LESSON 1

THE WORLD ECONOMIC CRISIS, 1929-34

--Prabhat Kumar
School of Open Learning
University of Delhi

Profound questions are sometimes very simply and innocently put. When Queen Elizabeth of England recently met a group of bankers and economists she asked them in the context of the current global economic crisis that if there was such a huge problem round the corner how could they not foresee it. This sense of bewilderment is as much true for the present crises as for the one that engulfed the world economy in 1929, though a few years preceding 1929 were indeed marked by a certain sense of anxiety and some desperate, albeit not very profound and wise, measures taken by some countries to arrest the fall.

Many parallels exist between what we are seeing now and what happened in 1929. In a way, the crisis of 1929 was the crisis of the modern world. A great living economist at the time, J.M. Keynes, remarked, 'We are today in the middle of the greatest economic catastrophe - the greatest catastrophe due almost entirely to economic causes – of the modern world.

The epicenter of the problem in 1929, as the one happening eight decades later, was the United States of America. The crisis was signaled by the Wall Street Crash on 24 October, 1929. Buyers's loss of confidence in the stock market first showed up in September, 1929, which was reflected in the slowing down of the purchase of shares. It soon reached a panick proportion with fear gripping the shareholders that not only could the share markets not to be further milked but that they might eventually crash washing away all profits. The panick was not merely confined to the stock market but rapidly spread elsewhere. First if affected the banks from where people were forced to withdraw their savings in the time of dire financial straits. Consequently, many banks were forced to close down. Further, in the absence of buyers the factories churning out prosperity in the previous decade had to put brakes on production. Factories, therefore, had to be wound up and unemployment stared in the face. People with a deeper economic insight soon realised that the boom that they had hoped to last forever was not to be. The faith in the future wavered and the investors rushed to the share market to heave off their shares. What began as a trickle soon swelled into a huge wave reaching a nervous peak on 24 October, 1929, also remembered as Black Thursday, when nearly 13 million shares were disposed off at a very low price very soon they were valued at about 25 percent of their boom level. The slide further continued.

This primarily American economic disaster was contagious enough to affect the whole world very soon. The world economies were now too closely linked not to be affected by the financial indiscretion of the major economy of the world. Through the nineteenth century of system of financial interdependence had developed by the growing volume of international trade for the purchase of raw materials and for the selling of manufactured goods and for capital investment. This interdependence was briefly affected during the First World War but soon bounced back into place once the war was over. A network, therefore, existed through which problems could as easily spread as prosperity.

The world economies were also marked by a differentiation of sorts. Though a large part of industrial production in European countries centered on coal, ship building and steel, the United States of America specialized more in the production of consumer goods. It did remarkably well in the motor vehicle industry. This economic imbalance in production affected the volume of foreign trade which came to be dominated by American goods while the share of European countries declined. Technological innovations in the field of agriculture increased production and reduced prices. As a result people had less money now to buy manufactured goods.

A similar story unfolded in the field of industrial production of manufactured goods in America. Mechanisation augmented the volume of production giving a huge profit margin to American industrialists inducing further greed. They filed to realize that they were producing far too much than what could be bought by the domestic consumers while the foreign markets had started drying up. Unemployment in agriculture, coupled with the laying off of factory workers, gave rise to an awesome mass of people, who, in the absence of any unemployment benefit, simply bought less thus further shrinking the domestic market.

The imbalance in the domestic economy can be understood by the uneven growth index. In the years 1923 to 1929 the salary of industrial labourers rose by about 8 percent but the increase in industrial profits during the time was 72 percent. The industrialists, therefore, were seemingly not willing to share their profits with the workers. They failed to read the writing on the wall and it soon led to a dreadful recession. One idea of the living standard of America at the time can be had from the fact that even before the slump began a large number of Americans were too poor to buy a radio, a washing machine or a car. For long they had lived in a blissful self-deception that the boom would last forever. This innocent conceit proved fatal.

The vicious economic circle was in operation in international trade too. The Fordney – McCumber tariff of 1922 had raised barriers against foreign goods and in the process the European economics were so badly hit that their capacity to buy American manufactured products declined some states also took retaliatory measures by raising tariff barriers against American products.

Crucial to the process of economic growth is the ready availability of capital. European economies needed capital both for production as well as for war reparations. The Treaty of Versailles had imposed a huge financial burden on Germany which was obliged to fulfill its obligations to Britain and France. It was able to discharge this only with the help of American capital. Britain and France too needed America's help to repay interest on American financial assistance rendered during the war. This led to what is called a 'cycle of indebtedness'. Further, many countries of the world needed more American loans to pay back previous loans. Repayment was to be done in gold reserves and, as a result, by 1929, America was in possession of a major part of gold's supply in the world.

This problem of a severe imbalance in international economy was addressed to by different countries through the 1920s. Britain reverted to the gold standard from sterling in 1925 and the other countries followed suit by 1928, though this led to increased instability. The Geneva Conference was convened in 1927 to solve the problem but it could not measure up to

the task. Consequently, financial imagination of the beleaguered nations cold no go beyond protective legislation. This was obviously no solution to the problem.

The Wall Street crash started a chain reaction which in a condition where the world economies were closely interlinked soon went beyond America and gripped the whole world with the exception of only the USSR which had been kept away from all this by Stalin's economic policies. The gold reserves of France helped it withstand the crisis till 1934 after which it also gave way.

Unemployment figures rose to 13.7 million in the USA, 5.6 million in Germany and 2.8 million in Britain. The number of banks in America dwindled from 25,000 in 1929 to 15,000 in 1933 mopping up the savings of the common man. By 1933 industrial production was halved. One out of eight farmers was left with no property at all. It led to increased queues for bread and for charity soup kitchens.

What was being realized all over now was the need for a comprehensive and concerted economic planning. Yet the World Economic Conference convened in London in 1933 failed to provide any convincing solution. Individual nations, therefore, were left to devise their own polices, quite often in conflict with each other, to deal with the crisis. One common thread running through these measures was the spirit of economic nationalism. When problems could not be solved in unison they had to tackle it in their own way. Protective tariffs was one answer to it to insulate domestic industries from competitive foreign imports. The Import Duties Act of 1932 raised tariff walls in Britain ending years of liberalised economic regime and similar tightening of controls was witnessed all over Europe. Free trade gave way to bilateral agreements between nations for an economic arrangement they were more comfortable with.

Financial extravagance was sought to be checked in Germany and France through deflationary policies whereby wage ceiling was imposed and public expenditure curtailed. Britain, on the other hand, resorted to budgetary control. But more than this it was the growth of private enterprise and a demand for consumer goods, coupled with a spurt in house building and motor vehicle industry, which lifted the British economy at the time.

Germany took a different route to recovery. It solved the problem of unemployment through public works and by promoting heavy industries, causing it to fall from 44 percent to 1 percent. The other measures that the Nazis resorted to were to set up a series of markets and to enter into bilateral trade relations with South Eastern Europe. The combined effect of all this was so salubrious on Germany economy that its recovery in the 1930s was the most spectacular.

The economic nightmare of the early 1930s led to the political nightmare of a later period. The political system formed on the principles of parliamentary democracy in the post First World War period atrophied and came to be replaced by a system based on a more strident totalitarian thinking. The phenomena of the rise of Mussolini in Italy, of Hitler in Germany and of militarism in Japan, largely the result of international economic instability, introduced a new element of hatred, distrust and aggrandizement in international relations.

THE COLD WAR

--Satish K. Jha
Reader in Political Science
RLA (E) College, Delhi University

The Second World War unleashed new forces and new powers in World Politics. In 1945, the allied forces led by the US, Soviet Union, Britain and France defeated the axis powers led by Germany, Italy and Japan. Thereafter, the world witnessed the rise of two centres of power – the US and the USSR. Gradually these two centres of power turned into power blocs – The Western camp led by the US and the Eastern camp led by the USSR. The two groupings in The World Politics for the first time in human history got organized on ideological lines. The rivalry between the two became intense setting the new type of warfare in operation, which came to be known as Cold War.

The Cold War was different from earlier wars in the sense that no military conflict between the US and the USSR took place. It was an ideological warfare in which power rivalries, military alliances and new type of balance of power equations were tried. The western alliance led by the US and its allies like Britain and France represented the ideology of liberal democracy, were as the Soviet Union championed the ideology of socialism and communism. The struggle for the power and the strategic superiority which this period witnessed was ideological warfare between the ideological blocks, known as the Western and the Eastern blocs. The bipolar division of World had a strategic dimension as well which got manifested in military alliances like NATO and Warsaw pact. The Cold War was a state of tension in which each side adopted policies designed to strengthen itself and weaken the other but it always fell short of actual war. In fact it involved all means of warfare except direct arm conflict, thereby, pushing the World in a state of uneasy peace.

Thus, the Cold war was central defining feature of post world war politics. However, what precisely caused this war and who were principally responsible for this conflict has been a debatable question. There are different theories and interpretations of events leading to the Cold War.

Western scholars talk of soviet expansionism, its occupation of Eastern Europe and their design to impose communism on nation after nation to be primarily responsible for compelling the U.S. to take defensive measures. On the other hand, scholars who were sympathetic to the Soviet Union held American Scheme of global domination and its imperialist design to be responsible for it. However, there is a third approach which believes that both were responsible and they give the example of Soviet refusal to allow elections in East Germany, their refusal to withdraw army from Iran after the war as to be provocative action. Similarly, they hold the US responsible for Cold War in the sense that it hardly ever missed an opportunity to prick Soviet Union and it could be seen from dropping of atom bombs on Hiroshima to 'Iron Curtain' speech of Churchill.

Williams, has opined that the Soviet Union was not interested in expansionism as it is believed to be what it was doing was building friendly relationships with neighbours in Eastern Europe and it was primarily interested in rebuilding its War- ravaged economy.

Fleming, on the other hand feels that it was not the role of ideology which caused Cold War. Had president Roosevelt of the US been alive, the policy of co-operation would have continued with the Soviet Union. In his opinion, it was President Truman and his advisers who adopted the policy of confrontation leading to the Cold War.

Albert Carry is of the opinion that the Cold War was the result of changes in balance of power equations. He feels that Europe which was the earlier centre of World Politics, had been eliminated from central position without blaming either the US or Russia, he says that demotion of Europe and emergence of the US and the USSR as major actors of World Politics were responsible for the Cold War.

Louis Halle feels that Cold War was caused by Russia. He does not blame either Stalin or Communism as responsible for the Cold War. In his opinion whenever balance of power in world politics had been disturbed, a combination of forces emerged to restore it and at that time Stalin was disturbing it. Hence, a combination of nations emerged to check it. Halle condemns Russia for having Russian behaviour and not communist behavior under communism. The Soviet Union continued to practice Tsarist culture, which was authoritarian and non-conciliatory.

Causes of Cold War

There is no unanimity among scholars about the origin and the precise reasons of Cold War. Some of them have traced its origin to Bolshevik revolution of 1917. While for others, the cold war started about the time the three powers namely U.S., Soviet Union and Britain started a conference in 1945 at Post Dam to discuss the future shape of World Politics. The mutual mistrust between the east and the west (Russia and the USA/Britain) got reflected in this conference itself. But some scholars seem to believe that the immediate reasons of the Cold War lay in the very circumstances under which the Second World War came to an end. Few of them also attribute it to the law of history, *i.e.,* the victorious powers always tend to fall out among themselves when the conflict which earlier had brought them together ceases to exist.

But on the basis of what happened in 50s, 60s and to some extent even in 70s, some factors can be mentioned which in one way or the other contributed towards plunging the entire World into the Cold War.

Bolshevik Revolution

Once communist revolution took place in Russia, the Western powers were uncomfortable with this development in the middle of the Europe. Though Western powers and the communist Russia fought against Nazi Germany together during the Second World War. But the western world always looked at Stalin and his communist ideology as dangerous as Nazism and Fascism.

Hence, the U.S. and its allies were not ready to accept the Soviet Union in the emerging framework to govern the world order. This mistrust between the two superpowers was at the root of all that transpired during the Cold War.

Question of Second Front

During the Cold War, Hitter had started fighting on the two fronts. On the eastern front Soviet Union solely bore the brunt of fighting Hitter whereas on the western front, the western powers were jointly dealing with Germany. Stalin, who was finding difficult to neutralize Hitter alone, requested the western powers to join the Second Front along with Russian army in order

to take the pressure off from Russia. However, the western powers turned it down thus making Stalin quite suspicious about western intentions and their strategic designs.

Atom Bomb

It was decided during the war itself that the two superpowers will together attack Japan after the conclusion of war but the US in order to demonstrate its strategic and military superiority over the Soviet Union dropped and atom bombs in 1945 on Japan. This action was meant to send signal to the Soviet Union that the U.S.A. was the nuclear power and hence would dictate terms – in the post Second World War world politics. Besides this, the U.S.A. had also concealed the research that was going on during Second World War to develop nuclear weapons particularly from Soviet Union.

Germany and Eastern Europe

The future of Europe in general and Germany in particular added new dimensions to already existing tensed political climate. At the conference four powers occupation of Germany and Berlin had been agreed upon. But the fact of the matter is that both the camps were strategizing to enhance their respective influence and control over Germany. Similarly Russia wanted that the Eastern Europe which was closer to its borders to be communized and by February 1948, Stalin succeeded in this endeavour when Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Poland were brought under Russian security umbrella. This communization of Eastern Europe triggered reactions in the rival camp and they reacted with equally provocative policy measures.

Iran and Turkey

Soviet armies, it is well known were kept in both Iran and Turkey for much longer period than it was stipulated earlier in the agreement. This action confirmed the western suspicion that the Soviet Union was interested in expanding its arena of influence to encircle the western democracies with ideological and strategic alliances and influence.

Churchill's Foulton Speech

British former Prime Minister Churchil who delivered his greatest policy speech at Foulton in the U.S. Prepared a ground for post war ideological confrontation of the Cold War. In this speech Churchill called Stalin and communism to be one of the greatest scourge for humanity. During this speech he also used the term 'Iron curtain' to explain how Russia had created barriers in Europe to protect its sphere of influence. Many scholars today believe that this Foulton speech was primarily responsible for starting the Cold War.

Growth and Evolution

The Cold War progressed through different phases till it was formally over after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, one of the main players in this game of Politics.

First phase (1947-1950)

The formal beginning of the Cold War was made with the initiation of the Truman doctrine, which put Cold War in action. Truman's **'Policy of Containment'** was based on its assessment of the Soviet Union as inherently hostile to western interests and which is hell bent on expanding its area of influence.

The Truman doctrine was accompanied by a strategy known as the 'Marshall Plan'. This plan was meant for economic recovery and reconstruction of Europe. The idea behind this plan was to extend help to those European nations which had been devastated during the World War and who were interested in accepting economic assistance. What worried the U.S. at that time was that for poverty stricken people in Western Europe communism might appear very attractive and hence they might go the Soviet way. Hence, the Marshall Plan was proposed to neutralize such danger of more and more European power sliping into Stalin's ideological framework. In other words one can say that the Marshall Plan was the economic version of the policy of containment propounded through the Truman doctrine.

In reaction to these measures, Stalin reactivated **com inform** to co-ordinate the activities of its allies. It was meant to tighten Soviet's control over the Eastern Europe.

Hence, we find that the Cold War was in full swing with these measures and counter-measures and the ideological warfare spread throughout the Europe. The Berlin blockade was the first indication of a confrontationist political climate and the subsequent creation of NATO in 1949 was further vindication of this politics. Apart from this, the thirty-years long Chinese civil war led to victory of the communists. This had a major impact in Asian affairs and perception in both Moscow and Washington.

Second Phase (1950-1953)

The Cold War entered into second phase with the Korean crisis which also took the Cold War outside the borders of Europe. Through this war did not bring any significant change in power equations but it certainly globalised the containment policy as well as the cold war. This period is also significant for the Soviet Union as it exploded its atom-bomb and attained strategic party with the U.S., forcing many scholars to observe that it was beginning of an era of balance of terror. Because both the superpowers now possessed the nuclear arsenals.

Third Phase (1953-1957)

The third phase of Cold War was marked by death of Stalin in 1953. There was also a change in Presidency in the U.S., as Eisenhower replaced Truman. In this period it is to be recalled that the US shifted its policy from simple containment to massive retaliation, to liberate people from communist dictatorship.

In Russia, interestingly a process of de Stalinisation was started by Khrushchev. This opened however of a possibility of some mitigation in the hostility. But very soon these hopes got shattered and the Cold War was transported to another part of Asia *i.e.,* Indo-China and Vietnam. Militarily, this phase was marked by the signing of Warsaw Pact among Russian allies and the formal division of Germany into East and West.

The death of Stalin in 1953 signified many developments for the USSR at home as well as in foreign affairs : Khrushchev policy let loose reformist forces in the Eastern Europe. Though Poland was controlled but situation in Hungary became worrisome for the Soviet Regime. In 1956, Soviet intervention in Hungary led to blood shed and heated up the Cold War temperature.

The Soviet intervention in Hungary coincided with an attack on Egypt by Britain, France and Israel, which was precipitated by Colonel Nasser's seizure of Suez Canal. Though American president Eisenhower was not in support of his allies act in Egypt as it deflected the attention from the Soviet action in Hungary. But, still the Suez crisis took the Cold War politics to the Middle East, which was smoldering since the founding of the state of Israel in 1948. Though

both the USA and the USSR had supported the creation of a Jewish State. But in 1950's, the Soviet foreign policy supported Arab nationalism. Nasser moved towards a form of socialism, though not of Marxist-Leninist brand. In the meanwhile, Israel developed relations with British and the French leading to a secret understanding to attack Egypt is 1956. The signing of Baghdad Pact (1955) later known as CENTO was a fall out of these events. Before this, in 1954, the SEATO had already come into existence in the South East Asia after the defeat of the French by the Vietnamese and the subsequent division of Vietnam along the 17th parallel.

Fourth Phase (1957-1962)

This phase was marked by two extreme trends – one in direction of the principle of co-existence, while the other pulling in another direction of bellicosity as reflected in the Cuban Missile crisis which brought the entire world on the brink of nuclear war.

The crisis over Cuba in 1962 was the most dangerous moment is the Cold War. The superpowers, perhaps, for the first time, stood in eye ball to eye ball confrontation. But both American President Kennedy and the Soviet President Khrushchev became anxious to reach at a diplomatic settlement. Finally Khrushchev decided to withdraw the missiles, which he has installed is Cuba in return of assurance that America would not invade Cuba.

Fifth Phase (1962-1969)

The happenings of 1962 were followed by a period of both competition and coexistence. Though nuclear armaments continued to grow and some new nuclear weapons states came into existence – Britain, France and China. But this was period was marked by the new realization that nuclear weapons were not good for peace and humanity. Hence Partial Test Bar Treaty (PTBT) was negotiated in 1963, which banned testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere. Simultaneously, the growing concern over the spread and proliferation of nuclear weapons culminated into the negotiation of Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treat (NPT) in 1968. Under this treaty, the states, which possessed nuclear weapons, committed themselves to stop arms race, while those who did not have, resolved not to develop them ever. In this period, Khrushchev talked of peaceful coexistence and carried it forward by visiting America.

Sixth Phase (1969-1978)

This phase is remembered for 'Détente' which was cessation of tensions. Interestingly, whereas the USSR and the USA began a new era of co-peration. On the other side of spectrum, a new rift started between two ideological friends and partners – the USSR and China known as Sino-Soviet conflict.

We will do well to remember that in spite of superpower 'Détente' they meddled in local conflicts, as for *e.g*, Indo-Pak war of 1971 is a case to be mentioned.

This period would be remembered for the 'Détente' between the USSR and the USA and rapprochement between China and the USA on the other. While America's involvement in vietnam was deepening, the Soviet-Chinese relations were also becoming strained. By 1969, China and the Soviet Russia had fought a minor border war due to territorial dispute. This Sino-Soviet Conflict became a major turning point in the history of Cold War, as it became in compatible with the ideological pattern of the Cold War Politics.

The American president Nixon and his adviser Henry Kissinger were instrumental in the US-USSR 'Détente' as well as the Sino-American rapprochement. Though it is to be

remembered that this new phase in the Soviet-American relations did not lead to cessation of all political conflict. Both superpowers supported and patronized friendly regimes and movement, while at the same time tried to subvert their adversaries. And most notably, the third world countries became the theatre of such activities. The Indo-Pak war of 1971 and the upheavals in Ethiopia in 1975 and Aagola in 1978 are case in point when the two superpowers pursued their political goals by meddling into local conflicts.

Seventh Phase (1979-1987) : The New Cold War

The new Cold War started with Soviet occupation of Afghanistan in 1979 as it marked the end of the period of 'Détente'. The new cold war phase witnessed massive arms race and it also reached the outer space which was done through American President Reagan's 'Star-war programme'.

The new or the second cold war, which followed the short peiod of detente in super power relationship is associated this period. The critics of détente in the west got vindicated when the Soviet forces occupied Afghanistan is 1979 and which is considered to be the beginning of the second cold war. The Western critics of détente, from the very beginning, were arguing that Soviet Union was only buying time to acquire nuclear superiority. The subsequent strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), which become popular as "Star Wars" and which was defence related research programme designed to explore the possibility of space based defence against missiles, was the immediate fall out of the second cold war.

The USA, under its new president Regan made significant departure on Nuclear Weapons and its intervention is Grenada (1983) and Libya (1986). Regan's support to rebels in Nicaragua and his doctrine for Latin America triggered fresh controversies.

The Soviet were not for behind. In 1983 its air defences shot down a South Korean civilian airlines in its air space.

But with a peculiar twist of history, Mikhail Gorbachev became president of the USSR in 1985. His new thinking and reformist approach in foreign policy along with his initiative for domestic reforms created a sort of new revolution both within the Soviet Union and its relations with the USA and the Western powers. His policy of Glasnost (openness) and Perestroika (restructuring) unleashed forces for change, which facilitated a new 'Détente' with the west.

End of the Cold War

The advent of Gorbachev on the Soviet scene and his reform policies of Glasnost and Perestroika in domestic matters and his desire to engage the west into peace negotiations transformed the international politics of the Cold War days. He paved the way for agreements on nuclear weapons and conventional forces. In 1987, Gorbachev signed the Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, which banned intermediate-range nuclear missiles, including cruise and perishing II. Later the American President George Bush and Gorbachev concluded a strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) agreement, which reduced long-range nuclear weapons. But this phase of new détente did not last long as due to quick succession of events and crises, the Soviet Union disintegrated in 1991 and formally ended a long chapter in international politics, that was the cold war.

Impact of the Cold War on International Politics

The Cold War impacted the World Politics to the same extent as the two world wars had done. The fear psychosis in international politics was triggered which set the nation-states on path of arms race. The division of the globe into rival camps-ideological and strategic – was the result of the cold war. The formation of military alliances – NATO and Warsaw Pact – and the covert and overt interventions in different regions were the manifestations of the cold war politics, which adversely affected both development and progress in the world. The nation-states diverted their resources from development to armament which sustained the military – industrial complexes which had come up in the developed countries of the west.

But the Cold War Politics also met with some resistance and reaction. The non-aligned movement (NAM) was one such protest movement in the world politics, which championed constructive dissociation from active power politics in context of the cold war and caught the imagination of many countries. It questioned the policies of the super power and tried to bring back the agenda of development and disarmament before the world community. The demand for New International Economic Order (NIEO) was the offshoot of this politics.

