THIRD
CONCEPT

English Monthly

❖ **US Global Empire**

❖ **India-Bangladesh Relations**

❖ **WTO & Developing Countries**

❖ **Water as Human Right**

❖ **Tagore on Environment**

❖ **Gandhi & HRD**

Editor	*Consulting Editor*
Babuddin Khan	**M. L. Sharma**
Managing Editor	*Art Director*
R. Prudhvi Raju	**Purba Roy**
Business Executive	*Chief of Production*
R.S.Rawat	**N. P. Agarwal**

INSIDE

Editorial

Independence Day

Observance of Independence Day on 15 August each year has seemingly become an annual ritual for most of us who celebrate it like any other national holiday without understanding its real significance. Our political leaders have also come to regard the occasion as a mere ritual which is observed by assembling at Red Fort where national flag is unfurled to be followed by Prime Minister of the day addressing the nation from the ramparts of Red Fort.

How many of us comprehend the real import of our tryst with India's destiny, which Nehru made us to understand at the stroke of the midnight on the eve of Independence is a debatable matter at this juncture. On that occasion Nehru had reminded us: "It is fitting that at this solemn moment, we take the pledge of dedication to the service of India and its people and to the still larger cause of humanity." Our jawans on the borders and the framing community are among those who are fulfilling this pledge of dedication to the service of the nation in true sense of the term. There are hard working, noble hearted and honest officials also who fall in this category, albeit they constitute a minority. This band of dedicated people is a neglected lot. One Rank-One Pension promise remains unimplemented. Farmers are committing suicides without getting any attention from the present dispensation at the helm.

Scams have become the order of the day and scammers get scot-free by hoodwinking the system through legal loopholes or political patronage and law stares to the face of the poor and marginalized people. Those who command political, monetary and muscle power are the real beneficiaries of this so-called Independence. Commitment to the nation has become a far cry. It is considered to be the duty of the poor and down-trodden, and majority of them are already reeling under appalling poverty, mal-nutrition and lack of adequate healthcare facilities. We are reminded of President Eisenhower's sane advice: "Freedom has its life in the hearts, the actions, the spirit of men and so it must be daily earned and refreshed – else like a flower cut from its life-giving roots, it will wither and die." Time has come for the political class to undertake a serious introspection and change its discourse. Indulgence in populist rhetoric to grab power by hoodwinking the masses even in this age of Internet and social media and ignore the mass aspirations is not going to last long. New breed of leadership should emerge to guide the destiny of the nation in a right direction. The old stereotyped leadership is dominating almost all political parties, which seldom allows the youth to come to the forefront and take the lead.

This obsolete system needs to be transformed and replaced by those who believe in: "Ask not what India can do for me, but ask what I can do for India." Young leadership with this set of thinking can really transform India. Thomas Paine has aptly observed: "Those who expect to reap the blessings of freedom, must, like men, undergo the fatigue of supporting it." Frankly speaking, there is no dearth of talent and leadership qualities among country's youth. Tragedy is that corruption, nepotism, political interference and red-tapism disallows such talent to emerge to the fore. Many reality shows telecast by the electronic media from time to time attest to the fact that there is no dearth of talent in the country and what is needed is to hunt them and prune them for the task of national reconstruction.

Those who should shoulder this responsibility are scared of this very idea for fear of losing their privileged position and power. However, the prevalent system of patronage and parasitism is not going to last for long because 'the old order changes, yielding its place to new' is on the way and another Independence Day in the near future may see someone like Lal Bahadur Shastri hoisting the Tricolour at Red Fort.

Hope sustains life and India's hope is the hope of its 1.2 billion people which cannot be belied because:

Life laughs at you when you are unhappy ….

Life smiles at you when you are happy ……

But, Life salutes you when you make others happy

—BK

The US Global Empire Today

Eddie J. Girdner*

Some academics who analyze current US global policies today attempt to pose the essential question as: "How can the US maintain its global power?" In other words, they realize that the US is a global hegemon and they wish to keep it that way. The problem for them is that US global power is weakening. They argue that this is what must be guarded against. It is typical of many academics to serve the existing global power structure characterized by US global hegemony.

In my view, maintaining the US as a global hegemon is not the solution. Rather it is a large part of the global problem.

Why not begin with the simple observation that every empire contains the seeds of its own destruction? This idea is at least as old as the work of Ibn Khaldun in the Muqaddimah. The US Empire is no exception. To quote Johan Galtung, "The cause of the decline and fall of western imperialism is western imperialism itself."

Some analysts argue for the theory of hegemonic stability (Charles Kindleberger). This theory posits that Western hegemony under the US Empire has been a great and necessary benefit to the world since Second World War. But in doing so, they stack the cards, rather than giving a clear and accurate historical picture.

This should be examined in terms of several categories below, such as the nature of the US capitalist economy, US foreign policy, US global hegemony, the Chinese economy, the post-war global order and so on. The above approach sees the post-war US hegemony and global order as benign, indeed beneficial apparently to the global community. This orthodox perspective should be examined more closely.

Mainstream academics generally examine US global hegemony under the rubric of the "Western-led liberal international order." They observe that this was set up by the US following Second World War and included the World Bank, the IMF, NATO, and later the EU.

Underwriting these, however, and critically, was the Bretton Woods Monetary System. This should also be emphasized. The critical role of the US dollar should also be mentioned. This gave the US great power to control, rule and eventually abuse the system. The dollar was the only global currency that could not be devalued. This allowed the US to force other countries to bear part of the cost of its imperialism, particularly imperialist wars, such as the Vietnam War. This led to the revolt in France in the universities in the late 1960s.

Mainstream analysts set up several supposed tenets of the "Western-led liberal international order." However, these are usually just taken for granted with no empirical examination or discussion of them. There is no examination of whether or not they were actually in operation after the Second World War, the Cold War period. They usually skip over the Cold War completely. But this period (1945-1990) was the period when the US basically controlled and ran the world order.

The Post-War Liberal World Order

It should be noted that the US set up the tri-lateral system centered on the US, Western Europe and Japan. In Europe, the US CIA largely restored the old ruling classes to power, with the Christian Democrat parties. The United States used the CIA to insure that social democrats would be kept out of power by secretly rigging elections with the help of the Italian Mafia in Italy. The US waged subversion with CIA operations against Eastern

---

* Fethiye, Turkey.

Europe and launched the Cold War against the Soviet Union.

In Japan, the US wrote the Japanese Constitution under General MacArthur and ensured that the Liberal Democratic Party (LDP) would rule in favor of the old capitalist classes and the zaibatsu. These industrial groups were not really disbanded, but reorganized as keiretsu groups. Japan failed to follow the liberal model of political economy, as the US urged. Instead, they went in for state-guided developmentalist capitalism. (Chalmers Johnson)

Western Europe and Japan were the junior partners in the global imperialist system ruled over by the US. The US waged war against socialists in China. But the corrupt nationalists under Chiang kai-Shek, supported by the US, were defeated by Mao's forces in 1949.

The US launched a global campaign to prevent any economic and political model from emerging that would challenge the capitalist model during the Cold War. The real problem was that markets, labor and resources should be made available for exploitation by Western companies. This led to mass killings in Korea and Vietnam, some three million in each country. Massive state terrorism was used. Chemical warfare and apparently biological warfare against North Korea was used by the US. Agent Orange (dioxin) poisoned much of Vietnam and killed and maimed thousands. The poison is still there to this day and still killing.

In Vietnam, under the secret Phoenix Program, run by the US CIA and the corrupt South Vietnamese Government, tens of thousands of innocent people were tortured and killed under suspicion of having communist sympathies or sometimes just to fill the weekly Pentagon quota for dead "communists." This was denied by William Colby, head of the program and later CIA Chief. There was no Internet then, but all the common methods of torture were used by the US in these wars.

When the US was pushed out of Vietnam, in the l970s, the Phoenix operators were dispatched to countries around the world to implement similar programs of state terrorism. Of course, the US overthrew many governments around the world in the Cold War period. Probably at least twenty million people died in these CIA operations and proxy wars. This was called counterinsurgency and counterterrorism. It goes on today in Iraq, Afghanistan, Syria, Yemen and so on. General David Petraeus just recycled the theories from Vietnam for Iraq and Afghanistan. They have failed miserably, however, as in Vietnam.

During the Cold War period, the US supported fascist dictatorships in Latin America, under the pretext that if the communists came to power, they could never be removed (the Kirkpatrick Doctrine from Jeane Kirkpatrick). The US ensured the continued rule of the feudal kingdoms in the Middle East, and of rule under the military in Egypt. This still goes on. Military regimes in Turkey too were supported. Bahrain, which has a terrible record of human rights, is supported by the US and the UK with Navy bases there.

The US had a huge world market with half of global production in the l950s. Even though the US was so prosperous, McCarthyism was used to crush democracy and the working class in the l950s. Many were blacklisted and went to jail as being suspected of being "communists." Still workers made some gains in real income up to the late sixties. With the later shift in US industrial policy, in the 1970s, these gains were rolled back.

Racism was still in place in the US with segregation in the southern states. The Civil Rights Movement was only to emerge in the sixties. When university students protested the Vietnam War in the sixties, the US Government cracked down. Of course, US propaganda about the war was largely lies. Daniel Ellsberg released the Pentagon Papers, the secret Rand study, and was branded an enemy of the US when the *New York Times* began to print the study. Ellsberg was sent to trial. But Nixon lost in the courts and the CIA report was published.

The US Economy

The US economy could be called "liberal" during this period if one considers that the massive attacks on the "welfare state" and Keynesianism had not

yet taken hold. It was Keynesian welfare liberalism. Social welfare programs were expanded in the sixties under Lyndon Johnson, the Great Society legislation. But this was all to be rolled back at the end of the l970s. The US realized the mistake of assisting students to attend the university, when it resulted in massive protests of the Vietnam War on university campuses.

The US used the defense budget, the Pentagon, to massively subsidize corporate profits and research and development for defense and other corporations. The military-industrial complex padded the profits of corporations. The iron triangle, between the government, the military and defense corporations, funneled money to defense industries. A quarter of the US economy was based on war profiteering.

The US was not and is not, in fact, a democracy, if one wants to be technical about it. The US is obviously an oligarchy, in terms of the political science classification of regimes. The US is ruled by those who own capital. It is ruled by the wealthy. The big corporations are the primary constituents of the US Government. One has to know that to get the money to get into political office and even more to stay in political office in the US, then one must pay attention to the corporate lobbyists in Washington and vote the right way on bills.

One may fudge and refer to the US as a "democracy" just because the system is set up so that one of two parties may win through elections. That makes a very safe and stable political system, since both parties represent exactly the same ideology, so-called liberal capitalism. Generally there is only tinkering differences in public policies between the two parties that have any chance of getting elected.

It looks like democracy to the outside world until one actually examines how the system works. One would think this might be interesting to political scientists, but they are usually willing to ignore these critical aspects for the most part. At least if they do address them, they will likely never get a job.

Up until the l970s, Keynesianism meant a great deal of state involvement in the US economy. This continued with the shift from "liberalism" to "neo-liberalism" except that under neo-liberalism, the state plays a different role. The state serves the corporations, the military and finance sectors, Finance, Insurance and Real Estate (FIRE). Social welfare is rolled back.

At the same time, the Bretton Woods Monetary System, due to the concerns of Keynes, was not liberal. Exchange rates were fixed among the major currencies of the world to allow European currencies to recover their strength in the market. Currency flows between countries was restricted.

Again, free trade was also not so free during the Cold War period. The US Congress balked at approving a world trade organization in the fifties. So GATT filled the gap and the trade negotiation rounds began. Congress acted to protect the interests of farmers to protect prices of their crops back in their rural constituencies.

The US could push free trade globally, since it was in the driver's seat, in the most powerful trade position. But we know that the terms of trade militated against many Third World countries. It took almost fifty years to overcome most domestic opposition to free trade in the US and bring the WTO into existence.

There has always been a strong religious element and foundation to US foreign policy. First, the ideology of Manifest Destiny, which in this construct, was to take all the land west to the Pacific Ocean. This idea was extended to the rest of the world. (William Appleton Williams) The US saw itself as the "New Jerusalem" and Americans as God's Chosen People. Millenarianism meant the US had a writ to rule the world and crush any opposition globally.

This led to Wilsonianism, and Woodrow Wilson said that the US had to root out evil with force, righteous force. God would be behind it. God would ensure that the US crushed any opposition anywhere and of course, would be the world's policeman. This was drummed into the heads of generations of students in American schools. No wonder, they are so arrogant and take it for granted that they will always win anywhere.

According to the ideology of American exceptionalism, the US is not just any nation, but different from all others. It cannot do any wrong. Whatever the US does is right by definition. This is pretty much what it dishes out from the US President's bully pulpit. Moreover, the right-wing pundits argue that the US is not capable of being a selfish nation. It has no selfish interests. Whatever it does in the world is out of generosity to help other peoples.

Sometimes they have to just be killed to be helped, unfortunately. International law is held to not apply to the US when it comes to national security interests. Therefore, the US need not obey international law. It can be a rogue state openly, with no possible sanction from any quarter.

Multiculturalism is much hated by the political right in America. Racism is a strong element and probably very useful when it comes to training soldiers that have to kill other people. In Vietnam, the local people were "dinks" and "gooks" and so on. Racism is strong in the US military as I know from my years in the US Navy.

The Shift to Neo-liberalism in the l970s

The US was the one country that was an Empire from the beginning. It was an "infant empire." (George Washington)

Following the Second World War, real wages rose for 15 or 20 years due to economic prosperity and the great global power of the US. The US enjoyed the privilege of having and printing the world's reserve currency. The US had dollar hegemony. But by the end of the l960s, the US began to experience competition from Western Europe and Japan. These countries caught up economically and their currencies became convertible.

One should make a distinction between the American national system of capitalism and the national systems in Germany (Europe) and Japan. American capitalism is stockholder capitalism. It is designed to serve those who own the stock. It must attempt to produce profits for the owners of capital. German capitalism was a system of stakeholder capitalism. The workers generally were seen to have

a stake in the system. In Japan's Shinto Capitalism, the government supported the big firms, Zaibatsu or Keiretsu, and workers were considered as part of the corporate family with lifetime employment.

In America, however, the working class was to be cut out, having little power in the system. The Taft-Hartley Labor Law greatly limited the ability of workers to strike for benefits and higher wages. They could not strike in sympathy with another company. In the US, the corporation is legally an "individual." This gave great power to corporations. Even at one point, minimum wage laws were ruled unconstitutional.

In the US, almost all Congress members (Senators and Representatives) are owned by the corporations. Otherwise, they cannot get the money to get reelected. They have to serve big business with the laws they have already bought and paid for. A number of Congressmen have noted that this is a rotten system. It stinks. It is not democracy. This generally gets swept under the carpet. It would be a scandal really if this was known by the world. The Hollywood image still holds for the most part.

After the 1970s, the US economy was transformed. Supply side economics took over at the University of Chicago School. Milton Friedman and others claimed Keynesianism no longer worked. Deindustrialization began. Manufacturing was dismantled. Jobs were shipped to slave-labor countries such as China and India, later Vietnam and Bangladesh and to Mexico.

The attack continued on Keynesianism and social welfare. The economy became financialized. It can be characterized as monopoly finance capitalism. That's where the profits are made. Real wages began to drop. Real jobs were replaced with low-wage and part-time temporary jobs, and long working hours with no overtime pay.

Inequality increased by leaps and bounds after Reagan came to office in l981. The era of neo-liberalism set in. Profits increased for those at the top of the system, some ten percent or less of the population. The tax rate dropped for corporations and they could use global strategies and transfer

pricing to avoid paying taxes. Some even get a rebate from the US Government after making billions in profits.

Free trade pacts shifted production globally (such as NAFTA). The US economy should be referred to as neoliberal, rather than liberal, after this point in the 1970s. Social welfare programs were dismantled. The business classes started calling themselves the masters of the universe.

Public Choice theory was ushered in along with New Political Economy. Economic theories took over social science, particularly in political science. Traditional American political science theory, interest group theory (David Truman, Robert Dahl), was scrapped. Under the new theories, democracy and participation by the people were seen as distorting the market. Profits would be higher without democracy. We can say that democracy, to the extent that it existed, was scrapped too. Democracy was just a nuisance to Wall Street.

This nonsense was then peddled around the world under the IMF structural adjustment programs. Everything had to be privatized, even if it made the system less efficient. Any losses would be put on the people while the companies reaped the profits protected by the government. Banks would be bailed out if they failed. Banks were too big to fail and bankers too big to jail, while the people were too small to save.

Democracy was generally seen as "rent seeking." This distorted the market. Labor unions that asked for increased wages were just counterproductive and a waste of good capital and so on. The same was with environmental protection and government regulation. The state, under neo-liberalism, would serve the corporations. It meant the free market for the people and corporate welfare for businesses. Trillions would be printed to bail out the banks and serve the corporate masters of the universe. One saw it in the US and Europe following the 2008 financial crises.

When the bankers collapsed the system, the taxpayers were stuck with the bill for trillions of dollars to bail them out. A few million people lost their homes. The rich got richer, the one percent. But those who really gained were far richer than most in the one percent.

The conclusion was that democracy was bad for the economy, and so technocrats would run the system. The people should just bug off and leave the capitalists alone and pay their taxes. The only problem was that their jobs had been sent to China and Mexico.

Public choice theory and New Political Economy became the dominant ideologies for neo-liberalism. It would serve to restructure economies so that US corporations could maximize profits through strategic global production. This does not dismantle the state. A strong state is needed to enforce austerity and discipline protests by the masses when they have no work; Greece and Spain today and also China. The state runs the economy with technocrats. There need not be democracy, at least not beyond the cosmetics of elections. Profits can soar under financialization and globalized production.

In the big emerging markets, like China, India, Turkey, and so on, the economy most generally takes the form of crony capitalism. These are essentially slave-labor regimes. Look at the mining sector in Turkey. In China, Deng divided the economy between his sons. Economic growth can be high under crony capitalism. MNCs increase their profits and repatriate them.

The Chinese Economy

There are two basic periods, of course. The first period under Mao was from 1949 till 1976. When Mao died, the capitalist roader, Deng Xiao Ping, came to power. The Maoist period was basically a mixed economy as there was also a private sector. It was not so different from India, after 1947, in significant ways. But the Chinese path was more successful in developing and mobilizing the country for future capitalist production. Both countries, of course, followed import substitution industrialization. This laid the basis for the later opening to the global economy.

China began to shift to the capitalist road from the mid-1970s onwards in the post-Mao period. This

was also not different from India, under Rajiv Gandhi. Economic liberalization began around the same time. In both the case of China and India, protection of the economy laid the foundation for entering the global market and globalization of production in the l980s.

Economic growth increased, of course, along with the familiar ills of greater inequality in both countries.

The US used this opportunity to dismantle the traditional manufacturing economy. Deindustrialization was carried out in the US in the l980s. Jobs were shifted abroad. The US is as much responsible for the rise of China as an economic power house as China itself.

American corporations loved to invest in China, not because it was democratizing. Rather, US businesses depended upon an authoritarian system to screw the workers to the wall and enforce labor discipline. After all, that is what neo-liberalism and New Political Economy argues is necessary for capitalist production and indeed, development today. Indeed the old idea that greater democracy is conducive to a more productive economy has been tossed out of the window.

