



CONTEMPORARY WORLD POLITICS

Textbook in Political Science for Class XII

Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	iii
<i>Preface</i>	v
Chapter 1 The Cold War Era	1
Chapter 2 The End of Bipolarity	17
Chapter 3 US Hegemony in World Politics	31
Chapter 4 Alternative Centres of Power	51
Chapter 5 Contemporary South Asia	65
Chapter 6 International Organisations	81
Chapter 7 Security in the Contemporary World	99
Chapter 8 Environment and Natural Resources	117
Chapter 9 Globalisation	135

Chapter 1

The Cold War Era

OVERVIEW

This chapter provides a backdrop to the entire book. The end of the Cold War is usually seen as the beginning of the contemporary era in world politics which is the subject matter of this book. It is, therefore, appropriate that we begin the story with a discussion of the Cold War. The chapter shows how the dominance of two superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, was central to the Cold War. It tracks the various arenas of the Cold War in different parts of the world. The chapter views the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) as a challenge to the dominance of the two superpowers and describes the attempts by the non-aligned countries to establish a New International Economic Order (NIEO) as a means of attaining economic development and political independence. It concludes with an assessment of India's role in NAM and asks how successful the policy of non-alignment has been in protecting India's interests.



The end of the Second World War led to the rise of two major centres of power. The two pictures above symbolise the victory of the US and the USSR in the Second World War.

1. American soldiers raising the US flag during the Battle of Iwo Jima, Japan, on 23 February 1945

Credit: Raising the Flag on Iwo Jima,

Photograph by Joe Rosenthal/The Associated Press

2. Soviet soldiers raising the USSR flag on the Reichstag building in Berlin, Germany, in May 1945

Credit: Reichstag flag, Photograph by Yevgeny Khaldei/TASS



We are on a world tour! Will meet you in different countries. Feels good to be around where events have happened.



Map showing the range of the nuclear missiles under construction in Cuba, used during the secret meetings on the Cuban missile crisis

Source: John F. Kennedy Presidential Library & Museum

CUBAN MISSILE CRISIS

In April 1961, the leaders of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) were worried that the United States of America (USA) would invade communist-ruled Cuba and overthrow Fidel Castro, the president of the small island nation off the coast of the United States. Cuba was an ally of the Soviet Union and received both diplomatic and financial aid from it. Nikita Khrushchev, the leader of the Soviet Union, decided to convert Cuba into a Russian base. In 1962, he placed nuclear missiles in Cuba. The installation of these weapons put the US, for the first time, under fire from close range and nearly doubled the number of bases or cities in the American mainland which could be threatened by the USSR.

Three weeks after the Soviet Union had placed the nuclear weapons in Cuba, the Americans became aware of it. The US President, John F. Kennedy, and his advisers were reluctant to do anything that might lead to full-scale nuclear war between the two countries, but they were determined to get Khrushchev to remove the missiles and nuclear weapons from Cuba. Kennedy ordered American warships to intercept any Soviet ships heading to Cuba as a way of warning the USSR of his seriousness. A clash seemed imminent in what came to be known as the Cuban Missile Crisis. The prospects of this

clash made the whole world nervous, for it would have been no ordinary war. Eventually, to the world's great relief, both sides decided to avoid war. The Soviet ships slowed down and turned back.

The Cuban Missile Crisis was a high point of what came to be known as the Cold War. The Cold War referred to the competition, the tensions and a series of confrontations between the United States and Soviet Union, backed by their respective allies. Fortunately, however, it never escalated into a 'hot war', that is, a full-scale war between these two powers. There were wars in various regions, with the two powers and their allies involved in warfare and in supporting regional allies, but at least the world avoided another global war.

The Cold War was not simply a matter of power rivalries, of military alliances, and of the balance of power. These were accompanied by a real ideological conflict as well, a difference over the best and the most appropriate way of organising political, economic, and social life all over the world. The western alliance, headed by the US, represented the ideology of liberal democracy and capitalism while the eastern alliance, headed by the Soviet Union, was committed to the ideology of socialism and communism. You have already studied these ideologies in Class XI.


WHAT IS THE COLD WAR?

The end of the Second World War is a landmark in contemporary world politics. In 1945, the Allied Forces, led by the US, Soviet Union, Britain and France defeated the Axis Powers led by Germany, Italy and Japan, ending the Second World War (1939-1945). The war had involved almost all the major powers of the world and spread out to regions outside Europe including Southeast Asia, China, Burma (now Myanmar) and parts of India's northeast. The war devastated the world in terms of loss of human lives and civilian property. The First World War had earlier shaken the world between 1914 and 1918.

The end of the Second World War was also the beginning of the Cold War. The world war ended when the United States dropped two atomic bombs on the Japanese cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945, causing Japan to surrender. Critics of the US decision to drop the bombs have argued that the US knew that Japan was about to surrender and that it was unnecessary to drop the bombs. They suggest that the US action was intended to stop the Soviet Union from making military and political gains in Asia and elsewhere and to show Moscow that the United States was supreme. US supporters have argued that the dropping of the atomic bombs was necessary to end the war quickly and to stop



So near yet so far!
I can't believe that
Cuba survived as a
communist country
for so long despite
being located so
close to the US. Just
look at the map.



further loss of American and Allied lives. Whatever the motives, the consequence of the end of the Second World War was the rise of two new powers on the global stage. With the defeat of Germany and Japan, the devastation of Europe and in many other parts of the world, the United States and the Soviet Union became the greatest powers in the world with the ability to influence events anywhere on earth.

While the Cold War was an outcome of the emergence of the US and the USSR as two superpowers rival to each other, it was also rooted in the understanding that the destruction caused by the use of atom bombs is too costly for any country to bear. The logic is simple yet powerful. When two rival powers are in possession of nuclear

The se pictures depict the destruction caused by the bombs dropped by the US on Hiroshima (the bomb was code-named 'Little Boy') and Nagasaki (code-named 'Fat Man'). Yet, the se bombs were very small in the ir destructive capacity (measured in terms of kiloton yield) as compared to the nuclear bombs that were to be available in the stockpile assembled by the superpowers. The yield of Little Boy and Fat Man were 15 and 21 kilotons respectively. By the early 1950s the US and the USSR were already making the monuclear weapons that had a yield between 10 and 15 thousand kilotons. In other words, the se bombs were a thousand times more destructive than the bombs used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. During much of the Cold War, both the superpowers possess ed thousands of such weapons. Just imagine the extent of destruction that the se could cause all over the globe.

weapons capable of inflicting death and destruction unacceptable to each other, a full-fledged war is unlikely. In spite of provocations, neither side would want to risk war since no political gains would justify the destruction of their societies.

In the event of a nuclear war, both sides will be so badly harmed that it will be impossible to declare one side or the other as the winner. Even if one of them tries to attack and disable the nuclear weapons of its rival, the other would still be left with enough nuclear weapons to inflict unacceptable destruction. This is called the logic of 'deterrence': both sides have the capacity to retaliate against an attack and to cause so much destruction that neither can afford to initiate war. Thus, the Cold War — in spite of being an intense form of rivalry between great powers — remained a 'cold' and not hot or shooting war. The deterrence relationship prevents war but not the rivalry between powers.

Note the main military features of the Cold War. The two superpowers and the countries in the rival blocs led by the superpowers were expected to behave as rational and responsible actors. They were to be rational and responsible in the sense that they understood the risks in fighting wars that might involve the two superpowers. When two superpowers and the blocs led by them are in a deterrence relationship, fighting wars will be massively destructive.

Responsibility, therefore, meant being restrained and avoiding the risk of another world war. In this sense the Cold War managed to ensure human survival.

THE EMERGENCE OF TWO POWER BLOCS

The two superpowers were keen on expanding their spheres of influence in different parts of the world. In a world sharply divided between the two alliance systems, a state was supposed to remain tied to its protective superpower to limit the influence of the other superpower and its allies.

The smaller states in the alliances used the link to the superpowers for their own purposes. They got the promise of protection, weapons, and economic aid against their local rivals, mostly regional neighbours with whom they had rivalries. The alliance systems led by the two superpowers, therefore, threatened to divide the entire world into two camps. This division happened first in Europe. Most countries of western Europe sided with the US and those of eastern Europe joined the Soviet camp. That is why these were also called the 'western' and the 'eastern' alliances.


1. Identify three countries from each of the rival blocs.

2. Look at the map of the European Union in Chapter 4 and identify four countries that were part of the Warsaw Pact and now belong to the EU.

3. By comparing this map with that of the European Union map, identify three new countries that came up in the post-Cold War period.



Map showing the way Europe was divided into rival alliances during the Cold War



In the following column, write the names of three countries, which belong to:

Capitalist Bloc

Communist Bloc

Non-Aligned Movement

The western alliance was formalised into an organisation, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), which came into existence in April 1949. It was an association of twelve states which declared that armed attack on any one of them in Europe or North America would be regarded as an attack on all of them. Each of these states would be obliged to help the other. The eastern alliance, known as the Warsaw Pact, was led by the Soviet Union. It was created in 1955 and its principal function was to counter NATO's forces in Europe.

International alliances during the Cold War era were determined by the requirements of the superpowers and the calculations of the smaller states. As noted above, Europe became the main arena of conflict between the superpowers. In some cases, the superpowers used their military power to bring countries into their

respective alliances. Soviet intervention in east Europe provides an example. The Soviet Union used its influence in eastern Europe, backed by the very large presence of its armies in the countries of the region, to ensure that the eastern half of Europe remained within its sphere of influence. In East and Southeast Asia and in West Asia (Middle East), the United States built an alliance system called — the Southeast Asian Treaty Organisation (SEATO) and the Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO). The Soviet Union and communist China responded by having close relations with regional countries such as North Vietnam, North Korea and Iraq.

The Cold War threatened to divide the world into two alliances. Under these circumstances, many of the newly independent countries, after gaining their independence from the colonial

powers such as Britain and France, were worried that they would lose their freedom as soon as they gained formal independence. Cracks and splits within the alliances were quick to appear. Communist China quarrelled with the USSR towards the late 1950s, and, in 1969, they fought a brief war over a territorial dispute. The other important development was the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM), which gave the newly independent countries a way of staying out of the alliances.

You may ask why the superpowers needed any allies at all. After all, with their nuclear weapons and regular armies, they were so powerful that the combined power of most of the smaller states in Asia and Africa, and even in Europe, was no match to that of the superpowers. Yet, the smaller states were helpful for the superpowers in gaining access to

- (i) vital resources, such as oil and minerals,
- (ii) territory, from where the superpowers could launch their weapons and troops,
- (iii) locations from where they could spy on each other, and
- (iv) economic support, in that many small allies together could help pay for military expenses.

They were also important for ideological reasons. The loyalty of allies suggested that the superpowers were winning the war of ideas as well, that liberal

democracy and capitalism were better than socialism and communism, or vice versa.

ARENAS OF THE COLD WAR

The Cuban Missile Crisis that we began this chapter with was only one of the several crises that occurred during the Cold War. The Cold War also led to several shooting wars, but it is important to note that these crises and wars did not lead to another world war. The two superpowers were poised for direct confrontations in Korea (1950 - 53), Berlin (1958 - 62), the Congo (the early 1960s), and in several other places. Crises deepened, as neither of the parties involved was willing to back down. When we talk about arenas of the Cold War, we refer, therefore, to areas where crisis and war occurred or threatened to occur between the alliance systems but did not cross certain limits. A great many lives were lost in some of these arenas like Korea, Vietnam and Afghanistan, but the world was spared a nuclear war and global hostilities. In some cases, huge military build-ups were reported. In many cases, diplomatic communication between the superpowers could not be sustained and contributed to the misunderstandings.

Sometimes, countries outside the two blocs, for example, the non-aligned countries, played a role in reducing Cold War conflicts and averting some grave crises. Jawaharlal Nehru — one of the key



How come there are still two Koreas while the other divisions created by the Cold War have ended? Do the people of Korea want the division to continue?

Locate the flashpoints of the Cold War on a world map.

LET'S DO IT

THE COLD WAR TIMELINE

- 1947 American President Harry Truman's Doctrine about the containment of communism
- 1947 - 52 Marshall Plan: US aid for the reconstruction of the Western Europe
- 1948 - 49 Berlin blockade by the Soviet Union and the airlift of supplies to the citizens of West Berlin by the US and its allies
- 1950 - 53 Korean War; division of Korea along the 38th Parallel
- 1954 Defeat of the French by the Vietnamese at Dien Bien Phu
Signing of the Geneva Accords
Division of Vietnam along the 17th Parallel
Formation of SEATO
- 1954 - 75 American intervention in Vietnam
- 1955 Signing of the Baghdad Pact, later CENTO
- 1956 Soviet intervention in Hungary
- 1961 US-sponsored Bay of Pigs invasion of Cuba
Construction of the Berlin Wall
- 1962 Cuban Missile Crisis
- 1965 American intervention in the Dominican Republic
- 1968 Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia
- 1972 US President Richard Nixon's visit to China
- 1978 - 89 Vietnamese intervention in Cambodia
- 1979 - 89 Soviet intervention in Afghanistan
- 1985 Gorbachev becomes the President of the USSR; begins the reform process
- 1989 Fall of the Berlin Wall; mass protests against governments in eastern Europe
- 1990 Unification of Germany
- 1991 Disintegration of the Soviet Union
End of the Cold War era

leaders of the NAM — played a crucial role in mediating between the two Koreas. In the Congo crisis, the UN Secretary-General played a key mediatory role. By and large, it was the realisation on a superpower's part that war by all means should be avoided that made them exercise restraint and behave more responsibly in international affairs. As the Cold War rolled from one arena to another, the logic of restraint was increasingly evident.


However, since the Cold War did not eliminate rivalries between the two alliances, mutual suspicions led them to arm themselves to the teeth and to constantly prepare for war. Huge stocks of arms were considered necessary to prevent wars from taking place.

The two sides understood that war might occur in spite of restraint. Either side might miscalculate the number of weapons in the possession of the other side. They might misunderstand the intentions of the other side. Besides, what if there was a nuclear accident? What would happen if someone fired off a nuclear weapon by mistake or if a soldier mischievously shot off a weapon deliberately to start a war? What if an accident occurred with a nuclear weapon? How would the leaders of that country know it was an accident and not an act of sabotage by the enemy or that a missile had not landed from the other side?

Drawn by well-known Indian cartoonist Kuttu, these two cartoons depict an Indian view of the Cold War. The first cartoon was drawn when the US entered into a secret understanding with China, keeping the USSR in the dark. Find out more about the characters in the cartoon. The second cartoon depicts the American misadventure in Vietnam. Find out more about the Vietnam War.



POLITICAL SPRING China makes overtures to the USA.



FOOD FOR THOUGHT President Johnson is in more troubles over Vietnam.



FOUNDER FIGURES OF NAM



Josip Broz Tito
(1892-1980)
President of
Yugoslavia (1945-
80); fought against
Germany in World
War II; communist;
maintained some
distance from the
Soviet Union;
forged unity in
Yugoslavia.



Jawaharlal Nehru
(1889-1964)
First Prime Minister
of India (1947-64);
made efforts for
Asian unity,
decolonisation,
nuclear
dissuagement;
advocated
peaceful
coexistence for
securing world
peace.

In time, therefore, the US and USSR decided to collaborate in limiting or eliminating certain kinds of nuclear and non-nuclear weapons. A stable balance of weapons, they decided, could be maintained through 'arms control'. Starting in the 1960s, the two sides signed three significant agreements within a decade. These were the Limited Test Ban Treaty, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. Thereafter, the superpowers held several rounds of arms limitation talks and signed several more treaties to limit their arms.

CHALLENGE TO BIPOLARITY

We have already seen how the Cold War tended to divide the world into two rival alliances. It was in this context that non-alignment offered the newly decolonised countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America a third option—not to join either alliance.

The roots of NAM went back to the friendship between three leaders — Yugoslavia's Josip Broz Tito, India's Jawaharlal Nehru, and Egypt's leader Gamal Abdel Nasser — who held a meeting in 1956. Indonesia's Sukarno and Ghana's Kwame Nkrumah strongly supported them. These five leaders came to be known as the five founders of NAM. The first non-aligned summit was held in Belgrade in 1961. This was the culmination of at least three factors:

- (i) cooperation among these five countries,
- (ii) growing Cold War tensions and its widening arenas, and
- (iii) the dramatic entry of many newly decolonised African countries into the international arena. By 1960, there were 16 new African members in the UN.

The first summit was attended by 25 member states. Over the years, the membership of NAM has expanded. The latest meeting, the 14th summit, was held in Havana in 2006. It included 116 member states and 15 observer countries.

As non-alignment grew into a popular international movement, countries of various different political systems and interests joined it. This made the movement less homogeneous and also made it more difficult to define in very neat and precise terms: what did it really stand for? Increasingly, NAM was easier to define in terms of what it was not. It was not about being a member of an alliance.

The policy of staying away from alliances should not be considered isolationism or neutrality. Non-alignment is not isolationism since isolationism means remaining aloof from world affairs. Isolationism sums up the foreign policy of the US from the American War of Independence in 1787 up to the beginning of the First World War. In comparison, the non-aligned countries, including India, played an active

role in mediating between the two rival alliances in the cause of peace and stability. Their strength was based on their unity and their resolve to remain non-aligned despite the attempt by the two superpowers to bring them into their alliances.

Non-alignment is also not neutrality. Neutrality refers principally to a policy of staying out of war. States practising neutrality are not required to help end a war. They do not get involved in wars and do not take any position on the appropriateness or morality of a war. Non-aligned states, including India, were actually involved in wars for various reasons. They also worked to prevent war between others and tried to end wars that had broken out.

NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

The non-aligned countries were more than merely mediators during the Cold War. The challenge for most of the non-aligned countries — a majority of them were categorised as the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) — was to be more developed economically and to lift their people out of poverty. Economic development was also vital for the independence of the new countries. Without sustained development, a country could not be truly free. It would remain dependent on the richer countries including the colonial powers from which political freedom had been achieved.

The idea of a New International Economic Order (NIEO) originated with this realisation. The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) brought out a report in 1972 entitled *Towards a New Trade Policy for Development*. The report proposed a reform of the global trading system so as to:

- (i) give the LDCs control over their natural resources exploited by the developed Western countries,
- (ii) obtain access to Western markets so that the LDCs could sell their products and, therefore, make trade more beneficial for the poorer countries,
- (iii) reduce the cost of technology from the Western countries, and
- (iv) provide the LDCs with a greater role in international economic institutions.

Gradually, the nature of non-alignment changed to give greater importance to economic issues. In 1961, at the first summit in Belgrade, economic issues had not been very important. By the mid-1970s, they had become the most important issues. As a result, NAM became an economic pressure group. By the late 1980s, however, the NIEO initiative had faded, mainly because of the stiff opposition from the developed countries who acted as a united group while the non-aligned countries struggled to maintain their unity in the face of this opposition.



FOUNDER FIGURES OF NAM



Gamal Abdel Nasser (1918-70)
Ruled Egypt from 1952 to 1970; espoused the cause of Arab nationalism, socialism and anti-imperialism; nationalised the Suez Canal, leading to an international conflict in 1956.



Sukarno (1901-70)
First President of Indonesia (1945-65); led the freedom struggle; espoused the cause of socialism and anti-imperialism; organised the Bandung Conference; overthrown in a military coup.



FOUNDER FIGURES OF NAM



Kwame Nkrumah
(1909-72)
First Prime Minister
of Ghana (1952-
66); led the
freedom
movement;
advocated the
causes of
socialism and
African unity;
opposed neo-
colonialism;
removed in a
military coup.



So, NIEO was just an
idea that never
became an order.
Right?



Name any five
countries,
which were
decolonised
following the
end of the
Second World
War.

INDIA AND THE COLD WAR

As a leader of NAM, India's response to the ongoing Cold War was two-fold: At one level, it took particular care in staying away from the two alliances. Second, it raised its voice against the newly decolonised countries becoming part of these alliances.

India's policy was neither negative nor passive. As Nehru reminded the world, non-alignment was not a policy of 'fleeing away'. On the contrary, India was in favour of actively intervening in world affairs to soften Cold War rivalries. India tried to reduce the differences between the alliances and thereby prevent differences from escalating into a full-scale war. Indian diplomats and leaders were often used to communicate and mediate between Cold War rivals such as in the Korea War in the early 1950s.

It is important to remember that India chose to involve other members of the non-aligned group in this mission. During the Cold War, India repeatedly tried to activate those regional and international organisations, which were not a part of the alliances led by the US and USSR. Nehru reposed great faith in 'a genuine commonwealth of free and cooperating nations' that would play a positive role in softening, if not ending, the Cold War.

Non-alignment was not, as some suggest, a noble international

cause which had little to do with India's real interests. A non-aligned posture also served India's interests very directly, in at least two ways:

- First, non-alignment allowed India to take international decisions and stances that served its interests rather than the interests of the superpowers and their allies.
- Second, India was often able to balance one superpower against the other. If India felt ignored or unduly pressurised by one superpower, it could tilt towards the other. Neither alliance system could take India for granted or bully it.

India's policy of non-alignment was criticised on a number of counts. Here we may refer to only two criticisms:

- First, India's non-alignment was said to be 'unprincipled'. In the name of pursuing its national interest, India, it was said, often refused to take a firm stand on crucial international issues.
- Second, it is suggested that India was inconsistent and took contradictory postures. Having criticised others for joining alliances, India signed the Treaty of Friendship in August 1971 with the USSR for 20 years. This was regarded, particularly by outside observers, as virtually joining the Soviet alliance system. The Indian government's view was that

India needed diplomatic and possibly military support during the Bangladesh crisis and that in any case the treaty did not stop India from having good relations with other countries including the US.

Non-alignment as a strategy evolved in the Cold War context. As we will see in Chapter 2, with the disintegration of the USSR and the end of the Cold War in 1991, non-alignment, both as an international movement and as the core of India's foreign policy, lost some of its earlier relevance and effectiveness. However, non-alignment contained some core values and enduring ideas. It was based on a recognition that decolonised states share a historical affiliation and can become a powerful force if they come together. It meant that the poor and often very small countries of the world need not become followers of any of the big powers, that they could pursue an independent foreign policy. It was also based on a resolve to democratise the international system by thinking about an alternative world order to redress existing inequities. These core ideas remain relevant even after the Cold War has ended.

LET'S DO IT TOGETHER

STEPS

- Divide the classroom into three groups of even number. Each group is to represent three different worlds - first world/capitalist world, second world/communist world and the third world/non-aligned world.
- The teacher is to select any two critical issues which posed a threat to world peace and security during the Cold War days. (The Korean and Vietnam Wars would be good examples).
- Assign each group to work on developing an 'event profile'. They have to develop, from the vantage point of the bloc they represent, a presentation that contains a timeline of the event, its causes, the irrefereed course of action to solve the problem.
- Each group is to present their event profile before the class.

Ideas for the Teacher

- Draw students' attention to the repercussions the crises had on the rest of the world and on the respective countries. Connect to the present situation in these countries.
- Highlight the role played by the leaders of the Third World (India's stand and contribution in Korea and Vietnam could be taken up for reference) and the UN to bring back peace in these regions.
- Open a debate on 'how we could avert these kind of crises' in the post-Cold War world.



ARMS CONTROL TREATIES



LIMITED TEST BAN TREATY (LTBT)

Banned nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and underwater. Signed by the US, UK and USSR in Moscow on 5 August 1963. Entered into force on 10 October 1963.

NUCLEAR NON-PROLIFERATION TREATY (NPT)

Allows only the nuclear weapon states to have nuclear weapons and stops others from acquiring them. For the purposes of the NPT, a nuclear weapon state is one which has manufactured and exploded a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device prior to 1 January 1967. So there are five nuclear weapon states: US, USSR (later Russia), Britain, France and China. Signed in Washington, London, and Moscow on 1 July 1968. Entered into force on 5 March 1970. Extended indefinitely in 1995.

STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TALKS I (SALT-I)

The first round of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks began in November 1969. The Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev and the US President Richard Nixon signed the following in Moscow on 26 May 1972 – a) Treaty on the limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty); and b) Interim Agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive arms. Entered into force on 3 October 1972.

STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TALKS II (SALT-II)

The second round started in November 1972. The US President Jimmy Carter and the Soviet leader Leonid Brezhnev signed the Treaty on the limitation of strategic offensive arms in Vienna on 18 June 1979.

STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTION TREATY I (START-I)

Treaty signed by the USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev and the US President George Bush (Senior) on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms in Moscow on 31 July 1991.

STRATEGIC ARMS REDUCTION TREATY II (START-II)

Treaty signed by the Russian President Boris Yeltsin and the US President George Bush (Senior) on the reduction and limitation of strategic offensive arms in Moscow on 3 January 1993.

1. Which among the following statements about the Cold War is wrong?
 - a) It was a competition between the US and Soviet Union and their respective allies.
 - b) It was an ideological war between the superpowers.
 - c) It triggered off an arms race.
 - d) the US and USSR were engaged in direct wars.
2. Which among the following statements does not reflect the objectives of NAM
 - a) Enabling newly decolonised countries to pursue independent policies
 - b) No to joining any military alliances
 - c) Following a policy of 'neutrality' on global issues
 - d) Focus on elimination of global economic inequalities
3. Mark correct or wrong against each of the following statements that describe the features of the military alliances formed by the superpowers.
 - a) Member countries of the alliance are to provide bases in their respective lands for the superpowers.
 - b) Member countries to support the superpower both in terms of ideology and military strategy.
 - c) When a nation attacks any member country, it is considered as an attack on all the member countries.
 - d) Superpowers assist all the member countries to develop their own nuclear weapons.
4. Here is a list of countries. Write against each of these the bloc they belonged to during the Cold War.
 - a) Poland
 - b) France
 - c) Japan
 - d) Nigeria
 - e) North Korea
 - f) Sri Lanka
5. The Cold War produced an arms race as well as arms control. What were the reasons for both these developments?
6. Why did the superpowers have military alliances with smaller countries? Give three reasons.

E
X
E
R
C
I
S
E
S

7. Sometimes it is said that the Cold War was a simple struggle for power and that ideology had nothing to do with it. Do you agree with this? Give one example to support your position.
8. What was India's foreign policy towards the US and USSR during the Cold War era? Do you think that this policy helped India's interests?
9. NAM was considered a 'third option' by Third World countries. How did this option benefit their growth during the peak of the Cold War?
10. What do you think about the statement that NAM has become irrelevant today. Give reasons to support your opinion.

Chapter 2

The End of Bipolarity

OVERVIEW

The Berlin Wall, which had been built at the height of the Cold War and was its greatest symbol, was toppled by the people in 1989. This dramatic event was followed by an equally dramatic and historic chain of events that led to the collapse of the 'second world' and the end of the Cold War. Germany, divided after the Second World War, was unified. One after another, the eight East European countries that were part of the Soviet bloc replaced their communist governments in response to mass demonstrations. The Soviet Union stood by as the Cold War began to end, not by military means but as a result of mass actions by ordinary men and women. Eventually the Soviet Union itself disintegrated. In this chapter, we discuss the meaning, the causes and the consequences of the disintegration of the 'second world'. We also discuss what happened to that part of the world after the collapse of communist regimes and how India relates to these countries now.



The Berlin Wall symbolised the division between the capitalist and the communist world. Built in 1961 to

separate East Berlin from West Berlin, this more than 150 kilometre long wall stood for 28 years and was finally broken by the people on 9 November 1989. This marked the unification of the two parts of Germany and the beginning of the end of the communist bloc. The pictures here depict:

- 1. People making a tiny hole in the wall*
- 2. A section of the wall opened to allow free movement*
- 3. The Berlin Wall as it stood before 1989*

*Credit: 1. and 2. Frederik Ramm, www.remote.org/frederik/culture/berlin
3. www.cs.uta.h.edu*



LEADERS OF THE SOVIET UNION



Vladimir Lenin
(1870-1924)
Founder of the
Bolshevik
Communist party;
leader of the
Russian Revolution
of 1917 and the
founder-head of
the USSR during
the most difficult
period following
the revolution
(1917-1924); an
outstanding
theoretician and
practitioner of
Marxism and a
source of
inspiration for
communists all
over the world.

WHAT WAS THE SOVIET SYSTEM?

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) came into being after the socialist revolution in Russia in 1917. The revolution was inspired by the ideals of socialism, as opposed to capitalism, and the need for an egalitarian society. This was perhaps the biggest attempt in human history to abolish the institution of private property and consciously design a society based on principles of equality. In doing so, the makers of the Soviet system gave primacy to the state and the institution of the party. The Soviet political system centred around the communist party, and no other political party or opposition was allowed. The economy was planned and controlled by the state.

After the Second World War, the east European countries that the Soviet army had liberated from the fascist forces came under the control of the USSR. The political and the economic systems of all these countries were modelled after the USSR. This group of countries was called the Second World or the 'socialist bloc'. The Warsaw Pact, a military alliance, held them together. The USSR was the leader of the bloc.

The Soviet Union became a great power after the Second World War. The Soviet economy was then more developed than the rest of the world except for the US. It had a complex communications network, vast energy resources including oil, iron and steel,

machinery production, and a transport sector that connected its remotest areas with efficiency. It had a domestic consumer industry that produced everything from pins to cars, though their quality did not match that of the Western capitalist countries. The Soviet state ensured a minimum standard of living for all citizens, and the government subsidised basic necessities including health, education, childcare and other welfare schemes. There was no unemployment. State ownership was the dominant form of ownership: land and productive assets were owned and controlled by the Soviet state.

