INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SINCE 1945 CE

Author
Dr. R. RAMASUBRAMANIAN
Assistant Professor
Department of History
Manonmaniam Sundaranar University
Tirunelveli – Tamil Nadu

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY

DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION

TIRUNELVELI – TAMIL NADU -627 012.

JANUARY - 2025

UNIT I

Theories of International Relations: Idealist Theory – Realist Theory – World Systems Theory – Neorealist Theory – Neoliberal Theory; State System: Origin – Nature – Sovereignty – Nationalism – Balance of Power: Meaning – Characteristics – Types – Techniques – Collective Security: Meaning – Nature – Diplomacy: Meaning – New Diplomacy – Types of Diplomacy – National Security: Definition – Internal Threats – External Threats

Objectives

- Realist Theory in International Relations
- Balance of Power" primarily aim to achieve
- considered an external threat to national security

Theories of International Relations

The study of international relations began as a theoretical discipline. Two of the foundational texts in the field, E. H. Carr's, The Twenty Years' Crisis (first published in 1939) and Hans Morgenthau's Politics Among Nations (first published in 1948) were works of theory in three central respects. Each developed a broad framework of analysis which distilled the essence of international politics from disparate events; each sought to provide future analysts with the theoretical tools for understanding general patterns underlying seemingly unique episodes; and each reflected on the forms of political action which were most appropriate in a realm in which the struggle for power was pre-eminent. Both thinkers were motivated by the desire to correct what they saw as deep misunderstandings about the nature of international politics lying at the heart of the liberal project – among them the belief that the struggle for power could be tamed by international law and the idea that the pursuit of selfinterest could be replaced by the shared objective of promoting security for all. Not that Morgenthau and Carr thought the international political system was condemned for all time to revolve around the relentless struggle for power and security. Their main claim was that all efforts to reform the international system which ignored the struggle for power would quickly end in failure. More worrying in their view was the danger that attempts to bring about fundamental change would compound the problem of international relations. They maintained the liberal internationalist world-view had been largely responsible for the crisis of the inter-war years.

Many scholars, particularly in United States in the 1960s, believed that Morgenthau's theoretical framework was too impressionistic in nature. Historical illustrations had been used to support rather than demonstrate ingenious conjectures about general patterns of international relations. In consequence, the discipline lagged significantly behind the study of Economics which used a sophisticated methodology drawn from the natural sciences to test specific hypotheses, develop general laws and predict human behaviour. Proponents of the scientific approach attempted to build a new theory of international politics, some for the sake of better explanation and higher levels of predictive accuracy, others in the belief that science held the key to understanding how to transform international politics for the better.

The scientific turn led to a major disciplinary debate in the 1960s in which scholars such as Hedley Bull (1966b) argued that international politics were not susceptible to scientific enquiry. This is a view widely shared by analysts committed to diverse intellectual projects. The radical scholar, Noam Chomsky (1994: 120) has claimed that in international relations 'historical conditions are too varied and complex for anything that might plausibly be called "a theory" to apply uniformly' (1994: 120). What is generally known as 'post-positivism' in International Relations rejects the possibility of a science of international relations which uses standards of proof associated with the physical sciences to develop equivalent levels of explanatory precision and predictive certainty (Smith, Booth and Zalewski 1996). In the 1990s, a major debate occurred around the claims of positivism. The question of whether there is a world of difference between the 'physical' and the 'social' sciences was a crucial issue, but no less important were disputes about the nature and purpose of theory. The debate centred on whether theories – even those that aim for objectivity – are ultimately 'political' because they generate views of the world which favour some political interests and disadvantage others. This dispute has produced very difficult questions about what theory is and what its purposes are. These questions are now central to the discipline – more central than at any other time in its history. What, in consequence, is it to speak of a 'theory of international politics?.

All academic disciplines are dedicated to the task of understanding or explaining some aspect of the world, although they do so in very different ways. And they are all

underpinned by bodies of theory formulated in response to particular problems or questions emerging from their particular subject matter. So the study of literature is underpinned by literary theory, sociology by social theory, physics by physical theory, politics by political theory, and so on. The study of international relations (IR), and its theorization, is a species of political studies or political science but has developed its own distinctive profile since it emerged as a specialized field almost a century ago. IR also draws on other disciplines in the humanities and social sciences, especially history, philosophy, law and economics, with social theory having a particular influence in recent years.

As an intellectual enterprise, theory is often contrasted with action or practice, sometimes in a negative sense, as reflected in the rather clichéd stock phrase 'It's all very well in theory but it doesn't work in practice'. Actually, if it doesn't work in practice, then it may not be much of a theory (whatever 'it' is) and must therefore be re-examined for errors or abandoned altogether. This suggests that theories stand to be tested in light of practice, or in competition with other theories, and succeed, fail or undergo modification on that basis. Even when theory does fail in some sense, the value of theoretical speculation should never be underestimated. Nor should 'the abstract' be set up in opposition to 'the real', as if they were completely unrelated. While theorizing is indeed a mental process rather than a physical action or event, it is intimately related to practice. It aims to make sense of actions, events or phenomena in the physical or natural world as well as the social world, of which politics is a significant part. Some go so far as to propose that theories actually create realities. At the very least, thinking generally precedes action – and, indeed, we are usually enjoined to think before we act. Whether those thinking processes always result in what we might consider desirable outcomes is another matter.

As is evident from the title and contents of this book, there is no one theory of IR but rather a number of theories. Some of these are addressed very generally to questions of power, interests, conflict, cooperation, order and justice. Others have particular starting points which are more issue-oriented but which nonetheless address the same general questions in one way or another. Some have developed at least partly as critiques, either of other theoretical approaches or as a response to particular problems, or both. And,

within each of them, there are different, competing strands. This introductory chapter provides some essential background to how these different approaches theorize the field of international politics, looking first at the importance of theory itself and at issues of knowledge and truth, objectivity and subjectivity, the nature of existence and reality, and the dynamics of power and interests in politics. We then consider the purpose and scope of IR as a discipline and some of the factors driving its initial theorization, as well as key historical developments, including the phenomenon of modernity and what has become the central institution of politics – the sovereign state.

Theory, Norms and Methods

'Theory' – derived from the Greek theoria, meaning contemplation or speculation – may be defined as an organized system of ideas devised to explain a certain set of phenomena. The phenomena about which we theorize may range from fairly simple or narrow ones to very wide-ranging, complex and controversial ones, such as those involved in theories of climate change or the evolution of species. These bodies of theory are essentially scientific, but the former in particular has generated much political controversy in the contemporary period, giving a slightly different nuance to the term 'political science'.

Because IR is a form of political or, more broadly, social science, it is important to consider the concept of science itself. It has been said that what makes science 'scientific' is not the nature of the phenomena under observation or study but how they are studied. Thus the term 'scientific' is often applied to a particular type of process or method (Kosso, 2011, p. 1). Scientific method in the natural sciences is typically described as beginning with the observation and description of phenomena followed by the formulation of a hypothesis, which is a tentative explanation of the phenomena in question, and then the testing of the hypothesis, ideally through repeated experimentation under the same conditions to confirm its capacity to make reliable, universally applicable predictions, thus constituting a 'reality' that is independent of time and place. If it stands up to such testing, it may turn from a mere hypothesis into a theory or even a law. Thus the hallmarks of scientific enquiry are the use of evidence and reason in an objective process following recognized procedures, free from the intrusion of human values, and resulting in the production of reliable, objective knowledge.

This is a rather idealized view of how science proceeds. In practice neither scientists nor the hypotheses or theories they produce are as objective as some might like to think. Scientists are, after all, human, and there will always be subjective elements at work in the production of scientific knowledge. This highlights the fact that, because it is a human activity, research in science is therefore by definition a social activity attended by all the dynamics characterizing social interaction, including cooperation, competition and conflict. Furthermore, the way in which science proceeds is often much more creative and contingent than the formal description of scientific method implies. Chance observations, unexpected reactions, accidental findings or unanticipated experimental results are as important as the more strictly methodical activities.

There has been much controversy about whether the basic methods applicable to the natural sciences can or should be adopted in the social sciences. This begs the question of whether the production of knowledge in the social sciences is amenable to the same kinds of methods as apply in the natural sciences. We can certainly generate hypotheses about a wide variety of social phenomena, and we can amass empirical data about them, but we cannot often run experiments in the social world, let alone run repeated tests over time under exactly the same conditions. Studying self-aware, sometimes rational, sometimes irrational humans in diverse social and political contexts in which a myriad of factors or variables come into play is simply not amenable to the scientific method described above. So what other methods are available?

Some social scientists make extensive use of statistical data which, on the face of it, may seem more or less objective and preclude the intrusion of the researcher's own values. However, even if the data is largely objective (which depends very much on what is counted or measured and how it is counted or measured), its interpretation is another matter. At virtually all stages of a project, subjective elements will intrude. There are also serious limits to what we can gain knowledge of through methods restricted to quantifiable data.

The use of quantitative methodology in social science research is often taken as the hallmark of positivism, a term coined by the French intellectual August Comte (1798–1857), who is also credited with popularizing the term 'sociology'. Comte envisaged the latter as a positive science capable of formulating invariant laws in the

social sphere. Positivism is sometimes used synonymously with ‘empiricism’, a doctrine that holds that real knowledge – as opposed to mere belief – can only be gained through more or less direct observation and experience. Empiricism, however, is not engaged with theory-building as such, only with the accumulation of verifiable facts. Positivism goes beyond empiricism in that its aim is to produce and test theories while relying on empirical data that can be aggregated, usually in statistical form. The results are believed to be objective, value-free conclusions about the phenomena under investigation and ultimately to be relied on to produce valid theory and even laws of human and social behaviour.

Positivism thus conceived is opposed to theological and metaphysical modes of discovering ‘truth’ which had dominated in an earlier era. But Comte’s stipulation that real knowledge of the social and political world could only be produced via positivism came to be regarded as far too narrow. Even the nature of empirical evidence itself is now recognized as very diverse and not always amenable to strict positivist treatment. Qualitative methods based on interpretive techniques are now recognized as more appropriate to the study of politics and society. Ethnography in anthropology, the collection and interpretation of artefacts in archaeology, the piecing together of archival information and other sources to produce narrative history, and participant observation in sociology, as well as case study analysis, focus group analysis, various forms of interviewing, and so on, common to a range of social science disciplines – all these are highly methodical in a qualitative sense and appropriate to the tasks they are designed to serve, but none would fit the narrower definitions of scientific method described above. Some have argued for the value of combining both quantitative and qualitative methods, thus producing an eclectic methodological framework – also known as mixed methods research – which is better suited to the task of studying complex social and political phenomena.

Suggest that, in the study of politics at any level, from the domestic through to the international, we need both. In other words, we need to be able to identify and describe with a fair degree of accuracy the political world as it is, and this is certainly where reliable methods, either quantitative or qualitative, or both, have their place in the production of knowledge. We then need to engage with normative theory to make

considered judgments about whether or not this is the most desirable of possible worlds from some ethical point of view. This involves 'value judgments', but perfectly legitimate ones. For both social scientists and those trained in the humanities, it is not a matter of avoiding making value judgments but, rather, a matter of making well-informed judgments based on an assessment of general principles as well as the particularities of any given case

Normative issues in politics are not so different from the ultimate concerns of many scientific endeavors, which are often (although certainly not always) directed to improving some aspect of the world. Indeed, normative judgments often go hand in hand with scientific projects, which are then implemented through social and political institutions. The eradication of diseases, which cause massive human suffering, through a fruitful combination of scientific research and international political action is a prime example.

Another important question in normative theory concerns the sources of human subjectivity and therefore of values, norms and moral sensibilities. One answer that may seem obvious is 'culture'. We tend to learn or absorb our norms and values from our immediate social environment. Initially, this means the family, but families are embedded in wider social groups – communities. And communities are frequently defined in terms of cultural factors – language, religion, socio-political organization, artistic expression and material culture. At a national level, states are often assumed to possess something called 'political culture' – a term used in comparative politics to denote the normative orientation of citizens to their political system. In IR theory, the idea of culture has played an important role, at least since the end of the Cold War, and has generated much debate over whether norms and values – especially those concerning democracy and human rights – can ever be truly universal, or whether they are irredeemably products of particular cultures, and therefore always relative to that culture.

Idealist Theory

Theories in International relations are assertions that try to explain and justify how international structures work. They explain the characteristics of ever-changing interactions across territories. Each theory has been developed and grounded on various perspectives relating to human nature and the world in general, but as the world is

constantly evolving, the usefulness of each theory is also constantly being tested in the face of critical issues as they arise and the success or failure of these applications will determine in essence which of these theories will stand the test of time. This essay is an analysis of the theory of Idealism and whether or not its application in modern international politics is capable of working successfully to solve the problem of common goods.

The Theory of Idealism

Idealism is one of the major theories in international relations. "The basic insight of this theory is that the national characteristics of individual States matter for their international relations." (Slaughter, 2011) This means that all states do not have the same goals based on selfish interests but that a state will relate with another state based on its internal norms and culture. Idealists believe that human nature is not inherently bad and that states are capable of cooperating to the extent of forgoing their interests to achieve a collective goal. Idealists strongly rely on the principles of identity and reciprocity to explain how peace and cooperation can be achieved example through forming international organizations, fostering international cooperation and general interdependence among states. "Idealism emphasizes international law, morality, and international organization, rather than power alone, as key influences on international events". This means that Idealists believe that morality is a very important aspect of interactions on an international level and that power is not the sole determinant of how these interactions go. The major goal of Idealism is to create a democratic and peaceful world where every actor from an individual to an international level can be seen and heard.

The 21st century is considered one of the most peaceful eras of the world and despite regional conflicts here and there, the aftermath of these conflicts on a global scale cannot be compared to other eras e.g. the first and second world wars. In other to achieve a complete state of total cooperation and peace in the world, Immanuel Kant who is considered as the major proponent of the theory of Idealism gave three key solutions: "The civil constitution of every State should be republican, the law of world citizenship shall be limited to conditions of universal hospitality and the law of nations shall be founded on a federation of free States." (Kant, 1795) This means that every state should

operate within a democratic system that has checks and balances, there should be a world federation that will facilitate cooperation among states and that trade among states promotes a situation where actors will be less likely to go to war in order not to jeopardize a process that brings economic gain. These answers can be exemplified in today's European Union and United Nations. Idealists believe that the more people are educated and understand that they can hold their leaders accountable for their actions; the world will be a better place. "They believe that the spread of education and democracy — including increasing democratic control of foreign policy — will empower world public opinion, and make it a powerful force that no government can resist."

The differences between Idealism and Realism.

Idealism is in stark contrast to the second major International relations theory which is realism. Realists strongly believe that the International system revolves around the concept of power and that states actively pursue their self-interests in an international system that is anarchic because of the lack of a central government. Unlike Idealists, realists believe that democratization is not the answer to peace as democratic countries will still go to war against each other. They believe that the state is the only actor that matters and that the international system which is in a constant state of anarchy, can never transition to peace in the absence of power. Now in the light of the argument presented by Realists, a new school of thought developed out of idealism which is the Neo-Liberalism. This theory agrees with realism on the assumption that "states are unitary actors rationally pursuing their self-interest in a system of anarchy."

The Theory of Idealism in Practice

One prominent example of idealism in practice is the United States current foreign policies under the Obama administration. In his speech at the U.S Military Academy at west point's class of 2014, President Obama made statements that are directly in line with the theory of idealism- "Democracies are our closest friends and are far less likely to go to war. Free and open economies perform better and respect for human rights is an antidote to instability and the grievances that fuel violence". Under his administration, President Obama has tried to shape America's policies in a way that its military capabilities are not always called into play in international relations (choosing not to send in troops in the war

in Syria.) That is, we can choose the realist way and use our power (military) to fulfil our national interests but instead, we choose international cooperation and reasoning.

Limitations of Idealism

Although the idealistic approach has been considered successful to an extent given the fact that the world is experiencing its most peaceful era and more international organizations have been formed, it does not always work for every situation. For example, the United States decided to back down from the plan to build a ballistic missile defence shield in central Europe because Russia was against it and threatened to deploy missiles but at the end of the day, Russia still went ahead to deploy missiles to Kaliningrad. It has also been criticized on the fact that it "minimizes considerations of power, and assumes that norms of right behaviour can substitute for national capabilities and material interests and that it neglects political prudence." This means that the fact that the theory of Idealism refuses to acknowledge power as a key component of international relations, it will always be lacking in effect. Some people have argued that Realism is the way to go because that's the way the world is and we need to look at international relations as they are not as they should be, others think that the only way to achieve total peace and cooperation is through realism i.e., there has to be a major power play whereby the aftermath will restore the international system and create a world government and international organizations that will facilitate cooperation and general transition to world peace.

Still, there is no denying the fact that the theory of idealism is composed of interesting keys to solving the problems of war and international relations even though it will be quite difficult to achieve:" ideals can be pursued effectively only if decision-makers are alert to the distribution of power, national interests, and the consequences of their policies." (Goldsmith & Krasner, 2003) This means that Idealists need to factor in the current state of International relations and find a way that the utopian world that they envision can be achieved regardless of the "obstacles" they perceive.

Realist Theory

Assumptions are logical beliefs and are very important as these are building blocks of a theoretical approach. For example, you assume that man is selfish by nature; or that he is a social animal who loves to cooperate and live peacefully with other human

beings. These assumptions together help explain a problem and provide coherence to a perspective or approach to IR. For these reasons, it is important to know the core assumptions of Realism that it uses as its basic tools to make sense of the International Relations.

States are the Primary Actors in the International System This assumption of Realism has three expressed meanings:

I. International politics is a domain of conflict between and among sovereign states. Conflictual interaction among these sovereign states is the core of international politics.

II. States in international politics are sovereign, unitary and rational actors. At least at conceptual level, sovereign states are supremely powerful, unified with fixed political goals and they do costbenefit analyses.

III. In its interaction with other states, each state seeks to promote and guarantee its own 'interest'. The foremost interest of each state is its own security and expansion of its power.

IV. In order to ensure its own security, each state seeks to secure and accumulate power. Power alone deters others from attacking it. In other words, every state is out to enhance and expand its capability at the cost of other states.

V. IR is Anarchic in Character In Realism, 'anarchy' defines International Relations. Anarchy means that there is no "central authority" or "world government" to manage or put in order the international relations among sovereign states which are distrustful of each other and which, out of a sense of insecurity, accumulate more and more power so as to become 'secure'. 'Anarchy' is an assumed political condition in which there is no world authority to enforce order. This assumed condition "frees" the state to undertake cost-benefit calculations and act towards its self-interest or "national interest" by depending solely on its own capability. Capability – military, technological, economic, and political – must continue to expand and become formidable; otherwise the state may risk its life and protection.

VI. Control over Material Resources is Fundamental to World Politics In order to enhance its capability, every state is constantly striving to gain maximum control

over the material resources and this tendency to control is fundamental to the world politics. Realism tries to justify this assumption by linking it with other assumptions that the approach fosters. States are motivated to have control over material resources because i) there is no central authority to reasonably distribute the resources among its constituent units; ii) the material resources are not in abundance; and iii) the material resources add to the coercive capacity of a state against its counterparts which is critical in an anarchic political set up. These reasons motivate a state to acquire more and more capability. Besides E. H. Carr, Hans Morgenthau and Kenneth Waltz, a number of other scholars have developed Realism ideas and insights which constitute the core of Realist School. Of, course, there are important differences among these scholars; for instance, between Morgenthau and Waltz. Be that as it may, while certain assumptions and principles constitute the core of Realism, there are several strands or categories within Realism.

Three principal assumptions have been stated above. What are the implications of these and other assumptions? Let us have a look at the following:

I. Sovereign states are the only full actors in international system. Realists draw from the ideas of Thomas Hobbes. Hobbes had described man as selfish, rational and calculating. In a similar fashion, a state is selfish, rational and thinks of its interests first. It feels insecure and remains distrustful of the intentions of other states who think and behave exactly the same way. Such a state has the tendency to prepare for war and expand its power at the cost of another state, so as to guarantee its own security.

II. With no supranational authority to impose order, international system, inhabited by such ratioinal, self-centred and distrustful actors, is anarchic. International system is simply a set of interacting states; each pursuing power in order to ensure its survival and further aggrandizement. In other words, anarchy in the international system produces an inherently unstable condition.

III. The foremost concern of every state is its security. To ensure its survival and security, a state tends to accumulate power. As one state gathers more power,

other states fear it. There is the context of power accumulation by every state and an atmosphere of mutual distrust.

IV. There is expediency in the behaviour of states. States may find it convenient to follow established international 'rules' in the short term, they do so in order to secure their long term goals viz. security and power. Realists argue that states will violate these rules as soon as they are no longer convenient to the state's pursuit of power. After all, there is no global government to enforce international law and customs.

V. According to Realism, international system is given shape and stability by the relative power of its constituent states. This means that the system's polarity is an important Realist tool when analysing the nature of international relations on the global or regional scale. Realism's model of the anarchic international system helps it to explain the persistence of war – defined as large-scale organised violence between two or more international actors in pursuit of political ends. Realism is a good guide in explaining the causes of war in international relations. It does so by simplifying the world– highlighting just those actors and interactions that contribute to its explanation of international conflict. Realists claim that they understand the world; that their claims are grounded in actual behaviour of the states and the ruling elites; therefore Realism is empirical and scientific.

World Systems Theory

World-system theory is a macro sociological perspective that seeks to explain the dynamics of the "capitalist world economy" as a "total social system". Its first major articulation, and classic example of this approach, is associated with Immanuel Wallenstein, who in 1974 published what is regarded as a seminal paper, The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis. In 1976 Wallenstein published The Modern World System I: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century. This is Wallenstein's landmark contribution to sociological and historical thought and it triggered numerous reactions, and inspired many others to build on his ideas. Because of the main concepts and intellectual building blocks of world-system theory –which will be outlined later–, it has had a major impact and perhaps its more warm reception in the developing world.

Where is world-system theory positioned in the intellectual world? It falls at the same time, into the fields of historical sociology and economic history. In addition, because of its emphasis on development and unequal opportunities across nations, it has been embraced by development theorists and practitioners. This combination makes the world-system project both a political and an intellectual endeavor. Wallenstein's approach is one of praxis, in which theory and practice are closely interrelated, and the objective of intellectual activity is to create knowledge that uncovers hidden structures and allows oneself to act upon the world and change it. "Man's ability to participate intelligently in the evolution of his own system is dependent on his ability to perceive the whole

World-system research is largely qualitative, although early on Wallenstein rejected the distinction between homothetic and idiographic methodologies to understand the world. For Wallenstein, there is an objective world which can be quantitatively understood, but it is, no matter for how long it has existed, a product of history. But to the most part, his methods are associated with history and with interpretive sociology. His work is methodologically somewhere in between Marx and Weber, both of whom were important inspirations for his own work.

Background

Immanuel Wallerstein

World-system theory has been closely associated with Immanuel Wallerstein, and understanding the intellectual context in which this body of knowledge is positioned, means also understanding Wallerstein, so let us begin by talking about him.

Immanuel Wallerstein was born in 1930 in New York, where he grew up and did all his studies. He entered Columbia University, where he obtained his BS, MA and PhD degrees. He remained a faculty member in Columbia's Department of Sociology from 1958 to 1971. His passage through Columbia occurred at a time when "[Columbia's] cosmopolitanism and rebelliousness stood in sharp contrast to the genteel established liberalism of Harvard and Yale. His primary mentor was C. Wright Mills, from whom, according to Gold frank, Wallenstein learned his historical sensitivity, his ambition to understand macro-structures, and his rejection of both liberalism and, to a lesser degree, Marxism. While being a faculty Member at Columbia, Wallenstein got interested in

Africa and along the way, he spent time in Paris. In Paris he was exposed to two major intellectual influences, the Annales group of historians, and also to what by the time were radical political ideas. Paris was the center for political and intellectual radicalism among Africans, Asians and Latin Americans, and the locus of the major challenges to Anglo-American liberalism and empiricism. In Africa he did field work that exposed him to the Third World, and he wrote his dissertation on the processes of national formation in West Africa. Here, Gold frank tells us, he started to build his world view of "creative self-destruction", of rise and demise. His exposure to the third world had a great impact on his work. In his introduction to The Modern World System, Wallenstein, in a revealing statement, says that "In general, in a deep conflict, the eyes of the downtrodden are more acute about the reality of the present. For it is in their interest to perceive correctly in order to expose the hypocrisies of the rulers. They have less interest in ideological deflection.

Aims

Wallenstein's work developed at a time when the dominant approach to understanding development, modernization theory, was under attack from many fronts, and he followed suit. He himself acknowledges that his aim was to create an alternative explanation (Wallerstein, 2000). He aimed at achieving "a clear conceptual break with theories of 'modernization' and thus provide a new theoretical paradigm to guide our investigations of the emergence and development of capitalism, industrialism, and national states" (Skocpol, 1977, p. 1075). Criticisms to modenization include (1) the reification of the nation-state as the sole unit of analysis, (2) assumption that all countries can follow only a single path of evolutionary development, (3) disregard of the world-historical development of transnational structures that constrain local and national development, (4) explaining in terms of historical ideal types of "tradition" versus "modernity", which are elaborated and applied to national cases. In reacting to modernization theory, Wallenstein outlined a research agenda with five major subjects: the functioning of the capitalist world-economy as a system, the how and why of its origins, its relations with no capitalist structures in previous centuries, comparative study of alternative modes of production, and the ongoing transition to socialism (Goldfrank, 2000; Wallenstein.

Building Blocks

There are three major intellectual building blocks of world-system theory, as conceived by Wallenstein: the Annales school, Marx, and dependence theory. These building blocks are associated with Wallenstein's life experience and exposure to various issues, theories, and situations.

World-system theory owes to the Annales School, whose major representative is Fernando Braudel, its historical approach. Wallenstein got from Braudel's his insistence on the long term (la longue dureé). He also learned to focus on geo-ecological regions as units of analysis (think of Braudel's The Mediterranean), attention to rural history, and reliance on empirical materials from Braudel. The impact of the Annales is at the general methodological level.

From Marx, Wallenstein learned that (1) the fundamental reality if social conflict among materially based human groups, (2) the concern with a relevant totality, (3) the transitory nature of social forms and theories about them, (4) the centrality of the accumulation process and competitive class struggles that result from it, (5) a dialectical sense of motion through conflict and contradiction. Wallenstein's ambition has been to revise Marxism itself.

World-system theory is in many ways an adaptation of dependency theory. Wallenstein draws heavily from dependency theory, a neo-Marxist explanation of development processes, popular in the developing world, and among whose figures are Fernando Henrique Cardoso, a Barzilian. Dependency theory focuses on understanding the "periphery" by looking at core-periphery relations, and it has flourished in peripheral regions like Latin America. It is from a dependency theory perspective that many contemporary critiques to global capitalism come from.

Other important influences in Wallenstein's work, still present in contemporary world system research, are Karl Polanyi and Joseph Schumpeter. From the latter comes world system interest in business cycles, nod from the former, the notion of three basic modes of economic organization: reciprocal, redistributive, and market modes. These are analogous to Wallerstein's concepts of mini-systems, world-empires, and world-economies.

Neorealism

New ideas emerged in the 1970s; some of them were critical of 'Classical' Realist assumptions. Together these ideas came to be described as 'Neorealism' or 'Structural Realism' as Kenneth Waltz calls it. Waltz wrote his Theory of International Politics in 1979 and used the expression 'Structural Realism.

Waltz said that theories of international politics could be developed at 'three levels of analysis – individual, the state and the international system.' The major defect of 'Classical' Realism is that it is not able to explain behaviour at a level above the state. 'Classical' Realism explains international politics in terms of the nature and action of state only. In other words, egoism and national interest are at the core of 'Classical' Realism'. Waltz takes an important step forward: he explains the behaviour of the state in terms of the structure of the international system. In other words, while 'Classical' Realism explains international politics in terms of 'the inside'; Neorealism does it in terms of 'the outside'. In shifting attention from the state to the international system, Neorealist places an emphasis on the implications of anarchy. The characteristics of international life stem from the fact that states (and other international actors) operate within a domain which has no formal central authority. But how does this shape the behaviour of states? And why, according to Neorealist's, does international anarchy tend towards conflict rather than cooperation? Let us explain.

Waltz draws from Systems theories. He argues that Systems are composed of a structure and their interacting units. Political structures have three elements: an ordering principle (anarchic), the character of the units (functionally alike or differentiated) and the distribution of capabilities. Waltz argues that two elements of the structure of the international system are constant: the lack of an overarching authority means that its ordering principle is anarchy, and the principle of self-help means that all of the units remain functionally alike. Accordingly, the one structural variable is the distribution of capabilities, with the main distinction falling between bipolar and multicolor systems. In other words, in the anarchic world system where all states are security conscious, power differential between states becomes crucial. Some states have more capabilities than others; and that shapes the world politics.

Anarchy is the organizing principle of the International System

The basic difference between 'Classical' Realism and Neorealist is their contrasting views on the source and content of states' preferences. In contrast to 'Classical' Realism, Neorealist excludes the internal makeup of different states. Morgenthau's Classical' Realism relied on the assumption that leaders of states are motivated by their lust for power. Waltz's theory, by contrast, omits leader's motivations and state characteristics as causal variables for international outcomes, except for the minimal assumption that states seek to survive. In other words, Waltz ignores two assumptions important in 'Classical' Realism namely egoism and power aggrandizement by the state. Instead he considers the third assumption namely, the anarchy in the international system. He wants to identify the persistent effects of the international system. Two points bear significance: states (units) in the anarchic international system are interconnected. Change in some units or change in their mutual relations produces notable changes in other parts of the international system. Secondly, international system is not the sum total of its parts. Rather, international system exhibits properties and behaviours that are different from those of the parts. Because systems are generative, the international political system is characterized by complex nonlinear relationships and unintended consequences. Outcomes are influenced by something more than simply the aggregation of individual states' behaviours, with a tendency toward unintended and ironic outcomes. As a result, there is a gap between what states want and what states get. Consequently, unlike 'Classical' Realists, Neorealist's see international politics as tragic, rather than as being driven by the aggressive behaviour of revisionist states. To put it in simple words, for Neorealist's, international system, from outside and above, impacts and shapes the behaviour of the states. In other words, the institutions and norms that inform the international system endow it with autonomy and, as if, with a purpose of its own.

What are the implications of international anarchy? Neorealist's argue that international anarchy necessarily tends towards tension, conflict and the unavoidable possibility of war for three main reasons. (i) In the first place, as states are separate, autonomous and formally equal political units, they must ultimately rely on their own resources to realize their interests. International anarchy therefore results in a system of 'self-help', because states cannot count on anyone else to 'take care of them.' (ii) Second, relationships between and amongst states are always characterized by uncertainty and

suspicion. This is best explained through the 'security dilemma'. Although self-help forces states to ensure security and survival by building up sufficient military capability to deter other states from attacking them, such actions are always liable to be interpreted as hostile or aggressive by other states. Uncertainty about motives therefore forces states to treat all other states as enemies, meaning that permanent insecurity is the inescapable consequence of living in conditions of anarchy. (iii) Third, conflict is also encouraged by the fact that states are primarily concerned about maintaining or improving their position relative to other states; that is, with making relative gains. Apart from anything else, this discourages cooperation and reduces the effectiveness of international organizations, because, although all states may benefit from a particular action or policy, each state is actually more worried about whether other states benefit more that it does. Although such Neorealist thinking had a profound impact both within and beyond the Realist tradition, since the 1990s Realist theories have often attempted to fuse other theories and assumptions, giving rise to what has been called 'Neoclassical Realism' or 'Post-Neorealist' – a new subcategory in Realism.

'Security Dilemma':

Neorealist or Structural Realism reaches many of the same conclusions as 'Classical' Realism. However, it does so by looking at systemic rather than individual and state-level causes. This means that it focuses less on human nature and more on the anarchic structure of the international system in which states operate. Kenneth Waltz emphasizes upon the distinction between his approach and that of Morgenthau. Whereas 'Classical' Realism places responsibility for war at the feet of selfish and narrow-minded individual human beings, Waltz points to the anarchical structure of the international system as the main reason for the persistence of war. He asserts that states are victims of the 'security dilemma', in which effort of a state to ensure its survival threatens the security of other states around it. Following Realism's concept of self-help, Waltz argues that the only rational course of action for a state in an anarchic international system is to maintain enough military and political power to defend itself against aggression. In doing so, it might invest in new weapons or seek alliances with other states that may or may not come to its aid in a crisis. Unfortunately, these steps toward self-defence appear threatening to neighboring states, forcing them to respond with their own military build-

up and alliance making. In a world defined by mutual suspicion, one state's attempts to safeguard its survival make other states less secure, forcing them to respond with their own self-help strategies. The result is an arms race in which every state builds up its military capability in response to others' actions. This is the crux of the 'security dilemma'. Neorealist's use it to explain the persistence of conflict and war on the international stage. In the absence of a world government, states are condemned to exist in an environment of mutual distrust and one state's declaration that it is seeking armed strength for purely defensive reasons is certain to be met with suspicion by its neighbors. Balance of Power, alliance system, arms race are few of the strategic tools of the states in this game of survival.

Balance of Power, Polarity and Stability: The fact that states are inclined to treat other states as enemies does not inevitably lead to bloodshed and open violence. Rather, Neorealist's, in common with 'Classical' Realists, believe that conflict can be contained by the balance of power - a key concept for all types of Realists. However, while 'Classical' Realists treat the balance of power (BOP) as a product of prudent statecraft, Neorealist's see it as a consequence of the structural dynamics of the international system, and specifically, of the distribution of power between and among states. To recall, distribution of power and power capability is a variable and not a constant in Waltz's thinking. The principal factor affecting the likelihood of a balance of power, and therefore the prospect of war or peace, is the number of great powers operating within the international system. Although Neorealist's believe that there is a general bias in the international system in favour of balance rather than imbalance, world order is determined by the changing fate of great powers. This is reflected in an emphasis on polarity. Power polarity indicates the level of stability or lack of it.

Waltz and Neorealist's have generally associated bipolar systems with stability and a reduced likelihood of war, while multicolor systems have been associated with instability and a greater likelihood of war. This had inclined Waltz and other Neorealist's to view Cold War bipolarity in broadly positive terms, as a 'long peace'; and to warn about the implications of rising multipolarity of the post-Cold War era. Obviously, therefore, Neorealist's are not happy about the rising tide of multipolarism. Neorealist's disagree among themselves about the relationship between structural Realism instability

and the likelihood of war. The 'Offensive Realists' believe that instability of a multipolar world could lead to conflict and war; whereas the 'Defensive Realists' maintain that since states tend to prioritize security over power, they remain generally reluctant to go to war, regardless of the dynamics of the international system.

For the Neorealist's, bipolar systems tend towards stability and strengthen the likelihood of peace. This happens for two main reasons: The existence of only two great powers encourages each to maintain the bipolar system as, in the process, they are maintaining themselves. Fewer great powers means the possibilities of great power wars are reduced. The existence of only two great powers reduces the chances of miscalculation and makes it easier to operate an effective system of deterrence: Power relationships are more stable as each bloc is forced to rely on inner (economic and military) resources; whereas, external (alliances with other states or blocs) means of expanding power not being available. On the other hand, multicolor systems tend to be inherently unstable. A larger number of great powers increases the number of possible great power conflicts. Multipolarity creates a bias in favour of fluidity and, perhaps, instability, as it leads to shifting alliances as great powers have external means of extending their influence. As power is more decentralized, existing great powers may be more restless and ambitious while weak states may be able to form alliances in order to challenge and displace existing great powers. The international political outcomes that Waltz predicts include: multipolar systems will be less stable than bipolar systems; interdependence will be lower in bipolarity than multipolarity; and that regardless of unit (state) behaviour, hegemony by any single state is unlikely or even impossible.

Waltz's Theory of International Politics proved to be influential generating new debates and giving new impetus to existing ones. For example, the debate over whether states' concerns over relative gains impeded cooperation?; and whether bipolar or multipolar international systems were more war prone? In the 1980s, Theory of International Politics came under scholarly criticism. As time went by, subcategories in Nonrealism, in particular the 'neoliberal institutionalism' and writings on the 'democratic peace' became more popular. Realism's decline in the 1990s was amplified by international events. The closing years of the twentieth century seemed to provide strong support for alternative approaches. The disintegration of Soviet Union; formation of the

European Union (EU) and economic integration in South East Asian and other regions; the wave of democratization and economic liberalization throughout the former Soviet Union, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the other parts of the developing world; and the improbability of war between the great powers all made Realism, both 'Classical' and 'Neo' and their various strands, seem outdated (Jervis 2002). It appeared that Liberal or Constructivist theories could better appreciate and explain the changes taking place in the international arena. But Realism staged a sort of comeback after the terrorist events of September 11, 2001 in the United States. Security of the state once again became the top concern in International Relations. Not surprisingly, the post-9/11, Realism is regarded as being better suited to address threats to national security. It is, however, ironic that its renaissance is at least partly owed to transnational terrorist networks motivated by religious extremism – non-state actors which Realism had never taken into account.

Neoliberal Theory

Like Realism, Liberalism (and its current variant neo-liberalism) is a mainstream approach to understand international politics. And, like Realism it is a name given to a family of related theories of international relations. It has a multidimensional tradition dating back to the 17th and 18th centuries. Historically, the liberal tradition emerged as a critique of feudal political rule. It also emerged as a critique of mercantilism, the dominant economic strategy of those times. Liberalism is also a rich tradition of thought concerning international relations. In this unit, we are concerned mainly with the latter dimension of liberalism.

In the 18th and 19th centuries, liberal philosophers and political thinkers debated the difficulties of establishing just, orderly and peaceful relations between peoples. A systematic account of the problems of world peace was given by Immanuel Kant in 1795. His ideas have had a profound impact on the development of liberalism in international relations.

In the 19th century, solutions to the problem of war evaded even the most eminent of thinkers. Much of the liberal scholarship became content with diplomatic history until the outbreak of the First World War. The Great War and the destruction that it caused forced the liberal thinkers to find new means to prevent violent conflicts and create conditions in which reason and cooperation would prevail. Basing their premise on the

inherent goodness of man, these liberal thinkers focused on negotiations, rule of law and establishing stable international institutions. The widespread anti-war sentiment within Europe and North America which existed in the 1920s provided the necessary support for the liberal enterprise.

However, the failure of the League of Nations and the outbreak of the Second World War led to the marginalization of liberal thought that was infused with idealism. Realism came to the fore as it seemed to provide a better explanation of the power politics of the Cold War that came to dominate international relations. Nevertheless, innovations in liberal tradition continued leading to the development of a number of theories to explain the developments in international relations. Prominent among them are sociological liberalism (or transnational's), pluralism, interdependence theory, liberal internationalism, liberal peace theory, world society and neo-liberal approaches.

In the early 1980s when conflict between major powers had receded and cooperation in pursuit of mutual interests had emerged as a prominent feature of world politics, a new paradigm or framework of analysis emerged in the liberal tradition-Neoliberal Internationalism. As this approach emerged in response to the development of neorealist, it is also called as the Neoliberal approach. This new approach infused greater scientific rigor in liberal scholarship.

In the 1990s, regional and international economic integration (globalization) on the one hand and new issues, such as multiculturalism, democracy, environment on the other, have led liberalism to focus on international order, institutions and processes of governance, human rights, democratisation, peace and economic integration. The focus of this unit is on the dominant features of the liberal tradition in the years before the Second World War and the important trends in the evolution of liberalism in the post-war years, focusing in particular on the neo-liberal approach.

Neo-Liberal

We have seen in the last unit that there was a new positivist orientation and shift in the scope of the Realist approach that has come to be called Neo-realism or structural realism. A similar shift occurred in Liberalism, largely as a reaction to the rise of Neorealism. Two seminal works that marked a break from the existing liberal tradition in international relations are Robert Keohane's After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord

in the World Political Economy (1984) and Robert Axelrod's Evolution of Cooperation (1981). While the former focused on complex interdependence, the latter applied game theory to explain how cooperation emerges and persists. These publications introduced a new conceptual framework in liberal studies which has come to be called as Neo-liberalism. The use of the 'neo-liberal' label is no doubt because the theories developed by Keohane and Axelrod shared a lot with neo-realism. They accepted the two basic assumptions of international anarchy and rational egoism of states to show that it was possible for rational egoists to cooperate even in anarchic systems. They also drew on material from the same kind of sources as the neorealists- in particular game theory, public choice and rational choice theory.

A Break with Tradtional Liberalism Neo-liberalism differed from classical liberalism in several important ways. To begin with Liberal thought had not addressed the question of anarchy in the international system. Neo-liberals accepted the neorealist proposition that the international system is anarchic, but rejected the realist assertion that this condition would lead to conflict. Instead, Neo-liberals emphasised the centrality of cooperation in international politics. An important question that they pose to the Realists is "If the anarchic international system necessarily creates a self-help environment-a war of all against all as Hobbes suggested -then why is war not more common?"

Neo-liberals also differ from classical liberals on the causes of conflict. As we saw, liberalism had emphasized on the centrality of human nature and argued that conflict and war was the result of bad actors or failure of cooperation. Neoliberals, on the other hand, stress on the importance of international institutions in structuring international environment in ways that mitigates against anarchy. In other words, causes for conflict cannot be traced to human nature, but to the presence or absence of international institutions. Neo-liberals assert that international institutions perform the following tasks:

1. Encourage communication and dialogue between states creating a forum to negotiate their differences.
2. Promote transparency in interaction between states and in the agreements that they negotiate.
3. Help to shape expectations and to develop collective international norms that offer stability and predictability in global politics

4. Establish a framework to promote reciprocity and bargaining between states facilitating the peaceful resolution of disputes. They permit the coordination of policy to address tensions in collective action problems and thus help to avoid the security and prisoners' dilemmas.

It is because of the importance placed on global institutions that the Neo-liberal theory of international relations is also referred to as Neo-liberal Institutionalism.

Secondly, Neo-Liberalism differs with Liberalism on the question of important actors in global politics. Liberalism tends to emphasise the importance of individual agents as actors in global politics. Individual choice and psychology tend to play an important role in the Liberal explanations and analysis. In sharp contrast, Neo-liberals accept the Realist assertion that the state is the most important actor though they add international institutions as essentially as collections of states as well. Other actors would include non state actors like MNCs and NGOs. They accept the Neorealist claim that the state is a rational actor and that it engages in cost benefit analysis in pursuit of defined goals. Liberals would not be necessarily comfortable with this claim.

Finally, Neo-liberalism differs with Liberalism in its analysis of conflicts. Liberalism is generally historical and philosophical in their orientation, explaining conflict in specific historical context. It draws extensively on fields like political theory and philosophy. Neo-liberal explanations of conflicts, on the other hand, tend to be more focused on ahistorical structural explanations. Neo-liberals draw extensively from game theory and behavioural economics rather than history and philosophy in their analysis. Neo-liberals often use concepts from game theory to show how the structure of the international system can force particular outcomes or can lead to situations where rational decision making which may appear to be rational but which lead to suboptimal outcomes.

The Neo-Neo Debate in IR

If we are to examine the emergence of liberalism and neoliberals as an academic discipline, it is necessary to focus on the Great Debates of IR. The First Great Debate between realism and liberal internationalism showed how the failure of the League of Nations proved that the idea of harmony of interest was not correct. Historians such as E.H Carr termed liberal internationalism as 'utopianism' and 'idealism' (Brown and Ainley 2009: 26). The Second Great Debate between Behaviouralism and Post-

behaviouralism focused on whether IR should be studied by taking help from methods of natural science or it should be done by taking a more value-based approach (Daddow 2013: 70). The third Great Debate in international relations between Neo-realism and Neo-Liberalism (the neo-neo debate) gives a detailed understanding of neoliberalism in IR as an approach to study. Both neorealism and neoliberalism believe that states are rational actors. But there are certain differences between them. They are as follows:

- Neorealist and Neoliberals accept that there is anarchy in the international system (Baldwin 1993). Neorealist argues that due to anarchy, states will never cooperate with one another. They will always compete with each other. Neorealist's feel that cooperation depends upon the will of the state. The neoliberals on the other hand point out that states do cooperate with one another on those issue areas where they have similar interests
- Neorealist focuses on survival. Hence, use of force cannot be avoided. On the other hand, the neoliberal school believes in the idea of complex interdependence.
- The neorealist's have given importance to 'high politics' such as military and diplomacy. For the neo-liberals, trade and economic activities are more important.
- Neo-liberals are optimistic about cooperative behaviour and therefore argue in favour of absolute gains. When states are conducting economic interactions, it leads to a positive sum game. All parties involved in the process benefit. Neo-realism, on the other hand, holds that states compete with one another and therefore there can be only relative gains.
- Neo-realism throws light on capabilities of the states. They feel that states are always uncertain about the intentions of other states. Neo-liberalism gives more importance to the preferences and intentions of states.
- Neo-liberals argue that international regimes play an important role world politics. They can help states to cooperate among themselves. Neo-realism does not agree with this point.

From the above, it is evident that there is much in common between the neorealism and neo-liberalism. Scholars outside the United States as well as those who work outside these paradigms therefore call it a 'neo-neo synthesis'. Moreover, they argue that the neo-neo debate has not advanced IR scholarship as a whole. Instead it has

narrowed the field to a superficial enquiry based on questionable assumptions (such as anarchy) and methodologies that may or may not be suitable to the discipline.

The Darker side of Neo-Liberalism

A number of studies based on the neoliberal approach have emerged since the 1980s. However, almost all studies have focused on the experience of Western countries with international interdependence and regimes. As Robert Cox has observed, "regime theory has much to say about economic cooperation among the Group of 7 (G- 7) and other groupings of advanced capitalist countries with regard to problems common to them. It has correspondingly less to say about attempts to change the structure of world economy, e.g. in the Third World demand for a New International Economic Order (NIEO). Indeed, regimes are designed to Liberalism & Neo-Liberalism stabilize the world economy and have the effect, as Keohane has underlined in his work, of inhibiting and deterring states from initiating radical departures from economic orthodoxy, e.g. through socialism."

The principal cooperative institution of the Global South during the Cold War, the Nonaligned Movement (NAM) has received scant attention from the Neoliberal theorists. Secondly, these theories would 'assume, rather than establish, regimes as benevolent, voluntary, cooperative and legitimate' (Kieley, 1990, 90), a highly questionable assumption when one considers the exclusionary nature of some of the regimes and multilateral institution, at least from the point of Global South. Consider the case of those Latin American countries which have experienced economic inequality as a result of privatization and Structural Adjustment Policy (SAP). Bolivia, Venezuela and other Latin American nations have expressed their voices in protest of the neoliberal economic policies (Lamy 2008: 136). Moreover, it needs to be remembered that due to the increased mobility of capital, the government of states have faced difficulties in taxing the profits incurring from privatization-led development projects (Rodrik 1997). Had the government been able to earn revenues from these projects, it could have been channelized towards the development of social sectors such as health, education and social security measures. Hence, it can be argued that as a theory, neoliberals is a construct of the developed world. As Robert Cox famously argued, 'Theory is always for someone and for some purposes'

State System

The 'State' in its modern sense of a territorial nation-state emerged as a result of momentous developments in Europe between the fifteenth and seventeenth centuries. In today's world, there are around 185 states which constitutes the international system. International relations and politics are generally understood as a set of actions, reactions and interactions between sovereign states, through the medium of their foreign policies. As the most authoritative political institution, the state can mobilize all domestic resources needed to carry on international interactions in the form of war, or the pursuit of diplomacy and peace. In this unit we will discuss the evolution of state system and its relevance in contemporary international relations and the world community.

Power is the capacity that enables a person to exercise control over the minds and actions of others. In respect of the sovereign stilts, power has been defined as the ability of state 'A' to influence the behaviour of state 'B' and other states. A powerful state can ensure that the powerful countries act in the manner that the former would like them to behave. Depending on the power that a state possesses, it may be described as a Super power, Big power or Small power. It is very difficult to exactly measure the power of a state, but power is often measured in terms of its elements. Some elements of power are tenable like the size of the territory, topography and its location; population of a state; the size of the armed forces; and possession of natural resources. There are a number of intangible elements also that determine power. These include quality of leadership and morale of the people and the armed forces. The state exercises power through methods such as persuasion, rewards, punishment and force. Those who possess power, which is like money, manage it by different means. Most prominent of these means are balance of power and collective security.

International Relations are often identified with foreign policy. This is not wholly correct, yet foreign policy is a vital tool of nation-states. National interest is the key concept in foreign policy. Foreign policy makers have to start with proper understanding of the country's national interest. National interest has been described as indeed the last word in international politics.

Primary objective of foreign policy makers is to ensure security of the state. In fact security is the most essential component of the national interest. Security is not

merely the protection of territorial integrity and sovereignty of the state. It is also vitally concerned with the economic development, which in turn enables a country to increase its power and to use it to secure a place of respect in the world community. Thus, the four concepts that we will discuss in this unit are closely interrelated and their understanding is essential for proper appreciation of international relations.

The State System

The world community is organized into over 185 sovereign states. The organization of humankind intg sovereign states is now called the state system. Palmer and Perkins define .what is variously described as Western State System, the nation-state system or (sovereign) state system as: "It is the pattern of political life in which people are separately organized into sovereign states that must manage to get along together." Sovereignty and a definite territory are two of the essential attributes of a state. Of course, there should always be, as Garner said, a community of persons, having an organized government. Each state acquires coercive power to ensure compliance. The state system has evolved during the last three and a half centuries. It is the dominant pattern today. International Relations, infect, are relations and interactions among the states who constitute the state-system.

Features of the State System

Certain features of the state system are essential conditions, without which the state. System cannot exist. These features have been described by Palmer and Perkins as corollaries. They are the concepts of nationalism, sovereignty and power. Nationalism is that psychological or spiritual quality which unites the people of a state and " gives them the will to champion what they regard as their national interest." sovereignty is the concept of unlimited powers. A group of people who are territorially organized are called sovereign when they possess both internal and external freedom to do what they wish to do. National power is the might of a state which enables the state to get things done as it would like them to be done. Power is a complex of many tangible and intangible elements.

We have studied about the concept of nationalism in unit 2, and the Concept of power is analyzed in detail in the next section of this unit. The concept of sovereignty is briefly dealt with below. You will notice in every modern state, such as India, Britain,

Russia, the United States, Pakistan or Egypt, there lives a community of numerous persons who possess a government which is generally obeyed by the people and which does not obey any external authority. Such a state is situated within a definite territory.

Sovereignty, in simple terms, means the supreme power of the state both internally and externally. It is the attribute of sovereignty which distinguishes the state from other associations or organisations.

One of the earliest definitions of sovereignty was given by the French philosopher Jean Bodin (1 530-1596),who defined it as "supreme power over citizens and subjects, unrestrained by law." However, Bodin's main object was to strengthen the position of the French Monarch who was then facing civil war and chaos.

Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), elaborated on the concept of sovereignty, shifting the emphasis from the person of the king to the abstraction called government or state. - Hobbes equated the sovereign with the state and government.

A useful distinction is made between internal and external sovereignty. Internal sovereignty concerns the supreme and lawful authority of the state over its citizens. External sovereignty, on the other hand, refers to the recognition by all states, of the independence, territorial integrity and inviolability of each state, as represented by its government. Hugo Grotius, (1583 -1645),the Dutch jurist defined sovereignty as "that power whose acts are not subject to the control of another." For him, sovereignty was manifested when a state, in dealing with its internal affairs, remained free from the control of other states. Thus defined, sovereignty has become the cornerstone of the modern international system. It is this external sovereignty that we are concerned with here.

This concept of sovereignty was for the first time recognized and institutionalized in the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. It provided that : (i) only sovereign states could engage in international relations; (ii) for the purpose of recognizing a state as an actor in international relations, it nust have a geographical territories a definite population, land and effective military power to fulfill international obligations; and (iii) all sovereign states are equal in international law and international relations.

Evolution of the State System

The signing of the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, after the Thirty years war, is identified as the beginning of the state system in its modern form. States did indeed exist before Westphalia, and they conducted relations among themselves but that was quite different from modern state system. In the ancient world there existed small city states in Greece, India, Egypt and Italy. Athens and Sparta in ancient Greece, and Indraprastha and Hastinapur in India were some such city-states. Then, there had been a succession of sprawling dynastic empires. The world had also known the vast Roman Empire which encompassed the entire civilised Western World. But there had been no nation state with sovereignty.