This principle is being applied all over the world today by the US corporate agenda of globalized production and strategic production and strategic trade. The corporations use a complex global strategy. And the new trade pacts (NAFTA, Trans Pacific Partnership, Trans-Atlantic Partnership) are institutions to discipline countries to line up to this agenda and be punished if they do not.

So US corporations turned to slave labor in China, India, Vietnam, Bangladesh, Mexico, and wherever cheap labor could be found, primarily in poor Third World countries. Of course, this will spur development in some of these countries, particularly China and India. Capitalism has from the very "Rosy Dawn" of the system depended upon a cheap labor force and reserve army of labor. So it is nothing surprising.

What the US is about is being a great global empire primarily through military might and force. The corporations will enjoy all the resources of the world

for their profits. And to hell with the domestic economy and the American people. That is not what it is all about. The domestic economy is about the financial sector. Industrial production will be done in slave-labor countries such as China. The US has now decided to treat this as if it was domestic production. Manufacturing in the US has shrunk to embarrassing levels. It is pretty hard to find anything made in America.

In fact, Chinese capitalism is based upon the East Asian model of state-guided capitalist development. The Chinese are copying Taiwan, which copied Japan. The Vietnamese are now following the same model. They need not be "transforming" to an American style "liberal democracy." The contradictions would be too great as the workers mobilize for more rights and higher wages.

Capitalists would just have to move on to other areas. The current gospel of neo-liberalism holds that democracy is incompatible with competitive global capitalism. Moreover, the regimes in high growth countries are usually characterized by crony capitalism. This is the case with China as Deng divided up the economy among his sons. This is similar to Suharto in Indonesia. We need not mention the current dispensation in Turkey.

There are massive and continuous worker disputes in China, but they are being ruthlessly crushed by the state. Tien an Mein Square in 1989 was a sort of right-wing coup in China that consolidated the foundation of neo-liberalism. The left liberals were thrown out of the government. Western corporate investors have no objection to this practice of busting and disciplining workers. It is one of the reasons they might prefer China to India as a place for their capital.

India is more democratic. There is no sign that the regime in China is "transforming" to democracy. Why would they want to be like America? The Chinese would be appalled at the American model. They have no intention of destroying the country, the way the global corporations are destroying American society. Most of the American people just do not get it.

As capitalism has always exploited cheap slave-labor, starting with the sweat-shops in England in the nineteenth century, why wouldn't they make use of save labor in China, India and other countries today? Profits are generally higher where production is the most labor-intensive.

Today, the Chinese political economy cannot be disentangled from the US. Holding something like three trillion dollars in foreign exchange, the US borrows several billion dollars a day from China. This makes the US somewhat dependent upon China. But on the other hand, as the US Treasure Secretary (John Connolly) once said, "It is our currency but it's your problem."

The US has a lever and can sink the value of the dollar costing China. And it does this continually with its QE agenda, simply printing dollars and flooding the world with increasingly worthless paper. The US tries to force China to let the value of the Yuan rise, but China resists.

Officially, China claims in its party line that it is using capitalism to build "socialism." This is, of course, nonsense. It is producing dollar billionaires faster than any other country in the world. It is developing and must embrace all the contradictions which capitalism brings in, particularly vast inequality. While I do not know exactly what socialism is, I greatly doubt if it is this.

In August 2014, it was reported that China's GDP in Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) was the highest in the world. The US, from a state power perspective, is of course concerned about this. However, it has largely been brought about by the US itself, using Chinese cheap labor to increase profits.

It is dialectic. The more the US tries to strengthen the Empire, the faster it declines. It is, after all, the historical trajectory of all past empires.

The dismantling of the US economy with deindustrialization (neo-liberalism) dovetailed nicely with the dismantling of socialism (neo-liberalism) in China in the l980s. Now, everyone should be happy, except the people. They have been screwed by the ruling classes in both countries. But as far as I can

tell, that is what the New Political Economy is all about; and to hell with democracy and the people. The new billionaires will be laughing all the way to the bank.

China does not embrace an ideology of becoming a global hegemon. However, it is true that China is engaging more in imperialist ventures as capitalism intensifies. Like all imperialistic countries, China in Africa will use the pretext of "helping the people" but it is primarily under the rubric of Chinese national interests. China needs resources to feed the capitalist machine and a huge population.

Clearly the size of the Chinese economy worries those at the helm of the US Empire. But it is the main workhouse of the world and part of the system that the US has helped to bring into existence under globalized production. As long as it is just a location for slave labor and producing for the world, no need to worry. It is not clear if the Chinese will come to create their own superior technology as the Japanese have done.

The US Empire and China

However, the US insists upon global hegemony, so-called "full spectrum dominance." It wants to be "top dog" and control the most critical resources, oil, and so on, around the globe. At this point in the historical trajectory of the Empire, it can only be achieved by perpetual wars. And since the Empire is essentially bankrupt, it can only continue perpetual war by printing dollars and forcing the world, all other countries and individuals who hold dollars, to help pay for it.

This is an intolerable situation and the world population is certainly going to revolt against it. It is also highly unethical if one can see through it. I wouldn't expect a US Congressman to, certainly, but intellectuals should be able to get at least a dim glimpse (Actually those congressmen who did are now mostly out of office, like Ron Paul.)

Putin is chomping at the bit because there is no alternative to the dollar. The Shanghai Cooperation Organization or the BRICS may not be able to overcome this very soon. Other regions of the world are also trying to get out of the system, such as

Latin America. (The Bolivarian Revolution). Latin America has largely dropped away from the US after recent experiences.

It is surely anachronistic to see the continuation and perpetuation of post-war US hegemony as the best solution and greatest situation for the world. One cannot freeze history. The world has to move on. There must be a change in the system.

Why insist upon the status quo under the US Empire as being the best of all possible worlds?

The Cold War period of US global hegemony was not benign. The projection of US power in the world killed some twenty million people. The war in Vietnam killed 59,000 American soldiers. More than this committed suicide from the stress of killing later on. It was not so much the fear of "communism" as the fear of losing access to global resources that the Cold War was all about. The US feared the success of an alternative system to capitalism. Finally this took the absurd form of the dogma that liberal capitalism is the only possible system. (Fukuyama) There is no alternative (TINA) from Margaret Thatcher and earlier Herbert Spencer.

If this is so, why worry? Just stand by and watch the other systems collapse. No need to fight with them! Imperialist wars must just be for fun.

That's why the end of the Cold War just meant the US had to invent a new pretext, terrorism, to justify fighting imperialist wars. What are all these American soldiers in Afghanistan, Iraq, and now Syria dying for? A wonderful democracy in Iraq, presumably. Could anyone in Washington or elsewhere actually take such hog wash seriously?

Why wouldn't the decline of the US global Empire be good news, as Johan Galtung thinks? It keeps being said the US provides stability. That is it "maintains global stability." Why is it that the least stable places in the world are those places where the West keeps invading repeatedly over the centuries? The Middle East is the best example.

If this could have produced stability, these areas would be insufferably stable, but just the opposite is true. The US has done enough damage in Afghanistan in a thirteen year war. Now they want another ten maybe. That stability is just now coming. It is just around the corner. Of course, who can be that foolish? Imperialists must be imperialists and that is the basic principle. The only solution is the historical collapse of the empire.

Now the admirable neocon regime change in Iraq has produced the Islamic State and probably a regional war between Sunni and Shia if we are not awfully lucky; so much for providing stability, so much for the counterterrorism strategy of General Petraeus in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The West created the state of Israel. The British used terrorism against the Palestinians. How much stability has this created in the region? Even regime change is included under the rubric of providing stability. However, the US achieved the extraordinary result of making Saddam Hussein look like a genius in Iraq. Such foreign policy surely must be admired. And now the neocons are on the way back.

One can see the decline of the American Empire as a historical process. It is a historical dialectic. The US Empire is addicted to war and this is bringing it down faster. The real problem is surely not the rise of China. One rather worries about what new folly will be forthcoming from the banks of the Potomac.

The European Union

This was a banker's project, led by Jean Monnet. The US wanted to lock in capitalist policies in Europe and prevent the rise of social democracy. That was the real threat, not any threat from the Soviet Union. The eventual solution was to embody a set of totalitarian principles about the functioning market economy and impose them from the top on as many European countries as possible. These were the so-called Copenhagen Criteria. The Commissars in Brussels became a sort of central committee beyond the reach of any democracy. Now they run the continent with economic technocrats, impose austerity and carry out quantitative easing for the benefit of the big bankers.

This helps the bankers, but creates poverty and unemployment (Paul Krugman). They kill the economy. Democracy is cut out. There are too many bureaucratic layers between the people and those in the lofty heights of the Berlaymont in Brussels. Countries no longer even make their own laws, for the most part. They wait for them to arrive from Brussels. No country can expand jobs and social welfare. It is a sort of Americanization of Europe under neoliberal policies. The jobs are exported to cheap labor countries, Turkey, China, and India.

The commissars in Brussels rush from place to place consuming vast quantities of wine and gourmet food at the expense of the people. They only serve the interests of the big corporations and the banks to increase corporate profits, They are overpaid. It is a huge racket and unnecessary layer of bureaucracy. They are like a central committee of bureaucrats insulated from democracy.

The Euro also serves to lock countries into the austerity policies of the commissars. But the system fails to create jobs for the youth today and there is a mismatch between the economies. This continually puts pressure on the weaker states like Greece, Spain and Portugal. The Europeans are the sub-imperialists to the US. They assist the US Empire. The slaves are the Chinese, Indians and Turks, who produce most of what they consume. But it is a dialectical process and over time, the periphery can gain more wealth and power.

A key to the maintenance of the Empire is the US dollar. While it is weakening, it will not collapse all at once. It is a long historical process. Every imperialist war weakens it further, however, as the Fed just creates fiat dollars. The dollar is perhaps the bell-weather of the system. If the dollar collapses, also the Empire must collapse. That's why the US must control the world's oil and market it in dollars.

The Collapse of the US Empire

From my perspective, the collapse of the US Empire would be a positive development for the entire world. It would also be great for the American people. The US could be a normal country and do some things for its people at home. Perhaps the businessmen would no longer be the masters of the universe, which would perhaps be a big blow to them.

Developing countries, like India, would have the sovereignty to provide help to farmers who are committing suicide by the thousands because trade pacts have forced down the price of their commodities. Countries could also engage in environmental protection without running up against problems with the dispute settlement bodies of the WTO. This would take some of the resentment off of Western imperialism as it is not imposed on the world.

Why worry about the US global empire, then? The dissolution of the post-war US global hegemony is not being brought about by the rise of China, as much as by the American Global Empire itself. This is the historical dialectic at work. Whatever replaces it may be a lot better. Galtung discusses some possibilities. He also does not see China as becoming a global hegemon.

As it is, the US is driving much of the world crazy with its policies and imperialist wars. This is the basic source of non-state terrorism. It is a reaction to massive state terrorism. Drone wars drive people crazy today in western Pakistan hovering above their villages for days and killing innocent people without warning. This is just a more sophisticated version of the Phoenix program in Vietnam that tortured and assassinated villagers that might have the wrong ideology, from the perspective of the Empire. The US cannot keep doing that and preach about human rights. It will just not wash.

One cannot freeze history and maintain the status quo. Empires do not endure forever, even though the rulers dream about a thousand years rule. There must be dialectical change. That is the nature of the historical beast.

◆◆

India-Bangladesh Relations in 21st Century

Dr. S.P.Vats* & Yogender S. Rangi**

[*India and Bangladesh share a unique bond and a special relationship rooted in a common cultural heritage, shared principles and values forged by common aspirations and sacrifices of its people. Apart from close neighbours, both countries are common members of SAARC, BIMSTEC, IORA and the Commonwealth.* Ed.]

Bangladesh and India are South Asian neighbours. India is the world's second most populous country, whereas Bangladesh is the world's eighth most populous nation. They are common members of SAARC, BIMSTEC, IORA and the Commonwealth. Bangladesh is bounded by the India states of West Bengal to the West and North and Northeast and Tripura and Mizoram to the east and by the Bay of Bengal to the South. So the Bangladesh is surrounded three fourth by India, and one fourth by the Bay of Bengal.[1]

Bangladesh shares 4096 Kilometers of land border[2], a vast maritime boundary, and 54 common rivers with India. The importance of geo-strategic and geo-economic considerations between North-eastern states of India and Bangladesh has played a significant role in determining the relationship between the two countries. Bangladesh shares 1879 Km border with the North-eastern States (NES) of India-Tripura 856 Km; Meghalaya 443 Km; Mizoram 318 Km and Assam 262 Km.[3]

India and Bangladesh share a unique bond and a special relationship rooted in a common cultural heritage, shared principles and values forged by common aspirations and sacrifices of its people. India is committed to carry forward the mission of strengthening the historic bonds and impart a vision for the future that is durable and sustainable and conducive for the collective prosperity of the region. India's relationship with Bangladesh is moving in the direction from conflict to cooperation.[4]

* Associate Prof., Dept. of Defence & Strategic Studies M.D.U. Rohtak.

** Asst Prof., Dept of Defence & Strategic Studies, Kurukshetra University Kurukshetra.

The aim of this paper is to analyze the geo-strategic importance of Bangladesh, major irritants between India and Bangladesh and current development in India-Bangladesh relations.

Geo-Strategic Importance of Bangladesh

Geo-strategy is not absolute but some of the ingredients or factors could be absolute and the value could change with changing characters of variables. Geo-strategy is transparent yet perceptive. Therefore, one needs to understand the prevalent geo-strategic reality in the global context in general and regional context in particular. One has to be clear in understanding as to how the global reality affects the region, such as Bangladesh, which is increasingly becoming an arena of middle power rivalry involving the lone superpower by one actor or another to counter balance the adversary.

In South Asian context, the region that India is directly concerned with, rapid geo-strategic changes have to be viewed in right perspective to understand the regional geo-strategic ambience, particularly by the policy makers of peripheral countries like Bangladesh. This is essential to make a comprehensive assessment of the regional dynamics. Bangladesh is part of South Asia that continues to be one of the most volatile geo-strategic regions.[5] Bangladesh's geo-strategic importance for India is due to four factors:

- Bangladesh's location is a strategic wedge between mainland India and Northeastern seven states of the Indian Union. Each of these states is land-locked and has shorter route to the sea through Bangladesh. Currently, Kolkata port is used by these states for both domestic and imported cargo. The navigable rivers in India's Northeast that could connect West Bengal or Orissa ports pass through Bangladesh. The only entry to and exit from the Northeastern region of India is through the Shiliguri Corridor that is close to the Chinese border and within striking distance of Bangladesh. The Shiliguri Corridor is the most sensitive 'choke point' for the Indian Union.

- A friendly Bangladesh that ensures no anti-India terror or insurgent activities can be carried out from its soil unlike in the past will substantially assist India in handling security problems in some of its restive north-east States. Importantly, a 'neutral' Bangladesh also ensures containment of an assertive China in this region, including along the strategic sea-lanes of the Bay of Bengal.

- Bangladesh began to be referred to as the third largest Muslim country in the world and as the second in the region.

- Bangladesh is a natural pillar of "Act East Policy" of India because Bangladesh is being regarded as a bridge between India and East Asian countries, also has enormous geographic advantages for its proximity to Myanmar and other East Asian nations to promote interregional economic, political and security cooperation. Once connected via Asian Highway and Trans-Asian Railway, India and East Asian nations will be using Bangladesh as the main transit point to increase economic interactions amongst themselves.[6]

Major Irritants between India and Bangladesh

India played significant great role in Bangladesh's liberation war. India was the first country to recognize Bangladesh as separate state. However, there are several main issues such as Water Dispute, Chakma Refugees Problem, Border Fencing Dispute, Illegal Migration and Role of Bangladesh in Northeast Insurgency etc. These have been major issues which have impacted on these two countries' bilateral relations.

Water dispute

River water sharing has been one of the main irritant between India-Bangladesh relations. India and Bangladesh share 54 big and small trans-boundary rivers. The major area of dispute has been India's construction and operation of the Farakka Barrage. In 1951 India announced intentions to build a barrage across the Ganga River 10-km from the Bangladesh border. The aim of construction of the Farakka Barrage was to divert water into the Baghirathi-Hooghly River to increase the lean period flow of river to increase the water depth at the Kolkata port which was threatened by siltation.

As irrigation withdrawals increased in Bangladesh, dispute arose between India and Bangladesh over the sharing of the lean season flow at Farakka. The inadequacy of water during the lean season to meet the assessed demands in the two countries is the root cause of the conflict.[7]

The Bangladesh government feels that the reduction in flow caused damage to agriculture, industry and ecology in the basin in Bangladesh. Because of the inability of the concerned governments to come to any lasting agreement over the last few decades on sharing the river water, this problem has grown and

now it is also viewed as a case of upstream-downstream dispute.[8]

The other reason for water dispute is Teesta River, which has its source in Sikkim – flows through the northern part of West Bengal in India before entering Bangladesh, where after crossing through about 45km of irrigable land, merges with the Brahmaputra River (Brahmaputra River is called Jamuna in Bangladesh).

In 1983, an ad-hoc water sharing agreement was reached between India and Bangladesh, whereby both countries were allocated 39% and 36% of the water flow respectively. The new bilateral treaty expands upon this agreement by proposing an equal allocation of the Teesta River. However, the deal fell through when the then newly elected Chief Minister of West Bengal, Ms. Mamata Banerjee, refused to approve the treaty, fearing that the loss of higher volume of water to the lower riparian would cause problems in the northern region of state, especially during drier months.[9]

Construction of the Tipaimukh Dam is another contentious issue between India and Bangladesh. The government of India has initiated construction of the Tipaimukh Dam 500m downstream from the confluence of the Barak, the second largest drainage system to the northeast of India. Tipaimukh Dam is a hydel power project proposed on the river Barak in Manipur.[10]

Bangladeshi experts have said the massive dam will disrupt the seasonal rhythm of the river and have an adverse effect on downstream agriculture and fisheries. The government of Bangladesh has decided to send an expert team to the dam area to examine the features and likely impact of the dam on the flow of water into the Surma and the Kushiara.

Another is the environmental factor. The Tipaimukh area lies in an ecologically sensitive and topographically fragile region. It is within one of the most seismically volatile regions on the planet. A major earthquake of magnitude of 6.6 on the Richter Scale rocked Manipur-Myanmar border on August 6, 1988. Bangladesh's objection is that it would have adverse ecological effects in its eastern Sylhet district.[11]

Chakma Refugees' Problem

The Chakmas are the tribal of the North-eastern states of India. They are settled mainly in the states of Mizoram, Tripura, Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Meghalaya and West Bengal. They migrated from the Chittagong Hill Tract (CHT) of East Bengal (now Bangladesh) to the Mizo hills. Chakmas follow Buddhism and have a language of Burmese stock and Sanskrit scripts. The Chakmas are the original inhabitants of the CHT and are perhaps the least known people of Asia being the residents of a remote and backward area which is of little political or economic consequence. This place has been the home land of the Chakmas particularly for centuries.[12]

In 1947 Radcliffe ceded the CHT district to Pakistan, when the India was partitioned on the basis of religion into Islamic Pakistan and secular India, though the district was 98.5 percent Buddhist.[13] On 15 August 1947, Chakma youths under the leadership of Sneha Kumar Chakma hoisted the Indian tricolour at Rangamati. Six days later the Pakistanis lowered the Indian tricolour at gunpoint.[14]

On the other side Jawaharlal Nehru promised Sneha Kumar Chakma, the representative of the Parbattya Chattogram Jana Samhati Samity (PCJSS) that the Bengal Boundary Commission had no jurisdiction over the CHT. Before India's independence, Sneha Kumar Chakma had met Sardar Patel and Jawaharlal Nehru in July 1947 and was promised by both, that CHT would remain with India.

