CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELEVANT LITERATURE

Hegel’s dialectical has often referred to a triadic mode like thesis, antithesis and synthesis means the contradictory process of opposite sides and its long-term outcome. Accordingly, a proposition of the existing power or state or idea is referred to the thesis, anti proposition or contradiction or the oppositions raised the thesis is referred to the antithesis, the outcome of the long-term struggle between thesis and antithesis is referred to the synthesis. The term ‘Contradiction’ also referred to conflict and oppositions also referred with the actions of resistive social movements. This chapter examines the theories of the relevant terms like conflict, Hegel’s dialectic and its outcomes, social change and social movements. In addition, this chapter discusses the theoretical and descriptive sources of the relevant areas of the theme of the study. The relevant works of literature of the study consisted in this chapter as the following order.

- Studies about conflicts
- Hegel’s dialectical and its outcomes
- Post War World
- Social movements

Extended reviews in this chapter are,

- Social Darwinism
- Genocides
- Non-Governmental Organizations
- Social Media
2.1 Understanding Conflict

Conflict often refers to the variety of frictions, disagreements, rejection or arguments arising between individuals, groups and organizations. Several types and characteristics of conflicts are being described by many theorists and subject experts.

2.1.1 Origin and Definitions of Conflict

Conflicts in the society are inevitable. Conflicts in postmodernist era are differentiated by many conflict theories. Many explanations have behind about the conflict in societies. The word “Conflict” has derived from the Latin word “Conflictus” means collision or clash. There is no unique definition available for the term “Conflict.” Sociologists have expressed their different views about the conflict. It is generally believed as a tendency to act two or more defiant responses at the same time that results in mental, emotional and physical level. It may originate within the individuals, groups, organizations and between the individuals or groups and organization. “Conflict exists when any potential positions of two behaviour units are mutually incompatible” (Kenneth Boulding, 1963). Roderick Ogley (1999) has defined the term conflict as “incompatibility in the aim, goals or interests of two or more individuals, groups or other units.” Such postmodernist writers have defined the conflict as a state of mutual antagonism or hostility between two or more parties.

Moreover, conflict is classically observed as a controversial reaction to an action that leads to further action. Ho-won Jeong (1999), a researcher has discussed that the relative deprivation, failure of organizational functions, dissatisfaction in basic needs, dominant social structures and asymmetric power relations are the key elements of the conflict’s origin in the society. Misunderstandings, weak communications, injustice, lack of accountability, autocratic and anarchist situations
in society, chauvinist discriminations, unilateral responses and disparities in actions of responsible ruling body, power accumulation, competitive spirits, false promises, unpleasant development projects, environmental factors and diplomatic political moves in social order are caused the some short and longtime conflicts in the civilized society.

Relative deprivation in the present world order exists when the people of a lawful society are feeling uncomfortable in their livelihood, social security and rights. Ho-won pointed that the lack of the basic physical need like food, shelter, education, medicine, etc., and psychological needs like affection, love, sex, caring, security, etc are generating conflicts among the society. Further Ho-won noted that the origin of group conflicts can be related to the fixation of the roles in society attached to subjection and domination. Generally, two kinds of groups have produced by the authority relations, one has acted as dominant and other is in a position of subjection. Usually, opposed interests have developed from the power differences and then to conflict.

In the first half of 20th century, the colonialism and imperialism have produced some worldwide conflicts and the conflicts have resulted in two world wars. In fact, the present inter-state and intrastate conflicts are the bi-products of the post world war political conspiracies known as the cold war. In the field of conflict study, several definitions have developed by the scholars such as follows:

- Conflict is a struggle between opponents over values and claims to scarce status, power and resources (Coser, 1956).
Conflicts are bargaining situations in which the ability of one participant to achieve his ends is dependent on the choices or decisions that the other participant makes (Schelling, 1960).

Conflict is a dynamic process in which structure, attitudes and behaviours are constantly changing and influencing one another (Galtung, 1969).

Conflict takes place whenever incompatible activities occur. One party is interfering, disrupting, obstructing, or in some other way making another party’s actions less effective (Deutsch, 1973).

Conflict is a process in which two or more parties attempt to frustrate the attainment of the other’s goals. The factors underlying conflict are threefold: interdependence, differences in goals, and differences in perceptions (Wall, 1985).

Conflict is a perceived divergence of interest, or a belief that the parties’ current aspirations cannot be achieved simultaneously (Pruitt and Rubin, 1986).

Conflicts are communicative interactions amongst people who are interdependent and who perceive that their interests are incompatible, inconsistent or in tension (Conrad, 1991).

Conflict is understood as incompatible activities – occurs within co-operative as well as competitive contexts. Conflict parties can hold co-operative or competitive goals (Tjosvold and Van de Vliert, 1994).

Conflict is the interaction of interdependent people who perceive incompatible goals and interference from each other in achieving those goals (Folger, Poole and Stutman, 1993).
Conflict is an interaction between actors (individuals, groups, organisations, etc.) where at least one actor senses incompatibilities between their thinking, imagination, perception, and/or feeling, and those of the others (Glasl, 1994)

“Conflict is a collective armed or unarmed confrontation between at least two organized groups, either state or non-state actors. There is a spectrum of different stages of a conflict, with varying levels of intensity and violence.” (CIVICUS, 2011)

2.1.2 Conflict – Theoretical Approach – Marxian Perspective

Based on the views of the experts from different fields, the term conflict has several theoretical approaches. Psychologists are defining the conflict at the interpersonal level. Economists are defining the conflict in terms of the investment and profit related disputes and labour-oriented aspect. Sociologists and political scientists have multiple approaches including inter-personal, inter-group and individual versus organization. The criminologists have defined that the contradiction of an individual with the norms or the values or the written laws is a crime. But the sociologists have defined that contradiction as deviance.

The term conflict has widely used by the critical criminologists in term of the crimes perpetrated by the dominant powers by violating the natural justice. In the view of critical criminology, theories of conflicts have usually discussed to the writings and discussions of Karl Marx, Max Weber, Sigmund Freud and their followers. Based on Marx’s writings, the theory of stratification has not produced by Marx; he has made a theory regarding the social classes based on the derived stratification or imbalanced social structure of the industrial society. Later, regarding the nature of social stratification, his followers have got a radical narration from his
perspectives. According to the Marxian perspective, the system of stratification has
developed through the relationship between the social groups and production forces.
His writings have exposed that every stratified society has two major social groups
like a ruling class and subject class and always the ruling class exploits and oppress
the subject class and it has usually resulted in some conflicts between the two classes.

Initially, most of the Max Weber’s writings have attained in order to test,
justify and develop the ideas of Marx. Weber has taken Marx’s ideas very seriously
and he has respected the practice of Marx as an economic and social historian.
However, Weber has developed several controversial ideas with the Marx’s ideas and
the contraries have identified from Weber’s various assumptions about the notions of
social development. After thirty years, Marxs’s several social observations and ideas
have criticized by Weber.

Fritz Ringer (2004) has discussed that Weber’s articulation of Marx’s view on
imperialism and capitalism. He has discussed that “the Rome was the capture of rent-
yielding land. The interests that have driven expansionist wars have been those of
state creditors and, increasingly, of arms manufacturers. Military conflicts have
yielded profits for these groups that have exceeded the earnings derived from rational
entrepreneurship and peaceful commerce, and this regardless of the outcome of these
conflicts. Moreover, successful aggression has normally enhanced the prestige and
domestic power of the status groups that have led the nation in wartime.” It is clearly
articulated that Weber's theory of imperialism has prototypically liberal. However,
Weber’s stratification has much more than an economically determined class
positions, it has also involved a consideration of status, power and political parties.
2.1.3 Characteristics of Conflicts

All conflicts have some unique characters and its qualities are differs. Some conflicts are classified by its character basis like symmetric and asymmetric. Symmetric conflict is referred to the conflict between the similar groups and the asymmetric conflict is referred to the conflicts between the dissimilar groups like a powerful organization and its dependent sector or an established governments and a group of opponents. Another character of conflict is realistic and non-realistic. The realistic conflict is known as the conflict arises from the disappointment of specific demands and these conflicts are often incorporated by distorted feels. Non-realistic conflict is referred to the result of the antagonist’s need arises in the unsatisfactory situations (Ho-won Jeong, 1999). A conflict characterized by prolonged violent actions of a communal group or insurgent group against an established government, it is known as the protracted conflict. The term has developed by Edward Azar (1986), a peace researcher. Generally, ethnic conflicts are discussed under this term.

In addition, the characters of conflict have advocated in the final report of the Civil Society Organization as follows:

- Political: this involves incompatibility over political systems; desire for secession; desire for autonomy; and power struggle to control or influence governance between different groups
- Socio-cultural: this involves incompatibility over ethnic, religious or ideological conceptions in societal relations
- Economic: this involves incompatibility over the distribution of resources
- Territorial: this involves incompatibility over boundaries and spheres of influence
2.1.4 Types of Conflicts

Based on the situations and causes, the conflicts are classified into several types. The following types are being discussed by the conflict researchers:

- Individual conflict
- Class conflict
- Economic conflict
- Environmental conflict
- Social conflict
- Political conflict
- Religious conflict
- Ethnic conflict

The department of peace and conflict research, Uppsala University (2015) is differentiated the types of conflicts as follows:

a) Intra-state conflict is the most common type of conflict and occurs between the armed forces of the government and an opposing organized group, operating within the state borders. These conflicts are often driven by ethnic, religious or ideologically incompatible positions. It is useful to make a difference between “classical” intra-state conflict without foreign intervention and intra-state conflict with foreign involvement, which involves at least one party engaged in the conflict supported by military troops of a foreign government.

b) Inter-state conflict occurs between governments, implying the mobilization of their respective armed forces. The conflict often begins with a formal declaration.

c) Non-state conflict takes place between two organized groups, neither of which is a government of the state.
d) Extra-state conflict occurs between a government and a political entity which is not a government and is located outside the territorial boundaries of the state.

### 2.2 Hegelian Dialectical and its Impacts

Without the dialectical idea of Hegel, it cannot properly understand the revolutionary history of the world since the 19th century. The major portion of the global revolutions in 19th and 20th centuries have catalyzed by the subsequent ideological developments of the young Hegelians. The term ‘dialectic’ is generally used to describe a method of philosophical argument that involved some kind of contradictory process between opposite sides. The triadic dialectical model of Hegel has emerged as a common theory of all types of oppositions and conflicts of the post-Hegelian era.

### 2.2.1 Historical developments of the Dialectical Idea

Following Immanuel Kant and Johann Gottlieb Fichte, the German philosopher Hegel has expressed his thoughts on social dialectics. Hegel was referred as the most influential thinker of the 19th century (Baird, 2009). During the repressive period, Hegel was very popular amongst the intellectual elites in all the German universities and his ideas have led to some worldwide reactionary changes in the political climate of the contemporary decades. After Hegel’s life, Berlin University has become as the headquarters of the Hegelian movement (David McLellan, 2006). The dialectic idea of Hegel was grounded within the struggles of contraries referred to the thesis and antithesis.
The dialectical idea has previously discussed by Heraclitus, and it was rooted in the Platonic dialogues. Heraclitus, the father of the ancient dialectical has advocated that "All things come into being through opposition, and all are in flux like a river" (Palmer, 1996). Kissin (1978), Heilbroner (1980) and Palmer (1996) have advocated that “the Platonic dialogues paint an exemplary portrait of this, as Socrates himself would present a thesis, often in the form of a question, with his opponent delivering its logical antithesis. The dialectical process would then take place via verbal exchange, often heated, and would culminate in a new found common ground for all intents and purposes, a synthesis of the two arguments. This synthesis would then serve as the thesis for its rising antithesis, and the process would repeat itself.” Later, Hegel has revitalized the dialectical idea with a pure and clear idealistic sense. In addition, Hegel has also reviewed that the dialectical idea from Socrates. Roman N. Briggs (2002) has stated that every dialectical process of the ruling contingent is recalling the dialectic thoughts of Socrates, and after 2000 years, it was revived by Hegel.

Hegel has reevaluated the old dialectical of Heraclitus, Plato and Socrates and he has developed the dialectical idea with a triangle model. Initially, Hegel’s dialectical has embraced some previous philosophical relics relating to the dialectical. Hegel has developed his idea of dialectical by referring the historical progression, not by the material relationships. Lately, it has pointed out by Marx. In Hegel’s basic view, the revolutionary process is only at home when vested in the spirit of one or many (Rees, 1998). By using the key principle of the conflict of opposites, Hegel has extended his idea of the dialectical method to cover the whole human society.

Followings are the basic elements of the Hegel’s dialectical idea:
Conflict between the individual and the state

Between new ideas and the status quo

Apex or Ideal of human existence can only be reached through Conflict and merging of opposites

Change leads to turning points in social evolution

Like the previous ideas, Hegel’s dialectical has described with three components as thesis, antithesis and synthesis. A proposition or idea is referred to the thesis, the anti-proposition or idea against the thesis is referred to the antithesis, and the result of the long-term conflict between the thesis and antithesis is referred to the synthesis. According to Hegel, the synthesis is becoming as a new thesis in time and an opposition can rise as an antithesis against the new thesis. In simple terms, every synthesis is a thesis of the new dialectical. Some researchers have stated that the process will continue until to get the absolute idea or solution. But, some scholars have argued that the process is endless; it will continue as cyclical.

