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ABSTRACT

The focus of this dissertation will be to ascertain the extent of the impact of SAARC on the ideology of regional integration in South Asia. Has regional cooperation fostered greater integration or not? The answer is not as easy as the question seems to suggest. The birth of SAARC was long and protracted. This is not surprising in a conflict prone area which had only recently shaken off foreign rule and guarded its ideal of sovereignty jealously.

Thus the answer to the central question lies in understanding the origins of SAARC, the meaning of integration and the basis of regional cooperation. More specifically it was found to be useful to look at the goals of SAARC, the dilution of power in the second half of the twentieth century, the role of sovereign nations in the UN, the growth of nationalism, the search for national identity in the new nations, the constraints and unifying factors in SAARC, the position taken by India, the perception of an
imperial New Delhi by neighboring countries, the fears and jealousies of Pakistan, the ethnic and religious divergences in the area, the problem of the six smaller countries vis-a-vis India, the absence of any security commitment in SAARC and the role played by each of the seven nations in originating and maintaining SAARC.

All these factors can be conveniently grouped into five themes that seem to run through these efforts. I can identify them from the initial cognition, to confrontation in the early days of independence, to the gradual convergence into cooperation, and finally, consolidation of these attempts not merely now but also in the future. Lastly, what is the future of SAARC? Can it solve all the problems it faces? More closeness and perhaps greater integration? The only real answer is that much can be achieved but regional integration is beyond the reach of SAARC as it is presently constituted. Nevertheless, there is always a first faltering step and SAARC is probably that.
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PART 1

COGNITION
This prologue will take up briefly three matters that have to be dealt with before a proper approach could be made in discussing the impact of SAARC on regional integration in South Asia. The first question that arises is, what is SAARC, how did it come about and what are its objectives? The second question could be, why is SAARC and South Asia so little known in the US? The third question may be, how important is SAARC and South Asia in the national interest of the US? If these matters are satisfactorily dealt with at the outset it would be easier to deal with the more complex matters in the subsequent chapters.

The term SAARC is an acronym formed from the first letters in the words:- South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation. This association was inaugurated on December 8, 1985 at Dhaka in Bangladesh by the Heads of State or Governments of seven sovereign nation-states in South Asia. They were, in alphabetical order, the following states:- Bangladesh, Bhutan, Ceylon, India, the Maldives, Nepal, and Pakistan. (The
term, Ceylon, is used advisedly instead of Sri Lanka as this is the English name of the country. This usage is consistent with the English usage of the terms Germany, Sweden, Spain or Japan which are known in their own languages as Deutschland, Sverige, Espagna or Nihon.)

SAARC was inaugurated with the intention of having a regional body to coordinate the efforts of seven independent nation states in cooperating with each other and perhaps with other nations, other regional bodies and international agencies for the very laudable purpose of raising the living standards of the people of South Asia. The aims of this association were embodied in a Charter consisting of ten articles. Basically, what the association emphasized was that there would be a measure of cooperation between the seven nation-states in certain previously outlined, discussed and agreed programs. It would not go beyond that. It guaranteed the territorial integrity, the sovereign equality and non-interference in the internal affairs of the states together with a complete acceptance of the principles of the United Nations Charter and the principles of
Non-alignment. There were seven objectives which were embodied in Article 1. They were:

(a) to promote the welfare of the peoples of South Asia and to improve their quality of life;
(b) 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 realise their full potentials;
(c) to promote and strengthen collective self-reliance among the countries of South Asia;
(d) to contribute to mutual trust, understanding and appreciation of one another's problems;
(e) to promote active collaboration and mutual assistance in the economic, social, cultural, technical and scientific fields;
(g) to strengthen cooperation among themselves in international forums on matters of common interests; and
(h) to cooperate with international and regional organisations with similar aims and purposes. (From SARC to SAARC, Vol 1, 1988:p96/97.)

There were nine more articles which dealt with principles, procedures and financial arrangements. Two matters that were perhaps unique to SAARC were that all decisions shall be unanimous and that all bilateral and contentious issues would be excluded from discussions. Even today it is difficult to fully comprehend that SAARC is an accomplished fact given the intense rivalry that exists between the two major partners in SAARC:- India and Pakistan. The chief architect
of this association for regional cooperation was the late Ziaur Rahman, President of Bangladesh, who in 1980 took the first steps internationally to push for the acceptance of some form of regional cooperation. This does not in anyway detract from the efforts of academics, intellectuals and leading personalities of many countries from pushing for the same objectives. But if it was Ziaur Rahman who took the first practical steps, it was Rajiv Gandhi and members of the Indian Foreign Service who gave it concrete shape and general acceptance among the other six members. It must borne in mind that India and Pakistan had fought three wars, the last of which dismembered Pakistan and confined it to the areas it held in the west of the Indian subcontinent thus making Pakistan an implacable foe of India. At the same time there were not many friendly dealings between India and other states in the area. Therefore it is really amazing that SAARC did actually take shape.

At this stage it is perhaps relevant to look at some factors that made SAARC possible and why it is so little known in the US and
perhaps in the rest of the world. South Asia itself is not very well known in the United States. This is partly due to historic reasons and partly due to the greater impact Europe and East Asia have had on the people of this country. Till the end of World War II the United States was content to see the subcontinent of India, as it was known then, to be ruled by England. Even no less a person than Karl Marx felt that England was doing a good job in India. (Ashis Nandy, *The Intimate Enemy*, 1983: p.ix and Farmer, *An Introduction to South Asia*, 2nd Ed, 1993: p34/35). The only Americans who ventured into these parts were missionaries who concentrated on educational and religious efforts and less on publicising this region to their compatriots. (Crunden in *New Perspectives on America and South Asia*, 1984: p2). South Asia unlike China and Japan had no Pearl Buck or Lafcadio Hearn to interpret and extoll the virtues of this complex and relatively unknown region to the American people before the Second World War. There were, no doubt, English authors such as Rudyard Kipling, E.M. Foster, Somerset Maugham or the American, Louis Bromfield and others, but their works were
directed towards a reading public in England or did not appeal to the American readers very much. However, more people in America became aware of the Indian subcontinent, after the entry of Japan into World War II. When the war ended in 1945 the US was already a global power. The possession of atomic weapons gave her unchallenged supremacy. The deployment of General Stillwell in the China-Burma-India Theater of Operations had already made the US aware that all was not well in the Indian subcontinent. The charismatic figures of Mohandas Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru were becoming known to the American public. Prestigious newspapers such as "The New York Times", "The Los Angeles Times" or "The Washington Post" began to carry more news about this little known region but many other newspapers and journals still did not because there was no real demand to know more about the Indian subcontinent.

Nevertheless, America exerted pressure on the British to grant independence to India. (Louis, *Imperialism at Bay*, 1978: p147). In this they were aided by the policy of the Labour government which came into power in England after
the war. India became independent in 1947 but not without some trauma in accepting a division of the country. Nehru who became Prime Minister of India admired America but had very definite views on how India was to be run and what the region should do in the face of two rival power blocs in a post-war world. He wanted the Asian region to come together and remain nonaligned with either power bloc. Unfortunately the growth of nationalism and the heady wine of new found sovereign independence made the new states veer away from Nehru's ideals and into what is known as self interest. This disappointed Nehru. On the other hand America tried to draw Pakistan into her orbit and ignored India. Americans perceived Nehru to be a Communist sympathiser and did not understand or appreciate the independent role he was playing.

After the end of World War II there was a growing desire to know more about the little known region which now came to be called South Asia in deference to the sensitivities of Pakistan. Authors such John Masters, M.M. Kaye, Paul Scott, Ruth Prawer Jhabvala, Kamala Markandaya, Nirad Chaudhuri and others were avidly
read. John Masters was the first of his genre to realize the great void presented to the American reader by India and he drew up a list of thirty five episodes in the three hundred year connection England had with India which could eventually be expanded into interesting novels. (Masters, Pilgrim Son, 1971: p136). He was proved right in that the first six books that he wrote from 1951 to 1956 sold over a million copies each and became best sellers. At least two were filmed. One of them, Bhowani Junction had Ava Gardner, Stewart Granger and Bill Travers in the leading roles and was one of the outstanding movies of 1956. It gave a peep into a greatly troubled land.

But India still remained a closed book to many Americans. They were wary of the spread of Communism and those who did not side with them were perceived to be Communists or Communist sympathizers. Nehru himself found it more and more difficult to have meetings or conferences with his Asian neighbors. The Bandung Conference in 1955 was the last effort of India to get their Asian neighbors together. In spite of many obstructions, regionalism and the nonaligned
movement grew very slowly. In the seventies the nonaligned movement reached its apex but regionalism did not progress very much.

There was much dissatisfaction in the late sixties and early seventies with the way America imposed her will on the rest of the world. There was a call for a New International Economic Order (NIEO) and a North / South dialogue. A resolution accepting the NIEO was passed in the UN but the developed countries ignored it. It was then that some scholars decided that another way should be found. The Marga Institute, a non governmental organization in Colombo, Ceylon, decided to have a meeting in September, 1978 to establish a Committee on Studies for Cooperation and Development (CSCD) for Regional Cooperation in South Asia.

According to V. Kanesalingam of the Marga Institute there were no less than twelve major themes in these studies. These were later increased to fourteen. They were:-

1. Introductory Survey
2. Development strategies
3. Trade Expansion
4. Regional Cooperation
5. Living Standards
6. Cooperation for Development
The work of these scholars took some time to complete and their efforts went on till 1984. In the meantime the President of Bangladesh saw the importance of a regional grouping. In his visits to India, Pakistan, Ceylon and Nepal he found the leaders of these countries receptive to the idea of a regional association. So he followed up his visits with a working paper which was studied with interest by officials of these South Asian countries. It is said that the Bangladesh Working Paper was prepared by Muhammad Shamsul Huq, an Economics Professor who was then Bangladesh's Foreign Minister. (Anand, 1991:p73).

The Working Paper was titled, "Regional Cooperation In South Asia" and it went on to say that though countries in the region had cooperated in such bodies as UN Agencies, the Commonwealth and in the Nonaligned Movement these activities could have been of greater
benefit if they had properly exploited the resources of the region and directed the benefits to specific areas. The paper called for the formation of institutional arrangements in such fields as telecommunications, meteorology, transport, shipping, tourism, agricultural research, joint ventures, marketing, scientific and technical cooperation. (Anand, 1991:p56/57).

Following the Bangladesh proposal a meeting was held in Colombo, Ceylon, at the level of Foreign Ministers in April, 1981. This body laid down the basis on which future cooperation was to take place. These guidelines later formed part of the Charter inaugurating SAARC in 1985. There were regular meetings thereafter by experts. Once these experts finalized their program the Foreign Ministers took it up on August, 1983 in New Delhi and formally accepted what was known then as South Asia Regional Cooperation or SARC. (Baxter et al, 1993: p356). The organization consisted of four bodies:

1. Foreign Ministers.
2. Standing Committee of Foreign Secretaries
3. Action Committees and
4. Technical or Expert Committees
The first Summit Meeting of seven Heads of State was held in Dhaka on 7-8 December, 1985. Here the name was changed to South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation and a Charter based more or less on the Delhi Declaration of the Foreign Ministers in 1983 was accepted by all seven states. One of the first steps taken was the establishment of a Secretariat with a Secretary-General appointed for a nonrenewable term of two years. In the next summit which was held in Bangalore, India, it was agreed to have the Secretariat in Kathmandu, Nepal. The first Secretary-General was a Bangladeshi diplomat, Abul Ahsan.

The third Summit was held in Kathmandu where a Food Security Reserve of 125,000 metric tonnes was agreed on. The Fourth Summit was held in Islamabad in December, 1988. A Pakistani proposal called, "SAARC 2000- A Basic Needs Perspective" was accepted. The next meeting was to have been held in Colombo but tensions caused by the Indian Peacekeeping Force prevented the annual meeting and the Fifth Summit was eventually held in Male, the capital of the Maldives in 1990. The Sixth was held in Colombo in 1991.
and the Seventh in Dhaka in 1993. Wherever the meetings are held it seems it is the personalities of the leaders that count. Zia al Huq, Rajiv Gandhi, Benazair Bhutto and J.R Jayawardena were able to stamp their impress on the meetings in contrast to the ineffectiveness of Narasimha Rao, Nawab Sharif, Khaleda Begum or Ranasingha Premadasa.

There is much in SAARC that can take it to great heights such as in the harnessing of the Himalayan Water System by India, Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh jointly or in the exploitation of the ocean resources that surround five of the seven South Asian countries. The achievements of SAARC so far though important are felt by some observers to be limited and rather insignificant. Some major issues such as trade, investment, technology transfer, industry and monetary cooperation have not yet been taken up. There are several problems which are both political and economic. These will be dealt with in greater detail in the subsequent chapters. Nevertheless a perusal of some of the published papers and agenda of meetings held and decisions taken show an enormous amount of studies and
work undertaken by this regional organization in a sphere where cooperation though very important was very often thwarted by vested interests, parochial outlook, or inordinate fears of domination by internal or external forces. The greatest achievement of SAARC is perhaps in bringing together the rulers and the ruling elites of the seven nation-states for the sole purpose of bettering the living conditions of the ordinary people of the region.

I have already indicated why South Asia is so little known in America, what SAARC is and what it has achieved so far. The next two chapters will give in greater detail the origins of SAARC and the role Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first Prime Minister had in expounding the need for a regional organization to solve regional problems. I will now indicate why it is in America's national interest to know India better and to interact more with the people of South Asia.

The world today is very different from that of our ancestors. The changes have been more dramatic, more pronounced and more rapid than at any time in the past. For example
we can send a man to the moon, devastate whole continents in a flash but cannot control inflation and money transactions worldwide. In an interdependent world every country has to unite with others and team up at least regionally rather work things out all by itself if it is to find a way of directing and controlling extranational forces.

Till the late eighties the Cold War paralysed the efforts of America to install a new economic and political order. Iraq was the last effort to have a common policy directed by the UN. Bosnia, Somalia, Ruwanda and even Haiti are symbols of great failures of UN directed operations. Therefore, is it in the national interest of the US to have more and better economic relations with a country such as India? The United States has had serious economic and financial problems in the last two decades. There has been large scale unemployment and many plant closings. Serious attempts are being made to reduce budget deficits and thereby indirectly strengthen the dollar. One way of achieving this result is to improve our terms of trade with other countries. The World Trade
Organization, NAFTA and other similar moves are an indication of the importance of trade to our economy. But our products need to be competitive in the world market. Both Deming and Ishihara emphasize that this not the fault of the worker but is a management problem. Rafael Aguayo repeatedly quotes Deming's words: -Quality is a management responsibility. Quality is the source of profits. Quality makes for loyal customers.

If in 1950 one were to have picked the future economic power of Asia, it would have been China with its huge land base, or India, which seemed to possess all the ingredients for success. India had people, knowledge, and resources. But India and China both lacked management. (Aguayo, 1990: p241)

Until quality becomes a prime factor in Indian industry there is an opportunity here that America could seize with immediate benefit for her export trade provided the US quickly revamps her management techniques. Secondly, there are shared values of democracy and secular government. According to Rummel democracies do not go to war with each other. There are no doubt exceptions to this rule but it is unthinkable for the US to go to war with India or vice versa.
Thirdly, India could provide a large two way trade with her rising middle class who are demanding the material benefits and labor saving devices of our modern world.

Deming was not the only one who criticized American business management. Shintaro Ishihara says,

In the 1990s, the United States must take stock of its management style and techniques. The political leadership should contribute new ideas and programs... (Ishihara, 1991: p133).

One of the matters Ishihara advocates is a review our labor management techniques. Nothing is more demoralizing to a worker than to be laid off while management increases their own rewards by way of salaries, bonuses and stock options. This does not obtain in other countries at least not to the extent it is practised here in the US. We have to invest in our human resources and offer more or less lifetime employment.

Our competitive problems are not due to the workers in the system. They are due to poor management. More accurately, they are due to our managing under a set of ideas that is outmoded and incorrect. (Aguayo, 1990: p31)
South Asia is an enormous market. It is as big as the whole of China but more easy to penetrate than China because it is more accessible and varied. It has a large English speaking professional class who could readily adapt to the needs of the US in computer software and other technological programs. The US has been shut out of this market for too long by India's policy of self reliance which no longer holds good in this interdependent age.

Lastly, just as India provided the muscle for England's Great Power status in the past she can now provide the muscle for the efforts of the UN in peacekeeping operations the world over, given the reluctance of the American public to permit US ground forces to engage in this task. Since the US operates through the UN this could be another way the US could extend her foreign policy goals without placing any burden on her financial and military resources.
Jawaharlal Nehru, India's first Prime Minister, was perhaps one of the few in a small group of people who understood the need for regional cooperation in politics, economics and social well being. Long before independence he had voiced the need for larger entities of states or group of states as he did not expect small states to be economically and financially viable units. As far back as 1926 he had written a letter to the editor of the *Journal de Geneve*, stating that the appearance of an international organization (the League of Nations) seemed logical as the days of small isolated states was no longer acceptable. He had already this notion of an Asian bloc with India as a key unit but only after India became independent. (Pandey, 1976: p122). Pandey goes on to say that Nehru "saw no future for a small country like Ceylon (Sri Lanka) outside the Indian federation" (Ibid, p250).

In March, 1947 even before India achieved independence Nehru had organized the First Asian
Relations Conference in New Delhi which was a great success. Twenty-seven Asian states sent 248 delegates. Its significance lay in that, it was an attempt at getting Asian leaders together. Secondly, it enabled many states to outline their foreign policies and lastly, it indicated to many Asian states the role they could play in world politics. After 15 August, 1947 when India became independent, Nehru faced many problems both internally as well as externally. Nevertheless, Nehru tried to convince his neighbors of the urgent need for a regional alignment in world affairs. But by 1948 the euphoria for making a brave new world had evaporated.

The Second Asian Relations Conference in New Delhi in 1949 championed the freedom of Indonesia from Dutch rule. Nehru's fierce anticolonialism and sponsorship of subject peoples did not win him many friends among Western colonial powers. Instead, his Policy of Nonalignment in world power blocs lost him support both among the Americans and the Russians. However the 1949 Asian Relations Conference led to another meeting in 1951 in Colombo, Ceylon, where seven British Commonwealth countries and Burma took part and
inaugurated the **Colombo Plan for Technical Cooperation**. This organization which still exists today, in a greatly expanded form but with rather modest outlays, has trained many persons in South Asia in modern technology. The Colombo Conference led to the Bandung Conference in 1955 which is important for two reasons. Firstly, because it gave rise later to the Nonaligned Movement which was formally inaugurated in Belgrade in 1961. Secondly, the Bandung Conference accepted the Nehru / Chou En Lai formula for world peace termed, **Pancha Sila** or Five Principles. They were:

- Respect for Territorial Integrity
- Non Interference in Internal Affairs
- Equality and Mutual Support
- Peaceful Coexistence
- Non Aggression on any State.

As far back as 1952 Nehru was interviewed by C.L. Sulzberger, a foreign correspondent for the **New York Times**, who had asked him about the possibility of federating with Pakistan and Burma because, "they shared the common 'matrix' of the subcontinent's cultural past." Nehru's answer was:
Yes, that common matrix of culture is also applicable to Pakistan. We share the same community of history despite the differences on a purely political level. When Pakistanis and Indians meet aside from politics - they do not meet as nationals from two different countries. They have the same background and speak the same languages. We are often misled by publicity given to extremist opinions in both Pakistan and India. But the masses of people do not feel this. I do hope that India and Pakistan will cooperate in a very large measure. They should not lose their common tradition. They cannot reverse history. They must increase the area of mutual cooperation. Groups of Pakistanis come here - refugees from Punjab. They are not bitter. They weep together with their old friends and discuss old memories.

In the modern world unless we destroy each other by war, there must inevitably be large spheres of cooperation. India, Pakistan and Burma ultimately should cooperate in that way. Perhaps they might form some kind of super federation but always keeping their identities. However these things must develop automatically not artificially... (Sulzberger, 1987:182)

It should be noted that Nehru's "superfederation" was to be a voluntary institution which would allow each country to preserve its identity. What he emphasized was mutual cooperation. Nehru spoke barely five years after independence when Pakistani identity had not yet taken firm hold. But now more than four decades later a new generation is in both sides of the divide. These persons have no experience of closer contact between the two countries. There has hardly been any social, cultural, commercial
or political contact between the two peoples. In fact their isolation now is more pronounced and their differences more emphasized.

The emphasis on religious differences is a far cry from the synthesizing influence of the Mughals in seeking a bridge between Islam and Hinduism. There is no doubt the Imperial Mughals were more or less completely Indianized by the time their rule ended in the mid nineteenth century. At the same time the Mughals left behind a concept that Delhi was an Imperial City. This concept of an Imperial Delhi was deliberately assumed by the British who proclaimed Queen Victoria, Empress of India, a measure which sought continuity with the Imperial Mughals. When the Congress government took over from the British in 1947, they unwittingly assumed this "Imperial" mantle. This is what their neighbors saw in the rulers at Delhi. Nehru never saw himself in this role and it pained him to find out what his neighbors, not excluding Chou En Lai, thought of him. He wanted their friendship but they were wary of his outstretched hand. Statements by K.M. Panikkar and others about the need for Burma and Ceylon to be a part of India for the proper defence
of the area, aggravated matters. Indian actions in Sikkim and in Goa confirmed their worst fears. Pakistan had from 1947 a dispute over Kashmir which India compounded in 1971 by aiding the Bangladeshis to free themselves from Pakistan. This dismemberment of Pakistan in the long run, very ironically, helped Pakistan to consolidate its position but it also gave Pakistan a tilt towards West Asia in seeking a common identity with other Islamic countries. Two divisions of Pakistani troops serve in Saudi Arabia, ostensibly to guard the Muslim holy places, especially Mecca. Pakistanis are welcomed in West Asia as co-religionists. They serve as military advisors and training personnel in other Arab countries and also work in many of these countries.