The Thirty Years War had resulted out of the Protestant-Catholic conflict The struggle did not establish any dominant religion, yet it ended the undisputed authority of the catholic church. It resulted in a spirit of mutual toleration which has not yet I been threatened. It laid the foundation of the nation state system. Palmer and Perkins write : "In spite of enormous destruction, the wrecking of the universal Church, and the fragmentation of Europe into well-defined nation-states, the resulting peace of Westphalia (1648) paved the way for a semblance of European stabihty."

The culmination of the Thirty Year War in the Peace of Westphalia marked the starting point for new norms governing the behaviour of states in their relations with each other. The medieval conception dominated by the image of a Euro-centric Christian commonwealth gave way to a new concept of an international system based on the co-existence of sovereign states. Territorial states emerged as the sole legitimate players in the new international system. Only sovereign states could either wage wars, or enter into treaties. or alliances with each other.

A corollary to the principle of state sovereignty was naturally the principle of state equality. As Vattel puts it in his celebrated argument ,"a dwarf is as much as man as a giant is. a small republic no less a sovereign state than the most powerful kingdom.

This was at least the juridical position. Reality, however, was quite different. State equality was practically limited to the great powers of Europe namely France, Great Britain, Austria and Russia. The so-called "anti-hegemony norm “embodied in the concept of a "just balance of power" was the exclusive privilege of the Great powers. The

non-European states however, did not figure in the actual scheme of thin6 that emerged after the Westphalian peace.

Rather, the international norms of this period were based on the then extant dynastic concept of state. The principle of sovereignty meant that the dynasties ruling the territorial states of Europe recognized each other as rightful, independent and sovereign. The post-Westphalia system thus developed its own hierarchies.

International relations between peace of Westphalia and the Treaty of Utrecht (17 13) were marked by the attempts of Louis XIV to establish French hegemony, and rivalry among Britain, Francs, Holland and Spain. Eventually, France suffered heavy losses by the Treaty of Utrecht. France promised that Spain and France would never be united. Unification of Prussia was encouraged leading to a new balance in Europe. Sweden, Russia and Poland could not take any decision without involving west European? Countries.

The mutation within the Westphalia system and its further elaboration was seen in the system that emerged after the Congress of Vienna (1815). This system was still Eurocentric with 22 of the 23 member states being European and the last being the B United States. Yet in a sense, it was a global system in that it lald the norms that were to affect every part of the world. The backward countries became the battleground for the resolution of the conflicts of great powers. The system that emerged after the Vienna Congress was a system of great-power hegemony and known as the Concert of Europe. It was somewhat of a prototype of the collective security system that we see today. Five great powers, namely, Britan, France, Prussia, Russia and Austria took upon themselves the responsibility of maintaining international order. The concert of Europe rested on the assumption that world order could not be maintained without the exercise of special rights by these great powers.

The rise of nationalism and thereby the emergence of new norms led to what has been termed, the updating of the Westphalia system, following the Congress of Vienna (1815). The concept of a sovereign state was not challenged, but its basis shifted from royalty to nationality. Thus merged the concept of the state with nationhood which laid the basis for the modern nation state. Subsequently, the Paris Treaty which ended the Crimean war recognized the principle of national self-determination. Gradually,

therefore, the right of each nationality to become an independent political actor on an equal footing developed. as a key principle of international relahs.

By 1914, the system's membership reached 43. For the first time the hypogeal exclusiveness was affected. There were 17 States from Latin America, 3 Asia, one from Africa and one from the Middle East. Though the prototype of model diplomacy was established much earlier at Westphalia, Vienna and Paris, it was only in the second half of the nineteenth century that regular international conferences skirted taking place for adopting conventions regarding the behaviour of states. The subjects covered by these conventions included the rules of diplomacy (rank, protocol, procedure and privilege), the principles of maritime law, neutrality, blockade and contraband, free navigation and international water ways, copyrights and patents, and rules of warfare.

In contemporary international re1ations; the principles of sovereign equality of all states and non-interference in the internal affairs of states are paramount in the formal conduct of states towards one another. In the absence of any superior legal authority, the present system functions in which each state is at liberty to act to secure its own interests. Though it is largely true about some of the Great Powers, the above characterization is somewhat of an exaggeration. Rules, conventions, procedures that evolved over hundreds of years do have some sanctity. The United Nations, which succeeded the League of Nations, though it has often failed to restrain powerful states from committing aggression at will, still enjoys a certain degree of legitimacy.

With the process of decolonization having become complete after World War 11, the focus on Europe changed to include newly independent states in Asia and Africa. A rapid scan through recent developments in the international system reveals new trends which suggest that the Westphalia system of territorially sovereign nation states is on decline.

Though formally sovereign yet vast majority of nation-states try to adjust to a highly hierarchical international system that has emerged. The resulting world is characterized by "super-powers" "satellites", and the UN system's various operations, arm-twisting of super power(s), conditionality’s of the International Monetary Fund's and activities of multinational corporations with budgets greater than many states GNPs etc. Due to globalization in various spheres, the state seems to be losing its power. The inter-

dependence of world economy and the growing importance of supra-state international authorities like IMF, (GATT) WTO, World Bank points to curtailment of authority. In the post-cold war phase, such curtailment of authority does not however apply to the United States of America whose state has become, if anything, more powerful and domineering.

State System: Origin

For the first 2 million years of his existence, man lived in bands or villages which, as far as we can tell,, were completely autonomous : Not until perhaps 5000 B.C . did' villages begin to aggregate into larger political units . But, once this process of aggregation began, it continued at a progressively faster pace and led, around 4000 B :C:, to the formation of the first state in history. (When I speak of a state I mean an autonomous politicali unit, encompassing many communities with* in its territory and having a centralized government with the power to collect taxes, draft men for work or war, and decree and enforce laws.)

Although it was by all odds the most far-reaching political development in human history, the origin of the state is still very imperfectly understood Indeed, not one of the current theories of the rise of the state is entirely satisfactory. At one point or another, all of them, fail. There is one theory, though, which I believe does provide a convincing explanation of how states began. It! is a theory which I proposed once before (1), and which I present here more fully. Before doing so, however, 21 AUGUST 1970

it' seems desirable to discuss, if only briefly, a few of the traditional theories. Explicit theories of the origin of the state are relatively modern. Classical writers like Aristotle, unfamiliar with other forms of political organization, tended to think of the state as "natural," and therefore as not requiring an explanation. However, the age of, exploration, by making, Europeans aware that many people’s throughout the world lived, not' in states, but in independent villages or tribes, made the state seem less natural, and thus more in need of explanation .

Of the many modern theories of state origins that have been proposed, we can consider only a few. Those with a racial basis, for example, are now so thoroughly discredited that they need not be dealt with here. We can also reject the belief that the state iss an expression of the "genius" of a people (2),, or that it arose through a

"historical accident ." Such notions make the state appear to be something metaphysical or adventitious, and thus place it beyond scientific understanding. In my opinion, the origin of the state was neither mysterious nor fortuitous. Moreover, it was not a unique event but a recurring phenomenon : states arose independently in different places and at different times . Where the appropriate conditions existed, the state emerged.

Voluntaristic Theories

Serious theories of state origins are of two general types: voluntaristic and coercive . Voluntaristic theories hold that, at some point in their history, certain peoples spontaneously, ration« ally, and voluntarily gave up their individual sovereignties and united with other communities to form a larger politicali unit deserving to be called a state. Of such theories the best' known is the old Social Contract theory, which was associated especially with the name of Rousseau. We now know that no such compact was ever subscribed to by human groups, and! the Social Contract theory is today nothing more than al historical curiosity .

The most widely accepted of modern voluntaristic theories is the one I call the "automatic" theory. According to this theory, the invention of agriculture automatically brought into being a surplus of food, enabling some individual to divorce themselves from food production and to become potters, weavers, smiths, masons, and so on, thus creating an extensive division of labor. Out of this occupational specialization there developed a political integration which united a number of previously independent communities into a state. This argument was set forth most frequently by the late British archeologist V. Gordon Childe

he principal difficulty with this theory is that agriculture does not automatically create a food surplus . We know this because many agricultural' peoples of the world produce no such~ surplus. Virtually all Amazonian Indians, for example, were agricultural,, but in aboriginal times they did not produce a food' surplus . That it was : technically feasible for them to produce such a surplus is shown by the if act that, under the stimulates of European settlers' desire for food, a number of tribes didl raise manioc in amounts well above their own needs, for the purpose of trading (4) . Thus the technical means for generating a food surplus were there ; it was the social mechanisms needed to actualize' it that were lacking.

Nature of the State

The state has been envisaged from various points of views. Every theorist conceives and defines the state in terms of his own discipline. Each has given his own theory regarding the origin, nature, sphere, function and ends of the state. These theories often differ from one another in form and substance. In this unit, we shall make an attempt to deal with the various theories regarding the nature of state.

The Liberal Theory

Before looking into the liberal theory of the origin and nature of the state, it will be proper to have some understanding of liberalism itself. With the emergence of the new bourgeois class (middle class) in the 16th and the 17th centuries, the philosophy of liberalism came into being as a progressive revolt against the reactionary forces represented by feudalism, the church and the monarchy. It was a voice for the recognition of the consent of the individuals based on individual's rights and liberty. Its concept of the individual was that of the 'possessive individual' and it was a political movement for the establishment of a democratic government.

This theory is based on the liberal notion of man, which gives due importance to man as a free agent in this world, having a free will of his own. So as regards the origin of the state, it assigns due role to individuals, their natures, activities, interests and objectives. The state is seen as a necessity, an institution – evil or otherwise – which may establish law and order, peace and justice in society. The state is there to serve the general interest of society as a whole. It is regarded as an agency of human welfare, which will secure life and property of man. It is regarded as a contributor to moral and social development of man. Liberalism distinguishes between state and society and maintains that state is for society and not otherwise.

Liberal views on the functions of state have been changing from time to time. During the 17th century, the requirements of the capitalist class – which supported liberalismwere quite different and during the 18th, 19th and the 20th centuries, the requirements of this class changed, thereby necessitating a different role of the state in society. Classical liberalism of the 18th and the early 19th century, which supported the negative state with minimal functions, changed to modern liberalism in the later half of

the 19th and the early 20th century that supported the positive state with welfare functions.

Classical liberalism is also known as the theory of 'liassez-faire' or the police state, or the theory of individualism that regards the state as a necessary evil. Necessary, because of the selfish nature of man and an evil, because it is an enemy of individual liberty. The state and individual freedom are seen as each other's opposite and classical liberalism wants to give more freedom to the individual by increasing the sphere of his activities and decreasing the sphere of the state. The function of the state is to provide physical security to the individual so that he can develop his personality without state interference. In brief, it means minimal state function and maximum individual liberty. Adam Smith supported this on an economic basis and Bentham on a moral and political basis. Later liberalism or modern liberalism is also called the 'theory of welfare state', 'revisionist' or 'reformist liberalism'. Here, the state is not regarded merely as a necessary evil, but it is assumed that the state can perform various functions of social welfare, can bring equilibrium and can satisfy socio-economic demands of the masses. Various thinkers - Mill, Freeman, Hobhouse, Lindsay, Keynes, Tawny, Cole, Barker, Laski and MacIver - gave the philosophy of the positive functions of the state.

Thus, the increasing democratization of the liberal state through the extension of franchise to all adults compelled the state to initiate policies of significant intervention in the economy. It also meant transferring resources from the wealthier to the less wealthy through taxation and state subsidy. Unlike the minimal state, which was the original form of the liberal sate, the welfare state was called upon to make public welfare one of its principal concerns. The welfare state was not simply a response to electoral pressure, but also a response to the increasing awareness among common people of their power, expressed through associations like the trade unions and public opinion. But the welfare state should not be seen as a radical shift from the classical minimal state. Rather, we should consider it as an attempt to give maximum concessions to the people consistent with the needs of a liberal, capitalist market economy.

Liberalism, in the late 20th century, has taken a new turn in the form of neo-liberalism. It may be regarded as going back to the ideas of classical political economy. The neoliberal goal is to 'roll back the frontiers of the state', in the belief that unregulated

market capitalism will deliver efficiency, growth and widespread prosperity. The neoliberal view of the state is found in the writings of economists like Fredrick Hayek and Milton Friedman, and philosophers like Robert Nozick.

The Marxist Theory

The Marxist theory of state emerged as a criticism of, and as an alternative to the liberal theory of state. If liberalism was a socio-economic and political philosophy of the working class, Marxism was a product of the capitalist economic system itself. According to the liberal view, state is the product of social contract, consent and consensus, and is there to serve the general interest of the whole community by maintaining law and order, and providing justice and welfare services. While according to the Marxist theory, the state is a product of class division and class struggle and serves only the interest of one particular class, because all the classes cannot have a single interest/common interests. It rejects the state, associates its pressure with the presence of classes, and suggests that by a revolution and the establishment of a classless society, the institution of the state would be done away with. You should know that in social sciences, the debate with regard to "consensus model" and "conflict model" remained hot for a longtime. The consensus model on which liberalism is based, maintains that the basis of society and social institutions, including the state is shared values, norms, beliefs, interests, ideas and institutions. The conflict theory gives importance to conflict and struggle and draws the conclusion that the state and many other institutions are the product of conflict.

Let us analyse carefully the Marxist assumptions about the nature, function and legitimacy of the state, which Karl Marx built through his various writings including 'Das-Capital' and 'The Critique of the Gotha Programme.' Though Marx himself never formulated a theory of state separately, discussion of the state is scattered in almost all the writings of Marx. Marx was busy with the historical analysis of the capitalist mode of production, so he could not concentrate on specific issues like the state. But Engels and other Marxist scholars and revolutionaries have written on this aspect.

The main points of the Marxian theory of state deserve the attention of students of political science. Marx made it clear in his early writings that the state is an organized power of one class oppressing the other i.e. the economically dominant minority class through dominant political dominance rules over the majority working class. Marx

regarded the state as an alienated and parasitical social force and rejected Hegel's idea of the state as 'a march of god on earth'. He never regarded the state as a higher morality ending conflicts in society and bringing unity and harmony. The state to him was neither equal to society nor above it, but was merely its product at a certain stage of historical development. Thus, Marx believes in a general theoretical framework known as 'Dialectical Materialism' and in the materialistic interpretation of history. Dialectical Materialism is a more general philosophical system from which is derived the more specific theory of historical development, which is termed 'Historical Materialism' or the materialistic interpretation of history.

Marxists hold that all phenomena that we experience are material, concrete and objective, outside our mind and consciousness. Also, all the phenomena are characterised by internal contradictions, leading to conflicts and then, eventually rising to a higher level of development. This whole process is termed by Marx as dialectical materialism. Therefore, to understand any phenomenon, one must grasp the way it changes.

A capitalist society is one that is based on the capitalist mode of production, where the capitalists (a minority class) own the means of production and the motive of production is profit and the workers (a majority class) sell their labour power to the capitalists for wages. In such a society politics, culture, morality and social norms are determined by the capitalist mode of production and the society is sharply divided into capitalists and workers. As the interests of these two classes are opposed to each other, class struggle between them is fundamental. The western liberal democraciesthe USA, England, France, West Germany, Italy, etc – are examples of such societies. For the abolition of classes, Marx gives the theory of revolution, which is the most important aspect of the Marxian theory of state. The task of Marxian philosophy is two-fold to understand the world and to change it. Marxism does not suggest reforms of the exploitative capitalist system, but suggests that it should be over-thrown by a violent revolution and a socialist state and economy established. This socialist state will be a temporary phenomenon; it will abolish private property and classes; and thereafter, it will wither away.

Thus, the Marxian theory of state does not glorify the state; rather it is a theory of its overthrow, its withering away, in a classless society. According to the theory, politics

and state are parts of the superstructure which is based on the economic system or the mode of production of a given society. Marxian theory of the origin of state is also based on this general view of state and politics.

A state originated with the division of society into classes and with the beginning of the struggle between classes. The historical analysis of the origin of state is that the state is by no means a power forced on society; rather, it is a product of society at a certain stage of development that is entangled in contradictions with it. The state has, thus, originated with the birth of classes and class struggle in society and is merely an instrument of exploitation in the hands of a dominant class. With the help of the state, ruling classes maintain their power over economically poor classes.

The Gandhian

Theory Let us now try to see how Gandhi conceptualized the nature of state. Before briefly examining it, we should note that it shows similarities and differences with the concept of state found in Liberal and Marxist perspectives. We may also note that though it is derived from the Indian tradition of thinking on state, it also shows some influence of western thinking on the subject.

First of all, Gandhi accepts the need of the state; though as an advocate of nonviolence, he does see that the state implies the use of violence or coercion. This is because Gandhi accepts the idea that man is by nature non-violent and that this applies to man in the ideal sense. Taking a realistic view, he agrees that there is some need of the state since in practice, men may not possess the ideal qualities of nonviolence and sociability. But having said this, Gandhi also holds that state as an institution of violence must be limited. In other words, Gandhi accepts the minimal state.

Secondly, Gandhi suggests that the state should be limited on the basis of certain considerations. On the one hand, the authority of the state should be reduced by a system based on decentralization of power, in which communities below the level of state should have greater autonomy and independence from the central state. The unit of such autonomy should be the village community. That community itself through a process of consensus should decide all decisions affecting the rural community. The Gandhian position is that insofar as the crucial local community decisions are taken at that level, the central state would be minimal, presumably concerned with the defence of the overall

territory under its jurisdiction, foreign relations and any other problems affecting the territory as a whole. The power of the state is also minimized in the Gandhian perspective by the ethical norms embedded in the society as a whole through customs and traditions.

Thirdly, and only non-violently, the state is also limited by moral challenges arising from the individual "conscience" or the "inner voice". In his great classic work, Hind Swaraj, he held this kind of polity in which political powers are dispersed over a large number of self-governing village communities, to be a Swaraj Polity. Gandhi claimed that this was a genuinely Indian political system evolved over centuries in India. However, the Gandhian state cannot be separated from its economic and social systems. Therefore, the concept of Swaraj or self-government extends to economic and social arrangements. Within the rural community itself, Gandhi emphasizes the significance of groups over individuals.

Thus, it would be wrong to call Gandhi an anarchist, if by that is meant a thinker who denies the need of the state. Certainly, he limits the state, but this does not mean that he dispenses with it. The case of the minimal state is that it involves minimal violence, and it also means the acceptance of the Gandhian political principle of Swaraj. While Gandhi's emphasis on individual conscience has a parallel with the liberal emphasis on individual rights, it should be differentiated from the notion of individual right. Gandhian rights are not given to the individual on liberal grounds of individualism, but on moral grounds; that is, the claim that one has a duty to act morally. The Gandhian notion of Satyagraha or the political action of protest or resistance to untruth is a moral right and duty, and the Gandhian state is also subject to this type of action.

Gandhi's conception of the state resembles the Marxist state in the sense that both regard the state as a system of violence. Gandhi also lays emphasis on duties rather than on rights, given his moral perspective. Further, the Gandhian state rests more on a moral, communitarian consensus than on any notion of a collectivity of individual wills. In many ways, the Gandhian state is a distinctively Indian form of state. Today, Gandhian elements are reflected in the notion of the Panchayat Raj or the ideals of democratic decentralization. Infact, one of the crucial issues in Indian politics has been whether and to what extent the Gandhian form of state can be introduced in India.

Sovereignty

n Sovereignty is an important element of the state which distinguishes the state from other political associations within a society and similar entities in the international society. The origin and history of the idea of sovereignty is intimately connected with the origin and development of the territorial states in modern times. It is for this reason that the meaning of sovereignty has undergone change across history. Despite the many meanings of the concept, sovereignty has a core meaning. Hinsley, an eminent Political Scientists, captures the core meaning of sovereignty when he says that it is "the idea that there is a final and absolute political authority in the political community…and that no final and absolute authority exists elsewhere

. Sovereignty, then, is an assumption about authority. We might say that sovereignty is the basic assumption about authority of modern political life, domestically and internationally. Authority is the right or title to rule. Sovereignty is the assumption that the government of a state is both supreme and independent. It is supreme over everybody who lives in its territorial jurisdiction and it is independent from other governing authority

. The concept of sovereignty has been controversial in academic discourse. To a large measure this is because of the contrasting ways in which it is usedto refer to independence and to autonomy. The former is a notion of authority and right, but the second is a notion of power and capability. While historians, international lawyers and political theorists tend to operate with the first concept, political economists, and political sociologists tend to employ the later concept. These two categorically different approaches to sovereignty exist and must be borne in mind as we proceed to analyse the key concept in political though.

From this starting point, this unit examines the rise of the modern territorial states with which the concept is associated with. Thereafter we will proceed to explain how the concept of sovereignty which was originally associated with the rulers came to be liked with the people or the ruled. We will also examine the two contrasting ways in which the concept has been used in Political Science and International Relations.

The Rise of Sovereign States

Sovereignty is a constitutional arrangement of political life. It is thus artificial and historical. There is nothing about sovereignty that is natural or inevitable or immutable.

In fact, the notion of sovereignty was absent before the modern territorial states came into being in Europe between the 15th and 17th centuries. The idea of sovereignty was not part of the ancient classical Greek world. There the city-states or polis did not differentiate between state and society-ruled as it was by citizen governors. The citizen was both a subject of state authority and also creator of public rules and regulations.

The Roman Empire that eclipsed the Greek city-states established a new type of rule, rule by a single central authority. What pleased the emperor had the force of law. While the idea of sovereignty as a distinct form of law making power was established, it did not outlive the Roman Empire.

The idea of sovereignty was progressively submerged by the rise of Christian faith when the Roman Empire was succeeded by a highly decentralized system of feudal order. During this period, Christianity gradually came to depend on two theocratic authorities, the Papacy and the Holy Roman Empire. The source of authority and wisdom shifted from this worldly to the other worldly representatives. At the core of the Christian worldview was the belief that the good lay in submission to God's will. Law of nature or religious rules came to be regarded as superior to laws of the state. As Benn and Peters point out "in the feudal world the primary concept was not the state but law- a law not made by politicians but part of a universal and eternal order, to be discovered by a study of custom and precedent. Kings, councils and judges found and formulated it but could not make it; for to create new law would be to impose a new obligation by an act of will, and only God could do that."

As the territorial state was occupying the European continent, piece by piece, eventually forming the system that came to occupy the globe, contemporary political philosophers embraced this form of polity and described what made it legitimate. In the early years of the formation of territorial State Society 11 states in Europe, two contemporary philosophers, Niccolo Machiavelli and Martin Luther, provided legitimacy to the idea of sovereignty of the territorial state. They did not write explicitly or consciously about sovereignty, yet their ideas amounted in substance to important developments in the concept. Observing the politics of city-states in his Renaissance Italy, Machiavelli (1469- 1527) described what a Prince had to do to promote a flourishing republic in terms that conferred on him supreme authority within his territory.

The Prince, he advised, should not be bound by natural law, canon law, Gospel precepts, or any of the norms or authorities that obligated members of Christendom. The Prince instead should be prepared to 'not to do good' and perform evil, not because evil is no longer evil, but because it was sometimes necessary to further the cause of a strong and well-ordered state. The obligation of the Prince was raison d'etat. The Prince was supreme within the states territory and responsible for the well being of this singular, unitary body.

Martin Luther argued for sovereignty from a different perspective. His theology of Reformation sought to strip the Catholic Church of its many powers, not only its ecclesiastical powers, but temporal powers as well. Luther held that under God's authority, there existed two orders with two forms of government. The realm of the spirit was the order in which Christ was related to the soul of the believer. The realm of the world was the order of the secular society where civil authorities ran governmental institutions through law and coercion. Both the realms furthered the good of the believers, though in different senses. Luther argued that these two realms need to be separately organised, with the leaders of the Church performing spiritual duties and the secular rulers, the princes, kings and magistrates would perform temporal ones. Thus, even without discussing the doctrine of sovereignty, Luther and his followers prescribed for princes all of its substance.

Nationalism

If we were to take a quick poll of what people commonly understand by the term nationalism we are likely to get responses which talk about patriotism, national flags, sacrificing for the country, and the like. The Republic Day parade in Delhi is a striking symbol of Indian nationalism and it brings out the sense of power, strength, as well as diversity which many associate with the Indian nation. But if we try to go deeper we will find that it is difficult to arrive at a precise and widely accepted definition of the term nationalism. This need not mean that we should abandon the effort. Nationalism needs to be studied because it plays such an important role in world affairs.

During the last two centuries or more, nationalism has emerged as one of the most compelling of political creeds which has helped to shape history. It has inspired intense loyalties as well as deep hatreds. It has united people as well as divided them, helped to

liberate them from oppressive rule as well as been the cause of conflict and bitterness and wars. It has been a factor in the break up of empires and states. Nationalist struggles have contributed to the drawing and redrawing of the boundaries of states and empires. At present a large part of the world is divided into different nation-states although the process of re-ordering of state boundaries has not come to an end and separatist struggles within existing states are common.

Nationalism has passed through many phases. For instance, in the nineteenth century Europe, it led to the unification of a number of small kingdoms into larger nation-states. The present day German and Italian states were formed through such a process of unification and consolidation. A large number of new states were also founded in Latin America. Along with the consolidation of state boundaries, local dialects and local loyalties were also gradually consolidated into state loyalties and common languages. The people of the new states acquired a new political identity which was based on membership of the nation-state. We have seen a similar process of consolidation taking place in our own country in the last century or more.

But nationalism also accompanied and contributed to the break up of large empires such as the Austro-Hungarian and Russian empires in the early twentieth century in Europe as well as the break-up of the British, French, Dutch and Portuguese empires in Asia and Africa. The struggle for freedom from colonial rule by India and other former colonies were nationalist struggles, inspired by the desire to establish nation-states which would be independent of foreign control.

The process of redrawing state boundaries continues to take place. Since 1960, even apparently stable nation-states have been confronted by nationalist demands put forward by groups or regions and these may include demands for separate statehood. Today, in many parts of the world we witness nationalist struggles that threaten to divide existing states. Such separatist movements have developed among the Quebecois in Canada, the Basques in northern Spain, the Kurds in Turkey and Iraq, and the Tamils in Sri Lanka, among others. The language of nationalism is also used by some groups in India. Arab nationalism today may hope to unite Arab countries in a pan Arab union but separatist movements like the Basques or Kurds struggle to divide existing states.

We may all agree that nationalism is a powerful force in the world even today. But it is more difficult to arrive at agreement regarding the definition of terms like nation or nationalism. What is a nation? Why do people form nations and to what do nations aspire? Why are people ready to sacrifice and even die for their nation? Why, and in what way, are claims to nationhood linked to claims to statehood? Do nations have a right to statehood or national self-determination? Or can the claims of nationalism be met without conceding separate statehood? In this chapter we will explore some of these issues.

Nations and Nationalism

A nation is not any casual collection of people. At the same time it is also different from other groups or communities found in human society. It is different from the family which is based on face-to-face relationships with each member having direct personal knowledge of the identity and character of others. It is also different from tribes and clans and other kinship groups in which ties of marriage and descent link members to each other so that even if we do not personally know all the members we can, if need be, trace the links that bind them to us. But as a member of a nation we may never come face to face with most of our fellow nationals nor need we share ties of descent with them. Yet nations exist, are lived in and valued by their members.

It is commonly believed that nations are constituted by a group who share certain features such as descent, or language, or religion or ethnicity. But there is in fact no common set of characteristics which is present in all nations. Many nations do not have a common language, Canada is an example here. Canada includes English speaking as well as French speaking peoples. India also has a large number of languages which are spoken in different regions and by different communities. Nor do many nations have a common religion to unite them. The same could be said of other characteristics such as race or descent.

What then constitutes a nation? A nation is to a great extent an ‘imagined’ community, held together by the collective beliefs, aspirations and imaginations of its members. It is based on certain assumptions which people make about the collective whole with which they identify. Let us identify and understand some of the assumptions which people make about the nation.

Meaning of Balance of Power

A State of stability amongst two or more contending powers is referred as the balance of power. In international relations, maintaining of equilibrium amongst the states or alliances to prevent or check on attaining absolute power by other state or a group of states is termed as the balance of power. The primary objective behind the balance of power remains to limit a state or a group of states from imposing their authorised or illicit will upon other countries in the region as well as global state system. In this manner, an international or regional order is maintained whereby different geostrategic moves from any state are significantly checked and balanced by others. No doubt, realists, and neo-realists have primarily used the concept of BOP in international relations. However, its history is as old as human civilization. Since, the ideology of realism and neo-realism is mainly guided by the principle of self-preservation, and hence, the BOP provides a milieu for the survival to the weaker states in the system.

The notion of balance of power in international relations is defined in different ways. Some of the well-known definitions of the concept are stated here, One of the renowned political realist, Hans. J. Morgenthau has defined the concept as "whenever the term is used without qualification, it refers to an actual state of affairs in which power is distributed among several nations with approximate equality".

One of the supreme American historians, Sidney B. Fay has defined the concept as "balance of power is such a 'just equilibrium' in power among the members of the family of nations as will prevent any one of them from becoming sufficiently strong to enforce its will upon others".

As per Palmer and Perkins, "The balance of power assumes that through shifting alliances and countervailing pressures no one power or combination of powers will be allowed to grow so strong as to threaten the security of the rest".

Therefore, from the descriptions mentioned above, it can be rightly concluded, that the concept of balance of power has been defined in different ways. The balance of power, in fact, confirms to protect state's interests by maintaining the symmetry of power through various means. In this regard, War, threat, annexation, alliances, and counter-alliances, buffer states, intervention, international pressure, armaments, sophisticated technology and occasionally persuasion are categorised as various strategies employed while maintaining the Balance of power.

Undoubtedly, the balance of power has given a round of applause for maintaining the peace and security through restricting aggressiveness of the aggressor. Throughout the history, BOP has remained a success in ensuring the global peace and security. The structure of the BOP has often protected the diverse interests of smaller and weaker nations against the dominant states. Though, war is categorized as a significant tool in maintaining the balance of power. However, continually various clashes and conflicts among global states are settling down through the peace negotiations as well. It is a widely accepted that the states often try to gain maximum power through military aggression, seizure of territory and alliance formations. In this way, the states endeavour to safeguard their interests without caring for the interests of smaller or weaker states. There are many opinions, which can be put forward against the balance of power viz. nations find it hard to break alliances, single power dominance can also ensure global peace, difficulty in maintaining mutual consensus amongst two or more strong states, etc. Therefore, it can be rightly said that the Balance of power is creating several challenges. Nevertheless, BOP is still considered as a better tool to maintain peace and security at both regional as well as global levels. In fact, since time immemorial, BOP has had been there in the international system in one form or other to maintain the required status quo as and when required.

- In ordinary sense it means there is at least a rough equilibrium of power between various nations.
- A large number of nations with varying degree of power exist and each nation tries to maximize its power.
- To achieve this end various nations form groups so that no single nation or other group of nations becomes strong enough to dominate others.
- The power of one group is balanced by the other opposing group.
- So long as there is balance of power between the antagonistic group, there is peace.

Nature or Characteristics

- It signifies some sort of equilibrium in power relations which is subject to constant ceaseless change.
- It is temporary and unstable

- It is to be achieved by the active intervention of men.
- Favors status quo
- A real balance of power seldom exists. It comes to an end when war breaks out.
- The objective view of historians holds balance of power as a situation in which the opposing nations or groups of nations are almost equal in power. The subjective view of a statesman holds BoP as a situation involving freedom to join one side other according to its own interests.
- It is not a device of peace but admits war as the means for securing balance.
- In it, the big powers are the actors and the small powers are either the spectators or the victims of the game.
- Multiplicity of states and not eliminating anyone in a war are the two fundamental features of the BoP.
- National interest is its basis.
- Security and peace are the main purposes of the BoP.

Techniques

The **Balance of Power** is a fundamental concept in international relations that aims to maintain stability and prevent any single state from becoming too powerful. Various techniques have been used historically to achieve this balance. One of the most common methods is **alliances and counter-alliances**, where weaker states form coalitions to counteract the dominance of a stronger power. This was evident during the Cold War when NATO and the Warsaw Pact emerged as rival blocs. Another technique is **compensation**, where territorial adjustments are made to maintain equilibrium. For example, after the Napoleonic Wars, the Congress of Vienna (1815) redistributed territories to ensure no single nation gained excessive power.

The **divide and rule** strategy is another approach, where a state intentionally creates divisions among potential rivals to prevent their unity. This method was effectively used by colonial powers such as Britain and France to maintain control over large territories. **Intervention and war** are sometimes employed to weaken an emerging dominant power. The World Wars saw major powers engaging in conflicts to re-establish balance when one nation threatened global stability. **Armament and disarmament**

policies also play a role; while arms build-ups can serve as deterrents, disarmament efforts like nuclear treaties aim to prevent excessive military growth.

Buffer states and spheres of influence are additional techniques used to maintain balance. Buffer states act as neutral zones between rival powers, such as Afghanistan between British India and Tsarist Russia in the 19th century. Spheres of influence, on the other hand, ensure that regions remain under the indirect control of a great power without direct colonization. Lastly, **diplomatic negotiations and international organizations**, such as the United Nations, contribute to balancing power through peace talks, conflict resolution, and economic cooperation. These techniques collectively work to maintain stability in international relations, preventing the emergence of a unipolar world order.

Collective Security: Meaning

Collective security is a collective measure for security. The word security represents the goal while the word collective indicates the nature of the combined strength will face the aggression. The basic principle of collective security is that an attack on one state will be regarded as an attack on all states. Security becomes the concern of all nations and all will take care collectively of the security of each of them as if their own security were at state.

- According to Morgenthau "one for all and all for one is the watchword of collective security."
- On collective security Palmer and Perkins observe "It clearly implies collective measure for dealing with threat to peace".
- George Schwarzenegger has defined collective security as machinery for joint action in order to prevent or counter any attack against an established international order".
- According to F.H Hartmann collective security in basically a mutual insurance plan against aggression anywhere and everywhere.

The basic principle of collective security is that if an aggression takes place it should be frustrated by an overwhelming force. It is therefore necessary that all nations must stand unitedly against the aggression. So the principle of collective security is based upon the preponderance of power in the hands of the protectors of peace and order and

this is said to be the only basis of the success of the system. Its chief merit lies in the force may not at all be needed. A threat of collective action will be sufficient to deter the potential aggressor.

Nature of Collective Security

Collective Security stands for preserving security through collective actions. Its two key elements are:

1. Security is the chief goal of all the nations. Presently the security of each nation stands inseparably linked up with the security of all other nations. National security is a part of the international security. Any attack on the security of a nation is in fact an attack on the security of all the nations. Hence, it is the responsibility of all the nations to defend the security of the victim nation.
2. The term 'collective', as a part of the concept of collective security, refers to the method by which security is to be defended in the event of any war or aggression against the security of any nation. The power of the aggressor has to be met with by the collective power of all the nations. All the nations are required to create an international preponderance of power for negating the aggression or for ending a war.

The underlying principle of Collective Security has been 'One for All and All for One'. Aggression or war against any one nation is a war against all the nations. Therefore all the nations are to act collectively against every War/Aggression.

Diplomacy: Meaning

Diplomacy is the process and practice of communication and negotiation between actors in the international system, with the aim of achieving their goals and resolving their conflicts and disputes. Diplomacy involves the use of various methods and tools, such as dialogue, persuasion, compromise, and coercion, to influence and shape the behavior and outcomes of other actors.

History of Diplomacy

Diplomacy has a long and rich history, and it has evolved and changed over time, along with the development and transformation of the international system and the actors in it. The history of diplomacy can be traced back to the ancient times, when the first

civilizations and empires emerged and interacted with each other, and when the first forms of diplomacy, such as envoys, treaties, and alliances, were practiced.

Diplomacy also developed and diversified in the medieval and modern times, when the rise and fall of various states and empires, the emergence and spread of various religions and ideologies, and the discovery and colonization of various regions and continents, shaped and reshaped the international system and the actors in it.

New Diplomacy

Diplomacy began as simple meetings between emissaries to discuss "next steps" in the relationship between and among tribes, states or empires. Today, diplomacy is anything but simple. A complex set of rules of engagement has evolved to deal with the ever more complex sets of issues that face modern nation states and their relationships.

Traditional diplomacy addresses the following major topics: War and Peace between nations (Middle East; India and Pakistan)

- Defining territorial borders and resolving border disputes (Kashmir, Middle East,
- Ecuador-Peru, Arctic Ocean, South China Sea) Trade rules between and among nations (GATT, WTO)
- Treatment of foreign nationals by governments (extradition, rights of foreign citizens)
- Operational rules for communication and transport between nations (postal service, air, sea and land transportation when crossing borders, international telecommunications, etc.)

The first two items listed above are often referred to as "spectacular diplomacy" because of the significance of the issues and their consequences. The goals of traditional diplomacy are to defend state sovereignty and territoriality. These are the two great principles that were defined for Europeans by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 that ended thirty years of lethal warfare that killed approximately one-third of the population, and which gave birth to the modern nation state. The treaty ended years of religious wars among competing groups of Christians in Europe, and gave the sovereign in each state the right to choose the religion of his or her people. This principle has evolved into the notion that governments have the sovereign right to make all decisions within their borders that determine the behavior of their own citizens as well as those of foreign

visitors, and to set the rules for operating their domestic economic and political systems. This has been confirmed and established by many subsequent international agreements. It is interesting that when European powers attempted to extend this principle to their colonial subjects, they rebelled and demanded sovereign rights for themselves. Today, the bulk of the world's nations are former colonies that are the strongest defenders of sovereignty and territoriality.

The formation of the United Nations following World War II began a process that has generated a "New Diplomacy" that challenges many of the perceptions of "Traditional Diplomacy." Perhaps "The Universal Declaration of Human Rights" (1948) was the first significant challenge to national sovereignty by asserting that other governments might have a concern about how a state treated its people. The newest aspect of the human rights agenda is "The Responsibility to Protect," which argues that sovereignty includes a responsibility of governments to protect citizens from harm. Additional issues concerning not only human rights, but also humanitarian, labor, environmental and global issues have begun to challenge traditional notions of sovereignty and the sanctity of national boundaries.

New Diplomacy addressed the following issues: Human rights (Apartheid in South Africa)

- Humanitarian intervention (Kosovo, Rwanda, Sierra Leon)
- Labor rights (Workers conditions in developing countries)
- National environmental issues (forestry and biodiversity)
- Transboundary environmental issues (transboundary acid rain and air and waterpollution)
- Global environmental issues (marine fisheries, stratospheric ozone protection, climatechange, Antarctica, outer space)
- Toxic substances, genetic engineering and biotechnology (Basel Convention,Persistent Organic Pollutants, Biosafety Protocol)
- Fair Trade (European Union, NAFTA, Free Trade Area of the Americas)

In all of these cases, national sovereignty is challenged, and in some cases foreign governments or coalitions of states have crossed national boundaries to address a violation of an international norm. The New Diplomacy is an evolving, incomplete, new

set of rules that makes traditional diplomats and many governments very uncomfortable. Where will it stop? When is intervention in the internal affairs of another country justified? Is sovereignty the last refuge of the corrupt scoundrels governing countries, or is it all that stands between international chaos and us?

The New Diplomacy raises many questions and challenges, as it attempts to address emerging issues that arise from an ever more densely populated planet with ever more far reaching technologies that is becoming global on many fronts. Globalization is not just about the economy, and the ability of transnational firms to extract natural resources anywhere in the world, send them to a third country for processing, to a fourth for manufacturing, and then market and sell products to a global consumer class. Globalization is also about equity and the impact that resource extraction, manufacture and use of a product has on the environment and the health and well being of the workers who produce it as well as for bystanders and other species. It is about the ability of private corporations and NGOs to move across national boundaries in ways that governments and intergovernmental organizations cannot. It is about the globalization of knowledge, information and science, and about transparency. The world is still uncertain how to do New Diplomacy, and governments tend to treat the issues as just a part of "unspectacular diplomacy," but the intensity of public response to the issues and the increasing share of diplomatic time being spent on these new topics suggests that it is addressing critical international issues. To succeed, this New Diplomacy needs to become Sustainable Development Diplomacy that addresses social, economic and environmental dimensions to create enduring societies that meet the needs of all people.

Type of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is not monolithic or homogeneous, but rather diverse and complex, and it can be classified and analyzed in different ways. One common way is to divide it into two broad categories: traditional and modern.

Traditional diplomacy is the type of diplomacy that is based on the formal and official relations between states, and that is conducted by the professional and accredited representatives of the states, such as diplomats and ambassadors.

Modern diplomacy is the type of diplomacy that is based on the informal and unofficial relations between various actors, such as non-state actors, civil society, and the

public, and that is conducted by the various agents and channels, such as NGOs, media, and celebrities.

Another type of diplomacy is international diplomacy which refers to the negotiations and interactions between states and other actors on the global stage, aimed at achieving specific goals and advancing national interests.

National Security: Definition

While much ahead of the basic idea of national security, Morton Berkowitz and Bookes'4 definition of national security as a "nation's ability to preserve its internal values from external dangers is still inadequate. It implies that dangers to a country's security originate from the outside, but it ignores the threat from within." Political unrest and widening economic inequities regional development disparities, as well as cultural, linguistic, and ethnic animosity, are the bane of modern politics. To a larger or lesser extent, every nation must protect itself from them. When a nation is economically and technologically developed, politically secure, and socio-culturally unified, it can be said to have a sword for its own protection.

Defining the Concept of National Security According to Walter Lippmann, "A nation has security when it does not have to sacrifice is it legitimate interest to avoid war and is able if challenge to maintain them by war." According to Michael law, "National security, is the state of being free from external physical threats." According to Low, all moral and intellectual dangers should be considered, but it is physical violence that is widely regarded as the ultimate leverage against the state, and thus as a real and tangible threat to its survival. However, if nations were not concerned with the defence of their values other than their survival as sovereign states, they would not have to be concerned about their security as much as they do now. As Orvik puts it, "security would be a matter of course if there were no threats to national ideals and institutions."

Robert McNamara's definition, which is more applicable to our times, "security is not military hardware do it may include it security is not military force though it may income pass it security is development and without development there is no security." The United Nations recognized this developmentalist approach to national security when, in its 25th session in 1970, it accepted the recommendations of the first committee of the general assembly and passed a resolution that, among other things, called for closing the

economic gap between developed and developing countries as soon as possible, which is closely and essentially linked to the strengthening of all nations' security and the establishment of peace.

K. Subrahmanyam, an expert on security and defence studies in India, "clarifies that national security does not simply imply preserving territorial integrity. It also entails ensuring the country's rapid industrialization and the development of a unified, equitable, and technical society. Anything that gets in the way of its progress, whether inside or outside, is a national security threat." Subramaniam's concepts are based on India as a generalization to the great majority of third-world countries.

The security of a country is intrinsically tied to its resource position and ecological balance, among other factors. Natural disasters pose a huge threat to national security. We are currently under attack from self-inflicted rapid environmental change, the long-term biological and ecological ramifications of which we are painfully unaware. The security of nations around the world is currently threatened by dwindling stockpiles of vital resources such as oil and ecological imbalance. National security cannot be maintained without the ability to sustain national economies.

As a result, the concept of national security is broad and multifaceted. The value component adds to the difficulty of deciphering its precise meaning. For some, it even contains expansionary elements such as ideological imperialism and other forms of imperialism. Given this complication, one must concur with Arnold Wolfers assessment of national security as an ambiguous symbol.

The problem is particularly acute in third-world countries, because security has been described as a state's or nation's immunity to dangers emerging from beyond its borders in varied degrees. Walter Lippmann, "presented his views and contends that a nation is secure to the extent that it is not in danger of having to lose cross ideals in order to avoid war and is able to keep them if challenged by such triumph in war."

This means that a country must have the capability and desire to preserve the essential ideals of political independence and territorial integrity, as well as the ability to use its capability to ward off all types of pressures in order to do so. Security, according to Bangladeshi academic Manir-Ul-Jama, "is the protection and preservation of the minimal essential values of political independence and territorial integrity."

The national security issues that third-world countries face must be identified, and their nature must be comprehended. Simultaneously, an endeavor must be made to distinguish the distinctions from the pattern of security concerns confronting industrialized western states, so that decision-making priorities are not muddled. Because the disparities that are initially recognized are the symptoms of a much deeper divergence in the different experiences of the Western and third world countries, the final understanding must not be limited to the symptomatic level.

The history of state formation in the third word as compared to its counterpart in the west, and

The pattern of recruitment and region establishment and maintenance in the third word as compared to the same processes in the developed States for stop these major variables have their own calorific values that can be analysed, but essentially it is necessary to understand the differences between the two variables differences not so much in absolute and culture based differences.

The problems of the twenty-first century are less military and more economic in nature, with a strong emphasis on the human dimension of security for staff. Their traditional militaristic and state-centric security discourse, with sovereignty and territorial integrity as target variables, can hardly capture today's fundamental security problems for the majority of the population in developing countries of the third world. In the eyes of the millions of people living in poor countries, ensuring state security has little relevance as long as they are suffering from hunger, malnutrition, and illiteracy. When their very survival is at stake, and their physical surroundings and economic base are threatened by environmental degradation, and their social and political lives are affected almost on a daily basis by strips and other forms of unorganised violence, as well as ethnic and sectarian conflict, national security as traditionally defined loses its importance and salience. It is now commonly acknowledged that state security does not necessarily imply human security. Indeed, a focus on state security can put human security at risk.

The priority and concern of rational decision-making is ultimately determined by national interest, not any utopian concept. This does not apply to any country. What must be remembered is that the national security that defence strategy strives to give entails the function of diplomacy, economic development, and, above all, a stable national and

global order, which had become almost imperatives in the world but have not turned out to be so. We are dealing with a deeply disturbed and conflict-prone world that is becoming more convoluted, volatile, and unpredictable. 15 Indeed, coining a new phrase to describe the current situation has become trendy. Beyond all of this, there are fundamental paradigm shifts affecting international security.

Internal Threats

In today's interconnected world, businesses face a myriad of challenges that can impact their operations, reputation, and overall success. One of the key areas where businesses need to be vigilant is in identifying and mitigating threats. Threats can come from both **Internal** and **external** sources, and understanding the distinction between them is crucial for effective risk management. In this blog post, we will delve into the concepts of internal and external threats and discuss the significance of a risk register in mitigating potential risks.

Defining Internal and External Threats:

Internal threats refer to risks that originate from within an organization. These can include actions or oversights by employees, system vulnerabilities, or operational failures. For example, data breaches caused by employees mishandling sensitive information or unauthorized access to confidential data can be considered internal threats. On the other hand, external threats are risks that arise from outside the organization. These can include cyberattacks, natural disasters, economic fluctuations, or even regulatory changes. External threats are often beyond the direct control of the organization, making it essential to identify and prepare for them proactively.

The Importance of Identifying Threats:

Identifying threats, whether internal or external, is the first step towards effective risk management. By understanding the potential risks, businesses can take appropriate measures to minimize their impact and protect their interests. Failing to identify threats leaves organizations vulnerable and ill-prepared to handle unexpected events that may disrupt their operations.

Mitigating Internal Threats:

To mitigate internal threats, organizations should focus on several key areas. Implementing robust security protocols and access controls can help prevent

unauthorized access to critical systems and data. Regular employee training and awareness programs are also crucial in ensuring that staff members understand their responsibilities and the potential consequences of their actions.

Additionally, establishing effective internal controls, such as segregation of duties and regular audits, can help identify and address vulnerabilities within the organization. By maintaining a culture of accountability and transparency, businesses can significantly reduce the risk of internal threats.

Mitigating External Threats:

Addressing external threats requires a proactive and multi-faceted approach. Cybersecurity measures, including firewalls, encryption, and intrusion detection systems, can help protect against cyberattacks and data breaches. Regular updates and patches should be applied to all software and systems to prevent the exploitation of known vulnerabilities.

Business continuity planning is another crucial aspect of mitigating external threats. This involves developing strategies and protocols to ensure the organization can continue operating during and after disruptive events such as natural disasters or power outages. Conducting risk assessments and staying updated on industry trends and regulatory changes are also essential for identifying and responding to external threats effectively.

Types of Threats

There are various types of threats that can pose risks to individuals, organizations, or systems. Here are some common types of threats:

1. **Natural Threats**: These are threats that arise from natural events or disasters, such as earthquakes, hurricanes, floods, wildfires, or pandemics.
2. **Technological Threats:** These threats originate from technological failures, malfunctions, or attacks. Examples include power outages, system failures, software bugs, or cyberattacks.
3. **Human-Generated Threats:** These threats are caused by human actions and can include intentional or unintentional acts. Examples include theft, vandalism, fraud, human error, or sabotage.

4. **Environmental Threats:** Environmental threats refer to risks associated with environmental factors, such as pollution, climate change, deforestation, or water scarcity.
5. **Financial Threats**: These threats are related to economic factors and financial instability. Examples include market fluctuations, inflation, currency devaluation, or credit risks.
6. **Reputational Threats:** Reputational threats arise from damage to an individual's or organization's reputation. This can result from negative publicity, social media backlash, customer dissatisfaction, or unethical behaviour.
7. **Legal and Regulatory Threats**: These threats stem from non-compliance with laws, regulations, or industry standards. Examples include lawsuits, fines, penalties, or changes in legislation.
8. **Health and Safety Threats**: These threats are associated with risks to the health and safety of individuals, such as accidents, injuries, occupational hazards, or exposure to hazardous substances.
9. **Supply Chain Threats:** Supply chain threats pertain to risks within the supply chain process, such as disruptions in the flow of goods or services, transportation issues, supplier failures, or delays in delivery.
10. **Geopolitical and Socioeconomic Threats:** These threats arise from geopolitical tensions, social unrest, economic instability, or political conflicts, which can affect businesses, investments, or global stability.

Check Your Progress

- Compare and contrast the Idealist Theory and Realist Theory in International Relations
- Explain the concept of Balance of Power in international politics.
- Define National Security and differentiate between internal and external threats.

UNIT II

Cold War: Origin – Phases of Cold War – End of Cold War – NAM: Origin – Membership and Conferences – Objectives – Achievements – India's Role; Middle East: Arab Israeli Conflict – Oil Crisis

Objectives

- Widely considered as the beginning of the Cold War
- Primary objective of the Non-Aligned Movement
- Oil Crisis of 1973 in the Middle East

Introduction

The Cold War was more than a rivalry between two superpowers. The period of this war, that is the years between 1945 and 1990, also contained a history of international politics of a different kind. The Cold War period saw the evolution of a world order where diplomacy and negotiation in their various forms were established. It added a very different dimension to military build-up – arms race, military blocs, proxy wars etc. The simultaneity of the existence of the United Nations is perhaps a very important dimension to the evolution of the Cold War as the world did not witness another world war. It is said that today's contemporary world is poles apart and very dynamic from what it was before 1945. How this dynamism did come to our world? To appreciate that dynamism, this Unit brings to you a brief summary of the significant events that unfolded in different phases between 1945 and 1990.

Meaning of the Cold War

Isn't it perplexing to say that a certain war was described as 'Cold'? War is always 'hot' fought with weapons by armies to gain some designated strategic goals. But it being 'Cold' is something that calls for some thinking and explanation. What we know is that the Cold War continued for more than four decades between 1945 and 1990. The War touched the entire world, actually divided several countries and also prompted them to join hands with others to form political and military blocs. A feature of Cold War was thus bloc politics – two blocs, led by the two super powers viz. United States of America and the erstwhile Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR, or Soviet Union). In the process, tens of millions of people suffered in very different ways, including violent

death, persecution and disappearance. Economic development was disrupted and in cases denied resulting in the misery and hunger for millions of poor people in different parts of the world. Millions suffered and hundreds of thousands were killed in 'communist' and 'anti-communist' rebellions, uprisings, repression, civil wars and interventions throughout Africa, Asia and Latin America and the Caribbean besides East Europe, Balkans and other parts of the world. Despite having these sufferings on record, interestingly, we continue to call this 45-year war as the Cold War! And interestingly, not once American and Soviet armies fought face to face in a battlefield. All this definitely calls for little thinking on the dimensions of its meaning. When one refers to this war as the Cold War, the aim is to convey that it was fought under an ideological cover. The war saw intense competition between two mutually hostile political ideologies and worldviews. These were 'capitalism' and 'socialism'. Both these terms have wide ranging expressions of two different variants of socio-economic, political and cultural organisations. In plain terms, therefore, capitalism stood up for liberal democracy and free market economy whereas socialism sought to champion state ownership, workers rights and egalitarian system. The United States provided leadership to the capitalist world and the Soviet Union.

