Mapping Research and Teaching Trajectories: A Critical Turn in the Indian IR

Navnita Behera

University of Delhi

The paper seeks to map the shifting contours of IR (International Relations) research in India from its predominantly area-studies focus towards disciplinary inquiries and within that, from the traditional realist frameworks towards an engagement with critical theories ranging from constructivism and feminism to post-colonialism. With a growing Indian involvement in the domain of global governance, the scholarly research is also going beyond an Indo-centric focus to addressing the diverse problematiques of modern IR as such. The pedagogic practices of Indian IR are however, not matching the pace of such changes. The paper concludes that developing critical pedagogic practices will play a determining role in shaping the future of the IR discipline in India.

Keywords: Indian IR, research trajectories, critical pedagogy, area studies

Research and pedagogy of International Relations (IR) in India has undergone a gradual albeit significant transformation from an area-studies focus towards strengthening its disciplinary bases. This, in turn, has helped create a ground for the critical traditions of thought to open up IR's disciplinary boundaries, expand its research agendas, re-work its theoretical toolkit and re-design the curriculum of teaching IR although critical pedagogical practices have yet to make their mark in classroom teaching in most Indian universities. This paper seeks to map this story – a task that is attempted in two parts. The first part offers historical background followed by a brief account of the different genres of research writings in Indian IR, and the second part focuses on the curriculum format and content along with the deployment, of critical pedagogical practices for teaching IR or lack thereof. The paper offers both qualitative and quantitative analysis to argue its case.

Historically, the IR discipline in India has broadly evolved in three stages. The first generation of IR scholars – from 1947 until about the mid-1950s – was largely trained in the British tradition. Although this body of work largely focused on India's foreign policy concerns, it did engage with important conceptual propositions of their times including but not restricted to decolonisation, disarmament, international institutions

Navnita Behera – Professor of the Institute for Research on India and International Studies, Department of Political Science, University of Delhi.

such as the United Nations, international law, nuclear non-proliferation, the Cold War and international power configurations particularly in Asia.

The second phase of disciplinary evolution of IR lasted until almost the end of the 1980s and was produced mainly by those trained at American and British universities who subsequently taught in Indian universities, especially the School of International Studies that was set up in 1955 and merged into Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU) in 1969, which in turn became the single most important source of supplying intellectual wo/manpower for the rest of India. SIS-trained scholars played a significant role in shaping the institutional and pedagogical structures of the IR discipline in India. A hallmark of this phase lay in the conceptual conflation of area studies and disciplinary-oriented IR studies whereby the latter was thought to be the same as idiographic foreign area studies.[1] The latter was based on the somewhat simplistic assumption that the area being studied was 'foreign.' The Indian conception of IR, then known as International Studies, was thus a peculiar product where disciplinary IR was often subsumed under the latter, which led to critical neglect of the former's development.[2] Since area studies specialists had poor grounding in disciplinary IR, this led successive generations to produce historical chronicles of India's relations with other states in a narrative and descriptive style without any rigorous training in historical research methods.

In the early 1990s, a host of external and internal factors set in motion the beginning of the third and contemporary phase. The end of the Cold War paved the way for wide ranging disciplinary debates between positivist and post-positivist theories and methodologies in mainstream IR. At home, many new think tanks and research institutes set up in the 1990s exposed IR scholars to these new genres of literatures and significantly influenced their research agendas though they mainly produced applied, policy-relevant research and paid little attention to the basic research. Many Indian universities, both public and private, also started new courses in International Relations at the undergraduate as well as postgraduate levels, thereby augmenting the overall intellectual pool of resources. At the same time, Indian foreign policy concerns have undergone a major transformation since then. With a fast-growing economy that is already the fourth-largest in the world, India is no longer engaging the world from a peripheral position but is becoming an active player in matters of global governance pertaining to economic and environmental matters as well as issues of global security.

---

[1] A. P. Rana and K. P. Misra, 'Communicative Discourse and Community in International Relations Studies in India: A Critique', in Kanti Bajpai and Siddharth Mallavarapu (eds), *International Relations in India: Bringing Theory Back Home,* New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2004, p. 74.

[2] A. P. Rana, *Reconstructing International Relations as a Field of Study in India: A Program for the Disciplinary Development of International Relations Studies*, Studying International Relations, The Baroda Perspective, Occasional Review-I; *The International Relations Study of the Political Universe: A Note on Supplementary Strategies for the Exploration of the Political Science-International Relations-Area Studies Continuum*, Studying International Relations, The Baroda Perspective, Occasional Review-II, Baroda: The Maharaja Sayajirao University, 1988.

Research agendas: changing contours

In the past two decades, the Indian IR community has produced a body of literature that is markedly different from their past endeavours. This assessment is borne out, first and foremost, by the findings of the Teaching, Research and International Policy (TRIP) faculty survey conducted in India for the first time in 2014. In this survey, 38% of respondents identified foreign policy issues of a region or an individual country as their primary area of research. The breakdown of this figure was as follows: foreign policy (15.81%), comparative foreign policy (2.41%), European studies (4.12%), IR of a particular country/region (13.06%) and US foreign policy (2.41%). In comparison, 47% of respondents listed their primary research interests in thematic/disciplinary terms including international/global security (12.71%), IR theory (8.59%), international/global political economy (6.53%), development studies (3.09%), gender (2.41%), global civil society (0.69%), history of the IR discipline (1.03%), human rights (2.41%), human security (1.72%), international/global environment (2.75%), international/global ethics (0.34%), international/global health (0.34%), international/global history (0.69%), international organisations (3.09%), and philosophy of science (0.69%). This proportion gets further reinforced when assessed in terms of their secondary areas of interest within IR, wherein 69% listed foreign policy issues as their preferred choices while 84% weighed in favour of disciplinary/thematic issues of inquiry in IR.[3] In terms of basic/applied research, choices of Indian scholars are fairly divided. While 15% of scholars described their own work as 'primarily basic,' and another 28% said 'both, it was more basic than applied,' and another 17% said 'both, equally.' On the other hand, 11% said 'primarily applied,' and 28%, 'both, but more applied than basic.'

Interestingly, such a transition from the area-studies oriented IR towards much more disciplinary engagements in the Indian IR was first captured in a study that closely analyzed the contents of the JNU's School of International Studies' flagship journal of *International Studies*, as shown in Figure 1.[4]

The first decade of this journal had a decisive edge in debating issues of international law, which was perhaps because the founder of the SIS, A. Appadorai, represented the British tradition of law, diplomatic history and philosophy and hence influenced the direction and foci of the School's early investigations in IR. The overall orientation

---

[3] The breakdown of this figure was foreign policy (31.48%), comparative foreign policy (8.89%), European studies (2.22%), IR of a particular country/region (20.37%) and US foreign policy (6.3%). These included international/global security (14.07%), IR theory (8.15%), international/global political economy (6.67%), development studies (5.56%), gender (5.56%), global civil society (4.07%), history of the IR discipline (4.44%), human rights (7.41%), human security (11.11%), international/global environment (5.93%), international/global ethics (1.85%), international/global health (1.11%), international/global history (3.7%), international organisations (1.85%), and philosophy of science (0.74%).