The Soviet system, however, became very bureaucratic and authoritarian, making life very difficult for its citizens. Lack of democracy and the absence of freedom of speech stifled people who often expressed their dissent in jokes and cartoons. Most of the institutions of the Soviet state needed reform: the one-party system represented by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union had tight control over all institutions and was unaccountable to the people. The party refused to recognise the urge of people in the fifteen different republics that formed the Soviet Union to manage their own affairs including their cultural affairs. Although, on paper, Russia was only one of the fifteen republics that together constituted the USSR, in reality Russia dominated everything, and people from other regions felt neglected and often suppressed.

In the arms race, the Soviet Union managed to match the US from time to time, but at great cost. The Soviet Union lagged behind the West in technology, infrastructure (e.g. transport, power), and most importantly, in fulfilling the political or economic aspirations of citizens. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 weakened the system even further. Though wages continued to grow, productivity and technology fell considerably behind that of the West. This led to shortages in all consumer goods. Food imports increased every year. The Soviet economy was faltering in the late 1970s and became stagnant.

GORBACHEV AND THE DISINTEGRATION

Mikhail Gorbachev, who had become General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1985, sought to reform this system. Reforms were necessary to keep the USSR abreast of the information and technological revolutions taking place in the West. However, Gorbachev's decision to normalise relations with the West and democratise and reform the Soviet Union had some other effects that neither he nor anyone else intended or anticipated. The people in the East European countries which were part of the Soviet bloc started to protest against their own governments and Soviet control. Unlike in the past, the Soviet Union, under


Gorbachev, did not intervene when the disturbances occurred, and the communist regimes collapsed one after another.

These developments were accompanied by a rapidly escalating crisis within the USSR that hastened its disintegration. Gorbachev initiated the policies of economic and political reform and democratisation within the country. The reforms were opposed by leaders within the Communist Party.

A coup took place in 1991 that was encouraged by Communist Party hardliners. The people had tasted freedom by then and did not want the old-style rule of the Communist Party. Boris Yeltsin emerged as a national hero in opposing this coup. The Russian Republic, where Yeltsin won a popular election, began to shake off centralised control. Power began to shift from the Soviet centre to the republics, especially in the more Europeanised part of the Soviet Union, which saw themselves as sovereign states. The Central Asian republics did not ask for independence and wanted to remain with the Soviet Federation. In December 1991, under the leadership of Yeltsin, Russia, Ukraine and Belarus, three major republics of the USSR, declared that the Soviet Union was disbanded. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union was banned. Capitalism and democracy were adopted as the bases for the post-Soviet republics.



LEADERS OF THE SOVIET UNION



Joseph Stalin
(1879-1953)

Successor to Lenin and led the Soviet Union during its consolidation (1924-53); began rapid industrialisation and forcible collectivisation of agriculture; credited with Soviet victory in the Second World War; held responsible for the Great Terror of the 1930s, authoritarian functioning and elimination of rivals within the party.



LEADERS OF THE SOVIET UNION



Nikita Khrushchev
(1894-1971)
Leader of the Soviet Union (1953-64); denounced Stalin's leadership style and introduced some reforms in 1956; suggested "peaceful coexistence" with the West; involved in suppressing popular rebellion in Hungary and in the Cuban missile crisis.



I am amazed! How could so many sensitive people all over the world admire a system like this?

A Communist Party bureaucrat drives down from Moscow to a collective farm to register a potato harvest.

"Comrade farmer, how has the harvest been this year?" the official asks.

"Oh, by the grace of God, we had mountains of potatoes," answers the farmer.

"But there is no God," counters the official.

"Huh", says the farmer, "And there are no mountains of potatoes either."

The declaration on the disintegration of the USSR and the formation of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) came as a surprise to the other republics, especially to the Central Asian ones. The exclusion of these republics was an issue that was quickly solved by making them founding members of the CIS. Russia was now accepted as the successor state of the Soviet Union. It inherited the Soviet seat in the UN Security Council. Russia accepted all the international treaties and commitments of the Soviet Union. It took over as the only nuclear state of the post-Soviet space and carried out some nuclear disarmament measures with the US. The old Soviet Union was thus dead and buried.

WHY DID THE SOVIET UNION DISINTEGRATE?

How did the second most powerful country in the world suddenly disintegrate? This is a question worth asking not just to understand the Soviet Union and the end of communism but also because it is not the first and may not be the last political system to collapse. While there are unique features of the Soviet collapse,

there may be more general lessons to be drawn from this very important case.

There is no doubt that the internal weaknesses of Soviet political and economic institutions, which failed to meet the aspirations of the people, were responsible for the collapse of the system. Economic stagnation for many years led to severe consumer shortages and a large section of Soviet society began to doubt and question the system and to do so openly.

Why did the system become so weak and why did the economy stagnate? The answer is partially clear. The Soviet economy used much of its resources in maintaining a nuclear and military arsenal and the development of its satellite states in Eastern Europe and within the Soviet system (the five Central Asian Republics in particular). This led to a huge economic burden that the system could not cope with. At the same time, ordinary citizens became more knowledgeable about the economic advance of the West. They could see the disparities between their system and the systems of the West. After years of being told that the Soviet

system was better than Western capitalism, the reality of its backwardness came as a political and psychological shock.

The Soviet Union had become stagnant in an administrative and political sense as well. The Communist Party that had ruled the Soviet Union for over 70 years was not accountable to the people. Ordinary people were alienated by slow and stifling administration, rampant corruption, the inability of the system to correct mistakes it had made, the unwillingness to allow more openness in government, and the centralisation of authority in a vast land. Worse still, the party bureaucrats gained more privileges than ordinary citizens. People did not identify with the system and with the rulers, and the government increasingly lost popular backing.

Gorbachev's reforms promised to deal with these problems. Gorbachev promised to reform the economy, catch up with the West, and loosen the administrative system. You may wonder why the Soviet Union collapsed in spite of Gorbachev's accurate diagnosis of the problem and his attempt to implement reforms. Here is where the answers become more controversial, and we have to depend on future historians to guide us better.

The most basic answer seems to be that when Gorbachev carried out his reforms and loosened the system, he set in motion forces and expectations that few could have predicted and became virtually

impossible to control. There were sections of Soviet society which felt that Gorbachev should have moved much faster and were disappointed and impatient with his methods. They did not benefit in the way they had hoped, or they benefited too slowly. Others, especially members of the Communist Party and those who were served by the system, took exactly the opposite view. They felt that their power and privileges were eroding and Gorbachev was moving too quickly. In this 'tug of war', Gorbachev lost support on all sides and divided public opinion. Even those who were with him became disillusioned as they felt that he did not adequately defend his own policies.

All this might not have led to the collapse of the Soviet Union but for another development that surprised most observers and indeed many insiders. The rise of nationalism and the desire for sovereignty within various republics including Russia and the Baltic Republics (Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania), Ukraine, Georgia, and others proved to be the final and most immediate cause for the disintegration of the USSR. Here again there are differing views.

One view is that nationalist urges and feelings were very much at work throughout the history of the Soviet Union and that whether or not the reforms had occurred there would have been an internal struggle within the Soviet Union. This is a 'what-if' of history, but surely it is not an unreasonable



LEADERS OF THE SOVIET UNION



Leonid Brezhnev
(1906-82)

Leader of the Soviet Union (1964-82); proposed Asian Collective Security system; associated with the détente phase in relations with the US; involved in suppressing a popular rebellion in Czechoslovakia and in invading Afghanistan.



LEADERS OF THE SOVIET UNION



Mikhail Gorbachev
(Born 1931)
Last leader of the Soviet Union (1985-91); introduced economic and political reform policies of *perestroika* (restructuring) and *glasnost* (openness); stopped the arms race with the US; withdrew Soviet troops from Afghanistan and eastern Europe; helped in the unification of Germany; ended the Cold War; blamed for the disintegration of the Soviet Union.

view given the size and diversity of the Soviet Union and its growing internal problems. Others think that Gorbachev's reforms speeded up and increased nationalist dissatisfaction to the point that the government and rulers could not control it.

Ironically, during the Cold War many thought that nationalist unrest would be strongest in the Central Asian republics given their ethnic and religious differences with the rest of the Soviet Union and their economic backwardness. However, as things turned out, nationalist



TIMELINE OF DISINTEGRATION OF THE SOVIET UNION

1985 March: Mikhail Gorbachev elected as the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union; appoints Boris Yeltsin as the head of the Communist Party in Moscow; initiates a series of reforms in the Soviet Union

1988: Independence movement begins in Lithuania; later spreads to Estonia and Latvia

1989 October: Soviet Union declares that the Warsaw Pact members are free to decide their own future; Berlin Wall falls in November

1990 February: Gorbachev strips the Soviet Communist Party of its 72-year-long monopoly on power by calling on the Soviet parliament (Duma) to permit multi-party politics

1990 March: Lithuania becomes the first of the 15 Soviet republics to declare its independence

1990 June: Russian parliament declares its independence from the Soviet Union

1991 June: Yeltsin, no longer in the Communist Party, becomes the President of Russia

1991 August: The Communist Party hardliners stage an abortive coup against Gorbachev

1991 September: Three Baltic republics of Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania become UN members (later join NATO in March 2004)

1991 December: Russia, Belarus and Ukraine decide to annul the 1922 Treaty on the Creation of the USSR and establish the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS); Armenia, Azerbaijan, Moldova, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan join the CIS (Georgia joins later in 1993); Russia takes over the USSR seat in the United Nations

1991 December 25: Gorbachev resigns as the President of the Soviet Union; the end of the Soviet Union

dissatisfaction with the Soviet Union was strongest in the more “European” and prosperous part – in Russia and the Baltic areas as well as Ukraine and Georgia. Ordinary people here felt alienated from the Central Asians and from each other and concluded also that they were paying too high an economic price to keep the more backward areas within the Soviet Union.

CONSEQUENCES OF DISINTEGRATION

The collapse of the second world of the Soviet Union and the socialist systems in eastern Europe had profound consequences for world politics. Let us note here three broad kinds of enduring changes that resulted from it. Each of these had a number of effects that we cannot list here.

First of all, it meant the end of Cold War confrontations. The ideological dispute over whether the socialist system would beat the capitalist system was not an issue any more. Since this dispute had engaged the military of the two blocs, had triggered a massive arms race and accumulation of nuclear weapons, and had led to the existence of military blocs, the end of the confrontation demanded an end to this arms race and a possible new peace.

Second, power relations in world politics changed and, therefore, the relative influence of ideas and institutions also

changed. The end of the Cold War left open only two possibilities: either the remaining superpower would dominate and create a unipolar system, or different countries or groups of countries could become important players in the international system, thereby bringing in a multipolar system where no one power could dominate. As it turned out, the US became the sole superpower. Backed by the power and prestige of the US, the capitalist economy was now the dominant economic system internationally. Institutions like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund became powerful advisors to all these countries since they gave them loans for their transitions to capitalism. Politically, the notion of liberal democracy emerged as the best way to organise political life.

Third, the end of the Soviet bloc meant the emergence of many new countries. All these countries had their own independent aspirations and choices. Some of them, especially the Baltic and east European states, wanted to join the European Union and become part of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). The Central Asian countries wanted to take advantage of their geographical location and continue their close ties with Russia and also to establish ties with the West, the US, China and others. Thus, the international system saw many new players emerge, each with its own identity, interests, and economic and political difficulties. It is to these issues that we now turn.



LEADERS OF THE SOVIET UNION



Boris Yeltsin (Born 1931)

The first elected President of Russia (1991-1999); rose to power in the Communist Party and was made the Mayor of Moscow by Gorbachev; later joined the critics of Gorbachev and left the Communist Party; led the protests against the Soviet regime in 1991; played a key role in dissolving the Soviet Union; blamed for hardships suffered by Russians in the transition from communism to capitalism.



I heard someone say
“The end of the
Soviet Union does
not mean the end of
socialism.” Is that
possible?

SHOCK THERAPY IN POST-COMMUNIST REGIMES

The collapse of communism was followed in most of these countries by a painful process of transition from an authoritarian socialist system to a democratic capitalist system. The model of transition in Russia, Central Asia and east Europe that was influenced by the World Bank and the IMF came to be known as ‘shock therapy’. Shock therapy varied in intensity and speed amongst the former second world countries, but its direction and features were quite similar.

Each of these countries was required to make a total shift to a capitalist economy, which meant rooting out completely any structures evolved during the Soviet period. Above all, it meant that private ownership was to be the dominant pattern of ownership of property. Privatisation of state assets and corporate ownership patterns were to be immediately brought in. Collective farms were to be replaced by private farming and capitalism in agriculture. This transition ruled out any alternate or ‘third way’, other than state-controlled socialism or capitalism.

POLITICAL MAP OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF INDEPENDENT STATES, 1997



Locate the
Central Asian
Republics on
the map.

“Courtesy of the University of Texas Libraries, The University of Texas at Austin”

Shock therapy also involved a drastic change in the external orientation of these economies. Development was now envisaged through more trade, and thus a sudden and complete switch to free trade was considered essential. The free trade regime and foreign direct investment (FDI) were to be the main engines of change. This also involved openness to foreign investment, financial opening up or deregulation, and currency convertibility.

Finally, the transition also involved a break up of the existing trade alliances among the countries of the Soviet bloc. Each state from this bloc was now linked directly to the West and not to each other in the region. These states were thus to be gradually absorbed into the Western economic system. The Western capitalist states now became the leaders and thus guided and controlled the development of the region through various agencies and organisations.

CONSEQUENCES OF SHOCK THERAPY

The shock therapy administered in the 1990s did not lead the people into the promised utopia of mass consumption. Generally, it brought ruin to the economies and disaster upon the people of the entire region. In Russia, the large state-controlled industrial complex almost collapsed, as

about 90 per cent of its industries were put up for sale to private individuals and companies. Since the restructuring was carried out through market forces and not by government-directed industrial policies, it led to the virtual disappearance of entire industries. This was called 'the largest garage sale in history', as valuable industries were undervalued and sold at throwaway prices. Though all citizens were given vouchers to participate in the sales, most citizens sold their vouchers in the black market because they needed the money.

The value of the ruble, the Russian currency, declined dramatically. The rate of inflation was so high that people lost all their savings. The collective farm system disintegrated leaving people without food security, and Russia started to import food. The real GDP of Russia in 1999 was below what it was in 1989. The old trading structure broke down with no alternative in its place.

The old system of social welfare was systematically destroyed. The withdrawal of government subsidies pushed large sections of the people into poverty. The middle classes were pushed to the periphery of society, and the academic and intellectual manpower disintegrated or migrated. A mafia emerged in most of these countries and started controlling many economic activities. Privatisation led to new disparities. Post-Soviet states, especially Russia, were divided



I can see the shock.
But where is the
therapy? Why do we
talk in such
euphemisms?



As a result of 'shock therapy' about half of Russia's 1,500 banks and other financial institutions went bankrupt. This image is that of Inko m bank, Russia's second largest bank, that went bankrupt in 1998. As a result, the money of 10,000 corporate and private shareholders was lost, along with the money kept in the bank by customers.



What is the difference between nationalism and secessionism? If you succeed, you are celebrated as a nationalist hero, and if you fail you are condemned for crimes of secessionism.

between rich and poor regions. Unlike the earlier system, there was now great economic inequality between people.

The construction of democratic institutions was not given the same attention and priority as the demands of economic transformation. The constitutions of all these countries were drafted in a hurry and most, including Russia, had a strong executive president with the widest possible powers that rendered elected parliaments relatively weak. In Central Asia, the presidents had great powers, and several of them became very authoritarian. For example, the presidents of Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan appointed themselves to power first for ten years and then extended it for another ten years. They allowed no dissent or opposition. A judicial culture and independence of the judiciary was yet to be established in most of these countries.

Most of these economies, especially Russia, started reviving in 2000, ten years after their independence. The reason for the revival for most of their economies was the export of natural resources like oil, natural gas and minerals. Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Russia, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan are major oil and gas producers. Other countries have gained because of the oil pipelines that cross their territories for which they get rent. Some amount of manufacturing has restarted.

TENSIONS AND CONFLICTS

Most of the former Soviet Republics are prone to conflicts, and many have had civil wars and insurgencies. Complicating the picture is the growing involvement of outside powers.

In Russia, two republics, Chechnya and Dagestan, have had violent secessionist movements. Moscow's method of dealing with the Chechen rebels and indiscriminate military bombings have led to many human rights violations but failed to deter the aspirations for independence.

In Central Asia, Tajikistan witnessed a civil war that went on for ten years till 2001. The region as a whole has many sectarian conflicts. In Azerbaijan's province of Nagorno-Karabakh, some local Armenians want to secede and join Armenia. In Georgia, the demand for independence has come from two provinces, resulting in a civil war. There are movements against the existing regimes in Ukraine, Kyrgyzstan and Georgia. Countries and provinces are fighting over river waters. All this has led to instability, making life difficult for the ordinary citizen.

The Central Asian Republics are areas with vast hydrocarbon resources, which have brought them economic benefit. Central Asia has also become a zone of competition between outside powers and oil companies. The region is next to Russia, China, Afghanistan, and Pakistan, and

close to West Asia. After 11 September 2001, the US wanted military bases in the region and paid the governments of all Central Asian states to hire bases and to allow airplanes to fly over their territory during the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. However, Russia perceives these states as its 'Near Abroad' and believes that they should be under Russian influence. China has interests here because of the oil resources, and the Chinese have begun to settle around the borders and conduct trade.

In eastern Europe, Czechoslovakia split peacefully into two, with the Czechs and the Slovaks forming independent countries. But the most severe conflict took place in the Balkan republics of Yugoslavia. After 1991, it broke apart with several provinces like Croatia, Slovenia and Bosnia and Herzegovina declaring independence. Ethnic Serbs opposed this, and a massacre of non-Serb Bosnians followed. The NATO intervention and the bombing of Yugoslavia followed the inter-ethnic civil war.

INDIA AND POST-COMMUNIST COUNTRIES

India has maintained good relations with all the post-communist countries. But the strongest relations are still those between Russia and India. India's relations with Russia are an important aspect of India's foreign policy. Indo-Russian relations are

embedded in a history of trust and common interests and are matched by popular perceptions. Indian heroes from Raj Kapoor to Amitabh Bachchan are household names in Russia and many post-Soviet countries. One can hear Hindi film songs all over the region, and India is part of the popular memory.

Russia and India share a vision of a multipolar world order. What they mean by a multipolar world

Make a list of the similarities between India and the USSR in their political and economic ideologies.



BOLLYWOOD STIRS UZBEK PASSIONS

Seven years after the Soviet Union collapsed, the Uzbek passion for Indian films continues. Within months of the release of the latest film in India, pirate copies were already on sale in the Uzbek capital, Tashkent.

Mohammed Sharif Pat runs a shop selling Indian films near one of Tashkent's biggest markets. He is an Afghan who brings videos from the Pakistani frontier town Peshawar. "There are many people who love Indian films here. I'd say at least 70% of the people in Tashkent buy them. We sell about 100 videos a day. I've just had to put in an order for a thousand more," he says. "The Uzbeks are Central Asians, they are part of Asia. They have a common culture. That's why they like Indian films."

Despite the shared history, for many Indians living in Uzbekistan, the passion the Uzbeks have for their films and film stars has come as a bit of a surprise. "Wherever we go and meet local dignitaries - even ministers or cabinet ministers - during our conversation it is always mentioned," says Ashok Shamer from the Indian embassy in Tashkent. "This shows that Indian films, culture, songs and especially Raj Kapoor have been household names here. Most of them can sing some Hindi songs, they may not know the meaning but the pronunciation is correct and they know the music," he says. "I have found out that almost all my neighbours can sing and play Hindi songs. This was really a big surprise to me when I came to Uzbekistan."

A report by the BBC's Central Asia Correspondent Louise Hidalgo



FLASHBACK: INDIA AND THE USSR

During the Cold War era, India and the USSR enjoyed a special relationship which led critics to say that India was part of the Soviet camp. It was a multi-dimensional relationship:

Economic: The Soviet Union assisted India's public sector companies at a time when such assistance was difficult to get. It gave aid and technical assistance for steel plants like Bhilai, Bokaro, Visakhapatnam, and machinery plants like Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd., etc. The Soviet Union accepted Indian currency for trade when India was short of foreign exchange.

Political: The Soviet Union supported India's positions on the Kashmir issue in the UN. It also supported India during its major conflicts, especially during the war with Pakistan in 1971. India too supported Soviet foreign policy in some crucial but indirect ways.

Military: India received most of its military hardware from the Soviet Union at a time when few other countries were willing to part with military technologies. The Soviet Union entered into various agreements allowing India to jointly produce military equipment.

Culture: Hindi films and Indian culture were popular in the Soviet Union. A large number of Indian writers and artists visited the USSR.

order is the co-existence of several powers in the international system, collective security (in which an attack on any country is regarded as a threat to all countries and requires a collective response), greater regionalism, negotiated settlements of international conflicts, an independent foreign policy for all countries, and decision making through bodies like the UN that should be strengthened, democratised, and empowered. More than 80 bilateral agreements have been signed between India and Russia as part of the Indo-Russian Strategic Agreement of 2001.

India stands to benefit from its relationship with Russia on issues like Kashmir, energy supplies, sharing information on international terrorism,

LET'S DO IT TOGETHER

STEPS

- Select any five Cold War allies each of the Soviet Union and the US.
- Divide the class accordingly (10 groups). Allocate a country to each group. Assign the group to collect information on the political, social and economic profile of these countries during the Cold War days.
- They should also prepare a profile of that country after the collapse of communism and say what difference, if any, the disintegration of the second world made to that country.
- Each group is to present its findings to the entire class. Ensure that students talk about how people of these countries felt about themselves as citizens.

Ideas for the Teacher

- You could link the students' findings to the working of the democratic system and communist system and highlight the pros and cons of both these systems.
- You could encourage the students to discuss if there is an alternative to both communism and capitalism.

access to Central Asia, and balancing its relations with China. Russia stands to benefit from this relationship because India is the second largest arms market for Russia. The Indian military gets most of its hardware from Russia. Since India is an oil-importing nation, Russia is important to India and has repeatedly come to the assistance of India during its oil crises. India is seeking to increase its energy

imports from Russia and the republics of Kazakhstan and Turkmenistan. Cooperation with these republics includes partnership and investment in oilfields. Russia is important for India's nuclear energy plans and assisted India's space industry by giving, for example, the cryogenic rocket when India needed it. Russia and India have collaborated on various scientific projects.

1. Which among the following statements that describe the nature of Soviet economy is wrong?
 - a. Socialism was the dominant ideology
 - b. State ownership/control existed over the factors of production
 - c. People enjoyed economic freedom
 - d. Every aspect of the economy was planned and controlled by the State
2. Arrange the following in chronological order:
 - a. Soviet invasion of Afghanistan
 - b. Fall of the Berlin Wall
 - c. Disintegration of the Soviet Union
 - d. Russian Revolution
3. Which among the following is NOT an outcome of the disintegration of the USSR?
 - a. End of the ideological war between the US and USSR
 - b. Birth of CIS
 - c. Change in the balance of power in the world order
 - d. Crisis in the Middle East
4. Match the following:

i. Mikhail Gorbachev	a. Successor of USSR
ii. Shock Therapy	b. Military pact
iii. Russia	c. Introduced reforms
iv. Boris Yeltsin	d. Economic model
v. Warsaw	e. President of Russia

EXERCISES

EXERCISES

5. Fill in the blanks.
 - a. The Soviet political system was based on _____ ideology.
 - b. _____ was the military alliance started by the USSR.
 - c. _____ party dominated the Soviet Union's political system.
 - d. _____ initiated the reforms in the USSR in 1985.
 - e. The fall of the _____ symbolised the end of the Cold War.
6. Mention any three features that distinguish the Soviet economy from that of a capitalist country like the US?
7. What were the factors that forced Gorbachev to initiate the reforms in the USSR?
8. What were the major consequences of the disintegration of the Soviet Union for countries like India?
9. What was Shock Therapy? Was this the best way to make a transition from communism to capitalism?
10. Write an essay for or against the following proposition: "With the disintegration of the second world, India should change its foreign policy and focus more on friendship with the US rather than with traditional friends like Russia".

Chapter 3

US Hegemony in World Politics

OVERVIEW

We have seen that the end of Cold War left the US without any serious rival in the world. The era since then has been described as a period of US dominance or a unipolar world. In this chapter, we try to understand the nature, extent and limits of this dominance. We begin by narrating the story of the rise of the new world order from the First Gulf War to the US-led invasion of Iraq. We then pause to understand the nature of US domination with the help of the concept of 'hegemony'. After exploring the political, economic and cultural aspects of US hegemony, we assess India's policy options in dealing with the US. Finally, we turn to see if there are challenges to this hegemony and whether it can be overcome.



The attack on the twin towers of the World Trade Centre in New York on 11 September 2001 has been seen as a watershed event in contemporary history.

AYESHA, JABU AND ANDREI

Ayesha was doing very well in her studies at a high school in the outskirts of Baghdad, and was planning to study medicine in university. She lost a leg in 2003 when a missile slammed into an air raid shelter in which she was hiding with her friends. Now she is learning to walk all over again. She still plans to become a doctor, but only after the foreign armies leave her country.

Jabu is a talented young artist who lives in Durban, South Africa. His paintings are heavily influenced by traditional tribal art forms. He wants to go to art school and later open his own studio. However, his father wants him to study for an MBA and then join the family business. The business is not doing too well; Jabu's father feels that with an MBA degree, Jabu will be able to make the family business profitable.

Andrei is a young man living in Perth, Australia. His parents are immigrants from Russia. His mother gets very angry every time Andrei puts on blue jeans to go to church. She wants him to look respectable in church. Andrei tells his mother that jeans are "cool", that they give him the sense of freedom. Andrei's father reminds his wife how they too used to wear jeans when they were youngsters in Leningrad, and for the same reason that their son now invokes.

Andrei has had an argument with his mother. Jabu may be

forced to study a subject that he has no interest in. In contrast, Ayesha has lost her leg and is lucky to be alive. How can we even discuss their problems in the same breath? We can, and must, do so. As we shall see in this chapter, all three have been, in different ways, affected by US hegemony. We will meet Ayesha, Jabu and Andrei again. But let us first understand how US hegemony began and how it operates in the world today.

We will follow the popular usage of the word 'America' to refer to the United States of America. But it may be useful to remind ourselves that the expression America covers the two continents of North and South America and that the US is only one of the countries of the American continent. Thus, the use of the word America solely for the US is already a sign of the US hegemony that we seek to understand in this chapter.

BEGINNING OF THE 'NEW WORLD ORDER'

The sudden collapse of the Soviet Union took everyone by surprise. While one of the two superpowers ceased to exist, the other remained with all its powers intact, even enhanced. Thus, it would appear that the US hegemony began in 1991 after Soviet power disappeared from the international scene. This is largely correct, but we need to keep in mind two riders to this. First, as we shall see in this



I'm glad I did not opt for the Science subjects. Or else I too would have been a victim of US hegemony. Can you think how and why?



This picture of bombed and broken vehicles was taken on the 'Highway of Death', a road between Kuwait and Basra, on which the retreating Iraqi army was attacked by American aircraft during the First Gulf War in February 1991. Some commentators have suggested that the US forces deliberately bombed this stretch of highway where fleeing and 'out of combat' Iraqi soldiers were stuck in a frenzied traffic jam and that the victims included Kuwaiti prisoners and hostages and Palestinian civilian refugees. Many observers have called it a 'war crime' and a violation of the Geneva Convention.

chapter, some aspects of US hegemony did not emerge in 1991 but in fact go back to the end of the Second World War in 1945. Second, the US did not start behaving like a hegemonic power right from 1991; it became clear much later that the world was in fact living in a period of hegemony. Let us therefore look at this process by which US hegemony got established more closely.

In August 1990, Iraq invaded Kuwait, rapidly occupying and subsequently annexing it. After a

series of diplomatic attempts failed at convincing Iraq to quit its aggression, the United Nations mandated the liberation of Kuwait by force. For the UN, this was a dramatic decision after years of deadlock during the Cold War. The US President George H.W. Bush hailed the emergence of a 'new world order'.

A massive coalition force of 660,000 troops from 34 countries fought against Iraq and defeated it in what came to be known as the First Gulf War. However, the



Is it true that the US has never fought a war on its own land? Doesn't that make it easy for Americans to get into military adventures?

UN operation, which was called 'Operation Desert Storm', was overwhelmingly American. An American general, Norman Schwarzkopf, led the UN coalition and nearly 75 per cent of the coalition forces were from the US. Although the Iraqi President, Saddam Hussein, had promised "the mother of all battles", the Iraqi forces were quickly defeated and forced to withdraw from Kuwait.

The First Gulf War revealed the vast technological gap that had opened up between the US military capability and that of other states. The highly publicised use of so-called 'smart bombs' by the US led some observers to call this a 'computer war'. Widespread television coverage also made it a 'video game war', with viewers around the world watching the destruction of Iraqi forces live on TV in the comfort of their living rooms.

Incredibly, the US may actually have made a profit from the war. According to many reports, the US received more money from countries like Germany, Japan and Saudi Arabia than it had spent on the war.

THE CLINTON YEARS

Despite winning the First Gulf War, George H.W. Bush lost the US presidential elections of 1992 to William Jefferson (Bill) Clinton of the Democratic Party, who had

campaigning on domestic rather than foreign policy issues. Bill Clinton won again in 1996 and thus remained the president of the US for eight years. During the Clinton years, it often seemed that the US had withdrawn into its internal affairs and was not fully engaged in world politics. In foreign policy, the Clinton government tended to focus on 'soft issues' like democracy promotion, climate change and world trade rather than on the 'hard politics' of military power and security.

Nevertheless, the US on occasion did show its readiness to use military power even during the Clinton years. The most important episode occurred in 1999, in response to Yugoslavian actions against the predominantly Albanian population in the province of Kosovo. The air forces of the NATO countries, led by the US, bombarded targets around Yugoslavia for well over two months, forcing the downfall of the government of Slobodan Milosevic and the stationing of a NATO force in Kosovo.