This intense ideological competitiveness gave rise to bloc rivalry. Bloc rivalry was a signpost of the 45-year Cold War. When the Soviets, for example, initiated the Molotov Plan in 1947 for its Eastern European allies to aid them and rebuild their ailing economies, the Americans responded with the multi-billion dollar Marshall Plan (or, the European Recovery Programme) in 1948 for the postWorld War II sick economies of the Western Europe. The Marshall Plan was in force only for four years, the Molotov Plan remained till the last breath of the USSR with a new name since 1949 known as the Council for Mutual Economic Assistant (COMECON). Similarly, when the American side of the war founded an intergovernmental military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in 1949, the Soviet side had rivaled them with signing the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (the Warsaw Pact) in 1955. These ideological underpinnings and bloc rivalry impressed the observers of the war to qualify it as 'Cold' as it did not involve direct military confrontations between the warring camps. This has led many to characterize the Cold War as 'nonmilitary' conflict. More

nuanced meanings, however, of the Cold War sits between its ideological cover and the so-called non-military conflict. Some described Cold War a collection of 'low-intensity' conflicts. Of course, the two sides fought several 'proxy' wars in Africa, Asia and Latin America – which was yet another feature of the Cold War.

Origins of the Cold War

There are two main explanations for the origin of the Cold War. These two can simply be termed as (i) geopolitical and (ii) ideological.

a. **Geopolitical Explanation**:

Some historians trace the origins of the Cold War to the Soviet socialist revolution of 1917 and the European military intervention in Russia in 1918 to scuttle the first socialist state in the world. Other scholars see the origins of the Cold War to the military pacts and their violations between the European great powers immediately prior to and in the course of the Second World War. But the Cold War is widely believed to have begun in 1945; this was the time when the Soviets and the Americans had started seeing themselves as two most powerful nations in the West. This perception was at the core that also nurtured the expansionist aspirations that were believed as incompatible among the Soviets and the Americans in terms of their own power and capability. The view that understands the Cold War from the angle of power, capability, expansionist aspirations etc is called the 'geopolitical explanation' to the origin of the Cold War. This is also a post-World War II view to the origin of the Cold War. It assumes that at the end of the war in 1945, the United States and the Soviet Union were the only two superpowers along with important powers like the United Kingdom and France – which had militarily weakened. It is said that though the Americans and the Soviets had allied in the World War II to defeat the Axis Powers, there was lack of trust between the two. Moreover, both were aspiring to achieve dominance in Europe and their aspirations were matched by their power and capability.

b. Ideological Explanation:

The 'geopolitical explanation', however, does not tell the reasons for the lack of trust between the United States and the Soviet Union. This gap is filled by the

'ideological explanation' that goes back to the Russian Bolshevik Revolution of 1917. The Bolshevik Revolution was inspired by communism – the ideology espoused by the 19th century philosopher, Karl Marx. Success of a workers' revolution in Russia under the leadership of the Vladimir Lenin was looked at with suspicion and hostility by the capitalist classes in Europe and the US. Foremost, the success of the socialist revolution sent a powerful and historically important message to the workers, peasantry and all other exploited classes and subjugated and colonized people. The message was: it is possible to overthrow capitalism and its attendant colonialism and imperialism and liberate the exploited and oppressed classes and people. Soviet revolution greatly inspired people in the colonies including in India; many began talking of liberating their nations from the colonial rule and establish an egalitarian socialist order. Likewise, Soviet revolution galvanized the workers in Europe especially in Germany, Britain, France and Italy where the communist and socialist parties became politically active and radical in anticipation of a workers revolution. Communist and socialist parties were formed in the 1920s in several Latin America countries, and in the European colonies in Asia and Africa; for instance, Communist Party of India was formed in 1925 to organize the peasantry and the working class. The imperial powers of Europe and the US looked at this with great hostility. Secondly, the Soviet Revolution offered a different paradigm of looking at international system and building a new international system that would be based on the solidarity and cooperation among liberated peoples of the world. Russia was part of the Allied forces during the First World War but withdrew from the War after the Revolution and abandoned all secret military pacts and understandings for territorial expansion which it had signed with Britain and other European powers. Promoting new norms of IR was not acceptable to great powers which were used to war, military alliances, spheres of influence and overseas colonies. As Soviet Union withdrew from the First World War, European imperial powers requested the US to military intervene in Russia. Russian revolution had aroused great enthusiasm and hope among colonial people. This was dangerous and unacceptable for colonial masters. American expeditionary forces and those

of other Allied countries thus intervened in Soviet Union in 1918; the intervention lasted several years. An ideological justification was given for this Allied military intervention. It was said that the Bolshevik Revolution was antagonistic to the "values of freedom" that the Americans claimed their own and that the Russian Revolution was a danger to freedom and democracy everywhere. Socialism was dubbed as totalitarianism which negated democracy and human rights.

The ideological antagonism and political hostility remained with the post1945 superpowers and contributed to widen the lack of trust between the two. The 1946 'iron curtain' speech of former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and the Americans dropping the atom bomb on Japan increased the ideological rivalry between the two superpowers. The origin of the Cold War was pre-1945 in the ideological sense and thus its vestiges are thought to remain in the post-1990 world. Speaking in the US, and joined in by the American President Harry Truman, Churchill declared: "From Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic, an iron curtain has descended across the continent." Churchill's 'iron curtain' speech is considered one of the opening shots in the Cold War. Churchill also spoke of "communist fifth columns" that, he said, were operating throughout western and southern Europe. He talked of the threat of communism to the European colonies in Asia and Africa which were fighting for their freedom and emancipation. Finally, Churchill asked the US to lead the free world against the threat posed by communism to the world. The die was cast. US, led the West, determined for half a century to 'contain' and 'roll-back' communism from the entire world; and this determination became the essence of Cold War-related interventions and wars.

Phases of the Cold War

It is difficult to neatly identify the phases of the Cold War, though the war had rising and falling tides of conflict. Yet a period of relaxation of the tensions between the warring blocs is generally perceived and that allows seeing the Cold War having phases with rising or declining tensions until it ends in the late 1980s. We can study the Cold War in the following three phases.

Beginning and Rising Hostilities

The conferences that were held in Crimea's Yalta and in German city of Potsdam in 1945 could not provide an effective framework to deal with the post-war situations that had developed in Germany and in Eastern European states that were occupied by German forces. Germany was divided into four occupation zones each under control of Britain, France, the Soviet Union and the United States. These four powers were main participants in the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. The United States, on the other hand, had detonated a nuclear device without the knowledge of its war allies, particularly the Soviet Union, and had dropped two of them on Japan in 1945. It was an unprecedented display of the American power that led to its recognition as a "superpower" and decreased its trustworthiness in the eyes of the Soviets. Meanwhile, the US economy was expanding very fast and had overtaken the combined economic strength of all the war-affected European states. The rate of industrialization of the post-1917 Soviet economy too was impressive. The weight of the American and Soviet military and economic strengths were now being decisively felt in the Western and East European countries respectively. Each of the superpowers eventually provided leadership to the blocs that emerged on geopolitical and ideological grounds. The United Nations Security Council (1945) further provided a world stage to these powers to take on each other and play the card of the Cold War.

The American President Harry Truman enunciated the so-called "Truman Doctrine" in 1947. It was an American strategy to 'contain communism'. It denounced the communist system as oppressive and warned against its possible subversive campaigns. Truman's words were signaling the American intention to resist the spread of communist system anywhere in the world and that was exactly what happened in the following years and decades.

When the Soviet Union's Molotov Plan came into light in 1947, the United States rivalled it with the Marshall Plan in 1948. Marshall Plan was a product of the Truman Doctrine. As stated before, Soviet's Molotov Plan had aimed at its Eastern European allies. Their economies were ailing and thus required reconstruction. America's multi-billion Marshall Plan, on the other side, had a similar scheme for the post-war sick economies of the West European states. But ultimately, both these plans were the

superpower strategies to contain each other and influence their own areas of ascendancy. These fish trap-like plans had left no trace of ambiguity of the breakout of geopolitical and ideological bloc rivalry that later on came to be known as the Cold War. When the Soviet Union acquired nuclear capability in 1949, America had invited its European allies the same year and founded an intergovernmental military alliance, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO). The birth of NATO invited similar military response from the other bloc. The Soviet response was signing of the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance (the Warsa Pact) in 1955 with its East European allies. Meanwhile, the Chinese communist revolution was complete in 1949, and a violent civil war had started in Korea around 1950. By this time, Korea was already divided into two separate zones (North and South) because the Japanese soldiers had surrendered to the Soviets in the North and to the Americans in the South during the Second World War. These developments had brought the bloc rivalry to Asia with high intensity of conflict and human suffering. The worst was yet to come with what is popularly known as the Cuban Missile Crisis. Cuba had seen a successful revolution in 1959. Among the things that followed the revolution were i) huge loss to the American private investors whose money was oiling the Cuban sugar industry; ii) America's failed invasion at Bay of Pigs, Cuba; iii) Fidel Castro declaring the Cuban Revolution as socialist and Cuba as a Soviet ally to secure Soviet military support against the United States; and iv) reversal of Cuban sugar exports from the American market to the Soviet market. These developments provided great opportunity for the Soviet Union to increase its strategic weight against the United States and thus installed nuclear missiles in Cuba for the latter's security. This Caribbean island, Cuba, is located barely 90 miles from the United States. The then American President Kennedy said that he would take whatever steps were necessary to protect American security and he ordered blockade of Cuba and demanded removal of the nuclear missiles. The two superpowers and the world had moved close to a nuclear war

Détente

Diplomatic conscience, however, prevailed over the Cuban Missile Crisis and the crisis had ended with removal of Soviet missiles from Cuba and America promising not to invade the island nation. This peaceful end of the Cuban Missile Crisis probably made

the world to realise the potential cost of bipolar military hostilities, and thus began a phase in the Cold War known as "détente". According to the Oxford Dictionary of Politics, détente refers to the periods of reduced tension in relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and was closely associated with the process of arms control. The main period of détente ran from the Partial Treat Ban Treaty (PTBT) in 1963 to the late 1970s. The Cuban Crisis hastened the PTBT agreement that was being negotiated since 1955. It was signed by Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union and agreed to limit the nuclear armaments to a bare minimum. PTBT had banned nuclear tests in the atmosphere, on the ground and under water. It, however, did not ban the underground testing. Talks to ban the underground testing could succeed only in 1996 under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). But these powers had agreed to ban nuclear testing in the space in 1967 and also the entire Latin American region was declared nuclear weapons free zone under the Treaty of Tlatelolco. Britain, the United States and the Soviet Union again signed a Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1968 and promised not to transfer such weapons to others.

Other developments that had helped relax the Cold War hostility were (i) establishment of a hotline link between the leaders of Washington and Moscow; (ii) the two German states viz. Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) were recognised by the superpowers and each was given membership of the United Nations; (iii) West Germany i.e. the FRG normalized relations with East European states and the Soviet Union; (iv) America and the Soviet Union signed the first Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) agreement in 1972; and (v) the famous Helsinki Summit was held in 1975; and it was regarded as having buried the Cold War and symbolized the culmination of détente in Europe. A brief description of the Helsinki summit and its various declarations helped the spirit of détente that characterized the decade of 1970s for a short while.

Helsinki Accords:

The Helsinki declaration was an act to revive the sagging spirit of detente between the Soviet Union and the United States and its allies. In 1975, the United States, Soviet Union, all members of NATO and the Warsaw pact signed the Helsinki Final Act during the meeting of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE),

held in Helsinki, Finland. Détente, literally a lessening of tension between the two super powers, was the policy fashioned out by US President Richard Nixon and his Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. As noted, there were significant gains under détente as several confidence building measures (CBMs) and arms reduction agreements were signed by the two Cold War adversaries. Important among other developments was the Nixon's historic visit to Moscow also. By mid-1975, the spirit of détente was apparently low. Nixon had resigned as America's president and US had withdrawn from Vietnam resulting in the victory of the communist North over South Vietnam. Progress on arms reduction talks with the Soviets had come to a standstill. In July 1975, the Soviet Union and the United States attempted to reinvigorate the policy of detente by calling the CSCE in Helsinki. On August 1, the attendees signed the Helsinki Final Act. The act established the CSCE as an ongoing consultative organization, and set out a number of issues for future discussion. These included economic and trade issues, arms reduction, and the protection of human rights. The Helsinki Accords are a series of formal but nonbinding agreements that were signed in August 1975. The Helsinki Accords dealt with three main issues of cooperation, security and human rights. Under the Helsinki Accords the nations of the East and West agreed to forge cultural links aimed at bringing the USA and the USSR closer together. It was agreed that the parties would recognize the borders of Eastern Europe that were established at the end of Second World War and in return the USSR promised to uphold basic human rights that included allowing people in the Eastern Bloc the right to move across borders. In brief, Helsinki Accords were an attempt to improve diplomatic and political relations between the two antagonistic blocs. The participating states reaffirmed their commitment to peace, security and justice and the continuing development of friendly relations and co-operation.

The 35 countries who signed the Helsinki Agreement agreed to the following principles: (i) sovereign equality and respect for the rights inherent in sovereignty; (ii) refraining from the threat or use of force; (iii) inviolability of frontiers; (iv) territorial integrity of states; (v) peaceful settlement of disputes; (vi) nonintervention in internal affairs; (vii) respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the freedom of thought, conscience, religion or belief; (viii) equal rights and self-determination of peoples; (ix) cooperation among states; (x) and fulfillment in good faith of obligations

under international law. Helsinki Accords was viewed as a significant step towards reducing Cold War tensions. But the Helsinki spirit was weak and the revival of détente proved short lived. US President Gerald Ford criticized Soviet Union for its domestic human rights violations and crushing of dissidence. Soviets called the American criticism as interference in its domestic affairs. US President Jimmy Carter had made human rights the cornerstone of his foreign policy and attacked the Soviet Union for curbing the dissidents; this further added to the erosion of détente and the Helsinki spirit. The famous Soviet dissident Alexander Solzhenitsyn denounced the Accords as "the betrayal of Eastern Europe". By mid-1978, the CSCE had ceased to function in any important sense. US President Ronald Reagan (1980-88) considered détente and Helsinki as appeasement and decided to confront the Soviet Union directly. Reagan 'revived' the Cold War and engaged the Soviet Union in Afghanistan by training and arming the Afghan and foreign fighters – the Mujahideen. Reagan described Helsinki Accords as having given "the American seal of approval for the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe." Détente came to an end and the Helsinki spirit died with the revival of Cold War by Reagan administration. CSCE was revived by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev only in the 1980s, and served as a foundation for his policy of closer and friendlier relations with the United States.

Rebirth and End

Détente was in effect for around one and a half decades. Many had thus believed that the Cold War had ceased to exist. But that belief was defied when a communist regime came to power in Afghanistan and the country soon plunged into civil war with deep involvement of the United States and the Soviet Union rivaling each other in the land of this South Asian nation. Afghanistan had a monarchy which was abolished by Mohammed Daud Khan in 1973 and he himself became the President of the newly founded Republic. Daud saw a possible threat from its neighour Pakistan. Pakistan was continuously receiving military assistance from the United States, and therefore Afghanistan sought weapons from the Soviet Union to balance Pakistan. The Soviet weapons did arrive in Afghanistan and it was interpreted as strengthening Daud's hand and also the Afghan communists who had helped Daud ascending the presidential office in Kabul. The situation soon went out of control when Daud was ousted in 1978 and his supporters were sent in exile. Riots broke out in Afghanistan with worsening economic

condition. Meanwhile, the American ambassador was killed in a riot-like situation. The following year, Hafizullah Amin became President of Afghanistan who, though a veteran Communist, was not liked by the Soviets. Thus, over 90,000 Soviets troops entered Afghanistan in 1979 as they had thought that this country may swing to the American side under Amin. With Soviet support, Babrak Karmal was made President after Amin's execution. This new regime in Afghanistan was opposed by a section of Afghan population who had seen onslaught on their religious rights as the government was encouraging secular practices in daily life. This was termed as "anti-Islamic" and promotion of "Western culture" in Afghanistan

These developments in Afghanistan was termed by the United States as deliberate acts of the Soviet Union to promote communist ideology, and that let to reemergence or revival of the Cold War in a significant way. The United States responded to these developments with its proxies in Afghanistan - the mujahedeen groups who launched a war on the communist regime of Babrak Karmal and the Soviet troops there. Soviet Union suffered heavy military losses at the hands of the US-armed mujahideen groups. Besides, by late 1980s, Soviet Union had begun unraveling under the pressure of prestroika and glasnost reforms of Mikhail Gorbachev. Soviet troops began withdrawing from Afghanistan in mid 1988 and finally left the country on 15 February 1989 without victory under the framework worked out between US, USSR, and the governments of Afghanistan and Pakistan. The other developments that were seen adding to the rebirth of the Cold War were: i) imposition of martial law in Poland by the Soviets in 1981 to quell "prodemocracy protests" and its American opposition; ii) the Soviet Union shooting down a South Korean "spy" airliner in 1983 and thus breaking off the SovietAmerican arms talks; and iii) American invasion of Grenada, a Caribbean country, in 1983 among others.

This geopolitical and ideological battle, however, was ended by the late 1980s. Once the Soviets had pulled out troops from Afghanistan, the bipolar tension reduced. The Americans and the Soviets agreed to dismantle a whole category of nuclear weapons in 1987. They reached an agreement to that effect. It was called the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty. News of positive developments in favour of easing the tensions started coming from Cuba, Vietnam, Cambodia, Angola etc. while Germany was

united. But it was widely believed that the policies pursued by the Soviet leadership of that time were primarily responsible for the end of the Cold War. The essence of those policies pursued by the Soviet Union was understood by the two highlighted terms of perestroika and glasnost. The meaning of perestroika was understood as economic "restructuring" in the sense of removing economic bottlenecks, inefficiency and raising production and productivity. Glasnost (opening) called for some minimal political liberalization in the Soviet political system. It called for openness in public policy-making and scrutiny. But the fact of the matter was that both the policies of perestroika and glasnost could not help the Soviets much, and the Soviet Union had ceased to exist in 1991.

End of Cold War

When Mikhail Gorbachev came to power, relations between Soviet Union and US began to improve. Gorbachev initiated glasnost and perestroika to provide some small political 'opening' (glasnost) at home and to bolster the faltering economy (perestroika). Cold War began winding down. At a summit in Reykjavik, Iceland, in October 1986, Gorbachev proposed Reagan a 50 per cent reduction in the nuclear arsenals of each side. Nothing came out of it; as Reagan was interested in building his 'star war' programme. However, on December 8, 1987, the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty was signed in Washington, eliminating an entire class of nuclear weapons. The INF Treaty was the first arms control pact to require an actual reduction in nuclear arsenals rather than merely restricting their proliferation.As the decade came to an end, much of the Eastern Bloc began to fall apart. Country after country walked back on communism; and the Soviet Union did nothing in response. The so-called 'iron curtain' was finally crumbling. On November 10, 1989, German people divided for decades physically tore down the Berlin Wall – one of the most famous symbols of the Cold War. Before the 1989 would end, leaders of every Eastern European nation except Bulgaria had been ousted by popular uprisings. By late 1991, Soviet Union itself dissolved into its component republics under a mix of factors – economic pressure, war in Afghanistan and breaking away of its East European allies. In a sense, Soviet socialist experiment crumbled under its own weight. It was the defeat of socialism at the political, if not the ideological level, but did it mark the triumph of capitalism and liberal democracy?

US emerged as the sole super power and took great credit for ending the Cold War. Triumphalism prevailed in US – a sense in American destiny and its infallibility. Francis Fukuyama declared the end of Cold War as the 'end of history'. Human societies will no further evolve in economic and political terms. Free market capitalism and liberal democracy were seen as the final forms of economic and political systems to live in. Bipolarity ended and the US became the sole superpower in the international relations.

NAM: Origin

Non-Aligned Movement, popularly known as NAM, is a platform of 120 developing countries who received their independence after the very 2 nd World War. Gradually the new independent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America were in a dilemma To be with any bloc formed due to the ideological hegemonies of USA and USSR and which lead the World in hostility among the members of the blocs. So the idea of Non- Alignment first came into the mind of Jawaharlal Nehru, the PM of India and he shared his view with G.A Naser, the President of Egypt; Nkhruma, the President of Ghana; General Sukarno, the President of Indonesia and of course with Marshal Joseph Tito, the President of Yogoslavia. The efforts of them finally took shape as the Non-Aligned Movement. The first Summit Conference was held in Belgrade, the capital of Yugoslavia in September 1961. Marshal Tito chaired the conference. Since then NAM organized it's 18^{th} conferences almost after every 3 years in the capital Cities of different member states. The last Summit held in 2019 in Baku of Azerbaijan and the next will be held in 2022.

Membership

Afghanistan, Colombia, Haiti, Mozambique, Singapore, Algeria, Comoros, Honduras, Myanmar, Somalia, Angola, Congo, India, Namibia, South Africa, Antigua and Barbuda Côte d'Ivoire Indonesia, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Azerbaijan, Cuba, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Nicaragua, Sudan, Bahamas, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Iraq, Niger, Suriname, Bahrain, Djibouti, Jamaica, Nigeria, Swaziland, Bangladesh, Dominica, Jordan, Oman, Syrian, Arab, Republic Barbados, Dominican, Republic Kenya, Pakistan, Thailand, Belarus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kuwait, Palestine, Timor-Leste, Belize, Ecuador, Lao People's Democratic Republic Panama, Togo, Benin, Egypt, Lebanon, Papua, New Guinea, Trinidad and Tobago, Bhutan, Equatorial, Guinea,

Lesotho, Peru, Tunisia, Bolivia, Eritrea, Liberia, Philippines, Turkmenistan, Botswana, Ethiopia, Libya, Qatar, Uganda, Brunei, Darussalam, Fiji, Madagascar, Rwanda, United Arab, Emirates, Burkina, Faso, Gabon, Malawi, Saint, Kitts and Nevis, United Republic of Tanzania, Burundi, Gambia, Malaysia, Saint, Lucia, Uzbekistan, Cambodia, Ghana, Maldives, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Vanuatu, Cameroon, Grenada, Mali Sao Tome and Principe, Venezuela, Cape, Verde, Guatemala, Mauritania, Saudi Arabia, Vietnam, Central African, Republic Guinea, Mauritius, Senegal, Yemen Chad, Guinea, Bissau, Mongolia, Seychelles, Zambia, Chile, Guyanam Morocco, Sierra, Leone, Zimbabwe.

Non-Aligned Conference of Heads of State or Government

S. No.	Place	Year	Members	Observers
1	Belgrade	September – 1961	25	03
2	Cairo	October – 1964	47	10
3	Lusaka	September – 1970	55	12
4	Algiers	September – 1973	75	15
5	Colombo	August – 1976	85	19
6	Havana	September - 1979	97	12
7	New Delhi	September – 1983	101	17
8	Harare	September - 1986	101	----

Objectives

- NAM has sought to "create an independent path in world politics that would not result in member States becoming pawns in the struggles between the major powers."
- It identifies the right of independent judgment, the struggle against imperialism and neo-colonialism, and the use of moderation in relations with all big powers as the three basic elements that have influenced its approach.
- At present, an additional goal is facilitating a restructuring of the international economic order.

Achievements

A major goal of .the Non-aligned Movement was to end colonialism. The conferences of the NAM continuously supported the national liberation movements and the organisations that led those movements were given the status of full members in these

conferences. This support greatly facilitated the Qecolonization process in Asia and Africa.

It also condemned racial discrimination and injustice and lent full support to the antiapartheid movement in South Africa and Namibia. Today in both countries this obnoxious policy has ended with independence and majority rule.

A third area in which the NAM made a significant contribution was towards the preservation of peace and disarmament. Its espousal of peace, of peaceful co-existence and of human brotherhood, opposition to wars of any kind contributed to the lowering of Cold War tensions and expanded areas of peace in the world with less states joining military blocs. It also continuously strove for disarmament and for an end to the arms race stating that universal peace and security can be assumed only by general and complete disarmament, under effective international control. It underlined that the arms race blocked scarce resources which ought to be used for socio-economic development. They first.called for a permanent moratorium or nuclear testing and later for the conclusion of a treaty banning the development, production stockpiling and use of all chemical weapons.

Fourthly, the non-aligned states succeeded in altering the composition of the U.N. and consequently in changing the tenor of the interstate relation conducted through its organs. In the forties and fifties deliberations in the U.N. organs were entirely dominated by the super power and their associate states. The emergence of non-alignment has changed this situation. It has created not only a new voting majority in the General Assembly but also common platform from where the third world can espouse its cause. It is no longer possible to ignore this platform. Thus we see that non-alignment has facilitated third world's participation in world politics and in the process has democratized the international relations.

The fifty important contribution was with regard to economic equality. It was the NAM that called for the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO). Despite their political sovereignty, the newly independent states remained economically unequal. They remained the same raw materials producing countries, which sold their commodities to the developed world at a lower price, and bought manufactured good from them at a higher price. The tragedies were that they were and continue to be part of

an oppressive economic system and that have to function within it. This makes them perpetually dependent on the developed North for capital goods, finance and technology. In order to end this economic exploitation, termed as neocolonialism, the NAM called for a restructuring of the international economic and monetary systems on the basis of equality, non-discrimination and cooperation.

Non-aligned Movement's struggle for economic justice has demonstrated how realistic I, is to divide the world between the North and the South rather than between the East and the West. It has proved that what concerns the majority of humanity is not the choice between capitalism and communism but a choice between poverty and prosperity. Preachings of non-alignment has made the developed world realize, to some extent, that deprivation of the third world would someday affect adversely their prosperity too. This has, to a large extent, forced them to come to the negotiating table. Besides the general success in making third world's economic demands negotiable, non-alignment has won its battle for some specific issues also. For example, economic sovereignty over natural resources is now an accepted principle. Non-alignment has also succeeded in legitimizing the interventionist trade policy that the developing countries want to pursue. It has successfully turned world attention to the problem created by the role as played by multinationals, specially in the context of transfer of technology. It has also succeeded in pursuing the IMF to establish system of compensatory finance which help the developing states in overcoming their balance of payments difficulties.

In the cultural field the establishment of the Pool of News Agencies needs to be considered as an achievement. This is the first time in history that politically and economically weaker nations have been able to gather information and communicate with the outside world without the aid of the western communication system.

The most significant achievement of non-aligned movement lies in the fact that it has taught the developing world how to pursue independent economic development in spite of being a part of the world capitalist economic order which makes them dependent on the developed states for capital and technology.

India’s Role

In March 1983 when due to unforeseen circumstances India was called upon to host the Seventh Summit meeting of the Non-aligned nations, it was both a challenge and

an opportunity for India because, first a controversial debate was going on in different parts of the world about the ideology of the Non-Aligned Movement; second, it was plagued by a serious internal crisis due to fratricidal war among some NAM countries; third the major thrust of the movement against politics. Cold War and Colonialism was being shifted to the growing tension over the North - South debate; and finally the generaj. Impression that one could gather from India's participation in the NAT-l activities from the very beginning was that of a calculated and cautious rather than an enthusiastic partner. Although, Jawaharlal Nehru was one of the three brains behind the NAM, India did not express its keeness to host a Summit meeting for at least twenty years since its inception in 1961.

Indira Gandhi's Role:

Ever since Indira Gandhi assumed the chairmanship of NAM, she remained very active until the cruel blow of death snatched her away. As the Chairperson of NAM she sent several letters to many heads of the government of the developed countries, requesting them to attend the 38th session of the UN General Assembly during which time there were informal meetings and consultations among the leading world leaders and the NAM, In her special appeal to the leaders from the US, USSR, UK, France, Wist Gemaany, GDR, Canada and Australia, she highlighted three distinct issues;

(1) The threat of nuclear war and global economic crisis confronting mankind’s.
(2) Urgency of such political issues such as Palestine and Namibia; and
(3) The need to arrest and reverse the arms race in order to release resources vitally required for economic development.

Thereafter in the UNCTAD VI Conference at Belgrade, Indira Gandhi on the one hand wanted to avoid confront-'ation with the US, on the other, she tried to bargain from more favourable terms to Least Developed Countries (LDCs),

A two-day ministerial Conference of nine nonaligned nations was convinced by her in New Delhi in the last week of April 1983, It had representation. from two South Asian States, Sri Lanka sent its Foreign Minister, whereas.

Bangla Desh v/as represented by its Minister of Agriculture, The prime motive of such a high-level meeting was to identify a NAl-1 strategy to ensure the early stand of global negotiations to restore economic problems facing the world. Narasimha Rao, the

then India's External Affairs minister while inaugurating the conference, suggested that the meeting would discuss the modalities of contacting heads of govt. of industrialized countries to bring their attention the concern of NAM over the current economic crisis.

There was a positive response to Indira Gandhi's written appeal and several world leaders came to attend the 38th session of the UN General Assembly. Prominent among the galaxies of statesman who attended the session were the President of France and top leaders from Canada Hungary, Poland, Surinam, Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus and EEC. Indira Gandhi chaired a number of informal session. All the discussions were conducted in a very cordial atmosphere.

In December 1983, New Delhi hosted the first ever Namedia Conference. It was attended by ninety-eight print and electronic media journalists and UNESCO officials. Indira Gandni as Chairperson of NAH addressed the gathering. The Conference in the course of its deliberations decided upon the following Broad objections.

a. To exchange national experience and explore new possibilities of «i«kjtual cooperation among media personnel of NAM countries so as to achieve collection ^elf-reliance in professional and technical fields.
b. To consider ways and means of speedily realizing the goals of the New World Information and Communication Order, to deepen and enrich understanding of its objectives and to coordinate approaches and programmes, which could be speedily carried out in the context of proliferating technological developments and their impact on information and economic activities.
c. To project the appreciation and thinking of media personnel of NAT': countries on problems of common concern.

Two major themes were given prominence during the deliberations:

- Imbalances - retrospect and prospect; and (ii) technological opportunity and challenges.

The final declaration of the Conference called upon fellow professionals to intensify their endeavors to widen and strengthen the base of freedom of communication and to democratize it. It was believed that Namidia would be a precursor to many such endeavors.

Soon after that another development took place. The NAM Information Ministers had a meeting in Jakarta on January 30, 1984 and a declaration was issued at the end of the 5-day session. An appeal was issued in the context of current climate of political conflict and economic disorder in the world grippled by a pervasive sense of insecurity and vulnerability. It emphasized that any cooperative action by NAr4 countries would - rectify the serious imbalances in the flow of global information, thereby profiling the hardly needed catalyst to step up the process of decolonization of information, India's the then information minister HKL Bhagat pointed out ^that decisions taken at the Jakarta meeting would give a flirter impetus to the cause of a balanced information flow.

A five-day session of NAI-l Foreign Ministers was held in the first week of October 1984 an the UN. The ministers reviewed the international situation and dwelt with several trouble spots. The Indian team was led by Q.Parthasarthy , welcomed the disarmament talks conducted by the leaders of the US and the Soviet Union and sincerely ho|)ed that it would lead to relaxation of global tension. Major controversies cropped up among several delegations as sensitive developments which had taken place in Latin America and the Caribbean region as a result of increased intervention and destabilization of the USA.

The communiqué particularly mentioned that an increasing number of nonaligned states were being subjected to all kinds of pressures designed to weaken the unity of the movement. The NAM Foreign Ministers particularly regretted the lack of political will on the part of the developed countries which had led to the continuing impasse in the North - South dialogue. They reaffirmed the threepron.7ed strategy of the New Delhi Summit which provided a balanced set of policy measures for global recovery and development. They called upon the super powers to resume the dialogue for detente and to mordent the scope of their dialogue to cover all regions, address to all issues and be open to participation of all states.

During Indira Gandhi's short tenure as NAM's Chairman, India's role was clearly visible on several crucial issues,

Rajiv's Contribution

With the brutal association of Indira Gandhi, the Chairmanship of NAM was practically thrust upon Rajiv Gandhi, once he was elected unopposed as Prime Minister of India.

The first major step that he took was to convene a six-nation Summit on disarmament on January 28-29, 1985. The presidents of three nonaligned states Tanzania, Mexico and Argentina joined the Indian Prime Minister, along with the Prime Ministers of Greece and Sweden in issuing the Delhi declaration which calls for a compressive test ban treaty, prevention of any arms race in outer space. Strengthening of the UN system and the division, of expenditure from arms to development.

Four of the Summit leaders also attended a follow-up Summit soon afterwards in Athens to take stock of the situation such a bold initiative by India provided a back drop to the disarmament talks in Geneva between the Foreign Ministers of the USA and the USSR.

The next major step by the young Prime Minister of India was the convening of an extraordinary NAM ministerial meeting on Namibia in New Delhi during April (19-21) 1985. In his inaugural address, Rajiv Gandhi recalled nostalgically that Mahatma Gandhi had launched the civil disobedience movement in South Africa before coming to India. He was highly critical of the 'settler colonialism' imposed by South Africa in Namibia since the First World War, since then South Africa has illegally treated it as its fifth province and has practiced unabashed deception and illegality.

The final decision to which India and other South Asian states richly contributed very categorically condemned the efforts by the USA and South Africa to link issue of Namibia independence with extraneous elements. In its view, 'they had the objective of distorting the issue and transforming what was basically a decolonization problem into an East-West issue. It was emphasized that there was an urgent need to inside comprehensive mandatory sanctions against the Pretoria regime i f i t persisted in it s intransigence. I t was also emphasized that the NAH countries fouled take direct t action not only to isolate e South Africa but also to se t up military and material assistance to SWAPO.

On April 20# 1985 with India's initiative an eight member Committee on Palestine met in New Delhi* It heard a detailed report by Yasser Arafat and i t was agreed to convene on behalf of MAM an international Conference on the Palestine issues.

In April 1986« iodine the united state s launched a major offensive in Libya by ai r raids# the NAM countries felt very much concerned about such an unprovoked aggression by a Super Power. The NAM Chairman decided to send a five-member team to Tripoli to espresso the movement's solidarity with India in the face of US military action. A NAM team was also sent to an emergency meeting of the UN Security Council. A vote on NAM draft condemning the US action was not adopted because of the Veto exercised by both the us and UK. However, NAM initiative on Libya did generate a major world reaction against American violation of international norms.

- Nehru wrote in 1948, "We shall take care not to align ourselves with one group or another…remaining neutral to those not affecting us directly …India obviously cannot join either of the two blocs…What she desires is an understanding between Russia and the U.S."(Scalpino, 1949)
- The Bandung Conference, which initiated the Non Aligned Movement, saw active participation from India, similar to the lines of the pre-NPT discussions and debates.
- The Indian focus was democratic, with emphasis on mutual respect.
- India's role in the formation and sustenance of the NAM has been immense. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first Prime Minister was not only one of the founding fathers of the Movement but, he was also the driving force behind the principles NAM came to stand for.
- In fact, 'Non-Alignment' itself was a phrase coined by India's Ambassador to the United Nations, V.K Menon.

Middle East: Arab Israeli Conflict

With the declaration of Israeli independence on May 14, 1948, the nature of the Arab-Israeli conflict and Britain's role in it entered a new phase. Before Israel's creation, the conflict was one between Zionism and the Palestinian Arabs that originated prior to World War I as a result of Jewish immigration into Palestine with the goal of ultimately creating a Jewish state. This objective had gained official recognition with the issuance of

the Balfour Declaration by Great Britain on November 2, 1917. It promised British support to create "in Palestine a national home for the Jewish people," understood by British and Zionist officials to mean a Jewish state in all of Palestine. Once the Balfour Declaration was incorporated into the 1922 British mandate for Palestine, Britain was obligated to prepare an incoming Jewish population for self-government, not the existing Arab population; mandates had been instituted with the idea of preparing local inhabitants for future independence.

As the mandatory power responsible for Palestine, Britain had faced an Arab revolt in the 1930s which it had crushed, and then a Jewish revolt from 1945 onward demanding a Jewish state. Faced with world knowledge of the Holocaust and American pressure favouring Zionism, Britain decided to abdicate its responsibility and in February 1947 handed the Palestine question over to the newly formed United Nations, though British forces remained in Palestine to May 1948. The U.N. General Assembly approved recommendations for partition of Palestine into a Jewish and an Arab state in November 1947, leading to intense civil strife between Jews and mostly Palestinian Arabs that resulted in the creation of Israel. This conflict, and attacks by Arab armies immediately following Israel's independence declaration, resulted in the flight or forcible expulsion by Israel of over 700,000 Palestinians.

Israel's victory in the first Arab-Israeli war inaugurated the new phase of the Arab-Israeli conflict as one of states in which the Palestinians played at times important but secondary roles throughout the period 1948–1970. Another consequence was Britain's relegation to a new status of involved observer. Britain had abstained in the U.N. partition vote of November 1947 though it had backed the division of Palestine between Israel and Transjordan, arousing suspicion of collusion to deny creation of a Palestinian entity; Transjordan was renamed the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan in 1948. Jordan absorbed the West Bank and its population of 400,000 Palestinians and admitted half a million Palestinian refugees from Israel. As a result, King Abdullah's Jordan found itself with a majority population of Palestinians to whom he gave citizenship, the only Arab state to do so for those refugees they accepted.

The PRO files for the period 1948–1970 can be divided into three periods for purposes of analysis: 1948–1957; 1957–1967; and 1968–1970. The first period, covered

extensively in this collection, ends with the aftermath of the Suez crisis where Israel, France and Britain collaborated in attacking Egypt. The Suez venture humiliated Britain and seriously affected its ability to intervene in Middle Eastern affairs generally, forcing it into a more pronounced secondary role allied with the United States. The second period, marked by intense intra-Arab strife between conservative monarchies and regimes led by leaders calling for pan-Arab unity, also saw increasing tensions within the Arab nationalist camp, notably between Egypt and Syria, that played a major role in instigating the 1967 Arab-Israeli war. With Israel's occupation of the Sinai Peninsula, the Golan Heights, and the West Bank as the result of the 1967 conflict, the Arab-Israeli conflict entered a new phase, focusing on the possible exchange of occupied lands for peace, that lasts to this day. The files available for 1968–1970 consider 1970 only, focusing on Jordan. There, increasing tensions involving rival Palestinian factions ultimately led to civil war in August-September 1970 and Jordan's crushing of the Palestinian resistance. The stress of negotiations that achieved a cease-fire at the end of September caused the collapse and death of Gamal Abd al-Nasser who had ruled Egypt since 1954 and symbolized the Arab nationalist cause to much of the Arab world.

1948–1957

The Arab-Israeli conflict evolved within two frameworks, the regional one within the Middle East and the global environment characterized by the Cold War between the Soviet Union and the Communist bloc on the one hand and the Western powers, notably the United States, Britain, and France, on the other. These files focus more on the region, though some (FO 371 files for 1950-51) consider the likelihood of a Middle East Command, to serve as a bulwark against communist influence, that might include Israel.

Britain's role in the region during this period was defined by her ongoing imperial obligations. She was deeply committed to Jordan, whose creation she had authored at the end of World War I, and likewise to Iraq for which she had had a mandate following that conflict. Palestinian and Jordanian issues are covered extensively in these files, especially because of ongoing Israeli-Jordanian tensions. Initially these arose over definitions of frontiers and fears that Israeli pressure might destabilize King Abdullah's regime whose Arab Legion was commanded by Sir John Glubb, a British subject. Abdullah's plight was accentuated by strong, and well-founded, suspicion among other Arab rulers and many

Palestinians that, with British approval, he had conspired with Israel to divide Palestine. Files FO 816/172, PREM 11/392 and FO 371/90287, 91431, 19789, 91796-98, 91838-39, and 96986 and 96996-97 cover Abdullah's assassination in Jerusalem by a Palestinian and its regional repercussions, including news of the deposition of Egypt's King Farouq and likely replacement by a military group led by the young colonel Gamal Abd al-Nasser.

British-Egyptian relations during this period became increasingly unstable. Officially Egypt was independent. However, Britain retained control of a two-hundred square mile area in the Suez Canal Zone as a military installation, stemming from its occupation of Egypt in 1882 and almost total control of Egyptian affairs from that point to the Anglo-Egyptian treaty of 1936. Egyptian nationalists, whether secular or of the Muslim Brotherhood, demanded Egypt's full withdrawal from the Suez Canal Zone. Egypt's Nasser would gain British agreement in 1954 for a full British withdrawal from the canal zone by June 1956 just prior to Nasser's nationalization of the Suez Canal that created the pretext for British-French-Israeli collusion. The particulars of the build-up to the Suez crisis are outside the purview of files dedicated to the Arab-Israeli conflict, but one sees in FO 371 files 96996-98, 97033, 121732-33, 121745-46, 121748-54, 121781 and 121783 and WO 322/2 discussion of immediate events and disputes such as the Egyptian blockade of ships destined for Israel, and efforts to resolve the matter at the United Nations.

The major coverage in these files is of border tensions between Israel and its immediate Arab neighbours, Syria, Jordan, and Egypt. Those with Syria involved disputes over demilitarized zones in the Lake Tiberias (Sea of Galilee) and Lake Huleh areas below the Golan Heights which Israel occupied contrary to UN truce arrangements in order to control supplies of water that originated in the Golan area.. The United Nations was deeply involved in efforts to resolve such disputes, though Israel frequently rejected UN offers of mediation as infringing on its sovereignty.

The most intense clashes during the early 1950s occurred along the Israeli-Jordanian frontier. There were frequent infiltrations by displaced Palestinians now residing in the West Bank. Most aimed at stealing crops or property but some resulted in Israeli casualties. Israel's standard response was massive military retaliation, holding the

Jordanian government responsible. Extensive treatment of these tensions and diplomatic exchanges relating to them, including the retaliatory raid on the Jordanian village of Qibya in 1953, led by Colonel Ariel Sharon, that resulted in many deaths can be found in FO 371 Files 104755-57 and 104777-91. Analysis of related events for 1954 exists in FO 371 Files and 111098-99 and 111101-07.

In the midst of such strife, Britain, France and the United States sought to monitor and control arms shipments to all sides to prevent further conflict, while also striving at times to propose peace talks based on Anglo-American initiatives. FO 371 files have much to say about arms supplies and sources of weapons. A major initiative during 1955-1956 was Project Alpha, a joint U.S.-British effort to gain a comprehensive peace that would include treaties between Israel and its Arab neighbours, starting with Egypt, and resolution of the Palestinian refugee problem. Further FO 371 files have extensive coverage of these efforts and the Israeli and Arab responses to them, which went beyond diplomatic exchanges to include further outbreaks of strife on all of Israel's frontiers.

In the midst of these efforts, Israel undertook a major attack on Egyptian posts in Gaza in February 1955, in part a reflection of Israeli domestic political instability. This raid led ultimately to Egypt's turn to the Soviet bloc for weapons, an Egyptian blockade of Israeli shipping between the Gulf of Aqaba and the Red Sea, intensified Israeli-Arab border strife, especially on the Egyptian frontier, covered extensively in FO 371/115829-49, 115898-911, and 115918 and FO 141/1395 and 1399, and contributed to the Suez crisis noted above.

1957–1967

The Egyptian-Israeli front was stable for nearly all of the decade from the Suez Crisis to the spring of 1967. This was in part due to the presence of U.N. Emergency Forces (UNEF) stationed at strategic locations in the Sinai Peninsula, including at Sharm al-Shaykh, a promontory that overlooks the Strait of Tiran, the passage connecting the Red Sea and Gulf of Aqaba. The Egyptian blockade of Israeli shipping through the Tiran Strait had been a major Israeli grievance, and Israel warned in 1957 that any future Egyptian blockade would be considered a casus belli, or legitimate cause for war. Nasser would blockade the Tiran Straits at the end of May 1967, though the timing of Israel's

attack did not reflect that declaration; instead it reflected knowledge that Egypt was sending emissaries to Washington to seek to negotiate a way out of the crisis.

Many files for this period consider British-Egyptian ties after Suez when diplomatic relations had been severed; PREM 13/414 contains material on British-Israeli talks as well.. The Arab-Israeli conflict for much of this period was overshadowed by intra-Arab rivalries. The Egyptian-Syrian union as the United Arab Republic (February 1958–September 1961), originally hailed as the first step toward true Arab unity, dissolved in bitterness, leading Syria from that point to present itself as in the vanguard of Arab nationalism, directly challenging Nasser's leadership of the "progressive Arab bloc." Simultaneously both Egypt, Syria, and Iraq, condemned and occasionally called for the overthrow of "reactionary" monarchies such as Saudi Arabia and Jordan. Files from the years 1957-60 cover Arab League meetings where these differences were aired as well as British concern for the fate of Jordan's King Husayn.

The mid-1960s saw the re-emergence to prominence of the Palestinian question with the formation of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in 1964, sponsored by Egypt, and the appearance of alFatah, led by young Palestinians among whom was Yasser Arafat. Al-Fatah was then separate from and opposed to the PLO, and undertook raids into Israel from 1965 onward, sponsored by Syria. The Palestinian issue now became a staple of Arab invective with Nasser being charged with being "soft" on Palestine and afraid of Israel, symbolized by the UNEF forces in the Sinai. Further files introduce the PLO and Fatah as of 1965 and devote attention to Palestinian issues and factions from 1965 through 1967. The general build up to the 1967 War and its consequences, including Palestinian activities and politics, appears in Files FCO 8/44, 636, 679, FCO 17/219, 526, 637, 690, FCO 39/18, FCO 73/124, FO 174/396-406, and PREM 13/1617-1624. PREM 13/1623-1624 contain material on negotiations at the United Nations leading to issuance of Security Council Resolution 242

1968–1970

Files for these years contain much material on the increasingly unstable situation in Jordan in 1970 that led to civil war. At that time Jordan housed the headquarters of the Palestinian resistance. Rival Palestinian factions within the PLO called for the overthrow of Jordan's King Husayn. At the same time, Palestinian raids from Jordan into Israel,

including the newly occupied West Bank, resulted in major Israeli retaliatory raids, further threatening the regime. These files, many marked "Internal Situation in Jordan," provide evidence of British concern for the stability of King Husayn's government as he faced Palestinian defiance of his authority and the external threat of further Israeli assaults. They end (PREM 15/123-125) with the outbreak of combat in September 1970 and the death of Egypt's Nasser, setting the stage for removal of the Palestinian resistance to Lebanon, and the accession to power in Egypt of Anwar al-Sadat. Over time, these developments would confirm that Lebanon would become a new front for the Arab-Israeli conflict, and, in Egypt, that its leadership would seek a negotiated path to remove itself from the conflict, realized by the end of the decade.

Oil Crisis

The oil weapon, that is, the implementation of production cutbacks and destination embargoes by the Arab producing states in order to pressure the United States and its allies to force Israel to withdraw from Arab territories seized in 1967 and 1973, must be seen in two seperate but interrelated con? texts. One is the Arab - Israeli conflict and the dynamics of inter-Arab politics centered around that conflict. The second is the drive by the oil producing countries, aided and abetted by the major oil companies, to take full advantage of the temporary and localized shortages and generally tight balance of supply and demand in world markets to register hefty in? creases in the prices charged for crude oil and its products.

The war, of course, and the implementation of the oil weapon, acquired a momentum and decisive influence of its own which effected qualitative changes in the structure of the world oil industry and on the present alignment of political power in the Middle East today. In addition, it accentuated significant developments in the competitive economic and political relationships of the United States with the other Industrial capitalist countries of Europe and Japan.

THE OIL WEAPON BEFORE THE WAR The close affinity of politics and oil and politics and war have made it almost inevitable that war in the Middle East and oil in the Middle East should be closely intertwined. In 1948, consciousness of this fact was evident in the deliberate ions and memoranda of U.S. political and military strategists as they attempted to formulate a policy toward the Zionist - Palestinian conflict, and more

than one Arab leader publicly raised the threat to cut off oil exports to those countries supporting Israel. As it turned out, only the ship mints of the Iraq Petroleum Company to Haifa were sign featly (and permanently) affected. Whether any more con carted campaign could have been mounted is highly doubt? full, given the low level of political collaboration and technical competence in and between the Arab states, and the limited dependence of the industrialized countries at that time on Arab oil. In any case, the Saudis refused to entertain such notions from the beginning, and the threat remained dim and distant.

It was raised again, in each succeeding war in 1956 and 1967, and in both cases limited embargoes were implemented, with little effect. In 1956, the United States was able to make up deliveries to Britain and France from domestic production. In 1967, the small level of U.S. imports from the Arab states and the ability of the major companies to re-route supplies rendered the embargo a farce. In the following years this failure was blamed by radicals on the perfidy of the reactor producers like Saudi Arabia, who reciprocated by pinning the failure on the incompetence of the radicals. The result was disrepute for the idea of an embargo or cutback. The rich producing states wrapped a cloak of virtue around their ever expanding production by declaring that oil had to be used as a "positive weapon": that is, as a source of revenues which might then be dispensed, at the ruling families' discretion, to build up the military and economic strength of those Arab states that behaved themselves political.

Debate about the potential of the oil weapon continued nonetheless. Given the conditions of surplus production and capacity that prevailed through 1970, it appeared axiomatic that no embargo could be affected without the support and participation of at least one of the two major producers, Saudi Arabia and Iran, who between them accounted for about two-thirds of Middle East production. Besides being non-Arab, Iran had a tacit strategic alliance with Israel, facilitated by the United States. In 1967, Iranian production was increased and used to supplement the Arab cutbacks. In short, Iran could be counted on to sabotage and neutralize any Arab oil offensive.

Saudi Arabia, for its part, had to maintain a modicum of solidarity with the rest of the Arab states in the struggle with Israel, which was covered with the oil-financed subsidies to Egypt and Jordan following the Khartoum Conference in 1967. The oil

weapon was, for Saudi Arabia, a lever for modifying and controlling the political behavior of the radical Arab states, chiefly Egypt. To those who called for a more direct use of Saudi oil production to pressure the United States into a less pro-Israeli position, the constant Saudi refrain was that "oil and politics don't mix." Oil Minister Yamani offered a unique interpretation of the oil weapon in November 1972.

The change in the structure of the oil industry which accelerated after 1970, notably the disappearance of surplus production and the increasing measure of government control over production levels, renewed the momentum for a more militant stance than Yamani's. The rising level of imports of low-sulfur crude to the U.S. east coast, though still a small proportion of U.S. supplies, accentuated the growing reliance of the United States on eastern hemisphere sources. Studies by the oil industry lobby in the United States, such as the National Petroleum Council, all stressed the growing shortage of domestic energy supplies and the accelerating dependence of this country on foreign supplies. The Middle East, and in particular Saudi Arabia, were stressed as the most likely if not the only sources for the coming decade. While much of this was self-serving propaganda in the drive for higher prices, profits and subsidies, the general thrust of the argument was assailed by very few: the voracious appetite of the U.S. for energy resources could only be met over the next decade by Middle East imports.

This in turn focused a good deal of attention on the stability and potential disruption of that source. The Saudis had managed after the 1967 war to isolate their oil policies from the contagious political emotions connected with the conflict with Israel. The new role of Saudi Arabia as the one country with the capacity and the willingness to expand production to meet growing American oil needs signaled the end of that isolation. In 1972, the Economic Council of the Arab League commissioned a study concerning the strategic use of Arab economic power in the fight with Israel. The report, finished at the end of the year, took the view that while Arab interests in the long run would be best served by developing independent and autonomous industrially-based economies, in the short term a more restrictive policy towards oil production would both conserve wasting resources for future use and bring a significant degree of pressure on the industrial consuming countries to alter their support for Israel and hostility toward the Palestinian cause. The report did not call for an embargo or cutback of oil production, but a slower

rate of expansion than that desired by the consuming countries. This tactic would allow maximum flexibility for proportionate degrees of escalation and de-escalation that a total cut-off lacks.2 This particular tactic of a freeze or constraint on production expansion was endorsed by a top Arab oil economist and former OPEC Secretary General, Nadim Pachachi, in June 1973, who predicted it would be "quite sufficient to cause a world? wide supply crisis in a fairly short period of time.