[4] Source: Navnita Chadha Behera, 'IR in South Asia: A Realist Past and Alternative Futures', in Arlene Tickner and Ole Waever (eds), *Global Scholarship in International Relations: Worlding Beyond the West (Geo-cultural Epistemologies), Vol.1*, London: Routledge, 2009, p. 138.

of *International Studies* has been significantly influenced by the area-studies focus of the School but since the early 1990s, it shows a slow albeit steady shift towards disciplinary writings that also records a much higher level of engagement with the theoretical debates in IR.[5]

Figure 1.

International Studies		
Year of Publication	**Area Studies**	**Disciplinary IR**
1959–1963	68	21
1964–1968	51	19
1969–1973	12	22
1974–1978	88	18
1979–1983	66	17
1984–1988	32	21
1989–1993	50	40
1994–1998	49	49
1999–2003	29	29
2004–2006	35	35

In the past two decades, the number of IR journals published in India has also steadily increased. These include *Jadavpur Journal of International Relations* (1995), *South Asian Survey* (1994), *World Affairs – The journal of International Issues* (1996) Indian *Journal of Politics and International Relations*, *Indian Foreign Affairs Journal* (2006) among others. While these professional journals have, no doubt, collectively augmented the intellectual space available to Indian IR scholars for publishing their work, it is important to recognise at the same time that the disciplinary debates in IR in post-colonial India have flourished in other critical sites as well. The most important ones among these include the *Economic and Political Weekly* since 1949,[6] and *Alternatives* since 1975. In striking contrast to *International Studies*, which was dominated by area studies, such debates thrived in *Alternatives* (see Figure 2),[7] and significantly, the sheer diversity and complexity of issues and perspectives published in this journal defied the standard disciplinary categories of analysis such as international law, international economy, international security, peace and conflict studies and so on, which were usually deployed in mainstream IR.

---

[5]   Ibidem, p. 137.
[6]   In 1949, it was published as *Economic Weekly* and since 1966, its been published as *Economic and Political Weekly*.
[7]   Behera, 'IR in South Asia', op.cit., p. 139.

Among the total articles published in *Alternatives* from 1980 to 2004, for instance, many scholars wrote about North–South issues (9%), nationalism and conflicts (11%), social movements and grass roots activism (4%), global cultures (6%) and world order (7%), global governance, democratisation, ecology and development related issues (9%), modern science and theology, race and culture in IR, Indian history, philosophy, literature and culture and so on. As regards issues such as military and strategic affairs that accounted for 9 per cent of its contributions during this period, the perspective was very different as they struggled with issues of armament, disarmament and militarism.

Figure 2.

Alternatives		
Year of Publication	**Area Studies**	**Disciplinary IR**
1974–1978		52
1979–1983	1	79
1984–1988	5	90
1989–1993	4[8]	109
1994–1998	1	95
1999–2003	6	35

The post-1990s IR literature published in books and monographs has also injected a significant corrective to the erstwhile area-studies related work, which offered historical, chronological narratives of India's foreign relations with other countries, regions and international regimes or institutions. Though this phenomenon persists because it's structural in nature, the body of knowledge generated during this period also shows a deepening engagement with the disciplinary problematics of IR. The terms, parameters and scope of such debates vary a great deal, but a brief discussion on some important genres of IR literature in India may suffice to illustrate this point. For analytical purposes, these may be broadly classified into four categories though it is important to understand that these are, at best, illustrative and *not* 'all-inclusive' categories and, their in-between dividing lines are somewhat thin and permeable.[8]

Indo-centric research

Traditionally, research agendas of Indian IR revolved around India's conception of 'self' and how it interacted with the world. In the early decades after independence, such research was mostly carried out in an area-studies format and shared the following common features: these were state-centric; sought to view India as a 'unitary' actor; and put a premium on its overarching and ubiquitous 'national interests', hence the

---

8   Ibidem.

plethora of writings on *India's* foreign policy, *India's* nuclear policy, *India's* strategic or security policy, *India's* economic policy and so on. Since then, Indian IR has continued to produce a significant body of literature on India's bilateral relations with several countries especially the United States, China, Pakistan and, to a lesser extent, its smaller neighbours as well as India's engagements and equations with different regions, particularly with South Asia.[9]

In the post-1990s period, however, the new discourse of India's rise to power was at the centre-stage. This body of scholarly literature presents a varied and nuanced picture. While many scholars still employ 'geo-strategic', 'geo-political' and 'geo-economic' understandings of power, analyzing power as a 'material' phenomenon, some view power as a 'normative value' while a few study the 'discursive' notion of power. The first set of writings share the realist belief that 'the success and failure of a nation's foreign policy is largely a function of its power and the manner in which that power is wielded'.[10] Discussing India's tryst with power, Raja Mohan, thus, describes India having 'transformed itself from a porcupine into a tiger' and if the former's 'famous defensiveness' was the earlier 'hallmark of India's approach to the world,' the post-1990s period posited 'a fundamental change of course and a reconstitution of its core premises'.[11] He explains 'whether it was the de-emphasis of non-alignment or the new embrace of the US, or the attempts to rethink regionalism in the subcontinent and its environs, a radically different foreign policy orientation emerged by the turn of the millennium'.[12] Some scholars have identified India's growing economic clout to be the key driving force in re-shaping its foreign policy choices.[13]

Narlikar highlights ways in which India has acquired the status of a 'de facto "veto-player" in international relations' and yet points to 'significant hurdles' – mainly domestic – that must be overcome if 'it is to fully realise its potential and acquire the status of a great power'.[14] Kiesow and Norling along with Kamdar also reflect on the problems faced in India's rise to power.[15] In fact, many scholars have expressed scepticism about India's power status partly because of a certain perceived lack of

---

[9] For a detailed, state of the art analysis of this genre of literature, see: Navnita Chadha Behera (ed.), *India Engages the World*, New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2013, pp. 18–21.

[10] Harsh V. Pant (ed.), *Indian Foreign Policy in a Unipolar World*, New Delhi: Routledge, 2009, p. 97.

[11] C. Raja Mohan, *Crossing the Rubicon: The Shaping of India's New Foreign Policy*, New Delhi: Viking Books, 2003, pp. 260–263.

