

## **CHAPTER 4: INDIA AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: CHALLENGES AND POSSIBILITIES**

- **Introduction**
- **Global Governance: Issues and Challenges**
- **India and Global Governance: Possibilities and Opportunities**
- **Conclusion**

### **INTRODUCTION**

In this chapter will talk about what are the challenges which India is facing from Global Governance institutions and how India convert those challenges into possibilities. This chapter is divided in two segments at first its about what are the general challenges with respect to Global Governance and in the second segment will discuss the challenges of Global Governance with particular concern to India in 21<sup>st</sup> century specifically. What are the ways in which those challenges convert into possibilities and opportunities.

### **GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: ISSUES AND CHALLENGES**

Challenges to Global Governance is often seen through the lens of legitimacy problem of international institutions. At descriptive level, it is evident that these institutions are capable to enforce their decision over Nation-States i.e. National governments, but it does not provide answers to question of legitimacy. The valid question of legitimacy of these global governance institution lies in normative terms i.e. who is enforcer and over whom enforced and under what equitable terms? The analysis of the past trend of actions tries to justify all empirical hypothesis

that raises concerns over validity and justifiability of existence of Global Governance for shake of whom? The basic problem of these concerns does not stand at periphery of governance but it lies at the core which includes the democratic standards of decision making. Either it being WTO or UNO or other vital institutions, does they meet democratic norms? Global Governance since World War II has been important aspect of Multi-National Business corporations which directly reflects the interests of superpowers.

Non-democratic proceedings of Global Governance were largely considered to be an academic problem for long (Dahl, 1994). The notion of being just an academic problem got huge blow after a series of economic and political crisis within Nation-States turned into reality; sometimes it became global problem ranging from exchange rate crisis of India (1991), Finnish Bank crisis (1991-93), Black Wednesday (1992), Mexican economic crisis (1994), Asian financial crisis (1997), Russian financial crisis (1998), Samba effect in Brazil (1999) to 21<sup>st</sup> century global financial crisis (2007-08) and recent Pandemic crisis in terms of socio-economic loss is yet to be evaluated. At current inter-dependency level, no crisis can restrict within boundaries of Nation-State but its spillover impact can be observed globally. This brings the light into principle of acceptability of international norms by sovereign states amounting to failure of the Post World-War II dynamics. However, economic institutions (more prominent than political institution) became more significant to idea of Global Governance under leadership of United States (Keohane, 2005).

The empirical belief of legitimacy of global governance can be tasted by (Lipset, 1981) i.e. normative validity of global order depends upon international dynamics of global institutions. This means foundation of international institution paved path for globalization unlike previous international organizations. Global governance is automatically induced from these institutions.

The next step of hypothesis sits with the testing of quality of the governance of international institutions and subject to societal acceptance. The legitimacy is temporal and have typical feature of spatial variance. With growing time new contenders i.e. emerging powers or regional powers' resistance to domination of P5 States demanded reforms in Executive multilateralism which is ultimately test of the 'quality of the governance'. Interdependency of states is key feature of multilateralism and further global governance, at same time disparity in decision making becomes challenge for equity in governance. The reason behind the contestation was largely the aspiration of National identity of emerging Nations; as the multilateral rule was primarily based on negotiations by multilateral executive but as a unit of Multilateral executive there was hardly any say of these emerging states and without systematic incorporation of these National and societal actors from developing world the allegation over international institution went further up to level of challenge from just resistance.

It has been more than half century, the global governance was dominated by western powers especially United States. Post-World War II era dominated by Global Governance institutions that came into effect after Bretton Wood agreement and formation of supranational organization like United Nations. Though these institutions appeared to be democratic in nature but domination of hegemonic powers (victorious powers of WWII) was never ousted and institutions worked like ad-hoc organizations working in interest of super-sovereign i.e. Big five nations-permanent member of United Nation Security Council. There were limited saying of developing countries like India, Brazil, South Africa, Germany and Japan. Reason behind limited role of Germany and Japan seems to be obvious as they were defeated power. But rise of new middle power countries or regional powers like India, Brazil, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Iran (India being exceptionally ideal democratic states among all and huge market makes it different from other

contenders) and few of the important democratic Countries put impediments in decision making process in Global Governance.

America led governance was challenged by communist bloc in cold war regime but after fall of Soviet the void became big and concerning issue for middle powers like India. From 1991, era of collaboration and idea of peaceful coexistence came in light of neoliberal agenda of hegemonic powers. At same time trickling up in hierarchy of power structure brought newly recognized powers to collaborate with western powers over range of issues out of which technological exchange is most prominent which is often seen as cradle of cooperation leading to acquire expertise in those area of high end manufacturing or services which was considered to be monopoly of west. Challenging the monopoly in service sector in highly reputed information technology or simply knowledge industry provided India an edge on negotiation table.

