the conflicts primarily is by mediating between the parties to the conflict. Generally, a representative from some neutral country is authorised by the UN Secretary General to act as the mediator between the warring factions to bring them to the discussion table, with a cease fire in force for the time being. The nature and scope of the mediation efforts in resolving conflicts range from providing merely the good offices to those of offering concrete proposals of solution based on an assessment of each side’s demands and aspirations.

The efficacy and effectiveness of the efforts in conflict resolution depend, to a large extent, upon the adjustability of the respective positions of the two parties, in the absence of which such efforts are bound to fail. The long drawn conflict in the West Asia is a case in point in this regard.

In final analysis, the principles of the functioning of UN stand out as the mandates given by the Charter to secure the primary objective of maintaining international peace and security. Putting premium on the peaceful settlement of disputes, the Charter squarely preordains the disputing parties to persevere enough to find a peaceful solution to their disputes, either on their own disposition or at the insistence of the Security Council. Yet, the failure to reach a peaceful solution to the dispute doesn’t necessarily involve the recourse to violent means by the parties, in which case the provisions have been provided for the coercive actions against the aggressor. In contemporary times, when most, if not all, of the disputes in the world seem to defy full and final settlement, thereby retaining the probability of violent flare ups, the peace-keeping operations emerge to be the best bet to keep peace, even if fragile, in the world.

**UN’S 1960 Declaration and Decolonisation:**

UN’s Declaration 1514 (XV) adopted in 1960 begins with the idea of granting independence to both colonial countries and peoples and upholds the right of all peoples to self-determination. However, it ends with two articles reaffirming the territorial integrity of states and the principle of non-interference in the internal affairs of all states. UN’s Declaration limited the scope and the meaning itself of decolonisation.

UN Declaration had a vague reference about colonialism. It recognised that peoples of the world ardently desired the end of colonialism in all its manifestations, but does not define what these are. The only part that really goes some way to describing colonialism is article 1, that: The subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation constitutes a denial of fundamental human rights. This idea of alien subjugation, domination and exploitation, which is really the only incisive part of the declaration, is never followed up further and these criteria were never applied per se.
In fact, to skirt the issue of what colonialism or alien subjugation, domination and exploitation consisted of, the Member States opted for a different methodology that would not put in cause their own practices. They merely drew up a list of territories to be decolonised. In the end, the idea, contained in the declaration, of granting independence to peoples under alien subjugation, is completely lost sight of. Decolonisation becomes a closed instead of an open-ended process and no mechanisms for participation or petition or appeal to the United Nations are made available. All debate and dialogue is closed off. There is only one problem and one solution.

**Decolonisation process and United Nations:**

The movement for decolonisation however can be understood as much broader movement, a process of contention which began way before the 1960 declaration and has its roots in the resistance to colonialism all over the globe. It’s as a result of this movement and the resistance to colonialism and imperialism, which had resulted in a number of states gaining independence that, led UN Members to formalise the declaration condemning colonialism.

The UN Declaration was a belated recognition of the right to self-determination of peoples under colonial rule and in many ways it consisted of a process within a process. Colonialism was not simply a process of taking over and administering territories and peoples. It was a complex ideological and cultural project which sought to legitimise the take-over, present it in positive terms and in as far as possible co-opt the local populations into acquiescing and participating in the process. The use of force was always portrayed as being exceptional and often excused as being needed because of the savagery, unruliness and general backwardness of those who resisted. In general these empires succeeded in the aim of co-opting the cooperation of large parts of the population. The ideological aspect was vital to the achievement of stability. Given this complexity of colonialism, its reverse the decolonisation process as defined in the UN Declaration seems exceedingly simple: Merely the granting of independence to countries that had been under the control of colonial powers, countries which existed as geographical entities only because of that very colonial occupation.

After the Second World War India, Pakistan and Sri Lanka became Independent. 1960s is regarded as ‘Decade as Decolonisation’. In 1960 many countries in Asia were freed from colonial fetters and later on took the membership in the United Nations. In the 1970s, a record number of African countries became Independent and members of UN. This brought a metamorphic change in the structure of the UN. The Asian and African countries constituted a powerful bloc within the UN and argued their position very strongly vis-à-vis the developed countries. They created a strong public opinion among the international community about number of issues- social, economic and political such as apartheid, colonialism and neo-colonialism, development, human rights and environment.

Decolonisation has unfettered a huge number of countries in Asia and Africa vying for a place of respect in the UN system and international politics; Germany and Japan along with the developing countries like India and China have emerged as the economic power in the world; and collective security, though remaining to be the plausible doctrine of maintaining world peace and security, yet derives funds for such operations from states like Germany and Japan and manpower in terms of soldiers from volunteering countries like India and Brazil. Also, the collapse of the Soviet Union has led to the demise of the bloc rivalry in global politics, unleashing two equally plausible scenarios in the global relations, marked by the pre-dominance of US as the sole super power, turning the international scenario into the unipolar system on the
hand, and the emergence of a number of regional powers, like India, Japan, Germany, Brazil etc. turning the global system into a multipolar one.

**Socio-Economic Perspectives in UN functioning:**

The framers of the UN Charter placed social and economic issues in the overall scheme of things within the UN. As Article 55 of the Charter points out: ‘with a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well-being which are necessary for peaceful and friendly relations among nations, the United Nations shall promote higher standard of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development; solutions of international economic, social, health and related problems; and universal respect for human rights’. Consequently, the socio-economic issues pertaining to the vulnerable sections like children, women, the disabled, minorities, refugees and displaced persons as well as pathetic conditions like poverty, hunger and diseases such as HIV, polio, etc., have attracted the attention of the UN to evolve a common and universally acceptable strategy to deal with the problems in hand.

After more than six decades of functioning with limited success in transforming the socio-economic profile of the people all across the world, a landmark dimension in the socio-economic perspectives of the UN functioning have been added by the adoption of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) in September 2000.

The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are eight goals to be achieved by 2015 that respond to the world's main development challenges. The MDGs are drawn from the actions and targets contained in the Millennium Declaration that was adopted by 189 nations-and signed by 147 heads of state and governments during the UN Millennium Summit in September 2000.

The eight MDGs are as follows:
- **Goal 1:** Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger
- **Goal 2:** Achieve universal primary education
- **Goal 3:** Promote gender equality and empower women
- **Goal 4:** Reduce child mortality
- **Goal 5:** Improve maternal health
- **Goal 6:** Combat HIV/AIDS, malaria and other diseases
- **Goal 7:** Ensure environmental sustainability
- **Goal 8:** Develop a Global Partnership for Development

**Political strengths and weaknesses**

The creation of the UN, amidst the realities of the post-Second World War in 1945, to satisfy the shrewd and selfish political requirements of the big powers came about along with concomitant political strengths and weaknesses. UN had to function in the anarchic international system in midst of intensified Cold War between the two power blocs led by the United States and the former Soviet Union. The functional dynamics of the UN, in the course of time, has further added and deducted a number of processes and elements, which both replenished and diminished the political strengths and weaknesses of UN. These political strengths and weaknesses are nothing but assets to facilitate the proper functioning of the UN to achieve the objectives of its existence on the one hand, and liabilities which obstructs or impedes the efficient and effective discharge of its responsibilities on the other.
The political strengths and weaknesses of the UN are drawn from three sources – structure of the UN, functional dynamics of the UN over the last six decades and the ancillary processes and products of international politics during the post-Second World War period.

The Charter-mandated structure of the UN may arguably be considered as a marked improvement upon all the previously existing international organisations, including the League of Nations. Plugging the loopholes of the structure existing in the form of the League of Nations, the framers of the Charter widened the scope of functioning of the UN by not only making the provisions of the institutions like the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council but also by making these institutions formidable in the UN structure by elevating them as the principal organs of the UN. Moreover, the marked improvements ingrained in the structure and functioning of the important organs like the General Assembly, Security Council and the Secretariat have added to the efficacy and effectiveness of the UN as a whole.

Similarly, the functional dynamics of the UN during the last sixty-two years, despite all odds, have not allowed itself to be rendered as an ineffective and inherently incoherent body. Rather, in times of need, responding to the deadlocks experienced in one organ, the other organs have risen to the occasion to meet the challenges of the time. The two important illustrations in this context appear to be the ‘Uniting for Peace Resolution’, adopted by the General Assembly in 1950 and the shift of focus in the functioning of the UN from that of the monitor of world peace and security to that of the pioneer of socio-economic transformation in the Developing countries during the sixties and seventies when the operational dynamics of the Cold War had rendered the Security Council to be a deadwood. Finally, a number of processes and products, emerging in the course of time, have also added to the strengths and weaknesses of the UN. The process and the products of the wave of Decolonization is a case in point in this regard.

**Strengths of the UN**

Structurally, the political strengths of the UN stem from the perspective which the framers of the Charter had while visualising the broad foundational moorings of the world body. Usually, the arena of international politics is construed to be the domain of the nation-states, operating to safeguard their national interest, as understood in the parochial and strict geographical sense of the term, with the interest of the common man, relegated to the background. In other words, an international organisation is considered to be the theatre where only state actors can perform and provide rational and legitimacy to the body. As against this, the UN is characterised as the body reflecting the conscience of the people at large, with the states acting as the representative, not the competing agent to the common people. It is for this explicit telepathy of the UN with the common masses across the world, as expressed in the phrase ‘we the peoples of the United Nations’, that it became an article of faith and a fundamental principle of the foreign policies of the most, if not all, of the countries of the world. In the early years of its existence, the UN drew enormous political strength from the numerous UN Clubs formed in various fields of human activity in all parts of the world, including India. The framers of the UN Charter tried to provide a structural political strength to the UN by not making it a part of the peace treaties signed after the end of the World War II.

The significance of this feature of the UN may be realised from the fact that most of the previous experiments of international organisations are marked by the fact that they came out as a part of one or the other peace treaties winding up a war. Beginning with the Treaty of Westphalia which produced the Westphalian world order till the Treaty of Versailles leading to the foundation of the League of Nations, the history of the growth of international organisations
bear witness to this inauspicious trend. As the World War II was also a war for selfish aggrandizement and redistribution of the colonies in the world, its result was equally, if not more, devastating, disgraceful and heralding an era of renewed power struggle in international relations which did not go well with the majority of nations in the world. Thus, by producing UN as a separate and distinct organization, having nothing to do with the Second World War and its results, the framers provided a unique political strength to this body.

The structure of the UN, as revealed by its six principal organs, stands out to provide political strength to it at two levels. Firstly, the make of this international body is such as to look like a world government, not only in form but also in substance. For instance, in addition to the General Assembly, the Security Council and the International Court of Justice to symbolise the legislative, executive and judicial branches of a national government, the idea of Economic and Social Council and various specialised agencies represent the substance of a national government designed to look after the well being of its citizens. Indeed, the tremendous activities of the social and economic welfare, carried out by the ECOSOC and other specialised agencies have gone a long way in deepening the political legitimacy of the UN in the minds of the masses. Despite the subdued functioning of the various other organs of the UN, including the General Assembly and the Security Council, the UN has definitely been able to save the world from the vortex of another world war. This somewhat undervalued political accomplishment of the UN, in conjunction with its social and humanitarian reach has been able to ensure that, despite being criticised for its meagre attainments, it is not cursed to doom for its utter failures, by the people all over the world.

The regional organisations, existing on the basis of the geographical unity of the member states, have also emerged to be the basis of the political strength of the UN. Realizing the value of such organisations and acknowledging the limitations of the UN in reaching all parts of the world to sort out all kinds of problems affecting the people, the Charter explicitly permits and encourages the formation of regional organisations and agencies for not only the maintenance of international peace and security but also for the initiation and promotion of socio-economic interactions amongst the governments and peoples of the region, provided they are consistent with the purposes and principles of the UN Charter. In fact, article 52 of the Charter goes to the extent of exhorting both members and the Security Council to utilise the mechanism of regional organisations for the pacific settlement of international disputes, before such disputes are placed before the Security Council for its attention. Moreover, under the Charter provisions, the Security Council is authorised to make use of such regional arrangements, as deemed appropriate, for enforcement action also, provided such action are undertaken under the authorization and monitoring of the Security Council. The recent skirmishes between Somalia and Ethiopia is sought to be managed by the regional organisation called the Organisation of African States (OAS) with the Security Council resting assured that the issue would be resolved by the OAS to the satisfaction of both the parties. Likewise, the strengthening of the position of the regional organisations like the EU, ASEAN, SAARC, OAS, etc., would not only reduce the potential points of dispute between the countries of the region but also enhance all round cooperation amongst them, thereby, advancing the goals for which the UN stands and exists.

The functional political strengths of the UN appear to be more significant, both in reach and substance, than the structural political strengths. These strengths, though provided to some extent in the Charter provisions, have been refined and developed to become the hallmark of the UN’s functional dynamics, over a period of time. The scope of activities as provided for in the Charter
is, in the first place, quite wide and diversified, as compared to the activities of the previous international organisations including the League of Nations.

The following two distinct features of the UN’s functional dynamics provide strength to it:

- First, the Charter has itself taken a holistic perspective in defining the functional domain of the UN in various fields. As in the case of maintenance of international peace and security, the Charter, in addition to the peace-keeping activities, has also provided for the peace-building activities as a major function, encompassing the social, economic, educational and cultural fields, as a result of which peace is built on a sustainable basis.
- Secondly, the UN has not remained oblivious of the emerging issues and problems of the time and has responded appropriately by either bestowing the responsibility to deal with such problems to an existing agency or creating a new organisation, which is exemplified by the creation of the agencies like the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

However, the passage of the ‘Uniting for Peace Resolution’ in 1950, by the General Assembly, in face of the paralysis of the Security Council due to the frequent use of veto by a particular super power, is a case in point, when, without altering the Charter provisions regarding the distribution of powers between the General Assembly and the Security Council, the General Assembly tried to rise to the occasion to deal with the simmering problems of the time. Similarly, the invention of the concepts like peace-keeping operations, etc., which has not been provided originally in the Charter, is a tribute to the wisdom of the former Secretary General Dag Hammarskjöld, who devised it to deal with situations arising in post-conflict periods.

The voting procedure, as devised by the framers of the Charter, for the General Assembly and the Security Council has also provided the basis for the political strength of the UN. As the General Assembly is taken to be the international conscience keeper of the world public opinion, it is provided for the passage of the resolutions in the Assembly either by a simple majority or a two-third majority as the case may be. Thus, by envisaging a simple voting procedure in the General Assembly, the Charter provides a kind of safety valve to the mass of developing countries to air their views on the issues that concern them.

The Assembly resolutions, being recommendatory in nature, does not make much impact on the shape of international relations, thereby providing a space for the big powers to ignore them if they want to do so, but at the same time expresses the public opinion on the issue in black and white. On the contrary, as the decisions of the Security Council are binding on the member states and would impact on the shape of the international relations, it is envisioned that the decisions of the Security Council would be made only in cases where the five permanent members agree on the ways to deal with a particular issue in hand. Thus, though the provision of veto may act as a double edged weapon in the functioning of the UN, its existence has done a favour to the UN by checking it from taking any such decision which either it could probably not execute or whose execution would have led to another global conflict in the world. However, a lot needs to be done on this count in order to turn the Security Council into a truly functional body to maintain international peace and security.

A substantive political strength to the UN has been afforded by the provisions regarding the enforcement action, as laid down in the Charter. Rooted in the doctrine of collective security, the enforcement action visualises the right of the Security Council to decide, on behalf of the
entire UN system whether a threat exists to the international peace and security and if so, what enforcement actions, in terms of military, political or economic can be taken to deal with the situation. In other words, the UN stands in unity to ward off any threat to international peace and security by identifying the aggressor and initiating suitable action against the aggressor in order to ensure the collective security of all the nations in the world.

What has, however, proved to be the high moral pedestal of the UN in the realm of the collective security doctrine is that adequate provisions have also been made in the Charter to provide for the peaceful settlement of disputes between the parties, failing which, only the recourse to the enforcement action may be taken. Still, the doctrine of collective security has not been frequently used owing to the continuance of the dynamics of the Cold War for a fairly large period of time in the post-Second World War period. In the post-Cold War period, this strength of the UN is being put to use, as in the case of Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1991.

Another innovation of the UN which has turned out to be its political strength is the provision to guarantee the member states the right to self-defence, in case their being attacked by another country. Laid down under the provisions of Article 51 of the Charter, which says that ‘nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations until the Security Council has taken the measure necessary to maintain the international peace and security,’ the right to self-defence of the member states ordains on them the responsibility to take sufficient care of their security and defence so that their lack of preparedness to suitably respond to any attack on their territory does not become an allurement for pernicious neighbour to wage war against it. Thus, all the member states of the UN are encouraged to maintain the minimum deterrence to ward off any undue threat to their safety and security, which in ultimate case, lessens the burden of the UN in discharging its onerous task of maintaining international peace and security.

Apart from the political strengths drawn from the structural and functional dynamics of the UN, a number of processes and products of the international politics, as experienced during the last six decades have also added up to become the valuable assets of the UN. The processes of Decolonization, conflict resolution, peaceful settlement of international disputes, etc., as well as the products like Disarmament, global concern for human rights, the emergence of the Third World as a formidable force in international politics and the immense goodwill which the UN has been able to accumulate in all parts of the world consolidate the political strengths of the UN to such an extent that the UN might one day stand true to the aspirations of its framers. In fact, the transitory phase of international relations, whereby the settled facts of the post-Second World War period are being sought to be unsettled and the hitherto marginalised big powers of the world are assiduously seeking to regain a place of pride in the international comity of nations, the UN stands a bright chance to become the beacon light of ushering in a new era in global politics and the sine qua non for the existence of a civilised and orderly world order.

Weaknesses of the UN

While the UN may be taken as the last hope of humanity to ensure a safe, secure, peaceful and prosperous human civilisational growth encompassing all parts of the world, a number of inherent and acquired political weaknesses of the world body also inhibit its potential to develop enough to become the synonym of a world government.
One of the most significant inherent political weaknesses of the UN is that it reflects the realities of the world politics as existing in 1945. The basic characteristics of the world scenario in the post-Second World War period included the dominance of the world power system by the traditional powers like Britain, France and the new monoliths like the United States and the former Soviet Union; vast territories of Asia and Africa still remaining colonies; total destruction of the political and economic power system of Germany and Japan; unflinching belief in the doctrine of collective security to be the guarantor of international peace and security as shouldered by the five permanent members of the UN Security Council; and growing polarisation of world politics into two blocs led by the United States and the ex-Soviet Union respectively.

In the contemporary times of the twenty first century, most, if not all, of the features characterising the global scenario have undergone thorough transformations yielding the exactly opposite results as compared to the situation at the time of the UN’s formation. Britain and France are no more the big players in international politics; Soviet Union has given way to fifteen independent states including Russia, its heir apparent; Decolonisation has unfettered a huge number of countries in Asia and Africa vying for a place of respect in the UN system and international politics; Germany and Japan along with the developing countries like India and China have emerged as the economic power houses of the world competing with the US as the economic super power in the world; and collective security, though remaining to be the plausible doctrine of maintaining world peace and security, yet derives funds for such operations from states like Germany and Japan and manpower in terms of soldiers from volunteering countries like India and Brazil.

The collapse of the Soviet Union has led to the demise of the bloc rivalry in global politics, unleashing two equally plausible scenarios in the global relations, marked by the predominance of US as the sole super power, turning the international scenario into the unipolar system on the one hand, and emergence of a number of regional powers like India, Japan, Germany, Brazil, etc., turning the global system into a multipolar one. Placed presently in a totally different global scenario altogether, the UN’s primary political weakness, which in many cases also proves to be the cause of its undoing, appears to be its inability to transform itself in accordance with the changed realities of the international scenario.

The archaic structure and functioning of the UN has not only robbed itself of its dynamism but also ingrained a sense of redundancy in those powers and players upon whose active support and assistance rests the major burden of responsibility which the UN is supposed to discharge. For instance, two important aspects of UN weaknesses relate to its inability to carry out the peace-keeping operations in various parts of the world effectively so that the peace and security in the world is sufficiently maintained and, its insufficient finances. There seems to be a good deal of possibility of streamlining these two vital factors of UN functioning by providing countries like India, Japan and Germany a greater say in the in the affairs of the UN by elevating them to the position of permanent members of the Security Council.

As the basic purpose behind the setting up of the UN was considered to be the maintenance of international peace and security, for which the effective functioning of the Security Council seems a pre-condition, the biggest weakness of the UN system emerges out to be the petty politics played by the big five in the Security Council. In reality, the provision of the veto power was provided for in the UN in order to make the functioning of the system of collective security in the world foolproof and specific. The consensus amongst the big five was
considered to be a major, if not only, determinant in formulating the response of the Security Council towards a dispute in the world. By the idea of veto, it was visualized to check the initiation of hasty and controversial actions in order to resolve any dispute by not allowing any decision to be taken until and unless a broad consensus emerges amongst the members of the Security Council. However, in practice, the provision of veto came to be one of the most formidable weapons to fight the Cold War in the post Second World War period, whose foremost casualty has been the effective functioning of the Security Council. Though, in the post Cold War period, the misuse of veto may appear to be a distinct probability, the issue at hand now appears to be the revamping of the whole system of veto in view of the changed realities of international politics.

The scrupulous and strident observance of the notion of state sovereignty in relation to the reach and effective functioning of the UN has also become one of the important weaknesses of the UN.

Thus, the UN system appeared to be the product of the situations characterised by the existence of sovereign states as the movers and shakers of the international relations. However, with the enhancement in the scope and variety of the UN functioning, the various states of the world started to shield themselves behind the Charter provisions which afforded the liberty to the member states in keeping those issues, on which they find themselves in an uneasy situation in face of any UN action, out of the reach of the UN under the garb of the issues pertaining to their domestic jurisdiction. The two UN organs, which became the target of this unsavoury alibi of the member states, seem to be the Security Council and the International Court of Justice, for, whenever a dispute was sought to be placed before these organs, the concerned parties to the dispute tried to extend the shield of state sovereignty and domestic jurisdiction to ward off any action or decision by these organs, if they find themselves in an embarrassing situation at the time of the issue being taken up. The limited scope of UN functioning in relation to international peace and security operations has also come to be a debilitating aspect of the UN existence as the guarantor of international peace and security.

Since, the Charter provisions in this regard were found to be too narrow and rigid to allow the maintenance of international peace and security, in both short and long term perspectives, an invention was made by Dag Hammarskjöld by way of initiating the peace-keeping operations under the UN auspices. However, the scope of activities under the peace-keeping operations has also been found wanting as it seeks to maintain peace once it is arrived at. What about cases where violent clashes or war is unceasing and long-drawn out? As a number of countries in the world were freeing themselves from the grip of the super powers, as was the case during the Cold War, and since quite often within a country, various groups of people may be at loggerheads thereby creating a situation of civil strife in those countries, the need was felt to raise the bar of peace-keeping operations to involve peace-making operations also as an inalienable package of maintaining the international peace and security.

