



Researcher's name and surname: Gopalan Balachandran
Citizenship(s): Indian
Organization: IHEID
Email: gopalan.balachandran@graduateinstitute.ch
Phone: +41 22 908 5874 (work)

WHAT PEACE? WHICH WORLD ORDER?

Questions to the project researchers

1. BIOGRAPHICAL QUESTIONS

1.1. What are the main elements of your biography and intellectual development?

My intellectual development has been varied and diverse. I started with a BA in the humanities, then graduated in Economics (with a specialization in International Economics), completed graduate coursework and a research dissertation (MPhil) on international monetary economics, before embarking on and completing a PhD in Economic History. Over the years my interests in history have extended to intellectual history, and hence social theory and philosophy. I am interested in critical epistemologies and hermeneutics, and relatedly in indigenous (and

vernacular) intellectual thought, and their interactions with Western thought. I am particularly interested in attempting to interpret collective thought and subjectivities from behaviour and practices to the extent it may help to unpeel a layer of mediation by comparison with written/published representations, or give insights into subjectivities that may otherwise be ignored.

1.2. What are your specializations? Your research topics?

My published research has largely related to the fields of imperial and international monetary and financial history, and global labour and social history. My current project is on cultures of commerce in the Indian Ocean world. This has an important intellectual history component rooted in practice. I have also published papers on religion and nationalism, etc.

1.3. How do you define yourself professionally?

Historian

1.4. What major books or articles have you written?

Books:

- *John Bullion's Empire: Britain's Gold Problem and India between the Wars* (London: Routledge 2015, 2013, Curzon, 1996) pp. 252
- *Globalizing Labour?: Indian Seafarers and World Shipping, c. 1870-1945* (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 2012)
- *India and the World Economy, c. 1850-1950* (Delhi and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003 and 2005) pp. 320
- *The Reserve Bank of India: 1951-1967* (Delhi and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998) pp. 1200

Recent papers (since 2011):

- 'Indefinite Transits: Mobility and Confinement in the Age of Steam', *Journal of Global History* (forthcoming 11: 2, 2016)
- 'Transnational Histories and Subcontinental Pasts', *Indian Economic and Social History Review* (52: 4, 2015) 533-45
- 'Colonial India and the World Economy, c. 1850-1940', in Bishnupriya Gupta, et al eds, *An Economic History of India* (2015)
- 'Subaltern Cosmopolitanism, Racial Governance, and Multiculturalism: Britain, c. 1900-1945', *Social History* (39: 4, 2014)

- 'Legacies beyond Empire: Reflections on Doing International History from Geneva', *Swiss Journal of History* (64: 2, 2014) 239-63
- 'Atlantic Paradigms and Aberrant Histories', *Atlantic Studies: Global Currents* (11: 1, 2014) 47-63.
- Roundtable with reviews and response of *Globalizing Labour? Indian Seafarers and World Shipping, c. 1870-1945*, *International Journal of Maritime History* (25: 1, 2013) 275-321
- 'Claiming Histories beyond Nations: Situating Global History', *Indian Economic and Social History Review* (49: 2, 2012) 247-72.
- 'Les marins indiens et leurs univers, 1870-1949', *Le Mouvement Social* (octobre-décembre 2012) 65-84.
- 'Global History' in B.S. Chimni and Siddharth Mallavarappu, eds, *International Relations: Perspectives from the Global South* (New Delhi: Pearson Educational Publishing, 2012) ch. 16.
- 'India: From a Colonial Outpost to a Leading Market', in Peter Borscheid and Niels Viggo Haueter, eds, *World Insurance: The Evolution of a Global Risk Network* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2012) 444-71
- 'Making Coolies, (Un)making Workers: Globalizing Labour in the late-19th and early-20th Centuries', *Journal of Historical Sociology* (24:3, 2011) 266-296
- 'History 2 or 2 B? Capital Narratives for Asia and Asian Narratives for Capital', *China Report*, 46:4 (December 2010) 447-469

1.5. Are you involved in any association or civic engagement? If yes, please specify.

Only loose, contextual, issue-oriented associations with select civil society groups