Pakistanis soon found that religion alone would not give them the larger identity they sought. Though Islam is a closely knit religion unlike many others, it still had the cleavages caused by social, cultural and ethnic differences. Pakistan's isolation thus became more pronounced especially when she sought favors from the US and other Western countries. When the Bangladesh President sent his "Working Paper on Regional
Cooperation in South Asia" on 25 November, 1980, Pakistan tended to be more receptive on the grounds that this would be a means of holding India in check.

After 1961 Nehru and the Indian people grew weary of expounding regional alignment to indifferent neighbors. Besides they had their hands full with internal problems. The war with China in 1962 was great shock to Nehru especially when the Indian Army failed to hold the MacMahon Line and the territories India was certain belonged to her. This was also the end of Pancha Sila whose basic principle was Peaceful Coexistence. Nehru died a broken man in 1964 and his successors downplayed the role regional alignment and/or regional cooperation.

Nevertheless, the principles of regional alignment and regional cooperation did not die with Nehru. Nehru's ideas were warmly accepted by his people especially by the politicians and the civil servants he had worked with for many years. If in Europe and America, Nehru was seen as a failed politician, this was not so in India where he was greatly honored and respected. For years nobody dared to tamper with any of his ideas.
Viewed from a South Asian perspective Nehru's Nonaligned Movement was a remarkable success. In the seventies there was a group of more than one hundred Afro-Asian nations voting in one solid bloc in the UN and thwarting the efforts of both the Americans and the Russians to change the course of international politics. The end of the Cold War in the late eighties was a revolution in international politics. If Nehru were living he would have done what Rao did in 1992 but his stature and standing in international politics would have given this generation a better approach in solving our problems. Nehru had a keen grasp of regional alignment and regional cooperation. Perhaps he was ahead of his time but India would not have been what it is today if he had not been the guiding hand in politics as Prime Minister of India for seventeen years from 1947 to 1964. After 1980 it was easy for the civil servants to put together SAARC because they had Nehru's vision before them. SAARC is perhaps one of Nehru's richest legacies to not only the people of India but also to the whole of South Asia.
CHAPTER 2

THE GENESIS OF SAARC

If SAARC has been in existence for only a little more than a few years, the idea it focuses on has been with the South Asians for more than five thousand years. This may have been the way the Indus Valley settlers interacted with the city states of Sumer and others in West Asia five millenia ago. But at the same time it would be unreal to say that all human activity was centered on cooperation. It was equally centered on conflict. But what we are attempting to ascertain here, is the importance of cooperation over conflict and the discernible results that flowed from such cooperation.

Ideas of conflict and cooperation are as old as the human race. In South Asia it could date back five thousand years to the Indus Valley civilization of Harrapa and Mohenjo Daro. In the South Asian context, conflict has often been deprecated but nevertheless indulged in for the benefits obtained from the use of force. But
remorse has overtaken the conqueror and changed his outlook. The most notable example from the past in India was the case in the 3rd century BC of the Emperor Asoka, who having conquered a large part of what is now India, Pakistan and Bangladesh decided one day to stop fighting and apply the Noble Eight Fold Path of Gautama Buddha. India has many times produced sages who abhored violence. Hindu and Buddhist religions do not generally expect human beings to kill animals for food, much less to kill a human being in anger or in conflict, but in spite of what purists dictate the evil in peoples' hearts continues unabated.

The year 1985 was remarkable in at least two different areas of the world. This was the year Gorbachev came to power in Soviet Russia and this was the year the seven South Asian nations came together to form the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). Perestroika and Glasnost put forward by Gorbachev were to end in dismantling Communism in Soviet Russia culminating in 1991 with the astonishing request by the electors of Leningrad to rename their city
St. Petersburg. In India the year 1991 saw the assassination of Rajiv Gandhi on whom many hopes were centered. If the voters in Russia looked backward, the voters in India had no choice but to move forward and look to the future with courage and resolution. There was no doubt the system would come up with a leader for the 900 million people of India. But for many days no one knew who that person would be and how he/or she would tackle the enormous problems India faced in the last decade of the twentieth century. One question many people overlooked was what would happen to SAARC. Where would it go from here? Fortunately SAARC was not dependent on one person or even one country. Like democracy in India, SAARC sought the welfare of the people not only in India but also in the other six countries in South Asia. SAARC was not formed to prevent killings, avoid conflicts and halt the use of force. SAARC sought cooperation among the states of South Asia and the welfare of the people who inhabit these lands.

As far back as 1978, several scholars from many countries met in Colombo, Ceylon, and decided to produce studies of various techniques to be
adopted for regional cooperation. One of these countries involved in this study group, Persia, gave up after the fall of Shah Reza Pahlevi but the others continued and in due course produced some exceptionally good programs in regional cooperation. There were both public and private sector contributions to these studies. V. Kanesanlingam of the Marga Institute in Colombo, Ceylon, gives a good account of these moves in Regional Cooperation in South Asia. (Prasad, [Ed] 1989: 198/211) In an annexure he gives details of these studies and by whom and where they were done. Other intellectuals in other countries such as Rajni Kothari in India, Johan Galtung in Norway, Saul Mendlovitz in the US among others spoke and wrote about the ideology of regional cooperation.

The ideology of regional cooperation as stated earlier, had been in Nehru's mind long before the independence of India. To a large extent the charismatic figures of Mohandas Gandhi and Jawaharlal Nehru shaped the thinking and the outlook of the elites as well as a good number of the masses in India. How valid this assumption is can be see even today, in the repeated attempts
at putting Nehru's kinsmen at the center stage in the hopes that Nehru's and Gandhi's ideals will live after their demise. The Indian Congress Party has been criticised for their eagerness to put the leadership of the party under the children and grandchildren of Jawaharlal Nehru which smacked of a semblance of "dynastic succession". Perhaps the real reason was to have some continuity with the ideals of Jawaharlal Nehru. The unfortunate events of May 21, 1991 did not put an end to the so-called dynastic speculation when the Congress Party offered the leadership to Sonia Gandhi. This was a very daring move in a country beset with narrow nationalism in some parts. It also showed the scant importance attached to one's birthplace compared to the importance attached to one's adopted country. It was a very American way of thinking where a person's origins are less important than his or her achievements in society and the people among whom he or she lived with.

It is well known that India took part in the deliberations of the League of Nations. The credit for this move should go to the English
rulers of India who wanted Indians exposed to the outside world so that they would be able to fulfil their rightful role in world affairs after independence. India had a reasonably well educated elite populace and a good administrative cadre at the higher levels. Nevertheless a large majority of the populace was illiterate in any language.

Nehru's ideas had been swayed by Fabian socialism while studying in England. He was a product of Harrow and Cambridge. When he became Prime Minister of India after independence in 1947, he had very definite ideas of how the country was to be run. Partition was a big blow to him but a mistake made by him and other Congress stalwarts was that they believed Pakistan's existence would be short lived such as Newfoundland's was before she joined Canada in 1948. This was a gross miscalculation on their part. The right of self determination and the formation of the United Nations allowed for even miniscule states with little or no support for their existence to flaunt their almost indestructible sovereignty to the outside world.

The only way partition of British India
could have been avoided would have been to make Mohamed Ali Jinnah, either the Governor General or the Prime Minister of undivided India. Both Nehru and other Congress Party members were adamantly opposed to handing power to Jinnah. According to Ayesha Jalal,

Jinnah sought to be recognized as the sole spokesman of Indian Muslims on the all-India stage. Throughout his long political career, he saw his role to be at the all-India level. From the late nineteen-thirties his main concern was the arrangements by which power at the centre was to be shared once the British quit India. (Jalal, 1985:p4).

On the other hand if the British had given India "Dominion Status" in 1935 when the Government of India Act was enacted by the British Parliament, Indian politics would have been vastly different. But having taken office as independent India's first Prime Minister, Nehru took his role very seriously. He rarely missed a day in Parliament. Nehru says in his Autobiography,

Honour and wealth did not go together, honour was meant to go...to men who served the community...Today it is fighting... the capitalist west...But the West also brings...the principle of socialism, of cooperation and service to the community for the common good...

Nehru was to instil into his officials the watchwords, "Socialism, Cooperation and Service to the Community." Nehru went back to the Asokan Era to seek the proper symbols for righteousness. The Lion Pillar and the Asoka Chakra or Wheel became the symbols of the new state. While keeping a British inspired Parliamentary democracy, Nehru introduced central planning through Five Year Plans to get the economy moving. Though he succeeded in this process very well, red tape began eventually to slow down the process. However it must be remembered that Nehru was on the center stage when the Cold War was beginning. Nehru admired America but he refused to be a client state of either Super Power.

Nehru's way out was to form a Nonaligned Bloc which at first alienated both Soviet Russia and the US. He attempted to foster cooperation among his Asian neighbors by fierce anticolonialism which again antagonized the Western Powers such as France, Holland, England and even the US. Nevertheless he persisted in his attempts at regional cooperation. He had some success in the
initial stages with the Colombo Plan which originated with J.R. Jayawardene of Ceylon and Percy Spender of Australia, and the Bandung Conference where China was brought in as a member. He could not, however, prevent divergences and anti-Indian sentiments both among the conferees as well as among the Western Powers. Though the Western Powers perceived Nehru to be a procommunist, he was actually never one. Nehru's socialism was a form of historicism. It can never be understood outside his era. This point was well explained by Sanjay Seth, a member of the Australian learned profession in a talk he gave at the University of Hawaii on November 8th, 1990, entitled, "Nationalism, Marxism and the Pursuit of Modernity: The Case of Nehru's Socialism."

One of Nehru's richest legacies to the Indian people was the idea of regional cooperation. Unfortunately after Bandung both Nehru and the Indian people grew weary of constantly propagating regional cooperation to indifferent neighbors. After Nehru died in 1964, the Indian government downplayed the idea of regional cooperation. They were wary of the way their neighbors looked at
them as a "hegemonist" regional power. Furthermore, they had their hands full in dealing with problems internally as well as externally. By 1971, however, India emerged as an unchallenged regional power according to Ashok Kapur who calls the event the creation of an "Indo-Centric power structure."

(Asian Survey, July 1988:693). Two Russian writers, Bratersky and Lunyou in an article in the October 1990 issue of Asian Survey, confirm this position and state,

The results of the 1971 Indo-Pakistan war and the emergence of Bangladesh created a situation in which there remained no country in South Asia able to seriously challenge India's predominance.

Geographically the Indian subcontinent is a distinct region but in deference to Pakistan, scholars in the US began calling the area South Asia. Today the name has received general acceptance in the area as well as abroad. However, for a very long time it remained an area without any regional organization. This is understandable as it had been a conflict prone area. India and Pakistan had fought three wars since independence in 1947. They had struggled to distance themselves
from each other. India's differences with Pakistan were so enormous that Pakistan was forced to leave the British Commonwealth of Nations, the only organization where the heads of the two countries had an opportunity to meet each other periodically. The differences the two countries had with each other were as serious as the one India had with South Africa. India's entry into the British Commonwealth of Nations was to radically change that organization. By insisting on being a republic in a monarchical organization she seriously weakened that body. Secondly, by fighting with another member country she tore up hitherto accepted procedures of sharing defence and foreign service intelligence with each other. The ultimate result was the withdrawal of Pakistan from the British Commonwealth of Nations. This was a serious blow not only to the Commonwealth but also to Indo-Pakistan relations. Even the formation of SAARC in 1985 did not mend matters and it had to wait till 1989 when Rajiv Gandhi, Prime Minister of India assured Benazir Bhutto, then Prime Minister of Pakistan that he would sponsor Pakistan's re-entry into the Commonwealth. The
good relations between these two children of slain Prime Ministers was a happy augury for the future. But unfortunately the future did not turn out that way. There were many more obstacles on the path. Both India and Pakistan threatened to fight another war, this time with nuclear weapons. This made all the world nervous and strenous efforts were made to diffuse the issues. However Kashmir remained a tinder box and neither the Commonwealth nor the United Nations have been able to find a way out.

Europe is still a model for international cooperation. In the French Declaration of May 9, 1950 Jean Monnet had suggested and Robert Schuman had accepted the following;-

The French Government proposes to place the whole of Franco-German coal and steel production under an International Authority open to the participation of the other countries of Europe...By pooling of basic production and the establishment of a new High Authority whose decisions will be binding on France, Germany, and the countries that join them, this proposal will lay the first concrete foundations of the European Federation which is indispensable to the maintenance of peace.

Monet adds,
I asked for this passage in our text to be underlined, because it described at one and the same time the method, the means, and the objective, which henceforth were indissolubly linked. The last word was the most important: peace. (Monnet, 1978:p295,298).

This was perhaps the first breach in the hitherto inviolable words, 'national sovereignty'. But what made Monnet and Schuman very happy was that the French Declaration was very warmly accepted by the then German Chancellor, Konrad Adenauer. This was the start of the long and arduous road towards European unity which began with two countries and in 1994 has twelve. Nevertheless in spite of all the optimism for full political integration in 1993 they still have a long way to go. The sticking point is the old bugbear, national sovereignty. The possessors of a precise national identity are loathe to see it merged into a larger one in which they do not know how they would fare.

The EC gave rise to a number of similar organizations such as the Organization of American States (OAS) 1951, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) 1963, the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) 1967. SAARC had all these
role models before it was inaugurated in 1985 but it went about it in a very different way. There was first a private study made by a body in Colombo, Ceylon, and then there was the incentive given by a leader of one of the countries in the region, finally there was the gentle push given by the smaller countries in the area but SAARC would never have been a viable proposition without India. But India is so huge that all the other six could easily disappear inside it. This is what made SAARC such a difficult proposition. There is an interesting Ph.D. dissertation on the origins of SAARC by Kanti Bajpai but very regretably he does not give much weight to the part played by the Marga Institute in Colombo, Ceylon. At the same time it must be borne in mind that Ceylon did try to wreck SAARC in the late eighties and early nineties. This was probably due to the personal idiosyncracies of the then President of Ceylon, Ranasinghe Premadasa. Premadasa's insular outlook and lack of exposure to the outside world unlike many of his fellow countrymen and women made for a very difficult situation both internally as well as externally.
The President's reserve was a drag on the infectious popularity and undoubtedly talents of the people of Ceylon some of whom such as Gamini Corea, Gananath Obeyasekera, Stanley J. Thambiah, Tarzie Vittachi, E.F.C. Ludowyk, A. Jeyaratnam Wilson, C.S Ponamperuma and others are well known outside Ceylon. When the first WHO Conference was held in Ceylon in the early fifties, the UN officials were so impressed with the arrangements made that they tapped the Civil Service officer, Andrew Joseph for a permanent post in the WHO. Similar success stories could be related about, H.S.Wansinghe or Bradman Weerakoon and many others. Thus it is surprising to find Ceylon languishing in the limbo of forgotten affairs and doing their very best or rather their worst to sabotage the progress and smooth working of SAARC.
PART 2

CONFRONTATION
CHAPTER 3
SAARC AND POWER

Political organizations are either vested with or acquire power in their dealings internally as well as with outside parties. One way of assessing such power is to examine the limitations and the circumstances under which it could be used. However the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) is unique in that it has hardly any power conferred on it nor has it acquired any power in its dealings internally or with outside parties. Instead it acts as a catalyst for cooperation among states and peoples. Its power is the power of persuasion, not the power of compulsion. Not only should one bear this in mind but one should also at the same time disabuse oneself of power mechanisms operated by similar political organizations such as ASEAN, the EC and others. The members of these organizations are bound by rules and by undertakings accepted when they sought membership. SAARC has hardly any rules and requires little or no undertakings from any member. Too often
theorists are shaken by the lack of commitment and the absence of rules. But in the short period of a little less than a decade, SAARC has succeeded in more ways than its founding fathers ever dreamed it possible. How SAARC did it and what the next scenario would be is important to this dissertation.

In his new book, Powershift, the third and the last of his trilogy, commencing with Future Shock and The Third Wave, Alvin Toffler says the very nature of power is changing.

We live at a moment when the entire structure of power that held the world together is now disintegrating. Out of this massive restructuring of power relationships,... will come one of the rarest events in human history: a revolution in the very nature of power. A "powershift" does not merely transfer power. It transforms it. (Toffler, 1990:3&4).

How does this transformation take place? According to Toffler it takes place in three ways. Firstly, by the use of force, secondly, by the use of wealth and thirdly, by the use of knowledge. Today it is mostly by the use of knowledge. But this does not mean that the first two are of no use. They are still needed but
have to be used judiciously. In the nineteenth century England solved most of her global problems by the use of what was known as "gunboat diplomacy". America today is richer and militarily more powerful than England was in the nineteenth century but she finds it hard to achieve her goals. If Korea was a stalemate, Vietnam was a disaster. In ten years of fighting with large scale application of air power and with the use of very sophisticated weapons with tremendous firepower, America could not defeat the rag-tag armies of General Giap. It was not the communism of Ho Chi Minh that confronted America but the nationalism of the people of Viet Nam. The same spirit prevails in Somalia as well as in Bosnia. The Russians encountered the same ideology in Afghanistan.

When Clinton spoke at the nomination of Dukakis in the 1988 Presidential election his speech was too long and too boring. But he made it a point to find out what went wrong and did something to change it.

By appearing on MTV and playing the saxophone on the Arsenio Hall Show during the campaign
and at one of his inaugural balls, and by revealing that his daughter had been named after a romantic popular song, Bill Clinton established connections with millions of voters who would never listen to his speeches. (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994:p39)

Bill Clinton is a quick learner. He used the music of Fleetwood Mac, Michael Bolton and such others in his campaign rallies. He moved into the crowd and greeted many of them with great warmth. He jogged like any one of them and drank coffee with them at the nearest McDonalds. He won in 1992 because he used knowledge and persuasion to give him success. But this is a double edged weapon and has hurt him in the office of the Presidency. This is where the "powershift" is today. One needs knowledge and persuasion to win, not just brute force and the power of money though these two cannot be completely ruled out. SAARC has arrived on the scene at a very propitious time.

One reason why there has been no solution to the Kashmir problem is perhaps power politics. The division of British India into two sovereign independent states has created an unmistakeable sense of power in these two states. Pakistan
believes that it is the equal of or perhaps even better than its neighbor India. On the other hand India feels the same way towards Pakistan. D.G. Kousoulas in his, Power and Influence: An Introduction to International Relations, says

Power has long been considered to be the key concept in the study of international relations.

Bertrand Russell very interestingly compares power in Social Science to the concept of energy in Physical Science. (Russell, 1962:p9). S.J. Rosen and W.S. Jones state very categorically in their Logic of International Relations, that power is

the ability of an actor in the international stage to use tangible and intangible resources and assets in such a way as to influence the outcome of international events to its own satisfaction. (Rosen & Jones, 1990:p203).

Kousoulas goes on to say,

We live in a world composed primarily of sovereign states: entities that are not subject to any superior authority and whose governments have exclusive jurisdictions within the territory of their state. Legally, no government or other entity has the right to
impose its will on the government of a sovereign state, and no government of a sovereign state has the legal obligation to obey another's commands. (Kousoulas, 1985:p13)

However in practice, force or threat of force, money or aid, or persuasion could make a sovereign state bend to another state's will or the will of an intergovernmental organization such as the United Nations Organization. But these are rare occurrences and are adopted with some justification in deference to world public opinion.

In the first place there is today a very large number of sovereign states - nearly four times as many as in 1945. There are also two other factors, proliferation of nuclear weapons and an increasing interdependence of governments in a global capitalist economy. Immanuel Wallerstein in his, Geopolitics and Geoculture, explains it thus-

The period 1945-67 had been one of unquestioned hegemony of the United States in the world-system,...It made possible the continuing expansion of the world-economy, with significant income benefits for 'middle' strata throughout the world. It made possible the construction of the United Nations network of international agencies, which at that
time reflected the political will of the United States... It contributed to the 'decolonization' of large parts of what came to be called the Third World... (Wallerstein, 1992:p66/67).

But all this was changed in 1968 when there was a revolution in and of the world-system... The primary protest of 1968 was against US hegemony in the world-system. (Wallerstein, 1992:p65).

The modern world-system is a capitalist world-economy. That is a description of its formal structure and its mode of production... It does however have a political superstructure. That is network of 'sovereign states' members of and defined by an 'interstate system' whose social and political reality and importance is far greater than its extraordinarily thin organizational apparatus might suggest. (Wallerstein, 1992:p107).

Since 1945, the antisystemic movements have been remarkably successful in achieving their nineteenth-century objective of state power... In South and Southeast Asia nationalist and national liberation movements have come to power... Yet it is no secret that there is great discontent... with... the nationalists in power... (Wallerstein, 1992:p113).

The result has been the rise of new movements. In South Asia and even in other parts of the world,

these new movements have often taken the form of religious renewal movements. (Wallerstein, 1992:p114).
One consequence of all these is

some rethinking of fundamental strategy. It is...a question of what...ought to be done in the 1990s and thereafter. The question that has been opened,...is whether the primary path to the social transformation of the world is via the acquisition of state power by movements separately in each state. (Wallerstein, 1992:p115).

Perhaps there is another way. There is no doubt the new movements are quite strong. They are looking forward to change but a simple change in government does not bring about the required social transformation. Even if it did it is limited to one country or one state. Movements today are more or less transnational. They are based on ecology or environment or ideas such as regional cooperation. Similarly in the commercial sector multinational corporations work their way across political borders. Some of these multinational corporations are richer and more powerful than some Third World countries. In 1981

Exxon, the largest MNC, made $103 billion in sales - having a larger income than that of 142 member-states of the United Nations...No MNC employs more than 600,000 people yet the
The gross income of MNCs far exceeds the GNP of states with much larger populations. (Kousoulas, 1985:p45).

Certain programs such as space research are beyond the means of some countries. Programs such as work on the supercollider are best done with the collaboration of several countries. England and France worked jointly to produce the super-sonic plane, the Concorde. They are even now working with other countries on the European made Airbus. Thus there is a definite movement towards collaboration in inter-state dealings. The stumbling block has been the idea of state sovereignty, but much progress has been made on the idea of international cooperation.

