

EU and the India in a globalized world

Padureanu, Mihaela-Adriana

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Padureanu, M.-A. (2011). EU and the India in a globalized world. *Eurotimes*, Supl. 3, 213-228. <https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-293722>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY Lizenz (Namensnennung) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY Licence (Attribution). For more information see:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

EU AND THE INDIA IN A GLOBALIZED WORLD

Mihaela-Adriana PĂDUREANU*

Abstract. *In this article I analyse the way in which European Union manages its relations with India using the neo-liberal institutionalism approach and I focus mainly on the economic cooperation as an instrument to improve and develop this link. In the first part I'll present the theory of reference and the concepts that I use and then the methodology and the arguments for this choice. I will use a case study: the relation between EU and India in order to see how this has developed and is related to the process of development. I'll present the history of this relation, stressing the way in which the cooperation has influenced the interests that those two entities have. In the last part I'll present the area in which the cooperation was more present and I'll explain why that happened. The article concludes that the main interests in these relations are related to the economic area.*

Keywords: *Anarchy, Authority, soft power, institutions, international organizations*

1. The theoretical approach: the neo-institutional liberalism

For this study I chose to use the neo-institutional liberalism theory to explain the way in which EU and India are developing their relation. First of all I would like to identify the level of analyze that I use in this article in order to clarity and stress the importance of this topic for my research. Using the level of analyze as a tool we gain clarity regarding the subject we study: what actors are important, what is their role in the decision-making process? The problem of level in International Relations was first mentioned in K. Waltz's *Man, the State and War* (Waltz, 2001: 11-15). K. Waltz uses the term image instead of level to

* PhD Candidate, National School of Political and Administrative Studies, Bucharest, Romania, clapadureanu@yahoo.com, beneficiary of the "Doctoral Scholarships for a Sustainable Society", project co-financed by the European Union through the European Social Fund, Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources and Development 2007-2013 and "Restructuring doctoral research in the fields of political sciences, public administration, sociology and communication", project co-funded by the European Union through the European Social Fund, Sectorial Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013.

identify the source through which we can explain the causes of war. The first image finds the causes of war in the human nature, that's why, in order to avoid the war, one must try to change the people's behavior – usually through institutions (Waltz, 2001: 47-48). The second image finds the causes of war in the internal structure of states. There are good states and bad states, and the bad ones are those that are willing to pursue a war. The main feature that allows us to recognize a state as good or bad is the form of government and the economic system that they have and the author concludes that if a state is a capitalist democracy, then it will be less prone to engage in war (Waltz, 2001: 126). The last image, the third one aims to explain the causes of war using the systemic level of analysis. According to this image the structure of the international system is the one which determines the state's behavior through its main feature, anarchy (Waltz, 2001: 164). The anarchical system makes the units and I mean by that the states, to act in a self-help manner. Another constituent element of the structure is the distribution of the capabilities. This distribution informs us about the power and the place that a state has in the international system. The structure's third attribute is identified as the states' functional similarity – all states share the same functions.

Using these images, and especially the third one, the structural realists try to explain the causes of war and, as Waltz puts it, to understand why a state reacts in a certain manner: "Force is a means of achieving the external ends of states because there exists no consistent, reliable process of reconciling the conflicts of interest that inevitably arise among similar units in a condition of anarchy" (Waltz, 2001: 242).

After K. Waltz there was another researcher who used the subject which studies the classification of causes in international relations. The level of analysis topic has been used under this label since 1961, when David J. Singer had published his article *The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations*. In his study, the main role of the level of analysis had been to help one describe the object that was studied (Singer, 1961: 78). The first level of analysis is the international system level, one which allows us to say more about the interaction between the units. The second level of analysis is the national state, the traditional one which lets us differentiate among the units (Singer, 1961: 82). I will use in this research the international system level of analysis as it appears in Singer's article.

Further on I will present the theoretical approach and the main concepts that I've chosen to use in this study. The theoretical framework is provided by the neo-liberalism, more precisely by the neo-liberal institutionalism. In the neo-liberal theory David Baldwin found four types or approaches: commercial, republican, sociological and liberal institutionalism (Lamy, 2011: 121). The first dimension, the commercial liberalism stresses the importance of the free trade

and market economy as tools which promote peace and prosperity. Later, this assumption that the free trade and the removal of barriers to commerce will assure prosperity and peace, will be found at the main core of modern interdependency theory (Burchill, 2008).