On high table of Global Governance India's concerned area largely focused over- Climate change, Cross Border-Terrorism, universal nuclear disarmament, parity in financial institutions operated and dominated by West, Permanent seat in United Nation Security Council, Adequate voice in World Trade Organization over matter of flow of capital, goods and labour etc.

The global macroeconomic adjustment program previously led by United States, Japan, Britain, Germany and France proved to be havoc for world economy. American led alliance was in question to itself, their members started to raise concerns regarding utility and purpose of few institutions like NATO and other security based regional alliances (Ikenberry, 2010). Doha round negotiations prolonged than expected which brought in question about merit of the issue that was in discussion. Success of regional organization like ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations), NAFTA (North America Free Trade Agreement), EEA (European Economic Area),

AEC (African Economic community), MERCOSUR (Southern Common Market) etc. has brought west led governance in question. However, these regional organizations didn't had capabilities to replace the order established by previously established west-led governance system; still they posed threat to legitimacy of existing Global Governance. If talk about global challenge in institutional terms then dimension of Power and its shift in past half century cannot be ignored. With growing new issues there have been huge demand of governance while supply remains narrowly conservative, impeding the question over reliability of Global Governance system.

2008, financial crisis exposed the international financial and monetary deficiencies withheld the weakness of global institutions. American led alliances felt trouble in balancing the governance without including emerging economies like India, Brazil, Turkey, Mexico, Korea and few others in decision making process. It was the new beginning of shifting of wealth and power from global north to global south. India's role in Global Governance system drastically elevated to fill the vacuum left after end of polarity as being an important pillar of world economic and political stability being largest democracy and one of the largest economy on the earth.

India's position of challenging International institutions doesn't come under domain of legitimacy but effectiveness of the institution (*The Advocacy of Democratic Governance by India and China: Patterns of Consistency/Inconsistency between Declaratory and Operational Practices - Andrew F. Cooper, Asif B. Farooq, 2015, n.d.*). Talking about India's position over advocacy for global governance, there has been no compromise with principle of democracy despite of having largest population under abject poverty in absolute terms. However, India is in favour of evolutionary change rather than revolutionary or abrupt. Recent response of global actors to the previously mentioned recession shows the informal acceptance of the inclusive

policy over Global Governance. Inception of G20 after global financial crisis of 2002 paved the way for informal forum for the top 20 countries that also included many developing countries like India, Turkey, Brazil, Argentina, Mexico, etc. At diplomatic level variation in regular conduct of Global Governance can be observed in light of inducting new rules and new issues that concerns world at large and issues which were previously remained unattended now got their stage to be shared. Many scholars cheered and celebrated G20 as beginning of era of reforms in global governance. David Held argues, “G20 being a successful attempt by developing countries to extent their participation in key institutions of Global Governance”(*PDF*) *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities – By David Held*, n.d.). While Ngaire Woods (2010) criticized those who were cheering for G20. He holds the view that G20 in not a new beginning but it is instrument of continuation and it is institution to maintain status quo of neo-liberal economic order that is largely beneficial for rich western countries (*Global Governance after the Financial Crisis: A New Multilateralism or the Last Gasp of the Great Powers? - Woods - 2010 - Global Policy - Wiley Online Library*, n.d.).

### **India’s Historic stand and challenges in Global Governance**

Since the edifice of Global Governance was laid down after end of World War II, India was one of the most enthusiastic and committed multilateralist actor seeking active role in international politics (Bhagavan, 2013). India’s enthusiasm for internationalism can be measured through the fact that India is among first 23 Nation-States that were signatory to GATT in 1947. For India multilateralism was instrument to win greater legitimacy and recognition, but India position was not to speak for herself but on behalf of all developing countries and newly decolonized countries. For addressing concerns of developing countries India voiced for more legitimate institution as substitute institution of GATT i.e. UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade

and Development) in 1964, which was sympathetic towards former colonies and poor countries. Soon it became evident that global justice is not favoured the global poor by global system of governance thus India started to radically campaign for distributive justice since 1970 (Narlikar, 2004).

India's major challenge comes at two level game in terms of promotion of democracy at domestic level and global institutions despite of struggle to translate the domestic democratic integrity into international eminence due to locus standi of India in terms relative power position in international politics (Cooper & Farooq, 2015). New Delhi always desired to play bigger role in international spectrum and her desire to reform governance of global affairs has been always in agenda as a part of multilateral approach. India's desire to reform governance clearly depicts India's interest and adherence to multilateralism. Increase in international actors in process of negotiations has further complicated decision making process leading to age of multilateral negotiations with limited efficiency. After end of cold war emergence of new powerful players in global power as aftereffect of declining US hegemony whose agenda bifurcates from established power adding challenges to the governance question. India is one of new powerful player whose stake are always in maneuvering positioning in world affairs.

