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MODULE 1

Cold War

The Cold War began because of a clash between two world superpowers, the United States of America and the USSR. These two countries were in a battle for superiority but this battle never once led to a 'hot' war as the United States and the USSR never actually fired at each other. The main reason there was such an initial clash between these superpowers is that each country had completely different ideologies. The USSR functioned in a Communist fashion and the United States operated with Capitalism. The Containment Policy came about because of these different ideologies and played a major role in the conflict between these two superpowers. Both of these countries were competing blow for blow and both of the countries strengthened their development in technology and weaponry with the space race and arms race. All of these events led to the development of a Cold War between these two powers because each country wanted to be the superior and there was no want to compromise. They were both so adamant to the fact that their side was greater than the other and this thought led to the start of the Cold War.

The primary reason that the Cold War began was the differing ideologies between the United States and the Soviet Union. The United States had a solid grasp on Capitalism and planned on other countries converting to the same economic policy that they were under. The United States' belief was that individuals should be paid based upon their own individual production while the Communists believed that everyone should be equal no matter what their output is. This differing in economic policies is the most important reason the Cold War got out of control and became such a concern. This can be attributed to Harry Truman’s ‘Containment Policy’. This policy, one of the most important policies in the United States' history, was the plan to keep Communism 'contained' in just the country of the Soviet Union. The United States has continued to carry out this policy for years and is still in effect to this date. In the short run, it succeeded in containing Communism from spreading out from the Soviet Union, as no other countries were influenced to embark on communism in their own given country.

With the development of new technology for both the United States and the USSR, the space race became much more important. The USSR needed to show more strength in their battle for superiority against the United States, and in October of 1957 they accomplished that by launching the Sputnik I satellite. This left the United States feeling inadequate compared to the Soviet Union. To combat this, the United States sent their own satellite into space a year later. In what ended up being a battle that the United States won in 1969, this was after the Cold War, when they put a man on the moon, until then it was an ongoing neck and neck race for superiority.
After the United States ended up winning the Cold War and the Soviet Union collapsed, the United States became the only world superpower and still is today. The United States became a much hated nation in the eyes of many countries because of this. Even though another superpower is building in the country of China, it seems that the world is turning away from the superpowers that it once had. Although the Soviet Union did collapse, it is still building and emerging as a decent country. The United States, on the other hand, has become without a doubt, the world’s most powerful and dominating country. Even with the economic crisis that the United States is in right now, it could be said that the United States will be the only superpower in existence for another decade; China is almost to the point of a superpower. The Cold War proved to be one of the most important issues in the recent history. The two largest superpowers of its time went into a war without fighting, yet only one country survived.

**International Politics in the Post Cold War Period**

In the '80s President Ronald Reagan of the US dubbed the Soviet Union as an ‘evil empire’ and predicted that it would be consigned to the ash heap of history. He announced a major weapons buildup and the SDI (Strategic Defense Initiative) also dubbed ‘Star Wars’. The Soviet Union was too economically enfeebled to reply in kind. In 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev became the leader of the Soviet Union. He adopted a conciliatory attitude towards the Americans and many arms reduction pacts were signed. In 1989 there was a Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan and in 1990 the Soviets agreed to the reunification of Germany. Movements against communist governments in Eastern Europe followed this. The Soviet Union collapsed in 1991 marking the end of the Cold War.

When the Cold War came to an end in 1989 with the dismantling of the Berlin Wall, when the countries of Eastern Europe regained independence, and when finally the Soviet Union disintegrated, there was widespread feeling throughout the world that at long last universal peace had descended on Earth. The fear of a war in which weapons of mass destruction would be used had vanished. The end of the Cold War in the early 1990s has had a dual impact on international relations. On the one hand, the Soviet military withdrawal from Eastern Europe and the Third World brought an end to the Cold War, allowed democratization to proceed in many states previously ruled by Marxist dictatorships, and led to significant progress in resolving several Third World conflicts that had become prolonged during the Cold War. The reduction in East-West tension also resulted in a great decrease in inter-state conflicts, some of which occurred due to the superpower ideological rivalry during the Cold War.

When the Cold War ended, the United States emerged as the only superpower and this involved great responsibilities as far as world peace was concerned. No other country was in a similar position to deal with dangers to world peace not only its own security. But even a superpower is not omnipotent; there are limits to its capacity to do its international duty. It cannot and should not go it alone, but ought to act as a leader in international action by persuasion as much as by pressure, if necessary. The Cold War had not put an end to the
proliferation of nuclear weapons and other means of mass destruction. But it had certainly slowed it down. This is no longer true today; there is not just the danger that a few more countries would achieve these weapons. The real threat is that the acquisition of these weapons by a few will generate a general rush to follow them, because their neighbors will feel exposed and threatened.

There have been few volunteers to act as world policemen—it is admittedly not an attractive job, unpaid, with little gratitude to be earned. Possibly, but scanning the world scene there is not much reason for excessive optimism. Russia has not yet accepted its new status in the world; there is resentment, not unnaturally, as the result of the loss of empire. There is a strong inclination to make all kind of outside factors responsible, and some are dreaming to restore the old power and glory. With the end of the Cold War, new centers of power have emerged, above all China and India. They have made spectacular economic progress, deemed almost unthinkable even a decade ago. But so far these countries have shown no desire to play a role in world politics commensurate with their economic strength. They are regional great powers and, in due time, will undoubtedly become more than that. But this could be many years off, and, in the meantime, they have shown no eagerness to shoulder responsibilities in keeping world order.

For a while, after the end of the Cold War, it appeared as if Europe could play such a role alongside, if not always in unison, with the United States. There were some observers of the political scene who claimed that the 21st century would be the century of Europe, mainly because the European model had been so attractive and would be copied by the rest of the world. This was the idea of Europe as a civilian and moral superpower. There is Africa, with its millions of victims in horrible civil wars, which the international community failed to prevent. Above all, there is the Middle East with its many tensions and terrorism, national and international. Terrorism is not a new phenomenon in the annals of mankind; it is as old as the hills. It has appeared in many forms and guises, nationalism-separatist, inspired by the extreme left and the radical right. But contemporary terrorism fueled by religious and nationalist fanaticism, operating in failed states, and sometimes instigated, financed, and manipulated by governments, is more dangerous than ever before. There have been and are many misconceptions about the origins of terrorism. It is often argued that poverty and oppression are the main causes.

In the 1990s war has taken on new and disturbing features. Though every war has different roots, most have several features in common. They are in the two-thirds world and the former USSR. They are waged with weapons that were designed and exported worldwide by the US, Russia, France, the UK, and China. They are fought over conflicts between groups within states, especially where states have been unable to meet all their peoples’ need for social and economic security. They last longer; they cause the collapse of states and the flight of millions of people to other countries. They kill few soldiers, but thousands of civilians. They destroy the delicate fabric of entire societies by turning whole
populations into victims who are maimed, orphaned or made "stateless" through sieges, ethnic cleansing, and the practice of atrocities, such as public rape, mutilation, and torture. They turn teenagers—and sometimes children—into soldiers and unemployed people into mercenaries, death, squads and warlord’s militia. The international system for controlling war and providing humanitarian assistance to refugees and victims was designed to help countries co-operate in putting war behind them. Though the ideal was often undermined, it has worked for many conflicts between states.

Throughout the period that the cold war lasted many wars were fought between the allies of the super powers. It could say that security situation that existed in the Global Community was very volatile. This could be partly because US and Russia all possessed Nuclear weapons which were capable of annihilating the entire world if they come to war. The United States armed forces were at their highest state of readiness ever and Soviet field commanders in Cuba were prepared to use battlefield nuclear weapons to defend the island if it was invaded by the Soviets. The security situation of the world is much stabilized now as compared to era during the cold war. However it would be a great mistake to say the world is much peaceful as compared to the cold war era. What happen during the cold war was an unrest situation between two super powers of the world and their allies. The conflict situation now is an intra-state conflict where countries are having internal wars. Most of these conflicts are in the African Region and the Middle East. But of course the invasion of Iraq by the US can also not be overlooked as a major security threat to the world. Though there are now more intra-state wars than there were during the cold War era, the security situation of those countries are just a small fraction to the overall security of the entire as compared to situation as existed during the Cold War era.

**Role of U.S.A in the New World Order**

A superpower is a state with a dominant position in the international system which has the ability to influence events and its own interests and project power on a worldwide scale to protect those interests. A superpower is traditionally considered to be a step higher than a great power. After the Cold War, only the United States appeared to fulfill the criteria to be considered a world superpower. The term "second superpower" has been applied by scholars to the possibility that the People's Republic of China could soon emerge as a superpower on par with the United States. Brazil, the European Union, and India are also thought to have the potential of achieving superpower status within the 21st century. For the first time in over half a century, no single great power, or coalition of powers, poses a "clear and present danger" to the national security of the United States. The end of the Cold War has left Americans in the fortunate position of being without an obvious major adversary. Given the costs of confronting adversaries who have been all too obvious since the beginning of World War II, that is a condition worthy of greater appreciation than it has so far received.
The end of the Cold War was too sweeping a defeat for totalitarianism—and too sweeping a victory for democracy—for this old geopolitical map to be of use any longer. But another form of competition has been emerging that could be just as stark and just as pervasive as was the rivalry between democracy and totalitarianism at the height of the Cold War: it is the contest between forces of integration and fragmentation in the contemporary international environment. The search for a new geopolitical cartography might well begin here. America still remains the most powerful country in the world, and its power and global leadership are critical for international security and prosperity. America's image is more positive today and American ideals are widely admired. But a systemic change is the rise of emerging powers, in particular China, India, Brazil and South Africa, which are enhancing their role in world affairs.

The world today faces a far more complex array of challenges than arguably any other time in recent history. And these challenges are more than any one country can face alone. How and with whom the United States pursues its goals is relatively more important now than in the past. America would need to engage both with this powerful group of new players and traditional powers to tackle global threats including nuclear proliferation, climate change, terrorism, infectious disease, mass atrocities and poverty. The United Nations is a unique instrument for international cooperation that can be used to address pressing global challenges. The U.S. can also use it to build coalitions and achieve its objectives in cooperation with allies and a wide range of other partners. Moreover, the world organization is an important vehicle for burden and cost sharing for the U.S., important considerations at a time of financial constraints.

American Intervention in Iraq

After decades of authoritarian rule under Saddam Hussein, Iraq was invaded in 2003 by a US-led 'coalition of the willing'. Ostensibly the invasion was initiated over the threat of Iraqi WMDs and Saddam's failure to cooperate with UN weapons inspectors, there are however many who question both the truth of this justification and the legality of the invasion as it occurred. Although the US-led coalition was reasonably successful in their initial aim of defeating the Baath party and the Iraqi army, the invasion triggered an insurgency that has caused continuing problems for the country.

There had been concerns over Iraq's possession, use and potential use of WMDs for some time before the 2003 invasion. The Iraqi government was accused of using chemical weapons against the Kurdish town of Halabjah in 1988, and in 1998 Iraq ended cooperation with the UN Special Commission to Oversee the Destruction of Iraqi Weapons of Mass Destruction (UNSCOM). This withdrawal of cooperation prompted 'Operation Desert Fox'; a US and UK bombing campaign to destroy Iraq's nuclear, chemical and biological weapons programme. This was followed in 1999 by a UN resolution to replace UNSCOM (with UNMOVIC), which was rejected by Iraq, and further US and UK bombings in 2001 to try to disable Iraq's air defense network. Public awareness of the issue
was raised after President George W Bush listed Iraq in his ‘axis of evil’. Repeated negotiations over Iraqi cooperation with UN weapons inspections teams were to follow before UNMOVIC were able to begin inspecting sites in November 2002. In March 2003 the US and Britain called on the Security Council to authorize military action against Iraq, but were met with stiff opposition from France, Russia, Germany and several Arab countries. Despite this, on 17 March President Bush gave Saddam and his sons 48 hours to leave Iraq or face war. Saddam did not comply and the invasion began on 19 March.

The invasion set off a Sunni-led insurgency that attacked the coalition forces and their supporters. The disbandment of the Iraqi army, leaving many men jobless, and the installation of a Shiite dominated government is considered to have contributed to the growth of this insurgency, and its sectarian nature. Shiite and Sunni militias began carrying out revenge attacks and many Iraqis fled their homes as neighborhoods became increasingly segregated. The insurgency has resulted in a polarization of ethnic identities that is even more complex than the Sunni-Shiite-Kurd distinctions that are normally recognized. The bombing of the Golden Mosque in Samara, one of the holiest Shiite sites, in mid-2006 is linked to an escalation in violence that particularly hit civilians. The US surge of the following year has been linked by some with a fall in levels of violence, although others question the accuracy and legitimacy of such claims. As well as the numerous ethnic and tribal divisions in Iraq, Al Qaeda is believed to retain a presence in the country through the Islamic State of Iraq organization.

As the US-led forces prepare to leave, power is gradually being passed over to the newly established and coalition trained Iraqi security forces, yet there are numerous obstacles ahead in the country’s path to reconstruction. These include the society’s deep divisions, problems of corruption and oil smuggling, and unanswered questions over the division of power. There are also problems relating to IDPs and refugees from Iraq; the IDMC estimates that around 2.8 million remain internally displaced, while a further 2 million are estimated to have found refuge outside the country. Estimates for the overall civilian death toll vary widely; between 100,000 and 1 million, and no official body has been set up to monitor this. Further hampering reconstruction efforts are the failure to produce a workable government after parliamentary elections in March 2010. No party won an overall majority, and it took until 11 November for the parties to agree a power-sharing government. However, there are concerns over how durable a solution it will prove to be. The reason for the U.S. invasion of Iraq - halting Saddam Hussein’s development of nuclear weapons - has been discredited. Another reason, the bringing democracy to Iraq as a prelude to democratizing and stabilizing the Middle East, has proved fruitless. The more likely objective was to subdue the Middle East nation that had the potential to become the focus of Middle East power.
American Intervention and Afghanistan

On October 7, 2001 the United States, supported by some NATO countries including the United Kingdom and Australia, as well as other allies, began an invasion of Afghanistan under Operation Enduring Freedom. The invasion was launched to capture Osama bin Laden, who was accused of the September 11, 2001 attacks. The US military forces did not capture him, though they toppled the Taliban government and disrupted bin Laden’s Al-Qaeda network. The Taliban government had given shelter to Bin Laden. On May 2, 2011, bin Laden was shot and killed by United States Armed Forces in Pakistan. The Taliban leadership survives in hiding in Afghanistan, largely in the southeast, and continues to launch terrorist attacks against forces of the United States, its allies, and the current government of President Hamid Karzai.

In 2006, the US forces turned over security of the country to NATO-deployed forces in the region, integrating 12,000 of their 20,000 soldiers with NATO’s 20,000. The remainder of the US forces continued to search for Al-Qaeda militants. The Canadian military assumed leadership and almost immediately began an offensive against areas where the Taliban guerrillas had encroached. At the cost of a few dozen of their own soldiers, the British, American, and Canadian Forces managed to kill over 1,000 alleged Taliban insurgents and sent thousands more into retreat. Many of the surviving insurgents, however, began to regroup and further clashes are expected by both NATO and Afghan National Army commanders.

Intending to destroy Al Qaeda, the U.S. attack on Afghanistan, which was supported by NATO, has only succeeded in displacing Al Qaeda and much of the Taliban to Pakistan. The principal accomplishment of the U.S. intervention has been to return Afghanistan to the immediate post-years of the Soviet defeat. The popularity of Hamid Karzai’s 2009 government is comparable to that of the 1992 Mohammad Najibullah government. While a corrupt national government maintains itself in Kabul, a reinvigorated Taliban rules portions of Afghanistan and tribal warlords rule other provinces of the nation. These tribal warlords wait to collect additional spoils and the Taliban waits to defeat the warlords and impose its ultra-extreme religious philosophy. Taking a page from the NLF in its Tet offensive, the Talban has demonstrated the scope of its presence by already managing to attack the center of Afghanistan government power in Kabul.

U.S. military presence has spawned a more hard-line Talban. Younger Taliban have allied themselves with foreign militants in the tribal areas who speak of a fundamentalist Islamic emirate that will encompass the Muslim world. Another consequence of the Bush administration’s intervention has been the widening of the conflict into Pakistan, already a highly troubled and unstable nuclear state. America is almost committed to withdraw its and NATO troops fighting in Afghanistan and possibly in Iraq before the end of 2010. American intervention to finish violent Talban had become necessary because the very Talban who were creation of USA with the assistance of Pakistan, to push out.
Russian Communists who had converted Afghanistan into a communist state. Withdrawal and expulsion of Russian troops was mainly due to courage and fighting capacity of dedicated Talibans. Thereafter Taliban turned to capture power in Afghanistan and push out the Americans, too. With a view to establish pro-American and Anti Communist government in Kabul American intervention got intensified. Talibans did not and could not tolerate that in place of Russian dominance there should be American dominance in Afghanistan.

Talibans not only resisted American and so called NATO troops, they started killing all those Afghans who were pro-American or had become power hungry to rule Afghanistan with American support and without Taliban participation or help. Thus besides thousands of US and NATO troops having been killed, lakhs of Afghans, many women and children, have perished in this fratricidal war of Talibans against their own Afghans, through suicide bombing and other war like attacks. Even when Americas war of intervention in Afghanistan was going on, George Bush, US President decided to intervene in Iraq on the plea that Iraq was preparing nuclear weapons. Though this view of George Bush had no validity, even the UN sponsored team that was sent to Iraq did not support this view of George Bush. Yet George Bush in 2003 sent American Army to Iraq to destroy their military and nuclear capability. As a result in 2003 USA sent its troops to finish Iraqi President Sadan and establish a pro American Government in Baghdad. America succeeded in their aim but the war in Iraq has continued for seven years.

Consequences of both the interventions of USA under the aegis of NATO, earlier in Afghanistan and in 2003 in Iraq, seem to have been utter failures in achieving American purpose of establishing with American help so called democratic governments. Both the attempts have failed and so USA is facing imminent failure. The above review points out that though, as a last resort Americans are trying to integrate with Karzai Government in Kabul the so called, comparatively non-combatant Talibans. This policy of dividing Talibans is likely to meet with failure. Thus American intervention in both Afghanistan and Iraq faces imminent failure. Thus in Afghanistan America’s hope of dividing Talibans and getting a section integrated in Karzai’s government in Kabul has been falsified. In Iraq, too, there is no hope of America succeeding and firmly establishing pro-American democratic government in view of almost daily suicide bombing. Latest being in Karbla where a woman suicide bomber killed more than 50 and injured more than 150. Thus failure of American intervention both in Afghanistan and Iraq seems imminent.