On 18 July 1947, when the Indian Independence Act was published, it showed that Radcliff had not listened to the submissions of the two Hindu members of the Bengal Boundary Commission, Justice Bijon Mukherjee and Charu Biswas, that CHT should be with India. Sneha Kumar ran to Delhi after hoisting the Indian Tricolor at Rangamati on the 15 August 1947, to meet the Indian leaders to try and get revised the decision of Radcliffe.[15] He met Sardar Patel, who told him that he, was with him but he should meet Jawaharlal Nehru.

It took 50 days for Sneha Kumar Chakma to meet Nehru. When he finally got an audience and told

Nehru the CHT should be with India, and the Chakmas were ready to fight for this and would India help with arms, Nehru got up in anger and shouted, "Do you propose to bring India under foreign rule again?" That decision sounded the death knell for the hapless Chakmas. Thus, the Chakmas had to unwillingly join Pakistan.[16]

The Chakma influx into India started just after the partition of the country. The first influx of the refugees took place shortly after partition when 40,000 Chakma families fled to India.[17] India did not treat the Chakma differently and resettled them in North India and later on in Northeast India. The manageable number of the Chakma refugees, their widespread dispersal in the sparsely populated Northeast and ethnic proximity with locals largely mitigated any potential opposition from the indigenous population.[18]

On 2 December 1997, the Government of Bangladesh signed a peace Accord with the Parbatya Chattagram Jana Samhati Samity and the Shanti Bahini, its armed wing. However, the Peace Accord so signed is yet be fully implemented and in the meantime, human rights violation continues unabated. Bangladesh government's initiatives were not realistic and professionally sound. Most of the past governments tried to solve the problem by persecuting indigenous people using military where political commitment was totally absent. The economic and social development was nil for decades due to continuing rebellion.[19]

Wiki Mini Atlas India wanted to send them back, but the people were not ready to go as they were afraid of hostile attitude of the Bangladeshi people (Muslims) and the non-cooperative and indifferent attitude of the Bangladesh Government.

Border Fencing Dispute

Bangladesh has the highest growth rate of population in world, but not able to provide basic amenities, including food to its citizens. Therefore, with the purpose of earning bread and butter Bangladeshi citizen illegally cross over to the Indian side. Illegal Bangladeshi migrants are causing a big strain over the Indian economy and a threat to the Indian security.[20] The border fencing proposal was first put forward by the Assam government in January 1965.

In order to prevent illegal migration from across the border, the Government of India had sanctioned the construction of fencing of border beyond the 150 yard zone within its own territory in line with the boundary agreement in two phases. The Indian government started border fencing project in 1989 and fencing was done in 854 km against the approved target of 857 km. The phase-II involved 2429 km of the total 4,096 km long border and 1907 km fencing was completed.

Phase-III was in Assam's Dhubri district. Around 364 km of the fencing that was constructed as part of phase-I of the project was replaced so far as the old fencing had become outdated and damaged at several portions. About 861 km of fencing constructed under Phase-I was replaced by March 31, 2010. By late 2010 India had fenced 3,300km.[21]

Bangladesh's Stand

Bangladesh says that the border fencing work is the violation of the International Boundary Laws as well as the violation of Indira-Mujib Land Boundary Agreement 1974.

Indian Stand

India defends its stand on the ground that fencing work is being done within 150 km inside the Indian Territory. Hence it is neither the violation of International Boundary Law, nor the violation of Indira-Mujib Land Boundary Agreement 1974.

However, In spite of this justification, BDR is still resorting to unprovoked firing and causing hindrances in the fencing work and pushing Bangladeshi citizens in the Indian territory.[22]

Illegal Migration

Illegal migration refers to those who migrate across national borders in a way that violates the migration laws of the destination country.[23] Issue of illegal migration is a crucial issue for India. Since the partition of the Indian subcontinent and formation of East Pakistan and later Bangladesh, a large

number of their nationals came to India without valid documents. The terror unleashed by the military of Pakistan forced about 10 million people to cross over to India in 1971. Many of them returned back after the liberation war in 1971, but a considerable undocumented section stayed back and mingled with mainstream of India's life.[24]

There are no authentic figures available of the exact number of illegal migrants from Bangladesh into India. Their estimates vary from 12 million to 13 million.[25] On August 2008, Sh. A.K. Mitra, DG BSF mentioned that out of the Bangladeshi nationals who had come to India through West Bengal on valid travel documents between 1972 to 2005, nearly 12 lakh did not return to their country after expiry of their visa.[26]

Illegal migrants have settled in various Indian states including West Bengal, Assam, Bihar, Tripura and New Delhi.[27] According to Assam Governor A.K. Sinha, there are 5.4 million in W.Bengal, 4 million in Assam, 0.8 million in Tripura, 0.5 million in Bihar, 0.5 million in Maharashtra, 0.5 million in Rajasthan and 0.3 million in Delhi illegal Bangladeshi migrants settled.[28]

Illegal migration is negatively affecting the demographic composition of India's North-East Region. It is alleged that smuggling, human trafficking, illegal movements and other displeasing occurrences often torment the border forces and Bangladesh's military campus are mainly cited as being responsible for carrying out disruptive activities thwarting the peace and security of India's North East Region.[29]

Role of Bangladesh in Northeast Insurgency

Northeast India has been facing insurgency since 1956, when Naga conflict started in Nagaland. It is one of the oldest unresolved armed conflicts of the world. Currently; over a dozen well-established fundamentalist militant organizations are operating armed conflict in Northeast India, most of them mainly active in Assam.[30] The armed insurgent groups in Assam like the United Liberation Front of Assam (ULFA), The National Democratic Front of Bodoland (NDFB), Kamtapur Liberation

Organization (KLO), The Muslim United Liberation Tiger of Assam (MULTA) etc have established training camps in Bangladesh and they also procure their weapons from Cox Bazar area near the Bangladesh–Myanmar border.[31]

MULTA has been maintaining its links with most of the Islamic militant groups in Bangladesh including HUJI, JMB and JMJB.[32] These outfits indulge in the guerilla/terrorist activities such as blasts in buses and trains, laying landmine, kidnappings, sabotages, shootouts murders etc. They are brutal terrorists who do not leave even women and children.[33]

The ULFA leader Anup Chetia and ATTF leader Sanjeev Deb Barman, who were arrested by the Awami League government (1997), were allowed to seek political asylum in Bangladesh and their movements, activities and political statements were periodically documented by the Bangladeshi media.

Bangladesh's former Prime Minister Begum Khaleda Zia even termed the Indian militants as "freedom fighters". India has time and again identified and named a number of terrorist training camps run by Northeast insurgents within Bangladesh. This allegation was trimly denied by the BNP government.[34]

India had maintained for long time that the insurgents from the Northeast found safe havens in Bangladesh and enjoyed the support of Md. Mafizur Rahman and Din Mohammad and the linkages between them were beyond doubt.[35] The AL government has also arrested some of the noted Indian terrorists based in Bangladesh. It shows that the northeast terrorist outfits had close link with Bangladesh and they used Bangladesh's territory to foment trouble in turbulent India's Northeastern states.[36]

Recent Development in India-Bangladesh relations

India was the first country to recognize Bangladesh as a separate and independent state and established diplomatic relations with the country immediately after its independence in December 1971. India's links with Bangladesh are civilisational, cultural, social and economic. There is much that unites the

two countries – a shared history and common heritage, linguistic and cultural ties, passion for music, literature and the arts.

This commonality is reflected in our multi-dimensional and expanding relations. India and Bangladesh's geographical locations complement each other and present an opportunity for both to further develop their connectivity links and economies. High-level exchanges, visits and meetings take place regularly alongside the wide ranging people-to-people interaction.

The landmark visit of Indian Prime Minister Narender Modi to Bangladesh in 6-7 June, 2015 has opened a new chapter in India-Bangladesh bilateral relations. During Prime Minister Modi's visit both countries ratified a historic agreement for exchange to end a four-decade old border dispute. Bangladesh endorsed the deal in 1974 (which was called Indira-Mujib Land Boundary Agreement) but the Indian Parliament passed a Constitution Amendment bill that paved the way for operationalising the agreement to exchange 162 enclaves only in June 2015.

Under the deal, 111 border enclaves will be transferred to Bangladesh in exchange 51 enclaves will be transferred to India. Officials of the two countries signed and exchanged documents for ratifying the 1974 India-Bangladesh Land Boundary Agreement in the presence of Indian Prime Minister Modi and his counterpart Sheikh Hasina.[37] The two countries also launched two trans-border bus services – one the Kolkata-Dhaka-Agartala route and another on the Dhaka-Shillong-Guwahati.

The Kolkata-Dhaka-Agartala bus service would reduce by 560 km or nearly one-third the distance between West Bengal to Tripura.[38] Another agreement was also signed for building power plants to produce 4600 MW of electricity to help Bangladesh overcome its energy crisis.

Prime Minister Modi announced a fresh line of credit of $2 billion to Bangladesh,[39] which is expected to be used particularly for developing public transport, roads, railways, inland waterways and ports, apart from education and health. It needs to be mentioned here that the earlier line of credit of $863 million and $200 million in grant was mostly used by Dhaka to improve rail connectivity. Definitely, it will improve the infrastructure development in Bangladesh.[40]

The visiting Indian Prime Minister also expressed confidence to have a fair solution to the Teesta and Feni river water sharing issues with Bangladesh with the support of state government in India. After extensive talks between Modi and Sheikh Hasina, Bangladesh's Prime Minister promised "zero tolerance stance against terrorism." That will be very helpful for India to counter Northeast insurgency because Bangladesh is seen as hiding ground for insurgents of Northeast India. Both countries signed 22 agreement[41] these are following:

1. Exchange of instruments of Ratification of 1974 Land Boundary Agreement and its 2011 protocol

2. Exchange of letters on Modalities for implementation of 1974 Land Boundary Agreement and its 2011 protocol

3. Bilateral Trade Agreement (renewal)

4. Agreement on Coastal Shipping between India and Bangladesh

5. Protocol on Inland Water Transit and Trade (renewal)

6. Bilateral Cooperation Agreement between Bangladesh Standards and Testing Institution and Bureau of Indian Standards (BIS) on cooperation in the field of standardisation.

7. Agreement on Dhaka-Shillong-Guwahati bus service and its protocol

8. Agreement on Kolkata-Dhaka-Agartala bus service and its protocol

9. MoU between Coast Guards

10. MoU on prevention of human-trafficking

11. MoU on prevention of smuggling and circulation fake currency notes

12. MoU between India and Bangladesh and for Extending a New Line of Credit (LoC) of $2

million by government of India to government of Bangladesh.

13. MoU on Blue Economy and Maritime Cooperation in the Bay of Bengal and the Indian Ocean

14. MoU on Use of Chittagong and Mongla Ports

15. MoU for a Project under IECC (India Endowment for Climate Change) of SAARC

16. MoU on Indian Economic Zone

17. Cultural Exchange Programmes for the years 2015-17

18. Statement of Intent on Bangladesh-India Education Cooperation (adoption)

19. Agreement between Bangladesh Submarine Cable Company Limited (BSCCL) and Bharat Sanchar Nagar Limited for leasing of international bandwidth for Internet at Akhaura

20. MoU between University of Dhaka, Bangladesh and Council of Scientific and Industrial Research, India for Joint Research on Oceanography of the Bay of Bengal

21. MoU between University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh and University of Jamia Milia Islamia, India

22. Handing over of consent letter by Insurance Development and Regulatory Authority (IDRA), Bangladesh to Life Insurance Cooperation (LIC), India to start operations in Bangladesh.[42]

Conclusion

It is favorable time to move towards a deeper relationship between India and Bangladesh, particularly in terms of India's North-East because Bangladesh adopted zero tolerance stance against terrorism and also explore greater connectivity, including transit and access to the Chittagong Port. Energy cooperation is an area where there are enormous opportunities, both at the bilateral as well as the regional levels.

The India-Bangladesh relationship does carry strong historical and cultural overtones, both sides also realize the immense benefits of a strong relationship. India is committed to carry forward the mission of strengthening the historic bonds and impart a vision for the future that is durable and sustainable and conducive for the collective prosperity of the region. Both countries are keen to enhance connectivity not just between them, but also with other countries in South Asia.

The BBIN (Bangladesh, Bhutan, India and Nepal) corridor was high on the agenda during the Modi visit. Apart from the SAARC region, Bangladesh is an important conduit for India's Act East Policy, and there have even been some proposals of a strong trilateral cooperation between India-Bangladesh and Myanmar, such as a gas pipeline (although the current security situation may not permit it).

Both countries are also part of a number of groupings that seek to expand South Asia's connectivity with Southeast Asia and China; these include the Mekong Ganga Cooperation Initiative, BIMSTEC, and the BCIM (Bangladesh-China-India-Myanmar) economic corridor project. The Teesta treaty has likely been placed on the backburner. Modi has been trying to build consensus with Mamta Banerjee, the West Bengal Chief Minister, but progress has not been forthcoming, and this is unlikely to change until after the West Bengal Assembly elections.

On the whole, the Modi visit symbolized the bipartisan consensus among the major political parties in India on enhancing relations with Bangladesh. With settled and demarcated land and maritime boundaries, the two countries are now set for opening a new chapter - New Beginning-New Direction - in their bilateral ties.

References

1. Kumar, Satish , "India-Bangladesh Relations and Problems of North East India", *World Focus*, Volume XXXIII, Number 2, Feb. 2012, p. 81

2. Bammi, Lt. Gen. Y.M., *India-Bangladesh Relations the Way Ahead*, Vis Books India, New Delhi, 2000, p. 1

3. Kumar, Satish, "India-Bangladesh Relations and Problems of North East India", *World Focus*, op/cit, p. 82

4. http://www.iasscore.in/latest-news-58.html

5. Mantoo, Shahnawaz Ahmad, "India and the Strategic importance of Bangladesh", *Peace and Security Review*, Vol.5, No.9, First Quarter, 2013, pp.48-57

6. Ibid, http://www.iasscore.in/latest-news-58.html

7. Pandey, Punam, "Revisiting the Politics of the Ganga Water Dispute between India and Bangladesh", *India Quarterly*, March 2012.

8. http://www.american.edu/ted/ice/indobang.htm

9. http://globalvoicesonline.org/2012/06/08/india-bangladesh-water-disputes-and-teesta-river-diplomacy/http://www.strategicforesight.com/innerarticles.php?id=189#.VXp6Ee_ALmQ

10. http://archive.thedailystar.net/forum/2009/july/tipaimukh.htm

11. Singh, Rickin Th, *India's Water relations with her neighbours*, Vij Books India, 2011, p.83-84;https://polehim.wordpress.com/article/dam-or-no-dam

12. Talukdar, S.P, *Chakmas: An Embattled Tribe*, Uppal Publication House, New Delhi, 1994, p.87.

13. "Victims of Partition: A Case of Chakma and Hajong Refugees of Arunachal Pradesh", *Think India*, Vol. 9, No.4, October-December, 2006, p. 59-71.

14. Bhattacharya, Swapna, "The Refugee-generating Chittagong Hill Tracts: past, present, and future", in S.K, Roy (ed.), *Refugees and Human Rights*, Rawat Publication, Delhi, 2001, pp.317-344.

15. Talukdar, S.P, *The Chakmas: Life and Struggle*, Gian Publication, New Delhi, 1988, p.47.

16. Prasad, Chunnu, India's refugee regime and resettlement policy: a case of Chakmas in Arunachal Pradesh, Thesis submitted to the Centre for Political Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, 2010.

17. Singh, Deepak K., "Stateless Chakmas in Arunachal Pradesh: From Rejected Peoples to Unwanted Migrants", *Social Science Research Journal*, 9(1), 2001, pp. 47-82.

18. Singh, Deepak K., "Refugee question in Arunachal Pradesh: Some conflicting currents", *Journal of Anthropological Survey of India*, 50(4), December, 2001, pp. 95-102.

19. http://epao.net/epSubPageExtractor.asp?src=news_section.Press_Release.Press_Release_2015.Chakmas_urge_Modi_to_raise_CHT_issue_during_Dhaka_visit; www.iosrjournals.org.

20. T.V. channel Aaj Tak 'Vishesh-Program on Dosti Ki Dushmni (Bangladesh)' 9:30pm April19, 2005.

21. http://www.globalsecurity.org/military/world/india/india-bangladesh-fence.htm

22. *The Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, April24, 2005.

23. Ahmed, Shahnawaj, "Bangladesh Illegal Immigration: Effect and Consequences", *Journal of Eurasian Studies*, Vol.4th, Issue 3, July-Sept.2012.

24. Datta , Pranati, "Push-Pull Factors of Undocumented Migration from Bangladesh to West Bengal: A Perception Study", *The Qualitative Report*,9(2), 2004, p.337

25. Bammi, Lt. Gen. Y.M., *India-Bangladesh Relations: The Way Ahead*, Vij Books India, New Delhi, 2010, p.147.

26. *The Statesman*, Kolkata, January 22, 2008.

27. Mazumdar, Sayantani Sen, "Illegal Immigration: A Cause Study of Deep Concerns in India Bangladesh Bilateral Relations", Global India Foundation Kolkata, Jan.5, 2011.

28. Hazarika, Sanjay, *Rites of Passage: Border Crossings, Imagined, Homelands India's East and Bangladesh*, Penguin Books, Delhi, p.229.

29. Mazumdar, Sayantani Sen, Op. Cit.

30. Upadhyay, Archana, *India's Fragile Borderlands: The Dynamics of Terrorism in North East India*, I.B. Tauris and Company Ltd, London, 2009, p. 70

31. Ibid, p. 142; See also Ahmed, Abu Nasar Saied, *Fundamentalism in Bangladesh: Its Impact on India*, Akansha Publishing House, New Delhi, 2008, p. 188; Gupta, Dipanpar Sen and Sudhir Kumar Singh, *Insurgency in North-East India: The Role of Bangladesh*, Vedams Books, New Delhi, 2004, pp. 103-104.

32. Ahmed, Abu Nasar Saied, *Fundamentalism in Bangladesh: Its Impact on India*, Akansha Publishing House, New Delhi, 2008, p. 189

33. Gupta, Dipanpar Sen and Sudhir Kumar Singh, *Insurgency in North-East India: The Role of Bangladesh*, Vedams Books, New Delhi, 2004, p. 104.

34. *India-Bangladesh Relations: Towards Convergence, Task Force Report*, IDSA, New Delhi, September 2011, p. 43

35. Datta, Sreeradha, "Complicity of State Actors, Strategic Comments", IDSA, New Delhi, March 9, 2009.

36. *India-Bangladesh Relations: Towards Convergence, Task Force Report*, IDSA, New Delhi, September 2011, p. 45

37. *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, June 7, 2015.

