

HULME, MICHAEL J., Ph.D. Education for Global Citizenship in America. (2011)
Directed by Dr. Harvey S. Shapiro. 232 pp.

This Dissertation is a peace project. It traces the rise of aspects of the myth of American Exceptionalism since the founding of the American Republic – a sense of superiority by the US with respect to the rest of the world, together with a ‘salvific mission’ to raise up other nations to accord with its own particular world view. It draws attention to the contribution of this world view to creating tension, and sometimes conflict, internationally. It then examines some of the major world changes since World War II that first resulted in the US achieving a substantial degree of economic, political and military dominance, but that in more recent decades have constituted a diffusion of power to other state and non-state actors. As part of this examination it includes statements made by students in South Indian universities during the summer of 2010. Together, the changes constitute grounds for re-formulation of the myth, and the final Chapter of the Dissertation proposes an educational protocol oriented to the American public education system intended to promote good ‘global citizenship’ in pursuit of the objective of pre-empting, reducing, or remediating tensions that might otherwise escalate into various forms of violence both at home and abroad.

EDUCATION FOR GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP IN AMERICA

by

Michael J. Hulme

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of The Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
2011

Approved by

H. S. Shapiro
Committee Chair

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of
The Graduate School at The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Committee Chair H. S. Shapiro

Committee Members W. T. Hamilton

T. G. Matyók

G. M. Hudak

March 23, 2011
Date of Acceptance by Committee

March 23, 2011
Date of Final Oral Examination

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks are due to all of my Committee, Drs. Shapiro (Chair), Hamilton, Hudak, and Matyók, for their contribution to my completion of the Ph.D. program. I am grateful to Walt Sherrill for providing many useful comments, suggestions and insights. Special thanks are due to those who contributed background knowledge pertaining to India, and facilitated the research conducted in India during the summer of 2010. These include Dr. G. Koteswara Prasad, Head of Department of Politics and Public Administration, University of Madras, Chennai: for arranging for the University of Madras cohort of students; Dr. Manoharan, Associate Professor in Mathematics, Nazareth Margoschis College, Nazareth: for arranging for the Nazareth cohort of students, and hospitality in Tirunelveli; Premkumar Kanagaraj, Chennai: for arranging for the Dee Cee cohort of students, arranging accommodation in Chennai, and providing all communications support; Navinkumar Kanagaraj, Chennai: for arranging transport between Chennai and Tirunelveli; N. Sridharan, Chennai: for acting as guide in and around Chennai; B. Stephen Subbiah, Panagudi: for hospitality in Panagudi, and providing extensive travel in the Panagudi area; A.M. Nagarajulu, Vaniyambadi: for hospitality and conversations that provided useful background information; Dr. Raj Gandhi, MD, FRCS, Atlanta, GA: for many conversations that provided useful background knowledge related to India; and my wife Aruna: for contributions in areas too many to mention, but which included introduction to many of the people acknowledged above, interpreting during the month spent in South India, keeping notes during the conversations with the Indian participants, checking transcripts, and commenting on the drafts of the Dissertation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER	
I. E PLURIBUS UNUM – NOVUS ORDO SECLORUM	1
The Function of Myth	2
The American Myth of Equality	2
The Great Seal	4
In the Beginning	6
In the Here and Now.	7
The Malignant Turn	9
The Slippery Slope	10
Political Intervention – Doctrines and the Like	11
God, Most Favored Nation, and Moral Imperative	19
Foreign ‘Aid’	22
Economic Dominance	27
Military Capabilities, and Military and Covert Interventions.	30
Conclusion	32
II. WIND OF CHANGE.	36
Political Change	37
Economic Change.	45
Economic Groupings.	46
Sustainable Development and ‘Aid’	51
Globalization	60
Public Health	64
Security Issues	66
Resources and the Environment.	71
All the World’s a Stage – with a New Cast	73
Conclusion	74
III. TRYST WITH DESTINY	78
India’s Aspirations and Expectations.	79
Political Structure.	88
Governance.	91
Security.	93
Social Factors.	94
Infrastructure	98

External Assistance (Aid)	100
Conclusion	101
IV. VOICES FROM INDIA	103
Preparation	104
Methodology	106
Findings	109
India's Place in the World.	111
Governance	124
Education.	130
External Actors	137
Other Issues.	148
Resolving the Issues	150
Conclusion	157
V. RE-VISIONING THE WORLD, RE-INVENTING THE MYTH	161
Peace.	164
The Case for Re-inventing the Myth	169
Education and Global Thinking	175
The Curriculum.	178
Teaching Resources.	180
Teachers.	181
Critical Thinking in the Connected Virtual Classroom.	182
Hindrances and Impediments	188
Other Potential Benefits	192
Conclusion	192
REFERENCES	196
APPENDIX A. METHODOLOGY	223
Preparation	223
Collection and Synthesis of Data	225
APPENDIX B. ABBREVIATIONS USED	230

CHAPTER I

E PLURIBUS UNUM – NOVUS ORDO SECLORUM

Take up the White Man's burden--
Send forth the best ye breed--
Go bind your sons to exile
To serve your captives' need;
To wait in heavy harness,
On fluttered folk and wild--
Your new-caught, sullen peoples,
Half-devil and half-child. (Rudyard Kipling, The White Man's Burden, 1899)

Whatever the historical justifications for the myth of “American Exceptionalism”, real or imagined, the last few decades have seen significant changes in international relations which suggest strongly that the myth requires reformulating. The purpose of this Dissertation is firstly to examine the historical roots of the idea and the extent to which it has given rise to increasing US interventions – economic, political and military – in the rest of the world; secondly to identify some of the principal changes that have occurred in the world at large since the end of World War II which impact America’s view of and relationship with the rest of the world, giving rise to increased tensions and potentially unnecessary conflict; thirdly to synthesize a worldview from the perspective of a small set of samples of University students in one ‘developing’ country and ‘emerging power’ – India – to identify inconsistencies between their worldview and the worldview encapsulated in aspects of American Exceptionalism; and fourthly to explore, in the mutual interests of America and the rest of the world, possibilities for ‘global

citizenship' education within America predicated on a desire to diminish those inconsistencies and the tensions and conflict they may engender.

The Function of Myth

Human beings are social animals. For them to flourish requires co-operation between individuals; this in turn requires the formation of communities based on common interests. Community bonding is achieved in part by the creation of stories with which the individuals within the community can identify. As time goes by, the stories may be modified: elements that become redundant or spurious may be lost, and new elements that address new issues may be added. So long as there is no harm to the community, or to other communities, from binding to these stories, they may be regarded as beneficial. Such stories may, but do not necessarily, contain elements of objective truth. They may be partial, in the sense of incomplete and biased. Such stories are, for the purpose of this Dissertation, myths.

The American Myth of Equality

Here is a specific element of the myth, supported by an appeal to the spirit of the Enlightenment: "All men (sic) are created equal". This questionable axiom constitutes the foundation upon which the US Declaration of Independence, the US Constitution (at least the Bill of Rights) and O'Sullivan's (1839) perception of America as "*the great nation of futurity*" were constructed. This exhibits a logical fallacy. Accepting, for the sake of argument, that "all men" are so created, it does not necessarily follow that "men" themselves would grant that equality to each other. That such equality was not granted is evident from the various categories of "men" recognized by those in a position to define

those categories – one of the obvious distinctions being that between free men and slaves. Thus the myth might be falsified by the apparently unqualified, unexamined and faintly Leibnizian mantra – or myth – that “America is the best country in the world”, which immediately and unequivocally places America in a position of superiority vis-à-vis all other countries (Zinn, 2005).

Inequality might signify no more than qualitative, incommensurable difference. Such inequality need not give rise to any form of ranking. Conversely, the inequality may be of a quantitative nature, giving rise to the possibility of ranking. There is also, however, the possibility of even qualitative difference allowing of preference – and the dispensing or withholding of favor. In human relations there is a remarkable propensity for the perception of qualitative difference to be transmogrified into a construction of superiority and inferiority. This is especially true where the nature of the difference is perceived to be in some way significant, even if by only one actor. That is to say, the difference, either of itself or in terms of the way that difference is acted upon, is perceived as unjust. Any community, no matter how small, is a forum for difference, which has the potential for creating tension. Where tension cannot be resolved, there is potential for conflict. In Galtung’s (2007) terms, negative peace exists where some form of coercion may be used, with more or less success, to manage the conflict.

In the context of long-term conflicts, highlighting the relevance of both qualitative and quantitative inequality, Maiese (2003) states that

At the core of most intractable conflicts are deeply rooted divisions affecting parties' fundamental interests, needs and values. These include irreconcilable moral values, matters of justice and human rights, high-stakes distributional

issues, unmet human needs, and issues of identity. Such conflicts tend to be protracted and have very damaging effects.

The UN's Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) addresses the issues of dignity and rights as contributing to justice (UN, 1948). Galtung, as quoted by FairVote (2003), has said that "the prerequisites to peace are building a just and equitable society." Galtung (2004) has also written on the importance of meeting human needs. Maalouf (1996) has documented the role of identity – or more accurately the multi-dimensional aspects of identity. Gordon (2007) describes the "War on Terror" declared by President G. W. Bush within hours of the events of 9/11/2001 at the World Trade Center in New York in terms of "long-term, multidimensional struggles against insidious and violent ideologies". In so doing, he draws parallels (despite the differences) with the Cold War: the post-WWII, four decade long ideological conflict between "western democracy" and Soviet-backed Communism. Williams (1980) attributes "serious tension and widespread violence" to imperialism, a form of ideology and structural violence that may be associated with "distributional issues".

The Great Seal

The U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs (2003) describes and explains the symbols on the 1782 Great Seal of the United States. The motto inscribed upon the obverse of the Seal is "*e pluribus unum*" – "out of many, one". This signifies the unity of the first thirteen states, symbolized on the same side of the Seal by the thirteen arrows clutched in the left talon of the Eagle. From a different perspective, this could also be said to signify the six principal 'nationalities' of the original colonists:

England, France, Germany, Holland, Ireland, and Scotland. The first committee charged with the task of designing a Seal included Pierre Du Simitière's shield in which these nations were represented (Potts, 1889, p. 343). In his Farewell Address to the nation in 1796, President George Washington drew attention to the degree of commonality in the "religion, manners, habits, and political principles" of citizens, and stressed the mutual self-interest of all the geographical regions of the union in enhancing economic prosperity, including international trade (Yale Law School, 2008a). The reverse of the Seal includes the motto "*novus ordo seclorum*". This translates 'literally' as "the new order for the ages"; however Charles Thomson, the Founding Father and Secretary of Congress who proposed it, explained that the phrase "signif[ied] the beginning of the new American Æra, which commences from that date [of Independence, 1776]".

Taken together, these mottos may be regarded as forming a narrative – a myth – to bind together a populace that had far from unanimously agreed to, let alone welcomed, either the Declaration of Independence in 1776, or twelve years later, the Constitution (Fresia, 1988). They may also be indicative of a state of mind leading to the enunciation of the fundamental precept of American Exceptionalism, predicated on inequality: that America and its ideals and principles were not only unique, but superior in some absolute, deterministic way to those of other nations; furthermore, those ideals and principles were regarded as of universal applicability and should therefore be adopted by those other nations, by force if necessary. This narrative exists to this day, though in a form that is no longer (even if it ever was) benign with respect either to the US and its people, or to the rest of the world. Taken separately or together, they may also be

interpreted in a more sinister way, from the perspective of the world beyond the borders of the US. This Chapter traces the changing, and sometimes questionable, face of this Exceptionalism from Independence in 1776 to the present day.

In the Beginning

The (Unilateral) Declaration of Independence of 1776 marked a radical turning point in the relationship between Great Britain and its Colonies in North America. This turn was precipitated by what was perceived by the American colonists as egregious behavior on the part of the British Monarch George III. The Declaration described this behavior as ‘tyrannical’, ‘despotic’ and ‘oppressive’. The Declaration, and subsequently the Constitution of the United States (including the ten Amendments in the Bill of Rights), foresaw a Brave New World of individual freedom and justice guaranteed by the rule of law. Extolling the virtues of these fundamental precepts of the Constitution, Washington declared that the resulting “happiness of the people of these States ... will acquire to them the glory of recommending [the Constitution] to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it” (Yale Law School, 2008a).

John Quincy Adams expressed a similar sentiment in a speech to the House of Representatives on the 45th anniversary of Independence:

Wherever the standard of freedom and independence has been or shall be unfurled, there will America’s heart, her benedictions and her prayers be ... She is the well-wisher to the freedom and independence of all ... She will commend the general cause by the countenance of her voice, and the benignant sympathy of her example. (The Future of Freedom Foundation, 2001)

Over the years since the US Constitution was promulgated, many national and international instruments have adopted important elements of the US Constitution (Schwartzberg, 1987). Altiero Spinelli, the “Father of the European Union”, advocated modeling a European Constitution on the example set by the US Constitution (Spinelli, 1957), though Glencross (2008) expressed reservations about its applicability. Schwartzberg considered “[a] democratic, federal world government ... [to be] a necessary precondition for a just and peaceful planetary society”. To support such a government, he considered the adoption of a global constitution that shared many of the core values of the US Constitution a real possibility (Schwartzberg, 1987, p. 246).

Yet even at the very beginning, the idea of an American Empire was in the minds of some. According to Williams (1980)

[O]ur...Founding Fathers, knew the ideas, language, and reality of empire....It became...synonymous with the realization of their Dream....Under the leadership of Madison, the ... convention of 1787 ... produced (behind locked doors) the Constitution. Both in the mind of Madison and in its nature, the Constitution was an instrument of imperial government at home and abroad. (pp. viii, 43)

Thus although the Constitution could be regarded in many ways as drawn upon a *tabula rasa*, the notion of Empire – and in particular British Empire – was so ingrained in the Framers’ consciousness that there was a certain inevitability in its infusion into the Constitutional structure.

In the Here and Now

Williams (1980), speaking specifically of “colonialism” in the context of “Empire as a[n American] Way of Life”, blames “sloppy usage” for the shifting meaning – and in

particular, debasement – of language. This perspective implies a degree of carelessness rather than the deliberate and sinister purposes underlying Orwellian Newspeak and Feitlowitzian (1998) ‘embezzlement’ of words. An alternate interpretation of *e pluribus unum* is that the US has imperial, hegemonic intentions with respect to the rest of the world, or at least those parts of it that represent some form of value to the US (Williams, 1980; Bacevich, 2008). Likewise, *novus ordo seclorum* could be interpreted, if one had the mind to do so, as “a new world order”. The first President Bush (G.H.W.), speaking to a Joint Session of Congress soon after the invasion of Iraq known as Desert Storm, spoke of “our fifth objective – a new world order”. Framed as concern for peace under the auspices of the UN¹ (though there seems a certain ambiguity and interchangeability between the US and the UN), Bush described this as

a new era – freer from the threat of terror, stronger in the pursuit of justice, and more secure in the quest for peace. An era in which the nations of the world, East and West, North and South, can prosper and live in harmony. (Miller Center of Public Affairs, 2011a)

In this he echoes, though on a global scale, the regional mutual interests of East, West, North and South expressed by Washington (Yale Law School, 2008a). These altruistic, moral-sounding motives, however, are overshadowed by others, arguably less noble: the defense of “common vital interests”, of which “economic interests” is key, and revolves primarily around the question of oil and other energy sources. Increasingly,

1. At the time UN membership was 158 members. It now stands at 192 members, which is essentially all sovereign states.

support for that axiom has been achieved by the use of US military power (Bacevich, 2008).

The Malignant Turn

The malignant turn, the tipping point at which the ‘good’ aspects of Exceptionalism started to be overtaken by the ‘bad’, may be seen in the Monroe Doctrine enunciated by President James Monroe, though written by John Quincy Adams a mere two years after his more benign representation of the US posture to the rest of the world in his speech to the House in 1821. Adams there asserted that the new nation had consistently respected “the independence of other nations”, to the point of refusing to engage in the affairs of such nations, even in support of principles close to America’s heart. In justifying this stance, Adams recognized the danger of any form of intervention in the affairs of others – even in support of ‘independence’ – as antithetical to those principles, and would “involve her beyond the powers of extrication”. America’s guiding principle of liberty would be subordinated to that of the use of force; “she might become the dictatress of the world”, even though America had no imperial designs (The Future of Freedom Foundation, 2001). Adams’ remarks were in part a restatement of warnings given by Washington in his Farewell Address, though Washington made much more issue of the risks inherent in foreign relations: his advice was to offer justice and friendship to all nations, treating them impartially, and ensuring that domestic (US) policy was free of foreign influence. In short, while commercial engagement was desirable, political engagement was to be avoided (Yale Law School, 2008a).

Against this setting, President James Monroe declared that any attempt by European powers to (re-)colonialize regions of the South American continent would be deemed prejudicial to the security of the US (Woolley & Peters, 2011a). Since it was ostensibly in their interest to do so, many of the South American nations welcomed the declaration of this Doctrine, even if its enforcement was considered impractical. The Doctrine could therefore be regarded as benign in its intent. Nevertheless it opened the door, even if unwittingly, to entertaining the possibility of some form of US intervention on the territory of foreign sovereign states. That Monroe has been quoted as a precedent in later Doctrines lends credence to this perception.

The Slippery Slope

The precedent of intervention, or the threat thereof,² set by the Monroe Doctrine has been followed in the years since at many times, in many locations, and in many forms – politically, economically and militarily. Some interventions have been overt, others covert. Attempted and realized reversals of the slide down the slope have been few: two examples are Franklin D. Roosevelt’s 1933 reversal of his cousin Theodore’s expansionism; and Jimmy Carter’s unsuccessful 1979 bid to induce Americans to re-examine themselves, and their way of life, twelve years’ before Bush’s spirited, even aggressive, defense of it.

Interventions have been in various forms, though they are to a certain extent inextricably intertwined – or different facets of the same phenomenon. Essentially,

2. For simplicity of expression, “threat of intervention” will be regarded as “intervention” – a mode of gunboat diplomacy that dispenses with the need for gunboats, as is fitting in this ‘virtual’ world.

however, they may be categorized into the three sources of power described by as political, economic, and military (Bacevich, 2008), aided – or perceived to be aided – by the Supernatural.

Political Intervention – Doctrines and the Like

Political interventions have been engaged in part as an expression of foreign policy. In some cases policy has been expressed in a doctrine explicitly enunciated by a President. In others, it has been less formally expressed, and the epithet ‘Doctrine’ applied by commentators. In the majority of cases, these Doctrines in some way expanded the scope of Monroe, notwithstanding their lack of accord with the firmly stated principles enumerated by Washington and Adams, either in terms of the geographical region to which they pertained, or in the nature or severity of the intervention. Some of the most relevant Doctrines since Monroe are identified below. In evaluating the impact of these Doctrines it should be understood that each had multiple audiences, and that each is a product of the political, economic, and military context in which it was formulated. Care must therefore be taken in drawing conclusions from a particular Doctrine, whether explicit or implicit, façade or real. Nevertheless, an image does emerge from an examination – including both intended and unintended consequences – of the various Doctrines that have been articulated or discerned over the years: an increasing propensity for America to intrude into the affairs of other sovereign nations, and to apply policy in an apparently inconsistent way, suggesting that there is an undeclared policy, too.

Theodore Roosevelt's Corollary initially emphasized the benign intent of Monroe, yet went on to give notice of US intervention as an 'armed international police force' where its southern neighbors failed to maintain social order, regardless of the lack of direct threat to the US that such perceived malfeasance engendered. Roosevelt clearly had expansionist intentions, despite his purported claim to moral high ground and denial of "land hunger ... save such as are for their [other nations of the Western Hemisphere] welfare" (Woolley & Peters, 2011b). Only five years earlier, he had asserted not only that "Of course our whole national history has been one of expansion", but that expansion was inextricably intertwined with – even causative – of "peace" in the affected regions (Roosevelt, 1899).

Theodore Roosevelt's expansionism and predisposition to intervention in the affairs of sovereign states was sufficiently ill-received in the international community that Franklin Delano Roosevelt felt impelled to roll back his cousin's policies, introducing in their place his own Good Neighbor policy. Roosevelt's Inaugural Address, which was concerned primarily with domestic issues arising from the Great Depression, nevertheless contained the essence of his policy with respect to Latin America in a single sentence: "In the field of world policy I would dedicate this nation to the policy of the good neighbor – the neighbor who resolutely respects himself and, because he does so, respects the rights of others" (Woolley & Peters, 2011c). Within the year, this policy was confirmed by Roosevelt's Secretary of State Cordell Hull, at the Seventh International Conference of American States held in Montevideo, and elaborated upon by Roosevelt himself. Hull simply recognized that sovereign states have the right

to manage their own affairs without intervention from outside states (LaFeber, 1994). Roosevelt, pointing to the failure of America to abide by a promise made by Woodrow Wilson in 1913 – “the United States will never again seek one additional foot of territory by conquest” – and that ‘liberty’ took precedence over ‘material interests’ declared unequivocally that “The definite policy of the United States from now on is one opposed to armed intervention” (Nixon, 1969, pp. 559-560).

In pursuit of global peace, the UN was formed in 1945 by 51 sovereign states. These states included the US and the USSR (both, incidentally, ‘appointed’ *permanent* members of the UN Security Council). Article 4.1 of that Charter reads “Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states ...” (UN, 1985). Nevertheless the US and USSR almost immediately faced off in an ideological battle: the US standing for capitalism and democracy; the USSR for communism. The struggle for supremacy between these ideologies was exemplified in the case of Greece and Turkey. In order to prevent the ‘fall’ of these two countries to Communism, President Truman enunciated the Truman Doctrine, in which he stated

I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure ... we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. (Yale Law School, 2008b)

This set a precedent both for a policy of ‘passive containment’, and for other foreign policy objectives achieved through the provision of “financial and economic assistance”. It also paved the way for the policy of ‘active containment’ articulated in the 1950 National Security Council Report 68 (National Security Council, 1950). Johnson

(1983) claims that it “enshrined the proposition that America, as the greatest free power, had moral, political and ideological obligations to preserve free institutions throughout the world” (p. 442). Bacevich (2008) states that “[h]istorians have long seen NSC 68 as one of the foundational documents of postwar statecraft” (p. 107). Elaborating, he describes it as “dogma”, a defining moment in US foreign policy, indicative of “paranoia, delusions of grandeur, and a cavalier disregard for empirical truth” (pp. 111, 112). Bacevich’s view is informed by the ‘official’ US view of the world in the immediately post-WWII period, articulated in the “Backgrounds of the Current World Crisis” in this top secret document:

During the span of one generation, the international distribution of power has been fundamentally altered. For several centuries ... no state was able to achieve hegemony ... power has increasingly gravitated to these two centers [the US and the USSR] ... the USSR is animated by a new fanatic faith, antithetical to our own, and seeks to impose its absolute authority over the rest of the world ... this Republic and its citizens in the ascendancy of their strength stand in deepest peril. The issues that face us are momentous, involving the fulfillment or destruction not only of this Republic, but of civilization itself. (p. 4)

This concern for communism, and the threat that it was perceived to entail for “the free world” became a pivotal point in US foreign policy until the fall of communism some four decades later, and presumably was in President Lyndon B. Johnson’s mind when he thought in terms not so much of “any ultimate [nuclear] weapon”, but “... the ultimate position – the position of total control over earth that lies somewhere out in space” (Johnson, 1971, p. 276). Thus Johnson’s dream of global control far exceeded President Reagan’s defensive objectives articulated in his Strategic Defense Initiative – the ill-fated “Star Wars” program (University of Texas, n.d.).

The threat of communism's advance into another UN member state precipitated a joint CIA (US) and SIS (British) 1953 operation TPAJAX (later known as Operation Ajax) to cause the overthrow of Iran's *democratically elected* government. This was not an ideological issue alone, but included a concern for the economic interests of the US (and the UK, who instigated this covert action). In particular this related to the West's increasing dependence on oil, a factor in many later doctrinal and military initiatives.

The first of these initiatives was encapsulated in the short-lived Eisenhower Doctrine (Woolley & Peters, 2001d). In enunciating this doctrine, Eisenhower made reference to the threat of communism – “alien forces hostile to freedom” – and the impact that communist encroachment in the Middle East would have on Western Europe. He also pointed out that “All this would have the most adverse, if not disastrous, effect upon our own nation's economic life and political prospects”. Drawing attention to the limited ability of the UN to intervene, not least because of the USSR's veto power in the UN Security Council, Eisenhower arrogated to the US the initiative for providing economic and military assistance, upon request, to Middle East countries whose national integrity was under threat from “any nation controlled by International Communism”. This Doctrine was used to justify military intervention in Jordan in 1957, and Lebanon in 1958, but the adverse reaction in the Middle East resulted in its abandonment in 1959. This was therefore one of the few Doctrines explicitly abandoned or reversed, though it returned twenty years later when Jimmy Carter made clear that

An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and

such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force. (Woolley & Peters, 2011e)

Nevertheless, the underlying issues of containment of Communism, and ‘protection of interests’ persisted. John Kennedy, for instance, in his Inaugural Speech of 1961, left no doubt that the “survival and success of liberty” would be of the highest priority in his administration: in the pursuit of this objective the US would “pay any price, bear any burden”. His perception of the US role in defending freedom in the world was made plain by his assertion that “In the long history of the world only a few generations have been granted the role of defending freedom in its hour of maximum danger. I do not shrink from this responsibility” (Woolley & Peters, 2011f). Kennedy’s emphasis on containment (of communism) related to Cuba was reinforced just a few years later by Lyndon B. Johnson, whose invasion of the Dominican Republic he justified as a hemispheric protection against the incursion of communism (Rabe, 2006), and Gerald Ford’s promise to take “appropriate action” against any Cuban interventions in the hemisphere (Time, 1976).

Reverting effectively to the world stage, but with communism still of major interest, Ronald Reagan’s policy was provision of both overt and covert support for nationals within communist states attempting to remove themselves from that sphere of influence. Reagan’s anathema to the USSR and communism was indicated by his use of the word “evil” in his speech to National Association of Evangelicals in March, 1983. While he did also use this word to describe elements of US history, he reserved his particular attention for “those who live in totalitarian darkness ... they are the focus of

evil in the modern world”, attributing them with “the aggressive impulses of an evil empire”, and warning his audience not to “remove yourself from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil” (American Reformation Project, n.d.).

With the communist “threat” no longer an issue, Presidents after Reagan turned their attention to other justifications for interventions abroad. Nevertheless, “American interests” continued to feature. Noting first that “there is no overriding threat to our survival or our freedom”, and that indeed more than half the world’s population was at least nominally democratic and ‘free’, President Clinton pointed to the possibility of a number of new demons arising – terrorism and rogue nations with weapons of mass destruction among them – against which the US should be vigilant, and able and willing to overcome. Emphasizing the significance of trade – especially in the increasingly global marketplace, he expressed concern for the “consequences to our security of letting conflicts fester and spread”, Clinton made it known that “where our values and our interests are at stake, and where we can make a difference, we must be prepared to do so” (Mount Holyoke College, 1999). Ambassador C. Paul Robinson, speaking at the Center for Strategic and International Studies on the topic of US policy with respect to “defense” against “rogue nations”, explained that “it hurts deterrence if we portray ourselves as too rational and cool-headed”, and continued “[t]hat the United States may become irrational and vindictive if its [unspecified] vital interests are attacked should be a part of the national persona we project to all adversaries” (Robinson, 2004). A potential issue with this strategy is that it might at the least result in alienating others, including potential

allies; at worst it might result in the unintended, unexpected and undesirable consequence of pre-emptive measures against the US on the part of an ‘adversary’.

The 9/11/2001 incident at the World Trade Center indicated a degree of prescience in Clinton’s concern about the possibilities of terrorism and provoked George (W.) Bush’s immediate and unilateral announcement of a “global war on terror”. This same President, on ‘evidence’ that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction, invaded that country on March 20, 2003. This set a new precedent in the domain of US foreign policy, the Doctrine of “preventive war”. In so doing, he negated Eisenhower’s statement that “the world thinks of us ... as a country which will never start a war” (Woolley & Peters, 2011g) and Reagan’s assertion that “The United States does not start fights” (University of Texas, 1983). According to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, this ‘war’ violated the UN Charter – a euphemism for ‘illegal war’.³ Justifying the invasion as a unilateral act, Bush claimed that “we really don't need anybody's permission” (Friedman, 2003). Kinsley (2003) described him as the closest thing in a long time to dictator of the world. Nichols (2008) reports that the Pope (Benedict XVI) reaffirmed his pre-war statement as Cardinal Ratzinger that the invasion was not in accordance with the Catholic doctrine of “just war”.

Intermingled with the rhetoric of Doctrines and Presidential utterances have been references to the special favor shown by the Almighty, and America’s special role in the world. This will be examined next.

3. Though this assertion has been challenged, it is nevertheless indicative of inappropriate, unilateral behavior by one of the UN Security Council member states.

God, Most Favored Nation and Moral Imperative

Whether or not the US was founded upon Christian principles gives rise to endless, and probably fruitless, debate. What is less arguable is the perceived role of God in the affairs of the nation and God's relationship with the nation (or more accurately perhaps, the nation's relationship with God) in imposing a moral obligation on the US with respect to the rest of the world. This obligation has been articulated in both word and deed from early in the nation's history.

O'Sullivan (1839) describes the US role in the world in fulsome terms. Relying on America's explicit embrace of the "great principle of equality" enshrined in the National Declaration of Independence, he asserts that

so far as regards the entire development of the natural rights of man, in moral, political, and national life, we may confidently assume that our country is destined to be *the great nation* of futurity. (p. 426, *italics in original*)

In so doing he aligns the US with "divine principles", envisaging a "congregation ... of hundreds of happy millions"⁴ enjoying and following the example set before them by America. In concluding this impassioned rhetoric, he continues

4. O'Sullivan's reference to "hundreds of happy millions" is illuminating. According to the Census taken the following year, the US population totaled some 17 million people (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). The estimated world population ten years later (the nearest available estimate) was 1.26 billion (UN, 1999, p. 5). O'Sullivan's later article "Annexation" provides additional insight. He regarded the annexation of much of the North American continent as America's manifest destiny, necessary for the accommodation of America's future population. This he estimated at "within a hundred years ... *two hundred and fifty millions* (if not more)" (O'Sullivan, 1845, pp. 5, 7, *italics in original*). The actual population of the Continental US in 1950 was approximately 150 million. O'Sullivan's 'estimate' of 250 million was reached in approximately 1990 (U.S. Census Bureau, 1993).

[America is the nation] of progress, of individual freedom ... Equality of rights ... equality of individuals ... onward to ... freedom of conscience, freedom of person, freedom of trade and business pursuits ... establish on earth the moral dignity and salvation of man ... For this blessed mission to the nations of the world ... has America been chosen ... Who, then, can doubt that our country is destined to be *the great nation of futurity?* (pp. 429-430, *italics in original*)

O’Sullivan’s ‘mission’ was endorsed by others; it was described by Miller (1982) as “paternalist racism”. These included Howard Taft, who, as Governor-General of the Philippines at the turn of the 20th century,⁵ helped shoulder the White Man’s Burden,⁶ and

assured President McKinley that “our little brown brothers” would need “fifty or one hundred years” of close supervision “to develop anything resembling Anglo-Saxon political principles and skills.” (Miller, 1982, p. 134)

A decade later, the theme was reiterated by Woodrow Wilson on the Presidential campaign trail

There is a spirit that rules us I believe that men are emancipated in proportion as they lift themselves to the conception of providence and of divine destiny, and therefore I cannot be deprived of the hope that is in me – in the hope not only that concerns myself, but the confident hope that concerns the nation – that we are chosen and prominently chosen to show the way to the nations of the world how they shall walk in the paths of liberty. (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2011)

5. Later the 27th President of the United States.

6. The Rudyard Kipling poem (the first stanza of which is quoted at the head of this Chapter) was a call to the US to “assume the task of developing the Philippines” (Brians, 1998).

The Manichean⁷ theme of the struggle between Good and Evil intimated by O’Sullivan has been re-articulated, among others, by Presidents Reagan and G.W. Bush. In each case, the US has been cast in the role of the Good. Reagan’s speech to an audience of Evangelicals cast the USSR in the role of the Evil Empire, because of its oppressive ideology of communism – “the focus of evil in the modern world”. Over this “evil”, the Godly nation of America should strive to triumph (American Reformation Project, 1983). Some two decades later, with the USSR having fallen, Bush declared the role of “evil” to be played by North Korea, Iraq and Iran – Bush’s “axis of evil”. This epithet was predicated on intention with respect to deployment of weapons of mass destruction and their implicit support of terrorist activity. This “evil”, Bush said, “must be opposed”. Recognizing the fact that “God is near”, he declared that “we have been called to a unique role in human events”, the pursuit of “freedom’s victory” (Woolley & Peters, 2011h). Developing the theme of terrorism, Bush drew parallels between this, especially insofar as it is embodied in “Islamic Radicalism”, with the ideology of communism, insofar as it had “inalterable objectives: to enslave whole nations and intimidate the world” (PresidentialRhetoric.com, 2005). According to Brzezinski (2005), the immediate political gains from such rhetoric may do more harm than good: In this way, Bush breathed new life into the decades-long fear of ‘alien’ ideology; it also runs the risk of alienating Muslims and Islamic states who do not subscribe to the ‘radical ideology’ of which he speaks. Wright (2004) perceives each of these instances of

7. Skinner (2004) takes exception to the casual (Williams, 1980, might say “sloppy”) usage of this word.

Manichean thinking to be dangerous reductionism. Yet the theme is implicit in other statements made by, or about, a number of recent Presidents.

Keen (2003) quotes Commerce Secretary Don Evans' claims that "Bush believes he was called by God to lead the nation at this time", continuing "He understands that he is the one person in the country, in this case really the one person in the world, who has a responsibility to protect and defend freedom". Waldman (2004) cites a number of sources alluding to the Hand of God in the 'appointment' of Bush to the office of Chief Executive. Colonel William Boykin, for example, responding to a question about that intervention in the election of George W. Bush, is reported to have responded "Absolutely ... And Bill Clinton, and others. I believe that our leadership is placed there by God." Boykin, it should be noted, attributed his 1993 capture of the Somali militia leader Osman Atto to the fact that "my [Boykin's] God was bigger than his". Boykin later insisted that this expression was misunderstood: he was not comparing his "Christian God" to Allah, but to Osman Atto's real God of "graft, corruption, power and money" (Leung, 2004). Whether or not this be true, however, it caused considerable consternation both at home and abroad in the eyes of Muslims.

Foreign 'Aid'⁸

Foreign aid is a post-WWII phenomenon.⁹ It entails the transfer of resources from the 'developed' countries to those countries which are not 'developed'.¹⁰ Examples

8. This term has been 'quoted' because it is problematic, given the discrepancy between the message it is intended to convey and the realities of its provision. From this point on, however, it will be used unquoted.

of resources are money (in the form of loans and grants), services, and capital and consumable goods. Some aid is bilateral: one example is the provision of wheat to India under Public Law 480 (PL480) in 1954.¹¹ Some aid is multilateral: one such multifaceted initiative is the UN Millennium Development Goals (MDG) (UN 2000, 2001a, 2010a). The extent and complexity of aid programs has created a substantial industry, as the title of de Haan's (2009) book *How the Aid Industry Works* suggests.

Often, especially in recent years, the provision of these resources has purported to be primarily, if not exclusively, for the benefit of the receiving country and its people: the achievement of significant reduction in what Kamdar (2007) describes, quoting Rohini Nilekani, as the "many avatars of poverty" (p. 283). Often, this has not been the reality.

That there is at least ambiguity in outcomes is attested to even by the titles of literature treating the topic: 'aid' is described as, or strongly associated with, various forms of negative outcomes: 'tragedy'; obstacles to development; and economic imperialism (Gibson et al, 2005; Hayter, 1971; Lappé et al, 1981; Loeber, 1961; Moyo, 2009). There are several explanations for the skepticism – even cynicism – evidenced in

9. Military aid in various forms is included under the rubric of foreign aid. However, such aid predates WWII.

10. The epithets applied to these countries have changed according to their perceived degree of development, and the 'political correctness' of the times. The epithets include Third World, undeveloped, less developed, under-developed. For the purpose of this text, the term 'underdeveloped' will be used to represent all of these terms.

11. Wheat had been supplied by the US to India prior to PL480. McMahon (1987) later described the 'loan' in 1951 as "food as a diplomatic weapon" (p. 349).

these titles and the substance of the texts. Broadly, these explanations break down into two categories, though in practice the distinction between them is often not clear.

Moyo (2009) asserts that the idea that aid can successfully address chronic, systemic poverty is “a myth”, (p. xix); rather than helping, aid is a hindrance, to the extent that she considers it an “unmitigated political, economic and humanitarian disaster” throughout the developing world (p. xix); indeed she regards as being causative of the very issues it is claimed to solve (pp. x, 48), resulting from “five decades of misdiagnosis” (p. xvii), and predicated, among other things, on a perception of a “moral imperative”, or more cynically perhaps, a “guilt-tripped morality” in the aid-provider communities (pp. xviii, 25). She adds that in the 2000s, aid had become something of a fashion statement, complete with its own supporting entertainment ‘industry’ in the form of Live Aid, embodied in such personalities as Bob Geldof and Bono. She regards the more generalized ‘aid industry’ as a self-perpetuating machine.

Moyo identifies specific reasons why aid as currently implemented cannot achieve its intended objectives. Among these are the damage to or destruction of indigenous producers by provision of ‘free’ goods or services that eradicate producers’ markets; the creation of aid dependency and an entitlement mentality; and the perpetuation and exacerbation of corruption. Furthermore, the much vaunted principle of democracy that is regarded in the West as an essential component of development strategy is at least neutral, possibly detrimental, in food insecure communities.

Lappé et al (1981) had already made some of Moyo’s arguments, claiming that “official foreign aid reinforces the power relationships that already exist”, and that

“[i]nstead of helping, we hurt the dispossessed majority” (p. 11). Hayter (1971) describes aid provided by the World Bank as an “integral part of the foreign policies of Western capitalist nations towards under-developed countries”, and the “smooth face of imperialism” (pp. 6, 7), concluding that the purpose of aid was the benefit of the provider nations, to the cost of the recipient nations. Examples of these benefits include influence of the general policies of the recipient governments even when those policies were neutral or antithetical to development. Some of these self-interested ‘foreign policy’ objectives were often quite overt.

President Kennedy, while desiring to cut “unpopular” foreign aid, observed in a Question and Answer session at the Economic Club of New York that aid “is a method by which the United States maintains a position of influence and control around the world, and sustains a good many countries which would definitely collapse or pass into the Communist bloc”; further, that he was aiming at tying the majority of this aid to “American purchases”. In this particular case, and indeed for the entire period of the Cold War, the motive of containing communism was at the root of much the policy related to foreign aid. But it should also be noted that ‘tied trade’ had other connotations: additional benefits accrued to the provider in the sense that specific suppliers or products were specified as part of the agreement; and/or prices were above ‘market’ rate. This is of particular note when considering the fact that the US, and other bilateral providers of aid, claimed to subscribe to the principle of free trade. The issues are not, however, restricted to bilateral providers (Woolley & Peters, 2011i); they apply also to multilateral

providers, the best known of which are the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

Joseph Stiglitz (2002), former chief economist of the World Bank, and winner of the 2001 Nobel Prize for Economics (The Nobel Foundation, n.d.) has criticized the IMF for its insistence on Structural Adjustments Programs that are the prerequisite for obtaining aid: “the same [answers] for every country” (p. 14); “‘one-size-fits-all’ approach” (p. 34); “policies were pushed too far, too fast ...” (p. 54); “mistakes in sequencing and pacing, and the failure to be sensitive to the broader context” (p. 73).¹² The World Bank claims to be “a vital source of financial and technical assistance to developing countries around the world” (World Bank, n.d.). Hansen (2007) enumerates criticisms leveled against this institution. Johan Galtung (2009) has described the IMF (and other Bretton-Woods institutions such as the World Bank) as “a major pillar in mal-development”.

