CONCLUSION
The basic feature of the post-Cold War forecasting of world futures is plurality of perspective determined by geographical location in the system, mixture of optimism and pessimism reflecting location in the theoretical debate and ideological struggle generated by the optimistic assertion of the victory of the liberal idea. The invariable preoccupation of most of the exercises is with the future of peace and the regional peace dividends that the end of the Cold War may have led to offer to the various regions. In this intellectual pursuit of peace the realist, the cultural heterogeneity, neorealist paradigm, the regional tensions and the liberal institution-building come in for examination as also the theme of the continuity or the discontinuity of the unipolar moment with the United States calling the shots in what has been perceived as the liberal agenda of world integration.

The liberal integration or interdependence since the days of J.S. Mill has been, as brought out by the one world system theorists, only at the level of trade and commerce and not at the level of mode of production. Along with the desire for interdependence, cooperation and peace, there shall be the compulsions of a balance of power, a strategy in the changed circumstance of the lack of the Russian capacity to dominate the Eurasian landmass and the predominance of the US sea power. However, the liberal democratic countries will have no problem in accepting the dominant point of liberal values as a starting point of a dialogue during the phase of the unipolar moment. Dialogue will mean a two way traffic and in the name of pluralism and self development they will have to advance their own interests while adjusting to the constraints that the structure of the unipolar moment imposes.
Therefore, the post-Cold War world does not offer hopes and better prospects for the vast majority of the Third World countries in terms of peace, development or ecological security. In the strategic and security field, the Third World countries may have to confront a formidable challenge of living with conflicts and tensions externally and to grapple with turmoil and instability internally. To this will be added the possibilities of pressures (subtle or direct) and interventions in terms of constraints from the major powers.

Thus, we are living in a violent and dangerous world marked by tensions and conflicts where protection of essential elements of national security becomes excessively important. In this direction, Indian security perspectives have always given importance to values such as democracy, independence, secularism, self-reliance, territorial integrity and national integration, welfarism and autonomous foreign policy in formulation of approaches to security policy. These policies continued to remain valid through most of the Nehru years and beyond until the shift towards South Asian regionalism in the 1970s. Even then, the key tenets of the approach continued to dominate neighbours. Today, in an age that professes transnationalism, India continues to reassert the fundamentals of peace and independent understanding of world affairs as key to its world view in the face of constrain(ment) from the hegemonic block.

Today, the global order has undergone several changes in terms of the disintegration of the Soviet Union and end of Cold War. These changes invariably have an impact on India's security policy not withstanding the relevance of both instrumental considerations of
power and the dominance of conflictual trends. The global context of conflict has changed from Cold War bipolarity to economic conflicts and military unipolarity. This has of course, not resulted in any significant change in the regional situation. Countries in the region are still living with conflicts and tensions both externally and internally, which specifically flow from the moment of unipolarity. China continues to be a threat to our national security and so does Pakistan. In the economic sector, the process of globalisation has meant hegemonic dominance and that has resulted in putting enormous pressures and interventions by the major powers led by the USA to throttle our economic autonomy. As a response, though the fundamental preoccupations of NAM: peace and development have not been altered, still Indian responses to these changes are visible to be constraintive at the operative dimensions of policy that would include responses to a wide range of security issues such as: nuclear disarmament in terms of NPT, CTBT & FMCT; economic security in terms of GATT & WTO; ecological security in terms of Earth Summit - Rio.

The series of disarmament and arms control agreement concluded between the superpowers and the possible promises of further reductions in conventional arms and armed forces, have created an atmosphere that may be seen as conducive to world peace and security. But a closer scrutiny of these agreements, however, shows that while Cold War may have ended, the arms race continues and that has led to intensification and eruption of conflicts particularly at the regional levels. There are a number of imposed orders consisting of regimes fostered by major industrial states through a combination
of coercion, co-optation and manipulation of various incentives: one such order is the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Regime which raised the factual domination of five nuclear weapon powers to a rule of law. It consists of a vast complex of national, bilateral and multilateral negotiations trade embargoes and sanctions.

India's policy on international issues in general and specific issues of disarmament in particular, has been based on its enlightened national self-interest, helping in easing tensions, reducing the situation of balance of power to a stage where the tensions are at a minimum and at the same time pursuing its interests not to anybody else's disadvantages. And in this, it has been supported by majority of Afro-Asian countries, pursuing their respective self-interests. And as a group it has been exercising political pressure on the major power blocs /major actors in international fora to abandon their rigid portions, find consensus on points of difference & narrow down the gaps. In this endeavour, the support enjoyed by India from NAM countries for the policies on disarmament is a measure of its success.