38. Ibid

39. *The Sunday Tribune*, Chandigarh, June 7, 2015.

40. http://www.idsa.in/idsacomments/ NotunProjonmo Nayi DishainIndia Bangladesh Relations_sspattanaik_110615.html

41. *The Sunday Tribune*, Chandigarh, June 7, 2015.

42. Ibid; http://www.ibnlive.com/news/india/india-bangladesh-sign-22-agreements-modi-announces-line-of-credit-worth-2-billion-1002615.html

◆◆

WTO Dispute Settlement Mechanism & Developing Countries

Biranchi N.P. Panda*

[In international trade, WTO promised to each member that trade liberalization will benefit all and it assures a free and fair trade practice through WTO regime. The multilateral framework of international trade originated after Second World War, which was a shift from bilateralism in the international economy, policy and trade. This process of shift from GATT to World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995, deals with the rules of trade between nations at the global level.]

In 1995, WTO introduced three major agreements consisting of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (formerly GATT), the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) and the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). In addition to that it also introduced and developed the old dispute settlement mechanism with special rules and procedures on settling trade disputes among member countries.

The main objectives of these agreements were to promote international trade, treat all nations equally and especially during the course of dispute settlement. However, many a time developing countries have questioned the Dispute Settlement System (DSM), which they feel does not favor them to the extent it favors and protects developed countries.

Nonetheless, they generally face three primary challenges if they are to participate effectively in the WTO dispute settlement system. These challenges are: (i) a lack of legal expertise in WTO law and the capacity to organize information concerning trade barriers and opportunities to challenge them; (ii) constrained financial resources, including for the hiring of outside legal counsel to effectively use the WTO legal system, which has become increasingly costly; and (iii) fear of political and economic pressure from the United States and EC, undermining their ability to bring WTO claims.

* Sr. Consultant, Indian Institute of Corporate Affairs (IICA), Govt. of India.

However, many scholars argue that the DSM has not eliminated power-based relationship between the countries till date. The problems and issues related to the dispute settlement system of WTO have raised concerns among developing countries. To avoid these issues and problems, there have been continuous proposals and suggestions by the developing countries to change some of the rules and procedure as well as to maintain transparency, equality and play a neutral role in the global trading system.

DSM: Development & Acceptance

Development of Dispute Settlement Mechanism

During the 1970s & the 1980s, the GATT panel was not compulsory as disputes were usually treated as diplomatic negotiations during regular meetings of the GATT signatories. The second change is about the "automaticity". One of the most decisive changes from GATT to the WTO mechanism is the introduction of "negative consensus." Unless there is a consensus within the DSB to reject the establishment of a panel, the panel must be set up.

Similarly, decisions of the panel and the AB are also automatically adopted unless there is a DSB consensus to reject them. The old system of GATT dispute settlement system was greatly criticized for its weaknesses by several GATT member countries. As a result, on 1 January 1995 the WTO came into force and the Dispute Settlement Understanding or DSU, was attached to the WTO Agreement as

Annex 2 and constitutes an integral part of that Agreement, which is effectively an interpretation and elaboration of GATT Article XXIII.

Dispute Settlement system is called the judicial body of the WTO mechanism. This judicial mechanism provides a legal and organized process to speedy resolution of disputes and prevents deliberate blocking action by the erring member countries. Its prime objective is the prompt settlement of disputes between WTO members concerning their rights and obligations under the various agreements.

Two important policy considerations are referred to in the DSU, namely, protecting the security and predictability of the DSS and satisfactory settlement of disputes (Article 3.2). The most significant innovations to the GATT dispute settlement system concern: (1) the quasi-automatic adoption of requests for the establishment of a Panel, of dispute settlement reports and of requests for the authorization to suspend concessions; (2) the strict timeframes for various stages of the dispute settlement process; and (3) the possibility of appellate review of Panel reports. Broadly, the objective and purpose of WTO DSS was to establish a neutral mechanism for peaceful and positive dispute settlement.

There are essentially four phases in the WTO dispute settlement process: consultations, the Panel process, the appellate process and surveillance of implementation. The Dispute Settlement Body is the custodian of the dispute settlement system. It has been empowered to establish panels, constitute an Appellate Body, exercise surveillance for compliance with rules and recommend and authorize retaliatory measures in case of non-implementation of recommendations.

The details of the procedures for dispute settlement are contained in the Uruguay documents. The WTO dispute settlement system provides for more than one dispute settlement process or method through bilateral procedures (negotiations and consultations - Article 4 of the DSU), through good offices, conciliation and mediation (Article 5); through adjudication by ad hoc panels and the Appellate Body (Articles 6 to 20) or through arbitration (Article 25).

Table 1. Stages in the WTO Dispute Settlement Process

How long to settle a dispute?	
60 days	Consultations, mediation, etc
45 days	Panel set up and panelists appointed
6 months	Final panel report to parties
3 weeks	Final panel report to WTO members
60 days	Dispute Settlement Body adopts report (if no appeal)
Total= 1 year	(without appeal)
60-90 days	Appeals report
30 days	Dispute Settlement Body adopts appeals report
Total =1year 3months	(with appeal)

Source: World Trade Organization, "Understanding the WTO – A Unique Contribution,"

http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/

tif_e/disp1_e.htm

Acceptance of DSM: Developing and Developed Countries

The WTO's main function is to provide an orderly and effective medium for international trade and communication and to reduce potential conflict in trade among member-states. DSU fosters a rule-based dispute settlement system as opposed to a power-based system. World Trade Organization attempts to treat all nations equally, especially during the course of dispute settlement. But in recent years, increased cases in DSU have strained resources in the WTO Secretariat and led to a notable slowdown in the dispute settlement process.

In 2012, the WTO received the highest number of complaints in ten years, and activity remained elevated in 2013. Over the same period, the number of senior secretariat lawyers decreased due to a

policy implemented by then-Director General Pascal Lamy to freeze all staff promotions to senior grades and recruit only at junior levels.

From the below table, it has been seen that developed countries are the most frequent user of the system. This table presents that the USA is on the top of the list, which has participated in 228 cases, out of which 107 cases as complainant and 121 cases as respondent. Second position is acquired by European Union with 174 cases, including 94 cases as complainant and 80 as respondent.

Similarly, other major developing countries have also used the system in a moderate way: Canada: (34 as complaints and 18 as respondent), also Japan: (19 cases as complaints and 15 as respondents), and Australia: (7 as complaints and 15 as respondents. India, for example, has participated in 21 cases as complaints and 22 cases as respondents. Brazil has participated as complaints in 27 cases and as respondent 15 cases.

Mexico has participated as complaints in 23 cases and as respondent in 14 cases. Argentina has participated as complaint 20 cases and as respondent 22 cases. China a relatively new member has participated in 12 cases as complaints and as respondent in 32 cases. This is also found that developing countries have a higher ratio of participation as third party. This can be attributed to the advantages associated with this kind of participation such as lower cost, the chance to gain experience and a lower degree of confrontation with trading partners.

It has been seen that after Doha Development Agenda in 2001, developing countries' involvement in DSU increased. This trend is significantly affected by major developing countries like India, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina and China, who managed to use the system to achieve and defend their trade interests in the last years. Developing countries represent more than two-thirds of WTO members. Although in the DSU it is more than their share of the international trade (around 30%), their participation is still less than their membership share in the WTO.

However, in the status of defendants, there is a clear tendency that the appearance of developed countries has decreased and the appearance of developing countries has increased continuously since 2001. This pattern reveals that developing countries began to overcome their passive attitude towards the legal dispute settlement mechanism, started using the system more actively for securing their trade interests.

In the figure 1,2,3 & 4 also it is clearly stated that the developed countries are steps ahead from developing countries in case of complainant and respondent. In 2013 and also in 2014 both years developed countries accessed more DSU system than developing countries as complaint and respondent. However, the developing countries also started involving themselves in the system more actively. (*See figure 1,2,3, & 4 below*).

The new DSM of the WTO better enables developing countries to use the system for trade dispute resolution. However, many developing members of the WTO are long being among the critics of the new system's inequality since its establishment.

According to Chakravarti Raghavan, the WTO dispute settlement mechanism has experienced major problems. One is in relation to a dispute between parties of equal strength and the second is the failure of the WTO system to foster relations with weaker and developing countries. The problems and issues in the WTO dispute settlement are discussed below.

Table 2: WTO members involved in disputes, 1995 to 2014*

Member	Complainant	Respondent	Member	Complainant	Respondent
Antigua and Barbuda	1	0	Malaysia	1	1
Argentina	20	22	Mexico	23	14
Armenia	0	1	Moldova, Republic of	1	1

Australia	7	15	Netherlands	0	3
Bangladesh	1	0	New Zealand	9	0
Belgium	0	3	Nicaragua	1	2
Brazil	27	15	Norway	4	0
Canada	34	18	Pakistan	4	3
Chile	10	13	Panama	7	1
China	12	32	Peru	3	5
Colombia	5	4	Philippines	5	6
Costa Rica	5	0	Poland	3	1
Croatia	0	1	Portugal	0	1
Czech Republic	1	2	Romania	0	2
Denmark	1	1	Russian Federation	2	5
Dominican Republic	1	7	Singapore	1	0
Ecuador	3	3	Slovak Republic	0	3
Egypt	0	4	South Africa	0	4
El Salvador	1	0	Spain	0	3
European Union (formerly EC)	94	80	Sri Lanka	1	0
France	0	4	Sweden	0	1
Germany	0	2	Switzerland	4	0
Greece	0	3	Chinese Taipei	4	0
Guatemala	9	2	Thailand	13	3
Honduras	8	0	Trinidad and Tobago	0	2
Hong Kong, China	1	0	Turkey	2	9
Hungary	5	2	Ukraine	3	2
India	21	22	United Kingdom	0	3
Indonesia	9	11	United States of America	107	121
Ireland	0	3	Uruguay	1	1
Italy	0	1	Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of	1	2
Japan	19	15	Viet Nam	2	0
Korea, Republic of	16	14			

Figure 2: Requests for consultations in 2013, by complainant

Argentina		2	
China	1		
Cuba	1		
Denmark/ Faroe Islands	1		
European Union			3
Guatemala	1		
Indonesia		2	
Japan		2	
Korea, Rep. of	1		
New Zealand	1		
Panama	1		
Russian Federation	1		
United States			3

Figure 1: Requests for consultations in 2013, by complainant

Australia		2		
Brazil	1			
China	1			
Colombia	1			
European Union				4
India	1			
Indonesia			3	
Pakistan	1			
Peru	1			
Russian Federation		2		
Ukraine	1			
United States		2		

Figure 4: Requests for consultations in 2014, by respondent

Figure 3: Requests for consultations in 2014, by complainant

Brazil	1		
Canada	1		
European Union		4	
Pakistan	1		
Indonesia	1		
Chinese Taipei New Zealand Panama	1 1 1		
Russian Federation	1		
United States	1		

Figure: 4 Requests for consultations by respondent

Canada	1		
European Union		3	
Indonesia			4
China	1		
Russian Federation		3	

DSM: Issues and Challenges

Operational Issues of WTO DSU: Concern has been seen on the DSU procedures and operations on part-time non-professional panelists, as disputes grow day-by-day among the nations. The question of competence of these part-time panelists, given the rules based legal foundations of the dispute settlement procedures and the heavy workload. Another concerns raises about the transparency of the Panel and Appellate Systems in their procedure.

Evidence and written submissions to Panels generally remain confidential until the publication of Panel Reports. Greater transparency is, therefore, unlikely to have an adverse impact upon the system although it is opposed by many developing countries.

Cost of Access: Due to shortage of human resources, the developing countries always depend

on the expertise of the developed countries to get their WTO rights. As the present dispute settlement process is very costly and lengthy, it may contain various elements such as preparation of a complaint, collection of data on the scope of the infringement, and calculation of the precise monetary value of the injury using plausible price elasticity.

In addition, the complaint needs to be prepared by lawyers having a thoroughgoing knowledge of the particular legal aspects of the GATT/WTO Agreement. The litigation costs can go up if there are other complainants whose complaints target the same disputable trade measure of the same defendant.

International Politics Factors: It has been seen that international politics factors are also one of the major concerns for developing countries, which could also influence country's position during DS procedure. In this perspective, trade disputes are partly generated by political relationships and are the result of the structures of power and conflicts between countries. Power is traditionally defined by its means, i.e. by the resources, which make it possible to impose its will on others (or to prevent the others from being opposed to its will).

In other words, it is defined like means of constraint on the decisions of the others. Iida (1999) argues that power is likely to influence the issue of the DS procedure, through bilateral arrangements, and to allow favorable verdicts in spite of trade deviant practices from WTO rules.

Limited Power of Retaliation: In the situation, where countries are found to be in breach of law, it is very difficult to penalise developed countries. In some cases the complainant countries have taken retaliatory measures but they are effective when implemented by developed countries. Bagwell and Staiger (2000) emphasize that retaliation threat is a central component of the WTO DS system.

Retaliation threat provides an enforcement mechanism, which deters violation of trade agreements. However, this mechanism is limited by

the severity of credible threat of retaliation. Retaliation must be sufficiently high to induce enough long-term losses in order to incite the defendant to conform its trade practice to WTO rules. Therefore, the current rules of the DS procedure entail a bias against countries with weak capacity to retaliate.

Butler and Hauser (1999), Breuss (2001) and Bown (2003a) argue that the nature of authorized sanction is likely, not only to discourage some countries to use the DSU, but more specifically, to influence the final outcome of the litigation. The advanced arguments refer to the traditional economic analysis.

Provisions Regarding Special and Differential Treatment: Although special and differential treatment had been provided to facilitate equal participation by developing countries in the dispute settlement process, these provisions have not in reality been implemented with equal effectiveness. Such provisions are of a declaratory nature and have no implementation modalities. Developing countries in several cases have failed to use them.

Special Attention: Some of the clauses in the DSU regarding developing countries have in practice proved to be more declaratory than operative. For instance, the concept (Article 4.10) of giving "special attention" to the particular problems and interests of developing countries during consultations has no operative content and has not been developed in Panel or Appellate Body reports. Although in one case this article was mentioned in a DSB meeting to support a developing country's position, there was no substantive discussion of the "special attention" concept. A similar problem arose with special and differential treatment clauses in such agreements as that on anti-dumping.

Article 8.10 states that if developing countries wish to keep one panellist in dispute cases with the developed countries, they can request for it and it is the duty of the Secretariat to nominate a panellist based on that request. However, in cases between the United States *Measure Affecting Imports of Woven Wool Shirts and Blouses* from India,

complaint by India (WT/DS33), there was very much disappointment in store for India.

Extension of the Time Periods: Article 12(10) of the DSU provides optional "extension of time periods" for the developing countries in the consultation period. It is the duty of the DSB Chairman to inform the developing-country complainant about it, but it has been seen neglected by the DSB chairman.

Surveillance of Implementation: DSU provisions related to the surveillance of implementation of DSB recommendations and rulings are too weak to imply any difference between the possibilities open to industrial and developing countries. Article 21.7, mandates that when a matter is raised by a developing country, the DSB is to consider what further action might be appropriate to the circumstances. The language of this provision merely replicates that of the 1979 Understanding on Notification, Consultation, Dispute Settlement and Surveillance. To date, this provision has not been used by a developing country, perhaps because a precondition is that the country devotes resources to analysing and following cases.

Responsibilities of the Secretariat: According to DSU Article 27.2, it is the responsibility of the Secretariat to provide all means of legal help. The experts in the secretariat are required to maintain impartiality. Unlike the lawyers hired to fight a case, the experts are constrained from advising on the best manner of pursuing a case with a view to gaining a favourable adjudication.

The Advisory Centre on WTO Law: The complex rules of the WTO require that members have a full understanding of the content and scope of their rights and obligations when they want to access the dispute settlement mechanism. The Centre has three principal functions: (a) training government officials in WTO dispute settlement, (b) providing specialized legal advice on WTO law, to include support throughout legal proceedings; and (c) legal assistance in WTO dispute settlement proceedings.

The ACWL faces the problem of funding to be able to function effectively. A developed country may not want to give sufficient funds for legal assistance that is used in litigation challenging its own actions. In respect of legal advice, developing-country members of the Centre are entitled to receive annually a specified amount of free legal advice on WTO law, while non-member developing countries may receive such advice at higher rates and subject to the priority enjoyed by members.

This current format allows only governments to seek subsidized legal assistance, and not necessarily the exporters or trade industry associations themselves. The problem mainly pertains to professionals in international law with a sound grasp of economic nuances.

Transparency and Participation: Under GATT, the 1979 DSU stated that its objective in international trade dispute proceedings was to bring "as much clarity and transparency as possible into the operation of the dispute settlement provisions of the General Agreement in order to make the provisions more predictable ..."

But during the negotiations of the Uruguay Round the importance of transparency was somewhat overshadowed by negotiations in critical new substantive trade areas, such as agriculture, intellectual property, services, and textiles. But some WTO provisions state explicitly that there should be confidentiality in consultation and Panel proceedings unlike other international bodies like ICJ & ECHR (Article 4, 14 and 18 DSU).

In addition, there are some other issues and challenges by which the developing countries not get equal status and opportunity in the WTO regime and these are as follow:

Participation in Consensus Based Decision-Making: Now, there are more than 100 developing and least developed countries, which are members of the WTO. Though in a majority, they experience that the WTO rules and regulations are weighted against them. This is because the decisions are not

taken on the basis of vote but by establishing consensus. In consensus-based decision-making the developing countries have less opportunity to participate. Some constraints to this participation are elaborated below.

Staff Assistance to Developing Countries: The Secretariat of the WTO has limited power. As a result, the power hierarchies outside get translated into the negotiating politics of the WTO. It has been observed that the Quad (US, EU, Canada and Japan) are the best equipped and able to negotiate deals to their advantage. The negotiators and experts belonging to developed countries have little interest in finding about a just solution for developing countries.

Informal Process in WTO Decision-Making: A major problem in WTO meetings is the informal consultation, which leads to lack of transparency. A small group of people decide on the list of participants for these consultations. Most of the time this is done in a confidential manner in order to avoid further requests for participation. In the Seattle Ministerial Conference, some steps were taken to avoid this non-transparency. However, this has not led to any substantial change in the consultation process. The 'Green Room' diplomacy has been replaced by the term 'small group meetings'.

The Role of the Secretary and Some Other Organisational Issues: Article VI.4 of the Agreement establishing the WTO states, "The responsibilities of the Director-General and of the staff of the Secretariat shall be exclusively international in character. In the discharge of their duties, the Director-General and the staff of the Secretariat shall not seek or accept instructions from any government or any other authority external to the WTO. They shall refrain from any action which might adversely reflect on their position as international officials." However, developing countries allege that the WTO Secretariat and the Director are partial to the interests of developed countries.

Conclusion

The debate is still going on whether the WTO provides an equal and fair trade among member nations, especially with respect to measure of openness and the choice of base years. These uncertainties will stop only when the developed countries give special attention to the developing countries' issues and challenges and keep up the practice of recommending selective trade openness.