1.6. Do you have one or few websites?

At work: <http://graduateinstitute.ch/faculty/directory/balachandran>

1.7. Are you part of a research or action network? If yes, please specify.

Research networks on global cultural studies, labour history, Indian Ocean studies, Asian studies, and Indian economic and social history

1.8. Have you lived or worked abroad? If yes, please specify how long and where.

United Kingdom, 1985-1990; Switzerland 2000-present

2. SEMANTIC AND LINGUISTIC QUESTIONS

2.1. How do you define "peace" and "World order" in your language? What do these terms mean?

Peace is rendered in Hindi and many other Indian languages as *Shanti* (शान्ति, śānti) which, like its English equivalent, has a wide range of meanings. Another expression for peace is *Aman* (अमन). There is no expression for 'world order', the closest would be 'world society' (i.e. विश्व समाज, viśva samāj). The Upanishads also speak of '*vasudeva kutumbakam*', i.e. the world as one family. This is, however, a phrase that is open to many interpretations.

2.2. What are their synonyms and antonyms?

Because of its wide range of meanings, antonyms of *Shanti* would depend on context. In relation to peace, they could be war – *yuddh* (युद्ध, yud'dh), *ladayi* (लड़ाई, laṛā'ī), *jang* (जंग, jaṅg)

2.3. Do you personally use these concepts? Do you consider them relevant? Are they limited? If yes, please specify.

To the extent I use these expressions, I find *samjautha* (समझौता, samajhautā), which means 'understanding' or 'accommodation' more meaningful. It is more positive than '*shanti*', which can mean merely an absence of war, and recognizes that at every level, living together involves working through innumerable tensions and sometimes conflicts.

2.4. What does "harmony", "balance", "disorder", "chaos" mean in your linguistic and cultural area? Are there different interpretations? If yes, please specify.

Terms for chaos shade into 'turbulence' (अस्तव्यस्तता, *astavyastatā*), 'disorder' (अव्यवस्था *avyavasthā*), 'anarchy' (अराजकता, *arājakatā*), or confusion / disarray (बवाल, *bavāla*). 'Harmony' shades into unity (e.g. एकता or *ēkatā*; and संगति or *saṅgati*). The latter can also denote 'conformity'. It has to be noted that depending on their use, these terms can acquire meanings that are gendered, and/or inflected by class, caste, and religious faith.

2.5. In which languages do you read?

English, Hindi, Tamil, French

2.6. Which languages do you speak?

English, Hindusthani, Tamil, Kannada, Telugu, French (not fluent)

2.7. In which languages can you write?

English, Tamil, Hindi, but my academic and professional writing is entirely in English

3. CONCEPTUAL QUESTIONS

3.1. Which main concepts do you use in your analysis of power?

Power itself is a central concept because it is ubiquitous and so diffuse. That said, I am mainly preoccupied by interplays between the material and cultural bases of power, hence 'hegemony' for me is an important concept to describe the nature of power

3.2. Which secondary concepts do you use in your analysis of power?

In some contexts, 'dominance'

3.3. According to you, what is the importance of the differences between "violence," "force," "strength" and "power"? Reference is made to the distinctions between auctoritas and potestas, potential and potestas, Macht and Gewalt, power and violence (Hannah Arendt), wealth and power, or economic strength and military strength (Paul Kennedy), autorité and pouvoir (Aglietta and Orlean see Glossary in progress), pouvoir and puissance? Please comment on similar words that are used in your own language to describe and explain national situations and international relations.

In Hindi *Shakti* (शक्ति, *śakti*, *cakti*) is the most commonly used expression for power. In derivation, and still in much contemporary usage, *Shakti* denotes the force of energy, including of divine origin (it is also the name of a venerated and feared goddess). Naturally it has multiple meanings, for instance it can be used to denote energy, capacity, as well as force. Google alone offers over 30 translation possibilities for this term. These meanings multiply when qualified or compounded (for example आत्मशक्ति or '*atmashakti*' / *ātma-śakti*) can mean 'soul-force' or spiritual force, as Gandhi propagated it).

Shakti is derived from Sanskrit, and despite the spread of words and meanings from other language families in tongues such as Tamil, remains the most common expression for capacity / power in almost every major Indian language. Interestingly in some other languages too, expressions for power may embrace meanings of capacity or skill – e.g. in Tamil *Thiran* and *Thiramai* (திறன் / *tiraṇ*, திறமை / *tiramai*).