2.2.2 Revolutions before Hegel’s Era

Prior to the theories of Hegel and his followers, several revolutions in Europe have appeared against the exploitations and severe repressions of the kings, lords, nobles and other feudal owners. The American independence revolution has emerged through the conflict between Britain and its 13 colonies and the French revolution has rooted between the lower classes and Royals of France. Both revolutions were stimulated by the slavery, inequality, exploitation especially through tax-impositions and repressions from the suppressors. These revolutions have led to generate the new evolutionary social order like the representational ruling system known as a
democracy. It has catalyzed by the enlightenment ideas of the contemporary writers intended to replace the existing monarchical system.

The revolutions are the significant turning points in the world history. In the end of 18\textsuperscript{th} century, most of the revolutions have fuelled by some significant political philosophies and principles. C.J.H. Hayes (1916) has articulated that “the role of Kant in 18\textsuperscript{th} and 19\textsuperscript{th} century is remarkable, and he marked the both century’s natural metaphysical climax, and he fuelled to Rousseau and the French revolutionaries by his political philosophies.” Hayes has also noted that “Kant was the pioneer of the early 19\textsuperscript{th} century idealists and he stressed the ‘spirit’ and ‘will’ concept by emphasizing the duties of human beings.”

Moreover, Hegel’s observations from past, especially in the French revolution, have vastly influenced in his dialectical idea. Samuel T. Schroetter (1936) has argued that “Hegel’s philosophy is not based on real perception, but is a synthetic doctrine. There was a good reason for that: Hegel was one of the first to see clearly the faults of the bold program of the French revolutionaries, but he was looking at a moving, changing, unsettled spectacle, the outcome of which was not determined. Hence, to oppose to it any revision, he must rely largely upon a static rather than a tentative philosophy, one complete within itself rather than one resting upon a material reality (for there was no settled economic surety at that time), a pure theory instead of a revolutionary theory. Hegel framed his bold, new discoveries in an absolute system of logic that rendered it impotent for revolution and conducive to the reaction.”

2.2.3 Marx and Engels as Young Hegelians

In the beginning of 19\textsuperscript{th} century, Hegel’s argument has not attracted the elite thinkers. After his death, the Hegel school was split into left and right wings. The
rightists are the representative viewers; they have advocated the trends of conservatism, especially in the metaphysics, logic and the philosophies of religion and rights. The leftists have stood against the conservatism; they developed some critical trends in Hegel’s idea. However, in the later decades, the ideas of the leftists have produced several popular political conflicts throughout the world (Herbert Marcuse, 1960).

Karl Marx and Fredrick Engels are the significant leftist young Hegelians and they have generated some reasonable interpretations for Hegel’s dialectic philosophy through some critical social studies in their contemporary industrial society. Moreover, they have followed Hegel’s dialectical model to make the theory of capitalism and Communism through their studies in the industrial society. However, Marx and Engels have contradicted with the Hegel’s thought about the ‘absolute spirit’ and the ‘historical activity of man’.

In order to criticize Hegel, the Young Hegelians have started their criticism from his religious point of view. Their criticisms against the Churches have stimulated them to discuss the social statuses of their contemporary society and thus led them to criticize the property of the state and the entire socio-political order. Marx’s system has enriched with the incorporation of three cardinal elements of Feuerbach. The elements are given below:

- To reconstruct philosophy as a method of approaching the practical problems of men.
- To regard man not in his abstract rationality but in his empirical social context as the carrier of history.
To explain traditional conceptions of religion and state as fetishistic expressions of unconscious activities in human society at different times (Christopher Phelps, 1997)

Initially, Marx was not attracted by Hegel’s philosophy; Hegel was a conceptual thinker but Marx was very empirical. In the beginning, Marx’s dialectic materialism has tied with the direct reflections of reality and that sense retains the aspects of Feuerbach’s approach. Marcuse has explained that “the transition from Hegel to Marx is, in all respects, a transition to an essentially different order of truth, not to be interpreted in terms of philosophy. We shall see that all the philosophical concepts of the Marxian theory are social and economic categories, whereas Hegel's social and economic categories are all philosophical concepts. Even Marx's early writings are not philosophical. They express the negation of philosophy, though they still do so in philosophical language. To be sure, several of Hegel's fundamental concepts crop up in the development from Hegel to Feuerbach to Marx, but the approach to Marxian theory cannot be made by showing the metamorphosis of old philosophical categories. Every single concept in the Marxian theory has a materially different foundation, just as the new theory has a new conceptual structure and framework that cannot be derived from preceding theories.”

According to the observations of Marx in the industrial society, he has ignored the Hegel’s dialectical as a utopian dialectical and he has developed his dialectical materialism aiming to find a solution for the conflicts of his contemporary material world. Marx and Engels have applied the Hegel’s dialectic idea to the class conflicts by pitting the working class or proletariat as an antithesis against the bourgeois. Marcuse has noted that “Marx considered Hegel's philosophy to be the most advanced
and comprehensive statement of bourgeois principles.” Marx has made the use of dialectics of nature as a way of unsettling the bourgeoisie. Marx’s observations and collections in Paris and the Engels findings in Manchester have led them to produce several writings such as the *Critique of Hegel’s Doctrine of the State* (1843), the *Critique of Hegel’s Philosophy Right* (1843-4), and the *Outline of a Critique of Political Economy* (1844). Engel’s first writings on political economy have pointed out some elements of their common understandings on the crisis (Peter Bell and Harry Cleaver, 2002).

In their class theory, Peter Bell and Harry Cleaver (1982) have critically examined some descriptions of Marx and Engels as “After first developing a critique of some of the economic categories of classical political economy (including private property, trade, value, price, rent, labor and capital) in the outline, Engels turned to a discussion of competition (between capitalists, between workers, and between classes), monopoly and trade crises. He established what would remain as some (but not all) of the basic tenets of Marxist crisis theory,

- Crises are caused by production outstripping available markets. This was analyzed in simple terms of supply and demand (Engels, 1843).
- This overproduction was the result of there being no plan to equalize production and demand, but merely the frenzied efforts of different capitalists to keep ahead of both workers and other capitalists (Engels, 1843).
- The pattern of expansion, overproduction, crisis and recovery was a recurrent one (Engels, 1843).
- The crises get progressively worse over time as capitalism developed (Engels, 1843).

- Finally, crisis accentuated the conflict between the classes and led ultimately to revolution (Engels, 1843).

- Engels saw in this the strange contradiction of capitalism that he and Marx would refer to repeatedly in the years ahead (Engels, 1843).

- Yet he also saw in this growth of productivity the basis of a possible social order in which increased social wealth and less work would go together (Engels, 1843)."

In addition, Marx and Engels (1845-1846) have focused the dominant ideology of the ruling class. They have argued that "the ideas of the ruling class are in every epoch the ruling ideas: i.e., the class, which is the ruling material force of society, is at the same time its ruling intellectual force.’’ According to their view, the mental production has controlled by the means of material production.

Marx has emphasized that the downfall of the capitalist system could be begun in the uprising of the proletariat class. Marx has believed that in due course of time, the repressive measures of capitalism would generate an upsurge for socialism. In addition, Marx has believed that the Communism is the next logical rung in the upcoming world. According to the Hegel’s dialectical model, Marx and Engels have developed the concept of Communism and declared their Communist Manifesto in 1848. In this Manifesto, they have proposed that the necessity of the Communism to establish a Communist and Socialist society. In chapter IV of the Manifesto, they have openly declared their agenda as "the Communists everywhere support every revolutionary movement against the existing social and political order of things.” The
chapter has ended with the statement “Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communistic revolution. The proletarians have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Working men of all countries, unite!”

In 1867, 1885 and 1894 respectively, Marx and Engels have published their economic related work *Das Kapital* as three volumes. These volumes have discussed the surplus value of the working class. According to Marx, the capital accumulation and the associated declines in profit rates are creates a way to exploit the workers and the exploitations are creates some class struggles between the workers and the property owners that would eventually terminate the existing class society (Oded Galor and Omer Moav, 2006).

Since the beginning of the 20th century, Marx’s *Economic and Philosophical Manuscripts*, *Communist Manifesto* and *Das Capital* have fuelled several revolutionary upsurges in the West and Europe. Inspired by the Hegel’s Dialectic, Marx’s theories have stimulated several revolutionary class struggles between the dominant and dominated classes both in the industry and the socio-political platform. Richard Bradford (1996) in his book *Introducing Literary Studies* has noted Knowel’s statement as “Western readers believe that the most familiar Marxism is the former Eastern bloc, represented by Stalinism and Leninism. Despite their connections with tyranny, Stalinism and Leninism had an important and productive stage in 1920. Some critics portray Marxism as vulgarly reductive.”

### 2.2.4 Revolutionary Marx and his Marxism

Marx and Engels have started their revolutionary activities since the epochs of their writings. As an empirical revolutionist, Marx was titled as a hero of the century. Alex Callinicos (1983) has stated that “It is easy to forget the heroism involved in the
task Marx set himself. He was a man of enormous and obvious brilliance. One contemporary described him in his mid-twenties: ‘Imagine Rousseau, Voltaire, Holbach, Lessing, Heine and Hegel fused into one person…and you have Dr. Marx.’ Had he conformed politically and led a conventional academic career, he would have risen to the top of the intellectual establishment of the day. He could have died rich and famous.” During his propagandas against the capitalism, Marx has met several repressions from the oppressors, thus, Marx was identified as the great enemy of the Bourgeois ruling class. Further, Alex Callinicos has stated that “Instead, Marx devoted his life to the cause of socialist revolution. He and his family were, as a result, hounded and spied on by the police forces of half of Europe. They lived in miserable poverty, with the bailiff always at the door, and survived thanks only to Engels’ self-sacrifice. When Marx died, his passing was ignored in his adopted country, England.”

In the most part of Alex Callinicos writings, he has articulated that the revolutionary acts of Marx and Engels. He has stated that “Marx and Engels were, then, natural partners. Their first work together was an attack on Bauer and the ‘Free’, who were reacting to the repression they had suffered at the hands of the Prussian state by adopting an increasingly elitist and anti-democratic attitude. Bauer, who was to become an anti-Semite and supporter of the Tsarist autocracy in Russia, wrote that ‘it is in the masses and there alone that one should look for the true enemy of the Mind.” In addition, he has pointed out that “Marx was by this time a prominent figure among the exiled revolutionaries who populated Paris in the 1840s” and “Marx’s prominence may have helped to persuade the French government, under Prussian pressure, to expel him from France. In February 1845 he moved from Paris to Brussels, where he was soon joined by Engels, who gave up his job in the family firm
to become a full-time revolutionary.” In his book *The Revolutionary Ideas of Karl Marx*, he has also chronologically discussed the entire revolutionary acts of Marx and Engels including their attempt to form the Communist correspondence committee and contribution in the German worker's’ movement since 1848.

Marx (1852) has stated that “the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat; that this dictatorship, itself, constitutes no more than a transition to the abolition of all classes and to a classless society, the proletarians move towards the political power known as the Dictatorship of the proletariat.” By the October Revolution in Russia, Marx’s revolutionary ideas have successfully established in the socio-political platform through the common mass of the working class and peasants. Leslie Holmes (2015) has explained it as “the rise of Communism, explaining that, in 1917, a Russian revolution took place, which was seen as the beginning of Communism in power. This revolution would eventually lead to the beginning of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in 1922, also known as the Soviet Union. The Tsarist autocracy, which had been in place for centuries, was replaced by the Bolsheviks, the first Communist party in the world, led by Vladimir Lenin.” Towards a socialist state, a collective action of the proletariat and the peasants has led to the success of the historical revolution carried out in the Tsarist regime. Through the great revolution, the Bolshevik party of the proletarians has seized the ruling power of Russia and established their Communist government by overthrown the Tsarist rule.

Subsequently, the great Soviet Union has emerged through the continuous operations of the proletarians. Diane Koenker (1981) has noted that “In October of 1917 the majority consensus among workers was that the Provisional Government
was ineffective, and political change was needed to improve the increasingly dire situation in urban Russia. By October 25th in Moscow alone, thirty-eight plants representing 54,000 workers had already written resolutions calling for transferring all power to the Soviets.” Inspired by the Marx’s word ‘the social revolution’, the proletarians have replaced the special repressive force of the bourgeoisie with their own forces (Eric Hobsbawm, 1998)

Georges Lukacs (1971) has stated that “the proletarian revolution was imminent in the agenda of world history.” Following the success of October Revolution, the Communists in China and some other countries have successfully established their Communist states (Hongqi, 1963).