The primary focus has been on EC or European Community. The year 1992 was to be the fateful year when there would be almost complete integration of the political, economic and social systems. The critical factor was the acceptance of the Maastricht Treaty by all the twelve member countries. If accepted there would have been one currency, one central bank, one parliament and no frontiers between the twelve European...
states. It would have been somewhat like the federal government in the US. Unfortunately Denmark rejected it and the Treaty had to be re-negotiated. There were also other reluctant members such as the British who did not want to change their currency nor put the Bank of England under perhaps a central bank dominated by the German Bundesbank. Thus we see that national rivalries could compound any progress towards integration. At the core of all this lies power politics. The ruling elite do not want to lose the power they have in a national state. They are afraid of losing their identities and becoming nobodies in a larger organization. Therefore how can progress be achieved in regional integration? There are perhaps two ways in which this could be done. One is a positive way and the other is a negative one. Successful achievement needs perhaps the combination of both. There should be an external threat and a positive desire on the part of the people concerned to reap the benefits of combining into one political or economic union. The Soviet Union and its Communist ideology was the external threat
and the desire for a huge common market was the positive one.

The fall of Communism and the break-up of the Soviet Union removed this external threat to the EC. This was one of Karl Deutsch's main arguments for integration. But as we can see this is not enough. Neither is the positive desire for a common market sufficient to achieve regional integration. There should be a combination of both positive and negative factors to achieve integration. Thus European integration is in the doldrums. It is the same elsewhere. SAARC faces no external threat and there is no overwhelming desire for a common market. SAARC has no power to impose its will on any unwilling member. SAARC will have to find its way out of this maze of power politics if it is to achieve integration. Two factors which may help it are democracy and the rising middle class in South Asia. At present it is only in India that these two factors are prevalent. There is a growing middle class in the other six countries but democracy has not made much headway. If democracy could be made to work in Pakistan and Bangladesh
much progress could be made because the power of religion could be minimized to achieve material and technological progress which would be a power in itself.

There could be another factor such as the increasing number of multinationals. I have given one example earlier in this chapter. There are many others. Diane Francis writing in the Canadian newspaper, The Financial Post says,

Swiss-Swedish industrial giant Asea Brown Boveri's revenues are bigger than the total combined exports of Alberta and British Columbia...

ABB has gone from US$2 billion in 1980 to US$34 billion in 1993, operates in 100 countries and employs 220,000 workers round the world...

ABB (has)...only 200 staff in its Swiss global headquarters and 30,000 managers out of its 220,000 workforce. 'Managers must be fluent in English...' (said ABB Chairman, Percy Barnnevik) (June 14, 1994: p11).

In Global Dreams, Imperial Corporations and the New World Order, Barnet and Cavanagh say many multinationals are bigger than many sovereign independent countries in the world, besides many multinationals operate with impunity across many national borders. They say Ford's economy is bigger than Saudi Arabia and Norway
combined. Besides Ford makes cars and trucks not only in the US but also in Canada, England, France and Germany among many other countries. Ford set up a sales office in France in 1908 which was five years after its founding. In 1911 it was making cars in England. So it has much experience in global manufacturing. The globalization of manufactures and the use of English widely can only result in the creation of certain standards with world-wide acceptance.

Nevertheless there is a crisis and Barnet and Cavanaugh are not restrained in their warnings:

As the world economy becomes more and more integrated, the processes of political disintegration are accelerating...

No world political figure is grappling with the sorts of political challenges that the radical technological and economic changes of the last quarter century have thrust upon us...

Because business enterprises have outgrown political institutions at the local, national, and supranational levels, national leaders are exerting less and less control over economic issues. As a result the world faces an authority crisis without precedent in modern times...

Over the last twenty years, governments have largely failed to deliver economic growth without inflation...

Most...newly created nations are too small or too poor to operate successfully in the
world economy. Since even well-established sovereign states lack the power to control their own economies, breaking off from a large nation...is not a promising strategy for economic development. (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994:pgs 421,422,340)

I began this chapter by showing how little power SAARC has, but SAARC is an association of seven sovereign independent states which individually have unlimited power legally and pragmatically over their citizens and in the territories under their jurisdiction. I also indicated how the concept of power has changed over the last fifty years. Unlimited power does not necessarily mean unlimited authority. The possession of nuclear weapons does not mean they can be used by any state to achieve its goals. There are however several restraints which are in the main scientific, social and moral. The communications revolution and the satellite TV would bring the horrors of nuclear war right into peoples' homes. There is a great aversion towards war, even a just war. The only way regional integration could succeed is by persuasion, by global economic trends, by a strong middle class demand for the material comforts
of modernization, and by an expanding number of multinationals which could blur the growth of narrow nationalism prevailing in some nation-states. SAARC has persuasion in a very large measure and it uses English as a link language in its efforts to communicate with many people in a variety of nation-states. These are two powerful factors in today's world and perhaps SAARC is on the right track. It is also idealistic enough to spell out cooperation as the rationale for its existence in the context of EC and other regional organizations. Therefore even without mentioning regional integration SAARC could achieve something that is sorely needed in today's troubled world.
There is a long standing perception among South Asian states that India is "hegemonistic" in her dealings with her neighbors. This means that India behaves in a very "imperial" manner. In one sense it means that India is conscious that she is the second largest country in the world in terms of its population. In terms of numbers India is 3.28 million sq.km., with a population of about 900 million. The other six SAARC members put together total 1.20 million sq.km., with a population of about 230 million. It is this great disparity that gives India the edge. But size and population alone are not the only factors, both history and politics continue to reinvent old theories.

SAARC is the only regional organization that has one huge country associated with six smaller ones. This has by itself produced a very neat tie-up in which neither the fears of the smaller powers nor the demands of the largest have prevented them from cooperating with each other. Nevertheless India is aware of the fears
of her neighbors and has gone a long way to assuage these apprehensions for the sake of a unified South Asian Foreign Policy. From the time of Indian independence in 1947, Nehru and his successors have repeatedly tried to befriend their neighbors with perhaps the sole exception of Pakistan. India still smarts under the division of British India into India and Pakistan on August 15, 1947. As time goes on the concept of an undivided India becomes more and more remote. It is not the accession of Kashmir that is the central issue but the creation of Pakistan out of undivided India. This has led India to fight three wars with Pakistan and in the process unwittingly created another Moslem state in the Indian subcontinent. Pakistan believes that India is still not reconciled to the existence of Pakistan as a separate state. However Pakistan's "Two Nation" theory based solely on religious differences finds little favor among India's multi-ethnic and multi-religious people who feel that a secular state is the best solution to this problem.

India's size and her antagonism with
Pakistan are not the only factors in this perception of an imperial New Delhi. There are other important ones such as the continuity with British imperial policies both internally as well as externally. Nehru was very reluctant to change the administrative policies built up by the British. He refused to give into the demand for linguistic states until he was shocked into doing so by people immolating themselves in pursuing their demands. The civil service was left more or less intact except for a change in the name. English continued as one of the official languages when people in the south refused to accept Hindi. Another factor that led to fear among India's neighbors was the enormous numbers of Indians in other countries. They were either settlers or persons brought over by the British to work in their plantations. Some Indian residents were the result of the division of the Indian subcontinent in 1947 such as Bengali Hindus in East Pakistan and Hindus and Sikhs in West Pakistan. It would have been easy for India to stand up for their nationals in foreign countries but it was Nehru's policy,
which his successors continued to adopt, to leave them alone. They were told to make the best deals they could with their new rulers. But India's neighbors still feared her. For example, before Ceylon disfranchised over a million citizens of Indian descent, Ceylon's rulers also took the precaution of entering into a Defence Agreement with England allowing England to station troops, aircraft and ships in Ceylon. Similarly there were Indians in Nepal and Nepalese in India which India did not mind as long as the Nepalese government toed the Indian line in Foreign Policy. But when in time they did not, there was trouble.

But the main perception of an imperial New Delhi was the presence of the new rulers in the seats of the former British imperial power. Delhi had been an imperial city for too long a time to erase the perception that it is the capital of an empire. In fact Delhi is one of the oldest cities in the world. It is older than London or Paris. It is even older than Athens and Rome. The site itself is an extraordinary one commanding the gateway between the Himalayas
and the Aravalli Hills into the rich plains of Ganges. There have been no less than eight cities in and round the area which by itself shows the importance of the location.

If the impact of Islam in northern India is pervasive considering the many and varied numbers of palaces, monuments, mosques and tombs of the Lodi Sultans and the Mughal Emperors erected over a period of nearly five hundred years, the impact of the British on India in a little less than a century is no less extensive. The British crystalized the importance of Delhi when the King-Emperor George V announced at the brilliant Delhi Durbar in 1911 that the capital of British India would be transferred from Calcutta to Delhi. But the British capital of the Indian Empire could not obviously be transferred to the old Mughal capital of Shahjahan. A new city had to be built to underscore British imperial power and prestige.

Accordingly Sir Edwin Lutyens, a well known English architect was commissioned to design and build a new imperial capital in Delhi. Sir Edwin brought in Sir Herbert Baker to assist...
him. Baker had already designed and built the Secretariat in Pretoria, South Africa. While Baker planned the new Secretariat in Delhi, Lutyens concentrated on the Viceroy's Palace and in the overall design of the city. One day Lutyens rode out with the then Viceroy, Lord Hardinge and the two of them suddenly came upon Raisina Hill. This hill which was not very high, say about fifty feet, gave an extraordinary view of the old city, the Jamuna River, Shahjahan's Mosque and the Red Fort. Lord Hardinge told Lutyens that he wanted the Viceroy's residence built there. Lutyens at once agreed.

The city the British built as the capital of the Indian Empire reflects the spaciousness and loftiness of an imperial capital. It is hierarchically structured with long and broad tree-lined avenues running from the Viceroy's residence to the India Gate where the names of all those who fell in India's wars are inscribed. The residences of the senior civil and military officers reflected their standing in the power structure by the size and extent of their homes and garden space. The center of power lay with
the Viceroy whose residence was one of the most imposing buildings in the world with a golden dome synthesizing Western, Buddhist and Mughal architecture. The Viceroy's Palace was to have been seen from as far as the India Gate two and a half kilometers away but acceding to a persuasive request from Baker, Lutyens agreed to push back the Viceroy's Palace 40 feet away from the top of Raisina Hill which was now given over to the two wings of the Secretariat. Though twenty feet was shaved off from the top of Raisina Hill, it was still a colossal blunder and Sir Edwin realized it only after the buildings came up when it was too late and too expensive to do anything about it. However some people find it intriguing that only the dome is seen from afar, then it disappears and then the whole building is visible when one comes near it. The Viceroy's Palace is huge and ornate. It is one kilometer round the foundation and has 340 rooms and stands on 330 acres. The gardens in Mughal style cover 250 acres. It is filled with terraces and water fountains. The palace is 640 feet from end to end and 540 feet deep. It has 200,000
square feet of internal courtyards. The Durbar Hall is inlaid with wood from all parts of India. The marble for it came from central India and Rajasthan. (Prasad, Rashtrapati Bhavan, 1992: p44/86). It is said to be bigger than the magnificent Palace of Versailles built by King Louis XIV of France in the 17th Century. If the Viceroy's Palace reflected the halcyon days of British imperial power it is now the residence of an unassuming President of India who shuns pomp and splendor and has very little actual power. Though the real power in India resides with the Prime Minister and his Cabinet of Ministers the actual rulers of the country are the civil servants. Thus Baker was perhaps vindicated in the long run for putting the two wings of the Secretariat on the top of Raisina Hill.

The whole perception of New Delhi is one of sweeping power and imperial expanse. Irrespective of who sits in those seats they spell out only one expression - Imperial Power. The Indian President may live in only one or two rooms in this huge palace which is now appropriately called the Rashtrapati Bhavan
or President's House but it still needs over 2000 servants and gardeners to run. (Irving, *Indian Summer*, 1981: p. 227). Again, it is no doubt an imperial perception. The Palace is an expression of Lutyens' genius for innovation and artistic expression. The Viceroy's House was an apt representative of the spacious, lofty and expansive imperial idea Lutyens and Baker were attempting to translate into an architectural expression. Another idea Lutyens borrowed from Indian history was to install a huge 145 feet high column in the courtyard of the Viceroy's House somewhat like Emperor Asoka's pillars or those of the Delhi Sultans. There is also an inscription which is said to have been composed by Lutyens himself. It said:

In thought, faith
In word, wisdom
In deed, courage
In life, service
So may India be great

This may not be a very elegant piece of verse
but to a certain extent it shows the English conqueror's identification with India which among all of India's conquerors the English were most reluctant to assume. Nevertheless they were proud of India and called it the "Jewel in the Crown". India absorbed all its conquerors and made them its own except the English who held themselves aloof. But any such identification was important to both India and England. This imperial idea was to haunt this imperial city long after the English conquerors had departed. The humble kaddhar (home-spun cloth) clad persons who took over could never erase this perception. It lived in the Indian Civil Service and in its successor the Indian Administrative Service.

The Viceroy's Palace has a wonderful combination of English oak leaves, Indian elephants, classic columns topped by Buddhist vihara-like copper plated dome. In spite of Lutyens' oft expressed refusal to have Indian motifs and designs, the palace as well as the Secretariat and other buildings have a profusion of Indian motifs, color and architectural decorations such as stone cornices, carved stone
screens and canopies so favored by Mughal and Rajput builders. The combination of all this is nothing but imperial. The more one looks at New Delhi the more one is impressed that it is one of the great capitals of the world. (Metcalf in Frykenberg [Ed], Delhi Through the Ages. 1986:p391/400).

Lutyens and Baker were not the only ones who designed and laid out this great city. W.R. Mustoe came from Kew Gardens to landscape the city with Walter Sykes George. Much planning and vision was put out in this effort which resulted in about 10,000 trees and 70 miles of hedges being planted around the main avenues. (Spear, Delhi Its Monuments and History. 1943: revised 1994:141). The residence of the British Commander in Chief which later became the residence of Nehru was designed and built by Robert Tor Russell. It is richly panelled in Burma teak wood with brass fittings and a copper banister. It has 16 rooms and lies in 28 acres of beautifully maintained grounds. It is now the Nehru Museum and Memorial Library and is as he left them. Nehru's favorite lines from
**Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening** by Robert Frost, the New England poet, which he had on his desk is still there. They read:

The woods are lovely, dark and deep,
But I have promises to keep,
And miles to go before I sleep,
And miles to go before I sleep.

Delhi has its dark side too. It was a city built for 70,000 it now has more than 3,500,000 people crowding it. It has refugees from all parts of India and other neighboring countries such as Tibet, Pakistan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Burma, Ceylon, Afghanistan and many others. It has sprawled over the banks of the Jamuna and every inch of available space on the west and south of the river. One third of the inhabitants of Delhi live a miserable life in shanty towns which outsiders do not fully see. What the outsiders see are the magnificent structures built by the Mughal emperors and their British successors. These are lofty and impressive. They are symbols of great power and
majesty. They are a sure sign of imperial
greatness even if the present incumbents do not
exercise them.

The whole of Delhi is strewn with relics
of a rich and diverse past. Delhi has seen wars,
the rise and fall of empires, wayward soldiers,
indifferent commanders, looting and pillage,
power struggles among the high and the mighty,
death and destruction, riots and revolution and
every infamy human nature could think of but
it has come out of all this as many Indians would
probably like to think, majestic and inviolate.

India is about one third the size of the
US but it has more than three times the population
of the US. One of the riches of a nation according
to an old Chinese saying are its people. India
is a fairly well administered country considering
its size and population. One of its assets is
a good civil service especially in the higher
ranks. The Indian Civil Service is now known
as the Indian Administrative Service otherwise
it is more or less the same as it was under the
British except that its officers are burdened
with four times more work than in the past from
a more intrusive government. Barbara Crossette in her book, India, says the IAS will never be short of applicants even though there are many new careers for young Indians to choose from.

This elite club of about 5000 men and women in the IAS and the officer corps of the Indian Police, Customs, Revenue, Railways and other federal services are expected to run India. More than 100,000 apply to join each year, competing for only 700 annual openings. (Crossette, 1993: p62.)

The Indian Foreign Service has about 7000 officers and is even more choosy in selecting its staff. Only the best and most talented are taken into either service. The net result is that though there is a lot of politics in India, many ministers defer to their bureaucrats because they realize that their officers know what they are talking about. One result of all this was that SAARC was almost wholly put together by the Indian Foreign Service personnel with a little assistance from the foreign service personnel of the six neighboring countries.

Pursuant to the Bangladesh proposal, the first meeting of the seven countries at the level of their foreign secretaries was held in
Colombo on April 21-23, 1981. The Colombo Conference reflected both caution and optimism. It finalized the fundamental framework within which regional cooperation was to be built up... (Anand, 1991:p58,59)

The British left behind not only a strong bureaucracy but also their mark on education, in the judicial system and on political thinking generally. The English language unites India regionally but divides it socially. Nowhere is this more exemplified than in the maintenance of the Rule of Law. This is a very English tradition which Indians are unwilling to give up. In his Politics and Government, Deutsch says,

Another key aspect of English politics from early times onward - in addition to centralization and solidarity - has been the tradition of enquiry ...
The notion of enquiry lies at the heart of British political and administrative tradition. (Deutsch. 1974:p394)

These legacies of British rule have been almost jealously retained by India unlike their neighbors such as Pakistan, Bangladesh, Ceylon and Burma who had soon after independence adopted radically new forms of government and politics. In a survey made by the Asian and Pacific
In India, political institutions have grown and the power of the politicians has grown along with that of the civil service. In Pakistan, political institutions have failed to grow and the politicians were unable to retain public support except for short periods. The civil service has therefore wielded a great deal of power along with the military. Bangladesh has also spells of army dictatorship. The civil service has not however grown to be a power centre by itself. In fact, selection for promotion to higher positions...is made not by the Public Service Commission but by a Committee of Ministers. In Sri Lanka, even the independence of the Public Service Commission has been done away with and the Cabinet of Ministers are all powerful as regards civil servants...

The services are manned mostly by direct recruits appointed through a competitive examination held by an independent Public Service Commission...except for the extraordinary practice of appointment in Sri Lanka by what is known as the Chit system on the recommendation of Members of Parliament. (In India) restructuring of the services has been considered more than once in the past...However, on careful consideration it was concluded that the structure should remain unaltered. (Salleh [Ed], 1992:p95&97).

It is perhaps the retention of these British traditions that had given rise to the
perception that the rulers of India were continuing the imperial way of life simply because they did not politicize. Further, the successors of the British were lifelong democrats and imbued with a passion for progress which was to be found within themselves. For example, they rejected foreign aid and looked for development funding with their own resources. They called this the return to self reliance. This was a situation where development is financed by internal savings and exports pay for imports.

More than the politicians it is the civil servants and the judges who carried on the British traditions. Basically the legal system is more or less like the system in British times. Important parts of the law such as the Criminal Justice system or the Law of Evidence remain virtually unchanged. But the judges have become more people oriented. There is a greater empathy with the underdog as Dr G.L. Peiris, Professor of Law at the University of Colombo stated in a recent article. Another factor in the perception of an imperial New Delhi is the widespread use of English in India. There are certainly more
speakers of English in India today than when the British were ruling. Many foreigners are astonished at this state of affairs. Barbara Crossette questioned a number of middle class folk to get to the bottom of this state of affairs and found that it is simply a matter of expediency. Caste and class are breaking down and traditional modes of family life are giving way. If the husband and wife are from different areas of India the easiest way for them to communicate with each other is in English. It is the lingua franca of India. Khushwant Singh the well known Indian author, editor and intellectual says without batting an eyelid that English is his mother tongue. There are many like him in India whose first language is English and they are proud of their command of this language.

All this is a far cry from Macaulay's Minute on Education of 2 February 1835 to Lord William Bentinck then Governor General of India, parts of which still rankle in the breasts of many Indians. But looking at it rather dispassionately, in the long run, it gave many
Indians and indeed many persons in South Asia easy access to an international language and paved the way for India to be an integrated nation. Perhaps it could pave the way for an integrated South Asian Community. Already India has the third largest pool of trained engineers next to the US and Russia in a computer dominated world and Bangalore is fast becoming the software capital of the computer world. A wide spread knowledge of English is certainly of great help in all these technological and scientific activities.

All SAARC meetings have been held in English and almost all the speeches have been made in English. English is the language of the elite and many of the ruling class and the intellectuals. The commander of the Pakistan Army, General Waheed carries his name in English in his tunic just like an American serviceman. He does not use Urdu. These facets show how widespread and understandable English has become in South Asia. Some Indians say English is already an Indian language. There are a host of papers, books and periodicals published all over South
Asia in English. India publishes more in English than in any other Indian language. There are many Indian writers of novels in English such as R.K. Narayan, Mulk Raj Anand, Salman Rushdie, or Kamala Markhandaya. Others less well known are Upamanyu Chatterjee in *English August* and *Last Burden* or Anita Desai in *Baumgartners Bombay* or Amitav Gosh in *The Shadow Lines* or *Circle of Reason* or *In an Antique Land* or Vikram Seth in *A Suitable Boy* which has become a best seller in America. There are many others some of whom like Bharati Mukherjee now live in the US and Nirad Chaudhuri who is more than ninety years old was knighted by the Queen of England last year and still writes in erudite and faultless English. His books have won praise from Churchill and Toynbee. He now lives in Oxford, England. Some of his writings such as *Autobiography of an Unknown Indian* and *Thy Hand, Great Anarch* are not just autobiographies but an exquisite combination of contemporary history and political thinking.

In the beginning SAARC had to face many negative perceptions. Forty years before SAARC's
formation after the first Asian Conference in 1947 India had to face a general reluctance among her neighbors to join her in any international activity against a wave of colonialism spearheaded by the Dutch and the French. The Second Asian Conference in 1949 and the Bandung Conference of 1955 were probably the last ones organized by India in this effort. The Nonaligned Movement after 1964 owed much to the charismatic figures of Gamal Abdul Nasser, Josif Broz Tito and Srimavo Bandaranaike, also Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi though Nehru was the original driving force behind it. The high point of NAM was the 1974 Conference in Colombo. After that it was all downhill.