The cold war also made the United Nations which was created to enforce collective security totally ineffective and country after country looked towards the super powers and their security umbrella for their protection than relying on the U.N. system.

But the **end of the Cold War** has equally transformed the politics of the globe. The end of it has impacted international politics as massively as its on set had done. Some of its impacts are :

(a) It has destroyed the bi-polarity in the world.

(b) It has put question mark on the relevance of NAM.

(c) The Third World Countries have become more vulnerable to arm twisting by the big powers.

(d) The disintegration of the Soviet Union and the new dominance of the USA which is now called new Pax-Americana, has a created new structures of dominance and resistance.

(e) The establishment of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and creation of new terms for trade and development which are loaded in favour of more developed countries are some of the indications of the post cold war world system.

(f) Proliferation of nuclear weapons and the rise of ethnic nationalism and religious fundamentalism in different parts of the world and their confrontation with the secular states, which is some time referred as the 'New Cold War", are emerging sites of threat to world peace and have become new menace in post cold war world politics.

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. Fred Halliday – *Making of the Second Cold War*

    (London, Verso, 1983)

2. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia oweas – *The Globalisation of World Politics: An introduction to International Relations*

    (London, Oxford university Press, 2004)

3. J.Young and J.Kent – *International Relations since 1945*

    (London, oxford university Press, 2003).

4. Northedge and Grieve – *One harded years of international relations*

    (New York: Praeger, 1971)

5. Peter Calvocoressi – *World Politics since 1945*

    (London, Longman, 2001)

CAREER OF SOCIALIST STATES OF SOVIET UNION

--Satish K. Jha
Reader in Political Science
RLA (E) College, Delhi University

The human history has witnessed many revolutions which were brought to better human life. But the socialist revolution of 1917 in the Tsarist Russia, which created the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) stands out as landmark in history. The revolution was not only inspired by the Marxian ideals of socialism and communism, but had also for the first time in known history consciously and programmatically tried to reorder and remodel a society to get rid of private property and bring about equality and justice. This revolutionary attempt was significant as the earlier theories of socialism were considered utopian with little feasibility and practical value. But when the Bolshevik revolution happened, it vindicated the Marxian claim that it was scientific socialism, which could offer a viable framework of governance.

The new socialist regime in the Soviet Union, as it came to be known after the revolution, was headed by Vladimir Lenin, who as the founder of the Bolshevik Communist party had led the Russian Revolution of 1917. Lenin was a great Marxist ideologue, who turned out to be equally great practitioner of Marxism when he successfully presided over the Soviet system in its most difficult period (1917-24). Later it was the ideas of Lenin along with that of Marx and Engels that the socialist system in the USSR primarily drew upon.

But the career of the socialist regime in the USSR witnessed many twists and turns of history till it finally got disintegrated in 1991. Defying the Marxian principle that the socialist revolution should take place in advanced capitalist society, the Bolshevik Party under Lenin decided to bring revolution in a relatively under-developed society that was Tsarist Russia. Hence, the socialist state started with a tragic note as it had to under take many responsibilities which according to Marxist theory, the capitalism would accomplish including the painful job of 'primitive accumulation' of capital for economic development. Consequently the Soviet system paid the price of short-circuiting history.

The soviet state apparatus which became the axis of development became centralized and authoritarian. The critiques even called it a totalitarian system. It turned highly bureaucratic to the extent that it throttled freedom of people. It did not allow democracy to take root. What was celebrated in name of 'peoples democracy' was monopoly on power by one Political Party that was the communist party of the Soviet Union. It stifled people's genuine democratic aspirations. The state and the party became synonymous with each other and no political dissent was allowed. The Political institutions lacked accountability as the communist party exercised tight control over both society and politics. The federal arrangement, which tied the fifteen republics into the Soviet Union, did not allow the people either the cultural space for self-expression or decentralized the Political authority. Even in the federal union, Russian dominance in all matters in spite of the principle of equality of status for all republics, became operative reality. People from other republics felt suffocated and neglected.

Even ideologically the Bolshevik communist Party, which oversaw the functioning of the Soviet system, paid only lip service to the Marxist-Leninist ideology, particularly after Joseph Stalin took over in 1924. During 1924-53, when Stalin was at the helm of affairs, the Soviet

Union, although witnessed massive industrialization and success of planned development and the Soviet economy became more developed than the rest of the world except that of the US. But this was achieved at heavy cost. The forcible collectivization of agriculture, liquidation of opponents, suppression of dissent and censure on freedom of speech were ordered, defaming both socialism and Marxism.

But there is no gainsaying the fact that during Stalin's leadership, the Soviet Union saw massive development. It became a great power after the Second World War and took on the mighty United States of America single-handedly. The cold war, which began after the Second World War was reflection of new achieved power of the Soviet economy and the growing appeal of its planned development world over. The Soviet path of development was being seen as a miracle on the earth, which many developing countries wanted to emulate. The Soviet Union, in a short span of time, built impressive communication network, vast energy resources like oil and got iron and steel. It also produced machines of different types. Its own consumer industry was producing everything from small pins to big cars. It was not dependent on other economies for its bare necessities. Rather it was catering to the need of its allies and dependents, mostly from the East European countries which constituted its core strategic allies in the cold war Politics. Later, it also acquired nuclear capability and challenged American dominance in the international politics to the extent that it gradually acquired the fame of one of the two superpowers in world politics.

What impressed the world most was the Soviet state's welfare activities for its people as it ensured a minimum standard of living for all citizens. It subsidized basic necessities of people like health, education and child-care. It took good care of unemployment and guaranteed right to work. The state not only preached the socialist principle of "each according to his ability and each according to her work" but tried to operationalise it to a great extent. Though one may say that the quality of life of the people was compromised if it were compared with the western capitalist countries. But still it adhered to the socialist commitment of bread, clothing and shelter.

In the global politics, the Soviet Union offered stiff competition to the US and the western bloc. In the bi-polar politics of the post-second world war period, the USSR acted as one of the super powers and balanced the global power equations by closely matching the US in both arms race and strategic manoeuvering. When the centre of gravity was shifting to the third world countries, the Soviet Union was successful in befriending many of them so much so that the non-aligned movement at one point of time debated the issue of declaring the USSR as its natural ally.

But the super power rivalry cost dearly for the Soviet Union. In order to deter American hegemony in global politics, it had to join the arms race. This led to massive diversion of resources to arms industry as it could not depend on other nations. Besides this, it also had to look after its dependencies in the Eastern Europe in particular and allies elsewhere. Consequently, it slipped behind to the west in technology and infrastructure. Although, the wages of the people were decently growing, but both productivity and technology were lagging behind. There also happened shortage of consumers goods. It also could not address the political and economic aspirations of its own people.

The Soviet invasion in Afghanistan in 1979 proved to be the last straw on the camel's back. The Soviet system started tattering due to its involvement in Afghanistan.

Though, Stalin's successor Nikita Khrushchev had realized the shortcomings of the system and had set out to reform it way back in 1956. What came to be known as "de-

Stalinisation" under Khrushchev, he initiated number of measures to rectify the maladies of the Soviet Union. But his initiatives turned out to be more effective in the sphere of foreign policy than domestic affairs. This policy of "peaceful coexistence" with the west, which culminated into the super power detente, bore fruits. But his action in the eastern Europe, when the suppressed popular rebellion in Hungary which did not sit well with his reform agenda and prevented him to do anything. Politically and economically significant on domestic front, which could have arrested the process of rot in the system. The rift in the socialist camp, known as Sino-Soviet conflict was another hurdle during his time, which ideologically robbed the socialist bloc of manoeuverability.

Throughout the 70's and 80's, the Soviet Union was grappling with succession and ageing Political leaders. Though Leonid Brezhnev had long tenure (1964-82) and he got actively associated with the "detente" with the US. But he did not show much interest in reforms. Rather, he preferred suppressing a popular uprising in Czechoslovakia and got involved in Afghanistan invasion. Subsequent leaders like Andropov and Chernenko were only struggling with their ill-health and could hardly do anything for the ailing economy and polity.

Things started changing dramatically after Mikhail Gorbachev at a relatively younger age took command and became president in 1985. His new thinking, in both foreign policy and domestic politics, created s revolution of sort. His policy of "Glasnost" or openness along with Perestroika (or restructuring) at home along with initiation of new detente with the west unleashed forces, which although unfortunately became uncontrollable and which ultimately led to disintegration of the Soviet Socialist Republics.

Gorbacher's democratic reforms were intended to treat the bleeding wound of the Soviet people. But to his dismay it stirred the hornest nest and opened the Pandora box all over. This foreign policy initiatives were meant to harmonise relations with the US and the west and to divert the attention on addressing the needs and aspirations of its own people, who were getting restive and were clamouring for change as the quality of life and living standard were fast deteriorating. The new communication revolution had made them more aware about the failings of the socialist system which was being compared to its western capitalist counter-parts.

Gorbachev's domestic agenda proved to be double-edged sword as it acted as a catalyst for change in the Eastern Europe which was equally crying for reforms. When the turmoil broke out in the Eastern Europe, Gorbachev unlike his predecessors Khrushchev and Brezhnev decided not to interfere. Instead, he allowed the East Europeans to do and go their own way, which led to the fall of the socialist regimes there by 1989, one after another. Even the two Germany, which were divided during the cold war, were allowed to be re-united in 1989 and the East Germany (The German democratic Republic) disappeared from the global map.

Gorbachev's reform agenda was quite broad which tried to deal with number of problems. Apart from restructuring the economy and catching up with the west it also sought to open the soviet society and loosen the administrative system in order to get back popular backing which had been eroded. The alienation of ordinary people due to corruption and unaccountable administration was deep rooted. The centralized authority of the communist party was stifling which Gerbachev vowed to rectify. In 1990 he enacted a law which ended the monopoly of the communist party of the Soviet Union [CPSU] over the state. This was the beginning of multi-party political process after 73 years. He also dismantled the state-controlled economy and moved in direction of free enterprises and recognized private ownership. He de-controlled the economy and paved the way for trade and commerce with other countries of the world.

Though Gerbachev justified the collectivization and Industrialization of thirties as indispensable for that time as otherwise, in his opinion, the country would not have been rehabilitated. He used Marxist and Leninist canons, which prescribe creative reassessment of objective conditions, to justify his new reforms. He argued that what happened in twenties and thirties were dictated by the then prevailing objective conditions. But that no longer existed in the Soviet Union. Hence new reality required new interpretation and new measures. The Glasnost and Perestioka precisely addressed this question in Gorbachev's scheme of things.

Gorbachevism opened a new chapter of freedom to the nationalities in the post-1917 USSR. It was a multi-national society where approximately sixty three nationalities lived. Before the Bolshevik revolution, the communist party had promised that the revolution would liberate them from the tsarist autocracy. Lenin's theory of self-determination, which stood for autonomy and freedom for different nationalities, looked quite attractive and promising to these nationalities. But things happened differently after the revolution. Although, the Soviet Constitution talked about the right to secession for all republics in the federal union and preached Leninist idea of self-determination. But in practice, due to centralized political arrangement it carried little value. Excessive concentration of power under the garb of "democratic centralism" robbed different regions of their cultural freedom and aspirations. Hence, when the reform was started, the nationality issue became most intractable and ultimately the Soviet Union disintegrated due to this in 1991 with the republics of the Soviet Union declaring independence, which formally dissolved the Soviet Union by forming a new commonwealth of independent states.

Gorbachev also extended his Glasnost and perestroika in the sphere of foreign relations. He decided to unilaterally stop nuclear tests in 1990. He allowed the US experts to visit the Soviet Nuclear plants and removed medium range nuclear missiles in tandem with the US. He also drastically cut conventional arms and withdrew from Afghanistan, besides reestablishing relations with China and cooperating with the US and the western powers within the UN to usher in new era of peace in international politics.

But, in spite of, correct diagnosis of the problems afflicting the Soviet system, the situation continued to worsen and many people thought that the condition of the people was as bad as 1930 depression – unemployment, hunger and poverty. Once the motion of change was set in and expectations of people grew, it became impossible to control it. Even Gorbachev could not foresee its intensity. Interestingly, Gorbachev's leadership failed to assuage the feelings of both the pro-changers and the no-chargers. Those who wanted reforms believed that Gorbachev was not moving fast enough on his agenda and were getting impatient with his method. For them Boris Yeltsin, a Gorbachev's protégé and who was made by him the mayor of Moscow appeared more promising to deliver on reforms. The members of the communist party, the no-changers, were also unhappy as they found that their power and privileges were slipping and thought that Gorbachev was moving too fast. Thus, Gorbachev was losing support on all sides.

The west, on the other hand, was disinterested is bailing out a beleaguered Gorbachev. They were making only false promises and were not sincere in their commitments. They were in fact eagerly waiting for the liquidation of the socialist bloc. In July 1991, the USSR had asked for a full membership of the IMF and the World Bank in order to be able to use their resources to deal with the growing economic miseries. But American President Bush was insisting on prior economic reforms as a condition for west's assistance, knowing perhaps well that Gorbachev would not be able to survive the growing discontent.

Finally, a coup was staged in August 1991 which was stage managed by the communist party hardliners and proved to be Achilles heel. It failed to get support of the people as the society which had tasted freedom, was not ready to revert back to old style centralized authoritarian rule. During the coup Yeltsin hogged the limelight as he led the protest against the communist hardliners. Thereafter he grew in stature and became national hero and representative of pro-reform forces, replacing Gorbachev.

After the coup, Gorbachev quit the post of the CPSU Chief and also disbanded the central committee of the CPSU. He asked the democratically inclined communists to set up a new party along with other progressive forces for democratic transformation of the society.

After the coup, Gorbachev began to lose ground and Yeltsin exploited it to his advantage. He became darling of the west and openly started discrediting Gorbachev and socialism. By November 1991, he issued decrees of radical economic reforms which, in essence were aimed at ushering in free market mechanism. Yeltsin danced to the tunes of western powers and signed a protocol with Germany under which Germany promised to help Russia develop a market economy.

The countdown of the Soviet disintegration began. The central authority was in disarray and Gorbachev was struggling to convince his countrymen to stay together as an Union and shun the secessionist moves. He even proposed a new union treaty to hold the nation together in form of a loose confederation. But all this fell on deaf ear. On 1st December 1991, Ukraine voted for its independence. Yeltsin was quick to recognize it. By December 8 1991, Ukraine, Byelorussia and Russia declared the formation of the so called commonwealth of independent states. Gorbachev reacted by declaring that he might hold a referendum on the future of the Soviet Union. But by December 14 1991, five central Asian Republics – Kazakhistan, Kughizia, Tadzhikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan – offered to be part of new commonwealth as cofounders. By then Gorbachev realized that the break up of the Soviet Union was imminent. But he advised the country men to go slow in order to prevent chaos. Things started moving very fast and the new "commonwealth of states" was proclaimed by 18th December 1991 with 11 republics as constituents. Georgia took time to decide. In short, the first socialist experiment in human history was dying an unceremonious death as the Soviet Union was being formally dissolved.

If the causes of the disintegration are analysed some factors seem to have played their role in hastening the destruction of the socialist edifice. They may be put as the following:

1. Weakness of Soviet Economy:

The command economy and planned development is the Soviet Union initially did miracle. The first five year plan started in 1928 and by 1935, when the second five year plan was announced, the Soviet Economy had been transformed into a developed industrial society. It became a self reliant economy which registered massive growth which was producing goods of different types. But this does not mean that there were no shortcomings – they were in plenty which gradually became responsible for its liquidation.

The command economy with strong centralizing featres was the biggest weakness of the Soviet planning process. In such a vast country, all decisions were centralized and there was hardly any local initiative. The diversity of social-cultural situations demanded a better mechanism of plan formulation and decision making where local needs and aspirations could be addressed. But this did not happen. In the absence of market mechanism, the state used to fix

prices as well as assessed the demand. The artificiality of price fixation affected the economy adversely, which gradually snow balled into crisis.

Apart from this, the Soviet policy makers gave importance to heavy industries and infrastructure building. But the consumer sector was neglected, leading to shortage of consumer goods. As a result, the quality of life of the people could not be upgraded. Even in the food sector problems remained. In spite of many experimentations; the enormity of food problem remained. The cooperatives and the collectivization of land only led to spiral of violence. But no lasting solution could be found.

The inefficiency of the state personnel, who were managing both agriculture and industrial sectors, took its own toll. By the time it was realized by Gorbachev it was too late. In the end he decided to de-control the economy and encourage private initiatives under his policy of Perestrika.

2. Militarisation and Arms Race

The Soviet's active involvement in the second world war led to a new set of problems. The western powers distrust towards Soviet establishment became known to Stalin during the war itself. Hence, the post-second world war period marked by changed priorities in the Soviet policy making. There was great amount of focus on military preparedness and armaments. The aim was to match the western powers military might during the cold war. Its attempt to establish satellite regimes in the eastern Europe also required massive investments in arms sector. Later, when it became a nuclear power and leader of Warsaw Pact alliance grouping, there was no way it could run away from militarization of its economy.

All these factors led to massive diversion of resources from other priorities including the foremost commitment of the socialist regime to address the basic needs of the people. Competing with the capitalist country like the USA and its military industrial complex for a recently developed economy like the USSR had its own limitation. But the post-second world war history of the world imposed its own logic and did not leave much options before it. The Afghan invasion and the onset of the new cold war was the last nail in its coffin. Due to this involvement it finally bled to death.

3. Absence of Political Pluralism and Rejection of Democracy

The Soviet Union's biggest weakness was its distaste for democracy. Confusing democracy for capitalism proved fatally dangerous for it. Marx had criticized capitalism and distortions of democracy within market society. But the Soviet leaders, particularly Stalin, misunderstood it and threw the baby with the bath water. The lack of democratic engagement in the Soviet system led to authoritarian tendencies taking firm root in the state apparatus. There was hardly any discourse on democratic institution-building. Whatever institutions were developed during Lenin's life time were robbed of their democratic potential and meaning. In spite of the guarantee of fundamental rights in the constitution, people did not have freedom and right to expression. Emphasis on socio-economic rights were not duly balanced with equal attention to other types of right. The human rights violation were rampant and the dissent was, dealt with force and violence. Political opponents during Stalin period were put in the concentration camp. Political pluralism was not allowed and the communist party monopolized all power and authority in name of farcical people's democracy. Rules of a accountability were not put in place and the dictatorship of proletariat became an excuse for few individuals to arrogate to themselves all powers and privileges.

4. Ethnicity and Nationality Problem

The tsarist Russia was multi-ethnic and multi-national society. According to one estimate, approximately 63 nationalities inhabited that land. The allurement of getting rid of the tsarist authoritarian rule had been primarily responsible for many nationalities to support the communist revolution of 1917. Lenin understood it fully well. Hence he came out with his theory of right to self determination. The Soviet constitution also recognized it and gave the right to secede to all the republics in the union.

But in practice it did not materialize. The Soviet federal system turned out to be imperfect arrangement in containing the disenchantment of the people. Cultural minorities felt suffocated. In absence of open society, people did clandestine observance of cultural and religious rites. People did not consider their socialist identity as a substitute for other cultural markers. The national identity turned out to be most durable and triggered whole host of crises, which finally led to its disintegration.

5. Corruption

In spite of the ideological framework of governance that was socialism, the Soviet system failed to offer a transparent administration. The huge state structure which was created led to massive expansion of bureaucracy, which developed its own vested interest in protecting its position and privileges at the cost of people's welfare. The dictatorship of proletariat was turned into the dictatorship of a "new middle class," which was corrupt and inefficient and lived off the state's resources. Gorbachev tried to dismantle their strangle hold over the system under Glasnost.

6. Glasnost and Perestroika

It is irony of history that what came as treatment for the illness became the immediate cause of the disintegration. Gorbachev diagnosed the ailments correctly but not timely. Things had gone out of control by the time he got the opportunity to address the maladies of the Soviet system through his reform agenda Glasnost and Perestrika were meant to bring back the ailing society and a stagnant economy to track. But, unfortunately before that could have happened, other hidden wounds got opened up which became difficult to be balmed. The denial of freedom to Soviet people proved fatal. The moment they tasted a new environment their clamour for change became unstoppable. Gorbachev's reform agenda could not keep pace with the new aspirations which were sky rocketing. As a result, Glasnost and Perestroika became new inputs in the Soviet crisis.

The abovementioned factors contributed in its disintegration in major way. But there were many more. The career of the socialist state in the Soviet Union thus came to an end in 1991. But the Soviet disintegration, apart from belying the hope of creating true humane society on the earth in form of socialism, has led to many other implications and ramifications for the world. Some of them can be put as the following:

1. Ideological A Triumph of Capitalism

The liquidation of socialism has given a sense of moral victory and superiority to the liberal capitalist countries of the west. The ideological challenge, which they got from the socialist bloc, is no longer there. It is because of this that "end of history" thesis has been openly propounded by apologists of the capitalist system implying that there is nothing beyond capitalism.

2. Question Mark on the Claim of Scientific Socialism

Karl Marx was not the first thinker to have talked about socialism. There has been a rich tradition of socialist thought. But most of them were called Utopian idea due to their predominant academic value with little practicability. But when Lenin brought about revolution in the Soviet union it proved beyond all shadow of doubt that Marxian socialism was different and, as claimed by the Marxists, scientific too, which could be turned into framework of governance. But the collapse of the Soviet brand of socialism has put a question mark on this claim. How can it prove now that it is not Utopian?

3. Power Vacuum in World Politics

The disintegration has also created power vacuum in international politics. Since it enjoyed the status of a superpower, its disappearance from the world scene has upset the global balance. The new pax-Americana in today's world can be seen as a fall out this disintegration. The third world countries suffer most due to this disturbance in the global power equations.

SUGGESTED READINGS

1. A.Z. Rubinstein – *The foreign Policy of the Soviet Union*. (New York, Random House, 1960).
2. A Brown and N. Kaser – The Soviet Union since the fall of Khrushchev (London, Verso, 1975).
3. E.H. Carr – A History of Soviet Russia : The Bolshevik Revolution, 1917-23, 3 volumes (Perugia, London, 1966).
4. Hobsbawm – *The age of Extreme* (London, Penguin, 1994).
5. Joha Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia oweas – *The Globalisation of World Politics – An introduction to International Relations.* (London, Oxford University Press, 2008)
6. Z.K. Brzeariska – *The Soviet Bloc* (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960).

GLOBALIZATION

Karunakar Patra
Dayal Singh College
University of Delhi

Introduction

Globalization is a buzz-word in every day life of today. Across the disciplines, people of different professions are now enmeshed with the process of globalization. Some people, however, stressed the need to adopt to globalization, and others to resist it. But what does it mean to be living with globalization? How do we experience and engage with its processes? And how are governments, societies and groups responding to it and contributing to it? Thinking about globalization leads us to pay a closer attention to how its numerous flows and processes are encountered and informed by different actors and agencies in a range of cultural, political, social and technological contexts. The latter might be regional, national, local, religious, institutional and so forth. As a result of this interplay between these different forces and groups within these different settings, we perhaps should not be surprised that complexity and heterogeneity are the recurring tendencies that emerge from living with globalization. In addressing these themes we shall discuss various dimensions of globalization. Before discussing the important dimensions of globalization it is suggestive to look into some of the definitional aspects of it.

