

NEXT IAS

CSE (MAINS) TEST SERIES - 2023

(To be filled by candidate)

Name of Candidate : Nivedita Chandra

Roll No. : _____

Mobile Number : 8004253194

Date of Examination : _____

Exam Centre : Old Rajinder Nagar ☐

Online ☐

Test-01

**POLITICAL SCIENCE &
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

Dated : 10-06-2023

Time Allowed : Three Hours

Maximum Marks: 250

QUESTION PAPER SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS

(Please read each of the following instructions carefully before attempting questions)

There are **EIGHT** questions. Candidate has to attempt **FIVE** questions in all.

Question no 1 and 5 are compulsory and out of the remaining **THREE** are to be attempted. Among these **THREE** questions, one should be from each section.

Answers must be written in the medium authorized in the Admission certification which must be stated clearly on the cover of this Question-cum-Answer (QCA) booklet in the space provided. No marks will be given for answers written in medium other than the authorized one.

Word limit in questions, wherever specified, should be adhered to.

Attempts of questions shall be counted in chronological order. Unless struck off, attempt of a question shall be counted even if attempted partly. Any page or portion of the page left blank in the answer book must be clearly struck off.

Observations:



SECTION A

Candidates must not write on this margin

Answer the following questions in about 150 words each:

(5 × 10 = 50)

- (a) How does the postcolonial perspective challenge traditional power, state, and security theories?
- (b) Evaluate the scholarly perspectives on the role and evolution of political parties with special reference to the views of James Jupp.
- (c) Critically examine the relationship between globalisation and the right to development. How can the fulfilment of human rights and fundamental freedoms be ensured in the era of globalisation?
- (d) Critically analyse the Democratic Peace Theory. How does it stand facing criticism from Realist perspectives and historical examples?
- (e) Discuss the common assumptions shared by neorealism and neoliberal institutionalism and their implications for understanding the behaviour of states in the international system.

(a)

Post colonial state perspective of international relations and comparative politics was started by Edward Said.

Inspired by Pontauk's knowledge - Power connection / Sociological aspect of power, he established that the study of orient was a political project to establish the hegemony of the west of over the east.

To describe it he coined the term 'Orientalism' which was used to describe the also post colonial perspective of state is inspired by the marxist perspectives.

The Straw Instrumentalist approach showed that States were instrumental of Bourgeoisie of Metropolisons. Thus Ag Brink describes Third world as 'satellites'. The Dependency established the interdependence was 'Development of underdevelopment'.

Structural approach of Hamza Alvi talked about 'Overdeveloped state / Bourgeois states which enjoyed Relative Autonomy and had become a power structure in useful eg - Deep state in Pakistan -

Similarly, the Postcolonial scholars like Amitav Acharya & Madhyatma Chatterjee challenge the Mainstream theories of IR. They say that the Third world doesn't suffer from security Dilemma (Realist concept) but insecurity Dilemma. Similarly liberal notion of 'Security Community' is not feasible in disintegrated S. Asian Region.

Hence, it would be justified to say that 'mainstream theories of power, state & Security' are 'Eurocentric'.

Candidates
must not write
on this margin





c) Globalisation can be seen as contraction of space & time. It is a society centric view different from internationalism which is state centric.

Globalisation has criticised by mainstream theories like Marxism and Reflexivist theories like Leninism, post-colonialism.

If we go by Marxist perspective, the Dependency school led by Al Bano, Dos Santos etc. They regard globalisation as global extent of capitalism.

They explain it through the term Neocolonialism which leading to 'dependency' rather than interdependence. Wealth is being drained from periphery to core leading to 'development of underdevelopment'.

The critical school doesn't regard it as emancipatory. Hence, Andrew Link later talks of draining 'moral boundaries' over territorial boundaries.

As per Thomas Piketty in his book Capital in 21st century. He is of the view that there is growing inequality & growth of patrimonial capitalism.

Similarly, feminist theories like criticise globalisation for ^{its} increased exploitation of 'environment' and 'women' alike (Shiva Vandana). Cynthia Enloe is of the view that women are exploited on Banana plantations.