Another significant US military action during the Clinton years was in response to the bombing of the US embassies in Nairobi, Kenya and Dar-es-Salaam, Tanzania in 1998. These bombings were attributed to Al-Qaeda, a terrorist organisation strongly influenced by extremist Islamist ideas. Within a few days of this bombing, President Clinton ordered Operation Infinite

This is ridiculous!
Does it mean
that Sri Lanka
can drop a
missile on Paris if
it suspects that
some of the LTTE
militants are
hiding there?



Reach, a series of cruise missile strikes on Al-Qaeda terrorist targets in Sudan and Afghanistan. The US did not bother about the UN sanction or provisions of international law in this regard. It was alleged that some of the targets were civilian facilities unconnected to terrorism. In retrospect, this was merely the beginning.

9/11 AND THE 'GLOBAL WAR ON TERROR'

On 11 September 2001, nineteen hijackers hailing from a number of Arab countries took control of four American commercial aircraft shortly after takeoff and flew them into important buildings in the US. One airliner each crashed into the North and South Towers of the World Trade Centre in New York. A third aircraft crashed into the Pentagon building in Arlington, Virginia, where the US Defence Department is headquartered. The fourth aircraft, presumably bound for the Capitol building of the US Congress, came down in a field in Pennsylvania. The attacks have come to be known as "9/11". (In America the convention is to



This is how The New York Times reported 9/11 in its edition the following morning.

write the month first, followed by the date; hence the short form '9/11' instead of '11/9' as we would write in India).

The attacks killed nearly three thousand persons. In terms of their shocking effect on Americans, they have been compared to the British burning of Washington, DC in 1814 and the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbour in 1941. However, in terms of loss of life, 9/11 was the most

severe attack on US soil since the founding of the country in 1776.

The US response to 9/11 was swift and ferocious. Clinton had been succeeded in the US presidency by George W. Bush of the Republican Party, son of the earlier President George H. W. Bush. Unlike Clinton, Bush had a much harder view of US interests and of the means by which to advance them. As a part of its 'Global War on Terror', the US launched 'Operation Enduring Freedom' against all those suspected to be behind this attack, mainly Al-Qaeda and the Taliban regime in Afghanistan. The Taliban regime was easily overthrown, but remnants of the Taliban and Al-

Qaeda have remained potent, as is clear from the number of terrorist attacks launched by them against Western targets since.

The US forces made arrests all over the world, often without the knowledge of the government of the persons being arrested, transported these persons across countries and detained them in secret prisons. Some of them were brought to Guantanamo Bay, a US Naval base in Cuba, where the prisoners did not enjoy the protection of international law or the law of their own country or that of the US. Even the UN representatives were not allowed to meet these prisoners.



Do they also have political dynasties in the US? Or was this the only exception?




Suppose you are the Secretary of State in the US (the equivalent of our Minister of External Affairs). How would you react in a press conference to these cartoons?

THE IRAQ INVASION

On 19 March 2003, the US launched its invasion of Iraq under the codename 'Operation Iraqi Freedom'. More than forty other countries joined in the US-led 'coalition of the willing' after the UN refused to give its mandate to the invasion. The ostensible purpose of the invasion was to prevent Iraq from developing weapons of mass destruction (WMD). Since no evidence of WMD has been unearthed in Iraq, it is speculated that the invasion was motivated by other objectives, such as controlling Iraqi oilfields and installing a regime friendly to the US.

Although the government of Saddam Hussein fell swiftly, the US has not been able to 'pacify' Iraq. Instead, a full-fledged insurgency against US occupation was ignited in Iraq. While the US has lost over 3,000 military personnel in the war, Iraqi casualties are very much higher. It is conservatively estimated that 50,000 Iraqi civilians have been killed since the US-led invasion. It is now widely recognised that the US invasion of Iraq was, in some crucial respects, both a military and political failure.



Soldier World Map

© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

WHAT DOES HEGEMONY MEAN?

Politics is about power. Just as individuals want to gain and retain power, groups too want to gain and retain power. We routinely talk of someone becoming powerful or someone doing something for power. In the case of world politics too, countries and groups of countries are engaged in constantly trying to gain and retain power. This power is in the form of military domination, economic power, political clout and cultural superiority.



Entitled 'Under US Thumb', this cartoon captures our commonsensical understanding of what hegemony means. What does this cartoon say about the nature of US hegemony? Which part of the world is the cartoonist talking about?



Why use such complicated words like hegemony? In my town they call it *dadagiri*. Isn't that better?

Therefore, if we wanted to understand world politics, it is necessary that we understand the distribution of power among the countries of the world. For instance, during the years of the Cold War (1945-91) power was divided between the two groups of countries, and the US and the Soviet Union represented the two 'camps' or centres of power in international politics during that period. The collapse of the Soviet Union left the world with only a single power, the United States of America. Sometimes, the international system dominated by a sole superpower, or hyper-power,


is called a 'unipolar' system. This appears to be a misapplication of the idea of 'pole' derived from physics. It may be more appropriate to describe an international system with only one centre of power by the term 'hegemony'.

We can identify three very different understandings of what hegemony is. Let us examine each of these meanings of hegemony and relate them to contemporary international politics.

HEGEMONY AS HARD POWER

The roots of the word hegemony lie in classical Greek. The word implies the leadership or predominance of one state, and was originally used to denote the preponderant position of Athens vis-à-vis the other city-states of ancient Greece. Thus, the first meaning of hegemony relates to the relations, patterns and balances of military capability between states. It is this notion of hegemony as military preponderance that is especially germane to the current position and role of the US in world politics. Do you remember Ayesha, who lost her leg in an American missile attack? It is hard power hegemony that has broken Ayesha's body, if not her spirit.

The bedrock of contemporary US power lies in the overwhelming superiority of its military power. American military dominance today is both absolute and relative. In absolute terms, the US



Source: http://www.army.mil/institution/organization/area_of_responsibility.jpg


today has military capabilities that can reach any point on the planet accurately, lethally and in real time, thereby crippling the adversary while its own forces are sheltered to the maximum extent possible from the dangers of war.

But even more awesome than the absolute capabilities of the US is the fact that no other power today can remotely match them. The US today spends more on its military capability than the next 12 powers combined. Furthermore, a large chunk of the Pentagon's budget goes into military research and development, or, in other words, technology. Thus, the military dominance of the US is not just based on higher military spending, but on a *qualitative* gap, a technological

chasm that no other power can at present conceivably span.

Undoubtedly, the US invasion of Iraq reveals several American vulnerabilities. The US has not been able to force the Iraqi people into submitting to the occupation forces of the US-led coalition. To fully understand the nature of American weakness, however, we need to have a historical perspective. Imperial powers through history have used military forces to accomplish only four tasks: to conquer, deter, punish and police. As the Iraq invasion shows, the American capacity to conquer is formidable. Similarly, the US capability to deter and to punish is self-evident. Where US military capability has thus far been shown to have

Most armed forces in the world divide the irareas of operation into various 'commands' which are assigned to different commanders. This map depicts the areas of responsibility of the five Commands of the USarmed forces. It shows that the commands of the USmilitary are not limited to the area of the United States; it extends to include the whole world. What does this map tell us about the military power of the US?



Source: The Military Balance 2006 (London: International Institute for Strategic Studies/Routledge, 2006), pp. 398-403 (Table 44: Comparative Defence Expenditure and Military Manpower, 2002-2004).

The US today spends more on its military capability than the next 12 powers combined. As you can see here, most of the other countries that are big military spenders are US friends and allies. Thus, balancing US power is not a feasible strategy today.

serious weaknesses is in policing an occupied territory.

HEGEMONY AS STRUCTURAL POWER

The second notion of hegemony is very different from the first. It emerges from a particular understanding of the world economy. The basic idea is that an open world economy requires a hegemon or dominant power to support its creation and existence. The hegemon must

possess both the ability and the desire to establish certain norms for order and must sustain the global structure. The hegemon usually does this to its own advantage but often to its relative detriment, as its competitors take advantage of the openness of the world economy without paying the costs of maintaining its openness.

Hegemony in this second sense is reflected in the role played by the US in providing global public goods. By public goods we mean those goods that can be consumed by one person without reducing the amount of the good available for someone else. Fresh air and roads are examples of public goods. In the context of the world economy, the best examples of a global public good are sea-lanes of communication (SLOCs), the sea routes commonly used by merchant ships. Free trade in an open world economy would not be possible without open SLOCs.



Dollar World

It is the naval power of the hegemon that underwrites the law of the sea and ensures freedom of navigation in international waters. Since the decline of British naval power after the Second World War, the multi-oceanic US Navy has played this role.

Another example of a global public good is the Internet. Although it is seen today as making the virtual world of the World Wide Web possible, we should not forget that the Internet is the direct outcome of a US military research project that began in 1950. Even today, the Internet relies on a global network of satellites, most of which are owned by the US government.

As we know, the US is present in all parts of the world, in all

sectors of the world economy and in all areas of technology. The US share of the world economy remains an enormous 28 per cent.

The US also accounts for 15 per cent of world trade, if intra-European Union trade is included in world trade data. There is not a single sector of the world economy in which an American firm does not feature in the “top three” list.

It is important to remember that the economic preponderance of the US is inseparable from its structural power, which is the power to shape the global economy in a particular way. After all, the Bretton Woods system, set up by the US after the Second World War, still constitutes the basic structure of the world economy. Thus, we can regard the



How can this country be so rich? I see so many poor people here. Most of them are non-White.

Gross Domestic Product 2005



Gross Domestic Product 2005 (Purchasing Power Parity)



Source: World Development Indicators database, World Bank, 1 July, 2006, accessed from <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/DATASTATISTICS/Resources/GDP.pdf>

The American economy is the largest in the world, but unlike in the sphere of military power, the US faces credible competitors in the world economy. This becomes even clearer if we consider the world economy in Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) terms as in the graphic on the right. PPP is what a nation's currency actually buys in goods and services.

World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Trade Organisation (WTO) as the products of American hegemony.

A classic example of the structural power of the US is the academic degree called the Master's in Business Administration (MBA). The idea that business is a profession that depends upon skills that can be taught in a university is uniquely American. The first business school in the world, the Wharton School at the University of Pennsylvania, was established in 1881. The first MBA courses were initiated around 1900. The first MBA course outside the US was established only in 1950. Today, there is no country in the world in which the MBA is not a prestigious academic degree. This takes us back to our South African friend Jabu. Structural hegemony explains why Jabu's father is insisting that his son gives up painting and studies for the MBA instead.



If I had opted for the Science subjects I would have to sit for the entrance exams to medical or engineering college. That would mean competing with so many others who wish to become doctors or engineers so as to go to the US.

HEGEMONY AS SOFT POWER

It would however be a mistake to see US hegemony in purely military and economic terms without considering the ideological or the cultural dimension of US hegemony. This third sense of hegemony is about the capacity to 'manufacture consent'. Here, hegemony implies class ascendancy in the social, political and particularly *ideological* spheres. Hegemony arises when the dominant class or country can

win the consent of dominated classes, by persuading the dominated classes to view the world in a manner favourable to the ascendancy of the dominant class. Adapted to the field of world politics, this notion of hegemony suggests that a dominant power deploys not only military power but also ideological resources to shape the behaviour of competing and lesser powers. The behaviour of the weaker countries is influenced in ways that favour the interests of the most powerful country, in particular its desire to remain pre-eminent. Consent, in other words, goes hand-in-hand with, and is often more effective than, coercion.

The predominance of the US in the world today is based not only on its military power and economic prowess, but also on its cultural presence. Whether we choose to recognise the fact or not, all ideas of the good life and personal success, most of the dreams of individuals and societies across the globe, are dreams churned out by practices prevailing in twentieth-century America. America is the most seductive, and in this sense the most powerful, culture on earth. This attribute is called 'soft power': the ability to persuade rather than coerce. Over time we get so used to hegemony that we hardly notice it, any more than we notice the rivers, birds, and trees around us.

You couldn't have forgotten Andrei and his 'cool' pair of blue jeans. When his parents were youngsters in the Soviet Union,

blue jeans were the ultimate symbol of 'liberation' for their generation. Young men and women often spent over a year's salary to buy blue jeans from foreign tourists on the black market. Somehow, for an entire Soviet generation blue jeans came to represent aspirations of the 'good life' that were not available in their own country.

During the Cold War, the US found it difficult to score victories against the Soviet Union in the realm of hard power. It was in the area of structural power and soft power that the US scored notable victories. Although the Soviet centrally-planned economy provided an alternate model of internal economic organisation, the world economy throughout the Cold War years remained a world capitalist economy. But it was in the area of soft power that the US was ultimately triumphant. As the example of blue jeans in



That is strange!
I never think of the US when buying jeans for myself. How can I still be a victim of US hegemony?

All these images are from Jakarta in Indonesia. Identify elements of US hegemony in each of these photographs. Can you identify similar elements on your way back from school to home?

the Soviet Union clearly shows, the US was able to engineer a generational divide in Soviet society on the basis of a cultural product.

CONSTRAINTS ON AMERICAN POWER

History tells us that empires decline because they decay from within. Similarly, the biggest constraints to American hegemony lie within the heart of hegemony itself. We can identify three constraints on American power. None of these constraints seemed to operate in the years following 9/11. However, it now appears that all three of these constraints are slowly beginning to operate again.

The first constraint is the institutional architecture of the American state itself. A system of division of powers between the

three branches of government places significant brakes upon the unrestrained and immoderate exercise of America's military power by the executive branch.

The second constraint on American power is also domestic in nature, and stems from the open nature of American society. Although the American mass media may from time to time impose or promote a particular perspective on domestic public opinion in the US, there is nevertheless a deep scepticism regarding the purposes and methods of government in American political culture. This factor, in the long run, is a huge constraint on US military action overseas.

However, it is the third constraint on the US that is perhaps the most important. There is only one organisation in the international system that



These two photographs are from an exhibition on the Human Costs of the Iraq War by the American Friends Service Committee organised at the National Convention of the Democratic Party in 2004. To what extent do protests like this constrain the US government?

could possibly moderate the exercise of American power today, and that is the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). The US obviously has an enormous interest in keeping the alliance of democracies that follow the market economies alive and therefore it is possible that its allies in the NATO will be able to moderate the exercise of US hegemony.

INDIA'S RELATIONSHIP WITH THE US

During the Cold War years, India found itself on the opposite side of the divide from the US. India's closest friendship during those years was with the Soviet Union. After the collapse of the Soviet Union, India suddenly found itself friendless in an increasingly hostile international environment. However, these were also the years when India decided to liberalise its economy and integrate it with the global economy. This policy and India's impressive economic growth rates in recent years have made the country an attractive economic partner for a number of countries including the US.

It is important that we do not lose sight of the fact that two new factors have emerged in Indo-US relations in recent years. These factors relate to the technological dimension and the role of the Indian-American diaspora. Indeed, these two factors are

interrelated. Consider the following facts:

- The US absorbs about 65 per cent of India's total exports in the software sector.
- 35 per cent of the technical staff of Boeing is estimated to be of Indian origin.
- 300,000 Indians work in Silicon Valley.
- 15 percent of all high-tech start-ups are by Indian-Americans.

Like all other countries, India too has to decide exactly what type of relationship it wants with the US in this phase of global hegemony. The choices are not exactly easy. Within India, the debate seems to be around three possible strategies.

- Those Indian analysts who see international politics largely in terms of military power are fearful of the growing closeness between India and the US. They would prefer that India maintains its aloofness from Washington and focuses upon increasing its own comprehensive national power.
- Other analysts see the growing convergence of interests between the US and India as a historic opportunity for India. They advocate a strategy that would allow India to take advantage of US hegemony and the mutual convergences to establish the best possible options for itself. Opposing the US, they argue, is a futile



As soon as I say I am from India, they ask me if I am a computer engineer. That feels nice.

Collect news clippings and articles about the recent Indo-US civil nuclear deal. Summarise the position of the supporters and opponents of the deal.

LET'S DO IT



LOK SABHA DEBATES INDO-US RELATIONS

Here are three extracts from the speeches by the Prime Minister and two opposition leaders during the debate in Lok Sabha on the Indo-US agreement on nuclear energy. Are these three positions in some way linked to the three strategies mentioned in the chapter?

Dr Manmohan Singh, Congress

“Sir, I would respectfully urge this august House to recognise the changed mood of the world towards India. This is not to say that power politics is a thing of the past; that there will never be any attempt to twist our arms. We will protect ourselves to ensure against the risks that are there. But it would be wrong for us not to take advantage of the opportunities that are now on the horizon. I sincerely believe that it is in the interest of our country to have good relations with all the major powers. I make no apology that we seek good relations with the United States. The United States is a pre-eminent power.”

Shri Basu Deb Acharya, CPI(M)

“Since Independence, we have been pursuing independent foreign policy because of our national interest. What have we seen in case of Iraq and in case of Iran? After the July statement, and when there was voting in International Atomic Energy Agency, we found that we sided with the United States of America. We supported the resolution moved by US and P 5. That was not expected before that. When we were trying to bring gas from Iran *via* Pakistan which we need, we supported America’s stand in regard to Iran. There we find that the independent foreign policy has been affected.”

Maj. Gen. (Retd.) B. C. Khanduri, BJP

“We have also to take note of the fact that today US is — whether we like it or not — the only superpower in this unipolar world. But at the same time, we must also remember that India is also emerging as a world power, and a superpower. Therefore, we feel that we should have good relations with the USA in the international scenario, but it should not be at the cost of our security.”

strategy that will only hurt India in the long run.

- A third group of analysts would advocate that India should take the lead in establishing a coalition of countries from the developing world. Over time, this coalition would become more powerful and may succeed in weaning the hegemon away from its dominating ways.

India-US relations are perhaps too complex to be managed by a single strategy. India needs to develop an appropriate mix of foreign policy strategies to deal with the US.

HOW CAN HEGEMONY BE OVERCOME?

How long will hegemony last? How do we get beyond hegemony? These become, for obvious reasons, some of the burning questions of our time. History provides us with some fascinating clues to answer these questions. But what about the present and the future? In international politics, very few factors formally curtail the exercise of military power by any country. There is no world government like the government of a country. As we shall see in Chapter 6, international organisation is not world government. Thus, international politics is ‘politics without government’. There are some rules and norms called the laws of war that restrict, but do

not prohibit, war. But few states will entrust their security to international law alone. Does this mean that there is no escape from war and hegemony?

In the short term, we must recognise that no single power is anywhere near balancing the US militarily. A military coalition against the US is even less likely given the differences that exist among big countries like China, India, and Russia that have the potential to challenge US hegemony.

Some people argue that it is strategically more prudent to take advantage of the opportunities that hegemony creates. For instance, raising economic growth rates requires increased trade, technology transfers, and investment, which are best acquired by working with rather than against the hegemon. Thus, it is suggested that instead of engaging in activities opposed to the hegemonic power, it may be advisable to extract benefits by operating within the hegemonic system. This is called the 'bandwagon' strategy.

Another strategy open to states is to 'hide'. This implies staying as far removed from the dominant power as possible. There are many examples of this behaviour. China, Russia, the European Union—all of them, in different ways, are seeking to stay below the radar, as it were, and not overly and unduly antagonise the US. However, this would not



How long do you think the US will stay on the super-power stage? If you were to draw this, who would you show as waiting in the wings?

seem to be viable for the big, second-rank powers for very long. While it may be an attractive, viable policy for small states, it is hard to imagine mega-states like China, India, and Russia or huge agglomerations such as the EU being able to hide for any substantial length of time.

Some people believe that resistance to American hegemony may not come from other states, which as we have seen are powerless to confront the US today, but rather from non-state actors. These challenges to American hegemony will emerge in the economic and cultural realms, and will come from a combination of non-governmental organisations (NGOs), social movements, and public opinion; it may arise from sections of the media and intellectuals, artists, and writers. These various actors

LET'S DO IT TOGETHER

STEPS

- Assign students to major geo-political regions of the world from the vantage point of the US (Central America, South America, Africa, Europe, former USSR, West Asia, South Asia, East Asia and Australia). Alternatively, you could assign students to major conflict zones of the post-Cold War period in which the US was involved. (e.g., Afghanistan, Iraq, Israel-Palestine or Kosovo or any active conflict at the time of teaching).
- Group the students in equal strength according to the number of areas identified. Each group is to prepare a fact-file on the role of the US in these regions or conflicts. The fact-file should focus on the US interest in the region, its activities and the public opinion about the US in the region. Students can also collect and present related picture/cartoons from all available sources.
- Each group is to present their fact-file before the class.

Ideas for the Teacher

- Using the fact-file as the background information, the teacher has to refocus on the intervention made by the US and whether these interventions have been in line with the principles advocated by the UN.
- Invite the students to reflect on the future of the region or conflict twenty years from now. How long will the US continue to be hegemonic? Which other powers may be in a position to challenge US hegemony in that region?

may well form links across national boundaries, including with Americans, to criticise and resist US policies.

You might have heard the saying that we now live in a 'global village'. In this global village, we are all neighbours of the village headman. If the behaviour of the headman becomes intolerable, we will not have the option of leaving the global village, because this is the only world we know and the only village we have. Resistance will then be the only option available.



All this sounds like a lot of jealousy. What is our problem with US hegemony? Just that we were not born there? Or something else?



WHAT DOES HISTORY TEACH US ABOUT HEGEMONY?

Given the logic of balance of power, hegemony is a rather unusual condition in international affairs. This is for a very simple reason: in the absence of world government, every state must ensure its own security and, in extreme circumstances, its own survival. Thus, states are acutely aware of power distribution in the international political system, and would not normally allow a single state to become so powerful as to pose a mortal threat to other states.

The balance of power logic of international politics, as outlined above, is amply supported by history. By convention, we regard 1648 as the year in which the sovereign territorial state emerged as the principal actor in world politics. In the over three and a half centuries since then, there have been only two previous occasions when a single state succeeded in gaining preponderance in the system to a similar degree as the US predominates the system today. France from 1660 to 1713 in the context of European continental politics in the first instance of hegemony, Britain with its global maritime empire from 1860 to 1910 is the second.

History also tells us that although at its height hegemony seems formidable, it does not last forever. To the contrary, balance of power politics over time reduces the relative power of the hegemon. In 1660, France under Louis XIV was unchallenged; by 1713, England, Habsburg Austria and Russia were contesting French power. In 1860, the high noon of the Victorian period, Pax Britannica looked secure forever. By 1910, it was clear that Germany, Japan and the US had emerged as contenders to British power. Thus, twenty years from now, another great power, or maybe a coalition of great powers could well emerge just as US capabilities are declining in relative terms.

Based on an article by Christopher Layne, "The Unipolar Illusion: Why New Great Powers Will Rise"

1. Which among the following statements about hegemony is incorrect?
 - a. The word implies the leadership or predominance of one State.
 - b. It was used to denote the predominance of Athens in the ancient Greece.
 - c. The country having hegemonic position will possess unchallenged military power.
 - d. Hegemonic position is fixed. Once a hegemon, always a hegemon.
2. Which among the following statements is wrong about the contemporary world order?
 - a. There is an absence of world government, which could regulate the State's behaviour.
 - b. The US is the predominant player in world affairs.
 - c. States are using force against one another.
 - d. States, which violate international law, are severely punished by the UN.

EXERCISES

EXERCISES

3. Which among the following statements is wrong with regard to 'Operation Iraqi Freedom'?
 - a. More than forty countries joined in the US-led coalition of the willing to invade Iraq.
 - b. The reason given for invading Iraq was to prevent it from developing weapons of mass destruction.
 - c. The action was taken with the prior approval of the UN.
 - d. The US-led coalition did not face major resistance from Iraqi forces.
4. Give an example each of the three kinds of hegemony that are dealt with in the chapter. Do not cite examples that are in the chapter.
5. Mention three ways in which US dominance since the Cold War is different from its position as a superpower during the Cold War.
6. Match the following:

i. Operation Infinite Reach	
ii. Operation Enduring Freedom	
iii. Operation Desert Storm	
iv. Operation Iraqi Freedom	

 - a. War against Al-Qaeda and Taliban
 - b. Coalition of the willing
 - c. Missile attack in Sudan
 - d. First Gulf War
7. What are the constraints on American hegemony today? Which one of these do you expect to get more important in the future?
8. Read the three extracts in the chapter from the Lok Sabha debate on the Indo-US deal. Develop any one of these into a full speech defending a certain position on Indo-US relations.
9. "If big and resourceful states cannot resist the US hegemony, it is unrealistic to expect much smaller and weaker non-state actors to offer any resistance." Examine this proposition and give your opinion.

Chapter 4

Alternative Centres of Power

OVERVIEW

After the end of the bipolar structure of world politics in the early 1990s, it became clear that alternative centres of political and economic power could limit America's dominance. Thus, in Europe, the European Union (EU) and, in Asia, the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), have emerged as forces to reckon with. While evolving regional solutions to their historical enmities and weaknesses, both the EU and the ASEAN have developed alternative institutions and conventions that build a more peaceful and cooperative regional order and have transformed the countries in the region into prosperous economies. The economic rise of China has made a dramatic impact on world politics. In this chapter, we take a look at some of these emerging alternative centres of power and assess their possible role in the future.



The two images here represent two phases of the history of China. The red poster – “The Socialist Road is the Broadest of All” – represents the ideology that guided China during its early phase after the Revolution. The photograph below is that of the city of Shanghai, the symbol of China’s new economic power.

EUROPEAN UNION

As the Second World War came to an end, many of Europe's leaders grappled with the 'Question of Europe'. Should Europe be allowed to revert to its old rivalries or be reconstructed on principles and institutions that would contribute to a positive conception of international relations? The Second World War shattered many of the assumptions and structures on which the European states had based their relations. In 1945, the European states confronted the ruin of their economies and the destruction of the assumptions and structures on which Europe had been founded.

European integration after 1945 was aided by the Cold War. America extended massive financial help for reviving Europe's economy under what was called the 'Marshall Plan'. The US also created a new collective security structure under NATO. Under the Marshall Plan, the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation

(OEEC) was established in 1948 to channel aid to the west European states. It became a forum where the western European states began to cooperate on trade and economic issues. The Council of Europe, established in 1949, was another step forward in political cooperation. The process of economic integration of European capitalist countries proceeded step by step (see Timeline of European Integration) leading to the formation of the European Economic Community in 1957. This process acquired a political dimension with the creation of the European Parliament. The collapse of the Soviet bloc put Europe on a fast track and resulted in the establishment of the European Union in 1992. The foundation was thus laid for a common foreign and security policy, cooperation on justice and home affairs, and the creation of a single currency.


The European Union has evolved over time from an economic union to an increasingly political one. The EU has started to act more as a nation state. While the attempts to have a Constitution for the EU have failed, it has its own flag, anthem, founding date, and currency. It also has some form of a common foreign and security policy in its dealings with other nations. The European Union has tried to expand areas of cooperation while acquiring new



The European Union Flag

The circle of gold stars stands for solidarity and harmony between the people of Europe. It has twelve stars, as the number twelve is traditionally the symbol of perfection, completeness and unity.

Source: http://europa.eu/abc/symbols/embblem/index_en.htm



members, especially from the erstwhile Soviet bloc. The process has not proved easy, for people in many countries are not very enthusiastic in giving the EU powers that were exercised by the government of their country. There are also reservations about including some new countries within the EU.

The EU has economic, political and diplomatic, and military influence. The EU is the world's biggest economy with a GDP of

more than \$12 trillion in 2005, slightly larger than that of the United States. Its currency, the euro, can pose a threat to the dominance of the US dollar. Its share of world trade is three times larger than that of the United States allowing it to be more assertive in trade disputes with the US and China. Its economic power gives it influence over its closest neighbours as well as in Asia and Africa. It also functions as an important bloc in international



Oh, now I know what a Schengen visa means! Under the Schengen agreement, you have to get a visa from just one of the EU countries and that allows you entry in most of the other European Union countries.



TIMELINE OF EUROPEAN INTEGRATION

1951 April: Six west European countries, France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg sign the Treaty of Paris establishing the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC).

1957 March 25: These six countries sign the Treaties of Rome establishing the European Economic Community (EEC) and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom).

1973 January: Denmark, Ireland and the United Kingdom join the European Community (EC).

1979 June: First direct elections to the European Parliament.

1981 January: Greece joins the EC.

1985 June: The Schengen Agreement abolishes border controls among the EC members.

1986 January: Spain and Portugal join the EC.

1990 October: Unification of Germany.

1992 February 7: The Treaty of Maastricht was signed establishing the European Union (EU).

1993 January: The single market was created.

1995 January: Austria, Finland and Sweden join the EU.

2002 January: Euro, the new currency, was introduced in the 12 EU members.

2004 May: Ten new members, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia join the EU.

2007 January: Bulgaria and Romania join the EU. Slovenia adopts the Euro.

economic organisations such as the World Trade Organisation (WTO).

The EU also has political and diplomatic influence. Two members of the EU, Britain and

France, hold permanent seats on the UN Security Council. The EU includes several non-permanent members of the UNSC. This has enabled the EU to influence some US policies such as the current US position on Iran's nuclear programme. Its use of diplomacy, economic investments, and negotiations rather than coercion and military force has been effective as in the case of its dialogue with China on human rights and environmental degradation.

Militarily, the EU's combined armed forces are the second largest in the world. Its total spending on defence is second after the US. Two EU member states, Britain and France, also have nuclear arsenals of approximately 550 nuclear warheads. It is also the world's second most important source of space and communications technology.