India's historic stance since Jawaharlal Nehru's highly idealist policy invoked in clear and sharp manner for decolonization, disarmament, denuclearization, de-construct of world affairs over equitable terms for recently decolonized countries. All idealism of Nehru era was reflected through NAM(Non-aligned movement), despite of sharp vision and clear language the effect of the movement remained under ambit of third world countries and had hardly any impact over any of the capitalist or communist bloc. Relevance of the movement tend to diminish soon for India after demise of Nehruvian era and Indian era of isolationism tend to reconstruct India

internally to build the fortune of the country in global governance. Since long India's isolationism and inward tendency prevailed in India's foreign policy determinant and solely over National interest. Despite of inwardness, from time to time India looked into global affairs actively. Lack of interest in global governance since long was reasoned on premise of non-fruitfulness of the reform movement in pursuance of India's National interest. The best example can be seen as Kashmir Crisis and role of UN in thawing the issue that clearly hurt India's National interest. The crisis also exposed the interest and domination of big five is not going to give space to developing world and it has to be earned through material success.

Similar setback for India was observed when India failed to win the negotiation over crucial demands on behalf of developing countries on TRIPS agreement where India was termed as an 'unrealistic combination of arrogance and poverty' by Stephen Kohen. This incident brought India's position over multilateralism into jeopardy and reconsideration was laid off. Similarly India's stance over nuclear disarmament was clear and declared its policy of universal denuclearization which Rajeev Gandhi government took to various international forums which many scholars of the time claimed it as a foolish campaign which didn't count over geopolitical realities of India. The premise of the campaign was based on ardent belief of internationalism which considered India's security challenge would be taken care by global responsible players.

India's experience with Bretton Wood system of governance had been relatively smooth and better than other multilateral institutions. For developing countries global financial institutions like World Bank and International Monetary Fund had similar problems of stake in decision making process. Since 1944, IMF and World Bank acting as intergovernmental pillars of development but these institutions are instrumental behind growing inequality among Nations and also within Nation. Newer institutions like MGA (Multilateral Guarantee Agency) had



National biases towards developing countries that has tendency to demean businesses of developing countries and promote unilateral flow of capital from developed country to developing and least developed countries in form of debt. At same time flow of supplies is highly maneuvered and structurally controlled in manner that helps Multi-National corporations based in west to monopolize market of all the developing country as dumping ground of western products leading to destruction of regional industries. The principles and philosophy of uncompromised open market of these institutions and the procedure of conducting business are making the developing countries more vulnerable and adding additional challenge to equitable Global Governance regime.

India being aspirational power not regionally but globally seeking greater role and thus from time to time India shifted its stance over global governance and multilateralism that oscillated between diplomatic bag and socio-economic realism. Major challenge for India came from foreign policy part where primary objective of the policy was to shape the global rules and norms in favour of India's economic interests and strategic interests. There has been three fold challenge to India's response to Global Governance regime. First, being historical intactness in policy which often subdue with gratifying the struggle of past from colonialism to neo-colonialism and diluting the case of real time realities obscuring the prominence of its position in geopolitical scene. This becomes very tough bid for India to claim her position in world affairs through systematic limitations by not considering India as important player as it has potential in institutions like permanent member of UN Security Council. Similarly India's position has been not raised in elite group of Nuclear Suppliers Group which control global export of enriched uranium and other component of nuclear instruments despite of being India a responsible nuclear power.

Second, challenge that is imposed by Global Governance system over India is being arrogance of western world while dealing with India's sovereign issues. The issues like Oil purchase from Russia or having trade deals with China and other countries which are facing Western sanctions limiting India's sovereign policy and giving a suspect eye. However, India retained and maintained the sovereign practice of balancing between both poles like those of cold war era. Still this makes India uncomfortable while dealing with west on orientalist matter. BRICS has been criticized by western bloc for the participant cooperation which completely bypassed western countries in dealing with finance and trade among members. India's autonomous alternative hurts the west leading to lack of trust that itself becoming convincing reason for India's altered role in global governance.

Third, India's entry into alternative to west institutions comes with unique kind of challenges. Due to geopolitical competitions among developing Nations for instance China and India; India cannot bear burden to cooperate with detrimental Chinese aspirations. When it comes to cooperate with China, India's stance is historically equivalent i.e. strategic autonomy. India faces two front backlash when India takes independent decision by boycotting One China Belt and Road's initiative from cooperative Nations that are part of the initiative as well as China. This makes India's case weak and little fragile because the initiative meant to be for development and progress and India appears more like a villain in the picture for most of the European partners of China who doesn't count over India's sovereign claim of Gilgit-Baltistan through which the project passes. India also has some reservations over joining RCEP (Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership), due to belligerent Chinese economic and strategic policy.