The Agenda for Peace, as provided by the former UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali, appears to provide a resounding perspective on the issue of the maintenance of world peace and security in the post Cold War periods. Finally, the weakness which proves to be the nemesis of the UN seems to be its financial resources which provide a stick to the most powerful country in the world to punish the UN, in case it fails to blindly toe the American line in international politics. So much so that during the 1990s, the UN experienced an unprecedented financial crisis owing to some of its members withholding portions of their annual contributions.
The uncertainty regarding the financial resources of the UN affects the stability of UN operations and works as a strong stumbling block in the visualising of innovations in the structure and functions of the UN.

Reforming the UN

Reforming the UN has emerged to be one of the most burning issues confronting policy makers across the world, keeping in view the more assertive and countervailing role the UN is expected to play in the contemporary unipolar world. Asian and African countries, which constitute a powerful bloc in UN, have made a strong point in favour of democratisation of UN, which is a major issue today concerning the strengthening of the world body. It was argued that the world has undergone a sea change since 1945 when UN was created.

Interestingly, of the six major organs constituting the UN, the focus of attention of the people are drawn mainly, if not exclusively, to the structure and functioning of the Security Council owing to the critical role assigned to this august body by the Charter to maintain international peace and security. Hence, despite the need for one or other types of reforms being carried out in all the organs of the UN, the entire debate and efforts of the experts have boiled down to reform the structure and functioning of the Security Council.

Being a product of the transitional and uncertain circumstances prevailing in the twilight of World War II, the structure and functioning of the UN were bound to reflect the crude realities of the time. Taking undue advantage of the fluid situation, all the major powers tried and succeeded to monopolise the critical decision making powers of the body in such a way that the UN, in reality, became a pawn in the hand of these powers, with the position of the other members remaining inconsequential for most of the time and purposes. Amongst the major organs of the UN, the Security Council was accorded the position of pride with the power to take binding decisions pertaining to the maintenance of international peace and security. But the marginalisation of the vast number of member states from the vortex of decision making of the Security Council, accompanied by the veto power of the five permanent members, turned the Council into the most undemocratic and unsuccessful organs of the UN, inducing the demand for bringing about substantial reforms in the structure and functioning of the Security Council.

Though the need to reform the structure and functioning of the Security Council has been felt for a long time, the imperatives of the Cold War did not allow the issue to take a centre stage in the realm of international politics. The real impetus, therefore, to press for the reform of the Security Council, came in the aftermath of the disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the resultant demise of the Cold War. Pioneered by countries like India, Germany, Japan and Brazil (G-4), the persistent demand for the reforms of the Security Council led to the holding of the first ever Summit Meeting of the Council at the UN Headquarters on 31 January 1992 to deliberate on the nature and scope of the Council’s functioning in the post Cold War era. Refraining from dwelling on the blue print to reform the structure of the Council, the Summit authorised Secretary-General Boutros Boutros Ghali to look into the functioning of the Council with regard to its role in the maintenance of international peace and security. Thus, ‘An Agenda for Peace’, authored by Ghali, came out to be the first well thought out document, containing numerous serious recommendations to reform the functioning of the Security Council. Now another grouping of developing countries, the IBSA (India, Brazil and South Africa) has also taken up the issue on a priority basis. The lukewarm response of the five permanent members of the Security Council to the issue of reforming the Security Council, accompanied by the straining of
relations between Ghali and United States, queered the pitch for the reform efforts of the Group of four countries (G-4).

The proposed reforms in the structure and functioning of the Security Council usually pertain to the expansion of its membership, limiting the use of veto power and reforming the sanctions and working methods of the Council. In the meanwhile, in March 2005, in a report titled ‘In Larger Freedom,’ the Secretary General Kofi Annan called on the members to reach a consensus on expanding the Council and presented a blueprint on the issue, which stipulating the number of members of an expanded Council at 24, gave two alternatives to sort out the issue: a) six new permanent members to be added along with three new non-permanent members; and b) eight new additions in a new class of members who would serve for four years, subject to renewal, in addition to one non-permanent member.

Even before the proposal of Kofi Annan, the G-4 countries had also presented the plan, according to which, apart from the five new permanent members, G-4 plus one member from African continent, four new non-permanent members could have been added. But owing to the political rivalry of different neighbours in various part of the world, five countries - Argentina, Italy, Canada, Colombia and Pakistan - joined hands together in July 2005, to sabotage the efforts of the G-4 and formed the platform called, Uniting for Consensus, to offer an alternative to the proposals of the G-4 and others. These countries, also called the Coffee Club, proposed to retain the permanent membership of the existing five countries and called for the expansion of the Security Council to include five other members in the nature of semi-permanent.

The real breakthrough in the move towards reforming the Security Council came in September 2005 when at the World Summit, leaders agreed to reform the Security Council in order to make it more transparent, accountable and equitably representative. Yet, individually, the five permanent members take different views on reforming the Security Council, keeping in view their own national interests.

The United States declared itself open to the reforms of the Security Council and its expansion as one element of the overall agenda for UN reforms. Advancing a criterion based approach under which the potential members must be supremely well qualified, based on the factors like economic size, population, military strength, commitment to democracy and human rights, financial contribution to the UN, contribution to UN peace keeping and record on counter terrorism and non-proliferation, it asserted to look at the overall geographical balance of the Council, though effectiveness is to remain the benchmark for any reform.

The position of China remains ambivalent in the matter, though it has declared itself in agreement with the proposals of the countries belonging to the Coffee Club. Britain, France and Russia have announced their willingness to support the proposal of the G-4 countries.

In view of the increasing acceptance of the desirability to expand the permanent membership of the Security Council, the G-4 countries tried to introduce a resolution in the General Assembly in September 2006 in continuation to an earlier unanimous resolution passed by the Security Council in 1995. Though, bereft of any substantive statutory value, the resolution of the General Assembly on the issue of the expansion of the Security Council would have gone a long way in arousing the public opinion of the masses in various parts of the world in its favour, which must have acted as some sort of a moral pressure on the five permanent members to accept the expansion plan of the Security Council.
However, due to the manoeuvring of the Coffee Club countries, the efforts of the G-4 countries could not bear fruit and the proposal to introduce the resolution in the General Assembly had to be aborted mid-way. Gathering courage again, the advocates of the reform of the Security Council initiated the discussion on the nature and scope of reforms with a two-day debate in the General Assembly in which the divergence of opinion continued to exist. Hence, in February 2007, the President of the General Assembly set up five tracks for consultations, with one ambassador appointed as a facilitator on each of the following: membership, veto power, regional representation, the size of an enlarged Security Council and the working methods of the Council and its relationship with the General Assembly. The findings of the five facilitators have been placed before the member countries for further consultations amongst themselves to narrow down their differences on the vital issues of the Security Council reforms.

Apart from the membership issue, the other matter which has been reckoned to be in need of reform is the provision of veto as the privilege given to the five permanent members of the Security Council. Depending on the perspectives of various countries and the people, different proposals have been mooted to reform the veto provision. Firstly, it has been argued to limit the use of veto to the vital issues of national security of the member states, so that its use in all and sundry cases may be minimised. Secondly, in order to use the veto, the agreement from multiple nations have been sought to be made compulsory to provide for a rational and majority perspective on the use of veto. Finally, the demand for the abolition of veto altogether as the instrument of indiscriminate negation of decision making in the Security Council has also been made. In sum, the talk of reforming the veto appears to hover around the idea of curtailing its use as a negative tool of paralyzing the functioning of the Security Council.

In spite of the growing support for the reform of the Security Council, including the expansion in its membership and curtailing the frivolous use of the veto, the prospects for far-reaching reforms appear to be improbable in the near future. The present contours of international politics is laid down in such a way that a number of the permanent members of the Security Council would like the prevailing system to remain intact, at least for some more time. At the same time, the political rivalry between the neighbours in many parts of the world would not allow a consensus to emerge on the issue, in the absence of which it would be difficult to carry out the reforms in the Security Council which suits all the member states of the UN. Lastly, any reform to be effected in the Security Council would need the majority vote of the Council including the affirmative vote of all the five permanent members. However, as long as even one permanent member of the Security Council remains unfazed on the issue of reforming the Council, it will retain the power to nullify the efforts of all other members of the Council. In such circumstances, a reform in the Security Council would need to be preceded by some sort of agreement at least amongst the five permanent members of the Council on the nature and scope of the reform, which appears to be a distant dream, at least for the time being.

The analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of the UN, contextualised in its historical development as well as its structure and functions, take us to two broad conclusions. Firstly, it seems an irony of the destiny of the UN that the same circumstances and provisions which provided the impetus for the establishment of the UN and conditioned its functioning for a fairly long number of years, are now set to make the UN a prisoner of the past. The structural, functional and conditioning aspects of the UN like the concept of state sovereignty, the provision of domestic jurisdiction, the structure of the organs like the Security Council, the provision of veto, the mandates on collective security, peaceful settlement of international disputes, conflict
resolution, the strained financial resources and the exaggeratedly raised hopes of the masses from the developing countries of the world, etc., have now turned out to be the fetters which do not allow the UN to reincarnate itself into an institution of the twenty first century.

In fact, the same post Second World War circumstances which facilitated the germination of the idea of UN to grow into a full fledged international organisation, now debilitates any move to reorient the structure and functions of the UN. In other words, the tragedy of the UN is that it is called upon to serve the humanity by addressing issues and resolving problems with a changed perspective in the new millennium, through the mechanism and the mindset of the mid twentieth century. Even at that time also the situations had not fully unfolded and very soon, after its inauguration, the UN found itself struck up in the mayhem of the Cold War.

The elimination of the weaknesses and the augmentation of the strengths of the UN, however, cannot be brought about by cosmetic changes and piece-meal engineering in the structure and functions of the world body. What is needed is a drastic overhaul of the whole system of the UN by not only redesigning its structure through the abolition organs like the Trusteeship Council, reforming the organs like the Security Council, augmenting the organs like the Economic and Social Council and reinventing the organs like the International Court of Justice as well as Secretariat but also by fine-tuning its functions and widening the scope of its activities in consonance with the needs and requirements of the international system and the people at large in the twenty first century. It has, now, more or less, become the fait accompli of the UN to either reform its structure and reorient its activities in order to meet the demands and exigencies of the new millennium or just wait for successive blows to its existence and image to occur, leading to its gradual demise and paving the way for the advent of a new international organisation.
Feminism in International Relations is a broad term given to works of those scholars who have sought to bring gender concerns into the academic study of international politics. In terms of international relations theory it is important to understand that feminism is derived from the school of thought known as reflectionism. One of the most influential works in feminist international relations is Cynthia Enloe's *Bananas, Beaches and Bases* published by Pandora Press 1990. This text sought to chart the many different roles that women play in international politics - as plantation sector workers, diplomatic wives, sex workers on military bases etc. The important point of this work was to emphasise how, when looking at international politics from the perspective of women, one is forced to reconsider his or her personal assumptions regarding what international politics is 'all about'.

However, it would be a mistake to think that feminist international relations was solely a matter of identifying how many groups of women are positioned in the international political system. From its inception, feminist international relations have always shown a strong concern with thinking about men and, in particular, masculinities. Indeed, many international relations feminists argue that the discipline is inherently masculine in nature. In her article "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defence Intellectuals" *Signs* (1988), Carol Cohn claimed that a highly masculinised culture within the defence establishment contributed to the divorcing of war from human emotion.

A feminist International Relations involves looking at how international politics affects and is affected by both men and women and also at how the core concepts that are employed within the discipline of international relations for instance. war, security, etc. are themselves gendered. Feminist international relations has not only concerned itself with the traditional focus of international relation on states, wars, diplomacy and security, but feminist International Relation scholars have also emphasised the importance of looking at how gender shapes the current global political economy. In this sense, there is no clear cut division between feminists working in International Relations and those working in the area of International Political Economy (IPE).

Feminist International Relations emerged largely from the late 1980s onwards. The end of the Cold War and the re-evaluation of traditional international relations theory during the 1990s opened up a space for gendering International Relations. Because feminist international relations is linked broadly to the critical project in IR, by and large most feminist scholarship has sought to problematise the politics of knowledge construction within the discipline - often by adopting methodologies of deconstructivism associated with postmodernism post structuralism. However, the growing influence of feminist and women-centric approaches within the international policy communities (for example at the World Bank and the United Nations) is more reflective of the liberal feminist emphasis on equality of opportunity for women.

They argue that this knowledge is primarily based on the experience from men's lives. An ontology based on unitary states operating in an asocial, anarchical international environment does not provide an entry point for feminist theories grounded in an epistemology that takes social relations, particularly gender relations, as its central category of analysis. Feminist
ontology is based on social relations that are constituted by historically contingent unequal political, economic, and social structures. Unlike practitioners of conventional Social Science feminists generally prefer historical or sociological analyses that begin with individuals and the hierarchical social relations in which their lives are situated.

Feminists are motivated by emancipatory goals – investigating the often disadvantaged lives of women within states or international institutions and structures in order to change them. Starting its investigations from the perspective of the lives of individuals on the margins who have never been the subject matter of IR, feminist analysis is often bottom-up rather than top-down. Feminists in IR are linking the everyday life experiences of women with the constitution and exercise of political and economic power at state and global levels. They have focused on the effects of international politics and the world economy on relational and distributional gender inequality and on how gender inequalities serve to support these same structures. Identity issues, including race and culture as well as gender, have been at the core of feminist investigations. Feminists in International Relations are demonstrating how gender is a pervasive feature of international life and international politics, the implications of which go well beyond its effects on women.

In broad terms feminist International Relations has expanded the work of feminist economic and political theory to reveal the masculine way of framing of politics and economics and the related institutions. In the course of time feminists have come to the following conclusions:

1) The state and market is run by masculinity assumptions.
2) The dominant agency of political and economic activity ignores the contribution of women to the economic and political activity.
3) Lack of attention to the analytical category of gender obscures the interrelated social construction of male and female identities and roles.

Feminist International Relations has identified the malestream international relations theory as one of the discourses that help perpetuate a distorted and partial world view that reflects the disproportionate power of control and influence that men held, rather than the full social reality of lives of women, child and men. Feminists try to challenge the traditional concept of gender. The term gender, as defined within contemporary discourse, refers to the complex social construction of men’s and women’s identities. One’s gender reflects not simply or necessarily evens one’s biological characteristics, but rather culturally specific notions of men’s and women’s behaviors, particularly in relation to each other. Fundamental in the discourse on gender is the notion of power and the power dynamics between genders.

A feminist approach, then, aims to reveal the gendered dimensions of theories, structures, and actions in the context of International Relations. In International Relations it is assumed that males fight wars and run states, whereas females are irrelevant to International Relations. This amounts to an epistemological approach of interrogating International Relations theory and, in so doing, placing and bringing to light women’s and gender issues in foreign policy and in the broader international arena. As Marysia Zalewski put it quite simply, this approach asks two main questions:

‘What work is gender doing?’ and ‘Where are the women?’. The ultimate objective is to bring to the study and practice of International Relations a more critical and grounded
understanding of the world and the way it works, as well as and particularly to better understand the gender dynamics that create inequities of power between men and women. It is important to note that there is no single feminist approach to International Relations. Although they are interrelated, they often run in different directions. On some core issues, they often have conflicting views. One strand, difference feminism focuses on valorizing the unique contributions of women to the society. They argue that because of their experience with nurturing and human relations, women are potentially seen as more effective than men in conflicting situations and group decision making. It provides a perspective from which the core assumptions of Realism can be criticised. One of the core ideas of Realism is that it believes in the autonomy of the discipline. Difference feminism argues that this is purely masculine since male find separation easier to deal than with interconnection.

Liberal feminism asserts the equality of men and women through political and legal reform. It is an individualistic form of feminism and theory, which focuses on women’s ability to show and maintain their equality through their own actions and choices. Liberal feminism looks at the personal interactions of men and women as the starting ground from which to transform society into a more gender-equitable place. It rejects the claims that are made by the difference feminism as they believe that men and women are equal. Critical of the way women are excluded from the power structure of international society, as they do not buy the argument that including women in the power structure would change the nature of International Relations. As they believe that when women are allowed to participate in International Relations, they play the game the same way men do, with similar results. It focuses on the integration of women into the overwhelmingly male preserves of foreign policy making and the military. They want to see women as leaders, warriors, etc.

Another strand is post modern feminism, which drastically rejects the claims of both difference and liberal feminism. It seeks to deconstruct Realism with the specific aim of uncovering the pervasive hidden influences of gender in International Relations while showing how arbitrary the construction of the gender role is. They look at the interplay of gender and power in a more open-ended way. Waging and concluding of wars has traditionally been male-centric. The postmodern feminists tell that women are more peaceful than men by nature and they argue that to effect change; they need to demand an equal voice and role in international decision-making positions, including roles in the military. Also feminists claim that knowledge is socially constructed. They views marginal position of the women in the society as a potential advantage rather than as an oppressive situation for women. Also they argue from the Marxist position that a socially oppressed class has great knowledge which is not available to the privileged class by the mere fact that it is oppressed. An argument for the value of this theory is that “knowledge which emerges from women’s experiences ‘on the margins’ of world politics is actually more neutral and critical because it is not complicit with, or blinded by, existing institutions and power relations.”

Furthermore, many feminists refuse to regard war as a series of discrete events, considering it instead as a systematic expression of the society within which it resides, so that it doesn’t separate war from either the preparations made for it, or from its long term physical, psychological, socio-economic, environmental and gendered factors. They also criticise difference feminism for glorifying the traditional role of women. In studying war, post modern feminists have challenged the archetypes of the male and female as just warrior and beautiful soul respectively. They argue that women are not just passive bystanders or victims in war, but active participants in a system of warfare. They argue that in military bases prostitutes play an important role. Similarly in diplomacy, diplomat’s wives also play a very critical role which should not be ignored.
The genesis of feminist International Relations

The emergence of a feminist approach in the field of International relations can be traced to different sources. The emergence and growth of the Women in Development movement (WID), which has evolved into the Gender and Development movement (GAD), initiated a process of academic and policy research that, by the end of the decade, led to the understanding that women’s lives cannot be understood apart from a gender approach that looks at the power relationships between men and women. Further, it created awareness that these gendered power relationships affect and are affected by global economic and political processes that are themselves gendered.

A second factor in the emergence of gender and International relations as a field was the end of the Cold War. The shift of issues and priorities from the militaristic and ideological confines of the East-West divide opened a space in which other International relations issues and approaches could be explored and considered. Gender is but one of the ‘new’ elements of this trend, which also includes considerations of the environment, the drug trade, economic globalization, demographic issues, and ethnicity.

Another development that has augured well for feminist work in International Relations is the fact that as the subject matter of International Relations changes in the post-Cold War era, and as issues of human rights, environmental relations, migration, and democratization move to the fore, women’s issues can no longer be ignored. Consider as an example of this International relations development the issuance in 1995 of new guidelines on gender by the US Immigration and Naturalisation Service, recognising that women suffer persecution and human rights violations different from those suffered by men. This was issued in response to requests for asylum by women fleeing various forms of gender-related oppression, such as genital mutilation, domestic violence, and forced marriage. Thus, not only has International relations expanded to comprise new issues, but women and gender feature prominently in these new issues. A fourth way of considering the beginnings of feminist International relations is as a matter of natural progression – that feminist incursions into International relations are merely the final crumbling of this last bastion of the Social Sciences. International relations theory, itself a relatively new discipline, comprises various aspects of Social Science theory that have been interrogated by feminist approaches since the early 1970s.

Yet only in the late 1980s did it become subject to feminist International relations. This is most likely because of the dominance of men and a male perspective in the field. Take, for example, the role of the state, a principal actor in International relations. The state is one of the most important subjects of feminist study, where it has long been argued that the foundations of the state are based on a patriarchal and gendered sexual division of labor that subordinates women. As Kathleen Staudt phrased it:

‘Women had little or no hand in the process of state formation and consolidation. Yet male control over women – specifically, over the International relations labor, sexuality, and reproduction – was central to laws and policies that governed the gender realm.’ The fifth rationale behind the growth of feminist approaches to International relations is the increasing presence of women as political actors in the international arena. This could be considered as an outcome of the aforementioned factors. As women’s societal and gender roles continue to be redefined, and as women participate more in the public and political spheres, the International relations presence as actors in the international arena is inevitable. Recent research suggests that while a ‘hegemonic masculine’ still pervades the field of International relations, more women in the field allow not only the evolution of norms and behaviors that are typically characterised as
‘feminine’, but also a discourse freer of gendered restrictions in general. While it cannot be said that there is equal, or even near equal, representation of women to men in governmental and foreign policy decision-making positions, the number of women has increased significantly. For example, the proportion of ministries run by female ministers’ world-wide doubled from 3.4 per cent in 1987 to 6.8 per cent in 1996; in 1997, fifteen countries had achieved a representation of 20 to 30 per cent women at the ministerial level. Furthermore, international women’s organisations and feminist groups have been a part of the growth of the international nongovernmental sector, which has been facilitated by rapid developments in communications and information technology.

These groups work on many of the ‘new’ International relations issues, such as environmental relations and refugees, and have proven the International Relations’ ability to mobilise at the global level, as demonstrated by the massive gathering at the nongovernmental organisation (NGO) conference parallel to the United Nations World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995. A new section of the ISA was launched at the 1990 meetings in Washington, D.C. to promote research and teaching at the nexus of International Relations and feminist theory/gender studies. It heralds the partial opening of professional International Relations to gender - and women - sensitive International Relations, despite the continuing resistances one can read in the pages of mainstream journals. Indeed, J. Ann Tickner points out in her introduction to Gender in International Relations that ‘while a leading British International Relations journal Millennium devoted a special issue to women and International relations no major American journal of International Relations has yet published an article using gender as a category of analysis.’

Gender-minded analysts seek to move from suspicion of officially ungendered IR texts to their subversion and to replacement theories. this process, however, does not rely on a single and steady course. Feminist in particular, like the broader field of feminist theory, features conversations and disagreements across epistemologies. Feminist empiricists, for instance, are comfortable using the standards of science to investigate masculine activities in officially gender-blind IR and unacknowledged women's activities in various sectors of the field, for example in wars, on global assembly lines, in the peace movement. Feminist standpointers argue that people in positions of social subordination -- in this case women in IR -- develop different and more accurate insights on how the world and its "rules" work and we should bring these perspectives to bear on a field. Feminist postmodernists suspect "men" and "women" are invented subject categories that function to maintain specific relations of inequality and to hide instances of unanticipated insurrections by people whose existences are strait-jacketed by labels, for example., women volunteering for the war, and women peace campers refusing to feel protected and secure by medium-range nuclear missiles in Europe.

That there is no single way forward, around and through the morass of official international relations does not mean that the members of this section are obeisant to the status quo. There have been three recent streams of gender-attentive research into IR; critique and reappropriation of stories told about the proper scope of the field; revisions of war and peace narratives; and reevaluations of women and development in the international system and its parts.