Emerging Role of India in the Changed Global Scenario

Almost all recent discussions about international security or economics have focused on the rise of China and India as the future agents of change in Asia. This is largely because economic expansion is rapidly translating into military power and the ability to shape events. As a representative of successful democracy in the third world, India should be in the forefront of promoting political rights, freedom, and justice. It is in this context that democratic India, Asia’s “second country,” the seat of a great world civilization, and growth rates to
match those of China. We might look at India’s soft power asset – liberal democracy – in at least two ways: as a model or an example of a viable federal, liberal, secular democracy and as a promoter of international democracy. India’s political path proves that a liberal democracy is possible in a tradition-bound, multi-ethnic, and poor society can be a solution to the problem of modernization and growth. The second perspective is to see India’s democratic identity as a stepping stone to international alliances and collective diplomatic engagement. A cluster of democracies can come together to create a common formula to exclude the politically incorrect, impose sanctions, or to deny recognition. A democratic coalition will not only enable its sponsors to capture the moral high ground and shape international discourse but also bring collective power to bear on recalcitrant regimes. India’s liberal, democratic, and market-oriented economy offers an alternative to the hard authoritarian growth model of East Asia. Furthermore, India’s democratic path is arguably more relevant to the developing countries of Asia, Africa, and Middle East than the European road to modernization and democracy. India has developed a unique formula to balance individual and group rights, devolve federal power down to the village-level (Panchayati Raj), and use its multiparty system as a grand bargain to reconcile differences over identities, interests, and office. In this sense, India’s democratic experiment is one of the greatest political experiments of our time.

One might argue that the policy of nonalignment pursued in the early years after there is considerable pressure from the Bush administration for India to redefine its ties with Iran. Some in India argue that such a sacrifice is worth the returns from strategic support from the United States. Beyond containing China and Pakistan, the United States is important to the development of India’s economy and military. Since 2001, India has opted for strategic. The “Look East” policy suggests that New Delhi is actively globalizing its diplomatic leverage and deploying military power to buttress diplomacy. India is Asia’s third largest economy after Japan and China and has entered into numerous free trade agreements with East Asian economies, including a comprehensive economic cooperation agreement with Singapore and an early harvest scheme with Thailand. It is also negotiating similar agreements with Japan, South Korea, and ASEAN. In turn, Japan, South Korea, and Singapore have invested large amounts of funds into India's infrastructure development. Democracy and respect for basic human rights as well as strategic interests.

Asia’s political alignments are in flux, but at least three broad security futures can be envisaged. Democratic India can play an important part in each future although each will engage India differently and to a different degree. The first is a region divided along an opposite axis, a kind of Asian bipolar order in which the United States and China constitute the opposing poles. As an authoritarian state, China could not become a core country in the proposed order for Asia. India’s preferred grand narrative is then distinctly different from the one China might construct. Indian leaders remain anxious not to get ahead of the current developments in this regard; they are keenly aware nevertheless of the advantages in establishing a loose alliance of democracies. What is more, their
ability to back it up has expanded substantially with the rapid growth in India’s economic and military power.

**Emerging Role of China in the Changed Global Scenario**

China as the 21st century’s indispensable power with a decisive say on the future of the global economy, climate change and world trade. It is predicted that over the next few decades China would become one of the two powers that count, along with the US, and Europe could emerge as a third only if it learned to speak with one voice. A pivotal moment in China’s rise came at the G20 summit last month in London. Hu Jintao, China’s president, arrived as the head of the only major power still enjoying strong growth (expected to be 8% this year), backed by substantial financial reserves. The G20 was a very significant coming of economic age in an international forum for China. If you looked around the 20 people sitting at the table ... what was striking was that when China spoke everybody listened. China’s indispensability in part comes from size, but a second part is that it wants to play a role. China’s economic stimulus package (equivalent to 16% of its GDP over two years) is widely seen as among the world’s best hopes for a recovery.

Historians will look back at 2009 and see that China played an incredibly important role in stabilizing global capitalism. That is very significant and sort of ironic. There’s a joke that goes: ‘After 1989, capitalism saved China. After 2009, China saved capitalism.’ Signals from Beijing since the London summit that it is considering tough concerted action to reduce CO₂ emissions, have raised hopes of reaching a workable international pact to contain climate change. China’s potential role in the coming years compared to the role the US claimed for itself in the 20th century, recalling a 1998 boast by Madeleine Albright, then US secretary of state.

China is becoming an indispensable power in the 21st century. It has become an indispensable power economically, and China will become an indispensable power across a wider range of issues. But in contrast to America’s 20th-century ascent, which eclipsed Britain, China would not displace the US but rather join it at "the new top table", and because of its low per capita income, it would not rival the US as the world’s leading superpower for at least a generation. At the G20 summit, some commentators argued that the most important axis was a "G2" of the US and China. Whether that could be expanded to a "G3", would be up to Europe. There is a scenario where America and China are the powers that count. A report by the European Council on Foreign Relations argued that China was exploiting the EU’s divisions and treating it with "diplomatic contempt". The report, published in advance of Wednesday's EU-China summit in Prague, said that European states, dealing with China individually, lacked leverage on issues such as trade, human rights and Tibet. Europe has not been sufficiently strategic in its relationship with China, a significant part of that is institutional. The EU-China relationship is a good case for the Lisbon treaty. At the moment, at every EU-China summit, the EU side is led by a different presidency and every year there’s a different set of priorities.
China is undoubtedly unique and abounds both with substantial opportunities and with significant challenges. Its rapid rate of GDP growth and the boom in exports and international reserves are without precedent. The latter phenomenon of course is a joint product: not only is it unprecedented for an emerging market to be such a large creditor, but it is equally unique for a reserve currency country to be such a large debtor. Still, the reserve buildup is at least in part a testimony to China’s competitiveness and of course to its massive savings rate. Moreover, by joining the WTO and welcoming capital inflows, it is signaling a desire to open its economy to international influences and, in turn, to influence international developments.
MODULE II

Role of Non-State actors in contemporary International Politics

Non-state actors are categorized as entities that (i) participating or acting in the sphere of international relations; organizations with sufficient power to influence and cause change in politics which are (ii) not belonging to or existing as a state-structure or established institution of a state; are not holding the characteristics of this, these being legal sovereignty and some measure of control over a countries people and territories.

Types of non-state actors

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs)

These groups are typically considered a part of civil society.

Multinational Corporations (MNCs; also known as Transnational Corporations

The International Media

Violent non-state actors

Armed groups, including groups such as Al-Qaeda

Criminal organizations.

Religious Groups

Transnational diaspora communities

Most types of non-state actors would be considered part of civil society, though some function within the international market (e.g. MNCs and organized crime). The proliferation of non-state actors in the post–Cold War era has been one of the factors leading to the theorizing of the Cobweb Paradigm in International Politics. Under this paradigm, the traditional Westphalian nation-state is experiencing an erosion of power and sovereignty, and non-state actors are part of the cause. Facilitated by globalization, non-state actors have challenged nation-state borders and claims to sovereignty. MNCs are not always sympathetic to the home country’s or host country’s national interests, but instead loyalty is given to the corporation’s interests. NGOs are challenging the nation-state’s sovereignty over internal matters through advocacy for societal issues, e.g. human rights and the environment.

There exist many armed non-state actors, e.g. opposition groups, that operate without state control and are involved in trans-border conflicts. The prevalence of these groups in armed conflicts has added layers of complexity to traditional conflict management and resolution. These conflicts are often fought not only between non-state actors and states, but also between non-state actors.
Any attempts at intervention in such conflicts has been particularly challenging given the fact that international law and norms governing the use of force for intervention or peacekeeping purposes has been primarily written in the context of the nation-state. So, the demands of non-state actors at the local and international level have further complicated international relations. Non-state actors have increasingly become vital for opinion building in international forum and actively participate in a number of multilateral processes, such as the Human Rights Council. International Organizations also rely on non-state actors, particularly NGOs in the form of implementing partners in the national context.

For the most part of the discipline’s history, international relations scholars have disregarded non-state actors like businesses, civic groups, transnational terrorist organizations and so on, since they appeared to stand on the border lines of world politics. They persisted, but their size, power and activities made them third-rate factors in making an analysis of world relations. Most scholars have seen states as the primary actors and, therefore, the sole legitimate object of study because state action – mainly in the form of military, diplomatic and policy activity – shaped the maps of international collective life to a large extent. This disregard for non-state actors began to change towards the end of the last century. In the beginning, scholars demonstrated that non-state actors, even though still lie within the shadow of states, remarkably control the behaviour of state. They started to view non-state actors as transnational pressure groups that porch or else try to control government officials. As time passed, it became clear that non-state entities were not merely outgrowths to the state-system, but they had their individual political life.

Transnational businesses, especially multinational corporations, change the economic scenario of world relations. Public minded non-governmental organizations not only porch government officials in different countries, but function to transfer vast cultural understandings concerning human rights, environmental protection and international peace. Humanitarian relief organizations go through action on the ground to feed, clothe, shelter and provide medical aid to those in times of need. Global media outlets form and broadly disseminate new understandings of world relations. Terrorist networks instill fright and change political calculations in different parts of the world. Apart from being at the borders of political life, non-state actors seem to be key players.

The mount of non-state actors such as multinational corporations is fraction of a wider prototype mainly in terms of the growth of complex interdependencies in the international scheme. Many transnational interactions are not under the control of states, but will yet be affected by decisions taken by states. On the other hand, the state in its turn will be affected by the activities of other actors as well as by the complex network of transnational interactions that has become an increasingly vital constituent in international relations. The crash of transnational support networks could well be outweighed by the blow of subterranean networks which challenge global norms, undermine global governance and look for to counterbalance instead of mobilizing the power of states. Appreciation of the significance of non-state actors rapidly gave way to
love. International relations scholars began to view certain non-state actors as promising agents of progressive social change. Scholars gave hope in these organizations and saw them as harbingers of a just, peaceful, economically viable and environmentally sane world. In fact, many scholars viewed non-state actors, on the whole, as boosting a nascent global democracy wherein transnational civil society would provide a non-state form of global representation.

**Role of Regional Organizations in contemporary International Politics**

Regional Organizations are in a sense, international organizations (IOs), as they incorporate international membership and encompass geopolitical entities that operationally transcend a single nation state. However, their membership is characterized by boundaries and demarcations characteristic to a defined and unique geography, such as continents, or geopolitics, such as economic blocks. They have been established to foster cooperation and political and economic integration or dialogue amongst states or entities within a restrictive geographical or geopolitical boundary. They both reflect common patterns of development and history that have been fostered since the end of World War II as well as the fragmentation inherent in globalization. Most of them tend to work alongside well-established multilateral organizations such as the United Nations. While in many instances a regional organizations are simply referred as international organizations, in many other it makes sense to use the ROs term to stress the more limited scope of a particular membership. Examples of ROs include the African Union (AU), European Union (EU), the Organization of American States (OAS), the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the Arab League, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC).

The past five years have witnessed a resurgence of regionalism in world politics. Old regionalist organizations have been revived, new organizations formed, and regionalism and the call for strengthened regionalist arrangements have been central to many of the debates about the nature of the post-Cold War international order. Leading specialists take a critical look at recent trends towards the new regionalism and regionalization, assessing their origins, their present and future prospects, and their place in the evolving international order. The past five years have witnessed a resurgence of regionalism in world politics and an increasingly important role for regional institutions.

The growing interdependence among nation-states has made regional organizations prominent in international relations today. They foster dialogue in various economic, political and social issues. Their activities, including inter-regional initiatives, are seen as complementary and supportive of the United Nations (UN) and other global initiatives. Moreover, cooperation and dialogue at the inter-regional level (i.e. relations between and among regions) as a level between the multilateral (e.g. the United Nations [UN]) and the regional levels (e.g. the European Union [EU], the African Union [AU], the Association of Southeast Asian Nations [ASEAN] and the Pacific Islands Forum [PIF]) in the conduct of international relations have also come to the fore. Perhaps the most
poignant examples of these are the relations of the EU with other regions, such as the AU, the League of Arab States (LAS), the Organization of American States (OAS) and the South Asian Association of Regional Co-operation (SAARC).

**Multinational Corporations**

As the name suggests, any company is referred to as a multinational company or corporation when that company manages its operation or production or service delivery from more than one single country. It can also be referred to as an international corporation. They play an important role in globalization. As defined by I. L. O. or the International Labor Organization, a M. N. C. is one, which has its operational headquarters based in one country with several other operating branches in different other countries. The country where the head quarter is located is called the home country whereas, the other countries with operational branches are called the host countries. Apart from playing an important role in globalization and international relations, these multinational companies even have notable influence in a country's economy as well as the world economy. The budget of some of the M. N. C.s are so high that at times they even exceed the G. D. P. (Gross Domestic Product) of a nation.

Corporations may make a foreign direct investment. Foreign direct investment is direct investment into one country by a company in production located in another country either by buying a company in the country or by expanding operations of an existing business in the country. A subsidiary or daughter company is a company that is completely or partly owned and wholly controlled by another company that owns more than half of the subsidiary's stock. A corporation may choose to locate in a special economic zone, which is a geographical region that has economic and other laws that are more free-market-oriented than a country's typical or national laws. Multinational corporations need to deal with different cultures of their employees, partners, suppliers and customers.

Multinational corporations are important factors in the processes of globalization. National and local governments often compete against one another to attract MNC facilities, with the expectation of increased tax revenue, employment, and economic activity. To compete, political entities may offer MNCs incentives such as tax breaks, pledges of governmental assistance or subsidized infrastructure, or lax environmental and labor regulations. These ways of attracting foreign investment may be criticized as a race to the bottom, a push towards greater autonomy for corporations, or both. MNCs play an important role in developing the economies of developing countries like investing in these countries provide market to the MNC but provide employment, choice of multi goods etc.

On the other hand, economist Jagdish Bhagwati has argued that in countries with comparatively low labor costs and weak environmental and social protection, multinationals actually bring about a 'race to the top.' While multinationals will certainly see a low tax burden or low labor costs as an element of comparative advantage, Bhagwati disputes the existence of evidence suggesting that MNCs deliberately avail themselves of lax environmental
regulation or poor labor standards. As Bhagwati has pointed out, MNC profits are tied to operational efficiency, which includes a high degree of standardisation. Thus, MNCs are likely to adapt production processes in many of their operations to conform to the standards of the most rigorous jurisdiction in which they operate (this tends to be either the USA, Japan, or the EU). As for labor costs, while MNCs clearly pay workers in developing countries far below levels in countries where labor productivity is high (and accordingly, will adopt more labor-intensive production processes), they also tend to pay a premium over local labor rates of 10 to 100 percent.

Finally, depending on the nature of the MNC, investment in any country reflects a desire for a medium- to long-term return, as establishing plant, training workers, etc., can be costly. Once established in a jurisdiction, therefore, MNCs are potentially vulnerable to arbitrary government intervention such as expropriation, sudden contract renegotiation, the arbitrary withdrawal or compulsory purchase of licenses, etc. Thus, both the negotiating power of MNCs and the ‘race to the bottom’ critique may be overstated, while understating the benefits (besides tax revenue) of MNCs becoming established in a jurisdiction. Anti-corporate advocates criticize multinational corporations for entering countries that have low human rights or environmental standards. Multinationals give rise to huge merged conglomerations that reduce competition and free enterprise, raise capital in host countries but export the profits, exploit countries for their natural resources, limit workers' wages, erode traditional cultures, and challenge national sovereignty.

Transnational Corporations

A Transnational Corporation (TNC) differs from a traditional MNC in that it does not identify itself with one national home. Whilst traditional MNCs are national companies with foreign subsidiaries, TNCs spread out their operations in many countries sustaining high levels of local responsiveness. An example of a TNC is Nestlé who employ senior executives from many countries and try to make decisions from a global perspective rather than from one centralised headquarters. However, the terms TNC and MNC are often used interchangeably.

World Trade Organization

The World Trade Organization (WTO) is an organization that intends to supervise and liberalize international trade. The organization officially commenced on January 1, 1995 under the Marrakech Agreement, replacing the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which commenced in 1948. The organization deals with regulation of trade between participating countries; it provides a framework for negotiating and formalizing trade agreements, and a dispute resolution process aimed at enforcing participants’ adherence to WTO agreements which are signed by representatives of member governments and ratified by their parliaments. Most of the issues that the WTO focuses on derive from previous trade negotiations, especially from the Uruguay Round (1986–1994).
The WTO’s predecessor, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), was established after World War II in the wake of other new multilateral institutions dedicated to international economic cooperation — notably the Bretton Woods institutions known as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. A comparable international institution for trade, named the International Trade Organization was successfully negotiated. The ITO was to be a United Nations specialized agency and would address not only trade barriers but other issues indirectly related to trade, including employment, investment, restrictive business practices, and commodity agreements. But the ITO treaty was not approved by the U.S. and a few other signatories and never went into effect.

In the absence of an international organization for trade, the GATT would over the years "transform itself" into a de facto international organization. Among the various functions of the WTO, these are regarded by analysts as the most important:

- It oversees the implementation, administration and operation of the covered agreements.
- It provides a forum for negotiations and for settling disputes.

Additionally, it is the WTO’s duty to review and propagate the national trade policies, and to ensure the coherence and transparency of trade policies through surveillance in global economic policy-making. Another priority of the WTO is the assistance of developing, least-developed and low-income countries in transition to adjust to WTO rules and disciplines through technical cooperation and training. The WTO is also a center of economic research and analysis: regular assessments of the global trade picture in its annual publications and research reports on specific topics are produced by the organization. Finally, the WTO cooperates closely with the two other components of the Bretton Woods system, the IMF and the World Bank.

The WTO has 155 members and 29 observer governments (including the Russian Federation). In addition to states, the European Union is a member. WTO members do not have to be full sovereign nation-members. Instead, they must be a customs territory with full autonomy in the conduct of their external commercial relations. Thus Hong Kong (as "Hong Kong, China" since 1997) became a GATT contracting party, and the Republic of China (Taiwan) acceded to the WTO in 2002 as "Separate Customs Territory of Taiwan, Penghu, Kinmen and Matsu" (Chinese Taipei) despite its disputed status. The WTO Secretariat omits the official titles (such as Counselor, First Secretary, Second Secretary and Third Secretary) of the members of Chinese Taipei’s Permanent Mission to the WTO, except for the titles of the Permanent Representative and the Deputy Permanent Representative.

The WTO was born out of negotiations, and everything the WTO does is the result of negotiations. The bulk of the WTO’s current work comes from the 1986–
94 negotiations called the Uruguay Round and earlier negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). The WTO is currently the host to new negotiations, under the ‘Doha Development Agenda’ launched in 2001.

The WTO provides a forum for negotiating agreements aimed at reducing obstacles to international trade and ensuring a level playing field for all, thus contributing to economic growth and development. The WTO also provides a legal and institutional framework for the implementation and monitoring of these agreements, as well as for settling disputes arising from their interpretation and application. Over the past 60 years, the WTO, which was established in 1995, and its predecessor organization the GATT have helped to create a strong and prosperous international trading system, thereby contributing to unprecedented global economic growth. WTO activities are supported by a Secretariat of some 700 staff, led by the WTO Director-General. The Secretariat is located in Geneva, Switzerland, and has an annual budget of approximately CHF 200 million ($180 million, €130 million). The three official languages of the WTO are English, French and Spanish.

Decisions in the WTO are generally taken by consensus of the entire membership. The highest institutional body is the Ministerial Conference, which meets roughly every two years. A General Council conducts the organization's business in the intervals between Ministerial Conferences. Both of these bodies comprise all members. Specialised subsidiary bodies (Councils, Committees, Sub-committees), also comprising all members, administer and monitor the implementation by members of the various WTO agreements.

More specifically, the WTO's main activities are

- negotiating the reduction or elimination of obstacles to trade (import tariffs, other barriers to trade) and agreeing on rules governing the conduct of international trade (e.g. antidumping, subsidies, product standards, etc.)