By definition (as multilateral aid providers), neither the IMF nor the WB are exclusively US artifacts. They do however have significant Western influence. Both institutions are headquartered in Washington DC. The Managing Director of the IMF, appointed by the IMF Executive Board, has traditionally been a European citizen, though this is not a requirement. The WB is more subject to US influence: its President of the WB is always, by tradition, a US citizen nominated by the US President. Recent

12. In these criticisms, the policies to which Stiglitz refers are the ten macroeconomic policies collectively known as the Washington Consensus. See Center for International Development at Harvard University (n.d.) and Williamson (2004); the latter includes a defense against Stiglitz’ criticisms.

appointments to the Presidency of the WB are Paul Wolfowitz (2005-2007) and Robert Zoellick (2007-present). Both are associated with the Project for the New American Century, whose objectives are hard to reconcile with the idea of global peace (PNAC, 1997; Donnelly, 2000). Wolfowitz was formerly a Deputy Secretary of Defense (Robert McNamara, the President from 1968-1981 was a former Secretary of Defense). Gardiner (2005) reports a mixed response to Wolfowitz' appointment, given his role related to the Iraq War: one of several negative responses considered this to be "another provocation from the U.S. administration and the neo-conservatives to the Third World, especially the Arabs and Muslims".

In addition to bilateral aid from the US and multilateral aid from institutions influenced by the US such as the WB and IMF there are other ways in which adverse economic outcomes have been suffered by developing countries as a result of economic policy and activity in the US.

Economic Dominance

Zencey (2009) argues that GDP is "a deeply foolish indicator of how the economy is doing". This is partly because many valuable economic activities are not included in GDP, and many activities that *are* included are actually, in many ways, wasteful of resources. Nevertheless, even with this caution in mind, it is clear that the US is a dominant force in worldwide economic activity. Its 2009 total GDP was higher than that of any other single nation, and nearly three times that of its nearest competitor, Japan (World Bank, 2010).

This concentration of economic strength supports asymmetry in trading relationships between the US and other countries. Williams (1980) describes this as “Trade between unequals is as harmless as a magnet around a compass” (p. 33). The adverse effects of this asymmetry on poorer nations is potentiated by economic groupings, formal and informal, in the developed world. Such groupings of the more economically powerful countries include G6, G8, G20 and the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD).¹³ These organizations subscribe to aims that are stated to be consistent with sustainable and equitable world-wide economic development. However, they have garnered some criticism. Jackson (2007), in his report to Congress, refers to criticism of the OECD by “some [unnamed] consumer groups” for its negative impact on the “poorest and least developed countries” (pp. 3-4). Lee & Silver (2009) draw attention to the exclusively self-interested focus of G8, to the detriment of the less developed nations. ActionAid (2009) charges that UN proposals to resolve global economic difficulties are being compromised by the self-interested responses of both G8 and G20. A more recent manifestation with wide ranging consequences was the failure of the US sub-prime mortgage business in 2008 (BBC, 2009). These phenomena should not be regarded as affecting (for better or worse) only the owners of those funds: their effects can be felt throughout economies, even economies which neither participated in the triggering events, nor have the fiscal space in which to mitigate or absorb their adverse impacts (Watkins & Montjourides, 2009, p. 14).

13. Membership in these organizations is (or has been) 6, 8, 20 and 33 respectively.

Even the older and larger WTO, with a membership of approximately seventy-five percent of the nations of the world, accounting for more than 90 percent of world trade, has come in for criticism. Global Exchange (2009) describes the organization as “the most powerful legislative and judicial body in the world”. This statement is illustrative of opprobrium which led to vocal demonstration against it in 1999 (Shah, 2001).

Additional asymmetry has resulted from the substantial rise in the size, reach, and mobility of multinational corporations over the last two decades. This is a part of the phenomenon commonly referred to as “globalization”. Bacevich (2008) considers this to be a “euphemism for soft, informal empire” (p. 2). Stiglitz (2002), using possibly less emotive terms, writes of “global governance without global government” (pp. 21-22). Griffin (2003) articulates a similar sentiment, arguing that globalization “reduc[es] the significance of state boundaries. We have a global economy but lack the institutions necessary for a global polity”. Galtung (2004) draws attention to the lack of accountability that the extent of corporate activity engenders, given that corporations are primarily accountable only to their stockholders, and not to other stakeholders whose interests may be substantially compromised by corporate activity.

The US promotes the concept of free trade – trade between nations that is not distorted by protectionist measures such as quotas and tariffs. According to the International Trade Administration (n.d.), the US had free trade agreements with 14 countries in place in 2006, accounting for almost 50 percent of US *export* trade. Enthusiastic pursuit of this policy is advocated, among others, by Daniel Griswold. Yet

this policy of free trade appears to be applied selectively, in situations which it favors the US to impose protectionist policies (Griswold, 2009a, 2009b).

Military Capabilities, and Military and Covert Interventions

Since the end of the Cold War, the US has ‘enjoyed’ worldwide military supremacy. This has been facilitated by allocation of a significant percentage of the Federal Budget to the Department of Defense. Bacevich (2008) points to the irony of this name: at the time of the destruction of the World Trade Center in 1991, the US was prepared for military action elsewhere in the world (defending our interests abroad), but not in any way equipped to ‘defend’ against attacks on US soil. Instead, the military’s role has included “power projection” (p. 3), as a means of ensuring that America’s dependence on oil, and the American way of life that it directly and indirectly supported, was protected and enabled (p. 53). The Monthly Review (2002) explained “power projection” as the existence of a worldwide string of US military bases whose purpose is to “promote the economic and political objectives of U.S. capitalism” – the “vital interests” that are referenced, without elaboration, in much of the political rhetoric used to justify the military establishment. Lutz (2009), drawing on “official” Department of Defense material, quantifies the military presence as exceeding 900 “military facilities” in nearly 50 countries. These statistics may, however, be somewhat misleading given the recent “lily-pad” strategy of establishing a larger number of relatively small – and less ‘visible’ – facilities distributed around the world.

President Clinton’s description of the US as “the indispensable nation” (Woolley & Peters, 2011j) has subsequently been used by Secretary of State Madeleine Albright to

rationalize the possibility of military intervention in Iraq. CNN reports that in a Town Hall meeting in February 1998 that was concerned with the possibility of war with Iraq, having described the US as “the greatest nation in the world” (for which she received a standing ovation), she declared the US to be the “indispensable nation” (CNN, 1998). In an interview the next day on NBC-TV she reiterated this stance: “But if we have to use force [because diplomatic initiatives are unsuccessful], it is because we are America; we are the indispensable nation. We stand tall and we see further than other countries into the future ...”. The possibility of embarking upon this intervention was purportedly predicated on Saddam Hussein’s refusal to abide by UN Security Council resolutions related to “weapons of mass destruction”. By way of further ‘justification’ for this initiative, Albright drew attention to her ‘knowledge’ that “American men and women in uniform are always prepared to sacrifice for freedom, democracy and the American way of life” (U.S. Department of State, 1998). The logic applied here seems tenuous at best, though as described above, these “men and women in uniform” were indeed called to intervene in Iraq in 2003, by the later Bush administration. Yet intervention in the name of protecting democracy is inconsistent with other interventions undertaken by the US. One example is the 1953 CIA-SIS operation TPAJAX mentioned above – the overthrow of Iran’s *democratically elected* government in order to further the commercial interests of the US and the UK. Another is a similar, covert overthrow of Chile’s *democratically elected* government in 1973 (Kornbluh, 1998).

Conclusion

The claim that the US respects the equality of all is false. This is manifest not only in the significant inequalities existing within the country, but also in America's posture towards other nations. In its simplest terms, this means that those other nations are largely perceived as inferior, and possibly subservient, to America. As has been shown in this Chapter, despite all the rhetoric to the contrary in terms of America's purported objectives of 'aiding' less-developed countries and their people, and spreading 'freedom, democracy, the rule of law' and the like throughout the world, the reality is very different. Rather, America sees the rest of the world (or at least those parts of it unable to resist) as forming, at least potentially, a part of America's legitimate sphere of operation. Out of those many nations, one American Empire, a world largely constructed from America's view of how the world should be ordered. To the extent that this world view subjugates those other nations (or attempts so to do), it seems that the Colonial Oppressed, having thrown off the yoke of the British Oppressor, has itself become an Oppressor.

Events domestically (so far as these are amenable to isolation) in recent times increasingly illustrate that the US position is tenuous. In his Inaugural Address, President Kennedy declared that "[America] shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe, in order to assure the survival and the success of liberty" (Woolley & Peters, 2011f). Kennedy was speaking in the context of the Cold War. But a half century later the multidimensional costs of support and opposition in pursuit not only of survival but expansion of 'freedom' continue unabated.

Concurrently, events in the rest of the world – in particular the economic and therefore also both political and military ascendancy of less-developed and emerging nations – strongly indicate additional challenges to its self-declared position as “the indispensable nation”. America may be unwilling, possibly unable to recognize this, predicated on an inseparable union of denial and pride – or as Reinhold Niebuhr put it, “under the most grievous temptations to self adulation” (Robertson, 1957, p. 97). Particularly when considering the American propensity for evaluating the world in Manichean terms, and the concomitant tendency to try to achieve zero-sum outcomes, the scope for perpetuation and exacerbation of tension and conflict remains. The presence of pride is ironic, given America’s declared Christian religiosity, for pride is the foremost of the seven deadly sins: as Augustine has written, explicating “Pride is the beginning of sin”,¹⁴ “[pride] was the first defect, and the first impoverishment, and the first flaw of their nature ... [nature becoming] therefore wretched”; and “[pride is] the craving for undue exaltation” (Dods, 2009, pp. 346, 415). Various Presidents claim to quote de Tocqueville as saying “America is great because she is good, and if America ceases to be good, she will cease to be great”. This might be a motivator for America to re-evaluate its motives with respect to its treatment of the rest of the world. There is, perhaps, “a way to be good again” (Hosseini, 2003). Given the power of myth (such as that of equality), the fact that the de Tocqueville quote is, according to Pitney (1995), another myth should not detract from the moral that America should seek to be good, whether or not ‘again’. As a first

14. Different editions of this text attribute this ‘quotation’ variously to Ecclesiastes 10:13 and Proverbs 18:12.

step, some introspection along the lines proposed by President Carter in his “Malaise Speech” is indicated (The Carter Center, 2011).

This Chapter has traced the evolution of one aspect of the myth of American Exceptionalism since the founding of the Republic. The remaining Chapters in this Dissertation work towards demonstrating that in contemporary times the myth has become inappropriate, and that for the good of both America and the rest of the world – partly because of their ever-increasing interaction and interdependence – it requires recasting to reflect the realities of today’s world that include perspectives of other actors on the world stage. Chapter II will demonstrate the increasing unsustainability of the current myth, and identify possible adverse outcomes that could arise from failing to recognize and act upon that demonstration. Chapter IV will express the voices of a number of students in India which provide a perspective from one ‘other’ community. The context in which to understand these Indian voices will be provided by Chapter III. Chapter V will present, within the framework provided by the fundamental principles upon which the Republic was founded, a strategy for educating America and its people for a role as a ‘global’, in contrast to ‘national’, citizenry. This strategy will encourage a mindset sympathetic to the constitution of new myths appropriate to a changing world and cognizant of the world views of other peoples. Myths constituted in this way will be conducive to a more just and therefore more genuinely peaceful world.

Chapter II, which follows, will describe the ‘winds of change’ that the world has experienced since WWII, in part elaborating upon material presented in this Chapter. It will demonstrate that a continuation of attempts to sustain the current myth in the face of

these 'winds' will inevitably increase tensions and risk precipitating conflict, to the detriment of the world 'community'. Recasting an interpretation of Vice President Spiro Agnew, as quoted by Watson (2001), to fit the larger context: national interests are "divisive" and undue concern for them is "a headwind blowing in the face of" prospects for peace in the world (p. 645).

CHAPTER II

WIND OF CHANGE

The wind of change is blowing through this continent. Whether we like it or not, this growth of national consciousness is a political fact, and we must all accept it as a fact, and our national policies must take account of it. (Harold Macmillan, British Prime Minister, 1960)

Video: [Macmillan and the Wind of Change](#)

Chapter I traced the evolution of the idea of American Exceptionalism from the foundation of the Republic to contemporary times. It identified some of the major political, economic and military factors shaping America's posture with respect to the rest of the world. This posture expresses an essentially US-centric view with undertones of superiority and salvific mission – a mission to propagate a version of its own 'values' to the rest of the world (or at least those parts of the world where it is in the interests of the US to do so), either directly or through the agency of institutions effectively under its control, regardless of whether those values are appropriate to, or desired by, those upon whom the US seeks to impose them. This Chapter identifies some of the significant ways in which the world has changed since WWII – some of which the US has itself introduced or encouraged – and demonstrates how these changes, considered together, are antithetical to America's (and Americans') ability to sustain this expression of the myth of American Exceptionalism. That is to say, that the myth that America has constructed of its role – and in particular the perceived importance of that role – in the world has lost salience in the face of those changes. Moreover, to persist in attempts to

perpetuate the myth may increase tensions between the US and other actors, with the risk that these tensions will escalate into conflict.

Events and phenomena of particular interest include the demise of colonization and imperialism (at least in its traditional sense); the institution of new political, economic and military alignments; and significant technological innovation. Between them, they have given rise to questions about the possible emergence of new “superpowers”, completing the circle from multipolarity, through bipolarity and unipolarity, to a new form of multipolarity (Foreign Policy, 2010a; The Statesman, 2010; Rein, 2010). In a sense, the Chapter identifies some of the more significant elements of Harold Macmillan’s African “Wind of Change” writ larger, on the stage of the entire world.

Political Change

WWI was the “War to End All Wars”. The League of Nations, proposed by US President Woodrow Wilson,¹⁵ and created as an artifact of the Treaty of Versailles in 1919, was an attempt to guarantee this. The League of Nations failed (Garrison, 2004, pp. 169-170). Only two decades after Versailles, and partly because of the punitive terms the Treaty imposed on Germany, the world became embroiled in a second global war. At the end of WWII (although some of the foundations were laid while the war was still in progress), a number of new institutions were formed in a further endeavor to prevent future outbreaks of major conflicts. These institutions include the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU). The post-war period also saw the demise of

15. The US did not, however, ratify the League’s Covenant.

colonialization and other imperial activity – primarily the British Empire – and, after a significant increase in its influence in world politics for more than four decades, the eventual collapse of the Communist USSR. These precipitated further changes to the UN and EU memberships, and the creation of other regional political associations. The formation of these institutions and political associations, taken together, have diluted the political influence of the US, even where (as in the case of the UN), the US is itself a participant with a disproportionately high degree of influence.

The UN was formed at the cessation of WWII hostilities in 1945 by representatives of 51 nations from around the world. The UN Charter declares the purposes of this body to be “to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war” by recognizing the importance of “equal rights” both of the individual person, and of “nations large and small”; this recognition would support the objective of international justice, and improvement in the general level of living standards worldwide.

Membership has grown over the years: since 2006 it has stood at 192 – for all practical purposes including every sovereign state – and thus the UN is a forum in which every nation’s voice may, at least nominally, be heard. However, this measure of ‘success’ is controverted in part by some significant shortcomings. One of these relates to the UN record on human rights; a second relates to the structure of its Security Council.

Apparent success in the UN’s achieving its objectives with respect to human rights, and the contribution respect for those rights is intended to make to global justice, is signaled by the award of the 2001 Nobel Peace Prize “for their work for a better

organized and more peaceful world” (Nobel Foundation, n.d.).¹⁶ This award seems curious given the record of the UN Commission on Human Rights (CHR). UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, recommending in 2005 the replacement of the Commission with a new Human Rights Council (HRC), found it necessary to concede that “We have reached a point at which the Commission's declining credibility has cast a shadow on the reputation of the United Nations system as a whole, and where piecemeal reforms will not be enough” (Annan, 2005). This is an evaluation with which Loconte & Gardiner (2005) presumably concurred, describing the Commission as “dysfunctional”. The new Council also drew substantial criticism for its failures in improving human rights. For example, Schaefer (2007) claims that the HRC has provided human rights abusers a forum in which to “deflect criticism rather than being held to account” and “under-mine the few effective aspects of the Council”. UN Watch (2008) uses a stronger form of words, claiming that “Never in the history of international human rights has one of its own institutions inflicted so much damage”. Bayefsky (2009), in commenting on the most recent Council election in which the US obtained a seat, claims that as a result the US “became part of the problem and not of the solution”. The extent of UN success in this key aspect of its *raison d'être* is therefore questionable at best. There are issues also with another important element of the UN set out in the Charter relating to equality of rights for all member nations.

16. The prize was shared equally between the UN and its Secretary-General at the time, Kofi Annan.

At the top of the UN hierarchy is a Security Council composed of 15 members.¹⁷ Five of these (China,¹⁸ France, UK, US, USSR¹⁹), essentially reflecting the balance of power at the formation of the UN, were appointed not just Permanent Members, but members with the right of veto, thus at a stroke militating against democratic “equal rights ... of nations large and small” fundamental to the UN Charter. Libya’s national leader, Colonel Muammar Al-Qadhafi, in an address to the UN General Assembly in 2009, in which he described the Security Council as the “Terror Council”, also pointed to the dissonance between the UN Charter’s Preamble and the composition of the Council:

The Preamble [to the UN Charter] says that all nations, small or large, are equal. Are we equal when it comes to the permanent seats? No, we are not equal. The Preamble states in writing that all nations are equal whether they are small or large. Do we have the right of veto? Are we equal? The Preamble says that we have equal rights, whether we are large or small. That is what is stated and what we agreed in the Preamble. So the veto contradicts the Charter. The permanent seats contradict the Charter. We neither accept nor recognize the veto. (UN, 2009, p. 16).

Al-Qadhafi is well-known for his controversial remarks, and the histrionics of his performance at the podium on this occasion may have shocked to a greater degree than did the possibly apocryphal story of Nikita Krushchev’s “shoe-banging” in the same forum in 1960 (Taubman, 2003). Some of his remarks are nevertheless valid. However, initiatives intended to change this Permanent Membership have so far failed to produce

17. The original membership was 11. This was increased to 15 in 1963 to recognize the increase in total membership of the UN – 113 at the time.

18. Republic of China from 1945 to 1971; subsequently the People’s Republic of China.

19. Since 1991, The Russian Federation.

results. The UN General Assembly itself, in its Millennium Declaration, resolved “To intensify our efforts to achieve a comprehensive reform of the Security Council in all its aspects” (UN, 2000, Art. 30). Subsequently, Paul and Nahory (2005) have described seven suggestions that have been made for reforms to the Security Council that would address issues of “representation, accountability, legitimacy, democracy, transparency, effectiveness and fairness” (p. 2). In 2004, Brazil, Germany, India and Japan allied themselves as the G4, pledging mutual support for candidacy to Permanent Membership (Deutsche Welle, 2004). The US has purportedly signaled its support for the admission of India, most recently during President Obama’s visit to India in November 2010, though Choudhury (2010) reports a perception that this is “a hollow gesture”. Nevertheless, the US endorsement was reiterated by the French President Nicolas Sarkozy while visiting New Delhi the following month (Hindustan Times, 2010). The initiative has, however, been challenged by China and Pakistan; furthermore, the question of admitting India raises questions about other states whose ‘candidacy’ should be considered – for example Turkey and Indonesia, and the G4 countries of Brazil and Japan (Wax & Lakshmi, 2010; Carpenter, 2010). Lamsal (2010) draws attention to the complete lack of representation of Africa in the Permanent Membership, despite the assertion that “more than 50 percent of the issues that the Security Council deals with pertain to the African continent”. It is worth noting that any questions of which countries enjoy permanent membership do little to mediate the underlying unequal and undemocratic nature of the Security Council, and therefore by extension the UN itself. Indeed, such questions are distractions from more significant questions about the

appropriateness of the very existence of the status of permanent membership, even if veto power were abolished.

As with the UN, the EU was born out of a desire to prevent war, though within the narrower scope of European countries. The first ‘incarnation’ of the Union arose in 1950 as the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC),²⁰ whose purpose was to “unite [member countries] politically and economically”. Notably, the original membership included “Germany”, which did not join the UN until 1973. The scope of the union was enlarged under the Treaty of Rome, resulting in the formation of the European Economic Community (EEC) with the original membership of the ECSC, and again under the Treaty of Maastricht, resulting in the formation of the EU. From 1973 the membership increased, with the current membership standing at 27 states. The Union has common labor and trade policies and a common currency.²¹ It exceeds the size of the US in terms of population and GDP (EU, n.d.).

Both the UN and, to a lesser extent the EU, have enjoyed increased memberships since their formation as a result of the passing of other ‘political unions’ in the post-WWII era. The ‘unions’ of particular interest are those represented by European colonization of non-Western countries, and the USSR.

20. The six founding members were Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands.

21. The Euro. However, for various reasons a small number of Union members retain their national currency.

The Jewel in the British Empire's crown was returned to – or more accurately taken back by – its rightful owners in 1947.²² The occasion was celebrated by Jawaharlal (Pandit) Nehru's "Tryst with Destiny" speech.²³ India's Independence constituted the most visible indication that the sun was setting on the British Empire. During the 1960s, many African nations were 'granted' Independence, a phenomenon foreshadowed by Macmillan's "Wind of Change" speech to the South Africa Parliament at the beginning of the decade. The "End of Empire" finally came as Hong Kong passed over to China as the sun was setting on the twentieth century (Brendon, 2007, p. 659).

The end of colonization by Great Britain and other European colonial 'masters'²⁴ resulted in the formation of some 50 new sovereign states (Khanna, 2009). All of these have become members of the UN. Many have voluntarily become members of other regional political (and/or economic) unions, such as the African Union (AU) formed in 2002 as a successor to the 1962 Organization of African Unity (OAU) (AU, n.d.), and the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC) formed in 1985 (SAARC, 2009).

22. This is of course a figurative expression. To this day, the Koh-i-Noor diamond, generally regarded as of Indian provenance, still forms a part of the Queen Elizabeth the Queen Mother's 1937 Coronation Crown. This is secured in the Tower of London, though as part of the Crown Jewels it is still viewable by all visitors to the Jewel House in which they are kept. As recently as 2010, the UK has refused to return this gem (and other artifacts of Indian provenance) to India (Murthy, 2010).

23. See Chapter III.

24. For example, Belgium, France, Italy, Portugal, Spain.

The UN and the EU were also beneficiaries in the demise of the USSR. From Allies during WWII, the US and USSR assumed an adversarial stance in an essentially bipolar distribution of power characterized as the Cold War. This tension shaped much of the US post-war foreign policy for more than four decades, giving rise to a number of conflicts around the world in which the US embroiled itself, including Korea and Vietnam, but coming to an end with the fall and partial breakup of the USSR in 1990. This resulted in a transition to an essentially unipolar world, the US being the single pole with a belief that the fall of the USSR vindicated the US claim to moral, political and economic superiority – the USSR had, after all, been described by President Reagan as “the evil empire” (American Reformation Project, 1983). In addition some 20 states became independent of the newly formed Russian Federation (Khanna, 2009). All of these states became members of the UN. Some also became members of the EU.

Asia too has a regional political ‘bloc’. ASEAN was formed in 1967 by five Asian nations, of whom four were formerly under the control of the US or European powers. Its purposes included co-operation in economic growth, social and cultural development, and peace and stability within the region. Membership now stands at 10 nations (ASEAN, n.d.).

The US continues to have considerable influence in the UN given its permanent seat on the Security Council, and the power of veto (including the threat of using that power) over all matters that come – or might otherwise come – before that Council. In the last resort, of course, it can and probably will continue to operate unilaterally, against the express wishes of the UN, as it has done in the past.

The political changes described above have, especially since the USSR's demise, resulted in the rise of other political associations with both the desire and the will to make their own mark on the political structure of the world. It is not unreasonable to suppose that these associations will, in the course of time, be increasingly successful in this endeavor; in addition other associations may be expected to form to pursue their own agendas for improving their political situation. This is the more likely if the UN continues to fail, for whatever reason, in its stated objectives of achieving a fairer world. Given its special status in the UN, the US might be seen as responsible for such failures, and therefore be held accountable by those associations.

Economic Change

In addition to the more politically based changes described above, there have been significant changes on the economic front, though a clear delineation between political and economic change is not possible. Many of these economic changes have involved more or less formal relationships between sovereign states for the purpose of promoting trade; increases in activity by institutions and individuals promoting economic development in less developed nations; and a quantum increase in economic globalization. Some of these changes have contributed to the emergence of new economic 'powers' from among formerly less developed nations. As with the political changes, some of these economic changes – insofar as they reflect increased economic strength of non-US nations – inevitably affect the US economy in ways that are, or at least may seem in the short term to be, disadvantageous to the US.

Economic Groupings

Since the 1960s, a number of more or less formal economic groupings formed between sovereign states for the purpose of promoting mutual interests in trade and other significant international issues such as ‘climate change’. These groupings have been relatively fluid, reflecting the changing perceived needs of the various member states, and the politico-economic environment in which they operated. The ‘oldest’ of these are the World Trade Organization (WTO), the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC).

The WTO grew out of an immediately post-war General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Its purpose is to “deal with the rules of trade between nations at a global or near-global level”, with particular reference to liberalizing trade – the reduction or removal of barriers, or protectionist policies – in the form of quotas and tariffs in the interests of promoting “economic development and well-being”. WTO membership is 153 (WTO, n.d.). Global Exchange (2009) describes the organization differently as

the most powerful legislative and judicial body in the world. By promoting the ‘free trade’ agenda of multinational corporations above the interests of local communities, working families, and the environment, the WTO has systematically undermined democracy around the world.

In support of this charge it reports on the 1999 Seattle demonstration against the WTO, in which demands were made for “a more democratic, socially just and environmentally sustainable global economy.” This demonstration had the effect of preventing the continuation of the WTO meeting.

The OECD was formed in 1960 from 18 European countries, together with the US and Canada. Since its inception, 14 more countries from the Americas, Europe and Asia have joined, resulting in a total of 34 members. The Organization is “dedicated to global development ... build[ing] a stronger, cleaner, fairer world” (OECD, n.d.), though one OECD detractor, in his report to the US Congress, refers to criticism of the OECD by “some [unnamed] consumer groups” for its negative impact on the “poorest and least developed countries” (Jackson, 2007, pp. 3-4).

OPEC was formed in 1960, partly in the wake of decolonization, by five oil producing nations – four from the Middle East, plus Venezuela – whose concern was to take control of oil production, export, and pricing from the “seven sisters” – multinational corporations who had essentially controlled these matters since the mid 1940s. Current membership stands at 12 nations, distributed between the Middle East, Africa and Latin America. In contrast to the other groupings described here, this is the only industry/product specific grouping. The power of this organization was demonstrated in 1973 when it first raised oil prices, and later implemented an export embargo: this caused considerable economic impact on the oil-importing nations including the US, and illustrated the extent to which those nations were dependent on oil as an energy source in general, and imported oil in particular (OPEC, n.d.).

The last quarter of the 20th century saw the emergence of a number of “G” groupings. The six largest national economies, those of France, Italy, Japan, West Germany, the United Kingdom and the United States formed the Group of Six (G6) in 1975. Canada joined in 1976, making the Group of Seven (G7), and Russia in 1998,

making the Group of Eight (G8). G8 claims to be "... a process that culminates in an annual Summit at which the Heads of State and Government of the member countries hold talks with a view to finding solutions to the main world issues ...". The membership in these groups has always been "highly industrialized democracies", with the arguable exception of Russia, whose continuing membership has therefore been challenged. By definition this 'qualification' excludes non-democratic nations (such as China) and large democratic economies that are not substantially "industrialized"²⁵ (such as India). To a certain extent this is countered by the inclusion of these countries in the Major Economies Forum (G8, n.d.; Lee & Silver, 2009).

The G20 was formed in 1999 independently from G6 – G8 for the purpose of "bring[ing] together systemically important industrialized and developing economies to discuss key issues in the global economy". Its membership includes the G8 countries, together with "emerging economies"; together, these members account for "around 90 percent of global gross national product, 80 percent of world trade (including EU intra-trade) as well as two-thirds of the world's population". Representatives of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB) also attend G20 meetings (G20, n.d.). "Emerging economies", the IMF and the WB are described below.

Unsurprisingly, since they formed largely to pursue their own objectives, these economic groups have drawn criticism. Lee and Silver (2009) draw attention to the

25. There is an implication here that "industrialized" and "economically developed" are approximately synonymous. Given the increasing significance of the service sectors, this may be a somewhat anachronistic view. This is of particular interest to India, where the service sector is, and will be probably continue for the foreseeable future to be, a significant component of its overall economic activity.

exclusively self-interested focus of G8, to the detriment of the less developed nations.

ActionAid (2009) charges that UN proposals to resolve global economic difficulties are being compromised by the self-interested responses of both G8 and G20.

Moving into the 21st century, the two economic ‘associations’ of major interest are the “BRIC” and the “Next 11” countries. BRIC is an acronym for Brazil, Russia, India and China, coined in a 2001 Goldman Sachs report identifying the global significance of these countries’ economies (O’Neill, 2001). A later Goldman Sachs report predicted a major realignment of participants in the global economy over the next few decades. Specifically, these four (BRIC) economies, when combined, “could be larger than the G6²⁶ in US dollar terms” by the middle of the century (Wilson & Purushothaman, 2003). The BRIC nations together account for some 40 percent of the world’s population.

Rounding out a decade of BRIC recognition, Wilson, Kelston and Ahmed (2010) saw the trend in the increased proportion of the world economy attributable to the BRIC nations increasing in the coming years, and predicted that their combined economies would exceed the size of the US economy before the end of the next decade. Their expectation is that a significant contribution to this growth is the increasing size of the middle classes in these countries, whose relative affluence will drive demand. They also point to the world political influence that follows from this economic strength. On a negative note, they draw attention to the impact on resource consumption and

26. G6, as shown above, has been superseded by G8. However in this report the authors deliberately focused on the original 1975 grouping.

environmental issues consequent upon them that will be the inevitable result of the increased consumption of goods implied by the growth in demand.

Though BRIC was originally no more than an acronym to identify these emerging economies, the nations concerned have since established a more formal relationship, conducting summit meetings in 2009 and 2010. The Joint Summit Statement issued after the April 2010 meeting noted that “the world is undergoing major and swift changes that highlight the need for corresponding transformations in global governance in all relevant areas” and “underline[d] our support for a multipolar, equitable and democratic world order”. In addition, the Statement addressed a number of global issues, beyond those of a directly economic nature. These included development, poverty reduction, energy, climate change, terrorism and the ‘alliance of civilizations’ (BRIC, 2010).

At the mid-point of the first BRICs decade, a new Goldman Sachs report identified the “next eleven” (N11) economies worthy of especial note, though there was no expectation that they would be comparable in magnitude to the BRICs (O’Neill, Wilson, Purushothaman, & Stupnytska, 2005). The BRICs and the N11, according to a more recent Goldman Sachs report, have recovered from the financial crisis in 2008 better than the countries of the developed world (O’Neill & Stupnytska, 2009). This might be regarded as somewhat ironic, given that the crisis was precipitated in the US (Watkins & Montjourides, 2009, p. 14).

The effects of all these alignments on the US have been mixed. Some, such as the G8, G20 and OECD, have been at least partly to the advantage of the US. On the other hand, some of OPEC’s policies from as early as the 1970s demonstrated US dependence

on overseas oil production and the economic damage that can result on such dependence. While the economic rise of China has provided the US with a plentiful supply of cheap consumption goods, which for some might be regarded as a benefit, the overall result of the emergence of the BRIC countries in particular has been a loss of jobs within America, with no immediate prospect of their replacement with new jobs at comparable, let alone better, real rates of pay. This is a phenomenon which can reasonably be regarded, for the present, as a negative outcome for the US.

Sustainable Development and ‘Aid’

Economic activity may seem to be an end in itself, but it should more properly be seen as a means to the end of permitting the full development of human potential. For those countries in which lack of development is made apparent in many dimensions of poverty, or ‘multidimensional unfreedom’, this end is more obvious. The theoretical response to lack of resources required to achieve sustainable development has been ‘aid’.

Brundtland (1987) defines sustainable development as “paths of progress which meet the needs and aspirations of the present generation without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their needs” (p. 4).²⁷ Industrialization is generally used to characterize ‘developed’ nations (such as the US and many of the European countries), though industrialization might better be regarded as one of the means by which development may be achieved. Significantly, industrialization and the consumption it

27. ‘Development’ may be viewed as a continuum extending from undeveloped to developed. There are other terms along this continuum. Some have been abandoned because of their pejorative connotations. All terms might be regarded as at least marginally ‘culturally’-centric. For the purpose of this Dissertation, the granularity will be ‘developing’ and ‘developed’ unless the context requires otherwise.

implies raise serious questions about ‘sustainability’, and the not-so-economic and not-so-visible costs that result – often in the form of negative externalities suffered by those least able to resist or mediate them. To describe a country as ‘developed’ also implies an end-point to the “paths of progress”. This is inconsistent with the propensity, or at least aspirations, within developed countries for increased consumption, even by those in the highest (socio)-economic groups. Those in the lowest socio-economic groups may, even giving appropriate cognizance to the reductionism implied by economic factors and the subjectivity in evaluating “needs and aspiration”, legitimately argue that, in their ‘world’ view, their nation is not developed at all. As but one example, in an article in a series on “The Great Divergence” titled “The United States of Inequality”, Noah (2010) points to the “needs and aspirations” described by Brundtland that are not met by those on the ‘wrong’ path of the divergence in the US.

As a predicate to the formulation of its Millennium Development Goals (MDG), the UN references ‘development’ (without defining it) as activity whose outcomes include “a more peaceful, prosperous and just world”. Elaborating, the MDGs are eight goals intended to reduce significantly the causes and manifestations of radical poverty by 2015 (UN, 2000, 2001a). Included in Goal 8 – “Develop a global partnership for development”, is a target for Official Development Assistance (ODA) by ‘donor’ countries. ODA constitutes one form of ‘aid’ provided to developing countries.²⁸

28. ‘Donor’ and ‘aid’ are italicized here because they are somewhat spurious and/or euphemistic, as we shall see later. They will not, however, be italicized from this point forward.

While the MDGs formalized, and placed a timeline on, the objectives they sought to achieve, other initiatives undertaken by a variety of actors since the end of WWII have set out to obtain, collectively, similar outcomes – at least ostensibly. These initiatives include the provision of aid (in the form of grants, loans, supply of goods and services, etc.). Aid has been provided by government institutions bilaterally (one national government acting as provider) and multilaterally (a pan-governmental institution such as the WB acting as provider); there has also been an increasing number of NGOs operating internationally. NGOs may provide direct benefits in particular geographical or functional areas of concern. For example, Oxfam International has since 1995²⁹ supported projects in nearly 100 countries to “eradicate poverty and combat injustice” (Oxfam, n.d.). Alternatively they may undertake activities that provide indirect benefit. For example, Transparency International has since its inception in 1993 performed research and disseminated its findings related to corruption; these services are useful since, *inter alia*, they help to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of not only aid provision, but also of indigenous, aid-independent development activities (see <http://www.transparency.org/>).

Bilateral aid is aid provided directly by one government (e.g. the US) to another nation. The aid may be provided to the receiving nation’s government (possibly with the intention that it will be propagated to an ‘end-user’ community); or it may be provided directly to that ‘end-user’ community. The aid may be in the form of grants, loans

29. This grew out of the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief founded in the UK in 1942 to campaign for war-time relief to civilians in Axis-occupied Greece.

(sometimes at preferential rates of interest), goods, equipment and services destined either for implementation of particular projects, or for consumption. Aid may be attached to “conditionalities” such as a requirement for the recipient to acquire services from the provider at prices favorable to the latter. Aid provided may be intended as beneficial to the recipient nation only. It may be intended as beneficial to both the provider and the recipient nation (mutual self-interest). It may be intended, for all practical purposes, to be for the exclusive benefit of the *provider*. Even where aid is intended to benefit the recipient, this is not always the outcome: it may do no good at all, or it may do more harm than good. Such harm is not necessarily apparent to the provider, though it may be apparent to the recipient. Eldridge (1969) describes American aid to India as a “tool of diplomacy” (p. 27), particularly relevant during the Cold War years where the US and the USSR were vying for superiority of influence in non-aligned India. Lappé et al (1981) note that food aid provided under the 1954 Public Law 480 – a law which, according to President Eisenhower, “lay the basis for a permanent expansion of our exports of agricultural products with lasting benefits to ourselves and peoples of other lands”³⁰ – even as part of disaster relief, can circumscribe “self-help” activity, and result in an entitlement mentality among recipients. Their conclusion is that chronic food aid should be terminated” (pp. 118-119). Ayittey (2005) comments on dependency on food aid induced by this law (p. 156). Moyo (2009) argues strenuously for an end to long-term aid on the grounds of its generally negative outcomes.

30. USAID (n.d.).

So far as multilateral aid is concerned, for the purpose of this Dissertation, partly in the interests of simplicity, the Institutions of interest are the sister institutions of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank (WB). These Institutions came into effect in 1945 as an outcome of the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference attended by representatives of 45 countries. Their current memberships stand at 187 nations. Contemporary IMF objectives are to “foster global monetary cooperation, secure financial stability, facilitate international trade, promote high employment and sustainable economic growth, and reduce poverty around the world” (IMF, n.d.). At the same time, the WB provides “financial and technical assistance to developing countries around the world” as part of its mission to “to fight poverty ... and to help people help themselves ...” (World Bank, n.d.). These objectives are conducive to achieving the objectives set out in the MDGs. They have not always been thus defined, nor have outcomes of their activities always been to the benefit of the recipients of their resources, though sometimes perceived or intended as of mutual interest (e.g. for international peace and stability).

These institutions are ultimately controlled – at least nominally – by the governments of their member states. Despite this wide constituency, these organizations have, over the years, garnered their own share of criticism for working (wittingly or otherwise) against the very goals that they purportedly espouse. Joseph Stiglitz (2002), former chief economist of the World Bank, and joint winner of the 2001 Nobel Prize for Economics (The Nobel Foundation, n.d.) has criticized the IMF for its insistence on the nature of “Structural Adjustments Programs” that are the prerequisite for obtaining aid.

Among his concerns he cites a propensity to require implementation of components of ‘standard’ programs in an order and at a pace that are insensitive to the particular economic, social and cultural circumstances of recipient. A similar charge is made against the WB by Hansen (2007), who also points to the fact that the US, as a major contributor to WB funding, has effective veto power in decision-making. Adding to the controversy surrounding this organization is the 2005 appointment of Paul Wolfowitz as President.³¹ Gardiner (2005) surveys a number of criticisms of this appointment by a variety of commentators, quoting remarks such as “a slap at the international community, which widely deplored the invasion [of Iraq] and the snubbing of the United Nations that accompanied it” and “either an act of provocation or an act so insensitive as to look like provocation ... could bring street protests and violence across the developing world”. These criticisms are hardly a surprise given Wolfowitz’ role under President G.W. Bush, as Deputy Defense Secretary, related to the US invasion of Iraq in 2003, and his association with the Project for the New American Century, whose objectives are hard to reconcile with the idea of global peace (PNAC, 1997; Donnelly, 2000). In an IMF Working Paper investigating the impact of aid on economic growth, Rajan and Subramanian (2005a) find little substantive evidence of either positive or adverse impact of aid transfers, but note that their findings

31. A major objective for Wolfowitz was eradication of corruption in beneficiary countries. Ironically, in 2007, Wolfowitz himself resigned over a violation of World Bank ethics rules (Goodman, 2007). Wolfowitz was succeeded by Robert Zoellick on July 1, 2007.

which relate to the past, do not imply that aid cannot be beneficial in the future. But they do suggest that for aid to be effective in the future, the aid apparatus will have to be rethought. Our findings raise the question: what aspects of aid offset what ought to be the indisputable growth enhancing effects of resource transfers? Thus, our findings support efforts under way at national and international levels to understand and improve aid effectiveness. (p. 1)

Despite the equivocation (and possibly ambiguity) in their remarks in this Working Paper, these same authors note in another Working Paper published almost simultaneously, that “We find that aid inflows have systematic adverse effects on a country’s competitiveness”, in contrast to “private-to-private flows”.³² They suggest, very tentatively, that an essential difference is that the latter, while in itself a transfer flow, does tend to promote economic growth, while the former often does not (Rajan & Subramanian, 2005b, pp. 1, 20). By way of endorsement, Moyo (2009) describes the benefits of remittances as “far-reaching” (p. 134). In their 2010 Joint Summit report, leaders of the BRIC countries called for both institutions to “address their legitimacy deficits”, including the need to reform governance rules to reflect the degree of participation in the world economy by less developed nations (BRIC, 2010).