Global Governance is not just west lead now, Role of china and its initiative is highly promising and futuristic, either it is Shanghai cooperation, BRICS, Belt Road initiative, Asian Development

Bank, ASEAN plus etc. Asian century so far appeared to be China dominated in last two decade, which is major challenge for India to counter the hegemonic influence of China in global as well as regional governance. India's biggest challenge either economically, politically or strategically appears to be People's Republic of China's 'one China Policy' which lengthens border between both countries up to 3488 km long which co-insides with several sovereign claims by both parties in many sectors. Chinese antagonism brings huge challenge for India when it comes to any cooperation on Global Governance ultimately affecting India's national as well as strategic interest.

India on many occasion, lost opportunities to cash the momentum of diplomatic prowess in projecting India's leadership capabilities. Either being regional organizations like SAARC, SAPTA, BIMSTEC or RCEP at entry level, India's credibility as a responsible player has been always doubted for India's rhetoric National interest roar. Due to instability in India's north-western neighbor, Indian foreign policy is highly focused over these instabilities and it consumes lot of energy when it comes to possess diplomatic confrontation. India's historic battle with terrorism over North-West border, however provided a case where India's capabilities has been well known and recognized. After Nine-Eleven pentagon event, the narrative of Global players over terrorism got drastic shift which led to a conducive environment for cooperation over counter-terrorism, technological and logistic cooperation among global players. India being a long victim and fighter, her position raise to leadership role when it comes to assurance to net security in region and global.

After Second World War, India has always been passionate about the building of Global Governance(Bhagavan, 2013). Immediate after Independence, India started actively participated to shape global institutions, but on global stage a war of ideology was started.

It was essentially a psychological war fought between capitalist bloc and communist bloc. It also includes the conflict of geopolitical and strategic interest. Entire world was divided into two blocks and India as an Independent country under Nehru leadership faced the very first challenge from outside world.

So India's leadership came a new path or a new forward looking approach to Global Governance. Non alignment as a foreign policy is contribution of India to the theory of international politics. Initially, it created lot of confusion as well as lot of criticism. United States of America called Non alignment policy as Opportunism and Immorality. Soviet Union held that those who are not with us it means they are against us. Such kind of scenario counters a newborn state. From West perspective, non alignment represents Idealism. They believed that India is never be able to practice non alignment. The structure of international politics does not provide scope for such exceptionalist approach like of non alignment.

Gradually, the non alignment option as a foreign policy became clear gradually. At the very first, the rest of the world and international community equated non alignment with isolationism and policy of neutrality as well. Isolationism means to keep themselves away from the political development of international stage and other parts of world. But in reality United States of America was the perfect example of isolationism as USA has pursued the policy of isolationism up till First World War. This theory is also known as Munroe doctrine and the Policy of Neutrality means indifference policy. Neutral country means country has to give similar privileges to all countries. Neutrality basically implies that in the situation of war country will give similar access to both the warring parties. But both the narratives of West which had been imposed on India was not true as world witnessed how India came on the stage of United

Nations and addressed whole world. Jawaharlal Nehru has clarified the contents of non alignment:

-Stay away from alliances

-Exercise independence and maintain strategic autonomy in foreign policy

-It is an assertion of sovereignty of India in external sphere.

Nehru clarified that it is not a policy of isolationism. India will not remain isolated rather will play an active part in international affairs in establishing norms and conventions. Non alignment is also not neutrality as India will not remain in different between good and evil. Indian decisions will be based on merit rather than prior alliances. According to C. Raja Mohan, non-alignment was not India's Idealism rather India's Pragmatism. India had no choice but to go for non aligned status for following reasons:

-Proximity of the communist bloc.

-Adoption of the liberal constitutional democracy.

-Nehruvian model of mixed economy (Mohan, 2010).

It seems that it was a wise decision in that scenario but it is also true that India could secure itself in a much better way after leaving the non alignment policy. It was possible for India to exercise greater autonomy and to take principled stand in initial days. However, since 1970's it was not possible to go for principled stand all the time. West has always accused India that its non alignment was tilted in favour of Soviet Union. India failed to oppose Soviet invasion in Afghanistan very strongly. But India always criticize intervention of Western multinational companies in domestic affair of third world countries. Active involvement in world affairs during

the time of Nehru as it played active role in Korean crisis, for Palestinian issue, and for nuclear disarmament as well.