The republican liberalism proclaims that democratic states are less inclined to go to war and that they respect their citizens' rights, this approach has been called the democratic peace theory in the '90. The sociological liberalism states that the community and the interdependence are important components in the present world and that it is more difficult for states to avoid cooperation with their neighbors. These assumptions are found in the literature about popular culture and civil society (Lamy, 2011: 121). Although the neoliberalism has developed in the '80 as an alternative to the structural realism its main component, the liberal institutionalism or neo-liberal institutionalism, finds its roots in the functionalism of the '40 and '50. According to this approaches independent states in order to obtain peace and prosperity are willing to give up on some of their sovereignty and to construct communities through which economic growth is developed. This is how one of the subjects of this study, European Union has begun its existence (*Ibidem*). According to D. Mitrany, states are starting to cooperate in fields as government and economy and without "surrendering sovereignty, but merely of pooling so much of it as may be needed for the joint performance of the particular task" (Mitrany, 1948: 358). Though functionalism, states will avoid nationalism and will feel motivated by the success in the economic field to expand their cooperation, a cooperation which is seen as necessary (Idem, 1971: 570-571) and which will lead to an international community (Idem, 1965: 137). The term used by Mitrany to describe the process through which initial cooperation in the technical area will lead to cooperation in other functional areas is *spillover* (Burchill, 2008). Spillover appears as a result of the economic integration (a functionalist hypothesis) and leads to a frameworks which favors political integration (Goldstein, Pevehouse, 499).

Another theoretical influence for liberal institutionalism has been the neofunctionalist approach establish by S. Hoffman and Ernst Haas (Dîrdală, 2007: 143). Based on Mitrany's arguments, it was developed the possibility to be formed a transnational economic society based on a global transnational economy (Hoffman, 1995: 173-174). In the same time it was stressed the importance of other actors in the international system, others than the states such as institutions and international organizations and the other valuable concept for this wave was the community, understood as an international community, or as the possibility to develop the community. The next passage illustrates the both tendencies: "The most interesting challenge inherent in the study of regionalism lies in the potentialities of the field for insights into the process of community formation at the international level. Regional relations,

meetings, decisions, administrative devices, bureaucracies, and inter-ministerial, inter-expert, and inter-parliamentary institutions provide a mass of data on the process of "denationalization" of normal government functions with their delegation to regional decision-making units" (Haas, 1958: 441).

Another influence was K. Deutsch's version of integration theory. His hypothesis was that increasing transaction flows and crossborder communication lead through trade, migration, tourism, educational exchanges to the establishment of a community sense (2002, 339). He focused on the „we feeling" (Raustiala; Slaughter, 2002: 727) which appears between the people as opposed to the nationalist feelings and which lead to the feeling of community (Goldstein; Pevehouse, 2008: 499). K. Deutsch research program studied the security communities and the transnational collective identities (Adler, 2002: 134) which appear in this process. These „pluralistic security communities" maintain the sovereignty of the member states, but also share „compatibility of core values derived from common institutions, and mutual responsiveness – a matter of mutual identity and loyalty, a sense of 'we-ness', and are integrated to the point that they entertain 'dependable expectations of peaceful change'" (Adler and Barnett, 1998b: 7; quoting Deutsch et al., 1957: 5 *apud* Risse, 2002: 339). Although K. Deutsch maintained a rationalist perspective in his research he will later become an influence for the social constructivist theory. As for this article I will focus only on the importance that K. Deutsch's study had for regionalism studies and the European Union.

These theories have influenced the developing of the complex interdependence in the '70 which has four main characteristics: "(1) increasing linkages among states and non-states actors; (2) a new agenda of international issues with no distinction between low and high politics; (3) a recognition of multiple channels for interaction among actors across national boundaries; and (4) the decline of the efficacy of military force as a tool of statecraft" (Lamy, 2011: 121). The main tool through which cooperation is achieved is the use of institutions. This approach is useful in the fields where the states have mutual interests. That is why it remains a rational theory - these scholars do not question the interest of the state or how the states' interests are formed. The interests that the states have are considered as given, or exogenous to the relationships that they form to other actor, states or non-states (Finnemore, 1996: 16). Besides the fact that for liberal institutional although the states are rational actors and the main units in the international system are not the only ones there is another important feature: the absolute gains. The problem of gains has been developed amongst others by J. Grieco. Absolute gains are those through which states are increasing their power and influence and are willing to cooperate with other states; and the relative gains are those can be obtained by the other state in the process of cooperation (Lamy, 2011: 119). One of the