Takhat (ताखत -- *tākat*) is a Hindustani expression often used to denote power. It can mean strength, so it shares meanings with *Shakti*. It also has a range of meanings in Persian and Arabic from which it is derived. Its association with power may derive from its usage as *Takht* (*tākt*) which can mean ‘throne’ or ‘seat’ (of power). Despite many common uses (including ironical), interestingly the multiple meanings of *Takht* in Arabic, especially, are reduced in India most commonly to signify power. This reversal contrasts with the plurality of meanings that continue to be associated with the Sanskrit expression *Shakti*, and may have its origins in the most common meaning with which this Arabic and Persian term was interpreted into Urdu, Hindusthani, and Hindi. *Takhat* thus more unambiguously denotes external expressions of strength and power. In its meaning as *Takht* (or seat), it has a Hindi equivalent in *Sattha* (सत्ता, *sattā*) which is typically understood as ‘seat of power’: thus ‘*sattha me aana*’ (सत्ता में आना) means ‘coming to power’. The phonetic likeness between *Sattha* and seat is suggestive, but so too its likeness with *Satya* – सत्य (*satya*) – which means truth. *Satya* also shares a likeness in some languages with ‘law’ (for e.g. *Shattam* or சட்டம் -- *caṭṭam* – in Tamil).

In Sanskrit, and thus in Hindi and many other major Indian languages, *Adhikar* (अधिकार, *adhikār*) and derivatives thereof can also be used to denote power. But this meaning derives from its association with ‘authority’, which in turn is also associated, ironically enough, with connotations of ‘right’ (as in a discourse of ‘rights’). ‘Right’ is more clearly distinguishable in Urdu (*haq*) It is noteworthy that a common Hindi expression for violence *hinsa* (हिंसा, *hīnsa*) can mean ‘to cause harm’ in Sanskrit and many Indian languages including Hindi. Other commonly used Hindi expressions (*Aakraman* / आक्रमण / *ākramaṇ*, *Hamla* / हमला / *hām̐la*) denote attack or invasion, rather than violence. The latter terms are among the more commonly used expressions for

aggression between states, while *Takhat* is probably the most commonly used expression for strength of nations. *Shakti* can also be used in this context. There may be a perception that it is used more often to denote benign forms of power and capacity (like economic power), and *Shakti* is also the name of a fleet tanker (rather than a frigate or frigate-class vessel) in the Indian navy. However 'airpower' is translated into 'vayushakti' (वायुशक्ति, vāyushakti). *Shakti* was also the name given to India's nuclear-test programme in 1998.

3.4. What concepts do you use when describing international relations?

Power, and structural and relational imbalances are central to my understanding of international relations. I am interested particularly in continuities in relations of power through periods of apparent transformation – for e.g. decolonization, emergence of new powers in Asia, and so on.

3.5. According to you, what are the main reasons of ongoing conflicts? In specific regions? In the world in general?

At both regional and international levels, existing regimes, ideologies, and arrangements are insufficiently accommodative towards rising aspirations – for freedom, empowerment, social and economic mobility, more effective political voice and representation, and other forms of self-expression. At the international level the gulf between profession and practice on the part of the major powers reinforces conflict dynamics in ways that conventional scholarship seems too fragmented to address.

3.6. Within which theoretical framework do you make your analyses?

No single expression would describe my theoretical framework which tends to be quite eclectic while being critical (in a sense that also opens paths to alternative approaches and possibilities).

3.7. To which fields of research, other than your own, do you often refer?

Political economy, literary and cultural studies

3.8. Do you think that societies need "totems", symbolic references, national mottos (*L'union fait la force, In God we trust...*) in order to manage conflicts? Why?

Depends on the nature of individual societies – since all the above can also be instruments of coercion and sources of disaffection in some contexts.

3.9. If so, do those “totems” seem universal or proper to each culture?

‘Universal’ can often be a claim, and serve as a pressure to conform or as a norm justifying coercion. To that extent I would advocate caution.

3.10. If you find the question relevant, to which main symbolic references in your country do you refer in your country? In your culture? What is your culture?

For me and millions of Indians, the Indian Constitution has a symbolic and substantive significance. I would also affiliate myself with the deep popular culture of pluralism and tolerance in India.