By this time Saudi Arabia was already coming under considerable and increasing pressure to limit its rate of expansion. Saudi Arabia's isolation from the Arab-Israeli confrontation was ending. Another factor in this process was the Egyptian shift to the right under Sadat. In order to consolidate the power of the new and old bourgeoisie represented by the Sadat regime, some concession to the patriotic sentiments of the Egyptian masses was necessary. Some means of restoring Egyptian sovereignty over the occupied Sinai was essential to undercut the insurgent political movement of students and workers that regularly brought Egypt to the edge of political crisis since the 1967 war and especially since Nasser's death. With the changing balance in the oil markets, and the growing testimony from the United States about the importance of Middle East oil in that balance, politically conscious Arabs saw the irrefutable need for an oil policy that would match the rhetorical militancy of the politicians. For Egypt the logical partner by geography and political temperament appeared to be Libya, and this was matched by Qaddafi's stress on the need for some specific form of Arab political union or federation. Qaddafi's staunch Islamic fundamentalist and anti-imperialist politics, though, forced Sadat to look to Saudi Arabia as an alternative. Faisal's regime, looking for a role that would give it pan-Arab legitimacy and would limit the influence of radicals like Qaddafi, was inclined to cautious cooperation.

Qaddafi's stress on confrontation and popular mobilization was countered by Faisal's emphasis on close ties to the United States. This meant the need to reduce sharply Egyptian links to the Soviet Union. Faisal apparently had some role in Sadat's decision to expel the Russian military advisors in 1972 as a way of inviting the United States to use its leverage with Israel to secure some territorial concession. There was no perceptible change in U.S. policy. Sadat went ahead with plans for an Arab federation comprised of Egypt, Libya and Syria. In early 1973, after renewed clashes in Egyptian cities between

militant students and workers and security forces, Sadat dispatched his special national security advisor, Hafez Ismail, to Washington to sound out any possible shifts in U.S. policy. Ismail's visit coincided with that of Golda Meir, and Washington's response was to leak word of a new shipment of Phantom jets to Israel. It appears that the Egyptian decision to go to war was made in the aftermath of these events.

The Saudis, now, had some stake in the outcome, having argued to Sadat that a diminished Russian role would lead to a change in U.S. policy. In April, oil Minister Yamani paid one of his frequent visits to Washington, where he linked oil and Israel far the first time publicly. It is politically impossible, he reportedly told U.S. officials, for Saudi Arabia to expand production at the desired rate in the absence of a change in U.S. policy toward Israel. In a story accompanying an interview with Yamani, the Washington Post wrote that the Saudis are known to feel under increasing pressure from the radical Arab states and the Palestinian guerrillas to use their oil as a political weapon for pressuring Washington into forcing Israel into a compromise settlement with the It was later reported that soon after this King Faisal called in the president of Aramco to stress that Saudi Arabia was "not able to stand alone much longer" in the Middle East as an American ally.5 Aramco cabled the details of Faisal's remarks to the American parent companies, who began taking out newspaper ads and appearing at Congressional hearings to warn of the need for an "evenhanded" American policy in the Arab-Israeli dispute. On May 15, 1973, anniversary of the establishment of Israel, four oil producing states engaged in a minor but symbolic stoppage of crude oil production: Algeria, Kuwait and Iraq for one hour and Libya for a full 24 hours. In June, Libya nationalized the small American independent Bunker Hunt, invoking U.S. imperialism and support for Israel as a primary reason. Washington responded to the Saudi initiatives by offering to provide a squadron of Phantom jets hitherto reserved in the Middle East for Israel and Iran. Saudi Arabia indicated the offer was not acceptable as a substitute for changing U.S. policy toward Israel. In July, the Palestine Liberation Organization endorsed the tactic of freezing oil production at present levels. Faisal let it be known that the debate inside Saudi ruling circles was between those who wanted to limit production increases and those who wanted to freeze them. Saudi Foreign Minister Saqqaf predicted that Arab oil would be denied to "those who down the widespread press reports of possible output

restrictions directed against the U.S.10 Later in September there were reports of two new Kissinger initiatives: one was a secret "peace plan" which would have settled most of the particular territorial claims between Israel and the Arab states in Israel's favor; the other was an equally secret decision to pursue the "special relationship" with Saudi Arabia proposed a year earlier by Yamani. The policy under the new Secretary of State was to be one of "compatibility rather than confrontation.

Since the founding of the State of Israel in 1948, the Middle East had been a hotbed of ongoing crisis. The Arab States refused to accept the presence of a Jewish State in Palestine. The simmering conflict was re-ignited by the Israeli occupation of Arab territories the Golan Heights, the West Bank and the Sinai Peninsula during the Six Day War in 1967.

The major powers intervened massively, with the United States as Israel's staunch ally and the Soviet Union as defender of the Arab States. The belligerents received enormous quantities of arms from their respective allies. During the 1973 Yom Kippur War, Israel was attacked by Egypt and Syria, which were seeking to recover their occupied territories, but it fought them off successfully.

With the visit to Jerusalem in September 1978 of the President of Egypt, Anwar Sadat, the peace process in the Middle East began to take shape. The Israeli Prime Minister, Menachem Begin, was willing to return the occupied territories in Sinai in exchange for peace. However, the other Arab countries and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) refused to follow Egypt's example in moving towards peace.

The fall of the Shah of Iran and the establishment of the Islamic Republic in 1979 further destabilized the Gulf region, where the Shah had acted as 'America's policeman'. Tensions increased further with the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the Iran–Iraq war from 1980 to 1988.

The conflicts between Israel and the Arab States and the fall of the Shah triggered two oil crises which had a profound impact on the Western economies, in particular those of Europe.

The oil crisis

In order to force the Western countries to put pressure on Israel during the Yom Kippur War, the Arab oil-producing countries cut oil exports to Europe and America. The

countries which were members of the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), supported by the Soviets, thus forced a sharp rise in the price of crude oil, which led to a global energy crisis. Oil became a weapon in the international struggle against Israel and its allies. Production was cut and embargo measures imposed on those countries deemed to be unfriendly, countries which directly depended on outside sources for almost two thirds of their imports. From October to December 1973, the price of a barrel of crude oil increased fivefold. That was the first oil crisis. In sparking off a broader economic crisis, it impacted on the Western economies in two ways: it severely exacerbated inflationary trends (the annual inflation rate in the UK soared to 20 %), and it siphoned off part of the wealth of the oil-importing countries, causing an enormous budget deficit.

From the early 1960s, oil consumption had been increasing steadily, while consumption of coal and natural gas had declined. Between 1950 and 1972, it almost doubled to account for over 60 % of total energy consumption. The cost of this was made even heavier by the oil crisis from October 1973 onwards. That aggravated the economic crisis affecting Western Europe, the first symptom of which was a recession that put a sudden stop to the growth of the 'thirty glorious years' that followed the Second World War. Industrial production declined, impacting on traditional economic sectors including textiles, shipbuilding and steel. International trade crumbled, and bankruptcies became regular occurrences.

The immediate consequence of this depression and the ensuing austerity policy was a huge rise in unemployment in Europe, a trend which continued with the second oil crisis which struck in 1979. Not all countries, of course, were equally affected: some managed better than others. Belgium and the United Kingdom, whose economies were traditionally based on industry, had more difficulty in adapting than Luxembourg, which avoided mass unemployment through close cooperation between management and labour and the provision of state subsidies to the steel industry, financed by tax revenue from the banking sector.

Check Your Progress

- Discuss the origin and different phases of the Cold War
- Analyze the objectives and achievements of the Non-Aligned Movement
- Examine the causes and consequences of the Arab-Israeli Conflict and the Oil Crisis of 1973.

UNIT III

United Nations Organization and its Specialized Agencies (UNESCO – UNICEF – WHO) – European Union – Organization of African Unity – ASEAN – SAARC

Objectives

- United Nations Organization Specialized Agencies.
- Formation of the European Union
- Association of Southeast Asian Nations

Specialized Agencies & Related Organizations

1. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
2. International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO)
3. International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)
4. International Labour Organization (ILO)
5. International Monetary Fund (IMF)
6. International Maritime Organization (IMO)
7. International Telecommunications Union (ITU)
8. The World Bank
9. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)
10. United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO)
11. United Nations World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)
12. World Health Organization (WHO)
13. Universal Postal Union (UPU)
14. World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO)
15. World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
16. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
17. World Trade Organization (WTO)
18. Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW)
19. Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Org. (CTBTO)
20. International Criminal Court (ICC)
21. International Seabed Authority (ISA)

22. International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea (ITLOS)

23. International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Introduction:

The constitution of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), signed on 16 November 1945, came into force on 4th November, 1946 after ratification by 20 countries including India. Today, UNESCO functions as a laboratory of ideas and a standard-setter to forge universal agreements on emerging ethical issues. It also serves as a clearinghouse – for the dissemination and sharing of information and knowledge – while helping Member States to build their human and institutional capacities in diverse fields. UNESCO promotes international co-operation among its 193 Member States and 6 Associate Members in the fields of education, science, culture and communication.

Historical Background:

World War II provided the impetus for the establishment of UNESCO. In 1942, the Ministers of Education from the countries of occupied Europe met in London to examine the possibility of setting up an international organization to address the problems in education created by a devastating war. As more meetings were held, the number of participating countries increased. In November 1945, an inaugural general meeting was called by Great Britain and France in London, and 44 nations attended. When they deliberated the UNESCO charter, the member nations were influenced by the tragedy of the use of nuclear weapons at Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945. The charter was adopted on November 16, 1945. The charter came into effect on November 4, 1946, by which time 20 nations had signed and UNESCO was inaugurated as an international body.

Objective

UNESCO's Constitution define its responsibilities and seats out its Objectives. A key phrase, "Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed', is based on the words of a man of State and a poet stand at the forefront of UNESCO's Constitution and contain the key to all its objectives.

To collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of people;

To give fresh impulse to popular education and the spread of culture;

To help to advance the ideal of equality of educational opportunity;

To assure the conservation and protection of the World's inheritance of books.

To give the people of all countries access to the printed and published material produces by any one of them and to realize these purposes the organization will:

Collaborate in the work of advancing the mutual knowledge and understanding of people, through all means of mass communication and to that end recommend such international give fresh impulse to popular education and to the spread of culture; by collaborating with members.

Maintain, increase and diffuse knowledge; by assuring the conservation and protection of the World's inheritance of books, works or art.

With a view to preserving the independence, integrity and fruitful diversity of the cultures and educational systems of the member states of this organization.

Organizational Structure

At the time of its establishment, UNESCO had a membership of 20 states. At present it includes 192 member states. UNESCO's constitution provides for three structural organs; (i) Assembly, (ii) Executive Board, and (iii) Secretariat.

General Conference

The general conference is the supreme body of UNESCO. In the association of states making up UNESCO, it serves as a general assembly of Member States. The other two structural components being the Executive Board and the Secretariat,which are headed by the Director General.

Constitution

This General Conference is made up of the representatives of all the Member States of UNESCO. It meets in ordinary session every two years for a period of approximately five weeks, either at its headquarter in Paris or in another capital city of its choice, may meet in extraordinary session if it decides to do so itself, if summoned by the Executive Board, or at the request of at least one-third of the Member States.

Executive Board

The executive Board is the pivot between the General Conference, which is the sovereign legislative body, and the Secretariat, which executes the programmes, deriving its authority from the General Conference which chooses Board members from among its delegates. The executive Board supervises all the operations of UNESCO, either by following instructions received from the General Conference or by acting on its own initiative, in which case it is accountable to the higher body. The meetings of the Board are held at least twice a year. The tenure of the office is four years. But generally half of the members of the Board retire eveiy 2 years and new ones are elected in their place.

The Secretariat

UNESCO's Secretariat is divided into 5 main sectors, each headed by an Assistance Director General. He is responsible for all the activities and functions of the divisions under his sector. Almost all of them are concerned with libraries, information etc., however, the following deal specifically with these subjects with whom we are concerned in this study. They are eight sectors of UNESCO. They are: (i) Education Sector, (ii) Natural Science Sector, (iii) Social and Human Sciences Sector, (iv) Culture Sector (v) Communication Sector, (vi) External Relations and Information Sector, (vii) General programmes and Programmes support Sector, and (viii) General Administration Sector.

Activities

Archives are important components that help at improving information access, both for the public at large and for specialized groups. Since its creation, UNESCO has contributed to the reinforcement of these types of services. The development of information technologies and in particular the Internet, networking, cooperation and digitization modify substantially the functions of acquiring, storing and disseminating information and knowledge. UNESCO pays special attention to the underdeveloped countries so that they do not lag behind technological advances. In the area of archives, UNESCO, through its Records and Archives Management Programme - RAMP (established in 1979) aims at:

Memory of the World

UNESCO established the Memory of the World Programme in 1992. It provides access to the documentary heritage of the world. The programme was envisioned to protect and preserve documents that are endangered due to natural or manmade disasters.

Community Multimedia Centres:

UNESCO's International Initiative for Community Multimedia Centres (CMCs) promotes community empowerment and addresses the digital divide by combining community broadcasting with the Internet and related technologies.

Multimedia databases for development:

The CMC can gradually build up its own database of materials that meet the community's information needs.

E-Governance:

E-governance is the use of ICT by different actors of the society with the aim to improve their access to information and to build their capacities. The principal ongoing UNESCO activity in the field of e-governance is a crosscutting project on

E - Governance Capacity-Building. Information Processing Tools:

UNESCO develops, maintains and disseminates, free-of-charge, two interrelated software packages for database management (CDS/ISIS) and data mining/statistical analysis (IDAMS).

Public Domain Information:

UNESCO strongly promotes access to public domain information, also known as the "information commons". International organizations should recognize and promulgate the right for each State to have access to essential data relating to its social or economic situation.

General Information Programme

The General Information Programme was created bringing together two series of activities so far separately conducted by UNESCO: the UNISIST Intergovernmental Programme dealing with scientific and technical information, on the one hand and NATIS, UNESCO's concept of integrated national information concerned with documentation, libraries and archives, on the other hand. The work of the General Information Programme is guided by the Intergovernmental Council for the General

Information Programme whose members are elected by UNESCO's General Conference. The General Information Programme has been replaced by Information for All Programme (IFAP) since 2001. IFAP strives to overcome the digital divide in the society. It advocates for all people on the wrong side of the information divide. The programme takes special concern of the needs of women, youth and the elderly and the differently abled.

UNESCO's purpose as a member of the CTN family of organisations is "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture in order to further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms which are affirmed for the people of the world without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, by the charter of the United Nations."

The UNESCO is to promote, on the one hand, the democratisation of education, science and arts and on the other hand, the progress of all sciences and all branches of intellectual activity which aim to improve material as well as spiritual life. The UNESCO seeks to stimulate a worldwide attack on illiteracy, raise educational standards, encourage fundamental education, foster scientific research and promote the dissemination of scientific knowledge, provide for the exchange of persons to promote cultural activities, improve facilities for mass communication, and in general, promote international understanding.

A large part of UNESCO's programmes are carried out under contract or through subvention to various non-governmental organizations, such as, International Council of Scientific Unions etc. UNESCO funds many of these organizations; UNESCO also works closely with other UN specialized agencies like WHO, FAO, UNEP etc. in respective matters.

INESCO and the National Commissions, through meetings, publications, broadcasts on tests, and exhibitions have stimulated public interest in its specific programmes, achieved substantial progress In education, natural sciences, social and human sciences, study and promotion of culture, and development of communications all over the globe. It amply gets reflected in the various public policies enacted in India as

well, for example, the proposed Cultural Policy Statement to be adopted by the Indian government.

UNICEF

UNICEF is fully committed to creating spaces and opportunities for the full participation of a broad range of civil society actors in its programming, advocacy, and partnerships.

A recent analysis of UNICEF's expenditures vis-à-vis partnerships with civil society organizations (CSOs) showed that on an annual basis, UNICEF partners with approximately 3,000 national CSOs and 300 international CSOs. It is noteworthy that expenditure to government partners has been approximately equal with expenditure to partners in civil society with a trend toward an increasing percentage of funds going to civil society, from 41% in 2010 to 52% in 2015. Though there is a slight decline in 2016 with civil society percentage dropping down to 49%, the overall upward trend of civil society is maintained.

The recently adopted UNICEF Strategic Plan 2018-2021 affirms a clear commitment to enhancing multi-stakeholder partnerships, stating: "Reflecting the people-centred nature of the 2030 Agenda, we will support innovative platforms that strengthen collaboration with Governments as well as with civil society and the private sector. We will build on recent progress in engaging citizens through volunteerism, empowerment, participation and other means to strengthen national ownership and capacity, and delivery of the sustainable development agenda. We will also intensify collaboration through multi-stakeholder partnerships at national, regional, and global levels, and assist in improving mutual accountability for the Sustainable Development Goals in such partnerships." The new Strategic Plan commits that "Collaboration with civil society partners will be increased, including engagement with non-governmental organizations, community-based organizations, foundations and academic institutions, to advocate and act on behalf of children." During the development phase of the new strategic plan, UNICEF issued a broad call for consultation with civil society to garner feedback on the draft plan. This call was issued to a global database of over 3700 CSOs, through an online survey as well as through a series of open-invitation webinars where members of CSO groups could engage in Q&A sessions with UNICEF staff developing the plan. This

was the first time such a broad based consultation process with civil society was an essential part of UNICEF's global development phase of its Strategic Plan and was appreciated by civil society.

UNICEF creates space for engagement with civil society in a myriad of ways at global, regional, and national levels. UNICEF provides a flexible framework within which partnerships can be organized formally (using three modalities for formal partnerships) or informally. Informal partnerships are established when the type of collaboration does not require a formal agreement, e.g. when CSOs cooperate for joint advocacy or knowledge sharing. CSOs have to fulfill the general requirements, such as a commitment to the core values of the Convention on the Rights of the Child, respect for UN standards, including human rights, transparency and integrity, the capacity to carry out the partnership, and the potential to deliver results. UNICEF's partnerships framework and guiding principles for partnerships are available through their website and guide partnership vetting decision-making. Full information regarding UNICEF civil society partnerships are found on both internal and external websites. Joint ownership is a defining feature of partnerships; through an initial and ongoing consultative process, both parties agree on the objectives and results to be achieved, including the implementation strategies and resources that each partner will contribute.

As a decentralized structure, UNICEF's formal partnerships with civil society are formed primarily at the country level. They are created to carry out diverse joint activities, including advocacy, programming, service delivery, awareness-raising, knowledge sharing, emergency response, research, prevention activities, capacity development and fundraising. Partnerships may also serve to engage in advocacy and policy reform or responding to humanitarian emergencies. UNICEF works with a broad range of CSOs that share its objective of realizing children's rights. Naturally, many CSO partners focus specifically on children, but they may also focus on other issues that affect children's rights such as poverty, climate change, health, gender equality and violence. Besides these country initiatives, other forms of cooperation exist including the UNICEF National Committees, the global advocacy networks for children, the NGO Committee on UNICEF (officially mandated to make presentations at UNICEF Executive Board Sessions, which are webcast), and standby agreements in emergencies. UNICEF also has

a particular focus on partnering with religious communities. Guidance is issued by Headquarters on partnering with diverse sets of civil society groups.

Additionally, UNICEF devotes financial and human resources to focus on civil society partnerships across the organization – at headquarters and regional levels. Regional Offices have senior level Partnerships Advisors that guide regional and country level work with regards to partnerships, including civil society partnerships.

Across headquarters, several staff members focus specifically on various aspects of civil society engagement – New York and Geneva have staffed and officially mandated civil society liaison functions that manage an array of issues related to relationship management. Specific teams in New York and Geneva also separately manage operational and procedural issues related to civil society engagement. In 2015, New York headquarters embarked on a comprehensive consultation process with CSOs to revise UNICEF's contractual procedures. This was a direct response to addressing recurring difficulties that civil society partners were having with UNICEF's "cumbersome" operational procedures – as a result the processes were simplified to respond to civil society concerns. This exercise is being revisited in 2018 to keep an on-going level of responsiveness to changing needs. In some specific cases, UNICEF adapted its processes to partner more efficiently with key CSOs with which the organization partners with most frequently.

While still in development, UNICEF will soon launch "The UN Partner Portal". The portal will be a shared database across UNHCR, WFP and UNICEF to map CSOs in each country and share CSO screening results. A major purpose of the portal is to share screening/vetting results across agencies so that we can collectively decrease the amount of time it takes to process partnership agreements, as well as to create a more fair and transparent vetting system across agencies.

An area of increasing potential in the era of Agenda 2030 is UNICEF's engagement with civil society for the monitoring and review of the goals using various methods of social accountability. Beyond working together on programme implementation, there are a number of ways that UNICEF supports the widening public space for civil society voices to be increasingly included.

In this regard, UNICEF is working closely with civil society at the global level through sharing of key asks/advocacy messages on the SDGs for influencing voluntary national reviews (VNRs); and working at national level to improve/facilitate consultations with civil society and children. UNICEF provides a set of key asks/principles and advocacy messages to our country offices and national committee offices regarding the SDG Voluntary National Reviews (VNRs) to the annual High-level Political Forum (HLPF). These are, in turn, used by our Country and National Committee offices in discussions with the UNCT and/or Government Ministry leading the VNR process. In 2017, "external" versions of each of those key asks were produced and shared with key civil society actors in advance of the HLPF and UNICEF will continue to share this messaging for future HLPFs. Starting in 2017, in addition to the cross-cutting asks, UNICEF produced sector specific asks based on the Goal areas under "special review" during the HLPF in 2017. UNICEF will conduct a similar activity for the goal areas under review in 2018 to the extent they relate to children and youth. UNICEF is working with civil society to determine appropriate ways of including children in SDG implementation actions. There has been increased government interest in consulting with children and/or youth as part of developing their VNRs and meaningfully engaging children in taking action on the SDGs in local and national contexts. For example 35 of the 43 countries who did a VNR in 2017 have reported consulting with children and/or youth as part of their process.

At the country level, any number of social accountability mechanisms are supported by UNICEF. Independent human rights institutions (IHRIs) are recognized as an important part of the accountability landscape. UNICEF supports the work of IHRIs and sees them as key allies in the advancement of children's rights and as holding potential for increased contributions to social accountability for the SDGs. Including civil society in national platforms via human rights institutions for example is one way that UNICEF is able to open up space for civil society in public platforms. Some examples from the last couple of years include:

UNICEF-Morocco has a growing collaboration with the Conseil National des Droits de l'Homme or National Human Rights Council (Morocco's NHRI). This engagement has since 2011 focused on knowledge generation and advocacy, and is now

growing through a new strategic partnership on capacity building on child rights monitoring. This initiative is expected to benefit not only the NHRI's own staff, but also civil society, media and the private sector. Supported by the EU and specific Member States, this initiative is expected to eventually take on a regional dimension. Working to strengthen 13 commissions through decentralization and working with civil society at the local government level. Media is engaged as a partner at local level to monitor and disseminate information on child rights. Evidence is generated from the local level and Rabat formulates a response.

UNICEF-Kosovo conducted a country-wide Know your Rights Campaign (RKLA10) in collaboration with the office of the Ombudsperson. This strategic partnership is an attempt to create an innovative system of monitoring the violation of rights. As a result, there is an increased awareness of rights under Kosovo legislation and CRC and 4,387 users (46% female) of the Know Your Rights platform and other 7,000+ users were actively involved in the development of 3 right violation reports submitted to the Ombudsperson Institution. To prepare adolescents and youth for professional readiness (RKLA 10), 1,003 young people (57% female) increased their skills and knowledge through mentorship in the design, development, and implementation of 36 youth-led social impact projects. There is an expanded opportunity for participation, community service, and engagement in municipal decision-making processes for the most vulnerable adolescents. For example, 112 Roma and Ashkali youth trained in community needs assessment, project cycle management, and nonformal advocacy resulting in 6 youth-led advocacy actions.

UNICEF has supported a number of initiatives aimed at bringing civil society actors closer to government processes. A notable example is Nepal:

The Nepalese Government legislated for decentralized governance through the Local Self Governance Act of 1999. Building on a strong foundation of civic engagement through a plethora of community networks, this legislation platform was an important window of opportunity that advanced discussions with Government on strengthening social accountability for children's rights, resulting in the Child-Friendly Local Governance (CFLG) initiative led by the Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development (MOFALD). Building on efforts to improve the capacity of 15,000

children's clubs across the country, Bal Bhelas or children's consultations have been mainstreamed in the Government's largest decentralized and local governance programme, the Local Governance and Community Development Program (LGCDP), and they occur prior to the local government annual planning processes. These consultations, informed by the results of participatory tools (visioning and risk mapping) similar to community scorecards, and by budget monitoring, culminate in public hearings at which the children's clubs present their recommendations to the local government. These have a real impact in village, district and municipal budgets, supported by a national policy decision that 10–15 per cent of the local capital block grant budget must be dedicated to children, especially the most marginalized. To ensure that the children's clubs and consultations are inclusive, the local bodies give attention to avoiding elite capture, and to ensuring that the most disadvantaged children are represented. Because children are involved in essentially political processes, great care is taken to protect them from being exposed to security risks that may occur as a result of their participation. The CFLG process has enhanced coordination and collaboration among sectoral line agencies, local associations, civil society and development partners on child rights issues and has provided a forum for sectoral convergence. Out of the 23 districts in which UNICEF Nepal promoted social accountability investments during 2008–2012, five have elevated their Human Development Index (HDI) to a point where UNICEF's focused support is no longer required, and annual monitoring continues to register increasing district level HDIs. Four other districts have made significant HDI progress and will soon no longer require intensive UNICEF assistance. Boosted by demonstrated success, the cabinet approved the National Strategy on Child Friendly Local Governance (CFLG) in July 2011, leading to local bodies allocating over US$ 48 million per year of the Government's own funding to disadvantaged children and women across the country, with priorities informed by Bal Bhelas. In Nepal, social accountability, in this case through children's clubs, accompanied, instigated and depended on legal and policy reforms, and on judicial and administrative accountability.

New technologies must also be given due emphasis. UNICEF has used a number of new communication tools to reach a greater number of voices. For example, U-Report stands out as an excellent tool to include the voices of children, youth, and civil society in

national level dialogues. Through a simple SMS-based platform – millions of users have signed up around the world to report back on a broad range of issues affecting their lives. This information is shared with Government partners as an additional way to take civil society feedback into account.

WHO

Almost the entire cost of health care in the developing world is borne by the developing countries themselves. According to two separate estimates, aid from international health organizations in the developed countries pays for less than 5% of the total health care costs in the developing world. The estimates do not specify exactly what they include as health aid, but they probably omit the value of food relief and other health-related disaster relief, as well as money spent on water supply and sanitation projects, although these activities have important health benefits.

Of 6.3 billion people in the world, 2.3 billion live in the poorest countries (LICs), 2.6 billion live in lower-middle income countries (LMICs), and 333 million in upper-middle income countries (UMICs). About 972 million people live in HICs, rich in part because of their access to or ability to exploit resources, for example, oil, and food. Restated, over 80% of people live in nations with access to less than 20% of the world's wealth and productive capacity. More striking is that 2.5 million of the world's poor collectively have less wealth than the world's richest 400 individuals. Such gross inequalities should challenge the world community.

Life Expectancy varies by more than 48 years among countries (Japan 81.5; Zambia 32.7), and 20 years or more within countries. Social factors influence the occurrence of most forms of disease and lie at the root of health inequalities. In response to this global challenge, WHO had launched a Commission on Social Determinants of Health (2005) to review evidence, raise societal debate, and recommend policies to improve the health of vulnerable people; the thrust was to transform public health knowledge into political action.

International Health Agencies

Health services in developing countries mostly reflect their own widely varying capacities. The international system plays an ancillary role, comprising four types of agency: multilateral, bilateral, nongovernmental, and other.

Multilateral Agencies

The term multilateral means that funding comes from multiple governments (as well as from non-governmental sources) and is distributed to many different countries. The major multilateral organizations are all part of the United Nations.

1. The United Nations is made up of 192 countries from around the world. It is often called the UN.
2. It was set up in 1945, after the Second World War, as a way of bringing people together and to avoid further wars.
3. It started with 51 countries. The United Kingdom is one of the original members. Germany did not join until 1973.

The UN has 4 main purposes

- ❖ To keep peace throughout the world;
- ❖ To develop friendly relations among nations;
- ❖ To help nations work together to improve the lives of poor people, to conquer hunger, disease and illiteracy, and to encourage respect for each other's rights and freedoms;
- ❖ To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations to achieve these goals.

The World Health Organization (WHO) is the premier international health organization of the UN with its headquarters at Geneva. Technically it is an "intergovernmental agency related to the United Nations." WHO and other such intergovernmental agencies are "separate, autonomous organizations which, by special agreements, work with the UN and each other through the coordinating machinery of the Economic and Social Council." According to its constitution (1948) its principal goal is "the attainment by all peoples of the highest possible level of health."

WHO has three main divisions. The governing body - the World Health Assembly, meets once a year to approve the budget and decide on major matters of health policy. All the 200 or so member nations send delegations. The World Health Assembly elects 31 member nations to designate health experts for the Executive Board, which meets twice a year and serves as the liaison between the Assembly and the Secretariat, which carries on the day-to-day work of the WHO. The Secretariat has a staff of about 4,500, with 30% of the employees at headquarters in Geneva, 30% in six regional field

offices, and 40% in individual countries, either as country-wide WHO representatives or as representatives of Special WHO programs.

The principal work of WHO is directing and coordinating international health activities and supplying technical assistance to countries. It develops norms and standards, disseminates health information, promotes research, provides training in international health, collects and analyzes epidemiologic data, and develops systems for monitoring and evaluating health programs.

The Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) serves as the regional field office for WHO in the Americas and, since it predates WHO, carries on some additional autonomous.

WHO has a biannual budget. Assessed contributions from the member nations constitute the regular budget. In recent years voluntary ("extra budgetary") contributions - from governments and private philanthropies - have exceeded the regular budget. Donors may earmark voluntary contributions for special programs; WHO allocates assessed contributions. While this diversification protects WHO against unstable government funding, extra budgetary support is mostly restricted to particular programs, which may influence or distort priorities.

Its noteworthy contribution is that, it spearheaded the global eradication of smallpox, accomplished in 1979. Similar initiatives for other conditions are underway.

Other multilateral agencies with health-related roles are UNICEF, UNDP, WB, UNAIDS (a separate agency since 1993, formerly the WHO Global Program on acquired immunodeficiency syndrome), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Fund for Population Activities (UNFPA), the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), and the UN Fund for Drug Abuse Control (UNFDAC).

The World Bank is the other major "intergovernmental agency related to the UN" heavily involved in international health. The World Bank loans money to poor countries on advantageous terms not available in commercial markets that will lead to economic growth of that country (India’s population project). The projects are usually concerned with electric power, roads, railway, agriculture, water supply, education, family planning, etc. health and environmental components have been added to many projects.

The United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) is a United Nations Programme headquartered in New York City, that provides long-term humanitarian and developmental assistance to children and mothers in developing countries. It is one of the members of the United Nations Development Group and its Executive Committee.

UNICEF was created by the United Nations General Assembly on December 11, 1946, to provide emergency food and healthcare to children in countries that had been devastated by World War II. In 1954, UNICEF became a permanent part of the United Nations System and its name was shortened from the original United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund but it has continued to be known by the popular acronym based on this old name.

UNICEF relies on contributions from governments and private donors. Governments contribute two thirds of the organization's resources; private groups and some 6 million individuals contribute the rest through the National Committees. It is estimated that 91.8% of their revenue is distributed to Program Services. UNICEF's programs emphasize developing community-level services to promote the health and well-being of children. UNICEF was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1965 and the Prince of Asturias Award of Concord in 2006.

Most of UNICEF's work is in the field, with staff in over 190 countries and territories. More than 200 country offices carry out UNICEF's mission through a program developed with host governments. Seventeen regional offices provide technical assistance to country offices as needed.

Overall management and administration of the organization takes place at its headquarters in New York. UNICEF's Supply Division is based in Copenhagen and serves as the primary point of distribution for such essential items as vaccines, antiretroviral medicines for children and mothers with HIV, nutritional supplements, emergency shelters, educational supplies, among others. A 36-member Executive Board establishes policies, approves programs and oversees administrative and financial plans. The Executive Board is made up of government representatives who are elected by the United Nations Economic and Social Council, usually for three-year terms.

UNICEF is an intergovernmental organization (IGO) and thus is accountable to those governments. UNICEF makes the world's most vulnerable children its top priority,

so it devotes most of its resources to the poorest countries and to children younger than 5. UNICEF runs many of the child health programs in cooperation with WHO.

European Union

The EU and the UN:

A strong partnership based on common values Both the EU and the UN trace their origins to the post-World War II period and aspirations to build lasting peace in the world by setting up comprehensive mechanisms for international cooperation. Both organisations are multilateral in nature and are committed to a set of basic values that are broadly similar, such as the pursuit of peace and security, a deep commitment to human rights, and a commitment to the principles of international solidarity and cooperation. The EU's commitment to work together with the UN is enshrined in its treaties. EU involvement in the UN dates back to its earlier manifestation as the European Economic Community (EEC), which was active as an observer in the world organisation already from 1974, when the UNGA granted it that status. The EEC established cooperation programmes and partnerships with various parts of the UN system. The Lisbon Treaty has strengthened EU's role as an international actor and has brought about institutional changes enabling the EU to ask for enhanced observer status in the UN.

EU Treaty legal bases for cooperation and support for the UN

According to Article 21 of the Treaty on European Union (TEU) the EU is to pursue international cooperation, to respect and support human rights and to work for peace and security in the world. This normative propensity makes the EU a natural partner and interlocutor for the United Nations. Furthermore, under the TEU, the EU is committed to upholding the principles of multilateralism (to 'promote multilateral solutions to common problems, in particular in the framework of the United Nations') and to respecting the principles of the UN Charter and international law (Article 21). Article 220(1) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union (TFEU) provides that the 'Union shall establish all appropriate forms of cooperation with the organs of the United Nations and its specialised agencies'. There are similar provisions in the TFEU obliging the EU to cooperate with all relevant international organisations with respect to specific policy areas, such as environment (Article 191(4)), development cooperation (Article 211), and economic, financial and technical cooperation (Article 212(3)): 'Within their

respective spheres of competence, the Union and the Member States shall cooperate with third countries and with the competent international organisations. The arrangements for Union cooperation may be the subject of agreements between the Union and the third parties concerned.'

The Lisbon Treaty brought about an important change for EU's representation at the UN. It created the position of High Representative of the European Union for Foreign Affairs and Security Policy/Vice-President of the Commission (HR/VP), who can represent the EU in external affairs, including in international organisations. It has also provided for the establishment of the European External Action Service and EU delegations, whose mission is the day-to-day conduct of external relations. Three EU delegations represent the Union at the United Nations, in New York, Geneva and Vienna. Before the Lisbon Treaty, the EU spoke in the UN's main bodies mainly through the voice of the state holding the rotating EU Council presidency. Currently, where the EU enjoys observer status, this task is performed routinely by the EU delegation head and, on special occasions, by the HR/VP or by the president of the EU Council.

EU legal status in the UN system

The UN system is complex, consisting of several entangled layers: the main UN bodies with their subsidiary organs, the funds and programmes, the research institutes, the agencies, the secretariats of international conventions, and other UN-related organisations. The UN is an organisation formally composed of states, thereby limiting possibilities for the participation of international organisations. The main UN bodies accept such organisations in their ranks only as observers. UN agencies and programmes have more freedom to establish their own rules and therefore can be more open to the participation and membership of non-state entities, such as the EU. EU status in the various entities of the UN system ranges from membership status (FAO, WTO) (see Chapters 5 and 6), to enhanced observer (UNGA), simple observer (ECOSOC and numerous agencies) or no status (UN Security Council and some agencies). The EU only has the right to vote in cases when it is a full member. As a simple observer, the EU can attend meetings and make statements, but only within the time span reserved for observers, after all UN member states have spoken. Its enhanced observer status in the

UNGA confers it the right to speak early on before individual states. The EU cannot raise points or propose candidates for governing bodies or positions however.

Another dimension of EU involvement in the UN relates to it being party to international treaties negotiated in the UN framework. According to the UN treaty database, the EU is party to original multilateral UN treaties and numerous other subsequent agreements. 32 Their scope ranges from technical issues of international relevance such as vehicle approval, to governance of international matters – the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (1994), tackling global challenges – the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, adopted in 1992, and the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (1993), or to upholding universal human rights – the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (2008) – the only UN human rights treaty to which the EU is a party. The EU is obliged to implement the provisions of these treaties in the areas of its competence. Being a party to a UN treaty gives the EU membership rights in the body supervising the treaty, if applicable. For instance, the EU is a full member of the International Seabed Authority, which was established under the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The EU has been actively involved in negotiations on stringent matters, such as on the adoption and implementation of subsequent agreements under the climate change convention (UNFCCC), strongly supporting the objective of reducing the greenhouse gas emissions, most recently at COP 24 in Katowice. The EU also participated actively in the negotiations and the ongoing implementation33 of the Global Compact on refugees, as well as in the preparation of the Global Compact on migration35 (the latter was not however endorsed by all Member States, because of its more disputed nature, and EU participation was limited in the negotiations).

The EU and its Member States among the main contributors to the UN system budget

The EU and its Member States contribute roughly a third to the UN system budget, while representing less than 15 % of UN membership. This contribution raises the Union's visibility and influence within the organisation. The EU has concluded a Financial and Administrative Framework Agreement with a number of UN departments and agencies, which enhances its cooperation avenues with these. The EU alone is the

biggest non-government donor to the United Nations. In 2018, it contributed approximately €3.12 billion38 (not including EU Member States' contributions, which are an important part of UN budget). This represents 6.5% of the total UN system budget of US$56 billion. The UN budget is funded from mandatory payments from states, as well as voluntary contributions from states and other donors. The mandatory payments by UN member states, called assessed contributions, are calculated through a complex formula that takes into account the respective state's wealth and role in the UN (such as permanent UNSC member). The assessed contributions fund the UN regular budget and the peace-keeping budget. Some of the agencies, programmes and funds are funded through a mixture of assessed contributions and voluntary contributions, while others are funded only through donor payments. The Breton Woods institutions (IMF, World Bank Group) are not included in the UN system total budget.

The EU in the General Assembly

The EU has had enhanced observer status in the UN General Assembly, which brings together all the 193 member states represented in the UN, since 2011. The Assembly debates on many issues of international relevance covered by the Charter of the United Nations. It meets in plenary each year in September in New York. The EEC obtained observer status in the General Assembly in 1974. A resolution adopted by the UNGA in May 2011 (65/276) gave the EU enhanced status (after a firs failed attempt on the part of the EU in 2010). This status comes with additional rights (some of which no other observers currently have) such as the right to intervene in the general debate of the General Assembly, the right to orally submit proposals and amendments (but these 'shall be put to vote only at the request of a member state'), the right to once reply to positions concerning it, and the right to have communications that relate to the work of the General Assembly circulated as documents of the respective session or meeting. As an observer, the EU does not have the right to vote, to co-sponsor draft resolutions or decisions, or to put forward candidates in the UNGA. While these rights are currently only attributed to the EU, any other international organisation entitled to represent its members in the UN on specific matters could claim them (according to Article 3 of the resolution).

Although it was hailed as a big success for EU diplomacy, the resolution did not fulfill all the EU's initial ambitions. According to researchers analysing it shortly after its

adoption, despite recognizing the Union's competences in foreign policy, it provided the EU with fewer participation rights than would have been 'needed under Lisbon for the EU to truly behave as a global actor within the UN'. The procedural constraints the resolution imposes mean that 'the EU [still] has to rely on its Member States to promote its agenda in the UNGA'. The resolution did not lend new impetus to the EU's efforts to obtain enhanced status in other UN bodies either. EU's enhanced status in the UNGA is difficult to replicate in other bodies 'due to the existing non-conducive international political environment'.

The President of the European Council, the HR/VP, the European Commission and the EU delegation can all present the positions of the EU and its Member States at the UN. They make their interventions in formal meetings early on among representatives of major groups, usually ahead of representatives of individual UN states. This is seen as 'one of the major achievements of the Resolution […] safeguarding the effectiveness in the delivery of EU messages and positions'. 46 Before 2011, the state holding the EU rotating presidency spoke on the EU's behalf, in the time slot allocated to the UN states. These changes have enabled the EU to present its positions systematically. The resolution also gives the right to the EU representative to speak in the general debate of the UN General Assembly, which is held at the beginning of each session, usually in September. Since 2011, using this right, the President of the European Council has delivered an annual speech in the General Debate on behalf of the EU. Every year, before the General Assembly meeting in September, Council adopts priorities for the EU in the UN General Assembly. The EU Delegation to the UN in New York represents the EU in the Assembly on a day-to-day basis. It coordinates with the 27 EU countries in advance in order to adopt common positions and statements, and acts as facilitator for coordinating voting among Member States in the UNGA. The EU is active in the UNGA's six main committees, where it regularly makes statements on the issues debated. Similarly to a parliamentary setting, the main committees, which are organised by thematic areas, analyse issues referred to them by the General Assembly and present reports, including draft resolutions, to the plenary.

These changes have had a positive impact on EU's involvement in the UN. According to research on the matter, the EU has been able to increase coherence among

Member States on its positions and its visibility in the UN since Lisbon and since the adoption of UNGA Resolution 65/276. However, Member States' divergent views remain an obstacle to achieving coherence on all issues: 'deeply rooted national interests of member states seem to be one of the main obstacles for the EU's desire to speak with one voice in the UNGA. This division by national interests did not fundamentally change with the implementation of the CFSP but seems to remain a generally stable pattern'. Domestic politics also drive divergence on international issues, as was the case with the UN Global Compact for Migration, endorsed by the UNGA. Despite this, EU's 'cohesion is remarkably high as compared to other regional organisations like the African Union, the Arab League, ASEAN.

Organization of African Unity

Section I of the article looks at the concept of "constitutive process" as the sine qua non of any viable social system or state. Constitutive process assures that necessary institutions exist to provide for national and transnational events, to sustain communal life and to maintain the social system. Section II discusses whether the establishment of the OAU Charter and the designated divisions are responsive to the perceived needs of African people when the OAU was conceived. This section demonstrates how the OAU in its formation and operation holds potential for providing for constitutive process. Section III examines the purposes, officers, duties and internal conflicts of the designated divisions of the OAU. Scrutiny of the organizational structure shows both the problems and potential of the OAU from the time of its founding. Given the structural alignment, Section IV applies and analyzes highlights of the functioning of the OAU in both its early phase and during its thirty years of existence under the constitutive process standard. Somalia is presented as a case study of the possibilities, potential and problems in deploying the statist-structure of the OAU to the varied circumstances and conditions of Africa and its nations. Section V evaluates the OAU with regard to contemporary expectations for meeting constitutive process requirements. Policy recommendations are presented in Section VI for solving some of Africa's problems related to fundamental needs. In summation.

Recent events on the Continent (the economic crisis of the 1990's as played out in Africa, the sub-Saharan drought and burgeoning famine, the starving of Somalia in 1992)

have compelled a re-examination of the viability of transnational organizations (regional and ecumenical) to respond to and overcome these chronic problems. Moreover, as with Malcolm X who tried to establish an organization in the United States modeled in part on the OAU, the OAU retains interest as a model for African-American people. Attention focused on historic and contemporary problems is indispensable in order not to thwart the immense potential of the future. Despite some inglorious historic elements in the glorious African past, the possibilities exist that Africa will now and in times to come continue to contribute vitally to the world.

Constitutive Process and African Unity

Constitutive process has been defined as "authoritative power exercised to provide an institutional framework for decision and to allocate indispensable functions", with the emergent decisions as a result of the exercise of this power "specialized to the shaping and sharing of wealth, enlightenment, respect and all other values.' Predicated on a "single sys tern of public order", this "world community" itself is dependent on a complex of broad and intense social (cross-cultural, international, intra-national) interaction with resultant technological advancement and interchange; constitutive process subsumes more than mere document writing ("constitutionalism") or embodiment of ideals through particular words given symbolic significance.

In addition to the mistaken identification of document writing-the drafting of a "constitution"-with the constitutive process, constitutionalism is often concerned with negation, with limitations on authority and control, rather than with balancing or integrating inclusive and particular interests with one another in arenas of every size. Consisting primarily of effective transnational decisions supported by power and validated by authority , the essence of constitutive process as an image may be expressed as an interlocking, intertwining spiral of crosscutting expectations and demands among nations (or transnational institutions) sustained by sanctions ranging from noncooperation to organized violence

Hence, according to the schemata for analyzing the significant ramifications of constitutive process outlined by McDouga, the central issues upon which attention must be focused in understanding the meaning and role of the OAU in African law and politics are these: the identities and roles of the nations, leaders and other participants; the

perspectives, value demands and expectations pursued by the participants; the situations, conditions and loci of their interaction; the base values (effective means) for the achievement of their objectives; the plans and strategies for the accomplishment of their values; the outcomes of the decisions as they impact upon value allocation; and the long- and short-term effects of aspects of constitutive process (elements of participation of elites and masses, diplomatic strategies, and evidence of emergent prescription.)

For Africa, these considerations are exemplified via culmination in the OAU: Here as elsewhere in the world, primary elites through diplomatic interaction decide for masses what values are in their best interests. Conjointly and inclusively, the national elites of Africa form international African elite with nearly conclusive impacts on Africa and contributory influence on the world. This unit, coalesced in the OAU, functions to create prescriptive norms which enhance the African present and assure the African future. To the end of better understanding the OAU, and thereby global, international and intra-continental African politics and law, the history, development and present status of the OAU are scrutinized.

The peace and stability of independent African nations who could conjointly work for Pan-African economic and technological progress was the raison d'etre for the creation of the OAU. Although the statesmen responsible for the organization at its inception realized that "neither sporadic act nor pious resolutions [could] solve the problems necessary for attaining the goals charted... ", they nonetheless correctly viewed the Charter-signing as one step, symbolic but significant, in the "undoing of the tangled knot of injustices bequeathed from long and shadowy years of colonialism.'

While the Charter-signing is not to be seen as a panacea, and while it certainly only begins to address the goals articulated by the African founding fathers, the symbolism of a Pan-African transnational entity devoted to peaceful progress in a cooperative spirit is evidence of the primary values of the leaders and their nations. Premising to work to end colonization in Africa, to rid the continent of apartheid and racism, to work for the removal of disputes and divisiveness, the OAU founders proposed the beginnings of an African unity which would preclude the redevelopment of these degradations upon Africa.

Organization of African Unity – ASEAN

The Regional Organisations are associations of sovereign states of a particular region with permanent organisation. These organisations have sets of objectives of common interest for co-operation among its members. The Regional Organisations are formed for three main security, economic assistance and political co-operation. African Union (AU) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) are two regional organisations. Both the organisations have sets of objectives and principles behind their formations. The proliferation of regional organisations in the third world in the post second world war period is evidence of a growing need to protect the interests of the countries of third world.

The AU and ASEAN have been chosen for comparison because they have some crucial characteristics and they occupy the different regional and sub regional space. They are the most prominent existing regional organisations in the third world countries. There are set of criteria establishing the comparability of the AU and ASEAN. First, both the organisations are based on a concept of regional membership within the Afro-Asian region. Secondly, both organisations are characterized by a series of generalized, ongoing commitments to co-operate in taking common, complementary, or no antagonistic actions in one or more issue areas. Thirdly, each institution has an internally consistent series of written and unbitten rules and norms of acceptable and unacceptable behaviour and a generally shared sense of where the thresholds of behaviour lie. Fourthly, both the organisations are serviced by regular meetings of member's leaders and officials, which give the two organisations a rolling agenda of aspirations and actions. Lastly, each institution has a formal and defined procedure for taking collective decisions. Each of these similarities suggests that it is indeed possible to compare the AU and ASEAN in a meaningful and productive way. The advantage of the comparative method is that it allows to focus selectively on certain common aspects of a variety of separate cases, and to use the observed commonalities or variations among the cases to draw general conclusion about the variables under study.

The Concept of Regional Organisation

Efforts to organize and regulate international relations on regional basis are rooted ih history. Scholars have traced regionalism from the early Greek period. They refer to

the leagues and confederacies of ancient Greece as examples o.f such regional organisations. Regionalism received a fillip in the wake of Napoleonic wars and a number of regional organisations were formed by the European powers. Regionalism gained a fresh impetus after the unification of Germany in 1870 and a number of alliances and counter alliances were formed. The Triples Alliance (consisting of Germany, Austria-Hungary and Italy) and Triples Entente (consisting of France, Russia and Britain) are the best examples of these Regional Organisations.

The role of the pre-existing regional arrangement was recognized since the formation of the League of Nations. Regionalism made further progress during the period between the first and the second world wars. During this period, a number of regional security arrangements such as treaty of mutual assistance, Locarno Pact etc. were envisaged. While the former could not materialize, the later was signed by Germany, Belgium, France, Great Britain and Italy. But probably, the best example of Regional Organisation formed during the inter war period is provided by the Little Entente and the Balkan Entente which were formed with a view to meet the growing threat of Hitler.

The United Nations Charter also provided for regional arrangements and co-operation. It laid down in Article 52 (1) "Nothing in the present charter preludes the existence of Regional Arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purpose and principles of the United Nations". Apart from these provision,· the charter of the UNO has supported the idea of Regionalism by creating various regional economic commissions. Thus, it has made it clear that regionalism is concerned not only with peace and security matter, but also with economic and social issues. One phenomenon of the period since 1945 is the rapid growth in the number of inter-governmental regional organizations. But not all regibhal organisations perform highly significant functions, but some have assumed and played important roles in world affairs.

Regional Organisations are variously defined often on the basis of geographical proximity of the members. According to Benneth, "A Regional Organisation is a segment of the world bound together by a common set of objects based on geographical, social,

cultural, economic or political ties and possessing a formal structure provided for informal intergovernmental agreements".

Padelford defines "A Regional Organisation in the sphere of international p~litics as an association of states, based upon location in a given geographical area, for safeguarding or promotion of the participants. The terms of this association are fixed by the treaty or other agreement". According to Stoessinger, "A Regional Arrangement is a voluntary association of states that have developed fairly elaborate organizational tools to forge among them such bonds of unity". He asserts that, "A purely military alliance among nations that do not pursue the goal of political building is not a regional arrangement". Robert Rainbow has observed that geography is an important factor in the formation of Regional Organisations in so far as it "fosters a sense of cohesion, common vulnerability, common isolation, shared poveqy of resources etc" .

Regional Organisations may be classified in several ways based on the nature or scope of their functions or memberships. One useful and instructive method of classification has been developed by Lynn H. Miller, who divides all regional organisations into three types- 1. Cooperative 2. Alliance and 3. Functional. And he used the term "Multipurpose" instead of "co-operative". Therefore three types of Regional Organisations are Co-operative Regional Organisation, Alliance type Regional Organisation and Multipurpose type Regional Organisation.

The Multipurpose Organisations are those whose broad aims and activities reach across the lines that divide political and military matters from those generally classified as economic and social. Alliance type organisations are those whose military and political orientation is intended to provide security against the external actors. Functional type organisations are those that promote economic social or political collaboration with little or no regard to security factors. The dividing line between all these organisations is somewhat arbitrary and subjective and is determined by the range and variety of activities pursued by the Regional Organisations.

The Multipurpose Organisations include, Organisation of American States (OAS), Organisation of African Unity (OAU) now African Union (AU), Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) etc. Some of the Alliance type organisations are: North Atlantic Treaty Organisation {NATO), Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO) and Australia, New

Zealand, United States Security Treaty Organisations (ANZUS). Functional Organisation includes: European Community (EC), European Atomic Energy Community (EURATOM) and Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) etc.

As already mentioned, the States form Regional Organisations for three reasons viz.. security, economic assistance and political cooperation's. Regional Organisations like North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), Warsaw Treaty Organisation (WTO) formed by the states for security reasons. These Organisations determine the disposition ·of armed forces of the member states, wlii.ch are also expected to conduct themselves in a particular way under set of circumstances. Secondly, certain Regional Organisations like Europe Community and Latin American Free Trade Association (LAFTA) etc. have been formed with a view to promote economic assistance, collaboration in technological know how etc. Finally, some Regional Organisations like Organisation of American States (OAS), African Union (AU) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) are formed for multifunctional purposes. These Organisations try to promote political, economic, cultural as well as military co-operation.