Despite WTO's non-legitimate governance, the strong northern nations dominate proceedings and sway decisions, and the southern nations often do not accurately represent their citizens' interests, meaning representation of citizens is unequal. Now it's the time developing countries have to take certain important steps to improve their participation in the WTO dispute settlement system, they have to continue to increase institutional capacity and coordination of trade policy at multiple levels, from the national to the regional to the global.

Side-by-side, they will need, in particular, to develop their own coordinative mechanisms to include private sector and civil society representatives. The developing countries should focus on working with the private sector, which can foster the development of reflexes in firms and trade associations to view the WTO as an opportunity to ensure market access, thereby, more effectively using the WTO system to their advantage.

References

1. WTO Agreements, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade 1947, General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. 1994, World Trade Development Report, World Trade Report, Trade and Development Report, Report of International Law Commission, GATT History Negotiation Documents.

Books & Articles

- Collier, John and Lowe, Vaughan. 2000."*The Settlement of Disputes in International Law (Institutions and Procedures)*". Oxford University Press, New York.

- Hudec E. Robert E. 2002. "The Adequacy of WTO Dispute Settlement Remedies: A Developing Country Perspective", *in* Bernard M. Hoekman et al. (eds.) *Development, Trade and the WTO: A Handbook*, 81, Washington, D.C.: World Bank.

- Den Bossche, Peter Van. 2005. The Law and Policy of the World Trade Organisation, Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- Hudec, Robert E. 2005. "The Adequacy of WTO Dispute Settlement Remedies", in Mavroidis, Petros C. and Sykes, Alan O. (eds.) The WTO and International Trade Law/ Dispute Settlement, Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc, 2005

- Jackson J. H. 2000. *"The Jurisprudence of GATT and the WTO: Insights on Treaty Law and Economic Relations"*, 133, Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press.

- Kent, Jones. 2004. *"Who's Afraid of the WTO"*. Oxford University Press, New York.

- Oesch, M. 2003. "*Standards of review in WTO Dispute Resolution*". Oxford University Press.

- Bello H. Judith. 2002. Some Practical Observations About WTO Settlement of Intellectual Property Disputes, 37, *Journal of International Law,* 357.

- Hoda, A., and S. Prakash. 2011. Is the GSP Scheme of the EU benefiting India's Exports? ICRIER Policy Series No. 6, November 2011(Accessed February 2012)

- Guzman, A. T., and Simmons, B. 2005. Power Plays & Capacity Constraints: The Selection of Defendants in WTO Disputes, *Journal for Legal studies,* 34 557-598.

- Jackson H. John. 1998. Dispute Settlement and the WTO: Emerging Problems, 1, *Journal of International Economic Law*, 329.

- Peter, Lichtenbaum, 1998. "Procedural issues in WTO dispute resolution", 19, *Michigan Journal of International Law,* 1195.

- MacRae, D. 2004. "What is the future of WTO dispute settlement?", *Journal of International Economic Law*, 3-21.

- Peter Lichtenbaum. 1998. Procedural Issues in WTO Dispute Resolution, 19 *Michigan Journal of International Law,* 11-95.

❖❖

Nehru: Nationalist to Internationalist

Rohit Kumar* & Balbir Singh**

[Colonial India gave birth to numerous great revolutionary thinkers and politicians and Nehru has his own place among those great thinkers. Though not a political philosopher in the conventional sense, Jawaharlal Nehru has nevertheless stressed his political ideas between idealism and realism; thinking somewhat as a philosopher while working as a politician and distinguished himself more or less as a philosopher politician. He becomes the sole figure of Indian national history only next to Gandhi. He virtually laid the foundation for modern India in his thought and deeds.]

Nehru was a great nationalist, though he had not propounded any new theory of nationalism. He struggled selflessly for about three decades and made tremendous sacrifices to win freedom for India. Due to his concerns for human race and civilization, he became more identified with internationalism, though he never sacrificed both into a great synthesis. He did not want that the independence of any country should endanger the right to the freedom of another country. The independence only for country's own sake was a myth in his opinion. He visualized that freedom of any country must be a milestone towards international cooperation and brotherhood.

Nehru as a Nationalist

Most of Nehru's life was dominated by politics. His was, in a profound sense, a political life. He first found a meaningful career in the politics of nationalism under the patronage and guidance of Mahatma Gandhi (Brown, 2004). Nehru says, "nationalism is essentially a group memory of past achievements, tradition and experiences, and nationalism is strong today than it has been... whenever a crises has arisen, nationalism has emerged again and dominated the scene, and people have sought comfort and strength in their old traditions. One of the remarkable developments of the present age has been rediscovery of the past and of the nation (Bhardwaj, 2005: 127).

---

* Research Scholar, Dept of Pol. Sc., Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla.
* UGC Sr. Research Fellow, Dept of Pol. Sc., Himachal Pradesh University, Shimla.

His *Discovery of India* helps in a sense to discover the real foundations of his nationalism. In fact, it was the result of an intellectual revolt against the misinterpretation of Indian traditions by imperialistic minds to keep the country in their subjugation.

After the First World War, Nehru had expressed his views about nationalism that, nationalism against hatred from alien rulers that, 'nationalism is essentially an anti-feeling and it feeds and fattens on hatred and anger against other national groups, and especially against the foreign rulers of the subject country' (Nehru 1958: 75). There was certainly this hatred and anger in India in 1921 against the British but, in comparison with other countries similarly situated, it was extraordinary little (Das M. N., 1961: 72-73).

Nehru's approach of nationalism was not narrow and imperialistic like the Fascist and Nazi regimes. His approach of nationalism was integrationist. According to him, national integration alone could eradicate the disruptionist forces of the country. He said that our goal of national integration is not merely confined to having a united nation but more than that, to make it useful for the services of humanity as a whole.

He stated: "we have to build up the great country into a mighty nation, mighty not in the ordinary sense of the word, that is, having great armies and all that, but mighty in thought, mighty in action, mighty in culture and mighty in its peaceful service of humanity" (Das, H. H. & Patro, 1988: 210).

The Nehruite nationalism clearly discriminated between friend and foe in national and international spheres on the basis of national self-interest. The targets of its hatred and anger were the exploiting systems, namely imperialism, fascism, capitalism, medievalism and feudalism. At home, it stood for active partnership and fraternity with growing movements of peasants, workers and middle classes. Abroad, it became an inalienable and powerful ally of the anti-fascist and anti- imperialist movements.

It shook off the purist and insular outlook of chauvinist negativism. It encouraged the inflow of progressive ideas and ideals (Prasad, 1998: 388). Nehru as a nationalist regarded nationalism as a living force in the history of modern nations. 'For any subject country', he said, 'national freedom must be the first and dominant urge; for India, with her intense sense of individuality and a past heritage, it was doubly so.

Three years after the independence of India, he said: 'We have just won our freedom but the nationalist sentiments that inspired our struggle still warm our hearts; they warm the heart of every Asian because the memories of past colonialism are still vivid in his mind. So, nationalism is still a live force in every part of nationalism, if it has to become real to the people. In any Asian country, a movement will succeed or fail in the measure that it associates itself with the deep seated urge of nationalism.'

Nationalism to Nehru is 'essentially a group memory of past achievements, traditions and experience'. Nehru's nationalism was not revival of the past, but it was a source of inspiration to the nationalist in a broader sense. The past history, traditions and heritage inspire nationalism among different peoples in varying degrees (Das, M. N., 1961: 73-75).

Nehru had said: 'The initial urge came to me, I suppose, through pride, both individual and national, and the desire, common to all men, to resist another's domination and have freedom to live the life of our choice. It seemed monstrous to me that a great country like India, with the rich and immemorial past, should be bound hand and foot to a far away island which impose its will upon her' (Nehru, 1951: 33).

Nehru wanted to make nationalism itself a kind of common religion for all and said: 'The time has come when we have to consider the service of India as our first religion whatever religion each one of us might profess. In the same way we hope all to consider ourselves Indians first, whatever caste or community we might represent' (Sharma & Chand, 1955: 77).

A great nation must believe in greater ideals as well as in greater actions. He never allowed his nationalistic ideas to tend towards any kind of irrationalism. In a rational way he lays great emphasis on national solidarity which means to him equally the development of the strength of a nation. It was his rationalism about Indian nationalism that serves ultimately the cause of internationalism also (Das, M. N., 1961: 91-93).

Nehru as an internationalist

With nationalistic vision Nehru slowly moved towards internationalism, keeping in mind India's interests and his socialist views. It was the outcome of his trip to Europe in 1927-28. In 1929, at the Lahore session of the Indian National Congress, Nehru spelt out his views on internationalism. He said, "having attained our freedom I have no doubt that India will welcome all attempts of world cooperation and federation, and will even agree to give up party of her own independence to a large group of which she is an equal member" (Das, H. H. & Patro, 1988: 212).

It was Nehru who broadened the outlook of the Indian National Congress and made it take keen interest in international affairs. He made Congress realise that the Indian struggle for freedom was a part for global struggle, and it could be made to succeed if it is geared in the international context. He visited Spain and China (1936-37) to express India's sympathy with the freedom fighters in pre-independence period (Chandra, 1998: 125).

He had said when he realised the power of growing independence among nations: "the world had become internationalised, production is international, markets are international and transport is international. Only man's ideas continue to be

governed by a dogma which has no real meaning today. No nation is really independent" (Bhagwan, Vishnu, 255). The realisation of the bond between man and man was the fundamental cause of his internationalist ideas. He could not think of Independence of India to be utilized only for a limited purpose to pursue selfish motives of nation only without having a regard for internationalism.

Nehru was greatly influenced by Gandhi in his internationalism too. Gandhi's patriotism, in Nehru's opinion, included the good of mankind in general. As a practitioner, Nehru always tried to keep a balance between his nationalistic and internationalist ideas. Even while looking for the interests for his own country, he never left the sight of well-being of other countries. Though, in politics after coming to the power, it is very difficult to practise the philosophy. But Nehru showed that neither his nationalism faded nor internationalism. He continuously worked for the pride and prestige of Indian nation and also for the well being of other nations of the world (Bhardwaj, 2005: 131-32).

As a principled thinker, Nehru set in motion some of his fundamental ideas on foreign policy in his *The Discovery of India*, which are as follow: First, there seems no alternative between world conquest and world association... The old division and the quest for power politics have little meaning today and do not fit it with our environment, yet they continue. Second, cooperation can only be on a basis of equality and mutual welfare on pulling up of the backward nations and people to a common level of well being and cultural advancement, on an elimination of racialism and domination (Nehru, 1989:540).

Third, no nation or no people are going to tolerate domination and exploitation by another, even though this is given some more pleasant name. With these principles, the rise of the Afro-Asian countries as independent blocs in world politics was consolidated in Nehru's policy of non-alignment which meant avoidance of alliances with either of two superpowers. The guiding principle was Panchsheel or the five principles of peaceful coexistence that emerged out of an agreement between India and China in 1954 (Chakrabarty & Pandey, 2009: 137-39).

He was such a great champion of internationalism that he even went ahead and talked of the world state in which not isolation but individuality of the nations will be respected. Nehru wished to have a 'demilitarised humanity' with a world police force. In spite of his advocacy of world government, Nehru never sacrificed true nationalism. Though his critics like John Foster Dulles who distrusted Nehru, went to such an extreme in criticizing the Non-Alignment policy that he remarked as "neutrality in all forms including non-alignment was a refusal to choose between evil and good... neutrality is immoral."

However, replying to such criticism, Nehru argued that non-alignment is not a policy of neutrality and also "It was not a policy which had grown out of nothing. It was conditioned by India's past, by the records of India's freedom struggle by her passion for peace" (Bhardwaj, 2005: 133-34).

Conclusion

Whatever may be the failures and successes, the fact remains that Nehru was a great internationalist and equally so he was a nationalist. Like other great heroes of modern India, viz., Tagore, Gandhi and Aurobindo, he believed in synthesis. His political ideas proved an excellent synthesis of nationalism and internationalism. Though, he cannot be created for presenting any theory of nationalism or internationalism, yet, he was a nationalist like any other patriot. His contribution in independence of India or in building the new nation cannot be overlooked.

To him there was no place for hatred based on culture, race and civilization. He was a believer of ideals of the United Nations. He laid foundations of non-alignment and gave priority for Afro-Asian cooperation and pleaded for equality of nations in any international setting but in 1949, he declared, "where freedom is threatened, where justice is menaced and where aggression takes place, we cannot and shall not be neutral". He pleaded that the world must have a world police force and advocated disarmament for realising the ideal of

world peace. He wished that hope of peace in the world should not remain just a pious aspiration but become a necessity if human civilization is to endure.

References

1. Brown, Judith M., *Nehru: A Political Life,* Oxford University Press, New Delhi, India, (2004).

2. Chakrabarty, Bidyut & Pandey, Indira Kumar, *Modern Indian Political Thought: text and Context,* Sage Publications, New Delhi, (2009).

3. Chandra, Prakash, *Modern Indian Political Thought,* Vikas Publishing House, New Delhi, (1998).

4. Das, H. H., and Patro, P. S. N., *Indian Political Traditions,* Sterling Publishers, New Delhi, (1988).

5. Das, M. N., *The Political Philosophy of Jawaharlal Nehru,* London, George Allen & Unwin, (1961).

6. Essay II, *Presidential Address to the National Congress,* Lucknow, India, (April, 1936).

7. Grover, Virender, *Jawarharlal Nehru: A Biography of his Vision and Ideas,* Deep & Deep Publications, New Delhi, (1998).

8. Kapoor, Suneera, *Thought and Vision of Jawaharlal Nehru,* Anamika Publishers & Distributors, New Delhi, (2005).

9. Nehru, Jawaharlal, *Autobiography: With Musing on Recent Events in India,* London: The Bodley Head, (1951).

10. Nehru, Jawaharlal, *the Discovery of India*, London, Meridian Books Limited, (1951).

11. Sharma, J. S., *Jawaharlal Nehru: A Descriptive Bibliography,* S. Chand & Co., Delhi, (1955).

◆◆

Water as a Human Right

Dr. Monica Chutani*

[Water is essential for all forms of life, well-being and productivity. In fact, access to clean water is a pre-requisite for achieving a minimum standard of health and production activities. Water is not just a commodity. It is a source of life, dignity, and equality of opportunity. That is why human need, regardless of ability to pay, must be the guiding regulating principle, and why governments bear ultimate responsibility for provision.]

There are more than a billion people with no regular access to clean water for drinking, bathing, cooking or basic sanitation. An estimated two million children die annually because their families don't have portable water or functioning toilets. 97 % of earth's water is in the oceans. Only 3 % of the earth's water can be used as drinking water. 75 % of the world's fresh water is frozen in the polar ice caps. 884 million people still do not have access to safe drinking water. However, 1.7 billion have gained such access since 1990.The average distance that women in Africa and Asia walk to collect water is 6 kilometers. 2.6 billion people lack access to basic sanitation services, such as toilets.

Water has enjoyed the highest social and religious status in ancient Indian culture. Prayers in all four main Vedas refer to water as nectar, honey source of life, protector of Earth and environment, cleanser of sins, generator of prosperity, and ambrosia. Sages in *Yajur Veda* pray thus, "O Water, thou art the reservoir of welfare and propriety, sustain us to become strong. We look up to thee to be blessed by thy kind ambrosia on this earth. O Water, we approach thee to get rid of our sins." Rivers were considered divine and worshipped as goddesses and people were ordained to use their life-sustaining waters most judiciously and with greatest reverence.

* Asst Prof., Kamala Nehru College, University of Delhi.

Making Water a Human Right

In 2010, the United Nations General Assembly recognized that water and sanitation should be a human right. Water as a human right is as much about the quality, making sure that the water is clean and you do not get sick from drinking it, as it is about access. UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon has said: "Safe drinking water and adequate sanitation are crucial for poverty reduction, crucial for sustainable development and crucial for achieving any and every one of the Millennium Development Goals".

The right to water is not specifically mentioned in The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948). However, without access to water, other rights could not be exercised such as the "right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being" and the fact that "Motherhood and childhood are entitled to special care and assistance." Article 6 of the UN Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) also guarantees the right to life. Articles 11 and 12 of the International Covenant on Economic and Social Rights (1966) guarantee an adequate standard of living.

The right to water was not considered as a right in itself in earlier UN human rights texts, but merely as a tool to guarantee other rights. However, in recent years water has become a more important issue leading to several international water conferences such as Mar d el Plata (1977) and New Delhi (1990). In September 2000, when the UN General Assembly decided to commit to the Millennium Development Goals (MDG), MDG7 aimed to halve the population without sustainable access to water by 2015.

In 2006, the Human Rights Council (HRC) adopted decision 2/104 "human rights and access to water". The HRC appointed Ms. Catarina de Albuquerque as the independent expert on the right to water and sanitation. She published her first report on 1st July 2009. And finally in 2010, the General Assembly declared access to water as a human right in a landmark resolution. "Everyone has the right to water, no matter where he/she lives," Ms. De Albuquerque said of this declaration.

With the recognition of water as a human right, the UN is taking action. The UN will use its available means and mechanisms to monitor the progress of nations in realizing the right to water and sanitation and to hold governments accountable. This does not mean that there is one globally coordinated and integrated policy on water within the UN.

The problems concerning water are too vast and diverse to be tackled by a "one fits all" policy. In 2003, UN Water was founded as an "inter-agency mechanism" with the task of enhancing coordination and coherence between the UN agencies in the field of water and sanitation. However, the UN cannot sanction governments.

Having recognized safe and clean drinking water and sanitation as a human right, pressure is now on local and national authorities to provide a better infrastructure for drains and clean water. For many of those who have access to water, it is either too expensive or suitable for consumption, often exposed to dangerous levels of biological contaminants and chemical pollutants partly due to inadequate management of urban, industrial or agricultural waste water. Simply put, for many people water is not yet a human right. Access to safe water should no longer be seen as a service, but as a human right. States and organizations should work towards using economic resources and technology to provide safe, clean, accessible and affordable water particularly in the developing countries.

There was also a demand on the completion of 60 years of UDHR to include right to water as 31st article, to the UDHR, establishing access to clean and portable water as a fundamental human right. There are several reasons in endorsing human right to water. The provision of free and basic water, so essential for survival, could reduce the spread of diseases, as well as improve health and well-being.

It could enhance poor household's sense of dignity and independence, reduce the drudgery of women and children who actually bear the brunt of these shortages who are responsible for water collection and it could give a lot of free time to them for other activities. The morning scene at village wells, hand-pumps and community taps has become a stress point with women tearing each other's clothes, pushing each other in order to be first with water buckets.

Some of the human right activists have also made a fervent plea for "the right to shit" in dignity. It has been seen where proper toilets have been provided,

attendance has arisen so much so that at times children even have to miss their school. In villages, women sometimes refuse to marry a person from another village if houses lack proper toilets.

More recently, we have heard forecasts of inevitable future 'water wars', rather than oil. Despite being known as 'global commons', it is impossible to say that state is perceived or experienced in the same way across the globe. Water is highly localized or at best regional in scope. Water availability is variable across time and space and dependent on factors such as climate, season and temperature. Rainfall, vegetation and grass cover vary from place to place, making it difficult to provide blanket statements on the global state of water. Even access to water is governed by factors such as caste, gender, status and wealth and local water management practices can also be conflict-ridden.