The fulfillment of HR & development in era of globalisation can be ensured by steps like:-

- a) human centric globalisation (PM mode)
- b) Replace profit oriented capitalism with people oriented (people, power, profits - Joseph Stiglitz)
- c) myposition of 'Wealth Can' (Thomas Piketty)

Globalisation has not brought qualitative changes to the condition of Third world rather promoted 'coca-colonialism'. Hence, it needs to be transformed.

'Democratic peace Thesis' is a concept given by Michael Doyle belonging to the school of Republican peace liberalism.

He was inspired by the Kant's concept of Perpetual Peace. The thesis explains that Authoritarian countries are inherently militaristic and promote a culture of violence.

At the same time democracies are inherently peaceful because they are based on the concept of 'communitarian action'. Hence there is chance for self correction.

The theory, however, has been criticised by realists who are of the view that ^{presence} democracies don't and absence of war has no correlation.

The cooperation among countries in the past possibly has been not ~~but~~ because of democracy but because of ^{fear} spread of 'communism'.

Similarly the Democratic peace thesis justifies the Human Rights / Democratic intervention by USA. It is often used to ~~is~~ introduce democracies at compulsory in the mid East countries eg 'Iraq'.

such interventions establishes 'Puppet Regimes' to favour the US & West eg Taliban in Afghanistan.

Hence Democratic Peace thesis can't be considered as a comprehensive explanation of state of affairs.

e) Neoliberal realism is has been expanded by Kenneth Waltz as a criticism of the classical realism of Morgenthau.

According to Waltz, Morgenthau's human centric approach was reductive 'ist' and didn't represent the actual picture of international politics which was guided by Anarchy.

He explains that the anarchised structure of international politics leaves states in self help environment hence, pursuit for power becomes necessary. The Theory explains distribution of power in the world → Balance of power. Realists believe in Relative gains.

Neoliberal Institutionalism on the other hand is based on the concept of collective security which

is based on Absolute gains over Relative gains. Collective security can be established by building institutions eg WTO, UN, IMF etc.

The 2 school despite difference
have following assumptions in

Common :-

- ① The Anarchical structure is common to both. However, liberals believe the Anarchy can be managed through cooperation i.e. Collective security.
- ② ~~The~~ Both BOP and collective security deal with management of Power. Collective security is called as 'institutionalised Balance of Power'.
- ③ There is emphasis on 'National security' by both approaches. Waltz claims states as 'Security maximiser', while 'collective security' is often operationalised as collective Defence.

In the context of globalisation, critically examine the continuing relevance of the nation-state.

(15 marks, 200 words)

Candidates
must not write
on this margin

Globalisation has been described as compression of time & space. It must be differentiated from internationalism (state-centric view) as globalisation gives society-centric view.

The phenomenon can be explained by 'Complex interdependence' model of Joseph Nye over Billiard Ball model.

There has been a debate on the relevance of Nation-State in the era of Complex interdependence & where there can be seen an emergence of Global Village (Michael McLuhan).

The both concepts i.e. Nation state and Globalisation represent

conflicting views of state represents 'territorialisation' and 'centralisation', globalisation represents 'deterre localisation' and 'decentralisation'.

The supporters of globalisation eg Susan Strange, Michael McLuhan etc believe that states are no more in control of globalisation. eg approx \$5 trillion cross border trade take place daily and states can't control it.

To quote Friedman 'World has become flat' and can no longer control the interaction across the borders eg - trade through cryptocurrency, #MeToo movement.

On the other hand there are state centric opinions led by scholars like Gulpin who believe that states are in very much

control of globalisation. Examples can be drawn from ability to impose global minimum ban on MNCs, Security-Development / hyphenations i.e. restrict trade in sectors important to security.

There is a third group of scholars who ~~to i.e.~~ Transformationalists who believe that 'globalisation' is not a 'zero sum game'. As per Sorinson it has impacted different countries in a different ~~most~~ manner. eg - they have ~~been~~ disempowered the states of Africa.

Finally, as per Critical Theorists eg Andrew Dardar it is better to replace territorial boundaries by moral boundaries to strengthen Global Civil Society & emancipation of mankind.

Discuss the criticisms of Almond's structural functionalism. How do these criticisms challenge the utility and applicability of structural functionalism in political science and international relations?