India downplayed her role in any international activity after Nehru's death in 1964. Thus when SAARC was first mooted in 1980 India was wary. She was suspicious of the motives of the other six countries until she realized that by joining she could be a check on their activities. The six smaller countries thought likewise. They felt they could check India's aggressive designs, if any. Thus the way was opened for an Association of South Asian States.
A neat touch was the unanimity rule the association has. Nothing can be done unless all the states agree on whatever they want to do. This gives the smaller states the same power or authority as India and goes a long way to allay their fears of an imperial New Delhi.

Therefore to summarize all the above, the perception of an imperial New Delhi had been based on India’s enormous size, her huge population, her continuity with British imperial policies, her retention of the ICS almost intact, the continued use of the English language in public administration, in academia and among the elite and intellectuals and last but not least the continued use of Delhi and the Mughal and British seats of power by the new rulers of India – all these created the fantasy that the new rulers of India were the direct successors of a previous set of imperial rulers. However SAARC by its unanimity rule provided the antidote to this extraordinary fantasy. Every one of the smaller countries had a say in what was to be done as much as India which was four times as big as the next smallest, Pakistan.
CHAPTER 5

NUCLEAR DETERENCE

Much has been said of the power of nuclear deterence between the US and Soviet Russia in the Cold War which prevailed from 1945 to 1989, but what has not been said or very rarely said is the criminality of using nuclear weapons on human beings. However this aspect has now sunk in fairly deeply in that on two or three occasions when there was a prospect of such weapons being used, the leaders of the states who held the trigger refused to use them. These occasions were against Russia between 1945 and 1948/49, against China during the Korean War, in the Cuban Missile Crisis, in Viet Nam and in Afghanistan. This augurs well for the future of human beings on this planet but the danger is in the immense number of nuclear weapons in the world and the continuing quest for such weapons by the military forces of smaller and less advanced countries. Added to this are the views of some scientists that the use of tactical nuclear weapons is possible without much harm to the first user. India has probably the technical know-how to make
nuclear weapons because she has the infrastructure to adopt nuclear technology for civilian use. She is also capable of constructing long range missiles. This makes Pakistan nervous and she has for long, planned the construction of a nuclear weapons facility not only to even the score against India but also, as she fondly imagined, give her great power status. With the help of money from the oil rich Arab countries she has probably made nuclear weapons. Anthony Spaeth in the April, 1993 issue of Harpers Magazine says in an article on Kashmir titled "No Peace in the Valley", among other matters this interesting sideline, "(Intelligence data suggests that Pakistan has at least half a dozen nuclear bombs; India, as many as twenty five)". Having nuclear weapons is one thing but using them is quite another matter. There is also the question of money and scarce resources wasted on such weapons. However it is the opinion of some scientists and politicians that the possession of such weapons is in itself a deterrence against usage. But an accidental usage can never be ruled out. This then is the real danger.

A better way is not to have any nuclear
weapons worldwide which is what the nuclear powers are in the process of adopting. It is however such a difficult task that universal agreement is virtually impossible. One very serious problem is, what does one do with the radioactive material taken from these weapons? There are actually no safe storage places. In A Path Where No Man Thought, Carl Sagan and Richard Turco, two space scientists give a horrifying description of a nuclear winter. In the 1980s both Reagan and Bush thought a nuclear war could be won but after 1985 when the extensive descriptions of a nuclear winter began influencing decision makers they gradually changed their views.

The Delhi Declaration of 1985 by the heads of state or governments of India, Sweden, Tanzania, Mexico, Argentina and Greece refers specifically to nuclear winter as 'posing unprecedented peril to all nations, even those far removed from nuclear explosions'; decries 'a small group of men and machines in cities far away who can decide our fate'; compares the peoples of the world to 'a prisoner in the death cell awaiting the uncertain moment of execution'; and calls for a freeze on nuclear weapons and their delivery systems... (Sagan & Turco, 1990:p179)

However by 1985 Reagan seems to have been aware of the dangers of a nuclear winter. On August 18, 1986 Gorbachev said on Russian TV,
The explosion of even a small part of the existing nuclear arsenal would be a catastrophe, an irreversible catastrophe, and if someone still dares to make a first nuclear strike, he will doom himself to agonizing death, not even from a retaliatory strike, but from the consequences of the explosion of his own warheads... (Sagan and Turco, 1990:p183).

The danger today is much greater after the end of the Cold War than it was before that. The absence of a strong controlling finger on the nuclear trigger and the proliferation of nuclear weapons in the hands of breakaway Soviet states such as Ukraine makes any form of control extremely difficult. Added to this, when China, India, Pakistan, Israel and South Africa have such weapons how can any control be effective?

In their well researched book, Critical Mass, William E. Burrows and Robert Windrem say that the production of major weapons such as nuclear, biological and chemical ones threaten millions of human beings with instant death and/or life of agonizing pain and disease. They say that more than any other country the US is the chief culprit, though such powers as France, Germany and England are not without their share of the blame. Refering to the case of Pakistan they say that successive US presidents from Carter...
down to Bush broke US laws by providing Pakistan with the technical advice and the materials needed to make atomic bombs. They trace Pakistan's attempts to make nuclear weapons after the humiliating loss of Bangladesh in 1971. The program which was started by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto was continued by Zia al Huq and lastly by Ghulam Ishaq Khan. The US was fully aware of what was going on but turned a blind eye and blithely certified to Congress that Pakistan was not making atomic weapons in order to circumvent the Pressler Amendment and get the aid flowing but more importantly to see that the Afghan rebels were provided with money and weapons parts of which Pakistan appropriated for her own use. Some of these weapons have fallen into the hands of anti-American terrorists and the consequences have come to haunt American policy makers today. Furthermore there has been no proper accounting of the Stinger missiles and the US has no way of recovering all of them even though the CIA has offered huge sums of money for them.

When presidential candidate Ronald Reagan was asked on January 31, 1980, how he felt about nuclear proliferation in Pakistan and elsewhere... he provided an answer that
resonated in Islamabad, 'I just don't think it's any of our business,' (Burrows & Windrem, 1994:p62).

Burrows and Windren explain how Zulfikar Ali Bhutto got together fifty nuclear scientists at Multan in January, 1972 and asked them to produce a nuclear weapon. They agreed and set out to work. In the same year Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan was hired by the Physical Dynamics Laboratory in Amsterdam. This institution was closely connected to URENCO, an important European nuclear facility. There Khan learnt how to separate U235 from U238 and make bomb grade material. In January, 1976 Khan turned up in Pakistan and joined the research team. Pakistan searched the world for materials needed for making nuclear weapons and also countries from whom they could get assistance. China and some western countries were eager to help. By 1988 Pakistan was looking for a test site and by 1990 Khan could diffidently say Pakistan was a nuclear power. But it still lacked the delivery systems. By 1990, India not only had nuclear weapons but also delivery systems that could take the bombs not only to Karachi but also to Beijing.
On August 18, 1992 just before the Indian and Pakistani foreign secretaries conferred on 'reducing tensions' over Kashmir, India indulged in some classic missile diplomacy: It tested one of its Prithvis. Whatever else was on the missile, it certainly carried a message.

But India's long-range plans extend well beyond even the mating of atomic or thermonuclear warheads and IRBMs. It sees itself as both a great culture and as well as the regional superpower responsible for the subcontinent and the ocean that bears its name. Accordingly, New Delhi now possesses the world's fourth largest army and navy. But even that isn't quite enough. Ultimately, the Indian military establishment intends to put hydrogen warheads on inter-continental ballistic missiles with ranges up to 5,000 miles. (Burrows & Windrem, 1994:373/374)

What can SAARC do in the midst of such gloomy forboding? For one thing it can bring the leaders of the seven countries together at regular annual meetings and provide an atmosphere of fellowship and good relations. It also gives an opportunity for many important officials to meet their counterparts and discuss such matters as cooperation in several different fields which may have been taken up earlier in smaller working committees. Closer contact does not necessarily imply more friendly feelings. It can also provide occasions which trigger intense dislike or hatred. But generally speaking it could help making for better
relations than when parties remain isolated and remote.

In South Asia only India and Pakistan have nuclear weapons. Benazir Bhutto became Prime Minister of Pakistan in 1988. Till June 1990 she was not told of her country's nuclear program. The first information came from two American friends, Galbraith and Siegel told her; Pakistan had 'crossed the line'...CIA had learned that the previous month Pakistani scientists had succeeded in converting highly enriched uranium from gas into 275 pounds of bomb-grade heavy metal...There was enough metal to make between six and eight nuclear weapons...In the months before the June meeting the two bitter rivals (India and Pakistan) had nearly fought again; even Bhutto had been so engaged by the passion of the moment that she swore a 1,000-year war to free Kashmir and appropriated $5 million for pro-Pakistani rebels in the Indian-held region... In May, (US ambassador Robert Oakley) had told her that the US had indications that her own military was getting dangerously close to crossing the line...The generals steadfastly denied to her that they were anywhere near the forbidden line. Now in July, Oakley told Bhutto that the intelligence was unassailable the generals and their scientists had crossed the line... On August 6, 1990, with the world's attention focussed on Saddam Hussein's brazen drive into Kuwait, Ghulam Ishaq Khan (President of Pakistan) went on television to denounce Bhutto's government as being corrupt and incompetent and to dismiss her. The generals made their position on the matter absolutely clear by sending tanks to surround Bhutto's house. Whatever Ishaq Khan said, Bhutto and her supporters considered the action to be a 'nuclear coup'.(Burrows & Windrem,1994: 61/66).
At this time there were three key figures in the production of nuclear weapons. They were the President, Ghulam Ishaq Khan, a former general, the Chief of Staff of the Army, General Mirza Aslam Beg and Dr Abdul Qudeer Khan, a metallurgist with a doctorate from the Catholic University of Leuven, in Belgium. These men worked in great secrecy to produce nuclear weapons for Pakistan. Ishaq Khan and General Beg were ready to use nuclear weapons on two different occasions until they were shown the futility of using such weapons. In 1990 Deputy National Security Adviser Robert M. Gates was sent by the US to warn Pakistan against using nuclear weapons.

Ishaq Khan hinted darkly to Gates that should Pakistan's fate be threatened by India, he would use atomic bombs early in the conflict. But the meeting with Ishaq Khan and Beg did not go the way Ishaq Khan had planned. Gates was less than tactful. 'General,' he told Beg, 'our military has war gamed every scenario between you and the Indians and there isn't a single way you can win.' The message was really directed, not at Beg but at Ishaq Khan, who the US believed had not been fully briefed by his excitable chief of staff. 'Don't expect any help from us' Gates added for emphasis. (Burrows & Windrem, 1994:p84).

Pakistan is one of the poorest countries in the world yet how did they find the money
for such huge expenditure in nuclear weaponry. According to Burrows and Windrem the CIA gave them in 1984 nearly one billion dollars plus other sums in direct aid. They also got an equal amount from King Fahd of Saudi Arabia plus other unstated amounts from the notorious Bank of Credit and Commerce (BCCI) where a Pakistani citizen was the Chairman. These monies had been flowing into the country while its people suffered great hardship.

In 1992, Pakistan ranked 120 out of 160 nations in terms of human development. Its per capita gross domestic product (GDP) was $370. Thirty-six million Pakistani, or 30% of the population, live below the poverty line by the UN's calculation...Nearly a million children under the age of five die each year from malnutrition or disease, while nine and a half million others are so badly malnourished that their growth is stunted...The country spends 2.6 percent of its GDP on education and 6.7% on the military. There are 50 percent more Pakistani soldiers, in fact, than teachers...

"Pakistan displays all the negative characteristics of an underdeveloped economy," The New Book of World Rankings reported in 1997...

But Pakistan does excel. While it ranks 144th on The New Book's Physical Quality of Life Index behind - even Haiti and Bangladesh - it ranks 11th on the CIA's Nuclear Weapons List...Pakistan's arsenal was built without the advantages that other members of the nuclear club have. It lacks the oil wealth of Iran, Iraq, and the peninsula sheikdoms. It does not have the vast industrial base of its adversary, India. It has neither Israel's abundance of trained scientific and technical
talent nor North Korea's secrecy. Pakistan is therefore the exception that makes the rule. It is a model of how far a down-and-out nation can go in acquiring nuclear arms when its leaders combine unwavering resolve with flexibility and imagination. (Burrows & Windrem, 1994: 67/68).

The surprising fact here is that the final stages of the so-called 'Islamic bomb' were made after SAARC had been formed. In other words SAARC did not deter Pakistan from making nuclear weapons. The bombs were Islamic only in name. Pakistan had no intention of giving the bombs or the techniques of making them to any of their co-religionists. Both Bhutto and Ghulam Ishaq Khan on their visits to Iran were perhaps asked by the Iranians to give them the bomb or the techniques for making them in return for a huge sum of money; some reports say they were offered the entire defence expenditure over a year, which they were reported to have declined. China did greatly help Pakistan in making the bombs but at the same time Pakistan got many items of literature from US nuclear facilities and did not find any great difficulty in getting specialized materials and products such as krypton and triggers which could be only used with atomic bombs. Germany and France too unwittingly helped
in these efforts. The reason for these efforts was Pakistan's fears that another war with India would lead to her dismemberment into not two but perhaps four little chunks. This was the greatest fear that Pakistan had. It is unfortunate that India did not do anything to allay these fears of a fellow-member of SAARC.

On the contrary India has been having a long standing nuclear program which they had often dismissed with a deprecative understatement that these were for "peaceful purposes".

India's nuclear energy program...was started in 1945 - even before independence - with the creation of the Institute for Fundamental Research. The IFR was headed by an enthusiastic Cambridge-educated physicist, Homi Bhabha, who shaped nuclear research for war and peace and, in the process, saw to it that the Indian program always moved towards self-sufficiency...

The French signed a nuclear cooperation agreement with India in 1951 that called for ... personnel exchanges and the training of Indian technicians...Dr Bertrand Goldschmidt, who headed the French Atomic Energy Commission's international relations division...recalled years later that Homi Bhabha's plans had certainly included nuclear weapons...

Typically, the United States outdid its cohorts in generosity. It subsidized loans and research grants for 1,300 Indian scientists and technicians to study nuclear facilities in the United States...

Indians trained in the West would ultimately include the two most critical figures in the weapons program: Raja Ramanna and P.K.Iyengar... Both Ramanna and Iyengar later rose to become chairmen of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission.
In addition Ramanna, a nuclear hawk, became Minister of State for Defence... (Burrows & Windrem, 1994:355/356)

Avul Pakir Jainulabuddin Abdul Kalam, the fifty eight-year-old doyen of India's space program, couched the triumph in less prosaic terms. He was to Agni what A.Q. Khan was to the Pakistani bomb program... (Burrows & Windrem, 1994:370)

Homi Bhabha's death in the mid-sixties in a plane crash slowed India's atomic weapons program but with more than 6000 scientists working on India's atomic and space research programs there was no letting up for long.

(During the eighties) India designed and built - not imported - five power reactors, each larger than 200 megawatts and each a potential plutonium producer. It constructed a uranium purification and conversion plant and a laboratory needed to enrich the metal to bomb-grade. It also set up three heavy water facilities, a fuel fabrication plant, and three separate research reactors. At 100 megawatts, one of the research reactors was the largest such plant in the world. The Indians even set up their own small fast-breeder in preparation for a much larger one they ordered from the Russians.

K. Subrahmanyam, Director of the Institute for Defense Studies and Analysis in New Delhi, was almost sanguine about his country exchanging atomic or even thermonuclear salvos with Pakistan or even with China. His thoughts, in fact, were eerily reminiscent of those in the American far right who believed in the 1980s that their countrymen could ride out and survive a nuclear war with the Soviet Union...

"It will be analogous to the situation between the superpowers in the early fifties. That situation will still be preferable to one of India remaining non-nuclear, facing
the threat of humiliation, defeat and disintegration (Burrows & Windren, 1994: 357,377)

International politics has come round a full circle and we are at the point of the Berlin Airlift and its aftermath. Will India and Pakistan reconsider their situation and decide that the weapons they have are as dangerous to their own people as they are to their neighbors? Perhaps SAARC will make them decide that it is better to cooperate and perhaps integrate than to disintegrate into nothingness.

There are no doubt hawks on both sides of the divide but the majority of the people in both Pakistan and India are peace loving and have no desire for a nuclear holocaust at any time. Territories do not mean much to any people but they are an important factor to the ruling elite in both countries. If South Asia is to achieve any progress in the 21st century both India and Pakistan have to join hands and develop the enormous potential of nuclear technology for the common betterment of both their peoples. This is probably one of the long term goals of SAARC but there has to be some clear agreement on this issue before any progress can be made. At the
present time both governments are down-playing the nuclear issue and the next few SAARC meetings may see a better understanding in this area. Pakistan needs India just as much as India needs Pakistan. Both Nehru and Jinnah understood this basic issue but their egos took them both on to the wrong road. If nuclear deterrence will now bring both countries back to the unity they enjoyed under foreign rule then the threat of nuclear war could in the long run be of great benefit to both countries. In this SAARC could play a very vital role.
PART 3

CONVERGENCE
SAARC is not an organization formed for or originating from a security point of view in terms of what Karl Deutsch would identify as a "security community". It is more of a socio-economic international organization. SAARC was formed "To promote the welfare of the peoples of South Asia and to improve their quality of life." Nevertheless security concerns did seep through but they were kept in check by a virtually inflexible foreign policy operated by India who wanted the other six nations to think in like manner. This was however a major hurdle. The other six nations wanted to pursue an independent foreign policy. The biggest offender in this respect was Pakistan and also perhaps Ceylon. There was very little India could do against Pakistan except to cut off all trade and prevent any contact between the two peoples. In the case of Ceylon there were periods of good relations when the Bandaranaikes were in power with their left wing governments. These soured when right wing pro-western governments came into power.
India used the growing rift between the Sinhalese and the Tamils to destabilize the Ceylon government as a way of bringing it to heel. This was a colossal blunder as neither India nor Ceylon could envisage with equanimity an independent Tamil state in north Ceylon. Perhaps India looked forward to the incorporation of northern Ceylon and later on the whole of Ceylon as a province of India. But in this age of nationalism and an expanding United Nations membership this could only be a dream.

Long before independence in 1947 the Congress Party in India had looked forward not only to the time when they would be a free nation but also to the time they would take their rightful place in international affairs. Indian intellectuals who had their impressionable education in English or in England were greatly influenced by liberal democratic traditions and Fabian socialism prevailing in the early part of the twentieth century. As far back as the mid 1920s the Congress working committee devoted some time to examine international affairs and passed resolutions praising or condemning various events such as dangers in the growth of fascism,
western imperialism, the progress of the Russian revolution and so on. Jawaharlal Nehru, the man behind all this activity was the Harrow and Cambridge educated son of a prominent lawyer Motilal Nehru. In Roy C. Macrides edition of, Foreign Policy in World Politics, Richard L. Park says,

Although it is not accurate to credit Prime Minister Nehru for the whole construction of India's foreign policy, it can be said that he was the architect and guide who prepared the way, from 1926, for politics that, by 1947, were acceptable to and taken for granted by the vast majority of the citizens of India. (1976, p321)

Nehru was Prime Minister from 1947 till his death in 1964. During this period he also held the post of Minister for External Affairs. This is a huge ministry and had a large professional staff under a Foreign Secretary who is assisted by a number of deputies and a staff of over seven thousand. This is an elite service recruited by a very stiff public examination. There are several advisory bodies in the Congress Party, in the Cabinet and in other institutions in addition to a Foreign Service Board chaired by the Foreign Secretary which has as its members
other senior secretaries such as the Secretary of Foreign Trade. Thus there are a number of persons who are aware of and share similar views on Indian Foreign policy as the core decision making personnel.

In a statement issued in New Delhi by Nehru as leader of the interim government before independence he said,

In the sphere of foreign affairs India will follow an independent foreign policy, keeping away from power politics of groups aligned one against another. She will uphold the principles of freedom for dependent peoples and will oppose racial discrimination wherever it may occur. She will work with other peace-loving nations for international cooperation and goodwill without exploitation of one nation by another.

It is necessary that, with the attainment of full international status, India should establish contact with all the great nations of the world and that her relations with neighboring countries in Asia should become still closer...

Towards the United Nations Organization India's attitude is that of wholehearted cooperation and unreserved adherence, in both spirit and letter, to the Charter governing it. To that end, India will participate fully in its varied activities and endeavor to play that role in its Councils to which her geographical position, population and contribution toward peaceful progress entitle her. In particular, the Indian delegate will make it clear that India stands for the independence of all colonial and dependent people and their full right to self-determination. (Macrides [Ed], 1976, p326).
This policy remained more or less unchanged and it remained a basic tenet of Indian Foreign Policy and was repeatedly endorsed by all of Nehru's successors. However this policy was not without its detractors and it did reach crisis points on at least five occasions. These were during the three Indo-Pakistan wars of 1947, 1967 and 1971, during the Sino-Indian war of 1962 and the confrontation of 1987 with Ceylon. India's policy towards Pakistan has always remained a difficult one. Pakistan believes in the so called "Two Nation" theory based solely on religious differences which India with her secular constitution and many ethnic and religious groups among her peoples cannot agree in any way. Pakistan with her pro-western, pro-China and pro-Islamic tilt makes India nervous. She does not want history to repeat itself. There had been many attempts at better relations but Kashmir has been the stumbling block. It still is, even today, and could possibly escalate into a more serious problem according to a report in the August 24, 1993 issue of the New York Times noting that former Afghan fighters are taking part with Pakistani and Kashmiri fighters
in Kashmir. As these men fought desperate battles with the more heavily armed Russians they are causing grave concern among the elite Border Security Force India has stationed there.

In the *Journal of Asian and African Studies* Jan/Apr, 1990, A. Jeyaratnam Wilson says,

> The foreign policies of one group of states, the Himalayan (Nepal, Bhutan and Sikkim), and Bangladesh and Sri Lanka are affected by India, the dominant power in the region. The rule was well laid down by...Nehru on 6 January, 1950 in a statement to the Indian Parliament on Nepal (a policy pronouncement which has been applied to all the states in this group)...'much as we appreciate the independence of Nepal, we cannot allow anything to go wrong in Nepal or permit that barrier to be crossed or weakened, because that would be a risk to our own security...'