As a supranational organisation, the EU is able to intervene in economic, political and social areas. But in many areas its member states have their own foreign relations and defence policies that are often at odds with each other. Thus, Britain's Prime Minister Tony Blair was America's partner in the Iraq invasion, and many of the EU's newer members made up the US-led 'coalition of the willing' whereas Germany and France opposed American policy. There is also a deep-seated 'Euro-skepticism' in some parts



© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

The cartoon appeared in 2003 when the European Union's initiative to draft a common constitution failed. Why does the cartoonist use the image of the ship Titanic to represent EU?

of Europe about the EU's integrationist agenda. Thus, for example, Britain's former prime minister, Margaret Thatcher, kept the UK out of the European Market. Denmark and Sweden have resisted the Maastricht Treaty and the adoption of the euro, the common European currency. This limits the ability of the EU to act in matters of foreign relations and defence.

ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH EAST ASIAN NATIONS (ASEAN)

Take a look at the political map of the world. Which countries would you say fall in the southeastern

region of Asia? Before and during the Second World War, this region of Asia suffered the economic and political consequences of repeated colonialisms, both European and Japanese. At the end of the war, it confronted problems of nation-building, the ravages of poverty and economic backwardness and the pressure to align with one great power or another during the Cold War. This was a recipe for conflict, which the countries of Southeast Asia could ill afford. Efforts at Asian and Third World unity, such as the Bandung Conference and the Non-Aligned Movement, were ineffective in establishing the conventions for informal cooperation and interaction. Hence, the Southeast Asian



Imagine what would happen if they have a European Union football team!



“Courtesy of the University of Texas Libraries, The University of Texas at Austin”

nations sought an alternative by establishing the Association for South East Asian Nations (ASEAN).

ASEAN was established in 1967 by five countries of this region — Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand — by signing the Bangkok Declaration. The objectives of ASEAN were primarily to accelerate economic growth and through that ‘social progress and

cultural development’. A secondary objective was to promote regional peace and stability based on the rule of law and the principles of the United Nations Charter. Over the years, Brunei Darussalam, Vietnam, Lao PDR, Myanmar (Burma) and Cambodia joined ASEAN taking its strength to ten.

Unlike the EU there is little desire in ASEAN for supranational structures and institutions. ASEAN countries have celebrated what has become known as the ‘ASEAN Way’, a form of interaction that is informal, non-confrontationist and cooperative. The respect for national sovereignty is critical to the functioning of ASEAN.


With some of the fastest growing economies in the world, ASEAN broadened its objectives beyond the economic and social spheres. In 2003, ASEAN moved along the path of the EU by agreeing to establish an ASEAN Community comprising three pillars, namely, the ASEAN Security Community, the ASEAN Economic Community and the ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community.



The ASEAN Flag

In the ASEAN logo, the ten stalks of paddy (rice) represent the ten Southeast Asian countries bound together in friendship and solidarity. The circle symbolises the unity of ASEAN.
Source : www.aseansec.org

Who are the members of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF)?



The ASEAN security community was based on the conviction that outstanding territorial disputes should not escalate into armed confrontation. By 2003, ASEAN had several agreements in place by which member states promised to uphold peace, neutrality, cooperation, non-interference, and respect for national differences and sovereign rights. The ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), which was established in 1994, is the organisation that carries out coordination of security and foreign policy.

ASEAN was and still remains principally an economic association. While the ASEAN region as a whole is a much smaller economy compared to the US, the EU, and Japan, its economy is growing much faster than all these. This accounts for the growth in its influence both in the region and beyond. The objectives of the ASEAN Economic Community are to create a common market and production base within ASEAN states and to aid social and economic development in the region. The Economic Community would also like to improve the existing ASEAN Dispute Settlement Mechanism to resolve economic disputes. ASEAN has focused on creating a Free Trade Area (FTA) for investment, labour, and services. The US and China have already moved fast to negotiate FTAs with ASEAN.

ASEAN is rapidly growing into a very important regional

organisation. Its Vision 2020 has defined an outward-looking role for ASEAN in the international community. This builds on the existing ASEAN policy to encourage negotiation over conflicts in the region. Thus, ASEAN has mediated the end of the Cambodian conflict, the East Timor crisis, and meets annually to discuss East Asian cooperation.

The current economic strength of ASEAN, especially its economic relevance as a trading and investment partner to the growing Asian economies such as India and China, makes this an attractive proposition. During the Cold War years Indian foreign policy did not pay adequate attention to ASEAN. But in recent years, India has tried to make amends. It signed FTAs with two ASEAN members, Singapore and



Isn't India a part of Southeast Asia? The north-eastern states are so close to the ASEAN countries.




Kesava, *The Hindu*

India's 'Look East' Policy since 1991 has led to greater economic interaction with the East Asian nations (ASEAN, China, Japan and South Korea).



Why did ASEAN succeed where SAARC did not? Is this because they do not have one dominant country in that region?

Thailand. It is trying to sign an FTA with ASEAN itself. ASEAN's strength, however, lies in its policies of interaction and consultation with member states, with dialogue partners, and with other non-regional organisations. It is the only regional association in Asia that provides a political forum where Asian countries and the major powers can discuss political and security concerns.



THE RISE OF THE CHINESE ECONOMY

Let us now turn to the third major alternative centre of power and our immediate neighbour, China. The cartoon on the following page sums up the current mood all over the world about the rise of China as an economic power. China's economic success since 1978 has been linked to its rise as a great power. China has been the fastest growing economy since the reforms first began there. It is projected to overtake the US as the world's largest economy by 2040. Its economic integration into the region makes it the driver of East Asian growth, thereby giving it enormous influence in regional

affairs. The strength of its economy, together with other factors such as population, land mass, resources, regional location and political influence, adds to its power in significant ways.

After the inception of the People's Republic of China in 1949, following the communist revolution under the leadership of Mao, its economy was based on the Soviet model. The economically backward communist China chose to sever its links with the capitalist world. It had little choice but to fall back on its own resources and, for a brief period, on Soviet aid and advice. The model was to create a state-owned heavy industries sector from the capital accumulated from agriculture. As it was short of foreign exchange that it needed in order to buy technology and goods on the world market, China decided to substitute imports by domestic goods.


This model allowed China to use its resources to establish the foundations of an industrial economy on a scale that did not exist before. Employment and social welfare was assured to all citizens, and China moved ahead of most developing countries in educating its citizens and ensuring better health for them. The economy also grew at a respectable rate of 5-6 per cent. But an annual growth of 2-3 per cent in population meant that economic growth was insufficient to meet the needs of a growing population. Agricultural production was not sufficient to

generate a surplus for industry. In Chapter 2, we discussed the crisis of the state controlled economy in the USSR. A similar crisis was to face China too: its industrial production was not growing fast enough, international trade was minimal and per capita income was very low.

The Chinese leadership took major policy decisions in the 1970s. China ended its political and economic isolation with the establishment of relations with the United States in 1972. Premier Zhou Enlai proposed the 'four modernisations' (agriculture, industry, science and technology and military) in 1973. By 1978, the then leader Deng Xiaoping announced the 'open door' policy and economic reforms in China. The policy was to generate higher productivity by investments of capital and technology from abroad.

China followed its own path in introducing a market economy. The Chinese did not go for 'shock therapy' but opened their economy step by step. The privatisation of agriculture in 1982 was followed by the privatisation of industry in 1998. Trade barriers were eliminated only in Special Economic Zones (SEZs) where foreign investors could set up enterprises. In China, the state played and continues to play a central role in setting up a market economy.

The new economic policies helped the Chinese economy to break from stagnation.



The Great Wall and Dragon are two symbols most commonly associated with China. This cartoon uses both these to depict China's economic rise. Who do you think is the little man in this cartoon? Can he stop the dragon?

Privatisation of agriculture led to a remarkable rise in agricultural production and rural incomes. High personal savings in the rural economy led to an exponential growth in rural industry. The Chinese economy, including both industry and agriculture, grew at a faster rate. The new trading laws and the creation of Special Economic Zones led to a phenomenal rise in foreign trade. China has become the most important destination for foreign direct investment (FDI) anywhere in the world. It has large foreign exchange reserves that now allow it to make big investment in other countries. China's accession to the



A total of 6 SEZs in China and more than 200 approved SEZs in India! Is this good for India?

© Mike Lane, Cagle Cartoons Inc.



China then and now

© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.



Chinese bicycle

Like the opening images for this chapter, the first cartoon comments on the change in China's orientation. The second cartoon uses the symbol of the bicycle — China is the largest user of bicycles in the world — to comment on a duality in today's China. What is this duality? Can we call this a contradiction?

WTO in 2001 has been a further step in its opening to the outside world. The country plans to deepen its integration into the world economy and shape the future world economic order.

While the Chinese economy has improved dramatically, not everyone in China has received the benefits of the reforms. Unemployment has risen in China with nearly 100 million people looking for jobs. Female employment and conditions of work are as bad as in Europe of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Environmental degradation and corruption have increased besides a rise in economic inequality between rural and urban residents and coastal and inland provinces.

However, regionally and globally, China has become an economic power to reckon with. The integration of China's economy and the inter-dependencies that this has created has enabled China to have considerable influence with its trade partners. Hence, its outstanding issues with Japan, the US, ASEAN, and Russia have been tempered by economic considerations. It hopes to resolve its differences with Taiwan, which it regards as a renegade province, by integrating it closely into its economy. Fears of China's rise have also been mitigated by its contributions to the stability of the ASEAN economies after the 1997 financial crisis. Its more outward looking investment and aid

policies in Latin America and Africa are increasingly projecting it as a global player on the side of developing economies.

INDIA – CHINA RELATIONS

India and China were great powers in Asia before the advent of Western imperialism. China had considerable influence and control on the periphery of its borders based on its unique tributary system. At different times in China's long history of dynastic rule, Mongolia, Korea, parts of Indo-China, and Tibet accepted China's authority. Various kingdoms and empires in India also extended their influence beyond their borders. In both cases this influence was political, economic and cultural. However, the regions where India and China exercised influence rarely ever overlapped. Thus, there was limited political and cultural interaction between the two. The result was that neither country was very familiar with the other. In the twentieth century, when both nations confronted each other, they had some difficulty evolving a foreign policy to deal with each other.

After India regained its independence from Britain, and China expelled the foreign powers, there was hope that both would come together to shape the future of the developing world and of Asia particularly. For a brief while, the slogan of 'Hindi-Chini bhai-bhai' was popular. However,

military conflict over a border dispute between the two countries marred that hope. Soon after independence, both states were involved in differences arising from the Chinese takeover of Tibet in 1950 and the final settlement of the Sino-Indian border. China and India were involved in a border conflict in 1962 over competing territorial claims principally in Arunachal Pradesh and in the Aksai Chin region of Ladakh.

The conflict of 1962, in which India suffered military reverses, had long-term implications for India-China relations. Diplomatic relations between the two countries were downgraded until 1976. Thereafter, relations between the two countries began to improve slowly. After the change in China's political leadership from the mid to late 1970s, China's policy became more pragmatic and less ideological. So it was prepared to put off the settlement of contentious issues while improving relations with India. A series of talks to resolve the border issue were also initiated in 1981.

Since the end of the Cold War, there have been significant changes in India-China relations. Their relations now have a strategic as well as an economic dimension. Both view themselves as rising powers in global politics, and both would like to play a

The Chinese President Hu Jintao was in India during November 2006. Find out about the agreements signed during his visit.

LET'S DO IT

LET'S DO IT TOGETHER

STEPS

- ▣ Divide the classroom into three groups.
- ▣ Assign each group one organisation to work on a fact file on the EU, ASEAN and SAARC.
- ▣ Students have to prepare a fact file that contains information on the objectives, functions and recent activities of these organisations. Pictures of the conferences / summit meetings can be collected.
- ▣ Each group is to present its fact file before the class.

Ideas for the Teacher

- ▣ The teacher is to focus on the functions of these organisations.
- ▣ Draw the attention of students to the achievements of regional organisations.
- ▣ Link the role of regional economic organisations to the overall development of the member countries.
- ▣ Sensitise students to the growing importance of regional economic organisations as an alternative approach to the peace and security of the world.



Some people say Chinese products are going to flood our market? But where are they?

major role in the Asian economy and politics.

Rajiv Gandhi's visit to China in December 1988 provided the impetus for an improvement in India–China relations. Since then both governments have taken measures to contain conflict and maintain 'peace and tranquility' on the border. They have also signed agreements on cultural exchanges and cooperation in science and technology, and opened four border posts for trade. With India–China trade growing at 30 per cent per year since 1999, a more

positive perspective on relations with China has emerged. Bilateral trade between India and China has increased from \$338 million in 1992 to more than \$18 billion in 2006. More recently, both countries have agreed to cooperate with each other in areas that could otherwise create conflict between the two, such as bidding for energy deals abroad. At the global level, India and China have adopted similar policies in international economic institutions like the World Trade Organisation.

India's nuclear tests in 1998, sometimes justified on the grounds of a threat from China, did not stop greater interaction. It is true that China was seen as contributing to the build up of Pakistan's nuclear programme. China's military relations with Bangladesh and Myanmar were viewed as hostile to Indian interests in South Asia. However, none of these issues is likely to lead to conflict between the two. One sign of this is that the talks to resolve the boundary question have continued without interruption and military-to-military cooperation is increasing. Indian and Chinese leaders and officials visit Beijing and New Delhi with greater frequency, and both sides are now becoming more familiar with each other. Increasing transportation and communication links, common economic interests and global concerns should help establish a more positive and sound relationship between the two most populous countries of the world.

JAPAN

You might have heard about famous Japanese brands such as Sony, Panasonic, Canon, Suzuki, Honda, Toyota, Mazda. They have a reputation for making high-technology products. Japan has very few natural resources and imports most of its raw materials. Even then it progressed rapidly after the end of the Second World War. It is the second largest economy in the world. It is the only Asian member of the G-8. It is the tenth most populous nation in the world.

Japan is the only nation that suffered the destruction caused by nuclear bombs. It is the second largest contributor to the regular budget of the UN, contributing almost 20 per cent of the total. Japan has a security alliance with the US since 1951. As per Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution, "the Japanese people forever renounce war as a sovereign right of the nation and the threat or use of force as means of settling international disputes." Although Japan's military expenditure is only one per cent of its GDP, it is the fourth largest in the world.

Keeping all this in mind, do you think Japan can effectively function as an alternative centre of power?

Also find out about the agreements signed during the visit of the Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh to Japan during December 2006.



ASIMO, The World's Most Advanced Humanoid Robot
Credit:

http://world.honda.com/news/2005/c_051213_13.html

1. Arrange the following in chronological order.

a. China's accession to WTO	b. Establishment of the EEC
c. Establishment of the EU	d. Birth of ARF
2. The 'ASEAN Way'
 - a. Reflects the life style of ASEAN members
 - b. A form of interaction among ASEAN members that is informal and cooperative
 - c. The defence policy followed by the ASEAN members
 - d. The road that connects all the ASEAN members
3. Who among the following adopted an 'open door' policy?

a. China	b. EU	c. Japan	d. USA
----------	-------	----------	--------
4. Fill in the blanks:
 - a. The border conflict between China and India in 1962 was principally over _____ and _____ region.
 - b. ARF was established in the year _____.
 - c. China entered into bilateral relations with _____ (a major country) in 1972.

EXERCISES

EXERCISES


- d. _____ Plan influenced the establishment of the Organisation for European Economic Cooperation in 1948.
 - e. _____ is the organisation of ASEAN that deals with security.
5. What are the objectives of establishing regional organisations?
 6. How does geographical proximity influence the formation of regional organisations?
 7. What are the components of the ASEAN Vision 2020?
 8. Name the pillars and the objectives of the ASEAN Community.
 9. In what ways does the present Chinese economy differ from its command economy?
 10. How did the European countries resolve their post-Second World War problem? Briefly outline the attempts that led to the formation of the European Union.
 11. What makes the European Union a highly influential regional organisation?
 12. The emerging economies of China and India have great potential to challenge the unipolar world. Do you agree with the statement? Substantiate your arguments.
 13. The Peace and prosperity of countries lay in the establishment and strengthening of regional economic organisations. Justify this statement.
 14. Identify the contentious issues between China and India. How could these be resolved for greater cooperation? Give your suggestions.

Chapter 5

Contemporary South Asia

OVERVIEW

Let us shift our gaze from the larger global developments in the post-Cold War era to developments in our own region, South Asia. When India and Pakistan joined the club of nuclear powers, this region suddenly became the focus of global attention. The focus was, of course, on the various kinds of conflict in this region: there are pending border and water sharing disputes between the states of the region. Besides, there are conflicts arising out of insurgency, ethnic strife and resource sharing. This makes the region very turbulent. At the same time, many people in South Asia recognise the fact that this region can develop and prosper if the states of the region cooperate with each other. In this chapter, we try to understand the nature of conflict and cooperation among different countries of the region. Since much of this is rooted in or conditioned by the domestic politics of these countries, we first introduce the region and the domestic politics of some of the big countries in the region.



Source: Subhas Rai's adaptation of 'Liberty Leading the People', painted by Eugene Delacroix in 1830. Courtesy of Himal Southasian, (January 2007) The Southasia Trust, Nepal

WHAT IS SOUTH ASIA?

We are all familiar with the gripping tension during an India-Pakistan cricket match. We have also seen the goodwill and hospitality shown to visiting Indian and Pakistani fans by their hosts when they come to watch a cricket match. This is symbolic of the larger pattern of South Asian affairs. Ours is a region where rivalry and goodwill, hope and despair, mutual suspicion and trust coexist.

Let us begin by asking an elementary question: what is South Asia? The expression 'South Asia' usually includes the following countries: Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka. The mighty Himalayas in the north and the vast Indian Ocean, the Arabian Sea and the Bay of Bengal in the south, west and east respectively provide a natural insularity to the region, which is largely responsible for the linguistic, social and cultural distinctiveness of the sub-continent. The boundaries of the region are not as clear in the east and the west, as they are in the north and the south. Afghanistan and Myanmar are often included in discussions of the region as a whole. China is an important player but is not considered to be a part of the region. In this chapter, we shall use South Asia to mean the seven countries mentioned above. Thus defined, South Asia stands for diversity in every sense and yet constitutes one geo-political space.

The various countries in South Asia do not have the same kind of political systems. Despite many problems and limitations, Sri Lanka and India have successfully operated a democratic system since their independence from the British. You will study more about the evolution of democracy in India in the textbook that deals with politics in India since independence. It is, of course, possible to point out many limitations of India's democracy; but we have to remember the fact that India has remained a democracy throughout its existence as an independent country. The same is true of Sri Lanka.

Pakistan and Bangladesh have experienced both civilian and military rulers, with Bangladesh remaining a democracy in the post-Cold War period. Pakistan began the post-Cold War period with successive democratic governments under Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif respectively. But it suffered a military coup in 1999 and has been run by a military regime since then. Till 2006, Nepal was a constitutional monarchy with the danger of the king taking over executive powers. In 2006 a successful popular uprising led to the restoration of democracy and reduced the king to a nominal position. From the experience of Bangladesh and Nepal, we can say that democracy is becoming an accepted norm in the entire region of South Asia.

Identify some features common to all the South Asian countries but different from countries in West Asia or Southeast Asia.

LET'S DO IT



Is there a fixed definition of these regions? Who decides that?

Similar changes are taking place in the two smallest countries of the region. Bhutan is still a monarchy but the king has initiated plans for its transition to multi-party democracy. The Maldives, the other island nation, was a Sultanate till 1968 when it was transformed into a republic with a presidential form of government. In June 2005, the parliament of the Maldives voted unanimously to introduce a multi-party system. The Maldivian Democratic Party (MDP) dominates the political affairs of the island. Democracy strengthened in the Maldives after the 2005 elections when some opposition parties were legalised.

Despite the mixed record of the democratic experience, the people in all these countries share the aspiration for democracy. A recent survey of the attitudes of the people in the five big countries of the region showed that there is widespread support for democracy in all these countries. Ordinary citizens, rich as well as poor and belonging to different religions, view the idea of democracy positively and support the institutions of representative democracy. They prefer democracy over any other form of democracy and think that democracy is suitable for their country. These are significant findings, for it was earlier believed that democracy could flourish and find support only in prosperous countries of the world.

Democracy is preferred over dictatorship everywhere except in Pakistan

Those who agree with one of these statements



	Bangladesh	India	Nepal	Pakistan	Sri Lanka
Democracy is preferable	69	70	62	37	71
Sometimes dictatorship is better	6	0	10	14	11
Doesn't matter to me	25	21	28	49	18

Very few doubt the suitability of democracy for their own country

How suitable is democracy for your country?



Both the se graphs are based on interviews with more than 19,000 ordinary citizens in the five countries of South Asia. Source: SDSA Team, State of Democracy in South Asia, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2007

Countries	Life expectancy at birth 2004	Adult literacy rate 2004	Combined gross school enrollment ratio 2004	GDP Per capita (PPP US\$) 2004	Infant mortality rate (per 1000 live births)	Prevalence of T.B. (per 1000 population)	Under-nourished population (%)	Population living under \$1 a day	Access to improved sanitation (% population)	Rural	Urban	HDI Rank 2006
World	67.3	-	87	8833	51	229	17					-
Developing countries	65.2	78.9	83	4775	57	275	17					
South Asia	63.7	60.9	86	2072	62	215	20					
Bangladesh	63.3	-	57	1870	56	435	30	36	71	41		137
India	63.6	61	62	3139	62	312	20	34.7	61	15		126
Nepal	62.1	48.6	57	1480	59	257	17	24.1	73	22		138
Pakistan	63.4	49.9	38	2225	80	329	23	17	95	43		134
Sri Lanka	74.3	90.7	63	4390	12	91	22	5.6	97	93		93

Source: Human Development Report, 2006



TIMELINE OF SOUTH ASIA SINCE 1947

1947: India and Pakistan emerge as independent nations after the end of British rule

1948: Sri Lanka (then Ceylon) gains independence; Indo-Pak conflict over Kashmir

1954-55: Pakistan joins the Cold War military blocs, SEATO and CENTO

1960 September: India and Pakistan sign the Indus Waters Treaty

1962: Border conflict between India and China

1965: Indo-Pak War; UN India-Pakistan Observation Mission

1966: India and Pakistan sign the Tashkent Agreement; Six-point proposal of Sheikh Mujib-ur Rahman for greater autonomy to East Pakistan

1971 March: Proclamation of Independence by leaders of Bangladesh

August: Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship signed for 20 years

December: Indo-Pak War; Liberation of Bangladesh

1972 July: India and Pakistan sign the Shimla Agreement

1974 May: India conducts nuclear test

1976: Pakistan and Bangladesh establish diplomatic relations

1985 December: South Asian leaders sign the SAARC Charter at the first summit in Dhaka

1987: Indo-Sri Lanka Accord; Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) operation in Sri Lanka (1987-90)

1988: India sends troops to the Maldives to foil a coup attempt by mercenaries

India and Pakistan sign the agreement not to attack nuclear installations and facilities of each other

1988-91: Democracy restoration in Pakistan, Bangladesh and Nepal

1996 December: India and Bangladesh sign the Farakka Treaty for sharing of the Ganga Waters

1998 May: India and Pakistan conduct nuclear tests

December: India and Sri Lanka sign the Free Trade Agreement (FTA)

1999 February: Indian PM Vajpayee undertakes bus journey to Lahore to sign a Peace Declaration

June-July: Kargil conflict between India and Pakistan

2001 July: Vajpayee - Musharraf Agra Summit unsuccessful

2004 January: SAFTA signed at the 12th SAARC Summit in Islamabad

In that sense the South Asian experience of democracy has expanded the global imagination of democracy.

Let us look at the experience of democracy in each of the four big countries of the region other than India.


THE MILITARY AND DEMOCRACY IN PAKISTAN

After Pakistan framed its first constitution, General Ayub Khan took over the administration of the country and soon got himself elected. He had to give up office when there was popular dissatisfaction against his rule. This gave way to a military takeover once again under General Yahya Khan. During Yahya's military rule, Pakistan faced the Bangladesh crisis, and after a war with India in 1971, East Pakistan broke away to emerge as an independent country called Bangladesh. After this, an elected government under the leadership of Zulfikar Ali Bhutto came to power in Pakistan from 1971 to 1977. The Bhutto government was removed by General Zia-ul-Haq in 1977. General Zia faced a pro-democracy movement from 1982 onwards and an elected democratic government was established once again in 1988 under the leadership of Benazir Bhutto. In the period that followed, Pakistani politics centred around the competition between her party, the Pakistan

People's Party, and the Muslim League. This phase of elective democracy lasted till 1999 when the army stepped in again and General Pervez Musharraf removed Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif. In 2001, General Musharraf got himself elected as the President. Pakistan continues to be ruled by the army, though the army rulers have held some elections to give their rule a democratic image.

Several factors have contributed to Pakistan's failure in building a stable democracy. The social dominance of the military, clergy, and landowning aristocracy has led to the frequent overthrow of elected governments and the establishment of military government. Pakistan's conflict with India has made the pro-military groups more powerful. These groups have often said that political parties and democracy in Pakistan are flawed, that Pakistan's security would be harmed by selfish-minded parties and chaotic democracy, and that the army's stay in power is, therefore, justified. While democracy has not been fully successful in Pakistan, there has been a strong pro-democracy sentiment in the country. Pakistan has a courageous and relatively free press and a strong human rights movement.

The lack of genuine international support for democratic rule in Pakistan has further encouraged the military to continue its dominance. The United States and other Western



Surendra, The Hindu

This cartoon comments on the dual role of Pakistan's ruler Pervez Musharraf as the President of the country and as the army General. Read the equations carefully and write down the message of this cartoon.

countries have encouraged the military's authoritarian rule in the past, for their own reasons. Given their fear of the threat of what they call 'global Islamic terrorism' and the apprehension that Pakistan's nuclear arsenal might fall into the hands of these terrorist groups, the military regime in Pakistan has been seen as the protector of Western interests in West Asia and South Asia.

DEMOCRACY IN BANGLADESH

Bangladesh was a part of Pakistan from 1947 to 1971. It consisted of the partitioned areas of Bengal and Assam from British India. The people of this region resented the domination of western Pakistan and the imposition of the Urdu language. Soon after the partition,



If Germany can be reunited, why can't the people of India and Pakistan at least travel more easily to each other's country?

they began protests against the unfair treatment meted out to the Bengali culture and language. They also demanded fair representation in administration and a fair share in political power. Sheikh Mujibur Rahman led the popular struggle against West Pakistani domination. He demanded autonomy for the eastern region. In the 1970 elections in the then Pakistan, the Awami League led by Sheikh Mujib won all the seats in East Pakistan and secured a majority in the proposed constituent assembly for the whole of Pakistan. But the government dominated by the West Pakistani leadership refused

to convene the assembly. Sheikh Mujib was arrested. Under the military rule of General Yahya Khan, the Pakistani army tried to suppress the mass movement of the Bengali people. Thousands were killed by the Pakistan army. This led to a large scale migration into India, creating a huge refugee problem for India. The government of India supported the demand of the people of East Pakistan for their independence and helped them financially and militarily. This resulted in a war between India and Pakistan in December 1971 that ended in the surrender of the Pakistani forces in East Pakistan and the formation of



A mural in Dhaka University to remember Noor Hossain who was killed by the police during pro-democracy protests against General Ershad in 1987. Painted on his back: "Let Democracy be Freed". Photo credit: Shahidul Alam / Drik

Bangladesh as an independent country.

Bangladesh drafted its constitution declaring faith in secularism, democracy and socialism. However, in 1975 Sheikh Mujib got the constitution amended to shift from the parliamentary to presidential form of government. He also abolished all parties except his own, the Awami League. This led to conflicts and tensions. In a dramatic and tragic development, he was assassinated in a military uprising in August 1975. The new military ruler, Ziaur Rahman, formed his own Bangladesh National Party and won elections in 1979. He was assassinated and another military takeover followed under the leadership of Lt Gen H. M. Ershad. The people of Bangladesh soon rose in support of the demand for democracy. Students were in the forefront. Ershad was forced to allow political activity on a limited scale. He was later elected as President for five years. Mass public protests made Ershad step down in 1990. Elections were held in 1991. Since then representative democracy based on multi-party elections has been working in Bangladesh.

MONARCHY AND DEMOCRACY IN NEPAL

Nepal was a Hindu kingdom in the past and then a constitutional monarchy in the modern period for many years. Throughout this period, political parties and the

common people of Nepal have wanted a more open and responsive system of government. But the king, with the help of the army, retained full control over the government and restricted the expansion of democracy in Nepal.

The king accepted the demand for a new democratic constitution in 1990, in the wake of a strong pro-democracy movement. However, democratic governments had a short and troubled career. During the nineties, the Maoists of Nepal were successful in spreading their influence in many parts of Nepal. They believed in armed insurrection against the monarch and the ruling elite. This led to a violent conflict between the Maoist guerrillas and the armed forces of the king. For some time, there was a triangular conflict among the monarchist forces, the democrats and the Maoists. In 2002, the king abolished the parliament and dismissed the government, thus ending even the limited democracy that existed in Nepal.

In April 2006, there were massive, country wide, pro-democracy protests. The struggling pro-democracy forces achieved their first major victory when the king was forced to restore the House of Representatives that had been dissolved in April 2002. The largely non-violent movement was led by the Seven Party Alliance (SPA), the Maoists and social activists.

Nepal's transition to democracy is not complete. At the moment, Nepal is undergoing a

Let's know more about Bangladesh's Grameen Bank. Can we make use of the idea to reduce poverty in India?





Nepal sounds really exciting. I wish I was in Nepal!

unique moment in its history because it is moving towards the formation of a constituent assembly that will write the constitution for Nepal. Some sections in Nepal still think that a nominal monarchy is necessary for Nepal to retain its link with the past. The Maoist groups have agreed to suspend armed struggle. They want the constitution to include the radical programmes of social and economic restructuring. All the parties in the SPA may not agree with this programme. The Maoists and some other political groups are also deeply suspicious of the Indian government and its role in the future of Nepal.