(15 marks, 200 words)

Candidates must not write on this margin

Structural functional approach of comparative politics is given by Almond and Powell.

It is a refutation of criticisms hailed against David Easton's Systems Theory. The ~~the~~ cc being too general. The structural functional approach tries to give a micro perspective and discusses about 7 variables i.e. 3 output & 4 input variables.

It also draws inspiration from Anthropologists like Radcliffe Brown & Malinowski in an attempt to build a Grand Theory which is Universalist.

The theory, however, has

been criticised by Traditionalists & Marxists alike.

Traditionalists believe that the theory has operational & conceptual inadequacy. It is full of unnecessary Jargons and it too general. So go by the traditionalists analysis, the theory is just a framework and goes no where as a vehicle of research.

Marxists on the other hand criticise the ~~these~~ approach for being status quoist, non-universal and Eurocentric.

They say that like David Easton's system theory there has been overemphasis on system maintenance. Thus no explanation is given for the absorption in

system like protests eg - the ongoing French protests, occupy wall street etc.

They also emphasise on the fact that overemphasis on system maintenance shows a subtle defence of liberal world order over other ideologies.

Despite criticisms, the structural functional approach remains relevant in the analysis of developing countries, ~~too far~~. It has also helped the political parties in formulation of election manifestos and in explaining the electoral behaviour.

Discuss the evolution and scope of Comparative Politics. Analyse its progression from a Eurocentric viewpoint to a more diverse and inclusive discipline in modern times.

Candidates must not write on this margin

(20 marks, 250 words)

Comparative Politics is as old as political science. The ^{emergence of the} discipline ^{can be traced to} the works of Aristotle when gave a comparative view of 15-8 constitutions.

If we discuss the Nature & scope of comparative politics we see various phases of evolution of the discipline.

Till World War II, the discipline evolved in Ancient Greece / Europe. The traditional theories of comparative politics were dominated by ~~and~~ disciplines like History, philosophy and legal-institutional, study of constitutions etc.

However, 1960s the discipline of Political science in general faced a decline. where theories were unable to give explanation of civil rights and protests etc.

The traditional theories were called as status quoist, formalist, parochial, static, ethnocentric and non monographic (Macridis).

With the end of cold war WWII and decolonisation as new lease of life was given to the discipline of comparative Politics.

To quote, Lucian Pye, it ~~has~~ became necessary to evolve new methods as political process in 3rd world were different from those of Europe.

Hence new approaches were developed like Systems Approach (David Easton), Structural Functional Approach (Almond & Powell), Political cultural approach etc.

These approaches incorporated the uniqueness of political processes in third world where there was presence of constitutionalism but no 'constitutionalism'.

Approaches like Political sociology approach helped in explaining the political process taking place in non political institutions.

Similarly Political Development approach was used to explain the electoral behaviour, working of state etc in Global South. FW Reggs talks of

'Developmental rap' and 'Prismatic societies' :- the ie societies where forces of both traditionality and modernity play a role eg SALA Model, Formalism (Confessionalism in debsanon & graq!) .

Hence, the new approaches helped making the discipline more test scientific by development of 'testable theories' and less 'Eurocentric' by including the societal structures / processes of 3rd world countries into politics .

Critically examine the limitations of realism in international relations and discuss alternative perspectives that challenge its power-centric approach.

(15 marks, 200 words)

Candidates must not write on this margin

'Realism' is a hegemonic school of International Relation. It draws inspiration from the works of Kautilya (Asthashastra), Machiavelli (The Prince) etc.

Classical 'Realism' was started by Hans Morganthau who in his book 'Politics among nations' explained that 'international politics' was a 'struggle for power'. Being rooted in human nature, state egoism is guided by 'human egoism'.

Neo Realists like Walt modified the approach by giving a systemic view. He maintained the view of 'power politics' but attributed it to Anarchical structure of International Politics. He gave the concept Balaine of power.

The discipline however has been criticised by liberals. They are of the view that states do pursue their 'National interest', but there is considerable amount of cooperation among states as they believe in 'Absolute gains' over 'Relativist' gains.

Scholars like Barry Buzan say that the liberal Realist approach is a natural home for those with conservative ideology.

