

विषयसूची

(Contents)

❖ Immanuel Wallerstein	15
❖ Definitions of Key Terms	21

CHAPTER - 1

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणको ऐतिहासिक

23

सन्दर्भ

(THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF WORLD-SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE)

1. **2020, Q. No. 6** 23
What are the reasons for the possible future demise of the world-system? Discuss with reference to Immanuel Wallerstein.
(विश्व-व्यवस्थाको सम्भाव्य आगामी अवसानका कारणहरू के-के छन् ? इमानुएल वालेस्टीनको सन्दर्भका साथ छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)
2. **2019*, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)** 26
What are some of the main reasons for the rise of the world-system analysis? Likewise, what are some of the reasons for the possible future demise of the world-systems analysis? Discuss reference to the key texts of Immanuel Wallerstein.
(विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको उदयका लागि केही प्रमुख कारणहरू के-के छन् ? त्यसैगरी विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको सम्भाव्य आगामी अवसानका केही प्रमुख कारणहरू के-के हुन् ? इमानुपल वालेस्टीनका मुख्य पाद्यसामग्रीहरूको सन्दर्भका साथ छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)
3. **2016, Q. No. 5** 31
Discuss the historical context in the rise of world-system approach.
(विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमको उदयमा ऐतिहासिक सन्दर्भ व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)
4. **2015, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)** 34
Describe about the historical contexts in the rise of world-system approach.
(विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमको उदयअन्तर्गतका ऐतिहासिक सन्दर्भहरूबाटे व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)
5. **2015, Q. No. 4** 38
Briefly discuss about the various stages of European world-economy (Wallerstein, 1974).
युरोपीयन विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रका विभिन्न चरणहरूबाटे सद्व्यापमा छलफल गर्नुहोस्।
(वालेस्टीन, 1974)

6. What are the views of Immanuel Wallerstein in the context of social change? Discuss with reference to 'On the Study of Social Change' (1974). (Long Answer Question) (Additional Question)
- [सामाजिक परिवर्तनका सन्दर्भमा इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीनका दृष्टिकोणहरू के-के छन्?
 'सामाजिक परिवर्तनको अध्ययनमा' (1974) का आधारबाट छलफल गर्नुहोस्।]

41 5

CHAPTER - 2

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका मुख्य प्रसङ्गहरू

(KEY THEMES OF THE WORLD -SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE)

45

6

7

1. **2020, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)**

"A capitalist system cannot exist within any framework except that of a world economy." Substantiate this argument with reference to Immanuel Wallerstein.

("एठटा पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र बाहेको अन्य कुनै पनि स्वरूपमा कायम राख्न सक्दैन।" इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीनको सन्दर्भका साथ यस तर्कलाई पुष्टि गर्नुहोस्।)

2. **2020, Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)**

Sovereignty is said to be a concept that was invented in the modern world-system. Discuss how disputes on sovereignty are best resolved?

(सार्वभौमिकतालाई आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा खोज गरिएको अवधारणा मानिन्छ। सार्वभौमिकताका बारे उत्पन्न भएका विवादहरू कसरी उत्तम ढंगबाट समाधान गर्न सकिन्छ भन्ने सम्बन्धमा छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

3. **2019,*Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)**

Discuss some of the key concepts used by world system perspective to account for the rise of the world capitalist system. What advantages does the world system perspective offer over other competing theories of development/ underdevelopment in the contemporary world?

(विश्व पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाको उदयका लागि उपयोगी हुने गरी विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणद्वारा प्रयोग गरिएका केही प्रमुख अवधारणाहरू छलफल गर्नुहोस्। समकालीन विश्वमा विकास/अल्पविकासका प्रतिस्पर्धी अन्य सिद्धान्तहरूभन्दा माथि रहेर विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणले के-कस्ता फाइदाहरू प्रस्ताव गर्दछ?)

51

4. **2019,*Q. No. 5**

How do you judge to the concept of sovereignty in the context of the rise of the state system? Is the modern state a sovereign state? What large scale and long term's history tells us about it?

(राज्य व्यवस्थाको उदयको सन्दर्भमा तपाईं सार्वभौमिकताको अवधारणालाई कसरी लेखाजोखा गर्नुहुन्छ ? के आधुनिक राज्य सार्वभौम राज्य हो। बृहत् स्केलको तथा लामो कालको इतिहासको यसबारे के बताउँदछ ?)