Moreover, in the first half of 20th century, several evolutionary changes in the socio-political stages have appeared in all the European and East Asian societies and the changes have shaken the existing social order throughout the world especially in the European and western societies and their colonies. However, the Hegelian and Marxian theories have catalyzed several social revolutions through some reactionary operations. Particularly, in the first half of 20th century, Marxian theories have fueled most of the working class revolutions. According to Hegel, the worldwide popular uprisings of the working classes and peasants against the bourgeois and their imperial states, to seize the political power, have collectively considered as the antithesis. Marx’s thought of Socialism has also led to throwing out the feudalism found in the majority of the European societies.

2.2.5 Leninism

Inspired by Hegel and Marx, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin has developed his ideologies during the extreme colonial warfare. He is the significant follower of Hegel
and Marx’s works of dialectic. Under the colonial spectrum, he has critically evaluated the concept of capitalism and he has produced the theory of Imperialism. In his many writings, Joseph Stalin, the famous dictator of Soviet Russia, has discussed the theoretical developments of Lenin. Joseph Stalin (1939) has articulated that “Leninism grew up and took shape under the conditions of imperialism, when the contradictions of capitalism had reached their extreme, when the proletarian revolution had become an immediate practical question, when the old period of preparation of the working class for the revolution had culminated in a new period, the period of the direct onslaught upon capitalism.” Further, Stalin (1956) has stated that “Leninism is Marxism of the era of imperialism and the proletarian revolution. To be more exact, Leninism is the theory and tactics of the proletarian revolution in general, the theory and tactics of the dictatorship of the proletariat in particular. Marx and Engels pursued their activities in the pre-revolutionary period (we have the proletarian revolution in mind), when developed imperialism did not yet exist, in the period of the proletarians' preparation for revolution, in the period when the proletarian revolution was not yet an immediate practical inevitability.”

Stalin, in his book *Foundation of Leninism*, has deeply discussed the Lenin’s theory of Imperialism and its gradual evolution from the Marx’s Capitalism under colonial perspective. He has discussed the Lenin’s term ‘moribund capitalism’ as the contradictions of capitalism to their last bounds, to the extreme limit and the beginning of the new revolution.

For the simple observation, inspired by Marx, he developed his capitalist theory in the First International; Lenin extended his theory as imperialism that developed under the roots of capitalism in the Second International, both were
advocated the exploitation beyond colonialism and colonialism respectively, under the Communist ideology. It clearly explained by the Hongqi Editorial publication (1963) as, “The essential thing about Leninism is the fact that it has carried the teachings of Marx and Engels further, providing a scientific analysis of capitalism’s sharpening contradictions in its development to the stage of imperialism, and further enriching Marxist theory and tactics on proletarian revolution and proletarian dictatorship.”

2.2.6 Marx’s Capitalism to Lenin’s Imperialism

Lenin’s basic dialectical observations have grounded with the class conflict theories of Marx. During the Marxian era, the European countries have also surrounded by the colonial occupation. Marx has only focused the complexes between the owners and workers or bourgeois and proletarians of the industrial world. Due to the lack of understanding of Marx about the colonial ethics and impacts, Marx has partially fulfilled his revolutionary goal. Georg G. Iggers (2012) has articulated that “the crisis of Marxism as a revolutionary working class movement came with the outbreak of the First World War. This crisis reflected the failure of Marx adequately to understand the social and economic realities of his time.” However, the warfare era has provided some better understandings to Lenin and that led him to make the theory of Imperialism developed as an evolutional shape of capitalism under the global colonial perspective. However, following notable Marxists Trotsky, Stalin and Mao have contradicted from Lenin's ideas in terms of the social administration and political policies.

2.2.7 Hegelianism during the World Wars

First World War has created severe vengeance between the successful countries and failed countries. Due to the vengances, the Second World War has
broken out in the 1940s. Besides the working class revolutions and the impact of the First World War, the colonial and the imperial competitions have also catalyzed the second World War between the European countries. Communist rule in Russia has established during the First World War with the unity of working-class movements. After the First World War, the Marxist and Leninist political models have spread throughout the world against the propositions of the capitalist states. Of course, the third international has evidenced as the Communist international.

Moreover, the Communism, Fascism and Nazism have emerged as the synthesis of the dialectical model described by Hegel. Marxism has developed under the perspectives of conflicts between the owner and labor classes. Fascism has developed in Italy under Mussolini regime intended to attain Italian nationalism, national syndicalism and restore and expand the Italian territories (Aristotle A. Kallis, 2000). The economic idea of the Fascism has intended to resolve the class conflicts by making cooperation between the classes (John Whittam, 1995). Stanley G. Payne (1996) has described that “Mussolini was a socialist until 1915, and fascism is a paradoxical but potent mixture of extreme socialist or syndicalist notions with a Hegelian or idealist theory of the state.”

In German, Nazism has also intended to attain a pure ethnic nationalism. The Nazism has often referred to the National Socialism and it has subscribed to the theories of Racial Hierarchy and Social Darwinism. In addition, Nazis have identified themselves as the Germans were the part of Aryan or Nordic master race (Bruce David Baum, 2006). Nazism has aimed to get Germany back its true values and traditions and it has followed the anti-Semitic. As a rightist Hegelian, Hitler has rejected the class conflict idea of Marx and he has opposed the concept of
internationalization. He has sought to convince all the parts of the new German society to subordinate their personal interests to the common good and accept political interests as the main priority of economic organization (, Per H. Hansen & Kobrak Christopher, 2004). According to the dialectical cyclic, Fascism and Nazism have risen as an antithesis against the Capitalists and Communists internationalism and it has resulted in the Second War. Samuel T. Schroetter (1936) has stated that “it sees the manifest origins of Fascism in the philosophy of Hegel and the milieu out of which Hegelianism grew.”

2.2.8 Dialectical and Social Darwinism

Herbert Spenser, an Englishmen has developed the concept of Social Darwinism incorporating the basics of Darwin’s biological evolution and natural selection. Spencer has challenged the conventional wisdom. He has argued that the social evolutionary advancement necessarily involves in the freedom and action of individual persons. Spencer’s articulations are consistent with his social evolutionary theoretical synthesis. He has advocated that the individual conservative ethics are causing disgust on all the interference of the ruling contingent into the lives and actions of the individuals (Eric Roark, 2004).

In the late 19th-century, the hereditarism has grown in all the sects of Europe. Besides Herbert Spencer, Francis Galton has also discussed the idea of the inherent racial domination of the upper classes. A number of great men of England like the military officials, philosophers, writers, scientists and artists came from the small upper-class section (Francis Galton, 1869). Spencer has compared the main themes of biological evolution with the social progress into a grand universal scheme.
Based on Darwinism, in the social phenomena, Spencer has synthesized the ideas of competition, the struggle for existence, and the survival of the fittest.

Spencer Darwin’s arguments relating the biological evolution have applied to all the forms of social, ethnic, cultural, political and religious practices found in the 19th century human societies. In fact, these practices are the outcomes of the similar evolutionary processes and those have proven themselves as fittest. This logic has habituated to justify the colonialism by arguing that the colonial powers have brought the civilization to the less fortuitous. Subsequently, the incipient use of the concept has articulated that the contemporary world powers with a view of religious-oriented rights suited to lead the human society towards an incipient stage in human evolution and a prosperous world civilization.

Spencer’s interpretations regarding the struggle for existence and the fittest of survival have used as an essential tool to validate the conflicts and its synthesis of the human society. Based on Herbert’s interpretation, several debates among the scholars have arisen after the First World War. Such arguments have articulated that the rightist Hegelian Hitler’s ideas in the race and the racial struggle were derived from the Darwinian, either directly or indirectly. Richard Weikart (2004) has noted that “no matter how crooked the road was from Darwin to Hitler, clearly Darwinism and eugenics smoothed the path for Nazi ideology, especially for the Nazi stress on explanation, war, racial struggle, and racial extermination.” Hannah Arendt (1966) has stated as “underlying the Nazis’ belief in race laws as the expression of the law of nature in man, is Darwin’s idea of man as the product of a natural development which does not necessarily stop with the present species of human being.”
In the socio-political conflicts, the terms ‘struggle for existence’ and ‘fittest of survival’ are particularly referred to the diplomacy, secret alliances, conspiracy, tactics of opposition and counter-opposition and collective actions. These are the main deciding factors of the success and failures of all the conflicts especially between the state and its opposing groups.

2.2.9 Hegel’s Dialectical and the Post-War Global Societies

It is already discussed that during the 19th and the 20th century, the Hegel’s dialectical idea has played a vital role in the major revolutionary political upsurges. The Hegelianism has realized in the development of the theories of Marx, Engels and Lenin. And the realization has continued through the proletariat revolution, over through of the Tsarist regime and the establishment of Communist government in Russia.

During the cold war era, the ideologies, Communism and Capitalism have become as the superpowers and they have stood against each other. The traditional Capitalism has centered on the economic system that allows the individuals own private property. In capitalism, the property owners are entitled profits from their properties. Accordingly, almost all the natural resources, factories, mines and land are owned by the individuals and the owners have obtained profits from their properties. The revolutionary Communism is also an economic system that proposed all the natural resources, factories, mines and the land as the common property of the people. Accordingly, the people’s government owns everything and the profits of all the citizens are the resources of a country. Moreover, the government sets all prices, employs everyone, and distributes all profits. By referring the
dialectical model of Hegel, the followings are generally discussed as the outbreaks and impacts of empirical developments of the Hegel’s dialectical idea.

- Theories like Marxism, Leninism and etc.
- Upsurge of working-class movements
- Capitalism and Imperialism
- Nation building
- Establishment of Communist rule
- Development of socialist and Communist social orders
- Communist international (3rd international)
- Fascism and Nazism
- Cold war
- Bi-polar world
- Diplomatic and conspiracies
- Neo-Capitalism and Neo-Imperialism
- Globalization, Privatization and Liberalization.

2.3 Post-War World

The post-war era has significantly characterized by the conflicts between the capitalism and Communism aiming to maintain their existence. The Capitalism and the Communism are often referred to the contemporary thesis and antithesis of a global dialectical and the conflicts between the superpowers, the United States and the Soviet, have resulted in the creation of the New World Order, presently being in practice. The conflicting era has known as the Cold war era. During this era, several diplomacies, strategies and covert operations have followed by the great powers intended to establish and maintain their domination and spread their ideas throughout
the world. Actually, the strategies of the cold war have planned in beforehand by the capitalist powers. In the mid od 20\textsuperscript{th} century, it has demonstrated through the decolonization and the emergence of new nations with Communist and democratic principles.

The anti-colonialism has evidenced into two waves. In the late 18\textsuperscript{th} century and the beginning of 19\textsuperscript{th} century, the first wave has appeared in America. The American Revolutionary War is identified as the first successful anti-colonial war against Great Britain. In addition, the Republicanism has introduced in United America through the success of the anti-colonial war. The second wave has rooted since the first half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century and it has reached the object since the Second World War. It is notable that as a reactionary antithesis, the Fascist and Nazi nationalisms have emerged during these decades against the colonial powers and the internationalism theories.

2.3.1. Critics of Decolonization

In the mid of 20\textsuperscript{th} century, many newly independent nations have followed the republic form of the democratic ruling system. Most of these nations have emerged as a newly formatted nation in contrast with their actual structure and boundaries existed which before the colonization. With the mixture pattern of the socialist, Communist and capital ethics, the Rule of Law has established in these newly emerged nations which decided to follow the democratic form of governance. According to the principles of democracy, several fundamental rights of the individuals have ensured through the written laws and separate institutions have established to exercise and keep the rights. In most of the newly emerged countries, all the process of the new governances have made with the influence and guidance of the promoters of
democratization, Capitalist powers. In order to keep the indirect imperialism, the capitalist powers have intrinsically inserted some diplomacy in these newly emerged democratic nations. Karol R. Sorby (2001) has pointed that “the Middle East itself, after the Second World War, presented a very different picture from before. The most significant changes flowed neither from the experience of the military campaigns nor from the influence of the great political and moral issues of the world struggle. They were discernible in the spirit and temper of the people. It was the coming to fruition of a longer historical process marked above all by the rise of nationalism. The war had speeded up this process. The result of the Western imperial legacy and its continuous Middle Eastern involvement was that the Middle East has become the most penetrated international relations subsystem in today’s world.”

Regarding the decolonization, Julian Go (2011) has questioned that “how and why did the dominant political form of the three or four centuries (at least) suddenly end?” To answer this question, he has cited the discussions of Abernathy (2000), Strang’s (1900 & 1991) and Wimmer and Feinstein (2010). Finally, Julian has articulated that “the decolonization of the European empires is part of the story about the end of colonialism but it is not the whole story. Yes, colonies were turned into independent nation-states and empires fell. But at the level of historical possibility, those fallen empires, or new great powers, could have just as well retaken them or taken other territory as colonial dependencies. To address this question about the end of colonialism as a dominant political form, we must not only ask why older empires fell and nation-states emerged but also: why did great powers not colonize or recolonize territory in the mid-twentieth century and afterwards? At issue is not the decolonization of the old empires but their lack of reemergence thereafter. In other words, at issue is the fact that formal colonization has been excised from the
repertoire of global power.” According to Julian, the decolonization is a strategy of the capitalist empires indented to keep their indirect domination upon the decolonized nations.