Similarly, the approach has been criticised by Marxist eg Robert Cox who believe that 'Theory is always for someone' meaning Realism is used to maintain the dominance of the powerful.

There has been criticism on the reductionist approach of Realism i.e. Power monism (Hoffman). Hence ^{has been} there ~~is~~ been an emergence of Neo-classical Realism which fuses domestic factors with anarchical factors.

Feminists believe that the hegemony of Realism has decreased the scope for women perspectives and representations. As per Carol Cohn Realists have divorced war from humanity.

They call for attack on masculinistic approach & incorporation of feminist perspective. (J Ann Tickner's modification of 6 principles of Morgenthau)

Finally, Critical Theorists criticise ~~these~~ approach for being just problem solving. Hence, present an alternative model of National boundaries being replaced by Moral boundaries.

To what extent does the liberal approach contribute to peace and security in the international arena in the 21st century?

(15 marks, 200 words)

Candidates must not write on this margin

Liberal approach to international politics is the oldest approach. It was started by Woodrow Wilson who established a chair of international politics in University of Wales.

The basic assumption of the approach is derived from English liberal self-interest of John Locke.

They believe that states believe in 'absolute gains' over Rel 'Relativist gains'. Moreover they believe in goodwill & cooperation.

The various approaches and their contributions can be listed as following :-

① Liberal Internationalism → It believes in collective security & was first conceptualised by building institutions like Ligue of Nation. However failure of LON resulted in delegitimising the role of collective security.

in post cold war era it has gained relevance, ^{eg IMF, WTO} however global institutions continue to suffer from Democratic Deficit.

② Sociological liberalism by Karl Deutsch & Burton has helped in decreasing the Trust Deficit and establishment of 'Security Community' eg US-Canada.

However, in present times in 3rd world countries there is a presence of insecurity dilemma (Amitava Acharya).

- ③ Golden Arches theory proposed by Milton Friedman believe that states with McDonalds franchises (e.g. ie. Trading states) don't go for war.

This theory has however come under criticism due to present scenario of friendshoring & deglobalisation.

- ④ Functionalism theory by David Mitrany is possibly the best alternative to ^{regional} Realist approaches. However, even it is under criticism due to failure of SAARC & weakening of EU (Brexit, Eurozone crisis).

Hence, liberal approaches alone are not sufficient in solving the crisis of 21st century. There is a need for comp combination of approaches.

Examine the characteristics and changing nature of the state in capitalist, socialist, and advanced industrial societies. Discuss the typical development patterns and analyse the role of ideologies in shaping these changes.

(20 marks, 250 words)

Candidates must not write on this margin

'State' in modern form can be seen as an instrument of development of the citizens as well as economy.

The characteristics and nature of state has kept on evolving and changing with changing ideologies, global environment of international politics and what not.

If we analyse the role character etc of capitalist/industrial states. we seek they in general they are dependant on free trade, market economy, borderless world etc.

The capitalist model of states have changed ~~with~~ with the evng

evies of time. For eg in 1920s & 30s
when there was a backlash against
capitalism due to rampant inequality
and rise of socialism, the capitalist
model of development mutated itself
from ~~the~~ laissez faire model to
Welfare State model (Key (Beveridge
Report in UK))

against with rampant growth
of Fiscal deficit & crony capitalism there
was a shift towards Neoliberal
model or TINA model. Now, in
the era of backlash against globalisation
the capitalist state swing between
social-liberal and Neoliberal model
eg US → announced welfare package
of \$2 trillion during COVID 19.

similar analysis of socialist
states disclose that these states

started ^{with a} social ownership of mode of production. However, owing to the limitations of supply side economy; they soon faced BoP crisis.

Consequently, Neoliberal model of development was adopted as a Structured Adjustment programme (SAP) in ~~East~~ Third world countries and as a Shock Therapy in Eastern Europe.

Now the states which follow 'socialism' as a ~~dom~~ political ideology have shifted to 'capitalist mode' of production in domestic sphere. eg - state led capitalism of China.

Despite adoption of neo liberal approach, the states are far from being a Neoliberal market economy with issues such as. Black market, crony capitalism, Tariff & Nontariff barriers.

Hence, the nature of capitalist and socialist models have changed often disregarding the ideologies they became with.