59

	2019,*Q. No. 6	63
5.	Why and how modern world system is a capitalist world economy? How it goes through cycles of contraction? (आधुनिक विश्व व्यवस्था किन र कसरी पूँजीवादी विश्व अर्थव्यवस्था हो ? किन यो सद्व्युचनका चक्रहरू मार्फत भएर गुञ्जन्छ ?)	
6.	2019, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question) Explain how the modern world-system is a capitalist world economy. (आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था कसरी पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र हो भने सम्बन्धमा वर्णन गर्नुहोस्।)	66
7.	2019, Q. No. 2; 2017, Q.No. 3, 2016, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question) Explain how the modern world system eventually goes into crisis? (आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था कसरी घटनावद्ध रूपबाट सद्व्युक्तमा पर्दछ भने सम्बन्धमा व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)	69
8.	2019, Q. No. 4 In your opinion, is the modern state a sovereign state? Substantiate your arguments with appropriate examples. (तपाईंको धारणामा, के आधुनिक राज्य सार्वभौम राज्य हो? उपयुक्त उदाहरणहरू सहित आफ्ना तर्कहरू प्रस्तुत गर्नुहोस्।)	73
9.	2017, Q. No. 4; 2016, Q. No. 4 Whether or not modern state is a sovereign state in your opinion? What insights can be drawn from Nepal experience historically? (तपाईंको अभिमतमा आधुनिक राज्य एउटा सार्वभौम राज्य हो वा होइन ? नेपालले ऐतिहासिक रूपबाट गरेका अनुभवबाट के अन्तर्दृष्टि चित्रण गर्न सकिन्छ।)	75
OR		
	What is your opinion on modern state as a sovereign state? Critically assess it from Nepali experience. (आधुनिक राज्य एउटा सार्वभौम राज्य हो भने सम्बन्धमा तपाईंको अभिमत के हो ? यसलाई नेपाली अनुभवका आधारबाट आलोचनात्मक ढण्डाले लेखाजोखा गर्नुहोस्।)	
10.	2016, Q. No. 8 Describe the key themes of the modern world-system. (आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाका मुख्य प्रसद्व्युचनका व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)	78
11.	2016, Q. No. 6 Explain the basic institutions of capitalist world-economy. (पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रका आधारभूत संस्थाहरू वर्णन गर्नुहोस्।)	82
12.	2015, Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question) Explain how the modern world-system is in crisis (Wallerstein, 2006). (आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था कसरी सद्व्युक्तमा रहेको छ भने सम्बन्धमा वर्णन गर्नुहोस्। (वालर्स्टीन, 2006).	85
13.	What are the arguments of world-system theory on the issue of developed and underdeveloped societies? (Additional Question)	88

(विकसित र अपविकसित समाजहरूका मुद्दाका सम्बन्धमा विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तका मुख्य तर्कहरू के-के छन्?)

14. Pulling ideas from World-system perspective, analyze the role played by NGOs and INGOs in the context of core and peripheral societies. (Additional Question)

(विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणबाट विचारहरू लिई मुख्य र पृष्ठक्षेत्रीय समाजहरूको सन्दर्भमा गैरसरकारी संस्था र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय गैरसरकारी संस्थाहरागा निर्वाह गरिएको भूमिका विश्लेषण गर्नुहोस।)

15. What are the core components of dependency and world system debates? Compare the similarity and differences in the arguments of Frank and Wallenstein. (Additional Question)

[परनिर्भरता र विश्व-व्यवस्था बहसका सार (वा मुख्य) तत्त्वहरू के-के छन् ? फ्रान्क र वालेस्टीनका तर्कहरूबीच समानता र भिन्नताहरूको तुलना गर्नुहोस।]

CHAPTER - 3

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका विभेदहरू

/आलोचनाहरू

97

(VARIANTS/CRITIQUES OF WORLD-SYSTEM PERSPECTIVES)

1. **2020, Q. No. 3; 2017, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)**

What value does the world-systems analysis add to contemporary understandings of the economic, political, and social relationships amongst the various nation-states in the world with varying levels of development? Discuss with relevant examples.

OR

In, your opinion, what value does the world-system analysis add to contemporary understandings of the economic, political, and social relationships amongst various nation-states in the world with varying levels of development? Discuss with relevant examples.

2. **2020, Q. No. 5; 2015, Q. No. 8**

How does Theda Skocpol criticize Wallerstein's notion of world capitalist system? What are the potentially important variables that Wallerstein ignored in his world-system analysis?

OR

Summarise Theda Skocpol's critique of world capitalist system (Skocpol, 1997).

3. **2019,*Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)**

How any why three corridors: Red sea, Syria-Mesopotamia, and the northern Caucasus routes were far more significant in the Eurasian political and economic development compared to Athens and other

parts of Europe in the 5th or 4th century BCE with reference to Barry K. Gills?

(बेरी के. गिल्सको सन्दर्भका साथ तीनवट्य करिङ्गेरहरू : रेड सी, सिरिया-मेसोपोटामिया, र उत्तरी काउकासस् मार्गहरू कसरी र किन इशापूर्व 5औं र 4औं शताब्दीअन्तर्गतका एथेन्स र यूरोपका अन्य भागहरूको तुलनामा युरेशियाली राजनैतिक र आर्थिक विकासमा बढी सार्थक थिए?)