Non alignment 2.0: is a foreign policy approach given by the civil society to be pursuit by India in 21st century. As per this theory, World is neither bipolar nor unipolar. Whole globe is living in an age of complex-interdependence. India's location, domestic requirements are such that India cannot leave its strategic autonomy. It cannot afford to join one block at the cost of the other. In the age of complex interdependence, non-alignment can be exercised only in the form of multiple alignments. The following guidelines are as:

-Whatever course of action adopted we should be in a position to address our core National interest.

-Our policies and priority should not be manufactured from outside.

-India should not leave its flexibilities.

-India should continue its effort to create more just world orders as it is in our benefit.

Non alignment has special significance for India. It provided the leadership of third world countries. It gave lot of soft power to India. It gave opportunity to India to punch beyond its weight. It still holds important for India as India aspire for the great power status.

In post cold war global politics, India was under the shackles of poverty. In 1991, when Soviet Union disintegrate, India was one of the largest country who deeply had economical consequences after USSR disintegration. After this, a New World Order emerged which also requires India's engagement and to become a partner of it, India needs to be a positive contributor to international arena. This period is contemporary of Liberalization, Globalization

and Privatization reforms in India as it has a possibility to smash the chain of 'Hindu rate of Growth' (Baru, 2016). After economic liberalization, the role played by India has a significant importance in global trade, policies related to climate change, and others which manifested India's rise in Global Governance. Gradually too India accept the global order decisively then ever (Mukherji, 2014). The acceptance shown by liberal world is largely attributed to the LPG reforms. World community also looked towards India for its involvement in global order. The principles on which India as a state born and the later period on which pragmatic world continuous still able to balance India's role with the globe.

In the current scenario, scholars are of the views that US hegemony is not any more prevalent, if we see during the times of cold war and after the disintegration of USSR, USA was a major force to maintain global order. A new challenge to all international norms, rules, conventions comes with the rise of China. As China has potential to change the global politics and diverse the rules and practices of Global Governance as per she needs(Kagan, 2017). This is also a state of gimmick exactly like when second world war over and Henry Kissinger termed it as a state of 'crisis'(Goldberg, 2016).

Like international politics who faced Balance of Power, global governance too going to witness the bipolar system(Xuetong, n.d.). Because the impact of China on Global Governance is going to be one sided approach. Firstly, If China get hold of Global Governance India may have to face drastic impact as China is very much aggressive on each stage of global institutions with respect to India. The other reason is, if all together US hegemony decline then the new Sino-centric world order would work on the whims and fancies of just one-party state system. USA was considered more tenderhearted to all problems but this can't be said in China case.

India has already witnessed Chinese attitude on multiple times on United Nations platforms where China is a P-5 state and NSG talks as well. Here NSG signifies nuclear suppliers group.

In recent case, when covid-19 virus crisis happened across the world, World Health Organization at first tries its best to not name China whether most of the Western states and other advanced and developed countries accused China for the spread of the deadly virus and when most nation joined together to get a probe of covid-19 with respect to Wuhan lab (Wuhan is a city in China) China not allowed any country for an independent investigation. This all shows that detrimental effect of Chinese growing influence and if China also get the centre stage on global institutions of global governance it will directly advocated the policies which will not be in favour of those States to whom China considered as a strategic opponent, and here India names must be there on the top list.

Internally some States have shown their resistance in global governance order (*The Globalization Disconnect* by Stephen S. Roach - Project Syndicate, n.d.). (*American Exceptionalism, Exemptionalism and Global Governance* by John Gerard Ruggie :: SSRN, n.d.). The powerful and advanced state which was previously the flag bearer of global order, has shown some neo-mercantilist policies. To look at the instances, firstly talk about the US under Trump presidency as how he pulled out from Paris deal based on climate change and other example comes from United Kingdom who ruled the major territory on earth once. United Kingdom decision to left European union act as a surprise to the liberal order. The free movement across the Europe is at stake.

From the existing structures of Global Governance, India too got lots of help from international institutions but when the fear and clouds of uncertainty roamed on the existence of global



governance, then India should take leading role to maintain the democratic and liberal world order. The situation on global order might be troublesome but it would never be possible to have a smooth road without constraints while building global regime. A lot of discipline, hard work, commitment, consistency, economy is required to take the role of Rule-Maker(Jones, 2013). Without any doubt, for long India's low profile on global stage, now that much growth India has achieved to play a vital role on global stage for its continuity, betterment and maintenance.