Unquestionably, many parts of the planet are faced with acute water shortages, a problem exacerbated by global warming. Whether it is water or the broader problem of global warming, the challenge is fundamentally not one of aggregate resources, but rather one of the priorities of political leaders, national and international. Too much of the policy discussion on water delivery has been dominated by a debate on privatization versus state ownership.

The real challenge is how to get portable water to those who can least afford to buy. The poor have to go through a web of intermediaries-tanker truck operators, vendors and other water suppliers-to purchase their water supplies. Because water is scarce, goes the logic it must be used judiciously and its demand must be managed.

South Africa is one of the few countries that explicitly recognise the right to water and its Free Basic Water (FBW) policy.

In South Africa, access to water was one of the defining racial divides during apartheid. In the post-apartheid period, the adoption of a rights-based approach to water supply empowered communities to hold local governments, private utilities and the national government to account. The government used its regulatory powers to require all municipalities to provide a basic minimum of 25 litres per day free of charge to each household, with the target of achieving free basic water for all by 2008, with no household more than 200 meters from a water source. The task is not yet complete, but South Africa's citizens rightly expect the government to keep its promise.

This year's World Environment Day theme- Seven billion dreams, One planet, Consume with care'- therefore, is highly relevant. If it is our right to have water then it is also our duty that we use water judiciously without wasting a single drop. Ancient Indian philosophy also wished for everyone to be happy and free from ailments, "Sarve Bhavantu Sukhinah, Sarve Santu Niraamayaah"-Let everyone be well and happy and pleaded for an all inclusive holistic development on the planet for harmony.

The governments of various countries should enact legislations so that every person gets water as a right. A person can still live without food for a couple of days but can't survive without water-It is a source of life for all species of Flora and Fauna.

References

1. Bajwa G.S, *Human Rights in India*, Anmol Publications, New Delhi, 1997.

2. 'Declare water a human right', *Hindustan Times*, New Delhi, Jan 14, 2014.

3. Ghosh Sutapa, 'Half baked Measures', *Down to Earth*, May 31, 2003.

4. Johari J.C, *Human Rights and New World Order*, Anmol Publications, 1996.

5. Jose Manuel Barroso, 'Time to Act Together', *The Times of India*, New Delhi, June 20, 2012.

6. Kemal Dervis and Trevor Manuel, 'Not a drop to drink', *The Times of India*, 15 November 2006.

7. 'Making water a Human Right', http://www.unric.org/

8. Orend Brian, *Human Rights: Concept and Context*, Broad View Press, 2002.

9. Sharma Kamla Nath, 'Environmental ethos in Vedic Times', *The Times of India* June 9, 2015.

10. 'Time to Act Together', *The Times of India*, New Delhi, June 20, 2012.

    Watkins Kevin, 'Children dying for a glass of water', *The Hindu*, March, 2006.

◆◆

Tagore's approach to Environment

Ms. Bhabani Saharia*

[Rabindranath Tagore, the first Asian Nobel Prize winner poet is famous for his philosophy based on the Upanishads, which were written in about 1000 B.C. to 300 B.C. His main stress is on man rather than on the absolute and that is why he may be considered as a Humanistic philosopher. But it is also fact that he never considered man as different or isolated from nature. He loves and adores man who resides in nature. He had immense love for nature and realized the intuitive relationship between man and nature.]

In his numerous writings viz. poems, essays, novels, dramas, stories, short stories, letters etc. he declares that nature makes man's life worth living by supplying air, water, its heavenly beauty so on and so forth. From this angle he also may be considered as an environmentalist. Actually he has not propounded any environmentalism, but his feelings and respect for nature as expressed in his writings remind the world that environmentalism is inseparable from Tagore's life.

He depicted his intense love for nature and its beauty in his plays and poems. His song, '*akashbhara, surjya tara, bishwa bhara pran*" speaks of his great affection for nature. Tagore's play *Muktadhara*, *Raktakarabi* , story *Balai*, *Prakriti Parjay(*a group of lyrics in the form of poems for songs), and his establishing of *Brahmacharyashram* at Santiniketan are some examples to identify him as an environmentalist In the *Brahmacharyashrama* at Santiniketan the classes were held under the shadow of the trees. It is a deliberate idea to bring students closer to nature and to learn how to respect the nature.

* Associate Prof., Dept of Philosophy, Moridhal College, P.O. Moridhal, Dhemaji, Assam.

The word 'environment' commonly means the surroundings. We generally observe that every organism lives amidst various living and non-living things and the aggregates of all these forms the environment. Environment is defined as the total conditions which is responsible for the life and development of an organism. Environmentalism which aims at the protection of environment upholds the view that the balance of the ecosystem which is constituted of both man and nature can be maintained only by protecting the both.

Again ecology means the study of the relationship among the components of environment viz. temperature, light, water, soil, air, topography, fire etc. and also with the organism. So it can be said that Ecological studies demonstrate how man can derive material benefits from the environment without destroying it. So far as the history of mankind is concerned, it witnesses that people have had impacts on natural systems.

This impact of man over nature will decide whether Earth can have long-term carrying capacity for people or not. Even the Vedic seers were attracted by the relationship between the human beings and nature. In the Upanishad, it is maintained that air, water, topography and fire are indispensable for man's life.

Nature got a unique position in Tagore's writings. In his writings this relationship between man and nature is fully expressed. His poems and songs reflect cloud-shadows dancing on the ripples of the stream and laying pall of darkness upon the jungles of the farther shore of Ganges.

Pabitra Sarkar, a former Vice Chancellor of Rabindra Bharati University and a Tagore expert said, "In his literary works he has said he was born along with the trees and flowers". In his introduction to The Message of the Wild (Bonobani) Tagore provided an interesting philosophical outline of his approach to Nature:

"…The language of Nature is the eternal language of creation. It penetrates reality to reach the deepest layers of our consciousness, it draws upon a language that has survived thousands of years with the human … it is the musical instrument of nature; it replicates the rhythm inherent in life itself. If we listen carefully we will be able to trace within them the murmurs of eternity where the spirit of liberation, peace and beauty lurk, it reminds us of the sea that is satyam, shivam, advaitam … it reminds us of our bond with the world … if we can accept this music of the wild within us, we can perceive the great music of oneness … in this hotel of Vienna, I thus often fondly remember the flora and the fauna of my household at Santiniketan. ("Introduction", to Bonobani, Rabindra Rachanavali, Vol. 8, 87, translated by Amrit Sen).

Man's deep attachment with natural phenomenon is revealed in his earlier poetic drama *Prakritir Pratisodh* (*The Ascetic*, 1884). The skeletal plot deals with the ascetic who renounces Nature as a deterrent to wisdom and higher knowledge. Tagore in his book *My Reminiscences* (1912) elaborated that human salvation does not lie in an ascetic segregation from Nature; it lies in acknowledging humanity as part of Nature and sharing its creative joy. As a humanist philosopher, he synthesizes an intuitive relationship between man and nature. Tagore in his story *Balai* expressed it in the form of a boy who loves *Simul* tree in front of his house.

Tagore's motif was not only to love nature, but also to realise the intuitive relationship between man and nature. He lamented at the deterioration of environment caused by the attitude of modern man who fails to love and respect nature and uses nature only as means to fulfill his lust. Some of Tagore's poems, written a century back viz. "The Tame Bird was in a Cage" and "I plucked you Flower" carry the message regarding environmental threats the world is facing today. It also seeks to examine measures which the poet feels humanity should adopt to overcome this major disaster in the near future.

His first concentration on man's impact on the environment was on his way to Japan in 1916. In this journey, he saw an oil spill at sea and was annoyed. He expressed it in his lectures in Japan. This experience provoked him to write at length about the modern man who was failing to respect nature. Tagore's plays *Raktakarabi* and *Muktadhara* show how man tortures nature for his greed.

In the essay *Aranyadebata*, he shows how man becomes unrestrained in his actions. Greedy human being has invited his or her own ruin by destroying the forests. So Tagore emphasizes symbiosis and balance between man and all other aspects of the mundane world (plants, other living beings, the Earth, atmosphere and the rest of the universe), and between man and the world beyond (moksha).

In "Aranya Devata", (Forest Deity: R.R. edition, Vol. 14, p.373), Tagore opines that modern man indulges too much in luxurious living. So long as he used to live in and around the forest, he had a deep love and respect for the forest and, therefore, he used to live in perfect harmony with it and its plants and animals. As soon as he became a city-dweller, he lost his love for the forest which had been the source of his sustenance.

Tagore emphasizes, we should retrieve our love and respect for the forest and restore symbiosis with the forest in order to avert peril. Tagore's views on ecological stability and symbiosis between man and Nature have been elaborated in the article "Tapavan" (R.R. edition, Vol. 7, pp.690-704).

Tagore, being a multidimensional personality, is not satisfied with mere theorizing of the concept. He has such type of personality where theory and practice are blended together. That's why he also may be considered as a philosopher not in the sense that he has formulated philosophical ideas and concepts, but in the sense that he has deep attachment with man and his problems. So, after realising the environmental problems, Tagore tried to solve them through his literary works and make the people aware of these problems.

Rabindranath Tagore stayed at the heart hospital at Balatonfured (Hungary) in 1926 after suffering from exhaustion while visiting Budapest at the end of a European tour. Before leaving Balatonfüred, Tagore had planted a tree at what is now the end of the Tagore promenade (Tagore Setany). It was one of Tagore's first tree-planting ceremonies – he went on to plant trees in various locations around the world during his travels. Many eminent people have followed Tagore's example in Balatonfüred, including Nobel laureates and Indian Prime Ministers, by planting trees near the Tagore Promenade.

In 1927, he started an annual tree-planting ceremony in Santiniketan (brikkhoropon), at which the students would sing and read his poems. This approach gave his environmental campaign a very positive image, so that it was not a negative campaign about what man should not do but rather it was a subtle reminder conveyed through creative expression. This encouraged more people to get involved in supporting his campaign. The ceremony is still held each year in Santiniketan. He also started an annual celebration of the arrival of the monsoons at the end of the dry season (Borsha mongol).

So, Tagore's approach to environment is of immense significance and bears relevance in the present day context too. It seems that Tagore valued the environment from aesthetic sense, which is not mere physical satisfaction, but it is the ultimate satisfaction of soul that emerges inwardly. Nature has intrinsic value that we cannot deny and it is implicit in the writings of Tagore.

◆◆

THIRD CONCEPT *welcomes your valuable comments on articles published in each issue. Suggestion to further improve quality and get up of your favourite magazine, which has a record of uninterrupted publication since 1987 are also*

Swachh Bharat Abhiyan and Development

Farooq A. Bakloo* & Asma**

[Sanitation is not a new concept as its importance is attached to ancient times. Chanakya's Arthashastra contains details on the concept of a hygienic and cleanliness system. In contemporary period, Tukadoji Maraj, a great saint of Maharashtra, in his famous book Gramgita has emphasized the importance of hygiene as thus: "Every house in a village will have to be transformed to make town or village's hygiene healthy and beautiful this will require each and every member of household to strive for highest moral values and righteousness."]

It is clear that our country cannot achieve a real development if its citizens live in an unhealthy and unclean ambience. The poor sanitation has many serious implications for human health. Improper disposal of human excreta, lack of personal and food hygiene and improper way to dispose of solid and liquid wastes have been the major source of deadly diseases in India, particularly among the children, girls and women.

In our country lack of sanitation costs nearly three lakh crore rupees in terms of expenses on health-related diseases. Sanitation is a vital part of public hygienic and healthcare. As per the Census of 2011, at national level only 32.7% of the population has toilet facilities and as such many people defecate in open areas, which results in the spread pathogenic diseases.

The human excreta, among all forms of wastes, is the principal source of 80% diseases in developing countries. Some recent studies have reported that about 50 types of infections can be spread from one person to another person from excreta. As per the World Bank report, lack of toilets and other sanitation facilities costs near $54 billion a year through health-related illness.

The main aim of any country's health policy is to make better standard of living, but if there is lack of sanitation in that country then its health policy will not yield better results on the ground level. So it is clear that health and sanitation are both directly co-related with each other. In order to have the positive impact of health policy on ground level, we have to clean our environment by keeping away from the communicable diseases spreading due to lack of proper sanitation.

According to W.H.O., an average of Rs 6, 500 per person was lost in India due to lack of cleanness and hygiene. So Swachh Bharat would, therefore, make a significant impact on public health and help in safeguarding income of the poor, which ultimately contribute to the national income. As per UNICEF report, India's sanitation deficit leads to losses worth roughly 6% of its GDP as per World Bank estimates.

Major Central Schemes for Improving Sanitation

1. Central Rural Sanitation Programme (1986)

2. Total Sanitation Campaign (1999)

3. Narmal Bharat Abhyian (2012)

As lot of effort has been made by the Government in launching the Sanitation programme in rural areas and the coverage in rural areas has gone up from one percent in 1981 to 32.7% and as per census 2011 to 40.60%. The government has spent lot of money for constructing toilets across the country but the Sanitation campaigns are yet to achieve success on ground as 60% rural households are lacking toilet facilities.

And according to a UNICEF report, India and Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability (CBGA) reported that only 49% of the budget had

*   Research Scholar, Dept of Pol. Sc., S.S.J Campus, Kumaun University Nainital, (Uttarakhand).
** Research Scholar, Dept of Education, S.S.J Campus, Kumaun University, Nainital, (Uttarakhand).

been utilised between 1999 and 2011. So it is clear from the report that problem has been at the implementation level. According to a W.H.O. report, India ranks the highest in open defection and we fall behind countries like Nigeria, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Pakistan.

So, poor performance of sanitary facilities continues to be the grave concern for the whole country. There are various factors responsible for that and these include: poor implementation, poverty, lack of education among the rural people, lack of hygiene literacy etc.

Swachh Bharat campaign was the need of hour for our country which addresses the poor sanitation positively at the grassroots level. This campaign covers all the people in villages, school children, women and the youth in order to generate awareness among the people, particularly the rural people, regarding the harmful and adverse effects of the poor sanitation and the diseases spread by it.

Keeping this in mind, Prime Minister Narendra Modi and his government are doing this job very positively. The Swachh Bharat campaign was launched on 2 October 2014 at Rajghat New Delhi where Prime Minister himself cleaned the road. In this way a massive mission was started to make the people aware regarding the importance of sanitation. It is the biggest cleanliness drive ever undertaken in our country in which 3 million government employees, school and college students participated. The campaign aims to achieve the vision of clean India by 2 October 2019, the 150th birth anniversary of Mahatma Gandhi.

The main objectives of this massive campaign are as:-

1. Elimination of open defection.

2. Conversion of insanitary toilets into flush toilets.

3. Eradication of manual scavenging.

4. Disposal of solid and liquid wastes scientifically.

5. A behavioural change in people of the county about the sanitation practices.

6. Generating awareness among the citizens about the adverse effects of poor sanitation and its impact on health.

Why we need Swachh Bharat?

According to the World Bank, India loses about Rs 24000cr annually due to the lack of toilets hygienic facilities. And inadequate sanitation has economic impacts across sectors like Health and Tourism, costing the country $ 53.8 billion in 2006. Therefore, Swachh Bharat campaign plays a significant role in protecting the economic losses in different sectors. Besides, it also plays a significant role in improving the safety of women and literacy of girls. It will also be helpful in reducing the caste system and the act of manual scavenging.

Swachh Bharat and Health

Sanitation and health are co-related to each other. There are lot of diseases spread by the lack of sanitation. In our country, every year 2000,000 infants die alone because of open defection that gives rise to pathogenic bacteria, which in turn transmits Diarrhoea and other related diseases. Medical experts have identified a numbers of diseases like skin disease, respiratory disease, Eye problems and Intestinal parasites etc, which are caused by open defection.

So by this Swachh Bharat mission, lot of human lives will be saved from these deadly diseases, particularly women and children. According to W.H.O., an average of Rs 6, 500 per person was lost in India due to the lack of cleanliness and hygiene, which indicates that the Swachh Bharat mission would make a significant impact on public health.

Swachh Bharat's Impact on Literacy

Prime Minister has emphasized that the working toilets are needed to be available in government schools for girls. In our country, many girls leave the school in early age due to the lack of toilets in the schools. According to report entitled *Elementary Education in India*, enrolment of girls has come down from 48.38% to 48.20% and at national level 19.5% of primary Schools don't have separate Girls' toilets.

Swachh Bharat will improve the safety and dignity of women

According to the World Bank study, due to the lack of toilets women suffer more in rural India. Due to lack of toilets women walk long distances to find the place and this exposes them to the danger of sexual harassment and sometimes there have been several cases of women being raped and killed.

Swachh Bharat will boost Indian Tourism

India is the land of cultural heritage the share of tourism in GDP is 6.6% and 39.5 million Indians are attached with this sector. The main challenge of this sector is cleanliness as the tourists of other countries like the hygienic environment. So Swachh Bharat will play important role in generating employment and bring foreign exchage to India which will indirectly boost our economy.

Protecting the Aquatic Bio-diversity

According to the report of Central Pollution Control Board, urban India generates about 47 million tons of solid waste every year, or about 1.3 lack tons every day. And according to calculations done by TERI in 1988, the garbage generated till 2011 would cover 2.20,000 football fields filled 9 metres high with garbage. According to another report, 26 billons litters wastage is dumped into our streams and rivers daily which results in spread of lot of water-borne diseases and destruction of aquatic biodiversity by the polluted water. Therefore, Swachh Bharat will play a significant role regarding the scientific use of this waste.

Swachh Bharat will reduce the caste system

In our country, most of jobs of cleaning houses and roads are done by the people who mainly belong to the lower castes, but as per the guidelines of Swachh Bharat programme every citizen of the country has to spend two hours for cleaning irrespective of his caste. So this programme will be helpful in forming the egalitarian Indian state.

Participation of rural people

In most rural areas of our country many people did not participate in these programmes due to ignorance and socio-economic factors but for this Swachh Bharat every person has to spend two hours every day and I think it is a very big challenge for Swachh Bharat programme.

Changing the behaviour of rural people

The main aim of Swachh Bharat is to change the behaviour of the people of our country that is why many personalities are nominated for the campaign again by our present Prime Minister. But it is very difficult to change the behaviour of the most rural people because of their rigid cultural and traditional norms. Only by the construction of toilets we will not bring the change but we have to keep other facilities like clean water available for them, which is a very big task for the government.

There is problem of policy and programme implementation in our country. Our past experience shows as to how lot of programmes had been run by different governments and lot of money was spent but yet we are facing sanitation problem and our country is in first position in open defecation. So there is problem in delivering the facilities at the grassroots or at the door step due to high corruption at lower levels which results in depriving the poor people of facilities they really deserve.

Suggestions

- As an independent subject Hygienic education should be added to the school curriculum.

- Panchayats should organise awareness programmes regarding the importance of Sanitation every week in their respective areas.

- For proper implementation at grassroots level promotion approach should be used for the success of Swachh Bharat programme; for example if any B.D.O became successful in implementing Swachh Bharat in his concerned area at grassroots level he/ she should be awarded with promotion.

- Workshops should be organised in Higher Secondary Schools, Colleges and Universities in order to generate awareness among students.