SECTION B

Answer the following questions in about 150 words each:

(5 × 10 = 50)

- (b) Discuss the global crisis of political parties. Analyze the reasons behind the growing mistrust in political parties in both established and emerging democracies.
- (c) Discuss the main assumptions of Realism in international relations and their implications. How do these assumptions shape the understanding of international politics?
- (d) Discuss Hegemonic Stability Theory and its role in establishing international order. Evaluate its significance in creating and upholding rules for cooperation.
- (e) Analyse the key concepts and critiques of Dependency Theory in understanding developing countries' development challenges. Discuss the contributions of prominent scholars of the school.
- (f) What are the criticisms against collective security, and how do they impact its feasibility and effectiveness in achieving global peace?

(a) Political Parties can be defined as a group of people ~~cons~~ (with similar ideologies) coming together to defend the National Interest. (Edmund Burke)

If we go by the analysis of Almond & Powell (structural functional approach), the political parties play the role of 'Interest Aggregation'.

However, as Behaviouralists, there is being witnessed a global decline of political parties. It can be manifested in Rise of the Right (AND in Germany; Jair Bolsonaro in Brazil), weakening of institutions

of democracies eg lowering JK powers of Israeli SC by the Knesset. &

As described by Larry Diamond we are witnessing decline of political parties both emerging and emerged economies. He describes it as Democratic slump. In

emerged economies there is a rise of authoritarian leaders eg - Russian Putin imprisoned Alexy Navalny (political opposition)

Similarly in emerging economies like Indonesia, Myanmar etc there are increased cases of military coups & Junta regimes.

The reasons of growing mistrust can be described through scholarly perspectives. Keechuan attributes it to the 'catch all parties' system where power is becoming more important than ideology.

He also talks of deideologisation, depoliticisation (of masses) etc.

Hence, ~~these~~ Political parties across the globe are seeing a decline in terms of internal democracy & ideology.

Realism in international relation is a hegemonic school given by Hans Morganthau ^{Book:} (Politics among Nations).

Main assumptions of Realism can be described as below:-

- ① Classical Realists: International politics is 'struggle for power'. It emanates from human egoism which defines state egoism.
- ② Neo Realists: Kenneth Waltz gives a systemic approach. 'Power struggle' is not a result of human nature but 'Anarchical structure' of international politics which leaves states in self-help situation.
- ③ Neo classical Realists: They ~~take~~ ^{also take} domestic factors in consideration for state behaviour (Randall Schmelke).

Implications of Realism can be decided through the perspective of offensive Realism and Defensive Realism.

While, Offensive Realists like Waltz believe that states are security maximisers, offensive Realists like John Mearsheimer is of the view that states are 'power maximisers' and aim at becoming 'Power Hegemon'.

The approach of offensive Realist can help in understanding the Realities of Present International Politics. According to Mearsheimer in his book 'The Tragedy of Great Power Politics', the Rise of China is not peaceful as it aspires to be no less than a global hegemon.

Similarly, the perspective of Realism as struggle for power, can help understanding the New Cold War, Russia Ukraine crisis etc.

c) Hegemonic stability Theory is given by Robert Gilpin and ~~Charles~~ Charles Kindleberger. It is based on the concept of hegemony in international relations.

A hegemon is one who has the economical, political, military and cultural power to influence the behaviour of other states in favour of his own interest.

As per the theory, there is a need for global hegemon who decides the rules, regulations, norms of behaviour of the other states.

Such rules help prevent Prisoner's Dilemma, and ~~reasons~~ ^{cause} of conflict. Hence, the global hegemon works as a global police man to establish rule of law in international sphere.

UK played the role till Second World War. After and US has been playing the role of global hegemon post Cold War.

However, the theory is criticised as the global hegemon is replaced every 100 yrs or so as the hegemon over exhausts itself resulting King Kunderberg trap & rise of 'New hegemon' leading to instability.

In current scenario, we see decrease in US hegemony & Rise of China leading to conflicts in form of Trade Wars, Territorial Disputes, Russia Ukraine Crisis. Hence, there is a need of 'Benign hegemon' to set the rules e.g. - Free Open & inclusive Indo Pacific.

The theory comes ~~very~~ very near to the 'Theory of International Regimes' by Stephen Krasner.