Any study of globalization is immediately confronted with the considerable problems of the lack of the agreement over what it is, with some commentators doubting its existence and others simply dismissing it al together. The discourse of globalization is interpreted by three broad schools of thought: globalists, skeptics and transformationalists (Held, et al. 1999).They have focused on each and every aspects of globalization and also have distinctive positions on its economic, political, cultural, technological and military and other dimensions.

Globalists consider that contemporary developments and processes constitute a new condition or phase within human history. They view that the emergence of an integrated global economy that emphasizes on open market economy by breaking down the national borders. Production is simply viewed as a global process evident, it is claimed, in the growing volume of international trade, the greater mobility of finance and capital, increased levels of foreign direct investment (FDI) and heightened importance of multinational corporations (MNCs) and transnational corporations (TNCs). These developments are considered to pose a number of challenges to the nation-state, by restricting the autonomy of the national governments to pursue independent economic management. Some of the hyper globalists like Kenichi Ohmae (1990) going to the extent by declaring the death of the nation-state.

Sceptics oppose the views advanced by the globalists. They mostly believe in the left of the politics and consider globalization to be simply a further expansion of international capitalism. They deny it constitutes a new epoch. They give many examples of labour exploitation by MNCs and TNCs as examples of what it means for many people to live with global capitalism. The most important exponent of this school of thought Paul Hirst and Grahame Thompson (1996, 20000) highlight the myths that have associated with the discourse of globalization. They maintain that the world economy is far from being genuinely 'global'. Trade, investment and financial flows are mostly concentrated in a triangle made by Europe, Japan and North America and look likely to remain so. These authors therefore contend it is more appropriate to talk of 'triadization' than globalization. Again they argue that genuinely transnational companies are relatively rare; most companies are nationally based partly it is

costly to relocate. They admit certain developments in the flows of trade, people, finance and capital investment across societies in the contemporary period but point to historical precedents such as the period 1870 – 1914 when, they claim, the world economy was even more internationalized than it is in our own time. Hirst and Thompson, therefore, conclude that contemporary trends can best be described as a process of economic internationalization rather than fully developed globalization.

Transformationalists stress the unprecedented nature of current economic, political and cultural flows and levels of global interconnectedness (Held, et al., 1999). According to Held and others, the leading advocates of this particular approach are Anthony Giddens (1990) and James Rosenau (1997). These writers consider the momentum behind globalization to be the combined forces of modernity. Globalization is, therefore, driven not just by capitalism, but by industrialization, technology, the Enlightenment, critical thinking and so on. From this position globalization is seen as a powerful and essentially indeterminate and open-ended transformative force or process responsible for massive change within societies and world order.

Greater Interconnectedness – Not Simply Global Capitalism

First of all, globalization in our time entails or constituted by more intensive forms of global interconnectedness than have previously existed. It reflected in increased interdependency, the formation of global networks, transnationalism, deterritorialization, time-space compression and the speeding up of everyday life. These developments, though some parts of the world remain on their margins, are facilitated by advances in communications and information technologies improvements I travel and the growth of tourism, the expansion of global finance and trade and shifting patterns of migration. In essence, there, are multiple globalizing process and flows at work.

The popular conception of globalization is that it is global capitalism and more specifically neo-liberal global capitalism. It is certainly the case that capitalism is providing much of the momentum behind contemporary globalization. Profit maximization is the primary reason that companies that companies seek to expand and develop trade networks through out the world. Moreover, capitalism is an important constitutive element of the transformationalist account. However, capitalism is not globalization. Put another way, globalization is more than simply global capitalism. People are moving across the globe and establishing global connections and networks for a variety of reasons, beyond the financial and economic. They are moving and connecting for a range of personal, cultural and sporting reasons, as well as the very human desire to travel and meet new peoples and enjoy new experiences. The multiple flows and processes that constitute globalization cannot therefore be reduced to economics, for that matter to technology or culture.

Furthermore, the equating of global capitalism with global capitalism does not provide a full explanation of the former. It neglects the forms of global interconnectedness that predate the advent of capitalism in the modern period. For example, Janet Abu-Lugod (1989, Before European Hegemony, OUP) identifies the emergence of global process as far back as the thirteenth century. In fact, there is a considerable debate about when this process began and the intensity and the extent of forms of global interconnectedness in the pre-capitalist period. While between different regions if the world varied and was less intensive during this period than in our time, it is possible to identify a range of different types of connection and interaction, from the cultural to economic, during the pre-modern phase of globalization. These are evident in the spread of world religions, the forging of multicultural empires, such as Roman and Islamic empires, the Silk Route that linked the Western Roman Empire and the Chinese Han Empire through to Europe's encounter with the New World, from the late fifteenth century onwards.

Indeed, it has been claimed that globalization is the human condition (J. N. Pieterse, 2004, Globalization and Culture, Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield). From the first human beings emerging from Africa and spreading out across the globe, human history has been one of migration. Furthermore, long-distance trading activity and trade-networking existed prior to the establishment of capitalism and even the emergence of Europe as a major economic centre, mostly centered on vast cities, such as those in China and India. Furthermore, boundaries and borders were not as rigid prior to the establishment of nation-state, itself another feature of modernity, enabling people to move freely and mix together.

In a sense, therefore, globalization is what human beings do. Finally, a further danger with conceiving of globalization simply in the relation to the history of capitalism is that of Eurocentrism. While the emergence of capitalism in Europe paved for its engagement with the rest of the world, notably through European imperial expansion, to focuss only open this would be to ignore important historical episodes, including the slave trade between Africa and America.

However, apart from this foundational interpretation of globalization, which acknowledges the long history of global interconnectedness, we have to understand the contemporary form of globalization. It is marked by an intensification of multiple forms of global interconnectedness. In this, as it is repeated whilst capitalism is an important dimension of contemporary globalization, it is not globalization. The present form of globalization facilitated by neo-liberal capitalism emphasizes on free trade differs from earlier liberal capitalism. The contemporary operations of neo-liberal globalization can be understood from the different approaches given below.

A Differentiating and Contextualist Approach to Globalization

The experience of globalization by people through the flows and forms of interconnectedness is also important in part to understand globalization. In other words, if we are to gain an informed understanding of globalization it is necessary to employ a differentiating approach to this study of it, investing the particular ways in which individuals, groups and societies engage with globalizing processes. General accounts of globalization often fail to comprehend its complex nature and effects, and the particular ways in which its processes are operating. Therefore, integral to a differentiating approach towards globalization must be an examination of how its multiple process are experienced within specific contexts that are shaped by factors such as geography, history, culture, social conditions, and the degree of economic development, to cite but a few. Furthermore, there are structural (material) and financial (agency) demands at work. For example, there is a material dimension to globalization entailing as it does the increased flows of products and peoples between different parts of the world and the globalization of production. This in turn can produce structural changes as some regimes and societies become more fully integrated into the global economy, and others have to restructure their own economies in order to adjust to the new conditions. The ideational dimension of globalization stems from how these processes and changes are perceived by different groups, societies and governments.

The ideas and ideologies about globalization are also an important part of the dynamic and inform the interacting context. All of which ensures that globalization engenders different perceptions and responses. Foe example, business people invariably view globalization as the expansion of the international economy and the prospect of new trading and financial opportunities. In contrast, for governmental leaders it entails greater economic competition from new regions and pressures from global financial markets. While ordinary citizens often consider the most notable aspects of globalization to be the emergence of a global culture, others are more specific and regard it as simply a form of Americanization. For many religious people and not

just fundamentalists, globalization represents the ongoing spread of the forces of modernization, rationalism and secularism. Many conservatives and nationalists will tend to focuss upon the way in which globalization challenges their particular nation-state and national government. For those on the extreme right, it means more economic migrants and threats to perceived national ways of life, while many on the political left think of globalization primarily in terms of the spread of neoliberal capitalism and/or American economic power. For many living in Arab and Muslim societies, globalization is experienced as the bombardment of Western ideas and images via global communications technologies. In short, it matters how globalization is conceived and who is making judgements about it. This in turn raises questions about power in relation to globalization.

Globalization as Contested Phenomena

In considering the issue of power in relation to globalization, we need to be aware of how governments and other agencies will often seek to impose their won agenda upon its process, constructing narratives to define what it entails, as well as seeking to shape its future course. This has been evident since 1980s when the Reagan and Thatcher governments along with organization like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) began to champion neoliberalism.

Furthermore a truly differentiating approach requires that governments and other organizations be studied regularly so that changes in their thinking and policy approaches towards globalization can be detected, In particular, national governments and democracies are frequently replaced and new governments will bring with them their own ideas and political agendas. What globalization is and entails is therefore, often contested within countries. At an international level the nature of globalization processes, flows and forms of interconnectedness is similarly a source of dispute. In this regard neoliberal globalization is regularly challenged by anti-globalization protestors at summit meetings of the major global institutions, as well as by everyday grass-roots activity.

There are also other factors which suggest contemporary globalization as a contested phenomenon. The emergence of a global discourse surrounding issues, such as international justice and law-making, and patterns of trade and economic development in which civil society organizations, such as international non-governmental organizations (INGOs), pressure groups and social movements are playing a greater role. More significantly in performing this rule these organizations are increasingly viewed as helping to ensure that the international policy-making is informed by the sensitive to a wider range of concerns and opinion. For example, civil society organizations, in particular, human rights groups pushed for the establishment of the International Criminal Court. They actively campaigned for and helped to design the Ottawa Convention banning landmines. They have also ensured that human rights, humanitarianism, global poverty and environmental issues are high up on the international agenda. Likewise, INGOs and social movements have highlighted and often successfully campaigned for the need for humanitarian intervention in various places throughout the world. More generally civil society organization continue to put pressure upon companies and governments to act in an ethical manner by highlighting and publicizing disreputable business associations, dubious financial dealings and poor labour practices.

Economic Globalization

International economy global of capitalist system in 1960s and 1970s is severely different from 1990s because of the importance of global finance is seen as the dominating force if the world economy. Whether it was called the social democratic economy, the Keynesian

economy, or state assisted capitalism, the following features marked most key economies in both the North and South during the Bretton Woods Era, which extended from 1945 to around the mid of 1970s: a state managed modus vivendi between labour and capital; limited capital flows; managed trade; dependence of corporations on retained earnings for investment; strong regulation of banks and the financial sector; fine tunning of the economy through the use of monetary and fiscal mechanisms, and fixed exchange rates.

In the financial sector, as a World Bank study noted as recently as the early 1970s few countries whether industrial or developing were without restriction on capital movements. Capital control were maintained in Europe well into the 1970s with the IMF's Articles of Agreement (Article VI, Section 3) in fact allowing members to exercise such controls as are necessary to regulate international capital movements.

Several factors, however, led to the liberalization of financial flows. First was the massive surplus dollars that found their way abroad the international transactions made by the US. These dollars formed the basis of the Eurodollar or Eurocurrency market centered in London, which the big commercial banks and other financial institutions tapped to expand their international and domestic activities – an option that freed them from their dependence on domestic banking.

Second, Eurocurrency liquidity was massively increased by the recycling of OPEC money following the oil price raises of the 1970s. Up to 1981, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries pilled a total of $475 billion investable surplus, and $400 billion of this was placed in the industrial countries. This was an enormous supply of funds seeking profitable investment, and pressure fro greater global financial liberalization came from the big commercial banks, which sought to recycle a lot of these funds via cross-border lending. Much of this lending went to the Third World because of the relatively unattractive opportunities in the industrial North during that decade. This preference for offshore lending also contributed to greater domestic deregulation as governments started to make tax and other concessions to entice (capital) back onshore.

Third is the rise of the free market hegemony, neoliberal ideology, which gathered steam with the increasing difficulties, including stagflation, encountered by the Keynesian state. Liberalization of trade and the capital account were the twin drivers of neoliberalism's international programme. Capital account liberalization received a great boost upon Margaret Thatcher's assumption of power with her removal of foreign exchange control s in Britain. With London and Wall Street leading the way, the trinity of deregulation, globalization and technological revolution combined to transform banking and finance. Global bang is what the Financial Times called the avalanche sweeping away geographic, institutional, and regulatory boundaries within the financial services industry.

The Key Features of Finance Capitalism

The wave of liberalization in the 1980s brought many important traits. First, having become overexposed in the Third World in the 1970s and early 1980s, the commercial banks pulled back from international lending. At the same time other major players were emerging as key conduits for cross-border flows of capital. The most important of these were investment banks like Goldman Sachs and Merrill Lynch, mutual funds, pension funds, and hedge funds.

Second, this is related to the first that is the role of banks and conventional lending for raising funds eclipsed by securitization of the transfer of capital via the dale of stocks or bonds. Thus, while loans accounted for $59.4 billion of lending on international capital markets and securities for $36.2 billion in 1976- 80, by 1993 the reverse was true, with securities accounting

for $521.7 billion and loans for $137.7 billion (Hirst and Thompson, 1990, Globalization in Question, Polity).

Third, there was an explosion of both old and new activities and instruments such as arbitrage and derivatives. Arbitrage is taking advantage of foreign exchange of interest rate differentials to turn a profit, while trading in derivatives refers to buying and selling all the risks of an underlying asset without trading the asset itself (Ian Cooper, 1998. The World of Futures, Forwards and Swaps, in Mastering Finance, Financial Times, London). Derivatives are very esoteric instruments, which are difficult to understand, monitor, or control (Hirst and Thompson, 1990).

Fourth, a great many transactions including those involving derivates were increasingly hard to monitor because they were made 'over the counter' that is, not via the floor of an exchange but among a few parties by telephone and computers. Monitoring was made all the more difficult by the fact that many of these transactions, such as forward contracts, were off-balance sheet or exchanges that were not reflected in the assets and liabilities statement making the actual financial condition of many institutions very hard to ascertain.

Political Globalization

The process of globalization does have many important political aspects. Commonly these aspects involve transformations in the relations between political processes and territorial states. We have a dual process in which nation-states and conditions under which national policies are formed and constructed and changed, while at the same time multiple international and transnational political relations develop and intensify, so that the nation-states increasingly must be seen as components in a large and more complex international political configuration. Globalization is not only a matter of nation-states facing challenges and opportunities from an increasingly integrated world economy, but also and significantly a question of the political institutions of territorially defined national societies becoming integral of an increasingly interconnected international and global political system.

The core aspect of political globalization is how to deal with global governance. Global governance is defined empirically and broadly as the institutions and processes that are involved in transborder regulation of societal activity and in the provision of global public goods, whether through intergovernmental organizations patterns of cooperation between nation-states, e.g. in conditions of the willing or international public private ownership.

Political globalization is simply understood as a political process in which political power authority and kinds of rule take place at the global level. The uniqueness of this change is marked by the shift of power from the national arena into the global politics. This shift of power suggests something very important in the sense that a decision taken at one end quickly reaches at another end by means of fastest techniques of communication. It is obscured in this process that whatever policy decision is taken at the global level makes an impact at the domestic level.

The scope of global politics challenges the Westphalian tradition of sovereignty. In the Westphalian structure, the importance of national sovereignty was attached to each independent nation-state. Thus, in this sense, the internal supremacy and external freedom become the dominant features of an independent sovereign state. It was also agreed among the nations that no independent state should interfere in the internal affairs of another independent nation-state. In this sense the cordial neighbourly relationship among nations get established for the purpose of peace and stability in the internal order. However, the complexity of inter connectedness inherent in global politics challenges the supremacy of the nation-state in many aspects of domestic representation. It may not be completely true, however that, who apparently affirm that

25

the forces of global politics for more than many decades, still nation-states have existed and on many counts very very protectionist as well as secured.

Global politics, however, is not limited within the rubric of geopolitics, rather its scope it's extending to other such spheres like economic, environmental and social. The complexities of global problems arising out of extensive and intensive interactions of various pressing issues like pollution, drug, human rights, terrorism, poverty, crime and many others attract the need for global politics. The intensity as well as depth of such problems cannot be simply addressed by particular nation-state not because of its prerogatives but for the largeness and unbounded character of such issuers. The possibility of happening of global politics is taking the concrete shape largely due to the innovation of communication and media. These peoples, nations and organizations through out the world organize at the global level. The innovation of information through technological devices like telephone, television, cable, satellite and jet transportation have made things very easy. People and organizations in the different parts of the world interact for the different issues delimiting the national boundaries.

The contemporary global politics is drastically different from premodern and modern politics. The postmodern global politics has intervened into its arena and has created a change through global communication in national politics created new experiences and understanding strongly among the citizens. They no more feel abided by national pressures and obligations. The communicative network that helps connecting people, however, is an unfinished project. People in this process are excluded and included into the global network of politics. The development of new communication opens up avenues at the global level certain types of changes in which some people get represented and others do not and also regional aspects of it get reinterpreted.

Cultural Globalization

The conventional and social scientific sense of culture is the values, beliefs and lifestyles of ordinary people in their everyday life. The emerging global culture is diffused through both elite and popular vehicles. Arguably the most important elite vehicle is what Huntington has felicitously called the Davos Culture (after the annual World Economics Summit meeting in that Swiss Mountain Resort), an international culture of business and political leaders. Its basic engine is international business, the same engine that drives economic and technological globalization. But it would be misleading to think of this culture only in terms of those few likely to be invited to Davos; there are millions who would like to be invited and engage in what sociologists have called 'anticipatory socialization'.

While cultural globalization between elites, it creates difficulties between these elites and nonelite populations with whom they must deal. Many moral and ideological conflicts in contemporary societies pit in elite culture against a resentful mass of culturally accredited and economically under privileged people. As Huntington points out, these resentments may lead to the emergence of a nationalist or religious counter-elite. Also, individuals who participate in 'Davos Culture' with reasonable success vary in their ability to balance this participation with other parts of their lives.

Secondly, according to Berger (Peter L. Berger, 2002, Cultural Dynamics of Globalization) both critics and advocates of contemporary global capitalism mainly think in terms of the Davos Culture and its ramifications in popular culture (Davos in interaction with McWorld). Yet there are two quite different types of cultural globalization going on. One of them is called 'faculty club' culture. Essentially, this is the internationalization of the Western intelligentsia, its values and ideologies.

26

While this culture has also penetrated the business world, its principal career is not business. Rather is carries by foundations, academic networks, non-governmental organizations, governmental and multinational agencies. It is too primarily an elite culture. More importantly, the faculty club spreads its values and beliefs through the educational system, the legal system, various therapeutic institutions, think tanks, and media and mass communication. If this culture internationalizes the Western intelligentsia it also internationalizes the conflict in which this intelligentsia has engaged on its home territories.

Thirdly, it is popular culture. The McWorld is the best example in this category of Western civilization. Young people through out the world dance to the American music, wearing American blue jeans and T-Shirts with messages. Old people watch American sitcoms on television and to American movies. Everyone loves American food. Here is a symptom of American cultural hegemony.

The critics of cultural imperialism also understand that the diffusion of popular culture is not just a mater of outward behaviour. It carries a significant freight of beliefs and values. Rock music is the best example again. Its attraction is, however, not just due to a particular preference for loud, rhythmic sound and dangerously athletic dancing. Rock music also symbolizes a whole cluster of cultural values - concerning self-expression, spontaneity, released sexuality, and perhaps most importantly, defiance of the alleged stodginess of tradition.

Fourthly, it is evangelical Protestantism. Its globalizing force is best seen by comparing it with the other dynamic religious phenomenon of out time, that if Islamic resurgence. While the latter has been limited to countries that have always been Muslim and to Muslim diaspora communities, Evangelical Protestantism has been exploding in parts of the worlds to which this religious traditions has always been alien, indeed mostly unknown.

Evangelical Protestantism brings about a cultural revolution in its new territories. It brings about radical changes in the relations between men and women, in the upbringing and education of the children, in attitudes towards traditional hierarchies. Most importantly it includes precisely that Protestant ethic that Max Weber analyzed as an important ingredient in the genesis of modern capitalism – a disciplined, frugal and rationally oriented approach to work. It is pluralistic and modernizing culture despite its North Atlantic origin.

Defining Culture

Culture is not static; it varies in time –space moments. It grows out of a systematically encouraged reverence for selected customs and habits. Webster's Third New International Dictionary defines culture as 'the total pattern of human behaviour and its products embodied in speech, action, and artifacts and dependent upon man's capacity for learning and transmitting knowledge to succeeding generations.

Language, religion, political and legal systems, and systems customs are the legacies of victors and marketers and reflect the judgments of the marketplace of ideas popular history. They might also rightly be seen as living artifacts, bits and pieces carried forward through the years on currents of indoctrination, popular acceptance and unthinking adherence to old ways. Culture is used by the organizations of society, politicians, academics, theologians and families – to impose and ensure order, the rudiments of which change over time need dictates. It is less often acknowledged as the means of justifying inhumanity and warfare.

Cultural conflicts can be placed into three broad categories; religious warfare, ethnic conflict, and conflict between cultural cousins, which amounts to historical animosity between cultures, that may be similar in some respects but still have significant differences that have used to justify conflict over issues of proximity.

Technological Globalization

The communication revolution is a very smart innovation in our time. The communication and information have got completely transformed in the post industrial society. It is because if the changing nature of capitalist economy in the post industrial phase. With the development of microprocessor, the whole gamut of information and technology in contemporary period released a new life to the late modern period. Its vastness in scope and intensive character developed a new kind of interaction across the national territories. The time and space limitation of modern period virtually extinguished because of the technological innovation. The current developments in information and communication technologies internationalizing the exchange of ideas and information in the same way the books, radio, television and many other communication inventions have done before. However, certain inherent, unique qualities if the new information and communication technologies indicate that this communication revolution is different from previous ones.

The qualities of new information and communication technologies are mainly divided into parts: digitalization, information processing, bandwidth and standards and decentralized architecture. Let us discuss each of these parts briefly.

Digitization

From the first ancient cave paintings to the mass-produced books, movies, telephone and television a particular medium has constrained the communication channel it established to a particular mode and type of message. Paintings are visual and cannot be listened to, a television conversation cannot be watched and movie cannot be felt. This inherent limitation has forced us to use a variety of different media to accommodate the many different modes of human communication.

Digitization changes this. By translating information into a universal binary code any kind of communication can be handled through time and space medium and transmitted through its infrastructure. Text, drawings, pictures, sounds and speech, video, and many other types of information once they are translated into binary code are transmittable through digital networks. Since different types of information can be sent over and the same network, many traditionally distinct information and communication uses migrate form dedicated networks to this universal networks, a development called convergence. Such digital networks even break sown the traditionally categories of one-to-one (telephone, letter) and one-to-one (television) networks.

The universal digital code is the most important of the new information and communication technologies. It permits the construction of networks. Which are custom tailored to a particular kind of information flow but remain open and adaptable form any possible future use. But digitization would not have been practical without the power of the information technologies to translate rich information flows into the digital code and back. A digitization is the theoretical precondition; dramatic increases in information processing power are the practical necessity to build integrated, digital universal networks.