major differences between neo-realism and neo-liberalism is that for neo-realists the states are more preoccupied with the relative gains, or what the other wins than with the absolute gains or what are its own gains. Anyway, neo-liberalism admits that the problem of cheating can be an obstacle for cooperation, but states can become loyal and provide resources for institutions if perceive their activity as beneficial (Lamy, 2011: 122). This perception is more emphasized in the areas where states have mutual interests, more precisely in the economic or environmental areas, or low politics than in the field of security where the actors are inclined to perceive more the relative gains. Liberal institutionalists maintain the assumption found in the structural realism, that the international system is anarchic and that this feature favors a self-help behavior and distance themselves from the classical liberalism's utopianism. In the same time they stress the importance of international regimes and institutions as frameworks for the development of solutions to similar problems.

According to R. Cox's criterions, liberal institutionalism is a status-quo and problem-solving theory, meaning that as a theory which works in the framework already existent and legitimizes this system. These kinds of theories serve the interests of those who have benefits in this system, or under this order. On the other hand, we have problem solving theories, or critical theories which are trying to challenge the existing system and to support the emancipation of the human beings (Lamy, 2011: 116; Hobden, 2011: 139).

After the presentation of the theoretical perspective used in this article, the neo-liberal institutionalism I will explain the main concepts used. The first term applied is that of *institution*. The whole theoretical framework is based on this concept that had been rediscovered in the late '70 and early '80 through the works of R. Keohane and J. Nye. They have explained how, via membership of international institutions, states can significantly broaden their conception of self interest in order to widen the scope for cooperation (complex interdependence) (Burchill 2008). Institutions have been considered "persistend and having connected sets of rules and practices that prescribe roles, constrain activity, and shape the expectations of actors (...) can include organizations, bureaucratic agencies, treaties and agreements, and informal practices that states accept as binding (Haas, Keohane and Levy *apud* Baylis; Smith; Owens, 2011: 567).

Following the same institutional neo-liberalism path, we should mention the term of soft-power. The concept was detailed by J. Nye in the book *Soft power* and refers to the ability to form the preferences of other people or to the power to attract (Nye, 2009: 22). This sort of power has three sources: its own culture and its object is represented by their own citizens; the second source is its own political values, which are seen as attractive to the domestic, as well as

to the international level; and finally another source is the foreign policy, when its purposes are seen as legitimate (Nye, 2009: 28).

Another important term for this article is that of organization. Organizations are more compact than the institutions and are understood as those institutions that are becoming agents, and have a bureaucracy and its own budget (Ungureanu, 2010: 70). In the same time “international organizations provide forums in which people from many states gather, often with the explicit agenda of rethinking what states should be doing” (Finnemore, 1996: 35). But even more important, international organizations are viewed as bureaucracies who have rational-legal authority but in the same time they obtain authority from delegation process (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 16). As bureaucracies, international organizations are four main characteristics. The first one is the hierarchical structure, and this means that each official has a well-defined sphere of competence, maintaining a division of labor and answers to a superior. The second feature is continuity – by that meaning that the official has a full-time salary and the prospects to regular advancement. The third characteristic is impersonality, understanding by this that the work done is based on rules and operating procedures that will not allow arbitrary and politicized influences (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 17-18). And finally, the last feature is that of expertise meaning that the personnel is selected “according to merits, are trained for their function, and control access to knowledge stored in files” (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 18). Based on these assumptions, M. Weber had considered the modern bureaucracies the more efficient system of administration. Rules are extremely important for bureaucracies and one of their aims is to create even more rules. By rules we can understand “explicit or implicit norms, regulations and expectations that define and order the social world and the behavior of actors in it” (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 18).