Here, see some important points, how India domestically faced constraints to put their best on global order. In the past years, nature of Indian foreign policy become more assertive. Vocal nature of New Delhi in new millennium become quite visible but still how India lagged behind. The land border of India is surrounded by hostile neighbors. This reason forced Indian foreign policy to put more focus on South Asian region rather than entire World. Without any doubt India's GDP rises but still a significant population under the grim of poverty. The growth and development of major parts of India itself not equally distributed and due to this some regions are extremely backward. Our military and paramilitary forces continuous laid down near border areas as both neighbors are not trustworthy. So the military and forces are focused on Defence Diplomacy basically in South Asia only.

Rising India confronts many challenges of global governance. The present global governance formed in the light of post second World war which comes from a mixture of power, ideology, and vested interests(*American Exceptionalism, Exemptionalism and Global Governance by John Gerard Ruggie* :: SSRN, n.d.) and this vested interest comes from the West perspective as they had the upper hand to create institutions of global governance and in the cold war period when military power was increasing on a massive scale both US and Soviet union piled up arms, then Non proliferation of nuclear weapons concept came. Only power holders create the rules, norms,

for the rest of the world while power itself remains in the hands of great powers so this great powers made the structure of global governance to sustain their legacy rather than create a equal platform for weak States(*Power and Liberal Order: America's Postwar World Order in Transition / International Relations of the Asia-Pacific / Oxford Academic, n.d.*).

But in New century, it is visible how the resources, power, economy has made it shift from west to east. The growth for international system itself chosen Asia as new engine for global growth. So, how it is equitable or sustainable that without changing the rules and norms of global governance where only West participated up to now, it is also important that other players too come on the table. For various global concerns like global terrorism, climate change issue' economic liberalization, trade and commerce issue, the rising India has a big say and become a part to the solution of global issues.

**Problems with United Nations :** There is disappointment with the performance of United Nations. But no one can deny this that today there is need of more United Nations than less UN. Security environment at present is more complex and threatening then it was in 1945. In 1945 only Nations were threat to other Nations and maybe collective security was sufficient but now there are non- state actors, problems like climate change which may threaten not simply national security but global security and human security. No nation today even the single superpower can manage this threat on its own. We need Global Governance to address security and development and United Nations is one such platform. Nations are repeating the same mistake which resulted into the failure of League of Nations that is manipulating multi lateral institutions for narrow National interest. However, United Nations to fulfill the necessary responsibilities need reforms both structural and functional. There has been demands for United nations reforms since seventies. However we have not seen any revision in United Nations charter.

When there is a consistent call for reforms it means there are some problems in the system. The very purpose of reform is to change it for betterment. The guiding themes of United nations reforms today are:-

-It should become reflective of the present political and economic realities.

-It should become representatives to gain legitimacy for its action.

-It has to become more democratic and inclusive.

-It has to become more effective, productive and the relevant.

United nations role towards peace and security that is a core concern of United nations and the two areas of urgent reforms are:

-Reform of United Nations security council.

-Reform of United Nations peacekeeping operations.

### **INDIA AND GLOBAL GOVERNANCE: POSSIBILITIES AND OPPORTUNITIES**

In past two decades, India has been most credible economic and political country where there is political stability with majority. On the Global scale we have seen that India's state of the world affairs have been increasing and New Delhi is willing to share the load of issues present in the Global scale and contributed its best to all the global challenges. In terms of bilateral relations of India with different nation states, it is quite successful as well. For example, if consider the case of China, on one side certain sensitive issues with them but on the other side, a huge trade deal with China. So, this example made us clear that India's capabilities to find a way in odd terms are exemplary as well.

Now, if we take about multilateral organizations, India plays a significant impact here as well. India always used its normal, values customs and interest which itself is a part of sectoral approach. India's manpower and expertise are of utmost helpful to maintain peace in some specialised agencies of United Nations(CSEP). India has immense strength and potential as well as willingness to serve the world order.

As entire world, was in the grim of covid-19 pandemic, every country has badly affected. Entire globe looked as "one global village" as the pandemic was so intense that no country was left out.

In the times of crisis, world see how WHO respond to the pandemic. It was clearly visible that politicisation of such prestigious international institution puts question mark on the credential of WHO. Here, there is no such intention to criticize any particular body. Rather, the main point is how each country comes forward, every regional and multilateral associations come forward and help each other nation state. This shows the interdependence of each other and shared resilience. On the other side, the international intelligences are required so that in future such agencies save the world from any such situation.

This pandemic also shows the fragile nature for system of institutions of global governance. This all shows that more global governance required for the welfare of the humanity. Since Trump presidency in US, we have seen and it is the topic of the town as well that us has deliberately pulled itself away from the global stage and for time being it will concentrate only on domestic policies and revamp themselves again before their presence again on global stage. From their multiple steps like when Trump with rose us participation from Paris deal, us trade also pursue the policy of protectionism, then recently the biggest step and entire world considered this as a blender when us forces came out from Afghanistan without any peace progressive solution.