4) 'Dependency Theory' is a Marxist approach to the unequal development of the Third world countries.

It bases its assumption on Latin Theory of imperialism as highest form of Capitalism.

The key concept of the theory establishes that there is a continuation of the 'hegemony' of the west in form of 'Neocolonialism'.

If we go by the analysis of Ag Frank, he distinguishes the core (industrial states) from the periphery (satellites of metropolitan bourgeoisie). He explains that there is a drain of wealth from periphery to the core thus leading to development of underdevelopment.

Similarly as per the ~~un~~ Imperial Wallerstein there was developed a World System of Capitalism post 15th century. represented by core, periphery & Semi periphery. Semiperipheries have acquired some core like features but peripheries remain to suffer (eg Latin America & Africa).

As per ~~Ne~~ DoS Santos, there are 3 types of Dependency - Colonial dependency, Financial capital dependency and New Dependency (ie through MNCs).

However, the Dependency Theory has been criticised for being too Reductionist. Similarly, Post Colonial Theories discredit them for being merely a problem solving & not emancipatory.

Despite the criticisms, the Dependency theories help in explaining the realities of global south.

Collective security 'is a concept' given by liberals. It is espoused especially by the school of liberal institutionalism given by Woodrow Wilson.

It has its assumption on the 'fact' that states believe in Absolute gains over Realist claims of Relative gains. Moreover, the Anarchy of international politics can be managed by establishing liberal institutions eg UN.

However, the approach has been facing criticisms by Realists & neo-realists & post colonialists & alike.

collective security, was criticised for no failure of LON and preventing World War II. Moreover Realists like Bernard Brodie believe that it was Nuclear deterrence and not collective security which established peace.

during cold war.

Similarly, the post-colonial states believe that there is trust deficit & democratic crisis among nations regarding institutions like UN, IMF etc due to presence of permanent sub members and weighted voting etc.

In fact, UN has been suffering from East-West divide e.g. Collection security operation and China on account of USA's covert intentions.

Similarly, WTO has been facing 'Crisis of functionality' due to dysfunctional Dispute settlement Body (Appellate body). Moreover, nothing substantial has been reached in implementation of Doha Development Agenda.

For a greater transparency group of 4 has emerged. India has also proposed NORMS for UN reforms.

Analyse the evolving dynamics of the Asian balance of power and its implications for regional security. Discuss the strategic challenges posed by China's rise and the responses of key actors in shaping the balance of power in Asia.

(15 marks, 200 words)

Candidates must not write on this margin

The concept of Balance of Power is given by Realists like Waltz, & Mearsheimer etc.

As per the realists, international politics is a 'struggle for power' and balance of power shifts in the direction of one which has military & political might i.e. Hard Power.

Recently, there has been a rise of China as against the decreasing hegemony of US. If we go by the perspective of hegemonic stability theory every 100 yrs there is a 'rise of a new hegemon'. The rise of China, can be linked to a similar phenomenon.

It has implications for regional ^{& global} security.
Analysing the rise through 'Polarity' of
Power Thesis (~~also~~ the rise of a unipolar
world can lead to multipolar
world which is notoriously unstable
& conflictual leading global instability.

On regional perspective i.e. Indo
Pacific there are chances of conflict
with US over free & open Indo Pacific.
~~Also~~ With rise of India as a regional
hegemon, clashes with China is
non avoidable (Power & Transition
Theory & Thucydides Trap).

The growth of conflict and
threat to regional security
can be seen in emerging dynamics
& organisations eg AUKUS, QUAD
~~and~~ China ~~and~~ Russia relationship
as relationship without borders
paint a similar picture.

China poses various challenges in the region eg → Grey zone operations in the Indo-Pacific challenges free & open Navigation. ~~It~~

It has also been surrounding India with 'String of pearls' and trapping smaller nations eg Sri Lanka through at check book diplomacy.

The key actors eg Japan, Australia and India have come together to balance against Chinese rise through defence initiatives like AUKUS, Malabar Exercise. Similarly on the economic and technological front China's rise is confronted through initiatives like SCRI, QUAD+ and IPEC.

As per John Mearshamer, in his book The Great Delusion, intense power struggle will continue and Rise of China will not be peaceful.