4. **2019, *Q. No. 4** 110
How does Andere Gunder Frank seem to be different from Immanuel Wallerstein in the case of world development with and without hyphen?
(विश्व विकासमा समास चिन्ह भएको र समास चिन्ह नभएको रूपका सन्दर्भमा एण्ड्रे गुण्डर फ्रान्क इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनभन्दा कसरी भिन्न देखिन्छन्?)
5. **2019, Q. No. 5** 112
Describe the critique of Wallerstein's theoretical perspective by William I. Robinson.
(विलियम आई. रबिन्सनद्वारा वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणमा गरिएको आलोचनालाई व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)
6. **2019, Q. No. 6** 115
The world-systems analysis is a variant of Marxist theory. In your opinion, what value does the world-systems analysis add to our contemporary understandings of inequalities at the global level?
(विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण मार्क्सवादी सिद्धान्तको एक विभेदी रूप हो। तपाईंको अभियान विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणले विश्वव्यापी स्तरमा रहेका असमानताहरूको बुझाइमा के-कस्ता मूल्यहरू थपेको छ?)
7. **2019, Q. No. 8; 2015, Q. No. 7** 117
Describe Barry Gill's continuity thesis in world development.
OR
Describe the continuity thesis in world development (Gills, 1996).
(विश्व विकासमा बेरी गिल्सको निरन्तरता वादलाई व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)
8. **2017; Q. No. 2; 2016, Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)** 120
What Barry Gills contends about the existence of world-system cycle and center gravity of economic activity and trade in this continuity thesis?
(बेरी गिल्सले आफ्नो निरन्तरता वादमा विश्व-व्यवस्था चक्र र आर्थिक क्रियाकलाप तथा व्यापारको मुख्य केन्द्रको अस्तित्वका सम्बन्धमा कस्तो दाबी गरेका छन्?)
- OR**
Describe the Barry K. Gills's continuity thesis in world development.
(विश्व विकासमा बेरी गिल्सको निरन्तरतावादलाई व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)
9. **2017, Q. No. 5** 124
What are the similarities and differences between 'world system' with and without hyphen?

- [समास चिन्ह (-) सहितको र चिन्ह रहितको 'विश्व व्यवस्था' बीचका समानता र भिन्नताहरू के-के छन् ?]
- 10. 2016, Q. No. 7** 127
Describe the critique of world-system analysis.
(विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणका आलोचनाहरूको व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)
- 11. 2015, Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)** 130
What are similarities and differences in the world- systems? Describe (Chase- Dunn, 1996).
[विश्व-व्यवस्था अन्तर्गतका समानता र भिन्नताहरू के-के छन् ? व्याख्या गर्नुहोस् (चेज डन, 1996)]।
- 12. 2015, Q. No. 8** 133
Summarise Theda Skocpol's critique of world capitalist system (Skocpal, 1997).
[विश्व पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाप्रति थेडा स्कोकपलको आलोचनालाई सारांशीकृत गर्नुहोस् (स्कोकपल, 1997)]

CHAPTER - 4

नेपालसम्बन्धी छलफल

(COLLOQUIUM OF NEPAL)

136

- 1. 2020, Q. No 7; 2019,* Q. No. 8** 136
Based on the book *Cardamom and Class* by Ian Carlos Fitzpatrick, describe how cardamom production and foreign labor migration have contributed to increased economic integration of Mamangkhe into the national and global capitalist economy and the emergence of economic differentiation or class formation.
(इयान कालोस फिजप्याट्रिकको पुस्तक *Cardamom land Class* मा आधारित रहेर कसरी अलैंची उत्पादन र वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनले मामाङ्खेको बढावे आर्थिक एकीकरणलाई राष्ट्रिय तथा विश्वव्यापी पूँजीवादी अर्थव्यवस्था र वर्ग निर्माण वा आर्थिक विविधीकरणमा योगदान दियो ?)
- OR**
- How does Ian Karlos Fitzpatrick account for relationship between changing mode of production (cardamom production and foreign labor migration) and class formation in Mamangkhe village in East Nepal?
(इयान कालोस फिजप्याट्रिकले पूर्वी नेपालको मामाङ्खे गाउँमा परिवर्तनशील उत्पादनको पद्धति (अलैंची उत्पादन र वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासन) तथा वर्ग निर्माणबीचको सम्बन्धका बारेमा कसरी विवरणहरू दिएका छन् ?)
- 2. 2020, Q. No. 8; 2017, Q. No. 6; 2015, Q. No. 5** 141
Explain how Chaitanya Mishra assesses Nepal's development and underdevelopment from world-system approach.
(चैतन्य मिश्रले नेपालको विकास र अपविकासलाई विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमबाट कसरी लेखाजोखा गरेका छन् ?)