Questioning the core of international relations: Elshtein, Enloe and Tickner

Feminist International Relations developed with the writings of Jean Bethke Elshtain, Cynthia Enloe and J.Ann. Tickner. Elshtain’s book Women and War is a bold rethink on
conventional war traditions. Elshtain probes war by juxtaposing conventional and unconventional perspectives on what is done, said and claimed about war. Women’s visibility was a major concern for Elshtain. Women were not in the state and system centric works of International Relations because they were neither fighters nor leaders, except in unusual and exceptional ways. In *Public Man, Private Woman* (1981), Jean Bethke Elshtain takes a more postmodernist route to reinterpret the philosophical core of the idea that women are mostly non-public creatures. Her discussion of the ‘sovereign subject’ and of public/private distinctions of ancient times has implications for continuing fixations on sovereign authority today, whether the authority is the state or the leadership of men in the public activities of politics. As Robert Keohane puts it, the usual way sovereignty is discussed ‘seems to reflect traditionally male thinking, with its emphasis on control and its penchant for absolute and dichotomous categories.’ Arguing that International Relations builds on an analogous distinction between domestic and international politics, R.B.J. Walker suggests that the task at hand is not simply to add the historically excluded voices of domestic-sphere people to International Relations, but to challenge the grounds on which International Relations has been constructed as an instance of sovereign boundary-drawing authority.

While the realm of International Relations between sovereign entities is denied to women, the things there may be room in the more ambivalent concept of ‘world politics’ for people and activities excluded from ancient and modern sovereign specifications.

Cynthia Enloe in her famous book, *Bananas, Beaches and Bases Making Sense of International Relations* returns to a feminist standpoint interpretation to argue that women are always inside International Relations through the practice of its politics, as diplomats’ wives and secretaries, as assemblers of commodities for export, as tourists bringing foreign exchange to the nearly empty tills of third world countries and dirty laundry for poor handmaids to wash, as consolers of soldiers based far from home, and wearers of khaki -- if we choose to see them there. She states the problem as learning ‘how the conduct of International Politics has depended on men’s control of women . . . .’ Whether that dependence is a sign of the taming powers of public/private images or of specific sovereignties at work is less the issue for Enloe than the complex relationship between continuities in International Relations – ‘seemingly new trends are likely to be gendered, just as past international events were’ and her sense that every time a woman explains how her government is trying to control her fears, her hopes and her labor, a fresh, more realistic approach to international politics is being made. Enloe tries to expose how relations between governments depend not only on capital and weaponry, but also on the control of women as symbols, consumers, workers and emotional comforts. Women working within the masculine landscape of international politics absorb her, as does the notion of women consuming other women’s work. Enloe endeavors to display the power dimensions of gendered militarism, work, and consumption that International Relations neglect to sight in International Relations.

Enloe argued that the feminist slogan ‘Personal is Political’ is like a palindrome. She showed how personal is political as international politics enters the lives of women. There is power in the personal and power in the political. One should read forwards and backwards around both sites, bearing in mind that the ‘political’ exists internationally and not just at one’s own doorstep. She gives a call for pro-women spirit in a global era. Both Enloe and Elshtain tirelessly argue that International Relation’s usual value knowledge contains little for women and it is not at all sensitive to the issues of gender.
Tickner’s work on Feminist theories of International Relations is based in the acknowledgement of the centrality of gender/human oppression. In her view, the discipline of IR was a decade ago and still is largely synonymous with maleness. This maleness is not based strictly in the personalities of individual males, but in a ‘hegemonic masculinity’ which defines what masculine men should be in opposition to femininities which are less valued. Women are not a strong force in the discipline, and knowledge gained from women’s experiences also remains at the margins of the discipline’s analysis. Though these elements of analysis are absent, it is clear to Tickner that there are gendered perceptions in IR; they are just hidden by purported ‘gender neutrality’ and ‘objectivity.’ In other words, women and gender are both important parts of the daily operation and scholarship of IR, yet this presence is neither discussed nor analyzed by most theorists. While critical scholarship has gained ground in the discipline, radical IR is not necessarily feminist IR because much radical IR omits gender as a category of analysis. The goal, then, of Feminist IR is two-fold: to point out gender where it exists in IR, and to move beyond gendered ideas into collaborative scholarship. In this vein, feminist international relations theory challenges other strands of IR theory on a number of levels, contributing to the major theoretical debates in the discipline and raising new, corresponding areas of analysis.

J. Ann Tickner is famous for her book Gender in International Relations: Feminist Perspective in Achieving Global Security. Tickner made a remarkable attempt on Morgenthau’s legacy of Realism. She argues that International Relations are dominated by men and their concerns. In International Relations, it is masculine experience which is projected as human experience. Tickner calls for the elimination of gender hierarchies as a way of achieving global security. Tickner is more explicit than Enloe in identifying the different streams of feminist standpoint, i.e. liberal, radical, Marxist, socialist and post-modern feminists. Tickner argues that male violence is present both in family setting and international analysis. Tickner tries to substantiate her arguments by giving examples from day to day life. She argues that woman is always absent in war like situations in international politics. Tickner was a firm believer in the idea that few concepts in International Relations can have alternative explanations. For example, power signifies domination in the language of mainstream International Relations. For feminists power implies mutual enablement. Tickner calls for the elimination of gender hierarchies as a way of achieving global security. Tickner believes that International Relations have been disillusioned by approaches like Realism, Idealism, and Neorealism. International Relations need fresh thinking with regard to its methodology. Tickner sketches canonical positions on security in Realism, international political economy, and international environmental studies, and indicates where aspects of the canon have been challenged within the international tradition. Her punchline each time is that the field and its usual challengers do not and cannot go far enough to consider women and gender in ways that feminist analysis requires and international security demands.

Tickner accuses economic liberalism of projecting economic gain as the main and universal human passion, and of lodging this passion in isolated individuals who pursue self-interested utilities. Tickner argued that economic model of security based on economic liberalism does not capture all the economic activities of women. It turns every moment of life into a context for rational choice. It is interesting to note that Tickner even did criticise Marxism to a great extent. Marxism never recognised the labour that the women does in the household and most of the times it goes unpaid.

Tickner even discusses about ecological security and argues that women’s lives are closely connected with ecology. Tickner points out changes in attitudes toward nature over time. Tickner takes the view that Western civilization’s subjugation of women relates to its
hierarchical constructions of power and agency, with men and men’s public creations valued as pinnacles. She wants to transcend this distorted wisdom rather than seek to work within its contours.

**Tickner’s criticism of realism**

Feminist scholars have attacked the assumptions of Realism because it is purely based on the experience of male. Some feminists have argued that the core assumptions of Realism especially of anarchy and sovereignty reflect the ways in which males tend to interact and see the world. The realist approach simply assumes male participants when discussing foreign policy decision making, state sovereignty, or the use of military force. As a feminist Tickner was a firm believer that the principles of Realism has nothing to offer to women. She argues that Morgenthau’s principles are embedded in a masculine perspective and finally she tries to reconceptualise the feminist International Relations. Before going into the arguments of Tickner it is necessary for us to have a look at the Morgenthau’s six principles of Realism. They are:

1) Politics like society in general, is governed by objective laws that have their roots in human nature, which is unchanging; therefore it is possible to develop a rational theory that reflects these objective laws.

2) The main signpost of political realism is the concept of interest defined in terms of power which infuses rational order into the subject matter of politics, and thus makes the theoretical understanding of politics possible. Political realism stresses the rational, objective and unemotional aspect of human life.

3) Realism assumes that interest defined as power is an objective category which is universally valid. Power implies control of man over man.

4) Political realism is aware of the moral significance of political action. It is also aware of the tension between the moral command and the requirements of successful political action.

5) Political realism refuses to identify the moral aspirations of a particular nation with the moral laws that govern the universe. It is the concept of interest defined in terms of power that saves us from moral excess and political folly.

6) The political realist maintains the autonomy of the political sphere.

7) Tickner agrees with Morgenthau’s portrayal of the international system. However it is a partial view of international politics that privilege masculinity. Feminists argue that masculinity and feminine are socially constructed categories which vary in place and time. Tickner is very much skeptical about the possibility of finding a universal and objective foundation for knowledge, which Morgenthau claims is possible. Most share the belief that knowledge is socially constructed; since it is language that transmits knowledge, the use of language and its claim to objectivity must be questioned.

Keller argues that objectivity, as it is usually defined in our culture, is associated with masculinity. She identifies it as a network of interactions between gender development, a belief system that equates objectivity with masculinity, and a set of cultural values that simultaneously elevates what is defined as scientific and masculine. Keller links the separation of self from other, an important stage of masculine gender development, with this notion of objectivity. Translated into scientific inquiry thus becomes the starving for separation of subject and object, an important goal of modern science and one which Keller asserts is based on the need for control; hence objectivity becomes associated with power and domination. The need for control has been an important motivating force for modern Realism. To begin his search for an objective, rational theory of international politics, this could impose a chaotic and conflicting world. Morgenthau constructs an abstraction which he calls political man, a beast completely lacking moral restraints. Morgenthau is deeply aware that real men, like real states, are both
moral and bestial but because states do not live up to the universal moral laws that govern the universe, those who behave morally in international politics are doomed to failure because of the immoral actions of others.

To solve this tension Morgenthau postulates a realm of international politics in which the amoral behavior of political man is not only permissible but prudent. It is a Hobbesian world, separate and distinct from the world of domestic order; in it, states may act like beasts, for survival depends on maximization of power and a willingness to fight. Tickner rejects the validity of constructing an autonomous political sphere around which boundaries of permissible modes of conduct have been drawn. Morgenthau’s political man is a social construct based on a partial representation of human nature. Morgenthau’s construction of an amoral realm of international power politics is an attempt to resolve what he sees as a fundamental tension between the moral laws that govern the universe and the requirements of successful political action in a world where states use morality as a cloak to justify the pursuit of their own national interests. Morgenthau’s universalistic morality postulates the highest form of morality as an abstract ideal, similar to the golden rule, to which states seldom adhere. The morality of states, by contrast, is an instrumental morality guided by self interest.

Tickner argues that Morgenthau’s concept of morality is purely masculine. Since women are socialised into a mode of thinking which is contextual and narrative, rather than formal and abstract, they tend to see issues in contextual rather than in abstract terms. In International Relations the tendency to think about morality either in terms of abstract, universal and unattainable standards or as purely instrumental, as Morgenthau does, detracts from our ability to tolerate cultural differences and to seek potential for building community in spite of these differences. Morgenthau’s definition of power, the control of man over man, is typical of the way power is usually defined in International Relations.

Tickner argues that this type of power as domination has always been associated with masculinity, since the exercise of power has generally been masculine activity. When women write about power they stress energy, capacity and potential. Tickner gives example of Hannah Arendt who defines power as the human ability to act in concert, or to take action in connection with others having similar concerns. So power symbolizes a relationship of mutual enablement. Tickner argues that power used in this sense may help us to think constructively about the potential for cooperation as well as conflict, an aspect of International Relations generally played down by Realism.

Redefining national security is another way in which feminist theory could contribute new thinking about International Relations. Traditionally in the West, the concept of national security has been tied to military strength and its role in the physical protection of the nation state from external threats. Morgenthau’s notion of defending the national interest in terms of power in consistent with this definition. However, this traditional definition of national security is partial at best in today’s world. The technologically advanced states are highly interdependent, and rely on weapons whose effects would be equally devastating to winners and losers alike. Moreover, if one thinks of security in North-South rather than East-West terms, for a large portion of the world’s population security has as much to do with the satisfaction of basic material needs as with military threats.

Tickner argued that there is a close relationship between nature and women. The mechanistic view of nature, contained in modern science, has helped to guide an industrial and technological development which has resulted in environmental damage that has now become a matter of global concern. The affiliation between women and culture has persisted throughout culture, language, and history. Hence she maintains that the ecology movement, which is
growing up in response to environmental threats and the women’s movement are deeply interconnected. Tickner has tried to develop a critique of Morgenthau’s principles of political realism in order to demonstrate how the theory and practice of International Relations may exhibit a masculine bias. Drawing on these criticisms Tickner tries to reformulate Morgenthau’s six principles of Realism as follows:

1) A feminist perspective believes that objectivity as it is culturally defined is associated with masculinity. Therefore, ‘objective’ laws of nature are based on a partial, masculine view of human nature. Human nature is both masculine and feminine: it contains elements of social reproduction and development as well as political domination. Dynamic objectivity offers us a more connected view of objectivity with less potential for domination.

2) A feminist perspective believes that the national interest is multidimensional and contextually contingent. Therefore, it can not be defined solely in terms of power. In the contemporary world the national interest demands cooperative rather than zero sum solutions to a set of interdependent global problems which include nuclear war, economic well-being and environmental degradation.

3) Power defined as domination and control can not be accepted as universally valid since it signifies masculinity and ignores the possibility of collective empowerment.

4) A feminist perspective rejects the possibility of separating moral command from political action. All political action has moral significance. The earliest agenda for maximizing order through power and control gives priority to the moral command of order over those of justice and the satisfaction of basic needs necessary to ensure social reproduction.

5) While recognizing that the moral aspirations of particular nations can not be equated with universal moral principles, a feminist perspective seeks to find common moral elements in human aspirations which could become the basis for de-escalating international conflict and building international community.

6) A feminist perspective denied the autonomy of the political. Since autonomy is associated with masculinity in Western culture, disciplinary efforts to construct a world view which does not rest on a pluralist connection of human nature are partial and masculine. Building boundaries around a narrowly denied political realm defines political in a way that excludes the concerns and contributions of women.

**Conclusion**

International Relations, as a distinct subject, are currently undergoing a phase of uncertainty. These uncertainties prove that there are major blind spots with respect to social and political change. This conceptual blindness frequently leads to empirical blindness. The recent events like September 11 have shocked the entire world community. Hence it clearly requires a rethinking of the basic assumptions of this discipline if at all the scholars want to understand global politics in the twenty first century. Feminism in International Relations offers a way out of this darkness. It is necessary to have fresh insights as well as inputs into the understanding of the dynamics of International Relations. This can be done by taking into account the domestic social processes and non-elite subjects. Feminist perspectives reveal that the craze for global power needs to change so that there can be permanent peace in the world. Women with their experience in running the household can be better in terms of being the head of the state. After all, the world has seen only male leaders. There must be a change in the power structure so that new ideas would come up. Feminism opens the gate for fresh ideas and perspectives in International Relations. It helps us to recognise power shifts within nation states that have ramifications for the whole world order.
LESSON 3

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES

Tarun Kanti Bose

The Earth is remarkable, and valuable, for both the nature and the culture that occur on it. It is unique in solar system that sustains life. Human beings represent just the latest stage in this evolutionary process. Ever since the early phases of evolution, man has always been at the mercy of nature. The evolutionary history has been going on for billions of years, while cultural history is only about a hundred thousand years old. Humans evolved out of nature; our biochemistries are natural and we draw our life support from the hydrological cycles and photosynthesis; we too have genes and inborn traits; we are subject to natural laws. But human life is radically different from that in wild, spontaneous nature. Unlike coyotes or bats, humans are not just what they are by nature; we come into the world by nature quite unfinished and become what we become by culture. Humans deliberately rebuild the wild environment and make rural and urban environments

Human beings represent just the latest stage in this evolutionary process. Our environment is dynamic, constantly changing and evolving in response to stimuli. Yet in the twentieth century, it became apparent that mankind is having an increased effect on the planet’s eco-systems and biogeochemical cycles so much so that our activities are now causing environmental change, which is overriding the natural dynamism of the earth. Yet despite the evidence of environmental problems such as loss of biodiversity, land cover changes as evident from satellite imagery, records of climate change; we still pursue activities which perpetuate the problems.

There are problems of overpopulation, overconsumption, and the underdistribution of resources. Increasing population and the rise in per capita consumption of natural resources have escalated the environmental problems. Any discussion on environment and to make it a ‘global issue’ is an arduous task. This is due to three broad reasons. First, the science of environmental problems is complex. We are dealing with many interrelated dynamic systems, within which and between which feedback mechanisms occur. Secondly, there are many stakeholders involved in both the causes and solutions to environmental problems. Organising all of these stakeholders to act in a coordinated manner is difficult. Thirdly, resolving global environmental issues will require changes in our own consumption pattern, which will mean changes in lifestyles. This requires commitment at the personal level which everyone many not like. Human-environment interaction involves not only the question of resource use per person, but also our ability to understand the science of the environment, our ability to regulate our impact on the environment, our beliefs in the value of the environment and our ability to negotiate solutions at both the local and the global level

Emergence of environmental issues in the International agenda

Human being’s desire had been to speed up the process speed up the process of production. But by the end of the nineteenth century it was clear that the process is causing wide spread damage to the environment. But the seriousness of the situation was not widely recognised. By the early decades of the twentieth century pressure from both industrial and agricultural development increased. The atmosphere of large cities in Europe and North America was covered with smoke released by the industrial and domestic use of coal as a fuel. Problems peaked in North America in the 1930s when droughts devastated the Great Plains. Soil erosion was rampant. Plain areas
became deserts. The socio-economic condition of USA and Canada was shattered because of the sheer magnitude of the above problems.

By the middle of the century, the environmental cost of serious pollution was beginning to attract broader attention. Air and water pollution received most attention. Land pollution was not discussed much. The issue of land pollution came into limelight with the introduction of pesticides. It was considered to be a revolution in agricultural sciences.

**Stockholm Conference**

The Stockholm Conference heralded the beginning of environmental awareness in the international community. When it was convened, the environmental movement itself was new. To the extent that any countries recognised environmental problems, they were primarily the industrialised ones. The problems that they identified were generally the correctable by-products of industrialisation, including water pollution and smog. In 1972, even the United States, world environmental affairs leader, had an Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) that was barely two years of age. The few existing treaties dealt primarily with shared natural resources, such as Antarctica or the high seas, and no formal international arena existed in which countries could raise environmental issues.

Stockholm placed the environment on the international agenda for the first time and set the stage for international actions over the course of the next twenty years—until Rio. From an international legal perspective, the 1972 conference's single most important achievement was the Stockholm Declaration, a non-binding statement of principles, "to inspire and guide the peoples of the world in the preservation and enhancement of the human environment." Principle 21, its most famous, held a state responsible for actions within its own borders that cross over those borders and harm another state; it has since become a binding international law. Institutionally, Stockholm's most impressive achievement was the creation of the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP), which today remains the world's primary international body that addresses global environmental problems from its headquarters in Nairobi, Kenya.

The success of Stockholm can be tangibly measured by the many international conferences that have since been sponsored by UNEP and the over 1,200 multilateral and bilateral treaties and other agreements on environmental matters that exist today. Virtually every country in the world has some form of environmental legislation or agencies, although the developed countries have made the most progress in these areas. And yet, the global environment is worse now than it was two decades ago—Not one major environmental issue debated in Stockholm has been solved.

The Stockholm Conference was the pivotal event in the growth of the global environmental movement. It was the first occasion on which the political, social and economic problems of the global environment were discussed at an intergovernmental forum with a view to actually taking corrective action.

The Conference has four major results.

- First, the conference confirmed the trend towards a new emphasis on the human environment. Before Stockholm, people usually saw the environment, as something not connected to humanity. Stockholm recorded a fundamental shift in the emphasis of our environmental thinking.
• Second, Stockholm forced a compromise between the different perceptions of the environment held by developed and developing countries. Before Stockholm, developed countries used to largely determine environmental priorities. After Stockholm, the needs of least developed and developing countries became a key factor in determining international policy.

• Third, the presence of so many NGOs at the conference and the role they played marked the beginning of a new and more insistently role for governments and intergovernmental organisations.

• Fourthly, the most tangible outcome of Stockholm was the creation of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). It had limitations and difficulties. But it was probably the best form of institution possible under the circumstances and it became the focus of a new interest in global responses to global problems. Public pressure forced the political and industrial establishment to reassess its environmental quality. There was explicit concern for environmental issues. In the mid 1980s there was a major resurgence of environmental problems. The resurgence can be attributed to the public backlash against the perceived anti-environmentalism of US Administration, when Ronald Reagan was the President. This phase is known as the second wave in the environmental movement. The second wave is characterised by a new environmentalism, in which there is a growing awareness of the breadth and complexity of issues. One of the results is that the economic and political components of the issues were better understood and better addressed than in the past. The second wave gave birth to important developments at the international stage. They were the World Commission on Environment and Development (1986), Rio Conference (1992), Kyoto Protocol (1997), and the Johannesburg Summit (2002).

**Brundtland Commission**

The World Commission on Environment and Development is popularly known as the Brundtland Commission. The Brundtland known by the name of its Chair Gro Harlem Brundtland, was convened by the United Nations in 1983. The commission was created to address growing concern about the accelerating deterioration of the human environment and natural resources and the consequences of that deterioration for economic and social development. In establishing the commission, the UN General Assembly recognised that environmental problems were global in nature and determined that it was in the common interest of all nations to establish policies for sustainable development. It firmly combines economy and environment through its promotion of sustainable development. It defines sustainable development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

The report concluded that environment and development were interrelated and the policy responses were handicapped by the fact that existing institutions tended to be independent, fragmented, too narrowly focused and so tended to address issues such as acid pollution as discrete policy problems.

Part of the Commission’s mandate was to explore new methods of international cooperation that would foster understanding of the concept of sustainable development and allow it to develop further To that end it promoted a major international conference held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 known as the Earth Summit.
The outcomes of Rio can be summarised in five key agreements.

a) **The Framework Convention on Climate Change**: The major significance of the Rio Convention was that it established the principle that climate change was a serious problem that needed precautionary measures that could not await the resolution of questions about scientific certainty. It also emphasised the role of Developed countries in the production of green house gases. The Developed countries agreed to take steps to cut green house gas emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000.

b) **The Convention on Biological Diversity**: Negotiated under the auspices of UNEP, this convention was aimed at preserving global biological diversity thorough the protection of species and ecosystems. Since most of the threats were being experienced in least developed countries and most biotechnology was based in Developed countries, discussions were again based around attempts to reach a compromise between the needs of the two sides.

c) **Agenda 21**: This was an action plan for sustainable development, integrating the goals of environmental protection and economic development, and based on local community and free market principles. Agenda 21 ensured that the concept of sustainable development became an important principle of the United Nations. A recommendation was made for the creation of a UN Commission on Sustainable Development to oversee the implementation of Agenda 21.

d) **The Rio Declaration on Environment and Development**: This consisted of 27 principles guiding action on environment and development. The declaration tried to maintain a balance between the least developed countries and the Developed countries.

e) **The Forest Principle**: It emphasised the sovereign right of individual states to exploit forest resources within the general principles of forest protection and management.

Rio drew unparalleled levels of public attention to the problems of environment and represented another major step along the road to a workable resolution of the tensions between environmental management and economic development.