- administering and monitoring the application of the WTO's agreed rules for trade in goods, trade in services, and trade-related intellectual property rights

- monitoring and reviewing the trade policies of our members, as well as ensuring transparency of regional and bilateral trade agreements

- settling disputes among our members regarding the interpretation and application of the agreements.

- building capacity of developing country government officials in international trade matters

- assisting the process of accession of some 30 countries who are not yet members of the organization
• conducting economic research and collecting and disseminating trade data in support of the WTO’s other main activities

• explaining to and educating the public about the WTO, its mission and its activities.

The WTO's founding and guiding principles remain the pursuit of open borders, the guarantee of mostfavoured-nation principle and non-discriminatory treatment by and among members, and a commitment to transparency in the conduct of its activities. The opening of national markets to international trade, with justifiable exceptions or with adequate flexibilities, will encourage and contribute to sustainable development, raise people's welfare, reduce poverty, and foster peace and stability. At the same time, such market opening must be accompanied by sound domestic and international policies that contribute to economic growth and development according to each member's needs and aspirations.

Regional Organisations (ROs)

Regional Organisations are international organizations, as they incorporate international membership and encompass geopolitical entities that operationally transcend a single nation state. However, their membership is characterized by boundaries and demarcations characteristic to a defined and unique geography, such as continents, or geopolitics, such as economic blocks. They have been established to foster cooperation and political and economic integration or dialogue amongst states or entities within a restrictive geographical or geopolitical boundary. They both reflect common patterns of development and history that have been fostered since the end of World War II as well as the fragmentation inherent in globalization. Most regional organizations tend to work alongside well-established multilateral organizations such as the United Nations. While in many instances a regional organizations are simply referred as international organizations, in many other it makes sense to use the ROs term to stress the more limited scope of a particular membership.

Examples include the African Union (AU), European Union (EU), the Organization of American States (OAS), the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the Arab League, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC).

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations

The Association of Southeast Asian Nations, or ASEAN, was established on 8 August 1967 in Bangkok, Thailand, with the signing of the ASEAN Declaration (Bangkok Declaration) by the Founding Fathers of ASEAN, namely Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand. Brunei Darussalam then joined on 7 January 1984, Viet Nam on 28 July 1995, Lao PDR and Myanmar on 23 July 1997, and Cambodia on 30 April 1999, making up what is today the ten Member States of ASEAN.
ASEAN was preceded by an organisation called the Association of Southeast Asia, commonly called ASA, an alliance consisting of the Philippines, Malaysia and Thailand that was formed in 1961. The bloc itself, however, was established on 8 August 1967, when foreign ministers of five countries – Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand – met at the Thai Department of Foreign Affairs building in Bangkok and signed the ASEAN Declaration, more commonly known as the Bangkok Declaration. The five foreign ministers – Adam Malik of Indonesia, Narciso Ramos of the Philippines, Abdul Razak of Malaysia, S. Rajaratnam of Singapore, and Thanat Khoman of Thailand – are considered the organization’s Founding Fathers. The motivations for the birth of ASEAN were so that its members’ governing elite could concentrate on nation building, the common fear of communism, reduced faith in or mistrust of external powers in the 1960s, and a desire for economic development; not to mention Indonesia’s ambition to become a regional hegemon through regional cooperation and the hope on the part of Malaysia and Singapore to constrain Indonesia and bring it into a more cooperative framework.

Papua New Guinea was accorded Observer status in 1976 and Special Observer status in 1981. Papua New Guinea is a Melanesian state. ASEAN embarked on a program of economic cooperation following the Bali Summit of 1976. This floundered in the mid-1980s and was only revived around 1991 due to a Thai proposal for a regional free trade area. The bloc grew when Brunei Darussalam became the sixth member on 8 January 1984, barely a week after gaining independence on 1 January.

**Aims and Purposes**

As set out in the ASEAN Declaration, the aims and purposes of ASEAN are:

1. To accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region through joint endeavors in the spirit of equality and partnership in order to strengthen the foundation for a prosperous and peaceful community of Southeast Asian Nations;

2. To promote regional peace and stability through abiding respect for justice and the rule of law in the relationship among countries of the region and adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter;

3. To promote active collaboration and mutual assistance on matters of common interest in the economic, social, cultural, technical, scientific and administrative fields;

4. To provide assistance to each other in the form of training and research facilities in the educational, professional, technical and administrative spheres;

5. To collaborate more effectively for the greater utilization of their agriculture and industries, the expansion of their trade, including the study of the problems of international commodity trade, the improvement of their
transportation and communications facilities and the raising of the living
standards of their peoples;

6. To promote Southeast Asian studies; and

7. To maintain close and beneficial cooperation with existing international and
regional organizations with similar aims and purposes, and explore all
avenues for even closer cooperation among themselves.

**Fundamental Principles**

In their relations with one another, the ASEAN Member States have
adopted the following fundamental principles, as contained in the Treaty of Amity
and Cooperation in Southeast Asia (TAC) of 1976:

1. Mutual respect for the independence, sovereignty, equality, territorial
   integrity, and national identity of all nations;

2. The right of every State to lead its national existence free from external
   interference, subversion or coercion;

3. Non-interference in the internal affairs of one another;

4. Settlement of differences or disputes by peaceful manner;

5. Renunciation of the threat or use of force; and

6. Effective cooperation among themselves.

**ASEAN Community**

The ASEAN Vision 2020, adopted by the ASEAN Leaders on the 30th
Anniversary of ASEAN, agreed on a shared vision of ASEAN as a concert of
Southeast Asian nations, outward looking, living in peace, stability and
prosperity, bonded together in partnership in dynamic development and in a
community of caring societies. At the 9th ASEAN Summit in 2003, the ASEAN
Leaders resolved that an ASEAN Community shall be established. At the 12th
ASEAN Summit in January 2007, the Leaders affirmed their strong commitment
to accelerate the establishment of an ASEAN Community by 2015 and signed the
Cebu Declaration on the Acceleration of the Establishment of an ASEAN
Community by 2015. The ASEAN Community is comprised of three pillars,
namely the ASEAN Political-Security Community, ASEAN Economic Community
and ASEAN Socio-Cultural Community. Each pillar has its own Blueprint, and,
together with the Initiative for ASEAN Integration (IAI) Strategic Framework and
IAI Work Plan Phase II (2009-2015), they form the Roadmap for and ASEAN
Community 2009-2015.
ASEAN Charter

The ASEAN Charter serves as a firm foundation in achieving the ASEAN Community by providing legal status and institutional framework for ASEAN. It also codifies ASEAN norms, rules and values; sets clear targets for ASEAN; and presents accountability and compliance. The ASEAN Charter entered into force on 15 December 2008. A gathering of the ASEAN Foreign Ministers was held at the ASEAN Secretariat in Jakarta to mark this very historic occasion for ASEAN. With the entry into force of the ASEAN Charter, ASEAN will henceforth operate under a new legal framework and establish a number of new organs to boost its community-building process. In effect, the ASEAN Charter has become a legally binding agreement among the 10 ASEAN Member States.

The European Union (EU)

The European Union (EU) is an economic and political entity and confederation of 27 member states which are located primarily in Europe. The EU traces its origins from the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the European Economic Community (EEC), formed by six countries in 1951 and 1958 respectively. In the intervening years the EU has grown in size by the accession of new member states and in power by the addition of policy areas to its remit. The Maastricht Treaty established the European Union under its current name in 1993. The EU operates through a system of supranational independent institutions and intergovernmental negotiated decisions by the member states. Important institutions of the EU include the European Commission, the Council of the European Union, the European Council, the Court of Justice of the European Union, and the European Central Bank. The European Parliament is elected every five years by EU citizens.

The EU has developed a single market through a standardised system of laws which apply in all member states. Within the Schengen Area (which includes 22 EU and 4 non-EU states) passport controls have been abolished. EU policies aim to ensure the free movement of people, goods, services, and capital, enact legislation in justice and home affairs, and maintain common policies on trade, agriculture, fisheries and regional development. A monetary union, the eurozone, was established in 1999 and is composed of 17 member states. Through the Common Foreign and Security Policy the EU has developed a limited role in external relations and defence. Permanent diplomatic missions have been established around the world. The EU is represented at the United Nations, the WTO, the G8, and the G-20.

With a combined population of over 500 million inhabitants, or 7.3% of the world population, the EU, in 2011, generated a nominal gross domestic product (GDP) of 17.6 trillion US dollars, representing approximately 20% of the global GDP when measured in terms of purchasing power parity. After World War II, moves towards European integration were seen by many as an escape from the extreme forms of nationalism that had devastated the continent. One such
attempt to unite Europeans was the European Coal and Steel Community, which was declared to be "a first step in the federation of Europe", starting with the aim of eliminating the possibility of further wars between its member states by means of pooling the national heavy industries.

In 1990, after the fall of the Iron Curtain, the former East Germany became part of the Community as part of a newly united Germany. With enlargement towards European formerly communist countries as well as Cyprus and Malta on the agenda, the Copenhagen criteria for candidate members to join the European Union were agreed. The introduction of the Euro in 2002 replaced several national currencies. In 2002, euro notes and coins replaced national currencies in 12 of the member states. Since then, the eurozone has increased to encompass 17 countries. In 2004, the EU saw its biggest enlargement to date when Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Slovakia and Slovenia joined the Union. On 1 January 2007, Romania and Bulgaria became the EU's members. In the same year Slovenia adopted the euro, followed in 2008 by Cyprus and Malta, by Slovakia in 2009 and by Estonia in 2011. In June 2009, the 2009 Parliament elections were held leading to a renewal of Barroso’s Commission Presidency, and in July 2009 Iceland formally applied for EU membership.

On 1 December 2009, the Lisbon Treaty entered into force and reformed many aspects of the EU. In particular it changed the legal structure of the European Union, merging the EU three pillars system into a single legal entity provisioned with legal personality, and it created a permanent President of the European Council, the first of which is Herman Van Rompuy, and a strengthened High Representative, Catherine Ashton. On 9 December 2011, Croatia signed the EU accession treaty. The EU accession referendum was held in Croatia on 22 January 2012, with the majority voting for Croatia's accession to the European Union making it the 28th member state as of July 2013.

**Member States**

The European Union is composed of 27 sovereign member states: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, the Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom. The Union’s membership has grown from the original six founding states—Belgium, France, (then-West) Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands—to the present-day 27 by successive enlargements as countries acceded to the treaties and by doing so, pooled their sovereignty in exchange for representation in the institutions.

To join the EU a country must meet the Copenhagen criteria, defined at the 1993 Copenhagen European Council. These require a stable democracy that respects human rights and the rule of law; a functioning market economy capable of competition within the EU; and the acceptance of the obligations of membership, including EU law. Evaluation of a country’s fulfilment of the criteria
is the responsibility of the European Council. No member state has ever left the Union, although Greenland (an autonomous province of Denmark) withdrew in 1985. The Lisbon Treaty now provides a clause dealing with how a member leaves the EU. Croatia is expected to become the 28th member state of the EU on 1 July 2013 after a referendum on EU membership was approved by Croatian voters on 22 January 2012. The Croatian accession treaty still has to be ratified by all current EU member states.

There are five candidate countries: Iceland, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey. Albania and Bosnia and Herzegovina are officially recognised as potential candidates. Kosovo is also listed as a potential candidate but the European Commission does not list it as an independent country because not all member states recognise it as an independent country separate from Serbia. Four countries forming the EFTA (that are not EU members) have partly committed to the EU’s economy and regulations: Iceland (a candidate country for EU membership), Liechtenstein and Norway, which are a part of the single market through the European Economic Area, and Switzerland, which has similar ties through bilateral treaties. The relationships of the European microstates, Andorra, Monaco, San Marino and the Vatican include the use of the euro and other areas of cooperation.

The EU operates solely within those competencies conferred on it upon the treaties and according to the principle of subsidiarity (which dictates that action by the EU should only be taken where an objective cannot be sufficiently achieved by the member states alone). Laws made by the EU institutions are passed in a variety of forms. Generally speaking they can be classified into two groups: those which come into force without the necessity for national implementation measures, and those which specifically require national implementation measures.

**Governance**

The European Union has seven institutions: the European Parliament, the Council of the European Union, the European Commission, the European Council, the European Central Bank, the Court of Justice of the European Union and the European Court of Auditors. Competencies in scrutinising and amending legislation are divided between the European Parliament and the Council of the European Union while executive tasks are carried out by the European Commission and in a limited capacity by the European Council (not to be confused with the aforementioned Council of the European Union). The monetary policy of the eurozone is governed by the European Central Bank. The interpretation and the application of EU law and the treaties are ensured by the Court of Justice of the European Union. The EU budget is scrutinised by the European Court of Auditors. There are also a number of ancillary bodies which advise the EU or operate in a specific area.
South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation

The South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) is an organization of South Asian nations, which was established on 8 December 1985 when the government of Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka formally adopted its charter providing for the promotion of economic and social progress, cultural development within the South Asia region and also for friendship and cooperation with other developing countries. It is dedicated to economic, technological, social, and cultural development emphasizing collective self-reliance. Its seven founding members are Sri Lanka, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan, and Bangladesh. Afghanistan joined the organization in 2007. Meetings of heads of state are usually scheduled annually; meetings of foreign secretaries, twice annually. It is headquartered in Kathmandu, Nepal.

The first concrete proposal for establishing a framework for regional cooperation in South Asia was made by the late president of Bangladesh, Ziaur Rahman, on May 2, 1980. Prior to this, the idea of regional cooperation in South Asia was discussed in at least three conferences: the Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi in April 1947, the Baguio Conference in the Philippines in May 1950, and the Colombo Powers Conference in April 1954. In the late 1970s, SAARC nations agreed upon the creation of a trade bloc consisting of South Asian countries. The idea of regional cooperation in South Asia was again mooted in May 1980. The foreign secretaries of the seven countries met for the first time in Colombo in April 1981. The Committee of the Whole, which met in Colombo in August 1985, identified five broad areas for regional cooperation. New areas of cooperation were added in the following years.

Objectives

The objectives of the Association as defined in the Charter are:

- to promote the welfare of the people of South Asia and to improve their quality of life;
- to accelerate economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region and to provide all individuals the opportunity to live in dignity and to realize their full potential;
- to promote and strengthen selective self-reliance among the countries of South Asia;
- to contribute to mutual trust, understanding and appreciation of one another’s problems;
- to promote active collaboration and mutual assistance in the economic, social, cultural, technical and scientific fields;
- to strengthen cooperation with other developing countries;
- to strengthen cooperation among themselves in international forums on matters of common interest; and
- to cooperate with international and regional organisations with similar aims and purposes.
Principles

The principles are:

- Respect for sovereignty, territorial integrity, political equality and independence of all member states
- Non-interference in the internal matters is one of its objectives
- Cooperation for mutual benefit
- All decisions to be taken unanimously and need a quorum of all eight members
- All bilateral issues to be kept aside and only multilateral (involving many countries) issues to be discussed without being prejudiced by bilateral issues

Afghanistan was added to the regional grouping on 13 November 2005. With the addition of Afghanistan, the total number of member states were raised to eight. In April 2006, the United States of America and South Korea made formal requests to be granted observer status. The European Union has also indicated interest in being given observer status, and made a formal request for the same to the SAARC Council of Ministers meeting in July 2006. On 2 August 2006 the foreign ministers of the SAARC countries agreed in principle to grant observer status to the US, South Korea and the European Union. On 4 March 2008, Iran requested observer status. Followed shortly by the entrance of Mauritius.

Political issues

SAARC has intentionally laid more stress on "core issues" mentioned above rather than more divisive political issues like the Kashmir dispute and the Sri Lankan civil war. However, political dialogue is often conducted on the margins of SAARC meetings. SAARC has also refrained from interfering in the internal matters of its member states. During the 12th and 13th SAARC summits, extreme emphasis was laid upon greater cooperation between the SAARC members to fight terrorism.

South Asian Free Trade Area

Over the years, the SAARC members have expressed their unwillingness on signing a free trade agreement. Though India has several trade pacts with Maldives, Nepal, Bhutan and Sri Lanka, similar trade agreements with Pakistan and Bangladesh have been stalled due to political and economic concerns on both sides. In 1993, SAARC countries signed an agreement to gradually lower tariffs within the region, in Dhaka. Eleven years later, at the 12th SAARC Summit at Islamabad, SAARC countries devised the South Asia Free Trade Agreement which created a framework for the establishment of a free trade area covering 1.6 billion people. This agreement went into force on January 1, 2006. Under this agreement, SAARC members will bring their duties down to 20 per cent by 2009.
MODULE III

Globalization

Globalization is an umbrella term for a complex series of economic, social, technological and political changes that have been identified since the 1980s. These changes and processes are seen as increasing interdependence and interaction between people and companies in disparate locations. It is a process of interaction and integration among the people, companies, and governments of different nations, a process driven by international trade and investment and aided by information technology. This process has effects on the environment, on culture, on political systems, on economic development and prosperity, and on human physical well-being in societies around the world. Globalization is the demise of the nation–state that permits the full integration of national economies to an international economy and different political systems to a world committee. Positively it includes the realization of a world government where everybody is a global citizen.

Meaning and Definition

A typical definition of globalization can be taken from the IMF (International Monetary Fund) which defines “Globalization as the growing economic interdependence of countries world wide through increasing volume and variety of cross border transaction in goods and services, free international capital flows, and more rapid and widespread diffusion of technology”. In The Consequences of Modernity Anthony Giddens used the following definition: “Globalization can thus be defined as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa.”

A precise definition of globalization is elusive, but it is widely accepted that the world is becoming increasingly interconnected in terms of its economic, political and cultural life and that information technology (IT) is deeply implicated in the change process. It is an often misused word, as are all of its derivatives: global market, global economy, global business, global players, global power elite and so on. J. B. Gelinas has defined globalization as a system, a process and an ideology, a modern mythology and an alibi. Globalization may well be all these things, depending on ones point of view.

As a system, globalization is the total control of the world by powerful supranational economic interests through a global deregulated market. It views, market as the mechanism by which transnational corporations exert and justify their influence. Globalization is also a process, a series of actions carried out in order to achieve a particular result. At the centre of the system there still remains insufficiently integrated sectors, such as agriculture, services in general and life itself. Globalization is also a discourse. In this sense it is an ideology. Its role is to
justify the established political and economic system and make people accept it as the only one that is legitimate, respectable and possible. The ideology of globalization is roughly the neo-liberal creed.

**Dimensions**

All definition appears to agree that globalization has economic, political, cultural and technological aspects that may be closely intertwined. Whatever definition one accepts from whatever approach one might take, globalization is, obviously, a multidimensional process with, four primary dimensions. They are:

1. **The Economic**

   This central dimension of globalization refers primarily to the increase in international trade and the success of the free market economy. What is startlingly new, however, is that these recent economic policies have effectively created a world market where workers, consumers, and companies have the potential (whether they know it or not) to enter into economic relationships with other workers, consumers and companies anywhere in the world. This is often known as economic globalization refers to increasing economic interdependence of national economies across the world through a rapid increase in cross-border movement of goods, service, technology and capital. Whereas globalization is centered on the diminution of international trade regulations as well as tariffs, taxes, and other impediments that suppresses global trade, economic globalization is the process of increasing economic integration between countries, leading to the emergence of a global marketplace or a single world market.