We have discussed about the evolution, meaning and classifications of the Regional Organisations. We will examine Regional Organisation in a Third World perspective. Regional Co-operation is seen as a more fruitful way of tackling the problems of economic development, for increasing the bargaining power of underdeveloped/ developing regions of the Third World vis-a-vis the developed North, und of reducing their dependence on the industrialized North.

Regional configurations identified on the basis of geography, felt cultural and other affinities and perceived interdependences are: Western Europe, Eastern Europe, and the USSR (now Russia), North America, East Asia, Southeast Asia, South Asia, the Middle East, Latin America and Africa.7 Regional Organisations of the first three parts of the globe have been largely successful. The most important factors that contribute to the success of the Regional Organisation and for the evolution of collective decision making mechanisms are- a relative degree of balance and complementarily and the extent to which its states are oriented towards integrative· behavior.

Third World Regional Organisations that came up in the post second world period in the fifties and sixties were aggressive blocks like ASEAN, South-East Asian Treaty

Organisation (SEATO) and Central Treaty Organisation (CENT0).8 Economic oriented organisations such as ECOW AS, South Asian Association for Regional Co-operation . ' (SAARC) etc. are the Regional Organisations in the 70s and 80s. There are organisations that are continental such as OAU (now AU) and OAS etc. Third World Regional Organisations do not have the degree of balance and complementarily as European or other Western Regional Organisations. Imbalances in· economic power of states and divergence of political regimes are characteristics of the Third World.

While in Africa, capabilities have central roles in the system, in Latin America and South Asia there is a very strong core member in each of the regions- Brazil and India. In Africa, the major area in activity that OAU has been the promotion of Southern African Liberation and settling of Inter- African disputes. The record of the OAU is a mixed one. From the Congo crisis in the early 1960s to the independence of Zimbabwe in 1979 and continued struggle for liberation of South Africa and Namibia, the OAU has had to face very knotty problems. "Over the years OAU's role as peace maker in Africa has been on decline".

Within Asia, the two Regional. Organisations that are likely· to play an important role are ASEAN and SAARC. The desire to achieve security through regional co-operation of the non-communist states of the Southeast Asia region was one of the important factors that led to the formation of ASEAN in 1967.

African Union (AU) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN):

Before we go into details of the AU and ASEAN, let us discuss growth of regional groupings in Africa and Southeast Asia. In the context of Africa, following independence most African States had closer ties especially in the economic field with outside states than they had with each other and foreign powers. Many attempts were made both before and after 1963 to establish such unions. African leaders favoured African Unity in principle, without necessarily agreeing on how closely united they should be and what forms their unity should take. They have established many regional political unions, the successful cases can be counted on one hand: the Union of Ghana and British Togoland in 1957, Italian and British Somaliland in 1960 (but now at an end) Southern Cameroon and the Republic of Cameroon in. 1961, Tanganyika and I Zanzibar in 1964.

The creation of Senegambia, which officially came into being as a loose confederation in February 1982, had advantages for both sides. It satisfied Gambia's need for effective protection following the antigovernment plot in October 1980. It gave Senegal control of a unified defence and security system. Other faillires to achieve lasting political union included the Mali federation, the Ghana-Guinea~Mali Union, the East African Federation the greater Maghreb. 11 Ethiopia and Eritrea disappeared in 1962 because of centralizing policies pursued by the imperial government. In April 1964 Tanganyika joined with Zanzibar to form a United Republic redesignated the United Republic of Tanzania in 1965.

In Africa, regional functional organisations are primarily for economic purposes, have fared better than the regional political unions. Three major functional groupings are East African Community (EAC), ECOW AS and Southern African Development Community (SADC) ..

In most regions attempts are made at forming trilateral or bilateral associations to begin with. Subsequently, the region uses its experience with smaller association in evolving a cohesive and a larger forum of nations with similar or better objectives. In case of Southeast Asia, the Association of Southeast Asia or ASA, comprising Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand was set up in 1961.12 ASA was created as a result of Malaysian initiative. It was considered a pro-western, anticommunist association with primarily political motives. Its objectives emphasized co-operation in economic, social, cultural, scientific and administrative fields. However, the absence of Indonesia, a dominant regional power with political and military ambitions reduced ASA ineffective.

The next attempt at regional co-operation was Maphilindo with Malaysia, the Philippines and Indonesia as members. Maphilindo attempted to overcome two of the limitations which ASA suffered from. All regional organisations suffer from problems arising from differing foreign and defence policy perceptions of the members. In 1966, when · the Asia Pacific Council was established under US auspices, Malaysia, the Philippines and Thailand joined it. Malaysia was keen to accept the American timberland.

·.By 1967, the non-communist South-East-Asian States of the Luzon Sea region were able to resolve their differences at least at the political level because the governments willed peace. Instability in the region leading to a sense of insecurity and

the· desire to achieve security through regional cooperation . resulted in the formation of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 1967.

The African Union (AU) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) are two Regional Organisations. Both Organisations have set of objectives and principles behind their formations. May 26, 2001, marked the beginning of a new chapter in the history of the African Union (AU). On this date the Constitutive Act of the AU entered into force representing the start of a new political, judicial and economic Organisation for Africa.

The Organisation of African Unity (OAU), which was formed in 1963, has so far failed to bring end of civil wars, military conflicts in Angola, Democratic Republic of Congo, the Great Lake region etc. Various plans and proposals for OAU such as Lagos Plan of Action (LP A) 1980 and others are remaining only on papers. Ahuja Treaty of 1991 proposed to establish an African Economic Community"(AEC) and came into force in 1994. The Organisation of African Unity (OAU) Summit in Lome in July 2000 had declared the African Union formally came into existence on 26th May 2001. The object of transforming the OAU in the AU is to enhance the institutional framework for unity and co-operation in Africa.

The organs and institutions of the AU are defined and described in the Constitutive Act of the AU. Some of the important organs of the AU are the Assembly of the Union, the Executive Council, the Pan African Parliament (PAP), the Court of Justice, the Commission, the Permanent Representative Committee, the specialized technical committee, economic, social and cultural council and Financial Instructions. The details of these structures will be discussed in chapter III of the dissertation. The establishment of the AU is a major landmark in the history of Africa. AU has adopted various programmes and activities which will be examined in chapter IV of the dissertation.

ASEAN was established in August, 1967 in Bangkok, Thailand to accelerate economic progress and to mcrease the stability of the Southeast Asia region. The Bangkok Declaration was signed by five original members namely Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand. The leaders of these countries felt the need of the organisation because of the situating in Vietnam, as a result of US imperialist action,

political crisis in Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos and Burma convinced them that their interest could be best served only if they united. The end of confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia also facilitated the creation of this Organisation.

At present, the ASEAN has 10 countries i.e. ASEAN- 10 (new members are Brunei, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam). Now, ASEAN is one of the most successful Regional Organisations among the Third World Countries. ASEAN has also various structures and mechanisms, like Summit Meeting, ASEAN Ministerial Meetings, Standing Committees, Permanent Secretariat etc. ASEAN has adopted set of programmes since its formations. These structures and programmes will be discussing in chapter III and IV respectively of the · dissertation.

SAARC

South Asia is characterized by some of the most economically underdeveloped countries such as Afghanistan and Bhutan. However it accounts for over twenty percent of the world's population and has emerged as one of the fastest growing regions in Asia in the recent years. South Asia as a bloc is highly relevant both from a growth and population perspective. Association of South East Asian Nations has been making effort for the acceleration of economic development of the region. In this Unit, you will learn, the evolution of SAARC, trade pattern with India and challenges and opportunities. You will further learn the evolution of ASEAN, trade pattern with India and India's trade prospects with SAARC and India.

South East Association of Regional Cooperation (SAARC)

Regional cooperation in the region began with the establishment of SAARC (South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation), a political consultation entity formed in 1985, by all South Asian economies, except Afghanistan. In 2005, Afghanistan requested its accession to SAARC and joined as the 8th member in 2007. SAARC comprises 8 member states namely, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, India, Maldives, and Afghanistan and 9 observer states namely, Australia, China, European Union, Iran, Japan, Mauritius, United States, Myanmar, and Republic of Korea. SAARC is the world's most densely populated region and one of the most fertile areas. It comprises 3% of the world's area, 23% of the world's population and 3.8% (US$2.9 trillion) of the global economy.

The eight countries in the region have diverse economic features with India and Pakistan being the two largest economies in terms of the regional GDP and population. India's dominance in nearly all respects is a vital and noteworthy feature of the region which could have a positive as well as a negative connotation in the context of endorsing enhanced economic cooperation. India has nearly 77.8 % of the region's GDP, accounts for 40.3 % of its trade and 75.8 % of incoming foreign direct investment (FDI). It is the only country in South Asia that has common borders with all others. On the whole, India is undeniably central to the region.

Accordingly, historically, this region has been referred to as the Indian sub-continent, which invited some level of apprehension in the smaller countries about their ability to retain their individual identity in the post SAARC context. Hence, the adoption of a more common use of "South Asia" for describing the region.

Comprising mainly on four phases of evolution- "Conception (1977-80), the Meeting of Foreign Secretaries (1981-83), the Meeting of Foreign Secretaries (1983-85), and the Summits (1985-2016)" -the foremost proposal for the establishment of a framework for regional cooperation was put forward by the then President of Bangladesh, Zia ur Rahman, on May 2, 1980. He visited Nepal, India, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka during 1977-78 to explore the possibilities of regional economic cooperation among the SAARC Countries. He proposed for the collective self- reliance in a common quest for peace and development of all these countries. In May 1980, he issued a formal call for SAARC Regional Cooperation, which received a positive response from all the SAARC nations. There were numerous developments which led to President Zia ur Rahman's determination for the constitution of a Framework for regional cooperation. Some of these factors were that President Zia ur Rahman required support to defend his coup d'état regime, adversities stemming from the balance of payments crisis across South Asia on account of the oil crisis of 1979, increased protectionism by developed countries. The Committee on Studies for Cooperation in Development in South Asia (CSCD) also recommended cooperation in its report, among others. In this scenario, the establishment of a regional organization, such as SAARC, emerged as a platform to deliberate on matters of common interest.

The first meeting of the foreign secretaries of the seven countries, viz., Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka was held in Colombo, Sri Lanka in April 1981 for regional cooperation. Herein, telecommunications, agriculture, health and population activities, rural development and meteorology, were identified as the key areas for regional cooperation.

India's interest and commitment to regional cooperation was quite evident post her independence from colonial rule. The idea was to seek solution to shared problems, political, economic, or cultural. On 7th September, 1946 in his very first ever broadcast to the nation, Jawaharlal Nehru said, "We are of Asia and the people of Asia are nearer and closer to us than other. India is so situated that she is pivot of Western, Southern and South-East Asia". On another occasion, Nehru reiterated the same "When we talk of Asia, remember that India, not because of any ambition of hers, but because of the force of circumstances, because of geography, because of history and because of many other things, inevitably has to play a very important part in Asia. Even if you think in terms of regional organizations in Asia you have to keep in touch with the other regions. And whatever regions you may in mind, the importance of India cannot be ignored."

The first SAARC summit meeting of South Asian leaders was convened at Dhaka from December 7-8, 1985. Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka became its founding members. Eventually, Australia, China, the European Union, Iran, Japan, South Korea, Mauritius, Myanmar and the United States (US) joined SAARC as observers between 2005 and 2008. Then, Afghanistan joined SAARC as a member at the New Delhi Summit in 2007 while Myanmar applied for membership in 2008 in the wake of the Colombo Summit.

As a first step towards constitution of SAFTA (South Asian Free Trade Area), a SAARC Preferential Agreement (SAPTA) was brought to effect in 1995. SAFTA was aimed at eliminating tariff and non-tariff barriers to trade, in order to facilitate unhindered movement of goods across borders of the member countries, paving the way for South Asian Economic Union along the lines of EU in future. Apart from SAFTA, several cross-country and a few sub-regional agreements have been formulated and executed in the region.

Avoidance of Double Taxation and Mutual Administrative Assistance in Tax Matters 2005, formation of South Asian Regional Standards Organization (SARSO), SAARC Framework Agreement for Energy Cooperation, Mutual Administrative Assistance in Custom Matters, are some of the successful initiatives of SAARC. However, a notable feature of almost all these agreements is that they represent a low level of integration, and are often labelled as traditional or shallow Regional Trade Agreements because these are broadly aimed at removing only trade barriers on goods, to the exclusion of several crucial elements such as services, investment, intellectual property, and competition.

Hence, when we look at South Asia in terms of levels of Regional Economic Integration, it appears to be on the second level, Free Trade Area, only gradually making progress towards the third level, Customs Union. Nonetheless, SAARC countries synergize their actions as they have common tradition, dress, food and culture, and political aspects. The SAARC nations have problems and solutions to the problems in common such as poverty, illiteracy, malnutrition, natural disasters, internal conflicts, industrial and technological backwardness, low GDP, and poor socio-economic condition. These nations could uplift their living standards by creating common areas of development.

SAARC is a game-changer for India's Act East Policy. It links South Asian economies with Southeast Asian that will further boost economic integration and prosperity to India mainly in the services sector. Moreover, nations of SAARC help in the creation of mutual trust and peace within the region thus promoting stability. SAARC can engage Nepal, Bhutan, the Maldives, and Sri Lanka in economic cooperation and development process to counter China. Overall, SAARC offers a platform to India to showcase its leadership in the region by taking up extra responsibilities. In a region increasingly targeted by Chinese investment and loans, SAARC could be a common platform to demand more sustainable alternatives for development, or to oppose trade tariffs together, or to demand better terms for South Asian labour around the world.

Intra-regional trade in South Asia (Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, Maldives, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka) is among the lowest in the world at 5.6 %. India's trade with its neighbourhood has ranged between 1.7% and 3.8% of its global

trade. India's largest export market in the region is Bangladesh, followed by Sri Lanka and Nepal, whereas the largest imports by value come from Myanmar, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. All countries in the neighbourhood have a trade deficit with India, the highest being Bangladesh, followed by Nepal.

Challenges and Opportunities

PM Narendra Modi described SAARC as a "vital instrument to add to the strength of each member nation and advance collective action for shared prosperity in the region."

But more than three decades since it was formed, SAARC stands on shaky ground, and has emerged as one of the most troubled neighbourhoods with majority of its constituent countries experiencing communal, regional or extremist conflict. Moreover, experts have touted its achievements as meagre and unconvincing, while adjudging its approach as lacklustre and disappointing

Economically, the region is one of the least integrated in the world, with very low levels of intra-regional trade and investment. Intra-regional trade is under 5 percent of total official trade – less than it was fifty years ago – while intra-regional foreign investments as a proportion of total investment figures are just as meagre. On the contrary, intra-regional trade accounts for nearly 35 percent of the total trade in East Asia, 25 percent in Southeast Asia, and almost 12 percent in Middle East and Africa. The SAFTA (South Asian Free Trade Agreement) group comprises a region that has tremendous economic potential, but despite having 23 percent of the world's population, the region accounts for only 6 percent of Purchasing Power Parity based global GDP, 2 percent of world goods trade, 3 percent of global foreign direct investment, but more than 40 percent of the world's poor.

SAARC has also done little to improve bilateral disagreements and scuffles, and the Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism has failed to combat terrorist activity. Inter-state conflict is also one of the most significant reasons for the stalling of the SAFTA. The group's commitment to the goals of the SAARC Charter for Democracy, have been disappointing with several member-nations struggling with military coups, unstable governments, rampant corruption and abuse of power.

While SAARC's failure to realize its goals may be attributed to several factors – ranging from terrorism, strained bilateral relations, and the absence of military and

strategic cooperation – India's own engagement with SAARC has been found wanting, though it has evolved over the years.

India's perception of SAARC's usefulness for its own national interests has undergone a marked change on account of several reasons. First, it is now evident to Indian policy makers that SAARC can hardly be used by its smaller neighbours as a forum for India baiting or even for achieving a better strategic balance vis-àvis India. Experience over the past two decades has now demonstrated that coalition formation by neighboring countries is not likely to be successful because of the dynamics between these countries themselves and their inevitable need to deal with India directly given the geographic and economic realities.

Second, major global powers, except perhaps China, have finally accepted India's relatively dominant position in South Asia, specially following the robust economic growth since 1991. There is consequently no significant on their part to "redress the asymmetry" within the region by building special relations with India's neighbours. This has also helped to bring about a change in India's perception about the possible threats from a successful SAARC.

Third, China's growing influence in South Asia is clearly visible and poses a clear challenge for India to maintain its own interests in the region. More significantly, bilateral trade volumes between some of the South Asian economies and China are larger than with India. This is despite China not having any preferential/free trade agreement with these countries as India has. Of course, China has long pushed for a strategic political-economic relationship with Pakistan, and finally signed an FTA in 2006 which envisages a multidimensional economic partnership on energy, communication, agriculture, technical cooperation, joint investment ventures, etc. (People's Daily 2006).

This has finally caused the positive response within the Ministry of External Affairs in India to secure its own interests in South Asia and see SAARC as an instrumentality for bringing its neighbouring economies within a network of regional production network as China has successfully achieved with its Southeast Asian neighbors.

Fourth, Delhi seems to have realised that regional cooperation, through SAARC or other formations like the Bay of Bengal Initiative for Multi-Sectoral Technical and

Economic Cooperation (BIMSTEC), is perhaps an effective instrument for securing India's territorial integrity in the peripheral regions and for fighting poverty in its border states. The change in India's perception about regional cooperation in South Asia is best seen by the Indian government's recent acceptance of a role of multilateral organisations in infrastructure development and improving connectivity in its border regions.

Fifth, until the Mumbai terrorist attack of 26 November 2008, Indo-Pak relations had shown a consistent improvement. Given that the political tension between the two countries has hindered regional cooperation and continues to hold hostage the full implementation of SAFTA today, this improvement contributed significantly to the prospect of pushing SAARC forward. Such terrorist actions are perpetrated by fringe extremist elements and their benefactors who see progress in regional cooperation and economic integration as threatening their own petty vested interests. It is, therefore, important that actions of religious and sectarian terrorist groups are not allowed to push the SAARC process backward. Indian establishment will do well to target these elements on the one hand for punitive action while promoting greater trade and other economic interaction across South Asian borders on the other. Successful economic integration will be one of the most effective responses to sectarian violence as it will contribute to eroding the economic and material base for such movements

For all the above reasons, the India's perception of SAARC and attitude toward regional cooperation in South Asia has perceptibly changed. This is most clearly visible in India taking unilateral action of allowing duty free imports from its low income neighbours within South Asia and permitting multilateral organisations to participate in regional infrastructure projects, which it had not done in the past. The changing realities of a globalising world have prompted India to accept countries from outside the region to become observers in SAARC and also stop treating South Asia as its exclusive backyard in which it would only pursue bilateral interaction and not brook any regional or multilateral intervention.

The terrorist threat to India and Pakistan is prompting the ruling establishments (with the notable exception of the ISI in Pakistan which apparently has its own agenda) in the two countries to improve their relationship and support political dialogue to ensure political stability and social harmony. Moreover, there is pressure from the growing

industrial and middle classes in emerging South Asian economies to expand business and social contacts within SAARC, especially to try and take advantage of the burgeoning Indian market. The changing global context has made it clear to India and other countries like Bangladesh, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Maldives that they also stand to gain from any forward movement in SAARC. Pakistan remains a reluctant participant as revealed by its continued denial of Most Favoured Nation (MFN) status to India. The biggest potential gainer today could be Afghanistan with better access to Indian investment and other resources and by reclaiming its historical role as the bridge between Central and South Asia. Thus, the changing realities not only make SAARC a viable undertaking but one with significant positive outcomes for its members both in the immediate and the longer term. It is perhaps for this reason that external members like China, Japan, the US and even the European Union (EU) have either already acquired or have expressed their desire to achieve observer status in SAARC.

Check Your Progress

- Discuss the role and functions of the United Nations Organization
- Analyze the objectives, structure, and impact of the European Union
- Compare and contrast the objectives and achievements of ASEAN and SAARC

UNIT IV

Bretton woods Institutions: World Bank and IMF –UNCTAD – North – South Dialogue – NIEO – GATT – WTO

Objectives

- Bretton Woods Conference held in 1944
- Institution provides financial assistance to countries
- Main objective of the New International Economic Order

The Bretton Woods institutions, the IMF and the World Bank, were created to bring about orderly development of the world economy in the post-World War II era. The IMF was to oversee the new international monetary system of adjustable peg linked to the gold, and the World Bank to provide financing for reconstruction and development projects. Over the course of the half a century's history, their roles have undergone drastic changes in response to the changes in the economic realities and the dominant economic thinking. They have at the same time been key players in shaping the world of today. Reforming the Bretton Woods institutions will be a critical part of any reform of global economic governance as we enter the new millennium.

At the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Bretton Woods conference, a number of forums examined the Bretton Woods institutions and proposed various reforms.1 However, it was only after the Asian Financial Crisis in 1997 and its repercussions in Russia in 1998 brought the world economy to the brink of a collapse that a momentum for a serious reform of the Bretton Woods institutions was formed. It was the devastation of the Great Depression and the disastrous breakdown of the international monetary and trading system in the 1930s that led the world leaders to create the Bretton Woods Institutions. The grossest failure of the "invisible hand" nurtured the belief that stable economic growth requires active economic management by the government in both the domestic and international spheres. In the wake of the recent financial turmoil the world is once again debating a new "international financial architecture".

Devising a new and safer international financial architecture is not the only major challenge to the Bretton Woods institutions. The capital flow volatility problem concerns mainly a couple of dozen middle-income developing countries and transition economies,

the so-called emerging markets, although its potential threat to the entire international financial system makes it indeed a grave problem. The persistent hunger and poverty of two billion people around the world and the failure of development in most of the poorest countries also pose a grave challenge to the Bretton Woods institutions. Amidst cheers for the wonderfully efficient globalized markets, the poor in the world have been losing ground further. More than half of the low-income economies saw declining living standards and the disparities between the rich and poor countries widened significantly over the pat few decades (World bank, 1999a). The Bretton Woods institutions must see to it that the world economy provides opportunities for the poor countries to step out of the poverty trap and start catching up with developed countries.

The acute financial crisis that threatens the middle-income countries and the chronic development crisis that grips most of the low-income countries call for a radical reform of the Bretton Woods institutions. This paper is an attempt to suggest broad directions of reform. It employs historical and institutional approaches in trying to understand the sources of the failures and limitations of the Bretton Woods institutions. A detailed blue print for reform would require much technical and analytical work on specific issues. However, at this stage, it is more important to forge a consensus on the direction of reform.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The following section reviews the evolution of the Bretton Woods institutions, identifying the main driving forces behind the changes in their roles and functions. Section II discusses the institutional reform, including reform of governance and conditionality. Section III discusses how to redefine the roles of the Bretton Woods institutions.

World Bank and IMF

On July 1, 1944, as the battles of the Second World War raged in Europe and the Pacific, delegates from forty-four nations met at the secluded Mount Washington Hotel in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire to participate in what became known as the Bretton Woods Conference. Their purpose was to agree on a system of economic order and international cooperation that would help countries recover from the devastation of the war and foster long-term global growth. At its conclusion, the conference attendees

produced the Articles of Agreement for the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

Years of planning and discussion preceded Bretton Woods and laid the foundation for the conference's success. While the final Articles were ultimately influenced to a significant degree by the initial plans of the United States with contributions from the United Kingdom, other countries attended consultations and presented proposals containing their own vision for an international bank prior to the conference.

The conference, formally known as the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, convened on July 1, 1944, and was attended by 730 delegates. U.S. Treasury Secretary Henry Morgenthau Jr. served as conference president. Lord John Maynard Keynes of the U.K. delegation led Commission II that dealt with the proposal for a bank for reconstruction and development. The commission's committees were tasked with studying the preliminary draft presented to the conference and gathering additional suggestions and proposals. Mexico, Chile, Brazil, Belgium, the Netherlands, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Canada, China, India, and the Soviet Union were among the active participants. Much of the discussions centered around the proposed bank's dual purposes of reconstruction and development and its capital structure.

By July 22, 1944, the Final Act of the United Nations Monetary and Financial Conference, which included charters outlining the goals and mechanisms of both the IMF and IBRD, were signed by the delegates, although many decisions had yet to be made. The IBRD Articles of Agreement were ratified on December 27, 1945, when representatives from twenty-one countries convened in Washington, DC to become the Bank's first members.

Imagine all of the paperwork, draft reports, notes, correspondence, and other records generated during the conference. Think of all this important documentary evidence. Where do all those archival sources live? Like the IMF, the World Bank did not technically exist during or even immediately after the conference and so did not have recordkeeping responsibilities. Country delegates may have taken the records back to their countries after the conference was over, and so it's likely that archival records relating to Bretton Woods can be found in the custody of archival institutions in those forty-four countries. As host of the conference, the records held by the United States are

particularly comprehensive. IMF Archives later become the repository for the records maintained by the conference secretariat. Records related to Bretton Woods in the holdings of the World Bank Group Archives were collected as the result of Bank units and staff collecting copies for the purpose of reference, and while not insignificant, are far from complete.

Records in our custody that relate to Bretton Woods include: early draft proposals by countries; conference proceedings and working documents; pamphlets; government reports; and drafts and commentary on the Articles leading up to the December 1945 ratification. There is also IBRD internal memoranda and annotated copies of the Articles regarding interpretation and amendments after the Bank began operations in 1946. These records are found in numerous fonds, or record groups, such as the Secretary's Department, Office of the President, Central Files, and the personal papers of the Bank's first Research Department Director, Leonard B. Rist. You will also find conference photographs collected by the Bank's communications unit. Many of the textual records have been declassified and a portion of them have been digitized. Below you will find inventories containing folder lists; those that have been digitized are hyperlinked.

Development Crisis and the Bank

Unlike the acute financial crises in the emerging economies, the chronic development crisis has failed to elicit any bold proposals. Politicians give frequent lip service to the urgent human needs to eradicate the abject poverty facing a third of the human population, but there is little action on the ground. The Bretton Woods institutions, too, have not come up with any bold action plans to fight the development crisis.

The fact of the matter is that the Bretton Woods institutions lacked a coherent strategy for development from the beginning till today. The first sign of this was the failure to introduce a scheme to stabilize commodity prices despite the fact that large fluctuations in commodity prices had been a key source of difficulties in managing developing country economies.26 Second, there was initially no plan for orderly and adequate capital flows, not to mention transfer of technology, to the developing countries. The Bank took this up later, but only on a limited scale and scope. Third, the difficult question of how to promote the political and institutional changes necessary for

sustainable development without compromising sovereignty was never faced squarely. Instead, it was left to be molded in practice by the financially powerful.

Since the 1980s the Washington Consensus came to represent the development strategy promoted by the Bretton Woods institutions. However, it was not a genuine global strategy for development as the Bretton Woods institutions frequently failed to add up the consequences of their actions in individual countries, producing a fallacy of composition (Stewart and FitzGerald, 1997). A classic example was provided by the episode of falling commodity prices in the 1980s, when the Bretton Woods institutions told the individual countries that had balance-of-payment difficulties as a consequence of falling commodity prices that they must encourage commodity production and export, precipitating further declines in commodity prices. Moreover, as we already saw, the Washington Consensus failed to generate sustained growth in most poor countries, often exacerbated income distribution and paid little attention to policy sustainability.

It is true that the Bretton Woods institutions have gradually shifted their emphases and objectives. They now pay greater attention to the distributional impact of their programs and, in the case of the Bank, the environmental consequences. There has also been some change in the underlying economics and consequently the policy stance of the Bretton Woods institutions. They now recognize the importance of some public interventions such as prudential regulation of financial institutions and establishment of social safety net. The need to provide supporting revenues is also now recognized. The Fund no longer maintains the doctrine that higher interest rate stimulates saving and therefore growth. There has also been realization that controls on external capital movements can help contain financial fragility. The World Bank is now developing Comprehensive Development Framework that purports to seek “broader goals” with “more instruments.

However, there remain doubts about the degree to which the Fund position has changed. Its programs for the Asian countries – Thailand, Indonesia and South Korea - in 1997 were heavily criticized for requiring fiscal tightening where no chronic deficit problem exists, imposing a high interest rate policy where it could cause serious damages owing to the high leverage ratio of firms, and demanding all-out capital market liberalization where earlier liberalization was an important cause of the crisis.28 The

Bank has certainly changed a great deal in terms of its rhetoric, but there has so far been little noticeable change in its country operations and in its capacity to accommodate dissenting views.

In any case, a move from the Washington Consensus to Comprehensive Development Framework is not enough. A truly global approach is necessary. For this, the Bank should become a staunch advocate of a system of international trade and finance that is supportive of rapid growth in poor countries and allows a degree of freedom in choosing development strategy. This will include commodity price stabilization as well as the reform of international finance discussed above. As far as efforts to bring about internal changes in developing countries, there has to be a fundamental break away from "We know what is good for you" attitude to extending helping hands to domestic forces of change. The Bank should stop trying to teach good economics and micro-manage the economies through conditionality. It should instead give real help in the field in terms of real resources and technical assistance.

The legacy of past mistakes in the form of hopeless indebtedness by poor countries must be cleared up, too. Recently, there was some progress in the HIPC initiative with the rich countries agreeing on how to finance a plan to write off $100 billion of debt owed by the world's poorest countries.29 However, progress in implementation is slow. This gradualist approach only serves to prolong the debt overhang in the poor countries and the bankrupt policy of trying to induce policy reform with loans as a leverage. It is time to put an end to the indebtedness problem by a oneshot write-off. Then, the Fund should get out of the business of providing long-term development loans, and the Bank should take the primary responsibility to tackle the development crisis.

What should be the main activities of the Bank? Obviously, the Bank must concentrate its efforts on the poor IDA countries, and its aid should clearly be focused on providing public goods in which private capital shows little interest. The best way in which the Bank could help poor countries develop is to contribute to investment in health, education, environmental protection and technology transfer. Infrastructure should be financed by private capital as much as possible, and only critically important but privately non-fundable projects must be considered for the Bank's support. For these

projects, instead of formal conditionality, heavy presence of the Bank staff in the recipient countries must be the primary means of ensuring quality management.

In carrying out these projects, the Bank should make fewer loans and more grants. Loans can be useful for 'good policy' countries in supporting social investment, but loans to 'poor policy' countries may end up creating debt problems without doing much good. In the beginning, the rationale for the Bank activities was the imperfections in the capital market that denied developing countries access to foreign capital. However, the capital market has developed greatly since then and there is no reason why good investment projects cannot be financed by private capital. It is true that poor developing countries are still by and large shut off from private capital inflows despite the growth of the capital market. But this is mostly because the economic and political conditions in these countries are such that what could be potentially good projects are not in fact commercially sensible. Given this situation, it has become less compelling to justify the Bank activities in terms of correcting capital market failures.

Recently, under the leadership of the President James Wolfensohn, the Bank declared its intention to transform itself from a 'loan bank' to a 'knowledge bank'. Knowledge being a public good, it is argued, the Bank can contribute to international development by producing and disseminating knowledge on development policies. Its loan operations will also be improved if this knowledge is used to identify good projects and programs. This 'knowledge bank' view contrasts with the 'conditionality bank' view that the Bank can lend profitably to projects and programs that private capital cannot because its ability to enforce conditionality raises prospects of repayment and returns on investment (Gilbert et al, 1999). Both views see making loans as the key activity of the Bank, and differ only in terms of what other activities, imposing conditionality and monitoring or producing and applying development knowledge, enable the Bank to do better than the private lending institutions. Such an interpretation of the 'knowledge bank' does not go far enough. The Bank should not see itself as a bank with a mission of making loans to what it deems would be commercially sensible had the capital market been perfect. Instead, it should redefine its role as development agency. Instead of offering mere policy advice, the Bank should put on field 'development soldiers' with skills, expertise and dedication while maximizing hiring of the local people.

The Bank-Fund Relations

Starting in the mid-1970s and more earnestly in the 1980s, the Fund and the Bank came to have a large degree of overlap in their activities. The 1966 guidelines for Fund-Bank collaboration had demarcated areas of primary responsibility for each institution: macroeconomic issues such as exchange rates, balance of payments and stabilization for the Fund and development programs and project evaluation for the Bank. But the increasing overlap of their activities created two major concerns - the possibility of conflict between the two institutions and the possibility of each institution losing focus on its core mission.

By and large, collaboration rather than conflict prevailed between the Fund and the Bank for three reasons. First, there was pressure from the rich countries on the administrations of the two institutions to collaborate more effectively (Junquito, 1996). Second, the Fund was in the driving seat, with its adjustment program being taken by the market as the seal of approval. Third, as already discussed, the two institutions converged greatly in their policy views.

But this is no cause for celebration. Collaboration and coordination to enhance the effectiveness of the overlapping and interconnected work is one thing. Suppression of the differences of opinion and healthy debates is another. We know that in matters of economic policy consensus is rare. Pretending there is a consensus while there is not precludes possibilities of correcting erroneous policies and undermines legitimacy of programs. The Bretton Woods institutions need to discard the bureaucratic instinct for maintaining the same voice in favor of freer discussions on controversial issues.

This does not, however, mean that they should continue the trend of convergence in their activities.32 There is a need for a shaper division of labor, with the Fund focusing on short-term and systemic problems of the international finance and the Bank on long-term development needs of poor countries. Since the former issues are immediately connected to the interests of the rich and powerful countries while the latter is not, the scarce Bank resources and activities can easily be diverted away from where they must focus. It is worrisome that the Bank has approved the Emergency Structural Adjustment Lending procedure that enables the Bank to provide direct financing to supplement Fund financing at times of crisis. The Bank should resist the role of providing extra funds for

the IMF rescue financing. Instead, its resources and capacities must be deployed to confront the other crisis of the neo-liberal era, the chronic development crisis.

A sharper division of labor between the Fund and the Bank does not remove the need for collaboration between them. For instance, their collaboration in strengthening financial systems through the newly created Financial Sector Liaison Committee is perfectly desirable. The Bank has also played useful roles in crisis management by emphasizing the social aspects of adjustment and providing technical assistance for financial restructuring. It is making efforts to promote better policy responses to the social consequences of financial crises (World Bank, 1999b). Strengthening social policy is now considered an integral part of the new financial system.

UNCTAD

1. Nearly six decades ago, the international community came together in Geneva in the firm conviction that trade could make a difference to the world and do more to connect nations and peoples and enhance their economic opportunities. In a spirit of solidarity and cooperation, the world came together to ensure that progress achieved became prosperity shared. The phrase “prosperity for all” captured the ideals and objectives of the first session of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD), and its realization became the raison d’être of UNCTAD and, subsequently, its creed.
2. The serious challenges to multilateralism are being exacerbated. Strengthened multilateralism and coordinated international action are crucial for effectively addressing these challenges and improving prosperity for all. Inequality, within and between countries, exacerbated by vulnerability, has become one of the most challenging issues facing policymakers at the national and international levels.
3. Now, the Conference meets again, for the fifteenth time, in the most unprecedented of circumstances. In addition to climate change threats, we are experiencing a corona virus disease (COVID-19) pandemic which has generated a global health and economic crisis, exacerbating fiscal as well as other challenges faced by developing countries. In this scenario, and faced with declining resources, it is paramount that member State engagement with UNCTAD be strengthened.

4. Since the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic, nearly 5 million people have lost their lives. Global gross domestic product contracted severely in 2020. Millions of people have already lost their jobs, and millions more have had their livelihoods compromised. Most disturbingly, more than 150 million people are expected to join the ranks of extreme poverty by the end of 2021, depending on the severity of the economic contraction. These grim figures and facts reflect the profound human suffering and immense challenges ahead. The end of the pandemic may be in sight with the arrival of a vaccine, but the scale and scope of the crisis and its consequences are likely to be long-lasting and are yet to be fully appreciated.
5. UNCTAD should contribute to the implementation of and follow-up to the outcomes of relevant global conferences, including the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Addis Ababa Action Agenda and, as appropriate, the Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, among other relevant international agreements and outcomes. While enhancing its work in support of addressing the trade and development challenges of all developing countries across all regions, UNCTAD should:

a. Strengthen its special focus on the trade and development needs of the least developed countries across all areas of its mandate, in accordance with the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2011–2020 (Istanbul Programme of Action) and any relevant successor agreement reached at the Fifth United Nations Conference on the Least Developed Countries;
b. Continue to support Africa in addressing its special concerns and needs, including as articulated in the New Partnership for Africa's Development, and in the implementation of the African Continental Free Trade Area,
c. Further address the special trade, investment and development needs of landlocked developing countries, including through continuation of its support for effective implementation of the Vienna Programme of Action for Landlocked Developing Countries for the Decade 2014–2024 (Vienna Programme of Action);
d. Continue its work in assisting small island developing States to address persistent trade, investment and development challenges that they encounter, including

through the implementation of the SIDS Accelerated Modalities of Action (SAMOA) Pathway;

e. Continue to give focus to the special needs and problems of structurally weak and vulnerable small economies in order to foster sustained economic growth and sustainable and inclusive development;

f. Continue to support the development efforts of middle-income countries, according to their needs, in facing specific challenges of sustainable economic development and poverty eradication

6. The year 2020 marked the start of the decade of action 2020–2030 to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. However, the COVID-19 pandemic has exacerbated existing challenges and created new vulnerabilities, especially for developing countries, and threatens to reverse the hard-fought progress on the three dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental. It is important to ensure a concerted global response, bearing in mind that the 2030 Agenda should serve as the blueprint to rebuild and to mitigate the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Focused and sustained efforts to implement the 2030 Agenda for all, with a focus on the poorest and most vulnerable, are necessary for a strengthened and accelerated decade of action for building more sustainable, peaceful, just, equitable, prosperous, inclusive and resilient societies and economies.

7. Our success in recovering from the pandemic and paving the way to a more inclusive, resilient and sustainable world will depend on the decisions and actions taken by the global community. The entire global community, public and private, as well as national and international actors, must jointly take decisions and actions that will determine to what extent and how fast the recovery from the crisis will be.

8. In this regard, it is essential to recognize the critical role that women are playing in COVID-19 response efforts, as well as the disproportionate negative impact of the pandemic, notably the socioeconomic impact, on women and girls. This may further deepen already existing inequalities and risks reversing the progress in achieving gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls in recent

decades. Concrete actions are necessary to minimize this impact and ensure the full, equal and meaningful participation of women and youth in the development and implementation of an adequate and sustainable response to the pandemic.

9. The pandemic underscored the uneven resilience and capacities of countries to deal with crises. In response to the pandemic, many developing countries lacked the ability to use fiscal and monetary measures, among others, to respond to the crisis. It is imperative that international cooperation advance to combat and recover from the pandemic, provide assistance to countries and regions most in need. It is important to ensure timely, global and equitable access to safe, effective and affordable COVID-19 tools (vaccines, therapeutics, diagnostics and personal protective equipment), recognizing extensive COVID-19 immunization as a global public good to help overcome the COVID-19 pandemic worldwide and recover the momentum for sustainable development. Sharing of information and technology for the detection, prevention, treatment and control of the pandemic is necessary, as well as initiatives in this regard, such as the Access to COVID-19 Tools (ACT) Accelerator, Friends of the COVID-19 Vaccine Global Access (COVAX) Facility, the COVID-19 Technology Access Pool (C-TAP) and relevant pledging appeals
10. The speed at which the pandemic has spread has also been a reminder that this is an age of unprecedented interdependence and interconnectedness. Therefore, full global recovery will not be possible without global cooperation and until the pandemic subsides in all countries.
11. Recent years have highlighted the link between trade and development and some key global challenges. For instance, an increase in the number of refugees and displaced people has additionally strained the socio-economic conditions for the economies of developing countries hosting these groups. Additionally, health concerns, both non-communicable and communicable diseases, can hinder immediate and long-term productive capacities. For instance, COVID-19 has caused significant global economic shocks and exacerbated food insecurity. The COVID-19 pandemic is a firm reminder of the value of an integrated approach that fosters cooperation between environmental conservation and the human

health, animal health and plant health sectors. Similarly, natural disasters, which are increasing in frequency due to climate change, as well as man-made disasters such as maritime and industrial accidents, frequently lead to biodiversity loss, environmental degradation and an additional strain on limited trade and development logistics, resources and infrastructure.

12. To address these interrelated challenges and build a world that is sustainable, more prosperous and more inclusive, holistic policies at all levels are needed. In this sense, effective inclusion through targeted social policies and social investment is crucial in order to strengthen people's skills and capacities, and help them to participate fully in employment and social life.
13. The fifteenth session of the Conference is therefore an opportunity to embrace cooperation and interdependence, strengthen the connections between us, better recover from the pandemic and empower the international community to realize the Sustainable Development Goals. This pandemic presents an opportunity and an urgent need to envision and shape a new path where trade, investment, technology and finance can be harnessed to achieve sustainable progress and build a more resilient, inclusive, environmentally sound and sustainable world.

North – South Dialogue

The North-South Dialogue refers to the process through which the developing and newly independent nations of the "third world," predominantly in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, engaged the industrialized countries of North America and Western Europe in negotiations over changes to the international economic system during the 1970s.

After World War II, many nations of Latin America became increasingly frustrated with U.S. trade and tariff policies. At the same time, nationalist movements in Asia and Africa helped lead to widespread decolonization. Membership in the United Nations had risen from 51 countries in 1945 to 100 in 1960 and 150 by 1979. The sudden influx of new countries changed the balance of power in the General Assembly and made possible the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, or UNCTAD, in 1964. UNCTAD created a forum through which the "southern" or "third world" nations could propose economic policies, engaging industrial democracies of the "north." The term "North-South Dialogue" was used to distinguish this dynamic from the

East-West conflict of the Cold War, and to stress the point that development issues were just as pressing as the ideological conflict between communists and capitalists.

Several factors increased the willingness of the industrialized nations to negotiate. One was the rising power of oil-producing countries in the Arab world, and another was the U.S. loss in the war in Vietnam, which demonstrated to both the world and the industrialized North that not even wealth and power were enough to guarantee military victory. Both of these issues drew Western attention toward the global balance of economic power. Additionally, the dialogue began in a period of relaxed East-West tensions, which meant that the industrialized world could give more attention to issues like development. The Newly Industrializing Economies, meanwhile, believed the entrenched international economic system benefited developed countries at the expense of the developing world. They hoped to facilitate a reorganization of the international economic system to rectify this imbalance. The North-South Dialogue addressed issues pertaining to trade and tariffs, international finance, foreign aid, and the governance of multinational companies and institutions. During the era of detente in the 1970s, when East West tensions were more relaxed, there was a willingness among industrialized nations to cooperate. Even as detente began to falter in the mid1970s, the parties to the North-South Dialogue continued their discussions. U.S. policies and relations with the other Northern powers inevitably served to help or hinder progress in the dialogue. For example, changes in trade policies between the United States and Western Europe could serve to distract these countries from their negotiations with the industrializing countries or cause them to extend new levels of control over their interactions within their respective spheres of influence in the developing world. Late in the 1970s, the increasing conflicts between the United States and the Soviet Union finally served to sour the prospects for continuing North-South discussions, as the industrialized nations renewed their focus and redirected their resources to the Cold War and paid less attention to development issues. By September of 1980, the discussions in the United Nations that had characterized this dialogue had lost their momentum. Although some dialogue on these issues continued, it remained a series of discussions on economic issues and never presented the workable solution that its proponents had hoped it would. There are many ways to interpret the high point of the North-South Dialogue in the 1970s. Some

economists have reviewed the southern proposals for broad changes in world economic policy and concluded that they were either fundamentally unworkable or designed to benefit only certain segments of the Third World; others counter that the proposals were necessarily extreme in order to establish a firm position from which to open negotiations with the industrialized North. Either way, the exact implementation of the proposals presented through UNCTAD was always unlikely, because they centered on the Southern ideal and would have required the economically-powerful North to concede every point. The North-South Dialogue can also be viewed as a political struggle between the world's "haves" and "have-nots." In this view, the discussions became a vehicle through which the South could unite and assert power within the United Nations and other international organizations to counter the ability of the North to dictate the course of world affairs.

In economic terms, as of the early 21st century, the North—with one quarter of the world population—controls four-fifths of the income earned anywhere in the world. 90% of the manufacturing industries are owned by and located in the North.[1] Inversely, the South—with three quarters of the world population—has access to one-fifth of the world income. As nations become economically developed, they may become part of definitions the "North", regardless of geographical location; similarly, any nations that do not qualify for "developed" status are in effect deemed to be part of the "South".

Countries by total wealth (trillions USD), Credit Suisse

The accuracy of the North–South divide has been challenged on a number of grounds. Firstly, differences in the political, economic and demographic makeup of countries tend to complicate the idea of a monolithic South.[4] Globalization has also challenged the notion of two distinct economic spheres. Following the liberalization of post-Mao China initiated in 1978, growing regional cooperation between the national economies of Asia has led to the growing decentralization of the North as the main economic power.[20] The economic status of the South has also been fractured. As of 2015, all but roughly the bottom 60 nations of the Global South were thought to be gaining on the North in terms of income, diversification, and participation in the world market.[19] Globalization has largely displaced the North–South divide as the theoretical underpinning of the development efforts of international institutions such as the IMF, World Bank, WTO, and various United Nations affiliated agencies, though these groups

differ in their perceptions of the relationship between globalization and inequality.[9] Yet some remain critical of the accuracy of globalization as a model of the world economy, emphasizing the enduring centrality of nation-states in world politics and the pro minence of regional trade relation.

Conferences related to north south dialogue

1. Paris conference 1975-77
2. Brant commission 1977
3. Kankun conference 1981
4. Urugvay Round and Dunkel proposal1986-1991
5. Prithivi conferences 1992 & 1997 6 International Human Rights Conferences - 1993.

Future development

Some economists have argued that international free trade and unhindered capital flows across countries could lead to a contraction in the North–South divide. In this case more equal trade and flow of capital would allow the possibility for developing countries to further develop economically.

As some countries in the South experience rapid development, there is evidence that those states are developing high levels of South–South aid. Brazil, in particular, has been noted for its high levels of aid ($1 billion annually—ahead of many traditional donors) and the ability to use its own experiences to provide high levels of expertise and knowledge transfer.This has been described as a "global model in waiting".

The United Nations has also established its role in diminishing the divide between North and South through the Millennium Development Goals, all of which were to be achieved by 2015. These goals seek to eradicate extreme poverty and hunger, achieve global universal education and healthcare, promote gender equality and empower women, reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases, ensure environmental sustainability, and develop a global partnership for development.

NIEO

The greatest and most significant achievement during the last decades has been the independence from colonial and alien domination of a large number of peoples and

nations which has enabled them to become members of the community of free people. Technological progress has also been made in all spheres of economic activities in the last three decades, thus providing a solid potential for improving a solid potential for improving the well being of all people. However, the remaining vestiges of alien and colonial domination, foreign occupation, racial discrimination, apartheid and neo-colonialism in all its forms continue to be among the greatest obstacles to the full emancipation and progress of the developing countries and all the people involved. The benefits of technological progress are not shared equitably by all members of the international community. The developing countries, which constitute 70 per cent of the world's population, account for only 30 per cent of the world's income. It has proved impossible to achieve an even and balanced development of the international community under the existing international economic order. The gap between the developed and the developing countries continues to widen in a system which was established at a time when most of the developing countries did not even exist as independent States and which perpetuates inequality. The present international economic order is in direct, conflict with current developments in international political and economic relations. Since 1970 the world economy has experienced a series of grave crises which have had severe repercussions, especially on the developing countries because of their generally greater vulnerability to external economic impulses. The developing world has become a powerful factor that makes its impudence felt in all fields of international activity. These irreversible changes in the relationship of forces in the world necessitate the active, full and equal participation of the developing countries in the formulation and application of all decisions that concern the international community.

The Origins of NIEO

The origins of the NIEO however, can be traced back to the Havana Conference in 1994 and stem from economic and political tensions that had been building between the developing and developed nations. After the end of Imperialism and Colonialism, about 130 newly independent and developing countries have been making frantic efforts for economic independence and development. In the decade of 1970's countries of the 3rd world made persistent demand for the establishment of NIEO. The conflict between North and South for quite some time has been over this very issue. While the South again

and again demands for NIEO, the North resists it. The international economic system is facing a crisis which is characterized by strains of stagflation in the developed market economies, problem of underdevelopment in the in the developing countries and slowing down of growth rate and collapsing of the socialist world. The developing countries have often complained that their interests are being adversely affected by the policies of developed world, while the developed blame the developing for mismanagement and sub optional utilization of resources

The Impact of Three Major Economies:

The New International Economic Order (NIEO) is the name given to the existing relationship between different countries economies of the world. At present there are three main economies existing side by side i.e. highly developed countries of the Western Europe and U.S.A., the socialist and capitalist countries of East Europe, the developing countries of Asia, Africa and South America belonging to third world. They are industrially and economically backward.

NIEO envisages such relations between these three economies that the developing countries can also develop themselves. UN is also giving suitable help to these developing countries. New International Economic Order is very useful for the economic development of the developing countries of the world as we know that the standard of living in the third world countries is very low with an improvement in the economic condition of the people they will enjoy social and economic Human Rights.

NIEO as a Turning Point of International Community:

At the Sixth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly in 1975, a declaration was made for the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO). It is regarded as "a turning-point in the evolution of the international community."NIEO is to be based on "equity, sovereign equality, common interest and cooperation among all States, irrespective of their social and economic systems, which shall correct inequalities and redress existing injustices, make it possible to eliminate the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries and ensure steadily accelerating economic and social development and peace and justice for present and future generation."NIEO was not a single coherent identity; rather, it was more like political bran the holding loosely compatible agendas, which together formed something

less than a coherent strategy. While everyone involved might have agreed that the goal of the NIEO was to improve the economic position of the global south in relation to the global north, there was no consensus about the ultimate political ends, much less about the best way to achieve those ends. This, as much as anything, helps to explain why the NIEO seemed unable to realize its proponents' hopes. With this caveat in mind, it is nonetheless possible to distinguish three distinct but interconnected aspects to the NIEO: economic proposals, legal tactics, and political objectives.

The Major Objectives of NIEO:

The important objectives of the NIEO are mainly concerned with attaining of United Nations official development assistant targets; providing technical assistance for development and eliminating the brain drain; re-negotiating the debts of developing countries; improving the terms and conditions of trade of developing countries; strengthening economic and technical cooperation among developing countries; reforming the International Monetary System; increasing the transfer of resources through the World Bank and IMF; negotiating and re-deployment of industrial productive capacities to developing countries; providing health services, education, higher cultural standards for the work force and assuring the well being of children and the integration of women in development; assuring economic sovereignty of states; re-structuring the economic and social sections of United Nations.