- Religious approach should be used in changing the behaviour of the people as a guideline should be framed for the religious preachers that they make the people aware regarding the harmful effects of lack of sanitation.

References

1. Dr K, Kavita. (2013 January), "Rural Sanitation: A Herculean Task", *Kurukshetra*: 3-7.

2. H, Anupan. (2013January), "Rural Sanitation and the need to encourage women's participation", *Kurukshetra*: 8-10.

3. World Bank report (2006), *The Economic impacts of inadequate sanitation in India*.

4. Planning Commission (2013), *Evaluation study on the total sanitation campaign*.

5. *The Financial Express*, December 2, 2014.

6. *Times of India*, October 3, 2014

7. *Times of India*, December 21, 2010

8. DISE Report, 2013-2104.

9. Speeches of Prime Minister Narendra Modi regarding the Swachh Bharat Abhiyan.

10. Google search Lack of toilets is affecting India's growth/gulfnews.com/about-gulf-news/al-nis...

11. Swachh Bharat Abhiyan Wikipedia/ en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Swachh-Bharat.

12. www.mapsofindia.com/my-india/society.

13. Financial benefits of Swachh Bharat Mission-nitinbhati. www.nitinbhatia.in>home>views

◆◆

Gandhi on Environment

Shesanjali Panda*

[*A clear conception of Gandhi's nonviolence is required in order to understand his resonance for contemporary environmentalism. Gandhi's nonviolence incorporates elements of the brahmin or ascetic, as well as the kshatriya or warrior. Many environmentalists rightly take inspiration from the ascetic components of Gandhi's project, which involves living simply and minimizing material consumption through a spiritual practice of realizing the same soul in both animate and inanimate. It reminds the words of Bhagvad Gita: yuktahar viharasya, implying limited and balanced consumption and enjoyment not pandering to bodily and sense derived pleasures.*]

Western capitalism accords priority to inordinate consumption and exorbitant sense dominated life style which helps run the wheels of market economy by whetting desires and their fulfillment through insatiable material consumption. It is not Gandhi's self-denial and self-abnegation, it is abnegation of material and sense derived life style in favour of a heightened spiritual life where his self is an enlarged self encompassing the nature, human beings and all both animate and inanimate.

Gandhi's interlacing of an ethical position involving asceticism and a strategic political position involving confrontation makes it possible for his nonviolence to be thoughtfully and successfully assertive, even combative or disruptive, while remaining peaceful in its disavowal of violence. Gandhi can thus be read as an advocate of a certain form of "ecological" citizenship, focused on the fulfillment of obligations to the political community, which requires both the minimization of one's bodily consumptive behaviour, as well as the necessary and literal placement of one's body on the frontlines of aggressive political contestation.

A thorough examination of Gandhi's thought reveals that he makes little reference to either ecology or to the Vedic traditions' emphasis on divine manifesting itself in the form of nature. What is a persistent

* PhD Scholar, Utkal University.

concern with the very human goal of truth seeking? It is in this sense that we may call Gandhi's thinking anthropocentric: it is squarely focused on the requirements of human life despite his emphasis on *ahimsa* or non-violence toward all beings, what is of ultimate importance is the human goal of truth-seeking.

Gandhi never believed that nature solely exists for human beings from an anthropocentric point of view. Realizing the divinity in all means all the parts of the creation must exist in themselves. Nothing is instrumental for the other except that all are interconnected, interwoven with the divine and coordinated and cooperative for the good of all. The impetus towards austerity is nature as connected to his concern for nature, because consumptive patterns and behaviors are seen as central to our ability to conserve resources (Gruzalski: 2002).

It is very difficult to say that Gandhi's asceticism emerged from any philosophical commitment to the preservation of natural resources. Rather, his primary philosophical commitment was to truth seeking of which asceticism was an important component.

Godrej shows how Gandhi's non-violence incorporates elements of the Brahmin or ascetic as well as the khyatriyas or warrior. Many environmentalists rightly take inspiration from the ascetic components of Gandhi's project, which involves living simply and minimizing material consumption through an ethics of self-denial and self-scrutiny. But in so doing they tend often to neglect the warriors like political non-violence that Gandhi focused with this ethical asceticism.

In so doing, they often also over-emphasize the ethical dimensions of Gandhi's thought missing the discursive political dimension with which Gandhian ethics is interwoven. In fact, Gandhi was remarkably silent on the question of the inherent value of nature or of human beings' relationship to their external environment (Vinay Lal: 2000).

South Asian philosophical traditions- Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism-by which Gandhi was inspired, are routinely characterized as less violent and less anthropocentric and more holistic, more sensitive to the continuities between the human and non-human worlds than the Judeo-Christian traditions.

Other scholars turn to the importance of karmic theory within these traditions. Any living being could be a relative, a loved one or great sage in another life, and this sense of mutual inter-dependence gives rise to non-violence toward all living beings (Sahni : 2008)

Gandhi recommended the village as the ideal form of economic and social organization. He says the earth has enough to satisfy everyone's need but not everyone's greed. Ramachandra Guha suggests that there are ecological undertones to his moral critique of Western industrial development (Guha; 1998). Gandhi is not a resource for environmentalism not because the purpose of the ascetic life is to conserve natural resources but because his resonance for environmental questions emerges most clearly when we remind ourselves of duties of active, disruptive citizenship that characterizes his theory of non-violence.

Godrej demonstrates that Gandhian non-violence has two main elements; non-violence as the primary instrument of political action and change. The first is an ethical position while the second is a strategic political position and two are inextricably interwoven.

Asceticism in the form of bodily self-denial and renunciation of worldly pleasures plays a crucial role, within this pursuit of total *ahimsa* (Sachidananda: 1990). Gandhi was known for his adherence to strict form of asceticism what he called Brahmacharya: control over all the senses in thought, word and deed. (Gandhi: 1993).

Gandhi conducted ascetic struggle publicly, wrote extensively about them, we may turn to Gandhi's habit of publishing every minute detail about his bodily self-discipline. He seemed to suggest that it was only in discussing the most primordial aspect of his bodily life that he could approximately pursue ahimsa. Gandhi's refusal to relegate certain aspect

of bodily life to the private sphere through his insistence on publicizing private details of bodily life obscures the distinction between public and private (Rudolph and Rudolph: 2006).

Truth-seeking, in his view, involves our ability to struggle with what are often considered private needs and desires precisely because of how these are often publicly manipulated. Modern civilization made bodily and material welfare the object of life (Parel: 1997).

The urbanization of modern civilization destroys the simplicity and self-sufficiency of human life. Gandhi's asceticism is, therefore, not only linked to the search for truth in a spiritual sense, it also suggests that the scrutiny and reform of mundane pattern of bodily need and desire is a collective moral responsibility.

This public self-scrutiny not only furthers the individual spiritual project of truth seeking, it fosters more ideal forms of social and economic organization in which human beings flourish. Urbanization also requires destruction of nature as housing, industries and other modern technologies become a crucial part of modern life.

This ethical position, which highlights particular elements of bodily experience, plays a central role in non-violence but Gandhi's asceticism regards the body not as a kind of instrument or means to an end, but rather as a crucial component of one's lived experience in the world, a lived experience that is continuously morally engaged in holistic way.

A crucial component of Gandhi's non-violent method is the practice of satyagraha which literally means holding firm to the 'truth' or truth force'. Even though Gandhi insists that non-violence is neither aggressive nor offensive in the purely physical sense, he also relies explicitly on the language of assertiveness, force, strength, battle and defiance and fighting.

In the classical Hindu tradition, the ascetic figure of Brahmin, characterized as contemplative, withdrawn from the world, passive and focused on overcoming sensual pleasure, is often contrasted with kshatriya or warrior who is material aggressive, passionate, active and in touch with the world sensuality (Nandy;1998). But to become a warrior or kshyatriya means to wipe out the evil propensities born out of attachment to body and senses, then one ultimately reaches Brahmanhood. In that sense, Gandhi combines both in order to bring changes in the society.

Gandhi emphasized his attraction to the term 'agraha', which meant firmness or forcefulness and combined this with 'satya' or truth. Gandhi also inverted traditional definition of strength, courage and warrior-hood. Thus he claims the kshatriya is not a person who knows how to kill other but rather one who acquires the art of sacrificing his own life… never retreating in the battle (Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Govt. of India 1958-1994).

Satyagraha is, therefore, a discursive act conducted with and through body, in addition to each discourse. Of course, the experience of being embodied- that is living in and experiencing the world through the body- is a crucial condition allowing human being to act with conviction in the political arena, while speaking volumes about their conviction.

Contemporary environmentalists perhaps turn here to Gandhi's asceticism, precisely because he recognized the connection between bodily needs and collective ethical impact, while offering a model of how to live in a way that turns the scrutiny of such need into an instinctive and regular ethical practice. In remaining focused only on self-scrutiny of asceticism, many environmentalists miss the crucial insight that this ethical position is necessarily intertwined with the discursive disruptiveness of warriors' like position. Forms of non –consumption patterns do include boycotting, striking marching, protesting and actively working to abolish any system of governance damaging to just forms of life.

But this form of public sacrifice alone, committed as it may seem, cannot be cast as a Gandhian Satyagraha, precisely because it misses the most important point of warrior- like non-violence. A fully Gandhian environmentalism would require ascetic self-scrutiny, but it would also ask activists to fast unto death, go on strike , place their bodies at the frontlines of breaking unjust laws and pay price in

terms of embodied pain; police action, arrests or even harsher violence.

Ecological citizenship focuses on duty, obligation and responsibilities, Dobson points out, seek intellectual resources for the idea of such citizenship within civic republication discourse, which includes the idea of striving toward the common good through cultivation of virtues such as courage, discipline and service, sacrificing personal inclinations and preferences (Berry;1999)

Godrej neither wishes to underplay the Gandhian warrior-like behaviour exhibited in such movements, nor to deny the importance of ethical self scrutiny within environmentalism. Her goal is simple to point us the subtle dangers involved, from a Gandhian point of view, in associating green activism primarily or solely with the self- scrutiny of thoughtful consumption.

Gandhi's non-violence speaks with urgency to environmental debates when it is understood in both ascetic and warrior-like terms. Gandhi offers as a way beyond liberalist public/private dichotomy. He sees bodily Satyagraha itself as a form of deliberation, in which both reason and emotion serve as equally persuasive forms of discourse.

Gandhi offers us an understanding of embodiment that is not dualistic. The body through warrior's modes of lived experience remains holistically engaged in ethical and political action at all times. But contemporary environmental thinkers also suggest that challenging liberal presumptions should not be confused with challenging democratic one. Public limits to private consumption can be posited within the very content of democratic decision-making.

We should explore whether and to what extent a commitment to Gandhian ecological citizenship will find us running up against the limits of liberal democracy. Complete Gandhian environmental politics must recognize that such claims are necessarily interwoven with the combative political strategy of the Kshatriya or warrior. A real spiritual person is one who always does works for the good of all as pronounced in Bhagvad Gita *Sarvabhuta hite ratah*. Gandhi showed strict adherence to this by combining in him the qualities of both a warrior and ascetic.

References

1. Lal, Vinay, "Too deep for deep Ecology: Gandhi and Ecological vision of life", in Hinduism *and Ecology; The Intersection of Earth, sky and water*, (eds.), Christopher Key Chapple and Mary Evelyn Tucker (Cambridge; MA; Harvard University Press 2000), p.183.

2. Sahni, Pragati, *Environmental Ethic in Buddhism; A virtuous Approach*, London: Routledge, 2008.

3. Gruzalshi, Bart, "Gandhi's contributions to Environmental Ethic", 24 No 3, 2002, pp.227-42.

4. Guha Ramachandra, "Mahatma Gandhi and the Environmental Movement in India", in *Environmental movement in Asia*, eds. Arne Kalpan and Gerard Person (Padstow UK; Nordic Institute of Asia studies 1998, p.69.

5. Sri Swami Sachidananda, *The Yoga sutras of Patanjali*, Buchingham, VA: Integral Yoga Publication, 1990, Chap2.1.79

6. Gandhi, Mohandas K., *An Autobiography; The story of my Experiment with Truth*, Boston: Beacon Press, 1993, p.210.

7. Rudolph, Susanne Heber and Rudolph, Lloyd I., *Postmodern Gandhi and other Essays: Gandhi in the world at home*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2006.

8. Parel, Anthony, ed., *M.K. Gandhi. Hind Swaraj and other writings*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press 1997, p.35.

9. Nandy, Ashis, 'Final Encounter: The politics of Assassination of Gandhi' and 'The Psychology of Colonialism' in Exiled at home Delhi: Oxford University Press 1998

10. The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi, 100 Volumes, Delhi: Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting Govt. of India, 1958-1994,47:1

11. Barry, John, *Rethinking Green Politics*, London: Sage, 1999.

◆◆

Gandhi and Human Resources Development

Dr. Sunita Samal*

[*For Gandhi the moral man in immoral society theory is misleading. He did not think that individually man could be moral in an unjust society and he did not believe in Niebuhrian anti-theses of moral man and immoral society. A normal society opposed to it is what has been called mass –society and mass man. The mass and society used to be contrary to each other. Those who talk of mass society certainly recognize the distinction between 'mass' and society. They are often aware—implicitly, if not always explicitly—that mass undermine society. They understand the mass undermine society. They understand the mass man is not human at least not fully human. They now realize that the mass will destroy this civilization more effectively than any barbarian onslaught could ever do. Here in lies the basic difference between Gandhi's critique of modern society and those of most other modern thinkers. Gandhi was against 'mass society.]*

Gandhi boldly set up the theory of 'aparigraha' (non-possession, non-acquisition) and the minimization of wants. It is to be noted that it severely limits the cumulative process and thus undermines a capitalist as well as a state planned 'socialist' production system. Indeed, the ideas of minimal want and non-possession presupposes a world outlook on human resources that is quite incompatible with the currently accepted ideology for planned society. From Gandhian point of view the modern industrial and technological mass society is really a collectivity of sub-human.

Mahatma Gandhi was born on 2nd October, 1869 in Porbander. He practiced the life of austerity, humbleness and truth. His simple living attracted peasants and humbled the mighty and the rich. He may be categorized as a religious and political leader and also an apostle of peace; He is admired as the path finder for downtrodden and has been hailed as the undisputed leader of India's struggle for freedom.

Human Capital

Human Resources Management is defined as human capital: Elton Mayo has concluded that human factor and its manifestation is human relation movement. It is that part of management associated with

working of human capital1. For Gandhi, the application of truth in daily life improves purity of heart and it ultimately results in self-realization. The non-violence or ahimsa is a weapon or tool to win over the enemy. The ahimsa is not attained through preaching but only through practice.

Satyagraha means passive resistance, a proactive approach to goal attainment. The application of his practices to human resources management started with his initiation. The exemplary strike in Ahmedabad is the beginning of his experiment. The human resources management is not redundant and open to experiment with principles. Some of these may be extracted as—satyagraha, trusteeship, conflict management, trade unionism and collective bargaining.

In India, Gandhian principle of satyagraha or strike was legalized by the Industrial Dispute Act 1947. Then the owner or trustee or custodian of the assets and the worker are equal in the trust. Some attribute the theory to managing practices of Sabarmati Ashram and Tolstoy Farm (South Africa. The Worker has a right to claim from the trust on equitable basis.

The increasing globalization has made market as localization meaning global presence in local market. These factors increase competition, which ultimately influence change in the mindset of the parties i.e. employees to pursue a path of mutual acceptance,

* Guest, Faculty of Ravenshaw University, Cuttack.

collaboration and middle path. Gandhi proposed win-win positions for conflict resolution, a strong proponent of arbitration for peaceful resolution of conflicts.

The trade union movement was given impetus by Gandhi, his efforts at organizing unions is a trade mark which ultimately recognized the principle unity wins. The entry of Gandhi into labor movement during 1920s has engraved a new path in settling dispute. In today's turbulent industrial setting the linkage of Gandhian ideology to human resources practices is expected to give human touch with self development and ultimately industrial harmony. The organization development is also likely to be achieved with application of the above principles[2].

Truth and Non-violence

A critical component of Gandhi's non-violent method is the practice of Satyagraha which literary means holding firm to the truth. Even though Gandhi insists that non-violence is neither aggressive nor offensive in purely physical sense, he also relies explicitly on the language of assertiveness, strength, battle and defiance. In the classical Hindu tradition, the ascetic figure of Brahmin characterized as contemplative, withdrawn from the world, passive and focused on overcoming sensual pleasure is often contrasted with Kshatriya or warrior who is martial, aggressive, passionate, active and in touch with the world of sensuality[3].

Gandhian non-violence has two main elements: first, non-violence as the primary mode of truth seeking, second, non-violence as the primary instrument of political action and change. The first is an ethical position while second is a strategic position. These two are inextricably interwoven.[4] Gandhi's non-violence incorporates elements of Brahmin or ascetic as well as the Kshatriya or warrior. Human capital cannot ignore the social services of other castes.

Gandhism is the living legend of social services. Gandhi's concept of human resources management is environmental friendly. Many environmentalists rightly take inspiration from ascetic components of Gandhi's project, which involves living simply and minimizing material consumption through an ethics of self-denial and self-scrutiny[5].

What is overwhelming evident instead is the persistent concern with human goal of truth seeking. Is it in this sense that we may call Gandhi's thinking is anthropocentric? It is squarely focused on the requirements of human life despite his emphasis on ahimsa or non-violence towards all beings. The impetus toward austerity is seen as connected to his concern for nature; because consumption patterns and behaviors are seen as central to our ability to conserve resources.[6]

It is very difficult to say that Gandhi's asceticism emerged from any philosophical commitment to the preservation of natural resources. He says that earth has enough to satisfy everyone's need but not one man's greed. There are ecological undertones to his moral critique of western industrialization and urban industrial developments[7].

Private and Public Spheres

Gandhi is a resource for environmentalism not because the purpose of the ascetic life is to conserve natural resources which are important for human resources development but Gandhi has conducted this ascetic struggle publicly; we may turn to Gandhi's habit of publicizing every minute detail about his bodily self-discipline. He seemed to suggest that it was only discussing the most primordial aspects of his bodily life that he could appropriately pursue ahimsa. Gandhi refused to relegate certain aspects of bodily life to the private spheres though his insistence of publicizing private.[8]

Gandhi's ascetic is not only linked to the search for truth in a spiritual sense, it also suggests that mundane patterns of bodily need and desire which is a collective moral responsibility. In this ethical position, human capital highlights particular elements of bodily experience that plays a central role in non-violence. His ascetic regards the body not as a kind of instrument or means to an end, but rather as a crucial component of one's lived experience in the world, a lived experience that is continuously morally engaged in holistic way.

In remaining focused only on the self-scrutiny of asceticism, human resources miss the crucial insights that this ethical position is necessarily intertwined with discursive disruptiveness of a warrior like position. Gandhi emphasized on 'agraha' which meant firmness or forcefulness combined with truth. Thus claims that the Kshatriya is not a person who knows how to kill other but rather one who acquires the art of self-sacrifice and never retreating from battle[9].