There are four types of authority which give international organizations the ability to be autonomous and authoritative. The first one is the rational-legal authority. As authorities, the international organizations obtain this feature through rational-legal authority in their domain but also through their moral standing, expertise and delegated tasks (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 20). Authority gives international organizations the possibility to tell the people what is right to do and delivers the social form and behavioral vocabulary of international organizations viewed as social actors. Their authority is based on legalities, procedures and rules. Because they have authority they can make rules that will define and classify the world and one of their strongest points is to present themselves as impersonal and neutral (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 20). Bureaucracies have the aim of serving some social purpose including the values that the people have and this is what makes them respected. The second type of authority is the delegated authority. By this feature we understand that

international organizations have authority because the states gave them certain tasks, they can act on their own if their actions is perceived as serving others (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 20). To be allowed to use it, international organizations must demonstrate that they serve others, naturally those that delegated the authority. One of the problems with this type of authority is that some states may understand the rules and procedures in a way different from other states. At this point the international organizations' staff can intervene to resolve this problem and to provide a more predictable view of this rules.

The third type of authority is the moral authority and refers to the idea that international organizations are established to protect some principles and values. Even more, they proclaim that represent and defend the interests of community (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 23). They are supposed to be more moral in their relation with the governments because their represent the community's interests.

Finally, the last type of authority is the expert authority. Specialized people are selected to work using specialized knowledge in order to resolve social tasks. The use of specialized knowledge allows those who work as bureaucrats to make judgments and solve problems and makes the use of such authority rational. Also, just as delegated and moral authority, this feature favors the perception that international organizations are depoliticized (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 24).

As I mentioned earlier, international organizations are allowed to classify and organize information, to solve problems and this is one of the elements that signifies power. Another element that shows the power that international organizations have is their ability to invest some situations with a certain meaning (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 32). That is why norms are so important for these organizations. Norms were defined by M. Finnemore as "shared expectations about appropriate behavior held by a community of actors. Unlike ideas which might be held privately, norms are shared and social; they are not just subjective but intersubjective. Ideas may or may not have behavioral implications; norms by definition concern behavior (Finnemore, 1996: 22). After they have established meanings, norms and rules the international organizations are willing to help spread them. That is why usually they allow the legitimization and of their own agenda and interfere with states and nonstateactors and ultimately to influence the world (Barnett; Finnemore, 2004: 33).

We can conclude that the international organizations have developed under the two main features of the western culture: rationalization and liberalism. M. Weber explained the rationalization as a concept which describes "a process whereby modes of action structured in terms of means and ends, often using impersonal rules and procedures, increasingly dominated the world" (Barnett; Finnemore, 2005: 163). On the other hand, liberal political ideas refer

to the autonomy of the individual and democracy as “the most desirable and just form of government” as well as to an economic system which proclaims the free market and capitalism as tools to evolve and progress (Barnett; Finnemore, 2005: 163). The classical liberalism link to the present day international organizations is based on the assumption that there is a capacity for technological progress and a possibility to progress and change the global politics in a better way in order to avoid conflicts (Barnett; Finnemore, 2005: 165).

In the last part of the theoretical dimension of this article, it would be useful to identify the limits or the critics that were detected or brought to liberal institutionalism and international organizations. First we'll present the constructivist critique regarding the liberal institutionalism approach. M. Finnemore observes in her book, *National Interests in International Society* that “liberalism does not provide a basis for treating preferences as malleable” and that “methodologically individualism used by liberalism cannot tell us very much about the socialization and persuasion processes that change what we value; it cannot address the ways in which what we want and who we are become shaped by culture and society. To the extent that we are products of the cultures and social values with which we live, methodological individualism is of little help in explaining these variations in behavior across time and space” (Finnemore, 1996: 146-147).

Then we find the critique which stresses the idea that the evolution brought by the international organizations comes with a price which is paid by the individuals and that the states are less able to control their own destiny. In the same time, the number of areas in which the international organizations can intervene has increased and their activity can be denied only if the states specify this thing (Barnett; Finnemore, 2005: 182).

Another problem is the increased power of transnational capital while the national economic sovereignty is decreasing something that affects the legitimacy of these states (Burchill, 2008). Finally, there is the question of subsidiarity and opting out, which first appeared for the European Union and then for other regions and international organizations. In the same time, bureaucracies are seen as too big to respond fast enough for the present challenges and that's why informal networks and less bureaucratic forms of government have been encouraged and developed in order to protect the local in relation to the universal (Barnett; Finnemore, 2005: 182). One of the main questions addressed to the international organizations is: who is governed in the global governance? Is about a community of states or a community of people? (Barnett; Finnemore, 2005: 183).

This question is even more accurate for the European Union and its democratic deficit. Although there is still not a consensus about what the

democratic deficit is, it is accepted that the EU is far from an ideal polity in democratic terms (Jensen, 2009: 2). In the same time it is an almost identical meaning between *democratic deficit* and *democratic deficit in the EU*. Probably the shortest definition for the democratic deficit is the lack of legitimization (Jensen, 2009: 2).