ETHNIC CONFLICT AND DEMOCRACY IN SRI LANKA

We have already seen that Sri Lanka has retained democracy

since its independence in 1948. But it faced a serious challenge, not from the military or monarchy but rather from ethnic conflict leading to the demand for secession by one of the regions.

After its independence, politics in Sri Lanka (it was then known as Ceylon) was dominated by forces that represented the interest of the majority Sinhala community. They were hostile to a large number of Tamils who had migrated from India to Sri Lanka and settled there. This migration continued even after independence. The Sinhala nationalists thought that Sri Lanka should not give 'concessions' to the Tamils because Sri Lanka belongs to the Sinhala people only. The neglect of Tamil concerns led to militant Tamil nationalism. From 1983 onwards, the militant organisation, the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam



Democracy activist, Durga Thapa, participating in a pro-democracy rally in Kathmandu in 1990. The second picture shows the same person in 2006, this time celebrating the success of the second democracy movement.

Photo credit: Min Bajracharya



(LTTE) has been fighting an armed struggle with the army of Sri Lanka and demanding 'Tamil Eelam' or a separate country for the Tamils of Sri Lanka. The LTTE controls the northeastern parts of Sri Lanka.

The Sri Lankan problem involves people of Indian origin, and there is considerable pressure from the Tamil people in India to the effect that the Indian government should protect the interests of the Tamils in Sri Lanka. The government of India has from time to time tried to negotiate with the Sri Lankan government on the Tamil question. But in 1987, the government of India for the first time got directly involved in the Sri Lankan Tamil question. India signed an accord with Sri Lanka and sent troops to stabilise relations between the Sri Lankan government and the Tamils. Eventually, the Indian Army got into a fight with the LTTE. The presence of Indian troops was also not liked much by the Sri Lankans. They saw this as an attempt by India to interfere in the internal affairs of Sri Lanka. In 1989, the Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) pulled out of Sri Lanka without attaining its objective.

The Sri Lankan crisis continues to be violent. However, international actors, particularly the Scandinavian countries such as Norway and Iceland have been trying to bring the warring groups back to negotiations. The future of the island hinges on the outcome of these talks.



Keshav, The Hindu

The cartoon depicts the dilemma of the Sri Lankan leadership in trying to balance Sinhala hardliners or the Lion and Tamil militants or the Tiger while negotiating peace.

In spite of the ongoing conflict, Sri Lanka has registered considerable economic growth and recorded high levels of human development. Sri Lanka was one of the first developing countries to successfully control the rate of growth of population, the first country in the region to liberalise the economy, and it has had the highest per capita gross domestic product (GDP) for many years right through the civil war. Despite the ravages of internal conflict, it has maintained a democratic political system.

INDIA-PAKISTAN CONFLICTS

Let us now move from domestic politics and take a look at some of the areas of conflict in the international relations in this region. The post-Cold War era has not meant the end of conflicts and

INDO-PAK. RELATIONS:
PROGRESSES FROM A MAZE OF BUNKERS-
TO A MAZE OF DIALOGUE TABLES...



Kesava, The Hindu

A view of the current phase of the Indo-Pak negotiations.

tensions in this region. We have already noted the conflicts around internal democracy or ethnic differences. But there are also some very crucial conflicts of an international nature. Given the position of India in this region, most of these conflicts involve India.

The most salient and overwhelming of these conflicts is, of course, the one between India and Pakistan. Soon after the partition, the two countries got embroiled in a conflict over the fate of Kashmir. The Pakistani government claimed that Kashmir belonged to it. Wars between India and Pakistan in 1947-48 and 1965 failed to settle the matter. The 1947-48 war resulted in the division of the province into Pakistan-occupied

Kashmir and the Indian province of Jammu and Kashmir divided by the Line of Control. In 1971, India won a decisive war against Pakistan but the Kashmir issue remained unsettled.

India's conflict with Pakistan is also over strategic issues like the control of the Siachen glacier and over acquisition of arms. The arms race between the two countries assumed a new character with both states acquiring nuclear weapons and missiles to deliver such arms against each other in the 1990s. In 1998, India conducted nuclear explosion in Pokaran. Pakistan responded within a few days by carrying out nuclear tests in the Chagai Hills. Since then India and Pakistan seem to have built a military relationship in which the possibility of a direct and full-scale war has declined.

But both the governments continue to be suspicious of each other. The Indian government has blamed the Pakistan government for using a strategy of low-key violence by helping the Kashmiri militants with arms, training, money and protection to carry out terrorist strikes against India. The Indian government also believes that Pakistan had aided the pro-Khalistani militants with arms and ammunitions during the period 1985-1995. Its spy agency, Inter Services Intelligence (ISI), is alleged to be involved in various anti-India campaigns in India's northeast, operating secretly through Bangladesh and Nepal.



Discussion on Kashmir sounds like a property dispute between the rulers of India and Pakistan! What do the Kashmiris feel about it?

The government of Pakistan, in turn, blames the Indian government and its security agencies for fomenting trouble in the provinces of Sindh and Balochistan.

India and Pakistan also have had problems over the sharing of river waters. Until 1960, they were locked in a fierce argument over the use of the rivers of the Indus basin. Eventually, in 1960, with the help of the World Bank, India and Pakistan signed the Indus Waters Treaty which has survived to this day in spite of various military conflicts in which the two countries have been involved. There are still some minor differences about the interpretation of the Indus Waters Treaty and the use of the river waters. The two countries are not in agreement over the demarcation line in Sir Creek in the Rann of Kutch. The dispute seems minor, but there is an underlying worry that how the dispute is settled may have an impact on the control of sea resources in the area adjoining Sir Creek. India and Pakistan are holding negotiations on all these issues.

INDIA AND ITS OTHER NEIGHBOURS

The governments of India and Bangladesh have had differences over several issues including the sharing of the Ganga and Brahmaputra river waters. The Indian government has been

unhappy with Bangladesh's denial of illegal immigration to India, its support for anti-Indian Islamic fundamentalist groups, Bangladesh's refusal to allow Indian troops to move through its territory to northeastern India, and its decision not to export natural gas to India or allow Myanmar to do so through Bangladeshi territory. Bangladeshi governments have felt that the Indian government behaves like a regional bully over the sharing of river waters, encouraging rebellion in the Chittagong Hill Tracts, trying to extract its natural gas and being unfair in trade. The two countries have not succeeded in resolving their boundary dispute.

Despite their differences, India and Bangladesh do cooperate on many issues. Economic relations have improved considerably in the last ten years. Bangladesh is a part of India's Look East policy that wants to link up with Southeast Asia via Myanmar. On disaster management and environmental issues, the two states have cooperated regularly. Efforts are on to broaden the areas of cooperation further by identifying common threats and being more sensitive to each other's needs.

Nepal and India enjoy a very special relationship that has very few parallels in the world. A treaty between the two countries allows the citizens of the two countries to travel to and work in the other country without visas and



Why is it that every one of our neighbours has a problem with India? Is there something wrong with our foreign policy? Or is it just our size?

LET'S DO IT TOGETHER

STEPS

- Divide the classroom into seven groups (as many as the number of countries). The number of students in each group may vary, reflecting the size of the countries of South Asia.
- Name each group after a country and hand over a brief country profile to respective groups. Besides the basic information, include a short note on the contentious issue/dispute among the South Asian countries. The issues could be those discussed in this chapter or an issue of relevance but not discussed in the chapter.
- Allow students to select an issue of their choice. The dispute could be bilateral or multilateral (the issue could be related to India, given the geographic peculiarity of the region).
- Assign each group to find out what initiatives the governments involved have taken and the reasons for their failures in resolving the dispute.
- Students should assume the role of representing their respective countries and share their findings.

Ideas for the Teacher

- Pair up the countries sharing the common issue/dispute. It could be two groups in the case of a bilateral issue or more in case of a multilateral issue (examples of bilateral issues include the Jammu and Kashmir dispute between India and Pakistan, the migrant problem between India and Bangladesh; multilateral issues include the creation of a free trade zone or tackling terrorism).
- Groups should negotiate on the proposals and counter-proposals within a time limit. The teacher is to take note of the outcome of the negotiations. The focus should be on the areas of agreement and disagreement.
- Link the outcome of the negotiations with the prevailing situation among the countries of South Asia. Talk about the difficulties involved in negotiating on a political issue based on the observation made. Conclude by discussing the importance of accommodating each other's interest for the sake of peaceful coexistence.

passports. Despite this special relationship, the governments of the two countries have had trade-related disputes in the past. The Indian government has often expressed displeasure at the warm relationship between Nepal and China and at the Nepal government's inaction against anti-Indian elements. Indian security agencies see the Maoist movement in Nepal as a growing security threat, given the rise of Naxalite groups in various Indian states from Bihar in the north to Andhra Pradesh in the south. Many leaders and citizens in Nepal think that the Indian government interferes in its internal affairs, has designs on its river waters and hydro-electricity, and prevents Nepal, a landlocked country, from getting easier access to the sea through Indian territory. Nevertheless, Indo-Nepal relations are fairly stable and peaceful. Despite differences, trade, scientific cooperation, common natural resources, electricity generation and interlocking water management grids hold the two countries together. There is a hope that the consolidation of democracy in Nepal will lead to improvements in the ties between the two countries.

The difficulties in the relationship between the governments of India and Sri Lanka are mostly over ethnic conflict in the island nation. Indian leaders and citizens find it impossible to remain neutral when Tamils are politically unhappy and are being killed. After the military intervention in 1987, the Indian

government now prefers a policy of disengagement vis-à-vis Sri Lanka's internal troubles. India signed a free trade agreement with Sri Lanka, which strengthened relations between two countries. India's help in post-tsunami reconstruction in Sri Lanka has also brought the two countries closer.

India enjoys a very special relationship with Bhutan too and does not have any major conflict with the Bhutanese government. The efforts made by the Bhutanese monarch to weed out the guerrillas and militants from northeastern India that operate in his country have been helpful to India. India is involved in big hydroelectric projects in Bhutan and remains the Himalayan kingdom's biggest source of development aid. India's ties with the Maldives remain warm and cordial. In November 1988, when some Tamil mercenaries from Sri Lanka attacked the Maldives, the Indian air force and navy reacted quickly to the Maldives' request to help stop the invasion. India has also contributed towards the island's economic development, tourism and fisheries.


You may have noticed that India has various problems with its smaller neighbours in the region. Given its size and power, they are bound to be suspicious of India's intentions. The Indian government, on the other hand, often feels exploited by its neighbours. It does not like the political instability in these countries, fearing it can help outside powers to gain influence in

the region. The smaller countries fear that India wants to be a regionally-dominant power.

Not all conflicts in South Asia are between India and its neighbours. Nepal and Bhutan, as well as Bangladesh and Myanmar, have had disagreements in the past over the migration of ethnic Nepalese into Bhutan and the Rohingyas into Myanmar, respectively. Bangladesh and Nepal have had some differences over the future of the Himalayan river waters. The major conflicts and differences, though, are between India and the others, partly because of the geography of the region, in which India is located centrally and is therefore the only country that borders the others.



If the chapter, on US was called 'US Hegemony' why is this chapter not called 'Indian Hegemony'?




Surendra, The Hindu

What does this cartoon tell you about the role of India and Pakistan in the process of regional cooperation in South Asia?



Keshav, The Hindu



Pakistan Tribune

The two cartoons, one from India and the other from Pakistan, interpret the role of two key players who are also interested in the region. Do you notice any commonality between the interpretations?



Every association seems to have emerged for trade! Is trade more important than people-to-people relations?

PEACE AND COOPERATION

Do the states of South Asia cooperate with each other? Or do they only keep fighting with each other? In spite of the many conflicts, the states of South Asia recognise the importance of cooperation and friendly relationship, among themselves. The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) is a major regional initiative by the South Asian states to evolve cooperation through multilateral means. It began in 1985. Unfortunately, due to persisting political differences, SAARC has not had much success. SAARC members signed the South Asian Free Trade (SAFTA) agreement which promised the formation of a free trade zone for the whole of South Asia.

A new chapter of peace and cooperation might evolve in South Asia if all the countries in the region allow free trade across the borders. This is the spirit behind the idea of SAFTA. The Agreement was signed in 2004 and came into effect on 1 January 2006. SAFTA aims at lowering trade tariffs by 20 percent by 2007. But some of our neighbours fear that SAFTA is a way for India to 'invade' their markets and to influence their societies and politics through commercial ventures and a commercial presence in their countries. India thinks that there are real economic benefits for all from SAFTA and that a region that trades more freely will be able to cooperate better on political issues. Some in India think that SAFTA is not worth the trouble since India already has bilateral agreements with Bhutan, Nepal and Sri Lanka.

Although India-Pakistan relations seem to be a story of endemic conflict and violence, there have been a series of efforts to manage tensions and build peace. The two countries have agreed to undertake confidence building measures to reduce the risk of war. Social activists and prominent personalities have collaborated to create an atmosphere of friendship among the people of both countries. Leaders have met at summits to understand each other better and to find solutions

to the major problems between the two neighbours. A number of bus routes have been opened up between the two countries. Trade between the two parts of Punjab has increased substantially in the last five years. Visas have been more easily given.

No region exists in a vacuum. It is influenced by outside powers and events no matter how much it may try to insulate itself from non-regional powers. China and the United States remain key players in South Asian politics. Sino-Indian relations have improved significantly in the last ten years, but China's strategic partnership with Pakistan remains a major irritant. The demands of development and globalisation have brought the two Asian giants closer, and their economic ties have multiplied rapidly since 1991.

American involvement in South Asia has rapidly increased after the Cold War. The US has had good relations with both India and Pakistan since the end of the Cold War and increasingly works as a moderator in India-Pakistan relations. Economic reforms and liberal economic policies in both countries have greatly increased the depth of American participation in the region. The large South Asian diasporas in the US and the huge size of the population and markets of the region also give America an added stake in the future of regional security and peace.

However, whether South Asia will continue to be known as a conflict prone zone or will evolve into a regional bloc with some common cultural features and trade interests will depend more on the people and the governments of the region than any other outside power.

1. Identify the country:

- a. The struggle among pro-monarchy, pro-democracy groups and extremists created an atmosphere of political instability:
- b. A landlocked country with multi-party competition:
- c. The first country to liberalise its economy in the South Asian region:
- d. In the conflict between the military and pro-democracy groups, the military has prevailed over democracy:
- e. Centrally located and shares borders with most of the South Asian countries:
- f. Earlier the island had the Sultan as the head of state. Now, it's a republic:
- g. Small savings and credit cooperatives in the rural areas have helped in reducing poverty:
- h. A landlocked country with a monarchy:

EXERCISES

EXERCISES

2. Which among the following statements about South Asia is wrong?
 - a) All the countries in South Asia are democratic.
 - b) Bangladesh and India have signed an agreement on river-water sharing.
 - c) SAFTA was signed at the 12th SAARC Summit in Islamabad.
 - d) The US and China play an influential role in South Asian politics.
3. What are some of the commonalities and differences between Bangladesh and Pakistan in their democratic experiences?
4. List three challenges to democracy in Nepal.
5. Name the principal players in the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka. How do you assess the prospects of the resolution of this conflict?
6. Mention some of the recent agreements between India and Pakistan. Can we be sure that the two countries are well on their way to a friendly relationship?
7. Mention two areas each of cooperation and disagreement between India and Bangladesh?
8. How are the external powers influencing bilateral relations in South Asia? Take any one example to illustrate your point.
9. Write a short note on the role and the limitations of SAARC as a forum for facilitating economic cooperation among the South Asian countries.
10. India's neighbours often think that the Indian government tries to dominate and interfere in the domestic affairs of the smaller countries of the region. Is this a correct impression?

Chapter 6

International Organisations

OVERVIEW

In this chapter we shall discuss the role of international organisations after the collapse of the Soviet Union. We shall examine how, in this emerging world, there were calls for the restructuring of international organisations to cope with various new challenges including the rise of US power. The potential reform of the United Nations Security Council is an interesting case of the reform process and its difficulties. We then turn to India's involvement in the UN and its view of Security Council reforms. The chapter closes by asking if the UN can play any role in dealing with a world dominated by one superpower. In this chapter we also look at some other trans-national organisations that are playing a crucial role.



This is the United Nations' logo. The emblem has a world map with olive branches around it, signifying world peace.

Credit : www.un.org

WHY INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS?

Read the two cartoons on this page. Both the cartoons comment on the ineffectiveness of the United Nations Organisation, usually referred to as the UN, in the Lebanon crisis in 2006. Both the cartoons represent the kind of opinions that we often hear about the UN.

On the other hand, we also find that the UN is generally regarded as the most important international organisation in today's world. In the eyes of many people all over the world, it is indispensable and represents the great hope of humanity for peace and progress. Why do we then need organisations like the UN? Let us hear two insiders:

"The United Nations was not created to take humanity to heaven, but to save it from hell."
— Dag Hammarskjold, the UN's second Secretary-General.

"Talking shop? Yes, there are a lot of speeches and meetings at the U.N., especially during the annual sessions of the General Assembly. But as Churchill put it, jaw-jaw is better than war-war. Isn't it better to have one place where all... countries in the world can get together, bore each other sometimes with their words rather than bore holes into each other on the battlefield?" — Shashi Tharoor, the former UN Under-Secretary-General for Communications and Public Information.

These two quotes suggest something important. International organisations are not the answer to everything, but they are important. International organisations help with matters of war and peace. They also help countries cooperate to make better living conditions for us all.

Countries have conflicts and differences with each other. That does not necessarily mean they must go to war to deal with their



That's what they say about the parliament too — a talking shop. Does it mean that we need talking shops?

© Harry Harrison, Cagle Cartoons Inc.



© Petar Pšemeštrović, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

During June 2006, Israel attacked Lebanon, saying that it was necessary to control the militant group called Hezbollah. Large numbers of civilians were killed and many public buildings and even residential areas came under Israeli bombardment. The UN passed a resolution on this only in August and the Israeli army withdrew from the region only in October. Both these cartoons comment on the role of the UN and its Secretary-General in this episode.

antagonisms. They can, instead, discuss contentious issues and find peaceful solutions; indeed, even though this is rarely noticed, most conflicts and differences are resolved without going to war. The role of an international organisation can be important in this context. An international organisation is not a super-state with authority over its members. It is created by and responds to states. It comes into being when states agree to its creation. Once created, it can help member states resolve their problems peacefully.

International organisations are helpful in another way. Nations can usually see that there are some things they must do together. There are issues that are so challenging that they can only be dealt with when everyone works together. Disease is an example. Some diseases can only be eradicated if everyone in the world cooperates in inoculating or vaccinating their populations. Or take global warming and its effects. As atmospheric temperatures rise because of the spread of certain chemicals called chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs), there is a danger that sea levels will also rise, thereby submerging many coastal areas of the world including huge cities. Of course, each country can try to find its own solution to the effects of global warming. But in the end a more effective approach is to stop the warming itself. This requires at least all of the major industrial powers to cooperate.

IMF

The International Monetary Fund (IMF) is an international organisation that oversees those financial institutions and regulations that act at the international level. The IMF has 184 member countries, but they do not enjoy an equal say. The top ten countries have 55 per cent of the votes. They are the G-8 members (the US, Japan, Germany, France, the UK, Italy, Canada and Russia), Saudi Arabia and China. The US alone has 17.4 per cent voting rights.



IMF

Unfortunately, recognising the need for cooperation and actually cooperating are two different things. Nations can recognise the need to cooperate but cannot always agree on how best to do so, how to share the costs of cooperating, how to make sure that the benefits of cooperating are justly divided, and how to ensure that others do not break their end of the bargain and cheat on an agreement. An international organisation can help produce information and ideas about how to cooperate. It can provide mechanisms, rules and a bureaucracy, to help members have more confidence that costs will be shared properly, that the benefits

Make a list of issues or problems (other than the ones mentioned in the text) that cannot be handled by any one country and require an international organisation.



FOUNDING OF THE UNITED NATIONS

1941 August: Signing of the Atlantic Charter by the US President Franklin D. Roosevelt and British PM Winston S. Churchill

1942 January: 26 Allied nations fighting against the Axis Powers meet in Washington, D.C., to support the Atlantic Charter and sign the 'Declaration by United Nations'

1943 December: Tehran Conference Declaration of the Three Powers (US, Britain and Soviet Union)

1945 February: Yalta Conference of the 'Big Three' (Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin) decides to organise a United Nations conference on the proposed world organisation

April-May: The 2-month long United Nations Conference on International Organisation at San Francisco

1945 June 26: Signing of the UN Charter by 50 nations (Poland signed on October 15; so the UN has 51 original founding members)

1945 October 24: the UN was founded (hence October 24 is celebrated as UN Day)

1945 October 30: India joins the UN

will be fairly divided, and that once a member joins an agreement it will honour the terms and conditions of the agreement.

With the end of the Cold War, we can see that the UN may have a slightly different role. As the United States and its allies emerged victorious, there was concern amongst many governments and peoples that the Western countries led by the US would be so powerful that there would be no check against their wishes and desires. Can the UN serve to promote dialogue and discussion with the US in particular, and could it limit the power of the American

government? We shall try to answer this question at the end of the chapter.


EVOLUTION OF THE UN

The First World War encouraged the world to invest in an international organisation to deal with conflict. Many believed that such an organisation would help the world to avoid war. As a result, the League of Nations was born. However, despite its initial success, it could not prevent the Second World War (1939-45). Many more people died and were wounded in this war than ever before.

The UN was founded as a successor to the League of Nations. It was established in 1945 immediately after the



The US Office of War Information created the above poster during the Second World War as per the Declaration by United Nations of 1942. The poster features the flags of all nations that were part of the Allied Forces. It reflects the belligerent origins of the UN.



Adapted from <http://www.newint.org/issue375/pics/un-map-big.gif>

LET'S DO IT!

Search for at least one news item about the activities of each of the UN agencies mentioned on this page.

Second World War. The organisation was set up through the signing of the United Nations Charter by 51 states. It tried to achieve what the League could not between the two world wars. The UN's objective is to prevent international conflict and to facilitate cooperation among states. It was founded with the hope that it would act to stop the conflicts between states escalating into war and, if war broke out, to limit the extent of hostilities. Furthermore, since conflicts often arose from the lack of social and economic development, the UN was intended to bring countries together to improve the prospects of social and economic development all over the world.

By 2006, the UN had 192 member states. These included almost all independent states. In the UN General Assembly, all members have one vote each. In the UN Security Council, there are five permanent members. These are: the United States, Russia, the United Kingdom, France and China. These states were selected as permanent members as they were the most powerful immediately after the Second World War and because they constituted the victors in the War.

The UN's most visible public figure, and the representative head, is the Secretary-General. The present Secretary-General is Ban Ki-Moon from South Korea. He is the eighth Secretary-General of the UN. He took over as the Secretary-General on 1 January

2007. He is the first Asian to hold the post since 1971.

The UN consists of many different structures and agencies. War and peace and differences between member states are discussed in the General Assembly as well as the Security Council. Social and economic issues are dealt with by many agencies including the World Health Organisation (WHO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Human Rights Commission (UNHRC), the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), and the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO), among others.

REFORM OF THE UN AFTER THE COLD WAR

Reform and improvement are fundamental to any organisation to serve the needs of a changing environment. The UN is no exception. In recent years, there have been demands for reform of the world body. However, there is little clarity and consensus on the nature of reform.

Two basic kinds of reforms face the UN: reform of the organisation's structures and processes; and a review of the issues that fall within the jurisdiction of the organisation. Almost everyone is agreed that both aspects of reform are



Cold War or no Cold War, one reform is needed above all. Only democratic leaders should be allowed to represent their countries in the UN. How can they allow dictators to speak in the name of the people of their country?

necessary. What they cannot agree on is precisely what is to be done, how it is to be done, and when it is to be done.

On the reform of structures and processes, the biggest discussion has been on the functioning of the Security Council. Related to this has been the demand for an increase in the UN Security Council's permanent and non-permanent membership so that the realities of contemporary world politics are better reflected in the structure of the organisation. In particular, there are proposals to increase membership from Asia, Africa and South America. Beyond this, the US and other Western countries want improvements in the UN's budgetary procedures and its administration.

On the issues to be given greater priority or to be brought within the jurisdiction of the UN, some countries and experts want the organisation to play a greater or more effective role in peace and security missions, while others want its role to be confined to development and humanitarian work (health, education, environment, population control, human rights, gender and social justice).

Let us look at both sets of reforms, with an emphasis on reform of the structures and processes.

The UN was established in 1945 immediately after the Second World War. The way it was

UN SECRETARIES-GENERAL

Tyggve Lie (1946-1952) Norway; lawyer and foreign minister; worked for cease fire between India and Pakistan on Kashmir; criticised for his failure to quickly end the Korean war; Soviet Union opposed second term for him; resigned from the post.



Dag Hammarskjöld (1953-1961) Sweden; Economist and lawyer; worked for resolving the Suez Canal dispute and the decolonisation of Africa; awarded Nobel Peace Prize posthumously in 1961 for his efforts to settle the Congo crisis; Soviet Union and France criticised his role in Africa.



U Thant (1961-1971) Burma (Myanmar); teacher and diplomat; worked for resolving the Cuban Missile Crisis and ending the Congo crisis; established the UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus; criticised the US during the Vietnam War.



Kurt Waldheim (1972-1981) Austria; diplomat and foreign minister; made efforts to resolve the problems of Namibia and Lebanon; oversaw the relief operation in Bangladesh; China blocked his bid for a third term.



Javier Perez de Cuellar (1982-1991) Peru; lawyer and diplomat; worked for peace in Cyprus, Afghanistan and El Salvador; mediated between Britain and Argentina after the Falklands War; negotiated for the independence of Namibia.



Boutros Boutros-Ghali (1992-1996) Egypt; diplomat, jurist, foreign minister; issued a report, *An Agenda for Peace*; conducted a successful UN operation in Mozambique; blamed for the UN failure in Bosnia, Somalia and Rwanda; due to serious disagreements, the US blocked a second term for him.



Kofi A. Annan (1997-2006) Ghana; UN official; created the Global Fund to fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria; declared the US-led invasion of Iraq as an illegal act; established the Peacebuilding Commission and the Human Rights Council in 2005; awarded the 2001 Nobel Peace Prize



Photo Credit: www.un.org



UN60: A Time for Renewal

Credit: www.un.org

organised and the way it functioned reflected the realities of world politics after the Second World War. After the Cold War, those realities are different. Here are some of the changes that have occurred:

- The Soviet Union has collapsed.
- The US is the strongest power.
- The relationship between Russia, the successor to the Soviet Union, and the US is much more cooperative.
- China is fast emerging as a great power, and India also is growing rapidly.
- The economies of Asia are growing at an unprecedented rate.
- Many new countries have joined the UN (as they became independent from the Soviet Union or former communist states in eastern Europe).
- A whole new set of challenges confronts the world (genocide, civil war, ethnic conflict,

terrorism, nuclear proliferation, climate change, environmental degradation, epidemics).

In this situation, in 1989, as the Cold War was ending, the question facing the world was: is the UN doing enough? Is it equipped to do what is required? What should it be doing? And how? What reforms are necessary to make it work better? For the past decade and a half, member states have been trying to find satisfactory and practical answers to these questions.

REFORM OF STRUCTURES AND PROCESSES

While the case for reform has widespread support, getting agreement on what to do is difficult. Let us examine the debate over reform of the UN Security Council. In 1992, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution. The resolution reflected three main complaints:

- The Security Council no longer represents contemporary political realities.
- Its decisions reflect only Western values and interests and are dominated by a few powers.
- It lacks equitable representation.


In view of these growing demands for the restructuring of the UN, on 1 January 1997, the UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan initiated an inquiry into how the

UN should be reformed. How, for instance, should new Security Council members be chosen?

In the years since then, the following are just some of the criteria that have been proposed for new permanent and non-permanent members of the Security Council. A new member, it has been suggested, should be:

- A major economic power
- A major military power
- A substantial contributor to the UN budget
- A big nation in terms of its population
- A nation that respects democracy and human rights
- A country that would make the Council more representative of the world's diversity in terms of geography, economic systems, and culture

Top 10 Contributors to the UN regular budget, 2005



World Bank



The World Bank was created immediately after the Second World War in 1945. Its activities are focused on the developing countries. It works for human development (education, health), agriculture and rural development (irrigation, rural services), environmental protection (pollution reduction, establishing and enforcing regulations), infrastructure (roads, urban regeneration, electricity) and governance (anti-corruption, development of legal institutions). It provides loans and grants to the member-countries. In this way, it exercises enormous influence on the economic policies of developing countries. It is often criticised for setting the economic agenda of the poorer nations, attaching stringent conditions to its loans and forcing free market reforms.

WORLD BANK

Clearly, each of these criteria has some validity. Governments saw advantages in some criteria and disadvantages in others depending on their interests and aspirations. Even if they had no desire to be members themselves, countries could see that the criteria were problematic. How big an economic or military power did you have to be to qualify for Security Council membership? What level of budget contribution would enable a state to buy its way into the Council? Was a big population an asset or a liability for a country trying to play a bigger role in the world? If respect for democracy and human rights was the criteria, countries with excellent records would be in line to be members; but would they be effective as Council members?

LET'S DO IT TOGETHER

STEPS

- Divide the class into six groups. Each group is to follow one of the six criteria (or more if there are more suggestions) listed here for permanent membership of the UN Security Council.
- Each group is to make its own list of the permanent members based on its given criterion (e.g. the group working on the 'population' criterion will find out the which are five most populous countries).
- Each group can make a presentation of their recommended list and reasons why their criterion should be accepted.

Ideas for the Teacher

- Allow the students to opt for the group whose criterion they themselves favour.
- Compare all the lists and see how many names are common and how often India features.
- Keep some time for an open ended discussion on which criterion should be adopted.