Julian has articulated that the colonial occupation is the direct controlling strategy of the capitalist empires and the colonial dependency strategy of the capitalist empires is the indirect control. He stated that “the formal colonialism is over, informal imperialism persists, precisely because informal imperialism is about exercising power over nominally independent states. Great powers can still intervene into the affairs of other countries, as long as they pay lip service to the principles of popular sovereignty. They can even use popular sovereignty as a warrant for neo-imperialism.” In addition, he stated that “Great Britain was weakened after the Second World War and became a dependent ally of the United States. Since the United States did not want to provoke its enemies by colonizing new territory, it forced Great Britain to refrain too.” This statement of Julian has clearly revealed that even before the decolonization, the United States, the capital of the capitalist empires, has laid its foundation to ensure the coalition and mutual co-operation in future, with the nations waiting to get independence from the colonial empires.

2.3.2 Bipolarization and the Opposite Alliances

It is notable that the decades in the late 19th century and the beginning of 20th century are very important in the economic history of United States. During these decades, the industrial and manufacturing economies of the United States of America have rapidly developed and the developments have led to the emergence of United States of America as a burgeoning superpower. Thus the United States of America has become as a nightmare to all the European great powers. In addition, the United States
of America itself has rapidly developed its material productions, wages and personal
wealth. Meanwhile, the 1917 proletarian revolution in Russia has triggered the anti-
Communist paranoia among the capitalists around the world especially in the United
States of America. In fact, the rivalry operations between the Capitalists USA and
Communist Russia have started during these decades.

America’s detestation on the Russian revolts has traced in the decision of
Woodrow Wilson in July 1918 to provide military support to the White anti-
Communist forces against the Russian Revolutionary Red Army (Willett L. Robert,
2003). American capitalists have feared that the Soviet’s revolutionary ideology or
the proletariat activism might influence the American labor unions and stimulate them
more violent, more radical and revolutionary. The capitalists have blamed that the
union movements in America have become more militant and radical. They have
justified their fear and charges by indicating the series of workers’ strikes in Seattle
dock, Boston police, eastern steel industries and coal mines. After the Second World
War, these predominant rivalries between the American capitalists and the Soviet
Communists have led to shaping the world as a bipolar model.

The term ‘Bipolarity’ is usually referred to a situation in which the
international system or one of its subsystems dominated by two superpowers. (Frank
Whelon Wayman, 1984). The post-war world order has entirely differed from the
previous world orders existed before the Second World War. The severe
contradictions between the capitalist and Communist ideologies have divided the
world into two stages. Moreover, the cold war era has characterized by several
diplomacies, conspiracies and secret alliances. For the sake of security and the
economic dependencies, most of the countries especially the newly structured nations
forced to stand themselves to one side of the power configuration created through the
competitions between the United States and the Soviet Union. In order to strengthen
them, Soviet Russia and the United States have dominated the rival political, military,
economic and social camps in the ‘Communist’ and the ‘Capitalist Bloc’ respectively.

Raymond Aron (2003) has stated that “a description of the international
system according to the method of diplomatic history would begin with one
observation: never have there been so many alliances concluded in peacetime, never
have there been so many organizations, either inter-state (postal union) or
transnational (churches, parties of universal vocation) or super-state (European High
Commission); never so many military groupings, despite the United Nations,
theoretically destined to bring power politics to an end. The United States, long
opposed to any external commitment, has become a collector of pacts. Two coalitions,
often called blocs, dominate the situation, one led by the United States, the other by
the Soviet Union, one officially instituted by the North Atlantic Treaty, and the other
by the Warsaw Pact. Everything occurs as if each of the two superpowers had
grouped protected or satellite states around itself.”

According to the 1949 NATO alliance, Britain, France, West Germany, Japan,
and Canada have stood on the side of United States. On another side, by the 1955
Warsaw Pact, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, East Germany, and
Romania have allied with the Soviet Union. All countries that have no partnership
with any side have identified as the third world nations or nonaligned nations.
Accordingly, the third world nations have alienated themselves from the cold war. By
the avoidance of the third world nations, the active bipolarity in the global politics has
emerged.
By supporting the nationalist wars and demonstrating the revolutionary Communist nationalism, the Communist allies have successfully expanded their Communist politics and the Communist form of governance to the majority countries of the East European, South Asian and East Asian regions. Through their containment policy, political and economic reconstruction policies, and anti-Communist campaigns, the Capitalist allies have expanded their democratic politics and democratic form of governance to the majority countries of the West Europe and South Asian regions and the western countries (Mohd. Noor Mat Yazid, 2014). During the 1980s, there are sixteen countries have identified under the leadership of Soviet Union (Archie Brown, 2009). Albania, Bulgaria, Cambodia, China, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Republic of German, Hungary, North Korea, Laos, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, Soviet Russia, Vietnam, and Yugoslavia are the sixteen countries.

2.3.3 Spread of Communism

Since 1920, the Moscow-centered Communist political ideology has begun to sow its seeds to several countries around the world and thus sowed ideology has gradually begun to grow with some difficulties depend upon the ethnic, cultural and political traditions of the respective countries. Richard Pipes (2001) has pointed that “every Communist country or party has its own specific history and its own particular regional and local variations, but a linkage can always be traced to the pattern elaborated in Moscow in November 1917. This linkage forms a genetic code of Communism.” Kuan Yew Lee (2000) has pointed that since the 1920s, Communism has already spread among the leftists of some South Asian countries. The Marxist and Leninist ideologies and their respective revolutionary frameworks for anti-capitalism
and anti-imperialism have fuelled some activism in some colonial territories of South Asia and it has led to activists to organize Communist parties in their respective countries Indonesia (1921), Indochina (1930), Malaya (1930), Philippines (1930) and Burma (1939).

In the mid of the 20th century, Communist politics has reached a rapid expanse through some developments made by the followers of Marx and Lenin. Archie Brown (2009) has articulated that “Marxist theory, as interpreted by Vladimir Lenin and subsequently refashioned by Josif Stalin in Russia and by Mao Zedong in China, became a rationalization for ruthless single-party dictatorship.” Further, he argued that “During most of the twentieth century Communism was the world’s dominant international political movement. People reacted to it in different ways – as a source of hope for a radiant future or as the greatest threat on the face of the earth. By the middle decades of the last century, there were Communist governments not only in a string of Soviet satellite states in Europe but also in Latin America and Asia. Communism held sway in what became the ‘Second World’. The ‘First World’ – headed by the United States and its main European allies – was to engage in a prolonged struggle with the international Communist movement for influence in the ‘Third World’.”

According to Soviet’s nuclear bomb test in August 1949, the United States’ monopoly of atomic weaponry has ended. Of course, the equalized weapon power is one of the significant cause for the beginning of the cold war. In the beginning of the cold war, Communism has rapidly spread across Eastern Europe. Despite the spread of Communism in Eastern Europe has usually occurred without the direct influence of Russia, in some countries, Russia has imposed communism through the invasions.
According to the support of Russia, Poland (1945), Albania, Bulgaria (1946), Romania (1947), Czechoslovakia (1948), East Germany and Hungary (1949) are succeeded by the Communist parties and, those have become as the Soviet’s satellite of Eastern Bloc.

China is the most populated country in South Asia. Except Cambodia and Thailand, all the Southeast Asian countries have shared their boundaries with China. In 1949, the ruling power of China was seized by the Communists. In histories, China has dominated all the mainland of the northern regions. Inspired by the Communists victory in China, the Communist activists in upheaval in Burma, Malaya, Indonesia and Philippines have conducted series of militant revolutions intended to establish the Communist in their respective states (Albert Lau, 2012). After the end of Second World War, the Communists under the leadership of Ho Chi Minh have established their rule in the northern part of Vietnam through a series of revolutionary events with the influence of Soviet (William J. Duiker, 1983). Despite the wider patriotic struggles in Vietnam have conducted by some leaders like Phan Boi Chau and Phan Chu Trinh, the Vietnamese nationalism has governed by the Marxist and Leninist political ideologies (Lester Edwin J. Ruiz, 2007). The Vietnam War is considered as an another proxy war supported and influenced by the Great powers. The successful establishment of Communist rule in Vietnam is another significant Communist expansion in Asia (Andrew Mumford, 2013). In the Korean War, Soviet has provided its immense support to North Korea intended to defeat South Korea and its political diplomacy with the United States. In 1950, the Communist nationalism has successfully established in North Korea. It is the milestone event of the expansion of Communism. (Charles K. Armstrong, 2003).
In the Western world, Cuba is a most significant country travelled in the path of the communist political ideology. Actually, Cuban political power has not seized by the Communists. In 1959, some indigenous militant revolutionary groups have replaced the existing authoritarian rule of Cuba and established a socialist form of republic government under the presidency of Fidel Castro. Later, Cuba is becoming to the Communist row (Archie Brown, 2009). Brown has highlighted that “Rather, it reflected the evolution in the thinking of the foremost leader of the revolution. Faced by the new challenges of managing, as distinct from seizing, state power, Fidel Castro turned to the only available long-term example of non-capitalist, post-revolutionary governance, that offered by the Soviet Union and other Communist states.”

In Africa, South Yemen is the first successful Communist state governed by the Communist political idea. After the decolonization from British, it has become in the Communist line in 1967. Through the direct influence of Soviet, Ethiopia has become in the Communist line in 1974. As a series of success, the Communist governments have established in Somalia, Angola and Mozambique through some insurgent operations of the local communists with the support of Soviet (Archie Brown, 2009).

In order to spread the Communist political ideology in South Africa, Soviet has experienced a long-term struggle with the diplomacy of the capitalist allies. Allison Drew (2014) in his work Communism in Africa has discussed that “this can be seen in Southern Africa, where struggles against settler colonialism and white minority rule became intertwined with Cold War ambitions. A hallmark of Marxism-Leninism in Southern Africa has been its orientation towards alliance politics, with Communists integrating themselves into armed liberation movements in
Mozambique, Angola, and South Africa. Thus, the guerrilla struggles in Mozambique and Angola were led by movements some of whose members had already embraced Communism in the 1950s while studying in Portugal.”

a) **Non-ruling Communist Parties and Movements**

Archie Brown has also discussed about the Communist activism in India. He has articulated that “just as Communist parties in Western Europe generally lost out to socialist parties of a social democratic type, so in India, the CPI – and subsequently the CPI (M) – was unable to compete nationally with the party which had led the struggle for independence and which had a generally leftist political orientation. In the 1930s Mahatma Gandhi’s civil disobedience campaign against the British won overwhelming support for his Indian National Congress, and the party which emerged from this movement, the Indian Congress Party, consistently eclipsed the Communists at national level.” In addition, he has evident that the Communist parties in India have inspired by the Marxist and Leninist ideas. These parties have often captured the ruling power in some state-level assemblies and the local bodies of the states. In almost every country, the Communists have attracted by the Marxism and Leninism. By using the collective action method, they have created many revolutionary movements and parties and often fought against the international capitalist society and their own governments which are acted likely as the imperial governments of the capitalists.

**2.3.4 Containment Policy of the United Stated of America**

Containment is a policy developed by the United States on the basis of the geopolitical strategy aimed to control the spread of Communism. The upheavals of the Communist politics in China, Burma, Malaya, Indonesia and Philippines have
created panic to the United States and its allies (Albert Lau, 2012). In addition, the Soviet’s intervention in the self-determination of the Eastern European countries and the establishment of Soviet’s satellite states in the East European Communist Blocs have also become a great threat to the United States and its allies. Moreover, the Communist politics has rapidly spread across the African states. It has also created a serious crisis for the existence of Capitalism. Because of these threats, the United States has called its allies to control the spreading of Communism to the other parts of the world (John Lewis Gaddis, 1992).

Under the containment policy, the United States has tried to mobilize the third world nations to its side by offering some attractive supporting schemes to them. According to the policy, the United States has introduced several supporting strategy to the developing or third world nations including the financial grants through the international financial institutions to develop their domestics economy and the domestic infrastructure and military support to control the revolutions influenced by the Communist ideology (Gregory Mitrovich, 2000).

2.3.5 Evolution of Capitalism and Imperialism

Most of the writers are starting their discussion on capitalism from the Marxist era. Some are just tracing the origin of capitalism from Fernand Braudel’s three-volume of Civilization and Capitalism (Bruce R. Scott, 2011). Capitalism is often referred to the transition of feudalism, Mercantilism and the emergence of markets. The Macmillan Dictionary of Modern Economics has defined capitalism as a “Political, social, and economic system in which property, including capital assets, is owned and controlled for the most part by private persons.” Ellen Meiksins Wood (2002) in his work ‘The origin of capitalism’ has discussed the relationship between
the capitalism and the production, trade and market. He has also explained the spaces between the feudalism and the people’s natural entrepreneurialism. R.H. Tawney (1961) has discussed the capitalist idea and the private ownership compared with the religious fundamentalism.

During the Marx’s era, industrial developments and the private ownership have somewhat revealed the structurization of capitalism. In the context of political economy, Lenin has extensively developed his imperial theory through the contradictions with the Marx’s capitalist theory. In order to keep and expand their mercantilism to the overseas countries especially to their colonies, the colonial empires have created a favourable environment to the bourgeoisie of their respective states. Moreover, their colonies are entirely converted into markets. In addition, the raw materials have also looted from the colonized territories. India is one the best exemplary territory to those exploitations perpetrated by the British (D.H. Buchanan, 1934).