I consider that this theoretical approach is the one able to offer answers for the selected case study. After presenting the theoretical framework the logic of the article assumes that we detail the methodology. The article is based on qualitative research and I'll choose a case study, the cooperation between European Union and India in the economic area. Because I use the theory of liberal institutionalism I consider that states are important actors in the international system, but are not the only ones and that's why I've selected the European Union as a distinct, non-stateactor and India as a state actor. In this study I am interested to see if cooperation in the some areas is prone to spill over in other areas, and more exactly if the hard politics themes, like security is subject to mutual actions aiming to assure assistance for these actors in case of threat. My hypothesis is that the actors are able to get over their differences and cooperate in areas related to human security. For this analyze I will use official document an official declarations.

2. The case study: The relation between European Union and India after the end of Cold War

After the end of the Cold War, Europe or more precisely the Western Europe had chosen a more significant role at the regional level and a clearer foreign policy, if there was going to be such one. The events that took place after 9/11 - and including after the beginning of the war in Iraq- had shown the division found inside the Union and the absence of unity regarding the problems that are found in the domain of hard politics, like security. The EU was forced to have an answer for the global problems, but without excluding its cooperation with the US. In the same time some common interests were necessary in order to engage in this process of cooperation. In order to consolidate its place, the EU will need not only the US partnership, but it will also need new allies. Following this assumption, EU understood the importance that Asia is beginning to have at the global level and that is why the relation with some of the Asian countries is deepening, more notably, those with China, India and Japan. In the same time, between South Korea and European Union

has been signed a Free Trade Agreement since 2007 and it is applied since 1 July 2011¹.

There are two main reasons for the increased attention on Asia. The first one is based on the fact that the local economies are becoming stronger. Between EU and Asia is held a Summit every two years since 1996. The second reason is a social one because in Asia are found two-thirds of world's poor and EU is known as the world's largest donor which offers consistent development assistance². This fact stresses the normative dimension that this relation has and shows the importance that cooperation has in Asia's region. For the 2007-2013 period, EU allocated over five billion dollars for this area³.

The EU-India Summit held in 2002, at Copenhagen was announced as: "India and EU, global actors in a multipolar world"⁴. At the same Summit, the both parts affirmed that "the common democratic values and pluralism" they share will allow them to sustain a stronger role for the United Nations in order for this organization to respond better to the global issues. The willingness to strengthen the UN's role was reaffirmed to the Summit of 2003 when there were propositions to build and consolidate "multilateral institutions based on the international law"⁵. The increasing support shown by other actors, states or non-states will attract fair sharing of the resources needed for them in order to function and take decisions.

India is probably the Asian state who shares the most values with the EU: it is a democracy, has free elections, a free press, independent judicial system, civil control over the army, but it still has problems regarding the minorities' rights, although it remains the emergent country which has the chance to develop not only an economic partnership with EU, but also a social one and the both actors are willing to resolve their problems through cooperation. Their relation was established in the '60 with India being the first country, outside the Economic Community, which opened an embassy in Brussels in 1962 (Biermann, 2004: 15). Anyway, for a long period of time the economic and political relations were not developed. Only after India decided

¹ See *The EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement* http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2011/october/tradoc_148303.pdf, accessed at 07.11.2011.

² See <http://development.donoratlas.eu/home.html>, accessed at 07.11.2011.

³ See MTR Document - Regional Strategy for Asia 2007-2013 Multi-annual Programme for Asia (MIP) 2011-2013 http://eeas.europa.eu/asia/rsp/07_13_mtr_annex_en.pdf, accessed at 07.11.2011.

⁴ See *Joint Press Statement*, 3rd EU-India Summit, http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/er/72693.pdf, accessed at 07.11.2011.

⁵ See *Joint Press Statement*, 4th EU-India Summit, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_reso_4th_page2_en.pdf, accessed at 07.11.2011.

to adopt an open economy the economic flows increased. In 1994 was signed the Cooperation Agreement, which represents until today the institutional framework that allows the relation between the two actors. Another tool used for dialog is the annually Summit held between EU and India; in the same time there are meetings between experts and ministers. The Summits have been held since 2000⁶ and since 2004 India has been a strategic partner, and since 2005 was enforced the Plan for Common Action, that contributes at using the full potential of this partnership in important areas for India and the EU⁷. The main directions for this partnership are represented by the free trade agreements, investments, and the finalization of accords regarding the naval transport and the implementation of the common agreement on climate change. In 2007 has been enforced the Strategy on India which goes up until 2013 and that has a budget of 430 billion with the aim of investing them in the following areas: health care, education the implementation of the Agreement on climate change.