Furthermore, how was the matter of representation to be resolved? Did equitable representation in geographical terms mean that there should be one seat each from Asia, Africa, and Latin America and the Caribbean? Should the representation, on the other hand, be by regions or sub-regions (rather than continents)? Why should the issue of equitable representation be decided by geography? Why not by levels of economic development? Why not, in other words, give more seats to

members of the developing world? Even here, there are difficulties. The developing world consists of countries at many different levels of development. What about culture? Should different cultures or 'civilisations' be given representation in a more balanced way? How does one divide the world by civilisations or cultures given that nations have so many cultural streams within their borders?

A related issue was to change the nature of membership altogether. Some insisted, for instance, that the veto power of the five permanent members be abolished. Many perceived the veto to be in conflict with the concept of democracy and sovereign equality in the UN and thought that the veto was no longer right or relevant.

In the Security Council, there are five permanent members and ten non-permanent members. The Charter gave the permanent members a privileged position to bring about stability in the world after the Second World War. The main privileges of the five permanent members are permanency and the veto power. The non-permanent members serve for only two years at a time and give way after that period to newly elected members. A country cannot be re-elected immediately after completing a term of two years. The non-permanent members are elected in a manner so that they represent all continents of the world.

Most importantly, the non-permanent members do not have the veto power. What is the veto power? In taking decisions, the Security Council proceeds by voting. All members have one vote. However, the permanent members can vote in a negative manner so that even if all other permanent and non-permanent members vote for a particular decision, any permanent member's negative vote can stall the decision. This negative vote is the veto.

While there has been a move to abolish or modify the veto system, there is also a realisation that the permanent members are unlikely to agree to such a reform. Also, the world may not be ready for such a radical step even though the Cold War is over. Without the veto, there is the danger as in 1945 that the great powers would lose interest in the world body, that they would do what they pleased outside it, and that without their support and involvement the body would be ineffective.

Use of veto power upto 2006 by permanent members



JURISDICTION OF THE UN

The question of membership is a serious one. In addition, though, there are more substantial issues before the world. As the UN completed 60 years of its existence, the heads of all the member-states met in September 2005 to celebrate the anniversary and review the situation. The leaders in this meeting decided that the following steps should be taken to make the UN more relevant in the changing context.

- Creation of a Peacebuilding Commission
- Acceptance of the responsibility of the international community in case of failures of national governments to protect their own citizens from atrocities
- Establishment of a Human Rights Council (operational since 19 June 2006)
- Agreements to achieve the Millennium Development Goals
- Condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations
- Creation of a Democracy Fund
- An agreement to wind up the Trusteeship Council


It is not hard to see that these are equally contentious issues for the UN. What should a Peacebuilding Commission do? There are any number of conflicts all over the world. Which ones should it intervene in? Is it possible or even desirable for it to intervene



That's very unfair! It's actually the weaker countries who need a veto, not those who already have so much power.

What are the Millennium Development Goals?


LET'S DO IT!



© Pat Bagley, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

The humanitarian crisis in Darfur, Sudan since 2003 has attracted empty promises by the International Community. How do you think the UN can intervene in situations like this? Would that require a change in its jurisdiction?

in each and every conflict? Similarly, what is the responsibility of the international community in dealing with atrocities? What are human rights and who should determine the level of human rights violations and the course of action to be taken when they are violated? Given that so many countries are still part of the developing world, how realistic is it for the UN to achieve an ambitious set of goals such as those listed in the Millennium Development Goals? Can there be agreement on a definition of terrorism? How shall the UN use funds to promote democracy? And so on.



Adapted from <http://www.un.org/depts/dhl/maplib/flag.html>. Should the UN increase its peacekeeping activities? Place a star on the parts of the world where you would like to see the UN peacekeeping forces.

INDIA AND THE UN REFORMS

India has supported the restructuring of the UN on several grounds. It believes that a strengthened and revitalised UN is desirable in a changing world. India also supports an enhanced role for the UN in promoting development and cooperation among states. India believes that development should be central to the UN's agenda as it is a vital precondition for the maintenance of international peace and security.

One of India's major concerns has been the composition of the Security Council, which has remained largely static while the UN General Assembly membership has expanded considerably. India considers that this has harmed the representative character of the Security Council. It also argues that an expanded Council, with more representation, will enjoy greater support in the world community.

We should keep in mind that the membership of the UN Security Council was expanded from 11 to 15 in 1965. But, there was no change in the number of permanent members. Since then, the size of the Council has remained stationary. The fact remains that the overwhelming majority of the UN General Assembly members now are developing countries. Therefore, India argues that they should also have a role in shaping the decisions in the Security Council which affect them.

WTO

WTO

The World Trade Organisation (WTO) is an international organisation which sets the rules for global trade. This organisation was set up in 1995 as the successor to the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) created after the Second World War. It has 150 members. All decisions are taken unanimously but the major economic powers such as the US, EU and Japan have managed to use the WTO to frame rules of trade to advance their own interests. The developing countries often complain of non-transparent procedures and being pushed around by big powers.



India supports an increase in the number of both permanent and non-permanent members. Its representatives have argued that the activities of the Security Council have greatly expanded in the past few years. The success of the Security Council's actions depends upon the political support of the international community. Any plan for restructuring of the Security Council should, therefore, be broad-based. For example, the Security Council should have more developing countries in it.

Not surprisingly, India itself also wishes to be a permanent member in a restructured UN. India is the second most populous country in the world comprising almost one-fifth of the world population. Moreover, India is also the world's largest democracy. India has participated in virtually all of the initiatives of the UN. Its role in the UN's peacekeeping



Do we want to oppose the bossism of the big five or do we want to join them and become another boss?

IAEA

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was established in 1957. It came into being to implement US President Dwight Eisenhower's "Atoms for Peace" proposal. It seeks to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy and to prevent its use for military purposes. IAEA teams regularly inspect nuclear facilities all over the world to ensure that civilian reactors are not being used for military purposes.



efforts is a long and substantial one. The country's economic emergence on the world stage is another factor that perhaps justifies India's claim to a permanent seat in the Security Council. India has also made regular financial contributions to the UN and never faltered on its payments. India is aware that permanent membership of the Security Council also has symbolic importance. It signifies a country's growing importance in world affairs. This greater status is an advantage to a country in the conduct of its foreign policy: the reputation for being powerful makes you more influential.

Despite India's wish to be a permanent veto-wielding member of the UN, some countries question its inclusion. Neighbouring Pakistan, with which India has troubled relations, is not the only country that is reluctant to see India become a permanent veto member of the Security Council. Some countries, for instance, are concerned about India's nuclear weapons capabilities. Others



What happens if the UN invites someone to New York but the US does not issue visa?

think that its difficulties with Pakistan will make India ineffective as a permanent member. Yet others feel that if India is included, then other emerging powers will have to be accommodated such as Brazil, Germany, Japan, perhaps even South Africa, whom they oppose. There are those who feel that Africa and South America must be represented in any expansion of the permanent membership since those are the only continents not to have representation in the present structure. Given these concerns, it may not be very easy for India or anyone else to become a permanent member of the UN in the near future.

THE UN IN A UNIPOLAR WORLD

Among the concerns about the reform and restructuring of the UN has been the hope of some countries that changes could help the UN cope better with a unipolar world in which the US was the most powerful country without any serious rivals. Can the UN serve as a balance against US dominance? Can it help maintain a dialogue between the rest of the world and the US and prevent America from doing whatever it wants?

US power cannot be easily checked. First of all, with the disappearance of the Soviet Union, the US stands as the only superpower. Its military and economic power allow it to ignore

the UN or any other international organisation.

Secondly, within the UN, the influence of the US is considerable. As the single largest contributor to the UN, the US has unmatched financial power. The fact that the UN is physically located within the US territory gives Washington additional sources of influence. The US also has many nationals in the UN bureaucracy. In addition, with its veto power the US can stop any moves that it finds annoying or damaging to its interests or the interests of its friends and allies. The power of the US and its veto within the organisation also ensure that Washington has a considerable degree of say in the choice of the Secretary General of the UN. The US can and does use this power to “split” the rest of the world and to reduce opposition to its policies.

The UN is not therefore a great balance to the US. Nevertheless, in a unipolar world in which the US is dominant, the UN can and has served to bring the US and the rest of the world into discussions over various issues. US leaders, in spite of their frequent criticism of the UN, do see the organisation as serving a purpose in bringing together over 190 nations in dealing with conflict and social and economic development. As for the rest of the world, the UN provides an arena in which it is possible to modify US attitudes and policies. While the rest of the world is rarely



© Mike Lane, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL

Amnesty International

Amnesty International is an NGO that campaigns for the protection of human rights all over the world. It promotes respect for all the human rights in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. It believes that human rights are interdependent and indivisible. It prepares and publishes reports on human rights. Governments are not always happy with these reports since a major focus of Amnesty is the misconduct of government authorities. Nevertheless, these reports play an important role in research and advocacy on human rights.



Human Rights Watch

Human Rights Watch is another international NGO involved in research and advocacy on human rights. It is the largest international human rights organisation in the US. It draws the global media's attention to human rights abuses. It helped in building international coalitions like the campaigns to ban landmines, to stop the use of child soldiers and to establish the International Criminal Court.



united against Washington, and while it is virtually impossible to “balance” US power, the UN does provide a space within which arguments against specific US attitudes and policies are heard and compromises and concessions can be shaped.

The UN is an imperfect body, but without it the world would be worse off. Given the growing connections and links between societies and issues—what we often call ‘interdependence’—it is hard to imagine how more than seven billion people would live together without an organisation such as the UN. Technology promises to increase planetary interdependence, and therefore the importance of the UN will only increase. Peoples and governments will have to find ways of supporting and using the UN and other international organisations in ways that are consistent with their own interests and the interests of the international community more broadly.

EXERCISES

1. Mark correct or wrong against each of the following statements below about the veto power.
 - a. Only the permanent members of the Security Council possess the veto power.
 - b. It's a kind of negative power.
 - c. The Secretary-General uses this power when not satisfied with any decision.
 - d. One veto can stall a Security Council resolution.
2. Mark correct or wrong against each of the following statements below that describe the way the UN functions.
 - a. All security and peace related issues are dealt with in the Security Council.
 - b. Humanitarian policies are implemented by the main organs and specialised agencies spread across the globe.
 - c. Having consensus among the five permanent members on security issues is vital for its implementation.
 - d. The members of the General Assembly are automatically the members of all other principal organs and specialised agencies of the UN.

3. Which among the following would give more weightage to India's proposal for permanent membership in the Security Council?
 - a. Nuclear capability
 - b. It has been a member of the UN since its inception
 - c. It is located in Asia
 - d. India's growing economic power and stable political system
4. The UN agency concerned with the safety and peaceful use of nuclear technology is:
 - a. The UN Committee on Disarmament
 - b. International Atomic Energy Agency
 - c. UN International Safeguard Committee
 - d. None of the above
5. WTO is serving as the successor to which of the following organisations
 - a. General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs
 - b. General Arrangement on Trade and Tariffs
 - c. World Health Organisation
 - d. UN Development Programme
6. Fill in the blanks.
 - a. The prime objective of the UN is _____
 - b. The highest functionary of the UN is called _____
 - c. The UN Security Council has _____ permanent and _____ non-permanent members.
 - d. _____ is the present UN Secretary-General.
7. Match the principal organs and agencies of the UN with their functions:
 1. Economic and Social Council
 2. International Court of Justice
 3. International Atomic Energy Agency
 4. Security Council
 5. UN High Commission for Refugees
 6. World Trade Organisation
 7. International Monetary Fund
 8. General Assembly
 9. World Health Organisation
 10. Secretariat

EXERCISES

- a. Oversees the global financial system
 - b. Preservation of international peace and security
 - c. Looks into the economic and social welfare of the member countries
 - d. Safety and peaceful use of nuclear technology
 - e. Resolves disputes between and among member countries
 - f. Provides shelter and medical help during emergencies
 - g. Debates and discusses global issues
 - h. Administration and coordination of UN affairs
 - i. Providing good health for all
 - j. Facilitates free trade among member countries
8. What are the functions of the Security Council?
 9. As a citizen of India, how would you support India's candidature for the permanent membership of the Security Council? Justify your proposal.
 10. Critically evaluate the difficulties involved in implementing the suggested reforms to reconstruct the UN.
 11. Though the UN has failed in preventing wars and related miseries, nations prefer its continuation. What makes the UN an indispensable organisation?
 12. 'Reforming the UN means restructuring of the Security Council'. Do you agree with this statement? Give arguments for or against this position.

Chapter 7

Security in the Contemporary World

OVERVIEW

In reading about world politics, we frequently encounter the terms 'security' or 'national security'. Do we know what these terms mean? Often, they are used to stop debate and discussion. We hear that an issue is a security issue and that it is vital for the well-being of the country. The implication is that it is too important or secret to be debated and discussed openly. We see movies in which everything surrounding 'national security' is shadowy and dangerous. Security seems to be something that is not the business of the ordinary citizen. In a democracy, surely this cannot be the case. As citizens of a democracy, we need to know more about the term security. What exactly is it? And what are India's security concerns? This chapter debates these questions. It introduces two different ways of looking at security and highlights the importance of keeping in mind different contexts or situations which determine our view of security.



The concern about human security was reflected in the 1994 UNDP's Human Development Report, which contends, "the concept of security has for too long been interpreted narrowly... It has been more related to nation states than people... Forgotten were the legitimate concerns of ordinary people who sought security in their daily lives." The images above show various forms of security threats.



Who decides about my security? Some leaders and experts? Can't I decide what is my security?

WHAT IS SECURITY?

At its most basic, security implies freedom from threats. Human existence and the life of a country are full of threats. Does that mean that every single threat counts as a security threat? Every time a person steps out of his or her house, there is some degree of threat to their existence and way of life. Our world would be saturated with security issues if we took such a broad view of what is threatening.

Those who study security, therefore, generally say that only

those things that threaten 'core values' should be regarded as being of interest in discussions of security. Whose core values though? The core values of the country as a whole? The core values of ordinary women and men in the street? Do governments, on behalf of citizens, always have the same notion of core values as the ordinary citizen?

Furthermore, when we speak of threats to core values, how intense should the threats be? Surely there are big and small threats to virtually every value we hold dear. Can all those threats be brought into the understanding of security? Every time another country does something or fails to do something, this may damage the core values of one's country. Every time a person is robbed in the streets, the security of ordinary people as they live their daily lives is harmed. Yet, we would be paralysed if we took such an extensive view of security: everywhere we looked, the world would be full of dangers.

So we are brought to a conclusion: security relates only to extremely dangerous threats—threats that could so endanger core values that those values would be damaged beyond repair if we did not do something to deal with the situation.

Having said that, we must admit that security remains a slippery idea. For instance, have societies always had the same conception of security? It would be surprising if they did because



© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

caglecartoons.com/wgpano1

Taming Peace

Have you heard of 'peacekeeping force'? Do you think this is paradoxical term?

so many things change in the world around us. And, at any given time in world history, do all societies have the same conception of security? Again, it would be amazing if six hundred and fifty crore people, organised in nearly 200 countries, had the same conception of security! Let us begin by putting the various notions of security under two groups: traditional and non-traditional conceptions of security.

TRADITIONAL NOTIONS:

EXTERNAL

Most of the time, when we read and hear about security we are talking about traditional, national security conceptions of security. In the traditional conception of security, the greatest danger to a country is from military threats. The source of this danger is another country which by threatening military action endangers the core values of sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity. Military action also endangers the lives of ordinary citizens. It is unlikely that in a war only soldiers will be hurt or killed. Quite often, ordinary men and women are made targets of war, to break their support of the war.

In responding to the threat of war, a government has three basic choices: to surrender; to prevent the other side from attacking by promising to raise the costs of war to an unacceptable level; and to defend itself when war actually



ARES. caglecartoons.com/espanol

Economy of war

© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

breaks out so as to deny the attacking country its objectives and to turn back or defeat the attacking forces altogether. Governments may choose to surrender when actually confronted by war, but they will not advertise this as the policy of the country. Therefore, security policy is concerned with preventing war, which is called deterrence, and with limiting or ending war, which is called defence.

Traditional security policy has a third component called balance of power. When countries look around them, they see that some countries are bigger and stronger. This is a clue to who might be a threat in the future. For instance, a neighbouring country may not say it is preparing for attack. There may be no obvious reason for attack. But the fact that this country is very powerful is a sign



War is all about insecurity, destruction and deaths. How can a war make anyone secure?

© Christo Komarnicki, Cagle Cartoons Inc.



How do the big powers react when new countries claim nuclear status? On what basis can we say that some countries can be trusted with nuclear weapons while others can't be?

that at some point in the future it may choose to be aggressive. Governments are, therefore, very sensitive to the balance of power between their country and other countries. They do work hard to maintain a favourable balance of power with other countries, especially those close by, those with whom they have differences, or with those they have had conflicts in the past. A good part of maintaining a balance of power is to build up one's military power, although economic and technological power are also important since they are the basis for military power.

A fourth and related component of traditional security policy is alliance building. An alliance is a coalition of states that coordinate their actions to deter or defend against military attack. Most alliances are

formalised in written treaties and are based on a fairly clear identification of who constitutes the threat. Countries form alliances to increase their effective power relative to another country or alliance. Alliances are based on national interests and can change when national interests change. For example, the US backed the Islamic militants in Afghanistan against the Soviet Union in the 1980s, but later attacked them when Al Qaeda—a group of Islamic militants led by Osama bin Laden—launched terrorist strikes against America on 11 September 2001.

In the traditional view of security, then, most threats to a country's security come from outside its borders. That is because the international system is a rather brutal arena in which there is no central authority capable of controlling behaviour. Within a country, the threat of violence is regulated by an acknowledged central authority—the government. In world politics, there is no acknowledged central authority that stands above everyone else. It is tempting to think that the United Nations is such an authority or could become such an institution. However, as presently constituted, the UN is a creature of its members and has authority only to the extent that the membership allows it to have authority and obeys it. So, in world politics, each country has to be responsible for its own security.

TRADITIONAL NOTIONS:

INTERNAL

By now you will have asked yourself: doesn't security depend on internal peace and order? How can a society be secure if there is violence or the threat of violence inside its borders? And how can it prepare to face violence from outside its borders if it is not secure inside its borders?

Traditional security must also, therefore, concern itself with internal security. The reason it is not given so much importance is that after the Second World War it seemed that, for the most powerful countries on earth, internal security was more or less assured. We said earlier that it is important to pay attention to contexts and situations. While internal security was certainly a part of the concerns of governments historically, after the Second World War there was a context and situation in which internal security did not seem to matter as much as it had in the past. After 1945, the US and the Soviet Union appeared to be united and could expect peace within their borders. Most of the European countries, particularly the powerful Western European countries, faced no serious threats from groups or communities living within those borders. Therefore, these countries focused primarily on threats from outside their borders.

What were the external threats facing these powerful countries?

Again, we draw attention to contexts and situations. We know that the period after the Second World War was the Cold War in which the US-led Western alliance faced the Soviet-led Communist alliance. Above all, the two alliances feared a military attack from each other. Some European powers, in addition, continued to worry about violence in their colonies, from colonised people who wanted independence. We have only to remember the French fighting in Vietnam in the 1950s or the British fighting in Kenya in the 1950s and the early 1960s.

As the colonies became free from the late 1940s onwards, their security concerns were often similar to that of the European powers. Some of the newly-independent countries, like the European powers, became members of the Cold War alliances. They, therefore, had to worry about the Cold War becoming a hot war and dragging them into hostilities — against neighbours who might have joined the other side in the Cold War, against the leaders of the alliances (the United States or Soviet Union), or against any of the other partners of the US and Soviet Union. The Cold War between the two superpowers was responsible for approximately one-third of all wars in the post-Second World War period. Most of these wars were fought in the Third World. Just as the European colonial powers feared violence in the colonies, some colonial people feared, after independence, that they might be attacked by their

Browse through a week's newspaper and list all the external and internal conflicts that are taking place around the globe.





Third World Arms

© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

former colonial rulers in Europe. They had to prepare, therefore, to defend themselves against an imperial war.

The security challenges facing the newly-independent countries of Asia and Africa were different from the challenges in Europe in two ways. For one thing, the new countries faced the prospect of military conflict with neighbouring countries. For another, they had to worry about internal military conflict. These countries faced threats not only from outside their borders, mostly from neighbours, but also from within. Many newly-independent countries came to fear their neighbours even more than they feared the US or Soviet Union or the former colonial powers. They quarrelled over borders and territories or control of people and populations or all of these simultaneously.



Those who fight against their own country must be unhappy about something. Perhaps it is the insecurity that creates insecurity for the country.

Internally, the new states worried about threats from separatist movements which wanted to form independent countries. Sometimes, the external and internal threats merged. A neighbour might help or instigate an internal separatist movement leading to tensions between the two neighbouring countries. Internal wars now make up more than 95 per cent of all armed conflicts fought anywhere in the world. Between 1946 and 1991, there was a twelve-fold rise in the number of civil wars—the greatest jump in 200 years. So, for the new states, external wars with neighbours and internal wars posed a serious challenge to their security.

TRADITIONAL SECURITY AND COOPERATION

In traditional security, there is a recognition that cooperation in limiting violence is possible. These limits relate both to the ends and the means of war. It is now an almost universally-accepted view that countries should only go to war for the right reasons, primarily self-defence or to protect other people from genocide. War must also be limited in terms of the means that are used. Armies must avoid killing or hurting non-combatants as well as unarmed and surrendering combatants. They should not be excessively violent. Force must in any case be used only after all the alternatives have failed.

Traditional views of security do not rule out other forms of cooperation as well. The most important of these are disarmament, arms control, and confidence building. Disarmament requires all states to give up certain kinds of weapons. For example, the 1972 Biological Weapons Convention (BWC) and the 1992 Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) banned the production and possession of these weapons. More than 155 states acceded to the BWC and 181 states acceded to the CWC. Both conventions included all the great powers. But the superpowers — the US and Soviet Union — did not want to give up the third type of weapons of mass destruction, namely, nuclear weapons, so they pursued arms control.

Arms control regulates the acquisition or development of weapons. The Anti-ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty in 1972 tried to stop the United States and Soviet Union from using ballistic missiles as a defensive shield to launch a nuclear attack. While it did allow both countries



The text says: “When the Elevated or Under Attack, the Department of Homeland Security Terror Meter takes the uncertainty out of staying informed of the level of terror in our nation. Move the Terror Indicator to the current threat level, which corresponds to how terrified the American people are of the threat of terror attacks. Terror is all around us, and can strike at anytime. Thanks to the Terror Meter, you will never have to wonder how terrified you should be. Proceed with caution”.

to deploy a very limited number of defensive systems, it stopped them from large-scale production of those systems.

As we noted in Chapter 1, the US and Soviet Union signed a number of other arms control treaties including the Strategic Arms Limitations Treaty II or SALT II and the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1968 was an arms control treaty in the sense that it regulated the acquisition of nuclear weapons: those countries that had tested and manufactured nuclear weapons before 1967 were allowed to keep their weapons; and those that had not done so were to give up the right to acquire them. The NPT did not abolish nuclear weapons; rather, it limited the number of countries that could have them.



How funny! First they make deadly and expensive weapons. Then they make complicated treaties to save themselves from these weapons. They call it security!

Traditional security also accepts confidence building as a means of avoiding violence. Confidence building is a process in which countries share ideas and information with their rivals. They tell each other about their military intentions and, up to a point, their military plans. This is a way of demonstrating that they are not planning a surprise attack. They also tell each other about the kind of forces they possess, and they may share information on where those forces are deployed. In short, confidence building is a process designed to ensure that rivals do not go to war through misunderstanding or misperception.

Overall, traditional conceptions of security are principally concerned with the use, or threat of use, of military force. In traditional security, force is both the principal threat to security and the principal means of achieving security.

NON-TRADITIONAL NOTIONS


Non-traditional notions of security go beyond military threats to include a wide range of threats and dangers affecting the conditions of human existence. They begin by questioning the traditional referent of security. In doing so, they also question the other three elements of security — what is being secured, from what kind of threats and the approach to security. When we say referent we mean ‘Security for who?’ In the traditional security

conception, the referent is the state with its territory and governing institutions. In the non-traditional conceptions, the referent is expanded. When we ask ‘Security for who?’ proponents of non-traditional security reply ‘Not just the state but also individuals or communities or indeed all of humankind’. Non-traditional views of security have been called ‘human security’ or ‘global security’.

Human security is about the protection of people more than the protection of states. Human security and state security should be — and often are — the same thing. But secure states do not automatically mean secure peoples. Protecting citizens from foreign attack may be a necessary condition for the security of individuals, but it is certainly not



Now we are talking!
That is what I call real
security for real
human beings.



The cartoon comments on the massive expenditure on defence and lack of money for peace-related initiatives in the US. Is it any different in our country?

a sufficient one. Indeed, during the last 100 years, more people have been killed by their own governments than by foreign armies.

All proponents of human security agree that its primary goal is the protection of individuals. However, there are differences about precisely what threats individuals should be protected from. Proponents of the 'narrow' concept of human security focus on violent threats to individuals or, as former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan puts it, "the protection of communities and individuals from internal violence". Proponents of the 'broad' concept of human security argue that the threat agenda should include hunger, disease and natural disasters because these kill far more people than war, genocide and terrorism combined. Human security policy, they argue, should protect people from these threats as well as from violence. In its broadest formulation, the human security agenda also encompasses economic security and 'threats to human dignity'. Put differently, the broadest formulation stresses what has been called 'freedom from want' and 'freedom from fear', respectively.

The idea of **global security** emerged in the 1990s in response to the global nature of threats such as global warming, international terrorism, and health epidemics like AIDS and


bird flu and so on. No country can resolve these problems alone. And, in some situations, one country may have to disproportionately bear the brunt of a global problem such as environmental degradation. For example, due to global warming, a sea level rise of 1.5–2.0 meters would flood 20 percent of Bangladesh, inundate most of the Maldives, and threaten nearly half the population of Thailand. Since these problems are global in nature, international cooperation is vital, even though it is difficult to achieve.

NEW SOURCES OF THREATS

The non-traditional conceptions—both human security and global security—focus on the changing nature of threats to security. We will discuss some of these threats in the section below.

Terrorism refers to political violence that targets civilians deliberately and indiscriminately. International terrorism involves the citizens or territory of more than one country. Terrorist groups seek to change a political context or condition that they do not like by force or threat of force. Civilian targets are usually chosen to terrorise the public and to use the unhappiness of the public as a weapon against national governments or other parties in conflict.

The classic cases of terrorism involve hijacking planes or planting bombs in trains, cafes, markets





Taking the train

© Tab, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

and other crowded places. Since 11 September 2001 when terrorists attacked the World Trade Centre in America, other governments and public have paid more attention to terrorism, though terrorism itself is not new. In the past, most of the terror attacks have occurred in the Middle East, Europe, Latin America and South Asia.

Human rights have come to be classified into three types. The first type is political rights such as freedom of speech and assembly. The second type is economic and social rights. The third type is the rights of colonised people or ethnic and indigenous minorities. While there is broad agreement on this classification, there is no agreement on which set of rights should be considered as universal



Why do we always look outside when talking about human rights violations? Don't we have examples from our own country?



He doesn't exist!

human rights, nor what the international community should do when rights are being violated.

Since the 1990s, developments such as Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the genocide in Rwanda, and the Indonesian military's killing of people in East Timor have led to a debate on whether or not the UN should intervene to stop human rights abuses. There are those who argue that the UN Charter empowers the international community to take up arms in defence of human rights. Others argue that the national interests of the powerful states will determine which instances of human rights violations the UN will act upon.

Global poverty is another source of insecurity. World population—now at 650 crore—will reach 700 to 800 crore within 25 years and may eventually level out at 900 to 1000 crore. Currently, half the world's

population growth occurs in just six countries—India, China, Pakistan, Nigeria, Bangladesh and Indonesia. Among the world's poorest countries, population is expected to triple in the next 50 years, whereas many rich countries will see population shrinkage in that period. High per capita income and low population growth make rich states or rich social groups get richer, whereas low incomes and high population growth reinforce each other to make poor states and poor groups get poorer.

Globally, this disparity contributes to the gap between the Northern and Southern countries of the world. Within the South, disparities have also sharpened, as a few countries have managed to slow down population growth and raise incomes while others have failed to do so. For example, most of the world's armed conflicts now take



LET'S DO IT!
 Take a map of Africa and plot various threats to the people's security on that map.

place in sub-Saharan Africa, which is also the poorest region of the world. At the turn of the 21st century, more people were being killed in wars in this region than in the rest of the world combined.

Poverty in the South has also led to large-scale **migration** to seek a better life, especially better economic opportunities, in the North. This has created international political frictions. International law and norms make a distinction between migrants (those who voluntarily leave their home countries) and refugees (those who flee from war, natural disaster or political persecution). States are generally supposed to accept refugees, but they do not

have to accept migrants. While refugees leave their country of origin, people who have fled their homes but remain within national borders are called 'internally displaced people'. Kashmiri Pandits that fled the violence in the Kashmir Valley in the early 1990s are an example of an internally displaced community.

The world refugee map tallies almost perfectly with the world conflicts map because wars and armed conflicts in the South have generated millions of refugees seeking safe haven. From 1990 to 1995, 70 states were involved in 93 wars which killed about 55 lakh people. As a result, individuals, and families and, at times, whole communities have been forced to migrate because of generalised fear of violence or due to the destruction of livelihoods, identities and living environments. A look at the correlation between wars and refugee migration shows that in the 1990s, all but three of the 60 refugee flows coincided with an internal armed conflict.

Health epidemics such as HIV-AIDS, bird flu, and severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) have rapidly spread across countries through migration, business, tourism and military operations. One country's success or failure in limiting the spread of these diseases affects infections in other countries.