This concept Wilson terms 'Finlandization'. This means that no state in the first group would be allowed to adopt any policy in foreign relations that would come in conflict with the security of India just as the policies of Finland are *vis a vis* Soviet Russia. One consequence of this policy was the annexation of Sikkim into the Indian Union in February, 1975. Bhutan was a different case and because it cooperated with India it was permitted to retain its independence become a member of the UN in 1971, the NAM in
1979, and SAARC in 1985. Nepal was a more intractable problem. To obviate criticism of Nepal's too close a relationship with India, the then King, Mahendra, tried to enter into diplomatic relations with China. This earned the ire of India. When Mahendra died in January, 1972, his successor King Birendra wanted to have better relations with India. One of the benefits indicated was India's promise to build about fifty water supply schemes in Nepal. Though Birendra tried to strike a balance between India and China he could not do much to move away from India because of his economic dependency on India.

A very different case was Ceylon. When England passed the British Nationality and Status of Aliens Act in 1948 indicating who could be citizens of England, Ceylon followed up with her own Ceylon Citizenship Act disfranchising nearly a million citizens of Indian origin who had labored in the tea plantations. This act of discrimination was bound to be looked at askance in India. Though Nehru tended to be conciliatory, Ceylon had insured that no future Indian government would take any retaliatory steps, by entering into a Defence Agreement with
England. But disfranchisement of the Indian settlers in Ceylon was the beginning of more and more acts of discrimination against earlier settlers in the North and East. These acts had repercussions in the Indian state of Tamil Nadu whose citizens belonged to the same ethnic group as the Tamils of the North and East of Ceylon.

The growing conflict between the Sinhalese and Tamils increasingly destabilized the island's policy and caused concern in Tamil Nadu, a relevant political constituency for Rajiv Gandhi's government. The last straw was the intervention of hostile and unfriendly foreign powers (to India) and their agents in the island's affairs, especially during 1983-87...

The situation was made worse when President Jayawardene obtained the services of Pakistani, Israeli and British (unofficial) military advisors and arms from the Republic of South Africa..." (Wilson, 1990: p 47)

India knew that Ceylon, while rejecting the efforts of India such as the 1984-85 visit of Indira Gandhi's Minister for Foreign Affairs, Narasimha Rao, and the Chairman of her Policy Planning Committee, G. Parthasarathy and also Rajiv Gandhi's Foreign Secretary, Romesh Bhandari and his Cabinet minister (of State), P. Chidambaram from 1984 to 1987, had gone on to seek help from Ronald Reagan in the US, from
Margaret Thatcher in England, Zia al Huq in Pakistan as well as from China and other countries. Wilson, who is from Ceylon and a former adviser to President Jayawardene adds,

India's intervention was not a part of a hegemonistic design or an implementation of Mrs Indira Gandhi's alleged version of a 'Monroe Doctrine' for South Asia, as various commentators speculated. Rajiv Gandhi's action in 1987, on the contrary, was in total agreement with the policy on Nepal spelled out by his grandfather, Jawaharlal Nehru in January, 1950... Ceylon's leaders by and large had no concept of foreign policy goals. (Wilson, 1990: p48/49)

Wilson's conclusion is a devastating one. However it is now very evident that Indian intervention in Ceylon was a greatly mistaken one. In the past India merely threatened by sending a warship or two to Colombo or Trincomalee. It was enough to correct the situation. But by physically sending seventy to eighty thousand soldiers as peacekeepers India overacted her part. These peacekeepers were looked on as an army of occupation and this generated sufficient national feeling to polarize the conflict and cause the Indians to be seen as enemies. Secondly, the Indian troops were not trained for their role as
peacekeepers and their instructions were sloppy. The Indian intervention in Ceylon greatly endangered the well being and the future of SAARC itself. The 1989 summit meeting of heads of state or governments was not held because of the intransigence of President Premadasa of Ceylon.

The other two countries in SAARC that have to be discussed are the tiny Republic of the Maldives Islands and Bangladesh. The Maldives Islands which were once a dependency of Ceylon consists of more than 1009 coral islands over an area of 35,000 square miles in the Indian Ocean about 400 miles southwest of Ceylon. Some of the islands are hardly six feet above the water and are not inhabited. The total habitable area is about 115 square miles and the total population is about 140,000. (Anand, 1991:29/30). The Maldives are greatly dependent on the goodwill of India. Tamil rebels from Ceylon attempted to seize the government in 1989 and India countered it by rushing paratroopers and restoring the Maldivian government. This quick response was part of India's regional focus.
Bangladesh on the other hand is a state India helped to create but is now at some odds with India. Bangladesh is one of the poorest countries in the world.

In the case of Bangladesh too, Mrs Gandhi did nothing more than follow her father's...policy of safeguarding India's vital interests... S. M. Mujtaba Razvi, described Mrs Gandhi's policy as her version of a 'Monroe Doctrine' in South Asia. However, our view is that Mrs. Gandhi was keeping to the policy enunciated by Nehru in 1950 (on Nepal) though in a more difficult context...

It was in these circumstances that Mrs Gandhi intervened in East Pakistan. In order to ward off a possible threat from the PRC, Mrs Gandhi took the precaution of concluding a mutual assistance pact with the Soviet Union, known as the Indo-Soviet Friendship Treaty of August, 1972. The decision to assist Mujibur Rahman in the creation of the state of Bangladesh had probably more to do with maintaining the stability of the South Asian system than this pact. (Wilson, 1990:p50)

Mujibur had a fairly good relationship with India but his close association was resented and resulted in his assassination and in the murder of many members of his family and close associates. In November, 1975, power was seized by General Ziaur Rahman. Ziaur was cool to Delhi, emphasized Bangladesh nationalism and the Islamic way of life. He sought a closer cooperation with Pakistan. But in 1977 Mrs Gandhi
was defeated by the hastily put together Janata Party and Moraji Desai became the Prime Minister of India. Desai wanted better relations with Bangladesh and entered into a five year agreement to provide sufficient water to Bangladesh during the dry season. This was the time when scholars were working on greater areas of cooperation in South Asia. Ziaur became an enthusiastic supporter of these ideas and took the initiative to put these ideas to other leaders of South Asia. The good reception he received made him present a working paper which later became the basis of SAARC. Ziaur was, however, assassinated in 1981 and Lt. General H.M. Ershad seized power. Ershad continued the process and also signed the Indo-Bangladesh Accord of 31 May, 1984. Wilson says,

Bangladesh will, in the final analysis, be obliged to refrain from actions which will affect India's interests. The leverage of water and India's superior military strength leaves Bangladesh with little or no option. (Wilson, 1990: p51)

Wilson treats Pakistan in a special category.

Resentment against India is rooted in Pakistan's foreign policy goals. The immediate
post-partition problems, including Kashmir, are not the only causes. Pakistan had been a state in search of a national identity. Pakistan seeks reinforcement of its presence in the Indian subcontinent by challenging India's position as the dominant power. This seems irrational. India has a larger Muslim population than Pakistan. While Pakistan emphasizes its Islamic identity, India maintains its secular character. India has 72% of the land area of the subcontinent and 77% of the population. Its sheer size and wealth in natural resources give India automatic pride of place. Nevertheless Pakistan's goal orientations have been directed at destablizing the Indian state system by, for example, encouraging Khalistani Sikhs in their separatism, developing a nuclear profile and entering strategic treaty networks that are not consonant with Indian policies to avoid South Asia from being drawn into the power politics of states outside the region. (Wilson, 1990: p52)

Pakistan has from its inception in 1947 sought help from England, the US, China and Islamic countries. Even though Pakistan was willing to enter into such pacts as CENTO and SEATO they were not satisfactory from Pakistan's view. These pacts were not anti-Indian. They were at most anti-communist. But when Russia moved into Afghanistan, Pakistan was able to obtain military and financial assistance from the US. These dried up when the Russians pulled out of Afghanistan and the Cold War ended and the Americans could no longer pretend that Pakistan was not attempting to produce nuclear weapons to even
the score with India. However this subject has been dealt with in Chapter 5 under Nuclear Deterrence.

Therefore to summarize, India's Foreign Policy has been fairly consistent with the one outlined by Nehru. The only deviation was in the twenty year Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship which created some inroads in the Nonaligned stand India took since independence. But the end of the Cold War and the break-up of the Soviet Union created bigger problems and India had to make some changes.

Basically India's foreign policy remains more or less unchanged but her economic difficulties had made her change her policy of self reliance and rejection of foreign aid. In pursuing a policy of inviting foreign investment and pushing exports she has achieved her goals of a fully convertible rupee and a higher living standard for her people but she still has a long way to go. However this has not been without some pain in the devaluation of the rupee, in a double digit inflation and hardship for those least able to accept it.

The impact of SAARC on Indian Foreign Policy has been minimal in both positive
and negative ways. But since it was put together mainly by Indian Foreign Service personnel together with some assistance from the Foreign Service personnel of the other six South Asian countries, there is always an unspoken undertone of the basic tenets of Indian Foreign Policy which was reflected in the Indian interventions in Ceylon and in the Maldives, both of which were undertaken, largely in pursuance of Indian Foreign Policy goals.
CHAPTER 7
THEORIES OF INTEGRATION

Integration and disintegration have been factors at work in human society from the beginning of time. But not much was said and analysed till the end of the 19th century. For the first glimmering of a theory on integration we are indebted to Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) who made it a part of his monumental work, The Division of Labour in Society (1893). According to Durkheim, "mechanical solidarity" in early societies was founded on common beliefs and consensus based on conscience collective. Industrialization and urbanization broke into this concept of solidarity. However he was convinced that a new social order of solidarity would come up based on interdependence and specialization. (Giddens, [Ed] Durkheim on Politics and the State. 1994:p2/3)

The next great figure in integration theories is Talcott Parsons (1902-1979). He was an academic whose voluminous writings gave rise to both acceptance as well as criticisms. Parsons attempted to synthesize individual actions with large scale social actions. According to Parsons what joins
social action with a social system is pattern variables. There are four such variables. These variables structure any system of interaction but they have four functional needs. These are adaptation, (economy); goal attainment (politics); integration (administration and legal system) and latent tension. In order to meet these requirements (AGIL), groups of action or subsystems of actions develop. At the most general level the cultural subsystem performs the latency function and the social subsystem the function of integration. Parsons asserts that social action tends to equilibrium and social change is actually movement from one state of equilibrium to another.

While Parsons was giving new life to social science other social scientists such as Harold D. Lasswell, who was a contemporary of Talcott Parsons, were narrowing the field in political science and highlighting such factors as power, influence and systems. Yet others were looking into specifically new integration theories. David Mitrany was in the twenties and thirties toying with the idea of using functionalism to rise above nationalism and state sovereignty to solve international problems in a global sphere. By the
forties he had polished his ideas which had by then caught the eye of policy makers in the newly formed United Nations. This was *A Working Peace System* (1946). Its subtitle was, "an argument for functional development of the international system". While functionalism had a place in the formation of the International Monetary Fund and World Bank and went on to influence the formation of the World Health Organization it could not progress any further. It failed in the Food and Agricultural Organization where an attempt to fix food prices ran into opposition from national states.

The many and varied functions of a state are duplicated in many other states, therefore by combining and regulating these functions one can operate in an extra-territorial manner. According to David Mitrany this would eventually lead to a working peace system. Such a system will develop a sense of community which would rise above national feelings and give an impetus to cooperation and general welfare. The decision making is by experts who would be guided by general welfare and social good rather than for sectarian and localised benefit. Functionalists believe that continued cooperation will lead to 'spill over' effects in other fields.
It is an idealized policy and its continued existence gives rise to hopes that there is a possibility of functionalism becoming more or less universal.

On the other hand neo-functionalists emphasize a slightly different aspect. Both agree it is a learning process but the neo-functionalists insist that the process needs a political will. While functionalists believe in a 'spill over' process, neo-functionalists reckon it to be a means of interstate integration in a new political effort. E.B. Haas and L.N. Lindberg are the chief exponents of neo-functionalism. (Lindberg & Scheingold in *Regional Integration and Research*, 1971).

There have been many other writers who have enunciated other theories of integration, which were mostly modifications or extensions of functionalism or neo-functionalism. The sixties and seventies were fruitful fields for these new theories. Among them were P.E. Jacob, R.O. Keohane, J.S. Nye, Amitab Etzioni and others but none could overshadow the prolific works of Karl W. Deutsch. He was the integration theorist *par excellence*. He made such a great study of the process of integration that there was hardly any aspect he left out. He was probably one of the first political
scientists to use mathematical formulas in his theories. Basically his theories of integration were focused on many aspects such as security, communication, territorial integrity and so on. Deutsch uses the communication model pioneered by electrical engineers. Deutsch begins with Nationalism and Social Communication: An Inquiry into the Foundations of Nationalism and goes on to Political Community and the North Atlantic Area: International Organization in the light of Historical Experience. Deutsch argued that the formation of a community by the people of a country implies a degree of assimilation both culturally and linguistically. When they are then induced to participate nationally, integration is complete. This could in a sense be right about a country such as India. In the same way security considerations could induce nations to participate with one another on the international level. Although Deutsch made a great deal of study of the past and contemporary world and rejected all types of integration not achieved voluntarily before he came up with the communications and security versions they were not enough. There were many examples of English speaking or Spanish speaking or French speaking states each
going their own way without sacrificing one iota of their sovereignty. The same is true of the security conscious states of NATO in Europe or the ASEAN states of Southeast Asia.

Deutsch defines integration,

as the attainment, within a territory, of a 'sense of community' and of institutions and practices strong enough and widespread enough to assure, for 'a long' time, dependable expectations of 'peaceful change' among its population.(1957,p.5).

Such integration nationally is possible but is doubtful internationally. Perhaps the only two such cases in the recent past, Egypt and Libya, and Syria and Egypt on the other hand both broke up after a very short time though linguistically and perhaps culturally they were on the same wavelength.

On the other hand E.B. Haas in The Study of Regional Integration, defines it as:

concerned with explaining how and why states cease to be wholly sovereign, how and why they mingle, merge, and mix with their neighbors so as to lose the factual attributes of sovereignty...

Thus the acceptance of national sovereignty of nations and the proliferation of nation states in the United Nations Organization made integration a negligible factor in the post World War II world.
The growth of European unity was so protracted a matter that most political scientists threw up their hands in virtual despair. Such was the case with E.B. Haas who even went to the extent of writing on the **Obsolescence of Regional Integration Theory**.

David Rutimer in "Theories of Political Integration" gives four theories. They are Federalism, Functionalism, Neofunctionalism and Communicative Interactionism. It is difficult to see Federalism as a part of Integration but at the same time it is not possible to rule it out completely. Basically Federalism is a form of power sharing at the center and at the periphery. Communicative interactionism is a learning process at both the social and official level, the end result being a security community. (Michelmann & Soldatos, [Eds] European Integration, 1994:p14). Though it is difficult to accept any one theory as consistently explaining regional integration it is possible to extract some parts in these theories which could go along to explain some tendencies in the process leading to integration such as communications, security consciousness, similarities, behavior patterns, religious and ethnic groupings and so on. India could be a model in working out such
theories for South Asia as a whole. But there is of course a limitation in that it is so far not possible to evoke a sense of national consciousness for an area such as South Asia. At the same time SAARC does not either overtly or covertly indicate its goal to be regional integration. SAARC's goal is explicitly cooperation among seven independent and sovereign states. There is no expectation of a merger - politically, economically or even culturally. SAARC's basic goal remains, as always, the welfare of the people of the region.
CHAPTER 8
SAARC AND SOUTH ASIAN SECURITY

According to Karl W. Deutsch in his scholarly and informative book, *The Analysis of International Relations*, there are three kinds of integrative communities.

If the main goal of integration is not only the preservation of peace among the integrated political units, but also—even more urgently—the acquisition of greater power for general purposes, or the attainment of some specific task, or the acquisition of some common role identity, or some combination of all these, then a so-called amalgamated political community with a common government is likely to seem most attractive. If, on the other hand, the main aim is the preservation of peace, then a pluralistic security community may suffice...

An amalgamated community may also be, of course, an amalgamated security community...(Deutsch, 1968:p193)

Deutsch however discounts functionalism as a means of integration. He says that at most it would provide only partial integration though he does not completely rule out this factor. In the case of SAARC functionalism does exist but it is on a minor key. However SAARC does not fall into any of the categories Deutsch has outlined. It has a completely different policy of extending
cooperation. There was to be specifically no amalgamation, no preservation of peace and no security commitment. SAARC was formed to advance the social welfare and economic progress of the people of South Asia.

The continuation of the old British policy of keeping out of the Indian Ocean and the Indian Subcontinent any nation that would be a danger to India's interests was an admirable but difficult policy in a rapidly changing world. Once a country obtained the long sought after power of sovereign independence there was no way it would or rather its elites would willingly give up this power.

At this stage it may be useful to indicate what others think of SAARC. Wilson writing in the *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, January/April, 1990, is gloomy about the prospects of SAARC. He says this cooperation is only on limited fields. Wilson is probably right to say this. Wilson also takes objection to SAARC discussing and taking steps to prevent acts of terrorism. The Indian delegates were themselves reluctant to discuss and take countermeasures against terrorism. Both England and Ceylon have in their statute books a law termed,
Prevention of Terrorism Act. In fact President Jayawardene of Ceylon drew attention to the English law as justification for Ceylon having a similar law. Unfortunately both laws are bad because they have been used to hold without trial the Irish in one instance and the Tamils in the other as terrorists contrary to the general law of both countries. Thomas A. Marks who has made a considerable study of terrorism in Ceylon, the Philippines and in Peru states in the journal *Low Intensity Conflict and Law Enforcement* (Winter, 1992 p215), that there is a distinction between terrorism and terror.

Terrorism is small-group violence carried out unilaterally by a group in pursuance of self-proclaimed political goals. Terror, on the other hand, though often indistinguishable in form, is undertaken by members of an infrastructure who seek to further the maintenance and expansion of that infrastructure.

Marks goes on to say the distinction is very important. If security forces do not make the proper distinction they will only make matters worse. Eamon de Valera, Jomo Kenyatta, Mahatma Gandhi, Yasser Arafat and Nelson Mandela were all at one time or another called terrorists by the ruling elites
only to see power pass into their hands eventually. This may have been one reason why India was reluctant to take action against the so-called terrorists. Jayawardene's terrorists were not necessarily Rajiv Gandhi's terrorists. But unfortunately the lines have become blurred and there could still be an identity of views between India and Ceylon.

Continuing with what Wilson has to say about SAARC, we find that he says that many of the steps taken in South Asia have been done bilaterally rather than multilaterally as in SAARC. On the other hand, persons such as S.D. Muni (of the Jawaharlal Nehru University in Delhi) wax eloquently about SAARC and its achievements. He has conveyed this information to other scholars such as Norman D. Palmer (formerly of the University of Pennsylvania) who has made reference to them in his book, The New Regionalism in Asia and the Pacific, in these words:

The list of areas for possible cooperation among the seven nations of South Asia, under the aegis of SAARC, is a reminder of the wide range of mutual interests among these states and the necessity for regional cooperation in dealing with many issues of mutual concern. Among those suggested, over and above those already on SAARC's agenda, are the following: the formulation
of common policies in the field of trade, both within (and outside the region)..., shipping and other maritime services, developing and harnessing natural resources, especially energy sources...and seabed resources; the joint sharing and control of river waters that run through two or more countries of the region; a regional food policy, ... the development of cooperative policies in dealing with multinational corporations, with a view to the furtherance of national and regional development programs, foreign investment, and technology transfer without being forced to make too many concessions to multinationals; the promotion of tourism throughout the region, through such means as advertising, 'package deals' for more than one country, and the development of regional transport networks along the lines of the West European network; regional security cooperation...

India seems particularly insistent that SAARC must not be in any sense a security arrangement and that it must not be pro-western in its security or political orientation. A typical Indian view is that SAARC is, and should be quite different from ASEAN in this respect. This view was expressed by S.D. Muni when he wrote that 'The SAARC unlike its predecessor the ASEAN..., is far from being a Western sponsored example of regionalism or having pronounced security pretensions ...(India) has...resisted pressures for reorienting the SAARC on the basis of ASEAN, which is a pro-Western organization. India does not view with favor at the move on the part of some members to forge links between the SAARC and ASEAN. Instead it has tried to bring such other neighbors like Burma and Afghanistan into the SAARC which do not readily endorse western strategic positions on Asian and international issues.' (Palmer, 1993:pgs 82,85,89).

Both Palmer and Muni realize that the SAARC has been in existence for only a few years but they feel confident about the future. Muni lists
the achievements of SAARC as,

'a benign influence on bilateral differences and problems'; the effective development of the organizational structure; the expansion of the Integrated Programme of Action (IPA), including such previously avoided areas of cooperation as suppression of terrorism, the problem of floods and other natural disasters, now on the IPA agenda 'under the wider canvas of protection of environment' and trade. Muni also calls attention to the development of SAARC 'as an approach to mutual confidence building'.(Palmer, 1993:p93).

SAARC is the result of a concerted effort by both the public and the private sectors. Nevertheless the yeoman effort was contributed by the Indian Foreign Service personnel who had in the main the unenviable task of evaluating, constructing and maintaining a viable organization that would in the long run suit the goals of all the seven South Asian nations. Indian and other foreign service personnel were fortunate that there was definite support for a regional organization in both the government and among the Indian intellectuals.

However SAARC is not seen in this way by the outside world. This may be due to ignorance or to indifference or to perhaps both. This should not
be surprising as the American public is generally Euro-centered. EC and NATO are better known. Even ASEAN is better known perhaps because of its longer history of existence and as well as its stated pro-west position and its connection with Singapore and the Philippines. South Asia is internationally one of the least known parts of the world. It came into the picture when the US government thought of rendering some assistance to the Chinese government through the Burma Road after the US entered World War II in December 1941. To expedite the opening of this road and to protect it, General Stillwell was appointed to command the China-Burma-India Theater of Operations. This was probably the first time that the US State Department had reports of people such as Nehru, Gandhi and Jinnah from a young staff officer named Dean Rusk who later on became President Kennedy's and afterwards President Johnson's Secretary of State.