The Prominent Principles of NIEO:

The New International Economic Order is to be found on full respect for the following principles; Sovereign equality of States, self-determination of all peoples, inadmissibility of the acquisition of territories by force, territorial integrity and non-interference in the internal affairs of other States; The broadest co-operation of all the States members of the international community, based on equity, whereby the prevailing disparities in the world may be banished and prosperity secured for all; Full and effective participation on the basis of equality of all countries in the solving of world economic problems in the common interest of all countries, bearing in mind the necessity to ensure the accelerated development of all the developing countries, while devoting particular attention to the adoption of measures in favor of the least developed land—locked and island developing countries as well as those developing countries most seriously affected

by economic crises and natural calamities, without losing sight of the interests of other developing countries; The right of every country to adopt the economic and social system that it deems the most appropriate for its own development and not to be subjected to discrimination of any kind as a result; Full permanent sovereignty of every State over its natural resources and all economic activities. In order to safeguard these resources, each State is entitled to exercise effective control over them and their exploitation with means suitable to its own situation, including the right to nationalization or transfer of ownership to its nationals, this right being an expression of the full permanent sovereignty of the State. No State may be subjected to economic, political or any other type of coercion to prevent the free and full exercise of this inalienable right; The right of all States, territories and peoples under foreign occupation, alien and colonial domination or apartheid to restitution and full compensation for the exploitation arid depletion of, and damages to, the natural resources and all other resources of those States, territories and peoples; Regulation and supervision of the activities of transnational corporations by taking measures in the interest of the national economies of the countries where such transnational corporations operate on the basis of the full sovereignty of those countries; The right of the developing countries and the peoples of territories under colonial and racial domination and foreign occupation to achieve their liberation and to regain effective control over their natural resources and economic activities; The extending of assistance to developing countries, peoples and territories which are under colonial and alien domination, foreign occupation, racial discrimination or apartheid or are subjected to economic, political or any other type of coercive measures to obtain from them the subordination of the exercise of their sovereign rights and to secure from them advantages of any kind, and to neo colonialism in all its forms, and which have established or are endeavoring to establish effective control over their natural resources and economic activities that have been or are still under foreign control; Just and equitable relationship between the prices of raw materials, primary commodities, manufactured and semi-manufactured goods exported by developing countries and the prices of raw materials, primary commodities, manufactures, capital goods and equipment imported by them with the aim of bringing about sustained improvement in their unsatisfactory terms of trade and the expansion of the world economy; Extension of

active assistance to developing countries by the whole international community, free of any political or military conditions; Ensuring that one of the main aims of the reformed international monetary system shall be the promotion of the development of the developing countries and the adequate flow of real resources to them; Improving the competitiveness of natural materials facing competition from synthetic substitutes

Preferential and non—reciprocal treatment for developing countries, wherever feasible, in all fields of international economic co—operation whenever possible; Securing favorable conditions for the transfer of financial resources to developing countries; Giving to the developing countries access to the achievements of modern science and technology, and promoting the transfer of technology and the creation of indigenous technology for the benefit of the developing countries in forms and in accordance with procedures which are suited to their economics; The need for all States to put an end to the waste of natural resources, including food products; The need for developing countries to concentrate all their resources for the cause of development; The strengthening, through individual and collective actions, of mutual economic, trade, financial and technical co—operation among the developing countries, mainly on a preferential basis; Facilitating the role which producers' associations may play within the framework of international co-operation and, in pursuance of their aims, inter alia assisting in the promotion of sustained growth of the world economy and accelerating the development of developing countries.

The Existing International Economic Order:

The crisis of 1930s was marked by very high unemployment rates and low economic growth rates. It was a classic long-term depression with a very low growth, fall in international trade and an unstable international monetary situation. International economic crisis of the 30s was tackled mainly through economic nationalism. It was manifested in high degree of protectionism and in a shift away from world-wide economic relations to bilateral agreements, both in the field of trade and in the field of finance. It was exhibited in an overall "beggar my neighbor" policy when the solution of domestic economic problems was concerned. The weakness of the world's economy, which was the result of a breakdown of the western economic order of 1930s, and the necessity to restore the international economic order after the Second World War gave

rise to the present international economic order, which was created in the mid-1940s.The economic system that emerged in the aftermath of the Second World War contained three sub-systems. These subsystems were

i. The Western system of Interdependence;
ii. The North-South system of dependence; and
iii. The East-West system of Independence.

No doubt the problems and processes of the subsystems differ yet the separation of the three sub-systems is artificial since interactions and problems overlap all systems in the real world. The existing NIEO relied on East-West Divisions and is marked by confrontation between the North and the South; it safeguards the interests of the North and is governed by economic interaction based on the principle of non-discriminatory liberal trade. It is nationalist and irrational; in the present economic system, the trade is so regulated that the developed countries gain access to markets of developing countries on favorable terms; it has encouraged inflow of foreign private capital from the developed country to the developing countries and consequent increase in the activities of multinational corporations.

The Major Issues and Means of NIEO:

Main issues of the existing world economic crisis and the various means through which NIEO can be achieved are discussed below. The following requisites are absolutely essential in a medium to long-run context; Substantial increase in food productivity in the Third World is required which will help to cushion their terms of trade against adverse demand conditions affecting commercial crops. An increase in agricultural productivity especially food grain production is essential if the international economic order is to be restructured. In this sphere, developed countries are hesitant to provide much help to the developing nations. The United States has the greatest export surplus which can perhaps help in feeding in millions in the poorest countries. A section in the US is of View that food can be used as a weapon like oil. A rapid growth in the production of capital goods is equally important for developing countries. It has been suggested that the developed countries should contribute one per cent of their GNP to the developing countries as development aid. The goals of NIEO can be rapidly achieved by means of development aid. The developed countries can also help the LDCs by writing

off of old debts or putting a moratorium over it. The Third World debt in 1990 stood at approximately 1.3 trillion dollars which represents approximately 44 per cent of the gross national product of all developing countries combined. If LDCs seek more aid or loans, what they should do is to use the resources for higher growth and profitability in order to improve their repaying capacity. What is needed is to formulate economic policies that reduce the burden of payment of interest and repayment of the principal (debt). In regard to foreign trade LDCs demand higher prices on their export goods, some sort of guarantee of a similar development for export and import prices and better possibilities for facilitating entry to the markets of the rich countries. There is an unrealized potential for more trade amongst the developing countries. South-South cooperation in trade may also help LDCs overcome limitations of domestic market size, offer possibilities for realization of economies of scale, lead to a decrease in transportation costs and, in the long run, foster indigenous technological development. The level of South-South trade in the contemporary world economy appears to be low, at first sight, but is roughly consistent with the distribution of world income and the direction of international trade flows. There appears to be, however, important economic, institutional and political constraints to an increase in South-South cooperation. It may be both a feasible and a desirable strategy to opt for regional cooperation on related mutually agreed upon items, selected cooperation between countries who agree on the issues based on mutual advantage, and concentrate on areas of like mindedness rather than conflict. This could be a transition strategy, creating the necessary precondition for more global cooperation. The interdependence between the industrialized and the developing countries has deepened. A growing number of developing countries have been integrated into the international economic system which has remained heavily dominated by the industrialized nations. It may be stressed that this development was mainly the result of the process of internationalization of capital. A large part of the volume of exports from the developing countries to the industrialized countries has been a result of the expansion of west-based commercial and business corporations that have set up subsidiaries in many developing countries.

As a result of the growing competition between countries in attracting investments, a globally managed restructuring may appear to be an illusion. If the

developing countries want to remain involved in international economic trade relations they have to consider significant modifications in their domestic structures to increase their leverage. To draw a policy in the sphere of industrial restructuring is thus somewhat risky task. Both industrialization and agricultural growth strategies in the developing countries require increasing inputs of energy. Excessive dependence on fossil fuels could lead to serious balance of payment problems in countries which depend upon petroleum import. Irrespective of this balance of payment problem, conventional wisdom also advocates a search for alternative and renewable sources of energy in view of the fast depletion of the scarce resources on our globe. With regard to policy choices for augmenting the energy supply, water is identified as a major source for further exploration. More often, hydel power stations are highly capital intensive and rivers flow across countries.

Inter-country cooperation in cost-sharing and output sharing, for both power generation and irrigation would serve a useful purpose. Other areas of inter-country cooperation among South and Southeast Asian countries were in petroleum refining and thermal electricity generation. Transnational Corporations (TNCs) or Multinational Corporations (MNCs) which are responsible for internationalizing capital in contemporary world. Thus, form an important part of the NIEO debate. Developed countries are failing to-transfer the promised, 1 percent of their GNP per annum to the developing countries as development aid, due to internal budgetary crises. The developed countries have been arguing that larger resource transfers to the developing countries could take place through direct investment of the Transnational Capital. There is an urgent need to examine what institutional forms could be developed as countervailing power to the TNCs.

It is also imperative that more research be done to examine the various forms of TNC participation, and the behavioral differences between them. Finally, the possibility of South-South investments, as an answer to the present TNC investments must be explored. The role of transfer of technology from developed to the developing countries is being of crucial importance in view of the wide disparity between the technological levels in the two groups. The disparity in the level of technology is conceived to be one that was leading to an accentuation of income disparities between the nations. For the

developed countries, technology has in fact become an instrument of domination. Scientific and technological know-how is precisely not under the direct control of the developing countries but under the control of multinational enterprises. For achieving the goals of NIEO, it is essential that developing countries should ensure that the developed countries are rid of the rights to produce any technique which they are capable of producing. It has to be ensured that such a system of rule is not monopolized or usurped by the MNCs.

A complete reform of the international monetary system and financial institutions having highly inequitable pattern of adjustment rules are urgently needed. The powerful international bodies where decisions are taken and can be enforced are the Security Council of the UN, the World Bank, other important economic organizations and international-financial institutions (IFI). The developing countries have little or no power in these important world bodies. Unless LDCs are given share in decision-making of these bodies, it is very difficult to realize the goals of NIEO.

GATT

Background

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (hereinafter "GATT") of 1947 emerged from the post-Second World War negotiations on international economic cooperation. These negotiations resulted in the Bretton Woods agreements – the International Monetary Fund and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development – but there was the belief that the Bretton Woods institutions needed to be complemented by an organization dealing with trade. The negotiations for the Havana Charter, that would incorporate an international trade organization (hereinafter "ITO"), were based on the view held in both the United States and the United Kingdom, who took the lead in the negotiations, that trade liberalization was essential to avoid the protectionism of the inter-War years which had been harmful to most economies. The United States was interested in seeing the end of British imperial preferences and the United Kingdom was interested in the lowering of the high United States tariffs.

However, in the initial negotiations for a comprehensive international trade organization, it became clear that negotiations would take some time and a group of States decided to negotiate a parallel separate arrangement of a more limited scale which,

by focusing on reducing State barriers to trade in particular tariffs, would realize early gains for States from trade liberalization. Hence, the negotiation of a general agreement on tariffs and trade which would essentially cover one of the chapters of the ITO and could be integrated into the ITO once it came into existence.

The negotiations for the GATT, in which the United States and the United Kingdom delegations also took the lead, were completed in less than one year, notwithstanding quite fundamental differences between the American and British views. The common concern of both the United States and the United Kingdom was to avoid discrimination in trade, although they had different views on how this should be achieved. GATT was an agreement with economic objectives; the key negotiators were primarily economists and their ultimate agreement reflected the assumptions of the time about the economic benefits of trade. The text, which was drafted by a member of the American delegation, also an economist, was completed in October 1947 and GATT entered into force on a provisional basis on 1 January 1948.

Initially there were 23 GATT signatories. By the time GATT was folded into the World Trade Organization (hereinafter "WTO"), there were 128 GATT contracting parties. Accession to GATT was open not just to fully sovereign States, but also to governments that were "acting on behalf of a separate customs territory possessing full autonomy in the conduct of its external commercial relations" (article XXXIII). As a result, Hong Kong became a GATT contracting party.

There were essentially two tracks to the GATT negotiations. First, there was the text of GATT itself and second, the actual tariff reduction negotiations. GATT was not only a set of obligations regarding what States could do in regulating trade, it was also a framework for tariff reductions, which in the long term became one of the signature successes of GATT. But GATT was the only instrument that emerged from the negotiations of 1946-48 and its "provisional" nature was to continue for another 47 years. Although the Havana Charter embodying an international trade organization was completed in March 1948, it was never ratified by the United States senate and it never entered into force. And, until the negotiation of the WTO, no effort was made to turn GATT into a permanent and not a provisional agreement.

The fact that GATT was seen as having a provisional nature, to be ended when the ITO came into being, affected its implementation, the way it functioned and how it was perceived. It had no real institutional structure; its signatories were designated as the CONTRACTING PARTIES, and it was administered by an "interim" secretariat which had been put in place to be the secretariat for the future ITO. Partly because it was an instrument negotiated by economists, GATT was seen not as a treaty but rather as a "contract" and for many years did not enter the horizon of public international lawyers. The language was often opaque and understanding it required knowledge of how domestic customs regimes operated. It was the work of John Jackson and Robert Hudec that made GATT accessible to international lawyers.

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994 ("GATT 1994") shall consist of:

(a) The provisions in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, dated 30 October 1947, annexed to the Final Act Adopted at the Conclusion of the Second Session of the Preparatory Committee of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Employment (excluding the Protocol of Provisional Application), as rectified, amended or modified by the terms of legal instruments which have entered into force before the date of entry into force of the WTO Agreement;

(b) The provisions of the legal instruments set forth below that have entered into force under the GATT 1947 before the date of entry into force of the WTO Agreement:

(i) Protocols and certifications relating to tariff concessions;

(ii) protocols of accession (excluding the provisions

(a) concerning provisional application and withdrawal of provisional application and

(b) providing that Part II of GATT 1947 shall be applied provisionally to the fullest extent not inconsistent with legislation existing on the date of the Protocol);

(iii) decisions on waivers granted under Article XXV of GATT 1947 and still in force on the date of entry into force of the WTO Agreement1 ;

(iv) other decisions of the CONTRACTING PARTIES to GATT 1947;

The Understandings set forth below:

(i) Understanding on the Interpretation of Article

(ii) II:1(b) of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994;

(iii) Understanding on the Interpretation of Article XVII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994;

(iv) Understanding on Balance-of-Payments Provisions of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994;

(v) Understanding on the Interpretation of Article XXIV of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994;

(vi) Understanding in Respect of Waivers of Obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994;

(vii) Understanding on the Interpretation of Article XXVIII of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1994; and

WTO

On the conclusion of the Uruguay Round, The WTO was setup on January 01, 1995, comprising 164 member States. It provides a common platform to negotiate trade agreements among member countries and to resolve any trade disputes. It manages 60 global and about 300 regional trade agreements. The 60 trade agreements are accorded the status of international law.

WTO Agreements cover goods, services, and intellectual property. It is a list of about 60 agreements, annexes, decisions, and understandings. Agreements relate to both multilateral and plurilateral agreements. Four annexes to the WTO define the substantive rights and obligations of members:

a. Annex 1 has three parts: Annex 1A, Multilateral Agreements on Trade in Goods, which contains the GATT 1994. Annex 1B, which contains the GATS' and Annex1C; the TRIPS agreement.
b. Annex 2 contains the Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes (DSU) – the WTO's common dispute settlement mechanism.
c. Annex 3 contains the Trade Policy Review Mechanism (TPRM), an instrument for surveillance of members' trade policies.
d. Annex 4 Plurilateral Trade Agreements, consists of Tokyo Round codes that were not multilateral zed in the Uruguay Round and that therefore bind only their signatories.

Together, Annexures 1 through 3 embody the multilateral trade agreements that are an integral part of the WTO agreement and are binding on all members.

Multilateral Trade Agreements are on: 1. Agriculture: (i) Market Access, (ii) Domestic Support and (iii) Reductions in Export Subsidies. 2. Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures. 3. Textiles and Clothing 4. Technical Barriers to Trade. 5. Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMS). 6. Anti-dumping. 7. Customs Valuation. 8. Pre-shipment Inspections. 9. Rules of Origin. 10. Import Licensing Procedures. 11. Subsidies and Countervailing Measures. 12. Safeguards. 14. General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). 15. Trade Related Intellectual Property (TRIPS). 16. Dispute Settlement. 17. Trade Policy Review Mechanism (TPRM).

Plurilateral Trade Agreements: 'Plurilateral Agreements' were formally annexed to the Final Act of the Uruguay Round and will be regulated and supervised by the WTO. These agreements will, however, only be applicable (and thus enforceable) between their signatories. There are four Plurilateral Agreements concerning:

a. Public procurement;
b. Trade in civil aircraft;
c. International dairy products; and
d. International bovine and meat products.

Distinction between GATT and WTO

The WTO differs in a number of important respects from the GATT. The differences are as follows:

1. The WTO is a forum for international cooperation on trade-related policies– the creation of codes of conduct for member governments.
2. The WTO contains a set of specific legal obligations regulating trade policies of member states, and these are embodied in the GATT, the GATS, and the TRIPS agreement. The WTO acts as an umbrella organization that encompasses the GATT along with two new sister bodies, one services and the other on intellectual property.
3. The WTO's GATS has taken the lead to extending free trade agreements to services. In the same way, the TRIPS is an attempt to narrow the gaps in the way

intellectual property rights are protected around the world and to bring them under common international rules.

4. WTO has taken over responsibility for arbitrating trade disputes and monitoring the trade policies of member countries. Countries that have been found by the arbitration panel to violate GATT rules may appeal to a permanent appellate body, but its verdict is binding. Every stage of the procedure is subject to strict time limits. Thus, the WTO has something that the GATT never had – teeth.
5. The clarification and strengthening of GATT rules and the creation of the WTO also hold out the promise of more effective policing and enforcement of GATT rules. The WTO is a distinctively as well as qualitatively an improvement upon the GATT.

Principles of WTO

1. Nondiscrimination: Nondiscrimination has two major components: the most-favored-nation (MFN) rule, and the national treatment principle. Non discrimination in the form of national treatment and most favoured nation (MFN) treatment to our exports in the markets of other WTO members. National treatment ensures that our exports to other member countries would not be discriminated vis-a-vis their domestic products. MFN treatment likewise ensures non-discrimination among various members in their tariff regimes and also other rules and regulations.
2. Reciprocity: The principle of reciprocity refers to the ideal of mutual changes in international trade policy. The granting of mutual concessions in tariff rates, quotas, or other commercial restrictions. Reciprocity implies that these concessions are neither intended nor expected to be generalized to other countries with which the contracting parties have commercial treaties. Reciprocity agreements may be made between individual countries or groups of countries. Reciprocity is a fundamental element of the negotiating process. Reciprocal concessions ensure that gains will materialize.
3. Binding and Enforceable Commitments: Liberalization commitments and agreements to abide by certain rules of the game have little value if they cannot be enforced. Once tariff commitments are bound, it is important that there be no

resort to other, nontariff, measures that have the effect of nullifying or impairing the value of the tariff concession.

4. Transparency: Transparency is a basic pillar of the WTO. Enforcement of commitments requires access to information on the trade regimes that are maintained by members. Transparency has a number of important benefits. With stability and predictability, investment is encouraged, jobs are created and consumers can fully enjoy the benefits of competition — choice and lower prices.
5. Safety Valves: A final principle embodied in the WTO is that, in specific circumstances governments should be able to restrict trade.
6. Freer Trade: Lowering trade barriers is one of the most obvious means of encouraging trade gradually through negotiations more accurately. It is a system of rules dedicated to open, fair and undistorted competition.

Objectives and Functions of WTO

a. Achieving 'sustainable development' in relation to the optimal use of the world's resources,
b. Ensuring the need to protect and preserve the environment in a manner consistent with the various levels of national economic development;
c. Safeguarding the interest of developing countries to secure a better share of the growth in international trade;

The following are the functions of the WTO:

a. Facilitates the implementation and operation of all the agreements and legal instruments negotiated in connection with the Uruguay Round, including the Plurilateral Trade Agreements; for the fulfilment of their obligations.
b. Provides a forum for all negotiations and also facilitates implementation of the results of the negotiations as decided by the Ministerial Conference.
c. The WTO is responsible for administration of the Trade Policy Review Mechanisms (TPRM).
d. It is also the organ for establishing co-ordination with other wings of the UNO such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Bank and its affiliated agencies.

Decisions will be taken by a majority of the votes cast, on the basis of 'one country, one vote.' This system of decision making by consensus is a major improvement as it seeks to ensure security, predictability and participation.

Organizational Structure of WTO

The structure of the WTO is dominated by its highest authority, the Ministerial Conference, composed of representatives of all WTO members. It can take decisions on all matters under any of the multilateral trade agreements.

The Ministerial Conference of the WTO meets every two years to make important decisions about existing trade agreements. The Ministerial Conference holds the authority to make decisions on any aspects of all multilateral agreements made under the WTO. The Conference includes representatives from all members of the WTO. It gives equal representation to all its members regardless of the size of their economy or share in international trade. It can be thought of as the legislative branch of the WTO. The WTO is headed by the Ministerial Conference, while the daily operations are carried out by three administrative bodies:

1. General Council: The General Council comprises the representatives of all member countries. Its job is to carry out the implementation and monitoring function of the WTO. The General Council is further divided into multiple councils and committees that focus on specific topics. Examples of such bodies include the Council on Goods, the Councils on Services, the Committee on Textiles under the Council on Goods, etc.
2. Dispute Settlement Body (DSB): The DSB is responsible for settling trade disputes between member states. The purpose of DSB is to resolve such disputes by a rule-based system rather than through unilateral retaliatory action by those complaining. There is now a time-table laid down for dispute settlement. The amount of time each stage of the process should take has been indicated, though there is some flexibility in the time-frames laid down. The DSB can reject the findings of a panel or of an appeals report – only by consensus. The dispute settlement system is undoubtedly the jewel in the WTO's crown. The consensus is certainly leaning in favour of preserving and strengthening the dispute settlement

function of the WTO. There is also an Appellate Body, where member states can appeal any decisions made against them during a dispute settlement.

3. Trade Policy Review Body: The Trade Policy Review Body is also a part of the General Council and is responsible for ensuring the trade policies of member states are in line with the goals of the WTO. Member countries are required to inform the WTO about changes in their laws and trade policies. The body undertakes regular reviews of the policies to ensure they conform to the rules of the WTO. This is part of the monitoring function of the WTO, and it helps the WTO to adapt to the changing economic landscape.

WTO and General Agreements on Trade in Services (GATS)

General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS): The growing role of international services and their implications have come to be recognized in the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). The WTO rules on services trade, as embodied in the GATS are the first ever set of multilateral, legally enforceable rules covering international trade in services. The economic significance of services has increased substantially since the GATS entered into force in 1995. A WTO council of services oversees the operation of agreement. The GATS did not directly remove any important barriers to trade in services. It did, however, set up a legal framework under which future negotiations to liberalize service trade could proceed.

a. Cross-border supply (Mode 1) is when the service is provided from one country to another (like international phone calls. Business Process Outsourcing, KPO or LPO services).
b. Consumption abroad (Mode 2) this mode covers supply of a service of one country to the service consumer of any other country, e.g. telecommunication, tourism.
c. Commercial presence (Mode 3) is when a firm sets up a subsidiary/branch in an export market, e. g branch of a foreign bank, subsidiary of a telecom firm and the like. This opens door of relevant sector in one country to investments from another country. Accordingly, it is in west's interest to push for liberalization in India. There has been sustained pressure to open up higher education sector, insurance sector, medical sector etc. through this mode.

d. Movement of Natural Persons (Mode 4) which covers services provided by a service supplier of one country through the presence of natural persons in the territory of any other country. e. g. Infosys or TCS sending its engineers for onsite work in US/Europe or Australia. Here again, it's in India's interest to push for liberalization. Negotiations in services under GATS are classified in these 4 modes, interests of different countries depend upon this classification.

WTO AND INDIA'S CONCERN WTO and India's Trade-in-Services

From India's point of view, services present a different picture from agriculture and industrial tariffs. As an emerging global power in IT and business services, the country is, in fact, a demander in the WTO talks on services. India seeks more liberal commitments on the part of its trading partners for cross-border supply of services, including the movement of 'natural persons' (human beings) to developed countries, or what is termed as Mode 4 for the supply of services. With respect to Mode 2, which requires consumption of services abroad, India has an offensive interest.

In sharp contrast, the interest of the EU and the US is more in Mode 3 of supply, which requires the establishment of a commercial presence in developing countries. Accordingly, requests for more liberal policies on foreign direct investment in sectors like insurance have been received. These developed countries are lukewarm to demands for a more liberal regime for the movement of natural persons. Among the different modes of services of supply, India is most interested in movement of natural persons (mode 4) and has also submitted a proposal at the WTO Council for trade in services. India has an obvious interest in the liberalisation of services trade and wants commercially meaningful access to be provided by the developed countries.

WTO and Indian Agriculture

India's domestic support to agriculture is well below the limit of 10 per cent of the value of agricultural produce and therefore India is not required to make any reduction in it at present. India's food security law subsidized food supply as an integral part of its welfare programmes. The problem is unlike the rich countries, because with limited financial means India is not able to give income support to farmers.

Agreement on agriculture is facing issues due to food security and development requirements for developing countries like India. India should attempt to bring its

domestic food legislation in line with WTO rules. Efficient internal policies are the best weapon against an unfair external market. But India's farm exports are fundamentally supply-constrained. India cannot ignore the wide-ranging provisions of the AOA covering domestic support, export subsidies, and market access, besides sanitary and phyto-sanitary measures

India strongly favours extension of higher levels of protection to geographical indications for products like Basmati rice, Darjeeling tea, and Alphonso mangoes at par with that provided to wines and spirits under the Trade-related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) agreement. India is against any inclusion of non-trade issues that are directed in the long run at enforcing protectionist measures, particularly against developing countries. India should worry about the multilateral trading system and integrate rapidly with the world economy. There is the need to align national economic policies with its WTO commitments.

Check Your Progress

- Explain the origin and functions of the Bretton Woods Institutions
- Analyze the significance of the North-South Dialogue
- Discuss the evolution of international trade organizations

UNIT - V

Nuclear Politics: IAEA – NPT – CTBT – Concepts – India's Nuclear Policy; International Terrorism: Origin – Types – 9/11 – US War on Terrorism – Indian Perspective; Indian Ocean: Cold War Politics – Contending Interests – India's Concerns; Environmental Concerns: Rio – Kyoto – Green Peace

Objectives

- Nuclear weapon tests worldwide
- Superpowers competed for influence in the Indian Ocean region
- Rio Declaration on Environment and Development

Introduction

The spread of nuclear weapons has been considered a grave threat to the security of the world at large. The debate is not so much about the use of nuclear technology, for the uses of nuclear technology in the development process of any nation has been well accepted. The debate is on the peaceful vs. the military uses of this technology. This debate has complicated over the years as this technology has been acknowledged as being 'dual use' technology and as such it would be difficult to differentiate from the end use for which the technology is pursued. Yet, the debate on the proliferation of nuclear weapons has dominated the writings on international security. The central concerns have been the horizontal and not vertical proliferation of these weapons.

Policies of nuclear proliferation present interplay of two sets of issues: one is the technical and political set of issues and the other relates to the capability and intent of the countries concerned. The technical element in non-proliferation seeks to either deny the critical technical assets to a country that seeks to embark on a nuclear programme or to make these assets available under a safeguard system. This places restraint on the possible use of nuclear technology for weapons production and ensures that the technology that is transferred or acquired remains for civilian (or confines to) use only. The political component of the system operates at two levels: one that seeks to create an international pressure on the countries to desist from going nuclear and two, provide various incentives and disincentives to countries in the form of economic and other ways

to dissuade them from going nuclear. The political component adds on to the technical component in providing a 'political' rationale for not going nuclear.

The capability of a state to go nuclear is dependent on the technical component. The development of nuclear technology and infrastructure that is capable of producing a nuclear weapon is a technical dimension of the problem of proliferation. A nuclear capable state may be technically ripe for nuclear proliferation, but it would be the political intention of exercising the choice to go in for a nuclear weapon that would determine nuclear proliferation. In fact, with the spread of nuclear technology and availability of nuclear material, the decision on whether or not to acquire nuclear weapons would be a political one.

The incentives to produce a nuclear weapon may be listed as follows:

a. Increased international status: This is a psychological aspect of perceiving to have crossed the 'threshold' and become a 'great power'.
b. Domestic political requirements or political pressures: These pressures may be visible in both democratic and authoritarian systems of government.
c. Increased strategic autonomy.
d. A strategic hedge against military and political uncertainty, especially about the reliability of allies.
e. Possession of a weapon of last resort.
f. Bargain or leverage over the developed nations.

The disincentives that may discourage nations from going in for nuclear weapons include:

a) Resource diversion to nuclear programme may lead to a loss of opportunity to pursue other pressing economic and social priorities.
b) Adverse national and international public opinion that would reflect on the 'status' of the nation.
c) Disruption of established or conventional security guarantees provided by some of the great powers.
d) Infeasibility of developing the required technology and consequently the corresponding nuclear strategy.

e) Fear of an adverse international reaction that would have an impact on the trade and other relations of the country

Nuclear weapons programmes usually require a long lead time for countries that have no nuclear infrastructure. Any nation seeking to manufacture nuclear weapons must develop an appropriate source of fissile material. This is a major technical barrier. The core of a nuclear bomb is made up of highly enriched uranium or plutonium. Fifteen to twenty-five kilograms of highly enriched uranium or five to eight kilograms of plutonium are generally considered the necessary minimum for the core of a multi-kiloton atomic bomb.

A nation seeking to manufacture nuclear weapons must have a source of this fissile material. There are three main approaches that nations take to overcome this barrier: One is by developing nuclear facilities dedicated for the purpose of weapons development. The second is the development of a civilian nuclear programme that is free of safeguards and the subsequent acquisition of sensitive technologies for the development of a nuclear bomb. In case of safeguarded facilities the option may be of diversion of material from civilian facilities. The third option is theft of the raw material or the weapon itself.

IAEA

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) The IAEA was established in 1957. Its statutory objective is to seek to accelerate and enlarge the contribution of atomic energy to peace, health and prosperity throughout the world. One of the IAEA's statutory functions is "to establish or adopt, in consultation and, where appropriate, in collaboration with the competent organs of the United Nations and with the specialized agencies concerned, standards of safety… (including such standards for labour conditions), and to provide for the application of these standards".

Deriving from this function, in the area of preparedness and response for a nuclear or radiological emergency, the IAEA develops safety standards and technical tools, supports its Member States in strengthening their emergency arrangements, provides for capacity building in its Member States, and performs, at the request of Member States, peer reviews on established emergency arrangements (such as Emergency Preparedness Review missions).

The role of the IAEA in the response to a nuclear or radiological emergency derives, primarily, from the Early Notification Convention and the Assistance Convention. It includes notification and the exchange of official information, assessment of the potential consequences of an emergency and prognosis of its possible progression, the provision of assistance to Member States on request, and the provision of information to the public. The IAEA maintains its own emergency arrangements to fulfil its role in emergency response.

The IAEA also provides the secretariat of IACRNE, coordinates the inter-agency response in a nuclear or radiological emergency, and is the main coordinating body for the development and maintenance of the Joint Radiation Emergency Management Plan of the International Organizations.

The International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) is an autonomous international organization made up of 151 member states, established to promote the peaceful use of nuclear energy and to ensure that nuclear energy is not used for military purposes. According to the IAEA statute (1956), the functions of the IAEA include:

- Taking action needed to promote research on, development of, and practical applications of nuclear energy for peaceful purpose (Article III. A.1);
- Providing material, services, equipment, and facilities for such research and development, and for practical applications of atomic energy (Article III. A.2);
- Fostering and exchange of scientific and technical information (Article III.A.3);
- Encouraging the exchange and training of scientists and experts in the field of peaceful uses of atomic energy;
- establishing and administering safeguards to ensure that any nuclear assistance or supplies with which IAEA was associated should not be used to further any military purposes—and applying such safeguards, if so requested, to any bilateral or multilateral arrangement (Article III.A.6);
- Establishing or adopting nuclear safety standards (Article III.A.6).

Though an independent international organization, the IAEA maintains a close working relationship with the United Nations. According to its own statute, the IAEA must “conduct its activities in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations to promote peace and international co-operation, and in conformity with policies

of the United Nations furthering the establishment of safeguarded worldwide disarmament and in conformity with any international agreements entered into pursuant to such policies." Moreover, the IAEA must report on its activities to the General Assembly annually and, as appropriate, to the UN Security Council.

The IAEA's framework for nuclear security includes international legal instruments that are both binding and nonbinding, which it encourages states to sign and adopt. The binding documents include the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (1980) and its amendment, the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism (2005), and the comprehensive safeguards agreements and additional protocols. The nonbinding international instruments include the IAEA Code of Conduct on Safety and Security of Radioactive Sources and the IAEA Supplementary Guidance on the Import and Export of Radioactive Sources. In addition, the IAEA has circulated a document entitled "The Physical Protection of Nuclear Material and Nuclear Facilities," containing recommendations for states to implement voluntarily. Moreover, the IAEA is entrusted with responsibilities under a number of other treaties and agreements that states have adopted related to nuclear materials, including providing the safeguarding system established under the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (1970).

Through its Nuclear Security Programme (NSP), the IAEA provides training, human resource development, assistance, and technical advice to states and facilitates the exchange of information and lessons learned. This includes assisting states in establishing an effective regulatory infrastructure, improving physical protection at facilities with nuclear and other radioactive materials, strengthening capabilities at borders to detect and respond to illicit nuclear trafficking and establishing preparedness to respond to acts of nuclear or radiological terrorism. The IAEA also offers a number of advisory services to aid states in assessing the effectiveness of their nuclear security arrangements and identifying any necessary enhancements.

After the September 11th terrorist attacks, the agency conducted a thorough review of its activities and programs relevant to preventing acts of terrorism involving nuclear and radioactive materials and developed the Nuclear Security Plan for 2002-2005. This was followed by subsequent plans for 2006-2009 and 2010-2013. The latter

focuses on three key areas of nuclear security: prevention, detection, and information coordination and response. Moreover, it seeks to move away from ad hoc interventions and towards providing long-term, sustained improvements to nuclear security.

The National Security Plan also provides a vehicle through which the IAEA supports multilateral counterterrorism efforts, in particular, Pillars II and III of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy, which focus on preventing and combating terrorism, and strengthening states' capacities to do so. In particular, the IAEA focuses on terrorism in the context of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and radioactive material, and assists states, upon request, in improving their nuclear security capacities. To this end, the IAEA supports states in improving their capacities to prevent, detect, and respond to the illegal use or transfer of nuclear and other radiological materials as well as the protection of nuclear installations.

As part of these efforts, the IAEA has provided a platform for the exchange of best practices and legislative assistance through a number of activities. For example, in May 2009, the agency hosted a workshop on implementing legislation on nuclear security for the League of Arab States in Vienna. In 2009, the IAEA's training courses on nuclear security reached more than 120 countries. The IAEA has also given equipment upgrades to a number of states to fulfill their obligations to combat nuclear terrorism.

Another tool to address the illicit use of WMDs is the agency's Illicit Trafficking Database, created in 1997 in order to track unauthorized activities and events involving nuclear and other radioactive material outside of regulatory control. As of September 2010, the database had 111 participating states.

The IAEA leads the Counter-Terrorism Implementation Task Force's Working Group on Preventing and Responding to a WMD Terrorist Attack. In this capacity, the IAEA has worked to strengthen an interagency response to a terrorist attack using chemical, biological, radiological, or nuclear weapons (CBRN) or materials. To that end, the working group produced a report in 2010 entitled Interagency Coordination in the Event of a Nuclear or Radiological Terrorist Attack: Current Status, Future Prospects. The report offers three recommendations to improve international capacities to respond to a terrorist attack using nuclear or radiological materials. In November 2011, the Working Group produced its second report on institutional response capacities to chemical and

biological terrorist attacks. The report, for the first time, analyzed at the international level the potential of the UN and international organizations to respond to biological and chemical terrorism and identified ways to strengthen these capacities.

NPT

Upon its conclusion in 1968, the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was acclaimed as the most important international agreement in the field of disarmament since the nuclear age began and a major success for the cause of peace.

The Treaty was achieved by the efforts of the Eighteen Nations' Disarmament Committee (ENDC now the CCD) in Geneva after years of tough and protracted negotiations. An overwhelming majority of the members of the United Nations commended the Treaty for signature and ratification by States at the resumed session of the XXU UN General Assembly in spring 1968, and after the requisite number of ratifications, the NPT entered into force on 5 March 1970.

As stipulated in Article VIII of the NPT, a Review Conference of the Parties was held in Geneva from 5 to 30 May 1975 to "review the operation of the Treaty with a view to assuring that the purposes of the preamble and the provisions of the Treaty were being realized". At the time of writing, altogether 100 States have either ratified the NPT or acceded to it — the last one to do so being Japan. In number of contractual parties, the NPT is second only to the Moscow Test Ban Treaty among international arms control agreements.

These then are the bare facts and figures in the life of the NPT. However bare, they do bear testimony to the fact of the NPT as the most significant multilateral arms control agreement yet concluded and as a cornerstone in the efforts of the international community to contain the threat posed by the very existence of nuclear weapons. But in political terms, the NPT has assumed a dimension which transcends its importance as a major arms control measure. By its genesis and its impact o.n political relations between States, the NPT has become an integral part of detente, whether we take this to mean a general relaxation of international tensions, the normalization of relations between the major powers or the incipient period of mutual understanding and co-operation in Europe, to which the leading statesmen pledged their nations at the third stage of the

Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe a little more than a year ago in Helsinki.

It is no exaggeration to say that as a means to avert the danger of nuclear war, the NPT serves the general interest of the international community as a whole. In fact it remains the best available instrument for promoting that interest. The main result of the Review Conference was the reaffirmation by the Parties to the Treaty of their faith in the continued validity of this overriding objective and the demonstration of their unity of purpose to strengthen the non-proliferation regime. More than ever, the NPT thus can be seen today as a part of the Law of Nations - as a fundamental norm of international life - which benefits all nations, party and non-party alike.

And yet the NPT is still far from universality! A considerable number of States have stayed outside it — many as an act of deliberate polity. Some of those States try to justify their position by levelling criticism against the Treaty. So do a number of individuals, some of them genuinely interested in disarmament. The detractors of the NPT depict the Treaty as> "discriminatory", "unbalanced", "serving the interests of some States only", "having failed to fulfill the pledges about further progress on disarmament", etc. Admittedly the NPT is not a perfect instrument — far less "the ultimate word of human wisdom". But what the NPT clearly amounts to, is that it is the best instrument for guarding against the dangers of further proliferation of nuclear weapons, if only because it is the only instrument available to the international community for this purpose. It follows that most of the criticism levelled against the NPT is either self-serving, intended to disguise ulterior motives which have nothing to do with the NPT as such or — at best — is based on a misunderstanding of the basic character of the NPT or on a basic lack of understanding of its overriding political significance. It is therefore important to underscore these "basics" without which the NPT can not be seen in its proper context or judged for its intrinsic value.

The Basic Character of the Non-Prol iteration Treaty

The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons is what the name indicates: an international, multilateral treaty, the main purpose of which is to restrict the ownership of nuclear weapons to the five powers — China, France, the United Kingdom, the USSR and the United States of America - which had exploded a nuclear device before

1 January 1967; in other words, to prevent the spread of the ownership of nuclear weapons to other States. The first two paragraphs in the preamble to the Treaty provide the rationale for this goal: "Considering the devastation that would be visited upon all mankind by a nuclear war and the consequent need to make every effort to avert the danger of such a war and to take measures to safeguard the security of peoples; and believing that the proliferation of nuclear weapons would seriously enhance the danger of nuclear war..."

These words clearly express a goal that is in the general interest of the international community as a whole. If the "general interest" is too vague an expression, then let us say that the aim also corresponds to the basic security interests of every State. The NPT remains the best instrument at the disposal of the international community for the promotion of these interests.

The main obligations of the Parties to the Treaty are included in Articles I and II of the Treaty and in the IAEA safeguards system stipulated by Article III. It is perhaps somewhat extreme, but not unreasonable to claim that a non-proliferation treaty that included only these three articles would still be in the interest of a vast majority of States.

However, the Treaty also includes other articles which make it more complete and more balanced. But it is important to constantly keep in mind the main purpose of the Treaty. The NPT contains provisions on co-operation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy, but this does not make it "a treaty on the peaceful uses of nuclear energy". The Treaty speaks about peaceful nuclear explosions, but that does not make it "a treaty about peaceful nuclear explosions". Article VI of the Treaty calls for the continuation of disarmament negotiations, but this does not make it "a treaty on disarmament".

Particularly with regard to disarmament negotiations, there has been a certain tendency to see the NPT as a sort of institutional framework for bargaining. Many non-nuclear-weapon States seem to feel that they have made a basic concession by giving up the so-called nuclear option, a concession for which the nuclear-weapon States must continually pay, for instance, with concessions in the field of disarmament. This in itself is, of course, neither wrong nor unjustified. But bargaining of this kind can become as dangerous as it is based on the belief that the NPT is solely in the interest of the nuclear-weapon States. This ignores the fact that it was the non-nuclear-weapon States who

originated the idea of a NPT. It also ignores the fact that the Treaty is, in terms of security interests, of perhaps greater importance to the non-nuclear-weapon States. It is not unreasonable to contend that the nuclear-weapon States would be able to take care of themselves also in a world in which there were some twenty nuclear-weapon States, i.e. the situation which the NPT was designed to prevent. The non-nuclear-weapon States, however, would be more gravely exposed to the perils of such a situation.

The Political Significance of the Non-Proliferation Treaty

Neither the Non-Proliferation Treaty nor disarmament negotiations in general can be viewed in isolation. Disarmament negotiations are a part and parcel of international politics. They are subject to the same forces and influences as international politics in general.

This article has already made the point that the Non-Proliferation Treaty has become an integral part of the relaxation of international tensions, i.e. of detente. One can go even further and claim that the whole process of detente, particularly in the relations between the USA and the USSR, first took shape at the Geneva disarmament negotiations in the aftermath of the Cuban Missile Crisis. The first important result of the negotiations was the Moscow Test Ban Treaty of 1963. But their most significant achievement to date is the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

The political significance of the Treaty for relations between the major powers stands in even clearer light when we bear in mind that the talks were brought to a successful conclusion in an international situation burdened by armed conflicts in Viet-Nam and the Middle East. But the political focus of the Treaty was then on Europe. Particularly in Europe, the Treaty was a major contribution to detente, the results of which were consecrated at the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. Would Brandt's "Ostpolitik" have been possible without the NPT? Would there have been agreements between the Federal Republic of Germany and the USSR, between the Federal Republic of Germany and Poland, and an agreement about Berlin? Would the normalization of relations between the two Germanys have been achieved and their international status settled? Would there have been a Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe and the MFR talks in Vienna? The conclusion seems obvious and hindsight does not detract from its value.

In assessing the political significance of the NPT, one also has to keep in mind that the SALT negotiations are a direct outgrowth from Article VI of the NPT. In addition to the agreements already achieved and those to be expected on the limitation of strategic nuclear arms and associated measures, the continuing strategic dialogue at the SALT-negotiations has a vital political importance for the relations between the USSR and the USA in the context of detente.

NPT Review Conference

As stipulated in Article VIII of the Treaty, the Conference to review the operation of the NPT was held in Geneva in May 1975. Those critical of the Treaty have tried to make much of the fact that only 58 of a total of 96 States Party to the NPT at the time of the Conference attended it. They fail to point out however, that all the Parties with significant nuclear activities were among those 58 in attendance.

The Review Conference had been carefully prepared through the three sessions of its preparatory committee. Its work was characterized by the intensity of interest which the Parties bring to the NPT, and by the unity of purpose, which found its expression in the Final Declaration of the Conference adopted by consensus. In this context, the role of the President of the Conference, Inga Thorsson, the State Secretary for Foreign Affairs of the Swedish Government, deserves a special tribute.

The main purpose of the Review Conference was to strengthen the Treaty and to ensure its better implementation. In this respect, the Conference achieved what it realistically could be expected to achieve. The Final Declaration of the Conference is essentially a political document. Its main thrust is the reaffirmation by the Parties of their strong support for the NPT and their continued dedication to its principles and objectives. Yet it is also a document of considerable substantive content and simultaneously an action programme for the future. It embodies in fact, not only an assessment of the Parties on how the Treaty so far has performed its role , but gives also rather precise and detailed guidelines on how it can be better implemented in the future.

The conclusions and recommendations included in the Final Declaration of the Review Conference cover the whole spectrum of the provisions of the NPT. The following effort at an analysis, however, concentrates on essential non-proliferation problems: the question of the so called "threshold countries", and the question of

safeguards in the context of the international trade in nuclear materials. These questions are closely interrelated.

The Problem of the "Threshold Countries"

The central provisions of the NPT are contained in its Articles I and II. In these, the nuclear-weapon States agree not to transfer their nuclear weapons to the ownership of nonnuclear-weapon States, and the non-nuclear-weapon States agree not to produce or otherwise acquire them.

As regards the performance of the Treaty on this crucial question, the Conference was able to confirm that Articles I and II had been faithfully observed by all Parties. The Conference expressed as its conviction that the continued strict observance of these Articles remains central to the shared objective of averting the further proliferation of nuclear weapons.

If all the States of the world were Parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, guarantees would already exist that the ownership of nuclear weapons would be restricted to those five countries which are also permanent members of the Security Council and which, in that capacity, have a special responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations. This, however, is not in fact the case. At present the Parties to the NPT include three nuclear-weapon States (the UK, the USSR and the USA) and more than 90 non-nuclear-weapon countries. About 15 other non-nuclear-weapon States have signed the Treaty, but not yet ratified it. While the Review Conference was instrumental in bringing forward a considerable number of new and important adherents — among them five Euratom countries and Japan - the Treaty is still far from universal and this naturally reduces its effectiveness.

Of the nuclear-weapon States, China and France are outside the Treaty, though France has made a public declaration that it shall refrain from action which would contribute to the proliferation of nuclear weapons. France has also co-operated with other major suppliers of nuclear materials and equipment with a view to devising common guidelines to regulate exports of these materials in the interest of nuclear non-proliferation. On political grounds, however, France and China have taken a negative attitude toward the NPT.

Another weakness of the NPT is that many so-called threshold States, i.e. those with a level of research and industry in peaceful applications of nuclear energy which would make the production of nuclear weapons possible, are not Parties to the Treaty. This is the case with States like Argentina, Brazil, India, Israel, Pakistan and South Africa. With the spread of the need for nuclear energy and its application for peaceful purposes the number of such threshold countries is likely to increase. This entails a growing risk for proliferation of nuclear weapons or equivalent nuclear explosive capacity unless the threshold countries can be persuaded to join the NPT or, failing this, unless other means can be found by the present Parties to the Treaty to put effective restraints on the emergence of new threshold countries or on the refinement of the explosive capacities of the present ones.

Until 18 May 1974, it could be said that the Non-Proliferation Treaty had fulfilled its central task. Proliferation of nuclear weapons to new States had not in fact occurred. But on that day the Indian Atomic Energy Commission announced the detonation by India of a peaceful nuclear explosive. India's announcement set off a wave of protest, particularly from those States that have most actively supported the Non-Proliferation Treaty. This concern was not dispelled by the assurances of the Indian Government that the explosion was solely for peaceful purposes and that India had no intention of producing nuclear weapons. The explosion carried out by India was termed a serious setback to the Treaty and to attempts to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons in general.

In assessing these reactions to the Indian explosion, it must be kept in mind that the NonProliferation Treaty makes no distinction between nuclear weapons and other nuclear explosives. The Treaty bans both. The technology involved in both is the same; a State which has developed a peaceful nuclear explosive also has a nuclear weapon in its hands. The difference is only in intentions.

This is the situation in terms of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. India, who is not Party to the Treaty is, of course, under no obligation to accept this interpretation. She can just as well demand understanding for her own point of view, according to which a peaceful nuclear explosion does not mean the proliferation of nuclear weapons. In any case, India's explosion raises anew the entire problem of peaceful nuclear explosions.

Safeguards in the Context of International Trade in Nuclear Materials

In its Final Declaration, the Review Conference recognized that the accelerated spread and development of peaceful applications of nuclear energy will, in the absence of effective safeguards, contribute to further proliferation of nuclear explosive capacity. This rather flat statement defines in a nutshell the basic yilemma of nuclear proliferation, to wit: How to satisfy the legitimate aspirations of nations to benefit from nuclear energy for peaceful purposes while guarding against the dangers of putting its enormous destructive potential in the hands of an evergrowing number of States? This is the very dilemma that the NPT proposes to solve. One of the major tools by which the NPT proposes to solve it, is the control mechanism provided for in Article III of the Treaty.

Article III, which provides for the IAEA safeguards system, has in fact created the most extensive international control mechanism eyer to result from disarmament talks. Control is directed at the nuclear energy industry of the non-nuclear-weapon States. Its purpose is to guarantee that peaceful nuclear energy is not diverted to nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosives. The Article requires the non-nuclear-weapon States that are Parties to the Treaty to conclude a separate bilateral agreement with the IAEA for implementing the safeguards. These agreements have been negotiated within the framework of a model agreement drawn up by the IAEA.

There is no doubt that the experience of the functioning of the IAEA safeguards has been one of the most successful features of the operation of the Treaty. While there is room for improvement in the technical application of safeguards, on the whole the control functions satisfactorily in the countries which are subject to it, i.e. Parties to the NPT. But the problem lies elsewhere. It stems from the fact that all countries are not Parties to the NPT and therefore not subject to the comprehensive control system it provides. The so-called threshold countries, discussed previously are a case in point. And yet even these countries continue to receive nuclear supplies from NPT-countries "in the absence of effective safeguards" which according to the very words of the Review Conference cited above "contribute to further proliferation of nuclear explosive capacity".

The only satisfactory solution to this problem of the so-called supply policies would seem to be the one advocated by the Director General of the IAEA, Dr. Sigvard Eklund, and by an overwhelming majority of the States at the Review Conference.

According to it, NPT Parties exporting nuclear materials and equipment should require membership of the NPT or other arrangements involving the application of safeguards to the complete nuclear fuel cycle of the importing countries as a condition for supply. The enforcement of such a condition would guarantee that Parties to the NPT do not contribute either by commission or omission to the spread of nuclear explosive capacity in contravention to the spirit of the NPT. It would be one of the means by which the present Parties to the Treaty could put effective restraints on the emergence of new threshold countries or on the refinement of the explosive capacities of the present ones.

It is the contention of this writer that Parties to the NPT have an incontrovertible obligation to act in this manner and that they are so obligated not only by the spirit of the NPT but indeed by its letter. In Article I of the NPT; the nuclear-weapon States that are Parties to the Treaty undertake not in any way to assist, encourage or induce any (that means whether Party to the NPT or not) non-nuclear-weapon State to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over them. As fast as supply policies are concerned, a further specification of this basic obligation is contained in Article 111:2 which enjoins all Parties to the Treaty to supply nuclear materials and equipment only subject to IAEA safeguards required by this Article (i.e. NPT safeguards covering the complete nuclear fuel cycle of the recipient).

So much for the legalities of the situation. Practice, however, has been different and has in fact allowed the emergence of the threshold countries. But it is still not too late to try to plug the loopholes, which a shortsighted laxity in observance of the NPT commitments has permitted to develop.

The first steps towards a tightening up of controls in connection with supplies of nuclear materials and equipment have already been taken. In 1974 the so-called Zangger Committee made recommendations about uniform supply policies which were accepted by a number of important supplying States within the framework of the IAEA. In the aftermath of the NPT Review Conference seven most important supplying States started a series of meetings in London. As a result of this work, a set of common guidelines concerning the application of safeguards in connection with exports of nuclear materials and equipment have been agreed upon and have been put in practice as a matter of national policy. The so-called London group has been recently enlarged by the

participation of a number of smaller, yet important exporting States. It is to be hoped that its work, which also covers aspects of the so-called physical protection of nuclear materials, will in time lead to results which will effectively contribute to non-proliferation purposes.

This is as yet not the case. The measures agreed upon so far are — what is called in technical parlance — "facility oriented" - i.e. while safeguarding a particular delivery, installation, technique and technology, they fall short of the requirement of full cycle control as a condition of supply. Yet the enforcement of this requirement presents the only satisfactory solution to the problem of supply policies and was recommended by the Review Conference as such. In absence of full cycle controls, a recipient country X — non-party to the NPT — can continue to develop its peaceful nuclear industry drawing on safeguarded foreign deliveries while concentrating all its indigenous resources and skills on developing a nuclear explosive capacity in unsafeguarded installations.

Why then has it been so difficult to agree on nuclear supply policies which would leave no loopholes for proliferation of nuclear weapons? The most obvious reason are the economic interests involved in nuclear trade, and the commercial competition between different suppliers provide at least part of the answer. The question is simply whether the major nuclear suppliers will be able to recognize their own overriding security interests in preventing proliferation of nuclear explosive capacity, be it at the expense of an immediate, but transient commercial interest. In order to equalize the situation in this regard and to give an economic incentive to supplier States to act in the interest of non-proliferation, the Finnish Government has put forward a suggestion that common export requirements recommended by the Review Conference be complemented by common import requirements. According to this suggestion. Parties to the NPT could consider committing themselves not to import nuclear materials and nuclear equipment from countries which are not Parties to the NPT, or which have not accepted full cycle safeguards or which have not otherwise shown that they follow responsible nuclear export policies. If effected, this suggestion would eliminate any element of distortion of competitive market conditions. It would put at a premium those suppliers which act in the interest of non-proliferation. The democratic candidate in the United States presidential elections. Governor Jimmy Carter, in a speech given on 13 May 1976, gave a very

succinct assessment of the Finnish proposal. He said i.a. the following: "The recent initiative of the Finnish Government along these lines deserves commendation. The Finns have urged a compact among the purchasers of nuclear fuel and technology to buy only from suppliers who require proper safeguards on their exports.