Information Processing

The development of information processing capacity and power from the early days of integrated circuits in the 1960s to the twenty first century has been nothing short of breath taking. In 1965, a young engineer, Gordon Moore, who would later confound Intel, the world's largest producer of microprocessors, published a four-page article forecasting that the information processing capacity of microprocessor would double every eight months, while cost

and power consumption would decrease with similar speed. Termed Moore's Law his prediction still holds. Today computing speed is million of times faster than in 1965. Experts predict that processing speed and power will continue to at double every eighteen months until the end of twenty-first century's first decade. By then information processing with silicon switches of electric current will be replaced by optical or biological computing, but as far as we know today Moore's Law still hold or be surpassed by even more dramatic increase. Information processing provides the power the power to transfer ever-richer streams of information into digital code and back into human absorbable forms, to permit it to be handled and transmitted across digital networks. Advances in storage and display further enhance this development. In the 1980s, typical hard disk in a personal computer would store twenty million characters of text.

Bandwidth

Moore's Law pertains to the processing of data the transformation of almost any kind of information into a binary code, its easy manipulation and storage, and its translation back into the analogue kind of information flows that our human senses can grasp. Processing information efficiently in millions of computers is quite useful. But what makes it more useful is the ability to move information around. Transformation of digitized information over networks, the necessary complement to processing power, has kept place. Indeed, network bandwidth – the amount of information capable of being transmitted over a network – just not just double every eighteen months – as Moore's Law predicts for processing speed and power every twelve months. Every three years, than, processing speed increases fourfold and transmission capabilities, a staggering twenty-seven fold. Experts expect this annual tripling of bandwidth to continue for at least the next twenty-five years. Already the prediction is called Gilder's Law and given a status comparable to Moore's Law. Digital storage is so cheap and bandwidth so plentiful that a leading computer manufacturer announced in early 2000 that it would give each if its more than 30 million customers 20 million characters of free disk storage on its savers, accessible through the internet to use temporary storage backup, or information sharing.

Standards and Decentralized Architecture

Universality of code, substantial and rapidly increasing processing power, and network bandwidth created the fertile soil for another, four major quality of the new information and communication technologies. It permitted the logistical tasks of sending and receiving information to become part of the communication infrastructures, the networks themselves. Historically, many communication networks were built around a few central organizational entities. Newspapers were written, edited, laid out, and printed in one place and depended only on a peripheral distribution network. The telephone network was controlled by central, regional and local switches owned and operated by the phone company. Terrestrial television was originally produced at and transmitted from one location. Like the phone networks, television networks are controlled buy the television company, its affiliates and business partners.

The most successful of all digital networks, the Internet, is built on an entirely different paradigm. The Internet's network is decentralized, almost by definition, because of the communication standards and protocols that it employs. It is built on the premise that all elements of the networks, whoever owns and operates them, will work together to function seamlessly. If one element if the network fails, the Internet protocols are designed to find ways to circumvent the failing element to re-route information flows around the trouble spot. Embedding this routing intelligence into the network was made possible only by virtue of the processing power available to millions of users and the bandwidth increases causes by advances in transmission technology, particularly but not limited to fibre optics. Technically, loosening central control over a communication network, like the internet necessitates crafting into the

communication protocols and structures of the networks, pragmatic means of network self-management and self-regulation. The Internet is the living example that such dispersal of control is not just technically feasible. But working- working very well. The delegation of control to the communication elements of the communication structures requires, however that these elements use a common communication standard.

These four interconnected qualities – digitization, processing power (Moore's Law), network bandwidth (Gilder's Law), and networks with a globally standardized but decentralized communication architecture taken together give the current digital information and communication networks a character that transcends previous technological innovations. If revolutions are symbolized by rapid replacement compared with evolutionary, incremental modifications and additions the current development in the communication arena qualifies as a particularly strong communication revolution. Unlike previous communication technologies, digital integrated networks do not just add this existing communication mix but cause substantial shifts of communication flows from old dedicated networks to the new universal net based on a globally accepted standard.

The consequences of this communication revolution are as profound as they are complex. Some of the most basic of these consequences will be felt by all societies affected, with governments' forces to react to them. They range from the dependency to network infrastructures for societal growth and well-being to changes in the global economic order, from consequences for domestic governance to potential power shifts in international affairs. The following consequences of communication revolution are discussed bellow.

Network Dependency

With digital networks taking an ever more prominent in our daily lives, from work to leisure, our society as a whole will become more dependent on the network, its functioning and integrity. The 1980 ARPANET collapse the nationwide saturation of the AT&T switching system in 1990, and the global havoc of the 'iloveyou' virus in the spring of 2000 provide early glimpses of how dependent will coincide with an inverse in vulnerability as the network standards as robust and decentralized as they insecure and open. To counter these insecurities, policy-makers will have to coordinate efforts domestically and on a global scale, augmenting their policies with technological additions, such as encryption and digital signatures.

Despite these technological fixes, the fundamental openness of the networks will always leave it somewhat vulnerable to attacks. The simple provision of a regulatory framework for the use of tools adding network security will not suffice. Infrastructure protection and disaster prevention experts and law enforcement will have to understand the stakes. The most dangerous scenario might be one of hackers using a whole string of little known security loopholes to bring down essential network parts in a domino effect that does not stop.

Convergence and Mass Customization

Many associate the Internet with globalization, particularly in the business sector. There is no doubt that global networks supplement international trade and economic globalization, as they lower the cross-border transaction costs for advertising, marketing and ordering. Globalization will receive a further boost from the Internet once a substantial part of the information traded globally is distributed over the network.

There is a second, highly important economic aspect of digital networks. They provide the framework for moving the economy from mass production, symbolized by Henry Ford's assurance that customers could get the Model T car in any colour they wanted so long as it was black, hinges on predicting demand, producing stock based on the prediction, and then using

advertisement to stimulate demand for the products. Mass production is made possible in part buy the ability of producers to 'broadcast' their marketing information to a large number of potential customers. Existing media have been successfully employed for that purpose.

The digital networks permit a different model of production, which is, at least in theory, much more efficient. By using the networks' ability for two way communication, producers now can querry the consumers have already ordered. Mass customization, a concept made popular by Stan Davis in 1987 and theoretically refined by Joseph Pine, is now a leading strategy in new economy. Concrete consumer information leading to customized production substitutes for massive information outflows from producers to consumers. Already it has made it possible for large computer companies like Dell or Apple to offer their computers 'built-in-order' on their websites, thus reducing overall inventory to as little as two days supply – a huge efficiency gain given the steep and fast inventory depreciation in the computer sector. But mass customization is not limited to the manufacturing sector, it is almost a natural choice for information-oriented service sectors and information media. The early 1990s predicted a world with 500 television channels do not carry the day, but, rather, a single highly customized stream of information for every user – 'one channel for one'.

This massive restructuring of the underlying business models in the new network economy poses many new and complex policy issue, including privacy and intellectual property, as the ability into control and use information becomes the source of wealth.

Virtual Communities

Global network reach, world wide content formatting standards, and continuous drastic increases in bandwidth will create a ubiquitous information experience for an increasing number of users. The Internet pricing model, with its disregard for distance, will further facilitate this development. With the 'information economy' moving from delivery if information across networks, issues of product distribution infrastructures hampering current e-commerce business in developing economies will becomes less important. The 'distance' if the digital networks will not be physical distances but bottlenecks in bandwidth and processing speeds. People will experience proximity and distance as the difference between a fast information server connected to the net with broad bandwidth and a small sever linked to an unreliable and slow network link.

Traditional policymaking is based at least in part on the notion that states bind people together on the basis of geographic proximity. Almost the entire legal system of the world is premised on the notion of determinate location. Rules have a certain territorial reach and people within this reach bound by them. But users of global digital networks will no longer experience geographic boundaries. Instead they will experience more and more boundaries of self-declared communities, created by users sharing similar interests or goals. These 'virtual communities', a term made popular by Internet visionary Howard Rheingold in 1993, are not tied together by geographic proximity but by shared values, goals or experiences. Moreover, while in most cases one can only be part of one physical community, there is no similar restriction for virtual community in most cases is much less costly for the individual.

Governance based on geographic proximity, territorial location, and exclusivity of membership to such physical communities will be fundamentally challenged by the advent of numerous non-proximity-based, overlapping virtual landscape have been suggested, from international law to community self-regulation, but how and how well these concepts may blend with the prevailing state-based governance model remains to be seen.

The Digital Divide

Digital networks are rapidly turning into tools of power. Access to networks will be key to playing a role in the new economy. Technological breakthroughs, for example, in wireless communications, and Moore's Law may permit societies with currently limited network access capabilities to leapfrog into the information age. At the same time, access to networks like the Internet is not only dependent on the technological infrastructure. People desiring to access the net also need to know how to navigate and explore a still largely English, text-oriented web regardless of how easy the actual information access appliances will have become. Some predict that this education gap will bar a large percentage of the world's population, especially the socially disadvantaged, from the full benefits of the net, with the result of further exclusion. Overcoming the challenges implicit in such an analysis of a two-tier society will pose another serious governance issue.

Wile digital universal networks are neither the sole nor the primary force of globalization, they are intimately linked with the move toward globalization, both fueling it and being fueled by it. The societal consequences will be profound. Network dependency, the shift from mass production to mass customization, virtual communities, and the decline of the importance of geographic proximity as a defining element, as well as the potential harms of a global and societal digital divide, represent four domains of challenge for governance in the twenty-first century.

Conclusion

The world has changed in truly fundamental ways since the burst of international institution building that followed the chaos of the Great Depression and the Second World War. The most important changes are usually summarized in the world interdependence which has already been something of a cliché in the rhetoric of international meetings. Yet we have not sufficiently incorporated either out analytical models or our politics.

The multinational corporation and international production reflect a world in which capital and technology have become mobile while labour has remained relatively immobile. Continuous changes in comparative advantage among national economics advances in modern transportation and communications, and favourable government policies encourage corporations to locate their production facilities in the most advantageous locations around the world. Some of these advantages include the existence of pools of low-cost skilled labour, proximity to markets and tax advantages. The result of this internationalization of industrial production has been the creation of a complex web of interlocking relationships among nation-states and corporations.

BIBILOGRAPHY

Martin Wolf, 2000, Why this Hatred of the Market? in Lechner and Boli, ed. The Globalization Reader. Oxford: Blackwell.

Robertson, R. 1992. Globalization: Social Theory and Global Culture. London: Sage. Held, D and Mc Grew. 1999. Global Transformations. Cambridge: Polity.

Schulte, J. A. 2000. Globalization: A Critical Introduction. Basingstoke: Macmillan.

Castells, M.1996. The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture, 3Vols, Oxford: Blackwell. 2000. Materials for an explanatory theory of the network society, *British Journal of Sociology*, 51: 5-24.

Wallerstein, I. 1979. The Modern World System. NY: Academic Press.

Murdoch, 1995:745. *Environment and Planning* A, 27: 731-57).

Allen, A. 1999. 'Post-Industrialism and Post- Fordism', in S. Hall, D. Held, and T. McGrew (eds.) Modernity and its Futures, Oxford:
Blackwell, p: 170-203.

James Clifford.1992. Travelling Cultures', in G. Grossberg et al., ed. Cultural Studies. London: Routledge.

Tomlinson, J. 1997. Internationalism, globalization and Cultural Imperialism', in K. Thomson. Ed. Media and Cultural Regulation. London:Sage.

Giddens, A. 190. The Consequences of Modernity. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.

1991. Modernity and Self Identity, Cambridge University Press.

Crawford and Marks. Global Democracy Deficit: An Essay on International Law and its Limits' in Archibugi, et al. (ed) Reimagining Political Community, Cambridge: CUP.

Garret. 2000. Globalization and National Autonomy, in Naigre Woods (ed.) The Political Economy of Globalization, Palgrave.

Eatwell, J. and L. Taylor, 2000. Global Finance at Risk: the Case for International Regulation. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Nayar, D. 2000. 'Globalization: The Game, the Players, and the Rules' in Baldev Raj Nayar (ed.) Globalization and Politics in India, Delhi: OUP.

Dunning. 2000. New Geography of Foreign Direct Investment", edited by Nagaire Woods, 2000:48, Palgrave.

Ohmae, K. 1995. Putting Global Logic First. *Harvard Business Review*: Jan-Feb, p-119.

Law, J. 1994. Organizing Modernity. Oxford: Blackwell.

HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENTS IN NORTH AND SOUTH

--Karunakar Patra
Dayal Singh College
University of Delhi

A Brief History of Human Rights Movement

The foundations of human rights have a long history. At the dawn of the civilization various religious scriptures present themselves with human ethos and values. Human rights as a movement first gained its currency in the form of human freedom characterized in *Magna Carta* (1215).The Charter not only made it clear that the rights of the kings or monarchy to interfere in the civil rights of the individuals but also it made the church free from governmental interference. Along with these crucial freedoms of human beings it also allowed them with property rights, widow rights to marry and have property, due process of law and equality before law. In short, *Magna Carta* laid the foundation as the most powerful instrument of human freedom and signpost for future struggle for human freedom.

At the same time the religious and political traditions in the other parts of the world also proclaimed what have come to be called human rights; calling rulers to rule justly and compassionately, and delineating limits on their power over lives, property and other civic activities of their citizens. But such claims became much more focused and pronounced in eighteenth century, especially in the writings of the numerous western philosophers. They proposed the concept of natural rights for man claiming that these rights are ascribed from the law of nature not because of his/her citizenship. This concept was vigorously debated by its promoters and detractors. With the passage of time, however, two important revolutions shaped the progress of human rights movements in the western world. In 1976, the American War of Independence defeated British colonial power, and uttered a famous declaration: 'We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal and that they are endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.' This was followed by French Revolution that overthrew monarchy in 1789 and established the First Republic in France. It also gave a slogan: 'life, liberty and fraternity are the motto of human civilization.' This gave an important contribution to the human society in the form of the 'Rights of Man'.

At a latter stage, the natural rights concept fell into disfavour. However, the concept of universal rights took its place. Thinkers like Thomas Paine, John Stuart Mill and Henry David Thoreau expanded the concept. Thoreau was the first philosopher to have used the term 'human rights' in his treatise – *Civil Disobedience* – that influenced Leo Tolstoy, Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King to develop and propagate the concept of non-violence resistance to unethical governmental action.

The middle and late nineteenth century witnessed a number of issues taking the centre stage, and many of these issues were named as human rights issues in the late twentieth century. They included slavery, serfdom, brutal working conditions, starvation, wages, and child labour. In United States a bloody war took place in the name of slavery. Russia freed its serfs the year the war begins.

Human rights movement was still at its infancy and largely tied to sectarian and often narrow ends. Human rights activism was largely tied to political and religious groups and beliefs. Either group had any credibility with the other and, most had little or no credibility with uninvolved citizens who got caught in the crossfire, usually cursed both sides. Nonetheless, many specific civil rights and human rights movements managed to affect profound social

changes during this time. Labour unions brought about laws granting workers the right to strike, establishing minimum work conditions, forbidding or regulating child labour, establishing a forty hour week in the United States and many European countries, etc. Meanwhile the women rights movement succeeded in gaining women right to vote. Freedom movements in many Afro-Asian countries succeeded in overthrowing colonial powers and thereby ending century long oppression. The most prominent among these movements was one led by M. K. Gandhi against the British Empire. At a later stage, martin Luther king Jr. led one of the most successful civil rights movements against racial oppression in twentieth century America.

The most critical period in the whole history of human rights movement came in the wake of the Second World War. The horrors of the war led to birth and recognition of the modern human rights movements in the international arena. President Roosevelt's proclamation in 1941, of the four freedoms – of speech and expression, of belief, freedom from fear and freedom from want – as a universally acceptable set of standards. The establishment of United Nations in 1945, and the subsequent international concern for the commitment of human rights that widened the scope of this movement. In the post war situation the 'Declaration of Universal Human Rights' (UDHR) on 10th December, 1948 marked one of the greatest event in the last century. In fact, the UN Declaration emerged in response to changing political context, universal demand for constitutionalism and representative government, universal suffrage, and popular education on the other hand, to the emergence of Soviet Republic, Peoples Republic of China and the Third World Countries who were justly got freed from the colonial rules. Besides, this was the time that universal principles of human rights found support from everybody irrespective of ideological differences.

Yet in the history of human rights movements, the most epoch making incident happened in 1961, when a group of lawyers, journalists, writers and activists felt offended and humiliated at the sentencing if two Portuguese college students to twenty years in prison for having raised their glasses in a toast to 'freedom' in a bar. The incident led to the formation of Appeal for Amnesty, which subsequently known as Amnesty International. The appeal was announced on May 28, in the London Observer's Sunday Supplement. The appeal narrated the stories of six 'prisoners of conscience' from different countries and of different political and religious background. All jailed for peacefully expressing their political and religious beliefs, and called on governments everywhere to free such prisoners. It is set forth a simple plan of action, calling for strictly impartial, non-partisan appeals to be made on behalf of these prisoners and any who like them had been imprisoned for peacefully expressing their beliefs.

The response to this appeal was larger than any one had expected. The one-year appeal grew and was extended beyond the year. With this Amnesty International and modern human rights movements were born. The modern human rights movement did not invent any new principles. It was different from what preceded it primarily in its explicit rejection of political ideology and partisanship, and its demand that governments every where, regardless of ideology, adhere to certain basic principles of human rights in the treatment of their citizens. This appealed to a larger audience all around the world, many of whom were politically inactive, not interested in joining a political movement, nor ideologically motivated, and did not care about creating the perfect society of perfect government. They were simply outraged that any government dared abuse, imprison, torture, or often kill the human beings whose only crime was in believing differently from their government and saying so in public. They took to writing letters to governments and publicizing the plights of these people in hopes of persuading abusive governments into better behaviour.

Taking these concerns more explicitly, many new groups emerged that took the issues of rights and human freedom to even grater heights. While Amnesty International played a crucial role in crusading the cause of human rights across the world, there were other groups who primarily differed in their strategy and orientation from Amnesty formed a coalition called "Human Rights Watch" in 1978 at Helsinki. Besides, there emerged several regional human rights groups that often operated under extremely difficult conditions, especially those in Soviet Block. The Helsinki Watch, which latter merged with other groups to form Human Rights Watch, stated as a few Russian activists who formed to monitor the Soviet Union's compliance with human rights provisions in the Helsinki Accords. Many of its members were shortly arrested after it was formed and had little chance to be active. The other regional groups formed after military takeovers in Chile in 1973, in East Timor in 1975, in Argentina in 1976, and after Chinese democracy Wall Movement in 1979. Although there were differences in philosophy, focus, and tactics between the groups, for the most part they remained on speaking terms, and a number of human rights activists belonged to more than one.

Global recognition for human rights movement grew during the 1970's. For example, Amnesty International gained permanent observer status as an NGO at the Untied Nations. Its reports and statements became mandatory reading in legislatures, state departments and foreign ministries around the world. Its press releases received respectful attention, even when its recommendations were ignored by the governments involved. In 1971, it was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for its contribution to the cause of human rights.

The impact of this global coalition for promoting human rights cause has been quite significant. While it put the agenda of human rights as enshrined in the UN Declaration, 1948, it caught the attention of civil society organizations and individual in the Third World to fight such precious rights. Numerous civil society organizations emerged in Asia, Africa and Latin America fighting against oppressive states and basic human rights, whether it is the right to life, or right to work or right to better working conditions. In short, Amnesty and many other organization inspired and shaped the alter course of civil liberties movements all-round the world.

The Practice of Human Rights Activism

The practices of human rights activism emerge differently in the development of the modern and contemporary human rights. Their density, diversity and direction, and their histories have been a subject of much lively discussion. The rich diversity of human rights instruments, norms, and standards and unending flows of interpretation complicate further any presentation of the histories of human rights activism, whether modern or contemporary.

Yet it remains important to understand human rights activism as a set of practices, forms, and social action that engage the 'labour transformation (Louis Althuser, 1969). What then do the practices of human rights activism work with and transform? In the present opinion, human rights activism works with the raw material of human suffering arising from the denial of dignity, equal worth and concern for all human beings. Its transformative practices combat human rightlessness at myriad institutional sites and with divergent ideological orientations. These remain directed to the normative production of human rights norms and standards at all levels (local, regional, national, supranational, and transnational/global) and further practices of preservation, protection, promotion and renovation and repair of human rights norms and practices. They produce both politics of and for human rights; put differently, they reinforce as well as reinvent the practices of the 'politics of production' and the production of politics.

NGOs and Human Rights Activism

Almost all contemporary human rights practices take an associative form, that of non-governmental organizations. The impact of the NGOs on the making and working of human rights is so considerable that contemporary human rights may remain unintelligible outside their networked practices. The NGO-ization of human rights is a pervasive reality.

Reading human rights practices through NGO-ization of the world raises an important question; how may we distinguish human rights NGOs from others? More specifically put, how may one read/place, along the axis of domination and resistance, the manifold cross-professional practices of human rights activism? This question assumes importance on many arenas and sites. Cooperation as well as ambivalence marks the relational patterns. While activists have encouraged and welcomed the emergence of activist justices who have, across the north-south divide, made some distinctive contribution towards securing human rights within that jurisdictional sphere, they also remain ambivalent concerning the role of adjudicatory power to ameliorate the reproduction of the old and new forms of human rightlessness. Second, while transnational human rights advocacy networks seek to foster collaboration with state and policy actors on a terrain as diverse as ethical or moral foreign policy, or a fair trade and ethical investment, international regional and financial institutions, and whole networks of aid and development funding agencies and foundations. Likewise, third, transnational advocacy networks increasingly accomplish human rights outcomes across a vast range of intergovernmental sites.

It is, in this context, however, to understand the human rights activism, it is imperative to look into its complex sociological historic origins. Human rights activist praxes remain both culturally embedded and autonomous. These also remain enclosed within national political histories, and processes, even when empowered by networks of transactional human rights advocacy and action. Often universalistic assertion of human rights norms and standards launch culture wars in which the 'national' human rights traditions confront styles of the 'global' imposition of human rights.

Human Rights Wariness

Human rights wariness takes many forms. Normative wariness signifies a state of moral fatigue with human rights languages and logics. Its dissipated residual energies contest the very notion of human rights as a moral language and rhetoric in different strokes that hastily improvise variations on Bentham's robust attack describing 'natural rights as nonsense upon stilts'. The idea that the notion of human rights is itself incoherent leads to the conclusion that there are no such rights and belief in witches and unicorns. In much the same vein, it is said that because human rights mean different things to different people, human rights have no 'robust ontological identity' and rights talk only mystify the problem.

The second wariness formation, related to the first, signifies nostalgia for old traditions for doing ethical and moral theory. The indictment here is that the rights-talk instead of addressing virtue and goodness, duty and responsibility, fosters conflicted and adversarial notions of social cooperation, displacing old notions about human perfectibility and communitarian harmony. To the extent that such displacement occurs, it said, the gulf between the individual and community widens in ways that promote and enhance 'atomism' over 'connectedness', abstraction over contextuality, rights over responsibility, independent over relational, rationality that contradict feminist and communitarian notions concerning human rights. Human rights wariness can be of different kinds. Let us discuss these human rights wariness very briefly.

Types of Representational Power

Rights wariness characterizes the communities of perpetrators of human rights violations as well as the communities of violated, on whose behalf human activist practices speak to the world. Articulation of rights wariness involves the problematic of representational power.