**Environmental issues: a global interpretation**

Environmental issues have become international and global in several senses. First, some environmental problems are inherently global. The cause of the problem may be local. But their effect and solution can be visualised at a global level. Carbon dioxide emissions contribute to global climate change which clearly indicates that the effects are global and it needs cooperation at the global level to tackle the problem. Second, there are some resources which are shared by the whole world. These include atmosphere, the deep-sea bed and outer space. Hence these resources need to be preserved at a global level in the interest of the whole world. Third, many environmental problems cross national boundaries even though they are not purely global. Any environment related hazardous activity in one country would produce changes in neighboring countries.

US war with Iraq produced black rain in Kashmir. Fourth, there are many environmental issues which are local or national. But they happen in too many localities. Hence they are considered as global problems. This includes unsustainable agricultural practices, soil erosion, and deforestation. Finally, and the most important among all these is the fact that environmental issues are intimately linked to broader political and socio-economic processes which themselves are part of global political economy. It is widely recognised that the pattern of wealth distribution, power, industrialisation affect the environment in a significant way.
Hence globalisation and interdependence among nation states give all environmental problems an international dimension. Thus it is very clear that global environmental issues encompass a wide range of problems which are interrelated. However each of these problems needs specific and careful explanation so that effective solutions can be found. The following is an attempt to illustrate some of global environmental issues.

**Global environmental issues**

Global environmental issues include ozone layer depletion, global warming, acid deposition, tropical deforestation, desertification, pollution problems in developing countries, endangered species, marine pollution, and transboundary movement of hazardous wastes. It’s because their impacts and damages affect not only the countries that caused the problems, but go beyond their national boundaries and can reach a global scale. It’s also because these are problems which require international efforts for solution.

**Depletion of fossil fuels**

Fossil Fuels are hydrocarbons, primarily coal, fuel oil or natural gas formed from the remains of dead plants and animals. Fossil fuel is a general term for buried combustible geologic deposits of organic materials, formed from decayed plants and animals that have been converted to crude oil, coal, natural gas, or heavy oils by exposure to heat and pressure in the earth’s crust over hundreds of millions of years. This theory is known as biogenic theory and it was first introduced by Mikhail Lomonosov in 1757. These are sometimes known as mineral fuels.

The utilisation of fossil fuels has enabled large-scale industrial development and largely supplanted water- driven mills, as well as the combustion of wood or peat for heat. The burning of fossil fuels by humans is the largest source of emissions of carbon dioxide, which is one of the greenhouse gases that allows radioactive forcing and contributes to global warming. The atmospheric concentration of Carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, is increasing, raising concerns that solar heat will be trapped and the average surface temperature of the Earth will rise in response.

Combustion of fossil fuels generates sulphuric, carbonic, and nitric acids, which fall to Earth as acid rain, impacting both natural areas and the built environment. Monuments and sculptures made from marble are particularly vulnerable, as the acids dissolve calcium carbonate. Fossil fuels also contain radioactive materials, mainly uranium and thorium, which are released into the atmosphere. In 2000, about 12,000 metric tons of thorium and 5,000 metric tons of uranium were released worldwide from burning coal. Burning coal also generates large amounts of fly ash and bottom ash. Processing and distributing fossil fuels can also create environmental problems. Coal mining methods, particularly mountaintop removal and strip mining, have been causes for concern.

Offshore oil drilling may create a hazard for aquatic organisms. Oil refineries also can pose threats to the environment. Transportation of coal requires the use of diesel-powered locomotives, while tanker ships typically transport crude oil. Each of these requires the combustion of fossil fuels.
Pollution of air, water and land (A, W L)

Environmental pollution is the greatest danger that the whole civilization is facing. Pollution is the addition to the ecosystem of something, which has a detrimental effect on it. One of the most important causes of pollution is the high rate of energy usage by modern, growing populations. Pollution is of different types. They are air pollution, water pollution and land pollution. These together have the capacity to destroy the whole civilization in another twenty years. Hence it is imperative to study and understand these various types of pollution.

Air pollution

Air pollution is the accumulation in the atmosphere of substances that, in sufficient concentrations, endanger human health or produce other measured effects on living matter and other materials. Among the major sources of pollution are power and heat generation, the burning of solid wastes, industrial processes, and, especially, transportation. The six major types of pollutants are carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, nitrogen oxides, particulates, sulphur dioxide, and photochemical oxidants.

Examples of Air Pollution include

- **Noise Pollution**
  Noise pollution or unwanted sounds that are carried by the air have an irritating and detrimental effect on humans and other animals. Careful planning of streets and buildings in towns and better control over noisy vehicles may add to the control of noise pollution.

- **Tobacco Pollution**
  Tobacco smoke is one of the major forms of pollution in buildings. It is not only the smoker who is infected, but everyone who inhales the polluted air. There is a very strong connection between smoking and lung cancer. Bronchitis is common among smokers and unborn babies of mothers who smoke also suffer from the harmful effects of smoking.

- **Exhaust Gases of Vehicles**
  Pollution from exhaust gases of vehicles is responsible for 60% of all air pollution and in cities up to 80%. There is a large variety of harmful chemicals present in these gases, with lead being one of the most dangerous.

- **Combustion of Coal**
  The combustion of coal without special precautions can have serious consequences. If winds do not blow away the poisonous gases, they can have fatal effects and may lead to death.

- **Acid rain**
  Acid rain is the term for pollution caused when sulfur and nitrogen dioxides combine with atmospheric moisture to produce highly acidic rain, snow, hail, or fog. The acid eats into the stone, brick and metal articles and pollutes water sources.

Control Measures

Although individual people can help to combat air pollution in their own immediate environment, efficient control can be best achieved by legislation. Some commonly enforced control measures include

- the establishment of more smokeless zones;
- control over the kinds of fuel used in cars, aeroplanes, power stations, etc.
Air Pollution affects human beings and other living species in a dangerous way. It makes the living process less happy. Some of the effects are quite definite and judged. But most of them are ill-defined and difficult to conceptualise. Even the scientists themselves disagree on the quantitative effects of pollution on living species.

So it is highly desirable that human beings themselves understand the consequences of air pollution and try to prevent air pollution as much as possible. Otherwise the whole civilization will become extinct like the dinosaurs.

Land pollution

Land pollution is the degradation of the Earth's land surface through misuse of the soil by poor agricultural practices, mineral exploitation, industrial waste dumping, and indiscriminate disposal of urban wastes. It includes visible waste and litter as well as pollution of the soil itself.

Examples of Land Pollution

- **Soil Pollution**
  Soil pollution is mainly due to chemicals in herbicides (weed killers) and pesticides (poisons which kill insects and other invertebrate pests). Litter is waste material dumped in public places such as streets, parks, picnic areas, at bus stops and near shops.

- **Waste Disposal**
  The accumulation of waste threatens the health of people in residential areas. Waste decays, encourages household pests and turns urban areas into unsightly, dirty and unhealthy places to live in.

Control Measures

The following measures can be used to control land pollution:

- Anti-litter campaigns can educate people against littering;
- Organic waste can be dumped in places far from residential areas;
- Inorganic materials such as metals, glass and plastic, but also paper, can be reclaimed and recycled.

Water pollution

Water pollution is the introduction into fresh or ocean waters of chemical, physical, or biological material that degrades the quality of the water and affects the organisms living in it. This process ranges from simple addition of dissolved or suspended solids to discharge of the most insidious and persistent toxic pollutants such as pesticides, heavy metals, and nondegradable, bioaccumulative, chemical compounds.

Examples of Water Pollution include

- **Industrial affluents**
  Water is discharged from after having been used in production processes. This waste water may contain acids, alkalis, salts, poisons, oils and in some cases harmful bacteria.

- **Mining and Agricultural Wastes**
  Mines, especially gold and coal mines are responsible for large quantities of acid water. Agricultural pesticides, fertilisers and herbicides may wash into rivers and stagnant water bodies.
• **Sewage Disposal and Domestic Wastes**

  Sewage as well as domestic and farm wastes were often allowed to pollute rivers and dams.

**Control Measures**

The following measures can be used to stop water pollution:

- Every intelligent people should be wise enough not to pollute water in any way;
- By research and legislation the pollution of water bodies, even though not entirely prevented, must be effectively controlled.

**Global warming**

Global warming is the increase in the average temperature of the Earth's near-surface air and oceans since the mid-20th century and its projected continuation. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), established in 1988 by the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), two organizations of the United Nations concluded that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations resulting from human activity such as fossil fuel burning and deforestation are responsible for most of the observed temperature increase since the middle of the 20th century. It also added that natural phenomena such as solar variation and volcanoes produced most of the warming from pre-industrial times to 1950 and had a small cooling effect afterward. These basic conclusions have been endorsed by more than 40 scientific societies and academies of science, including all of the national academies of science of the major industrialised countries.

Greenhouse gases also emit long wave radiation both upward to space and downward to the surface. The downward part of this long wave radiation emitted by the atmosphere is the ‘greenhouse effect’. An increase in global temperatures can in turn cause other changes, including a rising sea level and changes in the amount and pattern of precipitation. These changes may increase the frequency and intensity of extreme weather events, such as floods, droughts, heat waves, hurricanes, and tornados. Other consequences include higher or lower agricultural yields, glacier retreat, reduced summer stream flows, species extinctions and increases in the range of disease vectors. Warming is expected to affect the number and magnitude of these events; however, it is difficult to connect particular events to global warming. Although most studies focus on the period up to 2100, even if no further greenhouse gases were released after this date, warming (and sea level) would be expected to continue to rise since Carbon dioxide has a long average atmospheric lifeline.

Increasing global temperature will cause sea levels to rise and will change the amount and pattern of precipitation, probably including expansion of subtropical deserts. The continuing retreat of glaciers, permafrost and sea ice is expected, with the Arctic region being particularly affected.

Other likely effects include shrinkage of the Amazon rainforest and Boreal forests, increases in the intensity of extreme weather events, species extinctions and changes in agricultural yields.

*Political* and public debate continues regarding what actions (if any) to take in response to global warming. The available options are mitigation to reduce further emissions; adaptation to reduce the damage caused by warming; and, more speculatively, geo engineering to reverse
global warming. Most national governments have signed and ratified the Kyoto Protocol aimed at reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

Remaining scientific uncertainty comes from the exact degree of climate change expected in the future and particularly how changes will vary from region to region across the globe. A hotly contested political and public debate has yet to be resolved, regarding whether anything should be done, and what could be cost-effectively done to reduce or reverse future warming, or to deal with the expected consequences. Most national governments have signed and ratified the Kyoto Protocol aimed at combating global warming.

Impact of global warming

Global warming affects every aspect of human life. These include ocean, freshwater resources, agriculture and food supply, and forests. The most prominent ocean related threat from global warming is the sea level rise caused by the inflow of water from melting glaciers and polar ice sheets, and by thermal expansion (warmer water takes up more space than cooler water). Higher Seas are likely to increase damage from storm surges and accelerate coastal erosion, which could threaten coastal development, transportation infrastructure and tourism. Coral reefs have also been adversely affected by warming of seas. Nearly 500 million people around the world live within 100 kilometers of coral reefs, which provide a rich economic resource for fisheries, recreation, tourism and coastal protection. Corals have difficulty adapting to warming water, putting them under stress and causing them to expel the algae that live within them.

Climate change is also very likely to put stress on fisheries by altering the distribution and abundance of major fish stocks around the world. Many scientists believe that global warming is likely, in many regions, to alter the distribution of freshwater, an important resource that supports human activities and ecosystems. Increased temperature will mean that evaporation will occur at a higher rate, promoting cycles of intense drought and flood. This occurs because a warmer atmosphere with higher evaporation rates makes it difficult for water molecules in the air to stick together to form raindrops, thereby lengthening drought periods. During this time, however, more water vapor than usual will gather in the air. When a weather system finally triggers a rainstorm, the extra water vapour may lead to more intense rainfall and flooding.

These floods have the potential to cause massive dislocations and damage in some regions. The vulnerability of water supplies to climate change can be extended to vulnerability in the growing of crops and production of food. Changes in the precipitation type, timing, frequency and intensity will affect crop yields, and warmer temperatures may cause explosions in insect populations, leading to increased use of pesticides to control them. Global warming is expected to affect countries differently. Production in developed countries with relatively stable populations, such as the United States may increase, whereas crop yields are likely to decrease in developing countries with increasing populations. Many of these countries are located in arid and semi-arid regions, where drought and famine already pose challenges to agriculture.

The problem is expected to get worse, and the disparity between developed and developing nations is likely to increase as global warming and temperatures rise.

Biodiversity

Biodiversity is the range of life forms on our planet, as seen in the variety of living organisms and the range of ecological communities. The most obvious interpretation of
biodiversity is that it concerns the different types of animals and plants that we see. However, biodiversity is not just about having animals and plants. Biodiversity is also concerned with the genetic variability within a species. Genetic biodiversity broadens the range of attributes exhibited by a species such as disease resistance, or drought tolerance in the case of plants, and so enhances the likelihood of some individuals surviving through environmentally challenging times.

Biodiversity also goes beyond concern for individual plants and species to include concern for ecosystems. The variety of ecosystems in the world is vast and includes rainforests, boreal forests, swamps, savannas, deserts, tundra, coral reefs, alpine meadows and urban environments. Such ecosystems are important as mutually interdependent communities of plants and animals living within a distinct environment. Furthermore, the variability of habitats and ecosystems in our world plays a role in regulating global environmental process. Each form of biodiversity is important. The 1992 United Nations Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro defined ‘biodiversity’ as ‘the variability among living organisms from all sources, including, inter alia, terrestrial, marine, and other aquatic ecosystems, and the ecological complexes of which they are part: this includes diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems’. This is, in fact, the closest thing to a single legally accepted definition of biodiversity, since it is the definition adopted by the United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity. The parties to this convention include all the countries on Earth, with the exception of Andorra, Brunei Darussalam, the, Holy Iraq, Somalia, and the United States of America.

**Importance of biodiversity**

Biodiversity plays many roles in our lives, both directly and indirectly. It is important to identify the ways in which biodiversity has value for us. Biodiversity provides food for humans. About 80 per cent of our food supply comes from just 20 kinds of plant. Although many kinds of animal are utilised as food, most consumption is focused on a few species. There is vast untapped potential for increasing the range of food products suitable for human consumption.

- A significant proportion of drugs are derived, directly or indirectly, from biological sources. However, only a small proportion of the total diversity of plants has been thoroughly investigated for potential sources of new drugs.
- A wide range of industrial materials are derived directly from biological resources. These include building materials, fibers, dyes, resins, gums, adhesives, rubber and oil. There is enormous potential for further research into sustainably utilising materials from a wider diversity of organisms.
- Biodiversity provides many ecosystem services that we take for granted. It plays a part in regulating the chemistry of our atmosphere and water supply. It is directly involved in recycling nutrients and providing fertile soils. Experiments with controlled environments have shown that we cannot easily build ecosystems to support ourselves.
- Many people derive value from biodiversity through leisure activities such as enjoying a walk in the countryside, bird watching or natural history programs on television.

- Biodiversity has inspired musicians, painters, sculptors, writers and other artists. Many cultural groups view themselves as an integral part of the natural world and show respect for other living organisms.
Threats to biodiversity

During the last century, erosion of biodiversity has been increasingly observed. Some studies show that about one of eight known plant species is threatened with extinction. Some estimates put the loss at up to 140,000 species per year. This figure indicates unsustainable ecological practices, because only a small number of species come into being each year. Most of the species extinctions from 1000–2000 AD are due to human activities, in particular destruction of plant and animal habitats. Almost all scientists acknowledge that the rate of species loss is greater now than at any time in human history, with extinctions occurring at rates hundreds of times higher than background extinction rates.

Elevated rates of extinction are being driven by human consumption of organic resources, especially related to tropical forest destruction. While most of the species that are becoming extinct are not food species, their biomass is converted into human food when their habitat is transformed into pasture, cropland, and orchards.

It is estimated that more than 40 per cent of the Earth’s biomass comprises of only the few species that represent humans, our livestock and crops. Because an ecosystem decreases in stability as its species are made extinct, these studies warn that the global ecosystem is destined for collapse if it is further reduced in complexity.

Factors contributing to loss of biodiversity are: overpopulation, deforestation, pollution (air pollution, water pollution, soil contamination) and global warming or climate change, driven by human activity. These factors while all stemming from overpopulation; produce a cumulative impact upon biodiversity. Some characterise loss of biodiversity not as ecosystem degradation by arguing in favour of conversion to trivial standardized ecosystems (e.g. monoculture following deforestation). In some countries lack of property rights or access to biotic resources necessarily leads to biodiversity loss.

The widespread introduction of exotic species by humans is a potent threat to biodiversity. When exotic species are introduced to ecosystems and establish self-sustaining populations, the endemic species in that ecosystem, that have not evolved to cope with the exotic species, may not survive. The exotic organisms may be predators, parasites, or simply aggressive species that deprive indigenous species of nutrients, water and light. These exotic or invasive species often have features due to their evolutionary background and environment that makes them very competitive, and at the same time makes endemic species very defenseless and/or uncompetitive against these exotic species.

The rich diversity of unique species across many parts of the world exist only because they are separated by barriers, particularly seas and oceans, from other species of other land masses, particularly the highly fecund, ultra-competitive, generalist ‘super-species’. These are barriers that could never be crossed by natural processes, except in the course of many millions of years in the future through continental drift. However humans have invented ships and airplanes, and now have the power to bring into contact species that have never come into contact in their evolutionary history, and within a matter of days, unlike the centuries-long time spans that historically have accompanied major animal migrations.

As a consequence of the above, if humans continue to combine species from different eco regions, there is the potential that the world’s ecosystems will end up dominated by a very few, aggressive, cosmopolitan ‘super-species’.
The conservation of biological diversity has become a global concern. Although not everybody agrees on the extent and significance of current extinction of species, most consider biodiversity essential. There are basically two main types of conservation options, in-situ conservation and ex-situ conservation. In-situ is usually seen as the ideal conservation strategy. However, its implementation is sometimes unfeasible. Destruction of rare or endangered species’ habitats sometimes requires ex-situ conservation efforts. Furthermore, ex-situ conservation can provide a backup solution to in-situ conservation projects. Some believe both types of conservation are required to ensure proper preservation. An example of an in-situ conservation effort is the setting-up of protection areas. Examples of ex-situ conservation efforts, by contrast, would be planting germplasts in seed banks, or growing the Wollimi Pine in nurseries. Such efforts allow the preservation of large populations of plants with minimal genetic erosion. At national levels a Biodiversity Action Plan is sometimes prepared to state the protocols necessary to protect an individual species.

Usually this plan gives exact data on the species and its habitat. In the USA such a plan is called a Recovery Plan. The threat to biological diversity was among the hot topics discussed at the UN World Summit for Sustainable Development, in the hope of seeing the foundation of a Global Conservation Trust to help maintain plant collections. The international body is constantly trying to conserve the biological diversity of the world. For this an international treaty was signed on behalf of UN in 1992 at Rio de Janeiro. This is popularly known as the Convention on Biological Diversity. Its objective is to develop national strategies for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity The Convention has three broad goals:

1. Conservation of biological diversity (or biodiversity);
2. Sustainable use of its components; and
3. Fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from genetic resources.

Biodiversity has been described as the common concern of mankind. Although biodiversity is seen as a common concern of mankind, its global distribution raises questions as to who owns biodiversity. The distribution of Global biodiversity is skewed towards the countries which can afford least to invest in its conservation. Conservation of biodiversity is important for both the least developed and developed countries. The least developed countries need biological diversity for sustenance reasons whereas the developed countries need biodiversity for better functioning of the ecosystem. As biodiversity diminishes and more people realise its potential importance, the scramble for biodiversity raises questions as to who owns biodiversity from a property rights or selling point of view. Already the equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of biodiversity is proving complicated. Hence it is necessary to develop an international biodiversity management regime without alienating sovereign rights from individual countries.

The Kyoto Protocol

The Kyoto Protocol is a by product of the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992. This agreement was signed in December 1997 in the city of Kyoto in Japan. Over 160 nations gathered in Kyoto, to negotiate agreements binding on the developed countries for the control of emission of greenhouse gases. The negotiations were centered on the creation of a legal framework and the establishment of goals for the mitigation of global warming through the reduction in greenhouse gas emissions identified in the Berlin Mandate.

Berlin was the place where the nation states agreed to prepare and negotiate international commitments that would provide specific values and timelines for the reduction of green house gases. So Berlin provided the groundwork for Kyoto Protocol. Two weeks of intense and lengthy
negotiation produced the Kyoto Protocol, an agreement that is seen by some as the most important international environmental agreement yet signed and by others as the precursor of a major economic disaster.

The protocol requires the nation states to commit themselves to reduce their emissions of carbon dioxide and give other greenhouse gases. The Kyoto Protocol is signed by more than 160 countries. The agreement divides the nation states into two categories. Developed countries are referred to as Annex 1 countries and developing countries are referred to as Annex 2 countries. The agreement concluded that developing countries emit very less amount of greenhouse gases. The culprits were the developed nations. There was agreement for a common but differentiated responsibility. The agreement concluded that the agreement explicitly states that the Annex 1 countries have to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions by an average of 5 per cent below their 1990 levels. The agreement came into force on 16 February 2005. Till date 169 countries have signed the agreement. The USA had signed the treaty but withdrew later. India signed and ratified the Protocol in August 2002. Since India is exempted from the framework of the treaty, it is expected to gain from the protocol in terms of transfer of technology and related foreign investments. India maintains that the major responsibility of curbing emission rests with the developed countries, which have accumulated emissions over a long period of time.

Since the agreement has been signed there has been lot of debate on the issue of an international agreement on environmental protection. The agreement says that China, India, and other developing countries are exempted from the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol as they are not the main contributors of the poisonous gases. Critics argue that China, India and other developing countries will soon be the top contributors to greenhouse gases. Since there is no restriction on reduction of carbon emission in these countries, the thrust towards industry will be driven from developed countries to these countries. The main opposition has come from the USA which vehemently opposes the treaty since China has been exempted from the requirements of the Protocol. China is the second largest emitter of carbon dioxide. Hence the USA is concerned with the way there has been a division of the entire world into Annex 1 and Annex 2 countries.

Some public policy experts who are skeptical of global warming see Kyoto as a scheme to either slow the growth of the world’s industrial democracies or to transfer wealth to the third world in what they claim is a global socialism initiative. Others argue the protocol does not go far enough to curb greenhouse emissions. Even environmental economists have been critical of the Kyoto Protocol. Many see the costs of the Kyoto Protocol as outweighing the benefits; some believing the standards which Kyoto sets to be too optimistic while others seeing a highly inequitable and inefficient agreement which would do little to curb greenhouse gas emissions. It should be noted, however, that this opposition is not unanimous, and that the inclusion of emissions trading has led some environmental economists to embrace the treaty.