This proposal would convert the alleged advantages to a supplier of breaking ranks and offering "bargains" in safeguards into a commercial disadvantage. Instead of broadening his market by lowering his standards, the supplier would narrow it. There would be fewer purchasers for his dangerous merchandise than if he maintained a common front on safeguards with other suppliers. There would be competition to offer to buyers the safest product at the best price."

The risks of nuclear weapon proliferation inherent in peaceful applications of nuclear energy have been heightened by the prospective spread of technologies relating to particularly sensitive parts of the nuclear fuel cycle, i.e. enrichment and reprocessing. The latter provides a direct source for the main raw material for nuclear weapons — plutonium. Furthermore, the known sales of reprocessing plants would seem to have little, if any justification in economic terms. The NPT Review Conference clearly recognized the dangers involved and also recommended a sensible solution to the problem: the establishment of regional or multinational nuclear fuel cycle centres. This recommendation, which has been under intensive study by the IAEA, makes sense not only from the point of view of nonproliferation but also in economic terms. It has been calculated that in order to be economically profitable, a reprocessing plant would need to serve about 40 power reactors of a 1000 MW each — far exceeding the capacity that any non-nuclear-weapon country is planning in a foreseeable future.

Regional nuclear fuel centres would also facilitate the so-called physical protection of nuclear materials. With the spread of peaceful nuclear energy, attention has been recently focused on the risk that fissionable material might get into wrong hands, i.e. organized crime, terrorist groups, etc. Such groups might obtain or claim to have obtained enough fissionable material for an atomic weapon to use it for blackmail. Again, the Review Conference urged the IAEA to elaborate concrete recommendations on the physical protection of nuclear materials, a question oh which the London group has also taken action.

Since the NPT Review Conference, the Finnish Government has been actively pursuing the goal of the strengthening of the NPT safeguards regime in order to institute international co-operative action to guard against the risks of nuclear weapon proliferation involved in the international trade in nuclear materials. Bilateral consultations on the Finnish suggestion that common export requirements be complemented by common import requirements have been conducted with approximately forty Governments including both major suppliers and receivers of nuclear materials.

In June 1976, the Finnish Government conveyed its views on the subject to the Board of Governors of the IAEA in the form of an official memorandum (see annex). At the 31st session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, the Finnish Delegation introduced a draft resolution on the subject of the strengthening of the IAEA safeguards.

Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)

More than sixty years ago, the beautiful city of Hiroshima, Japan, was devastated by the explosion of an atomic bomb. The bomb released the explosive equivalent of 12,500 tons of Trinitrotoluene (TNT) and killed, outright, or over time by radiation poisoning, nearly 75 per cent of the population of that city. Three days later similar devastation was brought to the city of Nagasaki, Japan, and a few days after that the Second World War, the bloodiest and most destructive in the history of humanity, came to an end.

Many thought then, and in subsequent years, that the attacks on Hiroshima and Nagasaki were the harbingers of the future and that nuclear weapons were destined to spread around the world and be part of future wars, threatening the survival of humanity. These views were reinforced by the commencement in a few years of a vast nuclear arms race with both the United States and the Soviet Union rapidly developing the capability to destroy the earth many times over.

President John F. Kennedy was one of those who feared that nuclear weapons would inherit the earth. There were predictions during his Administration that, by the end of the 1970s there could be 15 to 20 nuclear weapon States in the world, with nuclear weapons fully integrated into their national arsenals. If this had happened, likely there would be twice or more than that many today. In 2004, for example, the Director-General of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Mohamed ElBaradei, asserted that there

were more than 40 States in the world that currently could build nuclear weapons if they so chose. Such a development would have placed the world community in a situation where every conflict would have run the risk of going nuclear and it would have been very difficult to keep nuclear weapons out of the hands of terrorist organizations, they would have been so widespread. Such an international security situation would have been created as to make today's time of troubles seem like paradise by comparison.

But such nuclear weapon proliferation did not happen; President Kennedy's darkest fears were not realized. The principal reason that this did not happen was the entry into force of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) in 1970 along with the related extended deterrence polices of the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War.

The NPT essentially drew the line where the world was in 1970; it recognized five existing nuclear weapon States: the United States, the United Kingdom, France, the Soviet Union (Russian Federation) and China and provided that the rest of the world would agree not to acquire nuclear weapons. And most of the world did agree to that. There are 183 NPT non-nuclear weapon States at present (April 2009). But the NPT did not come as a free gift to the five nuclear weapon States from the rest of the world; rather it is a strategic arrangement founded on a central bargain. That bargain was, and is, nonproliferation in exchange for the sharing of peaceful technology and nuclear disarmament. Nuclear disarmament was perceived by the non-nuclear States as the five nuclear weapon States over the long term agreeing to negotiate away their nuclear arsenals so that ultimately all States would receive equal treatment under the NPT. Since it was recognized that this would take a very long time, the non-nuclear weapon States pressed the nuclear weapon States to agree to interim measures, first and foremost a comprehensive nuclear weapon test-ban treaty, a CTBT. The test ban was included in the preamble of the NPT. NPT Review Conferences several times over the years failed because of disagreement over this issue. The non-nuclear weapon States' view was, and again, is, that if we are going to give up nuclear weapons, at least the five nuclear weapon States could agree to stop testing their weapons.

And in fact the very first disarmament issue of the nuclear era that was discussed was the effort to halt nuclear explosive testing. As early as 1954, Indian Prime Minister

Jawaharlal Nehru proposed a "standstill agreement" on nuclear testing. This disarmament effort began in earnest in 1955 just a year after an incident in which a United States thermonuclear device produced a much larger than expected yield and, as a result, Japanese fishermen aboard the fishing vessel Lucky Dragon were struck by fallout outside the area of the central Pacific cordoned off for testing by the United States Government. Fallout from a Soviet test fell on Japan the same year, and later concerns began to be expressed about the byproducts of nuclear explosions entering the food chain – most notably high levels of strontium 90 in milk. During the 1956 United States Presidential campaign, Democratic candidate Adlai Stevenson suggested a moratorium on nuclear testing. Stevenson's proposal was denounced during the campaign. In 1957, United States President Dwight D. Eisenhower proposed a two-year suspension of testing with an inspection system to ensure compliance with such an undertaking. The Soviet Union rejected the conditions and instead announced a unilateral moratorium on testing.

President Eisenhower responded to the Soviet moratorium by proposing a meeting of technical experts to discuss issues related to verifying a test ban. The Conference of Experts met in July and August 1958; it included scientists from the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Canada, the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia and Romania. On August 21, the Conference issued a report indicating that adherence to a comprehensive test ban treaty could be verified with a network of some 160 to 170 landbased monitoring stations. The following day, President Eisenhower proposed a one-year testing moratorium, and in the fall trilateral test ban negotiations began among the United States, the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom. While progress was made on numerous issues in the negotiations, concerns about verification emerged.

In 1960, France conducted its first nuclear test in the Sahara Desert, and in 1961 the Soviet Union broke the moratorium begun in 1958 with the largest nuclear explosion of all times (approximately 58 megatons). The United States responded with a vigorous test series. In January 1962, the trilateral negotiations were indefinitely adjourned, and in April 1962 the United States resumed atmospheric testing.

Thereafter, there was a renewed effort to move toward a test ban, with verification and inspection issues remaining the principal stumbling blocks. The United States wanted on-site inspections and unmanned seismic stations on Soviet territory. The Soviets

accepted both in principle, but the two sides could not agree on the numbers; at the closest point of the negotiation, the United States wanted the right to seven inspections per year and the Soviets would only agree to three. The same was true for remote sensors – the principle was agreed upon, the numbers were not.

In order to bypass the stalemate and at the same time address the environmental issues associated with atmospheric nuclear testing, President John F. Kennedy, in a June 1963 commencement address at the American University, proposed a treaty banning nuclear tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space. The Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT), which was negotiated in ten days in July 1963 and entered into force in October 1963, resolved the most prominent environmental issues, but – except for the United States/Soviet Threshold Test Ban Treaty and Peaceful Nuclear Explosion Treaty in 1974 and 1976, respectively (which established a 150 kiloton limit on nuclear explosions) – it led to more than twenty-five years of inaction on a comprehensive test ban. Ironically, the LTBT eased much of the public pressure to end testing, and with underground tests still allowed, a considerable increase in the number of tests followed.

If the United States and the Soviet Union were inactive on the test ban, however, the rest of the world was not. In the late 1960s the NPT was negotiated based on the aforementioned central bargain. From the beginning, the non-nuclear weapon States viewed the CTBT as the litmus test in judging whether nuclear weapon States were upholding their end of the bargain. For twenty years after the NPT entered into force in 1970, as stated, most of the NPT Review Conferences – held every five years – essentially failed over the issue of the United States and Soviet commitment to completing a CTBT.

But then there began to be movement. In 1990 Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev announced a Soviet nuclear test moratorium, which was continued by the Russian Federation after the collapse of the Soviet Union. President Francois Mitterand of France – apparently to the surprise of his military – announced a French moratorium in 1992. In the fall of that year the United States Congress passed the Hatfield-Mitchell-Exon legislation, which called upon the United States to pursue a CTBT and provided for the immediate commencement of a nine-month testing moratorium. The Hatfield-

Mitchell Exxon legislation had the effect of forcing the Clinton Administration to make key decisions relating to a CTBT in the spring of 1993.

Accordingly, after a long struggle within the United States Government, on 3 July 1993, President Bill Clinton announced that, looking toward a CTBT, he was continuing the moratorium in the legislation until September 1994 (renewable each year thereafter until a CTBT was achieved). Negotiations began in early 1994 in the Conference on Disarmament, but for a long time progress was slow. Gradually a draft treaty began to take shape. Progress in this regard was significantly aided by a United States decision in January 1995 to extend its testing moratorium and drop its proposal for a right to withdraw from the treaty in ten years after its entry into force, and by an August 1995 decision to support a true zero-yield test ban.

In April/May 1995, the NPT parties came together for the long awaited Review and Extension Conference. In 1968, when the NPT was signed, most of the negotiating parties intended to give the NPT permanent status as was, and is, the custom with multilateral arms control treaties. However, three States objected; Sweden, Germany and Italy, who did not want to forswear nuclear weapons forever because they were uncertain as to whether the NPT would in fact be effective and because they were concerned about the commercial impact of its safeguard system. The compromise reached gave the NPT a twenty-five year life and then on a one-time basis, a decision by majority vote of the parties in a conference as to the length of the remaining life of the treaty – without reference to national legislatures. Thus, in 1995, to secure for the world community the permanent protection of the NPT, it was crucial to achieve a majority at the Conference for an indefinite NPT extension. After a great effort by many countries this was achieved (indeed the NPT was extended indefinitely by a consensus decision), but the principal political price paid for this landmark achievement was the agreement by all the parties to conclude a CTBT in one year – by the end of 1996.

In January 1996, CTBT talks in Geneva were again stalled, this time by an Indian proposal to include a provision in the treaty that the nuclear weapon States agree to a timebound framework for nuclear disarmament and by a Chinese proposal to allow peaceful nuclear explosions (PNEs) for such things as civil engineering projects. While

India's condition would not be included in the treaty, and India would later refuse to support the agreement, China dropped its demand that PNEs be allowed in June 1996.

For many years, indeed throughout the long history of negotiations toward a CTBT, verification of compliance had been a separate issue. Over time, a broad consensus, based on considerable work by scientific personnel, developed in Geneva on a technical basis as to the means required to provide effective verification for a CTBT. This included improvements to and expansion of the worldwide seismic network, as well as radionuclide, hydro acoustic, and infrasound monitoring. All these systems were agreed to be incorporated into a vast international monitoring system established under the treaty. The primary system would consist of 50 seismic stations worldwide to monitor underground events (earthquakes and explosions) and 120 auxiliary stations, 80 radionuclide laboratories to monitor radioactive particles associated with a nuclear explosion, 11 hydro acoustic stations to listen for explosions under water, and 60 infrasound stations to monitor sound waves in the atmosphere. The data produced by these facilities flow continuously into an international data center, which is part of the technical secretariat of the CTBT Organization (CTBTO), located in Vienna, Austria. The data are stored, analyzed, and disseminated as appropriate and will be used to address compliance concerns, including decisions on requests for on-site inspections. Importantly, the treaty provides for the right of the States parties to use national technical means (e.g., information from United States satellite monitoring – as well as potentially from other States) for verification, particularly to evaluate on-site inspection requests (which after a long negotiation it was agreed would be authorized by an affirmative vote by at least thirty of the fifty-one technical secretariat members).

One of the most significant challenges to completing the negotiations came in July 1996 in the form of a confrontation with India over article XIV, which establishes the conditions under which the CTBT would enter into force. Essentially, China and the Russian Federation, supported by the United Kingdom, took the position that the three threshold States (India, Pakistan and Israel), particularly India, had to be necessary parties for the CTBT to enter into force. Most notably, the Chinese made it very clear that they would not undertake a legal commitment to stop testing unless India did the same. Accordingly, to avoid singling out India, Pakistan and Israel in the final draft text,

Ambassador Jaap Raamaker of the Netherlands, the 1996 Chair of the Conference on Disarmament ad hoc committee for the negotiations, fashioned an entry into force article that made all States that were members of the Conference on Disarmament and that had nuclear facilities on their territory (forty-four, including the Democratic People's Republic of Korea) necessary parties to entry into force of the CTBT. In addition there would be a conference on entry into force three years after the treaty was opened for signature – and as necessary every year thereafter – to discuss ways of facilitating entry into force. At Chinese insistence, the conference was to have no power to bring the CTBT into force or to make changes to the entry into force requirements, just to discuss how to do it.

By August 1996, most outstanding issues had been resolved (except India agreeing to article XIV). The Indians announced that they would break consensus and block the treaty from being sent to the United Nations to be opened for signature, as was the Conference on Disarmament practice. After several procedural steps, India did just that: it blocked the ad hoc committee from submitting its report to the Conference on Disarmament plenary, and it blocked the forwarding of the completed draft treaty to the United Nations without the report. Clearly, it had become necessary to bypass the Conference on Disarmament and introduce the CTBT into the United Nations General Assembly in New York directly. The United States approached the traditional troika group (Mexico, New Zealand and Australia) that each year for some time had introduced a resolution in the General Assembly calling for a CTBT, to introduce a resolution approving the opening for signature of the attached draft of a CTBT (the Conference on Disarmament draft). Only Australia was willing to take the step introducing such a resolution. The resolution was introduced and after floor debate, it passed by a vote of 158 to 3: India, Bhutan and Iraq voted no and Cuba, Lebanon, Syria, Mauritius and Tanzania abstained.

The treaty was opened for signature on 24 September 1996. The United States was the first to sign, and eventually 179 other nations followed suit. As of April 2009, there were 148 ratifications, including the United Kingdom, France, the Russian Federation and Japan, but only thirty-five of the required forty-four had ratified. Several of the nine remaining States, such as China, Israel, and perhaps India, were waiting for

the United States, but the United States Senate rejected ratification of the CTBT in October 1999 and the treaty still languishes in the Senate.

Article I of the CTBT sets forth its basic obligations. A party is not to carry out any nuclear test explosion or any other nuclear explosion, is to prohibit any such explosion at any place under its jurisdiction and control, and is to refrain from causing or participating in the carrying out of any other nuclear explosion. This language is based on the LTBT, but does not specify the four environments (i.e., atmosphere, outer space, under water and underground) set forth in the LTBT. To avoid argument over possible loopholes, the ban on nuclear explosives is universal. The phrase "any other nuclear explosion" is included to make it clear that the ban extends to so-called peaceful nuclear explosions, which explosions the Chinese advocated exempting during the negotiations and are similar to what the Soviets had advocated during the Threshold Test Ban Treaty negotiations of the 1970s.

Article II establishes the CTBTO to ensure the implementation of the treaty and to provide a forum for consultation and cooperation among States parties. Article IV and the Verification Protocol establish the extensive verification regime to ensure compliance with the basic obligations as described above. The regime is designed to monitor seismic and other events and to detect nuclear explosions anywhere in the world in order to deter possible efforts to evade the ban on testing. The verification regime consists of the International Monitoring System, with global seismological, radionuclide, hydroacoustic, and infrasound sensor networks; on-site inspection, consultation and clarification provisions; and confidence-building measures involving voluntary data exchanges. The treaty allows the States parties to use information gathered through national technical means for verification and as the basis for on-site inspection requests.

The treaty may be amended with the approval of a simple majority of the States parties, but with no State party casting a negative vote (article VII). The treaty will be subject to review by all States parties ten years after entry into force (and may be reviewed every ten years thereafter per article VIII). The treaty is of unlimited duration, although each State party has the right to withdraw from the treaty if it decides that extraordinary events related to the treaty's subject matter have jeopardized its "supreme interests" (article IX).

If the CTBT enters into force it will have a profound impact on the international security treaty structure. As said, the CTBT is the single most important element of the obligations of the NPT nuclear weapon States undertaken pursuant to article VI of the NPT. It is the barometer by which the non-nuclear weapon NPT parties judge the health of the NPT basic bargain and the underlying viability of the Treaty. The entry into force of the CTBT will rejuvenate the NPT and make the world a safer place.

Beyond this, a CTBT in force will mean it will no longer be possible to develop new types of sophisticated nuclear weapons and with the strength of the worldwide International Monitoring System behind it will make it impossible for additional States to acquire nuclear weapons except those of the crudest type, too heavy and unwieldy to be mated with a missile system. An operating CTBT regime will be a step toward the ultimate goal of eliminating nuclear weapons worldwide.

Concepts – India's Nuclear Policy

The Purpose of India's Nuclear Weapons

Indian leaders have generally considered nuclear weapons at best a necessary evil. Prime Ministers Lal Bahadur Shastri and Rajiv Gandhi sought international solutions to avoid committing to nuclear weapons; Prime Minister Morarji Desai shut down the weapons program for a time. Even Prime Minister Atal Vajpayee, who ordered the nuclear tests in 1998, was more ambivalent two decades earlier, siding with Desai in voting against restarting the nuclear weapons program in 1979. As a number of analysts have concluded, growing nuclear threats and a progressively unaccommodating global nuclear order forced New Delhi to move towards a declared nuclear arsenal in the 1990s. This discomfort with nuclear weapons has defined the manner in which India has viewed nuclear weapons.

Much of the Indian debate about nuclear weapons between the 1960s and the 1990s did not consider how nuclear weapons might be used within the framework of Indian strategy. The arguments and propositions largely revolved around whether India should go nuclear, not what India should do with nuclear weapons. It was only in the 1980s that some Indian strategists such as K. Subrahmanyam and General K. Sundarji started writing about what nuclear weapons might be useful for. This also coincided with greater attention among decision-makers to such questions. Both Sundarji and

Subrahmanyam argued that the kind of bloated nuclear arsenals that the US and the Soviet Union developed during the Cold War were unnecessary and wasteful. Nuclear deterrence could be had at far cheaper cost, with a relatively small arsenal. In essence, as Tellis has argued, what Sundarji and Subrahmanyam were suggesting was a view of nuclear weapons that emphasized its political rather than military utility, its deterrence rather than war-fighting capability. This view of the political utility of nuclear weapons is also reflected in arguments about nuclear weapons providing political space and strategic autonomy, arguments that former Indian Foreign Minister Jaswant Singh has made. Not surprisingly, the eventual Indian nuclear deterrent emphasized small numbers and a capability to retaliate, rather than building a deterrent force that would have parity with other nuclear powers.

But the notion that nuclear weapons are political tools is primarily about how India views the usability of nuclear weapons. It does not extend to India's views about how other states, particularly Pakistan, might see nuclear weapons. In fact Indian views about what nuclear weapons in others' hands might do are highly pessimistic, assuming implicitly that other states might not be as responsible as New Delhi is or has been. India's view on nuclear proliferation is one indicator of this deeply pessimistic view that India has of the possibility of nuclear weapons use by other states. Though India objected to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT), it has seen proliferation itself as a threat to international stability and has repeatedly touted its "exemplary non-proliferation record of four decades and more." Thus the Indian view of the spread of nuclear weapons is fundamentally different from the 'more may be better' arguments of proliferation optimists such as Kenneth Waltz, or even the radical rejection of the concept of non-proliferation by China prior to 1991. Indian officials do not think that nuclear weapons have stabilized the region; rather they believe that nuclear weapons in Pakistani hands increase the nuclear risk in the region because Pakistan is seen as irresponsible. This fits a larger pattern of contradiction which assumes that other powers, Pakistan in particular, will not be as responsible as India has been.

Indian views about missile defenses are a further indication of the contradiction in Indian views about nuclear weapons. If nuclear weapons are essentially political weapons, not usable in fighting wars, the logic of missile defenses seems difficult to

understand: clearly missile defenses are needed only if one assumes that nuclear weapons are going to be used. Nevertheless, New Delhi has pursued a ballistic missile defence (BMD) system since at least the mid-1990s. India's search for an appropriate BMD system appears linked to the growth of Pakistan's missile delivery capability, including the transfer of Chinese missiles such as the M-11. As with nuclear weapons, the search for a BMD system has continued despite changes of political leadership and ideology in New Delhi. At various times, India has sought the Russian-built S-300, the Israeli-American Arrow, and the US-built Patriot ballistic missile defence systems. India is also thought to have a domestic BMD system in development, built around the still under-development Akash Surface-to-Air missile (SAM). New Delhi's decade-long search has been unsuccessful possibly because Indian decision-makers have not given sufficient thought to what kind of system India needs. Indeed, it is not clear how missile defenses will fit into the existing Indian nuclear doctrine. India's official nuclear doctrine has made no mention of a missile defence system, and it is unlikely that the war-fighting orientation of missile defenses will sit well with the political/deterrence driven sentiment that dominates the nuclear doctrine. None of the Indian governments that have been in power since 1995 have given any reason why they want missile defences, though the issue had created dissension among some of allies of the United Progressive Alliance (UPA) government when it included communist parties because New Delhi has been seeking to buy a US-built system based on the Patriot PAC-3. Thus India's view of nuclear weapons suggests an element of inconsistency: nuclear weapons are essentially political weapons and unusable militarily by India, but other states might not be as restrained. As a consequence, India both opposes the spread of nuclear weapons and pursues BMDs.

India's Changing Nuclear Doctrine

India's nuclear doctrine, in its declaratory form if not in its operational variation, has undergone some changes since it was first announced in August 1999. The 1999 doctrine was produced by the National Security Advisory Board (NSAB), a group of non-governmental experts, and its status was thus somewhat suspect. Indeed, the government formally claimed that the doctrine was not the official doctrine. However, much of what was stated by the NSAB in the "unofficial" nuclear doctrine was what had already been

stated by various government officials, including the prime minister, at different times in and out of parliament. The only major difference between the various official statements and what was stated in the NSAB's nuclear doctrine was that the NSAB document discussed the need for a nuclear triad for India, which the government had not acknowledged until then but which was both logical and unsurprising. Thus, the government's coyness about the doctrine was probably unnecessary.

In any case, when some details of the Indian nuclear doctrine were officially released in January 2003 it in many ways stuck to some of the main elements of the 1999 doctrine though there were some important differences. The 2003 nuclear doctrine was released as a brief press statement, but it did state the key elements of the doctrine. The actual nuclear doctrine is reported to be a much more comprehensive document. Below I briefly outline the main elements of the 1999 doctrine and the changes made in the 2003 version.

The 1999 doctrine suggested a nuclear doctrine that was based on an unspecified minimum force but one which would also be credible and survivable. In addition, India would not use nuclear weapons first (no-first use of nuclear weapons or NFU) and will not use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear countries (Negative Security Assurance or NSA). The doctrine emphasized the need for credible nuclear forces that would be able to survive a first strike against it as well as the need for strict political control over nuclear forces. The NSAB document also emphasized India's nuclear disarmament objectives. None of these were new: what was new, however, was that the doctrine also talked about a nuclear triad of aircraft, long-range ballistic missiles and submarine-launched ballistic missiles.

In January 2003, the government released a brief press statement (of just 349 words) that revealed some aspects of the 'official' nuclear doctrine. From the press statement, it is unclear when this doctrine was formulated and its relationship to the 1999 doctrine, though it could be read as having been the official doctrine for a while. The press statement revealed that many of the elements of the Indian nuclear doctrine was the same as in the 1999 doctrine, but a number of caveats had been added, and some pledges especially that of the NFU and non-use against non-nuclear powers had been diluted. There were also details about command and control aspects that were new.

There were at least three variations of note in the new doctrine. First was the introduction of the notion of 'massive' retaliation to a nuclear attack on India. The 1999 doctrine had only talked of a 'punitive' retaliation that would cause 'unacceptable' damage. It is still unclear why this change was introduced, and indeed whether this was a change at all because some key individuals who presumably had a role in drafting the doctrine appeared unaware of the consequence of the change in such key concepts. A cynical but plausible interpretation is that this was simply public braggadocio, especially since the press release came in the wake of India's failed attempt at coercive diplomacy in the aftermath of the terrorist attack on the Indian parliament in December 2001. Whatever the interpretation of these words, there was little explication either in the press statement or subsequently about the meaning or logic of this change.

The second significant variation was the dilution of both India's NFU pledge as well as the pledge not to attack non-nuclear countries (NSA). The original NFU pledge and the NSA pledge not only in the 1999 doctrine but also in various official statements in and out of parliament was without any qualifiers. But in the 2003 version, there is an important qualifier: India will consider the use of nuclear weapons in response to a 'major attack' on India or on Indian forces anywhere with chemical or biological weapons (CBW). This dilutes both the NFU pledge as well as the pledge not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear states. It dilutes the NFU pledge because India could use nuclear weapons first against nuclear powers which decide to use chemical or biological weapons against India. For example, if Pakistan uses chemical weapons against India, India might use nuclear weapons in retaliation, though in such cases, New Delhi would also be violating its NFU pledge. Similarly, it dilutes the NSA because New Delhi could potentially use nuclear weapons against a state that does not have nuclear weapons. Hypothetically, if a country such as Bangladesh were to use chemical weapons against India, Indian leaders might be forced to consider the use of nuclear weapons in retaliation for such an attack, even if it is clear that Bangladesh does not possess nuclear weapons, thus violating India's non-attack against non-nuclear countries pledge. These contradictions have either not been thought through by those who framed the doctrine or else they have not taken these modifications seriously.

Interviews with Indian officials have suggested two reasons for such changes. First, since India no longer has CBW, it has only nuclear weapons to deter potential CBW use against India. The argument appears to be that there is a potential that Indian territory or forces might come under chemical or biological weapon attack from a non-nuclear country or even a terrorist entity but would be unable to respond because of the earlier blanket pledge on NFU. The second reason is that these changes reflect the government's response to domestic criticism about the NFU pledge being too weak to deal with potential threats. I suspect that the second reason is closer to the truth. Once again, the timing of these changes is significant. By late 2002, New Delhi was feeling particularly frustrated with Pakistan's support for terror and India's inability to do much about it, as well as the failure of Operation Parakram (the military mobilization in 2001–2002). A muscular nuclear doctrine may have been seen as one way of responding to this frustration. On the other hand, it is unclear if the government considered the problems of what Scott Sagan had called the 'commitment trap'. Sagan had argued that making such a commitment might force decision-makers into either using nuclear weapons unnecessarily or create credibility problems that will end up diluting deterrence. This will happen because unless you carry out your threats, threats on which your deterrence depends might not be very credible in the future. Thus leaders and decision-makers have to be careful and prudent about the deterrence threats they make in order to make sure that these are actually threats that can be carried out if the contingency arose. There is little indication that the implications of these contradictions have been considered seriously by the government. In any case, the 2003 press statement remains the only official statement of India's nuclear doctrine to date.

India's Assured Retaliation Strategy

Though Indian officials continue to characterize the nuclear doctrine as one of minimum deterrence, I have characterized it elsewhere as 'assured retaliation'.14 Minimum deterrence is politically attractive because it suggests limited goals and a responsible attitude towards nuclear weapons. Though this largely reflects India's approach towards nuclear weapons, the changes that have taken place in the doctrine, especially the dilution of the NFU and NSA pledges and the reference to massive

retaliation all suggest that assured retaliation is a better characterization of India's nuclear strategy than 'credible minimum deterrence'.

Assured retaliation includes the NFU pledge, with the problematic caveats noted earlier. It also includes the certainty of retaliation, but there is little indication that such retaliation will take place prior to an enemy attack striking India. Indian leaders appear content to wait until an attack has already landed on Indian soil before considering retaliation. In other words, there are no declaratory or operational indicators that suggest that India might adopt either a launch-on-warning (LOW) or a launch-under-attack (LUA) posture for its nuclear force. Indeed, Indian nuclear forces are still reportedly kept de-alerted and de-mated, which would obviate LOW or LUA strategies. Such a posture assumes that there will be considerable time between an attack and an order to retaliate because it will be many hours before the various components of India's nuclear forces can be brought together and mated for delivery. This might change once India's nuclear submarines assume a strategic deterrent role because India will then have to keep its submarine-based nuclear weapons mated, but it is unlikely that the nuclear submarine component of India's strategic forces would be ready for many more years.

Assured retaliation as strategy also includes massive retaliation, though this has certain other well-recognized problems. First, it is not very credible to threaten massive retaliation under all circumstances. For example, it will be difficult for Indian decision-makers to justify a massive retaliatory attack against Pakistan if Pakistan had only used one nuclear warhead to attack an advancing Indian military column inside Pakistani territory. Though this is an extreme scenario, it is possible to think of other scenarios of a limited Pakistani nuclear use in the context of a military confrontation between India and Pakistan. The massive retaliation doctrine will then force Indian leaders on to the horns of a dilemma: either stick to the doctrine and launch an unjustifiably large retaliation, or suffer the loss of credibility of not sticking to the doctrine.

Second, massive retaliation might force any potential adversary to also plan a massive attack and potentially a plan a counter-force first-strike as part of a damage limitation strategy. In other words, if Pakistan is convinced that India will launch a massive retaliation irrespective of the size of the original Pakistan attack, then Pakistan would have little reason to keep their nuclear first strike limited. After all why keep your

first blow limited —and risk losing your own nuclear forces in an Indian retaliation— if New Delhi will in any case retaliate massively ? New Delhi does not appear to recognize that its own choices can affect the choices of potential adversaries, sometimes with negative consequences for India.

Of course, one potential positive consequence also needs to be kept in mind. If an adversary thinks that India might actually carry out a massive retaliation and that no nuclear war was likely to remain limited to isolated or discrete nuclear exchanges, it could force them to reconsider any offensive plans. The choice for an attacker then would be all or nothing: such drastic choices might be unpalatable.

India's Nuclear Capabilities

India's nuclear capabilities are not known with any certainty. India is thought to have anywhere between 70 and 100 nuclear warheads. These are reportedly kept de-mated, with components in the hands of different agencies. Such a posture ensures greater safety for the nuclear assets and reduces the likelihood of accidents and inadvertent use of nuclear weapons. But there have been murmurs within the armed services about the feasibility of keeping weapons and delivery vehicles separated and about the smoothness and speed of integrating them. Given the sensitivity of the topic, obviously little is known about either the procedures or any problems.

India has significant stores of fissile materials, as much as ten tons. This would be sufficient for as many as 1000 warheads if it were all to be used for nuclear warheads. However, most of this stockpile appears intended for feeding India's indigenously built fast breeder reactors. Though that should eventually yield an even larger stockpile, India is not thought to have enough reprocessing capability to convert this to weapons-grade plutonium.

India's nuclear delivery capability has grown very slowly. Though the Indian guided missile development programme is almost a quarter century old, it has yet to develop a long-range missile capable of targeting all of China. Even the current underdevelopment long-range missile, the Agni-3, has a range of only 3500 kilometers which is too short to target much of China. The Agni-3 has now been tested four times, the fourth test being conducted by the Army as a user trial. Nevertheless, it will be some time before the missile is deployed with the Indian strategic forces. The rumors that an

even longer range missile, the Agni-5, is under development have now been officially confirmed by senior defence research officials. The Agni-5 will have a range of more than 5000 kilometers, allowing it to target much of China. The Agni-5 development is expected to begin shortly, and the first test should happen within two years.

India' current ballistic missile and combat aircraft are sufficient, however, for targeting Pakistan. India has a number of missiles including the Prithvi, the Agni-1 and Agni-2, as well as the Agni-3 for targeting Pakistan. India has a number of combat aircraft too which can be used as delivery vehicle vis-à-vis Pakistan, including the Jaguar, the Mirage-2000 and the Su-30.

India is also developing a sea-based deterrent in the form of a nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine. The first of these missile submarines, the Arihant, has been launched, though it will be some time before the submarine will be ready for sea-trial and even longer before it joins the deterrent force. Two more submarines of the same type are planned. What missile they will carry is unclear, with contradictory reports in the India media. It is also unclear how New Delhi will deal with the command and control issues that are raised by these platforms, including the thorny issue of how to keep these weapons de-mated in a submarine. Indian civilian leaders has consistently emphasized political control over these weapons, but maintaining political control over nuclear weapons in submarines has been a problem for all countries that have opted to put nuclear missiles in submarines.

The most notable aspect of the nuclear weapons capabilities has been their rather slow development. It has taken India a quarter century to develop even intermediate range missiles such as the Agni-3, and it has yet to develop one with intercontinental ranges. Similarly, the number of India's warhead stockpile has grown only very slowly. On the other hand, it is unclear what final state of capabilities India is aiming at, either in terms of the warheads or in terms of delivery vehicles. These decisions have probably not been finalized, and are likely to remain flexible to respond to changing strategic requirements.

The Implications of the US–India Nuclear Deal

The US–India nuclear deal was essential to India because India's traditional approach towards nuclear cooperation had reached a dead-end. Traditionally, India

sought international nuclear cooperation, even while maintaining a nuclear weapons program, by agreeing to partial safeguards on nuclear imports. This strategy allowed India to supplement its domestic nuclear power capability with international cooperation, as long as there were willing international partners. However, when the rules of international nuclear commerce changed from partial safeguards (safeguards only on the specific imported item) to full-scope safeguards (safeguards on the entire nuclear program as a condition for any nuclear commerce), India was faced with the choice of either giving up its nuclear weapons program, or giving up on international nuclear commerce. Not surprisingly, India chose the latter. What the US–India nuclear deal does is give India the option yet again to both keep its nuclear weapons program while also preserving its access to international nuclear commerce. The issue had become even more vital for India because India's explosive economic growth has put much greater strains on its electricity generation capacity, leading to peak power shortages of as such as 11 percent. Now that the nuclear deal is complete, and India has the necessary waiver from the NSG that permits other nuclear powers such as France and Russia to supply India with civilian nuclear technology, India is expected to significantly enhance its civilian nuclear power sector with international cooperation. Indeed, several agreements have already been signed to bring to fruition additional nuclear power generating capacity and more nuclear power agreements are expected to be signed over the next two years.

The nuclear deal is unlikely to have major impact on India's nuclear weapons program. In the last two decades, ever since India went nuclear in the late 1980s, India has only built a few dozen nuclear warheads. Most estimates suggest that India has enough fissile material for about 65 –110 warheads, with some estimates suggesting even lower numbers. If we assume a median of 85 warheads, it would suggest that India has only built, on average, about four warheads a year. This suggests that India feels no great pressure to rapidly increase its arsenal. The suggestion, by some arms control experts, that access to foreign nuclear fuel will free India's domestic fuel resources for weapons does not hold much water because India has much larger stockpiles of fuel (about one ton) that it could have converted for weapons if it had wanted to do so. In other words, the small size of the Indian nuclear force is the consequence of deliberate choice rather than because of any fissile material shortage.

International Terrorism

The word 'terrorism' has emerged from the Latin verbs 'terrere' and 'deterre' which means an act to tremble and frighten respectively. It implies a strategy to achieve avowed objectives via the systematic use of violence thereby undermining the lawful authority of a government or a state. When the ruling authorities or the state fails to redress the grievances of the people and resorts to oppression and an undue infringement on their rights, it becomes imperative for the terrorists to make the concerned authorities accept their perspective by means of terror. Terrorism thus particularly has political overtures as it seeks to influence politics and governmental behaviour through in an adverse manner. But terrorist activities are sometimes tacitly applauded by the public as the terrorists succeed in making explicit the failures of the political machinery. It follows that governments which are involved in large scale abuse of its powers become vulnerable to such attacks by the terrorists. However terrorists may estrange themselves from the community if their activities directly hamper the economy of the concerned country and result in a loss of jobs.

Terrorism does not have an universally accepted definition. As it is the cheapest way to fight without actually going to war terrorist practices have been prevalent always in all parts of the globe and has left it scar in every stages of history. But it had become popular only during the 1790's and henceforth, when revolutionary France sought to do away with the aristocracy and its concomitants.

Origin

As terrorism is a worldwide phenomenon, any related act involves several nations thereby making the process a complicated one. ~h essential precondition of international terrorism calls for international linkages between terrorist organisations and groups. Their use of violence at times makes their goals and objectives obscured. These groups . however exchange equipments, involve themselves in combine operation planning, avail the benefits of each others training areas and support each other from the administrative and logical points of view. The terrorist in fact considers the world as a stage where their problems, intentions and imaginations are made public. 'I'hey have no regard for their national boundaries. They belong to one country, achieve their training in some other country, get their finances and operate in some other different countries. Technological

advancements have introduced new kinds of weapons and explosives in the fields of terrorism. Moreover the entry of criminals on an individual plane and the mergence of criminal gangs have changed the character of terrorism from being a politically motivated one to a criminally motivated one which comparatively is more dangerous.

Types of International Terrorism

Types of International Terrorism Terrorism are of varied kinds no matter at which level it operates. -They .are:

- Discriminate and Indiscriminate Terrorism: This distinction is based on the activities undertaken by the terrorists. The former can be easily comprehended as discriminate terrorists attack their obvious enemies. All their victims are either combatants or potential billigerents. Such terrorism thus has an element of justification. The latter is always difficult to understand as in it people are indiscriminately attacked. Innocent public may be perceived as legitimate targets because they happen to be at the sight of the attack. The cause of such an attack is difficult to determine as it has no justification behind it.
- Right wing terrorism and Left wing Terrorism: The former involves themselves in pro-government activities and are reactionary in nature. The latter emerge from the intellectual class of the society and have a strong desire to move the economy in the right direction. Some of them may address one particulai problem and adopt terror related methods to publicise their cause and hence gain a sympathetic hearing.
- Nationalists and separatists: Such terrorists are imbued with a sense of nationhood and want their state or temtory to be returned back so that their land is recognised as an independent entity in the pages of history. The desire what they perceive to be originally belonging to them.

9/11

A recent poll asked American adults to identify "the single most significant event that has happened in your lifetime, in terms of its importance to the U.S. and the world." Two percent of respondents pointed to the collapse of communism; three percent cited the Vietnam War; six percent named the Iraq War. Only one event elicited substantial

agreement among respondents: fully 46 percent of those polled cited the attacks of September 11, 2001, as the most significant occurrence in their lifetime

In light of these results, it is not surprising that shortly after 9/11, many nonprofit organizations, for-profit publishers, and even the federal government developed curricular materials on 9/11 and its aftermath. As one curriculum writer explained, "The attacks of 9/11 are just too important to ignore. They present the ultimate teachable moment."

While there was strong agreement that 9/11 deserved inclusion in the curriculum, precisely what students should learn about 9/11 and its aftermath was a point of contention. Many prominent conservatives took umbrage at what they interpreted as classroom responses designed to foster a critique of the U.S., while many from the opposite side of the political spectrum worried that 9/11 would be exploited to promote a jingoistic form of nationalism. This disagreement was foreseeable. Evidence shows that schools in the U.S. are rife with conflict about which ideologies merit official recognition. More significantly, schools are one laboratory in which ideologies that often become dominant are formed. This undoubtedly explains why there was so much controversy after 9/11 about what teachers and curricula should communicate regarding what happened on 9/11, why the attacks occurred, and what response from the U.S. was justified and prudent.

Given that schools not only reflect "official knowledge" but contribute to shaping it, it follows that studying teaching materials written about 9/11 can shed light on the narratives that dominate this area of our national discourse, along with what is presented as "true" about 9/11 and its aftermath. Moreover, this analysis provides an opportunity to assess the differences among materials produced by non-profit organizations, the government, and for-profit companies.

To that end, in 2003 we began studying the content of 9/11 text and video curriculum materials from six major U.S. non-profit curricular organizations, along with a video and accompanying lessons developed by the U.S. Department of State. 3 (All were published within one year after 9/11.) In the summer of 2005, we broadened the study to include topselling U.S. history, world history, and government textbooks that

were published between 2004 and 2006 and that addressed the events of 9/11 and the war on terrorism.

The Ubiquity and Malleability of 9/11

When we embarked on this study, we were struck by the number of organizations that quickly distributed social studies curriculum materials on 9/11; a few years later, we were again struck by the prominent attention given to the attacks of 9/11 in social studies textbooks published by major corporations. Clearly, 9/11 and its aftermath were seen as important topics that deserved curricular attention—but what 9/11 is important for, and how it fits into the curriculum, differs widely depending on the overall purpose of the organization or the topic of the textbook. Non-profit organizations used 9/11 in ways that aligned with their missions, while textbooks treated 9/11 in ways that are directly linked to the subject of the books. For example, the Choices for the 21st Century Project at Brown University focuses primarily on foreign policy decision making. While their foreign policy materials always look beyond U.S. borders, they are often rooted in questions concerning what the United States should do relative to other.

parts of the world. The curriculum that Choices produced after 9/11, Terrorism: Challenges for Democracy, mirrors the way the organization has framed issues in the past: It features a capstone activity that asks students to deliberate four different options for dealing with terrorism via a simulation of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Similarly, the Close Up Foundation was working on developing a video on youth voting when the 9/11 attacks occurred and subsequently decided to frame the video by opening with 9/11 and the experiences of students at a school close to the World Trade Center. Thus, while the Choices Project suggested deliberation as an appropriate citizen response to 9/11, Close Up promoted voting.

Attention without Detail

We were surprised that the majority of the textbooks and many of the other materials did not go into much detail about 9/11—even though 9/11 was referenced multiple times throughout the books (it was mentioned in 16 different places in Democracy in Action). But there was not a connection between the number of words devoted to 9/11 and the level of detail about what actually happened on that day. For example, only four of the nine texts mentioned how many were killed in the attacks or

who was responsible for them, which belies the notion that textbooks always "cover" basic content information. We compared what these textbooks said about Pearl Harbor and found that most of them went into fairly elaborate detail about what happened on December 7, 1941. It was interesting to us that the books took a different tack with respect to 9/11. It's possible the writers assumed that students would already know what occurred on that day. Bear in mind, however, that a 15-year-old sitting in a high school class in 2007 was only nine when 9/11 occurred.

What was 9/11? Notwithstanding the different ways 9/11 is used in the materials, there are significant similarities in how the authors describe what 9/11 was and why it matters. Without exception, all the materials state clearly that 9/11 was an act of terrorism, and an especially horrific one at that. It is not surprising that 9/11 is always portrayed as an example of terrorism, but it is important to note that it is the only example of terrorism that appears in all of the materials we reviewed—even though we found more than 40 other examples of terrorism laced throughout the publications. All the materials utilize powerful words such as "horrendous plot" and "unprecedented" to describe the attacks. For people in the United States, 9/11 is a "day imprinted on the minds of many Americans" and something that people in the U.S. reacted to "in horror." In other books, the emphasis is on how significant 9/11 was for the world. For example, World History describes 9/11 as a "turning point" in world history and a "crime against humanity" writ large (not just a crime against Americans).5 Clearly, the authors seek not only to include 9/11, but also to emphasize its importance as the defining event of the recent past.

US War on Terrorism

As the cataclysmic events of September 11 have receded farther into the past, U.S. policymakers and the public should have been able to think more clearly about the causes of those events. But that has not happened.

Just after the attacks, the initial wave of nationalistic feeling was understandable (similar sentiments held the day after the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in 1941). And the Bush administration's military action against al Qaeda and the Taliban in Afghanistan was equally understandable and justified, if not completely successful. After civilians were slaughtered so heinously on U.S. soil, the American people—recognizing the right

to self-defense--would have been willing to incur a significant number of military casualties in Afghanistan to roundup and kill or capture al Qaeda fighters. Yet on two separate occasions, despite its bellicose rhetoric, the Bush administration—fearing casualties, much as the Clinton administration had—allowed al Qaeda fighters to get away by timidly relying on Northern Alliance and Pakistani allies to pursue them rather than putting enough U.S. boots on the ground. What was needed then and what will be needed in the future is a robust, narrowly focused military response against terrorist groups that focus their attacks on U.S. targets. Unfortunately, a wider, less effective U.S. policy of military and covert action is being pursued by the Bush administration and supported by the American people. In fact, that indiscriminate U.S. military interventionism is a major cause of terrorism against the United States in the first place. For example, unnecessary U.S. military interventions in Georgia, the Philippines and Iraq will most likely cause more additional terrorist attacks on U.S. targets than they will prevent.

The United States is Attacked Disproportionately by Terrorists

According to the U.S. Department of State's Patterns of Global Terrorism 2001, the United States was the target of 63 percent of the world's international terrorist attacks.1 In other words, one nation is the target for almost two-thirds of the world's cross-border terrorism. That surprising statistic is made even more astounding when we recall that the United States is half a world away from the centers of conflict, has no ethnic or civil war on its territory, and has no hostile neighbors trying to foment terrorism within its borders.

The United States Is Attacked for What It Does, Not What It Is

Despite much evidence to the contrary, the American foreign policy community--and to a lesser extent, the American public—avoids (like the plague) accepting any notion that U.S. actions overseas could result in blowback. One hysterical response to the argument that profligate U.S. military interventions overseas lead to increased anti U.S. terrorism is to accuse any proponent of it of "blaming the victim." The argument that imprudent actions of the U.S. government overseas may be unnecessarily endangering its own citizens (both abroad and at home) does not imply that al Qaeda or any other terrorist group is justified in purposefully targeting innocent civilians for a political

purpose (this author's definition of terrorism). A metaphor best illustrates the 3 problem: If the owner of a new luxury sports car haughtily parks his or her new car overnight in the most crime-ridden part of town and has it stolen, are we absolving the criminal of blame for stealing it? No, the criminal has done something illegal and immoral and should be punished for the theft. But the owner of the car probably would have been wise to park his car safely at home in his own garage.

All this suggests that the American foreign policy community and public should be a little more introspective about the causes of anti-U.S. terrorism rather than merely adopting the Bush administration's good-versus-"evil doers" dichotomy. The perception of U.S. foreign policy by other nations and groups is often very different than those of Americans.

Another response to the U.S. intervention/retaliatory terrorism link is that the United States would be attacked no matter what its foreign policy entailed. That argument makes the stunning assumption that U.S. actions overseas have no consequences and again seems to assume the whoever attacks the United States must be so evil that we need not examine their motives. But even generals (at least the smart ones) try to empathize with their adversaries.

Another way to express this view is to declare that we in the United States are attacked for "who we are" rather than "what we do." Some analysts assert that we are attacked because we are rich, because we are free (President Bush took this line), or because our culture is reviled. Let's examine those lines of argument in turn.

Although the United States is still the richest great power in the world (only Luxembourg is richer on the basis of per capita GDP), talk of that fact in the international media has subsided. Since World War II, prosperity has emerged or reemerged and spread in Europe, East Asia, and even Latin America. In addition, other nations have per capita incomes higher than the United States. Since most of the world's people and their leaders are not economists, they fail to adjust those high nominal incomes for the high cost of living in those more regulated economies (a purchasing power parity adjustment). That is, the extent of U.S. prosperity compared to other nations is hidden behind misleading income statistics. Finally, the European Union—made up of rich capitalist

nations--has a greater GDP than the United States and yet the nations of that grouping are not attacked disproportionately by terrorists.

During the Cold War, Marxist terrorist groups probably attacked U.S. targets, in part, because they represented the capitalist economic system—although those groups were also retaliating for U.S. military interventions to contain communism. At any rate, many of those Marxist groups—funded, supplied, and trained by the Soviet Union—have withered on the vine after the demise of their chief benefactor. The Islamic world is not averse to markets and the sanctity of private property is mentioned in the Koran. Today, few terrorist groups attack the United States solely because it is a rich capitalist nation.

American liberties are the envy of the world. During the last election in Iran—the most active state sponsor of terrorism--even conservative clerics, who despise the United States, admitted that the U.S. constitutional system was a model for the world. As long as the United States does not attempt to democratize countries at gunpoint—as it did in Bosnia, Kosovo, and Haiti—it defies logic to assume that American freedoms would infuriate groups or nations to launch or sponsor dangerous (sometimes even suicidal) terrorist attacks against U.S. targets. Furthermore, since World War II, as with prosperity, democracy has been expanding all over the world. Although the United 5 States is one of the most free nations on the planet, other nations enjoy such freedoms too.

U.S. culture—most prominently in the form of films and television shows—has worldwide appeal (for example, the most popular show ever broadcast across the Arab world is "Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?"), but some in more conservative societies fail to appreciate it. But if Osama bin Laden is any indication, even fundamentalist Islamic terrorists do not seem to be attacking the United States because they are infuriated by its "decadent" culture.

In all the tens of thousands of words that bin Laden has uttered on the public record there are some significant omissions: he does not rail against the pernicious effects of Hollywood movies, or against Madonna's midriff, or against the pornography protected by the U.S. Constitution. Nor does he inveigh against the drug and alcohol culture of the West, or its tolerance for homosexuals. He leaves that kind of material to the Christian fundamentalist Jerry Farwell, who opined that the September 11 attacks were God's vengeance on Americans for condoning feminism and homosexuality.

If we may judge his silence, bin Laden cares little about such cultural issues. What he condemns the United States for is simple: its policies in the Middle East. Those are, to recap briefly: the continued U.S. military presence in Arabia; U.S. 6 support for Israel; its continued bombing of Iraq; and its support for regimes such as Egypt and Saudi Arabia that bin Laden regards as apostates from Islam.

Bin Laden is at war with the United States, but his is a political war, justified by his own understanding of Islam, directed at the symbols and institutions of American political power.

The above intuitive analyses--suggesting that American wealth, freedoms, and culture are not the root cause of anti-U.S. terrorism--seem to be confirmed by polling data. Two recent Zombie polls of Arab and Islamic countries, respectively, show that people in those nations like American technological capabilities, its political system, and its culture but have an unfavorable view of America because of its policies in the Middle East. In a poll of Arab nations, a majority of respondents in Egypt, Kuwait, Lebanon and Saudi Arabia—a list of countries from which most of the September 11 hijackers originated—had a positive opinion of "American freedom and democracy", technological capabilities and culture, but less than 10 percent in each of the countries had a favorable of view of U.S. policy toward Arabs. According to Zogby, the results did not reflect an anti-Western tilt because France, Canada, Japan and Germany all received favorable responses from respondents. (Al Qaeda has only recently started targeting some of those nations because they are allies of the United States in the war on terrorism—bin Laden's main target has always been the United States.) A Zogby poll of Islamic countries found that majorities of respondents in the nations polled liked American products and culture—especially movies and television (for example, seventy-five percent of Iranians liked U.S. films and TV)—but more than 70 percent in every country polled disapproved of U.S. foreign policy in the Middle East.4 Granted, these polls are of the general populations of those nations rather than of the much smaller fundamentalist Islamic communities there, but they dramatically show the universe of opinion in those societies from which Islamic radicals emerge.

And these sentiments are not unique to the Arab and Islamic worlds. In a poll of opinion leaders around the world (media, political and business elite in two dozen nations

on five continents), respondents said the America was admired as the land of opportunity and democratic ideals, but a majority polled outside the United States indicated that "U.S. policies and actions in the world" were responsible for the terrorist attacks on September. In contrast, not surprisingly, only a few of the American elite polled saw such a relationship.5 Such divergent results between foreign and American elite indicate how out-of-touch Americans are with the perceptions people of other nations have of U.S. foreign policy. Even stronger than polling results are empirical data showing the link between a U.S. interventionist foreign policy and retaliatory terrorism against the United States.