[12] Ibidem.

[13] N. Kumar, *India's Global Powerhouses: How They Are Taking on the World*, Cambridge: Harvard Business School Press, 2009; T. Poddar and E. Yi, 'India's Rising Growth Potential', in *BRICS and Beyond* (Goldman Sachs Global Economics Paper, No. 152), Washington: Goldman Sachs, 2007; N. Rajadhyaksha, *The Rise of India: Its Transformation from Poverty to Prosperity*, New Delhi: Wiley India, 2006.

[14] Amrita Narlikar, 'All that Glitters is not Gold: India's Rise to Power', *Third World Quarterly*, 2007, Vol. 28, No. 5, p. 983.

[15] I. Kiesow and N. Norling, 'The Rise of India: Problems and Opportunities', *Silk Road Papers*, Uppsala: Central Asia-Caucasus Institute & Silk Road Studies Program, January 2007 pp. 1–137; Mira Kamdar, *Planet India: The Turbulent Rise of the World's Largest Democracy*, London: Simon and Schuster Ltd, 2007; and, Mira, 'India: Richer, Poorer, Hotter, Armed', *World Policy Journal*, 2008, Vol. 25, No. 3, pp. 95–107.

clarity on the part of India's policy makers about its implications in terms of whether it has the political will to use it, how to do so and to what ends and partly on account of hurdles that are envisaged in India's domestic sphere for realising its power potential. While acknowledging India's desire to seek greater global influence and indeed it's rising capabilities, Pant, for instance, argues that 'all this is happening in something of an intellectual vacuum'.[16] Sunil Khilnani, on the other hand, calls it India's lack of 'an instinct for power'.[17] Mehta argues in a similar vein that while 'India has always had a strong sense of its own exceptionalism, the underlying leitmotif of Indian foreign policy is *cautious prudence*' and that it might 'serve it better than the recklessness that comes with illusions of power.'[18]

Vanaik is one of the few scholars who have sought to understand the sociology of power. Much as 'the US hegemonic enterprise,' he argues, 'is based not just on its economic, military and political-diplomatic strength but on its cultural capacity to persuade the elites of other countries (including India) of its world view, its values and belief systems,' it's important to understand the 'sociology of Indian intelligentsia' and the Indian elite and middle classes, which have come to 'accept culturally, intellectually, emotionally and morally the particular "vision" and "leadership" of the US in its project of global transformation'.[19] I have also argued elsewhere the need to engage with fundamental questions about politics of knowledge, which had sharply impaired the ability of the Indian scholars and practitioners to comprehend the complex dynamics of the west's knowledge-power structures – a direct consequence of which has been the lack of recognition for India's own political philosopher, Kautilya as the 'father of realpolitik.'[20]

Doing disciplinary IR: the 'traditional way'

This genre of scholarly writings have engaged with the disciplinary problematics albeit within the frameworks set by mainstream (read Western) IR.[21] Scholarly attempts seeking to apply the given theoretical frameworks 'creatively' in their specific local contexts are also, some argue qualify as an exercise in IR theorising. Arjun Appadurai refers to this process as 'vernacularisation,' by which dominant modes of cultural

---

[16]   Pant, op.cit., p. 94.

[17]   Sunil Khilnani, 'India on a Bridging Power' in Sunil Khilnani et al, *India on a New Global Leader*, The Foreign Policy Centre London, 2006, p. 3.

[18]   Pratap Bhanu Mehta, 'Still Under Nehru's Shadow? The Absence of Foreign Policy Frameworks in India', *India Review*, 2009, Vol. 8, No. 3, p. 210.

[19]   Achin Vanaik, 'National Interest: A Flawed Notion; India Foreign Policy since 1991', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 2006, Vol. 46, No. 13, pp. 5048–5049.

[20]   Navnita Chadha Behera, 'Re-imagining IR in India', *International Relations of the Asia-Pacific*, 2007, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 364.

[21]   Admittedly, the term 'Western IR' is problematic for its essentialist overtones. As used in this paper, it mainly points to the shared epistemological foundations of IR rooted in the Anglo-American traditions – the birth place of IR – in a historical sense.

production are re-inscribed in peripheral contexts where they acquire a new meaning.[22] In so doing, it is argued, new knowledge enriches and at times qualitatively transforms the specificities of local ground realities and value-systems. Indian scholars in IR have produced a lot of such work which Acharya and Buzan define as 'exceptionalist' or 'subsystemic' theorising.[23]

The debate on nuclearisation and international politics is a case in point. While there is a plethora of literature on the logic and consequences of nuclearisation of South Asia and India's approach towards the global non-proliferation regime, the driving spirit to study fundamental issues such as nuclear stability, which has far-reaching ramifications for India's national and regional security, doesn't appear to be a home-grown pheno-menon. Rajagopalan argues that 'indeed, much of the subcontinental debate about nuclear stability has followed initiatives by US and European think-tanks'.[24] Barring a few exceptions, the deterrence theory frameworks have also largely been borrowed from those originally developed in the cold war context.[25] The Indian development thinking and praxis is another domain, where the Indian academic and policy literature has 'closely dovetailed the changing global paradigm of development'.[26] While this puts Indian scholarly analysis on the same footing as the global academia but staying within the parameters of such received frames has also proved to be problematic especially when these are simply applied to Indian situations rather than learning from its ground realities that may well provide avenues for questioning and altering such theoretical frameworks, as was indeed attempted much earlier by the subaltern critiques of econometric development models in the 1970s and 1980s. In the contemporary context too, there are a few contra-trends which may be noted. For instance, while the global discourse shared the neo-liberal developmental consensus in favour of lifting of all capital controls, the Indian state continued 'practicing a policy of limited decontrol only – termed as "neo-Keynesism" move – which served it well during the 2008 financial crisis'.[27] Second, while 'the global developmental discourse was unabashedly recommending utilising of market and civil society as mechanisms of developmental implementation', the Indian development policy has consistently relied upon the 'politically constituted local governance structures as anchors of its development policy'.[28]

---

[22] Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalisation*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996, pp. 110–112.

[23] Amitav Acharya and Barry Buzan (eds), *Non-Western International Relations Theory: Perspectives on and Beyond Asia*, London: Routledge, 2010.

[24] Rajesh Rajagopalan, 'Nuclear Weapons, Indian Strategy and International Politics', in Navnita Chadha Behera (ed.), *India Engages the World*, op.cit., p. 310.

[25] E. Sridharan, 'International Relations Theory and the India–Pakistan Conflict', *India Review*, 2005, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 103–124.

[26] Amit Prakash, 'Indian Development Discourse in a Changing World', in Navnita Chadha Behera (ed.), *India Engages the World*, op.cit.