   Increased role of international organizations such as WTO, IMF that deal with international transactions and increase of economic practices like outsourcing, development of global financial systems, growth in the world economy are also features of economic globalization. It also involves increase in international trade, increase in international flow of capital through Foreign Direct Investment (FDI), increased role of international organization like WTO, IMF, and World Bank, increase in economic practices like outsourcing by MNCs, etc. Private capital flows to developing countries soared during the 1990s, replacing "aid" or development assistance which fell significantly after the early 1980s. Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) became the most important category. Depending on the paradigm, economic globalization can be viewed as either a positive or a negative phenomenon.

2. **The Technological**

   The technological dimension of globalization refers primarily to the advancements of (a) NICTs which have fueled the communication and information revolution of recent years; and (b) new production technologies, which have produced efficiencies in production. The technological dynamics of globalization includes everything from the internet and mobile phones, which have done much to create the interconnectedness of the world, to improved logistics systems, which have enabled industries worldwide to function more
efficiently and profitably, to modern agronomic practices, which are restoring infertile lands and opening up new opportunities in agriculture. Free flow of information and dissemination of knowledge and increased global communication using such technologies like, internet, communication facilities, etc. also happens through the process of globalization. Information and technology exchange is an integral aspect of globalization. Technological innovations or technological transfer benefit most of the developing and Least Developing Countries (LDCs). Copyright laws and patents became established in the global competitive market.

3. The Political

The political dimension refers primarily to the decline of the sovereign state, which is due in part to the rise of multinational corporations, but also due to globalization’s ties with neoliberalism. Neoliberalism—promoted by the Reagan and Thatcher governments of the 1980s—essentially calls for a less interventionist state in both economic and social arenas, and its adherents, who have been in power at the World Bank and International Monetary Fund for over twenty years, have proposed and imposed: (a) deregulation and free markets, with less power for the sovereign state to set economic policies, (b) decentralization of government, shifting power from the sovereign to the more local, and (c) reduction of the role of the state by increasing the role of the private sector in most areas of economic and social life.

4. The Cultural

The cultural dimension of globalization appears at first glance to be a schizophrenic one. On the one hand, our increasing global interconnectedness has helped to produce a kind of homogenous mass culture. The increased migration and movement of people have led to the mixing of many different cultures and societies, helping to produce a new multiculturalism. But critics point it as westernization. In the period between 1965–90, the proportion of the labor forces migrating approximately doubled. The flow of migrants to advanced economic countries was claimed to provide a means through which global wages converge. International travel and tourism also accelerated as part of the globalization process. The cultural dimension of globalization also deals with gender issues, questions of identity, and the social construction of reality, as well as the production and consumption of media. But while the cultural dimension of globalization is certainly a significant one, the focus here, since we are concerned primarily with sustainable development, will be more on the economic, technological and political.

Impacts of Globalization

Globalization is the source of much debate and controversy about its nature and its merits. It is a complex process constantly redefined as world trends keep shifting and changing. Such debates have been fierce, with its supporters seeing Globalization as an economic savior for the world’s poor and as
helping to improve the quality of life; its opponents consider it to be oppressing the developing world, destroying local culture and contributing to global warming. Sharply differing and conflicting views on the impacts and implications of globalization has been juxtaposed. An issue of central importance in the globalization debate today concerns the impact of increasing economic openness upon national economy. Openness has, therefore, been interpreted differently. There is a hot debate on the issue between two prominent schools of globalization – “Constraints” and “the Sceptics”.

The constraints school, often referred to as “transformationalists” observe that globalization is real, it has changed the nature and scope of state, but not displaced it. Globalization is seen to be intrinsically constraining, because openness involves the fall of national barriers to trade, investment and financial flows, the multinationalisation of production and growth of global financial markets. Also conformity with inter-governmental agreements requiring that governments should open their markets to foreign trade and financial institutions and eliminate certain subsidies to industry. The other school is “the Sceptics” often referred to as “institutional adaptationists”. They question the very existence of strong globalization. They often acknowledge important changes in the structure of international political economy. As Augus Durnamo says, “Globalization has widened the gap between the have’s and havenot’s”.

Impact on National Sovereignty

Much has been written on the challenge that globalization poses to sovereignty, but, when it comes to interdependence, the fact that economic integration weakens the sovereignty of nation-states is nothing new. Globalization instead challenges the operational sovereignty of a government, that is, its ability to exercise sovereignty in its conduct of public policy. Second, states, according to John Hoffman, live a “double life” with sovereignty having two dimensions, an internal and an external. Economic interdependence poses a challenge to this external dimension of sovereignty. Responding to the challenge, governments largely followed the principles of liberal economic internationalism, endorsing the incremental reduction of their external economic sovereignty by lowering tariff barriers and capital controls. The reductions were structured around a set of international norms and standards, including in most instances the principle of reciprocity, embedded in international regimes such as the GATT, the IMF, and the OECD that formalized state adherence and assured their compliance. The concept of external sovereignty loses much of its significance when examining the implications of globalization. Global corporate networks are posing challenges instead to a state’s internal sovereignty, by altering the spatial relationship between private and public sectors.

The organizational logic of globalization induces corporations to seek the fusion of multiple, formerly segmented national markets into a single whole that subsumes multiple political geographies. As a result, governments no longer have a monopoly of the legitimate power over their territory, undermining the operability of internal sovereignty. The rising incidence of regulatory and tax arbitrage is a telling indicator that the monopoly has ended. By no means does
globalization imply that private sector actors are always deliberately undermining internal sovereignty. Rather, they follow a fundamentally different organizational logic. Markets, although initially relying for their creation on political power, do not depend on the presence of boundaries. The spatial symmetry between the 'public' and the 'private' upon which internal sovereignty depends is disappearing.

Governments, continually bound by territoriality, cannot project their power over the total space within which production and consumption organize themselves. Globalization thus integrates along the economic dimension and simultaneously fragments along the political. The fact that political fragmentation threatens only the operational aspects of internal sovereignty in no way minimizes the challenge. The threat to a government's ability to exercise internal sovereignty implies a threat to the effectiveness of democracy. Individuals may continue to exercise their formal right to vote, but the power of that vote to shape public policy decreases with the decline in operational internal sovereignty. Persistent weakness in internal sovereignty will cast doubt on democratic institutions, ultimately challenging formal sovereignty. It is an important factor in the declining trust in democratic institutions, giving governments no choice but to respond.

The responses of nation-states to the pressures of globalization for the most part fall into two broad categories. First, some governments adopt essentially interventionist strategies that reemphasize the territorial nature of state jurisdiction, in the hope of regaining control over the economic and social environment. Alternatively, governments may simply rely on existing structures and processes of international cooperation, including the use of international law, as practiced when managing external sovereignty. Those who consider globalization a threat may take measures of defensive intervention, such as the reinstatement of tariffs, non-tariff barriers, and capital controls, or they may force companies to reorganize along national lines. If economic nationalism fails to arouse broad popular support, its political counterpart -- territorial secession and partition – may do so. Alternatively, governments may pursue an offensive strategy of predatory competition, subsidizing national champions and encouraging competitive deregulation. Such states may become 'global competitors', seeking to entice corporations to operate within their own territory.

Today it is often said that a challenge from globalization is allegedly undercutting the very territorial base. The impact of globalization on states is felt not only in the challenge it poses to their overall or issue specific authority but also in its consequences for the territorialization of sovereignty at all. For example the world wide explosion of environmental issues like pollution and global warming does not respect international boundaries, currencies, long seen as the badges of state sovereignty are increasingly denationalized. Many people hold citizenship in multiple states; borders are increasingly porous to flows of migrants and refugees without much costly state regulation well beyond and within the borders themselves, knowledge and innovation networks are no longer
honor national boundaries but are within firms and between universities that are no longer exclusively networked on a national basis.

It is increasingly difficult to establish state origin for a larger number of commodities in world trade as transnational corporations coordinate their production activities across multiple locations in different countries. A large number of public and private organizations, particularly NGOs intervene, mediate and engage in the provision of public goods across state boundaries; a supranational organization such as European Union has the ability to enforce legislative and other changes in countries that aspire to join it; perhaps one of the most important political innovations of recent times, and even the Al Qaeda terrorist networks, works across state boundaries while exploiting the lack of territorial sovereignty and pirates on the high seas off the coasts of Indonesia, Somalia and Nigeria have made serious comebacks on national sovereignty. It proves that organized crime is increasingly transnational. The judicial regulation within states increasingly involves reference to supranational courts as with the European Union. The historical framing of the national by the global has been obscured because of its displacement in many academic and popular circles by thinking in terms of an entirely state-centered world. The new globalization represents the first impact of the global on a previously state-centered world.

Sovereignty in the state is hanging in a world tensed between globalism and localism. The turmoil is plain to see, evident in the everyday difficulties and frequent failures of governments. Economic insecurity, polluted environments, brooding conflicts all confound the capacity even of the most powerful state. Not only do states to cope with the forces of globalization, they cannot even resolve many of their own troubles at home. The character of the state is in doubt – its capacity challenged, its legitimacy contested. Huge transnational corporations, nongovernmental organizations, intergovernmental organizations, global media and multitudes of others, all lay claim to authority that states once called their own. If people come to believe that states cannot improve economies or supply adequate schooling or administer justice, they will assign their loyalties and their resources elsewhere. – inward to local institutions and movements, or outward to transnational alternatives. When that happens state capacity is diminished, legitimacy is lost and power seeps away.

Globalization breakdowns the states, but it can also build them up. It confines autonomy. But for the great purposes of governance – securing the peace alleviating poverty, creating an equitable social harmony, protecting the environment – globalization endows the states new capacities and new legitimacy for action beyond national borders. A defining characteristic of globalization is that it defeats the attempts of states to manage on their own. Not state not even the superpower, can by itself protect its people from conflict, climate change, drug trade or the upheavals caused by financial crisis. They demand cooperative solutions- states collaborating with each other and with institutions, NGOs, business and others. Globalization also proves that no effort of national governance will succeed if it is not sufficiently democratic. People have right to meaningful say in the institutions that governs them, be it the national
legislature or World Trade Organization. The three global challenges that illustrate the failures of the governance are, conflicts, diminishing opportunities to the young and climate change.

The dynamics of globalization are multifaceted and seemingly contradictory. In some respects they undermine the power of the states. The power of transnational corporations, the limits imposed on government policy by currency markets, the transborder politics of NGOs, the transfiguring power of global media – all reduce the autonomy of national governments. But it is also argued that globalization strengthens the state and extends its influence: in the international protection of human rights or in the cooperation that states undertake to preserve the oceans, eradicate diseases, subdue the contagion of financial shocks or stabilize global warming. Where globalization challenges governance and stir conflicts is in its tendency not only to integrate countries and societies but also to fragment them – in the politics of secession and in the division of tribe, caste and ethnic feeling. The teenagers feel more affinity towards the social networking sites and groups than with each other and their own parents and neighbours. The culture is contested and contradicted when Hollywood opposes diversity, when consumerism opposes identity.

The two ideologies always part of globalization, privatization and liberalization also pose threat to national sovereignty and integrity. Privatization is the incidence or process of transferring ownership of a business, enterprise, agency, public service or property from the public sector to the private sector or to private non-profit organizations. The protagonist of privatization argues that it will bring efficiency and economy in all fields that was absent in government institution and administration. Now the privatization experiments can be seen in all fields like, education, health transport, administration, services etc. On the contrary the antagonists of globalization argue that privatization in fact reduces the role of government. The state retreats from all vital functions that it performed earlier. It stops state-owned public sector units. The role of the state is like a facilitator and not an active player in the economic activates. The policies of the government in giving license to the firms, and industries were renewed and became more liberal under the policy of liberalization. The rules and restrictions will not apply to them. Many laws were amended in order to make the FDI easier. Thus liberalization is a process of removing government-imposed restrictions on movements between countries in order to create an, ‘open’, ‘borderless’ world economy which will eventually decrease the state power.

The Global Financial Crisis

The Global Financial Crisis is considered by many economists to be the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression of the 1930s. It resulted in the collapse of large financial institutions, the bailout of banks by national governments, and downturns in stock markets around the world. In many areas, the housing market also suffered, resulting in evictions, foreclosures and prolonged unemployment. The crisis played a significant role in the failure of key businesses, declines in consumer wealth and a downturn in economic activity.
leading to the 2008–2012 global recession and contributing to the European sovereign-debt crisis. The global financial crisis really started to show its effects in the middle of 2007 and into 2008. The governments in even the wealthiest nations have had to come up with rescue packages to bail out their financial systems. As a result, financial markets have become ever larger and financial crises have become more threatening to society, which forces governments to enact ever larger bailouts. The current global financial crisis, which is so deeply rooted that even unprecedented interventions by affected governments have, thus far, failed to contain it. On the one hand many people are concerned that those responsible for the financial problems are the ones being bailed out, while on the other hand, a global financial meltdown will affect the livelihoods of almost everyone in an increasingly inter-connected world.

Economies worldwide slowed during this period, as credit tightened and international trade declined. Governments and central banks responded with unprecedented fiscal stimulus, monetary policy expansion and institutional bailouts. Although there have been aftershocks, the financial crisis itself ended for sometime between late-2008 and mid-2009. In the U.S., Congress passed the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009. In the E.U., the U.K. responded with austerity measures of spending cuts and tax increases without export growth and it has since slid into a double-dip recession. In response to the financial crisis, both market-based and regulatory solutions have been implemented or are under consideration. Paul Krugman, author of *End This Depression Now!* (2012), argues that while current solutions have stabilized the world economy, the world economy will not improve unless it receives further stimulus.

The financial crisis of 2007–2008 is rooted in a number of factors, some common to previous financial crises, others new. Factors common to other crises, like asset price bubbles and current account deficits, help to explain cross-country differences in the severity of real economic impacts. New factors, such as increased financial integration and dependence on wholesale funding, help to account for the amplification and global spread of the financial crisis. In US while the housing and credit bubbles were building, a series of factors caused the financial system to both expand and become increasingly fragile, a process called financialization. U.S. Government policy from the 1970s onward has emphasized deregulation to encourage business, which resulted in less oversight of activities and less disclosure of information about new activities undertaken by banks and other evolving financial institutions. These institutions, as well as certain regulated banks, had also assumed significant debt burdens while providing the loans described above and did not have a financial cushion sufficient to absorb large loan defaults. These losses impacted the ability of financial institutions to lend, slowing economic activity. Governments also bailed out key financial institutions and implemented economic stimulus programs, assuming significant additional financial commitments.
The financial crisis which began in industrialized countries quickly spread to emerging market and developing economies. The global crisis now seems to be played out on two levels. The first is among industrialized nations of the world where most of the losses from subprime mortgage debt and excessive leveraging of investments have occurred. The second level of the crisis is among emerging market and other economies who have insufficient sources of capital and have turned to help from the international Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and capital surplus nations such as Japan. Reverberations from the financial crisis are not only being felt on Wall Street but are being manifest in world flows of exports and imports, rates of growth and unemployment, government revenues and expenditures and in political risk in some countries.

**Impacts**

The financial crisis has brought international financial institutions into the spotlight. They started to play a role in coordinating policy among nations, provide early warning of impending crises or assist countries financially. The IMF has expanded its activities along several dimensions. The interconnectedness of global financial and economic markets has highlighted the need for stronger institutions to coordinate regulatory policy across nations and induce corrective actions by national governments. A fundamental question in this process however rests on sovereignty how much power and authority should an international organization wield relative to national authorities?

The global crisis is causing huge loses and dislocation in the industrialized countries of the world, but in many of the developing countries it is pushing people into deep poverty. The crisis is being transported to the poorer countries through declining exports, failing commodity prices, reverse migration and shrinking remittances from citizens working overseas. The decline in tax revenues caused by the slowdowns in economic activity also is increasing competition within countries for scarce budget funds and affecting decisions about the allocation of natural resources. This budget constraint relates directly to the ability to finance official development assistance to poorer nations and other programs aimed at alleviating poverty.

**International Terrorism - Causes, Interpretations and Preventives**

Terrorism is fundamentally an attack on the state. It may be described as an act of violence, committed against innocent people to create fear, with an underlying political motive. This fear is an intended effect and not merely a by-product of terrorism. International Terrorism has international or trans-national consequences in which terrorists strike targets outside and beyond their country of origin such as the 11th September World Trade Centre attack or the strikes by Pakistan-based outfits in Jammu and Kashmir (J&K). International Terrorism also implies that such terrorist groups, e.g. Jammat-e-islami, Al Qaida, etc. have an organization/network/linkage in a number of countries.
International terrorism is not a new phenomenon to the world. The 11th September incident has only demonstrated another facet of international terrorism – the tremendous potency of technology and innovation – besides the globalization of economies, which have come to transcend national boundaries. Multi-national corporations and non-state players now have a worldwide reach. These have compromised the authority of the state. Non-state players and black money as well as narcotics trade have acquired power, making some of the terrorist groups (JEP, LTTE & PLO) financially viable and independent. The revolution in information technology (IT) and communication also enables instant transmission of ideas and information at a global level, by the terrorist outfits who can now exploit ‘cyber’ terrorism as well as the deadly and sophisticated Precision-Guided Missiles (PGMs), and other weapons of mass destruction. Terrorism today, therefore, has been transformed into a trans-national, high-tech, lethal and global phenomenon. The response to terrorism needs to be structured accordingly and the decision making process also needs to be modernized.

Causes

On the larger international scene, the factors that impact on terrorism are many. Globalization has made geographic borders transparent to the flow of ideas, people and also turmoil. Technology has extended the reach and capabilities of the terrorists at the global level. Economic interests of national and multi-national corporations (MNCs) pre-dominate all other interests. Therefore, unfriendly acts by some of our neighbors are not questioned. The lack of international cooperation to undertake anti-terrorist action till the September 11 incident also contributed to the growth of terrorism. There are also some political, cultural and psychological undercurrents which have also played behind terrorism.

1. Political Causes

In some cases the dissidents have what may best described as political motivations. It’s said that war is diplomacy by other means; violent political conflict could be described as politics by other means. The motivation may be to affect a political reform, or overthrow a regime perceived as illegitimate or lacking public trust and support. Terrorism may be used as to demonstrate the weakness and vulnerability of the regime, to reveal its inability to provide security, to provoke government repression to help recruit followers, and ultimately to force leaders from power.

2. Cultural Causes

This motivation is most common in situations where an ethnic or religious group fears extermination, or loss of their common identity, language or culture. It may also be combined with political motives, where the rulers discriminate against the ethnic group in terms of jobs, economic opportunity or access to the political process. In the case of oppressed minorities, opposed by a strong, entrenched regime, terrorism may be seen as the only available option. This is
especially true where demands for political reform are ignored, where there are few, if any, external allies, and where the regime resorts to collective punishment for what are seen as reasonable and justified demands.

3. Psychological Causes

A surprising number of pro-government analysts favor this explanation, which asserts that some terrorists are unbalanced, violent individuals suffering some form of psychosis. Others may be egomaniacs driven to achieve recognition through violence, and who attract a following of other dysfunctional individuals. This characterization may be accurate in cases where terrorist appear to have no logical goal, or motivation, or a purpose that makes little sense to normal people. This can include cases where the goal is the psychological benefit achieved by vengeance. Psychologically motivated terrorism is simply a criminal act, like serial killing.