From 19th to 21st Century, capitalism has evolved gradually and it is becoming as the most dominant ideology in almost all the global societies. Capitalism is itself transforming its evolutionary pattern by adapting to the changing world including the scientific developments, social advancements and the contemporary environments of each evolutionary decade. In order to stabilize the idea of Capitalism, the capitalists have been continuously developing some strategies and policies depending upon the modern scientific and technological evolution. And they are frequently implementing and adapting their new strategies and policies to the global societies through their imperial governments and regional capitalists. Thus, the capitalism has defeated the Communist Soviet and retains itself as a great ideology on a global scale. However,
the characteristics of capitalism are leading to its supreme triumphs. Bruce R. Scott (2011) has articulated the characteristics of capitalism as follows:

- Capitalism is an indirect system of governance.
- Capitalism is analogous to organized sports.
- Capitalism is comprised of three levels—markets, institutions, and political authority.
- Third level of political authority underscores the role of visible human agency not just that of invisible market forces, in capitalism.
- Political authority has the administrative opportunity and in many cases the responsibility to shape the capitalist system to favour certain interest groups over others, as well as the entrepreneurial responsibility to modernize the capitalist system over time.
- Capitalism is a system of governance not only for private goods but also for public or “common” goods, where some of the most important of those common goods are the market frameworks themselves, and political authority, not market forces, is essential for governing the latter.
- Political authority inevitably shapes capitalism according to a strategy, no matter how implicit or imperfect that strategy might be.
- Political and economic markets determine the nature of political authority, such that the political system of governance and the economic system (i.e., capitalism itself) are not only interdependent but also a theatre of competition in which economic and political actors compete with each other for power.

The above characteristics are indirectly embracing an imperial policy of capitalism and the flexible, innovative, modern, diplomatic approaches of capitalism
are deeply embracing the ethics of Darwinism like the struggle for existence and the fittest of survival. In the new world order existed after the Second World War is characterized by several new forms of movements and conflicts. The emergence of these new types of movements and conflicts has viewed as the propositions made by the capitalists indented to control the spread of capitalism and promote the process of democratization.

Since the decolonization, the capitalism and imperialism have evolved itself as neo-capitalism and neo-imperialism respectively. For the unrestrained mercantilism and transition of raw materials, the worldwide free market concept has adopted by the capitalists through some universally acceptable laws and policies. In fact, Democratization and the following Globalization, liberalization and Privatization are the basics of the successful evolutions of capitalism. Scott has argued that “Capitalism is an indirect system of governing an economy wherein various economic actors are allowed to compete to serve the needs of consumers according to a set of laws and rules, and where the ensuing competition serves to induce the mobilization of human energy and talent as well as other resources for the benefit of society as well as the economic actors themselves.” Of course, capitalism has evolved as a mixture idea of a socio-political and economic system indented to keep the principles of private property and the free market (Farah Naz, 2014).

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development is an organization has developed during the cold war era consisted especially of the democratized countries. Pistor (2006) has pointed out that all the liberal market economies in the countries which are the member of the OECD are following the common laws relating to the economy. The common law heritage of these countries
are embracing the principles of the liberal market systems such as securing property rights, the rule of law, corporate governance coordinated by the shareholder and liquid capital markets. The laws of these countries are contrasting with the multi-stakeholder forms of governance made with severe regulations.

The scholar from economics, sociology and political science are advocating as the recent worldwide social problems, conflicts and wars are the outcomes of the neo-imperial strategy of the capitalists and their governments. Mc.Candless and Tony Karbo (2011) in their edited volume ‘Peace, Conflict, and Development in Africa: A Reader’ have articulated about the consequences of the neo-colonial and neo-imperial operations of the Capitalist powers in Africa and its impacts on the human security in Africa.

2.3.6 Neo-Colonialism and Neo-Imperialism

The neo-colonialism is an evolved pattern of colonialism. The neo-colonial formula has implemented in the post-war era and the concept has developed by the capitalist empires to maintain the indirect exploitation in the decolonized nations. During the ideological conflicts between the great powers, both have accused each other as they trying to establish and keep their hegemonic pursuit on the decolonized nations and third world nations (T.R. Shannon, 1996). About neo-colonialism, Adam Jones (2006) has stated that “formal political rule is abandoned, and the colonial flag lowered. But underlying structures of control – economic, political, and cultural – remain.” About imperialism, Leonard Seabrooke (2005) has stated that “a policy undertaken by a state to directly control foreign economic, physical, and cultural resources.” These articulations have clearly given an outline about the motives of the
neo-colonialism and neo-imperialism policies developed by great powers and the capitalists of their respective states.

In order to develop the domestic infrastructure and economy, several independent countries have accepted and utilized the monetary support of the United States. Accordingly, the most of the newly independent countries have retained its dependency with the colonial powers. Barney Warf (2006) has noted that “Despite ostensible political independence, such societies were often woefully unprepared for independence economically and remained heavily dependent on their former colonial powers for capital, trade assistance, and foreign aid, leading to widespread fears of neocolonialism, generally via multinational corporations.” In addition, he has articulated the difference between the colonialism and neo-colonialism as “Neocolonialism differs from colonialism, therefore, in the sense that the former colony has attained a nominal degree of political sovereignty. A new national flag or anthem in many respects did little to change the status for most of the population or the real relations of power between the former colony and the former colonizer.” Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (2000) have cited the statement of the first president of independent Ghana, Nkrumah (1965) as “although countries like Ghana had achieved technical independence, the ex-colonial powers and the newly emerging superpowers such as the United States continued to play a decisive role through international monetary bodies.”

However, the newly independent nations have prominently influenced and exploited by the former colonial powers. Guy Martin (1985) has noted that “the existence of the influence of the former colonial powers, which persists after independence and in many cases, is responsible for the excessive exploitation of
African resources and inhibits an independent political policy.” Moreover, the majority of the newly independent countries in Africa hold the huge level of raw materials and human energy (Nkrumah, 1965). It is notable that a similar situation was seen in India which is got independence from British Empire.

### 2.3.7 Education Strategies under the Neo-Liberalism

The foundations of the existing neo-colonial policy have laid during the colonial era. Of course, the existing education system (Macaulay system) in India was introduced during the colonial regimes. Likewise, most of the colonizers have imposed their respective educational systems to their colonies (Sardar M. Anwaruddin, 2014). In India, the Britishers have offered the government jobs to the indigenous people of Indian territories who educated through the education system of Britishers. Through this strategy, the indigenous people of the Indian territories have gradually adopted the European and Western cultures and lifestyle. Anwaruddin has argued that “In India, the British rulers established a downward filtration system in which a small number of Indian elites would receive British style education and then would be responsible to educate and “enlighten” the masses. Such a policy reflected a system of power, domination and forcible Christianization”. He is indicating the statement of Thomas Macaulay “form a class who may be interpreters between us [colonizers] and the millions whom we govern; a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinions, in morals, and in intellect.” It is clearly proved that in order to make long-term dependency, the British Empire has injected its agendas in Indian territories during its colonial regime.

However, the education system has used as a most suitable strategy to assimilate the multi-ethnic and multicultural people of existing India and retain the
status quo (Harmeet S. Sandhu, 2014). Ksenija Svarc (2013) has articulated that “when English was introduced as the language of instruction in schools and universities, the final aim was to develop a class of Indians whose tastes, lifestyles, language and education will be more English than Indian in order to serve as interpreters between the colonizers and the colonized, as was expounded in Thomas Babington Lay’s Minute on Education.” Further, she has explored that “the ready acceptance of the Americanization and westernization of modern culture by members of the Indian elite is today the living proof of how successful the British have been in this endeavour”. Nkrumah has also evident that the neo-colonialism is also embracing the educational influence manipulated by the expatriation elites.

2.3.8 Financial Institutions and Neo-Liberalism

The neo-colonial and neo-imperial agendas have promoted by the effective triumvirate of the International Monetary Fund, United States Treasury and the World Bank, and imposed on the vulnerable and unwilling nations which are standing in the third world stage (Peter Dicken, 2007). The leading international financial institutions like World Bank and IMF are operated centralizing the campaigns focusing the development strategies including the improvement of domestic political and economic frameworks in the developing or third world nations. Moreover, the strategies have been lying with the global framework. Following these institutions, the Inter-American Development Bank (IADB), Asian Development Bank, and the African Development Bank are founded in the 1960s (Bruce Rich, 1994). Peter has discussed that the monetary assistance strategy is implemented to make the decolonized nations compatible and friendly with Washington. John Williamson (2000) has discussed that
“Washington Consensus” has come to be used to describe an extreme and dogmatic commitment to the belief that markets can handle everything.

The neo-liberalism is a dominant economic policy manipulated by the capitalist states, especially by the United States and the United Kingdom. Despite the substantial oppositions, the policy has imposed on the developing countries and it has succeeded partly through the international financial institutions under a direct pressure and guidance of the United States (David M. Kotz, 2000). David has articulated that the neo-liberalism is an updated version of the classical liberal economic system and it was developed from the interventionist approach followed by the US capital during the cold war. In addition, he has argued that “it is an accepted belief that capitalism requires significant state regulation in order to be viable”. Kehinde Olayode (2016) has articulated that the International Financial Institutions have pressured the newly independent African to undertake the domestic reforms under the neo-liberal policies and the implementation of neo-liberal reforms have caused to emerge several popular resistance movements to against the hardship created by the reforms.

At the last decade of the 20th century, capitalism has prevailed Communism by collapsing the Soviet Union. Subsequently, the capitalists have been implementing their policies as the evolved patterns. Accordingly, the policies internationalism, individualism and the free market are being implemented as globalization, privatization and liberalization respectively. Louis, Boron and Gladys (2005) have articulated that “The expansion of foreign indebtedness, added to the passage of the hegemonic model of capitalism from developmentism to neo-liberalism, favored the hegemony of financial capital over the continent’s economies. The opening to the international market, privatization of governmental enterprises, economic
deregulation and labour flexibilization, acted to the detriment of productive capital and of the overall welfare of the population.”

2.3.9 NGOs and Neo-Liberalism

Grace Ai-Ling Chou (2010) has stated that “The NGOs are not an explicit part of U.S. containment policy, but it was influenced by the policy direction that set by U.S., and the organizations evolved during the beginning of cold war and anti-Communist campaign of U.S.” She has revealed that in Hong Kong, an NGO ‘Asia Foundation’ was emerged by the initiative of Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and it established itself on the independent grounds. She has articulated that “the New Asia institution - a need that matched their policy interests. New Asia, consisting of both a postsecondary college and a research institute, was founded by self-exiled anti-Communist intellectuals who had left mainland China on the eve of the Communist assumption of power in 1949 to live and work in non-Communist Hong Kong. Believing that Communism not only defied the human spirit generally but the Chinese cultural spirit specifically, these intellectuals removed themselves from what they believed would be a culturally threatening environment in China in order to maintain and promote Chinese culture from beyond the official borders of the People’s Republic of China (PRC).”

In Derrick’s edited book *Civil Societies and Social Movements: Potentials and Problems*, Suvi Salmenniemi (2007) has articulated the contradiction between the NGOs and the Russian government. She has articulated that the abundant proliferation of the NGOs in Russia has funded and promoted by the international donors and institutions. She has pointed that “the federal security service chief Nikolai Patrushev has accused civic organizations are operating as a cover for Western spies in Russia,
and President Putin has warned that his government will not tolerate any foreign support to political activities of Russian civic organizations.” Further, she indicated that “Furthermore, Putin, in his ‘state of the nation’ speech in May 2004, accused civic organizations of serving ‘dubious groups and commercial interests’ and of ignoring the problems of citizens. He also criticized organizations for being more interested in obtaining funding from international donors than defending the real interests of people” In her conclusion, she stated, “It is, however, important to acknowledge the insistent resistance that organizations present vis-a-vis managed democracy and state-centred form of governance” (Derrick Purdue, 2007). Accordingly, Suvi has clearly explored that the NGOs are the product of capitalist powers and the powers are using the NGOs as a tool to control the spread of Communism and dilute the severe revolutions of the indigenous people against the capitalists. It clearly revealed that the NGOs are the subordinate body of the capitalists acting as agents.

Despite the Indonesian actor's severe repressions carried out against the civic organizations, the environmental NGOs in Indonesia have emerged and gradually grew. In the Indonesian revolution, the role of NGOs’ is significant to overthrow its dictator, and foothold the country in the path of democracy. In this revolution, the NGOs’ campaigns and mobilizations among the civil society and students are notable. In addition, colluding with the international NGOs and forums, the environmental NGOs have achieved some influential role in the policy-making of Indonesian government (Joshua Gordon, 1998).