ORIGIN OF MAJOR REFUGEE POPULATIONS - 1 JAN. 2006 | TEN LARGEST GROUPS

ORIGIN	MAIN COUNTRIES OF ASYLUM	TOTAL ¹
Middle East	Pakistan / Iran / Germany / Netherlands / United Kingdom	1,908,100
Southern	China / Uganda / Congo / Ethiopia / Central African Rep.	691,300
DRC (DRC)	Tanzania / DR Congo / Rwanda / South Africa / Zambia	458,700
DRC (Congo)	Tanzania / Zambia / France / Rwanda / Uganda	410,600
Southern	France / Germany / United Kingdom / USA / Ethiopia	354,800
Viet Nam	China / Germany / USA / France / Switzerland	358,700
Palestine (West Bank)	Saudi Arabia / Egypt / Iraq / Libya / Algeria	340,700
Iran	Iran / Germany / Netherlands / Syria / United Kingdom	262,100
Yemen (Yemen)	Germany / Germany / USA / Netherlands / France	231,700
Ethiopia	Switzerland / United Kingdom / USA	231,100

¹ This table includes UNHCR estimates for sub-Saharan Africa in individual countries on the basis of recent refugee arrivals and active under-registration.

² UNHCR figures for Palestinian refugees living in camps who are assisted by UNRWA, of 2003 government estimates of 4.6 million in Lebanon, and subsequent registration exercises, suggest an additional 1.3 million (4.9 million) - some of whom may be refugees who living outside camps. The figure for Iran has been revised upwards since 1 January.

³ This figure does not include some 2.1 million Palestinian refugees who come under the separate mandate of the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA).

Credit: www.unhcr.org

By 2003, an estimated 4 crore people were infected with HIV-AIDS worldwide, two-thirds of them in Africa and half of the rest in South Asia. In North America and other industrialised countries, new drug therapies dramatically lowered the death rate from HIV-AIDS in the late 1990s. But these treatments were too expensive to help poor regions like Africa where it has proved to be a major factor in driving the region backward into deeper poverty.

Other new and poorly understood diseases such as ebola virus, hantavirus, and hepatitis C have emerged, while old diseases like tuberculosis, malaria, dengue fever and cholera have mutated into drug resistant forms that are difficult to treat. Epidemics among animals have major economic effects. Since the late 1990s, Britain has lost billions of dollars of income during an outbreak of the mad-cow disease, and bird flu shut down supplies of poultry exports from several Asian countries. Such epidemics demonstrate the growing interdependence of states making their borders less meaningful than in the past and emphasise the need for international cooperation.

Expansion of the concept of security does not mean that we can include any kind of disease or distress in the ambit of security. If we do that, the concept of security stands to lose its coherence. Everything could become a security issue. To qualify



Keshav, The Hindu

How should the world address issues shown here?

as a security problem, therefore, an issue must share a minimum common criterion, say, of threatening the very existence of the referent (a state or group of people) though the precise nature of this threat may be different. For example, the Maldives may feel threatened by global warming because a big part of its territory may be submerged with the rising sea level, whereas for countries in Southern Africa, HIV-AIDS poses a serious threat as one in six adults has the disease (one in three for Botswana, the worst case). In 1994, the Tutsi tribe in Rwanda faced a threat to its existence as nearly five lakh of its people were killed by the rival Hutu tribe in a matter of weeks. This shows that non-traditional conceptions of security, like traditional conceptions of security, vary according to local contexts.

© Aris, Cagle Cartoons Inc.



World Blindness

COOPERATIVE SECURITY

We can see that dealing with many of these non-traditional threats to security require cooperation rather than military

confrontation. Military force may have a role to play in combating terrorism or in enforcing human rights (and even here there is a limit to what force can achieve), but it is difficult to see what force would do to help alleviate poverty, manage migration and refugee movements, and control epidemics. Indeed, in most cases, the use of military force would only make matters worse!

Far more effective is to devise strategies that involve international cooperation. Cooperation may be bilateral (i.e. between any two countries), regional, continental, or global. It would all depend on the nature of the threat and the willingness and ability of countries to respond. Cooperative security may also involve a variety of other players, both international and national—international organisations (the UN, the World Health Organisation, the World Bank, the IMF etc.), non-governmental organisations (Amnesty International, the Red Cross, private foundations and charities, churches and religious organisations, trade unions, associations, social and

development organisations), businesses and corporations, and great personalities (e.g. Mother Teresa, Nelson Mandela).

Cooperative security may involve the use of force as a last resort. The international community may have to sanction the use of force to deal with governments that kill their own people or ignore the misery of their populations who are devastated by poverty, disease and catastrophe. It may have to agree to the use of violence against international terrorists and those who harbour them. Non-traditional security is much better when the use of force is sanctioned and applied collectively by the international community rather than when an individual country decides to use force on its own.

INDIA'S SECURITY STRATEGY

India has faced traditional (military) and non-traditional threats to its security that have emerged from within as well as outside its borders. Its security strategy has four broad components, which have been used in a varying combination from time to time.

The first component was strengthening its military capabilities because India has been involved in conflicts with its neighbours — Pakistan in 1947–48, 1965, 1971 and 1999; and China in 1962. Since it is surrounded by nuclear-



I feel happy when I hear that my country has nuclear weapons. But I don't know how exactly it makes me and my family more secure.

armed countries in the South Asian region, India's decision to conduct nuclear tests in 1998 was justified by the Indian government in terms of safeguarding national security. India first tested a nuclear device in 1974.

The second component of India's security strategy has been to strengthen international norms and international institutions to protect its security interests. India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, supported the cause of Asian solidarity, decolonisation, disarmament, and the UN as a forum in which international conflicts could be settled. India also took initiatives to bring about a universal and non-discriminatory non-proliferation regime in which all countries would have the same rights and obligations with respect to weapons of mass destruction (nuclear, biological, chemical). It argued for an equitable New International Economic Order (NIEO). Most importantly, it used non-alignment to help carve out an area of peace outside the bloc politics of the two superpowers. India joined 160 countries that have signed and ratified the 1997 Kyoto Protocol, which provides a roadmap for reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases to check global warming. Indian troops have been sent abroad on UN peacekeeping missions in support of cooperative security initiatives.

The third component of Indian security strategy is geared towards meeting security

challenges within the country. Several militant groups from areas such as the Nagaland, Mizoram, the Punjab, and Kashmir among others have, from time to time, sought to break away from India. India has tried to preserve national unity by adopting a democratic political system, which allows different communities and groups of people to freely articulate their grievances and share political power.

Finally, there has been an attempt in India to develop its economy in a way that the vast mass of citizens are lifted out of poverty and misery and huge economic inequalities are not allowed to exist. The attempt has not quite succeeded; we are still a very poor and unequal country. Yet democratic politics allows spaces for articulating the voice of the poor and the deprived citizens. There is a pressure on the democratically elected governments to combine economic growth with human development. Thus democracy is not just a political ideal; a democratic government is also a way to provide greater security. You will read more about the successes and failures of Indian democracy in this respect in the textbook on politics in India since independence.

Compare the expenditure by the Indian government on traditional security with its expenditure on non-traditional security.

LET'S DO IT



STEPS

- ▣ Narrate the following imaginary situation of four villages settled on the banks of a river.

Kotabagh, Gewali, Kandali and Goppa are villages adjoining each other beside a river. People in Kotabagh were the first settlers on the riverbank. They had an uninterrupted access to abundant natural resources available in the region. Gradually, people from different regions started coming to this region because of the abundant natural resources and water. Now there are four villages. With time the population of these villages expanded. But resources did not expand. Each village started making claims over natural resources including the boundary of the respective settlement. Inhabitants of Kotabagh argued for a greater share in natural resources, as they were the first settlers. Settlers of Kandali and Gewali said that as they have bigger populations than the others they both need a greater share. The people of Goppa said as they are used to an extravagant life they need a bigger share, though their population is smaller in size. All four villages disagreed with each other's demands and continued to use the resources as they wished. This led to frequent clashes among the villagers. Gradually, everybody felt disgusted with the state of affairs and lost their peace of mind. Now they all wish to live the way they had lived earlier. But they do not know how to go back to that golden age.

- ▣ Make a brief note describing the characteristics of each village — the description should reflect the actual nature of present-day nations.
- ▣ Divide the classroom into four groups. Each group is to represent a village. Hand over the village notes to the respective groups.
- ▣ The teacher is to allot a time (15 minutes) for group discussions on how to go back to the golden age. Each should develop its own strategy.

All groups are to negotiate freely among themselves as village representatives, to arrive at a solution (within 20 minutes). Each would put forth its arguments and counter arguments. The result could be: an amicable agreement accommodating the demands of all, which seldom happens; or, the entire negotiation/discussion ends without achieving the purpose.

Ideas for the Teacher

- Link the villages to nations and connect to the problems of security (threat to geographic territory/access to natural resources/insurgency, and so on).
- Talk about the observations made during the negotiation and explain how similarly the nations behave while negotiating on related issues.
- The activity could be concluded by making reference to some of the current security issues between and among nations.

1. Match the terms with their meaning:
 - i. Confidence Building Measures (CBMs)
 - ii. Arms Control
 - iii. Alliance
 - iv. Disarmament
 - a. Giving up certain types of weapons
 - b. A process of exchanging information on defence matters between nations on a regular basis
 - c. A coalition of nations meant to deter or defend against military attacks
 - d. Regulates the acquisition or development of weapons
2. Which among the following would you consider as a traditional security concern / non-traditional security concern / not a threat?
 - a. The spread of chikungunya / dengue fever
 - b. Inflow of workers from a neighbouring nation
 - c. Emergence of a group demanding nationhood for their region
 - d. Emergence of a group demanding autonomy for their region
 - e. A newspaper that is critical of the armed forces in the country
3. What is the difference between traditional and non-traditional security? Which category would the creation and sustenance of alliances belong to?
4. What are the differences in the threats that people in the Third World face and those living in the First World face?
5. Is terrorism a traditional or non-traditional threat to security?
6. What are the choices available to a state when its security is threatened, according to the traditional security perspective?
7. What is 'Balance of Power'? How could a state achieve this?
8. What are the objectives of military alliances? Give an example of a functioning military alliance with its specific objectives.
9. Rapid environmental degradation is causing a serious threat to security. Do you agree with the statement? Substantiate your arguments.

EXERCISES

10. Nuclear weapons as deterrence or defence have limited usage against contemporary security threats to states. Explain the statement.
11. Looking at the Indian scenario, what type of security has been given priority in India, traditional or non-traditional? What examples could you cite to substantiate the argument?
12. Read the cartoon below and write a short note in favour or against the connection between war and terrorism depicted in this cartoon.



© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

Chapter 8

Environment and Natural Resources

OVERVIEW

This chapter examines the growing significance of environmental as well as resource issues in world politics. It analyses in a comparative perspective some of the important environmental movements against the backdrop of the rising profile of environmentalism from the 1960s onwards. Notions of common property resources and the global commons too are assessed. We also discuss, in brief, the stand taken by India in more recent environmental debates. Next follows a brief account of the geopolitics of resource competition. We conclude by taking note of the indigenous peoples' voices and concerns from the margins of contemporary world politics.



The 1992 Earth Summit has brought environmental issues to the centre-stage of global politics. The pictures above show rainforest and mangroves.



Politics in forests,
 politics in water,
 politics in
 atmosphere! What is
 not political then?

ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERNS IN GLOBAL POLITICS

In this book we have discussed 'world politics' in a fairly limited sense: wars and treaties, rise and decline of state power, the relationship between the governments that represent their countries in the international arena and the role of inter-governmental organisations. In Chapter 7, we expanded the scope of world politics to include issues like poverty and epidemics. That may not have been a very difficult step to take, for we all think that governments are responsible for controlling these. In that sense they fall within the scope of world politics. Now consider some other issues. Do you think they fall within the scope of contemporary world politics?



Around the Aral Sea, thousands of people have had to leave their homes as the toxic waters have totally destroyed the fishing industry. The shipping industry and all related activities have collapsed. Rising concentrations of salt in the soil have caused low crop yields. Numerous studies have been conducted. In fact locals joke that if everyone who'd come to study the Aral had brought a bucket of water, the sea would be full by now. Source: www.gobartimes.org

- Throughout the world, cultivable area is barely expanding any more, and a substantial portion of existing agricultural land is losing fertility. Grasslands have been overgrazed and fisheries overharvested. Water bodies have suffered extensive depletion and pollution, severely restricting food production.
- According to the *Human Development Report 2006* of the United Nations Development Programme, 1.2 billion people in developing countries have no access to safe water and 2.6 billion have no access to sanitation, resulting in the death of more than three million children every year.
- Natural forests — which help stabilise the climate, moderate water supplies, and harbour a majority of the planet's biodiversity on land—are being cut down and people are being displaced. The loss of biodiversity continues due to the destruction of habitat in areas which are rich in species.
- A steady decline in the total amount of ozone in the Earth's stratosphere (commonly referred to as the ozone hole) poses a real danger to ecosystems and human health.
- Coastal pollution too is increasing globally. Although the open sea is relatively clean, the coastal waters are

becoming increasingly polluted largely due to land-based activities. If unchecked, intensive human settlement of coastal zones across the globe will lead to further deterioration in the quality of marine environment.

You might ask are we not talking here about ‘natural phenomena’ that should be studied in geography rather than in political science. But think about it again. If the various governments take steps to check environmental degradation of the kind mentioned above, these issues will have political consequences in that sense. Most of them are such that no single government can address them fully. Therefore they have to become part of ‘world politics’. Issues of environment and natural resources are political in another deeper sense. Who causes environmental degradation? Who pays the price? And who is responsible for taking corrective action? Who gets to use how much of the natural resources of the Earth? All these raise the issue of who wields how much power. They are, therefore, deeply political questions.

Although environmental concerns have a long history, awareness of the environmental consequences of economic growth acquired an increasingly political character from the 1960s onwards. The Club of Rome, a global think tank, published a book in 1972 entitled *Limits to Growth*, dramatising the potential depletion



Global Warming

© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

Why do you think the fingers are designed like chimneys and the world made into a lighter?

of the Earth’s resources against the backdrop of rapidly growing world population. International agencies, including the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), began holding international conferences and promoting detailed studies to get a more coordinated and effective response to environmental problems. Since then, the environment has emerged as a significant issue of global politics.

The growing focus on environmental issues within the arena of global politics was firmly consolidated at the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, in June 1992. This was also called the Earth Summit. The summit was

Collect news
clippings on
reports
linking
environment
and politics
in your own
locality.

LET'S DO IT!



© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

Are the different perspectives from which the rich and the poor countries agree to protect the Earth?

attended by 170 states, thousands of NGOs and many multinational corporations. Five years earlier, the 1987 Brundtland Report, *Our Common Future*, had warned that traditional patterns of economic growth were not sustainable in the long term, especially in view of the demands of the South for further industrial development. What was obvious at the Rio Summit was that the rich and developed

countries of the First World, generally referred to as the 'global North' were pursuing a different environmental agenda than the poor and developing countries of the Third World, called the 'global South'. Whereas the Northern states were concerned with ozone depletion and global warming, the Southern states were anxious to address the relationship between economic development and environmental management.

The Rio Summit produced conventions dealing with climate change, biodiversity, forestry, and recommended a list of development practices called 'Agenda 21'. But it left unresolved considerable differences and difficulties. There was a consensus on combining economic growth with ecological responsibility. This approach to development is commonly known as 'sustainable development'. The problem however was how exactly this was to be achieved. Some critics have pointed out that Agenda 21 was biased in favour of economic growth rather than ensuring ecological conservation. Let us look at some of the contentious issues in the global politics of environment.

THE PROTECTION OF GLOBAL COMMONS

'Commons' are those resources which are not owned by anyone but rather shared by a community. This could be a 'common room', a 'community centre', a park or a river. Similarly, there are some



ANTARCTICA

The Antarctic continental region extends over 14 million square kilometres and comprises 26 per cent of the world's wilderness area, representing 90 per cent of all terrestrial ice and 70 per cent of planetary fresh water. The Antarctic also extends to a further 36 million square kilometres of ocean. It has a limited terrestrial life and a highly productive marine ecosystem, comprising a few plants (e.g. microscopic algae, fungi and lichen), marine mammals, fish and hordes of birds adapted to harsh conditions, as well as the krill, which is central to marine food chain and upon which other animals are dependent. The Antarctic plays an important role in maintaining climatic equilibrium, and deep ice cores provide an important source of information about greenhouse gas concentrations and atmospheric temperatures of hundreds and thousands of years ago.



Who owns this coldest, farthest, and windiest continent on globe? There are two claims about it. Some countries like the UK, Argentina, Chile, Norway, France, Australia and New Zealand have made legal claims to sovereign rights over Antarctic territory. Most other states have taken the opposite view that the Antarctic is a part of the global commons and not subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of any state. These differences, however, have not prevented the adoption of innovative and potentially far-reaching rules for the protection of the Antarctic environment and its ecosystem. The Antarctic and the Arctic polar regions are subjected to special regional rules of environmental protection. Since 1959, activities in the area have been limited to scientific research, fishing and tourism. Even these limited activities have not prevented parts of the region from being degraded by waste as a result of oil spills.

areas or regions of the world which are located outside the sovereign jurisdiction of any one state, and therefore require common governance by the international community. These are known as *res communis humanitatis* or *global commons*. They include the earth's atmosphere, Antarctica (see Box), the ocean floor, and outer space.

Cooperation over the global commons is not easy. There have been many path-breaking agreements such as the 1959 Antarctic Treaty, the 1987 Montreal Protocol, and the 1991 Antarctic Environmental Protocol. A major problem underlying all ecological issues relates to the difficulty of achieving consensus on common environmental



Very soon we will have ecological degradation of the moon!



One of the biggest catastrophes in Africa in the 1970s, a drought turned the best cropland in five countries into cracked and barren earth. In fact, the term environmental refugees came into popular vocabulary after this. Many had to flee their home lands as agriculture was no longer possible. Source: www.gobartime.org

agendas on the basis of vague scientific evidence and time frames. In that sense the discovery of the ozone hole over the Antarctic in the mid-1980s revealed the opportunity as well as dangers inherent in tackling global environmental problems.

Similarly, the history of outer space as a global commons shows that the management of these areas is thoroughly influenced by North-South inequalities. As with the earth's atmosphere and the

ocean floor, the crucial issue here is technology and industrial development. This is important because the benefits of exploitative activities in outer space are far from being equal either for the present or future generations.

COMMON BUT DIFFERENTIATED RESPONSIBILITY

We have noted above a difference in the approach to environment

Find out more about the Kyoto Protocol. Which major countries did not sign it? And why?

LET'S DO IT

between the countries of the North and the South. The developed countries of the North want to discuss the environmental issue as it stands now and want everyone to be equally responsible for ecological conservation. The developing countries of the South feel that much of the ecological degradation in the world is the product of industrial development undertaken by the developed countries. If they have caused more degradation, they must also take more responsibility for undoing the damage now. Moreover, the developing countries are in the process of industrialisation and they must not be subjected to the same restrictions, which apply to the developed countries. Thus the special needs of the developing countries must be taken into account in the development, application, and interpretation of rules of international environmental law. This argument was accepted in the Rio Declaration at the Earth Summit in 1992 and is called the principle of 'common but differentiated responsibilities'.

The relevant part of the Rio Declaration says that "States shall cooperate in the spirit of global partnership to conserve, protect and restore the health and integrity of the Earth's ecosystem. In view of the different contributions of global environmental degradation, states have common but differentiated responsibilities. The developed countries acknowledge the responsibility

that they bear in the international pursuit of sustainable development in view of the pressures their societies place on the global environment and of the technological and financial resources they command."

The 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) also provides that the parties should act to protect the climate system "on the basis of equity and in accordance with their common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities." The parties to the Convention agreed that the largest share of historical and current global emissions of greenhouse gases has originated in developed countries. It was also acknowledged that per capita emissions in developing countries are still relatively low. China, India, and other developing countries were, therefore, exempted from the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol. The Kyoto Protocol is an international agreement setting targets for industrialised countries to cut their greenhouse gas emissions. Certain gases like Carbon dioxide, Methane, Hydro-fluoro carbons etc. are considered at least partly responsible for global warming - the rise in global temperature which may have catastrophic consequences for life on Earth. The protocol was agreed to in 1997 in Kyoto in Japan, based on principles set out in UNFCCC.



That's a cool principle! A bit like the reservation policy in our country, isn't it?



I heard about some rivers being sold in Latin America. How can common property be sold?

COMMON PROPERTY RESOURCES

Common property represents common property for the group. The underlying norm here is that members of the group have both rights and duties with respect to the nature, levels of use, and the maintenance of a given resource. Through mutual understanding and centuries of practice, many village communities in India, for example, have defined members' rights and responsibilities. A combination of factors, including privatisation, agricultural intensification, population growth and ecosystem degradation have caused common property to dwindle in size, quality, and

availability to the poor in much of the world. The institutional arrangement for the actual management of the sacred groves on state-owned forest land appropriately fits the description of a common property regime. Along the forest belt of South India, sacred groves have been traditionally managed by village communities.

INDIA'S STAND ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES


India signed and ratified the 1997 Kyoto Protocol in August 2002. India, China and other developing countries were exempt from the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol because their contribution to the

✚ SACRED GROVES IN INDIA

Protecting nature for religious reasons is an ancient practice in many traditional societies. Sacred groves in India (parcels of uncut forest vegetation in the name of certain deities or natural or ancestral spirits) exemplify such practice. As a model of community-based resource management, groves have lately gained attention in conservation literature. The sacred groves can be seen as a system that informally forest traditional communities to harvest natural resources in an ecologically sustainable fashion. Some researchers believe that sacred groves hold the potential for preserving not only biodiversity and ecological functions, but also cultural diversity.

Sacred groves embody a rich set of forest preservation practices and they share characteristics with common property resource systems. Their size ranges from clumps of a few trees to several hundred acres. Traditionally, sacred groves have been valued for their embodied spiritual and cultural attributes. Hindus commonly worshipped natural objects, including trees and groves. Many temples have originated from sacred groves. Deep religious reverence for nature, rather than resource scarcity, seems to be the basis for the long-standing commitment to preserving these forests. In recent years, however, expansion and human settlement have slowly encroached on sacred forests.

In many places, the institutional identity of these traditional forests is fading with the advent of new national forest policies. A real problem in managing sacred groves arises when legal ownership and operational control are held by different entities. The two entities in question, the state and the community, vary in their policy norms and underlying motives for using the sacred grove.



emission of greenhouse gases during the industrialisation period (that is believed to be causing today's global warming and climate change) was not significant. However, the critics of the Kyoto Protocol point out that sooner or later, both India and China, along with other developing countries, will be among the leading contributors to greenhouse gas emission. At the G-8 meeting in June 2005, India pointed out that the per capita emission rates of the developing countries are a tiny fraction of those in the developed world. Following the principle of common but differentiated responsibility, India is of the view

that the major responsibility of curbing emission rests with the developed countries, which have accumulated emissions over a long period of time.

India's international negotiating position relies heavily on principles of historical responsibility, as enshrined in UNFCCC. This acknowledges that developed countries are responsible for most historical and current greenhouse emissions, and emphasizes that 'economic and social development are the first and overriding priorities of the developing country parties'. So India is wary of recent discussions



Get it! First they destroyed the earth, now it is our turn to do the same! Is that our stand?

within UNFCCC about introducing binding commitments on rapidly industrialising countries (such as Brazil, China and India) to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions. India feels this contravenes the very spirit of UNFCCC. Neither does it seem fair to impose restrictions on India when the country's rise in per capita carbon emissions by 2030 is likely to still represent less than half the world average of 3.8 tonnes in 2000. Indian emissions are predicted to rise from 0.9 tonnes per capita in 2000 to 1.6 tonnes per capita in 2030.

The Indian government is already participating in global efforts through a number of programmes. For example, India's National Auto-fuel Policy mandates cleaner fuels for vehicles. The Energy Conservation Act, passed in 2001, outlines initiatives to improve energy efficiency. Similarly, the Electricity Act of 2003 encourages the use of renewable energy. Recent trends in importing natural gas and encouraging the adoption of clean coal technologies show that India has been making real efforts. The government is also keen to launch a National Mission on Biodiesel, using about 11 million hectares of land to produce biodiesel by 2011–2012. And India has one of the largest renewable energy programmes in the world.

A review of the implementation of the agreements at the Earth Summit in Rio was undertaken by India in 1997. One of the key

conclusions was that there had been no meaningful progress with respect to transfer of new and additional financial resources and environmentally-sound technology on concessional terms to developing nations. India finds it necessary that developed countries take immediate measures to provide developing countries with financial resources and clean technologies to enable them to meet their existing commitments under UNFCCC. India is also of the view that the SAARC countries should adopt a common position on major global environment issues, so that the region's voice carries greater weight.

ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENTS: ONE OR MANY?

We have, so far, looked at the way governments have reacted at the international level to the challenge of environmental degradation. But some of the most significant responses to this challenge have come not from the governments but rather from groups of environmentally conscious volunteers working in different parts of the world. Some of them work at the international level, but most of them work at the local level. These environmental movements are amongst the most vibrant, diverse, and powerful social movements across the globe today. It is within social movements that new forms of political action are born or reinvented. These

movements raise new ideas and long-term visions of what we should do and what we should not do in our individual and collective lives. Here are just a few examples to show that diversity is an important trait of contemporary environmental movements.

The forest movements of the South, in Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Malaysia, Indonesia, continental Africa and India (just to list a few

examples) are faced with enormous pressures. Forest clearing in the Third World continues at an alarming rate, despite three decades of environmental activism. The destruction of the world's last remaining grand forests has actually increased in the last decade.

The minerals industry is one of the most powerful forms of industry on the planet. A large number of economies of the South



ARE FORESTS “WILDERNESS”?

What distinguishes the forest movements of the South from those of the North is that the forests of the former are still peopled, whilst the forests of the latter are more or less devoid of human habitation, at least, are perceived as thus. This explains to some extent the prevailing notion of *wilderness* in the North as a ‘wild place’ where people do not live. In this perspective, humans are not seen as part of nature. In other words, ‘environment’ is perceived as ‘somewhere out there’, as something that should be protected *from* humans through the creation of parks and reserves. On the other hand, most environmental issues in the South are based on the assumption that people live in the forests.

Wilderness-oriented perspectives have been predominant in Australia, Scandinavia, North America and New Zealand. In these regions, there are still large tracts of relatively ‘underdeveloped wilderness’, unlike in most European countries. This is not to say that wilderness campaigns are entirely missing in the South. In the Philippines, green organisations fight to protect eagles and other birds of prey from extinction. In India, a battle goes on to protect the alarmingly low number of Bengal tigers. In Africa, a long campaign has been waged against the ivory trade and the savage slaughter of elephants. Some of the most famous wilderness struggles have been fought in the forests of Brazil and Indonesia. All of these campaigns focus on individual species as well as the conservation of the wilderness habitats, which support them. Many of the wilderness issues have been renamed biodiversity issues in recent times, as the concept of wilderness has been proved difficult to sell in the South. Many of these campaigns have been initiated and funded by NGOs such as the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), in association with local people.



© Aris, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

Do you agree with the efforts made by ecologists? Do you agree with the way ecologists are portrayed here?



An entire community erupted in protests against a proposed open-cast coal mine project in Phulbari town, in the North-West district of Dinajpur, Bangladesh. Here several dozen women, one with her infant child, are chanting slogans against the proposed coal mine project in 2006.

are now being re-opened to MNCs through the liberalisation of the global economy. The mineral industry's extraction of earth, its use of chemicals, its pollution of waterways and land, its clearance

of native vegetation, its displacement of communities, amongst other factors, continue to invite criticism and resistance in various parts of the globe. One good example is that of the Philippines, where a vast network of groups and organisations campaigned against the Western Mining Corporation (WMC), an Australia-based multinational company. Much opposition to the company in its own country, Australia, is based on anti-nuclear sentiments and advocacy for the basic rights of Australian indigenous peoples.

Another group of movements are those involved in struggles against mega-dams. In every country where a mega-dam is being built, one is likely to find an environmental movement opposing it. Increasingly anti-dam movements are pro-river movements for more sustainable and equitable management of river systems and valleys. The early 1980s saw the first anti-dam movement launched in the North, namely, the campaign to save the Franklin River and its surrounding forests in Australia. This was a wilderness and forest campaign as well as anti-dam campaign. At

present, there has been a spurt in mega-dam building in the South, from Turkey to Thailand to South Africa, from Indonesia to China. India has had some of the leading anti-dam, pro-river movements. Narmada Bachao Andolan is one of the best known of these movements. It is significant to note that, in anti-dam and other environmental movements in India, the most important shared idea is non-violence.


RESOURCE GEO POLITICS

Resource geopolitics is all about who gets what, when, where and how. Resources have provided some of the key means and motives of global European power expansion. They have also been the focus of inter-state rivalry. Western geopolitical thinking about resources has been dominated by the relationship of trade, war and power, at the core of which were overseas resources and maritime navigation. Since sea power itself rested on access to timber, naval timber supply became a key priority for major European powers from the 17th century onwards. The critical importance of ensuring uninterrupted supply of strategic resources, in particular oil, was well established both during the First World War and the Second World War.

Throughout the Cold War the industrialised countries of the North adopted a number of methods to ensure a steady flow of resources. These included the

deployment of military forces near exploitation sites and along sea-lanes of communication, the stockpiling of strategic resources, efforts to prop up friendly governments in producing countries, as well as support to multinational companies and favourable international agreements. Traditional Western strategic thinking remained concerned with access to supplies, which might be threatened by the Soviet Union. A particular concern was Western control of oil in the Gulf and strategic minerals in Southern and Central Africa. After the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the security of supply continues to worry government and business decisions with regard to several minerals, in particular radioactive materials. However, oil continues to be the most important resource in global strategy.