Microfinance as a means to facilitate small-scale entrepreneurship among the world’s poor, especially women, was pioneered by Muhammad Yunus, through the medium of the Grameen Bank established in Bangladesh by Yunus in 1976 (Yunus, 1999; Counts, 2008; Todd, 1996). For this effort, Yunus and the Grameen Bank were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 2006 “for their efforts to create economic and social

32. Rajan & Subramanian focus on “remittances”, transfers of money typically made by a nation’s diaspora to family members in their native country.

development from below" (The Nobel Foundation, n.d.). The essence of microfinance is that it constitutes a platform for income and wealth creation rather than transfer, and therefore a means by which individuals, their families, and communities may achieve economic autonomy. Given its self-sustaining characteristics, microfinance is a development initiative much favored by Moyo (2009). It should be noted also that despite its roots in aid, much microfinance has moved into niche markets in the more traditional commercial financing sector.

Other actors in the sphere of development include philanthropic Non Governmental Organizations (NGOs) and individuals. Of particular interest here are actors whose objectives are intended – whether or not achieved – to promote effective, long-term, self-sustaining development, and whose activities are international in scope. Many of these activities have become focused on achievement of one or more of the MDGs, even for those organizations whose establishment preceded the articulation of those goals. Very recent developments include those of Warren Buffett and Bill Gates, who top Foreign Policy's (2010b) list of "global thinkers": between them they have not only pledged much of their own wealth to philanthropic activity, but have so far persuaded 40 other billionaires world-wide to do the same. Gates, incidentally, also makes it into tenth place on the Forbes list of the 68 most influential people of 2010 (Perlroth & Noer, 2010). Foreign Policy's list also includes George Soros (in 15th position) for his gifts to "charitable causes", and quotes Soros, in connection with his recent contribution to Human Rights Watch, as saying "America has lost the moral high ground for promoting human rights". While these initiatives may be regarded as

laudable, one question that arises is whether such extremes of wealth – or rather extreme disparities in wealth – are really justified.

As with other forms of development initiatives, philanthropic activity is susceptible to criticism. Kamdar (2007) quotes the chief executive of India's Azim Premji Foundation, whose objectives are concerned with enhancing the quality of primary education for the poorer segments of the Indian community, as saying that "charity and philanthropy are dirty words" (p. 208). Charity (and philanthropy, to the extent that it is 'charity') may tend to perpetuate injustice, because it involves income and wealth transfer rather than promoting personal and community autonomy. It may therefore result in a possibly more subtle form of oppression, including a failure to engage meaningful partnership with 'beneficiaries' of intervention which should result in ultimate control of the intervention being exercised by those 'beneficiaries'. Moyo (2009) provides her own elaboration of this critical statement, describing development and aid initiatives as tending to self-serving and (therefore) self-perpetuating motives. Hubbard and Duggan (2009), Corbett and Fikkert (2009), and Greer and Smith (2009) all point to the potential dangers of religiously (i.e. for all practical purposes Christian) based interventions that may precipitate moral dilemmas that are difficult to resolve without compromising perceived religious imperatives.

Much of the benefit of aid, especially in its early days, accrued to the benefit of the provider rather than the recipient nations. To a degree this is now changing. Nevertheless, some of the benefit accruing to the developing nations is in the form not only of improved living conditions for its people, but also greater economic self-

sufficiency. This self-sufficiency is, in the short term at least, detrimental to the interests of America since it reduces the need for imports from, and increases its ability to export to, the US. In short, it gives rise to unwanted competition.

Globalization

A significant contributor to economic activity, and changes in its distribution around the world, is globalization. This is popularly considered to be a new phenomenon, arising only in the last few decades. But its roots stretch back into prehistoric times, arising from the desire (if not the need) for goods created by or available to one community and surplus to its requirements to be traded for different goods likewise surplus to the requirements of another community. Both communities would consider this trading in some way beneficial to them. Diamond (1992) claims, for instance, that more than 10,000 years ago Cro-Magnon man traded both essentials and luxuries across long distances. A better known, more recent (though still ancient) example is the Silk Road, a network of trade routes facilitating the spread of commercial products, culture and even disease across Asia and into the Mediterranean (Wood, 2002). By the 17th century, Europe was trading in China and India. The (British) East India Company, for instance, obtained a Royal Charter for trade in the East Indies in 1600, a step which led later to its exercising sovereign power in India (Robins, 2006). In more recent times, the (first) industrial revolution starting in the late 18th century England, taking advantage of the benefits of specialization, mass production, and economies of scale, facilitated the production of greater surpluses of relatively inexpensive manufactured goods that could be traded at a distance. By the late 19th century,

globalization had reached a climax, the effects of which Cohen (1998) described as “traumatic for the third world” (p. 37).

Friedman (2005) attributes the explosive growth in global interactions in the late 20th and early 21st century to ten phenomena which he describes as metaphorical “world flatteners” – a phrase that he coined after a meeting with Nandan Nilekani,³³ the Indian CEO of Infosys Technologies in Bangalore (pp. 6-8). The first of these phenomena, having a strong political component, was the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989 (and later the breakup of the USSR), presaging the virtual end of the communist politico-economic system with its state ownership of the means of production and centralized economic planning.³⁴ This provided a great fillip to the ‘rival’ economic system of more or less free-market capitalism, even in countries such as India which already subscribed at least nominally to a capitalist economy.³⁵

Technological and infrastructural improvements in communications – internet connected computers (including personal computers) and telephones (including cell phones) over fiber optic and satellite connections reduced the cost and time required for data transmission to a fraction of what they had been before, essentially making worldwide propagation of data and information instantaneous. This provided a platform for a number of (economic) globalizing innovations, taking advantage additionally of

33. Foreign Policy (2010b) awarded Nilekani 43rd place on their list of 100 top thinkers.

34. China, a communist country, nevertheless has a relatively liberalized economy (Hu & Khan, 1987).

35. Capitalism (free market or otherwise) and globalization are not the same thing, though in practice they could be regarded as inextricably intertwined.

cheaper or better resources (including people) in different locations: people in different parts of the world collaborating on a task at the same time, for all practical purposes as if they were in the same physical location; contracting for specific services, for instance customer support, to be provided at a distance; moving entire production facilities to new locations (though the cost and time involved in bringing such locations on-stream remains); integrating the production and distribution of raw materials and finished goods (again with some element of cost and time involved in the physical transport of materials and goods). It has also facilitated the virtually instantaneous movement of funds, including capital funds, across the globe. The objective of corporate actors has been, essentially, to improve (generally short-term) profitability for the benefit of stockholders, without necessarily considering the potentially or actually negative impact of their activity on other (non-influential) stakeholders such as employees and the communities in which they operate.

The world might, then, be metaphorically flat. It still does not constitute a 'level playing field' in terms of its providing a platform for just and equitable trading patterns. Hayter (1971), writing in particular in the context of Latin America, claims that "[the international agencies which include IMF and WB] appear to have little or no concern for the inequities that result from a quasi-free-market economic system between nations with unequal economic strength" (p. 165). Williams (1980) describes this asymmetry, which disadvantages the less developed countries, using more picturesque language: "Trade between unequals is as harmless as a magnet around a compass" (p. 33).

Overall the last two decades have seen a radical shift in the conduct of international trade. A significant element of contemporary globalization is the growth and mobility of transnational corporations. The rise in the power wielded by these corporations has given rise to charges that they have challenged, if not overtaken, the authority of sovereign states, including the US (Dehesa, 2006; Friedman, 2000; Rorty, 1999). Teeple (2000) goes as far as to describe globalization as a “‘triumph of capitalism’ ... the ascendancy of economics over politics” (p. 10). Cortell (2006) and Thurow (2003) demur, conceding only that the roles undertaken by individual states, and their relationship to other actors, has changed and will continue to do so. On the larger stage, Stiglitz (2002) talks of “global governance without global government”, (pp. 21-22), though more in the context of the impact of institutions such as the IMF, the WTO, and the WB: these institutions are criticized by Stiglitz for enforcing Washington Consensus³⁶ policies counterproductively, and in a way that compromises the sovereignty of ‘beneficiary’ nations. Bacevich (2008), developing this theme, regards globalization as “a euphemism for soft, or informal, [American] empire” (p. 2) with its implications for overriding national sovereignty. In suggesting ways of addressing the degree of corporate influence in governance, Galtung (2004) perceives the ungovernability described by Griffin (2003) as justifying the institution of a new United Nations body – the United Nations Corporate Assembly – for the specific purpose of democratizing corporate activity, thereby making corporations answerable to a wider constituency than

36. See Williamson (2004) for background information on the Washington Consensus, and a defense against some its critics.

its stockholders. Galtung does not, however, propose how such democratization would be effected. Ban (2009), speaking at the World Economic Forum in Davos, perceives a need for global leadership achieved through international cooperation between “governments, civil society and the private sector, working together for a collective global good.”

To the extent that globalization has resulted in negative balances of trade between the US and other countries – China being a prime example – the US is disadvantaged in the sense of accruing substantial debt with those countries, and / or selling off its capital assets to them. To the extent that globalization facilitates more efficient use of resources, especially labor, the US is disadvantaged by the loss of jobs to locations where production costs are lower.

Public Health

As with the more directly economic aspects of globalization, international spread of disease is not new. Well known examples of widespread, virulent disease include the 14th century Black Death (bubonic plague), which Kelly (2005) attributes to growth in international trade resulting in transmission of shipboard disease by rats and humans as vessels sailed from port to port, killing perhaps 20 percent of the European population in the space of a few years; and the 1918 outbreak of Spanish Flu documented by Kolata (2001) which killed probably tens of millions of people: she quotes the historian Crosby as stating that this instance of flu “killed more humans than any other disease in a period of similar duration in the history of the world” (p. 7). As with changes in the economy, therefore, one change in contemporary globalization is the ability of disease to spread

quickly – a phenomenon to which the US is not immune. In its World Health Report 2007, the World Health Organization (WHO) draws attention to the magnitude and speed of air travel – more than two billion passengers annually facilitate the spread of infectious diseases and points out that “vulnerability is universal” (WHO, 2007). Knox (2009) puts this into the context of the outbreak of swine flu in 2009: “The new flu virus was literally jet-propelled. It had the help of 2.4 million airline passengers in spreading around the world [from Mexico] before anybody knew it existed”. Under these circumstances, it is for all practical purposes pointless to try containing an outbreak of disease by closing national borders – or by enforcing any other form of geographical isolation (Walsh, 2009, interviewing the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Acting Director-General Richard Besser). Recognizing the fact and the implications of this “growth in international travel and trade” the WHO (2008a), in its Foreword to the International Health Regulations (2005), stated that the regulations are intended to protect public health without undue disruption of international movement of people and goods.

The WHO (2007) also notes that panic can be spread worldwide in real time: in this context the remarks made by Senator McCain and reported by Sunnucks (2009) about “this deadly [swine flu] virus” – a statement that could be regarded as true up to a point, but nevertheless misleading and potentially damaging – could be regarded as a case in point. Examples of the impact of high speed disease-related information and misinformation are provided by the BBC (2003) in connection with SARS, which first appeared in China in 2002, and became recognized as a global threat in 2003, resulting in some 8,000 cases worldwide though with fewer than 1,000 mortalities (CDC, 2004); and

Capell (2005) in connection with Avian flu, which resulted in fewer than 250 deaths being reported (WHO, 2008b).

Receiving less popular attention is a particular form of health-related cultural export from the West, including the US. Kleinfield (2006) notes the increase in diabetes in India, where there is a relatively high predisposition to this non-communicable disease, whose complications include “blindness, kidney damage, cardiovascular disease, and lower-limb amputations”. Kleinfield recounts that the increasing prevalence of this disease in India – 35 million at the time and growing rapidly³⁷ – is one measure of rising affluence and the poor lifestyle choices it facilitates that, if the economy continues to grow as expected, will become more widespread: perversely, he notes, “Diabetes is bankrupting people in the country, often the reasonably well off ...”. The Indian propensity for sweets, he claims is exacerbated by the increasing consumption, especially among the burgeoning middle class, of Western style fast-foods. This, then, is a darker side to US/Western cultural exports.

Security Issues

The development (and use) of nuclear armaments towards the end of WWII ushered in a new era in the potential for the conduct of warfare. Since then, there have been further developments in the ‘effectiveness’ of the armaments themselves, and the means by which they could be delivered over increased distances. In addition, the technology and other resources required for their construction has become available to

37. By way of comparison, the National Diabetes Information Clearing House (2008) estimates the prevalence of diabetes in the US in 2007 at 23.8 million.

more nations and non-state actors. Concern over the proliferation of nuclear warheads and the radical negative worldwide impact that their use could have resulted in a 1968 Non-Proliferation Treaty, currently ratified by 189 nations. The treaty provides for five nuclear weapon nations: China, France, Russia,³⁸ UK, and US.³⁹ North Korea first ratified the Treaty, but then withdrew in 2003; India, Israel and Pakistan did not ratify it. North Korea, India and Pakistan have conducted nuclear tests. Israel is believed to have nuclear devices, despite having ratified the Treaty as a non-nuclear weapon state. The possibility that Iraq had, or was developing, nuclear weapons, contributed to the argument for the invasion of Iraq by the US and the “coalition of the willing” in 2003. Iran’s nuclear capability for other than peaceful purposes continues to be questioned, and has given rise to UN endorsed trade sanctions against that country (IAEA, 1970; Sutcliffe, 2006).

Sovereign states have long entered into alliances for mutual protection from other state aggressors. Theoretically, since essentially all states are members of the UN, which requires a commitment to peace, such alliances should be obsolete. In practice, they are not. Tertrais (2004), in a survey of military alliances from the mid-20th century (i.e. post-WWII), describes the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) as the “the single remaining multilateral alliance of the network created by U.S. diplomacy in the 1950s” (p. 143). NATO was formed in 1949 with an original membership of 12 nations to

38. At the time the Treaty was signed, and until 1991, USSR.

39, Coincidentally, these nations constitute the entire Permanent Membership of the UN Security Council.

provide mutual defense resources against the Communist bloc. Despite the ending of the Cold War in the early 1990's, the organization continues to exist and has in fact increased its membership to 28, a move which Davies (1995) has seen as increasing tensions with the relatively new, post Cold War Russia. NATO's principal purpose is to "safeguard the freedom and security of its member countries by political and military means" (NATO, n.d.). In analyzing a series of 13 articles related to NATO and authored by contributors from across the "political" spectrum, Filizer (2009) concludes that NATO "is in a bad way". Very little mention is made by any of these sources about NATO's position with respect to the UN, even though many of the former's functions overlap or arguably preempt those of the latter. By virtue of the fact that NATO members are all also UN members, they implicitly signal a lack of commitment to the UN. By way of witness, Vice President Biden, speaking at the 45th Munich Security Conference, made much of the need for strengthening NATO, but spoke not a word about the UN (The Washington Post, 2009). Foreign Policy Magazine, describing NATO as "in crisis", then awards Madeleine Albright 94th place on its list of 100 most influential people for "keeping NATO relevant" (Foreign Policy, 2010b).

Aggression is not the preserve of state actors alone, nor is war its only significant manifestation. "Terrorism" is arguably a phenomenon dating from antiquity, and has had some currency since WWII. However, it could also arguably be said to have taken center stage with President Bush's declaration of "War on Terror" following the destruction of the World Trade Center in 2001. Potentiating the effectiveness of terrorist activities is the instant worldwide visibility that such activities may enjoy; indeed the fact of such

visibility, and the extent to which terrorist organizations are able to use information channels directly rather than rely on third party media may have contributed to increases in such activity. The fear that terrorist activity sets out to generate is also achieved by activities propagated via various social networking channels and characterized as ‘scares’. The genuine ‘anthrax scare’ that occurred in the immediate aftermath of the World Trade Center destruction, and for which the FBI took eight years to complete its investigation, has given rise to periodic hoax scares, the latest being in January 2011 (Emery, 2011; Warrick, 2010). However, whether “war on terror”, no matter who might be the protagonists, is productive is questionable. Oberg (2006) points to the fact that at best such “war” addresses only symptoms, not the motivating causes of the terror activity, and may serve to exacerbate any sense of injustice that may have been felt by perpetrators, thereby reinforcing their desire to continue, and possibly escalate their activities.

The technological changes that facilitated beneficial rapid, inexpensive and world-wide storage and dissemination of data provide also an environment in which severe unexpected, unintended and undesirable outcomes may be experienced as a result of cyberactivity. Historically, the first of these adverse outcomes is generally regarded as the Asian financial crisis of 1997, which started in Thailand, but spread rapidly throughout South East Asia (Friedman, 2000; Liu, 2002). The 2008 sub-prime crisis in the US, whose adverse effects were propagated to many countries in the developing world who not only did not contribute to the cause of the crisis but were also more severely affected by it in terms of the impact on their export potential and cuts in aid

contributions,⁴⁰ was facilitated by similar technology. The crisis precipitated the need for significant additional support to the developing world by the WB. Under the circumstances, the extent to which the developed world should take credit for providing such assistance is questionable (Cowen, 2009; UN, 2009; Watkins & Montjourides, 2009; Zoellick, 2010). To a certain extent, these crises might have resulted from a combination of ignorance, naïveté and greed, which may be remediated in part by education, ethics, and regulation. Other uses – or perhaps more accurately abuses – of cyber technology are demonstrated by the recent Wikileaks controversy involving the publication on its web site of classified documents (Baranetsky, 2011). More radical threats to security are described by Clarke and Knake's (2010) *Cyber War*, which transcends, or possibly redefines, the traditional understanding of warfare. They include propagation of misinformation (as a political instrument), and exposure to attacks upon financial systems and service providers (such as power grids), in addition to military systems. These attacks may come in various forms, such as destructive viruses; denial of service; and damage to, or theft of data. It has been speculated that such an attack was launched using the Stuxnet virus to disable Iran's uranium enrichment facilities (Broad, Markoff & Sanger, 2011).

Taken together, these security issues place the US at increased risk of negative outcomes in terms of loss of human life, damage to and destruction of physical property, and the compromising of non-physical assets, including military resources. These risks

40. To the extent that aid actually results in negative outcomes, as is the general argument here, aid reductions might actually redound to the benefit of recipient nations.

subsist not only within the shores of the US, but in the many other locations in which US interests – which include corporate interests – are located. Arguably, in the case of terrorist activity (and this includes the perception of the possibility of such activity) this can be regarded as adversely affecting the American way of life by circumscribing various freedoms to which Americans claim entitlement as of right. There is also the substantial economic opportunity cost attributable to the administration and operations of the Department of Homeland Security.

Resources and the Environment

Locke (1690) claimed that a man (sic) could legitimately claim as much property (in the form of land) as he was able to work. This infringed no-one else's right to do the same – land was effectively an infinite resource. Nor, for the same reason, did it in any way reduce the long-term sustainability of production resources or damage the environment. He could therefore be regarded as subscribing to at least elements of the cornucopian world view. But Locke was writing before the industrial revolution, at a time when the vast majority of the worldwide population of some 610 million people (ThistleRose Publications, 2005), citing McEvedy & Jones, 1978), including the five million living in Locke's Great Britain (Dubrulle, 2003), were engaged in agriculture, and production methods were crude (Thurow, 2003). By contrast, the present world population is more than six billion, and predicted to rise to more than nine billion by 2050 (US Census Bureau, n.d.). This population increase has been supported in part by industrial methods applied to agricultural production, thereby circumventing some of the 'natural' phenomena of population control described by Malthus (1798).

Providing for the world's current wants (if not needs), even at a time when a billion of the world's human population exists in extreme poverty (UN, 2010) is consuming natural resources at an unprecedented and unsustainable rate (Jhally, 1997; Friedman, 2008). Some of these resources are not renewable, others only at a rate that is less than current consumption: of these, water – a resource that is crucial to life – is a prime example (USGS, n.d.; Earth Policy Institute, 2004 quoting Brown, 2005). Additionally, production methods result in increasing pollution of the environment (Friedman, 2008). Concern about such environmental impacts, together with the publication of Rachel Carson's (1962) Silent Spring, gave rise to the modern environmental movement (Silveira, 2001), though there continues to be dispute about the validity of her work – some even claiming that its role in banning the use of DDT as a pesticide (for example) has done more harm than good (Logomasini, 2007). Whether or not Logomasini's view is significantly tempered by her position at the Competitive Enterprise Institute is unclear. But more recent, and possibly more significant, concerns over climate change (also referred to as global warming) are embroiled in similar controversy. For instance, the scientific claims made in Gore's (2006) An Inconvenient Truth (for which he shared the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize) have been challenged, if not refuted, by Johnston (2006). Nevertheless, if Pollan (2006) is to be believed, the efficiency of food production and distribution, taking account of the transportation required even in the more domestic context of the US, is hardly stellar, requiring as it does ten calories of energy to deliver one calorie of food value to the table. This issue of energy efficiency is a central theme for Friedman (2008), who regards development of

“abundant, clean, reliable, and cheap electrons” part of the “biggest challenge of our lifetime”, especially for those “at the bottom of the pyramid” (pp. 6, 163).

The continuing emphasis on economic ‘growth’ (and therefore consumption) in order to improve the material condition of the expanding world population implies increasing pressure on non-renewable (or only partially renewable) resources and the environment. This pressure may require Americans to re-evaluate, and possibly scale back, at least their material expectations.

All the World’s a Stage – with a New Cast

In 2009, Forbes Magazine published its first list of the “most powerful people on earth” – people whose political, economic, philanthropic, spiritual and criminal reach was extensive. The list contained 67 names – one for each hundred million of the earth’s estimated population. The next year Forbes published a similar list containing 68 names (Noer & Perlroth, 2009; Perlroth & Noer, 2010). In each case the authors acknowledged a degree of subjectivity in deciding the criteria by which candidates were to be selected and ranked for these lists. They did not explicitly acknowledge the extent to which these criteria might have been selected and applied with a Western, and, in particular, US bias. Nevertheless, the lists, taken both separately and together do provide a perspective on where power and influence lie. In both cases the surveys strongly suggest that a preponderance of this power and influence lies with the US.

The 2009 list is headed by the US President Barack Obama. The US is further represented by many names, distributed throughout the list, in domains that include politics, finance and business. Other Western countries are similarly represented. In

addition there are a number of names from ‘developing’ or ‘emerging’ countries: one from Brazil; six from China; five from India; and four from Russia. In the 2010 list, Obama’s position has been exchanged for that of China’s President Hu Jintao (number two in the 2009 list). Brazil still holds one position; China’s representation has risen by one to a total of seven; similarly India has risen from five to six; Russia has dropped by one from four to three. The total BRIC representation has therefore risen from 16 to 17, though the percentage has remained relatively unchanged at approximately 25 percent of the total.

While drawing more than the most tentative conclusions from these data may be inadvisable, they do raise awareness of the extent to which power and influence lie in the hands of non-US actors. For the US to ignore this may not be in its best interests. It is reasonable to suppose that this awareness has contributed to the number and nature of international visits being made by some of these actors, two of the most recent occurring in January 2011: the Chinese President Hu Jintao’s state visit to the US, and US Secretary of Defense Robert Gates’ visit to China.

Conclusion

This Chapter has described some of the major political, economic and military changes that have taken place since the end of WWII. Taken together, they signal the need for a realignment of the relationship between America and the rest of the world, whether or not recognized by the US, whether or not indicative of an absolute or relative ‘decline’, and whether perceived by the US to be to its advantage or disadvantage. Many changes are not conceptually ‘new’; rather, their significance lies in the speed and degree

of change, and the extent to which change is propagated to and visible by the rest of the world, since “every village has a TV” (Thurow, 2003, pp. 221-222). The world has become, in Zygmunt Bauman’s (2000) terms, a manifestation of “liquid modernity”. In consequence of these changes, a number of commentators have argued that the US is in decline, or will be in the foreseeable future. This may be understood in at least two non-exclusive ways. First, it may be taken to mean that US expectations, for example in terms of domestic standards of living (at least as evaluated at present) will need to be revised downwards. Second, it may be taken to mean that the US will be less capable of exerting its will over the rest of the world – and that other nations, or associations of nations (including the UN), may have a greater capability for enforcing their will on the US. This latter element of the phenomenon of American decline is, to the extent that it reflects improvements in the fortunes of those other nations, described by Zakaria (2008) as “the rise of the rest”.

Paul Craig Roberts (2005) wrote that “By 2024 the US will be a has-been country.” In so doing he quoted a statement that he made at the Brookings Institute the previous year, in which he said “the US [will] be a third world economy in 20 years”. His justification for this assertion rests primarily on the extent to which US jobs have been outsourced / offshored to Asia – in particular India and China, largely facilitated by the some of the phenomena labeled by Friedman (2005) as “flatteners”: specifically, the end of Communism, the rise of the high speed Internet, and the extraordinary international mobility of US capital and technology. A factor, too, is the continuing decline of education in the US, both absolutely and relative to the educational levels

being achieved in countries reaping the benefits of these phenomena. While ‘prophecies’ might have the beneficial impact of precipitating change and thereby falsifying the prophecy, Roberts argues that the phenomena he describes are for all practical purposes irreversible, and reinforces his view in a later article that accuses economists who present a different, and (for the US) ‘better’ picture, of being in denial (Roberts, 2007).

Continuing Roberts’ theme of denial, Rachman (2011) likens dismissal over the years of predictions of American decline to Aesop’s “boy who cried wolf”, reminding his readers that the wolf eventually did arrive, and characterizes China as the modern-day wolf. In justifying this claim, Rachman draws attention – among other issues – to the increasing strength of the Chinese economy, and the debilitating costs of the US military establishment. According to Carden (2010) the increasing cost of this establishment is described by Admiral Mike Mullen as “the single biggest threat to national security”. In similar vein, Bacevich (2008) remarks that pursuing a policy of maintaining military supremacy will “invite inevitable overextension, bankruptcy and ruin” (p. 169). Grandin (2009) describes President Obama’s approach to Latin America in 2009 “not as leader of a confident superpower, but of an autumnal hegemon”; a visit to four Asian countries in 2010 prompted Foreign Policy (2010a) to remark that the leaders of these countries “are nervously watching the foundations of American supremacy crumble before their eyes”. Robert Zoellick, the President of the WB, described the emerging multipolar world as “there are now more states wielding influence on our common destiny. They are both developed and developing, spanning all regions of the globe” (Zoellick, 2010). Ackerman (2010) observes that rising nations (presumably implying nations such as the

‘emerging’ nations identified above) will seek out partners other than a nation in decline (implying America), thus exacerbating the impact of that decline. The irony is the extent to which undesirable change (at least in the short term, from the US perspective) has been unintentionally precipitated or facilitated by the developed world, including the US, partly (if not exclusively) in pursuit of its own interests.

Taken together, these changes invalidate at least a part of America’s current myth of Exceptionalism. President Kennedy, speaking at the Yale University Commencement in 1962, described “myth” as the enemy of “truth”, continuing “we must move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new, difficult, but essential confrontation with reality” (Miller Center of Public Affairs, 2011b). His words once again warrant being heard: It is time for the myth to be reinvented.

Chapters III and IV present some of these post-WWII changes from an Indian perspective, as an illustration of the view that there are other contenders for some of the role currently played on the world stage by the US, that there is an increasing desire for and ability to achieve autonomy by other sovereign states, and that domestic aspirations and expectations within the US are no longer sustainable. Chapter III provides background information about India which provides a context in which the views of the Indian students with whom we conducted conversations in August 2010 are expressed in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER III

TRYST WITH DESTINY

Long years ago we made a tryst with destiny, and now the time comes when we shall redeem our pledge, not wholly or in full measure, but very substantially. At the stroke of the midnight hour, when the world sleeps, India will awake to life and freedom. (Jawaharlal Nehru, First Prime Minister of India, 1947)

Video: [Tryst with Destiny](#)

Chapter II identified some of the major political, economic and military changes that have occurred in the world since the end of WWII. One result of these changes is a shift in the relationships between individual sovereign states and groups of sovereign states. In particular, these changes have affected, or are in the process of affecting, not only the ability of the US to influence the behavior of other nations, especially developing nations who are less able to resist, but also many of the domestic expectations and aspirations of Americans. One of the changes described is the emergence of the BRIC countries as powerful economic actors, and the international political (and possibly to a lesser extent, military) impact that this entails. Using one of those countries as an example, this Chapter and the next focus on India, providing evidence of how this one country's particular economic and political development enhance its own influence, and thereby contribute to a diminution in the influence of the West in general, and the US in particular. This Chapter identifies changes within India since Independence in 1947, and perceptions both within India and abroad of what these changes signify for India's expectations and aspirations for its place on the world stage. The Chapter also provides a

context in which to understand statements made by Indian students in Indian universities in South India during August 2010. These statements are synthesized and elaborated upon in Chapter IV, which follows. Taken together, these Chapters provide additional evidence of the diffusion of power and influence that is increasingly supplanting the unipolar power structure that has been centered on, and enjoyed by, the US for the last two decades. In so doing they also substantiate the need for America, looking to the benefit of all rather than just itself, to reformulate its own expectations and aspirations within the framework of a world community, predicated on awareness and understanding of, and respect for, others that has been lacking in the past: in other words, to invent a new myth for America more aligned with the circumstances of the present and more accommodating of those of the future, whatever they might be. Elements of an educative process within the US by which this might be accomplished form the substance of Chapter V.

India's Aspirations and Expectations

Jawaharlal Nehru made his “Tryst with Destiny” speech (quoted above) to the Indian Parliament as midnight approached on 14th August 1947, the eve of Independence from four hundred years of colonization by Great Britain. In describing this ‘tryst’, Nehru made reference to Mohandas Gandhi’s “ambition ... to wipe every tear from every eye”.⁴¹ To that end, India’s Constitution, which came into effect on January 26, 1950, made special provisions intended for the betterment of those in the ‘lowest’ social – and

41. It seems that there is some myth attached to this expression – that it is a Gandhi quote. The Financial Express (2010) claims otherwise.

therefore generally the ‘lowest’ economic – circumstances. The primary initiative for these provisions was Dr. B. R. Ambedkar, himself a Dalit,⁴² and one who stood in opposition to Mohandas Gandhi (a relatively high caste person) – falling short of calling him an “enemy” and describing him instead as “our [the Untouchables’] greatest opponent” (Ambedkar, 2010, p. 14). This was Nehru’s “dream”, not only for India, but for the world, recognizing that “all nations and peoples are too closely knit together today for any one of them to imagine that it can live apart” (Halsall, 1998). More than half a century later, Manmohan Singh repeated Nehru’s words in his address to the Nation on his inauguration as Prime Minister (Express India, 2004), and re-expressed the sentiment, though not the precise words, on the occasion of the nation’s 63rd anniversary of Independence on August 15, 2010 (Times of India, 2010).

As the 21st century approached, Abdul Kalam (1998), later the President of India,⁴³ set out his vision for India in 2020, dedicating his text to a ten year old girl who had told him her ambition was “to live in a developed India”. In working towards his definition of “developed”, Kalam visited the common measures of economic prosperity at the macro level – GNP, GDP, Balance of Payments, etc. While recognizing the importance of these macro-economic metrics, he found them inadequate: they failed to recognize the central importance of satisfying human needs, and satisfying them in an inclusive way. Italicizing for emphasis, he stated

42. “Untouchable” a low-caste person.

43. The 11th President, 2002-2007.

it does not make sense to achieve a 'developed' status without a major and continuing upliftment of all Indians who exist today and of the many more millions who would be added in the years to come. (p. 3)

In so doing, Kalam aligned his aspirations for India with those of Gandhi, Nehru, and Ambedkar. His vision was not, however, static: it included the notion that even when a “stable and enjoyable ‘present’” had been achieved, people should still be able to “look forward to a better ‘future’” (pp. v, 1-3). Kalam’s thinking was influential in formulating the government’s own vision for 2020, in which job creation, and the education at all levels required to support it, were of primary concern in its task of “nation-building” (Government of India, 2002, pp. iii-v). It was further revisited by Dr. Montek Singh Ahluwalia, a prominent economist whose *curriculum vitae* includes a position with the IMF and India’s Planning Commission,⁴⁴ in a 2009 lecture at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology. According to Ahluwalia, transforming India from a ‘poor’ country to a ‘rich’ country would take 32 years – thus significantly delaying achievement of ‘developed’ status by more than two decades beyond Kalam’s vision. Nevertheless, Ahluwalia asserts that by 2020, based on economic growth of nine percent,⁴⁵ India could achieve “middle income status”, and that there could be a “transformation” in state-wide provision of services, such that “the kinds of problems of poverty that affect India today can definitely be said to be behind us” (MIT, 2009). Despite this delay, ‘progress’ in

44. This body is responsible for India’s national Five Year (development) Plans.

45 . This is the figure used in the Eleventh Five Year Plan covering the period 2007 - 2012 (Government of India, 2008).

recent years has caused some to think in grander terms: as a potential, if not nascent, superpower.

Miller (2006) defines a superpower as “a country that has the capacity to project dominating power and influence anywhere in the world, and sometimes, in more than one region of the globe at a time, and so may plausibly attain the status of global hegemon”. He continues by enumerating the dimensions of power as “military, economic, political, and cultural”.⁴⁶ Since the fall of the USSR, the US has generally been regarded as the sole superpower. As was pointed out in Chapter II, relatively recent developments around the world have led commentators such as Bacevich (2008), Rachman (2011), Roberts (2005, 2007) and Zakaria (2008) to re-evaluate this. In particular, the BRIC countries (which include India) have attracted some attention internationally as potential or actual superpowers. Brazil has been described as an economic and political superpower in Latin America, and possibly globally (Newsweek, 2009; Ziabara, 2011). Moore (2011) views China’s increasing military capabilities as warranting superpower status. Moving beyond Miller’s dimensions of power, Russia, benefitting from a combination of substantial oil and gas reserves and the high prices obtaining for these resources, was awarded the epithet “energy superpower” by Broughton (2006), though less than five years later Matthews (2010) warns that Russia’s “alienation of its partners” might bring this status to an end. In a similar way, Adams and King (2010) note with “shock” the reduction in Russia’s research output in recent years, causing Baty (2010) to

46. The cultural dimension of power was not included in Chapter II, but is discussed later.

rescind his evaluation of Russia as a “science superpower”. That all of these evaluations are made by commentators outside the country in question suggests they warrant some degree of legitimacy. On the other hand, the claims do not span all (or even the first three) of Miller’s axes of power; also there is a degree of volatility in the phenomena which give rise to some of these claims. This could reasonably be regarded as antithetical to a legitimate use of the epithet ‘superpower’, since this implies a more reliable and persistent exercise of influence. It could instead be another use of what Williams (1980) describes as “sloppy usage”. Nevertheless, it is worth evaluating India with respect to its level of ‘power’ along Miller’s axes, especially as many commentators are themselves representatives of countries with a significant power base of their own rather than Indians expressing a partial and inappropriately optimistic view.

On the military front, Shankar (2010) quotes Russia’s Ambassador to India as saying, in the context of the completion of a joint Russian and Indian military exercise, that “Russia sees India as a super power in the coming years”. India, which is still not a signatory to the 1968 NPT, is now one of the eight sovereign states known to possess nuclear warheads.⁴⁷ India also has the capability to fabricate and deploy these nuclear devices. A strong military capability is regarded as necessary primarily as a response to tensions with China and Pakistan, with whom it shares borders to the north-east and north-west respectively. Contributing to concerns related to Pakistan is the conflict over Jammu and Kashmir that has existed since the Partition in 1947, and India’s concerns

47. China, France, Russia, UK, US (“nuclear powers” under the NPT). India, North Korea, Pakistan (not signatories to NPT).

over the possibility of US aid to Pakistan being subverted for use against India. China is an issue given the continuing tension between the countries, partly attributable to the border dispute in Kashmir that resulted in the Indo-Chinese war of 1962. This tension between India and China exists despite their common interests as BRIC countries.

Military capability requires an economy to support it. In his visit to India in November 2010, President Obama remarked upon India's response to the global economy as "unleashing an economic marvel that has lifted tens of millions from poverty and created one of the world's largest middle classes" (Rediff News, 2010). The next month, IMF Managing Director Dominique Strauss-Kahn described India as "becoming one of the leading power (sic) in the world. It is really an economic powerhouse" (Economic Times, 2010a). The Economist (2010), while pointing out a number of obstacles to economic achievement, nevertheless claims that India's growing economy "will change the world" (p. 89). Drawing on these remarks, perhaps, Gujarat Governor Kamla exhorted India's youth to take up the challenge of ensuring that India become "a leading economic superpower in the coming decades" (Economic Times, 2010b). Addressing a specific element of India's economic output, and quoting an earlier report by the US based information technology research and reporting firm Gartner, Inc., the same newspaper noted that India could become the "'software superpower' of the world by 2020", though this would depend greatly upon the non-trivial tasks of developing a technologically competent workforce, and resolving infrastructure related issues (Economic Times, 2010c). Recognizing the role of software in the 'knowledge industry' (Government of India, 2001a), the 'competent workforce' caveat concerns the economist

Amartya Sen,⁴⁸ who points out that educational levels are, and will continue to be for the foreseeable future, insufficient to sustain current patterns of growth over the longer term. He therefore questions the appropriateness of describing India as a “knowledge superpower” (Shivakumar, 2010).

Much of India’s economic rise has resulted from a combination of phenomena dating from the late 20th century. After nearly 50 years of a socialist economy following the USSR model, the government initiated a series of liberalization measures to transform it into a market economy. These measures included privatization, encouragement of foreign investment, and a substantial dismantling of the complex, time-consuming and costly system of permitting known as the license Raj. In addition, some of Friedman’s (2005) globalization-boosting ‘flatteners’ – high speed, low cost communications in particular – have facilitated the migration of many jobs from the West to countries such as India,⁴⁹ where wages are significantly lower even for relatively highly skilled jobs. This phenomenon has been described variously as outsourcing and offshoring.⁵⁰ In India the emphasis has been on ‘service’ industries, such as those provided by customer service call centers. These outsourced and offshored service industries do not, however, tell the whole story. India has a strong information technology sector, which includes software companies such as Tata Consultancy Services, Wipro and Infosys. This sector

48. Sen was the winner of the 1998 Nobel Prize in Economic Sciences for “his contributions to welfare economics” (The Nobel Foundation, n.d.).

49. India is only one of many countries to which jobs have migrated.

50. These terms have different meanings, but at least one similar outcome – the migration of jobs, though the types of jobs migrated might be different.

contributes a significant percentage of GDP, much of it in the form of export sales. Over the past five years, Indian companies have made almost 1,000 investments in foreign companies, the total investment being close to \$75bn (Ramsurya & Philip, 2010). Singh (2010) describes the Bharti acquisition of Zain Telecom, with a presence in 15 African countries, making Bharti the “sixth-largest telecom service provider in the world by number of subscribers” despite the fact that Africa is largely the preserve of Chinese investment. Moving beyond the services sector, Tata Steel’s acquisition of the Anglo-Dutch steel company Corus in 2007, made Tata one of the five largest steel manufacturers in the world (Khanna, 2007). Tata’s diverse interests are also signaled by its 2008 multi-billion US dollar acquisition of Jaguar and Land Rover, originally premier British auto brands, from the American Ford Motor Company. This acquisition is part of its continuing investment in foreign auto manufacturing which includes brands in Spain, Italy, Thailand and South Korea (Chandran, 2008).

The overall effect of these phenomena is that the WB ranks India’s 2009 economy, measured in terms of GDP, as the 11th largest (out of 192). Although growth suffered from the global slowdown in 2008, it is expected to return to a rate that matches the Five Year Plan expectations of nine percent in the near future (World Bank, 2010a, 2010b).

Politically, India’s presence on the world stage is signaled by the apparent support for Permanent Membership of the UN Security Council. At a more personal level, the influence of Sonia Gandhi, the President of the Indian National Congress Party, and Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, is suggested by their being awarded 9th and 18th places

respectively on the Perlroth and Noer (2010) list of the 68 most influential people world-wide.

Miller (2006) includes “cultural power” as one dimension of power. Joseph Nye coined the expression “soft power”, denoting the power to achieved desired means in a non-coercive way by presenting potential adversaries (or pre-empting the very idea of adversarial encounters) with an ‘attractive’ or ‘attracting’ posture (Nye, 1990, 2004). “Cultural power” is therefore at least potentially a component of “soft power”. Soft power, even by Miller’s narrower definition, may be exercised by both institutionalized and non-institutionalized actors with little or no direct political, economic or military power. The wider concept of “soft power” will be used for the remainder of this Dissertation.