[27] Ibidem.

[28] Ibidem.

Overall, however, critics point to the limitations of these research writings as most such scholars do not independently decide what to ask and how to answer; the fundamental problems of IR and theoretical frameworks for analyzing them are already 'given' by Western theories. The task of local scholars is, therefore, mostly confined to collecting relevant empirical data in their respective domestic contexts and, if need be, modifying the parameters of their inquiry.

Critical interrogations in the Indian IR

The expanse and outreach of this genre of work may be analyzed from two different standpoints. The first one pertains to those writings that castigated the tenets of positivism and stepping beyond the confines of the realist paradigm, explored alternative theoretical perspectives, tools, concepts and methods. Significantly, according to the TRIP survey in India, 50% of respondents acknowledged that their work draws on both rationalist approaches and alternatives approaches that do not assume the rationality of actors, while another 14% categorically stated that their work does not assume the rationality of actors. Only 15% stated that they deploy a rational choice framework, while another 21% said their work is broadly rationalist, often referred to as 'soft rational choice,' and it relies on a general assumption of utility-maximising actors. Characterising their work in epistemological terms, 44% said it was 'positivist,' and 36% said 'post-positivist,' while 20% said it was 'non-positivist.'

On a qualitative plane, this is evident from the much wider array of theoretical approaches and methodologies such as postcolonialism, development theory, critical theory and neo-Marxism among others that have been used by the Indian IR scholars, most of which are broadly positioned in the post-positivist domain of IR.

With regard to feminist scholarship, though engendering the discipline is likely to be a slow and long-drawn out process,[29] they have substantively questioned the state-centric conception of security that makes security effectively synonymous with 'citizenship', which they argue is historically and conceptually not a gender-neutral phenomenon.[30]Unlike neo-realists focusing on threats from 'outside' the state boundaries, feminists have highlighted the structural violence of ethnic, religion, class and gender hierarchies within nations[31] and the gendered nature of nationalism and state.[32] Rajagopalan and Faizal examined the dilemmas and insecurities of women and suggest-

---

29 Navnita Chadha Behera, 'The Long Road Ahead: Engendering Conflict Analysis in South Asia', *Indian Journal of Gender Studies*, 2004, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 95–103.

30 Ritu Menon, **'**Cartographies of Nations and Identities: A Post-Partition Predicament', *Interventions: The International Journal of Postcolonial Studies*, March 1999, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 157–166; Maitrayee Mukhopadhyay, *Gender, Justice, Citizenship and Development*, New Delhi: Zubaan, 2007.

31 Patricia Jeffery and Amrita Basu (eds), *Resisting the Sacred and the Secular: Women's Activism and Political Religion in South Asia*, New Delhi: Kali for Women, 1999.

32 Kamla Bhasin and Ritu Menon, *Borders and Boundaries: Women in India's Partition*, Piscataway, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1998.

ed a feminist vision of security in South Asia.[33] Banerjee's work has shown the multiplicity of women's roles in peace politics while tracing generic links between the transformative feminist politics and gendered binary of war and peace.[34] Feminist research on global governance has exposed its 'gendered system of rules and regulatory norms and mechanisms'.[35] Vandana Shiva, an eco-feminist, has produced a corpus of work that unravels the links between issues like genetic food engineering, cultural theft, and natural resource privatisation with the rising tide of fundamentalism, violence against women, and planetary death.[36]

Scholarly writings based on postcolonial and neo-Marxist thought are rather few in Indian IR. These include Abraham's research on the making of an Indian atomic bomb that is viewed to be part of the 'project of Indian modernity'.[37] Appadurai's work on globalisation[38] along with Bhabha highlights the hybrid 'in-betweenness' that characterises the post-colonial subject 'allowing for the emergence and negotiation of marginal, subaltern, minority subjectivities'.[39] Ramakrishnan draws upon Edward Said's work on postcolonial theory to understand non-Western perceptions of IR,[40] while Krishnan reflects upon the cartographic anxieties of the post-colonial nations in South Asia.[41] Harshe's work on imperialism seeks to move beyond the conventional parameters of capitalism and probes various related concepts including colonialism, neo-colonialism, proto second-tier imperialism, hegemony (in a Gramscian sense), and social imperialism in order to assess their theoretical and empirical validity in the contemporary context of the Third World. In addressing the issue of globalisation

---

[33] Farah Faizal and Swarna Rajagopalan (eds), *Women, Security, South Asia: A Clearing in the Thicke*, New Delhi: Sage Publication, 2005.

[34] Paula Banerjee (ed.), *South Asian Peace Studies: Women in Peace Politics*, New Delhi: Sage Publications, 2008.

[35] Shirin M. Rai and Georgina Waylen (eds), *Feminist Perspective on Global Governance*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008; Avtar Brah, 'Global Mobilities, Local Predicaments: Globalisation and the Critical Imagination', *Feminist Review*, 2002, no. 70, pp. 30–45; Mrinalini Sinha, 'Mapping the Imperial Social Formation: A Modest Proposal for Feminist History', *Signs*, Summer 2000, Vol. 25, No. 4, pp. 1077–1082; Nivedita Menon, 'Refusing Globalisation and the Authentic Nation: Feminist Politics in Current Conjuncture', *Economic and Political Weekly*, January 3–9 2004, Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 100–104.

[36] Mies Maria and Vandana Shiva, *Ecofeminism*, London: Zed Books, 1993; Vandana Shiva, *Earth Democracy; Justice, Sustainability, and Peace*, South End Press, 2005; Vandana Shiva, *Earth Democracy: Justice, Sustainability and Peace,* London: Zed Books, 2006; Vandana Shiva, *Democratising Biology: Reinventing Biology from a Feminist, Ecological and Third World Perspective*, Paradigm Publishers, 2007; Vandana Shiva, *Staying Alive*, South End Press, 2010.

[37] Itty Abraham, *The Making of the Indian Atomic Bomb: Science, Secrecy and the Post-Colonial State*, New Delhi: Orient Longman, 1999.

[38] Appadurai, op.cit.

[39] Homi Bhaba, *The Location of Culture*, London: Routledge, 1994, p. 25.

[40] A.K. Ramakrishnan, 'The Gaze of Orientalism: Reflections on Linking Postcolonialism and International Relations', in Kanti Bajpai and Siddharth Mallavarapu (eds), *International Relations in India: Bringing Theory Back Home*, New Delhi: Orient Longman, 2005.