Further, there is controversy surrounding the use of 1990 as a base year, as well as not using per capita emissions as a basis. Countries had different achievements in energy efficiency in 1990. The former Soviet Union and East European countries did little to tackle the problem, and their energy efficiency was at its worst level in 1990; the year just before their communist regimes fell. On the other hand, Japan, as a big importer of natural resources, had to improve its efficiency after the 1973 oil crisis and its emissions level in 1990 was better than most developed countries. The former Soviet Union remained complacent in complying with the norms concerning emission while it benefited financially from emission related trade. There is an argument that the use of per capita emissions as a basis in the following Kyoto-type treaties can
reduce the sense of inequality among developed and developing countries alike, as it can reveal inactivity and responsibilities among countries. In Australia, there is a strong and vocal anti-Kyoto lobby, with over 20,000 counter signatures presented to the government.

Economists have been trying to analyse the overall net benefit of the Kyoto Protocol through a cost-benefit analysis. Just as in the case of climatology, there is disagreement due to large uncertainties in economic variables. Still, the estimates so far generally indicate either that observing the Kyoto Protocol is more expensive than not observing the Kyoto Protocol, or that the Kyoto Protocol has a marginal net benefit which exceeds the cost of simply adjusting to global warming.

However, China, India, and other developing countries are exempted from the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol as they are not the main contributors of the poisonous gases. Critics argue that China, India and other developing countries will soon be the top contributors to greenhouse gases. Since there is no restriction on reduction of carbon emission in these countries, the thrust towards industry will be driven from developed countries to these countries. The main opposition has come from the USA which vehemently opposes the treaty since China has been exempted from the requirements of the Protocol. China is the second largest emitter of carbon dioxide. Hence the USA is concerned with the way there has been a division of the entire world into Annex 1 and Annex 2 countries.

**The Johannesburg Summit**

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development was held in Johannesburg, South Africa in 2002. It provided the fundamental principles and the programme of action for achieving sustainable development. The summit generated an incredible range of interests from heads of states to epistemic community. The summit reaffirmed sustainable development as a central element of the international agenda and paved the way for the practical and sustained steps needed to address many of the world’s pressing challenges. By any account, the Johannesburg Summit had laid the groundwork and paved the way for action.

Yet among all the targets, timetables and commitments that were agreed upon at Johannesburg, there were no silver bulleted solutions to aid the fight against poverty and a continually deteriorating natural environment. In fact, there was no magic formula and no miracle; only the realisation that practical and sustained steps were needed to address many of the world’s most pressing problems.

However, as an implementation-focused Summit, Johannesburg did not produce a particularly dramatic outcome. There were no agreements that would lead to new treaties and many of the agreed targets were derived from panoply of assorted low profile meetings. But some important new targets were established, such as, to reduce the proportion of people without access to basic sanitation into half by 2015; to use and produce chemicals by 2020 in ways that do not lead to significant adverse effects on human health and the environment; to maintain or restore depleted fish stocks to levels that can produce the maximum sustainable yield on an urgent basis and where possible by 2015; and to achieve by 2010 a significant reduction in the current rate of loss of biological diversity.

Thus there is a clear indication that the global environmental movement needs to be reshaped in a way where nation states can look beyond their national interest. Nation states are more interested in power politics and safeguarding of their interests. There is a lack of consensus
among the nation states to resolve these issues. If we look at the history of international cooperation with regard to environmental problems we find that the globe is divided into two blocs. One bloc is a leading producer of greenhouse gases and the other bloc is struggling to provide food to all of its citizens. There is huge gap between the nation states, which also at times poses a challenge for environmental protection on a global scale.

Along with increasing pressures on the natural environment came some encouraging responses from the political realm. A number of new global environment agreements entered into force, while the Kyoto Protocol, a critical driver of global negotiations on climate change, entered into force in early 2005. Other political achievements covered the areas of chemicals management, plant genetic resources, and ballast water management. Meanwhile the growing role of biotechnology in agriculture offered both promise and challenge.

The Bali Conference

The 2007 United Nations Climate Change Conference took place Bali, Indonesia, from December 3rd to 15th 2007. Representatives from over 180 countries attended, together with observers from intergovernmental and nongovernmental organisations. The conference encompassed meetings of several bodies, including the 13th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP 13), the 3rd Meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (MOP 3 or CMP 3), together with other subsidiary bodies and a meeting of ministers.

Negotiations on a successor to the Kyoto Protocol dominated the conference. A meeting of environment ministers and experts held in June 2007 called on the conference to agree on a road-map, timetable and 'concrete steps for the negotiations' with a view to reaching an agreement by 2009. It has been debated whether this global meeting on climate change has achieved anything significant at all.

In the conference, the world leaders recognised that 20% of the global emission of greenhouse gases can be contained by forestation. The programme, Reducing Emissions From Deforestation and Degradation (REDD) aims to compensate the developing countries in the tropical region to maintain their forests and discourages deforestation. It allows developing countries to sell carbon offsets to rich countries in return for not burning their tropical forests from 2013. REDD initiative is the need of the hour when large scale deforestation is taking place across the world for urbanisation, oil palm, soyabean and bio-fuel crop plantation.

The Bali conference also stressed upon the urgent need to cut carbon and methane emissions from tropical forests. The Bali conference also adopted a resolution on adaptation fund to help poor nations to cope with damage from climate change impact like droughts, extreme weather conditions or rising seas. The Adaptation Fund now comprises only about $36 million but might rise to $1-$5 billion a year by 2030, if investments in green technology in developing nations surges. The fund distinguished the responsibilities of the Global Environment Facility and the World Bank. The fund would have a 16-member board largely from developing countries and would start operating from 2008.

The Bali conference succeeded in adopting a resolution on technology transfer and also its monitoring. It, however, failed address the vital issue of cut in GHG emissions and deferred it till 2009.
India’s response to environmental crisis

Sixty two years of 'development' have spurred on unplanned urbanisation, extensive industrialisation, and the building of a series of big dams. In the process, India has landed bang in the middle of an ecological crisis. We have lost half our forests, poisoned our waters, eroded our lands and rendered millions homeless, resourceless and more impoverished. Three of our cities are amongst the 15 most-polluted cities in the world. Several of our plant and animal species are extinct.

Land and soil degradation

Land is the most threatened resource in India. In 1980, the union ministry of agriculture admitted that 175 million hectares of the total landmass, ie 53 per cent of the total area, is degraded to some extent. In 1994, Sehgal and Abrol placed this figure higher at 187.2 million hectares, of which 162.4 million hectares are degraded by water and wind erosion and 21.7 million hectares by salinity and waterlogging. The remaining 4 million hectares are affected by the depletion of nutrients. According to the National Remote Sensing Agency and Forest Survey of India, 80 million hectares of the 142 million hectares under cultivation are substantially degraded and about 40 million hectares of the 75 million hectares controlled by the forest department have canopy cover of less than 40 per cent. Nearly 12 million hectares of pasturelands are also substantially degraded. Thus, a total of 132 million hectares representing 40 per cent of the country's total landmass have productivity well below their potential

Causes of land degradation

The main causes of land degradation are deforestation, ignorance of soil conservation practices, extension of cultivation to marginal lands, improper crop rotation, imbalanced fertiliser use, surface irrigation ironically designed to increase land productivity, rapid growth in population, paucity of land, economic pressures and poverty.

Vanishing Forest

The dimensions of deforestation in India are staggering. The country's forest cover has increased by six per cent in the past two years -- from 6,37,293 sq km to 6,75,538 sq km — taking the country closer to the goal of bringing 25 per cent of the geographical area under forest by 2007. The State of the Forest Report 2001, released by the Union Environment Ministry assessed the forest cover and tree cover to be about 7,57,010 sq km constituting 23.03 per cent of the country's geographical area. The forest cover has been assessed as 20.55 per cent of the country's geographical areas. Of this, dense forest area is spread over 4,16,809 sq km (12.68 per cent) and the open forests over 2,58,729 sq km (7.87 per cent). The remaining included the area under tree cover along roads, canals, scattered green patches on agricultural farms, homes and urban areas.

The total area under such tree cover is estimated to be 81,472 sq km or 2.48 per cent of the land area. The report, which is the first of the millennium, is the eighth assessment of the forest cover carried out by the Dehradun-based Forest Survey of India. The assessment is done after every two years and this time it was done by using the Digital Image Processing techniques where the accuracy is close to 95.9 per cent.

However, this apparent increase in the forest cover is due to plantations by different agencies. The State of Forest Report does not differentiate between natural forests and
plantations. Therefore these reports fail to deliver accurate information about actual loss of natural forests.

Till 1980, India's forest cover was being lost at the rate of 144,000 hectares per year. This slowed to 23,533 hectares between 1981 to 1995. Between 1975 and 1982, India lost a total of 1.4 million hectares of forest cover. According to a FAO report (1994), the annual rate of deforestation in India is 0.6 per cent (0.34 million hectares). In 1990, the total forest area was 70.6 million hectares, of which 27 per cent was under commercial plantation, especially of eucalyptus, teak and pine. The area allotted for forestry plantation is increasing by 15.5 per cent a year since 1981. As a result of this, the total area under forests is increasing even as the extent of natural forests is decreasing.

Causes of degradation of forest resources

1. Over-exploitation by communities residing in the vicinity of forests for subsistence or economic use such as collection of fuel wood, fodder, non-timber forest produce, etc.
2. Over-grazing by livestock
3. Commercial extraction of timber and non-timber forest produces by State agencies.
4. Unregulated urbanisation and increased consumption needs of urban populations.
5. Rapid industrialisation.
6. Diversion of forestland to non-forest use such as mining industry, timber-based industry, paper and pulp industry, and so on.
7. Submergence of forest land in river valley projects.
8. Conversion of forest land for agricultural purposes, including encroachments.

Water Resources

The annual per capita availability of renewable freshwater in the country has fallen from around 5,277 cubic metres in 1955 to 2,464 cubic metres in 1990. Given the projected increase in population by the year 2025, the per capita availability is likely to drop to below 1,000 cubic metres. If the availability falls below 1,000 cubic metres, the situation is labelled one of water scarcity.

According to Professor Malin Falkenmark of the Swedish International Water Institute, 100 litres a day (36.5 cubic metres a year) is the minimum per capita water requirement for our basic human needs. Agriculture, industry and energy usage is roughly 5-20 times that of human requirements.

Although India is endowed with sufficient water, there are significant variations in the spatial and temporal availability of this resource. Consequently, at any given time, there are areas of both water excess and water stress in the country. There are significant variations in water availability even within a river basin. For instance, the availability of water within the Ganga basin varies from 740 cubic metres in the Yamuna to 3,379 cubic metres in the Gandhak.

Rural water schemes have remained the scourge of planners since Independence. Despite massive resource allocation during the last nine Five-Year Plans, there were as many as 61,747 problem villages in the country towards the end of 1997. Interestingly, the country started out with a figure of 150,000 problem villages in 1972; this rose dramatically to 231,000 in 1980.
According to the latest statistics, about 15,000 habitations in the country were reported to be without any source of potable water; some 200,000 villages were partially covered by drinking water schemes; and 217,000 villages reported problems with the quality of water.

It is difficult to estimate the proportion of population that has access to clean drinking water. At the time of the First Five-Year Plan, 6% of the rural population and some 48% of the urban population had access to safe drinking water. There has been a dramatic increase in coverage, and by 1994-95, as much as 82% of the rural population was covered. According to the Centre for Science and Environment, about 81% of the country's total population has access to safe water.

Water stress is becoming acute in both urban and rural situations. Not only the quantity but also the quality of water supplied or available is being questioned. At one extreme, water is being wasted in urban areas and by industries; at the other, the rural poor lack access to safe water. According to experts, the usable water resources in several river basins will eventually be exhausted, most surface water will be polluted, and environmental deprivation will be universal. Water scarcity has led to the emergence of the bottled water industry worth over Rs 1,000 crore.

Causes of degradation and pollution of water resources

1. Many industries in India have obsolete pollution control technology. They still follow the 'dilute and disperse' principle for treating effluents. Very few industries in India have in-built techniques for pollution prevention and waste minimisation.
2. Serious degradation of water resources is caused by excessive water withdrawal for various reasons such as irrigation, industry, domestic consumption, etc. The effect of this is compounded by the fact that the catchments of these water resources are now seriously degraded, hampering groundwater recharging.
3. The natural drainage and water flow of many important rivers has been altered due to the withdrawal of water and construction of big dams. In the absence of optimum water flow, river systems lose their capacity of self-cleansing.

Air and atmospheric resources

The air in most of our cities is dangerously polluted. Average levels of suspended particulate matter in the four metropolitan cities, namely, Mumbai, Delhi, Chennai and Kolkata is over 360 micrograms per cubic metre, while the World Health Organisation has stipulated a safety level of 150 mg/ cubic metre. Pollutants in India's urban areas include oxides of nitrogen (NO2), sulphur (SO2) and carbon (CO and CO2) and suspended particulate matter (soot and dust). In addition, there is a range of toxic and carcinogenic substances such as benzene, Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons (PAH), ozone, lead, etc. The main sources of these pollutants are vehicular exhaust and industrial activity (energy sector, refinery and petrochemicals, iron and steel industry and others). Delhi, Mumbai and Kolkata are among the 15 most polluted cities in the world.

To add to these hazards are the mushrooming chemical industries and nuclear power plants, both of which have shown terrible safety records in India. The Bhopal disaster of 1983, in which several thousand people died inhaling toxic gas, was only the most visible sign of the dangers posed. Smaller accidents of that kind happen frequently in the country. Though no major accident has so far taken place in nuclear facilities in India, the possibility is certainly not remote. Most Indian nuclear power plants have been plagued by small reactor accidents. The
Rajasthan Atomic Power Plant has perhaps the most radioactively contaminated interiors in the world.

Pesticides are another category of environmental contaminants. Many pesticides are known to have a biomagnifying character, i.e., having a cumulative effect after many years of accumulation in the body or magnifying in concentration while entering from prey to predator in the food chain. The use of seriously poisonous pesticides has resulted in the decline of many bird species and caused serious ailments among humans.

Causes of air pollution

- Various regulatory legal provisions exist for emission levels from industry and vehicles. However, malpractice and a lack of political will render their implementation ineffective.
- Lack of a sense of responsibility and awareness of the direct impact of pollution among the people.
- Use of bad fuel quality for short-term gains.
- Use of obsolete technology for energy production in vehicles and industry.

The biodiversity crisis

The Indian subcontinent has been identified as one of the top 12 hotspots of biodiversity in the world. India harbours 8 per cent of the total number of species in the world, estimated to be 1.6 million, with possibly twice or thrice that number still to be discovered. However, conservative estimates suggest that at least 10 per cent of India's recorded wild flora and 20 per cent of its mammals are on the threatened list. Many of these would now be categorised as 'critical', i.e., on the verge of extinction. In fact, no one can say how many species have already been lost. According to one estimate, 23 species of different animals and plants are extinct, including the cheetah, lesser one-horned rhino, pink-headed duck, mountain quail, forest spotted owlet, and plants like the Hubbardia heptaneuron. The latter disappeared when a hydroelectric dam was built upstream of its riverine habitat. Many species have gone extinct either because they were not 'glamorous' enough to attract attention like the larger mammals or because their existence was simply not known to us.

India's domesticated biodiversity suffers the same plight. The Indian sub-continent is recognised as one of the world's major centres of crop and livestock origin and diversity. For example, till not so long ago, Indian farmers grew about 50,000 to 60,000 varieties of rice. The use of a diverse range of crop species and varieties ensured that several human needs (food, fodder, thatching, medicines, ritual uses, etc.) are fulfilled, and that there are back-up crops if some are affected by disease, pests or natural calamities. Hundreds of varieties of cattle, chickens, camels, goats and sheep are still bred and used by communities all over the country.

Threats to Indian biodiversity

Ever-increasing market pressures, poaching, smuggling of timber, over-exploitation of natural resources, widespread pollution in combination with habitat destruction and large-scale introduction of exotics have endangered a large portion of our biological diversity.

Impact of environmental degradation: the poor are worst affected

The localised and national impact of environmental degradation is now becoming increasingly clear. Loss of topsoil, salinity, pollution, shortage of water and biomass has caused
serious declines in agricultural productivity in many areas, making the food security situation bleak. A World Bank study reported that the cost of environmental damage due to pollution is 4.5 per cent of the GDP. Polluted air poses serious threats to human life, the short-term effects of which can be seen as health hazards and diseases. India is spending about Rs 4,600 crore every year to make up for health damages due to ambient air quality. The Centre for Science and Environment's Fifth Citizen's Report states that in the 33 Indian cities for which air quality is available, deaths particularly due to particulate air pollution went from 40,000 to 52,000, an increase of 30 per cent in just three to four years. Noise levels are so high that certain areas record over 90 decibels for the better part of the day.

While environmental degradation ultimately affects everyone, the immediate and most severe impact is felt by the poor. Millions of workers in India are exposed to unhealthy occupational environments, full of dust, heat, noise, dirt, gases and dangerous machinery. Perhaps 70 per cent of the diseases in India (in terms of the number of people affected) are caused by polluted water. These diseases hit the poor more than the rich because of the unhygienic conditions in which they live. Annually, hundreds of thousands of industrial workers, especially contract labourers, fall prey to environmentally degraded working conditions. Agricultural labourers, the poorest rural strata, are most exposed to the dangers of threshers and pesticides.

When land productivity declines, rich farmers manage to sail through in the short-term by increasing external inputs such as pesticides and fertilisers. Marginal farmers, however, are fighting a losing battle and many end up taking their own lives, like the cotton farmers of Andhra Pradesh in recent times. Marginal farmers are further affected by the loss of various indigenous varieties and knowledge of crops and livestock as they are left with no fallback systems.

Loss of biodiversity has increasingly marginalised and impoverished many tribals and other forest-dependent communities which directly depend on various components of biodiversity for food, drink, medicine, culture, spirituality, etc. Even among the poor, women are affected more than men. In many societies, women bear the major responsibility of collection of fuel, fodder, water and such basic subsistence needs. As these resources are depleted, the drudgery of women increases and sometimes they have to walk for more than 10 kms to collect these resources. This causes serious health problems for women. Neglect of the home and children because of increased hours of work often has serious social implications.

The indirect impact of degradation -- such as severe drought or deforestation-induced floods -- also hits the poor hardest. Poverty in these cases is a direct outcome of environmental destruction.

**Causes of environmental degradation**

Inappropriate technologies and the mismanagement of resources are certainly responsible for environmental degradation. But they are not the root of the crisis. At the root is the socio-political structure of the country.

One important cause of environmental destruction is inequitable consumption of resources and sharing of responsibility for environmental well-being. Over-population in third world countries is often cited as the root cause of environmental degradation. However, an average American consumes 40 times more resources than an average Somali. Similarly, the richest 5 per cent of Indian society probably cause more ecological damage because of the
amount they consume than the poorest 25 per cent. The question is: who is consuming what, from where and how much?

On the other hand, how the environment should be treated and how natural resources should be managed and used is decided by a handful of powerful people in various walks of life. Forest degradation began when large tracts of forest were nationalised by the British in the 19th century to establish control over valuable resources. Large-scale forestry operations were started, which continued even after Independence. Such extractions are, however, at the cost of the local people in these areas: their access to resources is severely restricted. These people have to buy life-sustaining resources at ever-increasing prices. The local people are left with small stretches of forests, which get quickly degraded. The pressure then falls on the government-controlled forests where people resort to quick and illegal means to meet their needs, turning hostile to the surrounding ecosystem.

Bamboo forests in most parts of India have been nearly wiped out by the paper industry. Till not so long ago the paper mills in Karnataka were paying Rs 15 per tonne of bamboo while the poor tribals for whom it is a basic necessity could only buy it at Rs 1,200 per tonne. In Andhra Pradesh, the government is now intending to hand over to industry even forests conserved and managed by local communities under the state-sponsored Joint Forest Management Programme!

Millions of hectares of land are utilised for dams or mining or urban growth and other 'development' projects. This is because those who benefit from these projects, mostly urban consumers, industrialists, contractors, politicians and big farmers, have greater control over land than small farmers, pastoralists and others whose land is taken over and who are displaced by these projects, often with minimal or no compensation. Hundreds of local communities have local, cost-effective, time-tested means of water harvesting and watershed management. However, the mandate is still in favour of big dams, as the local communities have no political or economic powers.

There is little political will in favour of environmental well-being because the exploitation of nature yields instant and high gains. Hence, there is no comprehensive town, rural or regional plan which integrates environmental needs with developmental needs. Local welfare schemes are externally conceived and driven and are rarely born out of local needs and knowledge. This invariable work is in conflict with the local environmental needs.

Environment and development

India's entire development process has been distorted by the structure of inequality outlined above. Adapted almost wholesale from the West and characterised by unrestricted, large-scale industrialisation, urbanisation, consumerism and materialism, today's path towards progress is quite evidently causing severe environmental destruction and resource depletion. It is a process that greatly benefits small sections of Indian society, has some trickle-down effects on a somewhat larger section, but almost leaves out a large section that becomes more and more impoverished.

Millions of people today are worse off than they were when our modern development process was started. Tribals have been alienated from their land and forests, nomadic communities have had their pastures taken away by mega-projects, marginal peasants and the landless have become economically more insecure. Between 20 to 30 million people have been
displaced by development projects, rendered refugees in desperate search of shelter and jobs, because they had no say in the development planning of the country. For these people, "development or destruction?" is not a cliché, it is a burning question.

The process of liberalisation and structural adjustments, which India embarked upon in the 1990s, has only served to intensify the environmental and social crisis. There are at least four aspects to it:

1. The drive towards an export-led model of growth is rapidly depleting natural resources in order to earn foreign exchange, particularly in the fisheries and mining sectors.
2. The move towards liberalisation is resulting in a free-for-all atmosphere, with industries increasingly ignoring environmental standards and state governments sacrificing natural habitats, including their own wildlife protected areas, to make way for commercial enterprises.
3. Directives to reduce the government's expenditure are resulting in cuts in social and environmental sectors. This is leading to a stagnation or reduction in programmes for the conservation and regeneration of natural resources.
4. Opening up of the economy is bringing in companies with a notorious track record on the environment (including pesticide manufacturers who had almost wound-up in their parent country), and wasteful consumer goods and toxins, which are adding to the country's garbage and health problems.

The debate on the new economic policies since 1990s has highlighted another vital aspect of the environmental crisis: the role of international organisations. Much as inequities within the country have fuelled the crisis, those between countries have resulted in considerable environmental degradation. Unequal trade regimes are forcing Southern countries to over-exploit their resources to compete in the international market and reduce their financial debt burdens. Foreign aid from multilateral and bilateral donors (notably the World Bank) primarily finance environmentally destructive projects, and aid packages (notably IMF) drive macro-economic policies further towards unsustainable and inequitable resource use.

Towards solutions Governmental efforts

The United Nations Conference on the Human Environment at Stockholm in 1972 was a turning point in the history of environmental legislation in India. After the Stockholm Conference, the Indian government became more aware of environmental issues. One outcome was the creation of the National Committee on Environmental Planning and Co-ordination (NCEPC), established in the department of science and technology. Subsequently, the environmental situation of the country featured as a prominent issue under the Fourth and Fifth Five-Year Plans.