Given the logic of sovereign representation of peoples by states, and of states in turn by political regimes, it becomes often possible for the heads of the states and governments to claim pre-eminent representational power to speak on behalf of their peoples. And they articulate typical forms of rights wariness. One form of it provides the representation of contemporary human rights traditions as a threat to civilizational and cultural values, of which of course the leaders and the regimes claim to be example guardians and custodians. Another and related form consists in the representation that condemns contemporary human rights as being itself a form of radical evil, one that needs to be condemned in the name of God and the Holy. Yet another form of rights wariness takes an equally strident secular voice: contemporary human rights, western in their origins, are language of neo-colonization, concealing new designs of a progressive Eurocentrism.

But this representational character is ambiguous and multiplex, affecting the practices of what Baxi (2006: 82) calls the politics of and politics for human rights. Vigilant rights wariness, as an attitude of confrontation with the politics of human rights, often collapse when otherwise indefensible regimes stand supposed against the imperialism of a solitary superpower. In these moments, a nationalist defence of state sovereignty and sovereign equality of all states becomes curiously unproblematic even for the practitioners of the politics for human rights

At other moments, when characteristically repressive and brutal political regimes and elites seek to monopolize the narrative voice in the idiom and grammar of the Asian, Islamic, Latin America, or African approaches to human rights, rights wariness remains the only response available for those engaged in the difficult practices for the politics of human rights. The invocation of rich and diverse civilizational tradition by wicked regimes or leaders amount to no more, from the perspective of violated, than an endorsement of power to create and sustain their own genera of violent social exclusion, by proclaiming lesser human rights for culturally constituted inferior or despised peoples.

Coalescence

There are other less dramatic occasions when communities of power and of social activist share a platform of rights wariness. This happens in ideological practices that first, demonstrate the dualism of standards in the evaluation of human rights performance. Second, it testifies that the North consistently refuses to assume human rights obligations to South, whether in terms of reparations of past injuries and mayhems inflicted in the ex-colonial societies and indigenous peoples of the world or in terms of declaration of even a meager percentage of its resources to alleviate conditions of extreme global impoverishment caused all too often by its own global economic domination. Third, it archives the betrayal by the North of its human rights commitments, especially through its promotion of regimes of indebtedness and policies of 'structural adjustment'. Fourth, it critiques in the arena of sustainable development policies, the North's failure to assume burdens commensurate with its self-assumed leadership role. And finally, it laments the human rights diplomacy of the North, complicit of the worst violation of human rights of the peoples of the South both in the Cold War and the now nascent post Cold War era.

The politics of human rights in the South, naturally seeks to use this commonality between itself and its Other – the politics for human rights – towards its own ends. Rights wariness, in this context, has to combat on the side of activist thought and praxis, the extraordinarily rights – denying political appropriation by unscrupulous national regimes, of their critiques of global order.

Wariness of the Violated

Human rights wariness also increasingly an attribute for the consciousness of the violated that finds that the perpetrators of the gravest violation all too readily summon the ethic of human rights to serve their own ends of impunity. The originary habitats of Euro-American culture provide a safe haven for the worst perpetrators of human rights violation. They feel mystified by the see-saw of juridical process and power. They weep one day on hearing that the Lord Chief Justice of the UK, not merely quashes the arrest of Pinochet on the ground that a 'former sovereign is entitled to human rights respect but also at the award of the huge legal costs. They also weep though, with joy, the next day when a narrow majority or the House of Lords carefully reverses that decision.

Human Right's Movements

The important question here to ask is whether the practices of human rights activism amount to social movement and if so how may we understand the relations between human rights activism and social movements. Understanding of social movements, its forms, practices and carriers reflect an ambiguous character. They entail ensembles of collective social actors, located in different times, spaces and geographies. However, as far as human rights and social movements are concerned they relate to each other as ideology, grievance, and collective identity as contested sites. Both of these give rise to a potential opportunity that offers some kind of objective structural potential for collective political action (Baxi, 2006:201). The upsurge of these movements comes out suddenly of imposed grievances. In addition to this, social movements marshal master protest frames that is ideological accounts legitimating protest activity that come to be shared by a variety of social movements.

There is no such agreement as to what constitutes the core content of the notion. The ideal of social movement as 'a conscious collective and an organized attempt to bring about, or resist a large scale change in the social order by non-institutionalized means has proved contentious.

The notion of social movements, as often remarked, resists overarching definitions or description. The notion itself is a fuzzy one because of the problem of reading collective internationalities of those that indicate movements, participate and sustain these. Not all social movements proceed with a clear conscious and coherent original intent. Nor further so social movements always constitute fields of resistance to power; often they also contribute to reinforcement of structures of domination. In any event, the intent undergoes changes as the movements proceed to acquire some level if internal coherence in time and place but also begin to marshal a certain level of social legitimacy and political force.

The Emancipatory Character of Human Rights Movements

Human rights movements, as reformist movements, mark struggles to enhance individual human freedoms against the overweening powers of the modern state formations and the repressive power of social institutions and cultural processes. Such movements also limit such aspiration and achievement by the process of negotiation and compromise. Human rights movements, while seeking to disempower the state in relations to the individual human being power also seeks to re-empower it in the contexts of ameliorating, even eliminating, some

systemic patterns of social, economic, and cultural domination that result in human and social suffering. But as is well known the re-empowerment   of the state for even just human rights causes does not always lead to the real life achievement of emancipation from the oppressive structures of power and domination.

The subject of human rights movement (as Marx showed in relation to the histories of working classes) break away from the 'iron cage' only to be further bound in 'silken strings'. Michel Foucault expressed a similar idea differently in terms of 'infrapower'- these regimes of little powers little institutions that weave a web of macroscopic capillary power… attaching men to the production apparatus, while making them into agents of production, into workers, and thus create a synthetic, political linkage between hyperprofit and infrapower (Foucault, 2000).

All this invites the consideration of relationship between human rights movements and social movements. It is on this register that the complexities of the distinction, rife in contemporary social movement theory, between the old and new social movements fully emerge to view. To venture a large generalization, this distinction merely unfolds fresh understandings of and renewed forms of struggle with, the 'hyperprofit' and 'infrapower' regimes. However, the languages of human rights make a difference. One way of stating the difference is that the old social movements, encased within the manifold rise of industrialism capitalism, led social movements to generate the articulation of human rights norms and standards, hither to unscripted and even unknown. They also incrementally but surely fostered new human rights values and cultures of power and resistance. The new social movements continue a similar order of struggle against sweatshops and new economic zones, child labour and related forms of exploitation of outsourced labour practices in the heavily globalized conjunctures. However, the decisive shifts deserve notice: the old social movements formed historic struggles to articulate altogether new regimes of human rights; in contrast, the discourse of the new social movements thrives all too heavily in the language of human rights already in place. All the same, in both forms the place of human rights movements remains somewhat insecure.

The histories of the old social movements present fully the difficulties of reading the emancipatory character of human rights movements. How may human rights theory read the now furiously proclaimed divide between the 'old and new' social movements? Much here depends on what we may wish to regard as paradigmatic of the old social movements. Were we to regard the struggle of the working classes against the capitalist ones as such, the dominant trends in the Marxian discourse resist description of human rights movements as emancipatory movements. The figure of human rights appears in this genre of movement theory only in terms of critique of extend models of rights, state, and the law. In contrast, were one to locate a paradigmatic of the old social movements the anti-colonial struggles, we grasp the revolutionary emancipatory potential of the unique ethical invention of the right to self-determination. But even here as the exponents of the right to self-determination M. K. Gandhi demonstrated the emancipatory character of the struggles for self-determination entailed transcendence from the received ethical languages of human rights; he believed in the virtue of not the virtue of just freedom, not just freedom (Baxi, 1995). In a further contrast, some different and liberal discursive frames privilege the narratives of old social movements (such as slavery and slave abolitionist movements and suffragette movements) the emancipatory potential of human rights movements in terms of painstaking gradual displacement of status and hierarchy based ancient regime that in the net result, expands the power of individual choice of life-projects and projects autonomous constructions of lifeworlds. But even these narratives grasp human rights movements not as ends but as means to an end, enunciated in different terminologies and diction of democracy.

In contrast, and at first sight, many of the new social movements appear as distinctively human rights-oriented. Movements confronting patriarchy, environmental degradation, racism in all its forms, and the politics of imposed identities, for example every where entail recourse to contemporary languages of human rights values, norms, and standards. These movements are human rights reinforcing but also at time innovate human rights and standards, and thus remain jurisgenerative. In the pursuit of the realization of existing human rights values, norms, and standards, in this, they partake the defining features of the old movements as well.

Human Rights as Juridicalization

Contemporary movement theory approaches to human rights movements need to negotiate the ineluctable features of legalization and juridicalization. Legalization primarily consists of the production of lawyers' law concerning human rights as legislation, interpretation, implementation and enforcement. Law is itself a complex affair. The complexities aggravate when we turn to the production of human rights law, central to which is the belief that as legal codes, human rights norms and standards require constant engagement with renegotiation of legality and legitimacy of state power. Legal and judicial activism entails the consequence that human rights movements by definition pursue the tasks of reform and renovation of the law. Reformation of state and other global structures and practices constitutes a vital part of the very agenda of human rights movements. At stake, again, are the ways of refashioning or rethinking the ethical languages of the rule of law. Underlying legalization are forms of what Friedrich Engels named as – the world judicial outlook that consolidates economic and social relationships, as being founded on law and created by the state where in all redemptive human aspirations speak the languages of either to bourgeois or socialist legality. Thus the social meanings of human rights norms and standards remain complex.

A state centric understanding of human rights law remains contested by the practices of contemporary human rights activism and the new social movements. In this perspective, the production of human rights norms and standards may not be understood as a spectacle of state sovereignty. Peoples in struggle and communities of resistance as repeatedly stressed also emerge as the markets of human rights norms and standards. How then we may describe the power of contemporary human rights activism, in conjunction with the new social movements? Perhaps one way to achieve this is say that most human rights utterances belong to the genre of performative speech acts that create the very state of affairs is an institutional fact. The paradigmatic human rights declarations concerning equality and dignity of all human beings every where signify this performative power. While Tilak inaugurated the Indian struggle for independence with the motto: 'Swaraj is my birth right and I shall have it' and when Gandhi translated this into a collective feat of Indian independence, they were engaged in a series of performative act; so were the makers and successors of the UDHR. In each case of human rights declaration - the state of affairs represented by the prepositional content of the speech act is brought into existence by the successful performance of that very speech act.

In contrast, juridicalization of human rights, as understood here, helps us to understand the deep structure of which their legalization is merely the outward manifestation. Thus understood, human rights remain both language dependent and thought dependent. Human rights belong 'by human agreement' to use the symbolism of language in a shared manner. They are thought dependent on the sense that all institutional facts can exist only….. if represented as existing. Juridicalization ordains that these facts can exist only if people have certain sorts of belief and other mental attitudes. Because they have no existence outside representation, we need some way of representing them through language. Human rights norms and standards are social

objects is the sense that they are constituted by social acts and the object is the continuous possibility of activity.

The distinction that is made between the modern and contemporary language of human rights fully demonstrate different histories of juridicalization of human rights. The contemporary languages (whether through outlaw of slavery, genocide, apartheid, sexism, ethnic discrimination, for example) create social/institutional facts beliefs and attitudes alien to the languages of modern human rights. In both, however, a certain tendency toward sefl-referentiality remains inevitable.

The growing interaction between human rights movements and social movements increasingly redefine the missions, mandate and methodologies of human rights movements. The Amnesty International thus redefined in 2001 its mission to embrace aspects of social, economic and cultural human rights. Increasingly humanitarian NGOs and movements begin to assume a new human rights orientation. Perhaps the most significant instance of the interaction occurs when human rights movements, governments and international development agencies pursue 'a right-based approach to development, collaborative campaigning by human rights and development NGOs, and the adoption of economic rights orientation by human rights groups.'

Social movements including cultural, political and even spiritual movements, in contrast, are not always related to the universe of human rights movements. Not all social movements ideal typically address concerns to political actors and the sate apparatus. Far from being human rights-oriented, some social movements indeed shun the rights languages altogether, emphasizing languages of duties and solidarity. Some harbour deep suspicion concerning legalization of human rights via languages of law which are at the same time the languages of power. Intense juridicalization is said to expropriate the power of the voices of the violated (Baxi, 2004).

The various kinds of issues relating to human rights have been intensely fought both in North and South. Some of them are right to human dignity, right to livelihood, right against exploitation and human trafficking, right to shelter, right to privacy, right to education, protection of the rights of child labour, right of girl children and women, and right to healthy environment. Let us discuss briefly about these human rights.

Right to Human Dignity

Article 1 of the UDHR reads: 'All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in spirit of brotherhood.' The right to human dignity in every human society is justified on the basis of human beings are equal and are subject to equal treatment irrespective of their social origin. The life of dignity can be maintained by respecting the needs and the abilities of human beings in the society.

In India, the constitution has vehemently interpreted the Fundamental Rights provision in respect to the human dignity. Article 21 of the Indian constitution gives meaning to this provision. The Supreme Court made it very clear that right to dignity includes the right to adequate conditions of work and life, which further covers the hours of work and leisure, right to perseveration of physical integrity including occupational safety and health, right to an adequate nutrition etc. Adequate housing and welfare facilities are also essential to the realization of the right to living conditions compatible with human dignity.

In a landmark case of Francis Coralie vs. Union of India, the Supreme Court said that right to life and personal liberty were not merely to cover the bare existence but a life of dignity,

which includes at least the bare necessaries of life, such as adequate nutrition, food, clothing and shelter over the head.

Right to Livelihood

Another important area of concern in which the struggles have been intense is in the world regarding the right to livelihood. The situation in South is very pathetic. In Africa, Asia and Latin America the livelihood of the individuals have been a serious concern in the contemporary period. The colonial past in these places and the post- colonial present dominated by the globalization process has added salt to the injury. The developed North has also some implications of the process of globalization and neo-liberal economic policies. Feminization of labour and child labour in the contemporary situation pave the way for the wretched conditions of children and women both in North and South.

In India again, the Supreme Court has reinterpreted the contents of right to livelihood. It reiterated the rights of urban as well as rural poor and the court declared that no person can live without the means of living. Thus the access to earn a living is implicitly linked to right to life. The court went on to observe that if the right to livelihood was not treated as a part of the constitutional right to life, the easier way to deprive a person of his right to life would be to deprive him if his means of livelihood to the point of abrogation. Such deprivation would not only denude the life its effective content and meaningfulness but it would make life impossible to live.

Right against Exploitation and Human Trafficking

In the history of human civilization from the ancient Greek period through the Enlightenment period to the contemporary postmodern era, we have witnessed the depth and intensity of human exploitation. In the ancient Greek era human slavery was prevalent end even today slavery and serfdom in different form practice by the developed North. In United State slavery was a crucial phenomenon which was fought tooth and nail by its victims. All forms of slavery and serfdom have been prohibited by the provision of human rights in its declarations. In work places labourers are exploited whether it is industry, agriculture, household, even a contemporary spaces like 'call centres, etc. The exploitation of body and mind by the violators has been a continuous process in work places. The trade unions and other activists have consistently opposed this violence. In the present neo-economic policy structures we see quite often the search by the multinational for cheap labour by the women and children led to the serious exploitation of them.

In India the problem of bonded labour is seen as a serious offence against labourers. In due course, from time to time, the report has come up pertaining to the inhuman condition of workers in different sectors. The Supreme Court has come up very strongly as to the payment of minimum wages and provision of pure drinking water and medical facilities as some of the basic rights, which can not be denied to workers. As far as bonded labour is concerned the court has directed the perpetrators of the rights to rehabilitate them as well as to repay their wages fro the date of installment into works.

Human trafficking is seen as one of the heinous acts of the civilized society. Trafficking of Women and girl children for the purpose of prostitution is unbearable for human rights movements. Earlier it was limited to the borders of the states in which trafficking of women and children from rural areas to the cities was occurred for the purpose of sex trade. In the present global situation sex trade has got a world wide business. Cosmopolitan cities in Europe and North America are the centres of sex trade that happens through human trafficking. All the constitutions of the world democracies prohibit this act as suppressive and inhuman. The human

rights acts specifically prevent human trafficking. The struggle for ban on human trafficking as a practice by brothel leaders and other agencies emphasized on strict state protection of the rights of the victims.

Right to Shelter

The struggle against homelessness and shelter, in 1998 United Nations Social Summit at Istanbul, become a series of mandates authorizing whole range of human rights violative-practices of the construction industries and urban developers. The millions of poor people all over the world seek the support from the governments of different countries both in North and South (the situation is disappointing in South) shelter over their heads. A life of dignity which is the basic rights of all individual becomes unfulfilled if she is deprived of the right to shelter. It entitles her a peaceful and secured life. All the metropolitan cities in the South are surrounded by slum-clusters in which the urban poors lead inhuman life. In Mumbai, Dharavi is the biggest slum-cluster in the world in which millions of people living a distressful and pathetic life. Poor people in rural areas also deprived of houses. In Africa and lot other palaces where wars are continuously fought, either in the name of self-determination or terrorists acts, thousands of people become homeless every year.

Shelter does not mean mere physical protection. It should be a place where one can grow physically, mentally, intellectually, and spiritually. Therefore, right to shelter must include adequate living space, safe and descent structure, clean and descent surroundings, sufficient light, pure air and water, electricity, sanitation and other civic amenities like road, transport, etc.

Right to Privacy

Article 17 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights well emphasizes regarding the rights to privacy. It states that 'no one shall be subjected to arbitrary or unlawful interference with his privacy, family, home or correspondence, nor to unlawful attacks on his honour and reputation. This right to privacy exclusively enriches an individual to have free private life without the interference of any other agency whether it is state or society at large. Through out the world this right has been considered as a bone to the individual integrity and happiness. Unnecessary interference by state agencies in many parts of the world upon human privacy has been condemned on the basis of human rights.

Right to Education

It is highly important for every human being that he/she must be educated to lead an intellectual and happy life. As far as the peoples in the third world are concerned they are deprived of their education because of their poverty and other discrepancies arising out of social constraints. The education or literacy rate is very less in the South compared to the North. As it is an important issue for human society, it is imperative for everyone irrespective of social difference including even gender that every one should be entitled to education. The UDHR in its declaration, in Article 26 mentions very clearly that (i) every one has the right to education. Education shall be free, at least in the elementary and fundamental stages. Elementary education shall be compulsory. Technical and professional education shall be made generally available and higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit. And (ii) education shall be directed to the full development of the human personality and to the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It shall promote understanding, tolerance and friendship among all nations, racial, or religious groups, and shall further the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace. And ultimately (iii) parents have a prior choice the kind of education that shall be given to their children.

In India the provision for free and compulsory education is inherent in the Directive principles. These principles are there in Part IV of the constitution that can be an impetus for the government and policy makers to take care while formulating laws. Articles 41, 45 and 46 of the constitution make it necessary for the state to provide free and compulsory education for all children below the age of 14. The Supreme Court of India in its several judgements declared education is the fundamental rights of the children. The court has mad it clear that importance of education lies in the fact that it enables a man to understand the meaning of human rights and weaken him to cultural values adjusting him thereby to the healthy environment of the society. Therefore, the court in numerous cases has directed the government to fulfill its constitutional obligations. In this regard, the court has put the onus on the government to persuade the poor workmen to send their children to nearby school and arrange not only free education, but also provide free study material for the children.

Rights of Children and Women

Child labour through out the world is a serious phenomenon. It is debarred by the provisions of the human rights. All forms of child labour have been prohibited by the human rights acts.

Women's rights are specifically protected by UN conventions. Women constitute half of the world's population and perform two-thirds of the world's work, receive only one-tenth of its income, and own less than one-hundredth of its property. Significant numbers of the world's population are routinely subjected to torture, starvation, terrorism, humiliation, mutilation and even murder because they are female. On the basis of gender, women face all kinds of violence. Article 2 of the UDHR confers on all: ' the rights and freedoms set forth in this Declaration without distinction of any kind, such as race, colour, sex, language, religion, political or other opinion, national or social origin, property, birth, or other status.'

In 1993, the World Conference on Human Rights concluded that human rights of women and of the girl-child are inalienable, integral and indivisible part of universal human rights. The full and equal participation of women in political, civil, and economic, social and cultural life at the national, regional, and international levels and the eradication of all forms of discrimination on grounds of sex are priority objectives of the international community. The World Conference urged governments, institutions, and inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations to intensify their efforts for the protection and promotion of human rights of women and girl-child.

The Convention on Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women is unique in the sense that it recognizes the role of education of both men and women in changing attitudes, so that equality of rights and responsibilities become willingly and fully accepted and prejudices and practices based on tradition are overcome. In the Convention, the discrimination against women is defined as 'any distinction, exclusion or restriction made on the basis of sex which has the effect or purpose of impairing or making the recognition, enjoyment or exercise by women, irrespective of their marital status, on the basis of equality of men and women, of human rights and fundamental freedom in political, economic, social, cultural, civil or any other.'

Right to Healthy Environment

No one today will dispute that pollution free environment is as necessary for survival in both developed north and developing south. Most specifically in the context of globalization of economy, contentious matters of environmental laws call for deeper examination in the context of WTO. It is now broadly accepted that environmental sustainability and human rights are mutually dependent and thus developed countries in the North putting great pressures on developing countries to agree to apply the norms of environment. The governments of the

countries of the North have joined by their transnational corporations, their trade unions, and their NGOs in the field of environment.

However, in the guise of environment cleanliness, developed world is insisting on environmental laws which are disproportionate for the economic growth of the developing countries. They are being asked to apply high cost environmental regulations so that their exports are not able to compete against the developed countries. The developed countries have truly got benefited from environmentally offensive international trade in the last hundred years and still continuing their offence. That it is inequitable and impractical to ask the developing countries to enforce the same rigid environmental standards as the developed nations was recognized on the subject of trade and environment.

The third world governments are against the social and environmental classes in WTO because they function as protectionist measures in trade and therefore can be used to deny market access to developing countries exports. This is precisely why Agenda 21 adopted at the Rio Conference stressed that a supportive external economic environment is crucial to the promotion of sustainable development. It is aptly noted that the development process not gather momentum if the developing countries are weighed down by external indebtedness, if development finance is inadequate, if barriers restrict access to markets and if commodity prices and the terms of trade of developing countries remain depressed.

The recent trends in global warming have increased the human rights activists for the protection of the ecological fragility of the Earth. The danger of the depletion of Ozone layer leading to global warming necessitating control on the emission of Green House Gases (GHG), the worst being the carbon dioxide. By the February, 1998, 165 countries have ratified the Montreal Protocol (1987) which sets out the time schedule for freeze and reduction of the Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS).

According to the World Resources (1994- 95) carbon dioxide emission per capita of six major countries that of US is more than 5 MT of carbon followed by Japan of about 2.3 MT, while that of India is the lowest at 0.02 MT. USA is alone responsible for about 25 percent of the World's Green House emissions. It has ironically increased the emissions by 6 percent during the period 1990-95 that is even after Montreal Protocol (1987) had been signed. The developed countries make two-thirds of three-fourths of the current emissions.