[41] Sankaran Krishna, *Postcolonial Insecurities: India, Sri Lanka and the Question of Nationhood*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1999.

with its imperialist overtones Chatterjee rejects the claim that free market globalisation creates free societies and democratisation in line with the liberal doctrine and thus marks the end of imperial practice of the previous centuries.[42] Patnaik too avers that the current phase of capitalism is marked by the rise to dominance of financial or rentier interests, and the fluidity of finance across national boundaries has the effect of 'undermining the "control area" of nation-states and making all agendas of state intervention for improving the living conditions of the people appear vacuous.'[43] Underlining the importance of historicising the modern state from a neo-Marxist perspective, Vanaik has argued that realism/neo-realism 'illegitimately transhistoricises the particular' because a successful transhistorical abstraction of the international will not abstract the political from the specific social orders in which they are embedded and presenting one such choice (the modern capitalist form of the 'political' state) as the transhistorical phenomenon is flawed and misleading.[44]

This brings us to address the second vantage point that offers insights into how the critical traditions of thought have influenced the disciplinary research agendas of Indian IR. A fundamental problem with the realist paradigm in the Indian context has been its 'uncritical acceptance of the state being a "benevolent protector" rather than an "oppressor" in the domestic/international domain', thereby precluding any critical interrogation of 'the character and "efficacy" of the Indian state'.[45] This is, however, changing and the earlier view of the state as a 'national-territorial totality' and its state-centric ontology is making way to a growing recognition of its politico-sociological character.[46] This is unfolding in three distinct ways. First, there is growing recognition of the importance and impact of various non-state actors transforming the ways in which India interacts with the world. This includes a wide-ranging set of players from the corporate sector, the media, civil society organisations and social movements to the Indian diasporas.[47] Second, the long held 'inside-outside' binaries that led IR scholars to almost exclusively focus on the external domain of India's foreign policy

---

[42] Partha Chatterjee, 'Empire after Globalisation', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 11–17 September 2004, Vol. 39, No. 37, pp. 4155–4164.

[43] Prabhat Patnaik, 'Nation-State in the Era of Globalisation', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 19 August 1995, Vol. 30, No. 33, p. 2052.

[44] Vanaik, op.cit., p. 5045.

[45] Behera, 'Re-imagining IR', op.cit.

[46] Vanaik, op.cit.

[47] I. Nabi and A. Nasim, 'Trading with the Enemy', in Sajal Lahiri (ed.), *Regionalism and Globalisation: Theory and Practice*, New York: Routledge, 2001; Sanjaya Baru, 'The Influence of Business and Media on Indian Foreign Policy', *India Review*, July-September 2009, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 266–285; Navnita Chadha Behera, Paul M. Evans, and Gower Rizvi, *Beyond Boundaries: A Report on the State of Non-Official Dialogues on Peace, Security and Cooperation in South Asia*, University of Toronto-York University Joint Centre for Asia Pacific Studies, 1997; Navnita Chadha Behera, SAARC & Beyond Civil Society and Regional Integration in South Asia, *SACEPS Paper No. 19*, Nepal: South Asia Centre for Policy Studies (SACEPS); Navtej Sarna, 'Media and Diplomacy', in Atish Sinha and Madhup Mohan (eds), *Indian Foreign Policy: Challenges and Opportunities*, New Delhi: Manohar Books, p. 200.

vis-à-vis other states, regions, regimes and international institutions has been marked by a significant course-correction. There is a growing recognition that foreign policy making is a deeply political affair and without understanding the political character of the state, inner dynamics of its polity and political forces, it's difficult to understand its engagements in the global arena.[48] Such inside-outside binaries have also come under attack from those studying the phenomenon of globalisation, which has sought to undermine the state-centric ontology. Srivastava notes, 'the global governance paradigm acknowledges multiple actors and overlapping levels or spheres of authority – a trend that is seen at the heart of the transformation of the Westphalian state system and world order'.[49] The third shift pertains to problematising and historicising the basic and fundamental propositions of the idea of the nation-state. It has been argued that state formation processes in a Third World state like India have been radically different not only because of the limited time frame in which the latter has to complete the process as Ayoob argued but also because of its intrinsically different historical experiences of colonial rule; traditional social and political formations and a qualitatively different nature of political authority in the pre-colonial period.[50] As a result, the political character of the nation-state in this part of the world is qualitatively different from that of European nation-states because the former is 'not necessarily the provider of security to all its citizens, rather the state itself is the site of conflict between different nation-building enterprises and power struggles between contending social groups and elites'.[51] Nandy's philosophical plea for 'scepticism to be directed at the modern nation-state' while stressing the need to take stock of the costs of the nation-state system and the nationalism that sustains it calls for retrieving such thinking by Gandhi and Tagore as well as revisiting the image of the state as an 'oppressor' that was eclipsed in the neo-realist literature of the Indian IR, partly because it had shut its doors to insight from other social sciences – a trend that is slowly albeit strongly undergoing a change in the past two decades.

The Indian 'contributions' to the IR discipline

This strand of scholarly research traverses a terrain where Indian IR scholars have sought to contribute new ideas, concepts and perspectives to the mainstream discipline of IR. There are two schools of thought. The first one argues in favour of evolving an Indian School of IR, much like the Chinese school or the Kyoto school of IR, its rationale being that there is a growing demand in the global IR community to know

---

[48] Behera, *India Engages the World*, op.cit.

[49] Jayati Shrivastva, 'Global Governance Meets Globalisation: Mapping the Trajectory of a Contested Paradigm', in Behera, *India Engages the World*, op.cit.

[50] Navnita Chadha Behera, *State, People and Security: The South Asian Context*, Har-Anand Publications, 2002.

[51] Ibidem.

more about the 'India story', and hence the idea is to create a niche for Indian IR in the core IR discipline. The second school of thought is that Indian IR scholars need to engage with the core discipline of IR and take part in a collective endeavour for transforming its foundational bases and boundaries, in order to fashion a post-Western IR. So, the idea is to rise above the disciplinary practices of IR that view Western and all other variants of non-Western IR in a 'self-other' binary mode. This is certainly the most ambitious future trajectory for Indian IR, and it is too early to say whether its scholarly community will be able to muster new resources, coalesce and mobilise its intellectual wo/manpower and have the vision to take up this challenge, though this author has consistently argued in favour of pursuing this trajectory. What follows is a brief overview of certain intellectual resources that may be mobilised to help it move in this direction.

Academic writings on international law have not only criticised its Eurocentrism but also created grounds for recognising and understanding the diversity of international law in a civilisational context.[52] Baxi, for instance, seeks to outline some of the new approaches for analyzing the history of international law,[53] while Chimni's works on alternative visions of a just world order are based on Indian tales.[54] He along with Sornarajah have also sought to outline the Asian perspectives and civilisational aspects of international law.[55] Hegde points to the corpus of research work done on the Third World Approach to International Law (TWAIL), which seeks to draw upon the law-making experiences and knowledge practices from around the world, especially Asia, in order to pluralise the foundational bases of international law making.[56] The legal framework that shaped the agreements relating to the World Trade Organization (WTO), for example, evolved in a way that largely bypassed developing countries, benefitting in the process only few of the developed countries and the emerging developing countries.[57] The failure of existing intellectual property rights legislations

---

[52] V. G. Hegde, 'Contemporary Indian Perspectives on International Law', in Behera, *India Engages the World*, op.cit., p. 427.