EU has identified India's willingness to increase its visibility on the global scene in order to obtain a permanent seat in the Security Council. In the same time India wishes to be part of a multipolar system in which China and Russia have important roles. Having the aim of improving its relation with China, India implements the Look East policy and in order to engage its small neighbors uses ASEAN⁸. After the end of the Cold War, India was in a difficult position and had a dilemma regarding the direction that was going to follow in its foreign policy. It wished to have an important role on the global area and to maintain its territorial integrity, this problem was given by its borders permeability and by social problems it had - like poverty and corruption (Kavalski, 2007: 848). Looking at the economic dimension we can see that India is in a fast and deep transformation. This situation is given by the measures took in the early '90 and which meant changing the soviet economic model with a western one, focused on the market or theoretically speaking the spread of free market and capitalism. But even with these measures 65% of the population is engaged in the rural economy and most of it is poor⁹. The problem of poverty is very important and delicate a state which wants to become a great power. The poverty rate has fallen from 36% in 1994 at 28.6%

⁶ See http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/eu_india/political_relations/strategic_partnership/index_en.htm, accessed at 08.11.2011.

⁷ See *The India-EU Strategic Partnership Joint Action Plan* http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_res_6th_summit1_en.pdf, accessed at 08.11.2011.

⁸ See http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf, accessed at 08.11.2011.

⁹ See *Country Strategy Paper 2007 – 2013*, 5, http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf, accessed on 09.11.2011.

in 2000¹⁰. Poverty is concentrated in the northern and eastern parts and that is why the measures took to resolve this problem must analyze the regional level. 35% of the population was living in 2004 with less than a dollar per day¹¹ and women represent half of the poor's¹². But what is even more worrying is that the gap between the rich and the poor has increased and that this fact shows the access to resources is restricted and unequal. In order to resolve this problem, India adopted the *Tenth Five Year Plan* which has the aim of implementing an inclusive development that will bring advantages for the whole population. The direction actions established by the Five Year Plan are based on access to basic public services, improving the infrastructure and good governance. In order to obtain this aims is necessary an economic growth of 8-9% per year¹³.

Another area on which EU and India cooperate is education. In India almost 25% of the population, or more exactly 25 million children, doesn't have access on education and from those who go to school only 59% are starting the secondary school¹⁴. The gender differences can be seen in this field too: the girls have only 3.7% years spent in school, while the boys spent 6.3 years. The literacy rate was only 63% in 2006¹⁵. EU represents one of the main donors in the governmental program SarvaShikshaAbhiyan (SSA). The goal of this program is to ensure universal education for the target group formed by children with the ages between 6-14 years¹⁶. More than 192 million children are supposed to benefit from this program. Until now, the EU has allocated almost 270 million euros and has its own instrument for intervention *State Partnership Programme* in Chhattisgarh which received 32 million euros¹⁷.

In the education sector there has been progress comparing this to the health area, where the infant mortality wasn't decreased for a long period¹⁸. In

¹⁰ See <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SI.POV.NAHC/countries/IN?display=graph>, accessed at 09.11.2011.

¹¹ See *Country Strategy Paper 2007 – 2013*, 8 http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf, accessed on 09.11.2011, accessed at 09.11.2011.

¹² See <http://www.undp.org.in/>, accessed at 09.11.2011.

¹³ See *Country Strategy Paper 2007 – 2013*, 7 http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf, accessed on 09.11.2011.

¹⁴ See *Ibidem*, 9.

¹⁵ See <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SE.ADT.LITR.ZS>, accessed on 10.11.2011.

¹⁶ See <http://ssa.nic.in/>, accessed on 10.11.2011.

¹⁷ See http://ec.europa.eu/delegations/india/eu_india/development_cooperation/education/index_en.htm, accessed on 10.11.2011.

¹⁸ See *Country Strategy Paper 2007 – 2013*, 9 http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf, accessed on 09.11.2011.