Stromquist (1998) has stated that in developing countries, the non-governmental organizations are easily tending with the people and their socio-cultural
and socio-political activities. Ana Margarida Esteves, Sara Motta, Laurence Cox (2009) have articulated that “When, as at times in opposition to international financial institutions or around environmental issues, non-compliant NGOs have been able and willing to cooperate with popular movements organised on a democratic basis, or with those willing to confront the state and break the law (often in practice the same), this has sometimes led to spectacular successes, forced policy changes and advanced their respective issues.” Last few decades, the Indian government has faced several oppositions from the urban people movements due to the implementation of mega projects like power generation through dam constructions, establishing a nuclear power plant and fuel resource generation from the explorations. Several regional, national and global level NGOs are supporting the people movements and collude with them.

In the Third World Nations in Africa, the global NGOs have acted as agents of the Western liberal democracy by promoting the global disclosures and the modernization. In the 1980s in Africa, the rural NGOs and anti-apartheid activists have focused the populist class-based political mobilization and popular land struggle rather than cultural struggle (Steven L. Robins, 2008). Robins has accused that “These NGOs were often affiliated with the United Democratic Front (UDF) and formed part of a broad Left coalition of trade unions and civic organizations. Intellectuals in the popular Left tended to be dismissive towards cultural struggles and ethnic mobilization strategies, which were regarded as playing into the hands of apartheid divide and rule policies.” In the context of neo-liberalism, he has cited William F. Fisher’s (1997) notes “NGOs have also been identified by advocates of neo-liberalism as effective institutions for transferring training and skills that ‘assist individuals and communities to compete in markets, to provide welfare services to those who are
marginalized by the market, and to contribute to democratization and the growth of a robust civil society, all of which are considered critical to the success of neoliberal economic policies”. Henry Veltmeyer (2004) has also articulated that the NGOs are also involving in the politics of strategic alliances and concerted actions sought by civil and political organizations of the right (forces ranged in support of the status quo), left (dedicated in radical and systemic change) and liberal centre (reform the existing system).

2.3.10 Genocides: Colonial, Imperial and Cold War Context

In the post-war era, debates about genocide have widely emerged and several heated arguments have presented in last few decades in connection with the linkage between the neo-colonialism and genocidal consequences. The recent genocidal events around the world such as Syria, Lebanon, Eelam and Burma and the interventions of great powers and its strategies are criticized by many scholars. Hence, it is necessary to get a deep understanding about the genocide to fulfill this study.

i) Definitions

Adam Jones (2006) in his work *Genocide: A Comprehensive Introduction* has given a comprehensive detail about the origin and development of the term genocide. The term ‘Genocide’ was coined by Raphael Lemkin, lawyer of Polonized-Jewish descent. He is a refugee from Nazi-occupied Europe. In the context of human conflict, the term is a new debut. In 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations has adopted the term in its ‘Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide’ (CPPCG). Article 2 of the draft is defined genocide as the acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group as such:
a) Killing members of the group.

b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group.

c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part.

d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group.

e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.

Adam Jones has chronologically compiled the different definitions of genocide from various scholars. The definitions are following:

Peter Drost (1959) “Genocide is the deliberate destruction of physical life of individual human beings by reason of their membership of any human collectivity as such.”

Vahakn Dadrian (1975) “Genocide is the successful attempt by a dominant group, vested with formal authority and/or with preponderant access to the overall resources of power, to reduce by coercion or lethal violence the number of a minority group whose ultimate extermination is held desirable and useful and whose respective vulnerability is a major factor contributing to the decision for genocide.”

Irving Louis Horowitz (1976) “Genocide is a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus... Genocide represents a systematic effort over time to liquidate a national population, usually, a minority... [and] functions as a fundamental political policy to assure conformity and participation of the citizenry.”

Leo Kuper (1981) “I shall follow the definition of genocide given in the [UN] Convention. This is not to say that I agree with the definition. On the contrary, I believe a major omission to be in the exclusion of political groups from the list of
groups protected. In the contemporary world, political differences are at the very least as significant a basis for massacre and annihilation as racial, national, ethnic or religious differences. Then too, the genocides against racial, national, ethnic or religious groups are generally a consequence of, or intimately related to, political conflict. However, I do not think it helpful to create new definitions of genocide, when there is an internationally recognized definition and a Genocide Convention which might become the basis for some effective action, however, limited the underlying conception. But since it would vitiate the analysis to exclude political groups, I shall refer freely . . . to liquidating or exterminatory actions against them.”

Jack Nusan Porter (1982) “Genocide is the deliberate destruction, in whole or in part, by a government or its agents, of a racial, sexual, religious, tribal or political minority. It can involve not only mass murder, but also starvation, forced deportation, and political, economic and biological subjugation. Genocide involves three major components: ideology, technology, and bureaucracy/organization.”

Yehuda Bauer (1984) N.B. Bauer distinguishes between “genocide” and “holocaust”: “[Genocide is] the planned destruction, since the mid-nineteenth century, of a racial, national, or ethnic group as such, by the following means: (a) selective mass murder of elites or parts of the population; (b) elimination of national (racial, ethnic) culture and religious life with the intent of ‘denationalization’; (c) enslavement, with the same intent; (d) destruction of national (racial, ethnic) economic life, with the same intent; (e) biological decimation through the kidnapping of children, or the prevention of normal family life, with the same intent…. [Holocaust is] the planned physical annihilation, for ideological or pseudo-religious reasons, of all the members of a national, ethnic, or racial group.”
John L. Thompson and Gail A. Quets (1987) “Genocide is the extent of destruction of a social collectivity by whatever agents, with whatever intentions, by purposive actions which fall outside the recognized conventions of legitimate warfare.” Isidor Wallimann and Michael N. Dobkowski (1987) “Genocide is the deliberate, organized destruction, in whole or in large part, of racial or ethnic groups by a government or its agents. It can involve not only mass murder, but also forced deportation (ethnic cleansing), systematic rape, and economic and biological subjugation.”

Henry Huttenbach (1988) “Genocide is any act that puts the very existence of a group in jeopardy.”

Helen Fein (1988) “Genocide is a series of purposeful actions by a perpetrator(s) to destroy a collectivity through mass or selective murders of group members and suppressing the biological and social reproduction of the collectivity. This can be accomplished through the imposed proscription or restriction of reproduction of group members, increasing infant mortality, and breaking the linkage between reproduction and socialization of children in the family or group of origin. The perpetrator may represent the state of the victim, another state, or another collectivity.”

Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn (1990) “Genocide is a form of one-sided mass killing in which a state or other authority intends to destroy a group, as that group and membership in it are defined by the perpetrator.”

Helen Fein (1993) “Genocide is sustained purposeful action by a perpetrator to physically destroy a collectivity directly or indirectly, through interdiction of the
biological and social reproduction of group members, sustained regardless of the surrender or lack of threat offered by the victim.”

Steven T. Katz (1994) “[Genocide is] the actualization of the intent, however successfully carried out, to murder in whole or in substantial part of any national, ethnic, racial, religious, political, social, gender or economic group, as these groups are defined by the perpetrator, by whatever means.”

Israel Charny (1994) “Genocide in the generic sense means the mass killing of substantial numbers of human beings, when not in the course of military action against the military forces of an avowed enemy, under conditions of the essential defenselessness of the victim.”

Irving Louis Horowitz (1996) “Genocide is herein defined as a structural and systematic destruction of innocent people by a state bureaucratic apparatus [emphasis in original]. . . . Genocide means the physical dismemberment and liquidation of people on large scales, an attempt by those who rule to achieve the total elimination of a subject people.”

Barbara Harff (2003) “Genocides and politicides are the promotion, execution, and/or implied consent of sustained policies by governing elites or their agents – or, in the case of civil war, either of the contending authorities – that are intended to destroy, in whole or part, a communal, political, or politicized ethnic group.”

Further Adam Jones explored the basics of genocide as follows,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agents</th>
<th>– perpetrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victims</td>
<td>- target groups may be defined by the perpetrators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>- destruction/eradication of the victim group and/or its culture.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale – the level of target groups (whole or in a substantial part of the victims).

Strategies – handled by the perpetrators depends upon the target group, goal and scale.

Intent – Developed from the motives of the perpetrators.

ii) Genocides in Histories

The history of genocide is usually traced from the acts of slavery, expansion of territory and colonial occupations. Frank Chalk and Kurt Jonassohn (1990) have indicated several historical genocidal events since BCE including the Melos destruction by Athens. Ben Kiernan (2004) has labeled that the 3rd Punic War as ‘The First Genocide of the World’ and he has noted that near than 4,00,000 at least 1,50,000 Carthaginians perished in the event.” Adam has argued that “Among Rome’s other victims during its imperial ascendancy were the followers of Jesus Christ. After his death at Roman hands in 33 CE, Christ’s growing legions of followers were subjected to savage persecutions and mass murder. The scenes of torture and public spectacle were duplicated by Christians themselves during Europe’s medieval era.”

However, the discussion of genocide has often started from the Mongols invasions and the series massacres in the thirteenth to the fifteenth century aimed to the expansion of their rule to Central Asia, West Asia, East Asia, Europe, South Asia and South East Asia (Margolis, ES., 2001). Eric has stated that “entire nations were exterminated, leaving behind nothing but rubble, fallow fields, and bones”.

During the European colonial expansions, genocidal events have frequently identified in the Western, African and Asian continents. In Western, several massacre events have perpetrated against the indigenous people of the soil including the fortune
islands. The European colonialism and the following settlements have led to such mass ethnic destructions on the Native Americans (Crosby, AW., 1986). In his book, *A People’s History of the United States, 1492-Present*, Howard Zinn (1990) has uncovered the series of massacres perpetrated by the Spanish and Englishmen on the Native Americans, the sons of the soil. In addition, the ethnic conflicts between the European empires are also caused several massacres in colonial America. Michael Mann (2005) has advocated that “Europe from the late 15th to the 17th centuries saw severer religious cleansing entwined with ethnic elements in religious frontier zones. In Spain ethnic antagonisms and cleansing increased; in Ireland, they decreased.”

In French, the mass killings in the post-revolution times are perpetrated against people of the royal upper estates. From 1810 to 1828, the expansionism has caused a mass destruction of Zulus in Zulu kingdom (Adam Jones, 2006). The internal Chinese colonialism on Tibet and the following revolutions have resulted in a mass destruction. John King Fairbank has articulated that China has reduced its population from 410 million in 1850 to 350 million in 1873 (Fairbank, JK., 1986). Based on the ethnic conflict, the American genocide in 1830 (America), Armenian genocide in 1915 (Ottoman Empire), Jews genocide in 1933 (Germany), Bosnian genocide in 1992 (Yugoslavia), Rwandan genocide in 1994 (Rwanda), Greeks genocide in 1995 (Istanbul), Kurdish genocide in 2003 (Iraq), Tamils genocide in 2009 (Eelam) are the notable genocides.

iii) **Imperialism, Colonialism, Ethnicity and Genocide**

Adam Jones has argued that “the neo-colonial exploitations may have genocidal consequences”. Ido de Haan (2010) in his work *Imperialism, Colonialism and Genocide. The Dutch Case for an International History of the Holocaust* has
discussed the connections between the imperialism, colonialism and genocide with reference to the Jews genocide in Nazi regime. He has advocated that the Hitler’s ideology of unification of German was developed through the imperial and social Darwinist ideas and that led to the genocide of Jews. In this regard, he has cited Mark Mazower’s (2010) argument “Hitler’s imperialism was inspired by racism and social Darwinism, yet it differed from British, Dutch or French imperialism by its focus on Europe as the territory of expansion and therefore also by its antagonism to other nations and minorities on European soil”.

iv) Cold War and Genocide

Karl Cordell and Stefan Wolff (2010) have analyzed some post-war ethnic conflicts and other inter-state conflicts with the cold war strategies. They have cited Mc. Namara’s (1995) statement “we were trying to do something that was militarily impossible—we were trying to break the will; I don't think we can break the will by bombing short of genocide.” They have articulated “US paranoia about a ‘domino-effect’ in the spread of Communism in South East Asia led it to supporting a number of genocidal regimes in the region, notably Indonesia’s military rulers, who having exterminated their Communist opposition in the mid-1960s, massacred some 300,000 East Timorese seeking an independent state after Portuguese decolonization in 1975.” They have also criticized the failure of United Nations to control the genocides and punish the perpetrators.

Mark Levene (2000) has largely argued that “The very fact that genocide, which in the interwar years was most associated with new or newly remodeled states in Europe and the Near East, became a global phenomenon in the post-1945 ebb of the European imperial or neo-imperial tide must give some credence to this line of
thought. Superficially, for instance, the genocidal behavior of a number of South American and South Asian countries against tribal peoples, in their efforts to reach out, connect, and integrate rich forest and other extractive resources of geographically peripheral hinterlands for the benefit of their already advancing metropolitan economies, would suggest a wholly developmental logic. But even in these a largely ‘off the map’ instance of contemporary genocide, such logic has been rarely quite so one dimensional.” Further, he said that “In the post-1945 world of Cold War-dominated international politics, such accusations have flown thick and fast with devastating results. Tagging whole populations as "Communist" in the Indonesia of 1965, East Timor a decade later, or the Guatemala of the early 1980s provided state justification for genocide. But so too, in the Soviet Union, China, and Cambodia did diverse branding as "cosmopolitan," "Soviet revisionist," or "stooge of US imperialism."