[53] Upendra Baxi, 'New Approaches to the History of International Law', *Leiden Journal of International Law*, June 2006, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 555–566.

[54] B. S. Chimni, 'The Past, Present and Future of International Law: A Critical Third World Approach', *Melbourne Journal of International Law,* 2007, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp. 499–515.

[55] M. Sornarajah, 'The Asian Perspectives to International Law in the Age of Globalisation', *Singapore Journal of International and Comparative Law*, 2001, Vol. 5; B. S. Chimni, 'Asian Civilisations and International Law: Some Reflections', *Asian Journal of International Law*, January 2011, Vol.1, No.1, pp. 19–42.

[56] Upendra Baxi, 'Operation Enduring Freedom: Towards a New International Law and Order?' in Anthony Anghie et al. (eds), *The Third World and International Order: Law, Politics, and Globalisation*, Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff, 2003; Balakrishnan Rajagopal, *International Law From Below: Development, Social Movements and Third World Resistance*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003; B. S. Chimni, 'Third World Approaches to International Law: A Manifesto', *International Community Law Review*, 2006, Vol. 8, No. 1, pp. 3–27.

[57] Detlev Vagts, 'Hegemonic International Law', *American Journal of International Law*, 2001, Vol. 95, October, pp. 843–848; Jose Alavarez, 'Hegemonic International Law Revisited', *American Journal*

to effectively protect traditional knowledge and folklore is another important area of research in Indian IR literature.[58] The principle of 'common but differentiated responsibility' with regard to the climate change negotiations has been an important issue of debate among the scholars writing on international and Indian environmental laws. Rajamani and Dubash's work primarily deals with concerns and arguments of developing countries in the context of general environmental law and also within the framework of climate change negotiations.[59] Such discourses debating the effect of history and civilisation on international norm creation provide a promising vantage point for making a contribution towards the creation of post-Western IR.

> Another such resource pertains to the ideas and propositions that are born in India but have offered alternate ways to understand or resolve the problematics of mainstream IR. Concepts of non-alignment and Panchsheela are some of the earliest contributions offered by Indian IR. Although non-alignment did not get its due recognition as a 'systemic theoretical formulation' in core IR literature mainly due to its 'disciplinary gate-keeping practices', this should not detract from the fact that it offered an alternative world-view of how the global state system should function. The first decade of the new millennium has seen a renewed interest in discussing the future of non-alignment as an instrument of international diplomacy and as a principle of India's foreign policy. The scholarly opinion, however, remains sharply divided between those who insist on its irrelevance in the contemporary context and those who defend it and argue in favour of rejuvenating it.[60] Strongly defending it, Abraham argues that 'colonial ways of thinking and post-

---

of International Law, 2003, Vol. 97, October, pp. 873–888; B. S. Chimni, 'International Institutions Today: An Imperial Global State in the Making', *European Journal of International Law*, February 2004, Vol. 15, No.1, pp.1–37; Balakrishnan Rajagopal, 'Counter-hegemonic International Law: Rethinking Human Rights and Development as a Third World Strategy', *Third World Quarterly*, 2006, Vol. 27, No. 5, pp. 767–783.

58   N. S. Gopalakrishnan, 'Protection of Traditional Knowledge: The Need for a Sui Generis Law in India', *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, September 2002, Vol. 5, No. 5, pp. 725–742; Padmashree Gehl Sampath, 'Intellectual Property Rights on Traditional Medicinal Knowledge: A Process Oriented Perspective', *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, September 2004, Vol. 7, No. 5, pp. 711–737; Surinder Kaur Verma, 'Protecting Traditional Knowledge: Is a Sui Generis System an Answer?', *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, November 2004, Vol. 7, No. 6, pp. 765–805; Rajesh Sagar, 'Intellectual Property, Benefit-Sharing and Traditional Knowledge: How Effective is the Indian Biological Diversity Act', *Journal of World Intellectual Property*, May 2005, Vol. 8, No. 3, pp. 383–400.

59   Lavanya Rajamani, *Differential Treatment in International Environmental Law,* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006; Lavanya Rajamani, 'From Berlin to Bali and Beyond: Killing Kyoto Softly?', *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, October 2008, Vol. 57, No. 4, pp. 909–939; Lavanya Rajamani, 'Addressing the "Post-Kyoto" Stress Disorder: Reflections on the Emerging Legal Architecture of the Climate Regime', *International and Comparative Law Quarterly,* October 2009, Vol. 58, No. 4, pp. 803–834; Navroz K Dubash, 'Copenhagen: Climate of Mis-trust', *Economic and Political Weekly*, 26 December 2009, Vol. XIV, No. 52, pp. 55–58.

60   Those who are sceptical of its relevance include Ramesh Babu, 'The Nehruvian Legacy: The Eternal and the Ephemeral in Foreign Policy', *Journal of Polity and Society*, 2008, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp. 17–28; Harsh V. Pant (ed.), *Indian Foreign Policy in a Unipolar World*, New Delhi: Routledge, 2009; Subrata K. Mitra, 'Nuclear, Engaged, and Non-Aligned: Contradiction and Coherence in India's Foreign Policy', *India Quarterly*, 2009, Vol. 65, No. 1, pp. 15–35. And those arguing in favour of its continuing relevance include M. S. Rajan, 'India's Foreign Policy: The Continuing Relevance of Nonalignment', *International Studies*,

colonial reactions to them are still very much a part of the international system. What non-alignment uniquely brought with it was a worldview that broke decisively with this co-production of colonial and postcolonial modes of international relations: it offered a critique of prevailing modes of injustice while also articulating new universal norms for the formation of a global society. In that sense, the vision non-alignment offers remains all too relevant today, even if the force of the movement seems to have dissipated'.[61]

Likewise, the concept of Panchsheela has evoked fresh debates mainly in the context of the 'Bandung spirit'.[62] Narayanan described them as arising 'from the civilisational matrix of Asia' and as 'a new and creative contribution to the theory and practice of International Relations from the ancient continent of Asia'.[63] He notes that a major international concern today is that of 'defending the pluralistic world order where nations can evolve, grow and prosper according to their own genius'. For this, a new approach is needed, and he believes that the *Panchasheela* offers that approach. At a time when the rules of international relations on a range of issues are being reformulated, it is argued, India requires ideological and intellectual resources to reach out. It's interesting to note though that Narayanan's research paper on the 50th Anniversary of Panchsheel was published in the *Chinese Journal of International Law* in 2004.[64] To Mitra, 'in its second coming, *Panchasheela* as a *doctrine* should be able to build to heuristically on the innate, universal desire for peace, understanding of difference and respect for the dignity for man'.[65] Mitra sees this as a trump card which can be used by Indian diplomacy in the new context. Rajagopalan and Sahni argue that India as an emerging power has to address the normative question of offering an attractive vision at the global level in order for it to assume some form of leadership.[66] They propose the revisiting of the idea of trusteeship in such a way as to guide states to act as trustees of global commons.