2007 India was allocating to the health care system 4.1% from the GDP¹⁹. But India is still the second country with the most AIDS cases²⁰, a vulnerability for the human security. In 2008 it was signed the financial agreement for the implementation of the Programme called *National Rural Health Mission-Reproductive Child Health II*. The project's budget is 110 million euros and its goal is to implement the fourth *Millennium Development Goals* decreasing infant mortality and the fifth goal improving maternal health²¹.

Finally, the last area in which are established directions for cooperation is the environment. As we have already shown, India's population is growing as well as its economy and the resources it is using, a practice that could be dangerous for the environment. Some of the problems that India is facing today in this area are: deforestation, biodiversity loss, land/soil degradation, air pollution, poor management of waste, growing waterscarcity, falling groundwater tables and water pollution²². Almost 10% of the planet's whole flora and fauna is found in India, which makes this country very important for the environment issues and for maintain the habit useful for so many species. Until known have been developed two institutional instruments in order to facilitate the cooperation between India and EU in this area: *EU-India Environment Forum* and *EU-India Initiative on Clean Development and Climate Change*²³. In November 2005 had taken place a workshop for the implementation of the *Clean Development Mechanism* from the Protocol adopted at Kyoto.

The Action Plan for India mentions the necessity of a Joint Working Group on Environment, which had two meetings already. EU-India Environment Forum has discussed the inefficient administration of the resources. The meetings took place in 2005, 2006 and 2008²⁴.

All these elements represent models of cooperation and show the areas important for the both actors. Since the first Summit that has been held in 2000 and until now, the dialog's importance on the political level has increased consistently. Some of the instruments used for the political dialogue are: meetings on the Troika level, meetings between the ministers from six to six

¹⁹ See <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SH.XPD.TOTL.ZS>, accessed on 10.11.2011.

²⁰ See *Country Strategy Paper 2007 – 2013*, 11-12 http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf, accessed at 09.11.2011.

²¹ See http://ec.europa.eu/delegations/india/eu_india/development_cooperation/healthcare/index_en.htm, accessed on 11.11.2011.

²² See *Country Strategy Paper 2007 – 2013*, 12-14, http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf, accessed at 09.11.2011.

²³ See <http://www.undp.org.in/>, accessed at 11.11.2011.

²⁴ See http://ec.europa.eu/delegations/india/eu_india/environment/eu_india_cooperation/index_en.htm, accessed at 11.11.2011.

months, Summits and groups for consultations (COTER Troika). The civil society is sustained through the EU-India Round Table²⁵.

2. Conclusions

I would like to start this final part by stressing the limits of this study. I think that the main problem when analyzing EU and other country or body comes from the conceptual dimension and the why in which we define the EU. While India is a state and it is widely accepted what a state is the problem is more complicated when we discuss the EU. That's why I defined European Union as an organization.

In this paper I argued that we can understand the way in which European Union and India cooperate using the neo-liberal institutionalism approach and focusing on the soft power instruments that the European Union uses in its relation with the Asian giant. In the same time, I focused on the way in which the both parts define their interests and preferences: EU tries to stabilize the area and provide financial aid for India, while India is more focused on improving its internal problems using the mechanisms offered by the EU. Based on this analysis I conclude that EU is acting as a stabilizing factor in the area and might become in time an organization which exports norms and practices (for example regarding the environment and child protection) to other bodies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

The EU-South Korea Free Trade Agreement, http://trade.ec.europa.eu/doclib/docs/2011/october/tradoc_148303.pdf.

MTR Document Regional Strategy for Asia 2007-2013 Multi-annual Programme for Asia (MIP) 2011-2013, http://eeas.europa.eu/asia/rsp/07_13_mtr_annex_en.pdf.

Joint Press Statement, http://consilium.europa.eu/uedocs/cms_data/docs/pressdata/en/er/72693.pdf.

4th EU-India Summit - Joint Press Statement, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_reso_4th_page2_en.pdf.

²⁵ See *Country Strategy Paper 2007 – 2013*, 12, http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf, accessed at 09.11.2011.