2.4 Social Movements

Social movement is a type of collective group activism emerging in uncompromised economic, political and social situations. Generally, the movements are emerging in order to change or oppose any existing or introducing social, political, economic and cultural systems and ideas, customs, policies, projects of the individual or groups or state institutions. The movements are often characterized by several dependent and independent variables. The key concept of social movements is incorporated with several ideas like conflict, collective behavior, resource mobilization, political process, framing, identity and space and place. Agendas, goal, financial sources, organizational coordination, leadership, representation, inclusion and marginalization are some fundamentals of the social movements. Period of the
activism, contemporary political, economic and cultural conditions and the contemporary world order are the significant factors to understand the backgrounds, operations and goals of the movements.

2.4.1 History and Definitions

Social movement is a form of collective action that emerges in response to situations of inequality, oppression and/or unmet social, political, economic or cultural demands. The social movements are comprised “an organized set of constituents pursuing a common political agenda of change over time” (Batliwala, 2002). Lorenz von Stein (1964) in his book *History of the French Social Movements from 1789 to the Present (1850)* has introduced the term ‘Social Movements’. Collective activism has traced in the French Revolution and revolution of Polish Constitution on 3rd May 1791. Moreover, these collective activisms are considered the first documented social movements. Charles Tilly (2004) has argued that the British abolitionist movement is claimed to be the first social movement. In addition, he has articulated that in the mid-18th century, the early growths of social movements are connected to the broad economic and political changes of England including the political representation, market capitalization, and the proletarianization. In the late nineteenth century and from the twentieth century, the working class movements, socialist movements and Communist movements have evolved as the prototypical social movements. Further, Tilly has defined the term social movements as “a series of contentious performances, displays, and campaigns by which ordinary people made collective claims on others.” He has articulated that the social movements are the major vehicle for ordinary people's participation in public politics. He has argued that
a social movement has three major elements such as campaigns, repertoires and WUNC displays.

Sidney Tarrow (1994) has defined that the social movement as "collective challenges to elites, authorities, other groups or cultural codes by people with common purposes and solidarity in sustained interactions with elites, opponents and authorities, aim to achieve change by engaging in contestation.” David Sogge and Gisela Dutting (2010) have defined that “In understanding social movements it is vital to remember that they are dynamic, historical phenomena and as such are shaped by circumstance; they are contingent things, which grow or shrink in response to factors that enable or constrain them.”

2.4.2 Theoretical Overview

In common, the social movements are emerging with a contradictory or conflict nature. The theories collective behaviour, resource mobilization, political process, frame analysis and new social movement are often used to analyze the social movements. Except the New Social Movement theory, all the theories are developed in the Western capitalist dominant regions. In addition, the theories are developed during the epochs of the cold war. Moreover, the interpretations of the theories are minimally connected with the previous revolutionary movements influenced and strengthened by the Marxist and Leninist theories. The overview of the theories is discussed below:

i) Collective Behaviour

The collective behavior theories are developed in 1950s advocating the collective action and the spontaneous upheavals of various groups of people
organized with similar ideas or goals. Alain Touraine (1985) has revealed the two types of conflict behaviours in all the collective actions. He has stated as “These two types of conflict behavior are located at the same level: they ‘respond’ to an organizational status and to organizational change. Their analysis is generally made in terms of ‘system’ more than in terms of actors. But they are opposed in most ways to each other. The first one can be called instrumental, the second expressive.”

Based on collective behavior theory, Jean.L Cohen (1985) has explained his important assumptions as follows:

- There are two distinct kinds of action; institutional conventional and non-institutional - collective behaviour.
- Non-institutional collective behaviour is action, that is not guided by existing social norms but is formed to meet undefined or unstructured situations.
- These situations are understood in terms of a breakdown either in terms of organs of social control or in the adequacy of normative integration due to structural changes.
- The resulting strains, discontent, frustration and aggression lead the individual to participate in collective behaviour follows a 'life cycle' open to casual analysis, which moves from spontaneous crowd action to the formation of publics and social movements.
- The emergence and growth of movements within this cycle occurs through crude process of communication: contagion, rumour, circular reaction, diffusion etc.

Further, Cohen has argued that “All collective-behavior theories stress psychological reactions to break down, crude modes of communication and volatile
goals. This indicates an implicit bias toward regarding collective behaviour as a non-rational or irrational response to change.” Ralph H. Turner and Lewis M. Killian (1987) have explained the social movements as “a peculiar kind of collective behaviour, which is contrasted to organizational and institutional behaviour. It is collectivity acting with some continuity to promote or resist a change in the society or organization of which it is part.”

ii) **Resource Mobilization**

The theory of Resource mobilization is developed from the collective action model. In the role of organizational factors in social movements, the resource mobilization has paid greater attention than the collective behavior approach. Mayer N. Zald and John David McCarthy (1987) have explained that “The existence of marginal resources, gathered from many middle-class suppliers, or large amounts of resources, gathered through churches, philanthropic organizations, and labour unions, permits movement entrepreneurs to find an organizational niche even when mass bases of activists are difficult to find.” Further, they have argued that the success of the movements depends upon the organizational infrastructure of the movement. In general terms, the approach is dealt with the dynamics and tactics of the growth, decline and change of the social movements. Resource mobilization theory examines the variety of mobilized resources, the linkages of social movements to other groups, the dependence of movements and the tactics used by authorities to control or incorporate the movement.

Cohen’s assumptions on RMT are as follows:
Social movements must be understood in terms of conflict model of collective action. There is no fundamental difference between institutional and non-institutional collective action.

- Both entail conflicts of interest built into institutionalized power relations.
- Collective action involves the rational pursuit of interest by groups.
- Goals and grievances are permanent products of power relations and cannot account for the formation of movements.
- This depends instead on changes in resources, organization, and opportunities for collective action.
- Success is evidenced by the recognition of the group as a political actor or by increased material benefits.
- Mobilization involves large scale, special purpose, bureaucratic, formal organizations.

### iii) Political Process

It often referred to the emergence of revolutionary political movements including with the collective behavior model. Jeffrey M. Ayres (1997) has advocated that “it is the fight for power between polity members and challengers, and the various political relatives and political alignments facing those challengers that gives rise to this collective action.” Further, he has discussed the three crucial factors of the political process as “First, a favourable structure of political opportunities must exist within the political system to aid the building of political alliances and encourage the reception of the movements’ goals by established political groups and elites. Second, a movement must have a degree of pre-existing organization and indigenous resources to take advantage of such opportunities. Third, the existence of solidarity and moral
commitment to the movement on the part of individual activists ensures loyalty to the movement's cause and supports and sustains the movement's collective identity.” Thus the political process has specifically pointed the change in the political environment as a central determining factor in the emergence and trajectory of the movements. When the vulnerability in the political establishment becoming to increase, the social movements are arises, develops and provides the greatest impact (Mario Diani, 1992).

iv) Frame Analysis

It is often referred as a research method used to analyze people’s understanding method of situations and activities. This social movement theory was developed from the work of Erving Goffman (1974). David A. Snow and Robert D. Benford (1988) have articulated that frame alignment is an important element in all the social mobilization or movements. Further, they have argued that “when an individual frame become linked in congruency and complementariness, that frame alignment occurs, producing frame resonance, which is key to the process of a group transitioning from one frame to another.” They have identified three core framing tasks to determine the participant mobilization as follows:

- Diagnostic framing for the identification of a problem and assignment of blame,
- Prognostic framing to suggest solutions, strategies, and tactics to a problem; and
- Motivational framing that serves as a call to arms or rationale for action.

v) New Social Movement (NSM)

This theory is developed on the basis of the modern characterization of the society. The new social movements have emerged in the post industrial revolution society or cold war society. Like the traditional movements, these movements are usually characterized by some strategies, goals and membership diverse. Generally,
the new social movements are referred to the collective action and a new paradigm of the social movement activity. The new social movements have often emerged from the various channels of the society like race, sexuality, ethnic, gender, human rights, environmentalism, feminism, animal right and etc. In the globalized world, the new social movements are also considered as an inevitable production of the existing economical, social and political relationship. This theory is trying to narrate the social movements with structural and cultural changes in the respective society. Touraine has discussed the social movements with the conflicts of the society. Touraine has articulated that the new social movement is an organized collective behaviour of a group of actors who struggling against an existing dominant class which acting against the welfare of the majority population in a concrete community.

The origin of NSM Theory is rooted in the incongruities of the advanced capitalist society and in the anti-institutional and counter-cultural actions of its proponents. NSM Theorists have argued that the movements have emerged in the long-term protest against the increasing technocratic and bureaucratic political systems based on the prerogatives of material consumption and the assumed benefits of perpetual growth (Klaus Eder, 1985). From the 1960s, regarding the new social movements, several explanations are presented by many scholars under perspectives of the inequalities produced by the capitalism. Carl Boggs (1986) has articulated that the capitalist bureaucrats have produced a variety of negative effects among the people.

However, in the globalized world, the new social movements have been emerging especially from the grounds of exploitation, repression and denial of rights. The operations of the movements are depending upon the governance system of the
respective states. At present, the raw material, mineral and other resource-based
development and exploration projects are causing severe environmental degradations
and the degradations have been becoming a serious threat to the survival of the
people. It is leading to the emergence some collective actions of people against the
governments and the corporate bodies of government and private.

vi) Protracted Movements

Usually, the militant movements have been emerging from the prolonged
conflicts between the government and its indigenous groups. In the most of the armed
conflicts, the militant movements are motivated by the ethnic, religious and other
feelings. The armed ethnic conflicts are often viewed as the Fragmented Social
Reality Approach.

2.4.3 New Social Movements - Neo-Colonial, and Neo Imperial Perspectives

Since the cold war era, the communist revolutionary movements have become
weak and the new social movements alternatively emerge as the mainstream social
movements. Of course, these social movements are playing a vital role in every social
change of the existing societies throughout the world. Touraine (1981) has stated that
“modern society is the first type of society to reproduce itself, and new social
movements are the decisive force in this process.” In the 20th century, movements are
associated with the class systems produced by the industrial society and the class
movements have directly opposed the capitalists and the capitalist empires. The new
social movements differed from the classical movements. Friedrich Tenbruck (1981)
has argued about the consequences of the old movements are transformed into the
new movements. In both democratic and non-democratic countries, the capitalists’
idea of democratization and the following neo-colonial and neo-imperial strategies
have produced a variety of conflicts between the ruling and ruled classes. These conflicts are leading to the emergence of the new mass movements (cited from Hans Haferkamp and Neil J. Smelser).

Under the capitalists’ neo-liberal policy, the international financial institutions are promoting the structural adjustment policies in all the developing countries. The development projects introduced under the policy are often opposed by the indigenous people of the respective countries. Generally, the oppositions are represented by a spontaneous people group, temporary people movement and a long-term mass movement. Henry Veltmeyer (2004) has deeply discussed the neo-liberal structural adjustment policies in Latin America. He stated about the movements as follows:

- The economic and political organizations and collective action of the urban poor, including a myriad of popular economic organizations and movements of (spontaneous or organized) opposition and protest against the lack of democracy and International Monetary Fund (IMF)–sponsored government policy measures;
- A host of NSMs formed by diverse associations of urban-based neighborhood groups, groups of women, human and political rights and environmentalist activists, to advocate changes; and
- Socio-political movements based on organized or unionized labour.

During the last phase of the cold war, in some Southeast Asian countries, some mass protests were carried out by some organized movements against its dictators emphasizing the democratization. In the past two decades, dictators in Suharto (Indonesia), Burma, Ferdinand Marcos (Philippines) are removed from their power through the mass revolutions conducted by the democratically motivated
movements with the influence and guidance of the international democratic agents especially the NGOs. The popular revolutions have emerged against the repression of the respective states’ dictators and their institutional agents (Vincent Boudreau, 2002). Meanwhile, in South Asia and Africa, the democratized countries especially the decolonized democratic nations have experienced several resistive operations including insurgencies made by their indigenous people groups and organized movements.

In the last few decades in India, besides the reformation movements, several new social movements have been emerging against the government due to the policies and practices of the central and state governments and its actors. In the name of poverty elimination, modernizing the agriculture and the community development, the Indian government has adopted the neo-liberal policies. According to the neo-liberal policies, the Indian government has been allowing the foreign investments in the various sectors of the nation and the government has been promoting various economic and cultural exchanges between India and the international societies. But, these operations of the Indian government have resulted in the increase of domestic poverty. Moreover, neo-liberal policies have created several contradictions between the state machine and the people. It has been resulting in the emergence of new social classes and the creation of new social movements. Most of these social movements are inspired by the Gandhian and Marxian ideologies. In India, several series of long-term popular struggles are being carried out by the peasants, tribes, workers, environmentalists, and nationalist elites. Generally, these struggles are rooted in the issues of the poverty, survival threats, inequalities, discriminations and disparities produced by the neo-liberal policies introduced by the capitalist states. (Kothari, R., 1970, Frankel, F., 1977 and Kohli, A., 1990).
Almost, in all the decolonized nations, in the last few decades, the ethnic
discriminations, water disputes, resource exploitations, environmental threats, and
threats of nuclear and hazardous materials have increased. In fact, all these
oppositions are actually raised against the diplomacy of the capitalist powers and their
imperial states. Moreover, these oppositions are emerging as an antithesis against the
propositions of the states governed by the recent policies and strategies of capitalism.
At present, some restructured decolonized nations in South Asia such as India,
Pakistan and Sri Lanka are confronting several caste, religious and ethnic conflicts
including the interstate and intrastate militant wars and great insurgencies. T.k.
Oommen (1990) has stated that the multi-party democratic system has undoubtedly
favoured the protest movements to emerge and operate. Of course, the multi-party
system in India has been fuelling all the protest movements to emerge and operate in
the various platforms like environmental protection, gender protection, social justice
and others.