As far back as in the 1992 at the Earth Summit the principle of pollution pays was broadly accepted, though, of course, the steps taken in pursuance of this do not show that the acceptance e was genuine one. 80 percent of the current emissions come from the industrial nations which have only 20 percent of the world population. The global warming is a world wide phenomenon not restricted to any part of the world. From that it must follow that human beings in all parts of the world have an equal interest and right to see and demand that global warming does not go further but is reduced so as to reach a tolerable limit. But the responsibility for that has necessarily to be taken by the highest polluters. Some calculations so show that taking the average cost of reducing emission even at a minimum of US dollars 20 per ton the South is actually making subsidy of about 60 billions US dollars to the North. It is this amount which the rich North must make available to the South if it wants that the South should reduce considerably the emission of GHG – in the absence of such help, the burden cannot be borne by the developing countries.

Even by any test of sustainable development equity and consistency with the convention it has to be recognized that the energy needs of the developing countries are very great; that increased energy consumption and economic growth will be essential if living standards of the

poor are to be raised. That without accelerated development in many countries domestic environmental degradation will worsen, and that the current threat from anthropogenic climate change is caused much more by the affluent than the poor nations. For all these reasons, the convention is clear that continued growth of energy and use of fossil fuels in developing countries is quite consistent with the convention.

Critiques of Human Rights Movements

There is, clearly, much to be celebrated in the achievements if the human rights movement over the decades. The movement has a respectable pedigree. The horrors of the two World Wars have been seen by the peoples. This is why the utmost importance of the human rights today is celebrated. The advances regarding the different conventions passed from time to time and its achievements although slow but inexorably, to a greater awareness among the general public around the world about the importance of protecting and promoting human rights, which is a positive outcome of the post-war human rights movement. Apart from these advantages, human rights movements are also not free from certain serious criticisms. Let us discuss them very briefly.

Fragile Consensus

It is not sufficiently understood by many members of the contemporary human rights movements that the global consensus on human rights is still rather fragile. The importance of a domestic and international commitment to human rights is not in doubt, nor is its relevance to the formulation of policies on governance. But the consensus breaks down when we go into the details, for there is much disagreement globally over the actual content of human rights. The disagreement cannot, it must be said, always be attributed to bad faith on the part of the protagonists. The truth is that the way one looks at human rights is usually coloured by one's own experiences.

Dogma and Inconsistency

Like other social movements, the human rights movements has a fair share of individuals, institutions, and many professional human rights activists who are driven by dogma, rather than by a sense of genuine commitment to the notion of human rights, familiarity with social realities, and a sense of pragmatism and common sense. There are often inconsistencies in the articulation of the human rights ideas and principles, which lead to the myriad problems and which threaten the credibility of the movement. It is important for human rights professional to recognize that human rights are subject to interpretations. It is entirely possible for different cultures and societies to interpret human rights differently, in accordance with the values that underpin those societies. The unwillingness of the many of the human rights movement to accept this reality has manifested itself, first and foremost, in glaring inconsistencies in their approach to fundamental issues – inconsistencies which most ordinary people find very difficult to understand or overlook.

Most human rights groups are, on their own admission, committed to democratic governance, that is to say, respect for the wishes of the majority. In UK, for example, human rights activists have been in the vanguard of the campaign to reform the House of Lords, on the grounds that the hereditary element in the House was anti-democratic. However, confronted with strong democratic majorities in issues with which they disagree, they are often reluctant to accept the wishes of the majority.

Economic ideology often plays a deleterious role in the actions of the human rights movement. An examination of some prescriptions handed down by human rights activists for the real or imagined ills of the world would show an unmistakable bias towards the re-distributionist

philosophy. This is a relatively new phenomenon, because considerations of social equality or material equality were never traditionally considered a legitimate part of any prevailing creed of human rights. However, there has been a fundamental transition in the approach of human rights movement, the benefit of which is questionable. Consider this statement by Amnesty International in one of its recent annual reports; 'As globalization spreads, bringing greater wealth some and destitution and despair to others, human rights activists must promote not just legal justice but also social justice (Amnesty International Report 2002, Amnesty International, London).'

The issue of development and other infrastructural projects has become a central issue of contestation for many human rights campaigners. It is not sufficiently acknowledged by the human rights community that a number of these projects are aimed at larger social good, even if they involve some – usually temporary - hardship to a few. Again, this is an area that requires far more incisive analysis than that is being currently offered by the human rights movement. Both domestic and international non-governmental organizations have engaged in activism - and not always peaceful activism with a view to undermining the development goals of projects and in that process most of the time, there is often only one view that emerges, namely that developmental projects are against the interests of the people. Unfortunately, this may not be the case as there may be a good number of beneficiaries, and the human rights movement should provide the necessary space for other viewpoints to be aired and argued.

Like wise MNCs have been, time and again, criticized for unethical practices, exploitation of labour, and interferences in the affairs of the government. This is, in fact, to a lot extent might be true. But there is a paradox in this engagement with this view when it comes to the domestic multinational corporations. They are even not criticized for their bad acts against the labour standards and other unethical practices.

Sometimes self-interest rather than altruism guides the actions of some human rights activists. It is argued by some one that it is used as 'a weapon of blackmailing' against others in the hands of the human rights community leaders. There is often an element of narcissism which disguises itself as empathy on the part of professional human rights activists. As far as NGO activism is concerned, it is also not free from illusions. There is lack of accountability, responsibility, transparency as well as the unrepresentative character among the activists is observed.

Selectivity in Human Rights Enforcement

Human rights activists also often display a curious selectivity and bias in their campaigns, which does little credit to their cause. Take for example, the reaction of the global human rights lobby to the recent events in Zimbabwe, where the government of Robert Mugabe has been carrying out an organized campaign of brutal violence against that country's white farmers. It is the responsibility of the human rights NGOs to ensure consistency and moral coherence in their actions and not give the impression, as they do, that their response to, say, the human rights practices of the government of General Pinochet in Chile a few years ago deserves to be more robust than their response to the government of Mugabe.

One increasingly common reason for such selectivity in the application of human rights standards by campaigners is the growing tide of political correctness, which decrees that there are certain favoured groups and communities in the contemporary world who are immune to criticism, no matter how misguided, wrong or harmful their actions might be.

Political correctness has also resulted in the lack of sufficient recognition for the rights of victims, which are given second place to the rights of accused persons and criminals. An

example of political correctness arose from Scotland. A few years ago the parents of an infant who had smacked their child as a form of mild chastisement for improper behaviour were put behind bars and prosecuted for battery. These are the serious issues involving parenting and the rights of children, areas where the global consensus is still weak, and any attempt by human rights community to force the pace of change may not be best approach to reach a greater understanding on how to deal with such issues.

Another example of political correctness gone mad is to be found in a recent judgement of the European Court of Human Rights, which decreed that prisoners serving jail terms should be allowed to receive hardcore pornography. This said the court, was implicit in their right to freedom of expression guaranteed by the European Convention on Human Rights. The judgement came after a sustained campaign by Dennis Nilsen, a serial killer jailed in 1983 for murdering six young men in England, who demanded explicit homosexual material while in jail. So this is another act of political correctness which needs to be seen.

In India, the selectivity of some human rights activists can be seen in the alacrity with which they sometimes condemn particular groups or communities for misdemeanors and excuse others for similar conduct. This has led to the complaints by the members of the Hindu community, for instance, that those combating communalism usually tend to be harsher on Hindu or pro-Hindu elements than on Muslim or other minority groups.

Exaggeration and Factual Accuracy

Human rights campaigners are sometimes prone to exaggeration, which also impacts on their overall credibility. An example of such exaggeration happened during the 190-91 Gulf Crisis following the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. Amnesty International published a report which stated, among other things, that the invading Iraqi soldiers had removed over 300 premature babies from their incubators in one of the Kuwaiti hospitals with view to sending the incubators to Iraq, and further more that at least 72 corpses of such babies had been personally buried by an unnamed Red Crescent doctor. This story was later known as a false story which was designed by the Amnesty International for which act it was battered.

Another recent example of exaggeration concerns a statement by Amnesty International Secretary General, which equated the US military's detention camp for terrorists in Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, with the Soviet Gulag – a comparison which drew instant derision from a number of commentators. As the Wall Street Journal observed , 'a human rights group that can not distinguish between Stalin's death camps and detention centres for terrorists who kill civilians can not be taken seriously.'

These issues reflect a growing concern that the human rights movement should reflect on its inadequacies and how far it had been able to genuinely respond to the social expectations that it has generated.

Over-Ambitiousness

The human rights movement is also, unfortunately, characterized by a degree of over-ambitiousness, which cannot but be counterproductive in the long run. Recent years have seen a huge proliferation of rights some of which are actually antithetical to existing, time-tested civil liberties and to cherished social arrangements which command widespread support among the community at large. The right to roam on private land, which has, for example; been asserted by campaigners in the UK, is clearly at odds with the landowner's right to hold and enjoy his property without let or hindrance. The right to circulate pornographic material cannot but have serious adverse effects in the right of children and other vulnerable groups in society to be protected from undesirable influences. The right to homosexual marriage would, likewise, be

seen by many societies as an affront to the long-standing institution as a stable union between two persons of the opposite gender.

Another example of over-ambitiousness if human rights campaigners is their advocacy of 'third-generation of rights', that is, group rights or collective rights which, they argue, should exist over and above individual civil and political rights. This argument has profound practical consequences, such as the threat to the integrity of states and the dilution of existing guarantees for individual freedom, which many of the activists do not seem to recognize. It is ironic that such a campaign should be pushed at a time when there is, as noted earlier, no durable consensus on any of the first and second generation of rights. In the long run, such proliferation of rights can only lead to the notion of human rights being diminished and to have a large extent trivialized.

Obliviousness to Cultural Diversity

Many on the contemporary human rights movement often show an insufficient appreciation of reality and of common sense in other respects too. There is insufficient appreciation of the fact that we live in a world in which differences and diversities of cultures abound - differences that cannot be wished away overnight, even with the best will in the world. Even within the West, there are often sharp differences between nations in their approaches to human rights. The view which Sweitzerland takes on assisted suicide, or the Netherlands over 'soft' drugs, for example, is not the view that is taken in UK, nor is there a congruence in the approach to sexually explicit material between, say, the Scandinavian countries and Ireland.

There is clearly no escaping the wide chasms in values, practices and morality that abound in the world today. The 'class of civilizations' to which Samuel Huntington has famously drawn our attention is as real a it is troubling in its implications. To deny or ignore it would be naïve and not in the best interests of the human rights movement.

Of course the arrangement on diversity should not be allowed to be used as a smokescreen by tyrants. Where, for example, there is clear evidence that the measures taken by government have little or no popular support, or where the population in question is denied any opportunity to express an opinion on a contentious matter, or where the measures are so outrageous that they offend against basic norms of humanity, the human rights community would quite justifying in raising its voice against such measures. But otherwise, it would do well to show a measure of humility and tolerance, and not pretend that we live in a homogenous, morally pristine world.

Lack of Recognition of Duties

One of the unfortunate failings of the human rights movements is its reluctance to acknowledge that rights carry with them responsibilities and that unless those responsibilities are discharged, the stability and order that are necessary for he enjoyment of human rights would simply vanish. David Selbourne explains this imbalance thus: 'It is…. routine to find that lip-service to duty once paid, generally at the outset of discussion, it is rights which are the dominating subject of course. Duties never or rarely particularized soon forgotten, or alluded to in token or passing fashion as if their content and implications were taken for granted (Selbourne, 1994).'   A misguided emphasis on individualism often lies at the root of the rights lobby's unwillingness to countenance the idea of duties. Amitai Etzioni, a champion of communitarianism, draws attention to the absurd lengths to which such extreme individualism has sometimes been taken, citing the opposition of groups such as the American Civil liberties union even to measures of public health and safety. Such groups have he says, blocked the introduction of seat belt and motorcycle helmet laws in many jurisdictions and ensured the repeal

of such regulations in several localities where they had been in place, on the specious grounds that people have a rights to do with their lives what they wish, including endangering them (Etzioni, 1995)

Conclusion

The human rights practice and activism in both North and South faces challenges is no doubt about it. However, the serious efforts taken at the UN level as well as governmental levels are also quite remarkable. In addition to these, that there are also serious movements undertaken by NGOs and movements from different parts of the world to strengthen the cause of human rights awareness and protection. The serious steps still required to reach its full height as an emancipatory movement. The continuity in this direction would somewhere land up one day with high success.

REFERENCES

Althuser, L. 1969. For Marx. London: Allen Lane.

Baxi, U. 2004. The 'Just War' for Profit and War: The Bhopal Catastrophe and the principle of Double Effect, in Bomman-Larsen and Wiggen (eds.) *Responsibility in World Business: Managing Harmful Side-Effects of Corporate Activity.* Tokyo: United Nations University Press.

(2006). The Future of Human Rights. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Foucault, M. 2000. 'Power: Three Essential Works of Foucault 1954-1984, edited by James D. Faubion. New York: New York Press.

Etzioni, A.1995. The Spirit of Community, London: Fontana Press.

Selbourne, D. 1994. The Principle of Duty. London: Sinclair-Stevenson.

Iyer, V. 2007. 'The Human Rights Movement: Time to Turn the Searchlight Inwards' in C. Rajkumar and K. Chockalingam (Eds.) *Human Rights, Justice and Constitutional Empowerment*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

LESSON 6

ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT: NORTH AND SOUTH

Diwakar Kumar Singh
Research Scholar
Department of History
University of Delhi

Introduction

The term 'environment' in a broader sense connotes a set of factors such as physical, biological, psychological, social and cultural which constitute the context in which life (vegetal, animal and human) has evolved and continues to evolve. The origin of word, can be traced to the term *'oecologie'* coined by German biologist Ernst Haeckel in 1860, referring to the 'science of relation of living organism to their external world, their habitat, parasites, predatators, exposure to certain types of soil, climate and so forth' (Arnold, 1996: 3-4).

Environmentalism or the movement to protect the natural environment has had a long history, but it assumed its institutional prominence only in the recent past. The emergence of this key phenomenon of world history known as 'environmentalism' or ecological movement encapsulate a cluster of issues pertaining to the human-nature interaction and its causes and consequences. Thus, the second half of the twentieth century represents a conscious endeavour to protect the natural environment both from preservationist (those who seek to make the best use of natural habitats as they are) and conservationist (those who seek to make the best use of natural resources without doing damage to the environment) perspectives through intellectual ideas to mass activism.

This chapter is an attempt to review the perspectives on environmental movement as a phenomenon, which gained momentum both in advanced nations also known as global 'North' and poor or less advanced countries also known as global 'South'.

Environmentalism in the North

Environmental movements both in the North and the South represent similar trends but differ in their ideological origination. The issues of ecology in the South is seemingly linked with issues of human rights, ethnicity and distributive justice (Guha, 1997: 18). Their movements are seldom associated with protection of locality against the state and explicitly lay emphasis upon the issues of subsistence and survival, whereas in the North, its origination can be traced outside the production process. In all likelihood, the question of locality too is not as important as the question of biosphere as whole in the context of the North.

Industrial revolution and its consequences resulted in a rapid exhaustion of resources, massive production, and a surge in population. As a result, the twentieth century witnessed the emergence of a deep consciousness towards ecological concerns. Thus, people from all quarters have effectively mobilized against the destruction of wilderness, making of big dams and industrial wastes.

It is imperative to understand the intellectual approaches and articulation of ideas, which have played an important role, as McNeill has rightly argued that 'for environmental history the powerful, prevailing ideas mattered more than the explicitly environmental ones' (McNeill, 2000: 325). Thus, from historiographical perspective, certain important precursors of this movement needs to be discussed which may help us to develop a broader understanding of

environmentalism. Samuel P. Hay's 'Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency' (1959) seems to be an ostensive documentation of 'nature' as embodied in wilderness in the United States this writings reflect Roosevelt's Conservation concerns for ecological causes. Moreover, he has discussed the great change in American attitudes towards the environment in the period after the Second World War. In his another richly evocative work, 'Beauty, Health, and Permanence: Environmental Politics in the United States, 1955-1985', Hay carefully observes the emergence of new environmental amenities, recreation, aesthetics, and health – all associated with rising standards of living and education.

One of the most influential works 'Silent Spring' appeared in 1962 authored by Rachael Carson, a marine biologist. The book was full of details of lethal impact of the use of various pesticides, most significantly the use of DDT (dichloro-diophenyl-trichloro-ethane). The rapid use of this pesticide in U.S. shows a quantum jump in its consumption from 1.24 to 6.37 million pounds between 1947 and 1960.

According to Guha, 'The consequences of the book were far-reaching. In the wake of Silent Spring, town 'reconsidered their foolish herbicidal assault' on avenue, shrubs and trees; citizens and officials became more alert about to potential fish kills in rivers; ...a federal committee on pest control was established to scrutinize new products... (Guha, 2000: 72). The DDT was banned and the US Governments in order to, control and monitor such harmful chemicals, brought up many laws such as Pesticide Control Act of 1972 and Toxic Substances Control Act of 1974. Both from individual and institutional perspectives, the wave of environmentalism surfaced in US and Europe. The individuals like Barry Commoner argued for non-polluting technologies to preserve ecology.

The Club of Rome prepared a report in 1964 called "Limits to Growth", which categorically manifested the consequences of rapid growth and exploitation of resources, and moreover, suggested to follow a moderate path for development. A conscious mobilization of people and their massive procession against pollution and other ecological concerns eventually culminated into the celebration of 'Earth day' on April 1970. The entire decade of seventies has witnessed an impressive growth of organisations, clubs, societies in the US, primarily concerned with the conservation movement. Stephen Fox (1985) has shown that there was a phenomenal growth of membership in these organizations between 70s and 90s. According to Andrew Jamison, there was a huge participation of youth who stood as 'the mere impatient with the political method of their elders'. The environmentalists in North America particularly played a significant role in raising the issues such as industrial emission, toxic wastes, designating protected or endangered ecological entities and more importantly, they helped to set up environmental prosecution agencies which became an integral part of the US environmental policy.

As a social movement, environmentalism in US encapsulates varieties of ideas. For instance, 'Deep Ecology' expounded by a Norwegian philosopher Arne Naess in 1972, gave emphasis on 'bio centricism', which rejects a human-centered perspective by looking at history from the vantage point of other species and nature as a whole' (Guha, 2000: 85). In a sense, the ethics of the wilderness movement posits a greater degree of importance to the nature.

Another interesting dimension of environmental movement seems to appear what has been described as 'environmental justice movement', which largely represents the involvement of people from lower income groups and ethnic minorities (such as African-American).

The anti-toxic movement of Love Canal is one such striking example of justice movement. The massive deposition of toxic wastes by Hooker chemical company in and around

Love Canal in New York caused birth defects, cancer and other health problems in the same locality which was also inhabited largely by African-Americans. A movement against this was led by Lois Gibbs to clean up Love Canal, which helped to set up a national co-ordinating body, the Citizens Clearing House for Hazardous Wastes (CCHW). By 1980, due to the mounting pressure from affiliated groups and their campaigns, the Government of North America evacuated thousands of people and officially made it a natural disaster area.

In Europe too, the concerns for bad consequences of industrialization and ecology gained momentum and there are evidences of many such outcrops of activism. Some of such activism culminated into political parties. In New Zealand, the Value Party born in the 1960, was the first explicitly green party.

In 1978, a group of people formed Green Party in Germany. The German Green became a beacon for environmentalists in other European countries. Consequently, the Green Party made a strong presence in countries like Belgium, Italy and Sweden. According to Guha, "German Green stand out for their political victories and for the moral challenge, they offer to the governing beliefs of industrial civilization" (Guha, 2000: 90).

Movements in the South

Generally, it is believed that environmentalism as a movement emanated from the rich and industrialised nations. However contrary to such assumption the decade seems to have been witnessed an equal degree of ecological concern in the South too. The countries such as Brazil, Kenya, India and Thailand – all underwent the varied wave of environmentalism.

In Brazil, uncontrolled exploitation of its forests between 1960 and 1984, created a huge deforestation problem and turned larger part of Amazonic region into deserts. In 1976, we come across a strong ecological movement there, also known as 'Chico', as it was led by Francisco Chico Mendes – a leader of a group of rubber tappers (gatherers of natural latex from rubber trees). The movement started on March 10, 1976, against the ranchers and loggers who were supported by the Government involved in displacing more than 10,000 rubber tappers. Those rancher took over the forest land from tappers and around 6 million hectares of land were under their possession in the name of development. Mendes along with men, women and children marched to the forest, joined hands and dared the workers and their chain-saws from proceeding further'. In December 1988, Chico Mendes was murdered a by land owner but left an enormous impact. In Kenya, there is another striking example of ecological movement, founded by a woman Professor of Anatomy, Wangari Matthai, who was later awarded the Nobel Prize. The movement known as 'Green Belt', started in 1977, left a powerful impact. Rooted in common mass, it shows a brilliant example of plantation in environmental history. 'The Green Belt movement proved strong enough to make an impact on the land and provoke a backlash; it had planted some 20 million trees in Kenya by 1993' (McNeill, 2000: 352).

In India, we come across some brilliant examples of ecological movements. One of the earliest and novel examples of ecological movement can be seen as 'Chipko' in Garhwal and Kumaon region in 1970s led by Sunderlal Bahuguna and Chandi Prasad Bhatt. The great concern for protecting forests resulted into a huge mobalisation of people with an unique mode of protest involving the hugging the trees by men and women of the village. Although the protest was for their legitimate claim for subsistence against the commercial exploitation by outsiders, yet it reflects a great sense of ecological consciousness.

Another fascinating example is Narmada Bachao Andolan led by Medha Patkar, a woman, social activist. One of the largest ongoing movement against the construction of a dam

on Narmada river, it has raised strong protest due to the government's plan to build 30 large, 135 medium and 3000 small dams to harness the waters of Narmada and its tributaries. The consequences of the construction of dam manifest in huge displacement of people and destruction of their land. More than 250 villages are on the brink of destruction.

There are some other examples of ecological movement in India such as Silent Valley movement which is also an anti-dam movement. The movement was started in 1970s and got huge support from Kerala Sastra Sahitya Parishad. Thus, there are several examples to conclude that ecological movement appeared simultaneously in the South in its own socio-cultural milieu.

In retrospect, the differences between the Northern and the Southern environmental movements lie in a set of assumptions. It appears as American environmentalism, according to Hay, 'was not a throw back to the primitive, but an integral part of the modern standard of living as people sought to add new "amenity" and "aesthetic" goals and desires to their earlier preoccupation with necessities and conveniences' (Hay, 1982: 21). However, in countries like India, it has clearly originated from the conflict between competing groups – typically peasants and industry – over productive resources (Guha & Gadgil, 1995). Even, regarding the modes of protest and communication of agenda, there is marked difference between the two. In the north persists generally the language of protest in politically organised and structurally instituted forms, whereas in the South, it has been oriented in conventional forms of activism.

Global Environmental Debate and the North-South Divide

The decade of seventies shows a paradigm shift in environmentalism. The threat of ecological crisis was increasingly felt on a wider political platform. The first international conference on environmental concern was organised at Stockholm in 1972 by the United Nations. The meeting agreed upon a wide range of issues including a declaration containing 26 principles concerning the environment and development. Since then, many such conferences have been held to provide an enduring framework, central to environmental problem.

In 1987, the UN established a World Commission on Development chaired by the Prime Minister of Norway, Grottarteen Brundtland produced a report also known as Brundtland Report. The report exposed the global patterns of consumption. In a sense, the report offered a key explanation to understand the relationship between environment and economic development. The significance of report also lies in the fact that it bears the concept of 'sustainable development' as a remedy for both poverty and environmentalism.