Shashi Tharoor, a former Minister of State for External Affairs, and currently a Member of Parliament representing the state of Kerala, questions the value of traditional power measures, remarking at the same time upon the dissonance present in describing a country that is “super poor” as also a “superpower”. Instead, he favors manifestations of soft power, giving as non-Indian examples the Beijing Olympics, Alliance Française, McDonalds, Hollywood. He characterizes these as ‘telling a story’; and whoever has a better story “wins”⁵¹ (Tharoor, 2009). Kamdar (2007) points to increasing soft power that can be expected from the growth in the international appeal of Indian media, which extends beyond the Bollywood film industry. Rachman (2011), in supporting the idea of

51. Whether “winning” is an appropriate objective, and if so what it should really mean, will be discussed in Chapter V.

US decline, nevertheless points to the charisma of Barack Obama as an instance of soft power, even though he is clearly a political personality.

Britain's Foreign Minister David Miliband is quoted by the Indi-Asian News Service as saying at a London celebration of India's 61st Republic Day attended among others by Dr. Montek Singh Ahluwalia that

India is a superpower in its soft power, a superpower in the soft force of its democracy, and superpower in its intellectual advance and a super power in the world of business ... India is also a superpower in the world of culture ... an example of India's soft power. (The Statesman, 2010)

In summary, whether or not India warrants "superpower" status, there are strong indications that the country has become a significant player on the world stage in its own right, at least economically, and arguably to a lesser extent politically. Its impact on the rest of the world may be further potentiated by its cooperating with other nations – for example the other BRIC countries, including its immediate neighbor to the north-east, China, despite the continuing tension between the two countries. This view is implicitly endorsed by the fact that India has been, or will in the near future be, host to a number of influential foreign visitors, including state representatives of countries such as the US, the UK, France, and Germany, as well as international institutions such as the IMF.

Political Structure

Modern India was formed in 1947 when the Quit India Movement achieved its objective of Independence for India, thereby repossessing the Jewel in the British Empire's Crown. Bound up in Independence was the Partition, a separate Islamic Republic of Pakistan being formed from a region in the north-west (West Pakistan),

together with the geographically disconnected province of Bengal in the north-east (East Pakistan). This latter region achieved its own sovereign statehood as Bangladesh in 1972. The Partition was controversial at the time, and continues to be a source of discord and unrest. One instance of this is the continuing issues with the state of Jammu and Kashmir, which is territory upon which Pakistan makes claims (Mughal, 2011; Oommen, 2005).

Under its 1949 Constitution (as amended in 1976), India is a “sovereign socialist secular democratic republic”.⁵² Rights under the Constitution were suspended by a State of Emergency during 1975 – 1977 when Prime Minister Indira Gandhi’s election to the Lok Sabha was declared void (Iyer, 2000). The country enjoys universal adult suffrage, and has the largest electorate in the world. The country has a multi-party system in which political parties are required to be registered with the Election Commission of India (ECI). This body is required by law to provide lists of parties registered at the national and state levels, together with “unrecognized” parties (approximately equivalent to “independents” in the US). The most recent listing identified six national parties.⁵³ Of the 35 states and union territories, 23 have between zero and four (state) parties. A party registered in more than three states is automatically designated a “national party” by the ECI. There are 1,112 “unrecognized” parties nationwide (ECI, 2010).

52. Between 1949 and 1976, a “sovereign democratic republic”.

53 Bahujan Samaj Party, Bharatiya Janata Party, Communist Party of India, Communist Party of India (Marxist), Indian National Congress, National Congress Party.

Central government, “the Centre” is comprised of a bicameral Parliament located in the capital, New Delhi. The “upper house”, the Rajya Sabha, is limited to 250 members, most of whom are elected by State Parliaments. The “lower house”, the Lok Sabha, is limited to 552 members directly elected by popular vote. The official language is Hindi / English, though many of the Members of Parliament (MP) speak neither: rather, they speak the language of their own state.

In addition to the central government there are currently 28 states and seven union territories. Each state has its own elected parliament. In broad terms, union territories are administered by the Centre. At Independence, the country was administered according to the jurisdictions originally put in place under the British Raj. Because of the ethnic tensions arising from this administrative organization, states were reformed along linguistic lines under the authority of the States Reorganization Act of 1956. The process of state formation is ongoing. For example, Andhra Pradesh is currently in the process of being split into its original territories of Andhra Pradesh and Telangana.⁵⁴ Each state has an official language, although several states may use the same language, and many languages / dialects may be spoken in a single state.⁵⁵

54. Although the Centre approved this split in late 2009, there is still dispute within the State as to whether it should occur.

55. Official languages represent only a fraction of the total number of languages / dialects spoken in India. The 2001 Census identifies a total of 122 “scheduled and non-scheduled” languages with more than 10,000 speakers (Government of India, 2001b). A “scheduled language” is a constitutionally recognized official language. Oommen (2005) states that more than 1,000 languages and dialects are spoken in contemporary India, and that All India Radio broadcasts in some 170 languages. Hindi, in its various dialects, is the most prevalent language (38 percent of the population). English remains something

Devolution of government to local, rural communities was permitted by the 1992 73rd Amendment to the Constitution. It provides for election of representatives, formalizing ‘government’ by community elders (Government of India, 2007, pp. 129-138). Significantly, this Amendment reserves one third of the seats available for women, a change that Oommen (2005) describes as “nothing short of a revolutionary step which can provide momentum to social transformation in the 21st century”, though he concedes many ways in which these women continue to face gender bias. This phenomenon he describes as “transitional anomie” (p. 53).

Governance

Many aspects of life in India are adversely affected by constraints imposed by poor governance in the form of bureaucracy and corruption. Bureaucracy results in grossly inefficient use of resources. It is partly the result of India’s “planned” economy designed by Nehru on the USSR model, which was in effect for the first four decades of Independence. This included the “License Raj”, a complex system of licensing that controlled private business startup and operations, and therefore effectively stifled the private sector. The transition from a planned economy to an essentially market economy was begun in the 1980s under the Prime Ministership of Rajiv Gandhi. In 1991, as part of the continuation of this liberalization, then Finance Minister Manmohan Singh abolished the License Raj. Nevertheless, in the Heritage Foundation and Wall Street Journal’s (2010) Index of Economic Freedom, which measures various aspects of

of a lingua franca throughout the country, though generally among only the more educated.

constraints on business activity, India scores less than 54 percent, placing it at 124th out of the 179 countries ranked. The World Bank's Ease of Doing Business Index, which also measures the impact of factors in starting up, running, and closing a business, ranks India as 134th out of 183 (World Bank, 2010c). In its evaluation of the larger national economies' "ability to absorb information and communications technology (ICT) and use it for economic and social benefit", the Economist Intelligence Unit ranks India 58th out of 70 on its Digital Economy Rankings, with a score of approximately four out of 10 (The Economist Intelligence Unit, 2010, p. 4). This is somewhat surprising given India's role as an outsourcing resource for services that depend heavily on a digital communications and data storage infrastructure.

Recognizing the significant adverse impact of corruption "on democracy, development, the rule of law and economic activity", in 2000 the UN adopted Resolution 55/61, "An effective international legal instrument against corruption" (UN, 2001b). Prime Minister Manmohan Singh effectively reiterated the UN assertion, remarking that corruption in India impeded creation of a "just, fair and equitable society", and adding that "pervasive corruption in our country tarnishes our image" (Thaindian News, 2009). In describing corruption as "pervasive" it should be noted that "corrupt" practices occur at all levels of society. India's Eleventh Five Year Plan, covering the period 2007-2012, recognizing the adverse impact of poor governance on achieving its objectives of "inclusive growth, reducing poverty and bridging the various divides that continue to fragment our society" defines a plan for addressing governance issues, including corruption and the lack of transparency which tends to facilitate it (Government of India,

2008a, pp. 223-225). Confirming the prevalence of corruption in the country, Transparency International's most recent Corruption Perceptions report ranks India 87th in a survey of 178 nations, with a score of 3.3 out of 10 (Transparency International, 2010, p. 3).

Security

The principal contemporary security issues concern India's relations with Pakistan and China, which result in tensions between three nuclear states having common borders. Tensions with Pakistan have existed since the Partition in 1947. One point of issue is the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, which Pakistan claims as its own. Exacerbating the tension, and causing some rancor between India and the US, is the provision of military aid by the US to Pakistan ostensibly for the purpose of addressing terrorist activity on Pakistan's territory. A common feeling within India is that such aid may be subverted to India's disadvantage. Even without this particular dimension, any favoring of Pakistan is seen, by definition, as antithetical to India's interests. Feelings in India run high with respect to the Mumbai (Bombay) bombings in 2008, undertaken by Pakistani perpetrators, allegedly with support from one of Pakistan's official intelligence agencies (Heinrich Böll Stiftung, 2010; Rotella, 2010; Vasudevan, 2010).

Terrorist activity is also an issue in the 'red corridor' of India, running through 13 states in an approximately south-west direction from Nepal, in the north-east, and with a particularly strong presence and center of activity in the north-eastern states of West Bengal, Jharkhand, Bihar, Orissa and Chhattisgarh. This activity is undertaken by a Maoist / naxalite movement about which Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has said "It

would not be an exaggeration to say that the problem of naxalism is the single biggest internal security challenge ever faced by our country” (Singh, 2006; Zissis, 2008).

Historically there has also been a security issue with Sri Lanka, more specifically the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE), a secessionist movement dating from the mid 1970s whose objective was an independent state in the north east region of Sri Lanka.⁵⁶ The LTTE was widely regarded as a terrorist organization, one of its activities being the assassination of Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in 1991. The LTTE was claimed to be defeated by the Sri Lankan Government in 2009, though there has been activity attributed to them in Tamil Nadu since then. Despite its terrorist designation, the LTTE has had continuing support both within India and in the Tamil diaspora (Acharya, 2010).

Social Factors

Since 1990 the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) has published statistics that provide an overview of human development and human poverty for all 192 members of the UN. The Human Development Index (HDI) measures factors related to life expectancy, expected educational attainment, and per capita income, and computes a composite value for these factors. In its most recent report, India places towards the bottom of the “Medium Human Development” category, ranking 119th with a score of .52 out of 1 (UNDP, 2010, p. 145). The title of this report, which includes the words “the real wealth of nations” recognizes the central place of people in national welfare. The former Human Poverty Index (HPI), using factors including life expectancy, adult

56. Sri Lanka is an island to the east and south of India.

literacy, access to “improved” water sources, underweight children, and population below the poverty line, showed India as ranking 88th (UNDP, 2009, p. 177). This metric has been replaced by in the most recent report by the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI).⁵⁷ This is a more refined metric, developed by Sabina Alkire,⁵⁸ assessing both actual and risk of poverty across multiple dimensions related to health, education, and living standards, and provides for significantly more focused visibility of poverty related issues. India’s MPI is 0.3, indicating a substantial prevalence of ‘poverty’ (UNDP, 2010, p. 162). What follows is a more detailed view of some of the factors contributing to the HDI and MPI. It should be recognized, of course, that these factors are not only interlinked, but circular: poverty causes inability to take advantage of such educational services as are available (such as the perceived need for child labor, and emotional, physical and intellectual stunting), and the lack of education circumscribes employment opportunities.

India’s Millennium Development Goals report (Government of India, 2009a), based on data mostly collected between 2006 and 2008, and therefore representing data at the half way mark for overall achievement of the goals, provides background information related to progress on achievement of the eight MDGs related to the manifestations of poverty, their causes, and the means to diminish, if not eradicate, them. The objectives

57. Sah & Bhatt (2008) produced a detailed study of “multidimensional unfreedom”, in rural villages in Madhya Pradesh. This term includes other factors which constrain human development and autonomy.

58. For Alkire’s contribution to the development of this metric, Foreign Policy (2010) placed her 66th on their list of “the top 100 global thinkers”.

set out in the MDGs are consistent with the basic precepts of Nehru's "tryst with destiny", reified in India's Constitution, and also reflected in India's Five Year Plans.⁵⁹

The report identifies advances in education – specifically universal provision of primary education and gender parity – health, safe water, and telecommunications. The report also identifies individual goals, together with the targets and indicators to quantify the extent to which goals have been met (pp. 3, 8-13). Some of the key indicators from this report show that approximately 300 million people – approximately 25 percent of the total population – are living below the poverty line. The prevalence of underweight children still stands at 46 percent, indicating continuing food insecurity. In primary education, net enrolment of primary school aged children stands at 96 percent, with much of the shortfall (from 100 percent) occurring in hard-to-reach poor, rural areas. There continue to be gender disparities, with girls being under-represented. Overall, literacy in the 15-24 year old age group is estimated at 82 percent. Women continue to be under-represented in the work force and public sector administration, only partly accounted for by the continuing disparities in educational opportunities afforded to, or taken up by, females at primary, secondary and tertiary levels. This under-representation continues despite positive discrimination for females provided for by the Constitution as one component of "reservation". Child mortality – i.e. the percentage of live births resulting in death before the fifth birthday, stands at approximately seven percent. Most of these deaths (five percent) occur within the first year, and the majority of these within the first

59. The most recent Plan is the Eleventh, dated 2008, covering the period 2007-2012.

month, of life. Maternal mortality stands at approximately ¼ of one percent. Incidence and prevalence of HIV/AIDS, malaria and TB are reported to be in decline.

Expanding upon the education sector, relatively new legislation requires local governments to provide “free and compulsory education to all children of age six to fourteen years”, i.e. primary education. The law obliges parents / guardians to place elementary aged children in school, and requires local governments to provide and administer the resources necessary to implement the provisions of the Act, without charge (Government of India, 2009b). Despite these legal provisions, longer standing legislation concerning child labor, and a statement of intent set out in the National Common Minimum Programme, there continue to be issues with the prevalence of child labor (Government of India, 1986, 2004, 2008a). The National Common Minimum Programme also described steps to counter “communalist” moves, especially in education, to “Hinduize” India, which runs counter to the Constitution’s provisions related to social diversity. With respect to continuing gender issues in education, Shashi Tharoor, the MP for the state of Kerala, noting that a more educated society was necessary to facilitate growth in the economy, has suggested that education for girls is particularly important, because “an educated girl acquires the ability to empower her family”. He also drew particular attention to the need for more post-secondary education facilities in the form of vocational colleges (The Hindu, 2010).

In order to improve the status of historically weaker segments of society, India’s Constitution (and legislation enacted under its authority) provides for a form of “affirmative action”, by a system of “reservation”. This requires that in a number of

contexts, members of the designated categories of people, which include scheduled tribes, scheduled castes, backward classes, and women are given preferential treatment. This extends, for example, to education, employment, and government.

Infrastructure

A major constraint on India's economic, and therefore also human development, is poor infrastructure. The Government of India's (2008a) Eleventh Five Year Plan covering the period 2007 – 2012 identifies transport, energy, urban infrastructure (housing and related services), and communications as the primary components of physical infrastructure. For each of these components it identifies existing and anticipated constraints, together with plans for remediation during the plan period. The Plan envisages a nine percent growth in the economy, which is consistent with Ahluwalia's (2010) projections referenced above.

The vast majority of domestic passenger and freight transportation utilizes the road and rail networks. The rail network, largely a legacy of British colonization, is in need of substantial modernization and increases in carrying capacity to meet both existing and projected demand for services. Roads are recognized as a critical component of transportation infrastructure in order to support economic growth, and to provide access to services such as hospitals in remote rural areas, but these are described as “grossly inadequate in various respects”.

Economic growth is constrained by the availability of appropriate energy sources. This is a factor not just for medium to large scale industry, but also for the support of ‘sole trader’ entrepreneurship, which constitutes a vital, substantial and growing

component of economic activity. Provision of clean energy is also required to improve quality of life for a significant percentage of the population – especially women and girls – since more than half the population does not currently have access to any form of commercially supplied energy (for example, electricity). The issue is exacerbated by increasing population, and continuing rural to urban migration. The Plan describes electricity shortages, especially to accommodate peak power requirements, as “persistent”. Contributing to production shortages are inadequate supplies of the natural gas and uranium required as fuel for gas-based and nuclear generating plants respectively: as a result these plants are running below capacity. In addition, transmission and distribution networks are insufficient to handle such production as can be achieved. Coal is by far the primary energy source, which has implications on renewability and the environment. Other non-renewable sources are petroleum, natural gas, and to a lesser extent nuclear. Some attention is being paid to renewable sources such as hydro-electric and wind, but these will contribute only a small percentage of the total resource for the foreseeable future.

Urban centers are the primary generators of economic activity, accounting for approximately 70 percent of GDP, even though only one third of the country’s population inhabits these areas. Increasing population in the urban centers, including the continuing rural to urban migration, stresses housing, water, energy and sanitation resources, all of which affect public health adversely. Contributing to the stress is outdated, poor governance, and lack of finance.

Lack of housing for the urban population gives rise to slum and squatter settlements. These settlements generally have very poor access to such basic services as water and sanitation. According to the Plan, in 2001/2002 approximately 14 percent of the urban population was made up of slum dwellers. For all urban populations, though there is some access to water from tubewells and handpumps, the quality of this water is often poor, and is increasingly at risk from lowered water tables. The absence of adequate sanitation facilities frequently gives rise to open-field defecation. Even where sewerage exists, the capacity for waste treatment is insufficient for the demands placed upon it.

Advanced communications technology available throughout the country is required for both economic and social development. Rural areas are particularly poorly served by the existing communications infrastructure, despite the relatively low cost of mobile telephones and satellite communications channels. It is of particular importance to the information technology sector, which makes a significant contribution to GDP. A constraint on the growth of this sector is an adequate supply of suitably trained personnel.

External Assistance (Aid)

India continues to receive both bilateral and multilateral aid to fund some of its economic objectives. Historically, and especially during the Cold War years, the US provided substantial quantities of aid, as did the USSR, in furtherance of their foreign policy objectives. During this period, however, India remained politically 'non-aligned'. In recent years, significant providers of bilateral aid have included G8⁶⁰ countries and the

60. In the case of the US, bilateral aid is provided through the agency of USAID.

EU; multilateral providers have included agencies of the World Bank. Contemporary aid is oriented to “a supportive role in financing major infrastructure projects, social sector projects and in building up the institutional capacity.” As an indication of the reduction in dependence on aid in more recent years, partly attributed to the maturation of the Indian economy, “tied aid” (which attaches sometimes negative conditionalities on the provision of that aid) has ceased, as has food aid provided since the 1950s by the US under Public Law 480 (Government of India, 2008b). Aid is also supplied via NGOs such as World Vision (see <http://www.worldvision.org>).

Conclusion

Chapter II identified the emergence of the BRIC countries in the last decade as one of many significant post-WWII phenomena signaling a substantial and continuing diffusion of global influence away from the US. This Chapter has focused on India, being one of those emerging nations, and enumerated some perceptions, both from within India and by external observers, of India’s increasing presence and influence on the world stage, perceptions which necessarily imply a diminution in the global influence of the US. It has also provided a brief exposition of factors within India related not only to the country’s aspirations for its future as a global actor, but also to its vision for significant social improvement domestically, and some of the means by which it intends to achieve this vision. These factors include military, economic, political, governance, security, social issues, infrastructure, and external assistance (otherwise known as ‘aid’). The scope of the Chapter is intended to be sufficient for the purpose of providing contextualization for statements made by Indian students about their perception of India’s

present and future place in the world, and the internal issues requiring resolution to achieve their definition of a 'developed' nation. These statements were made in conversations with them during my visit to India in July and August 2010. Chapter IV, which follows, contains a synthesis of these statements, together with appropriate commentary and elaboration. Taken together, these Chapters add substance to the conclusion in Chapter II that there are viable contenders for some of the influence currently exerted on the world stage by the US, of whom India is but one. They also suggest the possibility of an increase in tensions between nations (and possibly other actors) that has the potential for escalation into conflict. Avoiding these tensions and conflicts brings to center stage the necessity for America to recast its own role as a cooperative partner, rather than a largely self-interested, independent actor, in the world community. This requires America to create for itself a new myth that, in a spirit of awareness, understanding and respect, takes appropriate cognizance of the expectations and aspirations of others. This sets the stage for Chapter V, which proposes elements of an educative process within the US whose purpose is to create the space in which such a myth may emerge.

CHAPTER IV

VOICES FROM INDIA

Chapter III provided some evidence that India is a specific example of one of several ‘emerging nations’ contributing to relatively recent changes in relationships between the US and the rest of the world which were outlined in Chapter II. These changes strongly suggest the need for the US to re-evaluate at least those aspects of its myth of American Exceptionalism relating to its superior and salvific posture to the world. Chapter III also provided background information about India that serves to establish a context in which to understand the views expressed by Indian students – the participants in this study – with respect to India’s current and future place in the world that are the focus of this Chapter. In essence, those views express considerable confidence in India’s increasing influence in world affairs. This confidence is justified partly by the expectation of a continuing substantial growth in the Indian economy. Added to this is the perception of a degree of decline in the West – especially in the US – that is partly attributable to development both in India and other nations (such as the other BRIC countries). The participants identified a number of constraints on both social and economic development domestically; these they regarded as India’s responsibility to address, though they also pointed out the negative impacts upon India of some Western / US actions, even though these actions were sometimes in contradiction of stated policy. They also identified some matters in which international co-operation was required in the

interests of responsible global citizenship. To a degree, therefore, participants' views reinforced the need for reformulation of some aspects of the myth of Exceptionalism.

Preparation

As a Westerner (specifically British with a long history of residence in the US) with no prior direct experience of India, there were some special considerations in preparing for and conducting these conversations. While this research could not be regarded as an intervention in an actual conflicted setting, its method has been guided by Lederach (1995), Mitchell (2002) and Stringer and Dwyer (2005), who inform the approach to be taken when interacting in a culturally unfamiliar context. In essence, this requires a diligent effort to avoid ethnocentrism, especially any form that might be perceived as imposing a foreign value-set upon participants. It further requires that the researcher acquire sufficient knowledge of the context to demonstrate authentic interest in relevant subject matter, and to be able to pose questions that are not only cognizant of the context, but also framed in such a way as to provide space for participants to develop themes and ideas that are significant to them, rather than to the researcher. Given the nature and scope of the enquiry, this required some preliminary reading on at least political, economic and cultural matters – both historical and contemporary – primarily from an Indian perspective. As part of this research, I read parts of online versions of the South Indian Tamil language daily newspaper *Dinamalar* (*Daily Flower*) for a three month period before leaving for India. This reading proved particularly useful, since much of the conversation included topics that had been reported upon in this source. Lastly, I had a number of informal conversations with first and second generation Indians

resident in the US, together with some Indian nationals visiting the US. These included extended conversations with my wife, who was born in the South Indian state of Tamil Nadu, and lived there for her first 30 years.

LeBaron (2003) emphasizes the importance of “cultural fluency”, which includes but is not limited to language, in achieving successful cross-cultural interactions. In Tamil Nadu, English is not only taught in all levels of schooling; it is also the medium of instruction in educational establishments. Nevertheless, the predominant language is the official language of the state, Tamil. This is partly because many people do not have a sufficient level of education to be able to converse in English; some may be able to understand relatively simple English, but not have sufficient command of the language to respond in English. While language was not expected to be an issue with the Chennai participants, it was a factor in day-to-day interactions with other local people. These included hotel staff, restaurant servers and auto-rickshaw drivers. They also included more ‘informed and educated’ people who contributed anecdotal evidence related to the topics that were discussed with the student participants. It was also found that compared with the participants in the urban setting of Chennai, those in rural Nazareth were less competent in English – at least in spoken English. It should be noted, however, that even in Chennai, idiosyncrasies in the use of English vocabulary, sentence structure and idiom did result in some statements that were difficult to understand. There has been some editing in the quotations below intended to facilitate comprehension without compromising their integrity. The various regional accents of the participants were also sometimes difficult to understand. To some extent this was reciprocal: my own accent

was unfamiliar to participants, and some expressions common in the UK and / or the US were either not understood, or misunderstood. These ‘communication gaps’ were to a large extent identified and closed by the presence of my Tamil-speaking wife. In the case of the conversation with the Nazareth participants, my wife’s familiarity with the nature of the enquiry was of particular value, since a reasonable ‘translation’ of both questions and answers depended upon it.

The most mindfully aware researcher may be led astray by the invisibility of his or her own ethnocentrism, even when diligently looking out for its manifestations: one’s own culture is normative and therefore unremarkable (Joseph, 2000). LeBaron (2003) describes this as “auto-ethnocentrism”. Also, when venturing into unfamiliar territory some aspects of the culture “on a strange island” (Greene, 1981) may be obvious when they are encountered, but others may be opaque (at least until it is too late) – and violating the cultural standards may be damaging to the research.

Methodology

Appendix A describes fully the methodology used for identifying and recruiting participants, and obtaining and synthesizing the ‘data’ for this study. What follows is a brief exposition of this methodology.

University students were selected as participants because they were more likely than many other sectors of the population to be “informed” (Eldridge, 1969, p. 85). Ayithey (2005), writing in the context of students in African countries describes these as the “Cheetah generation”: they are “go-getters”, the ones to make things happen, essentially unencumbered by the baggage of their freedom-fighting forbears (pp. xix-xx).

Kalam (1998) speaks of the Indian equivalent – though admittedly approximately a generation more distanced from the Independence movement than most of the African countries – as ‘ignited minds’.

I had conversations with three cohorts of students. Part of the reason for using more than one cohort was to reduce the possibility of a mild form of ‘groupthink’ operating between the participants. Two of these cohorts comprised post-graduate students in Colleges and Universities in Chennai. Most of these students were enrolled in Masters or Doctoral programs in either the department of Econometrics or the department of Politics and Public Administration at the University of Madras.⁶¹ There were four participants in the first cohort, and 18 in the second, although a small number of these participants were present for only one conversation. These participants were evenly split between male and female. The third cohort comprised 23 pre-service teachers in their final (third) year of a Bachelor of Arts program at a rural College in Nazareth. Of these, 19 were female and four were male. The original plan had been for a cohort of Masters level students in Economics, whose principal differences from the Chennai participants were expected to manifest in socio-economic standing, and a lesser general awareness of matters remote from the immediate geographical area. This plan was overturned by last minute maneuvering on the part of the College Principal, when we were already on campus.

Overall, some 50 percent of the participants in the two Chennai cohorts contributed to the conversations. All of these participants exhibited strong English, and

61. Madras is the former name of Chennai, but is still frequently used.

the conversations were therefore conducted almost exclusively in English. Given that the University of Madras caters primarily for residents of the State of Tamil Nadu, there was an unexpected diversity of participants. Several students came from the neighboring State of Kerala, a smaller number from more northerly States, and two from neighboring countries. At least two had spent time out of the country, either in Europe or in the US.

In Nazareth only a small percentage of the participants contributed to the conversation. This may be attributable to a number of factors: a dialogical approach was unfamiliar to them – their educational experience is effectively limited to a passive role reminiscent of Freire’s “banking” method; a lesser facility in English (compared with the Chennai participants) required that both the questions I asked, and the responses to those questions, be ‘translated’; and the more socially conservative culture may also have limited participation. Overall, this cohort was in many ways more homogeneous, which was to be expected from a College that catered to a relatively small, rural region.

There were two conversations, a few days apart, with each of the Chennai cohorts. For each cohort the two conversations lasted a combined total of approximately three hours. There was one conversation with the Nazareth cohort, which lasted one hour. All of the conversations were recorded both on video and a separate (theoretically redundant) audio recorder. The recordings were augmented by hand-written notes.

The format of the conversations was heavily influenced by Stringer and Dwyer’s (2005) description of ‘guided conversations’ (pp. 57-75). In essence, this method of data collection provides considerable space for participants to take the conversation in directions that are significant to them. This is in contrast to conversations in which

‘answers’ are effectively circumscribed by a pre-determined set of questions, even when those questions are open-ended (Fiumara, 1990). As a partial result of opening up this space, much of the conversation took place between participants, which provided a number of perspectives on the topics that they related, on their own initiative and in their own way, to the ‘seed’ questions.

With each cohort, the conversations were structured along the lines of participants’ perceptions of India’s current place in the world; their vision for India’s future; impediments to achievement of that vision and how those impediments might be removed; and the impact – both positive and negative – of the activities of external actors. More specific questions were used as follow-up to ‘answers’, or to precipitate elaboration. It transpired that this mode of operating was unfamiliar even to the advanced students: towards the end of the second conversation with the second cohort, two participants remarked, at considerable length, that in general even post-graduate students, at least up to Masters level (which therefore included many of these participants), acted in the role of passive recipients of ‘knowledge’ dispensed by their professors.

On return to the US, the video and audio recordings were transcribed, and the principal themes relating the subject of this Dissertation were extracted and synthesized into the findings set out below.

Findings

The conversations with each cohort were guided by a small set of questions concerning India’s current place in the world; its vision for the future; impediments to

achievement of that vision and how those impediments might be removed; and the impact of the activities of external actors. These questions, and the method for conducting the conversations, left a great deal of freedom for participants to develop their ideas in many directions.

Those participants in the Chennai cohorts who spoke appeared to be generally well-informed on both domestic and foreign issues, and demonstrated a well-developed level of critical thinking. Their considerable participation, including the willingness to engage both other participants and me with different, sometimes conflicting, views tended to dispel an initial concern that for various reasons they would be circumspect in expressing their opinions. In particular, some statements made were, or could be construed as, negative to the West in general and the US / UK in particular. Given that participants were aware that I was British, living in the US, and conducting this research under the auspices of an American University,⁶² the willingness of these participants to speak (seemingly) relatively freely engendered considerable confidence that their views were candidly expressed. The Nazareth participants demonstrated a lesser awareness and knowledge of matters outside the local community than the Chennai cohorts, and in some respects their views appeared to tend towards the conservative.

Many of the views expressed by participants were consistent not only with participants in other cohorts, but also with the material presented in Chapters II and III. On some topics, nevertheless, there was some ambiguity and ambivalence; there were

62. Though one participant, as we were concluding the last conversation, asked if my research was sponsored by the Tamil Nadu Government.

also some instances of substantive, heated disagreement between participants in the same cohort.

India's Place in the World

Can India become a global superpower, overtaking the United States? (Sign in Chennai Airport, July 2010)

Participants generally considered India to be a rising nation, with a substantially increasing presence and influence in the world, which they expected would continue for the foreseeable future. They attributed this largely to the growth in India's economy both absolutely, and as a percentage of the world economy, especially as they perceived some degree of decline in the West. They envisioned that this would bring additional political influence at the international level. They were aware that India was not the only country perceived to be growing (economically) at a high rate in both absolute and percentage terms – reference was frequently made to the other BRIC countries,⁶³ particularly their neighbor China, with whom they saw elements of competition and tension. They also recognized that there were many domestic constraints on growth that needed to be overcome for India to reach its potential, and many domestic social issues that they felt needed resolution, partly because these too were constraints on growth, and partly because of the moral implications embedded in Nehru's "Tryst with Destiny", with which they were generally in sympathy.

63. The BRIC countries are Brazil, Russia, India and China.

Participants described India as economically “on the map”, one of the BRIC emerging countries developing quickly, including in the industrial sector. The rate of growth was compared not unfavorably with China:

India is one of the developing countries right now, developing at a very fast pace behind China. And India is one of the BRIC countries that has been developing really fast – like, Brazil, Russia, India and China ... Industrialization is happening at a rapid pace.

The growth in the economy was attributed to a number of factors, with the transition from the immediately post-Independence socialist model of industrialization designed by the first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru in which the means of production were almost exclusively in public ownership – there was very little private sector or foreign investment activity – to a more liberalized market economy in the 1990s playing a significant part. Even so, the economy did not flourish until the passing of the 2000 Information Technology Act, at which point foreign companies (MNCs) started to invest in India:

India could have developed much faster than what was expected. But the big concern was that over the years the government that has ruled the country has been running protectionist policies in the name of protecting local industries ... and Indira Gandhi, when she was ruling the country, she brought in an economic policy wherein she discouraged these private companies from developing. All the money which are in the hands of private companies were given to the poor. Many of the disparities happened. Protection really despoiled the economy, and just after 1990 when Narasimha took over and now Manmohan Singh government is involving in MNCs and bringing here.

... when public ownership in India, it was not exercised as it was warranted, and we saw decline in industries, there's not much foreign industry, not much foreign direct investments coming in, and there's not much Indians who are willing to

accept say to Tata and Goodrich and Ambani who came in the later half of the 90s and except them there was no private sector ownership. And we saw a decline in the economy in, I think first, I'm not sure of the dates, I think 1975, 77, and then again in 1985, 86 something. That's what propelled people Narasimha government to go for this new economic policy and even then, even after that was being found there was not much growth, except when this 2000 I. T. Act, Information Technology Act came to India. That's when all the MNCs and factories are starting up their companies and industries in India.

Participants provided data to support their remarks concerning economic growth.

One, claiming considerable forward planning on the part of some of India's economic actors, described initiatives that had been seriously considered by Indian companies to rescue American banks in the wake of the sub-prime financial crisis in 2008 and 2009, the acquisition that had been made in Africa by the Indian company Bharti in the telecommunications sector, and other initiatives that were under consideration outside the service sectors of information technology, software, and business process outsourcing:

I have been in a place where I have seen recession to the core and at that point of time I have seen literally some banks in India almost ready to ready almost to be a part of a cartel that was trying to help and save some American banks. I had an idea of so many things. Now it's not just completely stupid that some companies almost form a cartel and want to go and invest in the US in a bank that's literally falling down the next day. I'm talking about 2009, 2008 and 2009. At that point of time, they were really looking at it. They were looking at some business, like, they were looking at something that they knew would give them some kind of fruit. So there is future. If there was no future there wouldn't have going into such things. And I think almost every other person, every other top-end company you talk about in India is looking at merger and acquisition with some other company which is in another country. So there is a lot of fuel there, there's a lot of kind thing that there is ... They know that the future is bright. You already captured the market in India but there is another place outside, probably South Africa, or you know the African nations where you can really hit good places. For example just recently I remember just a few days back, two, three months back, there's Bharti, which is supposed to be like India's number one cell phone provider, he could have been happy saying India is good, we're doing well in India, why should we go abroad? They bought Zain over in Africa so I think that

there is diversification that is happening. It's not just IT, software, BPO consulting. It's increasing, it's moving far and wide and we are restricting ourselves to these things but there's a lot more than that there are lot of other businesses that India is getting into.

Even so, development was hampered in a number of ways. Party politics and their conflicted economic ideologies introduced elements of protectionism to favor particular communities and block development projects. These political influences were articulated as

One more hurdle to India's development saga is that communism has started to rise in our country who are opposing every major economic reform in our country in the name of protecting this community, that community. For example they are opposing foreign trade in India, they are opposing these big infrastructure projects. They want their own heterarchy of government of India, putting hurdles to all sorts of development and I think everyone who is a member of the Alliance Partner is opposing industrialization. This is not valid. So that is a big hurdle for development at the moment, the rise of and growth of regional parties and communalistic proposals.

Anachronistic government policies – a bureaucracy whose inefficiency was also noted in other contexts – also contributed to making it difficult for India to achieve its potential:

I think if you look into the actual holistic strength of India I think we are way ahead, we have a lot of potential, but it's not being put to use or channelized properly, that's what I feel ... Because there are a lot of constraints, a lot of bottlenecks like government policies, as we see, like they are not up-to-date, they are outdated, they are obsolete. So they are using the same administrative methods that there were using in 1950, 1960, 1970. Somebody has to tell them that times have changed. Times are changing and a lot of MNCs are coming in. They need to know how to adjust to the newer challenges.

Even though the License Raj, a complex, time-consuming and costly bureaucratic system of business permitting, had been essentially dismantled as part of liberalization, permitting continued to constrain business development, even for very small businesses:

But in the bureaucracy there will be ... many processes you have to follow and people get stuck up and they don't want to go there even. Like in institutions you want to apply for something, you want to open a shop, you have to get your license. To go over there is a huge line you have to state what time you have to go. People end up just leaving.

There was a sense that India's position (together with China's) was enhanced by the perceived decline of the West. Expressions of this decline included

[India] has a very strong structural system, and it is very futuristic in the world at large. And nowadays because of the Western world, the collapse of the, going down of the Western world now India and China is essentially becoming important.

Another participant, however, saw the 'decline of the West' more as a temporary phenomenon in the wake of the 2008 sub-prime crash, and translated India's visibility into a perception in the West that India – given its large potential consumer base, and despite the relative poverty of that base – constituted a market opportunity:

Definitely you know [India is] on the map now at least. I mean, well I guess ever since more recently it's been focused after what we have seen as the collapse of the Western world financial markets ... I guess we have something else to offer, it does have markets as well as consumer base. Yes, so especially India, when it comes to consumerism, yes we have a very huge consumer base, so probably that's what interests the West right now ...

There was nevertheless an expectation that economic growth would continue, and result in a continuing, significant improvement in India's status. One participant envisaged a five year time frame for moving out of 'developing' status, though another thought a time frame longer by an order of magnitude was more realistic:

Definitely I think we can say in the next few years, five years even there could be a kind of, look out for India in a different perspective: no longer would it be a developing country.

... software is one area which is going to take India further in the next 20 to 30 years. That is a possibility, that we will be in par with China, Brazil and USSR (sic).

The reference in this comment to software was in the context of conversation about India's service sector, which included (though was not limited to) software. It was also cognizant of the fact that much of India's growth was service based, in contrast to China's manufacturing orientation.

Participants noted some undesirable outcomes associated with economic growth, especially for some less-privileged segments of the community. These included a growing disparity in real incomes. One participant expressed this as:

Looking to the wide disparities that occur with the pace [of economic development] is that there's a lot of, there's two different parallel economies in India. That is, one economy having the rich and one economy the poor.

This thought was later echoed, and elaborated upon, by another participant as:

India is, also has a very extreme point: some are ... very poor where they have no place to sleep and no food to eat, things like that, but some are very, very rich, ... again there's extremes: some are very modernized and Westernized, some are

very conservative and still follow orthodoxy. There is so much complexity and contradiction between the two sides in every field, social and political and economics, finance. India has a very clear future, but based on this development is very slow but it has a very firm structure I guess.

Another participant, possibly confusing cause and effect with respect to ‘the top half that is making industry powerful’, nevertheless clearly perceived increasing disparity, and the fact that no effective attention was being paid to this situation:

I think like he [the participant quoted above] mentioned there are two Indias, basically one that is extremely very below the poverty line, and one that is very above the poverty line. So I think it's the other half, the top half that is making industry powerful. ... The rich are becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer. No one is doing anything about that.

Yet another participant, using the local IT industry as an example, felt more strongly about the negative human impact of this disparity, and was vexed that others seemed unaware, or unconcerned:

... you have the IT industry flourishing in your country, don't you see the income gap, just like, you know, its elevating like anything, don't you see that? Just because the IT's flourishing, for instance, take Chennai as an example, don't you see the pain, don't you see the heat, the rising income gap here?

A second concern – not shared by all participants – was the extent that land development often entailed the displacement of large numbers of people, often with inadequate compensation. A specific example given was that of the development of the infrastructure for the Commonwealth Games, to be held in New Delhi in October 2010,⁶⁴

64. At the time of this conversation, the Commonwealth Games were still two months in the future.

though more general statements were made about development in economy boosting

Special Economic Zones (SEZ):

[T]his concern with displacement has just arrived in like 20 years, 10 years time because there are a lot MNCs and SEZs being developed as well as the Commonwealth Games, so in lieu of these Special Economic Zones and Export Crossing Zones they require a huge area, so these guys are given areas in rural setups and those people who have already set up their homes there, they are asked to move away from that particular place ...

However, displacement was associated with slum clearance generally, in which monetary compensation to the displaced people was considered partial justification. At least one participant considered this inadequate, since it failed to address the social and economic consequences for those displaced:

... I think it's great if a slum is cleared and you get toilets instead. The only problem is in most cases the rotten compensation we have for people, but that seems to be a constant problem, especially in northern India where you have a lot of slum clearance is happening. More than again the problem with compensation is being addressed but not taking into consideration their emotional needs, because there is a point when you evacuate a slum probably about 2,000 people which for a slum which is located in the heart of a city and then you pull them out about 250 km away from the city even though you build them good four-bedroomed houses even with a penthouse, it doesn't serve the purpose for them because they lose their livelihood.