Interpretations on International Terrorism

While interpreting terrorism, in addition to those situations already covered by the existing anti-terrorist instruments, it should be made clear that acts defined as terrorism can never be justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature. It’s doubtful that terrorism is any sane person’s first choice. Most disgruntled people would start with a petition stating their grievances and setting forth their demands for reform. If denied, they might organize to demonstrate, or protest and might engage in civil disobedience – all designed to attract public attention and broaden their support. If denied again, they might attempt legal action, if such avenues are open to them. The reactions of the state government can directly influence the course of future events. Oftentimes, counter-demonstrators who fear that the government will give into dissident’s demands confront demonstrators. These clashes can lead to violence and destroy hope for resolution of the problems.

There are three perspectives of terrorism: the terrorist’s, the victim’s, and the general public’s. In the perspective of the terrorist, ideology and motivation will influence the objectives of terrorist operations, especially regarding the casualty rate and the phrase, one man’s terrorist is another man’s freedom fighter, is a view terrorists themselves would accept. Groups with non-religious goals will attempt to target as minimal number of causalities in comparison to religious and military oriented who attempt to inflict as many causalities as possible. The type of target selected will often reflect motivations and ideologies and they conduct attacks on representative individuals whom they associate with economic exploitation, social injustice, or political repression. Also, due to the secretive nature and small size of terrorist organizations, they often offer opponents no clear organization to defend against or to deter.
As for the victims, they are generally devastated beyond description, and severely traumatized; view the terrorists as extremely volatile, unpredictable, unsympathetic and merciless. They do get help and aid from the government, but live the rest of the lives in paranoia and suffering, emotionally, physically and psychologically. The general public is very adversely affected too, though to a lesser extent in comparison to the victims, they generally become more alert to the world happenings, governmental processes, and protests and uproars from different segments of the world’s population.

Cures

It is clear that a long-term strategy is required to counter terrorism. It has to be comprehensively addressed on all fronts, political, economic, social and military. This strategy needs to be evolved from our national aims and objectives to protect ‘core values’. International terrorism cannot effectively be fought alone. At the international level states should aim for a rapid conclusion of the negotiations on the draft comprehensive convention on international terrorism and the draft international convention for the suppression of acts of nuclear terrorism with a view to adopting these instruments expeditiously, as called for in Security Council resolution 1566 (2004) and in the report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. International organizations, including in particular regional organizations and their member States, should adopt without delay the necessary legal framework to prevent or suppress terrorism and should reach out to, and actively support, states that need technical and operational support for counterterrorism activities. States can co-operate to develop mechanisms and procedures, such as co-ordination and cooperation with each other and with competent international agencies for intelligence and information sharing, in order to give prompt and full effect to the legal measures identified in Security Council Resolution 1566 (2004).

States should develop modalities for international cooperation and coordination within the regional and universal organizations of which they are members, taking advantage of the modalities already in place within existing organizations of which they may not be members. Such modalities should focus specifically on effective mutual assistance in law enforcement cooperation within a rule of law framework, guaranteeing fair treatment of suspected offenders in conformity with human rights laws and, in particular, standard minimum rules for treatment of prisoners and accused. In order to help States identify terrorist organizations to whom financial support is prohibited by the Convention on the Suppression of Terrorist Financing and Security Council resolution 1373 (2001), the Counter Terrorism Committee (CTC) established by the Security Council should develop a core list of organizations that the CTC determines to be involved, directly or indirectly, with acts of financing of terrorism. States would also remain free to impose sanctions on non-listed organizations that the State determines to be involved in terrorism.
In acting under chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council should pay due regard to obligations that States have assumed under international law by virtue of human rights treaties and customary international law. This applies in particular if a decision by the Council may affect someone’s civil rights and obligations, since the right to judicial review exists in the determination of such rights and obligations. The Committee established under Security Council resolution 1540 (2004) should extend technical assistance to States in the implementation of the resolution, in particular, by way of assistance in preparing the necessary domestic legislation and establishing effective domestic control measures to prevent the proliferation of nuclear, chemical, or biological weapons and their means of delivery. Effective multilateral and bilateral assistance to the safety and justice sector in low-income and middle-income countries is an essential component in the efforts to prevent or suppress terrorism. The international community should therefore contribute financially to advocacy, public awareness and training activities, targeting a larger body of experts, and make sure there is information and cooperation with respect to existing best practices among States. In order to ensure the quality of this assistance it should be subject to continuous third-party evaluation. In the prevention or suppression of terrorism the same standard should apply to all. For the purpose of preventing and suppressing terrorism, States should co-operate through joint actions or the establishment of international institutions. Regional organizations should engage actively in efforts to prevent or suppress terrorism, if they have not already done so. The periodic meetings between the United Nations Counter Terrorism Committee and representatives of such organizations should be a particularly useful tool to ensure synergies and avoid dispersion.

Non-governmental organizations that are in a position to extend assistance to States in the process of ratifying and implementing conventions against terrorism should make this known. States that have not ratified or acceded to the relevant international instruments against terrorism should be linked with those who have done so and who are in a position to offer assistance in subscribing to these instruments. The possibility of treating specific acts of terrorism which involve systematic attacks against the civilian population as crimes within the existing jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court (ICC) should be considered, bearing in mind that individual States have primary responsibility to prosecute suspected perpetrators of the most serious crimes and that the ICC is complementary to national jurisdiction. The Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute should also explore ways and means of including acts of terrorism which constitute serious international crimes under existing international instruments relating to terrorism or as defined in a future comprehensive convention on terrorism, as a crime within the scope of the ICC Statute.

**Ethnic Conflicts**

Ethnic conflicts around the world devastate the lives of millions of people, destabilize national governments and undermine the prospects of sustainable development and successful transitions to democracy in entire regions. The
threats to global peace and stability that ethnic conflicts in today’s globalising world pose often prompt the international community to engage in difficult and controversial peace-making and peace-keeping operations with uncertain costs and outcomes. Generally speaking, the term conflict describes a situation in which two or more actors pursue incompatible, yet from their individual perspectives entirely just, goals. Ethnic conflicts are one particular form of such conflict: that in which the goals of at least one conflict party are defined in (exclusively) ethnic terms, and in which the primary fault line of confrontation is one of ethnic distinctions. Whatever the concrete issues over which conflict erupts, at least one of the conflict parties will explain its dissatisfaction in ethnic terms that is, one party to the conflict will claim that its distinct ethnic identity is the reason why its members cannot realise their interests, why they do not have the same rights, or why their claims are not satisfied. Thus, ethnic conflicts are a form of group conflict in which at least one of the parties involved interprets the conflict, its causes, and potential remedies along an actually existing or perceived discriminating ethnic divide.

**West Asian Crisis**

West Asian crisis also known as the Israeli–Palestinian conflict is the ongoing struggle between Israelis and Palestinians that began in the early 20th century. The conflict is wide-ranging, and the term is also used in reference to the earlier phases of the same conflict, between the Zionist and the Arab population living in Palestine under Ottoman and then British rule. It forms part of the wider Arab–Israeli conflict. The remaining key issues are: mutual recognition, borders, security, water rights, control of Jerusalem, Israeli settlements, Palestinian freedom of movement and finding a resolution to the refugee question. The violence resulting from the conflict has prompted international actions, as well as other security and human rights concerns, both within and between both sides, and internationally. In addition, the violence has curbed expansion of tourism in the region, which is full of historic and religious sites that are of interest to many people around the world. Many attempts have been made to broker a two-state solution, involving the creation of an independent Palestinian state alongside an independent Jewish state or next to the State of Israel (after Israel’s establishment in 1948). As recently as 2007, a majority of both Israelis and Palestinians, according to a number of polls, prefer the two-state solution over any other solution as a means of resolving the conflict. Moreover, a considerable majority of the Jewish public sees the Palestinians’ demand for an independent state as just, and thinks Israel can agree to the establishment of such a state. A majority of Palestinians and Israelis view the West Bank and Gaza Strip as an acceptable location of the hypothetical Palestinian state in a two-state solution. However, there are significant areas of disagreement over the shape of any final agreement and also regarding the level of credibility each side sees in the other in upholding basic commitments.

Within Israeli and Palestinian society, the conflict generates a wide variety of views and opinions. This highlights the deep divisions which exist not only between Israelis and Palestinians, but also within each society. A hallmark of the
conflict has been the level of violence witnessed for virtually its entire duration. Fighting has been conducted by regular armies, paramilitary groups, terror cells and individuals. Casualties have not been restricted to the military, with a large number of fatalities in civilian population on both sides. There are prominent international actors involved in the conflict. The two parties engaged in direct negotiation are the Israeli government, currently led by Benjamin Netanyahu, and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), currently headed by Mahmoud Abbas. The official negotiations are mediated by an international contingent known as the Quartet on the Middle East (the Quartet) represented by a special envoy that consists of the United States, Russia, the European Union, and the United Nations. The Arab League is another important actor, which has proposed an alternative peace plan. Egypt, a founding member of the Arab League, has historically been a key participant.

Since 2003, the Palestinian side has been fractured by conflict between the two major factions: Fatah, the traditionally dominant party, and its later electoral challenger, Hamas. Following Hamas seizure of power in the Gaza Strip in June 2007, the territory controlled by the Palestinian National Authority (the Palestinian interim government) is split between Fatah in the West Bank, and Hamas in the Gaza Strip. The division of governance between the parties has effectively resulted in the collapse of bipartisan governance of the Palestinian National Authority (PA). A round of peace negotiations began at Annapolis, Maryland, United States, in November 2007. These talks were aimed at having a final resolution by the end of 2008. Direct negotiations between the Israeli government and Palestinian leadership began in September 2010 aimed at reaching an official final status settlement.

In the 19th century the land of Palestine was inhabited by a multicultural population – approximately 86 percent Muslim, 10 percent Christian, and 4 percent Jewish – living in peace. In the late 1800s a group in Europe decided to colonize this land. Known as Zionists, they represented an extremist minority of the Jewish population. Their goal was to create a Jewish homeland, and they considered locations in Africa and the Americas, before settling on Palestine. At first, this immigration created no problems. However, as more and more Zionists immigrated to Palestine – many with the express wish of taking over the land for a Jewish state – the indigenous population became increasingly alarmed. Eventually, fighting broke out, with escalating waves of violence. Hitler’s rise to power, combined with Zionist activities to sabotage efforts to place Jewish refugees in western countries, led to increased Jewish immigration to Palestine, and conflict grew.

Finally, in 1947 the United Nations decided to intervene. Under considerable Zionist pressure, the UN recommended giving away 55% of Palestine to a Jewish state – despite the fact that this group represented only about 30% of the total population, and owned under 7% of the land. In 1967, Israel conquered still more land. Following the Six Day War, in which Israeli forces launched a highly successful surprise attack on Egypt, Israel occupied the final 22% of Palestine that had eluded it in 1948 – the West Bank and Gaza Strip. There are
two primary issues at the core of this continuing conflict. First, there is the inevitably destabilizing effect of trying to maintain an ethnically preferential state, particularly when it is largely of foreign origin. The original population of what is now Israel was 96 percent Muslim and Christian, yet, these refugees are prohibited from returning to their homes in the self-described Jewish state (and those within Israel are subjected to systematic discrimination).

Second, Israel's continued military occupation and confiscation of privately owned land in the West Bank, and control over Gaza, are extremely oppressive, with Palestinians having minimal control over their lives. Over 10,000 Palestinian men, women, and children are held in Israeli prisons. Few of them have had a legitimate trial; Physical abuse and torture are frequent. Palestinian borders (even internal ones) are controlled by Israeli forces. Periodically men, women, and children are strip searched; people are beaten; women in labor are prevented from reaching hospitals (at times resulting in death); food and medicine are blocked from entering Gaza, producing an escalating humanitarian crisis. Israeli forces invade almost daily, injuring, kidnapping, and sometimes killing inhabitants.

According to the Oslo peace accords of 1993, these territories were supposed to finally become a Palestinian state. However, after years of Israel continuing to confiscate land and conditions steadily worsening, the Palestinian population rebelled. Largely due to special-interest lobbying, U.S. taxpayers give Israel an average of $8 million per day, and since its creation have given more U.S. funds to Israel than to any other nation. As Americans learn about how Israel is using our tax dollars, many are calling for an end to this expenditure.

**Sri Lankan Ethnic Problem**

The root of the conflict in Sri Lanka goes back to British colonial rule when the country was known as Ceylon. The British brought in Tamil laborers to work the coffee and tea plantations in the central highlands, making the island a major tea producer. But the majority Buddhist Sinhalese community resented what they saw as favoritism towards the mainly-Hindu Tamils under British administration. The majority Sinhalese began a program of making the island nation a Sinhala Buddhist State. This law in 1956 demoting Tamil and promoting Sinhala and Buddhism as the only official language and religion was a crucial turning point for Sri Lanka's politics.

The core problem of Sri Lanka has been one of identity. The Tamils want to preserve their identity and the Sinhalas want to overrun it. For much of the last 20 years it has suffered fighting between the armed forces of the predominantly Sinhalese government and Tamil Tiger rebels who want an independent homeland in the north and east. In the decades after independence, Tamils politicians pushed for a federal system through the Tamil Federal Party. The concept of a separate nation, Tamil Eelam, was proposed by the Tamil United Liberation Front (TULF) in 1976. In October 1983, all the TULF legislators, numbering sixteen at the time, forfeited their seats in Parliament for refusing to
swear an oath unconditionally renouncing support for a separate state in accordance with the Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of Sri Lanka. Frustrated by the lack of progress through politics and non-violent protest, Tamil youth started to form militant groups. The Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (commonly known as the LTTE or the Tamil Tigers) formed in 1976 to be a military organization based in northern Sri Lanka. Since its formation, the LTTE has been headed by its founder, Velupillai Prabhakaran.

Throughout the 1980s, 1990s and for parts of this decade, whilst Sri Lanka has witnessed a combination of Tamil Tiger suicide and military attacks, the conflict escalated sharply when in 2008 the government formally pulled out of a ceasefire brokered by Norway six years earlier. There have also been growing calls for the LTTE to surrender, including a joint statement issued in February 2009 by the United States, the European Union, Japan and Norway, which said there was "just a short time before the Tigers lost all the territory still under their control". The United States, the United Nations, the European Union and India have called for a cease-fire however without avail. India became involved in the conflict in the 1980s for a number of reasons, including its leaders' desire to project India as the regional power in the area and worries about India's own Tamils seeking independence. The latter was particularly strong in the Indian state of Tamil Nadu, where ethnic kinship led to strong support for independence for Sri Lankan Tamils. Throughout the conflict, the Indian central and state governments have supported both sides in different ways.

Under this accord, the Sri Lankan Government made a number of concessions to Tamil demands, including devolution of power to the provinces, a merger-subject to later referendum-of the Northern and the Eastern provinces into the single province, and official status for the Tamil language (this was enacted as the 13th Amendment to the Constitution of Sri Lanka). India agreed to establish order in the North and East through a peacekeeping force, and to cease assisting Tamil insurgents. Militant groups including the LTTE, although initially reluctant, agreed to surrender their arms to the IPKF, however in the end the IPKF had to be withdrawn under rather embarrassing circumstances due to the rising unpopularity amongst the Sri Lankans. Later India became the first country to ban the LTTE after being its early ally. The Indian change of policy came gradually, starting with the IPKF-LTTE conflict, and culminating with the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi. India opposes the new state Tamil Eelam that LTTE wants to establish, saying that it would lead to Tamil Nadu's separation from India.

The LTTE finally admitted defeat on 17 May 2009, with the rebels. The Sri Lankan armed forces claimed that the leader of the LTTE, Velupillai Prabhakaran, was killed in the morning of 18 May 2009 while he was trying to flee the conflict zone in an ambulance. After the complete military defeat of the LTTE, President Mahinda Rajapaksa announced that the government is committed to a political solution, and for this purpose action would be taken based on the 13th Amendment to the Constitution. Pro-LTTE political party Tamil National Alliance (TNA), also the largest political group representing Sri Lankan
Tamil community, dropped its demand for a separate state, in favour of a federal solution. There are ongoing bilateral talks between President Rajapaksa’s UPFA government and the TNA, on a viable political solution and devolution of power.

**Nuclear Weapons and Proliferation: Challenges and Opportunities**

A nuclear weapon is an explosive device that derives its destructive force from nuclear reactions, either fission or a combination of fission and fusion. Because of the immense military power they can confer, the political control of nuclear weapons has been a key issue for as long as they have existed; in most countries the use of nuclear force can only be authorized by the head of government or head of state. Nuclear proliferation is a term now used to describe the spread of nuclear weapons, fissile material, and weapons-applicable nuclear technology and information, to nations which are not recognized as ‘Nuclear Weapon States’ by the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also known as the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty or NPT. Proliferation has been opposed by many nations with and without nuclear weapons, the governments of which fear that more countries with nuclear weapons may increase the possibility of nuclear warfare, de-stabilize international or regional relations, or infringe upon the national sovereignty of states.

The two types of proliferation are horizontal and vertical proliferation. Horizontal proliferation refers to nation-states or non-state entities that do not have, but are acquiring, nuclear weapons or developing the capability and materials for producing them. Vertical proliferation refers to nation-states that do possess nuclear weapons and are increasing their stockpiles of these weapons, improving the technical sophistication or reliability of their weapons, or developing new weapons. Because nation-states or other entities that wish to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons need methods for delivering those weapons, proliferation of delivery mechanisms must also be prevented. Controlling proliferation and ultimately abolishing nuclear weapons known as nuclear disarmament involves national governments, intergovernmental organizations, nongovernmental and professional organizations, and society at large. Nuclear disarmament refers to both the act of reducing or eliminating nuclear weapons and to the end state of a nuclear-free world, in which nuclear weapons are completely eliminated.

**Challenges**

There is a set of serious, short-term dilemmas confronting the international community on nuclear issues. These include the question of the North Korean and alleged Iranian nuclear weapons programs, and the ever-present fear that terrorists will acquire nuclear or radiological weapons compatibility. Cold War nonproliferation measures mainly addressed the possibility of proliferation to and by states. Although recent initiatives attempt to extend coverage to non-state actors these are partial, administratively cumbersome, and difficult to enforce. Moreover, steps to gather intelligence about potential terrorist threats are corrosive of basic civil liberties and civilian oversight.
Confidence in the NPT is eroding and it is not clear that it can adequately handle proliferation risks. The Security Council has been unable to deal effectively with referrals of NPT noncompliance or withdrawal from treaties. At a time when many analysts predict substantial growth in reliance on nuclear energy, states can still legally develop indigenous fuel cycle capabilities, with apparently inadequate protection against diversion to military programs. If the Iranians are perceived to have successfully kept a nuclear weapons option, it is assumed that several other Middle East states will begin down the nuclear path (or have already begun). And while the pressures might not be as intense in Northeast Asia there is a strong argument that the North Korean program might not be rolled back lending greater fragility and complexity to regional and global security calculations. If the Middle East or Northeast Asia becomes a proliferating region, we can assume that other states will rethink their non-nuclear status especially those that already have the technological capability to produce weapons.