Like Africa, India has high amounts of resources and raw materials. Jose G.
Vargas-Hernandez and Mohammad Reza Noruzi (2009) have stated “Resource wealth
might lead to civil conflict in two ways. The ‘looting hypothesis’ sustains that rebel
movements arise from greed and grievances.” During the colonization, the forest
resources in Madras Presidency are largely looted by the British company through
their timber export. Besides the timber export, the deforestation was made to establish
the tea and coffee estates in the Western Ghats (Saravanan, V., 2008). In India, in
order to protect the environment and prevent the natural resources, some significant
people’s resistance and awareness campaigns have appeared in the 1970s (Sahu,
Geetanjoy, 2007). The below table is showing the exported timber values and the
respective periods:
Table 2.1: Years and Timber Exported Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value (in Rupees)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value (in Rupees)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1855-56</td>
<td>736117</td>
<td>1862-63</td>
<td>1144023</td>
<td>1869-70</td>
<td>1228689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1856-57</td>
<td>853704</td>
<td>1863-64</td>
<td>1570559</td>
<td>1870-71</td>
<td>1013878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857-58</td>
<td>882080</td>
<td>1864-65</td>
<td>1606538</td>
<td>1871-72</td>
<td>1022367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858-59</td>
<td>884444</td>
<td>1865-66</td>
<td>1654166</td>
<td>1872-73</td>
<td>1014176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859-60</td>
<td>847820</td>
<td>1866-67</td>
<td>930878</td>
<td>1873-74</td>
<td>1028803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860-61</td>
<td>931317</td>
<td>1867-68</td>
<td>979671</td>
<td>1874-75</td>
<td>1065906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861-62</td>
<td>1237475</td>
<td>1868-69</td>
<td>1307459</td>
<td>1875-76</td>
<td>1045109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Cited from Velayutham Saravanan, 2008)

Aviram Sharma (2007) has articulated that the environmental movements in India have frequently against some unsecured developmental policies, environmental degradation or destructions and the exploitation natural resources. In the recent decades in India, several environmental movements have sporadically emerged throughout India to oppose several projects proposed and implemented under the structural adjustment and neo-liberal policies. Anjali Monterio and Lakshmi Lingam (1998) have articulated that “The environmental movement, which has often been a crucial component also in other movement and it has contested state-sponsored notions of development, employing a range of strategies, from struggle to constructive action to advocacy at the national and global levels.”

In 1991, India has adopted the Liberalization, Privatization and Globalization policies indented to provide the features for less constraining of economic activity, transferring the ownership of the government properties to private and expanding the economic activities across political boundaries of nation-states respectively (Ravan,
Sanket V., 2014). David B. Abernethy (2000) has articulated that “The policy recommendations of neo-liberalism are concerned mainly with dismantling what remains of the regulationist welfare state. These recommendations include deregulation of business; privatization of public activities and assets; elimination of, or cutbacks in, social welfare programs; and reduction of taxes on businesses and the investing class. In the international sphere, neo-liberalism calls for free movement of goods, services, capital, and money (but not people) across national boundaries”.

In 2012, former Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh has addressed in the ‘7th Asia Gas Partnership Summit. In this summit, he stated, “expanding the use of natural gas in India is one of the most important and immediate ways of responding to the challenges of energy security and the management of climate change.” According to this statement, India is aiming to utilize its own energy and fuel resources and it ensured the liberal functions of the Indian petroleum companies. Moreover, in India, the gas and petroleum exploration and transportation projects have accelerated since 2012. During the implementation of the projects, the Indian corporate companies like ONGC, GAIL and Reliance have faced several oppositions from the people of the concerned project area.

Rudolph Rummel’s (1972) has noted that the resources have produced several deadly quarrels between the nation-states and their own citizens. Paranjoy Guha Thakurta, Subir Ghosh and Jyotirmoy Chaudhuri (2014) in their book *Gas Wars: Crony Capitalism and the Ambanis* have articulated the role of Indian capitalists in the exploitation of natural resources in India. They have also discussed the negative impacts of the projects and people oppositions against the projects. They have argued
that “The grassroots movements in the Third World are articulating the idea of alternative development through concrete political struggles.”

In India, most of the protest movements against the resource exploitation have been emerging from the tribe, village and agrarian sector. In Tamil Nadu, the peasants are the primary opponents of all the energy-related projects undertaken by the Indian multi-national companies. Jose Seoane, Emile Taddei and Clara Algranati (2005) have pointed that the most of the social movements in Latin America have influenced by the agrarian and village communities. They have articulated that “Thus, the model of a return in the economy to raw materials, and the central role taken on in this context by agrarian restructuring processes, witness the emergence, in counterpart, of notable movements of rural origin. Also acting in the same direction is the privatization and intensive exploitation of natural resources that affects and upsets the life of numerous rural communities.

In addition, several mass oppositions have also appeared in the developed capitalist countries carried out by some organized movements intended to oppose the neoliberal policies. Nina Eggert and Marco Giugni (2012) have noted that “the global justice movement, which has dominated the scene in the late 1990s and early 2000s, then more recently the Indignados in Spain as well as elsewhere in Europe and the various “Occupy” movements in the United States, all these protests seem to gather people from different social strata and to articulate a broad range of issues, although all of them can more or less be subsumed under the banner of the struggle against neoliberal capitalism and the resulting social injustice.”

In the West, several new social movements have emerged due to the poverty produced by the globalization policies. These movements have seemed to homogenize
the terms of political culture and the discourse of protest movements operated throughout the world (Sheth D.L., 2004). However, the democratization, modernization and political and economic ideas of the capitalists are creating some significant threats to the security of the individual and the common society. According to the insecurity and threat, several new movements have been emerging and struggling against the capitalists’ policies and these movements are strengthening its mobilizations by connecting to the global movements by using the advanced information and technological developments.

2.4.4 NSM and Non-Governmental Organizations

Since the post-war era, the voluntary civic organizations have been playing a vital role in order to spread the democratization throughout the world. The organizations are the core elements of the modern civil societies considering as a hub of the network of the global societies. Thomas Princen, Matthias Finger (1994) have noted that the organizations in a national level are called as ‘public interest groups’ and the international level are called as ‘NGOs’. After the Second World War, the non-governmental organizations have started to grow around all the world countries especially in the Communist blocs and newly independent third world countries. The organizations have grounded on the internationalism and focused the policies of democratization, individual development, social empowerment, human rights protection, environmental protection and abolition of discriminations. Stromquist (1998) has pointed that “the NGOs are functioning on the basis of social empowerment, creating awareness on education and environmental protection and lobbying for international assistance for specific purpose and monitoring or promoting pertinent state policies. Ana Margarida Esteves, Sara Motta, Laurence Cox (2009)
have pointed out the NGOs are increased from the 1980s and they are playing a vital role in the institutionalization of new social movements.

Henry Veltmeyer (2004) has articulated that “In the theoretical and political space between these two notions of civil society, a liberal one favoured by the community of international and governmental development agencies, and a critical one rooted in a Gramscian notion of hegemonic and counter-hegemonic power can be found a broad array of views and loose ideas associated with a growing complex, and diverse networks, of NGOs that see themselves as a primary agent for international development, acting in support of grassroots- or community-based development.” He has also articulated, “In the 1980s, these third-sector NGOs were the favoured partners of governments and international donors in the implementation of their programmes in the form of projects and at the level of the local community. However, these organizations of civil society, ranging from international advocacy networks to community-based organizations and pursuing alternative agendas of environmental protection, human rights and social development, or opposition to the corporate agenda, are generally oriented toward a politics of resistance and committed to what could be termed ‘another development’ - development that is from within and below rather from outside and above, that is people-centred and managed, human in scale, socially inclusive, sustainable in terms of both the environment and livelihoods, and participatory and empowering of the poor.”

The United Nations’ ‘Conference Decade’ in 1990 has ensured the right of NGO actors to participate in the shaping of global and national policies on the population, environment, economics, human rights, women empowerment and economic development (Batliwala, 2002). Accordingly, in developing countries, the
NGOs have mobilized many indigenous groups, political parties and non-political movements and started to involve the decision and policy-making of the respective states. Moreover, the NGOs with the mobilized groups have started to oppose some mega development projects of the government like mining, construction of dams, nuclear energy production, fuel exploration and others.

2.4.5 Social Media and Collective Actions

The modern activists are using the cyberspace as public space to collect the supports and the traditional activists are using that as a physical space to organize movements (Gerbaudo, Paolo 2012). Prior to the advancement of the social networking technology, the human communications has evolved through the ICT developments. In all the collective activisms, it has created new forms of expression, fastest communication pattern and it has triggered a wide range of civic participation (Hopper, Paul 2007). The ICT developments have provided a collective and critical resource to the successful mobilization of social movements (Wasserman, Herman 2007). The recent developments in the networking model social media have created a new platform for the collective activism and it has stimulated the process of socio-political changes. In addition, the social media are escalating the successful mobilization of leaderless collective actions. (Schneider, NC & Graf, B 2011). The advancement of social media has fueled the recent popular uprisings and revolutions in some North and African countries such as Egypt, Tunisia and Libya and the Middle East counties such as Syria and Iran (Smith, Catharine 2011).

In the Arab Spring including the Egyptian historical political change, the existing social media like Facebook, Twitter and YouTube have become a tool for the effective political transformation. Social media are not directly caused the revolutions
but it is creating a platform for the individual and people groups to discuss the conflicting issues and express their free thoughts. However, the advancement of social media is the influential tool and effective catalyst of the socio-political revolutions (Khamis, Sahar & Vaughn, Katherine 2011). The Arab Spring which is called as ‘Facebook Revolution’ is the outcome of the state’s repression and unemployment (Youmans, WL & York, JC 2012). Youmans and Jillian have cited Lynch’s (2011) articulation. Accordingly, the four significant uses of the social media in collective actions are as follows:

- by making it easier for disaffected citizens to act publicly in coordination
- by creating information cascades that bolstered protesters’ perceptions of the likelihood of success
- by raising the costs of repression by the ruling regimes
- by dramatically increasing publicity through diffusion of information to the regional and global public.

In addition, he has stated that “the main social media platforms are institutions that shape interactions within activists’ collective action spaces."

Moreover, the evolution of social media is providing an open platform for liberal communication without any control and repression of the state mechanism. It has clearly observed in the Occupy Wall Street protest. In the United States of America, the recent collective activism of a small group of American citizens against the capitalists’ diplomacy has utilized the social media to spread the message across the nation and world indent collect support (Sanchez, Ray 2016). A recent hashtag trend in social media is another advancement that seems to the ability to connect the
like-minded activists and the activists operating in the common political goals (Bonilla, Yarimar & Rosa, Jonathan 2015).

For India, the social media has in traduced a new resistive culture (Shaw, Aakash 2016). Aakash Shaw has pointed that the “#Hokkolorob is one of the largest hashtag movements in India which involved over sixty thousand people in more than one hundred countries.” He has articulated that the social media has provided instant sharing features within the closed and open organized circles and allowed to express the individuals’ views as a comment to certain wall posts or topics of discussions. In addition, the organized or spontaneous resistive movements are revealing their virtual protests to the global platforms without time and space constraints. Moreover, the social media is providing an opportunity to make collective actions in the cyberspace with or without some identities like caste, gender, religion, political and others. Thus the social media is creating another dimension in social realities. Aakash Shaw in his research paper Role of social media in social mobilization has examined the role of social media in the Shahbag movement (2013) in Shahbag Square at Dhaka and the Hokkolorob movement in India.

Need of the present study

In recent years, Tamil Nadu has become as India's most unrest state consisting with several series protest events and sudden popular uprisings intensified by interstate water disputes, ethnic issues and the recent developmental projects of the government. This study is evaluating the popular resistance as an antithesis under the Hegel’s dialectic especially under the triadic model. In addition, this study is attempting to find the actual factors of these conflicts and trying to find a solution to the unrest situation. Like Herbert Marcuse’s Reason and Revolution, only in a limited
range of studies have followed this approach. Several political parties, non-political movements and the NGOs have voluntarily participated in all the struggles. The present study aims to focus the various diplomatic interventions and influences of these voluntary organizations and also attempts to find the goals and agendas of the organizations. Moreover, this study aims to analyze some findings, observed from the field, with the global socio-political context including the ideologies and diplomacies.