Confidence in India's future led to remarks about significant enhancement in India's influence in the world, but with undertones of tension – if not outright conflict. The possibility of achieving 'superpower' status was raised. Initially, in one group, one participant conceded, without enthusiasm, that this was a possibility, but was much more concerned with domestic issues, especially those related to governance and inflation:

It's a possibility, there's nothing which is impossible. The current government is doing an excellent job, if they can do such a good job there's a possibility, but the concern in corruption and price rise.

Another was less confident, considering China's growth, even with an expectation of decline in the US:

Well I am of the opinion that it can but it cannot surpass China. I'm very skeptical about it, because China I think that will be the global leader in some years, and the US will definitely lose power. China, India, then I think it's going to be Germany.

Reference was made to the fact that both China and India were relative latecomers to significant economic development, compared with the US:

I think the US has had like a 100 year head start so it's going to take some time to catch up.

This was conceded, but this did not affect the expectation that China would take precedence over India, with the teaching of English in China being a contributing factor:

The US has definitely had its day but I think that China is going to be the next global leader because they are going at a very fast pace and they are like, India is not winning and they are even learning English right now so I think that will be an added bonus.

The idea of 'superpower' status was explored in greater depth with a second group, with questions being raised as to how many 'superpowers' there should be, which countries they should be, and what consequences flowed from superpower status. One description, reflecting both India and China's growth, was

China, yes, it is a part of, you know, something that we're looking at. But to be honest, if you've been reading The Economist for past few days you'd see that China is trying to compete with India. It's looking at a position, like two people are, it's like literally like two people are fighting for the top slot kind of thinking.

Questioned on the term “top slot”, this participant replied (though requiring some further prompting, and then with hesitation)

Quite literally, what US is today. This is in making for the entire world. [This is] absolutely desirable.

As to whether India and / or China should be superpowers (the US apparently discounted at this point), one observation was strongly conditioned by a recollection of the US/USSR Cold War era, and the repercussions of the standoff between those two poles of power on much of the rest of the world:

[I]n the interest of the nation, I think it will be common for everyone else, if there's only one superpower. Because everywhere we have seen there are two superpowers actually then they keep taking sides and there are a lot of for instance Cold Wars arise. But I would certainly feel that let India or China, either of the two, be a superpower not two both together ...

Another participant noted that economic influence alone was insufficient to merit superpower status; military power was also necessary:

[T]o be in the position where America is we have the muscle power as well as the money power we need.

The desirability of this status was not, however, accepted by all. There was concern, expressed angrily by one participant, that power was – or at least should be,

morally – inextricably linked with responsibility, and that in the context of occupying a ‘top position’, that responsibility had international implications:

I don't think we'd be able to make enough of the kind of peace we need to have across the globe. Will we do that? Do we ever think of creating peace when we have money, power, and everything in our hand? Does America think that way? I don't think so!

This impassioned view resulted in a more conservative reframing of the ‘top slot’ posture as

Obviously it's desirable to be the man on top ... But I believe we should be more concerned about our economic prosperity. People think, I believe, people think other things are more important. That should be top slot. That's what everyone should aspire to. More than deciding who gets to do what. We don't want to be told what to do.

This introduced a new concept, a desire for autonomy, a theme which recurred in the context of external assistance, where bilateral assistance was perceived by at least one participant to expose India to an unacceptable element of control by outsiders.⁶⁵

There was an overall sense that superpower status might be achieved in a relatively short time frame, despite the caveats raised. One participant expressed concern over this, recognizing that the necessary underlying stability might be absent:

I think if time element is longer it would be better because the more longer the process of development takes the better and stronger your platform is. So people might say, you know the next 10 years we want to see India as the US, or we want to see India like you know at the top. But that would be like not sustainable for too long because you've just come up too quick. It's like becoming a rich man all

65. See “External Assistance”, below.

of a sudden and losing it the next day. So time element, the longer it is the better it is.

The value of being a superpower, and its relationship to the fulfillment of domestic needs was also questioned:

But I feel that in some way something about superpower India can develop itself (e)quality wise and then look ahead to the superpower mark because there's nothing to it, you don't achieve anything by being a superpower.

There was also risk of being displaced, sooner or later, by some other power:

But still like it's not necessary that you have to be a superpower ... Even if you're a superpower in this modern times you have a lot of countries making you step down. It's not like earlier when there was only the [US]. Now there are a lot of, even Iran can come and blast you away. It's not going to be, you're not going to be staying a superpower for like 20 to 30 years.

There was confusion, too, over what sort of power was in question: the previous remark implied military power, but this was not another participant's view:

I don't think so. It'll not be in terms of power you have, it's more in terms of economic things, through trade, everything comes into play.

In this group, there was further dialogue concerning the merits and demerits of superpower status. There appeared to be some confusion over how this status could be achieved (possibly even what it really meant), and the relationship between development and superpower status:

Why do you want to look into other's country when your country is like really underdeveloped? Develop your country and then become a superpower. Being a superpower means you have control over everything that happens in the world.

What I'm trying to tell you is that when they look at the payoff between the two – becoming a superpower and developing the country – which do you think has more appeal?

Developing the country ... Obviously developing a country ...

Do you know how much time that takes? Do you know how much money that takes?

I'm of the opinion that you can't just concentrate your development activity just to one thing. For example ... either you increase the quality of the country or try to be a superpower. You can't do both. And India's doing both ... I'm of the opinion that it's not necessary currently to go for superpower status. Develop yourself, just have a small fund attached to your state's development, just to develop your country status as well as your quality of the country. Then you can also achieve your superpower status.

When prompted on the matter, participants were unimpressed by the possibility of Permanent Membership of the UN Security Council. Indeed, the UN was generally held in low regard, being described as “a silent observer”. Support for India in this regard by other countries was attributed to concerns by those supporters about India's nuclear capability, especially in light of statements made in other contexts, including external assistance, concerning pressure by the US for India to ratify the NPT:

I think that shows India's military power. I think in the eyes of military standing apart from other things, so I think that that's one of the many reasons. They want them to join the Security Council because to some extent the countries are scared of their power in the nuclear ... [cut off by another participant]

In summary, participants were generally optimistic, even over-optimistic, about India's current place in the world, and their prospects for the future. They were

nevertheless cognizant of hindrances and impediments to achieving both their international and domestic aspirations. Of these, the most important were governance and education, which are further described in the following sections. For the most part, the analysis presented by these participants was consistent with Chapters II and III, which described world changes since WWII, and other sources of information related to India's recent history and current (and possibly future) status respectively.

Governance

At every level of governance, the reform of government is today an urgent task before us. (Manmohan Singh, on Inauguration as Prime Minister of India, June 24, 2004)

Participants considered poor governance to be a significant hindrance to India's progress, both in terms of its macroeconomic performance, and in fulfilling what they perceived as India's obligation to improve the standard of living of its poorer people. Governance issues, which pervaded all the conversations, were largely related to systemic corruption and bureaucracy, though where the line might be drawn between the two was difficult to determine. Expressions used included "rampant corruption", "red tape", "bureaucracy takes over the whole system", "bottlenecks", "whatever we try to do it doesn't reach the poor". Describing the phenomenon of resources failing to reach its intended beneficiaries, one participant declared that this was attributable in part to multiple levels of government and administration, each absorbing some of the resource. This was not all attributable to negligence or malfeasance, though this was certainly a

factor. The participant felt that dealing successfully with this issue would significantly reduce the losses:

It comes back to the same point of excessive bureaucracy, too much government levels that come into play. The same thing, by the time the water flows down the mountain the river has like almost gone, it's over, there's almost nothing left. It doesn't reach the people it is supposed to reach. It's not that they are irresponsible, they are not interested in doing. I think there are certain leaders who are interested in doing something, they are looking at a future which is good, but you know there's a difference between the top and the bottom. In between there are a lot of middle men who interfere and meddle with stuff and kind of reduce the effectiveness of that particular policy. If we can reduce that I think more than good, you might have like 80 percent of the problem solved.

Pressed on the use of the word "meddle", this participant rearticulated this, bluntly, as "corruption".

Variations on this form of words were used several times during the course of the conversations. Elaborating on this theme, one participant intimated that government service was regarded by some as an opportunity for 'unofficial' income:

I think when you talk about bureaucracy in India, I think corruption goes with it. One of the main ideas is if you want to join the bureaucracy probably you want to get into a state where you would be able, you know, to have authority power, and at the same time you are able to get money not through the right way. I'm not saying, I'm not generalizing it to all the bureaucrats that I see or that I've heard of, but you know excessive regulations, every time a thing has to move, every time policy has to move from one person to another, these middlemen who have bureaucrats in their pay, they interfere with that. So let's assume that the Centre⁶⁶ allocates a certain amount of money, by the time the money comes down to the people who are supposed to receive I think it must be almost 50 percent or 40 percent of what was sent.

66. The central government.

Another participant, describing how funds intended to address issues faced by people in remote rural areas, put it this way:

And money is the main problem, like it doesn't penetrate, it doesn't penetrate to the real people. It always gets swept in between the office itself, it doesn't go to the right people.

There were concerns about the need for updating administrative processes in order to realize India's potential:

I think if you look into the actual holistic strength of India I think we are way ahead, we have a lot of potential, but it's not being put to use or channelized properly, that's what I feel ... Because there are a lot of constraints, a lot of bottlenecks like government policies, as we see, like they are not up-to-date, they are outdated, they are obsolete. So they are using the same administrative methods that there were using in 1950, 1960, 1970. Somebody has to tell them that times have changed. Times are changing and a lot of MNCs are coming in. They need to know how to adjust to the newer challenges.

There were also concerns about 'special interests', and how political representatives curtailed economic development in order to promote those interests:

One more hurdle to India's development saga is that communism has started to rise in our country, who are opposing every major economic reform in our country in the name of protecting this community, that community. For example they are opposing foreign trade in India, they are opposing these big infrastructure projects. They want their own heterarchy of government of India, putting hurdles to all sorts of development and I think everyone who is a member of the Alliance Partner is opposing industrialization. This is not valid. So that is a big hurdle for development at the moment, the rise of and growth of regional parties and communalistic proposals.

In the political arena, a particular manifestation of corruption was related to elections. There was an exchange of views in which remarks were made about the

possibility of ‘newcomers’ standing for election in order to overcome corruption and other issues. Despite remarks about the “growth of regional parties”, and there being “a lot of parties”, there were those who felt their political choices were limited: “We don’t have choices [of candidates]”. The difficulties involved in standing for election for the first time were explained:

How much money do you have the first time for buying votes? Or at least like show a factor to give a promising thing like okay I can do this, this, this. Because I got this much of money ...

Invited to explain the term “buying votes”, this participant did so, with some embarrassment, and then passion, involving some banging on the table to emphasize his points:

Buying votes is a trade technique which we people have. Understanding that the other communities, understanding certain ignorance of people we have just got, we just did a study that these are the people whom we can influence showing some signs and can be in the form of money, direct money. If you intend to vote for my party, if your entire family intends to vote for my party you will get this much amount of money. But the thing is, you’ve got to keep a track of that this person doesn't take money from the other party and to ensure that the vote has come to you, you have to have someone to monitor him, that he votes for you. If you are able to do all those things, you buy votes. Then we stand for an election, and you have a chance.

There appeared to be a degree of complacency about the existence of corruption, a willingness to regard it as a continuing fact of life – it was the *extent* of the corruption that was at issue. One participant’s “dream” of India as a “developed country” included:

I would say that to be a developed country, corruption not at all being there is too far a thought. Corruption, I mean you earn your money, but put the country first.

That's how it should be. That would be what I would want. Make the country grow. Do the best for the country. But if you earn money along the way I don't have a problem with it.

Asked whether this might be “a bit different from corruption”, given her use of the word “earn”, this participant became ambivalent:

I mean, yes. What I'm trying to tell is put the country first, and then whatever else.

Another partial explanation was the

[lack of] personal integrity of the officials, of the bureaucrats ... the politicians also.

Lack of oversight, possibly bordering on negligence, also had a part to play. One participant recounted a recent conversation with a representative of a large corporation based in Hyderabad, Andhra Pradesh:

He was talking about how the fact that the politicians, how they are corrupt no doubt, but even though they have a lot of developmental activities going on, they don't know the actual performance, because they delegate the authority. For example the different Ministries, the Chief Minister may have a lot of developmental activities listed down, but he gives it to the Ministry, he doesn't know how it is actually implemented. So the guy sitting in the room can say that this much growth has been taking place, this many houses are being built, how many families are being redirected but what are the actual figures he doesn't know. Or he doesn't take the pains to go out and check it out for himself.

Responding to a request to distinguish between corruption and poor administration, he continued:

They might be corrupt, and we don't know exactly for sure that's corruption is going on. Yes it is a little bit, but this is also included in the list because they really don't come to know what's happening. There's a lot of delegation, there's a lot of authorities, there's all Ministers, they delegate, ultimately they don't have the actual. We just have the projected figures.

The relationship between the Centre and the states also contributed to sub-optimal governance. A particular example cited related to the handling of the Tamil Tiger issue in Tamil Nadu. This was a case of a particular state's interests being permitted to override the interests of the country as a whole:

Because when the Sri Lanka issue with the Tamils came up, what happened was the Centre in India could not take any decisions without the Tamil Nadu Government's consent. It was a huge thing. So it will not, ok India taking a decision, but the Centre had to listen to those states, Tamil Nadu because it dealt with Tamils.

Language also contributes to sub-optimal outcomes. Each state has its own official language (though some languages are the official language in more than one state). This results in communication difficulties between Centre and state governments, and also within the central government, since many of the representatives from the states are not familiar with either of the languages having common currency in Delhi – namely, Hindi and English; there is in some cases a complete lack of literacy – and possibly other 'uneducated' behavior – as illustrated in this exchange between several participants:

It's exactly the same in Parliament.

...

Listen people but when you take a government, a parliament, there are so many people who are not literate ... because you know people are educated, at least

mostly, at least in Tamil Nadu and in a lot of states. And then when you look at the Parliament people are behaving, like, and they're throwing pots around, and they're throwing chairs.

And one guy doesn't choose to recognize Parliament because he can't speak in Hindi.

Some people choose not to go to the Parliament because they don't want Hindi to be spoken.

They don't want Hindi to be spoken. And they don't want to learn Hindi.

The Tamil Semmozhi controversy – Tamil should be allowed for the MPs in Parliament.

So we would translate that with hard work. Or English.

...

So language right here is the problem.

The problem is the country is divided on linguistic regions.

In summary, participants identified many aspects of poor governance that contributed to constraints on both economic growth, and the deprivation that poorer segments of the community suffered as a result of not receiving various forms of resource that should be available to them. The primary aspects were bureaucracy (inefficient and ineffective administration), pervasive corruption at many levels of government and administration, and poor relationships and communications between the central and state governments as well as within the central government.

Education

ஆட்சி வேலை அதிகம் இருக்கையில் நாட்டில் கட்டாயக் கல்வி ...

இந்த நாட்டில் எல்லாரும் படித்த நாளில் ...

While what we really need is civic sense, Government wants compulsory education for everyone ... So now everyone in the country is educated, where is the civic sense? ('Thought for the Day', August 3, 2010, at Jeeva Park, T. Nagur, Chennai)

Education, like governance, was a topic that recurred frequently in all the conversations. Participants identified relatively low levels of education and a lack of “civic sense” as a major constraint on development in India, both from the perspective of improving the general welfare of the people of India, especially those in the lower socio-economic segments of the population, and also of boosting the country’s overall economic performance as a pre-requisite to achieving higher standing among the nations of the world. It was noted that macro economic development did not necessarily address the issue of meeting relatively basic needs for a large segment – the poorer segment – of the population, since in practice macro economic development often led to a wider divergence in incomes and wealth. This sentiment was expressed on a number of occasions in a number of ways:

The rich are becoming richer and the poor becoming poorer.

“Low levels” essentially meant not only the prevalence of low literacy levels and basic ‘education for living’ (for example, health and sanitation), but also the relatively low prevalence of people educated at the secondary and tertiary levels that constrained employment for more skilled jobs:

Also, there's a lot of industries in India, a lot of small-scale industries, which are all coming up now, so if we give education to everybody, they'd be able to make it on a bigger scale. Like all these, Kanchipuram, the weavers, they'd be able to take it on a better scale. Which, they'd be able to provide employment to a lot of people. If they knew how to take it further. Right now all they have is skill to do that, so if they also had education to make it bigger, to make it a full-scale industry. They'd be able to give employment. So development of all these small-scale industries could also help and that would come through education. And for education, the government has to enforce it. Which they have started doing. At least to some extent.

Participants were aware of the basic provisions of the recent Right to Education Act which required “free and compulsory education to all children of age six to fourteen years”, i.e. primary education.⁶⁷ The law obliges parents⁶⁸ to place elementary aged children in school, and requires local governments to provide and administer the resources necessary to implement the provisions of the Act, and to do so without charge. Participants had a number of serious reservations about the effectiveness and utility of this law that extended beyond immediate implementation issues.

Nominally education is provided ‘free’, but in many cases the opportunity cost of sending children to school is more than parents can afford. As a result,

a child can go and [say] like I'm not allowed to study.

Prompted for an explanation, a number of contributing factors were presented, which included the economic pressures that lead to forcing children into labor both at

⁶⁷ Government of India (2009).

⁶⁸ And guardians. Synonymous for the purpose here.

home and in the commercial sector, and the absence of infrastructure to support the legal requirements:

Most of them are like child labor. Because most of the families, like they are not earning to that amount so that they can feed and make their child go for education. So most of the families they sell their kids to go for factories or any work, so that time is dead, that child wants to study they can go and ask the government help for studies.

Others elaborated upon the economic causes of child labor:

... why do parents like send their, force their children to choose child labor instead of education? No parent in the world would want to make a little kid of five or ten year work in a sweat shop, no parent in the world would want to do that. I mean it's an economic condition which forces them to do it. So in a way it's because you don't have enough economic, I mean, people are not feeling themselves economically invested enough to let their children forego the extra income, so that they get into the field of education and get a higher education and I think it's the short term difficulties they come into, economic strengths that make them make the choices which they are forced to.

Even legislation nominally prohibiting – or at least regulating – child labor had only limited efficacy:

Also an issue could be that a lot could be interpreted differently. In the Constitution of India⁶⁹ there is a directive of principles of state policy which states that no child below 14 years of age should be employed in any hazardous factories. That is what is defined as child labor. Which means that you can employ children below 14 years in any other kind of work. So that is not abolition of child labor. It is regulation of child labor ... I mean, you contradict your own laws. I mean there are people who interpret it this way.

69. This participant was probably referring instead (or in addition) to the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 (Government of India, 1986).

There were infrastructural issues, too, in terms of the facilities available to meet the legal requirements:

So basically blackboards, absence of teachers, absence of toilets, which led to a lot of kids, especially girls after adolescence, to leave the school of education. Yes, and basically other things, like many of the states don't they have a mid-day meals scheme, but they never actually enforce it. So you have kids who are going to school, but have no food to eat. So it's again problems of malnourishment comes into a parent might have said to bring the kid out to work and get the money and feed him.

The issue of nourishment went deeper than provision of midday meals within the school, but this was often overlooked:

The students, the children will get midday meal. How will you get them dinner and breakfast? There is no chance to get them breakfast and dinner. How can a child live on one meal? It's a big question. Initiative is there but not addressing these issues. They are always speaking of midday meal. They forget about the other things in the family background, those kinds of issues.

There were recourses for some of these issues, though their efficacy was questionable:

We have several cases like within India happening these days, like children coming out of their homes against child labor or marriages before 18,⁷⁰ they approach the police station and they get their problems resolved.

70. Child marriage is a separate issue. With respect to police stations, according to a former senior police officer who was our guide during our stay in southern Tamil Nadu, in order to provide extra protection for women and girls, there is a legal requirement in the state for separate police stations for females, staffed only by women police personnel; there is also a requirement for 30 percent of the police force to be women.

Indeed, laws in general came in for some criticism: of themselves, they achieved nothing:

We can make laws, we can make many laws, India has many laws, in India never a lack of laws, because we don't have the proper implementation system, but the government does not have the capacity to act on that particular purpose. I mean needs of the society, politics, socioeconomical issues...

There was a general feeling too that primary education was not enough in order to prepare people for a productive, self-sufficient life. Rather, a "minimum should be a high school education", perhaps followed by "vocational education" or "[a college] degree". These levels of education suggested by participants would, they felt, equip people to build up potential for employment, and thus "your future is better". "Employment" here included "small scale industries [including one-person business]". It was nevertheless recognized that education, at any level, would not necessarily guarantee employment, let alone employment relevant to the education level or subject matter that had been obtained: it would "Not necessarily [guarantee] relevant employment"

Education in rural areas, especially those in remote parts of the country, came in for special mention. Relevance of education was a key issue, and even in this context corruption was a part of the picture:

Yes, education for life. As in, relevant to, let's say a village needs to be educated. If it's primarily an agricultural village you teach them relevant information to that. So that, you know, they are able to put that into practice. Teach them better irrigation methods, better farming methods, better ways to distribute fertilizer, education about fertilizers. Things like that, things that would actually help them. And tell them how much is the current rate of it, so they don't get fooled by middle managers. Because most of these farmers are completely ripped off by middle managers, who pay them much less than is the actual rate. They don't

make too much money, and they work really hard for it. So education on those lines.

These rural, remote areas had other issues, which pertained to their cultural backgrounds:

They have these beliefs from past centuries, maybe like they are taking it from their grandparents, their forefathers, like these things are like to be kept secret or something like that, and they have built into the belief, and they like to stick to it, like they are orthodox, and they doesn't want to come out from this place ... sometimes it's like for them difficult to take in all [government or NGO] help programs ... people also they doesn't go to hospitals because they have only their own old beliefs. Like they do go to like we say Puja⁷¹ or something like that where they – it's not for proper doctor, like their village doctor, which they just do something like mantras. ... [I]t's a conservative society and a lot of things are still taboo in this society. Like you know people don't talk freely about certain things. So it's like the [Tamil] Nadu mentality stops them from developing or accepting ideas which will, you know, help them to develop.

Education, in the form of literacy, was seen as contributing to addressing these issues, though it was acknowledged that literacy was not a complete answer, and that significant change would be a multi-generational achievement:

So things are happening, things are changing, so the best thing would be the attainment of literacy rate. 100% literacy rate might bring about a little bit of change. That cannot change even everything ... because beliefs and their traditional strengths are carried from generation to generation. So literacy might bring about a little bit of change. It cannot change everything but definitely it will help change.

71. A Hindu religious ceremony.

The relationship between quality and quantity – and along the way a faintly cynical note about ‘rights’ – was raised in connection not only with education, but other ‘social’ services also.

... I think that the ultimate issue actually seems to be quality over quantity. India thinks that you know we give the right to education, right to health, right to everything. But the problem is how exactly the quality of any of these things are. You might say like you know we have 100% literacy rate and every person here in India is probably educated for the first time. You can say that, you know, two years from now, but the point is how exactly is he able to utilize the education that he gets, or how exactly is he trying to probably change the way he looks at things. ... Just providing quantity doesn’t ensure that you know, you have, theoretically you have a very good number to show, but when you talk about quality I think that theory doesn’t translate into practice. Quality is a major issue.

In summary, participants considered education, at least at primary level, as a right, and a key both to social (including economic) development and to improving India’s economic position in the world. Although there are laws in place requiring free, compulsory education at the primary level, there are economic pressures within some families that effectively prevent schooling because children are regarded as a necessary provider, and various societal resistances to according fully with law. These resistances might take generations to overcome. There are also administrative and infrastructural issues that require addressing by the various levels of government, in order to fulfill their legal requirements. There were concerns about the availability of suitable employment even when people have been educated at higher levels than is currently the case.

External Actors

India is affected by the activities of external actors. Essentially, external actors fall into three somewhat overlapping categories: private sector business; providers of

external assistance, or aid, (both bilateral and multilateral); and potential and actual aggressors, both state and non-state. The first two of these categories of actor have both positive and negative impacts; the last, only negative.

In the private sector, much of the conversation revolved around foreign multinational corporations (MNCs) based in countries other than India.⁷² These corporations extend beyond the service sector,⁷³ and include manufacturers from countries such as Korea and Japan, represented by, for example, Mercedes, Nissan, and Toyota.

The benefits of MNC activity include investment in the form of infrastructure (essentially for MNC benefit, but having positive externalities) and creation of jobs, collectively contributing to the general economic growth that provides income and wealth within India. On the other hand, MNC activity was perceived as responsible for, or at least contributing to, a number of adverse outcomes. Examples of these was the extent to which MNCs ‘crowded out’ the rise of indigenous business, the substantially increasing polarization of wealth and income and the seriously adverse effect this had on prices, especially for the poorer segments of the community in urban areas. This includes people for whom business opportunities are adversely impacted by MNC activity. Official support for MNC activity has in some cases resulted in negative externalities. The creation of an environment for MNCs in Special Economic Zones (SEZ) has caused the involuntary relocation of large numbers of people, with significant disruption to their way

72. There are Indian-based MNCs such as Bharti and Infosys, but since they are domestic actors they are not of interest here.

73 . Outsourcing activity is not counted here, because most outsourcing is undertaken by Indian companies on behalf of foreign companies.

of life. One example cited was the development of the site for the October 2010 Commonwealth Games to be held in New Delhi. Another example is that of Coca-Cola activities in Kerala, which resulted in the depletion and degradation of water supplies for the local community. Here is one participant's summary:

I see multinational companies have some positives. That is, they bring about employment, they develop infrastructure, they bring in new technology into our country, they bring an overall development package to India. But on the other hand, they create an impact on Indian domestic industries. Some of the Indian domestic industries, local industries ... all local markets will get affected, then sometimes multinational companies also tend to take Indians for a ride. ... Examples are if a company should enter India, then they should consider the fact that people here in India were running these local markets and local super markets will get affected. Because of the immense competition from Wal-Mart, and it is what many Indians feel, that if MNCs come into India local industries get affected. So first develop the local industries, and develop, and contribute more towards GDP to engage your position, and then bring in MNCs.

Another participant expressed some cautions, likening MNC activity with some aspects of the pre-Independence era. On the positive side, India benefitted from British Colonial infrastructural projects such as the extensive railway network that is still in use today; on the negative side, the same power exerted an unacceptable level of control over India:

So I think that MNC are the British government, the colonizers of previous years because they came in, they brought about a lot of development in India but they had to be chased out. Because they brought about railway network, everything they started. A lot of developments in India but they had to be chased out because they were controlling us. So I think that MNCs is good, but they should be checked periodically.

There was also a sense of hypocrisy in Western / US dealings with India. On the one hand the West claimed to espouse global free trade, but appeared to adopt a different posture when ‘free trade’ was perceived by the West to be antithetical to its own interests:

You [the West / the US] talk about a globalized economy and say that you want the world to be one single market, and then you have people here performing, you say you don’t want jobs to go to Bangalore or Mumbai or any other place; we want the jobs to stay back in Boston or in Detroit. You talk like that.

The agricultural sector was cited as a specific example of protectionist policies in the developed countries having a negative impact on developing countries, particularly taking account of the widely different percentages of population engaged in agricultural activities:

go to anywhere in the developing world you find a significant percentage of the population concentrated in the agricultural sector, and go to any global debate and you find the biggest problems devolving around protectionism for the agricultural sector in the Western world where you have ... the least percentage of the population being involved in that particular sector. So you have a lot of economic imbalances ...

External assistance also engendered mixed feelings. For the most part, participants felt that India was beyond the point at which external assistance was appropriate. India’s problems were for India to resolve, and India was (or needed to become) capable of fulfilling its obligations to its own people. One participant reminded everyone of the immediately post-WWII / post-colonial era, and one of the motivations of assistance providers:

Primarily it's just to any government, especially after the World War, when you had a lot of aid coming from the Western world to the newly independent state, or the post-colonial state. I think the first thing is always security, because most of the developed nations tend to invest a lot on the social infrastructure of most of the developing world. Yes, at the face of it, it might look as great Good Samaritan work, but what one tends to forget is that it is always a safe thing for the developed world to have a safe and secure and a stable neighborhood. So infrastructure, social infrastructure, into the developing world in a way allows a peaceful neighborhood ... That's probably what I see – global security is one, and of course securing your economic interests for the future. These are the two things that I see as the primary ones for any nation to receive aid.

Nevertheless, much of what was said on this topic was framed in the context of a sense of mistrust of the West, which was seen as being in control of multilateral organizations, and coercive in its methods:

Well, if we talk about the World Bank, I mean people have different opinions about the World Bank in the way they go about distributing aid. I think over the past 60 years, I think ever since the UN was created, you have a sense of mistrust among the developing world towards international organizations, not to a certain extent India these days, but to a large amount, I mean for example anybody, the IMF, or the World Bank, or even the UN to a certain extent, because in general you find these are institutions which are run by the developed world and [use of] force. I mean even you might have a lot of World Bank assistance being given at a lot of initiatives of the developing world, but again, yes, I think it's a sense of mistrust which is growing more in the developing world against such global institutes.

Asked to elaborate on why there should be 'mistrust', this participant instead talked about asymmetric representation:

For example, the IMF ... it's the representation – you know the IMF is divided on a particular basis. And for example something like India and China which are probably among the top five economies of the world don't have a big say in a forum like the IMF or the World Bank. Which is a shame, because you have the world currently depending on these two nations, and probably to a large extent the remaining part of Asia, but when it comes to global policies you don't have the

voice heard, or it's much easier for them to be suppressed, because you have the leading, or the developed nations controlling these thoughts.

One participant in particular was more favorably disposed to external assistance than the others, but (despite the concerns above pertaining to 'who runs these institutions') with a distinct bias towards multilateral aid from institutions, rather than bilateral aid from single countries. This bias was predicated on the loss of autonomy that might be suffered by India when receiving funds from bilateral sources. In particular, he was concerned about the implications of US pressure to ratify the NPT:

But ... if possible I prefer India obtain funds from institutions rather than countries, because it brings up a lot of obligations towards those countries ... I mean like institutions have a national, like for example USAID is a department of the US government so instead of going to the department of various US governments of any country, you go for global organizations such as World Bank, IMF, World Bank's small credits, ... IMF, then World Trade Organization for development, so you can go for funds from them rather than going for USAID ... there's not a direct influence, like for example ... different, for example the nuclear side, there's a lot of protests, because a lot of other left parties felt that ... the US goes with a Treaty into India, what happens the US finds a lot of points, that they have a lot of control over India. Now this small control is enough for them, you know, when they exercise it do you want to be slaves?

Another participant took exception to the use of the expression 'assistance', pointing out that the use of this term obfuscated the real motives of providers:

I just have a problem ... in terms of word assistance, because I mean I do understand citizens of this nation, we are responsible for our own problems, but a classic example was when the Prime Minister of Britain had made a recent trip to India, and he had his entire Council of Ministers spread across five different cities and basically one of the intentions was to build economic interests back home so that, you know, it could be generative of the economy of his nation, but then at a later point he mentioned that in Britain, the biggest [recipient] of Britain's external aid is India. But I guess we may be confusing a lot of things here. I

mean, most of the countries come to India under the pretext of giving aid, but actually they are getting a lot back.

There was an issue also with inappropriate assumptions made by providers about the circumstances prevailing in recipient nations, and how this could redound to the disadvantage of the recipient:

Every assistance or every aid that comes to India, or for that matter any developing country comes with certain terms and conditions which cannot be met by that nation. If the thing has got its own terms and conditions. So your economic, even economic conditions, your political conditions, and your social and other factors are completely different from what we face here. So any assistance, or any aid that comes to India should understand the existing political, social and economic conditions of the receiving nation. So in that understanding almost any assistance that comes to us will have to be rejected. It cannot take advantage.

In short, there was a desire for transparency and honesty in dealings between nations, both developed and non-developed:

I wouldn't mind any country coming in here to invest as long as it meets my requirements. And I have no problem in a smaller nation reaping the benefits of it too. So I like the word assistance to leave, to get out of the context, and it's more of an economic bargain that every nation is doing against itself. It can be in terms of monetary, but it can also be in terms of intellectual capital which happens most in the cases of movement from the underdeveloped world to the developed, or the developing world to the developed world, both ways.

Developing this theme of transparent, mutual interest, another participant wanted to see transactions based on arm's length, or 'peer to peer', dealings:

India has reached a position economically where they think beyond receiving foreign aid irrespective of the policy of a developed nation is to provide aid or not. I guess we should go forward increasing, I think building on our strengths,

and stick with our strengths, which is attracting capital from the Western world, and I think more step beyond ... being a nation which receives foreign aid to being a nation which attracts foreign capital etc.

Even to the limited extent that external assistance was regarded as acceptable, there were concerns about how decisions were made regarding deployment of resources, and the extent to which the assistance failed to reach, and benefit in a meaningful way, its intended beneficiaries:

When the World Bank is providing aid, in fact the research they come down to find out how much to give, they hire these, they outsource that, and it's not from the locals. In fact it's like somebody from another country comes to study what is the need for us, and then they do not take too much of the local requirements. I think mainly they come to a certain village, there's no point what the person's like, what the place is like, doesn't have any idea what life is like, what the people go through, and what the exact requirements are. It's like these people from different institutions have no clue as to what Indian society, the culture here and all those things. And they come and they do a study and then they provide and say yes, these people need this, but that wouldn't be exactly what we need. So I think, like, the World Bank should, like, look at, you know along with hiring people like that they should take expertise like from the local areas. Maybe if they're going to a village they hire the Panchayat or some representative like that who really knows the area there, what is required so that, like you know, your funds actually go for the right cause rather than something which is not required. And you can still do it but it's not the need of others. There's no point in coming in for different cause ...

A specific example was provided by another participant, drawing on personal experience:

I just did a financial plan for two years and this was one of those instances where there was this program where the World Bank was funding for providing power like in these local villages and you are understanding like the people who came to prove like the amount of money that needs to be pumped in. However the accounts are managed, done by like outsourced, actually, like to a foreign agency, or someone international and these people like they have no proper knowledge of

the conditions that they are working in. So it's like you concentrating, you might think that case might need a school but they might just need a hospital more than they need a school, so but you are helping us out but you could have taken some local advice and diverted those funds to a better cause.

There was a strong sense that the idea of 'assistance' should be reformulated to convey a sense of cooperation between nations as peers, and that ultimate responsibility for decisions should remain with India:

You talk about assistance. I would understand it's not only aid but you talk about other things like advisory service by other countries. The fact is, even you know let's not look at it from a country to country level, even if you look at it from a colleague to colleague level. Suppose I have a problem that I experience probably in my class when I don't understand something. I will probably go back to my friend and ask him, ok what are we doing, how are we doing it, he will help me. So, you know, it could be, like that he might have some problem and I might help him. So it's more of an advisory service where you are trying to ensure that you are answering someone else's doubt, and you are kind of experiencing what probably that person must have gone through those problems, you know what you've gone through and he's certainly helping you out with that.

I think like advice can be taken from other countries, but at the end of the day it should be like, you know, India's decision. Because like you will know your internal problems better. I think I would consider the pros and cons. And yes, if I think that I should take it, I will.

But it also arises from the fact that, Michael, if we call you, for example for advisory probably help, it's obvious that we have a problem, we have in our mind that we want to resolve the problem and we know that you have a solution to the problem, so the very fact that there is this dialogue of you know interacting between two people who are looking for the problem means that we are quite determined to solve the problem and we also know the fact that you have a solution to the problem. So yes, you might have recommendations which could be passed or which cannot be passed, also. Because ultimate scenario of this country would be owned by who takes the advice. So that's one question, certain things could be passed, certain things can be rejected. That's up to the person's discretion.

It's a similar issue that you have faced in your own country. You would have formed a policy. So you would bring that to India and just give your own

justifications for that particular policy for a similar situation. So it just stops with consultancy and it doesn't go beyond that...

To a certain extent, yes, I think you would agree to it as an aid, because you wouldn't really provide consulting services for free. Today you wouldn't expect a McKinsey or a Boston Consulting coming to India and saying we will help you for free. They would obviously charge their fee for whatever it is. And these people would probably draw their conclusions based on the fact of their studies, and when we talk about another nation they must have gone through an experience and there is a huge difference between a study and an experience ... So knowledge is through experience and that knowledge is priceless I'd say to a certain extent. And monetary, if you had to equate it to monetary, it is as good as money.

Moving beyond external assistance, potential and actual aggression from actors outside India was also of concern. From the very beginning of modern India's existence, at the time of Independence from Britain and the Partition, there has been tension between India and Pakistan. Much of this tension is related to the Indian state of Jammu and Kashmir, which Pakistan – India's border neighbor to the northwest – claims as its own territory. On India's north-east border is China, with whom there is likewise a long history of tension, part of this tension also being related to the border at Kashmir. In short:

... we have to remember about how India's strategically positioned in between two nations that are constantly ready to pounce on it and I am literally using the word because Pakistan is quite literally a problem to India and we are not literally talking about a war or we want to send our troops to fight in Kashmir, that's not the intention, but at least we need to checkmate Pakistan quite often because it doesn't look like India is a peace-loving country ...

As far as non-state actors are concerned, there was concern not only with Kashmir, which is both a Pakistan and China issue, but also with the Maoist/Naxalite

terrorist activities, in particular in the north-eastern states of West Bengal, Jharkhand, Bihar, Orissa and Chhattisgarh:

... we always concentrated on Kashmir, but now we have concentrated on LTTE and naxalite. We also have the highest number of terrorist groups are in north-east and we are still being ignored, and every time we look Pakistan / India, Sri Lanka / India. We still have one more like China / India who might any time {indistinct}. There was a war, Indo-China war in 1965 or something, so one day Bangladesh might come in, and it's already increasing. Bangladesh is almost.

There was another dimension to security that was predicated on external assistance rendered by the West to nations whose interests were at odds with India's and the extent to which that assistance was subverted to the disadvantage of India:

... in respect of military aid, I have pure confidence in India. We are the most peaceful people in the world and nothing will shatter that. But my problem is with the way that the establishment in the West for military power and aid to Pakistan and the neighborhood. I think it's time and again developing that you have a lot funds for social aid being moved towards military purposes which are intended to destabilize India. ... I guess the concern to be raised is the way the military aid is being distributed to countries in the neighborhood of India and the way they have been managed. I think you have a lot of interest shown by the Western world to make an establishment, to establish their force in the military alliance but they aren't really responsible, ensuring responsibility in ensuring that it is used for the right purposes. Similarly the way China goes about distributing aid in the neighborhood.

In summary, the general sense was that while activities of the private business sector and providers of 'external assistance' did provide some benefits to India, a great many of those activities were at best neutral, and at worst engendered negative outcomes for India, partly because those activities were intended primarily for the benefit of the external actors. There was also a degree of resentment about the pretence of altruism,

and the lack of respect for indigenous knowledge and skills. The activities of actual and potential aggressors were, of course, regarded as completely negative.

Other Issues

Responding to questions about how they would characterize a “developed” India, participants identified a number of social issues, some of them with an infrastructural component, that they considered important. Examples of these topics were mostly related to basic living standards: nutrition; shelter; health factors such as malaria, HIV/AIDS/TB, and maternal and infant mortality (including gender disparities in infant mortality); water; sanitation; energy sources – particularly electricity; roads; and communications. For the most part, participants regarded these as essentially domestic issues for whose resolution India should and could take responsibility.⁷⁴ However they also identified certain health issues, in particular communicable disease, with SARS, Bird Flu and Swine Flu being explicitly named, where international co-operation was at least desirable, and probably necessary. This was not regarded as “external assistance” so much as “international civic sense”, in the best interests of the world community.

Another issue of international significance that was only partly amenable to domestic resolution was that of the environment. It was acknowledged that India had a responsibility for the environment, but this had to be balanced against the need for economic development to support its people, but using outdated technologies:

74 The question of whether there might be any moral obligation for others to ‘assist’ was not addressed.

As a citizen of the world India is bound to be responsible in conserving the environmental problems we are facing but the situation, the question that Indians have to answer is how fast does it go, and how effective is it. Because we have a problem here in saying that we are a developing nation, we are 1 billion plus, and we have about 700 million who earn less than \$2 a day, we have a good amount of people who are under malnourished. You've got to look at it from a holistic perspective of how much of economic development do we need in order to sustain the population that we have, and how much of pollution or environmental degradation can we allow to enable that. I mean there isn't, it wouldn't stop, I'm sorry, I mean, it wouldn't be sensible for the administration of this country to go all out on environmental protection and not bothering about the economic development which is required in order to sustain the population that this country has. So it's a fine balance which the country has to do which, which balance being it has to make sure that we have a high level of economic growth. Sadly we currently we don't have a technology which can do it in the most efficient way in terms of environment, but nevertheless it has to do it, but also on the other aspect as being a global citizen and in the context of the post-Copenhagen era, we definitely need to take much more stronger and quicker actions. Yes, but India definitely would have to do a lot to catch up with the rest of the world.