The department of environment and forests was created in the central government, which subsequently became the ministry of environment and forests (MoEF) by the mid-1980s. The MoEF is a focal point and a nodal agency in the administrative structure for planning, promotion and implementation of environment, conservation and forestry-related programmes. The mandates of the ministry include conservation and survey of flora, fauna, forests and wildlife, prevention and control of pollution, afforestation and regeneration of degraded areas and protection of the environment. These tasks are being fulfilled by the ministry through environmental impact assessment, eco-regeneration, assistance to organisations implementing environmental and forestry programmes, promotion of environmental and forestry research,
extension, education and training to augment the requisite manpower, dissemination of environmental information, international cooperation and creation of environmental awareness among all sectors of the country's population.

In and after the '70 a number of old acts were amended and new ones passed: these included the Air (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1981, the Water (Prevention and Control of Pollution) Act, 1974, the Environment (Protection) Act, 1986, the Public Liability Insurance Act, 1991, the National Environment Tribunal Act, 1995, the National Environment Appellate Authority Act, 1997, the Wildlife Protection Act, 1972 and the Forests (Conservation) Act, 1980. Besides the legislative measures, a National Conservation Strategy and Policy Statement on Environment and Development, 1992, National Forest Policy, 1988 and a Policy Statement on Abatement of Pollution, 1992 have also been evolved.

The Government of India implemented a new Forest Policy in the year 2002. It made provisions for the access to land for the utilisation and development of forest resources, and secure the tenure of forest and trees and to conserve the biodiversity of the forest resources. The policy made provisions to encourage sustainable use and ensure that the benefits are shared equitably.

However, there are many loopholes in the policy, which allows the policy makers to deliberately delay its implementation. Prime Minister Manmohan Singh formulated the National Action Plan on Climate Change. The Plan encompasses a broad and extensive range of measures, and focusses on eight missions, which will be pursued as key components of the strategy for sustainable development. These include missions on solar energy, enhanced energy efficiency, sustainable habitat, conserving water, sustaining the Himalayan ecosystem, creating a ‘Green India’ sustainable habitat, conserving water, sustaining the Himalayan ecosystem, creating a Green India sustainable agriculture and finally, establishing a strategic knowledge platform for climate change. The action Plan will go a long way as far as India’s position on climate change is concerned. It clearly demonstrates India’s concerns and its strategy to meet the challenges of climate change and other environment related problems.

Several autonomous agencies, offices and institutions have also been set up by the government to implement environmental programmes and policies.

People's movements

Equally important has been the peoples' response to the environmental crisis. Literally thousands of citizens' groups have sprung up in the last two decades or so. There are two broad categories of groups: those who challenge and oppose environmentally destructive activities, and those who carry out regenerative work or work towards alternatives.

In the '70s, a major World Bank-funded project to replace a massive area of natural mixed forests in central India by industrial pine plantations was abandoned after strong local tribal opposition. A move to hand over thousands of hectares of common lands to a private industry in Karnataka was contested and won in court. The National Fisherfolk Federation has managed to stop destructive trawling off parts of the Indian coast and to enforce seasonal fishing restrictions in marine waters. Several major dams have been stopped before or during the planning stages by local opposition: these include the Bhopalpatnam and Inchampalli in Madhya Pradesh, Silent Valley in Kerala and Vishnuprayag in Uttar Pradesh.
The Narmada Bachao Andolan against the Sardar Sarovar Project has redefined the contours of the environment-development debate the world over and shown that even as powerful an agency as the World Bank can be challenged. The Andolan has combined massive grassroots mobilisation with incisive critiques of the project to generate awareness of the conflict between elitist development and sustainability of resource use.

Meanwhile, the famous Chipko movement in the Himalayas has not only successfully resisted deforestation in several areas but shown that community afforestation with indigenous species can be enormously successful. Attempts at reviving traditional, or developing new methods of ecological farming are now widespread. Farmers and citizens' groups like the Beej Bachao Andolan in Tehri and Navdanya have shown that adequate levels of diversified crop production without the use of synthetic chemicals are possible and economically viable. Energy experts are working on alternative sources of energy in various states.

Several experiments with watershed management and simple rainwater harvesting techniques have achieved with much less ecological, social and financial cost, what big dams cannot. Ralegan Siddhi (Maharashtra), Sukhomajri (Haryana), Gopalpura (Rajasthan) and Jardhar (Uttar Pradesh) are just some of the villages across the country that have reversed ecological degradation and shown alternative development models.

Social equity and decision-making by as many of the members of the village as possible have been essential features of these efforts. Water scarcity in arid tracts of Maharashtra has been tackled by *Pani Panchayats*, an innovative structure of decision-making in which villagers ensure the equitable distribution of irrigation water. *Van Panchayats* in the Himalayan foothills are attempting the same with forest resources.

The clear lesson from the dynamics of both environmental destruction and reconstruction in India is that people -- local communities everywhere -- have to be involved in any kind of natural resource management. But there is still a long way to go before local communities are centre-stage in decision-making. And just as long to go before the development process becomes truly environment-friendly.

**Critical evaluation**

Implementation of Indian environmental policy has been hampered by conceptual problems in understanding the nature of environmental problems and the kinds of policies and procedures necessary to address the problems. Without clear priorities or criteria for setting priorities, policymakers have tended to address the easy problems first and to adopt an end-of-the-pipe approach to pollution control. For example mobile pollution sources are yet to be covered by regulations, although vehicles are a major source of air pollution in most metropolitan cities. No attention has been given to the transport of hazardous substances.

Similarly, wastes from urban settlements (which account for almost 90 per cent of waste water generated) and misuse of disposed wastes have escaped regulatory attention, despite their significant health consequences for large populations. Related problems of policy design include ambiguous and ill-defined objectives, inappropriate measures to achieve the stated goals, lack of politically feasible approaches and no effort to estimate the costs of policy alternatives. These problems in policy design result from inadequate legal expertise in environmental administration at the center reflecting problems in resource constraints and the nature of federalism, and from
symbolic politics that emphasises policy as an instrument to appease certain interest groups rather than policy, which is designed for effective implementation.

A second conceptual weakness in policy design is India’s lack of key regulatory principles that have improved compliance elsewhere, such as the polluter pays principle. In Malaysia, the use of the polluter pays principle, with economic incentives for continued improvement, has facilitated quick reduction of water pollution from rubber and palm oil factories. In Thailand a national industrial zoning plan along with environmental impact assessment regulations has helped to improve the control of water pollution. India also lacks an environmental impact law that would require environmental clearance of new projects, and has not succeeded in imposing high costs for noncompliance with the regulations. India has adopted a command and control strategy for effluent control, with tough regulations that are not easily implemented. India’s current policy does not include any mechanisms to ensure that pollution control equipment is operated regularly after installation. Consequently, many firms turn off pollution control facilities at night or during power shortages. Despite recent efforts to improve the inspection system by placing industrial facilities in three categories of hazardous levels, serious shortcomings remain in specifying the procedures and training the staff to carry out the inspections. These factors of policy design contribute to poor implementation.

The lack of a strong policy analysis capability in the Ministry of Environment and Forest (MOEF) has contributed to the conceptual problems in India’s environmental policies, which have been designed and adopted without examining alternative policy options or considering the costs in implementation. The inability to set priorities and strategies for the severe problems of deforestation and sewage dumping by municipal bodies has also resulted partly from the absence of policy analysis. In the State Pollution Control Boards, the professional staff has little available time for policy analysis due to time-consuming litigation and related proceedings. In addition, major policies have been adopted without any public debate over the options, reflecting a strong adherence to secrecy within the Indian bureaucracy. Although the central government has implemented the Right to Information Act, the provisions are restrictive and would not allow disclosure of information considered detrimental to the interests of the government.

One area of inadequate analysis is the lack of an appropriate policy for the multiple small scale sources of both industrial and household wastes. India’s industrial structure includes many small firms, both unorganised and household units, that lack adequate capital resources, physical space, and skills needed for designing pollution control systems. These multiple sources create high costs and difficulty in administering the environmental regulations. In the state of Andhra Pradesh, for instance, there are 700 large and medium-sized factories and about 70,000 small-scale manufacturing units.

Another major problem of non-point-source pollution is household sewerage, which has not been addressed by current environmental policy and the magnitude of the problem is increasing because of growing population pressures in urban areas. The pollution problems of multiple small-scale units are exacerbated by the lack of public resources available to municipalities; in some cases, municipal budgets can provide only for human resource costs (salaries) and nothing else (for example, no equipment or operating costs). The large number of widely distributed, small-scale facilities, with varying technological processes and effluent characteristics, makes it difficult to administer a command and control approach to pollution control in India. This approach has additional difficulties due to the uneven and unexpected effluent discharges of relatively short duration, often deliberately planned to avoid detection. It is
imperative to note that India must explore some alternatives in the policy design so that we can minimise the environmental damages. The following is an account of the alternative energy resource guide, which can improve India’s record in keeping the environment safe.

**Coal**

Coal accounts for nearly half of India’s total energy use, a large part of it for electricity production. Most of the present day generators use 200 MW to 500 MW sub-critical boilers with a thermal efficiency of 35 per cent or less. Older units of 60 MW and 110/120 MW have efficiency. All new coal generators should use super-critical boilers in the size range of range 800 MW, which can achieve an efficiency of about 40 per cent. While most of the coal now used is domestic, imports will be needed in the decades ahead for power stations located in the south and west of India, for which port infrastructure should be built. A further gain in efficiency is possible when the integrated coal gasification technology is available. While some collaborative work with the US and other countries is planned, a proto-type development in India jointly between National Thermal Power Corporation (NTPC) and Bharat Heavy Electricals Limited (BHEL) is warranted. Removal of carbon dioxide from fuel gases of coal power stations is being studied in the US and elsewhere. However, as of now, the associated economic penalties are unclear. However, India should collaborate with other countries in these studies.

**Hydel potential**

India must give emphasis to developing the still fairly large untapped hydel potential in the North-West, North, and North-East. But this requires an enlightened policy of rehabilitation of project-affected people. There are also cultural factors such as submerged lands regarded as holy because ancestors of present inhabitants are buried there or for other reasons of tribal customs. People living in these areas where large hydel potential exists need to be provided incentives, as they may perceive that their energy wealth is being used to enrich people living in other parts of the country. A similar approach is required to access the large hydel potential available in Bhutan and Nepal beyond the needs of the populations of these countries.

**Nuclear energy**

A very important non-carbon energy source is nuclear power. India’s quest to rapidly develop this source has been hampered by a very limited resource base of uranium that too low grade, and technological isolation imposed by the US. This may result in an opening of the door for import of nuclear fuel and civilian nuclear technology. This will then provide for an immediate acceleration of the nuclear energy programme.

However, India is pinning its hopes on the eventual use of thorium as a source of energy, as it has abundant reserves of this substance. We shall have to build a series of fast-breeder reactors before significant amounts of thorium could be used to generate electricity, a process that may take some three decades. In parallel, India is participating in the International Thermonuclear Experimental Reactor (ITER), which is expected to pave the way for controlled fusion energy, which may become viable in some five decades. Thereafter, the heavy hydrogen, available in very small quantities in water, would be a source of energy.

**Solar energy**

Another energy option of great interest is solar energy. While it is possible to harvest solar energy using photovoltaic cells, the economics at present are unfavorable. Considering its abundance in India, the country must embark on a mission mode programme, comparable to
atomic energy and space, to develop economically viable solar polar systems. The department of New Energy Source needs to be headed by a competent scientist or technologist and sponsor new R&D in solar energy, fuel cells bio-fuel, hydrogen production and storage, and so on. Wind energy has made good progress through the dynamism of the private sector and it needs to be underpinned by advanced R&D. Solar water heaters and solar cookers need to be promoted through better designs and incentives.

**Oil and Gas**

These are the fastest growing segments of our energy basket and we should maximize their availability to run our economy. If the railway system was fully electrified and the Railways render satisfactory services for goods movement, a big reduction in the use of oil resources would take place. Similarly, all large cities must have metro railways and small cities should use electric trolley buses. An assumption that is being made is that our electric supply system will become reliable with good quality power and without interruptions. Magnetic levitation would greatly increase the efficiency in electric traction. In due course of time, motor vehicles and buses using hydrogen fuel cells would be a way of transport with no carbon emissions. However, hydrogen will have to be produced using solar energy or nuclear energy.

**Energy efficiency**

India has to achieve energy efficiency in industry, transport, domestic appliances, and agriculture. Agricultural pumping is notoriously inefficient due to electricity being supplied free. Similarly, power loses in transmission and distribution can be reduced drastically through investment in T&D systems and better transformers.

**Social option**

A fact that cannot be avoided lifestyle options determine the energy intensity of a society. India can lead the way to save the Earth by adopting the following social option:

- We should focus on decentralised and regional development that would minimize long distance transport of food articles, consumer goods, minerals and industrial items.
- Dwellings must be located close to the work place, minimising daily commuting.
- Residences must be designed to be energy efficient, needing minimum or no energy for cooling or heating.
- Both inter-city and intra-city transport should to a large extent be in well-designed mass transport systems.
- More importantly, manufactured articles should have long life, not requiring frequent replacement due to planned obsolescence.

**International negotiations and India**

Since the 1990s onwards, the focus of the entire world was shifted to protect the ecological systems of the planet. As an emerging leader of the developing countries, India was expected to lead the show. Before the 1990s, the debate between the North and South was related to material advancement. However, in the 1990s the nature of debate changed. The focus has been shifted to the degree of carbon emission. The developing countries are now blaming the developed countries for the degradation of the world’s ecosystem. India as a leader of the South (Developing Countries), has taken a tough stand in this regard. It has consistently maintained that developing countries including India should not be forced to reduce carbon emissions. The basic argument that was given was that till today the developed countries (most prominently the USA)
have been responsible for the world’s total pollution. If at all any target is going to be fixed, first the developed nations must lead the way. Starting from Kyoto to the recent negotiations held in Bali, what is evident is that India has been able to form a cartel of developing countries to put pressure on the USA and other Developed nations to accept their terms and conditions. This is a significant development as far as international politics is concerned. India has demonstrated its ability to lead the developing nations.

It is true that at the international level, India is displaying considerable amount of clout. However, the activities of the political leaders show immaturity with regard to India’s national interest. While it is true that we need industrial advancement; at the same time we have some responsibility towards protecting our own environment. This is also part of our national interest in the long run. Centre for Science and Environment report states that climate change is changing India more rapidly than any other developing country. Hence it is imperative for the policy makers to look at the ground realities before they take a stand in international conventions.

It is absolutely correct to pressurise the developed countries to have mandatory Carbon dioxide emissions. At the same time we must also try to look at the alternative development models which are morally just, economically viable, and environmentally sustainable.

Conclusion

The human species, which once had a role in the environment, has over the years, effectively destroyed it or replaced it. This was made possible by the development of a socio-economic and technological system that over the past 200-300 years, allowed society to initiate major changes in its relationship with the other elements in the environmental system. Indeed, in many ways human beings no longer see themselves as part of the environment. Such detachment has undoubtedly contributed to the problems that have arisen in the environment. There is a perception among the environmentalists that the situation will be improved only when humans once again begin to consider themselves as an integral part of the natural environment.

Much of the difficulty associated with attempts to solve environmental problems arises from the socio-economic and political consequences of the required changes which are perceived by some to be even more detrimental to society than the continued existence of the problem. Given the complexity of the environmental problems being considered, there is no one approach that satisfies all needs. Solutions will have to be flexible enough to deal with issues that have arisen as a result of deliberate human interference in the environment as well as those that arose inadvertently, perhaps as a byproduct of some activity designed to improve the quality of life.

Environment is a global issue. Hence it needs cooperation at a global stage. International cooperation has to consider world socio-economic and technological patterns which have an impact on the nature and intensity of environmental problems. The most common division of the world on these grounds is into developing and developed countries often identified as the North-South split. The developed nations belong to the northern hemisphere and the developing ones belong to the southern hemisphere. Each of these areas has different environmental priorities. In the North, it is over-consumption of resources and the environmental damage associated with it that needs to be addressed. The nations of the North have also pushed that impact beyond their boundaries by exporting environmentally damaging technologies.

The transfer of technology to developing nations has often had a detrimental rather than a beneficial effect on the environment. Toxic waste banned from dumps and landfill sites in the
North has found its way to the South and pesticides and herbicides banned in the Developed world continue to be exported to developing nations to be used in agriculture.

The fundamental problem with the North is their lack of interest in taking up the responsibility of reducing the green house emissions. Recently G8 Summit 2008 was held in Hokkaido Toyako where major emphasis was given on addressing climate change. The summit was a complete failure in the sense that the major industrial countries agreed to reduce half of the green house gas emissions by 2050. This is a major setback to the Kyoto Protocol agreement where the target was fixed 2012. So it is very clear that the developed nations are not in a mood to take up the responsibility and take corrective steps.

The ongoing environmental problems in the South however stem from continued high population growth rates and uncontrolled urban growth. In Africa, the implications of the HIV/AIDS epidemic extend beyond health, social development and population structure to the environment. The people in these areas are among the poorest in the world, and although they consume much less of the world’s resources than the rich, poverty can force them to use the environment inappropriately. Poverty also means that they are less able to adapt to change, and as a result they are more vulnerable to environmental threats such as drought, soil erosion or water pollution and a variety of natural disasters. It is a fact that the global environmental issues have become increasingly politicised because of the wide disparity between Northern and the Southern hemisphere. The issue of development has pushed the agenda of global environmental problems. Social scientists are now looking forward to sustainable development with great hope. This signifies development without compromising the environment. Also the concept argues for development without compromising the resources of future generations. The concept arose in its present form out of the Brundtland Commission and gained prominence through the Earth Summit and its agenda 21. The proposals set out in Agenda 21 are ambitious, requiring changes in previously accepted socio-economic, technological and environmental practices.

The United Commission on Sustainable Development has assumed the task of promoting the concept and its implementation. In one of its reports it concluded that some progress had been made in reducing poverty, curbing pollution and slowing the rate of environmental degradation, but overall the global environment continued to deteriorate and many nations had not lived up to the commitments they. In short, although the policies and principles of sustainable development are now well established, there is a considerable lag in putting them into practice. What ever may be the outcomes of the process of sustainable development, it is very clear that the society can not sit ideally and wait for results.

People are an integral part of the environment and being responsible for the environmental deterioration that has occurred. Hence they also must participate in the search of alternatives and solutions. Sustainable development offers the greatest promise, but it is also the approach that demands the greatest change in current socio-economic and cultural patterns and the greatest individual sacrifice. Success or failure in slowing and then reversing environmental deterioration will depend on society’s willingness to face these challenges and accept the sacrifices or ignore them and suffer the consequences.
Rebels, insurgents, paramilitaries, separatists, militants, guerrillas, insurrectionists, fundamentalists... are these all terrorists? Or does terrorism claim its own exclusive niche? The exasperating inability to define terrorism is betrayed in the United Nations Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy - "we, the States Members of the United Nations...strongly condemn terrorism in all its forms and manifestations, committed by whomever, wherever and for whatever purposes"

The United Nations has been striving for decades to find a wording for terrorism which, instead of "all its forms and manifestations", narrows down to a specific profile of violence which can be condemned regardless of the circumstances. It blocks the possibility of referring terrorist acts to an international court, as for genocide and other war crimes. It leaves individual countries free to outlaw activity, which they choose to classify as terrorism, perhaps for their own political convenience; and crucially it enabled the Bush administration to conjure in the public mind parallels between the destruction of the World Trade Centre and the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein.

The phenomenal rise of the menace of terrorism, primarily through the network of the Al-Qaeda on the centre-stage of international politics, cutting across the boundaries of nation-states and defying the perceived immunities of certain socio-economic and cultural systems, may arguably be reckoned as one of the most formidable factors underpinning the contemporary phase of international politics. Traversing a long course and powered by the rapid advancements in the scientific and technological domains, and in conjunction with the ideological intoxications rooted in the discourses on the clash of civilisations, the contemporary incarnation of the cult of terrorism, often branded as 'super terrorism,' has so spectacularly showed its prowess in the form of the 9/11 attacks in 2001 that even the mightier and seemingly invincible nations of the world are finding themselves in precarious and vulnerable situations.

**The concept of Terrorism:**

Concepts of political discourse are hardly models of clarity, but there is general agreement as to what constitutes terrorism. The "act of terrorism" means activities that are as follows:

a) That involves a violent act or an act dangerous to human life that is a violation of the criminal laws of the State, or that would be a criminal violation if committed within the jurisdiction of the State; and

b) That appears to be intended

(i) to intimidate or coerce a civilian population;

(ii) to influence the policy of a government by intimidation or coercion; or

(iii) to affect the conduct of a government by assassination or kidnapping.

The concept is not precisely delimited. First, the boundary between international terrorism and aggression is not always clear. On this matter, a benefit of doubt to the United States and its clients: if they reject the charge of aggression in the case of some act of...
international violence, then it falls under the lesser crime of terrorism. There is also
disagreement over the distinction between terrorism and retaliation or legitimate resistance.

US sources also provide more succinct definitions of "terrorism." A US Army manual on
countering terrorism defines it as "the calculated use of violence or threat of violence to attain
goals that are political, religious or ideological in nature. This is done through intimidation,
coercion, or instilling fear." Still simpler is the characterisation in a Pentagon-commissioned
study by noted terrorologist Robert Kupperman, which speaks of the threat or use of force "to
achieve political objectives without the full-scale commitment of resources.

Kupperman, however, is not discussing terrorism, rather, low intensity conflict (LIC), a
central doctrine of the Reagan administration. The description indicates and actual practice
confirms, LIC -- much like its predecessor "counterinsurgency" -- is hardly more than an
euphemism for state-directed international terrorism, that is, reliance on force that does not reach
the level of the war crime of aggression.

The point is recognised within the scholarly discipline, though with the usual doctrinal
twist. One leading Israeli specialist observes that ‘state-sponsored terrorism’ is a form of low-
intensity conflict that states undertake when they find it convenient to engage in ‘war’ without
being held accountable for their actions" Professor Yonah Alexander restricts his attention to the
Kremlin conspiracy to destabilise the West with "surrogate groups," offering such examples as
"an extensive Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) training programme... provided for
Nicaragua." In this conception, "the PLO, which maintained a special relationship with
Moscow," served its former Soviet master by passing on the "specialised training" in terrorism it
acquires in the Soviet Union to Nicaragua, which is therefore able to conduct LIC against the
United States and its interests. He also suggests ways in which "the Eastern Bloc's sincerity must
be tested;" for example, "Showing willingness to stop propaganda campaigns linking the US and
its allies to terrorism."

Recently, United States' State Department in the annual report on International terrorism
has said that India’s counter-terrorism efforts checked by outdated and overburdened law
enforcement and legal systems. Citing the 26/11 Mumbai Terror Attacks US said that while the
terrorists were equipped with cutting edge technology like the Global Positioning System
trackers; the Indian police were found to be 'poorly-trained and equipped and lacked central
control to coordinate an effective response'.