Another related problem to the prospect of new states acquiring nuclear weapons capabilities, is the possibility that the erosion of the international nuclear nonproliferation regime could lead to a more competitive, multipolar international security system in general. In such a system, other states might seek to balance the US, including through the possession of nuclear weapons. The emergence of a multipolar world would be facilitated by the breakdown or weakening of the international nuclear nonproliferation regime. A fourth dimension of the emerging nuclear scenario is that there is little support for strengthening the international nonproliferation regime. The international community has an existing, but frayed verification and enforcement system for nuclear inspections. If this system weakens further, countries may “head for the exit” and take hedging actions. According to some observers, the international nuclear nonproliferation regime as a whole has suffered from insufficient leadership from its most interested states. The problem is not the absence of the tools in the regime, but the failure of will to use the tools of the regime for their stated purpose. There is a crisis of confidence.

Much of the international discussion of nuclear weapons issues concerns nuclear proliferation, but it is important to remember that the danger of nuclear proliferation is only one aspect of the threat posed by the integration of nuclear weapons into international life. A world where there was no further proliferation, but in which nuclear-armed states were at war, would still not be a safe world. The reason, of course, is that the explosion of nuclear weapons on the scale contemplated by military doctrines would have devastating consequences for human and other life, and for the physical environment. Moreover, the deliberate detonation of even a small weapon, by a state or a terrorist group, would not only cause many deaths and create profound economic dislocation, but would likely lead to great instability in the international system. Even if no additional states acquire nuclear weapons capability, current arsenals stand at nearly 27,000 warheads, over 95 percent of which are held by Russia and the United States. There are some agreements in place to continue stockpile reductions, but their
eventual implementation would leave stockpiles still far beyond minimal deterrence levels.

Controlling the proliferation of nuclear weapons is one of the major challenges we face as a global society. Nuclear weapons pose a particularly destructive threat. Prevention of the proliferation and use of nuclear weapons is urgently important to public health. The threat posed by the proliferation of nuclear weapons has 3 major aspects:

1. The development of the capability for producing or acquiring nuclear weapons by countries that do not currently have nuclear weapons (horizontal proliferation).

2. The increase of weapon stockpiles by countries that currently have nuclear weapons, the improvement of technical sophistication or reliability of these weapons, and the development of new weapons.

The greatest risk from nuclear weapons proliferation comes from countries which have not joined the NPT and which have significant unsafeguarded nuclear activities. While safeguards apply to some of their activities, others remain beyond scrutiny. A further concern is that countries may develop various sensitive nuclear fuel cycle facilities and research reactors under full safeguards and then subsequently opt out of the NPT. If a nuclear-capable country does leave the NPT, it is likely to be reported by the IAEA to the UN Security Council, just as if it were in breach of its safeguards agreement. Trade sanctions would then be likely. IAEA safeguards, together with bilateral safeguards applied under the NPT can, and do, ensure that uranium supplied by countries does not contribute to nuclear weapons proliferation. In fact, the worldwide application of those safeguards and the substantial world trade in uranium for nuclear electricity make the proliferation of nuclear weapons much less likely.

Opportunities to Control Proliferation

Governments thus far have attempted to control the proliferation of nuclear weapons through bilateral and multilateral treaties. Intergovernmental bodies, such as the United Nations, the International Atomic Energy Agency, and the International Court of Justice (World Court), have also attempted to control proliferation. Nongovernmental organizations including professional organizations, such as the Federation of American Scientists, the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War (IPPNW), and Physicians for Social Responsibility (IPPNW’s US affiliate) have worked to control proliferation through education, information dissemination, and advocacy aimed at governments and governmental organizations. An increasing number of individuals and organizations, including senior US statesmen, believe that the only way to address the danger of nuclear weapons is to eliminate them entirely.

The Additional Protocol, once it is widely in force, will provide credible assurance that there are no undeclared nuclear materials or activities in the states concerned. This will be a major step forward in preventing nuclear
proliferation. Another important component of the nuclear proliferation issue involves delivery mechanisms. In order to pose a nuclear threat, nations or other entities not only need these weapons but also need missiles or other methods for delivering them.

There have been a number of significant and controversial treaties to try and control nuclear weapons:

**The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)**

The NPT was ratified in 1975. It has been ratified by 187 countries, more than any other arms limitation and disarmament agreement. The objective is “to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapons technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament and general and complete disarmament.” Some 180 plus countries thus agreed not to pursue nuclear weapons in exchange for the nuclear powers to adhere to treaties that would have the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons. However, as others have put more bluntly, this treaty was to prevent new members from joining the “nuclear club.”

**The Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty**

The ABM Treaty, signed in 1972, prohibits the use of defensive systems that might give an advantage to one side in a nuclear war. The Mutually Assured Destruction scenario was invoked here to assure that each nation had enough weapons to survive a nuclear attack and therefore have the ability to annihilate the other. Their rationale was that as long as both sides remained defenseless, in this respect, neither country would dare attack the other.

**The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)**

The CTBT was designed to prevent testing of nuclear weapons and hence reduce the chance of an arms race. It bans all nuclear explosions in all environments, for military or civilian purposes. It was adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 September 1996. The CTBT has achieved near universal adherence, however, Article XIV of the Treaty requires ratification by 44 named states, before the Treaty can enter into force.

**The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaties, START I and START II**

START I and II were designed to reduce the weapons that Russia and the US have. While the major nuclear powers have agreed to eliminate their nuclear arsenal at a UN review of the NPT, it remains to be seen how much of that will be rhetoric and how much real political will there will be to follow it through. Unfortunately, the nuclear weapons states, and particularly the United States, seem to have made virtually zero progress in the past five years. Despite its pledges to do otherwise, the United States has failed to ratify the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; opposed a verifiable fissile material cutoff treaty; substituted the
Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty (SORT), which is fully reversible, for the START treaties; scrapped the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, opening the door for deployment of missile defenses and moves toward placing weapons in outer space; kept nuclear weapons at the center of its security policies, including research to create new nuclear weapons; and demonstrated no political will toward the elimination of its nuclear arsenal.

Traditional safeguards are arrangements to account for and control the use of nuclear materials. This verification is a key element in the international system which ensures that uranium in particular is used only for peaceful purposes. Parties to the NPT agree to accept technical safeguard measures applied by the IAEA. These require that operators of nuclear facilities maintain and declare detailed accounting records of all movements and transactions involving nuclear material. Over 550 facilities and several hundred other locations are subject to regular inspection, and their records and the nuclear material being audited. Inspections by the IAEA are complemented by other measures such as surveillance cameras and instrumentation.

The inspections act as an alert system providing a warning of the possible diversion of nuclear material from peaceful activities. Material Accountancy – tracking all inward and outward transfers and the flow of materials in any nuclear facility. This includes sampling and analysis of nuclear material, on-site inspections, and review and verification of operating records.

All NPT non-weapons states must accept these full-scope safeguards. In the five weapons states plus the non-NPT states (India, Pakistan and Israel), facility-specific safeguards apply. IAEA inspectors regularly visit these facilities to verify completeness and accuracy of records. The terms of the NPT cannot be enforced by the IAEA itself, nor can nations be forced to sign the treaty. In reality, as shown in Iraq and North Korea, safeguards can be backed up by diplomatic, political and economic measures. While traditional safeguards easily verified the correctness of formal declarations by suspect states, in the 1990s attention turned to what might not have been declared. The weaknesses of the NPT regime lay in the fact that no obvious diversion of material was involved. The uranium used as fuel probably came from indigenous sources, and the nuclear facilities were built by the countries themselves without being declared or placed under safeguards. Nevertheless, the activities were detected and brought under control using international diplomacy.

In 1993 a program was initiated to strengthen and extend the classical safeguards system, and a model protocol was agreed by the IAEA Board of Governors 1997. The measures boosted the IAEA’s ability to detect undeclared nuclear activities, including those with no connection to the civil fuel cycle. Innovations were of two kinds. Some could be implemented on the basis of IAEA’s existing legal authority through safeguards agreements and inspections. Others required further legal authority to be conferred through an Additional Protocol. This must be agreed by each non-weapons state with IAEA, as a supplement to any existing comprehensive safeguards agreement. Weapons states have agreed to accept the principles of the model additional protocol.
As of 20 December 2010, 139 countries have signed Additional Protocols, 104 have brought them into force, and one (Iraq) is implementing its protocol provisionally. The IAEA is also applying the measures of the Additional Protocol in Taiwan. Among the leading countries that have not signed the Additional Protocol are Egypt, which says it will not sign until Israel accepts comprehensive IAEA safeguards, and Brazil, which opposes making the protocol a requirement for international cooperation on enrichment and reprocessing, but has not ruled out signing. The Nuclear Suppliers Group communicated its guidelines, essentially a set of export rules, to the IAEA in 1978. These were to ensure that transfers of nuclear material or equipment would not be diverted to unsafeguarded nuclear fuel cycle or nuclear explosive activities, and formal government assurances to this effect were required from recipients. The Guidelines also recognised the need for physical protection measures in the transfer of sensitive facilities, technology and weapons-usable materials, and strengthened retransfer provisions. The group began with seven members – the United States, the former USSR, the UK, France, Germany, Canada and Japan – but now includes 46 countries including all five nuclear weapons states.

In May 1995, NPT parties reaffirmed their commitment to a Fissile Materials Cut-off Treaty to prohibit the production of any further fissile material for weapons. This aims to complement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty of 1996 (not entered into force as of 2011) and to codify commitments made by the United States, the UK, France and Russia to cease production of weapons material, as well as putting a similar ban on China. This treaty will also put more pressure on Israel, India and Pakistan to agree to international verification. As of February 2006 Iran formally announced that uranium enrichment within their borders has continued. Iran claims it is for peaceful purposes but the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and the United States claim the purpose is for nuclear weapons research and construction.

**Climate change**

Climate change is now widely recognized as the major environmental problem facing the globe. Climate change has long-since ceased to be a scientific curiosity, and is no longer just one of many environmental and regulatory concerns. As the United Nations Secretary General has said, it is the major, overriding environmental issue of our time, and the single greatest challenge facing environmental regulators. It is a growing crisis with political, economic, health and safety, food production, security, and other dimensions. Climate change refers to a change in the state of the climate that can be identified by changes in the variability of its properties, and that persists for an extended period, typically decades or longer. It refers to any change in climate over time, whether due to natural variability or as a result of human activity.

Climate change is one of the defining challenges of our time. Receding forests, changing rainfall patterns and rising sea levels will exacerbate existing economic, political and humanitarian stresses and affect human development in all parts of the world. As the leading global organization in the fight against poverty, with a presence in 177 countries and territories, UNDP is responding on the front lines of climate change. UNDP works with national, regional, and local
planning bodies to help them respond effectively to climate change and promote low-emission, climate-resilient development. Climate change is expected to hit developing countries the hardest. Its effects—higher temperatures, changes in precipitation patterns, rising sea levels, and more frequent weather-related disasters pose risks for agriculture, food, and water supplies. Impacts are already being seen in unprecedented heat waves, cyclones, floods, salinisation of the coastline and effects on agriculture, fisheries and health.

At stake are recent gains in the fight against poverty, hunger and disease, and the lives and livelihoods of billions of people in developing countries. Tackling this immense challenge must involve both mitigation and adaptation techniques. Shifting weather patterns, for example, threaten food production through increased unpredictability of precipitation, rising sea levels contaminate coastal freshwater reserves and increase the risk of catastrophic flooding, and a warming atmosphere aids the pole-ward spread of pests and diseases once limited to the tropics. The changing climate impacts society and ecosystems in a broad variety of ways. For example climate change can increase or decrease rainfall, influence agricultural crop yields, affect human health, cause changes to forests and other ecosystems, or even impact our energy supply. Climate-related impacts are occurring across regions of the country and across many sectors of our economy. Many state and local governments are already preparing for the impacts of climate change through adaptation, which is planning for the changes that are expected to occur.

For India and other developing countries, climate change is a potential threat to sustainable development. Through a multitude of government, private, and individual initiatives, the country is making serious efforts to conserve energy, harness renewables, protect forests, and enhance understanding about climate change. By adopting this climate-friendly path to development, India is contributing effectively to global efforts for protecting our planet. Like other developing countries, several sections of the Indian populace will not be able to buffer themselves from impacts of global warming. With close economic ties to natural resources and climate-sensitive sectors such as agriculture, water and forestry, India may face a major threat, and require serious adaptive capacity to combat climate change. As a developing country, India can little afford the risks and economic backlashes that industrialized nations can. With 27.5% of the population still below the poverty line, reducing vulnerability to the impacts of climate change is essential. Many studies have underscored the nation’s vulnerability to climate change. With changes in key climate variables, namely temperature, precipitation and humidity, crucial sectors like agriculture and rural development are likely to be affected in a major way. India is home to a third of the world’s poor, and climate change will hit this section of society the hardest. Set to be the most populous nation in the world by 2045, the economic, social and ecological price of climate change will be massive.
Global warming

Global warming is the rise in the average temperature of Earth’s atmosphere and oceans since the late 19th century, and its projected continuation. Warming of the climate system is unequivocal, and scientists are more than 90% certain that it is primarily caused by increasing concentrations of greenhouse gases produced by human activities such as deforestation and the burning of fossil fuels. These findings are recognized by the national science academies of all major industrialized nations. An increase in global temperature will cause sea levels to rise and will change the amount and pattern of precipitation, as well as cause a probable expansion of subtropical deserts. Other likely effects of the warming include a more frequent occurrence of extreme-weather events including heat waves, droughts and heavy rainfall, species extinctions due to shifting temperature regimes, and changes in crop yields. Warming and related changes will vary from region to region around the globe, with projections being more robust in some areas than others.

Vulnerability of human societies to climate change mainly lies in the effects of extreme-weather events rather than gradual climate change. Impacts of climate change so far include adverse effects on small islands, adverse effects on indigenous populations in high-latitude areas, and small but discernable effects on human health. Over the 21st century, climate change is likely to adversely affect hundreds of millions of people through increased coastal flooding, reductions in water supplies, increased malnutrition and increased health impacts. Most economic studies suggest losses of world gross domestic product (GDP) for this magnitude of warming. In small islands and mega deltas, inundation as a result of sea level rise is expected to threaten vital infrastructure and human settlements. This could lead to issues of statelessness for population from countries including the Maldives and Tuvalu and homelessness in countries with low lying areas such as Bangladesh.

The global warming controversy refers to a variety of disputes, significantly more pronounced in the popular media than in the scientific literature, regarding the nature, causes, and consequences of global warming. The disputed issues include the causes of increased global average air temperature, especially since the mid-20th century, whether this warming trend is unprecedented or within normal climatic variations, whether humankind has contributed significantly to it, and whether the increase is wholly or partially an artifact of poor measurements. Additional disputes concern estimates of climate sensitivity, predictions of additional warming, and what the consequences of global warming will be. From 1990–1997 in the United States, conservative think tanks mobilized to undermine the legitimacy of global warming as a social problem. They challenged the scientific evidence; argued that global warming will have benefits; and asserted that proposed solutions would do more harm than good.

Policy responses to global warming include mitigation by emissions reduction, adaptation to its effects, and possible future geoengineering. Most countries are parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), whose ultimate objective is to prevent dangerous
anthropogenic (i.e., human-induced) climate change. Parties to the UNFCCC have adopted a range of policies designed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to assist in adaptation to global warming. Parties to the UNFCCC have agreed that deep cuts in emissions are required, and that future global warming should be limited to below 2.0 °C (3.6 °F) relative to the pre-industrial level. A 2011 report of analyses by the United Nations Environment Programme and International Energy Agency suggest that efforts as of the early 21st century to reduce emissions may be inadequate to meet the UNFCCC’s 2 °C target. There are different views over what the appropriate policy response to climate change should be. These competing views weigh the benefits of limiting emissions of greenhouse gases against the costs. In general, it seems likely that climate change will impose greater damages and risks in poorer regions.

Article 2 of the UN Framework Convention refers explicitly to "stabilization of greenhouse gas concentrations." In order to stabilize the atmospheric concentration of CO₂, emissions worldwide would need to be dramatically reduced from their present level. Most countries are Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The ultimate objective of the Convention is to prevent dangerous human interference of the climate system. As is stated in the Convention, this requires that GHG concentrations are stabilized in the atmosphere at a level where ecosystems can adapt naturally to climate change, food production is not threatened, and economic development can proceed in a sustainable fashion. The Framework Convention was agreed in 1992, but since then, global emissions have risen.

During negotiations, the G77 (a lobbying group in the United Nations representing 133 developing nations) pushed for a mandate requiring developed countries to take the lead in reducing their emissions. This was justified on the basis that: the developed world’s emissions had contributed most to the stock of GHGs in the atmosphere; per-capita emissions (i.e., emissions per head of population) were still relatively low in developing countries; and the emissions of developing countries would grow to meet their development needs. This mandate was sustained in the Kyoto Protocol to the Framework Convention, which entered into legal effect in 2005. In ratifying the Kyoto Protocol, most developed countries accepted legally binding commitments to limit their emissions. These first-round commitments expire in 2012. Former US President George W. Bush rejected the treaty on the basis that "it exempts 80% of the world, including major population centers such as China and India, from compliance, and would cause serious harm to the US economy." At the 15th UNFCCC Conference of the Parties, held in 2009 at Copenhagen, several UNFCCC Parties produced the Copenhagen Accord. Parties associated with the Accord (140 countries, as of November 2010) aim to limit the future increase in global mean temperature to below 2 °C. The 16th Conference of the Parties (COP16) was held at Cancun in 2010. It produced an agreement, not a binding treaty, that the Parties should take urgent action to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to meet a goal of limiting global warming to 2 °C above pre-industrial temperatures. It also recognized the need to consider strengthening the goal to a global average rise of 1.5 °C.
Fight against HIV/AIDS

HIV/AIDS is a major development crisis. Since the pandemic began, it has killed millions, separated families, and destroyed and impoverished communities. In some countries, life expectancy has fallen by more than 20 years. The scale of the epidemic is causing informal social safety nets to collapse. Overall health care is under pressure as health services struggle with mounting demand. Workforces are being decimated, with severe consequences for investment, production, and per capita income. The unparalleled global response of the past decade has already forced the epidemic into decline. The rate of new HIV infections has fallen, the number of AIDS-related deaths has decreased and unprecedented funding has been mobilized for HIV programmes. Historic political agreements had a demonstrable impact on the AIDS epidemic, including the 2001 Declaration of Commitment on HIV/AIDS and the 2006 Political Declaration on HIV/AIDS which endorsed the goal of universal access to HIV prevention, treatment, care and support.

The number of people dying of AIDS-related causes fell to 1.8 million in 2010, down from a peak of 2.2 million in the mid-2000s. A total of 2.5 million deaths have been averted in low- and middle-income countries since 1995 due to antiretroviral therapy being introduced, according to new calculations by UNAIDS. Much of that success has come in the past two years when rapid scale-up of access to treatment occurred; in 2010 alone, 700 000 AIDS related deaths were averted. The proportion of women living with HIV has remained stable at 50%. There were 2.7 million new HIV infections in 2010, including an estimated 3,90,000 among children. This was 15% less than in 2001, and 21% below the number of new infections at the peak of the epidemic in 1997. The number of people becoming infected with HIV is continuing to fall, in some countries more rapidly than others. HIV incidence has fallen in 33 countries, 22 of them in Sub-Saharan Africa, the region most affected by the AIDS epidemic.