An early statement that there was domestic inaction on this matter was soon recast as global inaction, with particular reference being made to the developed countries:

Globally there's been talk regarding environmental topic and India also, if you talk about the attitude of Indians, certainly as far as I observe from my own perspective people are still indifferent to what's happening here. It's not enough if only a few people, a few groups of people, talk about environmental issues and react, and like project what's happening to our environment here. Everyone has to realize this isn't just an issue at national level, but globally also, it's hard work. That's not happening... In the absence of particular action there are people who campaign for it and protest issues that affect the environment, but there are people, there is a lack of action; people just talking is not enough. Do something in action.

As with other issues, there was a feeling that there were different standards for the developing world (or at least India) and the developed world:

I'm just feeling a bit surprised. Because I guess we have an environment problem, but you just can't pinpoint it ... I guess it's a global issue at the moment in terms of inaction. Not necessarily just correlate to the Indian situation. Especially in terms of inaction, because you even see I mean the developed world having their own bit of inaction in their own terms in the subject of environment degradation.

They try to dictate terms to the developing nations. When it comes to greenhouse gases they say we have to cut down, the developing nations have to cut down on the emission of greenhouse gases. It's not realizing that they have created responsibility as developed nations to cut down on greenhouse gases.

The question of environment was later re-raised in combination with inconsistent attitudes by the US to "a single market" and "external assistance", prompting the question

that kind of raises the question, on the one side you say we want to assist you, but on the other side you are pointing fingers at us. So which way do you want to be, a devil or an angel?

Resolving the Issues

Participants generally considered that India had in large measure the responsibility for addressing the issues that had been identified during the conversations, and was able to fulfill that responsibility. Others made specific reference to limits on the role of outside agency, for example:

I think when it comes to India as such it has to learn to determine problems and solve it by itself. An important characteristic, I mean, you can't expect in India there's a problem, you can't expect UK to come in and deal with an internal problem with infant mortality or something like that.

Participants' attention was drawn to Dambisa Moyo's (2009) work in which she proposed (with reference to Africa) the idea that aid should cease in five years. One immediate response to this was

Every country requires the other one to probably help and that's why I probably don't get the idea why exactly Moyo is talking about five years from now no countries should probably have any international aid or should not give international aid. But probably you need to go through it really for what the reasons are for what she is talking. But at this point in time I would probably agree with what Stiglitz [probably Sachs] says probably that we are probably required to help every other country because everyone is interdependent and ...

This participant was interrupted at this point by another, who saw part of Moyo's reasoning – that aid was an enabling and dependence-inducing phenomenon:

Even if assistance are stopped, if they are stopped for countries like India that might be the advantage to nations like India for several reasons. One such as you like start pressures on your own government and they feel the pressure, and they feel their own responsibility to invest more and to work more to become more effective. In one way I would say it has advantages.

Another participant, in acknowledging the need for India to solve its own problems, noted a propensity for trying to deal with each issue independently, rather than adopting a holistic approach. He also cautioned against reverting to the isolationist model that had marked the early post-Independence era as a reaction against colonialism, but which had been rejected in favor of a more open attitude to the rest of the world in the 1990s as part of economic liberalization:

We just face a few indicators of problems, like in the case of health care, infant mortality rate, let us say, education, people in rural areas. If we could just deal with health care problems, education problems, I think we've got to look at it from a holistic perspective as to why India in the last 60 years of Independence hasn't been able to reach out to the entire population ... Now how do you solve that? ... We as a nation have all of the administration of this country as purely believe in the policies that we can do it all by ourselves. And then we had this huge problem in the late 80s and we opened up the economy and look at the growth we've had in the past two decades. But when you compare it, India didn't do the economic growth all by itself. So, I mean, looking at isolating ourselves

again to solve our problems will be the biggest mistake which our country can do going forward. Because all the growth that we've experienced in the past two decades are having more because we have allowed ourselves to open our closed eyed innocence to the world to let people come in ... I think it's just how India has gone looking abroad or looking outwardly to solve its economic problems we need to look outward to solve our social problems too. Of course, that doesn't believe India should think the world should help us. India will have to play a major role in, as you said, changing social backgrounds and all that stuff.

The 'isolationist' theme was taken up by another participant, who drew attention to the interconnectedness of the world, including India, and in so doing echoed the sentiments of Nehru in his Tryst with Destiny speech:

You can't talk just about India as such. It's not isolated. There are other things, it's a globalized country. It deals with almost every other nation on this planet so it depends on how their relationships also.

Education, in various forms, was seen as key to resolving many of the social issues, and this would help improve the country's economic standing. There was reluctance to place timeframes on achieving goals, but when pressed there were indications that timeframes should be measured in several years to multiple generations, depending upon the particular issue in question. Overcoming some of the resistance to change in more rural areas, where traditional ways still took precedence, was generally felt to be a multi-generational endeavor, and even then, people should be free to exercise autonomy:

If it's for their own growth, if we know something like we know it's certain practices among the community, like maybe something along the lines of like probably the spread of communicable diseases or something but which is an accepted practice. Now being a democracy and a responsible entity, we should at least try to educate them. I mean we should not force them, like how we had

family planning once upon a time, Sanjay Gandhi, he was really onto it, he actually pretty much was forcing the people, but I think that's where education would come in, in the sense that educating the people, telling them what is right and wrong, and after that they make their choices, ok, but most of these people who are so-called conservative and unmotivated, probably it's the lack of education, because education is probably removes taboos and such stigmas in society, because it makes them aware of what is right, what is wrong, or what is good, what is bad, what is perceived to be correct, I mean these are certain objectives education can accomplish. So probably, yes, if societies, probably education should be the first step, which could accomplish success in health care and family planning and so on. Even employment for that matter. And yes, and after that, if they choose to live their own way that is well and good. I mean if they find it is important for their society to go on that way, I mean if their, I don't know, something – identity, you know, what we have to offer kind of challenges or questions their identity, then they should be left alone.

There were also a number of statements made about increasing levels of enforcement of rules, rather than either disregarding them completely, or regarding them as an opportunity for corruption in the form of bribes. This was part of a recurring theme relating to “civic sense” or “civic responsibility” that was generally perceived as lacking nationally. Just one example, of an exchange that led one participant to propose the radical solution of declaring an Emergency, was

The first thing to look into to better India would be trying to improve the civic sense and the kind of mindset that people, because the civic sense here is really bad ... There was also that controversy from the Minister for Environment, Mr. Ramesh made a statement saying that basically Delhi, Bombay, Chennai, the so-called larger, better developed of developing cities in India are worse in civic sense as compared with America and Britain.

I think there should be rules, quite strict rules, which have to come down again from let's say the respective sectors. Like I'm saying if the police imposed, the police department imposed more stricter rules on traffic, see it can be relaxed after a while, but people should know this is how it has to be done. So I think that's very important. I mean spoil the rod, I mean spare the rod, spoil the child.

One participant went so far as to suggest declaring a State of Emergency, as Indira Gandhi had done in 1975, though this idea was strongly rejected by other participants, only partly because there was no Constitutionally valid reason for such an action. He eventually conceded that such a move was not appropriate; nevertheless, the tenacity with which this participant held on to the idea seemed indicative of a great sense of frustration – partly shared by the others – with the inability to effect change:

And one more this thing that can be done is that we have something called Emergency Rule, wherein for the President can declare for two or three years, or maximum for five years, no elections, you can't, the people are taken, like stolen of their rights, they can't exercise their rights, and so I think they can declare Emergency at least for three years, and impose whatever law they want to enforce.

But there has to be a solid reason you declare Emergency, right? ... You can't just take a fairly peaceful place and say ok, I'm going to impose Emergency over here because you have to have a reason. ... I understand the concept. But doesn't that spread widespread, I don't know, sadness or whatever, panic, among the people, because there's nothing going on in their everyday life, and Emergency is imposed, and how do you think people are going to react? ... I think small changes can be implemented ... like the traffic rules ... Because the way he's saying it, if you suddenly told you, ok, you have to live by this regime, nobody will do that. They'll be in rebel groups. People will start protesting, which will cause another tension, which will cause another emergency, which will cause ... It will just keep going. It's like a vicious cycle.

But still, I'm not talking about a sudden emergency, I'm just talking about a gradual ..., for example, in the sense like, not an Emergency as such, a gradual decline of powers, and then you go for a state of Emergency. Let the people get used to what's happening, and then get ... [Ok, there has to] be proper reason.

Reverting to the less radical possibilities for political solutions, and recollecting that there were issues of corruption in India's democratic process for political

representation, participants expressed concern that the young were, to a large extent uninterested in either voting or standing for election:

First of all in India, younger people I don't see a majority of younger people interested in politics. And if you see, if you do an analysis of an election, the voting percentage many people don't go to the polling booths to cast their votes and if at all there is a percentage which is, which features nearing the 70 that turns out to be a good voting percentage. So obviously younger people, the reason why they give for not coming to vote is that they are fed up with politics. They say politics is blah blah blah not willing to use that word. But then, yes, the politics which is happening in our country right now, it has made younger people to hate the field of politics. So if, I can see the force in younger people, they want a change, but then there are people who don't know, don't get any forum to come forward, or basically maybe they are not willing to come forward to enter the field of politics ... First thing is there would be a change in the scenario, the political scenario, that younger people are entering into politics. We have younger people in politics but comparatively the older people are on a majority. So maybe the first thing that takes place is a change and maybe we can see how they perform after that.

There was an exchange, somewhat heated, of ideas about setting retirement ages as a step towards limiting 'family dynasties', countering the diminishing capabilities of the elderly, and providing opportunities for the young to enter politics. This was, however, also seen as circumscribing democratic process:

You can be in advising committee, but you just can't stay on, say I'll stay on power until I'm 90, or you know, just can't just sit on, hang on to the seat and say I'll not give it to anybody. Because if I give it to anybody, like my children or my grandchildren might not get it, actually. That should not be the kind of attitude.

It's a personal preference. I mean if the law says that you are 100 and you should retire...

That's what I am saying. A politician should be beyond, not personal preference, should not be that by a politician

Yes, but it does not clear the new law so that you should be 90 means you should retire from politics

What I'm saying is he should certainly be an advisor actually.

That's his personal preference. I mean if you think that he has the ability to do it, I mean if you have the ability to be a Chief Minister I think I would certainly vote for you. If you have the ability, perfect.

That's what I am saying. Let's have a retirement age.

I do not agree. Not really. It's not a government job, you retire. It's not like ...

After five years, five years, the ideas of an individual can always well be taken as an advisor. But this physical constraint, if this physical state shouldn't be a constraint.

I think as we get older we all tend to lose our ability to think and make reasonable judgments, and all that, so ...

It's true, it's fact. And let's put the individual's health, whatever ...

No, but I mean if he has no issues. I mean, if he's still, if he knows, he's the best judge of himself, and that person if he's able to judge that he's quite a good situation to be in it shouldn't be an effect. But obviously, people are observing and it's a democracy, and it's not like you know you have communism where this person, till he dies he's going to be the one. No, there's no such thing as... if the people think he's not effective enough, you can make sure you get the other person in. And that right remains with the people.

Ultimately, there was a need for taking action, rather than ignoring issues or simply talking about them. One participant took partial ownership on behalf of the current generation of educators, which included herself, and in so doing articulated a summary of what was needed within India to resolve internal problems:

I think that this is the point of the current generation, or the politicians, or the social activists, so when we keep on saying that they are not educated, they are not conservative, we the generation, we the educators, the citizens should enter into the villages and taught them like this is right and this is wrong. Most of us,

most of the people in this country do not take that initiative. So that is very lacking. This is from the side of educated society, and this is the same plight with the politicians. So your job doesn't end with creating a quality, or creating a program, delegating it to the bureaucracy and not even ensuring that it does get implemented.

Conclusion

This Chapter has summarized some of the most significant elements of conversations with University students in South India in August 2010. In these conversations participants exhibited substantial knowledge of both international and domestic political and economic affairs, and domestic social matters. Much of what was said was broadly consistent with material presented in earlier Chapters, which had been obtained from other sources such as Government of India publications, and journals, newspapers and books by both Indian and non-Indian authors.

The principal focus of these conversations was participants' perception of India's current place in the world, and their vision for the country's future, including identification of hindrances and impediments to achievement of that vision, and how these might be overcome. In general, participants were optimistic about the future, and the increasing level of influence they expected their country to exert on the world economic and political stage. Their optimism was predicated primarily on significant historical economic growth in India since liberalization of the economy in the 1990s, and the expectation that growth would continue. They were aware that India was one of several nations described as 'emerging economies', each of whom would have an effect on the distribution of economic (and therefore political) influence worldwide. There was discussion of the appropriateness and desirability of India's emergence as a 'superpower'

– and even what exactly was the meaning of this term. Of the other emerging economies, they expressed particular interest in China, their neighbor to the north-east. While China was not regarded as a significant economic competitor – India’s primary strength lay in the service sector, and China’s in the manufacturing sector – there were other concerns about rivalry and hostility between the two nations. Participants were also generally well-versed in domestic social matters and expressed considerable concern for the resolution of issues related to ‘poverty’.

They recognized, nevertheless, that there were many hindrances to achieving their vision both for international influence and for domestic social issues; the latter, they acknowledged, would require many years, possibly several generations, to resolve. The most significant issues related to governance and education. Governance issues centered on inefficient and ineffective bureaucracy, pervasive political and administrative corruption, and poor inter- and intra-governmental relations resulting from language barriers, uneducated MPs, and pursuit of special (sometimes regional) interests to the detriment of the nation as a whole. There was a degree of frustration bordering on a feeling of helplessness with respect to making significant change in the political arena. Of great concern was the impact that these factors had on resolving social justice issues. These included a lack of satisfaction of basic needs such as shelter, nutrition, water, sanitation, and health services. There was concern also for some of the adverse effects of economic growth, including significant (and growing) disparities in wealth and income: these contributed to the deprivations enumerated above. In particular, they expressed frustration with the fact that lack of resources was, in some cases, less of an issue than the

distribution of resources to those who needed them. Nevertheless they noted access and availability issues with respect to infrastructural resources such as communications, roads, schools and hospitals.

Participants saw education as making a significant contribution to India's future. Broadly, the benefits accrued in two interlinked ways. Improved education was seen as one of the means by which the economy could be promoted – it would contribute to the development of small-scale industry (in a very wide sense of the word) that would lead to self-sufficiency for a significant percentage of the population, and also provide a more competent work-force in sectors requiring higher educational skills. Education was also considered a pre-requisite to improving quality of life in poorer communities, by providing 'life-skill' education such as health care, agricultural methods, etc. There was the hope, too, that education would instill a greater degree of 'civic sense', or civic responsibility in the population, and that this would add to India's ability to resolve its domestic issues without the need for recourse to external actors. Literacy, while important was only one of the several educational provisions necessary.

Participants made some adverse remarks related to the West, sometimes directed at individual countries such as the UK and the US, and sometimes directed to organizations which they perceived to be "run by the West", even though non-Western countries, including India, were also members. Among these organizations they included the World Bank, the World Trade Organization, and the United Nations. These remarks were made largely in the context of 'external assistance'. Their criticisms, generally expressed politely but firmly, included perceptions of unfair, paternalist, self-serving,

arrogant, dishonest, and hypocritical relations, and gave rise to a general feeling of mistrust of and antipathy toward the West. Nevertheless, there was a strong sense that since the nations of the world are so strongly interconnected, there would be mutual benefits to engaging more co-operative and respectful relationships.

Expressed succinctly, the conclusions are: first, that there has been a significant shift in international influence from a unipolar world centered on the US as identified in earlier Chapters and reinforced in part by the observations made by the Indian participants in this study; and second, that the myth of American Exceptionalism representing the US as superior to other nations and morally obligated to redress at least some of this asymmetry requires abandoning, or at least radically evolving into a new form that recognizes and accommodates these shifts in influence. The next and final Chapter examines in greater detail the concept of conflict and its relationship to peace; shows how perpetuation of the current myth of American Exceptionalism may exacerbate tensions to the point of their escalating into conflict; and presents some ideas for an educative process in the US whose purpose is to create space within which a new myth driven by recognition of the need for responsible global citizenship in a constantly changing world may be created and absorbed into the American psyche.

CHAPTER V

RE-VISIONING THE WORLD, RE-INVENTING THE MYTH

For the great enemy of the truth is very often not the lie – deliberate, contrived, and dishonest – but the myth – persistent, persuasive, and unrealistic. Too often we hold fast to the clichés of our forebears. We subject all facts to a prefabricated set of interpretations. We enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought. (President J.F. Kennedy, at Yale Commencement, June 11, 1962)⁷⁵
Audio: [Yale Commencement](#)

The previous Chapters identified some of the historical roots and contemporary manifestations of the myth of American Exceptionalism expressed in terms of superiority and salvific mission, and described some of the changes in the world, especially since WWII, which have brought into question the relevance and appropriateness of that myth. Chapter I traced the evolution of the myth from the founding of the US Republic. Chapter II enumerated some of the principal military, economic, political and other changes occurring in the world over the last six decades that have had significant effect on relationships between actors on the world stage. Among these changes are those that first gave rise to, and then started to challenge, the US as a unipolar base of power. Of the latter, one significant development has been the phenomenon of ‘emerging nations’, such as the BRIC countries, whose economic growth in the last decade has, in Zakaria’s (2008) words, contributed to “a tectonic power shift” (p. 1). Chapter III examined one of these emerging BRIC countries – India – and presented material that described some of

75. Miller Center of Public Affairs (2011b).

the most significant aspects of India's development since Independence from Great Britain in the immediate post-WWII era. The evidence demonstrated that India has become a notable presence in the world, though there are domestic issues currently constraining its development which must therefore be resolved in order for India to achieve its potential. Chapter III also served as a context in which to understand statements made by a number of Indian students at Indian Universities in conversations with them during August 2010. Those statements were the focus of Chapter IV. They were essentially consistent with the material presented in the earlier Chapters, and articulated a great deal of confidence in India's future with respect to its increasing presence in the world, despite their acknowledgment of some serious domestic constraints requiring domestic, rather than international or external, resolution. They also expressed some considerable antipathy to the way in which the West in general and the US more particularly continued – from India's perspective – to exert unwanted, unneeded, and sometimes harmful influence over India and its people. Their views, while not necessarily representative of Indians in general (or indeed any other 'community'), nevertheless contribute to the evidence that the US posture warrants re-invention.

The purpose of this final Chapter is to restate, primarily from a pragmatic rather than ethical or moral point of view, the case for that re-invention, and to present proposals for an educative protocol by which America and Americans might understand the need for responsible global citizenship, and then engage the process of creating a myth that is fully cognizant of that need, recognizing that

education must be a process that teaches the young the importance of thinking critically and approaching the truth of others' pronouncements and assertions with a healthy skepticism. A culture that will not fall blindly into war or organized violence depends on individuals who have been educated in the spirit of a fearless and penetrating readiness to question and contest the voices of authority. This is the radical meaning of civic literacy. Civic literacy means teaching young people the importance of engaging with the events, issues, and concerns that are shaping their world. It means that education must place at the center of its agenda the goal of individuals who see the connection between the quality of their own lives to the decisions and policies that shape their national and global communities. And crucial to this literacy is the capacity to go beyond a passive acceptance of whatever explanations and justifications are being presented by those in power. It demands the ability to critically interrogate the assumptions and values that are behind the decisions and actions of government or those who play a dominant role in setting the society's agenda. (Shapiro, 2011)

Such a myth may honor the more salutary underpinnings of the Republic, but also take full cognizance of the circumstances of the times, and remain sufficiently liquid (to use a Bauman expression)⁷⁶ to meet the challenges of continuing multi-dimensional change in an increasingly interconnected world. The process by which the myth might emerge is intended to facilitate acknowledgement that “citizenship and citizenship education are dynamic, context-bounded social constructions reinvented through the intertwined interactions of different actors in response to, and as part of, social changes, including globalization” (Law & Ng, 2009, p. 854). The objective is to create a climate in which international tensions may be resolved (or better still, prevented), thereby foreclosing as far as possible the escalation of tension into conflict and other forms of violence both domestically and abroad. In short, the Chapter is concerned with ways to move towards a more peaceful world – a state that has long been the subject of lip service

76. For example, Bauman (2000).

in the US, but lacking sincere, concerted, effective action on the part of those who claim to espouse this goal. To this end, the purpose here is to propose not a new myth, but instead a protocol that will create the space in which a new myth may emerge, and remain amenable to evolution in order to be relevant to and consistent with the changing circumstances of the times. It might therefore be regarded as a ‘meta-curriculum’ for promoting peace. The space is intended initially for self-reflection, rather than “the kind of hysterical reaction of reaching out, where reaching is a euphemism; war, violence, attack, do something, but no, no reflection” that Zinn (2005) defines as the US response to radical, unexpected, and seemingly inexplicable adverse events. It is intended also to permit the domestic reframing of America within the context of a world in which there are other communities, each with its own needs and aspirations that are not necessarily congruent with those of the US, and an increasing desire and ability to resist political, economic, military, and even some aspects of cultural encroachments by the US. The myth is for those who must live in (rather than with) it, and those to whom they will bequeath it. As an ‘outsider’, therefore, it is neither desirable nor possible for me to propose what the myth should be. It must emerge from within. First, however, it is worth examining the nature of the outcome that the new myth is intended to help produce: peace.

Peace

Do we ever think of creating peace when we have money, power, and everything in our hand? (Indian participant, August 2010)

Peace, in the popular imagination, is conceived of as the absence of war. However, absence of war often takes the form of containment of the potential for open conflict, achieved by means of actual or threatened coercion using any combination of economic, political and military power. Under these circumstances, a more appropriate expression is “negative peace”, which Woolman (1985), drawing on Johan Galtung, defines as

a state requiring a set of social structures that provide security and protection from acts of direct physical violence committed by individuals, groups or nations. The emphasis in negative peace is on control of violence. The main strategy is dissociation, whereby conflicting parties are separated ... In general, policies based on the idea of negative peace do not deal with the causes of violence, only its manifestations. Therefore, these policies are thought to be insufficient to assure lasting conditions of peace. Indeed, by suppressing the release of tensions resulting from social conflict, negative peace efforts may actually lead to future violence of greater magnitude. (p. 8)

This definition places emphasis on “direct physical violence”, exemplified by the many military interventions executed by the US (unilaterally, or with allies) over the years. To those might be added organized armed violence by both state and non-state actors, including that perpetrated by ‘terrorists’. Instances of physical violence tend to be very visible globally, partly facilitated by the low cost and high speed of communications even in the hands of the general public. But other forms of violence also exist, and these are not always so visible, or so attributable to their root causes, even by those who are the victims of such violence. Oberg (2006), in a critique of the Draft European Constitution, and drawing on Galtung (1973), enumerates these forms of violence as structural,

cultural, and environmental, though many instances of violence may cross these somewhat artificial boundaries, and may also give rise to physical violence.

Structural violence is systemic: “The system is constructed in such a way that it creates a gap between the possible realisation (sic) of social potentials and the actual realization” (Obergh, 2006, p. 11). Structural violence manifests in many forms. One example is US economic policies that, despite claimed espousal of free trade, continue to provide protection of US commercial interests. Agricultural subsidies are one instance of this dissonance, in which there is a double disadvantage to other countries, especially developing countries: subsidies not only facilitate cheap exports by the US; they also adversely affect those other countries’ ability to export (Ware, 2010). Taken together, these affects can result in the destruction of elements of indigenous agriculture. One Indian study participants drew attention to this issue of protectionism in Western agriculture, and the extent to which it was disadvantageous to developing countries:

[G]o to anywhere in the developing world you find a significant percentage of the population concentrated in the agricultural sector and go to any global debate and you find the biggest problems devolving around protectionism for the agricultural sector in the Western world where you have ... the least percentage of the population being involved in that particular sector. So you have a lot of economic imbalances ...

Explicitly within India, partly as a result of the comparatively recent economic growth generated by the IT industry, structural violence is exemplified by increasing disparity in real incomes:

... you have the IT industry flourishing in our country, don’t you see the income gap, just like, you know, its elevating like anything, don’t you see that? Just

because the IT's flourishing, for instance, take Chennai as an example, don't you see the pain, don't you see the heat, the rising income gap here?

Cultural violence is characterized by “[t]he conviction that one’s own culture or civilization is superior to others and is (sic) better, that others – for their own sake – should accept our standards or even accept having them forced upon them” (Oberg, 2006, p. 11). An example of cultural violence intended to coerce the behavior of sovereign states is economic sanctions such as have been enforced by the US against Cuba since 1960, despite wide condemnation in the UN General Assembly at a Plenary Session for many years. Most recently, the condemnation was almost universal (UN, 2010b). In the case of Cuba, sanctions have not only failed to achieve their objective of “[the] overthrow of the [Cuban] government”, but caused – possibly as an unintended consequence – significant hardship to the Cuban people (Lamrani, 2007).

Environmental violence is an expression of the view that “Creation around us is exclusively there to satisfy our material needs. Nature does not have a value in itself” (Oberg, 2006, p. 11). This is an inevitable corollary of a propensity to consume products created from non-renewable resources, or resources that are used at a rate which exceeds the rate of replenishment. It is exacerbated by a lack of concern for environmental and ecological damage that contributes to pollution. Environmental violence can be inflicted as externalities upon others, since environmental pollution is not constrained by geopolitical boundaries. Though there is still controversy over climate change, there are strong arguments that this is an example of environmental violence visited largely – though certainly not exclusively – by the industrialized nations (including the US) on

non-industrialized nations.⁷⁷ In the case of India, an example of environmental violence precipitated by MNC activity is that of Coca-Cola activities in the South Indian state of Kerala, which resulted in the depletion and degradation of water supplies for the local community.⁷⁸

While coercive measures may be used to maintain an apparently ‘peaceful’ state, latent hostility may, with the right catalyst, erupt and overpower the coercive actor. Recent events in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Yemen and United Arab Emirates attest to this. A particular twist to these events, given the US posture on “freedom and democracy”, is that to a degree those coercive agents have been supported by the US for many years in order to maintain its foreign policy objectives.

In contrast to “negative peace” stands “positive peace”, which Oberg (2006) defines as

everything that serves to secure development and to develop security, for the whole person (physical/psychological/spiritual) and for all people, in a permanent process that takes [its] point of departure in a model of human and social needs, is based on an ethics of care and, overall, allows for unity in diversity. (p. 10)

Galtung’s (2007) definition of “positive peace” connotes a continuing inter-community sense of

77. Environmental damage is not an outcome limited necessarily to industrialization. Certain forms of agriculture, for example, make their own contributions in terms of methane production, water depletion, and water pollution.

78. Coca Cola was fined 216 crore Rupees for “‘multi-sectoral’ loss” attributed to these activities (Indian Express, 2010). One crore is ten million. At rates of exchange at the time this fine was equivalent to \$47m.

equity as opposed to exploitation ... reciprocity as opposed to the mental conditioning of one by the other ... integration ... as opposed to fragmentation ... holism ... as opposed to segmentation ... and there is inclusion ... as opposed to exclusion, marginalization.

Galtung (2004) postulates that universal, consistent and continuous satisfaction of human needs – “survival, well-being, freedom, and identity” – provides a context in which positive peace might be achieved. For the purpose of this Dissertation, the desired objective is positive peace, elusive though that might be when peace is subordinated to other objectives, or where ‘peace’ is perceived as the means by which those objectives might be achieved. This might have been in the mind of the Indian participant who said

[If India were a superpower,] I don't think we'd be able to make enough of the kind of peace we need to have across the globe. Will we do that? Do we ever think of creating peace when we have money, power, and everything in our hand? Does America think that way? I don't think so!

The Case for Re-inventing the Myth

In the view of much of the world, the United States has played the role of bully in the school yard, throwing its weight around with little regard for others' interests ... American presence in Iraq ... an equal or greater danger to stability in the Middle East than the regime of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, ... a threat to Middle East stability greater than or equal to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. (*Pew Research Center, 2008*)

The current myth is that America is not just unique in the sense of qualitatively and incommensurably different, but in some way – possibly all ways considered important to the US – superior to other nations. The US is, for President Clinton, the

“indispensable nation”; for Madeleine Albright, the “greatest nation in the world”. Zinn (2005) articulates it differently:

[American Exceptionalism] suggests superiority. It suggests something that all of us living in the United States have encountered a lot, and that is self-congratulation, that we are fond in the United States of congratulating ourselves for how wonderful we are, and how we are best, we are the greatest, we are the strongest, we are the most prosperous, we are the freest, we are the most democratic, and yes, we are number one.

The myth also holds that in some way the US has the mission of raising up those other nations to be recast in the same image as the US – or at least in an image acceptable to the US. Woodrow Wilson expressed it early in the 20th century as

I believe that men are emancipated in proportion as they lift themselves to the conception of providence and of divine destiny, and therefore I cannot be deprived of the hope that is in me – in the hope not only that concerns myself, but the confident hope that concerns the nation – that we are chosen and prominently chosen to show the way to the nations of the world how they shall walk in the paths of liberty. (Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 2011)

For the last 10 years The Pew Research Center has published data showing the regard (or lack thereof) in which the US is held by publics abroad. The Center’s 2007 Pew Global Attitudes Project⁷⁹ report includes

Global distrust of American leadership is reflected in increasing disapproval of the cornerstones of U.S. foreign policy ... U.S. policies also are widely viewed as increasing the gap between rich nations and poor nations ... In much of the world there is broad and deepening dislike of American values and a global backlash against the spread of American ideas and customs. Majorities or pluralities in most countries surveyed say they dislike American ideas about democracy

79. Madeleine Albright is Co-Chair of the Pew Global Attitudes Project.

Majorities in 43 of 47 countries surveyed – including 63% in the United States – say that the U.S. promotes democracy mostly where it serves its interests, rather than promoting it wherever it can.⁸⁰ (Pew Research Center, 2007)

A year later, the Center's report notes, among other negative remarks,

Mounting discontent with U.S. foreign policy over the last eight years has translated into a concern about American power. In the view of much of the world, the United States has played the role of bully in the school yard, throwing its weight around with little regard for others' interests ... Respondents to the 2006 survey in 13 of 15 countries found the American presence in Iraq to be an equal or greater danger to stability in the Middle East than the regime of Iranian President Mahmoud Ahmadinejad, while 11 judged it a threat to Middle East stability greater than or equal to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. (Pew Research Center, 2008)

More recently, Kohut's (2010) synopsis of the Center's 2010 report could be regarded as showing the US in a relatively good light internationally – certainly better than how it was seen in 2008. It documents a significant improvement in the perceptions of both the US President and the US as a nation by the publics in the surveyed countries when compared to the previous administration. Nevertheless, Kohut expresses three reservations:

- (1) overwhelming numbers around the world continue to see the U.S as having a big – often bad – influence on their own countries;
- (2) the U.S. was not seen as considering the interests of other countries in the conduct of its foreign policy, expectations about Obama notwithstanding; and
- (3) majorities or pluralities in 20 of 24 publics believe that the U.S economy is hurting their own economies.

80. This has become more obvious in the last few weeks in various Middle Eastern countries, for example Egypt.

He goes on to say

There has been great wariness of American power, and you do not have to scratch too deeply to find it. Suspicion and resentment of American power has been clearly evident in polling over the years. A survey of opinion leaders taken soon after the 9/11 attacks found great sympathy for the U.S., but also the view that it was good that America knew what it is like to be vulnerable! And the belief that the U.S. really wants to run the world has been a theme of global public opinion in the past decade ... [W]e live in an era in which the global image of the U.S. can affect policies and actions in many, if not most nations of the world. In the past decade, we saw the extent to which opinion surveys and media are now able to tell the story of how the U.S. and its policies are regarded around the world. And we have seen how that story can, and has had [sometimes unfavorable to the U.S.] consequences.

Kohut also draws attention to the fact that Americans have a significantly better perception of America than do the publics in the surveyed countries. This appears consistent with Messick et al (1985), who assert that there is a tendency for US subjects to rate their own behavior as fairer than that of others.⁸¹ A reading of Lerner (2006) suggests a possible explanation, which he names “me-firstism”:

[In the US there is] a bottom-line mentality ... judges [everything as valuable] only to the extent that it produces money or power ... human relationships become increasingly instrumental, utilitarian, and manipulative, as people learn to see each other through the frame of “How can other people be of use to me to serve my needs?” (pp. 13-14)

Nor is this worldview limited to individuals: Lerner describes instances of me-firstism within corporations, and even at the national level: “Right now the United States

81. Moore and Small (2007) attribute erroneous self-assessment to the perception that “people typically have better information about themselves than they do about others”. This suggests a degree of bias, since if this finding were generalized, everyone would tend to be fairer than everyone else, and that is not possible.

has adopted a me-first policy, assuming that whatever is good for our country is good for the world”⁸² (p. 322).

Zakaria (2008), in his phenomenology of “the rise of the rest” in recent years speaks of this as a “tectonic power shift” (p. 1), giving rise to a world as an “international system in which countries in all parts of the world are no longer objects or observers but players in their own right. It is the birth of a truly global order”. In this new global order, there is

diffusion of power from states to other actors ... Power is shifting away from the nation-states, up, down, and sideways. In such an atmosphere, the traditional applications of national power, both economic and military, have become less effective. (pp. 3-4)

Robert Zoellick (2010), the President of the World Bank, echoing Zakaria’s remarks on the rising autonomy of ‘developing countries’, and power shifts away from nation-states, asserts that

[Multilateralism in ‘aid’] must recognize that most governmental authority still resides with nation-states. But many decisions and sources of influence flow around, through, and beyond governments ... It is time we put old concepts of First and Third Worlds, leader and led, donor and supplicant, behind us. We must support the rise of multiple poles of growth that can benefit all.

Bacevich (2008), addressing the US domestic situation, claims succinctly that despite the supremacy of US military might, “Americans are no longer masters of their own fate” (p. 17). Quoting Niebuhr’s (1979) “Social orders will probably destroy

82. The latter part of this statement appears to be a logical fallacy.

themselves in the effort to prove that they are indestructible”, Bacevich goes on to say that “Americans seem determined to affirm Niebuhr’s axiom of willful self-destruction” (p. 182).

The study participants in India expressed views that are largely consonant with the various commentaries above. There was confidence that India (and some other countries) were rising powers, economically, politically, and (possibly to a lesser extent) militarily; they observed signs of decline in the West in general and the US in particular; there was a sense of mistrust in connection with external assistance from both bilateral and multilateral sources because of the element of control to be exercised by the provider that such assistance implied; and there were concerns about imbalances in the application of free trade rules, other economic activity, and environmental initiatives.

Taken together, these views suggest strongly that there is substantial negative feeling internationally with respect to the US and its (ab)use of various forms of power. They also lend considerable credence to the assertion that Harold MacMillan’s irresistible “Wind of Change”⁸³ might be regarded as blowing with increasing intensity over the entire globe. Should the US fail to realign its thinking about both itself and the rest of the world in cognizance of these perspectives, taking account of increasing interconnectedness of all nations and increasing power wielded by some, there is risk of these dissonances leading to conflict that could be damaging to both the US and other actors in the world community.

83. See Chapter II.

Education and Global Thinking

In 1957, the USSR shocked the US by being the first nation to launch the world's first man-made earth-orbiting satellite – Sputnik. One of the responses in the US was educational reform largely geared to improving math and science skills, in order to remain ‘competitive’ internationally (Hiatt, 1986). A quarter century later, the report A Nation at Risk observed that “[w]hat was unimaginable a generation ago has begun to occur – others are matching and surpassing our educational attainments.” This, the authors noted, would have been treated as “an act of war” if imposed by “an unfriendly foreign power”. The report goes on to say “The world is indeed one global village ... We live among determined, well-educated, and strongly motivated competitors. We compete with them for international standing and markets ...” (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). Another quarter century later, in an address to Congress in 2009, President Obama placed “expand[ing] the promise of education in America” as “the third challenge we must address”, aligning education with success in “a global economy”, and observing that “the countries that out-teach us today will out-compete us tomorrow”. Education must be seen as the key to “global competitiveness”: the goal of his Administration would therefore be to “ensure that every child has access to a complete and competitive education ...” (Woolley & Peters, 2011k). Quoting the President, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce (2010), asserted that education is of importance because “America’s future in the global marketplace is at stake”.

Educational policy has, therefore been largely oriented to a desire for economic success in an increasingly globalized economy. The stakeholders in this perspective

might be regarded as essentially domestic actors: students, student families, the educational establishment (teachers, administrators, elected representatives at local, state and federal level), corporations, investors,⁸⁴ and the community at large. Domestic citizenship has been essentially sidelined; global citizenship, for all practical purposes, ignored – though a reasonable inference to be drawn from the current focus on the desired nature of educational outcomes (whether or not achieved) is that they run counter to the idea of global citizenship. The evidence presented in this Dissertation is, however, that while ‘economic success’ cannot be completely ignored (though there might be benefits to redefining what this term means), good global citizenship as an educational outcome requires greater attention, widening the stakeholder community to other countries, and the people who live in them. As part of this more inclusive approach, both morality and pragmatism require that ‘differences’ should be acknowledged and respected. They should not, by contrast, constitute a ground for adverse treatment, such as demonization based on some undesirable trait as perceived from time to time from an ethnocentric US perspective – for example Communism during the Cold War, and Islam in contemporary times. What follows describes some of the salient characteristics of education oriented to this concept of global citizenship.

This educational global citizenship project to engender engagement of critical faculties to develop awareness, understanding, respect, co-operation and collaboration with respect to other nations is a perpetual project. Its intent is the opening up of a space

84. Investors in the private sector are, to a certain extent, synonymous with corporations, since one form of investment is stock in publicly owned corporations.

in which a new American myth, whether or not of any form of Exceptionalism, may emerge, and then flourish, remaining sufficiently liquid to stay relevant to the continually changing context of the times. In particular, it is intended to help minimize, possibly eradicate, some of the most egregious behaviors that precipitate unnecessary tension, and the several forms of violence (not restricted to open conflict), between the US and other communities in the world.

Our public educational establishments are one place to start ‘teaching’ the necessary knowledge and skills, which in part requires a change of paradigm in these institutions. Thus a curriculum centered on “global competitiveness” (generally translated into a focus on mathematics and science, and its tendency to produce zero-sum outcomes) requires realignment with the concept of “global citizenship”. This change of paradigm is required from the earliest years, and fostered through all states of formal education, encompassing pre-school, K-12, and post-secondary. The outcome required transcends “knowing” in the usually limited understanding of the word, reaching to experiencing and living it.

For the project to succeed, however, more is required than a recognized institutionalized educational curriculum for ‘students’, though this might sow the necessary seeds. It must be recognized too that there is a Catch-22 here: the paradigm shift is required in the thinking of many whose involvement in propagating that paradigm shift is necessary for it to occur in the first place. As one participant put it in the context of education in remote rural areas in India, recognizing that significant change may well be a multi-generational endeavor,

Because it's like they have these beliefs from past centuries, maybe like they are taking it from their grandparents, their forefathers, like these things are like to be kept secret or something like that, and they have built into the belief, and they like to stick to it, like they are orthodox, and they doesn't want to come out from this place.

Among the many stakeholders in this project who might find themselves (or indeed not 'find' themselves in it even though they are) are teachers (at all levels of education), administrators, elected representatives at local and national level, parents, and community leaders. It must be recognized that many of these have a vested interest in the perpetuation of the current paradigm, for various reasons, and whether or not they recognize it. Complicating this further is the tendency for mutual reinforcement between those whom we call 'leaders' and those of us who 'follow'.

The Curriculum

Much of the existing curriculum at the various levels of formal public education covers topics that are of global significance, though they may currently be treated from an essentially domestic perspective. These include history, social studies, and earth sciences (for instance environmental studies, geography, etc.). On this point, the Indian participants expressed their perception of knowledge and understanding of world affairs in India and the US:

I think there's one point probably you have to appreciate in India, would be that it's awareness of things around him. Today if you probably ask a kid here, saying where is Niagara Falls he might tell you it's in North America, but if you had to ask the same kid in the US saying where is Taj Mahal he would probably say it's in Las Vegas, it's a club, he would say. So that, the awareness is probably really good in India, you would probably see more kids knowledgeable about things around them ...