In the report released on Thursday, 30th April 2009 US has ranked India among the
world's worst terrorism-afflicted countries in 2008 and stated that despite being attacker by the
terrorists in various incidents the country has failed to prosecute the perpetrators.

The Just Cause Conundrum

The difficulty in constructing a definition which eliminates any just cause for terrorism is
that history provides too many examples of organisations and their leaders branded as terrorists
but who eventually evolved into respected government. This has applied particularly to national
liberation movements fighting colonial or oppressive regimes, engaging in violence within their
own countries often as a last resort. Jomo Kenyatta of Kenya spent years of his life in peaceful
independence advocacy with the British government before his involvement with the Mau Mau
rebellion. Another convicted "terrorist", Nelson Mandela, wrote in his autobiography: "the hard
facts were that 50 years of non-violence had brought (my) people nothing but more repressive legislation, and fewer rights”.

All countries must deplore indiscriminate acts of terrorism which kill and maim civilians and which create a climate of fear. Countries from Africa and the Middle East have however proved reluctant to endorse any definition of terrorism which fails to place such acts within the broad sweep of history. The dilemma for the international community lies firstly in assessing whether a cause is "just" and therefore capable of remedy by political negotiation, and secondly in identifying which "terrorist" organisations are capable of emerging into the legitimate political process.

A central aim of the Irish Republican Army (IRA) - to reunite the northern and southern counties of Ireland - was never regarded as a just cause by the UK government, whilst other grievances linked to fair government in the north were accepted as negotiable. Sinn Fein, the political wing of the IRA, is now part of an elected power-sharing government in Northern Ireland. In the Middle East, the vision of a Palestinian state is considered a just cause by all stakeholders but world leaders have so far preferred to negotiate only with the Fatah party. This approach chooses to ignore the electoral success of Hamas which was based on its proven competence to govern at local level, an attribute equally associated with Hezbollah in Lebanon.

These extreme sensitivities in the dividing line between recognition and condemnation are found in other longstanding internal conflicts around the world. Despite a decade of outrages committed by the Communist Party of Nepal, Maoist (CPN-Maoist), its leader, Pushpa Kamal Dahal, alias Prachanda, was the head of a democratically elected government. By contrast, longstanding peace negotiations with the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka stalled with the group recently proscribed as a terrorist organisation by the European Union. Sri Lankan Army defeated the LTTE and killed its leader, V Prabhakaran. Potential negotiation dilemmas may also flare up with separatist groups in Kashmir, Mindanao in the Philippines, and in the Kurdish regions of Turkey and Iraq.

Keeping in view the changing nature, spatial domain and functional dynamics of the terrorism, this section attempts at articulating the basic issues involved in understanding the phenomenon including the contested domain of defining the concept, tracing its historical roots and exposition of the plausible intellectual perspectives and causal factors giving birth to terrorism. The globalization of the terror of terrorism in the aftermath of 9/11 and the multilateral, bilateral as well as the national efforts required in combating the menace also form the critical part of the section.

Global Jihad

Simultaneous bomb attacks on the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania in 1998 followed by the 9/11 tragedy in 2001 marked the globalisation of terror in which a populist and possibly negotiable cause within the nation state becomes subservient to principled grievances against the world order, communicated through the tools of globalisation led by the internet. Both attacks in Africa were traced to the group headed by Osama bin Laden known as al-Qaeda. Its ideology is shaped by the belief that Islam is being degraded and humiliated by "western" values, with particular disgust reserved for those Arab countries, such as Saudi Arabia and Egypt, which are close allies of the US. The plight of the Palestinians is a rallying call for al-Qaeda whose central goal is to expel Americans from Muslim lands and dismantle pro-US
Middle Eastern governments. To this end all US citizens and their sympathisers are to be killed, regardless of whether or not they are Muslim.

This extreme form of fundamentalist Sunni Islam adopted by bin Laden and his closest associates is often described as jihadism and is believed to have been inspired by an Egyptian radical, Sayyid Qutb, who opposed the Nasser regime. Fighting alongside the conservative Taliban in Afghanistan may have been a further influence on bin Laden. The manic ideology of al-Qaeda has no roots in mainstream Islam which shares core values of peace and tolerance with the world's major religions. The Koran teaches that the killing of innocent humans is a crime and that suicide is unacceptable.

The Jihadis

Guy Fawkes, one of the most infamous terrorists in history who came within a whisker of destroying the English monarchy and parliament in 1605 was, like the modern jihadis, acting in the name of a malignited and misunderstood religion. King James presented a list of questions to the torturers, headed by the demand to discover "as to what he is, for I can never yet hear of any man that knows him". Four hundred years later the nightmare of suicide terrorism has likewise prompted frantic efforts to understand the psychological motives of individuals who are prepared to strap dynamite around themselves and trigger the detonator whilst surrounded by defenceless citizens.

Although suicide attacks are particularly associated with Al-Qaeda ideology, they were adopted by the Tamil Tigers, by militant groups in Iraq and also by the Taliban. Attention is focused on the influence of institutions of Islamic education which in a small minority of cases advocate extreme views which "radicalise" students into beliefs which are inconsistent with mainstream Islam. This is believed to flourish especially in Pakistan where inadequate funding of state education has allowed unregulated madrasa religious education to take hold. About 1.5 million children attend madrasas in Pakistan, some of which are also open to foreign visitors. A number of terrorists belonging to the Jemaah Islamiyah (JII) group in Indonesia have been identified as alumni of religious schools there known as pesantrens. In the UK attendance at the radical Finsbury mosque has been traced to a disturbing proportion of known terrorists.

Attempts have been made to construct psychological profiles with proven susceptibility to indoctrination. In Islamic countries such interest focuses on the sense of political impotence created by inadequate democracy and corrupt governance. In Europe, there are suggestions that young Muslims from immigrant families suffer identity problems in reconciling differences between western lifestyles and their upbringing. As yet these theories remain in the realms of speculation. Likewise, media tendencies to brand Pakistan as a source of world terror have been countered by a remarkable petition "Say no to Terrorism" which has been signed by over 60 million people in the country, more than the number of voters in the recent election. Recently, the Pakistan Government has launched attack on the Taliban in Swat Valley.

Terrorism in the era of Globalisation

The pointed attack on the American signposts of prosperity and seemingly impregnable defence establishments on 11 September 2001 appears to have catapulted the entire world into the throes of international terrorism in such an inextricable manner that the menace of terrorism no longer seems to remain confined only to certain pockets or countries of the world and its tentacles tend to reach any part of the globe to strike at will and the stipulated targets.
In the era of globalisation, therefore, the character of international terrorism has undergone dramatic transformations with the balance tilting in favour of the terrorist groups, necessitating a concerted and globalised strategy on the part of the societies and states bearing the burnt of terrorism in the main. One of the most obvious results in the advancement of technology has been the refinements in the information technology owing to the fatal conjunction between computers and satellite communication.

The technological advancement in terms of unchecked and lightening pace of the flow of information has produced two discernible positive advantages for the monster of international terrorism. Firstly, as a major objective of the terrorist groups in conducting surprise and indiscriminate attacks on the people and properties is to gain immense publicity through the media coverage of their strikes, the modern techniques and processes of the transfer of information has come as a great help for the terrorists to get enormous publicity for each and every act of terrorism conducted by them.

In the previous times, the terrorists were at pains at most of the times to explain the rationale and validity of their cause and the methodology being adopted to serve such a cause as a result of which they were not only short of resources and public support for their cause but also their point of view was very scarcely transmitted to a wide range of audience so as to garner intellectual and material support for their cause. Such a difficulty has now become almost a thing of past owing to the easier and accessible methods like the internet and web sites whose recourse have been widely taken by the terrorists to address the targeted audience all over the world and gain subtle moral and material support from their sympathisers.

Rapid technological advancements associated with the processes and products of globalisation have afforded a number of operational advantages to international terrorism allowing it to manoeuvre its functional dynamics in such a way that not only is it able to strike in a superbly coordinated and foolproof manner but also fortify its defences using the facilities made available by modern technology and escape from being detected by the security agencies. In contrast to the era of individual and isolated terrorist attacks mounted from a single staging base, terrorism in the age of Globalisation has attained a higher degree of coordination and multiplicity of operational diversity over space and time with the use of modern facilities afforded by the information technology. The use of the Global System of Mobile Communication (GSM) technology, email, cell phones and Global Positioning System (GPS), etc., has reduced the gap of geographical distance from the various players of the group and provided them the ability to strike at various targets at the same time sitting at a far away place without much difficulty.

However, alarming is that such concerted strikes by the terrorists are by and large going to be undetected in advance, and facilitate the free movement of the perpetrators of terrorism across the world. The classic case of the vibrant security system of the terrorists has been the failure of the anti-terror operatives from various countries to trace the hideout of the Chief of the Al-Qaeda network despite the stunning 9/11 attacks and the regular release of tapes containing the threatening addresses by the operatives of the network including by Osama Bin Laden himself. In the wake of the processes of Globalisation, newer dimensions have also been added in the operational manoeuvrability of the terrorist groups as they have been provided with unprecedented flexibility and scope for movement from one place to another.
Keeping in mind the critical importance of mobility to the terrorists both for their security and operational effectiveness, the enhanced and smooth means and space for mobility has proved as a sort of boon for the terrorists. Having utilised the available methods of transportation to reach the various places of the world at their will and necessity, the terrorists have also shown their new found propensity to acquire and use more lethal weapons in order to aggravate the extent of damages caused by their strikes on people and properties. The use of nerve gas by the terrorists in the Tokyo subway system, aircrafts as missiles to strike at the World Trade Centre on 9/11, GPS and satellite phones used during the Mumbai terror attack on 26/11 and the never ending search of the terrorists to look for weapons of mass of destruction to execute their plans appear to be turning things from bad to worse in the age of Globalisation.

The cumulative impact of the processes of Globalisation on the nature of international terrorism is probably two fold. Firstly, the technological advancements propelling Globalisation have also proved to be very handy for the terrorists who happen to take advantage of such technological innovations more effectively than taken advantage of by the security agencies. Secondly, along with the globalization of economies and societies in the world, the globalisation of terrorism is also taking a subtle form in which, no part of the world appears to remain safe from the probable strike by the terrorists if it tends to have anything to do with the enemies of the terrorist?

US war on terrorism

United States of America’s strategy of fighting terrorism particularly in the aftermath of 9/11 has been deceptive. It follows double standard. In the name of fighting terrorism it aims at achieving its foreign policy objectives or serving its narrow political interest.

After 9/11 Afghanistan, a country ravaged by internecine strife and rabid Talibanisation turned into a poor country was attacked by US to catch Osama Bin Laden. Some of their foreign policy objectives were fulfilled by capturing Afghanistan. US attacked Iraq to dismantle its chemical weaponry but couldn’t get anything. Moreover, Iraq was never a threat to world peace. Rather, US forces were successful in capturing Saddam Hussein and executing him. American’s pushed the country into chaos and turmoil.

Ideology: the main driving force behind terror

The transformations brought about by the spectre of terrorism have been full of bewilderment to the policy makers in various countries in the era of Globalisation. Most of leverages in the conduct of foreign policy are supposed to be revolving around economic considerations. Huge efforts are required to be concentrated in the hitherto marginal states in order to help them not only save themselves from the scourge of terrorist violence within their countries. But it also becomes a frontal state in the collective endeavour of the international community to take the menace of terrorism head on.

As a variant of the violent methods of pursuing ones goals in the face of a legitimately established order in a country, terrorism has been in vogue for a fairly long period in the history of modern civilisation. What have, however, given new orientations to the idea of terrorism in the new millennium are probably the religion based pan-ideological as well as the spatial dimensions which are in manifestation in almost all major terrorist incidents across the world. Ideology, indeed, has been an important driving force behind the conduct of violent activities by terrorists in many countries of the world, as is seen in the cases of the Maoist inspired blood bath. Yet, the scale and reach of such ideologically motivated violent activities are very limited.
compared to the scale and reach of the mayhem carried out by the present-day terrorist groups, thereby making them a distinct category in themselves.

Quite evidently, therefore, the human force and the financial resources available at the disposal of the religion-based and ideology-driven terrorist groups far outweigh the logistical resources of the communist ideology inspired groups, which in turn provide them a sweeping international presence as against the pocketed influence of the latter.

Above all, amongst contemporary terrorism, the ideological influences have been so much blinding and overbearing that it has attained the form of the genie that is out to destroy its creator itself as is happening in the case of the countries like Afghanistan and Pakistan. These countries had earlier been the bastions of the terrorist groups, providing them shelter and logistical support and are in present times bearing the burnt of the activities of these terrorist groups. The brutal assassination of Ms Benazir Bhutto on 27 December 2007, allegedly by the Al-Qaeda operatives in Rawalpindi, is a stark reminder of fatalities which international terrorism can be wrought on its erstwhile supporting nations. Born, apparently, out of the ideological moorings of the contemporary terrorism, is the spatial dimension of terrorism which is reflected in the world-wide expansion in the network of the terrorist groups. As a matter of fact, previously, the professed cause of the terrorist groups remained confined to the articulation of one or the other grievance of a section of the people whose redressal they sought to achieve through the means of terrorist activities.

Consequently, the operational spatial domain of the terrorist groups was, by and large, centered on a particular region of a country, with sporadic terrorist strikes being carried out at selective strategic locations of the nation. For instance, the terrorists groups operating in Kashmir, Chechnya, Palestine, Northern Ireland, etc., were supposedly fighting for their isolated causes without any obvious design to carry forward their strikes to other parts of the world.

However, in the current phase of terrorism, such isolated and restrained terrorist operations are increasingly getting integrated with the global network of terrorist organisations, resulting in some sort of concerted and coordinated method of functioning of these organisations and expansion of their spatial functional domain to hitherto unnoticed places like Copenhagen, Bali, London, Karachi, Bangalore, etc. Thus, what the twenty-first century is experiencing by way of terrorist strikes is much more lethal and concerted owing presumably to the transformation of localised terrorism of the past into what may be termed as international terrorism of the present times.

The conceptualisation of terrorism as a meaningful notion in international relations may take place at two levels. At the first level, going by the Gandhian formulations on violence and the idea of non-violence – a value whose universality and timelessness even in international body of politics has been recognized by the United Nations by declaring October 2 as International Day for Non-Violence – all forms of violence, whether perpetrated for valid political reasons or otherwise might be branded as terrorism without any rationale in any society. In India, in the pre-independence days when under the brute force of the British colonial government, legitimate and democratic means of protest were almost absent the political violence of the Indian revolutionaries would defy the categorisation of terrorism. But in contemporary Indian polity, when the democratic political space has been wide enough to afford legitimate constitutional means of protest to various sections of society, it might not be wrong to label the conduct of
mindless and across-border induced violence by a section of people in Jammu and Kashmir and parts of North-East as terrorism.

**Historical roots of Terrorism**

The advent and growth of the phenomenon of terrorism over the years, attaining the form of international terrorism in contemporary times, reveal the ominous pursuit of human beings to utilise in an organised and more lethal ways the age old methods of violence for general political purposes. To put it differently, though the violent method of conducting ones affairs vis-à-vis others was known to the human beings from time immemorial, its application as a method of seeking the redressal of public grievances point out to the birth of terrorism in human civilizations, though the exact term ‘terrorism’ might not have been used for all such activities.

Thus, the earliest of such terrorist activities, without the term terrorism being used for them, appeared as early as 66-73AD when the Sicarii, an offshoot of the religious sect of Zealots in Palestine attacked the Jewish ‘collaborators’ with short swords in daylight in crowded public places to demonstrate the state’s impotence and to strike fear beyond their immediate targets, provoking conflict. Subsequently, during 1090-1275, another outfit called Assassins, a Shia sect of Ismailis and Nizari, probably introduced the element of suicide attacks by striking only with the dagger at close range which not only accentuated the terror inflicted but also carried the propensity of the attackers getting killed in pursuit of their mission. These early rudiments of modern terrorism were, however, bereft of any ideological moorings on the one hand and any alternative system of life or things they were fighting against, on the other.

The modern period saw the use of the term terrorism in the aftermath of the French Revolution when it was used to denote the policies and programmes carried out by the regime of Maximilien Robespierre and the Committee of Public Safety in France. Moreover, as has been argued, ‘systematic terrorism in its modern form received great impetus in the late 18th and 19th centuries with the propagation of secular ideologies and nationalism in the wake of French revolution.’

Some form of terrorism was also perpetrated by the Ku Klux Klan in the US, following the defeat of the confederacy in the American civil war, to terrorize the coloured population and fight the representatives and policies of the reconstruction administration set up by the federal government in the Southern United States. In Japan, terrorism showed its tentacles in 1868 when the pro-imperial nationalists, aspiring for the Meiji restoration indulged in terrorist attacks on Tokugawa Shogunate. During the 1870s, Irish terrorism also became formidable with the Dynamiters and the Phoenix Park murders of high dignitaries by the Irish National Invincibles. This was the time when the anarchists also gained proactive edge in terrorist strikes through the shadowy conglomerate of anarchists acting in various countries known as Anarchist International. Russians also experienced the menace of terrorism during the time when the revolutionary group Narodnaya Volya (People’s Will) carried out selective targeting and were able to assassinate Tsar Alexander II in 1881. The fragments of national terrorism, thus, were in vogue in almost all parts of the world in one form or other taking recourse to the common terrorist methods for the attainment of seemingly diverse objectives.

The dawn of the twentieth century was marked by the existence of a number of state sponsored nationalist streams of terrorism who were targeting their opponents to gain, among other things, propaganda by deed. One such notable terrorist strike was by the group Mlada Bosna (Young Bosnians) on the Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Sarajevo in broad daylight.
resulting in the death of the Prince which in turn precipitated the First World War in 1914. In the aftermath of the war, the rise of Fascism in Italy and Nazism in Germany entrenched the roots of state terrorism in these countries whose manifestations witnessed the massacre of a large number of people opposed to these regimes, showing that state or enforcement terrorism would be far more destructive and full of vengeance than agitational terrorism.

The outbreak of the Second World War heralded the end of these enforcement terrorism and the post-war years saw a paradigm shift in the whole concept of terrorism as is evident in international relations. As one observer has put it succinctly, ‘following the Second World War, terrorism seemed to be the preserve of indigenous nationalist groups which emerged out of various anticolonial campaigns in, among other countries, Israel, Cyprus, Kenya and Algeria. The idea of “freedom fighters” emerged at this time, along with the debate over the terminology and definition of terrorism. Political legitimacy was attached to a number of “wars of national liberation”, which many developing countries saw not as terrorist campaigns, but as wholly legitimate armed struggles.’

With the majority of national liberation movements getting fruition by end of 1960s, the sphere of terrorism during the succeeding decade got transformed from nationalist terrorist movements to ideologically motivated groups of terror-minded people with the objective of attaining the left-leaning systems of reforms in various countries. For instance, the surfaced of the terrorism in the form of Red Army Faction in Germany, Red Brigades in Italy in the West, the Maoist terrorism in India and the Maoist movement in Nepal marked reiteration of their commitment to carry on their struggle in the mould of ideologies professed by Marxism and Maoism in the times to come. Subsequently, this period also witnessed the inception of certain ethno-separatists groups contextualising themselves beyond the conventional colonial contexts to espouse their ethnic and identity related causes. Prominent groups such as the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO), the Euskadi Ta Askatasuna (ETA), the Basque separatists in northern Spain, the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN) in India, the Liberation of Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) in Sri Lanka, etc., emerged as the most dreaded face of terrorism fighting for their separate identities rooted in their ethno-linguistic-cultural traits.

The remarkable feature of all such forces of terrorism had however been their limited areas of influence and activities without much, if any, synchronisation of their activities amongst themselves. Consequently, the character of these terrorist activities remained predominantly national without any sizeable spill over of such activities on other surrounding parts of the country or on other countries of the region. Hence, the potentiality for damage and predictability of attacks by these groups remained within manageable limits with the national endeavour proving sufficient enough to tackle the menace of terrorism, which in turn did not allow these movements take any sort of transnational form so as to expand their span of operations in other countries of the region.

Explaining the transformation in the nature of terrorism during the decade of 1970s, an observer notes that ‘three factors led to the birth of transnational terrorism: the expansion of air travel; the wider availability of televised news coverage; and broad common political and ideological interests. These changes allowed terrorism to grow from a local and regional phenomenon into an international threat.’ Afterwards, ‘international terrorism came to be identified through the activities of various groups associated with the struggle against Israel, and a spate of aircraft hijackings and hostage-takings and the alleged use of terrorist organizations by certain state sponsors as tools of foreign policy. In the closing years of the 1970s, two significant
events added new dimensions to the menace of international terrorism. Firstly, the Iranian revolution in 1978-79 resulted in the revival of Shiite terrorism with intense antipathy for everything American and Israeli whose manifestation was witnessed in the advent of suicide attacks on the enemy targets. Secondly, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 emboldened the American policy of containment of Communism and in the furtherance of this policy the US gave birth to a new terrorist movement, called the Taliban, in the country which in the final analysis became the nemesis of the Americans themselves in the present times.

Quite evidently, by the end of the twentieth century, America emerged to be the prime target of the international Islamic terrorism whose prime mover undoubtedly happens to be the Al-Qaeda. The demise of the Cold War, while on the one hand led to conventional military dominance of the United States in international affairs, also put a number of countries like Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan, etc., variously dubbed as rogue states, face to face with the US as it charged many, if not all of them, of supporting or sponsoring terrorism which made them a threat to the international order. As many of these so-called rogue states are accused of engaging in the development of weapons of mass destruction, it is assumed that these states, unable to bear the American heat in conventional military strategies, might go for ‘asymmetric means’ to undermine or attack the enemy interest. The asymmetric means include information warfare, the use of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. Thus, such a category of terrorism sponsored by the rogue states with active assistance and by making available weapons of mass destruction to the terrorists may result into what is called as ‘super-terrorism.’

The evolution of terrorism, it is argued, in the contemporary times has reached the level of ‘post-modern terrorism’ the underlining features of which include its statelessness in existence and global reach and capability in attacking the desirable targets across the world. In the face of it, ‘the greatest dangers have been revealed to be the existence of lawless grey areas and regions around the world where literally thousands of activists can be trained unhindered over a number of years; the inability of intelligence agencies to cooperate effectively in the sharing of already acquired intelligence material; and the extent to which Western states can become transfixed by high-consequence, low probability threats to the detriment of prudent action against high-probability, lower-consequence threats.’ Getting reflected in the form of the Al-Qaeda network, the stateless and internationally oriented post modern terrorism would remain the bane of the peace and security of a number of nations in the times to come due to their perceived antipathy to things and people Islamic.