- The India-EU Strategic Partnership Joint Action Plan*, http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/india/documents/eu_india/021_eu_india_res_6th_summit_1_en.pdf.
- Country Strategy Paper 2007 – 2013*, http://eeas.europa.eu/india/csp/07_13_en.pdf.
- Adler, Emanuel (2002), “Constructivism and International Relations” in Walter, Risse; Thomas, Simmons; Beth A. (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*, Carlsnaes, The Cromwell Press, Trowbridge, Wiltshire.
- Barnett, Michael; Finnemore, Martha (2004), *Rules for the world*, New York, Cornell University Press.
- Idem (2008), “The power of liberal international organizations” in Barnett, Michael; Duvall, Raymond (eds.), *Power in Global Governance*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Biermann, Frank; Hans-Dieter Sohn (2004), "Multipolar Global Governance: India and East Asia as New Partners for Europe", Conference Papers - International Studies Association, 1-20.
- Burchill, Scott (2008), “Liberalismul” in *Teorii ale relațiilor internaționale*, Burchill, Scott; Linklater, Andrew; Devetak, Richard; Donnelly, Jack; Paterson, Matthew; Reus-Smit, Christian; True, Jacqui (eds.), Iași, Institutul European.
- Dîrdala, Lucian-Dumitru (2006), “Neoliberalismul” in Miroiu, Andrei; Ungureanu, Radu-Sebastian (eds.), *Manual de relații internaționale*, Polirom, Iași.
- Finnemore, Martha (1996), *National Interests in International Society*, New York, Cornell University Press.
- Goldstein, Joshua S.; Pevehouse, Jon C. (2008), *Relații internaționale*, Polirom, Iași.
- Haas, Ernst B. (1956), “Regionalism, Functionalism, and Universal International Organization” in *World Politics*, 8(2), 238-263.
- Idem (1958), “The Challenge of Regionalism” in *International Organization*, 12(4), 440-458.
- Hobden, Stephen; Jones, Richard Wyn (2011), “Marxist theories of international relations” in Baylis, John; Smith, Steve; Owens, Patricia (eds.) *Globalization of world politics*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Hoffmann, Stanley (1995), “The Crisis of Liberal Internationalism” in *Foreign Policy*, 98, 159-177.
- Jensen, Thomas (2009), "The Democratic Deficit of the European Union" in *Living Reviews In Democracy* 1, 1-8.
- Kavalski, Emilian (2007), "Partnership or Rivalry between the EU, China and India in Central Asia: The Normative Power of Regional Actors with Global Aspirations" in *European Law Journal* 13(6), 839-856.

- Kavalski, Emilian (2006), "Whom to Follow? Central Asia Between the EU and China" in *Turkish Review of Eurasian Studies*, 6, 153-173.
- Lamy, Steven L. (2011), "Contemporary mainstream approaches: neo-realism and neo-liberalism" in Baylis, John; Smith, Steve; Owens, Patricia (eds.) *Globalization of world politics*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Mitrany, David (1971), "The Functional Approach in Historical Perspective" in *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944)*, 47(3), 532-543.
- Idem (1965), "The Prospect of Integration: Federal or Functional" in *Journal Of Common Market Studies*, 4(2), 119-149.
- Idem, "The Functional Approach to World Organization" in *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944)*, 24(3), 350-363.
- Nye, Joseph S. (2009), *Puterea blândă*, Iași, Institutul European.
- Raustiala, Kal; Slaughter, Anne-Marie (2002), "International Law, International Relations and Compliance" in Carlsnaes, Walter; Risse, Thomas; Simmons, Beth A. (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*, The Cromwell Press, Trowbridge, Wiltshire.
- Risse, Thomas (2002), "Transnational Actors and World Politics" in Carlsnaes, Walter; Risse, Thomas; Simmons, Beth A. (eds.), *Handbook of International Relations*, The Cromwell Press, Trowbridge, Wiltshire.
- Singer, J. David (1961), "The Level-of-Analysis Problem in International Relations" in *World Politics*, 14(1), 77-92.
- Ungureanu, Radu-Sebastian (2010), *Securitate, suveranitate și instituții internaționale*. Iași, Polirom.
- Waltz, Kenneth (2001), *Omul, statul și războiul*, Iași, Institutul European.

Internet sources

<http://www.consilium.europa.eu>
<http://data.worldbank.org>
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk>
<http://ec.europa.eu>
<http://eeas.europa.eu>
<http://euobserver.com>
<http://mideast.foreignpolicy.com>
<http://www.idsa.in>
<http://www.ipcs.org>
<http://www.mtcr.info>
<http://www.undp.org.in>
<http://www.undp.org.in>
<http://www.polecon.no>
<http://ssa.nic.in>