Actually there's a point that goes along with that. Americans still believe that we ride on elephants ... we study like world history so we know what's happening. We like know who your President is. I'm sure that the majority your college students wouldn't know who our President is, or what's happening around them.

Such knowledge, or lack thereof, might be of no consequence. Other cases give rise to tension:

I have certain friends working where the clients call in and say you've got my job, so it's like they actually don't know what's happening, like government policies. So, but, they just see from their point of view, I don't have a job and the reason is Indians so they have a general hatred to us or something of that sort ... You need to know, to be aware of the situation, not to a very great extent, but at least at some level ... But I think it's very bad in the West, like it's literally like the common people have no clue as to what's happening around them actually...

A curriculum oriented to global citizenship requires a change of focus to place more emphasis on these areas of study from a global perspective; and inclusion of ethics as a required area of study. Curriculum must re-architected in a maturity-appropriate way for elementary through post-secondary education. The curriculum, and therefore those who design and execute it, must remain "liquid" to recognize that change is both rapid, and non-linear. It must also recognize that the particular issues of the day (such as Americans' contemporary concerns – whether or not justified – about Islam) are partly manifestations of deep-seated underlying issues of identity, injustice etc., and it is those issues that global citizenship education is intended to identify and address. The rapidity of change has been alluded to in earlier Chapters. Recent globally significant events in the Middle East (and in particular their significance to the US) are a further illustration of this.

Teaching Resources

Textbooks are a traditional adjunct to teaching, and in some formal educational settings might still, for all practical purposes, be the only resource available to students beyond the teacher. While they may continue to occupy a useful place in contemporary formal education (possibly more in some settings than others), modern technology provides immediate and inexpensive connectivity to a rich set of complementary resources in a virtual classroom that extends globally – well beyond the bounds of the traditional physical classroom. These resources include both ‘one-way’ resources such as streamed television, radio, podcasts and web-sites; and ‘two-way/multi-way’ resources such as social networking sites, email, and electronic devices such as telephones – many of which support real-time communications beyond voice. By implication, and of great importance, these resources include people. In the context of global citizenship education, this means people in other countries.

Together, these various resources provide immediate (or at least very swift) access to information emanating from, and events occurring in, relatively remote regions of the world. A dramatic example of this recently has been the popular uprising against oppressive regimes in the Middle East (Kornalian & Kutsch, 2011).⁸⁵ They also facilitate the visibility of perspectives substantially untainted by ‘official’ sources (for example government, NGO and corporate, including media directed by them), and other media

85. The “wave of protests” described by these authors demonstrates the empowering capabilities of modern communications technology – in particular the speed with which the ‘wave’ spread. It has also brought into focus the selectivity of the US in “spreading freedom and democracy”; other interests might take precedence, and result in the US supporting the kind of oppressive regimes that it nominally denounces.

channels, both in the originating country and domestically. Furthermore, there is at least the potential for dialogue with ‘ordinary people’, thus providing for the exchange of perceptions of each participant in the dialogue. Such dialogue is not, of course, restricted to occasions on which momentous events are occurring. Indeed, one intended longer-term outcome of cementing relationships between people in different countries is the development of “soft power” – a mutual understanding and acceptance that pre-empts the tensions leading to those events in the first place.⁸⁶

Teachers

Teachers continue to be regarded largely as dispensers of “knowledge” and maintainers of control. Use of the word “knowledge” suggests a degree of certainty, objectivity, and possibly universality. This is open to increasing challenge, partly because of the rapidity and extent of change, and partly because different communities subscribe to different perceptions of “knowledge” – and these differences are increasingly visible. In an educational paradigm oriented to global citizenship, teachers must themselves exhibit an open, enquiring mind, as free as possible from prejudice, and be well grounded in the theory and practice of ‘cultural fluency’ as described by LeBaron (2003). They must be willing to engage the relevant technologies of the day, at least so far as communications are concerned, and this is likely to require regular continuing education in these technologies. There is a strong probability that among older teachers in particular, their knowledge and skills in this realm will be far inferior to that of their

86. Post-WWII “town-twinning” between communities in Europe that had been at war is an example of an attempt to do this.

students. Teachers must also be willing to relinquish a sufficient degree of control to allow students to make their own discoveries in a significantly wider context than has traditionally been the case in the school setting, and probably in the personal lives of many students. The teacher role might therefore be understood as one of ‘igniting minds’.

Critical Thinking in the Connected Virtual Classroom

The richness and diversity of sources reinforces the need for their critical evaluation. This is more than understanding that all ‘data’ are more or less partial, in the senses of being both biased and incomplete: a compounding factor is the extent to which interpretation may be influenced, possibly unintentionally, by the mediating influence of one’s own (possibly ethnocentric, certainly partial) view of the world. Even where ethnocentrism is not a factor, interactions with others might nevertheless be perceived as ethnocentric, especially in the minds of those whose understanding of the US and Americans have already been adversely prejudiced, in the same way as some Americans have internalized prejudices against others. This points to a greater need to develop the willingness to try to see the world through the eyes of others – and conversely to help others to see the world through American eyes (though without imparting any sense of superiority). Developing this skill, and generally developing awareness and understanding of others’ perspectives, might additionally inform students’ perceptions of bias in domestic media, domestic political representations, and other domestic sources. It should also provide insights into the extent to which media channels reinforce the

prejudices of their respective audiences, no matter how ‘false’ those prejudices might be, effectively stifling critical thinking.

An example of a particular lesson here is to compare and deconstruct the various stories presented about a particular event or phenomenon in another country, whether contemporary or historical. These various presentations might include historical records, news media coverage, ‘official’ statements, and stories shared by individuals with whom relationships have been established on the one hand, and the domestic equivalents on the other.⁸⁷ Comparisons of this sort may well provide significant insights into how others (even those essentially friendly to the US) view the US and Americans, and why they do so. This in turn might lead to some understanding of others’ behavior, which would otherwise remain opaque. Some of the findings set out in Chapter IV constitute cases in point, two example being

on the one side you say we want to assist you, but on the other side you are pointing fingers at us. So which way do you want to be, a devil or an angel?

I think you have a lot of interest shown by the Western world to make an establishment, to establish their force in the military alliance but they aren't really responsible, ensuring responsibility in ensuring that it is used for the right purposes.⁸⁸

87. Public comments to news articles posted on the Web provide an abundant supply of such representations. On this point, it is also worth noting that these comments are visible to others, and may be taken by them to be ‘representative’ of American feelings. Many of these comments are extremely negative.

88. This remark was in the context of US military aid to Pakistan, ostensibly to counter terrorism. There are feelings in India that such ‘aid’ is actually used in ways that are contrary to India’s interests.

The lessons implicit in this form of investigation should lead to a more critical evaluation of the myths of superiority and salvific mission which form the focus of this Dissertation, and facilitate President Kennedy's 1962 exhortation to "move on from the reassuring repetition of stale phrases to a new, difficult, but essential confrontation with reality" (Miller Center of Public Affairs, 2011b). This includes the extent to which America still clings to some isolationist, nationalist ideologies despite a proclaimed espousal of globalization, together with the symbols that are used to reinforce those ideologies rather than simply engendering a legitimate sense of community and unity – flags and Pledges being examples.⁸⁹ They also include an ethnocentric orientation to other cultures predicated only in part on a reductionist view of those cultures' identity, potentiated by the demonizing rhetoric of those who 'lead' the country, which characterizes others based on their different political or religious orientations (or some other facet of identity) as "evil". There is also the hope that this will lead to an awareness of the dissonance bound up in beliefs about freedom and democracy on the one hand, and US foreign policy and militarism, including coerced regime change (both covert and overt) in other sovereign states, in pursuit of maintaining its (meaning Americans') 'interests' abroad.

89. Between them, Bacon (1620), Feitlowitz (1998), Fiumara (1990), Fromm (1941), Hoffer (1951), Krishnamurti (1969, 1987) and Orwell (1946, 1949) have written extensively about the negative effects of ideology, doctrine, dogma, and symbols – including words and phrases whose meanings have been debased or subverted.

Critical thinking requires a degree of ‘letting go’, which Chödrön (2000) interprets in a variety of ways that may be difficult to acknowledge, let alone address, for those caught up in contemporary US culture.

We strive for control: to hold on to what we have, or add to our ‘possessions’. Chödrön describes this clinging as a “means of escape” (p. 6), as “addiction” (p. 13). This is not restricted to material possession, but extends to emotions and our relationships with ourselves and others. In holding on in this way we implicitly reject the idea that all things are impermanent, uncertain, and subject to change. To the extent that this results in change remaining unacknowledged, we live in a fantasy, a state of denial. Worse, with everyone concentrating on holding on to what they have (and maybe trying to get more), there is little or no time for recognition of others – except perhaps to the extent that others might contribute to, or conversely impede, attainment of our own goals. Total acknowledgment of impermanence and its implications takes courage.

We tend to have high opinions of ourselves. Partly out of fear of what we might find, we tend not to want to examine ourselves. We find distractions – things, activity, entertainments – to avoid examination of ourselves. But humility has a place, too, and these high opinions must therefore be let go. In order to help with this we need to be willing to take stock of ourselves honestly, and let go of judgments of what we find within ourselves. By resisting judgment, we may form a better understanding of ourselves. We should not, however, confuse non-judgmental self-awareness with ‘self-improvement’, which has a tendency to self-centeredness. On the contrary, we must be aware of those behaviors, not all of which are necessarily immediately obvious, that may

be hurtful to others, including “our actions, our speech” and even “our minds” (pp. 26, 32).

Certainty is a form of holding on, and may lead to confrontation where we encounter others who hold to a different – possibly mutually exclusive ‘certainty’. Furthermore, since certainty also suggests universality, it contributes to a belief that our way is the only way, with implications for the way we regard others. We should not be persuaded to certainty on the strength of popular belief: as Bacon (1620) indicates, that may be the more reason for challenge (Aphorism LXXVII). Letting go of certainty requires that we become accepting of “paradox and ambiguity”, and of others whose views of the world may be different from ours (p. 54).

Then there is the tendency to reduce complex relationships into confrontational, mutually exclusive binaries – for example right and wrong; good and evil; true and false. Often, these binaries constitute no more than ‘convenient’ endpoints on a continuum. They may be no more than inherited opinions that were never grounded in any genuine reality at the time they were formed, let alone exposed to re-evaluation in the light of changing circumstances. Holding fast to these opinions can prevent us from seeing that there may be multiple legitimate, different (but not mutually exclusive) viewpoints, relating to other people, and possibly even adopting a new positionality as a result of interaction with those people: a form of Middle Way, an acceptance of ambiguity, and a move towards compassion and peace. This is not to say that we should abandon deeply held ‘truths’ that we believe we have worked out for ourselves. We can still aim to make

change for the better according to those truths so long as they are not imposed upon others.

Critical thinking requires “attentive listening”, a skill that Fiumara (1990) observes “has been lost in western thought” (p. 11). More recently, Mahbubani (2009) confirms Fiumara’s contention with respect to the US: “American thinkers and policymakers have lost the ability to listen to other voices on the planet because they cannot conceive of the possibility that they are not already listening” (p. 51). In part, Lear (1998) attributes this inability (or perhaps unwillingness) to listen to a perception of ‘already knowing’. Whatever the reasons for not listening, this may manifest as foreclosing the opportunity for others to speak. This caused one Indian participant to observe with respect to the World Bank (perceived to be an essentially Western institution)

When the World Bank is providing aid, in fact the research they come down to find out how much to give, they hire these, they outsource that, and it’s not from the locals. In fact it’s like somebody from another country comes to study what is the need for us, and then they do not take too much of the local requirements ... The World Bank should ... take expertise like from the local areas.

Critical thinking also requires attention to language, and the way it is used. By way of example, the use of the term ‘external assistance’ (or ‘aid’), implying altruistic motives on the part of the West in its dealings with developing countries drew this rebuke from an Indian participant:

I just have a problem ... in terms of word assistance ... a classic example was when the Prime Minister of Britain had made a recent trip to India, and he had his entire Council of Ministers spread across five different cities and basically one of

the intentions were to build economic interests back home so that, you know, it could be generative of the economy of his nation. But then at a later point he mentioned that in Britain, the biggest recipient of Britain's external aid is India ... most of the countries come to India under the pretext of giving aid, but actually they are getting a lot back. And that's why I have a problem with the word "assistance" ... So I like the word assistance to leave, to get out of the context, and it's more of an economic bargain that every nation is doing against itself. ... Yes, at the face of it, it might look great Good Samaritan work, but ... what I see – global security is one [thing], and of course securing your economic interests for the future. These are the two things that I see are the primary ones for any nation to receive aid.

Hindrances and Impediments

Proposed change tends to generate controversy, to provoke objections. The changes suggested here are sufficiently counter to received wisdom to precipitate objections by some stakeholders in the educational process. Some of the more important of these are identified below.

Education is a politically driven enterprise. The ideas presented here in terms of redefining American Exceptionalism and cultivating global citizenship will be resisted by those whose ideologies conflict with them. So long as there is sufficient political power in the hands of those who resist, that resistance will tend to be successful. One of the many outcomes will be a perpetuation of what one Indian participant described as a "biased" education – one that is antithetical to a knowledge and understanding of both ourselves and others that is a crucial component of responsible global citizenship.

Global competitiveness is, to a degree, perceived to be about zero-sum economics – gaining or preserving jobs here at the 'expense' of jobs in other communities. In the current weak economic environment domestically, there is a strong focus on improving competitiveness in order at least to preserve, and better still to restore or increase our

share of economic activity and the standard of living that it supports. In other words, it is partly a case of what the world can do to make our domestic way of life possible, rather than what we can do to contribute to a better world. Given other countries' successful challenges to US pre-eminence in the various disciplines that have contributed to its economic superiority over the last several decades, the vigor with which educational outcomes are oriented to restore that pre-eminence by concentrating on math and science is no surprise. Thus any educational protocol that is seen to de-emphasize these disciplines is likely to be strenuously resisted.

A curriculum designed and executed along the lines indicated here encourages students to seek out world views subscribed to by others. It therefore creates an opportunity for students to re-form their own world view taking cognizance of those other world views. To the more conservative (not necessarily politically conservative) this may constitute an unacceptable incursion into parental responsibility and a challenge to their own sincerely and strongly held beliefs, and be seen to expose children to the risk of some form of corruption.⁹⁰ This is of particular relevance given our contemporary “monster” of Islam, taking account of the religiosity – sometimes dogmatic – of the US (Swanbrow, 2003), and the rhetoric used in high places to cast Islam as inferior to Christianity – to the point of engaging a 21st century Crusade, or what might be regarded as a form of reverse *jihad* (Leung, 2004). There is also risk that teachers will find their

90. Nietzsche (1881) takes a directly contrary view: “The surest way to corrupt a youth is to instruct him to hold in higher esteem those who think alike than those who think differently.” (Aphorism 297)

own beliefs challenged, possibly inhibiting their willingness and ability to provide the space for students to make their own discoveries and draw their own (tentative) conclusions – a potentially powerful and negative manifestation of hidden curriculum.

America tends to be oriented to the measurement of immediate, quantifiable (and therefore comparable and rankable) results, reinforced by an emphasis on “accountability”. On this point, the post-Sputnik educational reforms “created some new dangers, such as those inherent in restricting instruction to the teaching of measurable skills” (Hiatt, 1986). By contrast, the proposed curriculum is in pursuit of results that may require a long gestation period – possibly multiple generations – and which may be largely amenable, if at all, to subjective evaluation only. Furthermore, part of this evaluation might necessarily be undertaken by among the more than 90 percent of the world’s population living outside the physical borders of the US, according to their own value system rather than America’s. Benefits might however include a greater degree of domestic tranquility and security, and a genuinely more peaceful world. Some of these benefits might arise in a negative form, i.e. the absence of undesirable phenomena. As with the road not taken, it will not be possible to know what these might be.

American-English is the predominant language spoken in the US (Shin & Bruno, 2003). This might be regarded as a constraint on the ‘resources’ available for use. However, English is in common use, and taught, in many countries of the world. There are therefore many English language resources for popular consumption, including books, journals, newspapers, television and radio. Furthermore, other languages are

options at various levels of education in some American schools.⁹¹ This not only makes available a wider set of international resources, but creative use of these resources might encourage more students to enroll in foreign language courses. It should of course be noted that communication involves more than just ‘language’ in the commonly understood meaning, though vocabulary and idiom may well cause misunderstandings between people from different cultures who are nominally fluent in a particular language: there are other components to communication, such as body language, that must also be understood.

There are two aspects to objections related to time. The first is the time available to teach to the global citizenship curriculum, and the extent to which this might be seen to require reducing time spent on other curricular material – in particular those of greater relevance to supporting “global competitiveness”. The second relates to the different time zones in which candidates for dialogue reside. However, many resources are available 24 hours a day; the window of opportunity for dialog does not necessarily need to be constrained by the hours of the school day; the school day does not necessarily need

91. For instance, Winston-Salem / Forsyth Schools High Schools Registration for 2011-2012 offers Chinese, French, German, Spanish and Japanese (Winston-Salem / Forsyth County Schools, 2011). UNCG (see www.uncg.edu) offers courses in these languages, plus Italian, Portuguese and Russian. Of these languages, those interested in “global competitiveness” might be particularly interested in the languages of the BRIC nations (Brazil, Russia and China), and the language of the world’s second largest economy, Japan (World Bank, 2010a).

to be constrained as is currently the case;⁹² and dialog does not necessarily need to occur in real time.

Other Potential Benefits

Many students throughout the continuum of formal education are already frequent voluntary users of at least some of the technological resources identified here for personal social benefit. Applying their use to further a global citizenship agenda is therefore leveraging these students' skills with, and attraction to, these resources. While this cannot be guaranteed, there is the possibility that this fact alone will encourage student engagement with the learning process. The collaborative and investigative nature of inquiry, together with the sense of relevance to students' own lives that might be felt (facilitated if necessary by teachers), might well increase that engagement further.

Conclusion

This Dissertation is, in essence, a peace project. It has demonstrated that some manifestations of the current myth of American Exceptionalism that has evolved since the founding of the US Republic – superiority and salvific mission – have lost much of the salience they might have had historically. Chapter I described the evolution of the myth since the founding of the US Republic. Chapter II identified some of the major changes occurring over the last 60 years that have significantly affected relationships between state and non-state actors. Chapters III and IV illustrated some of those changes seen through the eyes of India, one of the 'emerging nations' identified in Chapter II

92. Silva (2007) presents some of the pros and cons of increasing both the length of the school day, and the number of days students spend in school during the year.

whose rising influence in the world has contributed to Zakaria's (2008) "tectonic power shifts" (p. 1). The illustration included the recounting of views of University students in India. These Chapters are part of the evidence to sustain the argument for re-invention of the myth.

This Chapter has examined the concept of peace. It has distinguished between negative peace, a coerced absence of physical violence between state and/or non-state actors, and positive peace, in which all forms of violence (physical, structural, cultural, and environmental) are eradicated, or at least minimized. The contribution that the old myth has made to negative peace has been described, together with the risks entailed in perpetuating that old myth, and provided examples of unsustainable negative peace giving way to open conflict. It has proceeded to define a pathway to the creation of a new myth that would move America towards making a contribution to achievement of positive peace: it has presented some ideas on how a space might be opened up for this new myth to be created and evolved, and then propagated to the American (and possibly world-wide) community through a process for developing soft power and cultivating global citizenship in formal public educational establishments. This process requires a fundamental shift in the American mindset with respect to a what is currently perceived as a principal purpose of education: global competitiveness as the means to economic success. The US no longer enjoys its historical edge in global competitiveness, and this has implications for the standard of living that Americans can expect to enjoy in the future unless this competitiveness can be restored. Neither is the US the good global citizen that perhaps Americans like to believe it is, should they even choose to think

about it. The US tendency to various forms of coercion in order to maintain its economic well-being is increasingly subject to challenge from the shifts in the various forms of power described in Chapter II, and is less sustainable financially due to America's relative loss of economic power. The signs are that trying to fight the "wind of change" will be at best non-productive, at worst counter-productive, in terms of both domestic tranquility and international peace. Furthermore, events in the last decade have demonstrated that the two are, in some respects, inseparable. This being so, there is a clear case for redefining who we are, and how we relate to the rest of the world, in terms that cast the US as a co-operative and collaborative player on the world stage. Other nations – India being one of them – are re-inventing themselves: so must America. In the conversations with the Indian participants, their role as 'global citizens' was mentioned by them many times: so, in the future, might Americans.

This is not a short-term project, which might be disheartening to a nation one of whose present cultural imperatives is immediate, identifiable, and quantifiable gratification. On the contrary, it is a multi-generational, even perpetual, project. It recognizes that obsolete ideas tend to die out as the people who subscribe to them themselves die, and that it is the young – Ayittey's Cheetahs and Kalam's Ignited Minds – who will keep the myth relevant and useful to the people living in the ever-changing context in which it plays its part. Whether American "leadership" remains a part of that myth is yet to be decided; but if it is, Hoffer's (1951) thoughts on leadership warrant consideration: "the leader finds out where people are going so that he (sic) can lead them [there]" (p. 119). A guiding principle for evolution of the myth might also be mindful of

this: rather than “A new order for the age”, the motto *novus ordo seclorum* might anticipate many “New orders for their age”; rather than implying “out of many, one”, *e pluribus unum* might be reinterpreted, using Oberg’s (2006) words, as “unity in diversity”.

The magnitude of this project may seem daunting, and discourage any effort to engage it. Even the outspoken Mark Twain failed to publish during his lifetime his response to the Philippine-American War of 1899-1902, symbolic perhaps of

[T]he half dozen rash spirits that ventured to disapprove of the war and cast a doubt upon its righteousness straightway got such a stern and angry warning that for their personal safety's sake they quickly shrank out of sight and offended no more in that way. (Twain, 1923)

Yet Krishnamurti (1969) believes that change will only occur if

each one of us recognizes the central fact that we, as individuals, as human beings, in whatever part of the world we happen to live or whatever culture we happen to belong to, are totally responsible for the whole state of the world. (p. 14)

Morally, the corollary is that each of us must change, because “this will change the whole of mankind” (Krishnamurti, 1987, p. 82). Even if, like Twain’s mysterious “aged stranger”, we are considered “a lunatic”. Or, as was considered Henry David Thoreau, a dissenter from the Spanish-American War, “unpatriotic” (Emerson, 1917).

REFERENCES

- Acharya, A. (2010). Tamil diaspora keeps 'Eelam' dreams alive. *Asia Times*, June 16, 2010. Retrieved from http://www.atimes.com/atimes/South_Asia/LF16Df04.html on February 1, 2011.
- Ackerman, B. (2010). The radical presidency. *Yale Law School*, September 15, 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.law.yale.edu/news/12257.htm> on January 5, 2011.
- ActionAid. (2009). *UN showdown exposes rich countries' resistance to financial reform, warns ActionAid*. Retrieved from <http://www.actionaid.org/pages.aspx?PageID=34&ItemID=476> on December 30, 2010.
- Adams, J. & King, C. (2010). *Global research report: Russia*. UK: ThomsonReuters.
- Ambedkar, B. (2010). *Words of freedom: Ideas of a nation*. New Delhi: Penguin Books.
- American Reformation Project. (n.d.). *Speech to the National Association of Evangelicals, March 8, 1983*. Retrieved from http://www.americanreformation.org/Freedoms-Documents/Evil_Empire_Speech.htm on February 25, 2011.
- Annan, K. (2005). *Secretary-General's Address to the Commission on Human Rights, April 7, 2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/apps/sg/sgstats.asp?nid=1388> on December 30, 2010.
- ASEAN. (n.d.). *The founding of ASEAN*. Retrieved from <http://www.asean.org/20024.htm> on February 26, 2011.
- AU. (n.d.). *African Union in a nutshell*. Retrieved from http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/AboutAu/au_in_a_nutshell_en.htm on February 26, 2011.
- Ayittey, G. (2005). *Africa unchained: The blueprint for Africa's future*. NY: Palgrave McMillan.
- Bacevich, A. (2008). *The limits of power: The end of American Exceptionalism*. NY: Metropolitan Books.
- Bacon, F. (1620). *The New Organon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Ban, K. (2009). *UN and civil government*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/civilsociety/index.html> on December 30, 2010.
- Baranetsky, V. (2011). Essay: Is Wikileaks more dangerous than the alternative? *Harvard Civil Rights – Civil Liberties Law Review*, January 5, 2011. Retrieved from <http://harvardcrcl.org/2011/01/05/essay-is-wikileaks-more-dangerous-than-the-alternative> on January 5, 2011.
- Baty, P. (2010). Once a science superpower, Russia is now a fading light. *The Times Higher Education*, February 4, 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.timeshighereducation.co.uk/story.asp?storycode=410229> on January 10, 2011.
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Bayefsky, A. (2009). Bayefsky: U.S. on Human Rights Council. *The Washington Times*, May 14, 2009. Retrieved from <http://washingtontimes.com/news/2009/may/14/us-on-human-rights-council/> on December 29, 2010.
- BBC. (2003). Sars: Is global panic justified? *BBC News*, April 24, 2003. Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/health/2972927.stm> on January 5, 2011.
- BBC. (2009). G20 : Economic summit snapshot. *BBC News*, April 2, 2009. Retrieved from http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/in_depth/business/2009/g20/7897719.stm on February 25, 2011.
- Brendon, P. (2007). *The decline and fall of the British Empire, 1781-1997*. NY: Random House.
- Brians, P. (1998). *Rudyard Kipling, "The White Man's Burden", (1899)*. Retrieved from http://www.wsu.edu:8080/~wldciv/world_civ_reader/world_civ_reader_2/kipling.html on February 26, 2011.
- BRIC. (2010). BRIC Summit Joint Statement April 2010. *Council on Foreign Relations*, April 15, 2010. Retrieved from http://www.cfr.org/publication/21927/bric_summit_joint_statement_april_2010.html on December 29, 2010.
- Broad, W., Markoff, J., & Sanger, D. (2011). Israeli test on worm called crucial in Iran nuclear delay. *The New York Times*, January 15, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/16/world/middleeast/16stuxnet.html> on January 22, 2011.

- Broughton, P. (2006). Beware Russia, energy superpower. *The First Post*, October 12, 2006. Retrieved from <http://www.thefirstpost.co.uk/4883,news-comment,news-politics,beware-russia-energy-superpower> on January 10, 2011.
- Brown, L. (2005). *Outgrowing the earth: The food security challenge in an age of falling water tables and rising temperatures*. NY: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Brundtland, G. (1987). *Presentation of the report of the World Commission on Environment and Development to UNEP's 14th Governing Council Session*. Nairobi: World Commission on Environment and Development.
- Brzezinski, Z. (2005). Do These Two Have Anything in Common? *The Washington Post*, December 4, 2005.
- Capell, K. (2005). Avian-flu panic takes wing in Europe. *Business Week*, October 26, 2005. Retrieved from http://www.businessweek.com/bwdaily/dnflash/oct2005/nf20051026_0254_db089.htm on January 5, 2011.
- Carden, J. (2010). National debt threatens security, Mullen says. *US Department of Defense*, August 27, 2010.
- Carpenter, T. (2010). *Long overdue: Adding permanent members to the UN Security Council*. Retrieved from <http://nationalinterest.org/blog/the-skeptics/long-overdue-adding-permanent-members-the-un-security-council-4380> on December 30, 2010.
- Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. MA: The Riverside Press.
- The Carter Center. (2011). *Crisis of confidence, July 15, 1979*. Retrieved from http://www.cartercenter.org/news/editorials_speeches/crisis_of_confidence.html on October 29, 2010.
- CDC. (2004). *Severe acute respiratory syndrome*. GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Chandran, R. (2008). Tata Motors completes acquisition of Jag, Land Rover. *Reuters*, June 28, 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.reuters.com/article/2008/06/02/us-tata-jaguar-idUSBMA00084220080602> on February 1, 2011.
- Chödrön, P. (2000). *When things fall apart: Heart advice for difficult times*. MA: Shambala Publications, Inc.

- Choudhury, U. (2010). *Obama backing India at UN Security Council is a hollow gesture*. Retrieved from http://www.dnaindia.com/opinion/interview_obama-backing-india-at-un-security-council-is-a-hollow-gesture_1476206 on December 30, 2010.
- Clarke, R. & Knake, R. (2010). *Cyber war: The next threat to national security and what to do about it*. NY: HarperCollins.
- CNN. (1998). U.S. policy draws fire in Ohio. CNN, February 18, 1998. *CNN*. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/WORLD/9802/18/town.meeting.folo> on November 26, 2010.
- Cohen, D. (1998). *The wealth of the world and the poverty of nations*. (Trans. Lindenfeld, J.). Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Corbett, S. & Fikkert, B. (2009). *When helping hurts: How to alleviate poverty without hurting the poor or yourself*. IL: Moody Publishers.
- Cortell, A. (2006). *Mediating globalization: Domestic institutions and industrial policies in the United States and Britain*. Albany: State University of New York.
- Counts, A. (2008). *Small loans, big dreams: How Nobel Prize winner Muhammad Yunus and microfinance are changing the world*. NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Cowen, T. (2009). Last man standing. *Wilson Quarterly*, 33(2), 55-58.
- Davies, R. (1995). Should NATO grow? – A dissent. *The New York Review of Books*, 42(14) September 21, 1995. Retrieved from <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1788> on January 4, 2011.
- De Haan, A. (2009). *How the aid industry works*. VA: Kumarian Pres.
- Dehesa, G. (2006). *Winners and losers in globalization*. MA: Blackwell Publishing.
- Deutsche Welle. (2004). G4 nations bid for Permanent Security Council seat. *Deutsche Welle*, September 22, 2004. Retrieved from <http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,,1335522,00.html> on December 28, 2010.
- Diamond, J. (1992). *The third chimpanzee: The evolution and future of the human animal*. NY: HarperCollins.
- Dods, M. (2009). (Trans.). *Saint Augustine: The City of God*. MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

- Donnelly, T. (2000). *Rebuilding America's defenses: Strategy, forces and resources for a new century*. DC: Project for the New American Century.
- DuBrulle, H. (2003). *Britain since 1760*. Retrieved from <http://www.anselm.edu/academic/history/hdubrulle/ModernBritain/text/generalinfo/gallery03.htm> on July 15, 2009.
- Earth Policy Institute. (2004). *Falling water tables*. Retrieved from http://www.earth-policy.org/Books/Out/Ote6_2.htm on August 19, 2009.
- ECI. (2010). *Notification*. New Delhi: The Election Commission of India.
- Economic Times. (2010a). IMF chief describes India as economic powerhouse. *Economic Times, December 2, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/economy/indicators/IMF-chief-describes-India-as-economic-power-house/articleshow/7029174.cms> on January 11, 2011.
- Economic Times. (2010b). Ensure emergence of India as a superpower: Governor. *Economic Times, December 28, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/articleshow/7180311.cms> on January 6, 2011.
- Economic Times. (2010c). India may become global software superpower by 2020: Gartner. *Economic Times, March 14, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/infotech/software/India-may-become-global-software-superpower-by-2020-Gartner/articleshow/5681934.cms> on January 6, 2011.
- The Economist Intelligence Unit. (2010). *Digital economy rankings 2010: Beyond e-readiness*. London: The Economist Intelligence Unit.
- The Economist. (2010). A bumpier but freer road. *The Economist*, 397(8702), 89-91.
- Eldridge, P. (1969). *The politics of foreign aid in India*. London: London School of Economics and Political Science.
- Emerson, E. (1917). *Henry Thoreau, as remembered by a young friend*. NY: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Emery, D. (2011). False rumor: Anthrax in Tide detergent. *David Emery's urban legends blog, January 6, 2011*. Retrieved from <http://urbanlegends.about.com/b/2011/01/06/anthrax-in-tide-detergent-hoax.htm> on January 9, 2011.

- EU. (n.d.). *About the European Union*. Retrieved from <http://europa.eu/about-eu> on February 26, 2011.
- Express India. (2004). Address to the nation. *Express India, June 24, 2004*. Retrieved from <http://www.expressindia.com/news/fullstory.php?newsid=33003> on January 7, 2011.
- FairVote. (2003). People's review, Nepal: Dr. Johan Galtung suggests for revision of constitution. *FairVote*. Retrieved from <http://archive.fairvote.org/pr/global/nepalpeacestudies.htm> on February 25, 2011.
- Feitlowitz, M. (1998). *A lexicon of terror: Argentina and the legacies of torture*. Oxford: Oxford World's Classics.
- Filizer, L. (2009). Skeptics at NATO's 60th anniversary: a critique of the criticism. *Strategic Insights*, 8, 3.
- Financial Express. (2010). The tale of two Gandhiji quotes. *Financial Express, July 7, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.financialexpress.com/news/the-tale-of-two-gandhiji-quotes/66458/0#> on December 1, 2010.
- Fiumara, G. (1990). *The other side of language: A philosophy of listening*. Oxon: Routledge.
- Fromm, E. (1941). *Escape from Freedom*. MD: Holt Paperbacks.
- Foreign Policy. (2010a). India rising. *Foreign Policy, November 4, 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/11/04/india_rising on January 2, 2010.
- Foreign Policy. (2010b). The FP top 100 global thinkers. *Foreign Policy, November 29, 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2010/11/29/the_fp_top_100_global_thinkers on January 3, 2010.
- Fresia, J. (1988). *Toward an American revolution: Exposing the Constitution & other illusions*. MA: South End Press.
- Friedman, T. (2000). *The Lexus and the olive tree*. NY: Anchor Books.
- Friedman, T. (2003). Fire, ready, aim. *The New York Times, March 9, 2003*.
- Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. NY: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.

- Friedman, T. (2008). *Hot, flat, and crowded: Why we need a green revolution – and how it can renew America*. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- The Future of Freedom Foundation. (2001). *Speech by John Quincy Adams to the House of Representatives, July 4, 1821*. Retrieved from <http://www.fff.org/comment/AdamsPolicy.asp> on October 31, 2010.
- G20. (n.d.). *About G-20*. Retrieved from http://www.g20.org/about_faq.aspx on February 26, 2011.
- G8. (n.d.). *G8 FAQ*. Retrieved from http://www.g8italia2009.it/G8/Home/G8-G8_Layout_locale-1199882116809_FAQ.htm#ancora1 on December 28, 2010.
- Galtung, J. (1973). *The European Community: A superpower in the making*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Galtung, J. (2004). Imagining global democracy. *Development and Change*, 35, 1073-1079.
- Galtung, J. (2004). Imagining global democracy. *Development and Change*, 35, 1073-1079.
- Galtung, J. (2007). A mini theory of peace. *The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research*. Retrieved from http://www.transnational.org/Resources_Treasures/2007/Galtung_MiniTheory.html on February 22, 2011.
- Galtung, J. (2009). G20. And NATO. And the world. *Transcend Media Service, April 6, 2009*. Retrieved from <http://www.transcend.org/tms/2009/04/g-20-and-nato-and-the-world/> on February 25, 2011.
- Gardiner, N. (2005). Paul Wolfowitz: Freedom fighter. *The Heritage Foundation, June 1, 2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.heritage.org/research/commentary/2005/06/paul-wolfowitz-freedom-fighter> on December 31, 2010.
- Garrison, J. (2004). *America as Empire: Global leader or rogue power?* CA: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.
- Gibson, C., Andersson, K., Ostrom, E., and Shivakumar, S. *The Samaritan's dilemma: The political economy of development aid*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glencross, A. (2008). *Altiero Spinelli and the idea of the US Constitution as a model for Europe*. Florence: European University Institute.

- Global Exchange. (2009). World Trade Organization. *Global Exchange, July 21, 2009*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalexchange.org/campaigns/wto/> on February 25, 2011.
- Goodman, P. (2007). Ending battle, Wolfowitz resigns from World Bank. *The Washington Post, May 18, 2007*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/05/17/AR2007051700216.html> on December 31, 2010.
- Gordon, P. (2007). Can the War on Terror Be Won? *Foreign Affairs, 86, 6, 53-66*
- Gore, A. (2006). *An inconvenient truth: The planetary emergency of global warming and what we can do about it*. NY: Rodale.
- Government of India. (1986). *The child labour (prohibition and regulation) act, 1986 and rules*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Government of India. (2001a). *India as knowledge superpower: Strategy for transformation*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Government of India. (2001b). *Census of India – data on language*. Retrieved from http://censusindia.gov.in/Census_Data_2001/Census_Data_Online/Language/data_on_language.html on January 24, 2011.
- Government of India. (2002). *India Vision 2020*. New Delhi: Planning Commission, Government of India.
- Government of India. (2004). *The National Common Minimum Programme of the Government of India*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Government of India. (2007). *The Constitution of India*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Government of India. (2008a). *Eleventh five year plan*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Government of India. (2008b). *Position paper on external assistance received by India*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Government of India. (2009a). *Millennium Development Goals – India country report, 2009*. New Delhi: Government of India.
- Government of India. (2009b). *The right of children to free and compulsory education act, 2009*. New Delhi: Government of India.

- Grandin, G. (2009). What can Obama do in Latin America? *The Nation*, April 15, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.thenation.com/print/article/what-can-obama-do-latin-america> on January 5, 2011.
- Greene, M. (1981). The humanities and emancipatory possibility. *Journal of Education*, 163, 287-305.
- Greer, P. & Smith, P. (2009). *The poor will be glad: Joining the revolution to lift the world out of poverty*. MI: Zondervan.
- Griffin, K. (2003). Economic Globalization and Institutions of Global Governance. *Development and Change*, 34, 789-807.
- Griswold, D. (2009a). Obama's protectionist policies are hurting low-income Americans. *The Washington Times*, September 29, 2009.
- Griswold, D. (2009b). *Mad about trade: Why Main Street America should embrace globalization*. DC: Cato Institute.
- Halsall, P. (1998). *Nehru's Speech on the granting of Indian Independence, 14 August 1947*. Retrieved from <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/mod/1947nehru1.html> on January 6, 2011.
- Hansen, A. (2007). The World Bank and International Development Lenders. *Council on Foreign Relations*, June 1, 2007. Retrieved from <http://www.cfr.org/world-bank/world-bank-international-development-lenders/p13513> on February 25, 2011.
- Hayter, T. (1971). *Aid as imperialism*. England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Hayter, T. (1971). *Aid as imperialism*. England: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Heinrich Böll Stiftung. (2010). *India-Pakistan conference: A road map towards peace*. New Delhi: Heinrich Böll Stiftung.
- Heritage Foundation & Wall Street Journal. (2010). *The 2011 index of economic freedom*. Retrieved from <http://www.heritage.org/index/> on January 3, 2011.
- Hiatt, D. (1986). *Post-Sputnik educational reform era: To dream the impossible dream*. CA: California Educational Reform Association.
- The Hindu. (2010). Educate girls to empower nation, says Tharoor. *The Hindu*, November 28, 2010. Retrieved from

<http://www.hindu.com/2010/11/28/stories/2010112860340300.htm> on January 30, 2011.

Hindustan Times. (2010). Sarkozy backs India for UN Security Council, top N-club. *Hindustan Times, December 4, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.hindustantimes.com/Sarkozy-backs-India-for-UN-Security-Council-top-N-club/Article1-634290.aspx> on December 28, 2010.

Hoffer, E. (1951). *The true believer: Thoughts on the nature of mass movements*. NY: HarperPerennial

Hosseini, K. (2003). *The kite runner*. NY: Riverhead Books.

Hu, Z. & Khan, M.(1987). *Why is China growing so fast?* DC: International Monetary Fund.

Hubbard, R. & Duggan, W. (2009). *The aid trap: Hard truths about ending poverty*. NY: Columbia University Press.

IAEA. (1970). *Treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons*. Washington: International Atomic Energy Agency.

IMF. (n.d.). *About the IMF*. Retrieved from <http://www.imf.org/external/index.htm> on February 26, 2011.

Indian Express. (2010). Coca Cola to pay Rs 216 cr fine? *Indian Express, March 22, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.indianexpress.com/news/coca-cola-to-pay-rs-216-cr-fine/593990/> on February 17, 2011.

International Trade Administration. (n.d.). *Free Trade Agreements*. Retrieved from <http://trade.gov/fta/> on February 25, 2011.

Iyer, V. (2000). Emergency – Darkest hour in India’s judicial history. *Indian Express, June 27, 2000*. Retrieved from <http://www.indianexpress.com/ie/daily/20000627/ina27053.html> on February 1, 2011.