Causes of Terrorism

An analysis of the causal factors of the complex phenomena like terrorism ordinarily defies reducing the discussion into some strait jacket hypothesis to lay bare the roots of the problem. Accentuating the issues involved in the problem are not only the fact that terrorism is found in various shades and colours all over the world but also by the complexity of the political systems which are exposed to the menace terrorism. In other words, right from the days of the Jacobins in the aftermath of the French revolution to the grave situation created by the routine threats of the Al-Qaeda network, the changing colours of the terrorism has been too baffling to afford any sort of generalisations regarding their causation.

Similarly, the operational theatre of the terrorism has not essentially been the so called high grade authoritarian or dictatorial regimes. On the contrary, terrorism has, more often than not, been found to be flourishing and making its impact felt in a very terrific manner in societies which are democratic or semi-democratic and where the ways of life are more liberal and accommodative in
comparison to the societies which are kept behind the impregnable sheet of authoritarian and regulated ways of life. Any discussion, therefore, on the causation of terrorism must go to analyse the complex factors rooted in political, economic, socio-cultural, religious, ideological, technological and cross border aspects of a country.

The most common factor behind most of the terrorist activities in the world has been the political one, though the degree and nature of political deprivation which lay beneath such terrorism may differ from country to country. Rooted in the subdued nationalist urge to gain either respectable place within the political space of the country or seeking outright independence from the perceived subjugation of the major political formation of the country, the majority of the terrorist activities in the world ranging from the Irish Republican Army to the terrorist groups in Palestine, Kashmir, etc., share the common lineage of being born out of the factors political in nature. Quite evidently, in consonance with the liberal perspective on terrorism, it may arguably be said that while the terrorists operating in Palestine may be termed as freedom fighters owing to their valid fight against the Israeli occupation of their territory, the perpetrators of violence in Britain and India may be branded as mindless terrorism ostensibly due to the fact that the political systems in both the countries allow the scope for the expression of peoples’ grievance and subsequent redressal.

A widespread feeling of economic deprivation amongst the majority of people within a region or country would in all probability lead to the launching of a violent struggle against the power-holders of the country to bring about some sort of equitable socio-economic order in the region. Surprisingly, the noteworthy point in this regard is that terrorism born out of economic factors arises mostly, if not exclusively, from the sense of perceived rather than actual economic deprivation of the people which might be exploited by certain ideologically or otherwise inclined people to wage a violent struggle against the politico-economic dispensation of the country.

Socio-cultural factors also go a long way in consolidating the forces having within themselves the roots of terrorism in the multicultural and multi ethnic societies. Ordinarily, most of the multicultural societies do have a number of sub-national and ethnic groups distinct from among themselves owing to their socio-cultural moorings. However, in the course of time, when, while living together some of the ethnic groups start discovering that their differences with the other groups are gradually being converted into divisions, they turn quite obviously apprehensive of such moves. Experiencing the actual manifestations of such divisions in their daily chorus of life, such ethnic groups, unable to find any other plausible method of getting their due, take recourse to the violent methods and are labeled as terrorists.

In the contemporary times, faith based ideological predilections have also been argued by scholars to be one of the most fundamental cause of international terrorism emanating from the Islamic countries of North Africa and Central and South Asia. There is inherent contradictions amongst the mainstream faith based systems of life like the Christian dominated Western value system and the predominantly Islamic North African, Central and South Asia dispensations. With the initiation of the adventurist policy of the US, countries like Afghanistan, Iraq, Iran etc. in the post-cold war times, and the advent of the personalities like Osama bin Laden on the scene afforded both stimulus and nucleus for these fault lines to come into open, giving birth to what we today call as ‘post-modern’ or ‘new’ terrorism.

In the final analysis, the factors behind the rise of terrorism may be more complex than what appear at the hindsight, for, despite the apparent motivations for the initiation of terrorist
activities in a region or a country, many subtle simmering discontents might also lie underneath such activities. Indeed, on being marginalised and reduced to a position of perceived subordination by the powerful, terrorism starts breeding in a region to gain some sort of parity with the power holders in the society in terms of psychological, if not material leverages in the society. As Goldstein points out, ‘terrorism thus amplifies a small amount of power by its psychological effect on large populations; this is why it is usually a tool of the powerless.

However what seems to be the new thing in the contemporary phase of international terrorism is the galvanisation of the numerous terrorist organisations operating in different parts of the world on the basis of factors like religion by the formations like Al-Qaeda and orienting the combined force of all such organisations against their perceived enemies in terms of the countries like United States, Israel, India, Britain, Pakistan and for that matter any other country which is supposed to working in an inimical fashion to the interests and considerations of their religion and culture.

India and International Terrorism

India has been at the receiving end of international terrorism much before the menace became endemic to other important countries in the world like the United States. The terror attack in Mumbai from November 26 to 29, 2008 marked a qualitatively new and dangerous escalation of the terrorism that India has faced for over two decades. Through in the Mumbai attack, major terrorist acts in India have been sponsored and organised by groups and forces from across India’s borders.

However, the stark reminder to the US in the form of the 9/11 attacks was that the phenomenon of international terrorism is for real and no country in the world could remain immune from its sinister designs and onslaughts. This realisation bears testimony to the Indian argument before the US government that all sorts of terrorism are some kind of hidden enemies which can strike even their erstwhile promoters and supporters. In other words, the grim reality which India has been facing for a number of years became a matter of concern for other major countries in the world only when they themselves got a taste of the demon.

The Mumbai carnage and other terror attacks has proved that India has been joined by several other countries as the prime targets of the network of international terrorism, carried forward by the radical Islamists in the main. Indeed, the situation has become so precarious for almost all the countries in the world that none of them finds themselves in a position to tackle the menace single-handedly, necessitating the formation of a global front against international terrorism. Owing to several internal as well as external factors, the emergence of the country as an independent nation was marked by the sowing of the seeds of terrorism in one form or the other, though the threat did not appear to be as severe as it has become in the contemporary times.

Set to be developed in the mould of a liberal democracy affording some sort of political space for articulation of all shades of political opinions and aspirations of its people, the country started facing a number of unsavoury and probably unyielding demands from a section of people in many parts of the country. The early streams of such demands emanated from the North-Eastern states and Jammu and Kashmir and ranged from the demand for greater autonomy to outright independence from the country.
Despite the nascent nature of Indian nationhood, the spirit of protecting the unity and integrity of the country was so profound in the minds of the people that the question of acceding to the territorial demands of such sections of people did not arise. Nevertheless, the spark of some kind of autonomous existence or gaining independence from the country sooner or later remained alive in the hearts of a few sections and they initiated the unfortunate course of terrorist activities to attain their objectives.

Initially, the insurgent activities in India were mainly in the nature of sporadic attacks on the security forces and more symbolic in nature than for real. Even the most formidable of the insurgent groups like the National Socialist Council of Nagaland (NSCN) was not able to inflict severe harm to the people or property in the state and their prime target appeared to be to just compel the government to negotiate with them on the issues which they were fighting for. Gradually, the separatist demands started emanating from other states like Punjab and getting more strident in the cases like that of Jammu and Kashmir. At the same time, a number of problems like that of Mizoram, Assam, etc., were resolved to the satisfaction of the people and they no longer remained contentious issues in the political system of the country. In present times, the moves of international terrorism in India has remained rooted in the state of Jammu and Kashmir and barring a few sporadic carnages carried out by the groups of North-East and Punjab, the terrorist activities in various parts of the country have been found to be handiwork of the Islamic terrorists.

The causal perspective of international terrorism in India presents a very complex picture whereby it is not possible to attribute the rise in the incidents of terrorist activities to any one specific and exclusive factor. As mentioned above, the genesis of the problems which in later years became the catalyst for the galvanisation of various forces to wage a war against the Indian state may be found in the situations prevailing immediately after independence. However, over the years, two factors appear to have contributed in magnifying the menace of terrorism to convert it in the category of international terrorism. Firstly, the handling of the ensuing crisis by the respective governments seated in New Delhi had not been effective and satisfactory, allowing the problem to remain in perpetual existence. Moreover, in certain cases, the mishandling of the situation had back-fired on the central government and instead of resolving the dispute, it had accentuated the problem to the extent of making it a flash point for others to take undue advantage of.

Yet, the second and probably the more important factor seems to be the existence of not-so-friendly neighbours in the surroundings of India who had made it a point to exploit the precarious situations in India and impose on the country the spectre of international terrorism. There is no denying the fact that the situation would not have been so severe in the country had there been no political, logistical and moral support to the terrorists from across the border. In fact, the continuing menace of terrorism in India has taken the form of a proxy war waged on the country from across the border and it is asked to fight this proxy war by remaining within the limits of dealing with it as a matter of law and order.

The original field of terrorism in India happens to be the North-East where the urge for creation of certain separate or independent states led few people to pick up arms to wage an armed struggle against the government of India. While the demand for independence was out rightly turned down by the government, North-East saw the creation of a number of separate states like Meghalaya, Manipur, Tripura, and Arunachal Pradesh in order to accede to the demands of the people to have their own distinct homeland. Yet, owing to several intra-tribal and
extraneous factors, a number of insurgent groups continued to exist in the North-East and made their presence felt in the region from time to time by carrying out sporadic acts of violence. While the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA) is considered to be most dreaded terrorist group in the region, a few other terrorist outfits also exist to disturb the peace and tranquility of the people.

Nevertheless, the North-East has no longer remained a hot-bed of terrorist activities in India barring, to some extent, the activities of the ULFA. Similarly, Punjab, which was, during the decade of the 1980s, the theatre of frequent and deadly conduct of terrorist activities and whose culmination point was the assassination of Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi at the hands of her security guards, have also limped back to normalcy with the high handed crushing of the various terrorist outfits at the hands of the police and para military forces. Interestingly, though the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) did not have any ill will towards India owing to their pressing preoccupations with the affairs in Sri Lanka, assassinated former Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi apparently to take revenge for the sending of Indian Peace Keeping Forces (IPKF) to the Island nation in accordance with the Indo-Sri Lanka Peace Accord signed between the two countries. Nonetheless, these acts of terrorist violence have become the things of past and they no longer remained a cause for concern to the government in India.

Since 1989, the epicentre of terrorism in India has remained centred in Jammu and Kashmir, with the situation taking a uglier turn with the passage of time. But the root of the problem in Kashmir goes back to days of the partition of India when the valley became a bone of contention between India and Pakistan. Consequently, the first direct assault on the unity and integrity of the country took place in 1948 itself when a band of Pakistani soldiers in the guise of the northern tribals intruded into Indian territory and captured a large part the Indian territory. These were the early signals for the ominous portents for the things lying for the future of the region which unfortunately the successive governments could not comprehend and kept on playing dirty games in the politics of the valley.

In the early years of the Kashmir imbroglio, the expression of the feelings of dissatisfaction of the people were by and large through peaceful methods with only sporadic incidents of violence taking place here and there. Later on, a few liberation fronts were formed in the valley with the overt or covert support of the establishment across the border. But due to the initial inhibitions of the proponents of these groups from across the border to provide full moral and material support, they could not turn out to be a formidable challenge to the state in India. Their activities remained focused on raising the issue of Kashmir as a political problem whose solutions could have been found through peaceful means also.

However, such an approach of the political groups in Kashmir could not be sustained for long and due to a number of factors the movement started getting converted in the mould of terrorist formations which gained more and more notoriety with the changing dynamics of the dictates received from their bosses sitting across the border. Evidence collected by the Indian intelligence agencies clearly proves the direct involvement of the Pakistani agencies in fomenting and sustaining the terrorist activities in the valley since 1989. The initial moral support provided by Pakistan to the terrorist organizations in Kashmir in the name of resisting the Indian rule over the valley got transformed into full fledged political and logistical support in terms of recruitment, training, supply of arms and ammunitions, shelter and back up support in their operations in the valley. Gradually, a whole new set of organizations like the notorious Inter-Services Intelligence (ISI) grew up in Pakistan with the sole purpose of making terrorism
bleed India and horrify the entire nation. The financing of these terrorist groups is now being organised through the narco-terrorism by turning India into the hub of trafficking of drugs from the Golden Crescent.

The sophisticated arms supplied by the US to the Afghan fighters to fight the Soviet establishment in Afghanistan were diverted towards the Kashmir militants. Armed with the lethal weapons like the AK-47, the terrorist groups in Kashmir now tuned their attention toward greater crimes like hijacking of aircrafts, taking hostage important personalities of the valley and carrying out mindless massacre of the people, mainly Hindus. Terrorism, in fact, turned out to be a lucrative business in the valley and a number of terror groups came into existence to take advantage of the uneasy situations prevailing in the region. Though the situation was never allowed to go out of control in the valley, the terrorist groups definitely wielded good amount of influence in the valley and their activities led to the exodus of Hindus from Kashmir. The ongoing terrorist movement in valley gained true international character with the joining to their rank and file by the fighters from countries like Pakistan, Bangladesh, Afghanistan, Sudan etc.

With the establishment of the Taliban rule over Afghanistan, the terrorists engaged in that country became redundant and they shifted their area of work to the Kashmir valley. Moreover, the arousal of the element of jihad and presentation of the Kashmir problem as one of the components of the global persecution of Muslims have also contributed to make the terrorism in the valley gaining international overtones. At the same time, the advent of the global terror network al-Qaeda has also contributed to the integration of the Kashmir terrorists with the international network of Islamic terrorists. Another aggravating factor came in the form of the growing association of India with the United States in various fields which has led to more strident terrorist attacks in India not only for its own role in Kashmir but also for being an ally of the US.

A remarkable impact of the internationalisation of terrorism in the valley has been that they appear to have lost the respect for the sensibilities for the local people while carrying out their attacks as was proved by the terrorist assault on the noted shrine of Charar-e-Sharif in the Kashmir valley. Obviously, the internationalization of terrorist activities in Kashmir has resulted into certain subtle shift in the strategy and focus of activities of the terrorist groups. The theatre of activities for the terrorists has now been shifted to the areas out of the valley and they have now started carrying out their attacks on an all India basis since no part of the country has remained safe from the terrorist attacks anymore. The terrorist attacks in the form of Bombay bombings in March 1993, Coimbatore bomb blast in February 1993, Akshardham Temple massacre in Ahmedabad in September 2002 and Lumbini Park bomb blasts in August 2007 bear testimony to the shift in the strategy of the terrorists.

Another shift in the pattern of terrorist attacks took place in the form of the assault on the places of national significance and the attacks on the Parliament in December 2001 and Red Fort in 2002 provide ample illustrations of this shift. As a part of their bigger game plan of fomenting communal tension in the country, the terrorists have also been targeting the religious places in various parts of the country. Hence, the attacks on temples in Ahmedabad, Ayodhya, Varanasi and mosques in Malegaon in Maharashtra, Hyderabad etc. were precisely aimed at instigating communal riots in these places. A new trend has emerged in the recent times to attack the particular sections of people who have taken strong stand against the terrorists as the terrorist attacks were carried out against the lawyers in various courts of Uttar Pradesh in 2007. Likewise, the attack on the camps of the security forces outside the Kashmir valley also became apparent as
on the new years day of 2008, the CRPF camp was attacked in the Rampur area of Uttar Pradesh. The cumulative impact of all such terrorist attacks has been found to put India in the category of hyper sensitive countries in the world from the point of view of dastardly attacks being planned and carried out by the network of international terrorism. The country may still not be on the direct hit list of the dreaded groups like al-Qaeda but the shifting strategy as well as the operational maneuverability of the terrorist groups in India amply exemplifies the point that they are in constant touch with the international groups and any future counter-terrorism strategy in the country must be factored on such assumptions.

The approach followed by the government of India to tackle the menace of terrorism since the very beginning has been quite mild and circumscribed by the system of rule of law in the country. As against this approach has been the pro-active and no-holds-barred strategy adopted by the Israel and now the United States in rooting out terrorism by hitting at the very bastion of the menace. It has also been alleged that the Indian state has been excessively soft on the terrorists and the Indian judicial system has been so procrastinating and lenient that very few terrorists are tried and punished for the crimes against the humanity. Despite such charges, Indian approach to tackle terrorism continued to consist of two pronged strategy of keeping the security forces on high alert to meet any challenge mounted by the terrorist on the one hand and engage these groups in negotiations to find certain plausible solutions to their valid demands on the other. Though such strategy has paid dividends in the case of terrorist movements in North-Eastern states like Mizoram and Nagaland, it had failed to achieve any concrete results in Jammu and Kashmir. More importantly, with the internationalisation of terrorism in India also, such a negotiated settlement of the contentious problem appears to be more difficult. Consequently, the government is left with very few options like joining hands with other victim countries of the world to mount a concerted strategy to choke the financial support and logistical supplies to the terrorist organisations. Of added value in the case of India is the trick that unless across the border support to the terrorist groups are not stopped, it would not be possible to root out the menace from the country.

Coping with International Terrorism

The all pervasive nature of international terrorism has compelled most of the countries in the world to take effective and curative measures to check the terrorists from carrying out any devastating strike on the people or property in the short term and identify and uproot the root causes of the phenomenon of terrorism as the long term strategy of their anti-terror policies.

Followed by most of the countries in the world and appearing to be only plausible response in the face of the inscrutable nature of the problem lying at the root of the rise of terrorism. It assumes to be an aberration in the internal affairs of the country which has been taken undue advantage of by the neighbouring country or countries in order to settle scores with it. In such a scenario, the talk of looking inward to seek any plausible solution to the problem of terrorism would appear to be absurd as long as the promoters and sponsors of the terrorism sitting across the border are not brought to their knees by whatever means possible In the case of Kashmir, the problem of terrorism is more the result of the tireless efforts of the people and organizations sitting across the border than the actors located within the country. Moreover, as the issue at stake seems to be irresolvable owing to the factor of unity and integrity of the country, the pursuit of looking for the root causes of terrorism in Kashmir in the internal matters of the valley would prove to be a futile exercise, based on the prescriptions of the cosmopolitan response to terrorism.
However, along with the taking short term measures based on the calculations and strategies of the security agencies to avoid heavy and devastating losses due to the terrorist activities, the government must make effort to go deeper into the broader issues involved in the rise and growth of terrorism in the particular context. The long term strategy of counter terrorism, according to the cosmopolitan strategists, lie in diagnosing the roots of the problem in terms of the problems like poverty, inequality, social divisions and political discontentment amongst the masses. However, the basic difficulty with the cosmopolitan response lies in arriving at a consensus whether the causes enumerated above truly lie underneath the problem or something else is also relevant, and sometimes if they are the overbearing factor in the rise and growth of terrorism. Such a poser acquires real value in cases of terrorist activities carried out in places like Kashmir where more than the so called deep seated causes, the factor of cross border support is of utmost significance in sustaining the tide of terrorism in the valley.

An extension of the cosmopolitan response to terrorism also goes to base the strategy of coping with terrorism on the principles and strategies formulated in accordance with the body of international law and supported by the international organisations. However the value of such an international strategy is found to be quite limited and somewhat ineffective owing to the fact that such efforts are mainly moralistic in nature without any concrete and effective potential to uproot the menace.

Nevertheless, the utmost utility of such an international endeavour has been found to stem the effectiveness of the appeal of messages that inspire terrorist to commit heinous and horrific acts of violence. Notwithstanding the limitation on the international bodies to be an effective instrument of combating terrorism, the globalisation of the phenomenon of terrorism has inspired the countries to join hands together to afford a joint and concerted strategy to track down the movement and striking capabilities of the terrorist groups. Coalition military forces, working with national forces, are structured and have the capabilities to lead efforts that will deny terrorist groups sanctuaries in ungoverned or ungovernable sections of the globe, while law enforcement officials locate and deny access to international sources of funding and support. Though such a strategy to cope up with the menace of terrorism seems to be appreciable in the era of globalisation of international terrorism, difficulties arise at the level of national as well as transnational considerations when the time comes to decide whether to join or not join such a coalition of the willing.

Despite being an important country suffering from the menace of terrorism, India could not join a coalition of forces to take on the problem precisely due to the preponderant role assumed by the US in any such a coalition. While for India joining such a coalition could have serious repercussions on the internal politics of the country in terms of the probable alienation of a section of the people due to the US role in such a coalition, the US itself could not take India on board such a coalition due to its all weather friendship with Pakistan which happens to be the main proponent of the cross border terrorism in the Kashmir valley as it would cost the former the crucial support of the Pakistan in its fight against the Islamic terrorists in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

**Conclusion**

International terrorism has emerged as the most formidable common security related challenge to most of the countries in the world in the post Cold War period probably due to the ensuing American hegemony in international relations. It is, indeed, magnified by the unusual rush with which most of the countries are trying to be seen as a collaborator of the only super
power in the world in all its pursuits in the global politics. While previously the threat of terrorism was localized and drew its causal inspiration from the particular regions and countries of the world, the era of Globalisation has heralded the new trend of even globalisation of terrorism which means that the growing integration of various parts of the world is also turning them into an integrated landscape for the conduct of terrorist activities all over.

Moreover, the processes of Globalisation resulting from the rapid advancements in the technological know-how and the unchecked nature of the use of information technology have afforded newer advantages to the terrorist groups which are using them to their benefits in terms of canvassing, coordination, security, mobility and lethality of their operations. The fateful tragedy of 9/11 has proved beyond doubt the capabilities and emboldened spirit of the terrorist outfits in carrying out attacks on their targets with high degree of precision and devastation. This notion of new, post-modern and super terrorism has placed humanity in a very precarious situation compelling it to evolve suitable and effective short term and long term strategies to cope with the menace.

Despite international terrorism turning out to be a real and lethal threat to the peace and prosperity of the people, views differ amongst the scholars regarding the causes and remedies to the problem of terrorism. Owing to the complexity of issues involved in the rise and growth of international terrorism, the causal phenomenon of terrorism is sought to be explained in terms of the socio, political, economic, religious and ideological situations prevailing in the region or the country. Still, the factor of cross border terrorism occupies a crucial position in any explanation on the roots of terrorism mainly due to the reason that while there may exist some sort of trouble in a country, it may not take the shape of terrorist menace unless active moral and material support is given to the terrorists by one or more country. Such an understanding of the roots of the problem has conditioned the nature of response desirable from the countries suffering from the problem.

The cosmopolitan approach assumes the terrorist activities to be criminal acts born out of the domestic causes like poverty, inequality, political divisions, etc., and argues that for the sustainable and peaceful settlement of the problem of terrorism, the focus of states must be directed inwardly to look for the root causes of the trouble and long term efforts be made to uproot such causes in order to wipe out the propitious background for the rise and growth of terrorism in the country.

In the post 9/11 scenario the focus of the anti-terrorist strategy has shifted from being rooted in national endeavours exclusively to create some sort of international coalition of the willing in order to initiate a concerted and coordinated strategy to flush out the terrorist forces from their hideouts. Such a strategy is also marred by the domestic and foreign policy related calculations of various actors in the game. Thus, the whole notion of international terrorism remains an intractable problem for the major countries owing to the difference of opinion amongst themselves on the issues like causes and remedies of the problem. The years to come, therefore, would probably remain hostage to the menace of international terrorism posing a grave challenge to the peaceful and prosperous life for the human beings all over the world.