3.11. Do you think that the concept of Nation-State is an outdated concept? Why? If yes, with what would you replace it?

I tend to be generally sceptical of notions of what is ‘outdated’ and what is not. For e.g. the idea that the nation-state is outdated may represent the sensibilities of powerful elites, and powerful states with a capacity for extra-territorial sovereignty. No one can reasonably say, from the policies of many Western countries and the political rhetoric in their societies, that the age of the nation-state is at an end. It is also clear from their subsequent words and actions that what leading protagonists like Tony Blair really had in mind when they championed the arrival of a post-national world order, was a project to entrench Western dominance in a rapidly evolving world. What seems to have changed is the distribution of power and capacity between and within nation-states, a result arguably to some extent of the uneven political, functional, and ideological disruption of the nation-state. That said, the nation-state’s loss of *ethical hegemony* as a concept needs to be noted.

3.12. To which authors do you often refer? In your country? Abroad?

It depends on need and context – this is a tough question for an academic to answer in general.

3.13. How would you characterize the international system today?

Fragmented, and caught in what in Gramscian terms would be a ‘war of position’ or a ‘war of manoeuvre’

3.14. Which authors and colleagues are closest to you? In your country? Abroad?

Please see answer to 3.12 above

3.15. Which authors and colleagues are the furthest from you? In your country? Abroad?

Chauvinistic authors who preach or justify hatred, including in defence purportedly of 'freedom'

4. GEOPOLITICAL QUESTIONS

4.1. How could we define the legitimate interests of a State that triggers or gets involved in a conflict outside its borders? What role is played by disinformation, incomplete information and the manipulation of public opinion in the decision-making mechanisms of government, in regard to initiating, or participating in, armed conflicts, or destabilization, or violence in certain countries?

This is a hard question to answer in general terms; rarely in my view are 'interests' that drive a country to get involved in a conflict outside its borders, legitimate. That said, given that the world is made up of unequal powers, threats of countervailing external intervention can play a role in keeping a lid on conflicts.

4.2. What are the "founding documents" of your country? Which dates?

Principally the Indian Constitution, adopted in 1950

4.3. What are the major events that shaped the history of your country?

In the last 100 years the Indian national movement, independence from British rule and liberation from feudatory princes, the adoption of the Indian Constitution, and the founding of an (aspirationally) democratic and secular republic on that basis; and the growth of movements of marginalized communities claiming their democratic rights including under the Indian Constitution.

4.4. According to you, what are the major historic events of international life? Why?

Decolonization, the end of segregation in the US, and white-majority rule in South Africa – all of which have raised the prospect of the liberation and empowerment, as yet incomplete and to a great extent imperfect, of formerly suppressed people. The defeat of Nazism and fascism, and the end of the cold war retain a powerful potential as historic events

4.5. To which foreign country do you feel the closest? Why?

It varies – at present to Greece (because of its generosity towards refugees despite the economic and political pressures it has been under for the last several years); and in the

subcontinent with Pakistan where many groups are valiantly battling the 'deep security state' for miring their country in religious extremism and terror, and where the civil society has shown a most remarkable capacity for resilience and creativity.

4.6. To which foreign country do you feel the furthest? Why?

Again can vary – I am out of sympathy currently with European states who have adopted policies of varying degree of hostility towards refugees.

4.7. What are the major internal challenges of your country today?

Poverty, inequality, environmental degradation, declining quality of life for a majority of the people, and shrinking tolerance and space for resistance

4.8. In twenty years?

Many of these problems will endure, but hopefully India will have returned to its tolerant ways, and we will also see the emergence of creative, new solutions

4.9. What are the main assets of your country today?

The innate good sense of the ordinary people and their sense of fairness, justice, and tolerance

4.10. In twenty years?

The same, especially if more and more of the present-day youth from privileged backgrounds learn to appreciate it, as many appear to be doing, not just in India but throughout the subcontinent.