Today almost every country in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and Latin America has a success story to tell, a story of lives saved through stopping new HIV infections and preventing AIDS-related deaths. In a decade, committed political leadership, social change, innovation and rapid injection of new resources have transformed the AIDS response into a vanguard of global health success. The AIDS response has reinvigorated interest in global health and now has a new face of hope, resilience, courage and responsibility.

Role of UN in HIV/AIDS prevention and care

The United Nations has supported a wide range of activities and initiatives around the world in its battle against HIV and AIDS. The creation of a coherent and effective long-term campaign against the epidemic has been given new impetus by the UN Secretary-General’s call to action against HIV/AIDS and the proposed global fund on AIDS and health. The following are a few examples of the UN's work to broaden partnerships, encourage prevention, promote care and
treatment, mobilize resources, and grapple with issues of AIDS and food security, human rights, and workplace policies.

The UN has been active in the struggle against AIDS since the early days of the epidemic. In 1987, the World Health Organization (WHO) took the lead responsibility in the UN on AIDS by setting up a Special Programme on AIDS, which soon became the Global Programme on AIDS. At its World Health Assembly in 1993, WHO outlined the need for a joint programme on HIV/AIDS that would coordinate the activities of other UN bodies against the epidemic. This resulted in the creation of the Joint UN Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), which has been operating since 1996. The UN’s role, and particularly that of UNAIDS, in partnership with other players, is to provide governments with the necessary technical and institutional support and information needed to respond effectively to the epidemic. As the main advocate for global action on HIV/AIDS, UNAIDS leads, strengthens and supports an expanded response to the epidemic. In particular, it supports the strengthening of HIV/AIDS-related planning, policy coordination and strategy development within the UN system. As well, it supports national leadership on HIV/AIDS, especially through strengthened national coordination mechanisms and national strategic plans. Its work emphasizes support for country-led processes.

Importantly, UNAIDS works also to mobilize the UN system and to help bring focus and coherence to its activities against HIV/AIDS. This coordination is now being achieved through the UN System Strategic Plan for HIV/AIDS, which links the operational work of individual UN agencies to the overarching UN objective of providing leadership and adding value to the work of national governments and other partners in achieving agreed goals. Participating in the plan are 29 UN organizations. In that context, various branches of the UN-such as the Security Council and Economic Commissions-are intensifying their contributions to the struggle against AIDS. For example, the African Development Forum, which was organized by the UN Economic Commission for Africa in Addis Ababa in December 2000, brought together leaders from the continent to commit themselves to strategies to halt the epidemic’s advance. The UN also supports efforts by other regional and international groupings to intensify their action against the epidemic. In the Caribbean region, the Pan-Caribbean Partnership Against HIV/AIDS has emerged as a key player in the struggle against HIV/AIDS, and is working with UNAIDS, and others.

Prominent among the partnerships assembled to fight the epidemic is the International Partnership against AIDS in Africa (IPAA)-a coalition that works under the leadership of African governments and harnesses the resources of the United Nations, donors, and the private and community sectors. The venture harnesses the strengths of its partners, with UN organizations providing support to country-level efforts. On the corporate front, the skills and strengths of the business community are being harnessed in creative ways that go beyond financial contributions. As an example of the ‘multiplier effect’ of working with a large, global company, UNAIDS has teamed up with MTV to promote HIV/AIDS awareness to its one billion young viewers around the world. Initiatives are also
being mounted in partnership with the Global Business Council on HIV/AIDS, a group of 15 large companies that are advocating a stronger business response to HIV around the world. The United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO) is also involved in mobilizing the business communities in several countries to support HIV/AIDS activities.

The UN system recognizes the value of encouraging volunteers in its outreach work against HIV/AIDS. The UN Volunteers, together with UNAIDS and UNDP, has launched a unique pilot project to enlist people living with HIV/AIDS to work as national UN volunteers in their own communities. Among other things, the project helps set up support groups for AIDS orphans and their foster parents. It also provides technical assistance to help communities produce their own publications on HIV/AIDS. In order to help protect young people against HIV, UNESCO provides planners and decision-makers with prototype educational material and organizes workshops for sharing experiences and knowledge. Since effective HIV/AIDS education must be country-driven, UNESCO also provides countries with expertise to help them assess their situations and develop national preventive education strategies.

The UNAIDS Secretariat is supporting the Open Society and Medecins sans Frontieres’ large-scale prison programme in Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Moldova, Poland and Russia. The aim is to train prisoners as peer educators, provide counselling for injecting drug users, offer confidential and free HIV testing, train administrative staff and police, as well as distribute condoms, and where feasible, clean needles or bleach in prisons. Young people who inject drugs and workers in the sex industry are being targeted in programmes such as those run by the UNICEF-sponsored Vera, Madeshma, Ljubov (‘Faith, Hope and Love’) NGO in Ukraine. This initiative offers people the information and means to protect themselves against infection, provides psychosocial and medical support, and tries to inculcate a more caring approach among law enforcement personnel. In Brazil, activists and politicians helped win laws forcing local governments to fund outreach programmes for injecting drug users, with support from UNAIDS and UNDCP. Also included are AIDS education, condom promotion, needle exchange and drug treatment.

The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) is strengthening HIV/AIDS prevention and care components of reproductive health programmes in refugee settings, especially in the Great Lakes Region and West Africa. The United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) is generating new knowledge about the course and consequences of the epidemic, as well as new ideas on bolstering countries’ responses. The United Nations Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM) is engaged in programmes aimed at integrating gender issues into national HIV/AIDS plans and initiatives. In May 2000, UNICEF, UNFPA, WHO, the World Bank and the UNAIDS Secretariat began the accelerating access initiative to support countries that are trying to set up national action plans that incorporate comprehensive care programmes for people living with HIV/AIDS. Reducing mother-to-child transmission is an essential part of a comprehensive approach to care and treatment. The UN Inter-Agency Task Team on Mother-to-Child Transmission is supporting pilot projects
to prevent this form of transmission in Botswana, Burundi, Cambodia, Côte d’Ivoire, Honduras, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Targeting antenatal clinics, they combine voluntary counselling and testing of mothers with the provision of antiretroviral drugs, self-delivery practices and infant-feeding counselling.

Worried by the growing impact of the epidemic on food security and the rural sector, the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) is developing guidelines to incorporate an HIV/AIDS dimension in all its relevant field activities, especially agricultural investment projects. FAO is also developing nutritional guidelines for people living with HIV/AIDS for use by community-level health staff and other extension workers. It is also devising strategies to combat food insecurity among AIDS orphans living in rural areas. The World Food Programme, meanwhile, is using food aid to improve the food security of HIV/AIDS families and orphans. Guidelines were called for by the UN Secretary-General to serve as a framework for discussing human rights considerations in the fight against HIV/AIDS at the national, regional and international levels. The guidelines were developed and published jointly by the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and UNAIDS in 1998, and have been used as the basis for subsequent resolutions of the UN Commission on Human Rights concerning human rights and HIV/AIDS. The ILO has developed a ‘Code of Practice on HIV/AIDS and the World of Work’ to offer guidance on issues involving HIV/AIDS and the workplace. It will be promoted for use by ministries of labour, employers’ bodies and workers’ unions. The ILO is also working to incorporate workplace policies into national action plans against HIV/AIDS and to integrate HIV/AIDS issues into all its programmes at both national and enterprise levels.

The Role of NGOs in HIV/AIDS prevention and care

Widespread pressure for popular participation and a declining faith in the capacities of governments to solve the interrelated problems of social welfare, development, and the environment, lead to the global upsurge of organised private activity through a new non-profit sector. The non-profit sector has grown increasingly important in its efforts to provide alleviation of societal problems and injustices and the promotion of democratic values throughout the world in recent years. This sector has also become a major economic force with sizeable expenditures and multiple levels of paid and volunteer employment. Non-governmental organisations make up the subset of the non-profit sector involved in development work. The role of NGOs in society cannot be ignored in the field of prevention and treatment of HIV/AIDS. In areas of the industrialised world hardest-hit by AIDS, NGOs helped set trends that have now been institutionalised within AIDS prevention:

- Advocacy for persons living with HIV/AIDS,
- Targeting educational materials to specific groups,
- Improved access to experimental drug trials and health care, and
- Peer education.
The Role of IMF in HIV/AIDS prevention and care

The IMF has endorsed the call by the UN Secretary-General for this global campaign in the fight against HIV/AIDS, and has participated in the meetings of the Global Steering Committee of UNAIDS. The IMF is also collaborating with other organizations, most notably the World Bank, to expand country-level HIV prevention and treatment programs. Such programs are important components of many Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs), which are prepared by government agencies in collaboration with civil society and development partners. PRSPs provide the operational basis for concessional lending by the Fund and Bank and for debt relief under the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries (HIPC) Initiative. The IMF, in cooperation with the World Bank, is also helping poor countries to improve their public expenditure management systems and ensure that funds, including those for all health programs, are used efficiently and transparently.

In addition, HIV/AIDS features in the regular surveillance discussions the IMF holds with member countries. The severe economic impact that HIV/AIDS can have is a key factor that Fund staff consider when analyzing an affected country’s economic outlook and providing policy advice. Another component of surveillance discussions is to provide advice on how to effectively absorb large increases in foreign aid. The IMF is a vocal advocate for expanding Official Development Assistance from the industrial countries, including through new and increased contributions to the Global Fund. The IMF helps countries mobilize resources and create fiscal space for higher social spending. Moreover, IMF-supported programs support the full use of all available aid.

Role of World Bank

In 1991, the Government of India and the World Bank expanded their collaboration on infectious disease control programs and by 1992 the first National AIDS Control Project was launched with a World Bank credit of US$84 million. The project helped the government to broaden prevention efforts and to establish institutions and procedures necessary to curb the spread of HIV. Building upon lessons learned from the first project, India requested World Bank financing for a follow on project. With a World Bank credit of US$191 million, the Second National HIV/AIDS Control Project was started. The use of State AIDS Control Societies to speed the distribution of funds at the state level helped increase the pace of implementation. In 2006-07, the Bank worked closely with the Government of India and other donors on the preparation of the third National HIV/AIDS Control Project (US$ 250 million) which was launched in July, 2007. The midterm review of NACP 3, in December 2009, showed encouraging progress towards the national goals of curbing the epidemic and preventing new infections. NACP 3 coordinates all donor and NGO activities within the scope of the country’s national program on AIDS control in consonance with the Three Ones. It aims for higher coverage of key populations at risk of HIV infection (NACP 2 covered 10 60% of key populations, NACP 3 envisages to cover 80%). NACP 3 also clearly differentiates activities that must be delivered through general health services and places responsibility on those relevant government health programs. It will also further support CBOs to deliver about half of all interventions targeting the most at risk groups.
Moving forward with the preparation for the fourth phase of the national response, 2012 – 2017, the Government of India is mobilizing domestic financial support (more than 80 percent of program cost) and seeking sustained support from development partners, including the Bank. The Bank has been asked by the Department of Economic Affairs to support the fourth phase of the program as it aims to accelerate reversal of trends and integrate the program with other health programs and increase convergence with other health services over the next program phase. The national program will continue to innovate and generate lessons from its innovative performance management system. World Bank will continue to support the program in NACP IV (US$250 million) with a focus on targeted interventions and institutional strengthening.

The Bank has undertaken analytical work to strengthen the national response, including an analysis of the full array of costs and consequences likely to result from several plausible government policy options regarding funding for anti-retroviral therapy (ART). The Bank has also carried out sector work on the economic consequences of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on India. In April, 2007, the Bank, together with UNODC, AusAID and SIDA, sponsored an inter-country consultation on preventing HIV among injecting drug users. To inform the midterm review of NACP 3, the Bank collaborated with NACO on an impact assessment of targeted interventions for the prevention of HIV. The impact evaluation shows a significant effect on behavior change and HIV prevalence among female sex workers in high (intervention) intensity areas, attributable to the program. Preliminary data also demonstrate the high cost effectiveness of targeted HIV prevention interventions. An analysis of the economic development risks of HIV in India was conducted in 2009. The study shows the risk of escalating concentrated epidemics, the welfare costs, the disproportionate impact among the poor and the burden on the health system – and health budget of an increasing number of people living with AIDS, who will require treatment. The study contributes to the evidence base for an emphasis of prevention as the most cost beneficial and effective national response. World Bank will continue to support the program by bringing global experience to the program and showcase the best practices of the India program to other countries across the globe.

In a new report launched 14 May 2008, the World Bank reaffirms its commitment to a long-term engagement to the AIDS response in Africa. The new publication, The World Bank's commitment to HIV/AIDS in Africa: Our agenda for action, 2007–2011, reports that AIDS remains the leading cause of premature death and is a major threat to development in Africa. It also states that the disease has disproportionately hit women and young girls, who need the legal, social, and economic power to protect them, access treatment and care, reverse infection, and stem stigmatization. Agenda for Action is a road map for the next five years to guide the Bank’s staff. It underscores lessons learned to date and identifies actions the World Bank will need to take to ensure it can respond to the demands of member countries and other partners for financial, technical, analytical, and collaborative support. The Bank says it is moving away from its initial ‘emergency response’ role as the world’s principal financier of HIV.
programmes, towards a new mission with four new strategic objectives. These include: at global level, advising countries on how best to manage the complexity of the international financing they receive; and at local level, helping countries to accelerate implementation and take a long-term sustainable development response to HIV; strengthening the monitoring and evaluation capacity of countries to track the efficiency, effectiveness, and transparency of their AIDS response; and building up stronger health and financial systems. The World Bank was one of the first organizations to respond to AIDS worldwide. Since 2000, it has provided more than $1.5 billion to more than 30 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa to respond to the epidemic. As one of the ten cosponsors of the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), it is the lead organization in the areas of strategic planning, governance and financial management.
MODULE IV

UN Peacekeeping

Today’s multidimensional peacekeeping operations facilitate the political process, protect civilians, assist in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; support the organization of elections, protect and promote human rights and assist in restoring the rule of law. While UN peacekeeping operations are, in principle, deployed to support the implementation of a ceasefire or peace agreement, they are often required to play an active role in peacemaking efforts and may also be involved in early peace-building activities. UN peacekeeping operations may use force to defend themselves, their mandate, and civilians, particularly in situations where the State is unable to provide security and maintain public order.

United Nations Peacekeeping began in 1948 when the Security Council authorized the deployment of UN military observers to the Middle East. The mission’s role was to monitor the Armistice Agreement between Israel and its Arab neighbors – an operation which became known as the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO). Since then, 67 peacekeeping operations have been deployed by the UN, 54 of them since 1988. Over the years, hundreds of thousands of military personnel, as well as tens of thousands of UN police and other civilians from more than 120 countries have participated in UN peacekeeping operations. More than 3,000 UN peacekeepers from some 120 countries have died while serving under the UN flag.

UN Peacekeeping was born at a time when Cold War rivalries frequently paralyzed the Security Council. Peacekeeping was primarily limited to maintaining ceasefires and stabilizing situations on the ground, providing crucial support for political efforts to resolve conflict by peaceful means. Those missions consisted of unarmed military observers and lightly armed troops with primarily monitoring, reporting and confidence-building roles. The first two peacekeeping operations deployed by the UN were the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) and the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP). Both of these missions, which continue operating to this day, exemplified the observation and monitoring type of operation and had authorized strengths in the low hundreds. The UN military observers were unarmed.

United Nations peacekeeping helps countries torn by conflict create conditions for lasting peace. Peacekeeping has proven to be one of the most effective tools available to the UN to assist host countries navigate the difficult path from conflict to peace. Peacekeeping has unique strengths, including legitimacy, burden sharing, and an ability to deploy and sustain troops and police from around the globe, integrating them with civilian peacekeepers to advance multidimensional mandates. UN Peacekeepers provide security and the political and peace-building support to help countries make the difficult, early transition from conflict to peace.
UN Peacekeeping is guided by three basic principles:

- Consent of the parties;
- Impartiality;
- Non-use of force except in self-defense and defense of the mandate.

Peacekeeping is flexible and over the past two decades has been deployed in many configurations. There are currently 17 UN peace operations deployed on four continents. The General Assembly plays a key role in the financing of peacekeeping. The Security Council has primary responsibility, under the UN Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security. A number of steps have to happen before the deployment of a new UN Peacekeeping operation. 29 May is the International Day of United Nations Peacekeepers.

**Role of the Security Council**

The Security Council has primary responsibility, under the United Nations Charter, for the maintenance of international peace and security. It is for the Security Council to determine when and where a UN Peacekeeping operation should be deployed. The Security Council responds to crises around the world on a case-by-case basis and it has a range of options at its disposal. The Security Council establishes a peacekeeping operation by adopting a Security Council resolution. The resolution sets out that mission’s mandate and size. The Security Council monitors the work of UN Peacekeeping operations on an ongoing basis, including through periodic reports from the Secretary-General and by holding dedicated Security Council sessions to discuss the work of specific operations. The Security Council can vote to extend, amend or end mission mandates as it deems appropriate. Under Article 25 of the Charter, all UN members agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council. While other organs of the UN make recommendations to Member States, the Council alone has the power to take decisions which Member States are obligated to implement.

**Role of the General Assembly**

The General Assembly plays a key role in the financing of peacekeeping. The General Assembly is the main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the United Nations. Comprising all 193 Member States of the UN, it provides a unique forum for multilateral discussion of the full spectrum of international issues. This includes international peace and security matters. Under the UN Charter, however, the General Assembly cannot discuss and make recommendations on peace and security matters which are at that time being addressed by the Security Council. UN Peacekeeping’s global partnership today includes Member States, the UN Secretariat, host countries, regional organizations and UN partners. UN Peacekeeping is a unique global partnership. It draws together the legal and political authority of the Security Council, the personnel and financial contributions of Member States, the support of host countries and the accumulated experience of the Secretariat in managing
operations in the field. It is this partnership that gives UN Peacekeeping its legitimacy, sustainability and global reach. The General Assembly is responsible for decisions relating to the financing of operations.

**Post Cold-War surge**

With the end of the Cold War, the strategic context for UN Peacekeeping changed dramatically. The UN shifted and expanded its field operations from “traditional” missions involving generally observational tasks performed by military personnel to complex “multidimensional” enterprises. These multidimensional missions were designed to ensure the implementation of comprehensive peace agreements and assist in laying the foundations for sustainable peace. The nature of conflicts also changed over the years. UN Peacekeeping, originally developed as a means of dealing with inter-State conflict, was increasingly being applied to intra-State conflicts and civil wars. UN Peacekeepers were now increasingly asked to undertake a wide variety of complex tasks, from helping to build sustainable institutions of governance, to human rights monitoring, to security sector reform, to the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants.

**1989 - 1994: Rapid increase in numbers**

After the Cold War ended, there was a rapid increase in the number of peacekeeping operations. With a new consensus and a common sense of purpose, the Security Council authorized a total of 20 new operations between 1989 and 1994, raising the number of peacekeepers from 11,000 to 75,000. Peacekeeping operations established in such countries as Angola - UN Angola Verification Mission I (UNAVEM I) and UN Angola Verification Mission II (UNAVEM II), Cambodia - UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC), El Salvador - UN Observer Mission in El Salvador (ONUSAL), Mozambique - UN Operation in Mozambique (ONUMOZ) and Namibia - UN Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG), were deployed to:

- help implement complex peace agreements;
- stabilize the security situation;
- re-organize military and police;
- elect new governments and build democratic institutions.