Having been an active supporter of the disarmament measures ever since 1950 when Nehru called for an "immediate standstill" of nuclear explosions, India kept her nuclear option open without subscribing to disarmament measure like NPT, CTBT, FMCT precisely because of the varied constraints it faces in these measures, which have been discussed in detail in Chapter - IV of this exercise. However, these constraints and other security compulsions were so grave that India had no other choice but to go in for nuclear weapon testing. In this situation, we have announced a draft doctrine but
have not yet worked out our policy towards deployment that has to be linked to our notions of limited war/limited nuclear war. We have consciously refrained from spelling it out apparently owing to the current oppositions from the West and China. This is the dynamic in the sameness logic in which constraint(ment) operates.

By conducting the tests and making the covert arms race an overt one, India has in one way contributed to the avoidance of accelerating the pace because of misconception about each others' capabilities, as it happened during the early phases of the arms race between the U.S and the erstwhile Soviet Union. Now, having a declared nuclear programme might give rise to a legitimate forum to discuss a phased and realistic disarmament scenario. There is nothing cynical about the claim that these tests would actually contribute to disarmament.

As far as economic security is concerned, globalization of the economy has put constraints on the government's power to intervene into the system and new relations are likely to evolve between the government and the global corporations. The logic of globalisation demands that the national barriers are removed in favour of liberalisation of economies. As a result of this globalisation process, terms of trade and credit flows have consistently moved in favour of capitalist countries to the detriment of the "Third World". The international or multilateral financial agencies, dominated by the West and Japan, have forced debtor countries of the South to adopt policies damaging to their own interests in terms of sovereignty over natural resources, science and technology, R&D and the Developmental process.
In the Uruguay Round of talks, there was tremendous pressure from the EC and G-7 countries on countries such as India to liberalise their policies on TRIPS and TRIMS i.e. trade related intellectual property rights and trade related investment measures, with potentially very damaging consequences for the Indian economy. The realities of international politics and the inequitous structure of the international economic order continues to operate against countries of the South, and the US continues to use all the force at its command to maintain its dominance. Thus, countries like India can be threatened with Special and Super 301 and be pressurized to change their patent and foreign investment policies through GATT and the IMF - World Bank. The current US moves only highlight the continuity of certain unequal power relations in the world order, and the threat these pose to the sovereignty and autonomy of countries such as India, which are active semi-peripheries with their own outer agenda.

The progress at the Uruguay Round clearly shows that the liberalisation of the world trade is critically dependent on the negotiations between three leading economic powers and the developing world has hardly any say in its progress. In all probability the outcome of GATT will be decided by the global power structure where the US has leverage over the others. The threat by the America that she would not hesitate to take unilateral steps if the Uruguay round fails, and rely on measures like Super 301 or Special 301 or act through trade groups of its choice to safeguard its national interest is a pointer that countries like India have been under heavy pressure if it seeks larger participation in the world economy. The US trade
officials, it is reported, have warned India of retaliation against it under the Special 301 provision unless it changes its patent laws including those relating to pharmaceuticals. Similar threats have come from Germany and Japan as well, former has decided to cut aid to India on the ground of high defense expenditure while the latter wants India to modify its stand on nuclear-issue. It appears that India is adjusting its policies under global influence.

From the above analysis it appears that to withstand the global pressure and promote national interest, India will have to devise a foreign policy which facilitates its integration with the world market but at the same time provides adequate safeguards to preserve the national sovereignty.

In the area of ecological security, depletion of the ozone layer, global warming, ravages of the ecosystem and demographic changes have a disrupting effect on economies and social structures around the world. Burning of fossil fuels releases carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and thereby contributes to global warming. International efforts are being made to impose limitations on such emissions as well. Since the current problem has arisen largely because of the cumulative impact of the developmental process in the industrialized world, any set of environmentally related limitations should differ from country to country depending on stages of development, available sources of energy and technological competence. This is a contentious issue because the developing countries have only recently entered into the phase of energy-intensive development. In this direction, the recently held Earth Summit at Rio de Janeiro in 1992
focused on the wide scale North-South divide on the issue of sustainable development and also marked the constrains that India faced, which have been clearly dealt with in the last chapter.

The empirical analysis of these three dimensions of security clearly demonstrate the responses of Indian policy to constraint(ment). That also strengthens the neo-realist argument of dominance of conflictual trends in the international order/disorder and reflects the inadequacy of liberal perspective of interdependence. The current unipolar moment marked by US hegemony is having the sameness effect in which constrainment is operative. That determines the constraintive response of India, which has an agenda of its own and pursues it in that given framework with unavoidable compromises. In this, some times internal pressures also come up. The core of the sameness paradigm has elements of conflicts. The situation will change in the direction of the multipolar setting. India can contribute towards it with higher growth rates along with accrual of strategic powers to meet the balance of power in the multipolar world.