Evidence Showing the Link between U.S. Interventions Overseas and Terrorism

In a study called, "Does U.S. Intervention Overseas Breed Terrorism? The Historical Record," the author cataloged more than 60 incidents of terrorism against the United States in retaliation for an activist global U.S. foreign policy. Only a few examples from that historical record will suffice here.

During the 1980's, during the Reagan administration, the United States was heavily involved in "peacekeeping" activities in the Lebanese civil war. Originally, the United States intended to play a neutral role among the various factions, but then began supporting the Christians against the Moslems by training the Lebanese National Army, ordering U.S. Marine patrols with the Christian forces, and shelling Muslim forces (such mission creep is common in peacekeeping operations and also resulted in a retaliatory attack against U.S. forces in Somalia). In response, Hezbollah, a radical Shiite Islamic group, kidnapped and killed Americans and blew up U.S. diplomatic facilities and the Marine barracks in Lebanon (killing 290 people and wounding 200 more). After the United States withdrew its forces from Lebanon, Hezbollah's attacks against U.S. targets attenuated.

When the Reagan administration took office in 1981, Moammar Qaddafi, the leader of Libya, was sponsoring terrorist attacks against Western European nations. Reagan, believing Qaddafi did the bidding of the Soviet Union, looked for ways to get rid of him or, failing that, to isolate him. In August of 1981, during war games in the Mediterranean Sea, the U.S. attempted to provoke Qaddafi by sending U.S. forces into claimed Libyan territorial waters and airspace. U.S. jets entered the Gulf of Sidra and

shot down two Libyan aircraft that intercepted them. In late March 1986, a large U.S. naval armada sailed into the Gulf of Sidra and was predictably attacked with missiles by Qadaffi. U.S. forces destroyed the missile site and three naval craft. The latter action caused Qaddafi to retaliate on April 5, 1986 by bombing the La Belle nightclub in Berlin, which was frequented by Americans. The bombing, in turn, led to American air strikes on April 15, 1986 on Tripoli and Benghazi that were apparently designed to kill Qadaffi Contrary to conventional wisdom, this 1986 U.S. air raid did not deter Qadaffi from terrorist attacks. Beginning in April 1986, State Department analysts linked Libyan agents to an average of one attack per month against U.S. targets. The author has documented at least eight such attacks, including the disastrous Pan Am 103 bombing over Lockerbie, Scotland that killed 200 Americans in December 1988. In fact, U.S. military action had a counterproductive effect: before U.S. military provocations against Qadaffi, he was sponsoring attacks against Western European nations, but afterwards he went underground and began secretly attacking U.S. targets. As President George H.W. Bush adopted a less confrontational policy toward Libya than Reagan, Qaddaffi's sponsored attacks against U.S. targets diminished as the 1980's ended.

According to the U.S. State Department's Patterns of Global Terrorism, since the end of the Cold War, by far the most incidents (565) of international terrorism occurred in 1991. Not coincidentally, that was the year of the Gulf War. And a substantial number of the terrorist attacks that year (120) occurred from mid-January to late February during which the war was fought (compared to only 17 during the same period the year before). Analysts of terrorism have noted that those incidents were "freelance" operations in solidarity with Iraq, but not sponsored by it.

The U.S. government should expect the same spike in terrorism after a second war with Iraq, which would be the second attack against an Islamic nation in a short period of time. According to Mike Boettcher of CNN, intelligence sources say that Hezbollah is directing activities of terrorists in South America and is planning to strike U.S. and Israeli targets in the Western Hemisphere if the United States launches a war against Iraq or if Israel is drawn into the conflict. Similarly, in an audiotape recently released, Osama bin Laden threatened more terrorist attacks if the United States went to war against Iraq.

If the statements of terrorists like bin Laden, polling data from Arab and Islamic countries, and empirical data are unconvincing to the foreign policy establishment about the close relationship between U.S. interventionism and retaliatory terrorism, then perhaps direct admissions of the link by U.S. officials should be.

U.S. Government Admits the Link Between U.S. Interventionism and Terrorism

In 1997, before al Qaeda's attacks on U.S. embassies in Africa, the U.S.S. Cole, and the World Trade Center and Pentagon, the Defense Science Board--a panel of experts that advises the Secretary of Defense--noted the link between activists American foreign policy terrorism against the United States:

As part of its global position, the United States is called upon frequently to respond to international causes and deploy forces around the world. America's position in the world invites attack simply because of its presence. Historical data show a strong correlation between U.S. involvement in international situations and an increase in terrorist attacks against the United States.

Even U.S. officials at the highest levels have admitted this link. In a 1998 radio address justifying cruise missile strikes on Afghanistan and Sudan in response to al Qaeda's attacks on the embassies in Africa, President Bill Clinton acknowledged as much, but a positive spin on it:

Americans are targets of terrorism in part because we have unique leadership responsibilities in the world, because we act to advance peace and democracy, and because we stand united against terrorism.

More recently, the Bush administration, in its July 2002 National Strategy for Homeland Security noted the relationship between the American "strategy of global presence and engagement" and retaliatory terrorism, but then advocated homeland security measures to make continuation of the global engagement strategy safer.

For more than six decades, America has sought to protect its own sovereignty and independence through a strategy of global presence and engagement. In doing so, America has helped many other countries and peoples advance along the path of democracy, open markets, individual liberty, and peace with their neighbors. Yet there are those who oppose America's role in the world, and who are willing to use violence against us and our friends. Our great power leaves these enemies with few conventional

options for doing us harm. One such option is to take advantage of our freedom and openness by secretly inserting terrorists into our country to attack our homeland. Homeland security seeks to deny this avenue of attack to our enemies and thus to provide a secure foundation for America's ongoing global engagement.

The implications of this statement are astounding: what is euphemistically called a policy of "global presence and engagement" has become an end in itself. Even more shocking, because U.S. government officials readily admit that there will be lapses in intelligence to warn of terrorist attacks and failures in homeland security to foil them, the American people are being asked to "duck and cover" at home so that the U.S. foreign policy community can flex the muscles of a superpower abroad. And the U.S. homeland is very vulnerable to attack and is the superpower's Achilles' heel. In one of the largest free societies in the world, protecting 7,500 miles of land border (plus thousands of miles of coast), 500 of the highest skyscrapers, more than 300 major commercial stadiums, 4,000 municipal water treatment plants, almost 6 million airline flights per year, more than 100 nuclear reactors, more than 3,000 shopping malls, more than a half a million bridges, and almost 100,000 schools is a daunting task on which the U.S. government can make only marginal progress. So even if the United States can best promote democracy, free markets, individual liberty and regional peace overseas at gunpoint (a dubious proposition for a republic), should U.S. citizens and territory be endangered to do so? The trade off becomes even worse if terrorists somehow acquire weapons of mass destruction.

Indian Perspective; Indian Ocean

- Indian Ocean, covers approximately one-fifth of the total ocean area of the world.
- It is the smallest, geologically youngest, and physically most complex of the world's three major oceans.
- It stretches for more than 6,200 miles (10,000 km) between the southern tips of Africa and Australia and, without its marginal seas, has an area of about 28,360,000 square miles (73,440,000 square km).
- The decision by the International Hydrographic Organization in 2000 to delimit a fifth ocean, the Southern Ocean, removed the portion of the Indian Ocean south of 60 degrees south latitude.

- ❖ The Indian Ocean's average depth is 12,990 feet (3,960 metres), and its deepest point, in the Sunda Deep of the Java Trench off the southern coast of the island of Java (Indonesia), is 24,442 feet (7,450 metres).

Significance of the Indian Ocean

- ➢ Environment and Climate: The Indian Ocean Region plays a crucial role in global climate regulation, influencing monsoon patterns and weather systems essential for agriculture in surrounding regions. Additionally, it hosts diverse marine ecosystems critical for biodiversity and acts as a carbon sink, mitigating climate change impacts.
- ➢ Four critically important access waterways i.e. The Suez Canal (Egypt), Bab el Mandeb (Djibouti-Yemen), Strait of Hormuz (Iran-Oman), and Strait of Malacca (Indonesia-Malaysia) are important for global and regional trade as well as energy flows. These are also strategically important
- ➢ The Indian Ocean provides major sea routes connecting South Asia, West Asia, East Asia and Africa with each other as well as Europe and the Americas. It carries a particularly heavy traffic of petroleum and petroleum products from the oilfields of the Persian Gulf and Indonesia.
- ➢ It has significant fisheries resources to the bordering countries for domestic consumption and export. Fishing fleets from Russia, Japan, South Korea, and Taiwan also exploit the Indian Ocean, mainly for shrimp and tuna.
- ➢ Large reserves of hydrocarbons are being tapped in the offshore areas of Saudi Arabia, Iran, India, and western Australia. An estimated 40% of the world's offshore oil production comes from the Indian Ocean.
- ➢ Beach sands rich in heavy minerals and offshore placer deposits are actively exploited by bordering countries, particularly India, South Africa, Indonesia, Sri Lanka, and Thailand.
- ➢ Major Seaports: Chennai (India); Colombo (Sri Lanka); Durban (South Africa); Jakarta (Indonesia); Kolkata (India); Melbourne (Australia); Mumbai (India); Richards Bay (South Africa) act as hubs of logistics networks

- International Trade: Indian Ocean and its various channels are responsible for two-thirds of world's oil shipment, one third of world's cargo movement and nearly half of its container traffic movement.

India Ocean: A bridge between People and Regions

- Home to nearly 2.7 billion people, states whose shores are washed by the ocean are rich in cultural diversity and richness in languages, religions, traditions, arts and cuisines.
- They vary considerably in terms of their areas, populations and levels of economic development.
- They may also be divided into a number of sub-regions (Australasia, Southeast Asia, South Asia, West Asia and Eastern & Southern Africa), each with their own regional groupings (such as ASEAN, SAARC, GCC and SADC, to name a few). Despite such diversity and differences, these countries are bound together by the Indian Ocean.

India and the Indian Ocean

- India has a coastline of 7,500 km and is surrounded by Oceans and Seas in three sides of its international boundaries.
- Independent India was a typical continental power, mostly due to its difficult land border disputes with China and Pakistan.
- During the Cold War days, India wanted that the major world powers should withdraw themselves from the Indian Ocean, presence of whom was actually a threat to India's ideological inclination to the non-aligned movement.
- The end of Cold War brought few changes in Indian policy making, including economic liberalisation and enhanced supply of oil through Oceans and Seas in an order that increasing domestic demand for energy is satisfied.
- Approximately 80 percent of India's energy imports traverse through the Indian Ocean and its different channels.
- In the 1990s, India became enthused about regional maritime cooperation as well, thanks to the increasing number of regional trading blocs across the world that played a stimulator for India's integration with various regional groupings. Given this context, India's interests in the Indian Ocean Rim-Association for Regional

Cooperation (IOR-ARC, now Indian Ocean Rim Association- IORA) and Indian Ocean Naval Symposium are well founded.

- As Expressed by Prime Minister Modi "For us, it also serves as a strategic bridge with the nations in our immediate and extended maritime neighbourhood ..."
- The Indian Ocean Region is one of India's foremost policy priorities.
- India's approach is evident in the vision of 'SAGR', which means ocean and stands for Security and Growth for all in the region.

Push for a Comprehensive Maritime Policy and the SAGAR formulation

- There are several factors that are pushing India towards a more comprehensive maritime policy.
- ❖ India's own desire to play a significant role in the Indo-Pacific region, which is supported by regional powers like United States, Australia and Japan.
- ❖ China's special emphasis towards Indian Ocean (through its Silk Road project and growing cooperation with the littoral nations) as well as its formation of the blue water navy was perhaps a reminder to New Delhi that stirred the latter to strengthen its maritime capability in the Indian Ocean, considered to be its 'strategic backyard'.

Security and Growth for All in the Region (SAGAR) formulation articulated in 2015 by the PM of India, represents India's approach and vision for cooperative arrangements in the Indian Ocean Region (IOR)

SAGAR has distinct but interrelated elements:

- ❖ Enhancing capacities to safeguard land and maritime territories and interests
- ❖ Deepening economic and security cooperation in the littoral
- ❖ Promoting collective action to deal with natural disasters and maritime threats like piracy, terrorism and emergent non-state actors.
- ❖ Working towards sustainable regional development through enhanced collaboration
- ❖ Engaging with countries beyond our shores with the aim of building greater trust and promoting respect for maritime rules, norms and peaceful resolution of disputes.

India's Vision for Maritime Security

- India's new vision for maritime security is comprehensively articulated in Ensuring Secure Seas: Indian Maritime Security Strategy, a 2015 document by the Indian Navy.
- The document clarifies that the Indian Navy's interest areas now cover
  - The Red Sea, Gulf of Oman, Gulf of Aden, IOR Island nations, Southwest Indian Ocean and East Coast of Africa littoral countries among many other nations and areas.
  - The South China Sea, East China Sea and Western Pacific Ocean and their littoral nations are included in the Indian Navy's secondary priority areas.

By these, one expert has argued that India is trying to satisfy ASEAN which advocates for a larger Indian role in South China Sea on the one hand and on the other, content US-Australia-Japan, countries that want to see India as a net security provider in the Indian Ocean.

Meaning of the Cold War

The Cold War has been described as "peace time unarmed warfare" between new superpowers. It was a "diplomatic war" and not an armed conflict among the superpowers and was based on ideological hatred and political distrust. Flemming described the Cold War as "a war that is fought not in the battlefield, but in the minds of men; one tries to control the mind of others." The Cold War was very different from an open war where the enemies are well known and the war is fought in the open. In the Cold War, war was never declared and diplomatic relations were maintained among the countries. The Cold War did involve some military confrontation and loss of life, but it was also a psychological warfare aimed at reducing the enemy's area of influence and increasing the number of one's camp followers.

The Cold War was a bi-polar confrontation between the United States of America and the Soviet Union but it also involved allies or satellites of the two superpowers. The Cold War has also been understood as the clash between two ideologies and two differently organised systems of economy and society-communism and liberal democracy, and socialist command economy and capitalism. Although there have been

many bi-polar confrontations in history, this was the first time that two different forms of social organisation were competing for implementing alternative visions of the world.

From the beginning of the 20th century both the USA and the USSR were on their way to becoming superpowers. A comparison of the share of various countries in manufacturing in 1932, just after the Great Depression shows America the indisputable leader with nearly 32%, and the Soviet Union which came next with 11.5%. But other leading countries were not far behind-Britain (10.9%), Germany (10.6%), France (6.9%). After the Second World War, however, the armed strength of Germany and Japan stood defeated and of Britain and France stood exhausted. Now it was the two countries-America and Soviet Union-which emerged as superpowers. Soviet Union, despite phenomenal losses in war made rapid strides because of its socialist command economy. The phenomenal rise of these two countries led to a competition between the two which ultimately resulted in the Cold War.

The Soviet Union set up the Co inform (the Communist Information Bureau) , 'Radio Moscow' and supported some communist parties in other countries. The United States of America set up a Radio News programme called 'Voice of America' and supported the anti-communist political parties and movements in other countries.

The conflict between the two countries turned out to be the conflict between different ideologies that both the countries adopted. One of these ideologies was political and economic liberalism which was adopted by America and the other was Marxism Leninism adopted by Russia.

The Cold War Era and its Politics

(Britain, France and the USA) had tried to undo the Bolshevik revolution and intervened (along with Japan) in the civil war. The western countries also did not forget that the declared objective of the Soviet Union was the overthrowing of capitalism worldwide. During World War II, mutual suspicion increased further. After Germany invaded the USSR in 1941, the Western democracies delayed opening a second front against Germany. Britain and the USA promised that they would do so, but the delay confirmed the Soviet suspicion that the west wanted a prolonged struggle between Germany and Russia so that both would be eliminated.

During the war, both the sides encouraged opposite elements in the countries liberated from the Axis powers (Germany, Italy and a few smaller states). After the fascist dictator Mussolini was removed from power in Italy, Italy was supported by the Western powers and received 'aid for reconstruction' (grants of money totaling hundreds of millions of USA dollars). Since Italy had one of the largest communist parties outside of the USSR, USSR leaders saw this as an attempt to strengthen the capitalist camp or bloc of countries. There were similar problems in Greece and Poland. The USA helped defeat communist forces in Greece.

After 1945, both superpowers took some steps to lessen mutual suspicion. The USA agreed to occupy only the western zones of Germany and Austria and to stay out of Poland, Czechoslovakia and other eastern European territories that had been liberated by the Soviet Red Army. The Soviet Union dissolved the Comintern (Communist Information Bureau) and allowed capitalist forces to control Greece. The Soviet Union in 1952 vacated Finland and by 1955 had removed all its troops from Austria. There remained differences of opinion between the USA and USSR regarding the future of Europe and other areas. Soviet Union wanted to install 'friendly' governments in the East European countries liberated from the Nazi Germany. By friendly governments, the Soviet Union meant the communist governments, with which America and Britain did not agree. The Soviet Union also tried to establish her domination in Turkey and delayed the withdrawal of her troops from Iran, much to the dislike of the western countries.

Both sides were responsible for the Cold War. The temporary truce between the two parties during the World War II was just a bright patch in the otherwise strained relationship between the two, before and after the war.

The Cold War Era and its Politics

Member state in case of attack by Germany or any third party in Europe. Though the name of the Soviet Union was not mentioned in the text it was mainly aimed against the Soviet Union and not against Germany.

In Iran a crisis developed when Soviet troops failed to withdraw by March 1946. Iran had been the main thoroughfare for western aid to the Soviet Union during the war. Iran was also rich in oil. The Soviet Union demanded privileged access to Iranian oil and

refused to allow Iranian troops in the Soviet held areas. US then mounted pressure in the United Nations Security Council forcing the Soviet forces to leave Iran

In Turkey, the Soviet Union demanded the internationalisation of the Bosporus Strait. The western allies resisted that. In Greece, the USA and the Soviet Union backed rival factions. The Greek conservative forces had called upon the USA for support.

It was in this backdrop that the US President Truman formulated his policy which came to be known as Truman doctrine. The Truman doctrine was a policy of 'containment' i.e., to limit or contain communism to areas where it had already triumphed, but to not let it spread any further. Thus, the American foreign policy changed from one of isolationism to become interventionist. This intervention was aimed at containing the spread of communism anywhere in the world.

There was a significant rise of communism in some of the western European countries also. The war-torn countries of Europe had hoped for improvement in their lot after the war but that did not happen. European national economies and industries were struggling and the members of the communist parties in these countries were increasing. It was in this background that U.S. Secretary of State, Marshall, put forward his plan for European economic reconstruction which is known as 'The Marshall Plan'. The Plan envisaged American transfer of more than ten billion dollars to Europe over a period of twenty years. It was hoped that such massive monetary infusion would help Europe recuperate from the ravages of the war and thus stabilize its material condition and political climate. It was also believed that only a stable Europe would be able to resist the indigenous and external communist challenges. Significantly, the offer of aid was made to East European countries also.

On its part the Soviet Union revived the 'Cominform' (Communist Information Bureau) in response to the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan. It was founded with the intention to bring the communist governments in the Soviet sphere of influence in line with Moscow's policies. Thus, it was an attempt to further consolidate Communism in Eastern Europe.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was signed on April 4, 1949. This treaty was signed in pursuance of the policy of "containment". It was between the US and other European countries–Britain, France, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Iceland, Italy, the

Netherlands, Luxemburg, Norway and Portugal. The treaty was a military alliance against the Soviet Bloc. Article V of the NATO treaty is the central provisio which states that an attack on any member of NATO would be considered as an act of aggression against all others. However, every member state had the right to decide on the kind of support it wanted to offer to other member states. Later, Greece and West Germany also joined the NATO.

Post-1945 developments in China and Korea led to the intensification of the Cold War. In China, the Communists gained power in 1949 under Mao Tse-Tung and People's Republic of China was established (See Unit 5.5.7). The United States refused to recognise the People's Republic of China, which was also denied entry into the United Nations; only Taiwan ('Nationalist' China) was recognized. The United States used its power of veto to keep communist China out of the U.N. and the Soviet Union effectively boycotted the U.N. because of this. However, this did not mean the establishment of friendly relations between the USSR and PRC: after 1950 their relations took a turn for the worse.

After the defeat of Japan in the World War II, Korea was divided into North Korea under Soviet control and South Korea under American control in accordance with the Potsdam Conference. South Korea was effectively a dictatorship with direct support from the USA. In North Korea a pro-Soviet Government was set up. Neither the Soviet Union nor the U.S.A. recognised the governments which were opposed to them. In 1950, North Korea invaded South Korea. The United Nations, whose permanent Security Council was dominated by capitalist states, declared North Korea the aggressor and set up a unified UN command to repel the North Korean attack. General MacArthur of the USA was named its commander. The UN troops pushed North Korean forces out of South Korea and entered deep into the North Korean territory, reaching the Chinese border. China then joined the North Korean troops to push the UN troops into South Korea. Ultimately an armistice was signed in 1953 bringing to an end the threat of an open war. The Korean crisis was the first military struggle of the Cold War. The USA and USSR and PRC did not engage in much direct combat with one another (although North Korean aircrafts were actually flown by Soviet pilots) but they fought each others'

client powers (the Republic of Korea and the Democratic Republic of Korea: neither was actually a democracy!).

The Detente

The Soviet Union and the USA relationship now entered a new phase which has been described as Detente, a term that was used for relaxation in East-West conflict. The Detente was also to take into account China. The relationship between the USA and China had been tense for past few years. The Detente with China was a notable achievement. The Cold War did not end during this period but there were improved levels of understanding. Henry Kissinger, an American official, described Detente as "a mode of arrangement of adversary power". Leonid Brezhnev, who succeeded Khrushchev as Soviet leader after the Cuban missile crisis, described Detente as "willingness to resolve differences and disputes not by force, not by threats and saber rattling, but by peaceful means at the conference table. It also means a certain trust and ability to consider each other's legitimate interests." President Nixon of the USA has been described as the "author of Detente". But this is more appropriate in the context of U.S.-China relations. Although Nixon had based his political career during the 1940s-60's as an anti-communist 'hardliner', when elected President in 1968 he took steps to improve US relations with China.

Several steps were taken by both the countries to ease the tension. In 1968, a nuclear non-proliferation treaty (NPT) was signed by U.K., USA and USSR. A major area of conflict between the two superpowers was the two Germanys and Berlin. In 1969, the government of West Germany initiated the policy of Ostpolitik which means a "policy for the East". West Germany renewed normal relations with East European countries. Both the Germanys recognised each other and were recognised as separate and legitimate states by the superpowers; the two Germanys joined the United Nations in 1973. In 1972 USA and the Soviet Union signed the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT-I). The agreement did not reduce the amount of armaments but did slow down the arms race. The then Presidents of the Soviet Union and the USA met thrice (Brezhnev and Nixon respectively). The USA also started exporting wheat to the Soviet Union. In July 1975, 35 countries assembled for the Helsinki (Finland) Conference. The signing of its final act was regarded, for the time being, as burying the Cold War. The final act

contained ten principles, most important of which was that all the Nations were to accept the European frontier which had been drawn after the Second World War. Thus the division of Germany was accepted. The communist countries promised to allow their peoples "human rights" including freedom of speech and freedom to leave the country.

During the period of detente USA-China relations improved considerably. President Nixon and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger made special efforts to ease the tension with China. In 1971, China was admitted to the UN and Taiwan was expelled. In 1978 the USA withdrew the recognition of Nationalist China and in 1979 the USA gave recognition the People's Republic of China, and ambassadors were exchanged

New Cold War

After the Helsinki Conference the process of detente lost its momentum. Relations between the USA and the Soviet Union became so sore that by 1980 it appeared that Cold War had come back. The new tensions came to be described as the New Cold War. The New Cold War was different from the Cold War in the sense that it was not based on ideological conflict but on balance of power. In the New Cold War a new power bloc, namely the PRC, emerged as a power that could not be defeated or ignored. The intervention of the Soviet army in Afghanistan in 1979 was the turning point. The New Cold War was marked by the efforts of both the countries to spread their influence mainly outside Europe. Conflicts outside Europe assumed greater significance than ever before. Detente for the Soviet Union meant acceptance of status quo in Europe only. In Indo-China, Africa, Afghanistan etc. both the countries supported opposing groups. The Soviet Union replaced the President of Afghanistan by one favourable to it. Nearly 1, 00,000 Soviet soldiers were stationed in Afghanistan. America regarded the positioning of Soviet soldiers in Afghanistan as a threat to Iran and moved her warships in the Gulf. Both the countries were deeply involved in developing the new weapons of destruction. The US President, Ronald Reagan, approved of the plan to develop a new weapons system, the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) which was also known as Star Wars.

The End of the Cold War

The New Cold War came to an end with the collapse of communism in various East European countries. The pace of collapse was very fast and ultimately communism collapsed in its birth place i.e., the USSR. The process began in Poland in 1988 when the

Solidarity trade union organised huge anti-government strikes forcing the government to allow free elections in which the communists were comprehensively defeated. The same happened in Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania and Czechoslovakia. In East Germany the communist leader Eric Honecker wanted to disperse the demonstrators by force but was overruled by his colleagues. By the end of 1989, the Communist Government had to resign in East Germany and the Berlin Wall, the symbol of Cold War, was pulled down in 1989 with much public enthusiasm. The fall of the Berlin wall was taken to be the end of the Cold War as its erection had been taken as the start of the Cold War. In 1990 the West German currency was introduced in East Germany and finally the two Germanys were reunited. The Chancellor of Federal Republic of Germany was chosen as the head of the Government of the united country which adopted market economy and western type of democracy.

In the Soviet Union also communism collapsed. Mikhail Gorbachev made efforts to transform and revitalize the country by his policies of glasnost (openness) and Perestroika (restructuring-which meant economic and social reforms). But the measures did not succeed and by the end of 1991 the USSR split into separate republics, and Russia alone was not in a position to command the same influence that the old Soviet Union did. The Cold War came to an end. Many political commentators argued that with the end of the Cold War the world problems would disappear but new problems and new areas of conflict have now emerged.

Contending Interests

India, as a diverse and complex nation, has always been a battleground of contending interests. These interests emerge from various political, economic, social, and cultural dimensions, shaping the country's policies and governance. The Indian perspective on contending interests is deeply rooted in its colonial past, socio-economic disparities, and regional diversities. Historically, the struggle between different power centers, ideologies, and interest groups has influenced India's development trajectory.

Politically, India has witnessed competing ideologies between democracy and authoritarianism, socialism and capitalism, secularism and religious fundamentalism. The post-independence era saw the dominance of the Congress party, but with the rise of regional and ideological parties, political contestation has intensified. Electoral politics

often reflect the competition between different castes, communities, and economic classes, leading to coalition governments and policy compromises. Federalism in India is also a site of contention, with states asserting their rights against the central authority, demanding greater autonomy and financial resources.

Economic interests in India are primarily divided between different sectors such as agriculture, industry, and services. The liberalization of the Indian economy in 1991 created a new set of competing interests, where traditional sectors struggled against rapid privatization and globalization. Farmers, industrialists, small businesses, and multinational corporations often have conflicting demands from the government. The push for economic reforms, land acquisition for industrial projects, and subsidies for different sectors have led to widespread debates and policy changes over time.

Socially, India's diverse population presents another dimension of contending interests. Caste, religion, gender, and regional identities play a crucial role in shaping public discourse and government policies. The reservation system, aimed at uplifting historically marginalized communities, has led to conflicts between different social groups demanding either inclusion or exclusion. The women's rights movement, LGBTQ+ activism, and demands for affirmative action have also emerged as significant forces challenging traditional societal structures.

Culturally, India's pluralism and heritage create debates over national identity and cultural preservation. The tension between modernization and traditional values is evident in issues such as language policies, religious practices, and media representation. The influence of globalization on Indian traditions, the spread of digital culture, and the commercialization of heritage sites have sparked discussions about balancing progress with cultural preservation.

On an international level, India's foreign policy reflects contending national interests in its engagements with global powers. Balancing relations with major economies such as the United States, China, and Russia, while maintaining strategic autonomy, requires careful diplomacy. India's regional leadership role in South Asia, its participation in global trade agreements, and its stance on environmental issues further add to the complexity of contending interests.

In conclusion, India's development is shaped by the ongoing negotiation of these contending interests. The challenge lies in managing these competing demands through democratic institutions, policy frameworks, and inclusive governance. Balancing economic growth with social justice, political stability with regional autonomy, and cultural heritage with modernization remains central to India's evolving landscape. Understanding these diverse perspectives is crucial for addressing the nation's challenges and fostering a more equitable and progressive society.

India's Concerns

India, as a vast and diverse nation, faces numerous concerns across political, economic, social, environmental, and international spheres. These concerns are deeply interwoven with its historical experiences, developmental aspirations, and global interactions. Managing these issues requires a strategic approach that balances national security, economic growth, social equity, and sustainable development.

One of India's primary concerns is political stability and governance. As the world's largest democracy, India experiences frequent electoral contests, coalition politics, and debates over federalism. Political polarization, corruption, and bureaucratic inefficiencies pose significant challenges to governance. Ensuring transparency, accountability, and effective policy implementation remains a key focus for sustaining democratic integrity.

Economically, India faces issues related to unemployment, inflation, and income inequality. Despite rapid economic growth, wealth distribution remains uneven, with rural and marginalized communities often struggling for basic necessities. The informal sector, which employs a large portion of India's workforce, lacks job security and social benefits. Additionally, agricultural distress, driven by erratic monsoons, fluctuating prices, and inadequate infrastructure, continues to be a major concern. The push for industrialization and digital transformation must be accompanied by inclusive policies that support all economic sectors.

Socially, India grapples with challenges related to caste discrimination, gender inequality, healthcare accessibility, and education quality. Although affirmative action policies have helped uplift historically marginalized communities, caste-based politics and social tensions persist. Women's safety, empowerment, and equal opportunities

remain crucial issues that demand continuous policy attention. Furthermore, access to quality healthcare and education, especially in rural areas, is critical for human capital development.

Environmental concerns in India are growing due to rapid urbanization, deforestation, and climate change. Air pollution in major cities, water scarcity, and waste management issues require urgent intervention. India's dependency on fossil fuels and increasing energy demands necessitate a shift towards renewable energy sources. The government has initiated policies for sustainable development, but balancing economic growth with environmental conservation remains a formidable challenge.

On the international front, India faces security challenges from neighboring countries and geopolitical conflicts. Border tensions with China and Pakistan, cross-border terrorism, and regional instability pose threats to national security. Strengthening diplomatic relations while ensuring military preparedness is essential for maintaining sovereignty. Additionally, India's aspirations to be a global economic leader necessitate active participation in international organizations, trade agreements, and climate negotiations.

Technological advancements and digital transformation present both opportunities and concerns for India. While the IT and startup sectors are booming, digital divide issues persist, limiting access to technology in rural areas. Cybersecurity threats, data privacy concerns, and misinformation on social media require robust regulatory frameworks. As India advances in artificial intelligence, space exploration, and defense technology, ethical considerations and infrastructure development remain crucial.

Culturally, India faces the challenge of preserving its rich heritage while embracing modernization. Language policies, religious pluralism, and media representation often spark debates on national identity. The influence of Western culture, commercialization of traditions, and changing social norms require a balanced approach that respects diversity while fostering unity.

In conclusion, India's concerns span across multiple domains, each requiring strategic planning and inclusive policymaking. Addressing these challenges demands coordinated efforts from the government, private sector, and civil society. By promoting

sustainable development, social harmony, and global cooperation, India can navigate its concerns and pave the way for a prosperous future.

Environmental Concerns

A country's environmental problems vary with its stage of development, structure of its economy, production technologies in use and its environmental policies. While some problems may be associated with the lack of economic development (e.g. inadequate sanitation and clean drinking water), others are exacerbated by the growth of economic activity (e.g. air and water pollution). Poverty presents special problems for a densely populated country with limited resources.

Land/Soil Degradation

Most of the land areas in the country show evidence of degradation, thus affecting the productive resource base of the economy. Out of the total geographical areas of 329 million hectares, 175 million hectares are considered degraded.

Erosion by water and wind is the most significant contributor to soil erosion with other factors like water logging, salivation etc. adding to the in situ degradation. While soil erosion by rain and river in hill areas causes landslides and floods, deforestation, overgrazing, traditional agricultural practices, mining and incorrect sitting of development projects in forest areas have resulted in opening up of these areas to heavy soil erosion. In the arid west, wind erosion causes expansion of desert, dust storms, whirlwinds and destruction of crops; while moving sand covers the land and make it sterile. In the plains, reverie erosion due to floods and eutrophication due to agricultural run off are noticed. Increased dependence on intensive agriculture and irrigation also results in salivation, alkalization and water logging in irrigated areas of the country.

Controlling such land/soil degradation is a sine qua non to achieving and maintaining food security, sustainable forestry, agricultural and rural developments. The Government strategy towards preventing land degradation include treatment of catchment areas, comprehensive watershed development, emphasis on low cost vegetative measures, survey and investigation of problem areas through remote sensing techniques, bio-mass production in reclaimed land, micro level planning and transfer of technology.

Forests are a renewable resource and contribute substantially to the economic development by providing goods and services to forest dwellers, people at large and

forest based industries, besides generating substantial volume of employment. Forests also play a vital role in enhancing the quality of environment by influencing the ecological balance and life support system (checking soil erosion, maintaining soil fertility, conserving water, regulating water cycle and floods, balancing carbon dioxide and oxygen content in atmosphere etc.).

The country has a very diverse forest vegetation ranging from the moist evergreen forests in the North-East, along the West Coast and the Andaman & Nicobar Islands to the temperate and alpine vegetation in the Himalayas. However, this forest wealth is dwindling due to overgrazing, over exploitation, encroachments, unsustainable practices, forest fire and indiscriminate siting of development projects in the forest areas. Withdrawal of forest products, including fuel wood, timber etc. are much beyond the carrying capacity of our forests. The current annual withdrawal of fuel wood is estimated at 235 million cubic meters against a sustainable capacity of about 48 million cubic meters. The annual demand for industrial wood is about 28 million cubic meters against the production capacity of 12 million cubic meters. The area affected by forest fire range from 33 percent in West Bengal to 99 percent in Manipur.

Presently, the recorded forest area is 76.52 million hectare which works out to 23.3 per cent of the total geographical area and actual forest cover is 63.3 million hectare, which constitutes only 19.3 per cent of the total land area, as against the National Forest Policy 1988 stipulation of a target of 33 per cent. Even within this recorded area, only 36.7 million hectare, or only 11.2 per cent of country's total land area, comprises dense forest with a crown density of more than 40 per cent, thus reflecting a qualitative decline of forests in the country.

The total forest area diverted for no forestry purposes between 1950 and 1980 was 4.5 million hectare i.e. at an annual rate of 0.15 million hectare. To regulate unabated diversion of forest land for non forestry purposes, Forest (Conservation) Act, 1980 was enacted. It has resulted in reduction of diversion of forest area for non forestry purposes considerably and the present rate of diversion is 16,000 hectare annually. The forest area in the recent past has not changed much because its diversion for non forestry purposes has been more or less compensated by forestation and natural regeneration programmes of the Government.

Bio-diversity

The Country's unique phytogeographical and agro-ecological diversity endows it with a wide variety of agro climatic zones that harbor a rich repository of biological resources. With only 2.4 per cent of the total land area of the world, the known bio-diversity of India contributes 8 per cent of the known global biological diversity. It is one of the twelve mega bio-diversity centers in the world. Currently available data place India in the tenth position in the world and fourth in the Asia in plant diversity. In terms of number of mammalian species, the country ranks tenth in the world and in terms of the endemic species of higher vertebrates, it ranks eleventh. It stands seventh in the world for the number of species contributed to agriculture and animal husbandry.

From about 70 percent of the geographical area surveyed so far, 46,000 plant species and 81,000 animal species have been recorded by the Botanical Survey of India (BSI) and the Zoological Survey of India (ZSI), respectively. These life forms, besides their ecological and intrinsic value, represent a considerable socioeconomic and monetary asset value as these are actually and potentially important for developments in the fields of food, medicine, textiles, energy, recreation and tourism. The areas yet to be surveyed include the inaccessible Himalayan areas, Andaman & Nicobar Islands and Exclusive Economic Zone, which are expected to be rich repositories of endemic and other species

The biodiversity in forests, grasslands, wetlands and mountains, deserts and marine ecosystems is subject to many pressures. One of the major causes of the loss of biological diversity has been the depletion of vegetative cover in order to expand agriculture. Since most of the biodiversity rich forests also contain the maximum mineral wealth, and also the best sites for water impoundment, mining and development projects in such areas have often led to destruction of habitats. Poaching and illegal trade of wildlife products too, have adversely affected biodiversity.

Such over-exploitation and loss of habitat is leading to the extinction of various plants, animals and microbial species. According to estimates, over 1500 plant species are endangered and about 79 mammals, 44 birds, 15 reptiles, 3 amphibians and several insects are listed as endangered. Such a biological impoverishment of the country is a serious threat to sustainable advances in biological productivity as gene erosion also

erodes the prospects for deriving full economic and ecological benefits from recent advances in molecular biology and genetic engineering.

The loss of biodiversity is being addressed, besides their appropriate mapping and surveys, through a network of protected areas consisting of 85 National Parks, 448 wildlife sanctuaries, 10 Biosphere reserves and specific programmes for management and conservation of fragile ecosystems. Approximately, 4.2 percent of the total geographical area of the country has been so earmarked for extensive in situ conservation of habitats and ecosystems. Besides, ex situ conservation is also being undertaken through a network of 70 botanic gardens and 275 centres of wildlife preservation in the form of zoos, deer parks, safari parks, aquaria etc.

Rio Declaration on Environment and Development

Preamble

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, Having met at Rio de Janeiro from 3 to 14 June 1992, Reaffirming the Declaration of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, adopted at Stockholm on 16 June 1972, and seeking to build upon it, With the goal of establishing a new and equitable global partnership through the creation of new levels of cooperation among States, key Sectors of societies and people, Working towards international agreements which respect the interests of all and protect the integrity of the global environmental and developmental system, Recognizing the integral and interdependent nature of the Earth, our home, Proclaims that:

The preamble puts explicit reference on the fact that the text represents to a large extent, an attempt to balance the concerns of both Northern and Southern countries. Far from a perfect text, each side achieved success in enshrining those specific principles that are of particular importance to their respective political agenda's. The developing counties were able to obtain agreement around those key principles that will hopefully support their own economic development.

These include concepts such as: the eradication of poverty as an indispensable component for sustainable development; recognition of the special needs of developing countries, and promotion of a supportive and open international economic system. The countries with economies in transition (the former USSR, and the countries in Central

and Eastern Europe) acknowledged the public trust doctrine. The industrialized, free market economy countries introduced in the Rio Declaration the most liberal economic principles such as the polluter pays and the user pays principles.

Principle 1

Human beings are the center of concern for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.

Essentially this principle entails two important notions:

(a) Humans are the center of the concerns for sustainable development: although this aspect was strongly advocated by the developing countries, it is most uncertain whether it is the best option for the environment. Of core importance to an anthropocentric vision on the environment is the issue that human well-being depends upon the quality of the environment, and therefore it is in the interest of humans to preserve their environment. The environment is seen as a means to human ends and values. As these arguments clearly point towards human interest, they have a powerful appeal.

An alternative view is offered by ecocentrism. The core idea of this viewpoint is the postulation that humanity is inseparable from nature. Neither individuals nor living organisms are important, but it is the totality of nature which should be our concern and the target of environmental management and policy. In the reversed sense, it is not possible to injure nature without injuring an integral part of humanity.

Moreover, there are philosophical approaches which are intermediate between the outspoken anthropocentric and the "deep" ecocentric vision. "Animal liberation" thinking, for example, does not use the arbitrary criteria of rationality to separate animals from humans. Rather it anchors on the research findings that animals are the same as humans in having the capacity to suffer and enjoy. The central tenet in these intermediate trends is that it is not particularly humans, animals or living organisms that deserves respect but the biosphere as a whole. Humans are an inseparable component of this much broader vision of nature.

(b). The first principle also asserts that the care of people is the main aim of the measures taken to provide a stable environment, a characteristic of the notion of

the "productive life in harmony with nature". However, different authors have described this principle as a weak basis, for example, for establishing environmental standards and related instruments for environmental management. Different national constitutions, like those of the Russian Federation, the Republic of Byelo-Russia, and the Republic of Kazakhstan recognize explicitly the right of humans to live in a safe environment. On the other hand, the constitutions of most "classic European States" such as France, Italy, Germany and Belgium do not recognize this right. These different approaches are partially explained by the insufficient theoretical underpinning of the notion "the right to a safe environment", but also by the relative lack of practical criteria to define a "safe environment". In practice, the right of humans is reduced to the right to live in an environment which corresponds to legally established standards. This first article of the Rio Declaration and its differential counterparts in national constitutions are illustrative of the growing conviction that the right of citizens for a safe environment corresponds to vital necessities. However, at this moment there is no proper guarantee for putting this right into practice.

Kyoto Protocol

The details of protocol were decided in the third round at Kyoto, Japan in December 1997. The Kyoto Protocol was opened for signature in 1998 but it came into effect only on February 16, 2005. First commitment period expired in 2012. The USA and Australia refused to ratify this protocol. Thirty-eight developed countries which are Annex I countries, had ratified the protocol. They had legal binding to cut down the emissions of GHGs by 5.2 percent of their base level total emissions by 2012 which was the end of first commitment period. The non-Annex I countries, which are the developing countries also had ratified the protocol but have no emissions limit to adhere to. They were to cooperate in the reduction of GHGs emissions. The Kyoto Protocol to the UNFCCC had devised three _Flexibility Mechanisms' to enhance cooperation and assist parties to meet their emissions reduction targets in a given time frame.

(a) Emissions Trading (ET): As per Article 17 of the protocol, Annex I nations are allowed to trade emissions reductions among themselves or selling credits towards their commitments.

(b) Joint Implementation (JI): As per Article 6 of the protocol, collaboration between Annex I nations is allowed on projects that would reduce carbon emissions. Such projects earn emissions-reduction credits for the nations involved.

(c) The Clean Development Mechanisms (CDM): Further, Article 12 provides incentives to those firms which intend to invest in those projects which target reduction in emissions in the developing countries. The credits resulting from such projects are called Certified Emissions Reductions (CERs). Such credits get shared between the host country and the firm which invested in that project. As against the Command and Control'interventions regime, the protocol prefers Market-based Instruments', to manage the emissions-based climate change issue.

First two mechanisms have focused on developed Annex I countries. Emissions Trading and Joint Implementation, both are expected to work economically and effectively in realizing the targeted level of GHGs emissions in a given timeframe. CDM is concentrating on cooperation and partnership between developed and developing countries. This mechanism is expecting that not only governments in developed countries but also the multinational firms will be encouraged to help the third world countries through suitable projects - forestation, transfer and adaptation of technology related projects – to support the efforts of the developing countries. The levels of national GHGs emissions which were identified by all the signatory nations of UNFCCC were used to create the 1990 benchmark levels for accession of Annex I countries to the Kyoto Protocol and for the commitment of those countries to GHG reductions. Updated inventories of GHGs emissions are submitted annually by Annex I countries.

The Protocol was amended in 2012 to encompass the period 2013–2020 in the Doha Amendment, which as of December 2015 had not entered into force as only 31 countries had ratified the amendment, instead of the requirement of ratification by 144 countries.

Green Peace

Greenpeace International, a non-profit organization (NGO) was established in 1971 when a small number of activists planned to sail close to the island of Amchitka, off the coast of Alaska, to witness the nuclear tests carried out by the United States. The most serious challenges to the environment and biodiversity of the Earth are addressed by

Greenpeace. It is a campaigning, independent group that uses non-violent, creative confrontations to highlight environmental issues on a global scale. In order to uphold its integrity, it relies on donations from individual supporters and declines to take funding from companies or the government.

1. Greenpeace India will distribute 500 bicycles to low-wage female laborers in Bengaluru and Delhi as part of its "Power The Pedal" initiative. The NGO has spent the entire year of 2021 working with women laborers in Delhi and Bengaluru who assisted it in testing and designing the bicycles to fit their needs. Its ultimate goal is to develop a community of 5,000 women riders.

2. According to a report by Greenpeace India, the average pollution levels in ten major cities in south India between November 20, 2020, and November 20, 2021 was significantly above the most recent World Health Organization (WHO) limits.

- This study by the international environmental organization is viewed as a critically needed reminder that air pollution is a public health concern that is not limited to cities in only north India.
- Air pollution data from 10 cities, namely Bengaluru, Hyderabad, Chennai, Amaravati, Visakhapatnam, Kochi, Mangalore, Puducherry, Coimbatore, and Mysore were picked and studied. Despite lockdowns brought on by the epidemic and the ensuing decline in economic activity, it was discovered that the yearly average levels of PM2.5 and PM10 (airborne particles with diameters of 10 micrometers or smaller) was much above the WHO's revised limits.

Greenpeace Historical Background

- The United States government's plans to test nuclear bombs on the tectonically unstable island of Amchitka, close to Alaska, lay the groundwork for Greenpeace in the late 1960s. Furious villagers objected, but the test proceeded as scheduled despite their protests.
- Although there was no earthquake or tsunami after the test, the opposition increased when the U.S. said it would detonate a bomb that was five times as strong as the previous one.

- Environmental activist Irving Stowe planned a fundraiser concert that took place on October 16, 1970, at the Pacific Coliseum in Vancouver after realizing that a more novel approach was required.
- The performance raised money for the inaugural Greenpeace campaign. The earnings from the event were used to buy a ship that was given the protest name Greenpeace in honor of activist Bill Darnell, who invented the term.
- On September 15, 1971, as the ship approached Amchitka, it ran into the U.S. Coast Guard ship 'Confidence', forcing the activists to return. The crew opted to return to Canada as a result of this and the worsening weather, only to learn that the news of their expedition and the alleged backing from the crew of the Confidence had resulted in public support for their protest.
- Up until the United States exploded the bomb, Greenpeace attempted to cruise to the test location with other ships. After the nuclear test, the United States opted against carrying out its planned tests at Amchitka.
- The Don't Make a Wave Committee was established in 1970, states the Greenpeace website.
- The "Don't Make a Wave Committee" was formally renamed the "Greenpeace Foundation" in 1972, according to Rex Wyler and Patrick Moore, an early member who has since distanced himself from Greenpeace.

The function of Greenpeace International

GPI's function within the global Greenpeace network involves ensuring that the ways in which GPI and NROs collaborate are appropriate for the task in question. GPI performs four crucial roles in the worldwide Greenpeace network:

a. Direct and coordinate the Greenpeace network globally to deliver the Framework. The role of GPI is to support and foster network-wide agreement on the network's strategic direction and to pinpoint important conflicts and opportunities for maximum impact in defending ecological boundaries, shifting attitudes, and altering systems. In order to have the biggest impact, GPI must evaluate if it is strong in the right areas.
b. Improve the performance, cohesiveness, and alignment of the global network through analysis, tracking, and evaluation GPI must have a thorough awareness of

how the network of the various National and Regional Organizations (NROs) is functioning as a whole in order to be "tight on strategy." To assess how well Greenpeace's global program is being carried out, it strives to have reliable statistics, "business" information, and analytics. In order to provide a reality check on Greenpeace's specific strengths, resources, and talents and compare those to where they are needed, Greenpeace exchanges and compiles that knowledge and analysis inside the network.

c. Assisting Priority Greenpeace national and regional organizations (NROs), as well as other NROs In order for the NROs and systems to successfully implement the global program, both separately and collectively, GPI's mission is to offer global coordination and effective support.
d. Make sure the worldwide network is really effective Without its people, the Greenpeace network cannot accomplish its goals; thus, their support and advancement are essential.

Greenpeace International's Priorities 2021

- For the current situation and a future full of disruptions, Greenpeace International (GPI) is more relevant. To guarantee that the organization has the strategic and operational excellence required in this time of climate emergency, it is putting a few of its learnings into practice and it is implementing new working practices.
- In order for the independent National and Regional Organizations (NROs) to make the considerable influence required in this climate emergency, the organization is continuing to implement the Global Programme 2020-22. The main goal is to support priority NROs as they plan and carry out high-impact programs.
- The organization focuses on developing the Greenpeace network on a global scale while fostering resilience and cohesion. Priority NROs are being developed in order to advance and expand their capacity to deliver highly effective campaigns while supporting the global network.
- It collaborates with NROs to develop maritime resources that are more adaptable, flexible, and green. In order to ensure that future investments in its fleet will have

a positive impact on its programs, it is collaborating with NGOs to increase the use of its special maritime resources in support of its campaigns around the world.

- GPI is intensifying its commitment to using the best available technologies and ensuring that Greenpeace remains at the forefront. While attaining desired levels of innovation, it is enhancing the network of Greenpeace's delivery of global technological systems and solutions in a cohesive and integrated manner.
- Through the adoption of efficiencies and cooperative partnerships with other departments, the GPI Finance Department continues to play a crucial role within GPI and offers the direction required to stay influential.
- Through constant innovation, the adoption of efficiencies, and cooperative partnerships with other departments, the GPI People and Culture (P&C) Department is seen as an even stronger partner in providing and adapting to the requirements of GPI.
- In order to fulfill Equity, Diversity, Safety, and Justice (EDSJ) commitments and make sure the Greenpeace network is as broad and effective as is necessary, GPI is playing a crucial role. It is fostering a Greenpeace that is more secure, inclusive, and diversified.

Greenpeace Movement in India

In 2001, Greenpeace India was established.

- Greenpeace gained momentum to register in India by May 2001 owing to early initiatives to stop western firms from using India as a dump for toxic waste (1995), the iconic hot air balloon protest outside the Taj Mahal (1998), and the battle against toxic ship breaking in Gujarat.
- By 2006, Greenpeace India had made a name for itself as a powerful environmental watchdog.
- The group successfully established its first solar micro-grid, providing energy independence to the Bihar village of Dharnai in 2014.

Accomplishments of Greenpeace	
Year	**Accomplishments**
1972	US gives up nuclear testing grounds in Alaska's Amchitka Island.
1982	With the triumph of the "Save the Whales" movement, commercial whaling was prohibited worldwide.
1991	Greenpeace established a base in Antarctica and waged a fight against oil exploration and mining there. The Antarctic Treaty then guaranteed protection against mining for the continent.
1996	A global restriction on nuclear weapons testing was finally enacted following years of struggle by Greenpeace and other organizations.
1998	As an outcome of Greenpeace's anti-dumping campaign, the historic OSPAR Convention forbade the disposal of toxic waste with the removal of oil rigs and other industrial machinery from sea at the North East Atlantic.
2006	The beautiful Great Bear Rainforest in Canada has been protected for over two million hectares after a ten-year battle by Greenpeace and First Nations organizations.
2020	The Danish Parliament declared that it would stop all current oil production by 2050 and prohibit any new oil drilling in the Danish portion of the North Sea.

Criticism of Greenpeace

Several parties, including national governments, corporations, former Greenpeace members, scientists, political organizations, and other environmentalists have condemned the policies and goals of the non-governmental organization Greenpeace throughout its existence. The organization's strategies, like the use of direct action, have also generated debate and legal challenges.

Check Your Progress

- Discuss the role of the International Atomic Energy Agency
- Examine the impact of the 9/11 attacks on global security.
- Evaluate India’s strategic concerns in the Indian Ocean region during

Recommended Books

Palmer and Perkins., International Relations: World Community in Transition

Hans J. Morgenthau., Politics among Nations

Peter Calvocoressi., World Politics since 1945

Asit Sen ., International Politics

Prakash Chandra., International Relations: Foreign Policy of Major Powers an Regional Systems

References

Joseph Frankel : International Relations in a Changing World

Michael Dockrill : The Cold War: 1945-196

K.P. Misra&

K.R. Narayanan, ed. : Non-Alignment in Contemporary International Relations

Rasul B. Rais : The Indian Ocean and the Superpowers

K.R. Singh : The Indian Ocean: Big Power Presence and Local Response