By May 2010, UN Peacekeeping operations had more than 1,24,000 military, police and civilian staff. Since then UN Peacekeeping has entered a phase of consolidation. The numbers have, for the first time in a decade, started to decline slightly, with the reduction of troops in UN Organization Stabilization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUSCO) and the withdrawal of UN Mission in the Central African Republic and Chad (MINURCAT) at the end of 2010. However, this by no means indicates that the challenges faced by the UN are diminishing. While the numbers of military
peacekeepers may be decreasing, the demand for field missions is expected to remain high, and peacekeeping will continue to be one of the UN's most complex operational tasks. Moreover, the political complexity facing peacekeeping operations and the scope of their mandates, including on the civilian side, remain very broad. There are strong indications that certain specialized capabilities – including police – will be in especially high demand over the coming years.

**Current peacekeeping operations**

There are currently 17 UN peace operations deployed on four continents. These include 16 peacekeeping operations, and one special political mission in Afghanistan. These are all led by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO).

**Africa**

1. **UNMISS (United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan)**

   Consolidating peace and security and helping to establish conditions for development. On 9 July 2011 South Sudan became the newest country in the world. The birth of the Republic of South Sudan is the culmination of a six-year peace process which began with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2005. In adopting resolution 1996 (2011) on 8 July 2011, the Security Council determined that the situation faced by South Sudan continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security in the region. The Security Council established the United Nations Mission in the Republic of South Sudan (UNMISS) for an initial period of one year, starting from 9 July 2011. UNMISS is on the ground to consolidate peace and security and to help establish conditions for development.

2. **UNMIL (United Nations Mission in Liberia)**

   Support for the implementation of the Peace Process. The United Nations Mission in Liberia (UNMIL) was established by Security Council resolution 1509 (2003) of 19 September 2003 to support the implementation of the ceasefire agreement and the peace process; protect United Nations staff, facilities and civilians; support humanitarian and human rights activities; as well as assist in national security reform, including national police training and formation of a new, restructured military.

**America**

3. **MINUSTAH (United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti)**

   The United Nations Stabilization Mission in Haiti (MINUSTAH) was established on 1 June 2004 by Security Council resolution 1542. The UN mission succeeded a Multinational Interim Force (MIF) authorized by the Security
Council in February 2004 after President Bertrand Aristide departed Haiti for exile in the aftermath of an armed conflict which spread to several cities across the country. The devastating earthquake of 12 January 2010, which resulted in more than 2,20,000 deaths (according to Haitian Government figures), including 96 UN peacekeepers, delivered a severe blow to country’s already shaky economy and infrastructure. The Security Council, by resolution 1908 of 19 January 2010, endorsed the Secretary-General’s recommendation to increase the overall force levels of MINUSTAH to support the immediate recovery, reconstruction and stability efforts in the country. Following the completion of Presidential elections in 2011, MINUSTAH has been working to fulfill its original mandate to restore a secure and stable environment, to promote the political process, to strengthen Haiti’s Government institutions and rule-of-law-structures, as well as to promote and to protect human rights. The Mission has continued to mobilize its logistical resources to assist in the effort to contain and treat the cholera outbreak of October 2010.

Asia and the Pacific

4. UNMIT (United Nations Integrated Mission in Timor-Leste)

UNMIT—a multidimensional, integrated UN peacekeeping operation— was established by Security Council resolution 1704 of 25 August 2006 in the wake of a major political, humanitarian and security crisis which erupted in Timor-Leste in April-May 2006. Among other things, UNMIT has been mandated to support the Government in “consolidating stability, enhancing a culture of democratic governance, and facilitating political dialogue among Timorese stakeholders, in their efforts to bring about a process of national reconciliation and to foster social cohesion”. UNMIT has replaced the UN Office in Timor-Leste (UNOTIL) which in turn was the latest in a series of successive United Nations operations or missions deployed in this country beginning in 1999.

5. UNMOGIP (United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan)

The first group of United Nations military observers arrived in the mission area on 24 January of 1949 to supervise the ceasefire between India and Pakistan in the State of Jammu and Kashmir. These observers, under the command of the Military Adviser appointed by the UN Secretary-General, formed the nucleus of the United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP). Following renewed hostilities of 1971, UNMOGIP has remained in the area to observe developments pertaining to the strict observance of the ceasefire of 17 December 1971 and report there on to the Secretary-General.

6. UNAMA (United Nation’s Assistance Mission in Afghanistan)

The United Nations Assistance Mission in Afghanistan (UNAMA) is a political mission established by the Security Council in 2002 at the request of the Government to assist it and the people of Afghanistan in laying the foundations for sustainable peace and development in the country. On 22 March 2012, the 15-member UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 2041.
renewing UNAMA’s mandate until March 2013. The Security Council reaffirmed that UNAMA, under the direction of Ján Kubiš, Special Representative of the Secretary-General, would continue to play a proactive role in promoting peace and stability in Afghanistan by leading the efforts of the international community, regional cooperation and the work of all United Nations agencies, funds and programmes.

Guided by the principle of reinforcing Afghan sovereignty, leadership and ownership, UNAMA will continue to lead and coordinate the international civilian efforts with a particular focus on National Priority Programmes, cooperation with NATO/ISAF for transition, reconciliation, elections, regional cooperation, human rights and humanitarian assistance. An important new element of the 2012 mandate is in reference to the role of the United Nations in the elections planned for 2014. While acknowledging the ownership of Afghan authorities in the electoral process the new mandate defines the United Nations as an active partner of the authorities, the institutions and the civil society – particularly women’s organizations – in Afghanistan. It underscores the importance of active and equal participation of women in the electoral process. The mutual goal is to work together towards strengthening the integrity, inclusivity and sustainability of the electoral process as agreed in the London, Kabul and Bonn conferences. If requested, the United Nations will provide capacity building and technical assistance.

The new mandate also stresses the importance of a comprehensive and inclusive, Afghan-led and Afghan-owned political process to support reconciliation for all those who are prepared to reconcile, while continuing to assess – including in collaboration with AIHRC – its human rights and gender implications. The United Nations encourages dialogue with those who “renounce violence, have no links to international terrorist organizations”, including Al-Qaida, “respect the constitution,” including its human rights provisions, notably the rights of women, “and are willing to join in building a peaceful Afghanistan”. In the mandate renewal, the Security Council put greater emphasis than ever before on.

**Europe**

7. **UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP)**

UNFICYP was originally set up by the Security Council in 1964 to prevent further fighting between the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot communities. After the hostilities of 1974, the Council has mandated the Force to perform certain additional functions. In the absence of a political settlement to the Cyprus problem, UNFICYP has remained on the island to supervise ceasefire lines, maintain a buffer zone, undertake humanitarian activities and support the good offices mission of the Secretary-General.
8. UNMIK (United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo)

Originally, the Security Council, by its resolution 1244 of 10 June 1999, authorized the Secretary-General to establish an international civil presence in Kosovo – the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) – in order to provide an interim administration for Kosovo under which the people of Kosovo could enjoy substantial autonomy. Its task was unprecedented in complexity and scope; the Council vested UNMIK with authority over the territory and people of Kosovo, including all legislative and executive powers and administration of the judiciary. Subsequently, following the declaration of independence by the Kosovo authorities and the entry into force of a new constitution on 15 June 2008, the tasks of the Mission have significantly been modified to focus primarily on the promotion of security, stability and respect for human rights in Kosovo.

Middle East

9. UNSMIS (United Nations Supervision Mission in Syria)

Established by United Nations Security Council resolution 2043 of 21 April 2012, initially for a 90-day period, to monitor a cessation of armed violence in all its forms by all parties and to monitor and support the full implementation of the Joint Special Envoy’s six-point plan to end the conflict in Syria. On 15 June 2012, UNSMIS suspended its activities owing to an intensification of armed violence across the country. This suspension was to be reviewed on a daily basis. On 20 July 2012, the Security Council decided to extend UNSMIS for a final period of 30 days.

10. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force

From early March 1974, the situation in the Israel-Syria sector became increasingly unstable, and firing intensified. The United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) was established on 31 May 1974 by Security Council resolution 350 (1974), following the agreed disengagement of the Israeli and Syrian forces in the Golan Heights. Since then, UNDOF has remained in the area to maintain the ceasefire between the Israeli and Syrian forces and to supervise the implementation of the disengagement agreement.

Reforms in the UN Charter

The Charter of the United Nations was signed on 26 June 1945, in San Francisco, at the conclusion of the United Nations Conference on International Organization, and came into force on 24 October 1945. The Statute of the International Court of Justice is an integral part of the Charter. Amendments to Articles 23, 27 and 61 of the Charter were adopted by the General Assembly on 17 December 1963 and came into force on 31 August 1965. A further amendment to Article 61 was adopted by the General Assembly on 20 December 1971, and came into force on 24 September 1973. An amendment to Article 109,
adopted by the General Assembly on 20 December 1965, came into force on 12 June 1968. The amendment to Article 23 enlarges the membership of the Security Council from eleven to fifteen. The amended Article 27 provides that decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members (formerly seven) and on all other matters by an affirmative vote of nine members (formerly seven), including the concurring votes of the five permanent members of the Security Council.

The amendment to Article 61, which entered into force on 31 August 1965, enlarged the membership of the Economic and Social Council from eighteen to twenty-seven. The subsequent amendment to that Article, which entered into force on 24 September 1973, further increased the membership of the Council from twenty-seven to fifty-four. The amendment to Article 109, which relates to the first paragraph of that Article, provides that a General Conference of Member States for the purpose of reviewing the Charter may be held at a date and place to be fixed by a two-thirds vote of the members of the General Assembly and by a vote of any nine members (formerly seven) of the Security Council. Paragraph 3 of Article 109, which deals with the consideration of a possible review conference during the tenth regular session of the General Assembly, has been retained in its original form in its reference to a "vote, of any seven members of the Security Council", the paragraph having been acted upon in 1955 by the General Assembly, at its tenth regular session, and by the Security Council.

**United Nations Security Council**

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is one of the principal organs of the United Nations and is charged with the maintenance of international peace and security. Its powers, outlined in the United Nations Charter, include the establishment of peacekeeping operations, the establishment of international sanctions, and the authorization of military action. Its powers are exercised through United Nations Security Council resolutions. The Security Council held its first session on 17 January 1946 at Church House, Westminster, London. Since its first meeting, the Council, which exists in continuous session, has travelled widely, holding meetings in many cities, such as Paris and Addis Ababa, as well as at its current permanent home at the United Nations Headquarters in New York City.

There are 15 members of the Security Council, consisting of five veto-wielding permanent members—China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States—based on the great powers that were the victors of World War II, and 10 elected non-permanent members with two-year terms. This basic structure is set out in Chapter V of the UN Charter. Security Council members must always be present at UN headquarters in New York so that the Security Council can meet at any time. This requirement of the United Nations Charter was adopted to address a weakness of the League of Nations since that organization was often unable to respond quickly to a crisis.
Nature of Membership

The permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, also known as the Permanent Five, Big Five, or P5, include the following five governments: People Republic of China (China), France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The members represent the great powers considered the victors of World War II. Each of the permanent members has power to veto, enabling them to prevent the adoption of any "substantive" draft Council resolution, regardless of the level of international support for the draft. Ten other members are elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms starting on 1 January, with five replaced each year. The members are chosen by regional groups and confirmed by the United Nations General Assembly. To be approved, a candidate must receive at least 2/3 of all votes cast for that seat, which can result in deadlock if there are two roughly evenly matched candidates; in 1979, a standoff between Cuba and Colombia only ended after three months and 154 rounds of voting, when both withdrew in favor of Mexico as a compromise candidate.

The African bloc is represented by three members; the Latin America and the Caribbean, Asian, and Western European and Others blocs by two members each; and the Eastern European bloc by one member. Also, one of the members is an "Arab country," alternately from the Asian or African bloc. Currently, elections for terms beginning in even-numbered years select two African members, and one each within Eastern Europe, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. Additionally, the Arab state is represented in this group (Libya within Africa in 2008, Lebanon within Asia in 2010). Terms beginning in odd-numbered years consist of two Western European and Other members, and one within each of Latin America and the Caribbean, Asia, and Africa. The current elected members, with the regions they were elected to represent and their Permanent Representatives are: Azerbaijan, Columbia, Germany, Guatemala, India, Morocco, Pakistan, Portugal, South Africa, Togo are the non-permanent members in un security council.

Need for Democratization of UN Security Council

Democratization of UN Security Council is a need of the present era. Democratization is important because without democracy a world organization like the UN will not be effective. The failure of the Security Council so far in dealing with various challenges to global security was the result of its being still undemocratic. Democratization of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) encompasses five key issues: categories of membership, the question of the veto held by the five permanent members, regional representation, the size of an enlarged Council and its working methods, and the Security Council-General Assembly relationship.

Even though the geopolitical realities have changed drastically since 1945, when the set-up of the current Council was decided, the Security Council has changed very little during this long period. The winners of Second World War shaped the Charter of the United Nations in their national interests, dividing the veto-power pertinent to the permanent seats amongst themselves. With
the enlargement of the United Nations membership and increasing self-confidence among the new members, going hand in hand with processes of decolonization, old structures and procedures were increasingly challenged. The imbalance between the number of seats in the Security Council and the total number of member States became evident and the only significant reform of the Security Council came to pass in 1965 after the ratification of two thirds of the membership, including the five permanent members of the Security Council (that have a veto right on Charter changes). The reform included an increase of the non-permanent membership from six to 10 members. With Boutros-Ghali elected as Secretary-General in 1992, the reform discussions of the UN Security Council were launched again as he started his new term with the first-ever summit of the Security Council and thereafter published “An Agenda for Peace”. His motivation was to restructure the composition and anachronistic procedures of the UN organ recognizing the changed world.

By 1992, Japan and Germany had become the second and third largest contributor to the United Nations and started to demand a permanent seat. Also Brazil (fifth largest country in terms of territory) and India (second largest country in terms of population) as the most powerful countries within their regional groups and key players within their regions saw themselves with a permanent seat. This group of four countries formed an interest group later known as the G4. On the other hand their regional rivals were opposed to the G4 becoming permanent members with a veto power. They favored the expansion of the non-permanent category of seats with members to be elected on a regional basis. Italy, Spain, Argentina, Canada, Mexico, South Korea and Pakistan started to form an interest group, known as the “Coffee Club” and later “Uniting for Consensus”. Simultaneously, the African Group started to demand two permanent seats for themselves, on the basis of historical injustices and the fact that a large part of the Council’s agenda is concentrated on the continent. Those two seats would be permanent African seats, that rotate between African countries chosen by the African group.

The existing permanent members, each holding the right of veto on Security Council reform, announced their positions reluctantly. The United States supported the permanent membership of Japan and India and a small number of additional non-permanent members. The United Kingdom and France essentially supported the G4 position, with the expansion of permanent and non-permanent members and the accession of Germany, Brazil, India and Japan to permanent member status, as well as an increase the presence by African countries on the Council. China supported the stronger representation of developing countries, voicing support for the Republic of India. Russia, India’s long time friend and ally has also endorsed the fast growing power’s candidature to assume a seat of a permanent member on the Security Council.

Democratization in the Security Council means distributing membership not to geographical representation only but the majority of world civilization also has to be represented. The number of Muslims in the world reaching 1.1 billion
needs to be represented in the Security Council if the Council really wants to be
democratic. The permanent members are included in the Security Council from
the early days of the UN formation. Hence the Security Council is reflecting a
world order around 1950. Since then a lot of happenings took place in the world.
A number of new countries emerged as global powers. Japan, Germany, Brazil,
New Zealand, India, most of the ASEAN countries became more financially
powerful. In the case of Japan and Germany they are contributing around 25% of
the UN budget. If consider India’s inclusion it also acceptable that India is the
largest democratic country in the world and shows almost fixed economic growth
rate.

It has been argued that the five permanent members of the United Nations
Security Council, who are all nuclear powers, have created an exclusive nuclear
club that predominately addresses the strategic interests and political motives of
the permanent members; for example, protecting the oil-rich Kuwaitis in 1991
but poorly protecting resource-poor Rwandans in 1994. Since 60% of the
permanent members are also European, and 80% predominantly white Western
nations, the Security Council has been described as a pillar of global apartheid

To make the Security Council more democratic, the exercise of a veto by
the UN permanent members must be regulated. The veto power was adopted at
the insistence of the Soviet Union and the United States after World War II.
According to the by-rules of the UN, a “no” vote by any one permanent Security
Council member is enough to strike down any given proposal. The “no” vote is the
same as a veto. Permanent members often use this veto power to strike down
measures that run contrary to their individual national interests. For example,
the People’s Republic of China, which, in 1971, replaced the Republic of China as
a permanent Security Council member, has vetoed sparingly, but always and
only on issues relating to Chinese national interests. In another example, in the
first ten years of the UN’s existence, Russia was responsible for 79 vetoes—more
than half of all the vetoes cast during that period—and cast them to dispute the
U.S.’s refusal to admit all of the Soviet Republics as member states of the UN. In
another example of the use of the veto power to advance national interests,
between 1982 and today, the U.S. vetoed 32 Security Council resolutions that
were critical of Israel.

Due to the immense power of the veto, permanent members often now meet
privately and then present their resolutions to the full council, which critics from
the Global Policy Forum characterize as a fait accompli. The Security Council’s
effectiveness and relevance is questioned because, in most high-profile cases,
there are essentially no consequences for violating a Security Council resolution.
During the Darfur crisis, Janjaweed militias, allowed by elements of
the Sudanese government, committed violence against an indigenous population,
killing thousands of civilians. In the Srebrenica massacre, Serbian troops
committed genocide against Bosniaks, although Srebrenica had been declared a
UN “safe area” and was even “protected” by 400 armed Dutch
peacekeepers. The UN Charter gives all three powers of the legislative, executive, and judiciary branches to the Security Council.

The Security Council should also include those UN member states that are not part of the Council more closely in its deliberations. The vast majority of UN member states are not represented on the Security Council. Nevertheless, all member States are obliged to implement the Council’s decisions. More transparency and a better inclusion of non-members in the whole decision-making process would result in greater political acceptance and lead to better implementation of the Council’s decisions. The Security Council makes more of its meetings public and thus accessible to non-members. In particular, those states affected by conflict and those that provide troops for peacekeeping operations should be more closely involved in the Council’s decision-making. Limits to be placed on the use of the veto in the Security Council. Specifically, the five permanent members with veto power – the United States, Russia, China, France and Britain – should renounce the use of the veto in cases of genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. A resolution adopted by the General Assembly is not legally binding on the Security Council. It can, however, create political pressure.

In the present situation it is obvious that the VETO holders have a hand over the overall decisions of UN Security Council. This is against the concept of equality which is the basic element of democracy. As UN is a world organization all the member states should have an equal opportunity to took part in decision making. So it’s the time to restructure the UN Security Council by abolishing the permanent member system and it will be acceptable by all if all the members were elected by periodic election. A restructuring in the direction of democratization is important to include the countries like Japan and Germany from developed world, India and Brazil from developing world so as to reflect the contemporary world order in the most influential international forum.
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