1993, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 141–150; Muchkund Dubey, 'India's Foreign Policy in the Evolving Global Order', *International Studies*, 1993, Vol. 30, No. 2, pp. 117–129; Jayantanuja Bandyopadhyaya, 'From Nonalignment to Pro-imperialism: Class and Foreign Policy in India', *The Marxist,* 2003, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 16–41; A.K. Damodaran, 'Non-aligned Movement and its Future', in Atish Sinha & Madhup Mohta (eds), *Indian Foreign Policy: Challenges and Opportunities*, New Delhi: Academic Foundation, in association with Foreign Service Institute, 2007, pp. 125–138.

[61] Itty Abraham, 'From Bandung to NAM: Non-Alignment and Indian Foreign Policy', *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, April 2008, Vol. 46, No. 2, p. 216.

[62] Amitav Acharya and See Seng Tan (eds), *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1956 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, Singapore: National University of Singapore Press, 2008.

[63] K. R. Narayanan, 'The Five Principles of Peaceful Co-Existence: The Appropriate Code for a Globalised World', in C. V. Ranganathan (ed.), *Panchasheel and the Future: Perspectives on India-China Relations*, New Delhi: Samskriti, 2005, p. xxii.

[64] K. R. Narayanan, 'The 50th Anniversary of Panchsheel', *Chinese Journal of International Law*, 2004, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 369–372.

[65] Mitra, op.cit., p. 34.

[66] Rajesh Rajagopalan and Varun Sahni, 'India and Great Powers: Strategic Imperatives, Normative Necessities', *South Asian Survey*, 2008, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 5–32.

The Gandhian thought constitutes another such example as Gandhi's views on non-violence have provided a forum for systemic knowledge creation in IR. Upadhayaya explains how Gandhian writings may be used for understanding not only Indian problems and issues but also those in other parts of the world as well. Indeed, both Indian and foreign scholars have discussed Gandhian insights and highlighted the cross-cultural sway of Gandhi's non-violent activism in the contemporary context.[67] Others have drawn upon Gandhi and Tagore's work to re-examine the civilisational way of organising political life in a distinct move away from the 'nation-state-centric' mode of analyses. Unlike Huntington's 'clash of civilisations thesis' and in direct opposition to the 'aggressiveness of the Western civilisation, which tried to forcibly homogenise different cultures', Tagore's view was that right from the Vedic period, the pantheons of the Hindu civilisation were those heroes/kings who were worshipped as an Avatar for striving to bring about the reconciliation between Aryans and non-Aryans in contrast to those who sought to acquire dominance over others through physical prowess and military skill and were long forgotten.[68] And that is precisely why the essence of Hinduism lies in its attempting 'the reconciliation of the opposites', which is what 'India has to offer to the world'.[69]

Behera's work sought to look into India's historical pasts and draw insights from its deeply plural ways of knowing to explore if and how these may help in understanding the problematics of modern IR. And this, it's argued, may be accomplished by 'cultivating a political imagination that recognises, understands and nurtures differences and creates alternative ontological possibilities of social and political spaces for differently conceiving communities as well as their interactions that criss-cross the spatial (territorial) boundaries of nation-states.' Hindu cultural traditions provide a rich resource for thinking through such formulations and concepts. Contrary to the Western model of universality, which is premised upon a self-other binary in which the other's agency and identity must necessarily be negated, Hindu culture's universality does not require the suppression of difference, given that each of the particularistic identities that comprise it are viewed as legitimate and equal parts of a unified whole.[70] Such a non-dualistic

---

[67]   Indian scholars include R. P. Misra, 'Rediscovering Gandhi' in *Hind Swaraj: Gandhi's Challenge to Modern Civilisation*, Vol. 1, Concept Publications: Gandhian Studies and Peace Research Series, 2007; Priyankar Upadhyaya, 'Gandhi Visions on Structural Violence', *Journal of Conflict Management and Development*, 2010, Vol. 3, No. 3, pp. 74–88; Siby K. Joseph (ed.), *Explorations in Culture of Peace*, Wardha: Institute of Gandhian Studies, 2006; Siby K. Joseph, John Moolakkattu and Bharat Mahodaya, *Non-violent Struggles of the Twentieth Century: Retrospect and Prospect*, Wardha: Institute of Gandhian Studies, 2009. And, foreign scholars are Catherine Ingram, *In the Footsteps of Gandhi: Conversations with Spiritual Social Activists*, CA: Parallax Press, 2003; Mark Juergensmeyer, *Gandhi's Way: A Handbook of Conflict Resolution*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002; Dennis Dalton, *Mahatma Gandhi: Nonviolent Power in Action*, New York: Columbia University Press, 2003; Anne Sibley O'Brien, and Perry Edmond O'Brien, *After Gandhi: One Hundred Years of Nonviolent Resistant*, MA: Charlesbridge Press, 2009.

[68]   Dipesh Chakravarty cited in Behera, 'Re-Imagining IR', op.cit.

[69]   Cited in Ashis Nandy, *The Illegitimacy of Nationalism: Rabindranath Tagore and the Politics of Self*, New Delhi: Oxford University of Press, 1994, p. 6.

[70]   Arlene B. Tickner, Seeing IR Differently: Notes from the Third World', *Millennium*, 2003, Vol. 32, No. 2, p. 304.

schema is also reflected traditionally in the way questions of war and peace have been articulated in the Vedic philosophy of *Kshma* (forbearance), the tenet of *Sarva Dharma Sambhava* (impulse of peaceful coexistence) or the concept of *Vasudhaiv Kutumbakam* (the world is but one family). Recovering and exploring the dynamics of such a *non-dualistic mode of thinking* may have significant ramifications for maintaining political order in domestic and international domains in the contemporary world. Shahi and Ascione's work explores the adavita monism as an alternative epistemological resource for theorising in IR. 'Global connectedness', which Advaitic monism makes foreseeable, they argue, 'discloses a new creative space in the social sciences, wherein new relations can be constructed as analytical spaces of enquiry, since every possible choice is grounded ontologically on the assumption that there exist no relations that are more real than others, *a priori*.'[71]

Finally, although it is not clear which trajectory is likely to be pursued by the Indian IR in the foreseeable future, it is important to note that they share an overwhelming consensus about the IR discipline being 'American-dominated' (68%) and/or Western-dominated (85%), which is only matched by them underlining the need to counter the same by 83% and 86% of respondents respectively.