4.11. On the scale of 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum) indicate the appropriate position of your country today in the following areas:

Economic	1	2	3	4	5
Financial	1	2	3	4	5
Monetary	1	2	3	4	5
Political	1	2	3	4	5
Military	1	2	3	4	5
Scientific	1	2	3	4	5
Cultural	1	2	3	4	5
Innovation	1	2	3	4	5

4.12. On the scale of 1 (minimum) to 5 (maximum) indicate the appropriate position of your country in twenty years:

Economic	1	2	3	4	5
Financial	1	2	3	4	5
Monetary	1	2	3	4	5
Political	1	2	3	4	5
Military	1	2	3	4	5
Scientific	1	2	3	4	5
Cultural	1	2	3	4	5
Innovation	1	2	3	4	5

4.13. What are the major threats for your country today?

Please see 4.7

4.14. In twenty years?

Please see 4.8

4.15. Rank in decreasing order the nations that you consider to be the biggest threats to world peace?

I would say countries that are acting most provocatively in two of the world's most combustible regions, i.e. Syria and the Arab peninsula, and the South China Sea risk setting off larger conflicts beyond their ability to manage or control. That is not to say these countries are the 'biggest threats to world peace', since 'threats' are often interactive outcomes. To label any power unconditionally as a 'threat to world peace' would already be to point a finger, and to prefigure a conflict or a conflict-laden outcome.

4.16. Which non-state actors are threatening world peace at the present time? Tomorrow?

Mainly the IS, and potentially radical Islamists in Pakistan

In some possible future, cyber ultra-nationalists

But many of these so-called 'non-state' actors are state proxies with plausible deniability. So the line between state and non-state actors risks being drawn arbitrarily.

4.17. What are the new forms of war today? Tomorrow?

Proxy wars through armed militias and warlords; and punitive, long-distance / high-altitude attacks

Cyber warfare can easily get out of hand—especially if they lead, deliberately or not, to the failure of vital infrastructure. Many cyber-warriors are also ultra-nationalists, and cyber-warfare can become a form of ‘drone warfare’ at the hands of ultra-nationalists in less powerful countries.

4.18. Are you familiar with the “non-military war operation” referred to by the Chinese authors Qiao Liang and Wang Xiangsui? If so, what do you think about this concept?

It is not new, and seems to become newsworthy only when the Chinese explicitly articulate a form of war that has long been in use by different powers at different times.

4.19. What are the major threats for your continent?

Managing the emergence of Asian powers while also managing the transformation of an Atlantic-centred world system

4.20. What are the major threats for our planet?

The environment

4.21. Do you consider nuclear weapons as a threat? What are the main actions to be taken against proliferation? At the regional level? Globally?

Nuclear weapons are a threat—but proliferation concerns will always appear dubious so long as there is no serious disarmament

4.22. How do you assess the threats of cyberwar? For your country? In the world? What solutions would you propose?

Serious (see above): I am no expert, but on the face of it, it seems hard to control without intrusive surveillance that, unless carefully regulated, risks offending our rights and freedoms

4.23. Do you consider terrorism to be a major threat? How would you define it? What kinds of terrorism can you distinguish? How to prevent or fight them?

Yes, these issues have been under inconclusive discussion since at least 2001 in a number of forums including the UN and the CCIT

4.24. How do you assess the robotization of war?

Deadly and dangerous

4.25. According to you, how important is the growing shortage of water within the next decades? What solutions would you propose?

Certainly in many regions—greater understanding between upstream and downstream stakeholders, which is easier said than done. It is also essential to return to traditional forms water-management in many parts of the world.

4.26. According to you, who are the main allies of your country? Why?

India professes a policy of friendship with all and alliance with none. Hard as it is to follow, and inconsistent as India has been in this policy, including with its neighbours, it is hard to fault this principle

4.27. According to you, who are the main opponents of your country? Why?

India and Pakistan continue to act as if they are playing a zero-sum game. India is fearful of China, and its seemingly insular capacity for what many Indians fear to be aggressive behaviour. This could have reactive consequences. Right-wing nationalist groups and their elite allies are also opposing India from within (including paradoxically from within the government)!

4.28. According to you, what are the opportunities as well as geopolitical risks related to competition and future rivalries in the exploitation of the seas?

Remains to be seen; at sea, the lines and norms relating to geopolitics, national interests, and the most effective, ethical, and sustainable way of exploiting its resources, are still work in progress (if that is the right term)

4.29. According to you, what are the opportunities as well as geopolitical risks related to competition and future rivalries rivalry in the exploitation of outer space?