Jackson, J. (2007). *The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development*. DC: Congressional Research Office, The Library of Congress.

Jhally, S. (1997). *Advertising and the end of the world*. MA: Media Education Foundation.

Johnson, L. (1971). *The vantage point*. NY: The Populay Library.

- Johnson, P. (1983). *Modern times: The world from the twenties to the nineties*. NY: HarperPerennial.
- Johnston, W. (2006). *Falsehoods in Gore's An Inconvenient Truth*. Retrieved from <http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/environment/gore.html> on July 16, 2009.
- Kalam, A. (1998). *India 2020: A vision for the new millennium*. London: Penguin Books.
- Kamdar, M. (2007). *Planet India: How the fastest growing democracy is transforming America and the World*. NY: Scribner.
- Keen, J. (2003). Strain of Iraq war showing on Bush, those who know him say. *USA Today*, April 2, 2003.
- Kelly, J. (2005). *The great mortality: An intimate history of the Black Death, the most devastating plague of all time*. NY: HarperCollins.
- Khanna, P. (2009). *Parag Khanna maps the future of countries*. TEDTalks. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XRWTyUVh0BQ&feature=channel> on February 26, 2011.
- Khanna, T. (2007). Tata-Corus: India's New Steel Giant. *Harvard Business School*, February 14, 2007. Retrieved from <http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/5634.html> on October 18, 2007.
- Kinsley, M. (2003). The Bush Doctrine: War without anyone's permission. *Slate*, March 20, 2003. Retrieved from <http://www.slate.com/id/2080455/> on November 14, 2010.
- Kleinfield, N. (2006). Modern ways open India's doors to diabetes. *The New York Times*, September 13, 2006. Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2006/09/13/world/asia/13diabetes.html> on January 23, 2011.
- Knox, R. (2009). Swine flu spread mirrors air travel. *NPR*, June 30, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.npr.org/templates/story/story.php?storyId=106064035&ft=1&f=1001&sc=emaf> on January 5, 2011.
- Kohut, A. (2010). Restoring America's reputation in the world. *Pew Research Center*, March 4, 2010. Retrieved from <http://pewresearch.org/pubs/1512/restoring-americas-reputation-globally-gains-may-be-fragile> on February 15, 2011.
- Kolata, G. (2001). *Flu: The story of the great influenza pandemic of 1918 and the search for the virus that caused it*. NY: Touchstone.

- Kornalian, M. & Kutsch, T. (2011). News Brief: Waves of protests spread across the region. *Foreign Policy, February 16, 2011*. Retrieved from http://mideast.foreignpolicy.com/posts/2011/02/16/news_brief_waves_of_protests_spread_across_the_region on February 28, 2011.
- Kornbluh, P. (1998). Chile and the United States: Declassified Documents Relating to the Military Coup, September 11, 1973. *The George Washington University*. Retrieved from <http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/NSAEBB/NSAEBB8/nsaebb8i.htm> on February 25, 2011.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1969). *Freedom from the known*. NY: HarperCollins.
- Krishnamurti, J. (1987). *Krishnamurti to himself: His last journal*. Chennai: Krishnamurti Foundation India.
- LaFeber, W. (1994). *The American Age: U.S. Foreign Policy at Home and Abroad, 1750 to Present* (2nd ed.). NY: Norton.
- Lamrani, S. (2007). The Economic sanctions against Cuba: The failure of a cruel and irrational policy. *Centre for Research on Globalization*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalresearch.ca/index.php?context=va&aid=7024> on February 16, 2011.
- Lamsal, Y. (2010). UN needs restructuring to ensure equal representation of all continents. *Newsblaze, December 3, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://newsblaze.com/story/20101203142636zzzz.nb/topstory.html> on December 8, 2010.
- Lappé, F., Collins, J., & Kinley, D. (1981). *Aid as obstacle: Twenty questions about our foreign aid and the hungry*. San Francisco: IFDP.
- Law, W. & Ng, H. (2009). *Globalization and multileveled citizenship education*. Hong Kong: University of Hong Kong.
- LeBaron, M. (2003). *Bridging cultural conflicts*. CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Lederach, J. (1995). *Preparing for peace: Conflict transformation across cultures*. NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Lear, J. (1998). *Open minded: Working out the logic of the soul*. MA: Harvard University Press.

- Lee, S. & Silver, A. (2009). The Group of Eight (G8) industrialized nations. *Council on Foreign Relations, March 27, 2009*. Retrieved from http://www.cfr.org/publication/10647/group_of_eight_g8_industrialized_nations.html on December 28, 2010.
- Lerner, M. (2006). *The left hand of God: Taking back our country from the religious right*. NY: HarperCollins.
- Leung, R. (2010). The Holy Warrior. *CBS News, September 15, 2004*.
- Leung, R. (2010). The Holy Warrior. *CBS News, September 15, 2004*.
- Liu, H. (2002). The dangers of derivatives. *The Asian Times, May 23, 2002*. Retrieved from <http://www.atimes.com/global-econ/DE23Dj01.html> on January 5, 2011.
- Locke, J. (1690). *Two treatises of government*. London: Orion Publishing Group. (1993).
- Loconte, J. & Gardiner, N. (2005). Human-Rights failure: Irrelevance and ignominy at the United Nations. *National Review Online*. Retrieved from http://old.nationalreview.com/comment/loconte_gardiner200509280814.asp on December 29, 2010.
- Loeber, T. (1961). *Foreign aid: Our tragic experiment*. NY: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Logomasini, A. (2007). Rachel Carson's deadly legacy. *The Washington Times, May 30, 2007*. Retrieved from http://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2007/may/30/20070530-094047-8018r/?feat=article_related_stories on January 5, 2011.
- Lutz, C. (2009). *The bases of Empire: The global struggle against US military posts*. London: Pluto Press.
- Maalouf, A. (1996). *In the name of identity: Violence and the need to belong*. NY: Penguin Books.
- Mahbubani, K. (2009). Can America Fail? *The Wilson Quarterly, 33(2)*, 48-54.
- Maiese, M. (2003). Causes of disputes and conflicts. *Beyond Intractability*. Ed. Guy Burgess and Heidi Burgess. October 2003. CO: Conflict Research Consortium, University of Colorado.
- Malthus, T. (1798). *An essay on the principle of population*. NY: Dover Publications.

- Matthews, O. (2010). So long, salad days. *Newsweek*, February 24, 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/2010/02/23/so-long-salad-days.html> on January 10, 2011.
- McEvedy, C., & Jones, R. (1978). *Atlas of World Population History*. London: Penguin.
- McMahon, R. (1987). Food as a Diplomatic Weapon. *Pacific Historical Review*, 56, 349-377.
- Messick, D., Bloom, S., Boldizar, J., & Samuelson, C. (1985). Why we are fairer than others. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 21(5), 407-500.
- Miller Center of Public Affairs. (2011a). *Address before a Joint Session of Congress, September 11, 1990*. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/scripps/archive/speeches/detail/3425> on February 25, 2011.
- Miller Center of Public Affairs. (2011b). *Yale University Commencement Speech, June 11, 1962*. Retrieved from <http://millercenter.org/scripps/archive/speeches/detail/3370> on January 8, 2011.
- Miller, D. (2004). Calling Bush's Views Manichean Is an Insult to the Manicheans. *History News Network*. Retrieved from <http://hnn.us/articles/7202.html> on December 6, 2010.
- Miller, L. (2006). China an emerging superpower. *Stanford Journal of International Relations*. Retrieved from http://www.stanford.edu/group/sjir/6.1.03_miller.html on January 6, 2011.
- Miller, S. (1982). *Benevolent assimilation: The American conquest of the Philippines, 1899-1903*. New Haven: Yale University.
- MIT. (2009). Toward India 2020: Challenges and Opportunities. *Speech by Montek Singh Ahluwalia, September 9, 2009*. Retrieved from <http://mitworld.mit.edu/video/705> on January 7, 2011.
- Mitchell, C. (2002). *How Much Do I Need to Know?* In Lederach, J. & Jenner, J. (2002). *A handbook of international peacebuilding: Into the eye of the storm*. CA: Jossey-Bass.
- The Monthly Review. (2002). U.S. Military bases and Empire. *Monthly Review*, 53, 10. Retrieved from <http://www.monthlyreview.org/0302editr.htm> on February 25, 2011.

- Moore, D. & Small, D. (2007). Error and bias in comparative judgment: On being both better and worse than we think we are. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 92, 972–989.
- Moore, M. (2011). China: A force fit for a superpower. *The Telegraph*, January 10, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/china/8251307/China-a-force-fit-for-a-superpower.html> on January 10, 2011.
- Mount Holyoke College. (1999). Remarks by the President on foreign policy, February 26, 1999. *Mount Holyoke College*. Retrieved from <http://www.mtholyoke.edu/acad/intrel/clintfps.htm>.
- Moyo, D. (2009). *Dead aid: Why aid is not working and how there is another way for Africa*. NY: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Mughal, R. (2011). Kashmir dispute: No point in further dialogue with India, says Geelani. *The Express Tribune*, January 12, 2011. Retrieved from <http://tribune.com.pk/story/102545/kashmir-dispute-no-point-in-further-dialogue-with-india-says-geelani/> on January 12, 2011.
- Murthy, R. (2010). *India wants its crown jewel – Koh-I-Noor*. Retrieved from <http://despardes.com/?p=17457> on December 27, 2010.
- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform*. DC: United States Department of Education.
- National Diabetes Information Clearinghouse. (2008). *National diabetes statistics, 2007*. Retrieved from <http://diabetes.niddk.nih.gov/dm/pubs/statistics/#allages> on January 23, 2011.
- National Security Council. (1950). *NSC68: United States objectives and programs for national security*: DC: National Security Council.
- NATO. (n.d.). *What does NATO do?* Retrieved from <http://www.nato.int/cps/en/natolive/faq.htm#A1> on January 4, 2011.
- Newsweek. (2009). The crafty superpower. *Newsweek*, April 18, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.newsweek.com/2009/04/17/the-crafty-superpower.html> on January 10, 2011.
- Nichols, J. (2008). Bush should actually listen to the Pope. *CBS News*, April 16, 2008. Retrieved from

- <http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2008/04/16/opinion/main4019265.shtml> on November 14, 2010.
- Niebuhr, R. (1979). *Beyond tragedy: Essays on the Christian interpretation of history*. Scribner Book Company.
- Nietzsche, F. (1881). *Daybreak: Thoughts on the prejudices of morality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nixon, E. (1969). (Ed.). *Franklin D. Roosevelt and Foreign Affairs: Volume I*. MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Noah, T. (2010). The Great Divergence. The United States of Inequality: Why we can't ignore income inequality. *Slate*, September 16, 2010. Retrieved from <http://www.slate.com/id/2266025/> on December 30, 2010.
- The Nobel Foundation. (n.d.). *The Nobel Prize*. Retrieved from <http://nobelprize.org/> on December 31, 2010.
- Noer, M. & Perlroth, N. (2009). The world's most powerful people. *Forbes Magazine*, November 11, 2009. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/2009/11/11/worlds-most-powerful-leadership-power-09-people_land.html on November 22, 2010.
- Nye, J. (1990). *Bound to lead: The changing nature of American power*. NY: Basic Books.
- Nye, J. (2004). *Soft power: The means to success in world politics*. NY: Perseus Books Group.
- O'Neill, J. & Stupnytska, A. (2009). *The long-term outlook for the BRICs and N-11 post crisis*. NY: Goldman Sachs.
- O'Neill, J. (2001). *Building a better global economic BRICs*. NY: Goldman Sachs.
- O'Neill, J., Wilson, D., Purushothaman, R., & Stupnytska, A. (2005). *How solid are the BRICs?* NY: Goldman Sachs.
- O'Sullivan, J. (1839). The Great Nation of Futurity. *The United States democratic review*, 6, 426-430.
- O'Sullivan, J. (1845). Annexation. *The United States Democratic Review*, 17, 5-10.
- Oberg, J. (2006). *Does the European Union promote peace?* Denmark: The Transnational Foundation for Peace and Future Research.

- OECD. (n.d.). *Members and partners*. Retrieved from http://www.oecd.org/pages/0,3417,en_36734052_36761800_1_1_1_1_1,00.html on February 26, 2011.
- Oommen, T. (2005). *Crisis and contention in Indian society*. New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- OPEC. (n.d.). *Brief history*. Retrieved from http://www.opec.org/opec_web/en/about_us/24.htm on February 26, 2011.
- Orwell, G. (1946). Politics and the English language. *Horizon*, 13, 252-265.
- Orwell, G. (1949). 1984. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Oxfam. (n.d.). *About us*. Retrieved from <http://www.oxfam.org/> on February 26, 2011.
- Paul, J. & Nahory, C. (2005). Theses towards a democratic reform of the UN Security Council. *Global Policy Forum, July 13, 2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/200/41131.html> on January 9, 2011.
- Perloth, N. & Noer, M. (2010). One in a billion: The most powerful people on earth. *Forbes Magazine, November 3, 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.forbes.com/2010/11/01/obama-china-power-opinions-powerful-people-10-intro_print.html on January 3, 2010.
- Pew Research Center. (2007). *Global attitudes project, 2007*. DC: Pew Research Center.
- Pew Research Center. (2008). *Global attitudes project, 2008*. Retrieved from <http://pewglobal.org/2008/12/18/global-public-opinion-in-the-bush-years-2001-2008/> on February 17, 2011.
- Pitney, J. (1995). The Tocqueville fraud. *The Weekly Standard, November 13, 1995*.
- PNAC. (1997). Statement of principles, June 3, 1997. *Project for the New American Century*. Retrieved from <http://www.newamericancentury.org/statementofprinciples.htm> on February 25, 2011.
- Pollan, M. (2006). *The omnivore's dilemma: A natural history of four meals*. London: Penguin.

- Potts, W. (1889). Du Simitière, Artist, Antiquary, and Naturalist, Projector of the First American Museum, with some Extracts from his Notebook. *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography*, 13, 341-375.
- PresidentialRhetoric.com. (2005). *Speech at the National Endowment for Democracy, October 6, 2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.presidentialrhetoric.com/speeches/10.06.05.html> on November 15, 2010.
- Rabe, G. (2006). The Johnson Doctrine. *Presidential Studies Quarterly*, 36, 48-58.
- Rachman, G. (2011). Think again: American decline. *Foreign Policy, January/February 2011*. Retrieved from http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2011/01/02/think_again_american_decline on January 5, 2011.
- Rajan, R., & Subramanian, A. (2005a). *Aid and growth: What does the cross-country evidence really show?* DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Rajan, R., & Subramanian, A. (2005b). *What undermines aid's impact on growth?* DC: International Monetary Fund.
- Ramsurya, M. & Philip, L. (2010). India Inc's iconic buys Corus, JLR, Novelis return to profitability. *The Economic Times, July 2, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://economictimes.indiatimes.com/news/news-by-company/corporate-trends/India-Incs-iconic-buys-Corus-JLR-Novelis-return-to-profitability/articleshow/6117421.cms> on October 10, 2010.
- Rediff News. (2010). *President Obama's address to Parliament: The transcript*. Retrieved from <http://www.rediff.com/news/special/obama-visit-president-obamas-address-to-parliament-the-transcript/20101108.htm> on January 11, 2011.
- Rein, S. (2010). China: Not yet a superpower. *Business Week, May 20, 2010*. Retrieved from http://www.businessweek.com/globalbiz/content/may2010/gb20100510_312924.htm on January 2, 2010.
- Roberts, P. (2005). Welcome to a Has-Been Country. *CounterPunch, June 3, 2005*. Retrieved from <http://www.counterpunch.org/roberts06032005.html> on November 11, 2010.
- Roberts, P. (2007). Commentary & analysis: Economists in denial; blind to offshoring's adverse impact. *Manufacturing and Technology News, 14*.

- Robertson, D. (1957). (Ed.). *Love and justice: Selections from the shorter writings of Reinhold Neibuhr*. PA: Westminster Press.
- Robins, N. (2006). *The corporation that changed the world: How the East India Company shaped the modern multinational*. London: Pluto Press.
- Robinson, C. (2004). *Is there a case for nuclear deterrence after the Cold War?* NM: Sandia National Laboratories.
- Roosevelt, T. (1899). *The strenuous life: Essays and addresses*. NY: The Century Co.
- Rorty, R. (1999). *Philosophy and social hope*. London: Penguin.
- Rotella, S. (2010). Mumbai case offers rare picture of ties between Pakistan's intelligence service, militants. *ProPublica, December 29, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.propublica.org/article/mumbai-case-offers-rare-picture-of-ties-between-pakistans-intelligence-serv> on February 1, 2011.
- SAARC. (2009). *Charter Day*. Retrieved from <http://www.saarc-sec.org/Charter-Day/6/> on February 26, 2011.
- Sah, D. & Bhatt, A. (2008). *Trapped in poverty: Chronic poor in remote tribal areas*. New Delhi: Rawat Publications.
- Schaefer, B. (2007). The United Nations Human Rights Council: A disastrous first year. *The Heritage Foundation, 2038*, 1-11.
- Schwartzberg, J. (1987). The US Constitution, A Model for Global Government. *Journal of Geography, 86*, 246-252. DOI: 0.1080/00221348708979053.
- Shah, A. (2001). WTO protests in Seattle, 1999. *GlobalIssues.org*. Retrieved from <http://www.globalissues.org/article/46/wto-protests-in-seattle-1999> on August 16, 2009
- Shankar, A. (2010). Russia sees India as a super power in coming years: Ambassador Kadakin. *Times of India, October 24, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.newkerala.com/news/world/fullnews-69327.html> on January 6, 2011.
- Shapiro, H. (2011). *Educating youth for a world beyond violence: A pedagogy for peace*. NY: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Shin, H. & Bruno, R. (2003). *Language use and English-speaking ability: 2000*. USA: US Census Bureau.

- Shivakumar, G. (2010). Amartya Sen questions India's title as "knowledge superpower". *Financial Times*, August 5, 2010. Retrieved from <http://blogs.ft.com/beyond-brics/2010/08/05/amartya-sen-questions-indias-title-as-knowledge-superpower/> on January 13, 2011.
- Silva, E. (2007). *On the clock: Rethinking the way schools use time*. DC: Education Sector.
- Silveira, S. (2001). The American environmental movement: Surviving through diversity. *Boston College Environmental Affairs Law Review*, 28, 497-532.
- Singh, M. (2006). *PM's speech at the Chief Minister's meet on Naxalism*. New Delhi: Prime Minister's Office.
- Spinelli, A. (1957). Il modello costituzionale americano e i tentativi di unita europea. In Bolis, L. (a cura di), *La nascita degli Stati Uniti d'Americ*. Milano:
- The Statesman. (2010). Britain anoints India a superpower on Republic Day. *The Statesman*, January 27, 2010. Retrieved from http://www.thestatesman.net/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&show=archive&id=318326&catid=35&year=2010&month=1&day=27&Itemid=66 on January 6, 2011.
- Stiglitz, J. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. NY: Norton & Co.
- Stringer, E. & Dwyer, R. (1999). *Action research in human services*. NJ: Merrill Prentice Hall.
- Sunnucks, M. (2009). McCain: Closing Mexican border should be option to hold back swine flu. *Phoenix Business Journal*, April 29, 2009. Retrieved from <http://www.bizjournals.com/phoenix/stories/2009/04/27/daily40.html> on August 24, 2009.
- Sutcliffe, K. (2006). The growing nuclear club. *Council on Foreign Relations*, November 17, 2006. Retrieved from http://www.cfr.org/publication/12050/growing_nuclear_club.html on January 4, 2011.
- Swanbrow, D. (2003). *U.S. one of the most religious countries*. University of Michigan. Retrieved from http://www.ur.umich.edu/0304/Nov24_03/15.shtml on March 2, 2011.
- Taubman, W. (2003). Did he bang it? Nikita Krushchev and the shoe. *The New York Times*, July 26, 2003. Retrieved from

- http://www.nytimes.com/2003/07/26/opinion/26iht-edtaubman_ed3_.html on December 28, 2010.
- Teeple, G. (2000). *What is globalization?* In McBride, S., & Wiseman, J. (Eds.). (2000). *Globalization and its discontents*. London: MacMillan Press.
- Tertrais, B. (2004). The changing nature of military alliances. *The Washington Quarterly*, 27, 135–150.
- Thaindian News. (2009). Pervasive corruption tarnishing India's image. *Thaindian News*, August 26, 2009. Retrieved from http://www.thaindian.com/newsportal/uncategorized/pervasive-corruption-tarnishing-indias-image-pm-lead_100238185.html on January 3, 2011.
- Tharoor, S. (2009). *Why nations should pursue 'soft power'*. TED. from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=EiTrl0W1QrM&feature=related>
- ThistleRose Publications. (2005). *World Population*. Retrieved from <http://www.worldhistorysite.com/population.html> on January 5, 2011.
- Thurow, L. (2003). *Fortune favors the bold: What we must do to build a new and lasting global prosperity*. NY: HarperCollins.
- Time. (1976). *American Notes: now the Ford Doctrine*. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,945540,00.html> on February 25, 2011.
- Times of India. (2010). Text of PM's address to the nation on I-Day. *Times of India*, August 15, 2010. Retrieved from <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/india/Text-of-PMs-address-to-the-nation-on-I-Day-/articleshow/6313857.cms#ixzz1ALqUE6ln> on January 6, 2011.
- Todd, H. (1996). *Women at the center*. USA: Westview Press.
- Transparency International. (2010). *Corruption perceptions index 2010*. Brussels: Transparency International.
- Twain, M. (1923). *Europe and elsewhere*. NY: Harper & Brothers.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). History: 1840 fast facts. *U.S. Census Bureau*. Retrieved from http://www.census.gov/history/www/through_the_decades/fast_facts/1840_fast_facts.html on February 25, 2011.

- U.S. Chamber of Commerce. (2010). *Education: The key to global competitiveness*. Retrieved from <http://icw.uschamber.com/newsletter-article/education-key-global-competitiveness> on February 28, 2011.
- U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs. (2003). *The Great Seal of the United States*. DC: U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs.
- U.S. Department of State. (1998). *Interview on NBC-TV "The Today Show" with Matt Lauer, Columbus, Ohio, February 19, 1998*. DC: U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Public Affairs. Retrieved from <http://secretary.state.gov/www/statements/1998/980219a.html> on November 26, 2010.
- UN Watch. (2008). More patience needed for UN Rights Council, its President says. *UN Watch, November 5, 2008*. Retrieved from <http://blog.unwatch.org/?p=236> on December 29, 2010.
- UN. (1948). The universal declaration of human rights. *United Nations*. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/en/documents/udhr/index.shtml> on February 25, 2011.
- UN. (1985). *Charter of the United Nations and Statutes of the International Court of Justice*. NY: United Nations.
- UN. (1999). *The world at six billion*. NY: United Nations.
- UN. (2000). *United Nations Millennium Declaration*. NY: United Nations.
- UN. (2001a). *Road map towards the implementation of the United Nations Millennium Declaration*. NY: United Nations.
- UN. (2001b). Resolution adopted by the General Assembly. 55/61, An effective international legal instrument against corruption. NY: United Nations.
- UN. (2009a). *General Assembly. 64th Session. 3rd Plenary Meeting*. NY: United Nations.
- UN. (2009b). *The millennium development goals report 2009*. NY: United Nations.
- UN. (2010a). *Millennium Development Goals report, 2010*. NY: United Nations.
- UN. (2010b). *Resolution 65/6. Necessity of ending the economic, commercial and financial embargo imposed by the United States of America against Cuba*. NY: United Nations.

- UNDP. (2009). *Human development report 2009. Overcoming barriers: Human mobility and development*. NY: United Nations Development Programme.
- UNDP. (2010). *Human development report 2010: The real wealth of nations: Pathways to human development*. NY: United Nations Development Programme.
- University of Texas. (n.d.). *Address to the Nation on National Security, March 23, 1983*. University of Texas. Retrieved from <http://www.reagan.utexas.edu/archives/speeches/1983/32383d.htm> on November 28, 2010.
- US Census Bureau. (n.d.). *World population 1950-2050*. Retrieved from <http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idb/worldpopgraph.php> on January 5, 2011.
- USAID. (n.d.). *The history of America's food aid*. Retrieved from http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/ffp/50th/history.html on January 2, 2011.
- USGS. (n.d.). *Water science for schools*. Retrieved from <http://ga.water.usgs.gov/edu/gwdepletion.html> on January 5, 2011.
- Vasudevan, R. (2010). Misuse of US military aid to Pakistan: India conveys concern to Mullen. *Asian Tribune, July 24, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.asiantribune.com/news/2010/07/24/misuse-us-military-aid-pakistan-india-conveys-concern-mullen> on February 2, 2011.
- Waldman, S. (2004). Does God endorse Bush? *Slate Magazine, September 13, 2004*.
- Walsh, B. (2009). CDC's Dr. Richard Besser on Swine Flu and Katrina. *Time.com, May 5, 2009*. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/health/article/0,8599,1895820,00.html> on January 5, 2011.
- Ware, G. (2010). After the crisis, is now the moment to cut Western farm subsidies? *Global Policy Forum, March 30, 2010*.
- Warrick, J. (2010). FBI investigation of 2001 anthrax attacks concluded; U.S. releases details. *The Washington Post, February 20, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/02/19/AR2010021902369.html> on January 9, 2011.
- The Washington Post. (2009). Biden addresses Munich Conference. *Washington Post, February 7, 2009*. Retrieved from

http://voices.washingtonpost.com/44/2009/02/07/biden_addresses_munich_conference.html on January 4, 2011.

- Watkins, K. & Montjourides, P. (2009). *The Millennium Development Goals – bankable pledge or sub-prime asset?* Paris: UNESCO.
- Watson, P. (2001). *The Modern Mind: An Intellectual History of the 20th Century*. NY: HarperCollins.
- Wax, E. & Lakshmi, R. (2010). Obama supports adding India as a permanent member of U.N. Security Council. *The Washington Post, November 10, 2010*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2010/11/08/AR2010110800495.html?sid=ST2010110402773> on December 29, 2010.
- WHO. (2007). *The World health report 2007. A safer future: Global public health security in the 21st century*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- WHO. (2008a). *International health regulations (2005): Areas of work for implementation*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
- WHO. (2008b). *Cumulative number of confirmed human cases of Avian Influenza A/(H5N1) reported to WHO*. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/csr/disease/avian_influenza/country/cases_table_2008_01_15/en/index.html
- Williams, W. (1980). *Empire as a way of life: An essay on the causes and character of America's present predicament along with a few thoughts about an alternative*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, J. (2004). *The Washington Consensus as policy prescription for development*. DC: Institute for International Economics.
- Wilson, D. & Puroshothaman, R. (2003). *Dreaming with BRICS: The path to 2050*. NY: Goldman Sachs.
- Wilson, D., Kelston, A., & Ahmed, S. (2010). *Is this the 'BRICs Decade'?* NY: Goldman Sachs.
- Winston-Salem / Forsyth County Schools. (2011). *High school registration 2011-2012*. NC: Winston-Salem / Forsyth County Schools.
- Wood, F. (2002). *The Silk Road: Two thousand years in the heart of Asia*. CA: University of California Press.

- Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars. (2011). *Campaign address in Jersey City, NJ, May 25, 1912*. Retrieved from <http://www.wilsoncenter.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=about.woodrow#quotes> on February 26, 2011.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011a). *James Monroe: Seventh annual message, December 2, 1823*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29465> on February 25, 2011.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011b). *Theodore Roosevelt: Fourth annual message, December 6, 1904*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29545> on February 25, 2011.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011c). *Franklin D. Roosevelt: Inaugural address, March 4, 1933*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=14473> on February 25, 2011.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011d). *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Special Message to the Congress on the situation in the Middle East, January 5, 1957*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=11007> on November 14, 2010.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011e). *Jimmy Carter: The State of the Union address delivered before a joint session of the Congress, January 23, 1980*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=33079> on October 29, 2010.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011f). *John F. Kennedy: Inaugural address, January 20, 1961*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=8032> on February 25, 2011.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011g). *Dwight D. Eisenhower: Annual message to the Congress on the state of the Union, January 9, 1958*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=11162> on November 14, 2010.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011h). *George W. Bush: Address before a joint session of the Congress on the state of the Union, January 29, 2002*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=29644> on February 25, 2011.

- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011i). *John F. Kennedy: Address and question and answer period at the Economic Club of New York, December 14, 1962*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=9057> on November 17, 2010.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011j). *William J. Clinton: Second inaugural address, January 20, 1997*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/index.php?pid=54183> on February 25, 2011.
- Woolley, J. & Peters, G. (2011k). *Barack Obama: Address before a Joint Session of the Congress, February 24, 2009*. The American Presidency Project. Retrieved from <http://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/> on February 28, 2011.
- Woolman, D. (1985). Education and peace in the thought of Johan Galtung. *Currents: Issues in Education and Human Development Education and Peace*, 3(2), 7-20.
- World Bank. (2010). World development indicators database, 1 July 2010. DC: World Bank.
- World Bank. (2010a). *Gross Domestic Product*. NY: The World Bank.
- World Bank. (2010b). *India Economic Update, June 2010*. NY: The World Bank.
- World Bank. (2010c). *Doing business 2011: Making a difference for entrepreneurs*. NY: The World Bank.
- World Bank. (n.d.). *About Us*. Retrieved from <http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/0,,pagePK:50004410~piPK:36602~theSitePK:29708,00.html> on February 25, 2011.
- Wright, R. (2004). The War on Evil. *Foreign Policy*, 144, 34-35.
- WTO. (n.d.). *Understanding the WTO: Members and observers*. Retrieved from http://www.wto.org/english/thewto_e/whatis_e/tif_e/org6_e.htm on February 26, 2011.
- Yale Law School. (2008a). *Washington's farewell address 1796*. Retrieved from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp on October 31, 2010.
- Yale Law School. (2008b). *President Harry S. Truman's address before a joint session of Congress, March 12, 1947*. Retrieved from http://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/trudoc.asp on October 29, 2010.

- Yunus, M. (1999). *Banker to the poor: Micro-lending and the battle against world poverty*. USA: Perseus Books Group.
- Zakaria, F. (2008). *The post-American world*. NY: W.W. Norton & Co.
- Zencey, E. (2009). G.D.P. R.I.P. *The New York Times*, August 10, 2009. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2009/08/10/opinion/10zencey.html?_r=1&emc=eta1 on August 14, 2009.
- Ziabara, K. (2011). Brazil; An emerging global superpower. *PressTV*, January 5, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.presstv.ir/detail/158794.html> on January 10, 2011.
- Zinn, H. (2005). *The myth of American Exceptionalism*. MITWorld. Retrieved from <http://mitworld.mit.edu/video/258> on February 25, 2011.
- Zissis, C. (2008). Terror groups in India. *Council on Foreign Relations*, November 27, 2008. Retrieved from http://www.cfr.org/publication/12773/terror_groups_in_india.html on January 29, 2011.
- Zoellick, R. (2010). The end of the Third World? Modernizing multilateralism for a multipolar world. *The World Bank*, April 14, 2010. NY: The World Bank.

APPENDIX A

METHODOLOGY

This Appendix describes the methodology for collecting and synthesizing the qualitative data provided by three convenience samples of University students in South India that form the substance of Chapter IV. It includes some preliminary material concerned with preparation in the months prior to the visit to India in July and August 2010 during which the data were collected.

Preparation

As a Westerner (specifically British with a long history of residence in the US) with no prior direct experience of India, there were some special considerations in preparing for and conducting the conversations with the Indian student participants. While this research could not be regarded as an intervention in an actual conflicted setting, its method has been guided by LeBaron (2003), Lederach (1995), Mitchell (2002), and Stringer and Dwyer (2005), who inform the approach to be taken when interacting in a culturally unfamiliar context. In essence, this requires a diligent effort to avoid of ethnocentrism, especially any form that might be perceived as imposing a foreign value-set upon participants. It further requires that the researcher develop ‘cultural fluency’, and acquire sufficient knowledge of the context to demonstrate authentic interest in relevant subject matter, and to be able to pose questions that are not only cognizant of the context, but also framed in such a way as to provide space for

participants to develop themes and ideas that are significant to them, rather than to the researcher. Given the nature and scope of the enquiry, this required some preliminary reading on at least political, economic and cultural matters – both historical and contemporary – primarily from an Indian perspective. As part of this research, I read parts of online versions of the South Indian Tamil language daily newspaper Dinamalar (*Daily Flower*), together with parts of other online English language Indian daily newspapers (e.g. The Hindu, Indian Express, Times of India) for a three month period before leaving for India. I also had a number of informal conversations with first and second generation Indians resident in the US, together with some Indian nationals visiting the US. These included extended conversations with my wife, who was born in the South Indian state of Tamil Nadu, and lived there for her first 30 years. Participation and attendance over a period of some years at Indian cultural events, festivals and religious ceremonies taking place in North Carolina and Georgia contributed additional background. These included Pongal (Tamil Nadu harvest festival), Diwali (Hindu Festival of Lights) and Puja (Hindu religious ceremonies).

In Tamil Nadu, English is not only taught in all levels of schooling; it is also the medium of instruction in most educational establishments. Nevertheless, the predominant language is the official language of the state, Tamil. This is partly because many people do not have a sufficient level of education to be able to converse in English; some may be able to understand relatively simple English, but not have sufficient command of the language to respond in English. While language was not expected to be an issue with the Chennai participants, it was a factor in day-to-day interactions with

other local people. These included hotel staff, restaurant servers and auto-rickshaw drivers. They also included more ‘informed and educated’ people who contributed anecdotal evidence related to the topics that were discussed with the student participants.

Collection and Synthesis of Data

The data for this qualitative study were obtained from conversations with three cohorts of University students in the state of Tamil Nadu, South India, during August 2010. This choice of location was predicated primarily on the number of contacts both in the US and India who would be able to assist in the identification and recruitment of participants; make arrangements for accommodation, travel, and communications in India; and where necessary provide for translation / interpretation.

Two cohorts comprised post-graduate students in Colleges and Universities in Chennai, the capital city of Tamil Nadu. The first cohort of four students was identified and recruited by a relative who is a graduate of the Madras Institute of Technology. The second cohort of 18 students⁹³ was identified and recruited as a result of emailed solicitations to heads of departments in three Chennai Colleges and Universities during July 2010. Of these Dr. G.K. Prasad of the University of Madras undertook to introduce me to students enrolled in Masters or Doctoral programs in the department of Econometrics and the department of Politics and Public Administration at the University. In each of these two cohorts there was an approximately equal split between male and female students. The third cohort was identified and recruited by a relative who is

93. A small number of these students were able to attend only one of the two conversations held with this cohort.

Assistant Professor of Mathematics at the rural Nazareth Margoschis College. This cohort comprised 23 pre-service teachers in their final (third) year of a Bachelor of Arts program. Of these, 19 were female and 4 were male. Both the locales in which the conversations took place and the participants in those conversations constitute convenience samples, and are not necessarily representative of any larger community in India or elsewhere.

Overall, some 50 percent of the participants in the two Chennai cohorts contributed to the conversations. All of these participants exhibited strong English, and the conversations were therefore conducted almost exclusively in English. Given that the University of Madras caters primarily for residents of the State of Tamil Nadu, there was an unexpected diversity of participants. Several students came from the neighboring State of Kerala, a smaller number from more northerly States, and two from neighboring countries. At least two had spent time out of the country, either in Europe or in the US.

In Nazareth only a small percentage of the participants contributed to the conversation. This may be attributable to a number of factors: a dialogical approach was unfamiliar to them – their educational experience is effectively limited to a passive role reminiscent of Freire’s “banking” method; a lesser facility in English (compared with the Chennai participants) required that both the questions I asked, and the responses to those questions, be ‘translated’; and the more socially conservative culture may also have limited participation. Overall, this cohort was in many ways more homogeneous, which was to be expected from a College that catered to a relatively small, rural region.

There were two conversations, a few days apart, with each of the Chennai cohorts. For the first cohort of four participants, the conversations were conducted in a service apartment of the Dee Cee Manor Hotel in T. Nagur, Chennai. For the second cohort of 18 students, the conversations were conducted in a conference room and a computer lab on the Chepauk Campus of the University of Madras. The duration of each conversation was approximately an hour and a half. Thus the total conversation time for each of these cohorts was approximately three hours. There was one conversation with the Nazareth cohort; this took place in a College classroom and lasted one hour. Neither faculty nor administration was represented at these conversations. Informed consent under IRB 10-0134 (approved on 4/8/2010) was obtained before any of the conversations began. All of the conversations were recorded both on video and a separate (theoretically redundant) audio recorder. The recordings were augmented by hand-written notes taken by my wife acting in the role of assistant.

The format of the conversations was heavily influenced by Stringer and Dwyer's (2005) description of "guided conversations", using 'seed' questions that solicited participants' perceptions of India's domestic and international situation, both now and in the future. This method provided considerable space for participants to take the conversation in directions significant to them, and thus diminished to a degree the risk of bias inherent in a pre-defined questionnaire. This bias might have circumscribed the research outcomes – providing 'answers' deemed important to the researcher rather than to the participants – even though questions might be open-ended (Fiumara, 1990). One result of providing this freedom was that much of the conversation took place between

participants, which provided a number of perspectives on the topics that they related, on their own initiative and in their own way, to the ‘seed’ questions. More specific questions were framed where necessary as follow-up to ‘answers’, or to precipitate explanation and elaboration.

The prepared ‘seed’ questions are listed below. It should be noted, however, that in practice the fluidity of the conversations resulted in modification to the precise wording, and the order in which some of these questions were put to each cohorts:

- What is your view of India’s current place in the world?
- What is your vision for India’s future position in the world?
- What impediments and hindrances are there to achieving your vision for India’s future?
- How, and by whom, might those impediments and hindrances be removed?
- What role, if any, do you see for external actors in removing those impediments and hindrances?
- What is your view of the current domestic situation of India and its people?
- What is your vision for the future domestic situation of India and its people?
- What impediments and hindrances are there to achieving your vision for the domestic situation of India and its people?
- How, and by whom, might those impediments and hindrances be removed?
- What role, if any, do you see for external actors in removing those impediments and hindrances?

On return to the US, the video and audio recordings were transcribed into an electronically searchable medium. A number of factors contributed to some difficulty in this process: occasionally both the video and audio recordings were indistinct; there was some strongly accented and idiosyncratic use of English; some of the context in which statements were made was unfamiliar to me; and there were some instances of participants talking over and interrupting each other. Where appropriate, there were several passes at transcription; some of these passes were undertaken by my wife, who was more adept at discerning the spoken words, and able to provide the context in which to understand their intended meaning. After transcription the principal themes of relevance to this Dissertation were identified, and the various statements made by participants related to these themes extracted and synthesized. There has been some editing in the material quoted in Chapter IV intended to facilitate comprehension without unduly compromising integrity. In general, there was a high degree of inter-cohort consistency in both the themes that emerged, and the statements made related to those themes. There was also substantial consistency with other sources, both Western and non-Western, cited in Chapters I to III.

APPENDIX B
ABBREVIATIONS USED

ASEAN	Association of Southeast Asian Nations
AU	African Union
BJP	Bharatiya Janata Party
BRIC	Brazil, Russia, India, China
CHR	(UN) Commission on Human Rights
CRC	(United Nations) Convention on the Rights of the Child
ECI	Election Commission of India
ECSC	European Coal and Steel Community
EEC	European Economic Community (the Common Market)
EFA	Education for All
EU	European Union
G4	Group of 4
G6	Group of 6
G7	Group of 7
G8	Group of 8
G20	Group of 20
GATT	General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade
GDP	Gross Domestic Product

GNI	Gross National Income
GNP	Gross National Product
HDI	Human Development Index
HPI	Human Poverty Index
HRC	(UN) Human Rights Council
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
IMF	International Monetary Fund
LTTE	Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam
MDG	Millennium Development Goals
MIT	Massachusetts Institute of Technology
MNC	Multi-National Corporation (synonym for TNC)
MP	Member of Parliament
MPI	Multidimensional Poverty Index
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
N11	Next 11 (national economies)
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPT	Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty
NSC	National Security Council
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
OAU	Organization of African Unity
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OPEC	Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries

PPP	Purchasing Power Parity
SAARC	South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation
SEZ	Special Economic Zone
TNC	Trans-National Corporation (synonym for MNC)
UDHR	(United Nations) Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCG	University of North Carolina at Greensboro
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
US	United States
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WB	World Bank
WHO	World Health Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWI	World War I
WWII	World War II