These steps shows that and it is quite visible that us may be tired to fulfill the global commitments.

And if US disappear on major global events then this vacuum has to be filled by India. As if the oldest democracy is no more willing to continue than the largest democracy should grasp the space which are best possible contender as well. From the perspectives of India's ethos towards outside world, India's commitment to its regional, bilateral, multilateral forums, it is evident that India's has learnt a lot from previous 75 years, how to conduct the international issues and in terms of trade, economy, advancement in science and technologically, military forces with advanced warfare, political cooperation and the support of largest democracy. This all puts together a strong contender on international platform of global governance to take the lead. Prime Minister Modi himself appointed that Indian now not only acts as "balancing power", rather it will become "leading power". And if US look back on global platform, then India will act as a partner to US rather than just Rule-Taker(Ayres, 2017).

In the last decades, we have seen that New Delhi Outlook become more assertive and pragmatic as well. India's neighbor that is Pakistan who are in every possible manner help Taliban in Afghanistan so that without a direct conflict with India, Pakistan can create the disturbance in India through Taliban. This issue of Global Terrorism, has been raised by India on many times on international platform which till now India's don't get a positive response from global governance. Only rehabilitation and facilitation of humanitarian aid is going on from global platforms. But India cannot sit quietly, New Delhi invited all the regional States for Delhi dialogues on the issue of Afghanistan. New Delhi got overwhelming response and it act as a rule maker for upcoming events in Afghanistan. The regional grouping where all the central Asian countries present their to give their best solution on how to tope up the global terror issues.

Delhi declaration shows India's caliber, capability and commitment to get rid of any such issue which created the radicalism in society. Like getting positive response from such regional grouping New Delhi should put more focus on such regional and small groups because with this India's relations will improve with all regional countries and secondly, it can help in maintaining the peace and also contribute in the development of the region. Search regional groups too get recognition from Global Governance as they are regional players. They know the ground situation in a much better way.

China also show its aggressiveness from quite a long time. India China military standoff is going on from past 20 months around Pangong Tso lake in Ladakh and other fronts as well and in Indian ocean region, China almost created a kind of pearl of strings, it means increase Chinese presence in India's backyard in militarily, economically, diplomatically as well. In Gwadar port of Pakistan, then, Hambantota port of Sri Lanka, kyaukyu in Myanmar. On wider map, it is visible that the complete encirclement of India in Indian ocean has been going on.

In August 2021, when India added as President of UNSC, India raised Maritime security issues on the table. But no concluding factor comes out from global platform. So, India joined many regional groups which came help to counter China strength and presence in Indian ocean region. The main groups are - QUAD and AUKUS. With the help of regional groups, India can contain the presence of Chinese strength and also we need to remember the global governance so that when any nation genuinely needs help from global stage. Global governance should be able to rule out every dispute and provide the best practiceable and workable solutions.

India's ancient political ideas of Universalism and Egalitarianism, since carried out by Indians approach to outside world. In the 'Arthashastra' of kautilya it was mentioned and recognize the

importance of legitimacy, accountability. The text is based on 'realist' approach. This text shows how power shift and the use of soft power and hard power by country specific. India's ancient texts always give importance to collective action and shared global commons. And in today's time this same is the key principle on the working of global governance. India's cultural roots provide the vision to lead the international agenda-setter. This how our ancient text and modern character amalgamates. Recently Prime Minister Modi address at COP26 in Glasgow for the commitment for climate action. India put five major commitments:

-by 2030, installed capacity of 500 GH by non fossil fuel energy.

-by 2030 50% of India's energy metre through renewable energy.

-bringing down the carbon intensity of India's economy by more than 45% by 2030.

-until 2030, cut down its net projected carbon emission by 1 billion tons from now.

-2070, achieve the target of net zero carbon emission(*National Statement by Prime Minister Shri Narendra Modi at COP26 Summit in Glasgow, n.d.*).

India advocated climate equality monitor, so that as per actions of particular country one has to achieve its climate goals. Here, India stood as a hero for developing world and developed world itself can't stop at my India. India took the stage as a role model and at the same time counts all the actions achieved under Paris deal. Where some countries are not even started work upon it. So this shows India's credibility, on commitments to proceed in climate combat issues.

### **Promotion of democracy on Global Governance:**

Explicitly, UN charter does not mention democracy as a goal of United Nations. However, the preamble of UN mentions - we, the people which reflects the fundamental principle of

democracy. Democracy and human right are interlinked. Democracy create better environment for realisation of human rights. United nation is involved in promotion of democracy through programs. Like UNDP too stand on democracy. As UN has created a special fund that is, UN democracy fund. India is the second largest contribution to this fun after USA.