To what extent is women's security central to understanding peace and post-conflict reconstruction? Discuss the challenges and limitations in mainstreaming a gender perspective in peacekeeping missions and peace-building efforts.

(15 marks, 200 words)

Candidates must not write on this margin

'Peacekeeping Mission' was introduced by SK Daghammer, ~~to~~ due to limited success of 'collective security'. It is an extra constitutional measure metaphorically called as Chapter VI 1/2.

It was aimed at bringing peace, development and conflict resolution of conflict ridden states. However, a trend has been observed that there are often instances of ~~state~~ violation of H.R. Women suffer disproportionately to such violations.

Partly it can be attributed to the feminist ~~critic~~ emphasis that the malestream / mainstream theories

~~so~~ lack gender perspective. ~~For~~ As
per Cynthia Enloe women's role have
been discredited in international politics.
In fact it has led to invisibilisation
of women's contribution in form of
Diplomat's wife, sexual workers at
military bases etc. Hence, she asks
Where are the women.

Moreover, the National Security
concept of Realist scholars have been
deeply criticised by feminists for its
over emphasis on masculinistic
concept of military & economic
power.

Feminists suggest the concept
of National security which is mult
idimensional and prioritises women's
safety.

UN has recognised the role

women through UNSC 1325 resolution and asked for greater role of women in security & post conflict reconstruction. It also advocated for incorporating women's perspective in foreign policy.

The possibility of incorporating role of women in peacekeeping seems to be a difficult task. Considering the malestream decision making, under representation of women in security forces, the dangerous working environment, blue helmets work, and lack of technological & material power of forces.

Nevertheless, difficulty should not lead to complacency. As women form an important part of giving a 'healy touch' to post conflict reconstruction 'eg New Zealand' ^{women} PM handled Covid crisis better than rest of the world.

Analyse the varied theoretical perspectives on globalisation. How do these theories critique or reinforce the prevailing global economic and political order? Discuss with relevant examples.

(20 marks, 250 words)

Candidates must not write on this margin

'Globalisation' is a compression of ~~space~~ space & time. To explain in words of Joseph Nye, it is the emergence of complex interdependence.

'Globalisation' shouldn't be mistaken as Internationalism (State centered) as it is a Society centered concept?

The concept of globalisation is highly contested. ~~and it~~ is a multiconceptual and multidimensional in nature.

There are various perspectives to analyse globalisation. If we go by liberal view of golden Asches of Freedman, it has led

to decrease of conflicts and
increase of economic gain. ~~It~~ The
 growth in interconnectedness has
 made the world flat (Friedman).

To quote, Michael McLuhan,
Globalisation has helped in develop-
 ment of Global Village i.e growth
 of 'sphere of awareness' and [&] strengthening
 of Global Civil Society - eg #metoo
 movement, Black lives matter movement
 etc.

Jagdish Bhagwati, in his book.
 'In defence of Capitalism' quotes
 that globalisation has led to unprecedented
upliftment of poor eg - 41.5% ⁱⁿ India
 lifted out of multidimensional poverty
(UNDP MPI)

However, it ~~can~~ has also
 been criticised by many. The poor

colonial perspective believes that it has led to 'Neocolonialism' & Dependency (New Dependency of Dos Santos).

Feminists, like Shiva Vandana believe that global capitalism has exploited women & environment alike.

Cultural Relativist & Asean leaders like Ind Mahathir believe the spread Human Rights & through global civil society as Cultural Imperialism.

Marxists like Thomas Piketty believe that there is a growth of Patrimonial Capitalism. (Capital in 21st century) and growing inequalities eg.. According to oxfam report Top 1% Indians hold 40.5% of countries wealth.

social liberals like Joseph Stiglitz believe that the resentment against globalisation can be seen in protests eg occupy wall street. Globalisation has led to establishment of 'one vote one dollar' principle (globalisation and its discontent)

The backlash against globalisation can be seen through Brexit, modification of NAFTA etc, friendshoring etc.

Toquero, Shashi Narayan in his book 'New World Disorder' the new division of international politics will be between 'winners & losers of globalisation'.

~~pm~~ There is no need for development of globalisation based of equality, Justice & fairness (pm modi)