In spite of what Palmer states, SAARC will never be a security oriented community such as ASEAN or the EC. SAARC is a unique organization unlike other regional organizations. In the first place India is so big that it can easily swallow up all
the other six countries in South Asia. In one sense this could mean that Indian views may dominate SAARC. But this is not so with the application of the unanimity rule. Thus in actual fact SAARC is all things to all seven nations in South Asia. In his dissertation, *The Origins of Association in South Asia: SAARC, 1979-1989*, Kanti Bajpai puts it this way:

The real focus of South Asian containment is internal to the region. The smaller states all wish to contain India; and India wishes to contain the smaller states to the region, to prevent them from drifting away to other regions or from reaching out to the great powers. The smaller states have been forced to come together in a diplomatic containment of India because over time potential extra-regional balancers of Indian power have either been unreliable or have signalled that they do not wish to play that role. (Bajpai, 1990:p254,255)

Thus there are three security problems in the region. Two are internal and one external. Basically India considers her security needs paramount and will fight to prevent an external power allying itself with one or more of the smaller powers. The smaller powers are of course afraid of India and look for support from outside. But India does not want to allow this. From the very
inception of the state, India has laid down as an inflexible policy not to ally itself with either super power. This nonalignment policy broke down in 1972 with the Indo-Soviet Treaty of Friendship. But when the Soviet Union broke up, India had to change many positions. Her terms of trade deteriorated, her growing middle class exerted pressure for foreign goods, her industrialists wanted foreign collaboration, her businessmen wanted an end to bureaucratic control, her foreign exchange was being depleted very alarmingly and she had to go hat in hand to the International Monetary Fund to obtain relief. The result was devaluation and the domestic pressures that go with it.

The other six South Asian countries too had their own problems, some of which arose out of the Gulf War (1990/1991) which disrupted their trade with Iraq and the lucrative remittances sent by their citizens from their employment in Arab countries. SAARC was in no position to help them out very much. SAARC did not have a voice in the UN as much as the nonaligned states once had. Nonalignment was virtually dead. The new order in international politics after the breakup of Soviet
Russia did not have anything very much to say about South Asia. South Asia was virtually ignored in the Gulf War, her trade with Iraq was cut off by an UN embargo and South Asians caught up in the conflict were repatriated without compensation by either the UN or the Gulf War allies.

Thus South Asian problems had little to do with security and more with economic and monetary policies. The growing erosion in the value of their currencies and the falling values of their primary products were a bigger concern than wars and rumours of wars. Nevertheless the Gulf war taught a very important lesson. There is a great reluctance now to employ US troops in UN directed operations. Edward N. Luttwak, a senior Fellow at the Center for Strategic and International Studies in Washington, DC puts this facetiously in an article in the journal *Foreign Affairs*, July/August, 1994 by asking with mock seriousness "Where are the Great Powers?" and answering it with equal levity, "At home with the kids." The result is that the bulk of the UN peacekeeping operations are manned by troops from Pakistan, India and Bangladesh. There is also a prospect of Nepalese Gurkha troops being
permanently employed in difficult UN operations. All four are members of SAARC. Indian troops have found that service with the UN is lucrative to both the country as well as to the individual serviceman. Indian army authorities are working on plans to place larger contingents at the disposal of the UN if the great powers want to be home with the kids. This could give India and perhaps SAARC a bigger voice in UN affairs.
PART 4

COOPERATION
Regional cooperation among states and peoples is not a new idea. It has been tried out for a long time and found to be workable in many areas such as in Western Europe, South America, in Southeast Asia and elsewhere. One prime requirement is a clearly defined area. Secondly, there should be clearly defined programs of cooperation. These may be in the field of security or in trade and commerce such as a customs union in the old German states or as in Southern Africa between South Africa and the other states in southern Africa such as Lesotho, Swaziland and Botswana. Cooperation may also be in the arts or literature or in staging plays and other cultural activities such as ballet and opera. Even during the Cold War the Russian Bolshoi Ballet and other works by Soviet composers and writers were warmly received in the West. Similarly American jazz and American jeans were welcome in the Soviet Union. Thus there is reason to believe that culture knows
no boundaries or frontiers.

Nevertheless there is also good reason to believe that the world today is a more dangerous place than it was when World War II took place. Millions of people could lose their lives in a flash and major parts of the land and sea could be devastated. Therefore it is all the more necessary that states exercise very good relations in dealing with each other and with international agencies such as the UN, the World Bank, the World Health Organization and so on. There is a perception that national governments are losing their hold on the people they govern. This is not merely in far away places such as Zaire, Liberia or Ruwanda or even in Nigeria where effective systems of government are not available, thus leaving the people of these countries at the mercy of freebooters and indisciplined men in uniform; but also in the so-called First World countries in Europe and America. The cry here is that crime has become so pervasive that the police and the legal sector are unable to stop it. More laws are passed and more severe punishments are exacted but with little or no avail. When more prisons are built
and more offenders are incarcerated more burdens are cast on the remaining law abiding citizens.

Nation-states like the people who inhabit these lands have, generally speaking, good relations with their neighbors. But sometimes it does not turn out this way. Close connections may give rise to serious disputes over borders, ethnic groups or behavior patterns. In South Asia a glaring example would be the relations between India and Pakistan. There is no doubt that these relations could have been better if both parties had been more accommodating or perhaps been more understanding of each others problems. But once the break occured in 1947 it was easy to slide further and further away from each other. However with the inauguration of SAARC in 1985 there was a good prospect of better relations. But as these have not transpired, it is perhaps due, in a very large measure, to lack of understanding and goodwill among these two nation states and their ruling elites.

Dr. Sarvapalli Radhakrishnan, the noted Oxford Don and philosopher said, in 1965 when he was President of India in connection with
We have no choice now but to live together as members of a single world community. The twentieth century man who is already probing the mysteries of the universe cannot restrict his very existence to a narrow corner of the world in which he happens to dwell. Our true nationality is the human race; our home, the world. (India News, March 12, 1965:p1)

There are two ways in which cooperation could be exercised. Firstly, by using a transnational ideology such as Communism, Capitalism and so on. It can also be by way of a Trade Union such as the International Brotherhood of Teamsters or an international association of authors, poets, architects, accountants and so on. In other words it could be groupings of professionals cutting across national borders. The other way is that one could be a good national of one country but volunteer to go to the assistance of another country to help for example, children in distress. This leads us to two other sets of differentiation: Cooperation by governments and cooperation by non-governmental organizations (NGOs). This is a very important classification. Most states prefer government-to-government acts of cooperation. They usually look at askance at any acts by NGOs. This is, because in the
present state of suspicion in the world there is a worry that ordinary citizens would reveal real or imagined state secrets to outsiders. Even in an open society such as the US or England there is always a danger that important official or industrial secrets would be revealed to potential enemies and in some cases even to so-called friends such as in the Pollard case which dealt with the transmission of US military data to Israel.

SAARC is a state-sponsored organization and it deals with other states who are members of this organization on an official basis. Some writers criticise this position. They feel that nothing good can come from a state organization, on the other hand much good can flow from a people to people organization. This is however a very difficult proposition. Setting up an NGO requires an alert and sophisticated populace willing to take responsibility and carry out very difficult tasks. Many countries do not have the infrastructure for this effort. Even in highly developed countries such as the US and West European states it is still not easy to set up NGOs.
In *SAARC Beyond State-Centric Cooperation*, Meghna Guhathakurta in "Regionalism: Two Views of SAARC", argues this very same problem. Cooperation in agriculture, rural development, telecommunications, health and population matters has been minimal because

Elite perceptions dominate government policy-making and since in each country one elite government jealously guards their interests vis-a-vis other elite governments of the region, any attempt at cooperation tends to be taken as a 'sell-out' of national interest. Regionalism thus becomes subservient to national policies...

In addition, in each of the South Asian countries, there have arisen problems and issues which the governments of the respective country have failed to resolve...for example the Sindh problem in Pakistan, the Kashmiri and Assamese problem in India, the Tamil problem in Sri Lanka and the Hill people problem in Bangladesh...The fact that these problems are seen essentially as problems of 'national' integration rather than one of regional resolution is indicative of the relatively low value which is invested in regional conflict resolution. (Ahmed & Guhathakurtha, [Ed], 1992:33/34).

The solution put forward by Guhathakurta in addition to growth of tourism, student and cultural visits, access to newspapers and literature, radio and TV, greater trade and transport which the governments have agreed to embark on, is in the creation of several forums
for free exchange of ideas and more intensive discussion by non-governmental intellectuals and academics. Guhathakurta also calls on the governments to provide free and open elections, assurance of fundamental rights, free press, proper arrangements for sharing powers with minorities, change in approaches to the World Bank, greater administrative and local government freedom and last but not least the greater emphasis on the rights of women. The first such discussion was held in New Delhi in December 1991. Working Committees were established to consider the following:

1. Economic Cooperation.
2. Environmental Issues.
3. Information flows and Media perception in the region.
5. Population and Quality of life.

It is too early to assess what these non-governmental efforts could achieve over and above what governments could do. But it goes without much effort to indicate that states have the finances and the authority to achieve many of their goals unlike many non-governmental
organizations. NGOs need an extensive groundswell of grassroots organizations which generally comes in places where there is an active and prominent middle class together with the trappings of real democracy such as free and open elections, a free and uncensored press, and an open society. This is a real problem in South Asia and my observations and readings had gone on to indicate the immense difficulties NGOs would have in regions such as South Asia. Imagine my surprise when Tim Carrington, a staff reporter for The Wall Street Journal, wrote an article entitled, "In the Third World, Self Help Groups Pop Up to Fill Gaps Left by Governments", in the issue of 11 July, 1994. Carrington quotes John Rigby, President of the International Institute of Rural Reconstruction to affirm the enormous increase in NGOs in developing countries in the past five years. Carrington interviewed Julie Fisher, the author of, The Road from Rio: Sustainable Development and the Nongovernmental Movement in the Third World and quotes her thus:—

"It relates to both market failure and government failure". Third World governments ignore the needs of poor villagers and squatter communities, while corporations and commercial
banks seldom penetrate the sprawling "informal sector" of market women, food sellers and traders that account for as much (as) half of economic activity in developing countries...

She estimates that there are hundreds of thousands of grass-roots organizations, micro-enterprise lenders and neighborhood improvement groups in Latin America, Africa and Asia. (The Wall Street Journal, 11 July, 1994, p. A8).

Carrington also says that the World Bank and the US Agency for International Development which in the past did not deal with NGOs are coming round to dealing with them as it is less expensive and perhaps more successful in the long run. At the same time, NGOs such as the Grameen Bank in Bangladesh who did not want to deal with the World Bank and other International Agencies as they felt that aid had strings have changed their minds.

In "The Rise of the Nonprofit Sector" in the July/August, 1994 issue of Foreign Affairs, Lester M. Salamon, Director of the Institute for Policy Research at the Johns Hopkins University gives some very interesting data about NGOs. He says there are 10,000 registered NGOs in Bangladesh.

All my readings and observation had given me some idea of successful farmers' cooperatives
in India and the successful working of the Cooperative movement in Ceylon but I tended to discount them as the respective countries had a very weak infrastructure to support these movements. But when Salamon says there are 10,000 registered NGOs in Bangladesh alone it was time to have a second look. Farmers Cooperatives and Rural Development organizations have done sterling work in educating and promoting better methods of agriculture and marketing. In the Grameen Bank, Bangladesh has created a very innovative and unusual method of assisting low income farmers, cultivators, housewives and traders to better themselves without getting into debt too much. The loans also provide a radical departure from the customary insistence of many banks in demanding a collateral security against a loan. (Wahid, A.N.M. [Ed], The Grameen Bank, 1993).

One of the most fruitful fields of regional cooperation in South Asia could be in harnessing the Himalayan Water System. This could provide self sufficiency in energy and food.

The development of the giant river basins of the Ganges, Brahmaputra and Indus under
the cooperative framework of SAARC, according to experts, is a key to bring about an agricultural revolution in South Asia. The hydrel power obtained thereof will be an added bonus to meet energy shortages...Nepal's hydrel-power potential of some 83 million kw is said to be the equivalent to the combined installed hydro-electric capacity of the United States, Canada and Mexico. (Also) existing and potential energy resources include Indian coal and Pakistani and Bangladeshi natural gas...SAARC should, therefore, focus on ways and means of adopting a regional approach for the development and expansion of existing and potential energy resources. (Anand, 1991: 67/68).

Therefore it is necessary that the main effort should be directed towards developing the resources of all the seven countries on a regional basis. The most important of these resources is river valley development which has the potential of helping more than one country. In fact it could be three or four countries in several different ways such as flood control, irrigation, electric power supply and so on. Julie Fisher's book and the articles by Carrington and Salamon and others show how much has changed in the last five years or so. I see NGOs as a very important factor in the economic life of South Asian countries, overshadowing even the place of governments which in any case are losing their effectiveness all over the world.
Integration theories in South Asia cannot be properly understood without examining them through South Asian eyes. Many integration theories are Euro-centered and this is perhaps one reason why European and American political scientists have often envisaged the break up of India right from the time of independence in 1947. The separation of Pakistan from India was partly due to English policy and partly due to Indian pigheadedness. After the failure of this policy, Nehru who was at the helm of affairs was quick to realize the need for change and the building of institutions to provide legitimacy for these new ideas. According to Rajni Kothari there were four basic goals which were pursued simultaneously. They were: (1) National Integration, (2) Economic Development, (3) Social Equality, (4) Political Democracy.

It was these values, the institutions they nurtured, and the pragmatic political forms through which they were played out that provided the sinews of integration to highly diverse,
in many ways divided, and inherently plural and segmented social fabric. This was the greatest achievement of democracy in India, of building a unity which derived its strength from infinite diversity and differentiation and did not need to steamroller the country into some dead uniformity under a leader or a party or an idea... (Kothari in Peter Lyon and James Manor [Ed] 1983, p36).

The second big difference from Western and American thinking is the seemingly deceptive absence of an opposition party in Indian politics. This is not true and to quote Kothari again:

It was from a very small and homogeneous (upper class, English-educated) elite that the ruling class of India was formed, and it was from this ruling class that oppositional elements emerged. This situation was perpetuated by (a) the length of dominance of the Congress Party and the fact that the more effective opposition was carried out within the fold of the Congress and of the governmental and patronage structure to which it gave rise, (b) the process of selective assimilation in the Congress, through which leaders from other social groups have been co-opted into the framework of dominance, and (c) the socialization within the Congress of the men who challenged its dominance...

At the same time it should be remembered that the Opposition was given an importance which was out of proportion to its size ... Also, certain prominent leaders of the opposition were given considerable personal importance by the ruling group in the Congress (especially by Nehru), thus preventing frustration and bitterness from taking undesirable forms ...

All this ensured the democratic and competitive character of the intellectual climate in which the party system developed in India, again setting it apart from the 'one party' models of many other countries ... While continued dominance and a nationwide spread led to an
impressive consolidation of power in the hands of the Congress, this did not lead to authoritarianism because of the free working of the electoral process, the crystallization of a factional structure within the party of consensus, the continuous pressure exercised by the opposition, and the general tendency of the leadership to preserve democratic forms, to respect the rule of law, to avoid undue strife and to hold various elements together in some sort of a balance of interests... and any suggestion of imposing an authoritarian model of the party system in order to avoid dissidence and preserve unity was categorically rejected. (Lyon & Manor[Ed]1983,p37).

Even though some of the institutional framework was broken down during the Emergency proclaimed by Indira Gandhi the more important ones such as the electoral processes, the courts, the party system, or the bureaucracy remained more or less intact or were reintroduced later. Even today the Congress Party remains the party of consensus. Its umbrella is big enough to shelter both the right wing and the left wing ideologists. At the 'No Confidence' motion on 28 July, 1993 the Rao government was able to win over a four member faction from Bihar with a promise to consider favorably its demand for a separate state for tribal population.

One of the big accusations against the ruling elite in India is that they are corrupt. But corruption in politics is endemic in every government including our own. However some governments are
more energetic in rooting out this evil than many others. But India seems more lukewarm than many others. How much of this is true it is not easy to say. Therefore it is better to hold our judgement till more facts are uncovered. It is unfair to throw out a serious accusation such as corruption without being sure of what one is saying.

Religion is supposed to provide a bigger hold in South Asia than in the West. There is an often proclaimed separation of church and state in European and American politics. Clive Ponting in his *A Green History of the World* says,

Although the religious element had dwindled or disappeared from much of European thought by the end of the nineteenth century, many of the assumptions that lay at the centre of Christian thought for two thousand years, together with the earlier classical and Jewish influences, had been incorporated, almost unthinkingly, into the general pattern of assumptions that formed the foundations of the European view of the world. Humans were regarded as apart from, and superior to, a separate natural world which they were entitled to exploit as they saw fit ...

The Indian tradition, as exemplified in writings such as the Upanishads and religions such as Jainism and Buddhism, is built on a radically different view of the world ... It does not conceive of humans as being placed above and beyond a natural world which is theirs to exploit. Humans are only a small part of a much greater whole and what sets them apart—greater intellectual and spiritual capabilities—should be directed to the goal of Enlightenment and enable them to act wisely towards other
creatures and not to take life unnecessarily. 
Central to this way of thinking is not dominion 
over the world but the idea of suffering and 
the need for universal compassion. (Ponting, 1993: 
pp. 151/152).

This approach makes it easier to integrate peoples 
and to provide for their greater development without 
damaging the ecosystem. India has been very cautious 
in adopting western models of development and 
reluctant to obtain assistance from the World Bank 
and IMF until recently. However the pace of progress 
and the globalization of trade and monetary systems 
has given her no choice but to follow suit.

Much has been said of India being a Hindu 
state. The latest in a long line of commentators 
has been no less a person than the well known editor, 
author and intellectual - Khushwant Singh, who in 
an article in the New York Times of 3 August, 1993 
titled, INDIA, THE HINDU STATE wondered loud about 
this very problem.

...Religious sentiment runs strong in the 
veins of Indians. The most disturbing development 
is the increasing number of senior civil servants, 
intellectuals and journalists who have begun 
to talk the language of Hindu fundamentalism, 
protesting that religious minorities, particularly 
the Muslims, have pushed them beyond the limits 
of patience.

India may retain its secular facade but the 
spirit within will be that of militant Hinduism. 
The country is in no immediate danger of breaking
up but it will no longer be the India we have known over the past 47 years.

These are surprising words. But the quiet assurance that "the country is in no danger of breaking up is a tribute to its political integration. But what about "militant Hinduism" or "Hindu fundamentalism"? How real are those fears? In the first place Hinduism is not an established religion with a hierarchy and dogmas. It grew over thousands of years from the writings and sayings of sages and other religious minded people. It does not proselytize. It seeks no converts. It is not by itself an aggressive religion.

Perhaps there is an identity crisis among the followers of Hinduism and this shortcoming has been made use of by selfseeking politicians especially by those in the Bharatiya Janata Party to bolster their so called nationalist sentiments. This action looks very suspiciously like the one adopted by the Sri Lanka Freedom Party (SLFP) in Ceylon to gain favor with the Sinhalese Buddhists. But there are major differences. The BJP's program is not acceptable to a large part of the country. It is popular in only four northern states. The
other parts of the country will not support it even though they are overwhelmingly Hindu.

There are linguistic and ethnic factors that militate against a Hindu state. It requires a fundamental alteration to the Constitution. Nehru's ideals are still kept alive in a changing India. As long as this tendency obtains the so called Hindu fundamentalism should not worry anyone. B.Seshadri writing in the London journal, Contemporary Review of August, 1992 in an article entitled THE ABERRATION OF HINDU FUNDAMENTALISM says just that.

Hindu fundamentalism is a contradiction in terms ... It was an unscrupulous exploitation of the economic ills of a vast underclass for acquiring power... There is no historical evidence of (religious) persecution since Vedic times (when Hinduism originated) ... The Muslim scholar, Al-Biruni, who travelled in the 11th century and made an extended study of Hinduism, amply makes this point...The great Hindu teachers through the centuries expounded that all religions are simply different phases of the same Truth, called God by those who prefer. The intellectual debate of the nature of this Truth has been a continuing one. A significant element of this debate is that it does not seek to safeguard Hinduism and protect conformity, but encourages revision and improvement...The emergence of Hindu fundamentalism is not so much a religious phenomenon as a political one. Therefore, the dire economic stress on India's millions has to be overcome.

This is what SAARC and the new economic policies of the Rao government are attempting to do. But
the problem is enormous. Manmohan Singh, Finance Minister in the Rao government thinks the new liberal economic policies are one way of achieving this result. Economic prosperity could result in greater and perhaps closer national integration. If national integration is brought into a firmer footing it is possible to extend it to regional integration in South Asia.

One of the stumbling blocks to any movement for regional integration is the United Nations and its acceptance of national sovereignty. Britain and France have no place in the Security Council. They have outlived their great power role. They are more like Spain and Portugal. There were five permanent members when only 51 members made up the international body. Today there are 189. The last one was Andorra which is really a travesty of a state. With 189 there should be at least 18 permanent members of the Security Council. This will, as has been argued elsewhere, make the Security Council an unwieldy body, one that could hardly ever take quick action in a rapidly changing world. Many management consultant personnel reckon five to be an ideal body for decision making. If this is so the five could be: USA, Russia, China, India
and Japan. This could be a well balanced global body and a good representative of the world body itself. There is not much controversy about the place of Japan in the Security Council. But there could be with India. But India could go in as the spokesperson for one-fifth of the world population living in South Asia. I know I have left out Africa. But no country in Africa can speak for all the others in that continent. Perhaps it could be South Africa but this has to be seen in the future.

It has been said earlier that democracy played a key role in national integration in India. I have mentioned Rajni Kothari in this context. But there are others such as Das Gupta, 1989; Brown, 1985; Kohli, 1988; Manor, 1990 and many others. Writing in the International Social Science Journal of August, 1991 on, CRISIS AND RESILIENCE IN INDIAN DEMOCRACY, Subrata Kumar Mitra, a lecturer in politics at the University of Hull gives a good account of the ups and downs of Indian democracy.

Indian democracy has proved to be resilient, in contrast with the experience of her neighbours which share some of her cultural, political and historical legacies.