Since, beginning India has stood for Democratisation of world order. India always talk about the strengthening of voice of smaller Nations. Even at present Times, India has an agenda of Democratisation of UNSC, WB, IMF, increasing its representativeness. At the same time, from very beginning India head commitments toward respecting the sovereignty of the state.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Non-alignment policy of India was not completed irrelevant rather than it has to be updated with current circumstance and gave a new form. During the times of 1960's India's approach towards outside World was different but in 21st century, India has gained a reputable stature and clearly about all the challenges and possibilities which are present in today's time. It just need to bring a more flexible approach on the global affairs.

## ***References***

*American Exceptionalism, Exemptionalism and Global Governance* by John Gerard Ruggie:

SSRN. (n.d.). Retrieved June 14, 2022, from

[https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=517642](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=517642)

Baru, S. (2016). *1991: How P.V. Narasimha Rao made history*. Aleph.

Bhagavan, M. (2013). *India and the quest for one world the peacemakers*. Palgrave

Macmillan : [distributor] Not Avail.



- Cooper, A. F., & Farooq, A. B. (2015). The Advocacy of Democratic Governance by India and China: Patterns of Consistency/Inconsistency between Declaratory and Operational Practices. *India Quarterly*, 71(3), 221–238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0974928415584023>
- Dahl, R. A. (1994). A Democratic Dilemma: System Effectiveness versus Citizen Participation. *Political Science Quarterly*, 109(1), 23–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2151659>
- Global Governance after the Financial Crisis: A New Multilateralism or the Last Gasp of the Great Powers? - Woods—2010—Global Policy—Wiley Online Library*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 14, 2022, from <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/j.1758-5899.2009.0013.x>
- Goldberg, J. (2016, November 10). *World Chaos and World Order: Conversations With Henry Kissinger*. The Atlantic. <https://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2016/11/kissinger-order-and-chaos/506876/>
- Ikenberry, G. J. (2010). A Crisis of Global Governance? *Current History*, 109(730), 315–321. <https://doi.org/10.1525/curh.2010.109.730.315>
- Jones, B. (Ed.). (2013). *Shaping the emerging world: India and multilateral order*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Kagan, R. (2017, January 24). The twilight of the liberal world order. *Brookings*. <https://www.brookings.edu/research/the-twilight-of-the-liberal-world-order/>
- Keohane, R. O. (2005). *After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy*. Princeton University Press. <http://www.vlebooks.com/vleweb/product/openreader?id=none&isbn=9781400820269>

Lipset, S. M. (1981). *Political man: The social bases of politics* (Expanded ed). Johns Hopkins University Press.

Mohan, C. R. (2010). Rising India: Partner in Shaping the Global Commons? *The Washington Quarterly*, 33(3), 133–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2010.492345>

Mukherji, R. (2014). India and Global Economic Governance: From Structural Conflict to Embedded Liberalism. *International Studies Review*, 16(3), 460–466.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/misr.12155>

Narlikar, A. (2004). *International Trade and Developing Countries: Bargaining Coalitions in GATT and WTO* (0 ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203633946>

*National Statement by Prime Minister Shri Narendra Modi at COP26 Summit in Glasgow*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 15, 2022, from <https://www.mea.gov.in/Speeches-Statements.htm?dtl/34466/national+statement+by+prime+minister+shri+narendra+modi+at+cop26+summit+in+glasgow>

*(PDF) Cosmopolitanism: Ideals and Realities – By David Held*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 14, 2022, from [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263115251\\_Cosmopolitanism\\_Ideals\\_and\\_Realities\\_-\\_By\\_David\\_Held](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/263115251_Cosmopolitanism_Ideals_and_Realities_-_By_David_Held)

*Power and liberal order: America's postwar world order in transition | International Relations of the Asia-Pacific | Oxford Academic*. (n.d.). Retrieved June 14, 2022, from <https://academic.oup.com/irap/article/5/2/133/2357368>

*The Advocacy of Democratic Governance by India and China: Patterns of Consistency/Inconsistency between Declaratory and Operational Practices*—Andrew F. Cooper, Asif B. Farooq, 2015. (n.d.). Retrieved June 14, 2022, from <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0974928415584023>

*The Globalization Disconnect* by Stephen S. Roach—Project Syndicate. (n.d.). Retrieved June 14, 2022, from <https://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/find-solutions-for-free-trade-backlash-by-stephen-s--roach-2016-07>

Xuetong, Y. (n.d.). *From a Unipolar to a Bipolar Superpower System: The Future of the Global Power Dynamic*. Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. Retrieved June 14, 2022, from <https://carnegietsinghua.org/2011/12/30/from-unipolar-to-bipolar-superpower-system-future-of-global-power-dynamic-pub-47688>