The global economy relied on **oil** for much of the 20th century as a portable and indispensable fuel. The immense wealth associated with oil generates political struggles to control it, and the history of petroleum is also the history of war and struggle. Nowhere is this more obviously the case than in West Asia and Central Asia. West Asia, specifically the Gulf region, accounts for about 30 per cent of global oil production. But it has about 64 percent of the planet's known reserves, and is therefore the only region able to satisfy any



© Andy Singer, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

substantial rise in oil demand. Saudi Arabia has a quarter of the world's total reserves and is the single largest producer. Iraq's known reserves are second only to Saudi Arabia's. And, since substantial portions of Iraqi territory are yet to be fully explored, there is a fair chance that actual reserves might be far larger. The United States, Europe, Japan, and increasingly India and China, which consume this petroleum, are located at a considerable distance from the region.

Water is another crucial resource that is relevant to global

EVERYONE IS PLAYING CRUDE!

"The list of petroleum based products in our lives is endless. Toothbrush, pacemaker, paints, inks,Oil provides the energy for 95 per cent of the world's transportation needs. The whole industrialised world survives on petroleum. We cannot imagine living without it. There are billions of barrels of it under the earth for us to use. Yet there are disputes between countries. Why here is one of the problems"

I belong to the Royal Family of the Kingdom of Black Gold. I am what they call filthy rich. Ever since black gold was found in my Kingdom things have never been the same again. Mr. Bigoil and his government came prospecting one day. We struck oil...and a deal. They armed me to the teeth till it hurt. So when I grin my subjects look at me with awe. In return Bigoil and sons get to buy all my oil and loyalty. I am happy and rich and so are they. I turn my blind eye to their military in this holy land.

I value precious things. Bigoil says his President values freedom and democracy. So I keep both safely under lock and key in my land.



Sheikh Petrodollah
King of the land of Black Gold



Mr. Bigoil
CEO of Bigoil and sons

As advised, I did ask myself what can I do for my country. My country has an enormous appetite for oil. So ...provide it with oil of course! I believe in the free market system. Free to dig up oil in far away countries, free to create pliable tin-pot dictators to keep local populations at bay and free to destroy ecology.

We play no politics but pay them at election campaigns and get them to invest in our company. That way we don't have to embarrass ourselves by foolishly waving and smiling at TV cameras.

Leading the good life

A new beauty is parked outside our garage. Awesome! Isn't it?... sleek chrome finish, power steering, automatic gears. Excellent pick up and great mileage too. It is low on emissions too...gentle on the atmosphere, you know. Global warming and all that stuff. Now we really are in hurry to zoom off and lead the good life...God Save Everyone!...vrrrooommmmm



Mr & Mrs Gobbledo



Errorists
Loose cannonballs

Toppleton defends freedom and democracy. That's why he is so generous with guns and missiles. Like the ones he gave us to fight the invading Ruffians. He even trained us. We did not realise that it was the oil they were after. Bigoil is always trying to woo us. But we are too busy playing war games. Now we have rules of our own.

Toppleton's govt. kept changing its rules. Not fair we said. Some of us now hate Toppleton, his government and his people. Of course their bullets and missiles come in handy when we have to beat them at their game.

Make no mistake, we are Errorists.



© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

The larger part of the Earth is water than the land and yet the cartoonist decides to show larger image of the land than water. How does the image show the scarcity of water?

politics. Regional variations and the increasing scarcity of freshwater in some parts of the world point to the possibility of disagreements over shared water resources as a leading source of conflicts in the 21st century. Some commentators on world politics have referred to 'water wars' to describe the possibility of violent conflict over this life-sustaining resource. Countries that share rivers can disagree over many things. For instance, a typical disagreement is a downstream

(lower riparian) state's objection to pollution, excessive irrigation, or the construction of dams by an upstream (upper riparian) state, which might decrease or degrade the quality of water available to the downstream state. States have used force to protect or seize freshwater resources. Examples of violence include those between Israel, Syria, and Jordan in the 1950s and 1960s over attempts by each side to divert water from the Jordan and Yarmuk Rivers, and more recent threats between Turkey, Syria, and Iraq over the construction of dams on the Euphrates River. A number of studies show that countries that share rivers — and many countries do share rivers — are involved in military conflicts with each other.

THE INDIGENOUS PEOPLES AND THEIR RIGHTS

The question of indigenous people brings the issues of environment, resources and politics together. The UN defines indigenous populations as comprising the descendants of peoples who inhabited the present territory of a country at the time when persons of a different culture or ethnic origin arrived there from other parts of the world and overcame them. Indigenous people today live more in conformity with their particular social, economic, and cultural customs and traditions than the institutions of the country of which they now form a part.



How are these conflicts different from the many water conflicts within our own country?



In the context of world politics, what are the common interests of approximately 30 crore indigenous peoples spread throughout the world including India? There are 20 lakh indigenous people of the Cordillera region of the Philippines, 10 lakh Mapuche people of Chile, six lakh tribal people of the Chittagong Hill Tracts in Bangladesh, 35 lakh North American natives, 50,000 Kuna living east of Panama Canal and 10 lakh Small Peoples of the Soviet North. Like other social movements, indigenous people speak of their struggles, their agenda and their rights.



Why don't we hear much about the indigenous people and their movements? Is the media biased against them?

The indigenous voices in world politics call for the admission of indigenous people to the world community as equals. Indigenous people occupy areas in Central and South America, Africa, India (where they are known as Tribals) and Southeast Asia. Many of the

present day island states in the Oceania region (including Australia and New Zealand), were inhabited by the Polynesian, Melanesian and Micronesian people over the course of thousands of years. They appeal to governments to come to terms with the continuing existence of indigenous nations as enduring communities with an identity of their own. 'Since times immemorial' is the phrase used by indigenous people all over the world to refer to their continued occupancy of the lands from which they originate. The worldviews of indigenous societies, irrespective of their geographical location, are strikingly similar with respect to land and the variety of life systems supported by it. The loss of land, which also means the loss of an economic resource base, is the



© Aris, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

Spoonful of Ecology

Do you agree with this perspective where a man from an urban (developed!) area becomes greedy for nature?

most obvious threat to the survival of indigenous people. Can political autonomy be enjoyed without its attachment to the means of physical survival?

In India, the description 'indigenous people' is usually applied to the Scheduled Tribes who constitute nearly eight per cent of the population of the country. With the exception of small communities of hunters and gatherers, most indigenous populations in India depend for their subsistence primarily on the cultivation of land. For centuries, if not millennia, they had free access to as much land as they could cultivate. It was only after the establishment of the British colonial rule that areas, which had previously been inhabited by the Scheduled Tribe communities, were subjected to outside forces. Although they enjoy a constitutional protection in political representation, they have not got much of the benefits of development in the country. In fact they have paid a huge cost for development since they are the single largest group among the people displaced by various developmental projects since independence.

Issues related to the rights of the indigenous communities have been neglected in domestic and international politics for very long. During the 1970s, growing international contacts among indigenous leaders from around the world aroused a sense of common concern and shared

experiences. The World Council of Indigenous Peoples was formed in 1975. The Council became subsequently the first of 11 indigenous NGOs to receive consultative status in the UN. Many of the movements against globalisation, discussed in Chapter 9, have focussed on the rights of the indigenous people.

LET'S DO IT TOGETHER

STEPS


- Each student is asked to list any ten items they consume/use every day.
(The list could include — pen/paper/erase/r/computer/water etc.)
- Ask students to calculate the amount of natural resources being used to make these items. (For finished products like pen/pencil/computer etc., students will calculate the amount of resources and for items like water they could calculate the amount of electricity used for purifying and pumping along with gallons of water). Each would calculate and arrive at an approximate figure.

Ideas for the Teacher

- Collect the approximate figures from each student and sum up all to arrive at total resources consumed by the students of that particular class. (Teacher is to act as a facilitator and allow students to do the calculations.)
- Project this figure to other classes of the same school, then to schools across the country. The country figure could be used to measure the amount of resources being used by schools in other countries too. (The teacher is to have background information about the resources being used by students in a few select countries. While selecting countries, teachers should ensure that the selected countries belong to the developed / developing countries category).
- Ask students to imagine the amount of resources we are consuming and also to estimate future consumption.

EXERCISES

1. Which among the following best explains the reason for growing concerns about the environment?
 - a. The developed countries are concerned about protecting nature.
 - b. Protection of the environment is vital for indigenous people and natural habitats.
 - c. The environmental degradation caused by human activities has become pervasive and has reached a dangerous level.
 - d. None of the above.
2. Mark correct or wrong against each of the following statements below that describe the Earth Summit:
 - a. It was attended by 170 countries, thousands of NGOs and many MNCs.
 - b. The summit was held under the aegis of the UN.
 - c. For the first time, global environmental issues were firmly consolidated at the political level.
 - d. It was a summit meeting.
3. Which among the following are TRUE about the global commons?
 - a. The Earth's atmosphere, Antarctica, ocean floor and outer space are considered as part of the global commons.
 - b. The global commons are outside sovereign jurisdiction.
 - c. The question of managing the global commons has reflected the North-South divide.
 - d. The countries of the North are more concerned about the protection of the global commons than the countries of the South.
4. What were the outcomes of the Rio Summit?
5. What is meant by the global commons? How are they exploited and polluted?
6. What is meant by 'common but differentiated responsibilities'? How could we implement the idea?
7. Why have issues related to global environmental protection become the priority concern of states since the 1990s?
8. Compromise and accommodation are the two essential policies required by states to save planet Earth. Substantiate the statement in the light of the ongoing negotiations between the North and South on environmental issues.
9. The most serious challenge before the states is pursuing economic development without causing further damage to the global environment. How could we achieve this? Explain with a few examples.



OVERVIEW

In this final chapter of the book we look at globalisation, something that has been referred to in many chapters of this book and textbooks of many other subjects. We begin by analysing the concept of globalisation and then examine its causes. We then discuss at length the political, economic and cultural consequences of globalisation. Our interest is also in studying the impact of globalisation on India as well as how India is affecting globalisation. We finally draw attention to resistance to globalisation and how social movements in India also form part of this resistance.

Chapter 9 Globalisation



So many Nepalese workers come to India to work. Is that globalisation?

THE CONCEPT OF GLOBALISATION

Janardhan works in a call centre. He leaves late in the evening for work, becomes John when he enters his office, acquires a new accent and speaks a different language (than he does when he is at home) to communicate with his clients who are living thousands of miles away. He works all night, which is actually day time for his overseas customers. Janardhan is rendering a service to somebody who in all probability he is never likely to meet physically. This is his daily routine. His holidays also do not correspond to the Indian calendar but to those of his clients who happen to be from the US.

Ramdhari has gone shopping to buy a birthday gift for his nine-year old daughter. He has promised her a small cycle and decides to search the market for something he finds affordable as well as of reasonable quality. He finally does buy a cycle, which is actually manufactured in China but is being marketed in India. It meets his requirements of quality as well as affordability, and Ramdhari decides to go ahead with his purchase. Last year, Ramdhari on his daughter's insistence had bought her a Barbie doll, which was originally manufactured in the US but was being sold in India.

Sarika is a first generation learner who has done remarkably well throughout her school and college life by working very hard.

She now has an opportunity to take on a job and begin an independent career, which the women of her family had never dreamt of earlier. While some of her relatives are opposed, she finally decides to go ahead because of the new opportunities that have been made available to her generation.

All three examples illustrate an aspect each of what we call globalisation. In the first instance Janardhan was participating in the globalisation of services. Ramdhari's birthday purchases tell us something about the movement of commodities from one part of the world to another. Sarika is faced with a conflict of values partly originating from a new opportunity that earlier was not available to the women in her family but today is part of a reality that has gained wider acceptability.

If we look for examples of the use of the term 'globalisation' in real life, we will realise that it is used in various contexts. Let us look at some examples, different from the ones that we have looked above:

- Some farmers committed suicide because their crops failed. They had bought very expensive seeds supplied by a multinational company (MNC).
- An Indian company bought a major rival company based in Europe, despite protests by some of the current owners.

Go through newspapers for a week and collect clippings on anything related to globalisation.

LET'S DO IT

- Many retail shopkeepers fear that they would lose their livelihoods if some major international companies open retail chains in the country.
- A film producer in Mumbai was accused of lifting the story of his film from another film made in Hollywood.
- A militant group issued a statement threatening college girls who wear western clothes.

These examples show us that globalisation need not always be positive; it can have negative consequences for the people. Indeed, there are many who believe that globalisation has more negative consequences than positive. These examples also show us that globalisation need not be only about the economic issues, nor is the direction of influence always from the rich to the poor countries.

Since much of the usage tends to be imprecise, it becomes important to clarify what we mean by globalisation. Globalisation as a concept fundamentally deals with flows. These flows could be of various kinds — ideas moving from one part of the world to another, capital shunted between two or more places, commodities being traded across borders, and people moving in search of better livelihoods to different parts of the world. The crucial element is the ‘worldwide interconnectedness’ that is created and sustained as a consequence of these constant flows.



This chapter has a series of images about political, economic and cultural aspects of globalisation, taken from different parts of the world.



Much of the Chinese stuff that comes to India is smuggled. Does globalisation lead to smuggling?



Isn't globalisation a new name for imperialism? Why do we need a new name?

Globalisation is a multi-dimensional concept. It has political, economic and cultural manifestations, and these must be adequately distinguished. It is wrong to assume that globalisation has purely economic dimensions, just as it would also be mistaken to assume that it is a purely cultural phenomenon. The impact of globalisation is vastly uneven — it affects some societies more than others and some parts of some societies more than others — and it is important to avoid drawing general conclusions about the impact of globalisation without paying sufficient attention to specific contexts.

CAUSES OF GLOBALISATION

What accounts for globalisation? If globalisation is about the flows of ideas, capital, commodities, and people, it is perhaps logical to ask if there is anything novel about this phenomenon. Globalisation in terms of these four flows along has taken place through much of human history. However, those who argue that there is something distinct about contemporary globalisation point out that it is the scale and speed of these flows that account for the uniqueness of globalisation in the contemporary era. Globalisation has a strong historical basis, and it is important to view contemporary flows against this backdrop.

While globalisation is not caused by any single factor, technology remains a critical element. There is no doubt that the invention of the telegraph, the telephone, and the microchip in more recent times has revolutionised communication between actors in different parts of the world. When printing initially came into being it laid the basis for the creation of nationalism. So also today we should expect that technology will affect the way we think of our personal but also our collective lives.

The ability of ideas, capital, commodities and people to move more easily from one part of the world to another has been made possible largely by technological advances. The pace of these flows may vary. For instance, the movement of capital and commodities will most likely be quicker and wider than the movement of peoples across different parts of the world.

Globalisation, however, does not emerge merely because of the availability of improved communications. What is important is for people in different parts of the world to recognise these interconnections with the rest of the world. Currently, we are aware of the fact that events taking place in one part of the world could have an impact on another part of the world. The Bird flu or tsunami is not confined to any particular nation. It does not respect national boundaries. Similarly,



© Ares, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

Digital Economy

when major economic events take place, their impact is felt outside their immediate local, national or regional environment at the global level.

POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

One of the debates that has been generated as a consequence of contemporary processes of globalisation relates to its ongoing political impact. How does globalisation affect traditional conceptions of state sovereignty? There are at least three aspects that we need to consider when answering this question.

At the most simple level, globalisation results in an erosion of state capacity, that is, the ability of government to do what they do. All over the world, the old 'welfare state' is now giving way to a more minimalist state that performs certain core functions such as the maintenance of law and order and the security of its citizens. However, it withdraws from many of its earlier welfare functions directed at economic and social well-being. In place of the welfare state, it is the market that becomes the prime determinant of economic and social priorities. The entry and the increased role of multinational companies all over the world leads to a reduction in the capacity of governments to take decisions on their own.

At the same time, globalisation does not always reduce state capacity. The primacy of the state



continues to be the unchallenged basis of political community. The old jealousies and rivalries between countries have not ceased to matter in world politics. The state continues to discharge its essential functions (law and order, national security) and consciously withdraws from certain domains from which it wishes to. States continue to be important.

Indeed, in some respects state capacity has received a boost as a consequence of globalisation, with enhanced technologies available at the disposal of the state to collect information about its citizens. With this information, the state is better able to rule, not less able. Thus, states become more powerful than they were earlier as an outcome of the new technology.

ECONOMIC CONSEQUENCES

While everything may not be known about the economic facets of globalisation, this particular dimension shapes a large part of the content and direction of contemporary debates surrounding globalisation.

A part of the problem has to do with defining economic globalisation itself. The mention of economic globalisation draws our attention immediately to the role of international institutions like the IMF and the WTO and the role they play in determining economic policies across the world. Yet, globalisation must not be viewed in such narrow terms. Economic globalisation involves many actors other than these international institutions. A much broader way of understanding of economic globalisation requires us to look at the distribution of economic gains, i.e. who gets the most from globalisation and who gets less, indeed who loses from it.

What is often called economic globalisation usually involves greater economic flows among different countries of the world. Some of this is voluntary and some forced by international institutions and powerful countries. As we saw in the examples at the beginning of this chapter, this flow or exchange can take various forms: commodities, capital, people and ideas. Globalisation has involved greater trade in commodities across the globe; the restrictions imposed by



different countries on allowing the imports of other countries have been reduced. Similarly, the restrictions on movement of capital across countries have also been reduced. In operational terms, it means that investors in the rich countries can invest their money in countries other than their own, including developing countries, where they might get better returns. Globalisation has also led to the flow of ideas across national boundaries. The spread of internet and computer related services is an example of that. But globalisation has not led to the same degree of increase in the movement of people across the globe. Developed countries have carefully guarded their borders with visa policies to ensure that citizens of other countries cannot take away the jobs of their own citizens.

In thinking about the consequences of globalisation, it is necessary to keep in mind that the same set of policies do not lead to the same results everywhere. While globalisation has led to similar economic policies adopted by governments in different parts of the world, this has generated vastly different outcomes in different parts of the world. It is again crucial to pay attention to specific context rather than make simple generalisations in this connection.

Economic globalisation has created an intense division of opinion all over the world. Those who are concerned about social



When we talk about 'safety net' it means that we expect some people to fall down because of globalisation. Isn't that right?

justice are worried about the extent of state withdrawal caused by processes of economic globalisation. They point out that it is likely to benefit only a small section of the population while impoverishing those who were dependent on the government for jobs and welfare (education, health, sanitation, etc.). They have emphasised the need to ensure institutional safeguards or creating 'social safety nets' to minimise the negative effects of globalisation on those who are economically weak. Many movements all over the world feel that safety nets are insufficient or unworkable. They have called for a halt to forced economic globalisation, for its results would lead to economic ruin for the weaker countries, especially for the poor within these countries. Some economists have described economic globalisation as re-colonisation of the world.

be denied is the increased momentum towards interdependence and integration between governments, businesses, and ordinary people in different parts of the world as a result of globalisation.

CULTURAL CONSEQUENCES

The consequences of globalisation are not confined only to the sphere of politics and economy. Globalisation affects us in our home, in what we eat, drink, wear and indeed in what we think. It shapes what we think are our preferences. The cultural effect of globalisation leads to the fear that this process poses a threat to cultures in the world. It does so, because globalisation leads to the rise of a uniform culture or what is called cultural homogenisation. The rise of a uniform culture is not the emergence of a global culture. What we have in the name

Make a list of products of multinational companies (MNCs) that are used by you or your family.

Advocates of economic globalisation argue that it generates greater economic growth and well-being for larger sections of the population when there is de-regulation. Greater trade among countries allows each economy to do what it does best. This would benefit the whole world. They also argue that economic globalisation is inevitable and it is not wise to resist the march of history. More moderate supporters of globalisation say that globalisation provides a challenge that can be responded to intelligently without accepting it uncritically. What, however, cannot



Invading new markets

© Andy Singer, Cagle Cartoons Inc.

of a global culture is the imposition of Western culture on the rest of the world. We have already studied this phenomenon as the soft power of US hegemony in Chapter 3. The popularity of a burger or blue jeans, some argue, has a lot to do with the powerful influence of the American way of life. Thus, the culture of the politically and economically dominant society leaves its imprint on a less powerful society, and the world begins to look more like the dominant power wishes it to be. Those who make this argument often draw attention to the 'McDonaldisation' of the world, with cultures seeking to buy into the dominant American dream. This is dangerous not only for the poor countries but for the whole of humanity, for it leads to the shrinking of the rich cultural heritage of the entire globe.

At the same time, it would be a mistake to assume that cultural consequences of globalisation are only negative. Cultures are not static things. All cultures accept outside influences all the time. Some external influences are negative because they reduce our choices. But sometimes external influences simply enlarge our choices, and sometimes they modify our culture without overwhelming the traditional. The burger is no substitute for a *masala dosa* and, therefore, does not pose any real challenge. It is simply added on to our food choices. Blue jeans, on the other hand, can go well with a homespun *khadi kurta*. Here the



Why are we scared
of Western culture?
Are we not confident
of our own culture?

Make a list of all the known 'dialects' of your language. Consult people of your grandparents' generation about this. How many people speak those dialects today?

LET'S DO IT

outcome of outside influence is a new combination that is unique — a *khadi kurta* worn over jeans. Interestingly, this clothing combination has been exported back to the country that gave us blue jeans so that it is possible to see young Americans wearing a *kurta* and jeans!

While cultural homogenisation is an aspect of globalisation, the same process also generates precisely the opposite effect. It leads to each culture becoming more different and distinctive. This phenomenon is called cultural heterogenisation. This is not to deny that there remain differences in power when cultures interact but instead more fundamentally to suggest that cultural exchange is rarely one way.



'Gosh, an Indian again!'

An insider's view of a call centre job

Working in a call centre, in fact, can be enlightening in its own way. As you handle calls from Americans, you get an insight into the true American culture. An average American comes out as more lively and honest than we imagine...

However, not all calls and conversations are pleasant. You can also receive irate and abusive callers. Sometimes the hatred that they exhibit in their tone on knowing that their call has been routed to India is very stressful. Americans tend to perceive every Indian as one who has denied them their rightful job...

One can receive a call, beginning on the lines of "I spoke to a South African a few minutes ago and now I'm speaking to an Indian!" or "Oh gosh, an Indian again! Connect me to an American please...". It's difficult to find the right response in situations of this kind.

Source: Report by Ranjetha Urs in *The Hindu*, 10 January 2005.

INDIA AND GLOBALISATION

We said earlier that globalisation has occurred in earlier periods in history in different parts of the world. Flows pertaining to the movement of capital, commodities, ideas and people go back several centuries in Indian history.

During the colonial period, as a consequence of Britain's imperial ambitions, India became an exporter of primary goods and raw materials and a consumer of finished goods. After independence, because of this experience with the British, we decided to make things ourselves rather than relying on others. We also decided not to allow others to export to us so that our own producers could learn to make things. This 'protectionism' generated its own problems. While some advances were made in certain arenas, critical sectors such as health, housing and primary education did not receive the attention they deserved. India had a fairly sluggish rate of economic growth.

In 1991, responding to a financial crisis and to the desire for higher rates of economic growth, India embarked on a programme of economic reforms that has sought increasingly to de-regulate various sectors including trade and foreign investment. While it may be too early to say how good this has been for India, the ultimate test is not high growth rates as making sure that the benefits of growth are shared so that everyone is better off.

RESISTANCE TO GLOBALISATION

We have already noted that globalisation is a very contentious subject and has invited strong criticism all over the globe. Critics of globalisation make a variety of arguments. Those on the left argue that contemporary globalisation represents a particular phase of global capitalism that makes the rich richer (and fewer) and the poor poorer. Weakening of the state leads to a reduction in the capacity of the state to protect the interest of its poor. Critics of globalisation from the political right express anxiety over the political, economic and cultural effects. In political terms, they also fear the weakening of the state. Economically, they want a return to self-reliance and protectionism, at least in certain areas of the economy. Culturally, they are worried that traditional culture will be harmed and people will lose their age-old values and ways.

It is important to note here that anti-globalisation movements too participate in global networks, allying with those who feel like them in other countries. Many anti-globalisation movements are not opposed to the idea of globalisation *per se* as much as they are opposed to a specific programme of globalisation, which they see as a form of imperialism.

In 1999, at the World Trade Organisation (WTO) Ministerial Meeting there were widespread



It is true sometimes
I like the new songs.
Didn't we all like to
dance a bit? Does it
really matter if it is
influenced by
western music?



LET'S DO IT TOGETHER

The activity enables students to understand how globalisation has penetrated our lives and the impact the all-inclusive nature of globalisation has on an individual, a community and a nation as a whole.

STEPS

- Students are to list the names of products — food products, white goods, and luxuries, they are familiar with.
- Students are to write down their favourite TV programmes.
- The teacher is to collect the list and consolidate.
- Divide the classroom (into convenient groups) and assign each group a number of items (depends on how exhaustive the list is) and TV programmes.
- Let students find out who are the manufacturers of the products they use everyday and the makers/sponsors of their favourite TV programmes.
- The teacher is to (by involving students) classify the names of manufacturers and makers/sponsors collected by students into three categories: exclusive foreign companies; exclusive Indian companies; and companies working in collaboration.

Ideas for the Teacher

- The teacher is to debrief the students focussing on:
How globalisation has been impacting our lives.
- Drawing the attention of the students to different faces of globalisation. As we use more foreign goods, our own small-scale industries have been losing their customers and are closing down.
- The activity could be concluded by introducing students to the ongoing debates about the impact of globalisation on the developing and developed countries.

protests at Seattle alleging unfair trading practices by the economically powerful states. It was argued that the interests of the developing world were not given sufficient importance in the evolving global economic system.

The World Social Forum (WSF) is another global platform, which brings together a wide coalition composed of human rights activists, environmentalists, labour, youth and women activists opposed to neo-liberal globalisation. The first WSF meeting was organised in Porto Alegre, Brazil in 2001. The fourth WSF meeting was held in Mumbai in 2004. The seventh WSF meeting was held in Nairobi, Kenya in January 2007.

INDIA AND RESISTANCE TO GLOBALISATION

What has been India's experience in resisting globalisation? Social movements play a role in helping people make sense of the world


around them and finding ways to deal with matters that trouble them. Resistance to globalisation in India has come from different quarters. There have been left wing protests to economic liberalisation voiced through political parties as well as through forums like the Indian Social Forum. Trade unions of industrial workforce as well as those representing farmer interests have organised protests against the entry of multinationals. The patenting of certain plants like *Neem* by American and European firms has also generated considerable opposition.

Resistance to globalisation has also come from the political right. This has taken the form of objecting particularly to various cultural influences — ranging from the availability of foreign T.V. channels provided by cable networks, celebration of Valentine's Day, and westernisation of the dress tastes of girl students in schools and colleges.

1. Which of the statements are TRUE about globalisation?
 - a. Globalisation is purely an economic phenomenon.
 - b. Globalisation began in 1991.
 - c. Globalisation is the same thing as westernisation.
 - d. Globalisation is a multi-dimensional phenomenon.
2. Which of the statements are TRUE about the impact of globalisation?
 - a. Globalisation has been uneven in its impact on states and societies.
 - b. Globalisation has had a uniform impact on all states and societies.

EXERCISES

- c. The impact of globalisation has been confined to the political sphere.
 - d. Globalisation inevitably results in cultural homogeneity.
3. Which of the statements are TRUE about the causes of globalisation?
 - a. Technology is an important cause of globalisation.
 - b. Globalisation is caused by a particular community of people.
 - c. Globalisation originated in the US.
 - d. Economic interdependence alone causes globalisation.
 4. Which of the statements are TRUE about globalisation?
 - a. Globalisation is only about movement of commodities
 - b. Globalisation does not involve a conflict of values.
 - c. Services are an insignificant part of globalisation.
 - d. Globalisation is about worldwide interconnectedness.
 5. Which of the statements are FALSE about globalisation?
 - a. Advocates of globalisation argue that it will result in greater economic growth.
 - b. Critics of globalisation argue that it will result in greater economic disparity.
 - c. Advocates of globalisation argue that it will result in cultural homogenisation.
 - d. Critics of globalisation argue that it will result in cultural homogenisation.
 6. What is worldwide interconnectedness? What are its components?
 7. How has technology contributed to globalisation?
 8. Critically evaluate the impact of the changing role of the state in the developing countries in the light of globalisation.
 9. What are the economic implications of globalisation? How has globalisation impacted on India with regard to this particular dimension?
 10. Do you agree with the argument that globalisation leads to cultural heterogeneity?
 11. How has globalisation impacted on India and how is India in turn impacting on globalisation?



1. © Government of India, Copyright 2007
 2. The responsibility for the correctness of internal details rests with the publisher.
 3. The maritime waters of India extend into the sea to a distance of twelve nautical miles measured from the appropriate base line.
 4. The administrative headquarters of Chandigarh, Haryana and Punjab are at Chandigarh.
 5. The interstate boundaries amongst Arunachal Pradesh, Assam and Meghalaya shown on this map are as interpreted from the "North-Eastern Areas (Reorganisation) Act, 1951," but have yet to be verified.
 6. The external boundaries and coastlines of India agree with the Revised Master Copy certified by Survey of India.
 7. The state boundaries between Uttaranchal & Uttar Pradesh, Bihar & Jharkhand and Chhattisgarh & Madhya Pradesh have not been verified by the Governments concerned.
 8. The spellings of names in this map have been taken from various sources.



Credit: Himal Southasian, The Southasia Trust, Nepal

Cartographers follow a convention that puts North on the top and the South at the bottom. This symbolic representation of the 'upside-down map' of South Asia invites us to change our mental maps of the region. It changes neither the present day boundaries nor the locations of places and people within South Asia but provides new meanings to both. What strikes you about South Asia when you look at this map? Does this map say something about the significance of the Indian Ocean to the South Asia region?



That is exciting! What if we did this not just to South Asia but to the map of the whole world?