These neighbors are Pakistan, Bangladesh and Ceylon.
Mitra gives several reasons. These were,

1. success in managing challenges to national cohesion and promoting agricultural development...

2. there was the steady and substantial improvements ... in the physical quality of life, ... such ... as the infant mortality rate, child death rate, life expectancy, and primary, secondary and university enrollment ratios ...

3. transactional politics and incremental growth have together provided the channels of political recruitment for aspiring social elites as well as the means for upward mobility to the lower social strata. One of the consequences is the high degree of legitimacy attached to the mediating role of the state between conflicting classes and social groups. An informal quota system tends to balance the need for talent and regional and social proportionality in the national services and armed forces ...

4. compared with the situation at independence, the number of men-at-arms has increased significantly, but the government remains firmly in control.

There is no danger of a takeover by the armed forces. This is in sharp contrast to what took place in Pakistan. Both armies were raised and trained by the British who emphasized civilian control on the armed services. While the Pakistani army was ready to take over the government the Indian army made no such move and it could be emphatically stated that they would never make such a move. The only reason for saying that is the groundwork of democracy laid down by the Congress party in the early days.
and the institution building carried out by Nehru in the seventeen years he was at the helm. I have stated earlier that partition could have been avoided if Jinnah had been made Governor General or Prime Minister of undivided India but if the democratic institutions had not been built up and consolidated with a firm hand India would have faced a bleak future.

However during the time of Indira Gandhi the Congress Party was destabilized.

From the time of the party split in 1969, Mrs Gandhi sought to centralize what was fundamentally a federal party. Through direct intervention in the regional units of the Congress, she deposed entrenched chief ministers and replaced them with her own nominees, personally loyal to her but without bases in their own regions. (Mitra, 1991)

In 1984 Rajiv Gandhi attempted to reverse what happened in his mother's time. But not achieving much success he fell back on the earlier policy.

During the Emergency a number of political forces came together to defend civil liberties. These forces did not disband after the Emergency was withdrawn. They continued even after Rajiv Gandhi's defeat. New forces such as the DMK, the Tamil Separatist Party in the south became
institutionalized in state government and sought accommodation with national organizations. Robert W. Bradnock in his, *India's Foreign Policy since 1971*, indicates how domestic matters influence India's Foreign Policy. He says,

> It is ironical that DMK's demand for a separate nation state had been dropped by its leader C.N. Annadurai only in 1962, as a direct result of India's war with China. That war roused Indian nationalist feelings across the country and support for separatism withered. The consolidation of the DMK's support for integration with India has survived both the party's split into two factions and the post-1983 crisis in Sri Lanka. (1990, p32)

Other new forces such as local protest movements, lobbying decision makers, putting pressure on public officials either morally or physically were eminently successful.

The democratic process has become a self-correcting mechanism for society ... Experience has shown that Indian democracy both encourages and exposes corruption, for, while political transactions at the local level are often worked out through the patronage network, the existence of a relatively free press and political competition at higher levels ensures the maintenance of limits to corruption...

The universal significance of the Indian achievement lies in showing the democratic potentials of determined political action at the local level, combined with representative political institutions, tied to political competition and social reform, notwithstanding the absence of material affluence or
possessive individualism as an integral part of the cultural inheritance. (Mitra, 1991)

It is now possible to go back and recount briefly the factors that aided integration in India. Firstly, there was this conscious desire to provide democratic institutions and the values they gave rise to. Secondly, Nehru went out of his way to befriend his opponents and to bring them into the mainstream of democratic life, having realized the damage caused by his opposition to Mohamed Ali Jinnah. Thirdly, Nehru and the Congress Party did not tamper very much with the administrative system left behind by the British, especially the Civil Service and the Judicial system. Fourthly, English was retained when there was opposition to the use of Hindi, thus creating an atmosphere of accommodation and harmony which in the long run, perhaps unwittingly, gave internal unity and external advantage by the use of an international language. Nehru and Gandhi were charismatic figures well known both in India and in the outside world and therefore what they said and did was accepted with little or no questioning by their followers and the general public. Even today Nehru is greatly honored and respected in India and his views are given pride
of place though he has been dead for more than thirty years.

Re-stating all this, I can come up with the theory that integration in South Asia needs a catastrophic danger on one hand (the negative factor) and a grass roots desire to be part of a bigger or larger entity (positive factor) which means reaping the benefits of a large scale economy. India had this when China attacked her in 1962 and when the Five Year Plans were put in place after independence. SAARC and South Asia have a long way to go to achieve this goal.
PART 5

CONSOLIDATION
CHAPTER 11

GLOBALIZATION AND INTEGRATION

Globalization has been called the "buzz" word of the nineties. It is easy to see why. So many actions, ideas and expressions have a global connection or a global consequence. Multinational corporations are in the thick of these efforts. Many big and small corporations have spread across national boundaries that they are not necessarily stateless but international.

Nationalism was spreading fast in the East especially in South Asia at the turn of the century but today nationalism is encountering a new force called globalization. In understandable terms globalization is the spread of western culture, western dress, western languages especially English, and western commerce all over the world in the guise of modernization. But modernization really means the spread of American ways, American culture, American music, American forms of dress, the use of the English language and most importantly American forms of sociological behavior in politics which we call democracy. Today's communications revolution and satellite imagery have almost supplanted the
pervasive imagery provided hitherto by the ever popular American films acted out by John Wayne, Humphrey Bogart, Gary Cooper, Jimmy Stewart and a host of other adulatory role models.

Needless to say, though these transnational imageries have found many adherents they have also roused the ire of entrenched conservative and religious leaders in many lands, especially among the followers of Islam. They see anti-Americanism as a follow up to the wars of the Crusades.

In the last decade of the twentieth century our communications revolution and satellite imagery has exploded all over the globe and though it has brought people in many areas of the world closer to each other, it has not brought any real understanding of human problems nor given us better approaches to human interaction. In the guise of modernization we have been busy selling the American Dream.

To us these approaches are excellent but to many people in other parts of the world they are, if not irrelevant many times, abominable sometimes. The growth of nationalism in many parts of South Asia has stifled the absorption of many new ideas including those of pluralism and individual liberty.
To fight these tendencies we have only the growing number of the middle class whose expansion we have only marginally encouraged. For ideas to grow and flower we need a good infrastructure that will permit the nascent growth and unfettered expansion of democratic ideas. Fortunately South Asia has had in many areas an acceptable form of democratic local government under elders and influential leaders of the area in spite of strong central governments under kings and other rulers. This was known as the Panchayat system. The existence of traditional law and custom gave the rulers and the ruled ample opportunity for benevolent rule though there were times when aberrations were tolerated but not necessarily accepted.

Bringing people together does not always provide the means of integration. This is perhaps part of the task. There has to be a strong motivation among the people to integrate. This motivation has to come from a grass-roots movement from the bottom and not from the top. This is one aspect of SAARC that was dealt with in Chapter Nine. In the meantime it will be useful to explore certain aspects of nationalism, the growth of the middle class, the idea of national sovereignty, the Americanization.
of the world, the growth and expansion of multinational corporations and the ease in which increasing speculation in national currencies is taking place.

Nationalism has been both constructive and destructive to the forces of integration. We have seen many aspects of this factor during the last two hundred years. The German and Italian states are symbols of the constructive phase of nationalism. On the other hand its destructive forces are seen in the breakup of the Yugoslav state and in the dissolution of the Soviet Union. Thus neither social ideology nor political structure is proof against the ravaging forces of nationalism. The ideology of Marxism with its universal appeal to people all over the world has fallen victim to a more powerful but narrower ideology.

The growth of nationalism is a world-wide phenomenon. Hans Kohn as far back as 1944 discussed the origins and development of nationalism in his *The Idea of Nationalism*. Since then Louis S. Snyder, Anthony D. Smith, Seton Watson and others have worked on different aspects of nationalism including Karl W. Deutsch in *Nationalism and Social Communication*. A different theory was espoused by Benedict Anderson
in *Imagined Communities*. There are many writers such as Hans Kohn, Ernest Gellner, E.J. Hobsbawm and others who have tried to analyse this phenomenon but with little success. The United Nations Organization shows the proliferation of nation-states from 51 at the time of its inauguration to somewhere near 200 now. Some writers state that nation-states will continue to grow and may even reach the improbable figure of 3000. How does any factor militate against such fantastic growth? Integration is probably the only answer. India is a good example of an integrated nation. How did a country with so many diverse tongues and faiths and even cultures become one integrated Indian nation? Ninety years of somewhat enlightened British rule, excepting for a few lapses into barbarism, was probably one factor. Another, very surprisingly, was the continued use of the English language. Agitation against British rule which had the support of the majority of the people, the charismatic figures of Gandhi and Nehru, the breakaway of Pakistan, the Sino-Indian War of 1962, the Cold War, and the Nonaligned Movement were all elements in the creation of an Indian identity.

It would be unreal to say that the creation
of this identity is a success. There are still a few loose ends. Some are due to unfortunate delays in righting the grievances of the Sikhs, Kashmiris and the tribal people of the North East. But on the whole integration has been very successfully accomplished in India. Therefore the key factor in integration seems to be in the creation of an ideology in which all people could share in equally and also identify themselves with. This can be brought about in many different ways, such as politically, economically, socially or even culturally. Uniformity is not necessarily a unifying factor. Using force may perhaps work in the long run but it is often ruinous in the short term.

Many writers date nationalism from the days of the French Revolution. Therefore it is essentially a western concept but today it is more or less a universal concept. It is hard to define what exactly nationalism is but it is possibly very easy to recognize it. A simplistic explanation would be to say that it is pride in one's own ethnic group. If many ethnic groups take pride not only in their own group but also in a larger grouping, in a recognizable space such as a nation-state, then
we could with confidence say that a certain pattern of integration has taken place.

The seven SAARC countries are all in one recognizable area which we call South Asia. This area is merely the area previously known as the Indian subcontinent together with the island of Ceylon and the Maldives Islands. Four countries, Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan and Bangladesh adjoin India; Ceylon and the Maldives are 18 and 700 miles by sea from India. Thus all the seven SAARC countries are very close to each other. They have also very common cultural links with India and perhaps also with each other. Therefore integration should be easy in this atmosphere. Unfortunately this is not so in actual fact. The problem lies in the growth of nationalism in the region and in the establishment of what is known as sovereign independent states. The concept of a sovereign independent state like nationalism is a western one which is now made universal by acceptance in the United Nations Organization. If political integration is to make progress a whole lot of changes are needed in the UN as well as in political thinking generally. The very first idea that would have to be changed is the idea of a sovereign independent state. Initially some amount of a sovereign independent state's power
would have to be taken away and replaced by functional power. The rulers of a state and their principal officers should be held accountable to an independent body for such functions as human rights, ethical standards of conduct, financial accountability, environmental degradation and so on.

The difficult task is, how to bell the cat. In this case who is going to set up such an independent organization? Which countries will have to do the enforcing and what right have these countries to do that? Secondly, why should it devolve on countries to do the enforcing: why not give it to another body? If this is agreed, how is it set up? F.H. Hinsley in his book, Sovereignty, tries to explore these and other problems. He says at one point,

The internal mechanism of the modern body politic would grind to a halt if the assumption that there was a final and absolute authority within it were to be abandoned. In international practice the existence of a sovereign authority within the separate community is universally recognized as the essential qualification for its membership of the international community; and the principle that there is no supreme authority over and above the states which make up the international community - the logical antithesis in the international context of the notion that the state is sovereign in the domestic context - has withstood not only the criticism
of theorists but even sustained efforts by states themselves to dispense with it. (Hinsley, 1986:p215/216)

Hinsley goes on to say that several attempts were made by such distinguished persons as Lowes Dickinson in 1914 and Harold Laski in 1941 to either have a strong international organization or to have the concept of sovereignty done away with but with no avail. The UN has only strengthened the idea of sovereignty though considerable progress was made on the thinking of David Mitrany in organizing a World Health Organization and a World Bank on functional lines. Since there are many common factors in every state organization such as trade, environment, public administration, budgeting, transport and so on, these could be organized on functional lines applicable to all countries. The only hitch would perhaps be in that, what is applicable to highly developed country such as the US, cannot be applied in a less developed country because it would lack the infrastructure to carry it through successfully. However with rapid spread of communications especially in such forms as radio, satellite TV and computers no country can remain isolated for any length of time. This means that in course of time almost all countries will tend
to be uniform in many aspects of life. American forms of dress, such as blue jeans or music such as jazz, labor saving devices such as washing machines have an almost universal appeal. Already there are hotel chains such as Hilton, Sheraton, Holiday Inn and such others in many out of the way countries such as Indonesia, India, Mongolia, China or Japan which are run almost like the ones in the US. The whole world is being Americanized; a process that was started in 1900 according to W.T. Stead in his, *The Americanization of the World*. But actually the world was Americanized only after World War II. Traditional ways of life are being rapidly swept away. It is hard to say whether this is good or bad. Many people bemoan the passing of the old ways but the more important question from our point of view is whether it does or does not make for greater integration. There can be no doubt about the answer. It certainly does make for greater integration. When the Chinese Premier or an African chief dress in Western clothes, or when the Indonesians and Malaysians romanize their script, or when India adopts the English Parliamentary system we are all closer to some sort of integration. When public announcements are made from Japan to Iceland
or from Russia to Argentina in English we are again closer to integration. Why should Yasser Arafat and Yitzhak Rabin make their statements in English? Because they feel it would reach a bigger audience and would probably be more effective. But without much effort this is actually leading people to greater integration. What happens to nationalism then? Probably nothing. It would remain but act in a less corrosive manner, just as in America. Some might say it is the Americanization of nationalism.

Another factor in bringing the peoples of the world closer is the growth of multinational corporations. Multinationals blithely ignore national borders and set up business in regions where they could make a profit. They may look for several advantages such as cheap labor, easy access to markets, availability of raw materials, profitability of product and many others.

In the South African movie, *The Gods Must Be Crazy*, the plot revolves around a simple symbol of western culture that wreaks havoc among remote tribal members. There was never an explanation of what "the thing" that fell from a passing airplane was but viewers around the world recognized it instantly. A Coca-Cola bottle.

Coca-Cola is the best known brand name in the world and one of the most uniquely American
products that exists. Yet the Coca-Cola Company has been international since the 1920s and now generates 77% of its operating income from outside the United States. It distributes its soft drinks in more than 160 countries...and it employs a relatively small number of expatriate Americans abroad... More than 45% of all carbonated soft drinks sold round the world are Coke products... (Lowe, 1992:125/126)

Coke has used great skill in marketing its drinks around the world. It was not deterred by the Arab League boycott of companies doing business with Israel when even big Japanese car makers honored the boycott and refused to sell their cars in Israel. It continued to distribute its products in both Israel and the Arab countries for over twenty years till the boycott was ended in 1991. It sold its products in South Africa through franchises, it left India when the government made impossible demands but came back in 1990 when the Indian government removed those restrictions. The reason for all this is-

In the United States, Coke earns less than 22 cents on the dollar...but abroad, Coke earns 54 cents on the dollar. (Lowe, 1992:129).

I was a researcher for the late Dr. Herbert Winter of the Political Science Department of Rhode Island College, in Providence, Rhode Island, and when the third edition of his book, People and
Politics, was in galley proof stage we had a hard time selecting suitable photographs to go with the text. One of the pictures we selected was that of a little Chinese boy standing on the Great Wall drinking from a can of Coca-Cola which symbolized the globalization of typical American products.

Another big multinational is Nike. It was started in 1964 by John Knight. Its total annual production is worth $2 billion of which 40% is sold in the US. Most of its production was in South Korea and Taiwan but now it has moved to Indonesia where wages are lower.

Nikes made in Indonesia cost $5.60 to produce and sell on the average in North America and Europe for $73 and as much as $135. The Indonesian girls who sew them earn as little as fifteen cents an hour...

A research institute in Bandung (and others) complained that Nike was profiting from the exploitation of Indonesian workers. "Exploitation?" John Woodman, Nike's General Manager ... responded. "Yes, they are low wages. But we've come in here and given jobs to thousands of people who wouldn't be working otherwise." The statement is undoubtedly true. But it neatly skirts the fundamental human rights issue raised by these production arrangements that are now spreading across the world. In the free-trade zone near the Colombo International Airport in Sri Lanka...textile factories have served as magnets drawing young women from distant villages...(Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994:p326)

These are the birth pangs of global free
trade started by multinationals but they cannot continue like this for long. The number of multinationals is increasing wildly and with it will come competition.

In 1970 according to UN Center on Transnationals, there were 7000 multinational companies in the world, and more than half were based in the US and Britain. But by the early 1990s there were 35,000 multinationals, and the US, Japan, Germany and Switzerland combined had less than half. (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994: p423)

This enormous increase in the number of multinational corporations operating in the world will give rise to many other factors such as better employment practices, better wages, better living conditions, uniform work methods and closer understanding between peoples and their rulers; all arising from the communications revolution and satellite imagery. In other words it will closely follow the aftermath of the industrial revolution in England and the West but at a much faster pace. In the end it will probably make for greater integration among peoples.

As multinationals become more and more global there is intense competition and marketing becomes the preoccupation of the CEOs of these multinational corporations.
The best known advocate of global marketing was Theodore Levitt, a professor at Harvard Business School, (who argued) it is no longer necessary ...to be so "respectful" of local differences, tastes, quirks, and religions. Push your products in the right way and the local customs will fall away. Surely Hindus and Muslims both need to brush their teeth...Norman Vale, the international area director for Grey Advertising Agency, told the editor of Management Review. "The lie is that people are different. Yes, there are differences among cultures, but a headache is a headache." And asprin is asprin. The right message on television or on the back of the bus... was all-important in insuring that people reached for the right bottle. (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994: 168/169).

In keeping with this line of thinking global products are generally advertised in the same way all over the world unless words themselves or their pronunciation gives rise to an adverse meaning in local languages or in local cultural attitudes. This happened to Coca-Cola in China and the CEO was quick to make corrections. Products such as LUX soap, TIDE detergent, CAPSTAN cigarettes or KELLOGGS cornflakes are marketed in the same cartons all over the world. Nobody bothers to translate the English words into Spanish, German, Hindi or Malay. The logos, the colors, the shape and appearance of the carton or container is all that is required. There is supposed to be instant name recognition. But what happens when the tribesmen
in the South African film are mystified by an empty Coke bottle? That however is another story and it could be related when the tribesmen have enough money to buy and drink Coke.

On the other hand Nestle one of the world's biggest multinationals operates in a different way. They pay much attention to local conditions and local likes and dislikes. It was not always like that. At one time they aggressively marketed baby formula in Third World countries which unwittingly led to many infant deaths because the powdered milk was mixed by the mothers with contaminated water. Now, in Japan they market cereals that taste like seaweed, coconuts and papaya...In contrast, Kellogg, which has dominated the global cereal market for almost a century, has kept pushing Sugar Pops on Japanese kids with little success so far...

In Indonesia, which currently accounts for no more than one-third of 1 percent of Nestle's global sales, the company has a powdered milk processing operation in eastern Java. It is hard to think of a less promising place to put one...Nestle...is counting on the world's fifth-most populous nation to develop enough in the early years of the next century to provide 50 million new customers for Nestle's products. (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994: 225/226).

Nestle though a global giant still operates from the little Swiss town of Vevey but has many foreigners in its staff. The CEO is a German. Half
the General Managers are not Swiss. An American was in Japan, an Indian in Australia, a Scotsman was in France and more than half a dozen others were in the Asia-Pacific Region. Paul Kennedy says in his book, *Preparing For The Twenty-First Century*, that this approach gives rise to,

supranational organizations of a regional sort... The creation of something such as a North American Free Trade Zone does involve agreements to reduce national economic integrity; within the borders of the zone itself, national differences will begin to blur. (Kennedy, 1993:132).

There is no doubt the authority of the nation-state is being eroded to a great extent and with that the power of its ruling elite. What is left will be the authority of the multinational corporations who are not interested in political problems but only in the financial well-being of the corporations they run.

The retreat of government in many places around the world has left a power vacuum that corporations have rushed in to fill. But business corporations are not chartered to solve social problems or to support communities... They are in the business to make products and sell services anywhere they can make money. For these reasons, corporate behavior is having the unintended effect of breaking up communities and widening the gap between the beneficiaries of successful market strategies and the losers. The consequences can be felt in virtually every city in the United
States and they are magnified in the Third World...
In 'A Survey of Multinationals' (by the London periodical) Economist, the world's top 300 industrial corporations now control more like 25 percent of the world's $20 trillion stock of productive assets. But these footloose business enterprises in a world of weakened governments hold the power to veto a range of crucial political decisions across the planet. In the world economy, as in a large public corporation, powerful minority stockholders can end up in control. (Barnet & Cavanagh, 1994:342 & 423)

In the seventies MNCs were feared but today they are welcomed in many countries. The need for foreign capital and the attraction of new jobs makes the MNC a good proposition. From the 50s to the 70s world trade increased by about ten times in volume but in the 90s trade is not that important as currency transactions. Enormous amounts of money cross national borders daily not to satisfy trade demands but to placate the growing tendency among people all over the world to speculate in the values of national currencies. The result again is the inability of national governments to control financial transactions unlike in the past. Money has become a commodity to be traded and speculated. Multinational corporations are in it in a big way. The end result could be greater regional integration.

Thomas L. Friedman writing in the New York Times of July 24th, 1994 says,
The global currency markets trade about one trillion worth of dollars each day... Twenty-two-year-old bond traders tyrannize the President (of the US), passing judgment on his economic performance by raising or lowering interest rates...

Now national economies have been knit into a global economy, but so far national governments have not forged super-national institutions to monitor it, because nations are reluctant to cede any sovereignty to global institutions...

Michael J. Sandel, a Harvard University political theorist said, "One of the biggest challenges for democracy in our time is to develop political institutions that will be powerful enough to deal with global markets, but accountable enough to enable citizens to feel that they are still in control."