Potentially serious, it is time we took seriously attempts to regulate the exploration and use of outer space.

4.30. Regarding geostrategy, what are the different schools of thought in your country?

India is not particularly distinguished for its geostrategic thinking

4.31. Who are their leading personalities?

See above

4.32. What are their main characteristics?

See above

4.33. How would you define “*leadership*”, “*unilateralism*”, “*bilateralism*”, “*multilateralism*”, “*unipolarity*”, and “*multipolarity*”? In the context of today’s reality? Ideally?

I would appreciate more clarity on this question

4.34. Do you believe that the concepts of “power” and “empire” are relevant? Why?

For ‘power’ see answers to 3.1 and 3.4; as for ‘empire’, yes: colonial relations and forms of dominance have not disappeared

4.35. Would you suggest additional or alternative concepts? If so, please specify which and why?

No

4.36. What do you think about the ongoing transpacific and transatlantic trade projects? What implications and consequences for your country?

It remains to be seen how the former will work, especially vis-à-vis China, and whether or how the latter takes shape. India appears interested in the former, but seems mainly reactive on the question of multilateral vs regional trading arrangements

4.37. What do you think about the stakes, opportunities and risks related to the exploitation of the Arctic?

I don’t know enough about this; but my feeling is that the Western paranoia over Russia is likely to produce sub-optimal outcomes for the planet or the world. The West should acknowledge and draw Russia in as a legitimate stakeholder in the Arctic, rather than seeing it as one more boundary within which it has to be bottled up.

4.38. How do you conceive the future of Africa?

A future where the African people of all races and nations can come into their own after nearly two centuries of colonial exploitation and dependence, and lay claim to and restore their intellectual, cultural, and political heritage

4.39. How do you see the future of Asia?

Hopefully as a continent that does not lose its spiritual and ethical bearings as it grows richer and more powerful, and grows in an inclusive way without yielding to chauvinisms, external as well as internal

4.40. How do you see the future of Europe? Of the European Union?

Contrary to what it believes, Europe faces more challenges from within than from outside. As distant states become more powerful, and Europe encounters an increasingly unstable neighbourhood, its self-righteous beliefs and behaviour could lead to dangerous behaviour on the part of extreme right-wing groups and governments. It would help for Europe to recognize that it has still a great number of historical wrongs to live down, from colonialism, to the two world wars, and the horrors of Nazism and the holocaust. It should also attempt to do so without finding new scapegoats—for e.g. Islam or Muslims. A more complete acknowledgement of its historical wrongs would be a positive augury for the future of Europe, and indispensable if Europe is serious about combating racism and right-wing extremism.

This is not only or necessarily about guilt, as much as a honest historical reckoning that gives the rest of the world a voice into Europe's conversations about itself, its history, and its society.

This often requires a greater degree of self-reflexivity than often seems evident even in the best-intentioned circles. An good example, close to hand, is this project's own classification of some experts as national, others as 'transversal'! So a good place to start for this project would be by asking whether there is a single 'transversal', and what does it imply to assume a single 'transversal'.

As for the EU these are challenging times. It remains to be seen how it emerges from them.

4.41. How do you see the future of the Americas (North and South)?

I am positive, on the whole, about the Americas, particularly the many levels of popular mobilizations taking place in both regions. These can sometimes lead to conflict, but also open up quite exciting future possibilities that Europe's preference for the bureaucratic resolution of

political conflicts, and the papering-over of historical tensions, can preclude.

- 4.42. What do you think about the creation of the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank? What implications do you see? What are the implications or consequences for your country?

It is an important new initiative. Much would depend on how it functions—it is too early to assess its implications.

- 4.43. What do you think about updating the Silk Roads? What would be the impact or consequences for your country?

Again another interesting initiative—remains to be seen what happens as Chinese growth slows and the consequences of slower growth ripple through Chinese politics and society. It also remains to be seen whether the necessary investments materialize, and how any slowdown in Chinese growth and reduction in export surpluses (or increase in capital flight) affect them. There are some Chinese project investments overseas that are being wound down. The Silk Roads are of greater strategic benefit to China, still their future is not assured. India is concerned about their implications, and perhaps more interested in the possibilities of railway connectivity than road connectivity, not least because in some versions the road spans territories India considers disputed. The interest of Central Asia in sustaining the project as China winds down its external commitments also remains to be seen.