Pedagogical practices

Unlike the global practices, IR as a discipline is first introduced to many Indian students only at the postgraduate level. The TRIP survey shows that to be the case for the existing faculty members and researchers, only 50% of whom were first introduced to the IR discipline at the undergraduate level, while 44.5% had their first encounter with the discipline at the Masters level, with another 4% at the M.Phil. and Ph.D. levels. In the current scenario, 37% of students are being introduced to the course of IR and global politics at the Masters level, with another 37% at the M. Phil/Ph.D. level and, about the same, 38% are first taught IR at the undergraduate level. A greater source of concern is the content of such courses because the foundational years of a student's learning curve are devoted towards studying the parent discipline of Political Science, in which International Relations plays only a small role and that too mostly by way of studying diplomatic histories of the two World Wars, the Cold War, the United Nations and, at best, India's foreign policy. Pedagogy of IR in many parts of India still retains an area-studies focus. This holds true for some research programs like M.Phil. and Ph.D. as well. For instance, 34.51% of the faculty noted that their teaching materials organised for such courses focused on problem areas and another 15% on 'regions'. On the other hand, 30% focused on paradigms or schools of thought, while only 3%

---

[71]   Deepshika Shahi and Gennaro Ascione, *Rethinking the Absence of Post-Western IR Theory in India: 'Advaitic Monism' as an Alternative Epistemological Resource*, *European Journal of International Relations*, 2015, pp. 1–22.

used the anchor of rational and non-rational approaches and only 7% focused on questions or problems.

   A qualitative analysis of the curriculum and the syllabi of IR courses taught in universities across India reveals a different picture. For instance, 16 out of 20 universities offering a Masters programme in International Relations/Political Science teach a core or compulsory paper on theories of IR.[72] In most cases, however, these are still accompanied by at least one paper on contemporary international issues or India's foreign policy. The detailed components of their syllabi and the resources – mostly books – used for teaching these courses, on the other hand, show that a predominant part of their syllabi is devoted towards teaching the *positivist* theories in IR, with the realist tradition occupying a central position including a few old and rather dated components like behaviourism, system theories, decision-making and game theories. At the same time, the post-positivist school of theoretical perspectives does not find adequate attention; especially constructivism, post-colonialism, neo-Marxism and historical sociology rarely figure, while Feminism is often introduced as an 'issue' rather than as a theoretical approach. Viewed from a different vantage point, almost 90 per cent or more of the syllabi taught in almost all universities except JNU, DU and Sikkim University comprise theoretical tools as these have evolved in the Western academia. It is only in these three universities that non-Western writings on IR, including original Indian writings, are included. In terms of the elective papers too, most universities have struck a balance between area studies and disciplinary subject areas ranging from common choices including international law, international organisations, international security, diplomacy, peace and conflict studies, global economy, international terrorism, global environment and a few specialised courses including peace pedagogy and approaches (BHU), migration/refugees and displacement (Presidency University & Mumbai University), Gender and IR (DU), Critical Thought in Global South (JNU), maritime security (Goa University), Himalayan Civilisations and Sustainability (Sikkim University), Geopolitics (Punjab University), Third World (Jadavpur University) and political economy of energy policy (DDU).

   Interestingly, when the TRIP survey posed the curricula-related question in a normative manner, that is: 'regardless of what elective courses might be offered, which four courses *should be* offered in an undergraduate degree program', the choice of faculty respondents weighing in favour of disciplinary papers is quite clear. While 52% of respondents selected foreign policy and 26% comparative foreign policy along with 12% naming comparative history and 19% diplomatic history – all falling broadly under the rubric of area studies – those favouring a disciplinary or thematic focus were much

---

   [72]   These included Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU), Delhi University (DU), South Asian University, Jamia Millia Islamia University, Jadavpur University, Stella Morris College (Chennai), Deen Dayal Upadhyaya University (DDU) (Gandhinagar), Mahatama Gandhi University (Kottayam), University of Rajasthan, Pune University, Sikkim University, Ravenshaw University, Punjab University, North-eastern Hill University (NEHU), Goa University, Central Gujrat University & Benaras Hindu University (BHU).

more numerous. These identified courses on IR theory (71%), international/global political economy (34%), international/global economics (13%), international/global security (27%), international law (20%), international organisations (19%), ethics and IR (18%), international/global development (18%), international/global environmental politcs (11%), international/global sociology (5%) and 25% underlining the need for a course on research methods.

There is however, no data available to make any assessment of the critical pedagogic practices – to whatever extent these are used – at Indian universities, which raises an altogether different and important set of questions about 'how' these papers are taught by the IR faculty. Two sets of issues may be noted in this context. First, to what extent are the teachers able to use their classrooms as a site of knowledge creation in which their students are active participants. This is important because any knowledge transmitted to students is best imbibed when it helps them make sense of the world they live in. An essential problem commonly faced and yet rarely debated among IR teachers is that imparting theoretical knowledge coined by the Western academe is mostly ill-suited to help students understand their ground social realities. Critical pedagogy postulates that knowledge is not an authoritative body of information and frameworks to be delivered to students but emerges through acquisition or learning processes through which students come to see their world and their own life experiences. This calls for de-centring the all-encompassing Western frameworks of epistemological knowledge – a difficult proposition to achieve as a large proportion of the faculty at most Indian universities may not necessarily share this world-view nor are they trained to have the requisite pedagogical skills needed for this purpose. A second and related set of pedagogical practices pertain to developing and sharpening the students' critical thinking skills. However, the very basic structure and style in which most courses are devised and taught end up reproducing the existing hegemony of the Western academe. In almost all universities, as explained earlier, 90 per cent of the course and teaching time is devoted towards teaching the Western theories of IR, pushing the classroom discussions, if any, about alternative theories/concepts being offered by scholars of Global South to a peripheral position towards the end of the course.

To conclude, herein lies the key to the future. Whether Indian IR will remain on the periphery of the mainstream IR discipline, creates a niche for itself therein or is actively involved in forging post-Western IR will certainly depend on the IR faculty's practice of critical pedagogy for training the future generation of IR scholars in India. In the long run, any significant gaps as well as inter-connections between the trajectories of research and pedagogy will determine the future of IR in India.