This means in effect that every country in the world will have to give up some element of their sovereignty to an international institution somewhat like our Federal Reserve Board to control global markets and national currencies. Initially this may be on a regional basis before going global. At the same time alterations will have to be effected in the structure and operations of the International Monetary Fund which was founded in Bretton Woods in 1944. Many profound changes have taken place since then. The more important ones are that the dollar is no longer a reserve currency pegged to a fixed value per ounce of gold and that much of what is called Eurodollars are outside the control of the Federal Reserve Board.
Therefore to sum up, considerable work has to be done on the issues that are global in content but national in origin. Every country big and small has to take part and arrive at a consensus without which no worthwhile solution is possible. If this is not quickly and effectively carried out many persons all over the globe could be affected very seriously. The interest rate crisis in Europe and the falling value of the dollar in the US are serious portends for the future.
At the fourth summit in 1988 which was held in Islamabad, the capital of Pakistan, the host country submitted a proposal to the meeting which was entitled, "SAARC 2000- A Basic needs perspective." Though this proposal was accepted nothing of importance has come off this proposal so far. In matters of this nature SAARC as an organization is very diplomatic. The unanimity rule helps to shelve inconvenient suggestions, such as Prevention of Terrorism. This was one of the proposals put forward in the early days of SAARC when terrorism was rampant. The Indian delegates strenuously objected to this and in terms of the unanimity rule was taken off the agenda. But to the surprise of many delegates the proposal turned up a couple of years later. This time it was discussed but no real action was taken. Terrorism is no doubt a very serious matter. National governments which theoretically are all powerful have very great difficulty in dealing with this problem.
SAARC is not equipped to deal with such issues. There are other matters in the future which SAARC may be called upon to deal with such as space research, widespread movement of people across national borders, increases in trade, agricultural and power development, protection from natural calamities such as flooding of prime agricultural and residential land in many parts of South Asia. On the positive side there is betterment in living conditions, better administrative methods, better research and technological development. South Asia cannot remain isolated from the rest of the world.

In the seventies the London journal, The Economist, brought out a special issue with an eye on the 21st century. One of the items they set a great store by was that by the 80s we would have what could be known as the paperless office. Unfortunately this is not true even in the 90s though computers and compact discs have made such great headway. As the years pass by a number of people, organizations, newspapers and journals would come out with articles about what we could expect in the 21st century. Many books were also
written. There was at least one book about, SAARC and the year 2000, but it did not contain anything of great interest. SAARC also went into this mode with great gusto but so far nothing very concrete has been achieved. More than many futurists, Arthur C. Clarke who now lives in Ceylon was remarkably accurate in much of his writing and Clarke is a prolific writer with more than fifty books to his credit. One book, titled: *The Hammer of God*, appeared nearly two years before the Comet Shoemaker-Levy 9 struck the planet Jupiter on July 20, 1994. Clarke says he does not predict anything and this is what all good futurists say. They are merely using a scientific probability to expand on a reasonable theory. With so many satellites both man-made as well as inter-galactical floating about in space there is a good chance that some of them could strike the earth as fireballs and fall on thickly populated places. The real danger is when a huge planet or star loses it way in space and crashes on to the earth. This could be a great cataclysm. One way of taking steps against such dangers is to work on them on a regional basis. A curved
surface is better protected by dividing it into numerous sections. There is no way the earth could be protected from a direct hit by a planet such as the Jupiter but if we know in advance there is a possibility that such mishaps could be avoided when the danger is still outside the protective atmospheric layers. As Clarke says a small mouse power is enough to deflect such mass. This may be so as the astronauts proved when they removed and repaired huge components of the Hubble Telescope in space. The last fifty years have seen some extraordinary achievements of humanity. Landing a man in the moon, keeping in contact with them all the while they were there by watching and talking to them and then bringing them back to earth was an achievement unparallelled in human endeavor. At least seven more landings were made on the moon thus giving the impression that there were more worlds to conquer by the daring spirit of human adventure rather than by the vicious force of human belligerence. Another book by Clarke is 1984: Spring A Choice of Futures. This is a collection of essays and speeches made by him. On 11th December, 1982 he spoke
in Colombo on "War and Peace in the Space Age" wherein he quoted from an essay he wrote in 1946 on "The Rocket and the Future of Warfare", the contents of which are more true today than they were in 1946.

The only defence against the weapons of the future is to prevent them ever being used. In other words, the problem is political and not military at all. A country's armed forces can no longer defend it; the most they can promise is the destruction of the attacker...

Upon us, the heirs to all the past and the trustees of a future which our folly can slay before its birth, lies a responsibility no other age has ever known. If we fail in our generation, those who come after us may be too few to rebuild the world, when the dust of the cities has descended, and the radiation of the rocks has died away. (Clarke, 1984: p59)

SAARC is not an isolated phenomenon. It has many objectives in common with other similar organizations. But it has one objective that is very important to it, 'To promote the welfare of the people of South Asia and to improve their quality of life'.

To achieve this goal in the 21st Century, SAARC has to tighten its security and prevent capricious nature from striking it from beyond the outer space. This requires a very elaborate
program to which all SAARC members would contribute as best as they could but India may have carry the main burden. But this is not a national or even regional affair, it is more of a global matter. Thus it is possible that it would, in the end, be an international affair. This is the only way inter-galactic cataclysms could be avoided.

Coming down to earth SAARC has more mundane problems such as a population explosion in South Asia. Limiting population is always a very difficult problem whether it is in a developed country or in South Asia. There are very strong opinions on both sides of the argument as we can see in the US today. Sanjay Gandhi was detested for his population control methods and slum clearance in New Delhi. Even in China limitations in population are not well received. These efforts on the part of governments or of non-profit organizations are often looked on as interference with and meddling in peoples' personal problems. A higher standard of living, the growth of the middle class and technological improvement in eliminating repetitive work could in the long run
automatically reduce the population increase as is happening now in the developed countries. Population need not be curbed by famine and disease as in the past.

This takes us to the next problem SAARC may have to face in the 21st century. How much should a country industrialize? Every country can theoretically industrialize. Lack of raw materials or lack of coal, oil or electricity need not handicap any country. But industries could cause air polution and environmental degradation and inexpensive ways have to be found to counteract this and protect the people. Japan is an example of a country lacking in all forms of raw materials and indigenous power to work the machines and yet it has risen to almost the top rank in the list of industrial countries. In 1945 it was defeated in a major war and occupied by the conquerors, yet it is today in the front rank of industrial powers. This could only be by the resourcefulness of an industrious people.

The air today is full of varying forms of the technological revolution we are in. There is a much talk about the information highway.
Some have even said it is an information super-highway. But technological progress is not necessarily everything that is invented. Some inventions languish for many years till they are perhaps needed. In the sixties the method of looking at a telephone caller was found but nobody wanted it. But in the last few years we have seen how the idea of fax has come to stay world-wide. It is even used to order a sandwich from the downstairs cafeteria. The paperless office is giving way to the office at home and with perhaps no commute to work. There could come very radical changes in the way we live and work. In South Asia this could mean really very radical changes. In the January, 1992 issue of Analog, a magazine of Science Fiction and Fact there was an article by Hans Moravec and was titled, "The Universal Robot"

Machine calculation has been improving a thousandfold every twenty years, and there are basic developments in research labs that can sustain this for at least several decades more...In less than fifty years computer hardware should be powerful enough to match, and exceed, even the well-developed parts of human intelligence...I feel that the fastest progress...will come from...the construction of systems that must see and move in the physical world...Robot evolution in the direction of full intelligence
will greatly accelerate, I believe, in about a decade, when mass-produced general purpose, universal robot becomes possible. These machines will do in the physical world what personal computers do in the world of data—act in our behalf as literal-minded slaves. (Moravec, in ANALOG, Jan. 1992: pp 94/95.

Moravec, who is a well known MIT scientist has amplified his theories about universal robots in his book, *Mind Children*. There are robots cleaning the platforms and carriages of the Paris Underground. One of the ways Japanese and American car manufacturers had dealt with precision cutting and assembling of automobile engines and other parts was to use robots. In South Asia these robots will be not merely labor-saving devices but may even go on to change the social system of castes. Though caste has outlived its role it is difficult to change an age old system without some radical move like the French Revolution. To illustrate, serfdom was abolished in the middle ages but it persisted in western Europe till the advent of the French Revolution. Even then it existed in Eastern Europe till recent times. Therefore what South Asia needs is a technological revolution which could combine both the
industrial revolution of the English and the
social revolution of the French. Such an advance
will then give rise to very radical social and
technological change in South Asia. Hitherto
governments in India have reserved a percentage
of jobs for depressed classes and disadvantaged
tribal people. This process will take two or
three generations to even the score as much
as the civil rights legislation is attempting
to do here in the US. Time is the one factor
that is in short supply in the so-called timeless
East. What is needed is knowledge and change
and it is only a technological revolution that
can make it come alive. For example the time
consuming wait for the sweeper to sweep the
airport floors or the hotel floors or hospital
floors can be eliminated by use of robot. There
is no doubt the sweeper would be out of a job
because there would be no need for human sweepers
as a occupational caste but in a rapidly changing
world the sweeper could, if he has the knowledge
and the ability, latch on to any other job he
prefers. This is similar to what happened in
the western industrial world and there no reason
to think otherwise in any other part of the world.

In the May, 1992 issue of airline magazine Profiles, James Kaminsky in an article titled, "Robotics" gives a fascinating account of robots already at work in a Connecticut hospital delivering food and medicines, floor cleaners at work in an US postal office and security robots in buildings and homes. A lot was expected of the early manufactures of robots but perhaps because they were very expensive many US companies lost money and only 40,000 were installed by 1992 as against an expected number of 250,000. However the Bloomfield Research and Development company says its Scout-About made by Samsung costs only about $1,000.

But the Scout-About can be used as a nighttime security device, roaming unassisted for up to 50 hours, detecting body heat, movement, and air temperature changes within a 30 foot radius. When an intruder is detected, the robot sounds an alarm and sends a signal to a central monitoring station. With its on board microphone, the machine can double as a baby-monitoring device. "This is the first true robot for the home," says its creator, John Bloomfield. He is already working on a more sophisticated second generation home robot, and believes such machines will eventually become every bit as commonplace as telephones or alarm clocks. "We're about five years away from a servile robot that can clean up an entire household by itself," he says. "After that-who knows?"
Joseph Engelberger, whose former company, Unimation, invented the first industrial robots back in the 1960s, says that robotics has become a $3 billion industry, just as he predicted in 1974. "But I just never predicted that $2 billion of it would be in Japan," he adds. (Robotics by Kaminski in PROFILES, May 1992: p35).

Having lost the edge on industrial robots, many US companies are hoping to retain control of robots in service industries especially in the health care field. If the US is successful there is every likelihood that US multinationals will carry it all over the globe. A country such as India with a number of very capable engineers, with a widespread use of English in the country and a computer software base in Bangalore could take up to robotics in a big way. Arun Katiyar in the 15th August 1994 issue of India Today, states that 31 CEOs from some of India biggest computer companies have joined together in an informal gathering. The main requirement was to have 10 years experience in information technology. Six meetings have already been held and the organization is planning to get in touch with similarly interested personnel in Singapore.

Though South Asia is not very well known
in the US, the US is very well known in South Asia through American films, books, magazines and in radio and TV programs. In the 90s when satellite imagery and communications revolution became a global phenomenon no country was more isolated than the US because we lived in an ivory tower. The Indians too maintained a similar complex till their world crashed with the collapse of the Soviet Union. They woke up to find little tigers such as South Korea and Taiwan had left them far behind. Nevertheless they had laid a fairly effective infrastructure of industrial growth on which they could build rapidly. The only hindrance was the lack of foreign exchange which was overcome by a massive loan from the World Bank. Indian economy was almost fully open by 1992. Today more than two years later there is supposed to be a glut of foreign exchange. India Today in a comment says—

India's bulging foreign resources that now stand at an uncomfortable $17 billion. Uncomfortable? That, precisely, is the catch. The transition from the empty coffer disgrace of three years ago to the overflowing vaults of today should be cause for celebration. Ironically, trepidation is a better word. This is because the forex inflow has caused
a dramatic increase in money supply...and is now being considered as the main culprit behind double digit inflation. (India Today), August 15, 1994: p5).

One way of dealing with this problem is to allow a full convertibility of the Indian rupee and to open the economy to all manner of imports. However when major Indian industries such as the giant Tata Iron and Steel Mills and others are afraid of being victims of hostile take over by foreign capitalists the government has reason to be wary. Many of the Indian industries are woefully undervalued and are easy pickings for a determined raider. Many multinationals such as United Distillers (Johnnie Walker), Daimler Benz, Walls Ice Cream, KFC, Ray Ban, Philip Morris, Heinz, Levi's, McDonalds, Mars, Kelloggs, Electrolux and many others have moved in or are about to. There is a tremendous market in India and in the rest of South Asia. This market is both stable and secure and it has a growing and prosperous middle class which can afford the material benefits the multinationals can offer. Gene Koretz writing about Economic Trends in the June 6th, 1994 issue of Business Week says-
There are far more middle class consumers in emerging countries in Asia and Latin America than most studies indicate, reports the Futures Group Inc., a consulting firm based in Connecticut...Futures Group analysts use the so called purchasing power parity method developed by economists at the World Bank and the UN. These methods factor local prices of nontraded goods and services, such as housing, utilities, and health care, into their income measures. (According to this) India's per capita income jumps five-fold, to $1,250...And that is exactly what US exporters are interested in.(Koretz in BusinessWeek, June 6, 1994: p22)

Multinationals and other companies working globally are keenly interested in these trends which are important to an integrated global economy. GATT, WTO, NAFTA, OECD and other international organizations are breaking down national independence and national sovereignty. Robert S. McNamara, a former president of Ford Motor Company, and a former Defense Secretary in the Kennedy Administration and a former President of the World Bank bemoans, in An Agenda for the 21st Century, the lack of compassion and the absence of sensitivity to those less fortunate both in our country and elsewhere in the world. He points out that after World War II when the Marshall Plan was started, America's GNP per capita was half of what it is today but the country gave as aid 2.5% of
its GNP. Today it gives something like 0.21 and that too mostly in military aid to keep in power repressive and undemocratic rulers. There is little altruism and less pure charity. Granted that much of the aid was wasted, ways could have been found in channelling assistance the way we organized the Marshall Plan.

It has become a truism to say that the world is becoming interdependent economically...our economic welfare depends on the welfare of Brazil, Mexico, India and China, while their welfare depends on ours. (Kidder[Ed], 1988:102).

This is probably the crux of the problem in the year 2000 and beyond. Every country both big and small is becoming more and more interdependent on each other and unless this is realized and steps taken to prevent selfishness and national aggrandizement there could be a total collapse of world order. SAARC by emphasizing cooperation is using a method of getting people together and in assisting one another for the benefit of everyone. It is of the utmost importance that SAARC should succeed because if SAARC fails we will all fail and may never again get another opportunity to take the right path.
CHAPTER 13
SAARC AND INTEGRATION

Either implicitly or explicitly SAARC has no stated goal of achieving integration. This may seem surprisingly naive. But tensions caused by the theory of sovereignty and the right of self determination of various ethnic groups making up nation-states in South Asia could shape up in no other manner. The very term integration could only be construed as domination of one group by another. Therefore SAARC was very careful to spell out that each and every member was a fully sovereign and completely independent nation state whose rights and privileges would be fully respected and honored by the other six members.

Nevertheless regional associations such as EC or ASEAN or OAU have tinkered with the long term goal of a fully regional sovereign body. But unless there is some urgency such as defense these goals tend to get pushed back further and further. Even the EC which made such a big commitment with the Maastricht Treaty now seems more ambivalent. One reason perhaps
is that there is no Soviet threat in the east of Europe and therefore the European nations feel fairly safe. External threat is one of the classic reasons for integration. SAARC has no inkling of an external threat and therefore needs some other compelling reason to advocate integration. Cooperation is not a compelling reason but it is no doubt an idealistic one. Idealism does not however shape national thinking nor does it drive the ruling elites to give up their share of power.

The world however is rapidly changing and it is not like the world our fathers and mothers knew or for that matter it is in no way like the world our ancestors knew or were familiar with. The generation gap is wider and more pronounced today than at any time in the past. The changes are not so much in the basic conditions of life but in the approach to life. There is today increased global economic integration but with rules made for national economies. No country can successfully manage its economy and at the same time preserve the value of its currency as the US and many other countries are finding out to their dismay. New
rules similar to the ones worked out at Bretton Woods have to be set out for a regional economy and perhaps thereafter for a world economy. This is uncharted territory and many national governments are in no mood to make changes without a drastic push. Regional organizations such as SAARC have to grope their way by pursuing programs such as river valley development, flood control, hydro-power supply, communications, transport, tourism and so on which may run over more than two or three countries. If they perform their activities in an acceptable manner there is a greater likelihood of more effective cooperation taking place which may in due course lead to some measure of political, economic or social and cultural integration. This however would be a long drawn out process.

A lot depends on the future. How powerful is the nation-state going to be? Will it give up some of its powers and privileges to an international body such as the UN? Up to now only one country is under the control of the UN. This happened because Iraq defied the demand of the United States and the Security Council to withdraw from Kuwait. The US brought to bear
overwhelming firepower and a number of nations to join it in forcing Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. Having forced Iraq to withdraw the allies stopped short of making drastic changes in Iraq. The right of self determination of the Kurds and marsh Arabs was accepted but the allies stopped short of dismembering Iraq by raising these two entities to nationhood. There were many problems in doing so and much opposition to any redrawing of old colonial frontiers. Even the UN is unable to find support for measures she would like put across.

Integration is not possible unless the two factors I had outlined in Chapter 3 are present. There must be a dramatic push or fear that would compel nations and peoples to come closer and join together and on the positive side there must be a grassroots movement among the peoples of various lands to team up together for better economic returns, better monetary policy, better protection from space disasters, or better living conditions for all peoples. Therefore it is possible that SAARC would eventually make India and Pakistan cease threatening each other with their nuclear
weaponry just like the way it happened between the US and Soviet Russia. There is already an understanding between India and Pakistan not to attack each other's nuclear facilities. If this understanding makes greater progress SAARC could create a new identity in South Asia for all South Asians. This however would be a long drawn out process because the ruling elites seem comfortable with the set up as it is now.

On the other hand, our future is as unpredictable as it has been for many years. Geographically the Indian subcontinent has many common characteristics such as climate, weather, crop cultivation, physical characteristics of the people in this region and so on. But at the same time there are enormous differences which came out of the great distances separating peoples of many diverse areas. However modern communications and the rapid development of transport should in theory bring people closer together but sometimes greater accessibility gives rise to greater provocation. It is supposed that better education would give people better understanding of each other. One country in
South Asia which did this, Ceylon, had free education from the kindergarten to the university from 1946. This was touted as the "pearl of great price". The then Vice Chancellor of the University of Ceylon, Sir Ivor Jennings, who was a member of this commission disagreed and wrote a dissenting report. Today the literacy rate is said to be 87% but that has not solved their social and political problems. They have had clashes at every election, a running civil war for more than a decade, and a third of the country is in shambles. One cannot blame education for this unfortunate state of affairs but the type of education imparted which did not give the children a proper understanding of each other. It did not teach them to be good citizens. It did not give them better understanding of different ethnic groups, languages and religion. It did not instruct them and the ruling elites on the importance and intrinsic worth of cooperation over conflict. If the people of South Asia learn more about SAARC it is possible they can build a better world for themselves and for their children.

One group whom we could rely on to
foster integration in South Asia is perhaps
the rising middle class. Lord Desai, an Indian
economist now living in England says the middle
class in India are "Nehru's children"

The economic growth of the last forty years,
moderate though the pace is, has created
a nationally mobile modern middle class;
these 200 million people have weak regional
and religious loyalties and a lot of stake
in a continuing modernizing economy. These
are Nehru's children; they may yet realize
his vision of Indian nationality, though
one should never take such things for granted.

If this assumption is right it could go a long
way to ensure stability and progress in a country
such as India. If India prospers this could
no doubt influence activities of the middle
class in the other six South Asian countries.

There are perhaps three ways in which
integration could be achieved. The first is
by the use of force which is not the right way
according standard integration theories. The
second is by the creation of a supranational
international body and staffing it with
supranational civil servants. These civil
servants will be experts in their field. The
UN has two ways of recruiting staff. It recruits
directly from all over the world or accepts secondment either for a short term or for a long term from the national civil services. SAARC has a Secretariat headed by a Secretary-General appointed by the Council of Ministers for a non-renewable term of two years. There are also 7 Directors appointed for 3-year terms which are renewable for a further term. Both the Secretary-General and the Directors are on deputation from their national governments. The General Service Staff consists of 10 permanent administrative staff and 25 permanent technical staff. The working language is English. This set up is probably the germ of a supranational administrative and technical service at the regional level. The third method is by emphasizing cooperation as opposed to conflict. Cooperation has been emphasized by many theorists such as Haas, Deutsch and many others. But SAARC while emphasizing cooperation was very careful to insist that such cooperation was acceptable to all the members and did not in any way infringe on their sovereignty and liberty of action. This takes us back to square one with a nation-state and a completely intact
sovereignty. Any integration achieved is only in semblance and not, it is emphasized, actual.

Therefore to conclude this dissertation we find that SAARC is without much power, seeks a common policy for the area, has no security pretensions, needs assistance in meeting the challenges of multinationals and in having a stable international currency. It may also need international assistance in warding off space based catastrophes and regional disasters which it may not be able to avoid even though it has self-reliance as one of its objectives. So far SAARC has been careful to avoid any measure that would over-ride national sovereignty. It would move into integration in a big way if it could harness a river valley project or a commercial or industrial project that could benefit three or four countries. This however has to be a carefully thought out project which should prevent a recurring major disaster such as flooding of the Ganges delta in Bangladesh and at the same time helping two or more countries such as India, Nepal and others in power generation, irrigation, and keeping the port of Calcutta from being silted. This means
it is a major project with both positive and negative results. Such a project could attract support both from the governments and the NGOs and this could create a South Asian identity. Without the creation of such an identity SAARC cannot in anyway progress from what it is now. Regional integration is not possible with SAARC as it is presently constituted. Nevertheless SAARC could be the first faltering step towards this possibility.
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