- 4.44. Do you know other projects that merit attention and commentary? Which? Why?

The environmental impact of Chinese projects to damn its rivers could have profound transformative effects on South Asia and Southeast Asia.

- 4.45. What do you think of politico-military alliances such as NATO, SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organisation), CSTO (Collective Security Treaty Organization), OSCE (Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe), and BRICS?

It is hard to bundle them into one category—they have different roles, histories, levels of institutional development and integration, and effectiveness.

- 4.46. How would you develop or transform them?

See above

4.47. Do you think the UN should strengthen its role in the field of peace? How? In security? How?

Yes, by undertaking urgent reform that makes the UN more representative of contemporary realities, and of the diversity of the world's people, experiences, and ideas. The UN's interlocutors in civil society also have a responsibility to transform it from a body of bureaucrats to a more political entity that is capable of reflecting the global winds of change in favour of more democracy and better representation at the international level of marginalized groups, nations, and regions.

4.48. What other international fields of activity should be developed?

I would appreciate more clarity on this question

4.49. What do you think about current regional and continental organizations and their probable or desired evolution?

Again they are quite different from one another as to histories, missions, institutional development, etc. In general, I would say they make a positive contribution to regional understanding

5. SUGGESTIONS

5.1. What theoretical or practical paths do you advocate following in order to allow your country to face its challenges? Do you differentiate "peace" and "security"? In what way?

Peace and security can be mutually determining except when the pursuit of security becomes a source of conflict.

As for the challenges confronting India, it should strive to restore its tradition of plural and inclusive nationalism, and improve relations with its neighbours.

5.2. What do you expect from your country's allies? Which allies?

India's friends should recognize that despite any short-term problems it may create for specific (business) interests, investments, etc., India's noisy, diverse, pluralistic, and inclusive democracy is the best guarantee of its stability and progress.

5.3. What economic reforms (IMF, World Bank, WTO) would you suggest at the international level?

WTO could rebalance its priorities, and pay more attention to concerns of developing countries, especially market-access

The World Bank and IMF are in dire need of governance reform

5.4. What political reforms (UN...) would you suggest at the international level?

The UN is in imperative need of reform to bring it into greater conformity with present-day challenges and power configurations. UNGA meetings could once again strive to become platforms of expression and hope of popular movements, as they were especially in its first two decades, and indeed even until the 1970s.

5.5. What reforms would you suggest in the field of security and military at the international level?

The most important reform would involve the role of military alliances such as the NATO—disbandment of the NATO would be a dramatic transformation that is impossible, however, to envisage

5.6. What cultural reforms (UNESCO...) would you suggest at the international level?

Greater sensitivity for the cultures and practices of indigenous communities and minority groups

5.7. In your opinion, which international projects should be given priority? In second place?

This question is too broad. Perhaps this could be attempted at the conference in conversation with the other participants.

5.8. What would be your personal proposals in connection with regional or international reorganization?

Please see above

5.9. Which language or languages will be dominant in 50 years? Why?

I see English continuing to grow in importance, and become more plural. As the 'ownership' of the language diffuses, 'English' will find many more ways of expression according to place, context, and media. It remains to be seen what this means for English as a language of diplomacy and international relations.

6. SUGGESTIONS FOR THE PROJECT "WHAT PEACE? WHICH WORLD ORDER?"

6.1. Which books would you recommend to your project colleagues?

Gandhi's *Hind Swaraj*, undoubtedly, for addressing broader meanings of the political especially under colonialism

6.2. Which websites do you recommend about your country? About a foreign country? About a subject related to the project?

None in particular, but in India I would commend the sites of groups fighting for the rights of minorities and marginal social groups, and resisting sectarian politics

6.3. According to you, which issues should be discussed with priority at the workshop on peace and world order? Please draft, at your convenience, a table of subjects.

The effect of interventions and other forms of interference by Western powers, and what could be done to recover vernacular indigenous voices and means of coping with conflict and building peace

6.4. What type of project, related to the theme of peace, would you like to carry out with which partner?

I would appreciate more clarity on this question