The concept of 'sustainable development', according to the report, posits a development 'that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generation to meet theirs'. The idea was further elaborated in 1992 at Rio UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) also known as the Earth Summit. The Summit was organised, in order to, promote and develop certain principles to provide guidelines on environment and development. The Rio-Conference proclaimed 27 general principles to guide action on environment and development. Maurice Strong proposed a document to set out how to make the planet sustainable which is also known as 'Agenda 21'. The 400 page-document covers a wide range of issues such as promoting sustainable urban development, managing fragile mountain ecosystems and hazardous wastes.

There was sharp disagreement between nations representing the North and the South (industrialised and poor) on certain issues including bio-diversity. On the question of bio-diversity, the biasness in favour of the Global North was distinctly clear. The major portion of biodiversity (70%) lies in countries such as Mexico, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Brazil, Zaire,

Madagascar, China, Malaysia, India and Australia but due to weak economies, they were more vulnerable to exploitation.

The developed countries wanted the developing countries to take measures for the conservation of biodiversity resources. However, the cost of the most protection programmes was in the range of $ 10 to $ 14 billion per annum, and technological advantage derived from the genetic resources would go into the pocket of advanced countries. Thus, this principle was highly contentious and embedded within ambiguous agenda.

Subsequently, in 1997, Kyoto (in Japan) protocol was successfully agreed by many nations to limit their green house emissions. The EU, USA and Japan respectively committed themselves to reduce their annual green house gas emissions by 2012 to 8, 7 and 6% less than 1990 level. India too signed and ratified it in year 2000.

Even after rounds of negotiations between the Developed and the Underdeveloped nations on certain issues, related to protection of environment, there is a wide gap of understanding between them. The most disappointing fact is that many industrialised and developed nations want to negotiate certain issues with underdeveloped or developing countries in the most rigid and hegemonic framework.

The paradox can be understood in the words of Agrawal and Narain (1985: 363) –

"In all those who came from the Third World, there was a sneaking suspicion that the western countries were up to some trick. The West may simply be pushing the environmental concern on to an unsuspecting Third World to retard its technological modernisation and industrial development. It was even argued that having got their riches and affluent life styles, westerners were now simply asking for more affluence; clear air, clean water, and a large tract of nature of enjoyment and recreation, many of which were going to be preserved in the tropical forests and Savannas of Asia, Africa and South America."

At the international level, in 1987, the Montreal Protocol was signed to prevent the depletion of the ozone layer. Thereafter, it led to the 1990 (London), 1992 (Copenhagen) and 1995 (Vienna) Conventions for adopting substantive measures to curtail ozone depleting substances such as CFC, halons, methylchloropen, carbon tetrachloride etc.

The recent data released by UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) suggests that emission of green house gases has increased upto 10% by rich nations in the last 16 years. The problem lies in the relationship between industrial development and green house emissions. The North blames the South for using conventional sources of energy which is principal cause of green house gases. However, industrialized countries are responsible for about 77% of the accumulated stock of green house gases, a fundamental reason for phenomenon of climate change. Moreover, the contentions and negotiations over the issues of emission of green house gases and climate change between the North and the South envelops the causes for this divide. Due to the enormous emission of green house gases (carbon dioxide, methane, CFC, nitrous oxides etc.), ozone layer is being depleted day by day and consequently has affected the ecosystem by rise in temperature, a phenomenon also known as 'global warming'.

According to McNeill, 'for the thousand years before 1800, carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere varied around 270 to 290 parts per million (ppm). Around 1800, an accelerating buildup began, reaching about 295 ppm by 1900, 310 to 315 ppm by 1950 and about 360 ppm by 1995' (McWeill 2001: 109). McNeill outlines two reasons for this enormous increase in the amount of carbon dioxide-fossil combustion and deforestation.

For the rich countries, it is easier to put such blame on poor; however, it is strange enough that despite of their claims to have green technology and strong economy, they have failed to address their own pollution problems. It is true that poor countries are heavily dependent upon conventional sources of energy and it equipped with technology, and thus, a wide gap exists between them.

In a nutshell, the effective solution lies in adopting an integrated approach to bridge this hiatus. Developing or less industrialized countries too need to address this problem in formidable ways while adopting innovative methods and effective tools to save the environment from the impending dangers of all kinds of emissions and pollutions.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Agarwal, Anil and Narain, S. (1985). The State of India's Environment: The Second Citizens' Report. New Delhi, Centre for Science and Environment.

Arnold, David (1996). The Problem of Nature Environment, Culture and European Expansion. USA, Blackwell.

Guha, Ramchandra (2000). Environmentalism: A Global History. New Delhi: Oxford.

Guha, Ramchandra and J. Martiner-Alier (1997). Varieties of Environmentalism: Essays North and South. London: Earthscan.

Hay, S.P. (1982). From Conservation to Environment: Environmental Politics in the United States since World War Two, Environmental Review 6(1).

Hughes, J. Donald (2006). What is Environmental History? UK: Polity Press.

McNeill, J.R. (2000). Something New Under Sun: An Environmental History of the Twentieth-Century World. London: Allen Lane.

Rangarajan, Mahesh (2007). Environmental Issues in India: A Reader, New Delhi: Pearson Longman.

ISSUES IN 20TH CENTURY WORLD-FEMINIST MOVEMENT

--Puja Rani
Assistant Professor
Department of Political Science
Gargi College
University of Delhi

Although the term 'Feminism' is of recent origin (late nineteenth century) feminist/women's movement has a long history. Feminist views have been expressed in many civilizations, long back since Italy's Christine de Pisan in her *Book of the City of Ladies* (1405) advocated for women's rights. In Europe feminist consciousness began spreading during and after the French Revolution. However, by the end of the century in England, France and Germany, the feminist ideas started being expressed by radicals.

The first text of modern Feminism is usually taken from Mary Wollstonecraft's *Vindication of the Rights of Women* ([1792] 1967), written against the backdrop of the French Revolution. Later in the nineteenth century, women's nature, capacities and potential became subjects of heated discussion all over the world. Views on women in India began with social reform movements that started deploring the wrongs done to women such as practice of sati, child marriage etc. However, the common starting point of all feminist ideas was the belief that women are disadvantaged in comparison with men and this disadvantage is not natural or inevitable result of biological difference but something that can be and should be challenged and changed.

Nevertheless, the existence of an organized women's movement could not develop until the nineteenth century, and it first culminated into a demand of franchise to women. They started with an assumption that all the forms of sexual discrimination would disappear if women were given the right to vote. The famous Seneca Falls Convention held in 1848 marked the birth of the United States (US) women's rights' movement. Later in 1869 Stanton and Susan B. Anthony led to the set up of the National Women's suffrage Association. In United Kingdom (UK), too, Women's Social and Political Union was established in 1903 by Emmeline Pankhurst.

This struggle for suffrage got its first success in 1893 when New Zealand granted the voting granted the voting right to women. Correspondingly the UK and the US, too, granted the same in 1918 and 1920 respectively. However, more importantly, this struggle and its achievement united the feminists across the world and provided a new inspiration to the movement. They now also expanded their agenda of political emancipation and became more coherent in their structure. Soon their interest started growing in liberating women from all other oppressive aspects too. Political rights, to them now were not sufficient enough to solve all their questions. So at this stage women's ideas grew were more radical and started focusing attention upon the personal, psychological and sexual aspects of female oppression. Kate Millet's *Sexual Politics* (1970) and Betty Freidan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) can be said as the chief proponent of the radical thought.

By the early twentieth century women's own autonomous organizations began to be formed and women's activism was constructed. Feminist thought after the 1960s became more diverse. It is believed that feminist movement during this period expanded beyond single goal

oriented movement and established 'Feminism' as an ideology. It was established that women's conditions based on birth by accident, cannot be treated as inferior to men. Earlier it was taken for granted that both the sexes were such that their functions, role, aims and desire were different. So both the sex has to be treated differently.

Major Themes/ Ideologies of Feminism

With the growth of Feminism as an ideology, it brought into its ambit several major themes. Some of the important themes of feminism are patriarchy, personal to political, sex and gender, and equality and difference. In what follows, we will discuss each of these themes in detail.

The term 'patriarchy' (*pitrasatta*- Hindi) is derived from the word 'patriarch', which means that the head of the specific type of male dominated family will always be the eldest man of the family or the father. This is a very specific type of practice of male domination. Feminist used the concept of patriarchy to describe the subordinate situation of women in the family where the father or eldest male is the head of the family. However, later they showed that patriarchy produces male dominance in all walks of life. Patriarchy includes many things like preference of male child;, discrimination between girls and boys; lack of educational opportunities for girls; burden of household work on the shoulder of women and harassment of women in work place. They also linked patriarchy with women's property rights. Daughters are seen as burden, and as a temporary member of their father's family. Having daughters is equated with draining of resources and as serving no purpose for family. Male is always considered as the successor of the family. Continuity of the family is linked through him, only. Feminists believe that all these practices, mentioned above symbolizes the male supremacy in the structure of the family and it also decides the gender relations in a society at large. A patriarchy is a hierarchic society where male is always in the highest order and women are subordinated. Men under patriarchy enjoy privileges, power and rights by virtue of simply being men.

As feminists believed that men have dominated in all societies, so in order to expose the whole gender based system of sexism and patriarchal power expressed in social, economic and political structures; in languages and cultural images of men and women, adopted the term 'patriarchy' enthusiastically. They started questioning the repression of their sexuality and male violence against women. According to Millet (1970) patriarchy contains two principles i.e. male shall dominate female and elder male shall dominate younger. Patriarchy is therefore a hierarchic society characterized by both sexual and generational oppression. Thus, they started using patriarchy in a broader sense of rule of men both within the family and outside. However, they continued to believe that patriarchal families lie at the heart of a systematic process of male domination, and in that process, it spreads its dominance in every sphere. Men have moulded women according to their expectations and needs.

Some feminists do not view the concept of patriarchy as universal, as they say, it is not practiced everywhere. There is/are evidence of matrilineal society where a woman who is the head of the family or the tribe. However, this dissenting expression of feminism should not be confused as an attempt to prove a substantial shift in their stand. It was primarily to denote that though historically our societies are patriarchal, it does not demonstrate that male domination is either natural or inevitable. It's a great challenge for feminist to understand patriarchy as it operates at many different levels and in all social institutions.

The feminism derives its second important theme around the public-private divide. They say that sometimes 'personal is political', too. This originated as a concept of US civil rights movement and later gained an enormous significance for modern feminism. Feminists consider

that gender division within society is 'political' and not 'natural'. It reflects a power relationship between men and women. Feminists argue that sexual inequality has been preserved because the sexual division of labour that runs through society has been thought of as 'natural' rather than political. The book *Public Man, Private Woman* (1981) by Jean B. Elshtain highlighted this issue. Since then the feminists have questioning the origin of the division and the politics behind its sustenance. Simultaneously, they also started to challenge and overthrow the existing thought. Feminists basically were attempting to break down the resonance of divide between public and private to that of between men and women. They started saying that emancipation could only be achieved if some or perhaps all of the responsibilities of private life are transferred to the state or other public bodies. So in the nineteenth century the idea that the 'personal' is 'political' was widely accepted and many issues acquired a central focus.

This can be better understood in the context of family were there is unequal distribution of domestic labour. Politics has usually been understood as an activity that takes place within the public sphere of government, institutions or overall in the public platform. Traditionally the public sphere of life encompassing politics, work and art has been the preserve of men and women were confined to domestic responsibilities. Women were restricted to private role of housewife and mother and are excluded from politics. So family is a part of private sphere and therefore it is non-political. The family has so far been not only relegated to the private realm but has simply been ignored. So women interests were harmed because it failed to be examined in the public sphere.

Feminists say politics is found everywhere, but even the conventional political theorists have upheld the former belief by ignoring gender divisions altogether. So the demarcation of public and private sphere needs to be changed. Women are confined to household responsibilities and if politics takes place within the public sphere then the women issues will always be excluded. Feminists want to have equal access in the public sphere; their role in decision making; and their will to bring any change in their position. They also want to overcome the barriers between the public and private spheres and recreate the society, culture and politics in new and non-patriarchal forms. The political character of male and female relations and the idea that the 'personal is political' thus are widely accepted and great changes have taken place.

The third important theme of feminism distinguishes between sex and gender. According to the feminist theory, sex refers to biological term that distinguishes between men and women. Therefore it is natural. But, on the contrary, gender is not natural but a cultural term. It means that the difference between masculinity and feminity is created by the different roles ascribed to men and women in society. So the gender differences are entirely cultural because it is imposed upon individuals by the society. There is also a common thread in the way the male and female are shaped and valued. First women biological factor is linked to women's social position and the capacity of child bearing. The result is that, t has acquired values of nurturing, service and subordination to the need of others, i.e. the reproductive role as a whole is identified with women, only. On the contrary, men are encouraged to be masculine, assertive, aggressive and competitive. The activities and attributes provided to men are not just different from those of women but are valued more highly too.

Anti feminists argue that the gender divisions have been designed by nature and, therefore, in a way it is natural. In other words, they say that 'biology is destiny'. However, feminists believe that sex differences are biological facts of life, but they have no social, political or economic significance. Women and men should not be judged by their sex but as individuals or as persons. Gender differences are not natural and can be expunged from the society. Simone de Beauvoir (*The second sex* 1949) says "women are made, they are not born". Thus gendered

differences are made by the society by creating certain stereotypes of men and women behaviour, and are not natural.

The fourth theme of feminism is revolves around the debate of equality and difference. Despite the fact that the overall goal of feminism is equality between sexes, they have not been able to come to a concrete conclusion for what does it mean in practical terms. Different schools of feminist movements (discussed in detail below) have expressed different opinion about the issue. While some (liberal feminists) believe that women should be treated equally with men, in political and legal aspects, irrespective of sexual differences and should be given equal opportunity to compete with men. Some feminists (socialist feminists) add that political and legal equality should also be complemented with social equality, which in simpler words means abolition of both sexual and class oppression. However, some feminists oppose this view on the ground that their struggle should not be equated with 'equality with men' as it identifies with a 'male identified' norms and practices. They want to build a society that is developed and achieved completely by women, i.e. 'women identified'. In other words, they insist on separatism from men and male society.

According to MacKinnon (Feminism *Unmodified, Discourses on life and law*, 1987) sexual equality laws have been ineffective in getting women what they need. They are still socially prevented from physical security, minimal respect and dignity. Equality could not be achieved by allowing men to build social institutions according to their interests and ignoring the women and their role in the institution. According to feminists the problem is that the roles may be defined in such a way which suited men. Hence there is no guarantee of sexual equality under these circumstances. If a group is kept out of something for long enough then it is likely that activities of that sort will develop in a way unsuited to the excluded group. Women are kept out of many kinds of work and this resulted in the belief that the work is unsuited to them. The most obvious example is the incompatibility of most work with bearing and raising of children. If women had been given opportunity or involved in running the society from the starting, then the division of work would have been sorted out.

Various Schools in Feminism

There are different schools of feminism, viz. liberal, socialist, radical, and feminism of the women of colour and they disagree, fundamentally on the nature of causes and cure of women's inequalities, subordination or oppression.

Liberal feminism talks about equal rights and opportunities to compete with men in all fields. They believe that women should have same rights and privilege as possessed by men. They assert the equality of men and women through political and legal reform. According to liberal feminists, all women are capable of asserting their ability to achieve equality, and therefore, it is possible to change the society without altering the basis structure of the society. John Stuart mill a staunch supporter of liberty believed that an individual should be left free for his or her development. Mill's *'On the Subjection of the Women'* was an important work in the history of feminism. It was written in collaboration with Harriet Taylor and proposed that society should be based on reason and accidents of birth such as sex should be irrelevant. Liberal feminists emphasize on the principle of individualism and consider that all individuals are of equal moral worth.

Liberals demand for equal rights for all and advocates that all individuals are entitled to participate in or gain access to public or private life. Indeed, the entire suffrage movement in the early days of feminist movement was based upon liberal individualism and the assumption was that female emancipation can be achieved, once women enjoy equal voting rights with men.

However, in the later days, some of the other important issues raised by liberal feminists include education, reproductive rights, abortion access, sexual harassment, fair compensation for work, affordable childcare, affordable health care, and bringing to light the frequency of sexual and domestic violence against women. Hence liberal feminists are understood as reformists and it seeks to open up public life to equal competition between men and women. Betty Friedan and Mary Wollstonecraft stand high on the list of the liberal feminist.

Radical feminism considers patriarchy as a root of all problems. It believes that the complexity of relationship between men and women emerge from the family. This is based on the male supremacy and this supremacy is used to oppress the women. Radical feminism aims to challenge and to overthrow patriarchy by opposing the standard gender role. They view it as the main reason for all kinds of male oppression on women, and calls for a radical reordering of the society. According to Kate Millet (1970) patriarchy should be challenged through a process of 'consciousness raising', and this can be achieved through discussions and women education. This would help women understand the situation and then they will be able to challenge the society. Women's liberation requires a revolutionary change where the sexual and psychological oppression have to be destroyed at all levels of society.

Though Millet saw the roots of patriarchy in social conditioning, Shulamith Firestone in her work *Dialectic of Sex* (1972) argued that gender inequality forced on women, originated in patriarchy through their biology. The physical, social and psychological disadvantages have made them imposed of pregnancy, childbirth, and subsequent child-rearing. She said that society could be understood not as Marx had claimed through the process of production but through the process of reproduction. She also tried to explain the social and historical processes in terms of sexual divisions. However, Firestone believed that modern technology will relieve the women of the burden of childbirth and pregnancy.

Socialist feminism focuses upon both the public and private spheres of a woman's life and argues that liberation can only be achieved by working to end both the economic and cultural sources of women's oppression. According to Socialist feminists, patriarchy can only be understood in the light of social and economic factors. It seeks to combine the radical perspective of patriarchy with the Marxist class analysis by exploring the relationship between capitalism and patriarchy. Engels (*The Origins of the Family, Private Property and the State;* [1884] 1976) suggested that position of women has changed in the capitalist society. As capitalism is based upon the ownership of private property by men so the position of women has changed in this system. Engels argued that bourgeois family is always patriarchal and oppressive because the successor of property will only be passed to their sons. He believed that marriage should be dissolved and once private property is dissolved than features of patriarchy will also disappear. He suggested that class exploitation is a deeper and more significant process than sexual oppression. Women are exploited not by men but by capitalism and private property. So through revolution capitalism should be overthrown and replaced by socialism.

Feminism of the Women of Colour pointed towards the more intense kind of oppression of black women on the hands of white women. Feminists of this school contend that the liberation of black women entails freedom for all people, since it would require the end of racism, sexism, and class oppression. It was a struggle for recognition not only from men in their own culture, but also from White women. Black women, though, faced the same struggles as white women; however, they had to face issues of diversity on top of inequality. Black feminist organizations emerged during the 1970s and started fighting against suppression from the larger movements in which many of its members came from. However, the Black feminists had to overcome double challenges than any other feminist organization: one was to "prove to other

black women that feminism was not only for white women", two, they also had to demand that white women "share power with them and affirm diversity".

Besides the various schools of feminism discussed above, when the feminist theory reached a high point of creativity in the 1960's and 1970's, there emerged some others schools, too. This was the period of modern women movement. However, modern women movement was so heterogonous that there was hardly any unified structure on the basis of which certain thought could be easily categorized. There were several issues, such as eco-feminism, lesbianism, separatism and many more.

Feminist/Women's Movement in India

Movements related to women's rights have not existed as a single movement in India. It has rather, over the years, surfaced as a part of various social movements, both in the pre-Independence and the contemporary era. However, this does not mean that there hasn't been any existence of a self-conscious women's movement in the country. Despite being a part of broader social movements it has always maintained distinctiveness for itself. For the purpose of this paper, the discussion on women's movement in India is presented in two parts.

The Historical Context

During the pre-Independence phase, women's issues came to forefront in the context of the colonial encounters. The social reformers who emerged in the late nineteenth century were western educated elites and it was they who, for the first time raised the question of women's oppression. During this time there emerged several groups, such as the Brahmo Samaj, the Prarthana Samaj, the Arya Samaj, the Theosophical society etc. that started working largely for social reform, but also included the issues of woman. However, women themselves remained largely absent from these campaigns (except in few examples such as the Theosophical society in southern India). These movements were largely comprised of men, and therefore, the laws that emerged from them in many ways, were in continuation of patriarchy.

Some of the important issues raised in this period were *sati*, women's education, widow remarriage, female infanticide, child marriage, and *purdah* system. Raja Ram Mohan Roy, considered as the modern man of India was the first man to raise his concern against *sati*. He said that *sati* is a social evil and it should be abolished. Though for the initial years, British parliament refused to make law against sati, on the ground that it would amount to interference in the religious affairs of the Hindus, they finally accepted Roy's demand in 1829 and passed the Abolition of Sati Act.

With the achievement against sati, social reformers also started raising issues like women's education. They wanted to create a new Indian woman who would have new approach to life. The schools for girls were first started by English and American missionaries in the 1810. However, in the year 1827, there numbers increased upto twelve (in Calcutta). By the mid nineteenth century women's education had become an issue and it was supported by many unorthodox students of Bengal. Later these educated women formed different groups like Indian Women's Association; National Council of Indian Women etc. and started pressurizing the governments for their demands.

The mid-nineteenth century social reformist also raised the issue like widow remarriage. I.C. Vidyasagar launched a campaign to remove the ban on widow remarriage. He debated the issue with Hindu pundits and showed them that widow remarriage was accepted by *shastras*. The act for widow remarriage was passed in 1890s and the widow remarriage society conducted several widow remarriage after that. By the late nineteenth century social reform movements

created a great impact and as a result role of woman in public spheres increased considerably. Names of such few women leaders during this period were Anandibai Joshi, Jyotiba Phule, and Tarabai Shinde.

Soon, there came into light the issue of child marriage. In the 1920s, organizations started campaigning for an increase in the minimum age of marriage. This campaign became successful by the passage of the Child Marriage Restraint Act (1929) that increased the age of marriage for women to 14 and that for men to 18. However, with the advent of the new century there also had begun the movement for freedom struggle. The women's organizations such as the All India Women's Conference established in 1927, during this period though began taking up 'women's issues', they were subdued by the nationalist fervour. Thus, these organizations became a part of the larger freedom movement. Women started participating in the movement with full vigour. They did not even hesitate in taking the leadership on many occasions. Later when Mahatma Gandhi joined the freedom struggle, women's participation reached to its zenith. Gandhi's believed that women have the great capacity of self sacrifice and the role of tolerance and self sacrificing attitude will play an important role in non-violent nationalist struggle. Thus, he intentionally started making appeals to the women to participate in the freedom struggle. Responding to Gandhi's call for *satyagraha* and civil disobedience movement, women came out in large numbers from their houses. The salt *satyagraha* also saw huge participation of women. Gandhi's support for the women participation in the politics led the congress party to draft the Fundamental Rights Resolution at the Karachi session in 1931 and it passed the resolution of equality of the sexes. Later, when India became independent, it incorporated this resolution in our constitution.