Satyagraha is, therefore, a discursive art conducted for the development of human resources through the body in addition to speech and discourse. Of course, the experience of being embodied in experiencing the world through the body—is a crucial condition allowing human beings to act with conviction in the political arena. Forms of non-violent resistance must, therefore, extend beyond consumption or non-consumption patterns to include boycotting, striking, marching, protesting and actively working to abolish any system of governance damaging just forms of life.[10]

Many seek intellectual resources for the idea of such citizenship within civic republican discourse, which includes the idea of striving towards the common good through cultivation of virtues such as courage, discipline and service by sacrificing personal inclination and preferences.[11]

Conclusion

Gandhi offers us a way beyond public/private dichotomy in the development of human resources. He sees bodily satyagraha itself as a form of deliberation, in which both reason and emotion serve as equally persuasive forms of discourse. He offers us an understanding of embodiment that is not dualistic to human resources management. The human capital through various modes of lived experiences remains holistically engaged in ethical and political action at all times. We should explore to what extent a commitment to Gandhian ethically sensitive human resources will find us running up against the limit of liberal democracy.

References

1. Miller, Hugh T. and Charles J. Fox (2007), Post-modern Public Administration, Prentice Hall of India, New Delhi.

2. Choudhari, Arindam (2003), *Count Your Chickens before They Hatch*, New Delhi.

3. Nandy, Ashis (1998), "The Politics of Assassination of Gandhi", in *Exiled at Home*, Delhi: Oxford University Press.

4. Sri Swami Satchidananda, (1090) 'The Yogosutras of Patanjali' Bukingham, V.A.: Integral Yoga Publications.

5. Godrej, Farah (2012), "Ascetics, Warrior and Gandhian Ecological Citizenship", *Political Theory*, 40(4): 437-465.

6. Gruzalski, Bart, "Gandhi's Contributions to Environmental Thought and Action", *Environmental Ethics*, 24, No-3, (2002): 227-42.

7. Guha Ramachandra, "Mahatma Gandhi and the Environmental Movement in India", in *Environmental Movement in Asia*, eds., Arne Kalland and Gerard Persoon, Padstow UK, Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, 1998.

8. Rudolph, Susanne H. and Lloyd I. Rudolph (2006) "The Coffee House and Ashram Revisited: How Gandhi Democratize Habermas' Public Sphere' in *Post-modern Gandhi and at Home*, eds., By Rudolph and Rudolph, New York, Oxford University Press.

9. *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, 100 Volume, (Publication Division, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting, Government of India, Delhi. 1958-1994, 47:1

10. M.K. Gandhi, *An Autobiography: 'The story of My Experiment with Truth*, Boston: Beacon Press.

11. John Barry 'Rethinking Green Politics', London, Sage, 1999.

◆ ◆

Jajmani System in Yadgir District

Raghavendra Mallanna* and Dr.L.Srinivas**

[This Jajmani system is a system which associated with the agrarian society. More than 30 percent of the rural mass who are engaged themselves in one or the other occupation is the integral part of the Jajmani system. These individuals are helping the farmers by rendering their services and they provide different types of implements on time to the farmers which are required to carry out agricultural activities. In Jajmani system cash was not being given to the Kameens (those who render their services), instead food grains were given to them.]

The craft or handicraft sector is the largest decentralized and unorganized sector of the Indian economy. Crafts form the second largest employment sector in India, second only to agriculture. Handicrafts are rightly described as the craft of the people: there are twenty-three million crafts people in India today. In India, craft is not merely an industry but a creation symbolizing the inner desire and fulfillment of the community. While handicrafts, be it metal ware, pottery, mats, wood-work or weaving, fulfill a positive need in the daily life of the people, they also act as a vehicle of self-expression, and of a conscious aesthetic approach.

The artisan is an important factor in the equation of Indian society and culture. By performing valid and fruitful social functions for the community, they earn for themselves a certain status and position in society. Most craft people have learned their skills from their fathers or mothers since caste and family associations, rather than training or market demand, have dominance in the Indian society.

The handicrafts sector is a home-based industry which requires minimum expenditure, infrastructure or training to set up. It uses existing skills and locally available materials. Income generation through craft does not disturb the cultural and social balance of either the home or the community. Many agricultural and pastoral communities depend on their traditional craft skills as a secondary source of income in times of drought, lean harvests, floods or famine. Skills in embroidery, weaving, basket-making, manufacturing pots and vessels, furniture etc. are a natural means to social and financial independence of the rural people in India.

The craft sector contains many paradoxes. Artisanal contribution i.e., contribution of crafts people to the economy and the export market increases every year and more and more new crafts-people are being introduced into the sector - especially women - as a solution to rural and urban unemployment. At the same time mass-produced goods are steadily replacing utility items of daily use made by crafts people, destroying the livelihood of many, without the related capacity to absorb them into industry.

However, with ever-increasing competition from mill-made products and decreasing buying power of village communities due to prevailing poor economic conditions, artisans have lost their traditional rural markets of their own kind and the position of the rural craftsmen is also more or less same within the community.

There is a swing against small scale village industries and indigenous technologies in favour of macro industries and hi-tech mechanized production. Traditional rural marketing infrastructures are being edged out by multinational corporations, supported by sophisticated marketing and advertising. The change in consumer buying trends and the entry of various new, aggressively promoted factory produced commodities into the rural and urban market, has meant that craft producers need more support than ever if they are to become viable and competitive in Indian society.

* Research Scholar, Dept. of Anthropology, Kannada University, Karnataka.
** HOD, Dept. of Anthropology, Kannada University, Karnataka.

Concept

Jajmani system is tended to conceptualize agrarian social structure in the framework of exchange of relations. In its classical construct, different caste groups specialized in specific occupations and exchanged their services through an elaborate system of division of labour. William H. Wiser argued that, each served the other in rural society. Each in turn was master. Each in turn was servant. This system of inter-relatedness in service within Hindu community was called the Jajmani system. Central to such a construction of exchange is the idea of reciprocity (Gouldner) with the assumption that it was a non-exploitative system where mutual gratification was supposed to be the outcome of the reciprocal exchange.

Agriculture is the main occupation of Indian villages. This Jajmani system is a system which is associated with the agrarian society. More than 30 percent of the rural mass who are engaged themselves in one or the other occupation is the integral part of the Jajmani system. These individuals are helping the farmers by rendering their services and they provide different types of implements on time to the farmers which are required to carry out agricultural activities. In Jajmani system cash was not being given to the Kameens (those who render their services), instead food grains were given to them.

The term Jajmani is derived from the Sanskrit word 'Yajaman' meaning one who performs 'Yagna' (religious rite). So, one who performs 'Yagna' is considered as 'Yajaman' or 'Master' and a Brahmin who give his services for the performance of the religious rite (Yagna) is called as 'Kameen' or 'Parjan' . In due course of time, a person who serves was being called as 'Kameen' and one who takes the services called as 'Yajaman' or 'Master'.

As the backbone of rural economy and social order, Jajmani is a system of traditional occupational obligations. Oscar Levis defined it as "Under this system each caste group within a village is expected to give certain standardized services to the families of other castes". Harold Gould described Jajmani system as interfamilial and inter-caste relationship pertaining to pattern of super-ordinate and subordinate relation between patrons or yajaman and suppliers of services. It is a traditional specialized occupation of villagers based on caste system leading to the exchange of services in the rural society.

The Objectives

The objectives of the present study are as follows:

1. To know the social condition of the Jajmani system.

2. To study about the economic conditions of the rural artisans.

3. To study in detail about the reasons for the changes occurring in the Jajmani system.

Statement of the Problem

In Indian villages, till today Jajmani system is in practice in one or the other form. Earlier this system was totally depending upon the social structure. As the time changed, social structure of the rural India also changed. As a result, the rural artisans are facing lot of problems. Market for their products is shrinking and fulfilment of their needs has become difficult due to the globalization and the entry of multinational companies in the production of all materials required to lead a life in general and rural life in particular.

At the same time, the scope of their work is also creating several problems for them. The socio-economic conditions of the rural artisans of all 12 categories are not good. The 12 categories of rural artisans are Carpenter, Ironsmith, Potter, Goldsmith, Barber, Laundryman, Shoemaker, Talawar, Korava, Einor, Hoogar and Jeera. All these categories of rural artisans are covered in the present study.

These artisans have provided the same skill of production of different goods and services to their young generation. So, this is a hereditary occupation for rural artisans. All the members of the family are depending upon the services which they have to provide to the farming community and the people of other caste groups.

Area of the Study

Yadgir District is one of the 30 Districts of Karnataka state in southern India. This district was

carved out from the erstwhile Gulbarga District as the 30th district of Karnataka on 10 April 2010. Yadgir town is the administrative headquarters of the district. The district occupies an area of 5,160.88 square KMs. Area of the study of present study is Yadgir District. As it is mentioned above, earlier Yadgir was a Taluka in Gulbarga District. Now it is an independent District which has 3 Talukas. Yadgir, Shahapur and Shorapur are the Talukas of the District.

According to 2011 census, Yadgir had population of 1,174,271 of which male and female were 590,329 and 583,942 respectively. In 2001, Yadgir had a population of 956,180 of which males were 482,347 and remaining 473,933 were females. There was change of 22.81 percent in the population compared to population as per 2001. In the previous census of India 2001, Yadgir District recorded a increase of 20.12 percent to its population compared to the 1991 census of India. So, Yadgir District has a growth of more than 20%.

Methodology

As the present study is an explanatory and analytical one, the methods adopted to collect the research data are depending on primary data, secondary data as well as sampling method. The primary data is obtained from rural artisans of the Yadgir District. Secondary data is collected from the books, magazines, articles, journals, newspapers, online data etc. The study is more dependent on sampling method in which the researcher has selected all 3 talukas of the district.

Review of Literature

A few individuals and institutions have conducted studies on Jajmani system or rural artisans. Some important ones are mentioned here. Prof. Y. Singh describes Jajmani system as a system governed by relationship based on reciprocity in inter-caste relations in villages. Ishwaran holds the view that, it is a system in which each caste has a role to play in a community life as a whole called as "aya" in Mysore in South India; each caste plays a role consisting of economic, social and moral functions. Mandelbaum held that the Jajmani system essentially operates at the family level. The landowning family

has its Jajmani ties with one family each from Brahmin, Barber, and Carpenter etc.

N.S Reddy observes that, the farmer who engages carpenter or iron smith for manufacture or repair of his tools is Jajman and the Carpenter and the iron-smith are Kamin or Parjan. Between Jajman and Parjan the relationship is hereditary and is based on tradition. Jajmans get a variety of jobs done by Parjans. For example, the barber dresses the hair and shaves the beard, Kahar brings water from the well or river as the case may be, Sweeper does sanitary jobs.

For these services Parjans are paid something, in a majority of cases farmers in Indian villages give grains for the services of the Parjans. In modern times currency notes are fast replacing all other media of exchange even in villages. In Jajmani system, Jajman enjoys so much respect that he is often referred to as Rajah (King) and Parjans as subjects.

Conclusion

It can be concluded on the basis of the available data from the present study that, both government agencies and private ones have to take more care of the rural artisans of the state of Karnataka in general and the rural artisans of Yadgir District in particular. The socio-economic conditions of rural artisans or the people who engaged themselves in Jajmani system in the district are not good. Hence, it is suggested that, some constructive steps have to be taken for the improvement of their social and economic status.

References

1. A. Vinayak Reddy – *Rural artisans in India.*

2. B.Mohan Rao – *A study of Indian Society – structure and change*

3. Simon Commander – *The Jajmani system in North India – An examination of its logic status across two centuries.*

4. William Rowe – *Changing rural class structure and the Jajmani system.*

5. Pauline Kolenda – *Toward a model of the Hindu Jajmani system – Online publication – 2008.*   ◆◆

Indo – US Nuclear Agreement

E. Elaiyasundarrajan*

India and USA first in the joint statement released on July 18, 2005, announced their intention to enter into a civil nuclear agreement. The then US President, George W. Bush, visited India on March 1, 2006, and on July 26, 2006, the US House of Representatives passed the "Henry J Hyde United states – India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act of 2006", which stipulates that Washington will cooperate with New Delhi on nuclear issues and exempt it from signing the Nuclear Non – Proliferation Treaty. The U.S Congress on October 1, 2008, gave final approval to an agreement facilitating nuclear co-operation between the United States and India.

Nuclear Agreement

The Deal is seen as a watershed in India-U.S. relations and introduces a new aspect to international non-proliferation efforts. It lifts a three-decade-old U.S. moratorium on nuclear trade with India. It provides U.S. assistance to India's civilian nuclear energy program, and expands U.S.-India co-operation in energy and satellite technology. But critics in the United States say the Deal fundamentally reverses half a century of U.S. non-proliferation efforts, undermines attempts to prevent states like Iran and North Korea from acquiring nuclear weapons, and potentially contributes to a nuclear arms race in Asia.

It's an unprecedented deal for India, says Charles D. Ferguson, science and technology fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations. If you look at the

*   Research Scholar, Dept. of Pol. Sc. & Pub. Admn., Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu.

three countries outside the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) – Israel, India, and Pakistan this stands to be a unique deal. In July 2009, New Delhi designated two sites for U.S. companies to build nuclear reactors in India. But a nuclear liability law passed by the Indian Parliament in August 2010 is causing a rift with U.S. nuclear suppliers.

Critics of the law contend India's proposal to seek legal redress against nuclear suppliers is a sharp deviation from the international liability regime which holds nuclear operators solely responsible in case of an accident. India would also like the United States to relax some of its restrictions on technology transfer to India.

Indo – US Civil Nuclear Agreement

George W. Bush visited India for the first time in March 1, 2006. Bush and Singh issued a joint statement on their growing strategic partnership emphasizing their agreement on civil nuclear cooperation on March 3, 2006. On 26 July, 2006, the US Houses of representatives passed the Henry J Hyde United States – India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act of 2006, which stipulated that Washington would cooperate with New Delhi on nuclear issues and exempt it from signing the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

On July 28, 2006, the Left parties in India demanded threadbare discussion on the issue in Parliament. On November 16, 2006, the US Senate passed the United States – India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation and US Additional Protocol

implementation Act to exempt from certain requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, United States export of nuclear materials, equipment, and technology to India.

On December 18, 2006, President Bush signed law congressional legislation on Indian atomic energy. Negotiations on a bilateral agreement between the US and India concluded on July 27, 2007. The text of the agreement for cooperation between the government of the United States of America and the government of India concerning peaceful uses of nuclear energy (123 Agreement) was released on August 3, 2007, by both governments. On August13, 2007, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh made a *suo moto* statement in Parliament on the nuclear deal.

On August 17, 2007, CPI (M) general secretary Prakash Karat said the honeymoon (with UPA government) might be over but the marriage could go on. Subsequently on September 4, 2007, a UPA-Left committee to discuss civil nuclear issue was set up. However, on February 25, 2008, Left parties said the UPA would have to choose between the deal and its government's stability. Thereafter, the US government said on April 23, 2008 that it would seek the sense of the House on the 123 Agreement before it could be taken up for ratification by the American Congress.

On 9 July, 2008, the draft India-Specific safeguard accord with the IAEA was circulated to IAEA's Board of Governors for Approval. On July 10, 2008, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh called for a vote of confidence in Parliament. On 14 July, 2008, the IAEA said it would meet on August 1st to consider the India–Specific safeguards agreement. On July 24, 2008, India launched full blast lobbying among the 45-nations, Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG) for an exemption for nuclear commerce.

The IAEA Board of Governors adopted on Aug 1st, 2008, India – Specific safeguards agreement unanimously and on September 11, 2008, President Bush sent the text of 123 Agreement to the US-Congress for final approval. Nevertheless, US remained silent over the controversy in India triggered by Bush's assertions that nuclear fuel supply assurances to New Delhi under the deal were only political commitments and not legally binding.

On September 18, 2008, the US Senate Foreign Relations Committee started a crucial hearing on the Indo-US nuclear deal and a week later when on September 26, 2008, Prime Minister Manmohan Singh met Gorge W. Bush at the White House, both leaders were not able to sign the nuclear deal as the US Congress did not approve it. The US House of Representatives passed the bill to approve the deal on September 28, 2008. Two days later, India and France inked a similar nuclear pact, making France the first country to have such an agreement with India.

On October 1st, 2008 the US Senate also approved the civilian nuclear agreement allowing India to purchase nuclear fuel and technology from – and sell them to – the United States. US President, George W. Bush, signed the legislation on the Indo – US nuclear deal, approved by the US congress, into law, now called the United States – India Nuclear Cooperation Approval and Non – Proliferation Enhancement Act, on October 8, 2008. The agreement was signed by then Indian External Affairs Minister Pranab Mukherjee and his counterpart then Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice, on October 10, 2008.

On September 27, 2008, House of Representatives approved the Indo-US nuclear deal, in which 298 members voted for the Bill While 117 voted against it. On Oct 4th, 2008, Bush signed legislation to enact

the landmark US – India civil nuclear agreement. On 25th January, 2014, US President Barack Obama said the US and India had reached a breakthrough and they were moving towards commercial cooperation in the civil nuclear energy deal. The deal is done, said Indian Foreign Secretary Sujatha Singh. India has set for itself an ambitious target of generating around 10,000 MW of additional nuclear energy by 2020-21 and then another 13, 500 MW by 2032.

Conclusion

The deal also had faced opposition from non–proliferation activists, anti – nuclear organizations, and some states within the Nuclear Suppliers Group. In February 2008, US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice said that any agreement would be consistent with the obligations of the Hyde Act. The bill was signed on October 8, 2008. The 123 deal agreement defines the terms and conditions for bilateral civilian nuclear cooperation, and requires separate approvals by the US Congress and by Indian Cabinet Ministers. The agreement will also help India meet its goal of adding 25,000 MW of nuclear power capacity through imports of nuclear reactors and fuel by 2020.

References

1. Joint statement between President George W. Bush and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, 18 June 2005, Washington: Office of the Press Secretary, White House, available at http://georgebush-whitehouse.archives.gov/news/releases/2005/07/20050718-1.html retrieved on January 2015.

2. For details see, Henry J. Hyde United States-India Peaceful Atomic Energy Cooperation Act of 2006, 3 January 2006, available at http://frwegate.aaccess.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=109_cong_bills&docid=f:h5682enr:txt.pdf, retrieved on 27 January 2015.

3. For more information see Sultan, Maria, Mian Behzad Adil, The Henry J. Hyde Act and 123 agreement An Assessment, September 2008, … http://www.sassu.org.uk/pdfs/The123 Agreement and Hyde Act.pdf retrieved on 28 January 2015.

4. "House of Reps clear N-deal, France set to sign agreement". The Times of India. September 29, 2008. Retrieved October 2, 2008.

5. "India, France ink nuclear deal, first after NSG waiver". *The Indian Express*. Retrieved October 2, 2008.

6. Rajghatta, Chidanand (October 2, 2008). "Finally, it's done: India back on the nuclear train". *The Times of India*. Retrieved October 2, 2008.

7. "Senate approves nuclear deal with India". CNN. October 1, 2008. Retrieved October 2, 2008.

8. "Bush signs bill on N-deal on October 8". United States Office of the Press Secretary. October 8, 2008. Retrieved October 8, 2008.

9. Done Deal: India, US seal landmark nuclear pact CNN-IBN.

10. Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice and Indian Minister of External Affairs Pranab Mukherjee at the Signing of the U.S.-India Civilian Nuclear Cooperation Agreement

❖❖