Women's Movements in Contemporary India

Women's movement in contemporary India is multi-associational, ideologically diverse, regionally broad, and concerned with a vast array of issues. As a new independent country there were lots of hope it would improve the women's position in society. The period between the 1950s and 1970s saw women organizing in different parts of the country on specific issues relating to their livelihood and the well-being of their families. Women's movement activists re-emerged briefly in the 1950s during debates surrounding the passage of a Hindu Code Bill. Demands for a comprehensive and uniform law to reform Hindu personal laws were made by women's organisations in the 1930s. However, no action was taken on this issue until after Independence, when a committee was appointed by the government in order to look into the matter. This committee followed the recommendation made by feminists earlier and introduced the Hindu Code Bill, which raised the age of consent, and to give women the rights to divorce, maintenance and inheritance. Dr. Bhim Rao Ambedkar (as Law Minister during the time) defended the idea of women's equality in matters related to marriage, divorce, adoption and property rights. However, the bill despite the support amongst feminists and the Congress could not get passed because of objections raised by Hindu revivalists. In order to appease the opposition, the Bill was watered down and passed in the form of four different acts in 1955-56, the Hindu Marriage Act, the Hindu Succession Act, the Hindu Minority and Guardianship Act, and the Hindu Adoption and Maintenance.

The women issue rose again with the rise of the leftist struggles in different parts of the country. It once again saw the support of women in large numbers. The Telangana Movement that occurred between 1946 and 1951 in Andhra Pradesh for widespread changes in the land distribution system saw thousands of women involved in the struggle. Later, there came into being several individuals, groups and networks that started working locally and nationally on a

range of gender-related issues. The contemporary Indian women's movement emerged in the 1970s in response to wider political changes that were occurring at the time.

One such important precursor to the contemporary women's movement was the formation of the Self-Employed Women's Association (SEWA) in Gujarat. SEWA was one of the first attempts at organizing women's trade union and was started by Ela Bhatt, a member of the Gandhian Socialist Textile Labour Association. It was formed in 1972 in Ahmedabad. Sewa focused on the issue of exploitation and low wages paid to women in informal sector. It advocated that the work of women was not even recognized. It was a big achievement since its members did not work either in a factory or for a particular employer. The Chipko movement of the 1970s was another important movement that saw the participation of women in large numbers. It was an environmental movement to save the trees of the Uttranchal.

Later in the year 1970s, there grew an international concern for women's issues all across the world and India too. This was marked by the UN's declaration of 1975 as the International Year of Women, which was then followed by the UN's Decade of Women. In preparation for this event, the Indian government appointed a Committee on the Status of Women, which published their report, *Towards Equality* in 1974. This event was a watershed in the development of the contemporary women's movement. The findings of the report revealed major disparities in terms of the status of women, and especially poor women, in terms of employment, health, education, and political participation as well as drawing attention to the declining sex ratio.

However, in the later decades, the focus of the India's women's movement kept revolving around the issue of violence perpetrated against women. The issue of violence in the form of rape, dowry, and the problem of female infanticide were issues that brought the women's movement together on a national scale. Though these issues were not new to the Indian context, its ability to mobilize significantly around such isues, was certainly new. Violence against women was perpetrated by power-holders at various levels of society, including the agents of the state, local landlords, family members. These mobilizations highlighted the gender-specific nature of women's oppression. In the mid 1980s, the women movement was focused around the Shah Bano controversy. However, this led women's movement in India to reach an impasse with regards to the rights of Muslim women. Furthermore, the Supreme Court judgement called for the creation of a Uniform Civil Code, reopening a long-standing debate over the relationship between the state and religious groups.

In the year 1981, the Communist party of India (Marxist) established the All India Democratic Women's Association and it started working for women's education, employment and status. Simultaneously, there came into being many more issues and campaigns such as reservation, family laws, environment, and women's land rights that became part of women's movement in India. Besides these issues there were legal and constitutional reforms which helped in women empowerment. The Government of India in the year 1992 established a statutory body for women, National Commission for Women (NCW).

The most significant development for women in the last few decades, perhaps, has been the empowerment of women at the Panchayat level. The government of India, responding to the various concerns, passed the seventy third amendment (22nd December 1992, came into effect from 24th April 1993) that allowed thirty three per cent reservation for women at grass root level. This gave the women of India a platform to raise their voice and become a part of decision making. However, women still is not represented in the legislatures and the Parliament adequately, and they are fighting for their quota in the Lok Sabha. According to them a greater presence of women will be a step towards empowerment of Indian women. Reserving one third

of seats (33 per cent) in the Parliament will undoubtedly bestow special power and privileges and many women on the strength of quota system will reach to the highest law making body.

The women's movement in India has reached today to a rich and vibrant phase of the movement. It has spread to various parts of the country. Though, critics say now that there doesn't exist a single cohesive movement in the country, they cannot deny the fact that there are a number of fragmented campaigns that are struggling for the issue of women. Women movement sees this as one of the strengths of the movement which takes different forms in different times. Today women have reached to a position where they can take leadership in their own hands not only for their causes, but also for larger issue of mankind and humanity. Medha Patkar (for her role in Narmada Bachao Aandolan), who is fighting for poor people is a well known example of this kind. While the movement may have gone scattered, it has nonetheless become a strong and plural force.

SUGGESTED READINGS

Bhasin, Kamala (1986). *What Is Patriarchy*? New Delhi: Kali for Women

Geetha, V (2002). *Gender.* Calcutta: Stree.

Kumar, Radha (1998). *The History of Doing*. New Delhi: Kali for Women

Mehrotra, Deepti Priya (2001). *Bhartiya Mahila Andolan: Kal, Aaj aur Kal* , Delhi: Books for Change.

Menon. Nivedita (ed.) (1999). *Gender and Politics in India,* New Delhi: Oxford University Press.

LESSON 8

MODERNITY IN THE LIGHT OF CHANGING CULTURAL SCENARIO

--Shubhankita Ojha
Department of History
University of Delhi

Modernity is a term that very simply speaking, refers to the modern era. Modernity means different things to different people. Some schools of thought hold that modernity ended in the late 20th century, replaced by post-modernity, while others would extend modernity to cover the developments denoted by post-modernity and into the present. The term modern period or modern era (sometimes also modern times) is the period of history that succeeds the Middle Ages. The 1500s is usually taken as an approximate starting period for the modern era. Many major events caused the Western world to change around the turn of the 16th century: from the Fall of Constantinople (1453), the fall of Muslim Spain, and Christopher Columbus's voyage to the Americas (both 1492), to the Protestant Reformation begun with Martin Luther's Ninety-Five Theses (1517). Modern history may contain references to the history of Early modern Europe from the turn of the 15th century until the late 18th century, but generally refers to the history of the world since the advent of the Age of Reason and the Age of Enlightenment in the 17th and 18th centuries and the beginning of the Industrial Revolution. The concepts and ideas developed since then are part of the modern era. This terminology is a historical periodization that is applied primarily to Western history.

Portrayed in more detail, it is associated with (1) a certain set of attitudes towards the world, the idea of the world as open to transformation by human intervention; (2) a complex of economic institutions, especially industrial production and a market economy; (3) a certain range of political institutions, including the nation-state and mass democracy. Largely as a result of these characteristics, modernity is vastly more dynamic than any previous type of social order. It is a society—more technically, a complex of institutions—which unlike any preceding culture lives in the future rather than the past.[1]

Modernity of all things involves positive attitude towards change and attempts to make progress in technology, economics and military power. It is a positive attitude towards experimentation with new forms of government, including democracy or that of a republic, combined with a realistic attitude towards extant institutions, such as that of monarchies, assessing their strengths and weaknesses based on their record of accomplishments and failures.

Aspects of modernity

One of the most important aspects of modernity is the encouragement of advance or progress in useful sciences and arts. Revolutions in science and technology have been no less influential than political revolutions in changing the shape of the modern world. The scientific revolution, beginning with the discoveries of Johannes Kepler and Galileo, and culminating with

---

[1] Giddens, A., *The Consequences of Modernity*, Cambridge, England, Polity Press (1990).

Isaac Newton's *Philosophiae Naturalis Principia Mathematica* (1687), changed the way in which educated people looked at the natural world.

What is now called technology is the most obvious success of modernity. Mechanical and scientific invention has changed human health and all aspects of human society: economic, religious, social, and theoretical. For example, modern machines in Britain sped up the manufacture of cloth and iron. The horse and ox were no longer needed as beasts of burden. The newly invented engine powered the car, train, ship, and eventually the plane, revolutionizing the way people travelled. Newly discovered energy sources such as petroleum and nuclear power could power the new machines. Raw goods could be transported in huge quantities over vast distances; products could be manufactured quickly and then marketed all over the world, a situation that Britain, and later the US, Europe and Japan all used to their advantage.

Progress continued as science saw many new scientific discoveries. The telephone, radio, X-rays, microscopes, electricity all contributed to rapid changes in life-styles and societies. Discoveries of antibiotics such as penicillin brought new ways of combating diseases. Surgery and various medications made further progress in medical care, hospitals, and nursing. New theories such as evolution and psychoanalysis changed humanity's "old fashioned" views of itself. The theory of evolution, the law of the progress of species and races, and the various new theories of the laws of the progress of history, also set the stage for the ideas of racism and ethnological superiority to be used as a basis for nationalism and political systems.

From about 1700 there was a rapid population explosion. Between 1650 and 1850 the average annual rate of increase of the world's population doubled, it doubled again by the 1920s, and more than doubled, once more, by the 1970s. With industrialisation, improvements in medical knowledge and public health, together with a more regular food supply, bring about a drastic reduction in the death rate but no corresponding decline in the birth rate. The result was a population explosion, as experienced in 19th century Europe. The same held good for the developing societies as well.

Warfare changed with the advent of new varieties of rifle, cannon, gun, machine gun, armor, tank, plane, jet, and missile. Weapons such as the atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb, known along with chemical weapons and biological weapons as weapons of mass destruction, actually made the devastation of the entire planet possible in minutes. All these are among the markings of the Modern World.

New attitudes towards religion, with the church diminished, and a desire for personal freedoms, induced desires for sexual freedoms, which were ultimately accepted by large sectors of the Western World. Theories of "free love" and uninhibited sexual freedom were advanced only later in the 1960s. These are the broad effects of modernity which may be seen as a complex of the polical, social, economic and the cultural and shall be seen in such a light ahead in the chapter.

Meanings of Modernity

Modernity implies modernization, a continuous process of improvement in the capacity of humanity to manage and control its physical, social and cultural environment for its own benefit.

According to *Malcolm Waters*[2], modernity is a stable, long term, sociocultural configuration that has the following characteristics:

- Production systems are industrial, that is relatively large in scale, internally specialized into occupations, externally specialized by product, and mechanized.

- An increasing proportion of interpersonal practices are self-interested, rational and calculating.

- Physical and social objects, including human labour, are defined as commodities, that is they are alienable and can be exchanged in markets.

- Control of the state if specified by social role rather than by personal characteristics and is subject to periodic constituency legitimation.

- Social units— families, schools, governments, firms, churches, voluntary associations, etc.— are differentiated from one another, that is separated and distinguished from one another.

A more elaborate definition is given by *Stuart Hall* who explains the transition to modernity in terms of interaction between four processes— the political (the rise of the secular state and polity), the economic (the global capitalist economy), the social (formation of classes and an advanced sexual and social division of labour) and the cultural (the transition from a religious to a secular culture). One effect of the operation of these processes is to give modern societies a distinctive shape and form, making them not simply "societies"(a loose ensemble of social activities) but social formation (societies with a definite structure and a well defined set of social relations).

According to him, the defining features or characteristics of modern societies are:

1. The nation-state and an international system of states.

2. The dominance of secular forms of political power and authority and conceptions of sovereignty and legitimacy, operating within defined territorial boundaries, which are characteristic of the large, complex structures of the modern nation-state.

3. A monetarized exchange economy, based on the large scale production and consumption of commodities for the market, extensive ownership of private property and the accumulation of capital on a systematic, long term basis.

4. Growth of large scale administrative and bureaucratic systems of social organization and regulation.

5. Decline of the traditional social order, with its fixed social hierarchies and overlapping allegiances, and the appearance of a dynamic social and sexual division of labour. In modern capitalist societies, this was characterised by new class formations, and distinctive patriarchal relations between men and women.

6. Decline of the religious world-view typical of traditional societies and the rise of a secular and materialistic culture, exhibiting those individualistic, rationalist, and instrumental impulses now so familiar to us.

---

[2] Waters, Malcolm.(ed.), *Modernity: Critical Concepts*, Vol.1, Routledge, 1999.

7. Formal separation of the "private" from the "public".

Apart from these, for Hall there exist two other aspects of modernity which he includes under the rubric of "the cultural". The first refers to ways of producing and classifying knowledge. The emergence of modern societies was marked by the birth of a new intellectual and cognitive world, which gradually emerged with Reformation, the Renaissance, the scientific revolution of 17th century and the Enlightenment of 18th century. This shift in Europe's intellectual and moral universe was dramatic, and as constitutive for the formation of modern societies as early capitalism or the rise of the nation-state. Second, is the construction of cultural and social identities as part of the formation process. This refers to the construction of a sense of belonging, which draws people together into an 'imagined community' and the construction of symbolic boundaries which define who does *not* belong or is excluded from it. So the formation of modern societies as in Europe had to include the construction of the language, the images and symbols which defined these societies as 'communities' and set them apart, in their represented differences from others.

Beginnings of Modernity

There is considerable debate about when the modern era began. Many historians and social scientists accept that the originating society for modernity was Britain and its colonies. They date the early modern period from the sixteenth century. They make their argument on the grounds that during this period many mercantile capitalists rose to prominence, that there was some constitutionalization of monarchies, that the puritan reformation established the individual as the primary site of moral responsibility, and that there was some autonomization of the value spheres in so far as science was establishing itself independently of religion. However, against this many sociologists argue that the modern era did not begin until what is known as the 'Industrial Revolution' occurred in Britain between about 1750 and about 1820, and political revolutions that had the effect of overturning monarchical power occurred in the American colonies in 1776 and in France in 1789. These sociologists consider that the advent of mercantile capitalism is insufficient to meet the criterions of modernity. By and large, we can say that while modern societies began to emerge in Europe in the fifteenth century, modernity in the true sense could hardly be said to exist in any developed form until the idea of "the modern" was given a decisive formulation in the discourses of the Enlightenment in the eighteenth century.In the nineteenth century, modernity became identified with industrialism and the sweeping social, economic, and cultural changes associated with it. By the twentieth century, modernity became a progressively global phenomenon.

The analysis of modernity was the primary impetus for the development of social science in eighteenth and nineteenth-century Europe. *Peter Hamilton* in "The Enlightenment & the Birth of Social Science"[3] examines the explosion of intellectual energy in eighteenth century Western Europe which became known as "the Enlightenment". This movement gave definition to the very idea of 'modernity' and is often described as the original matrix of the modern social sciences. Ofcourse in one sense, the study of society was not new. Observations about social life had been going on since long. But the idea of 'the social' as a separate and distinct form of reality, which could be analyzed in entirely "this worldly", material terms and laid out for rational investigation and explanation, is a distinctly modern idea which only finally crystallized in the discourses of

---

[3] Hamilton, Peter, "The Enlightenment and the birth of Social Science" in Stuart Hall et al. (ed.) *Modernity: An introduction to modern societies*, Polity Press,1995.

the Enlightenment. The "birth of the social" as an object of knowledge made possible for the first time the systematic analysis and the practices of investigation we call "the social sciences". Enlightenment opened the prospect of an unending era of material progress and prosperity, the abolition of prejudice and superstition and the mastery of the forces of nature based on the expansion of human knowledge and understanding.

In the emergence of distinctively modern societies, two upheavals of the 18th century played an important role. One was political while the other was economic. The first helped provoke political revolutions in America and France. The social and political transformations which occurred in the American and French Revolutions of 1776 and 1789 appear to be intimately linked. They were widely represented as thresholds between traditional and modern society, symbolising the end of feudalism and absolutism and rise of the bourgeoisie as the dominant class in capitalist society, as well as major steps along the roads to both liberal democracy and totalitarianism. These revolutions estalished the political character of modern society as constitutional and democratic. Now it became clear that no political system could now claim legitimacy that was not in some sense based on "the will of the people". Crucial innovations of the modern state are territoriality, control of the means of violence, impersonal structure of power and legitimacy. The second, created an atmosphere conducive to technological innovations— one of the chief elements in the emergence of the Industrial Revolution in Great Britain. Although the transition from the absolutist to the modern state was marked by dramatic events and processes such as the English (1640-88) and French (1789) Revolutions, an exclusive focus on these hinders an understanding of the way in which the absolutist state itself was crucial in the development of modern political rule. It was the confluence of "internal" transformation in European states with shifting geopolitical relations and forces which provided a key impetus to the formation of the modern state.

Ideas of progress and enlightenment had already established themselves in the eighteenth century and had manifested themselves in the French Revolution of 1789 and the American Revolution of 1776. However, the Industrial Revolution set off an altogether more complex and impressive set of developments. Industrializing societies made rapid material progress. Their productive capacity increased massively, enriching new sections of the population, expanding capital and setting off a chain search of scientific and technological innovation. Nations that industrialized had the clear capacity to dominate and even colonize nations that were less industrialized, and the European nations established colonial empires that both further enriched them and further convinced them of their superiority. Moreover, the reorganization of production altered radically the fabric of everyday social life. It created population movements that disrupted established patterns of kinship and community. It caused people to separate their work life from their home life. It placed workers in authority systems that were based on rules and monetary coercion rather than long-standing relationships.

In the economic life there is an emergence of a distinct sphere, governed by new economic relations, and regulated and represented by new economic ideas. There is a gradual spread of commerce and trade, the expansion of markets, the new division of labour, and the growth of material wealth and consumption— starting in eighteenth century with British society consequent upon the rise of capitalism in Europe and the gradual transformation of the traditional economy. By the eighteenth century, however, laissez-faire and the market forces of the private economy were beginning to unleash the productive energies of the capitalist system. Engines of this development were the commercial and agrarian revolutions.

Robert Bocock in "Cultural Formations of Modern Society"[4] discusses three key cultural themes in the transition to modernity: 1st, the shift from a religious to a secular worldview, and from a "sacred" to a "profane" foundation for social and moral values, which characterizes the passage from traditional to modern society; 2nd, the role which religion played in the formation of the 'spirit of capitalism'; 3rd, the growing awareness among western philosophers and social theorists of the costs of modern culture— what Freud called "civilization's discontent" and Weber saw as the consequences of the increasing rationalization and disenchantment of the modern world.

One might raise questions about how Europe particularly the north-western part of the continent suddenly leapt to modernity. Northwestern Europe early in the 16th century was backward, technically and culturally. In the 16th and 17th centuries it was still absorbing the commercial and artistic innovations of the Italian city-states of the Renaissance. Yet it was here that the changes took place that propelled those particular societies into the forefront of world development. One reason for this could have been the Protestant Reformation of the 16th century here which valued frugality and hard work suited to the development of industrial capitalism. The Protestant work ethic has similarly been linked to the development of modern science. What was crucial was the rationalist culture and the scientific habits of mind that this culture nurtured. Moreover, the scientific method of observation, hypothesis, experimentation, and verification could be applied not only to nature but also to society. Eventually, toward the end of the 18th century, what would later be called social science— economics and sociology— began to find a place alongside natural science. Already, by the17th century, western Europe had embarked on the course of transoceanic exansion that was to become one of its most notable features in the succeeding centuries.

Modern societies are especially marked by their complexity. It offers a proliferation of consumer products and a variety of lifestyles. The hold of tradition has weakened in favour of individual choice and the individual is increasingly aware of the possibility of constructing new identities. Nevertheless, this greater cultural pluralism and individualism has been accompanied by a growth of organizations seeking greater regulation and surveillance of social life.

Modernity in the 20th century

What remains to be explained is the fact that what was modern about the twentieth century particularly? Twentieth century started against a backdrop of the first world war and in no time the world was caught up between the two great wars. In terms of class and gender relations, society that was divided on class lines in the industrial capitalist economy did not make much progress. Nevertheless it did bring forth the question of "rights". One of the defining stories of the 20th century was the struggle for women's emacipation and equality. The war saw an important change in the position of women in society. With men away at war, women were needed to work in a variety of jobs from farming to heavy engineering. Before the war, some women, the "suffragettes" had been carrying out a campaign of violence against the government to win the vote for women. It was in response to the suffragettes' contribution to the war effort that in 1918 won them the right to vote. Though the idea of universal adult franchise shall take many years more and voting by and large was restricted to women aged 30 while men voted at 21. Despite the fact that the legal framework of patriarchy was being dismantled, male control of

---

[4] Bocock, R., "Cultural Formations of Modern Society", in Stuart Hall et al (ed.) *Modernity: An introduction to Modern Societies.* Polity Press 1995.

the public sphere was nevertheless furthered by the rigidifying of the sexual division of labour. Politically speaking the period after 1945 saw the eventual culmination of major ideas of modernity and social formations underwent dramatic changes. That although patriarchy has been greatly eroded and the class structure further fragmented, class and gender hierarchies still exist can certainly not be negated.

It is the same mid decades of the twentieth century that ushered in the wave of anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism in major parts of the world. These drew primarily from the so called 'modern ideas' of earlier times transmitted from the West and the construction of a national community belonging to a particular nation-state starts taking shape even in the developing parts of the world.

Towards the end of twentieth century and even today in the first decade of 21st century, satellite images from space of planet Earth as a single place has reawakened intellectual interest in Enlightenment notions of a universal community of humankind. Further on as the last century developed, the growing internationalization of the industrial economy made nation-states increasingly subordinate to the world economic developments. This process led up to the formation of a 'global economy' which integrated different parts of the world into a single whole.

Quite obviously modernity has a dark side too. Demographically, it leads to crowding, pollution and environmental destruction. At the same time the competitive modern order that stimulates unreal expectations provides insufficient and unequal means for their realization. As according to *Krishan Kumar*, "Industrial work exacts a high price for the enormous increase in productivity brought about by the intensified division of labour."[5] This estranged him from his work because his task became fragmented, undemanding and meaningless.

Though most of what has already been said so far in the chapter acknowledges differences between different societies, the story is largely looked at from within Western Europe (the West) where such processes of formation first emerged. This makes the concept of modernity to some extent "eurocentric". However, this formation was also a 'global' process. The cultural and ideological dimensions of the West's expansion need to be taken into consideration. For if the Rest of the World was necessary for the political, economic, and social formation of the West, it was also essential to the West's formation both of its own sense of itself— a 'western identity'— and of western forms of knowledge. The formation of the modern state has to be related to at least two overarching phenomenon: the structures of political and social groups and classes, and the relations among states – "their position relative to each other, and their overall position in the world". Struggles among social collectivities at home and conflicts among states/nations abroad have had a dramatic impact on the nature, organization and dynamics of individual states/nations.

Whether the effects of forces that pushed a developing Western Europe to expand outwards into the "new world" have been socially progressive is debatable. Colonization and Imperialism have not promoted economic and social development in many societies, most of which remain profoundly under-developed. The destruction of indigenous cultural life by western culture is for most of them, a mixed blessing. And as the human, cultural, and ecological consequences of this form of 'western development' become more obvious, the question of whether there is only one path to modernity is being debated with increased urgency.

---

[5] Krishan Kumar, "Modernization and Industrialization" in Malcolm Waters (ed.) *Modernity: Critical Concepts Vol.1,* Routledge, 1999.