OR

Critically discuss the major arguments emphasized by Chaitanya Mishra in his essay "Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective."

(चैतन्य मिश्रले आफ्नो निबन्ध "Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective" मा जोड दिएका मुख्य तर्कहरूको आलोचनात्मक छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

OR

What are some of your major critiques of Chaitanya Mishra's essay "Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective?"

(चैतन्य मिश्रको निबन्ध "Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective" मा तपाईंका केही प्रमुख आलोचनात्मक पक्षहरू के-के छन् ?)

3. **2019*, Q. No. 7** 144

How would you use the world-systems analysis to explain the unequal economic and political relationship between Nepal and India in a historical perspective?

(एउटा ऐतिहासिक दृष्टिकोणमा नेपाल र भारतबीचको असमान आर्थिक तथा राजनैतिक सम्बन्धलाई व्याख्या गर्न तपाईंले विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणलाई कसरी प्रयोग गर्नुहुन्छ ?)

4. **2019, Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)** 148

Based on the book "*Nepal in Crisis*" by Blaikie, Cameron and Seddon; and the essay "*Development and Underdevelopment*" by Mishra; describe how Nepal has historically evolved into a peripheral, dependent, and underdeveloped country.

(ब्लाइकी, क्यामरुन र सेडनको पुस्तक "सद्व्यवस्था नेपाल"; र मिश्रको निबन्ध "विकास र अपविकास" मा आधारित रहेर कसरी नेपाल ऐतिहासिक रूपबाट पृष्ठक्षेत्रीय, परनिर्भर र अल्पविकसित देशमा उदय भयो भने सम्बन्धमा व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

5. **2019, Q. No. 7** 153

Based on your readings of various texts related to foreign labor migration in Nepal, discuss some of the positive and negative effects of foreign labor migration and remittance on the Nepali economy.

(नेपालमा वैदेशिक श्रम स्थानान्तरणसँग सम्बन्धित तपाईंका विभिन्न पाद्यसामग्रीका अध्ययनहरूमा आधारित रही नेपाली अर्थतन्त्रमा वैदेशिक श्रम स्थानान्तरण र विप्रेषणका केही सकारात्मक तथा नकारात्मक प्रभावहरूको छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

6. **2017, Q. No. 7** 156

Critically engage with the book "Cardamom and Class" by Ian Karlos Fitzpatrick to describe how changes in agricultural productivity and mode of production can lead to socio-economic differentiation and new class formation?

(इयान कालोंस् फिजप्याट्रिकद्वारा लिखित पुस्तक *Cardamom and Class* सँग आलोचनात्मक रूपमा अभ्यस्त भइ कृषि उत्पादकत्व र उत्पादनका पद्धतिमा आएका

परिवर्तनहरूले कसरी सामाजिक-आर्थिक विभिन्नता र नयाँ वर्ग निर्माण गराए भन्ने सम्बन्धमा व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

7. **2017, Q. No. 8**

Based on your readings of various texts related to foreign labor migration in Nepal, discuss with relevant examples, how foreign labor migration and remittances have further exacerbated Nepal's status as a dependent country?

159

(नेपालमा वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनसँग सम्बन्धित तपाईंका विभिन्न अध्ययनहरूमा आधारित रहेर कसरी वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासन र विप्रेषणले नेपाललाई अझ परनिर्भर देशको रूपमा कायम गरिरहेका छन् भन्ने सम्बन्धमा सान्दर्भिक उदाहरणहरूसहित छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

8. **2016, Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)**

Briefly Discuss about Nepal's Development of Underdevelopment with reference *Chaitnya Mishra*.

161

(चैतन्य मिश्रको सन्दर्भका साथ नेपालको अपविकासको विकासका बारे सङ्खेपमा छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

9. **2015, Q. No. 6**

Discuss the nature of economy and society of Nepal from world-system approach with reference to Blaikie, Cameron and Seddon.

165

(ब्लाइकी, क्यामरून र सेडनका सन्दर्भका साथ नेपालको अर्थतन्त्र र समाजको प्रकृतिलाई विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमबाट छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

Definitions of Key Terms

Capitalist world-system

Wallerstein's definition follows dependency theory, which intended to combine the developments of the different societies since the 16th century in different regions into one collaborative development. The main characteristic of his definition is the development of a global division of labor, including independent political units (in this case, states) at the same time. There is no political center, compared to global empires like the Roman Empire; instead, the capitalist world-system is identified by the global market economy. It is divided into core, semi-periphery, and periphery regions and is ruled by the capitalist mode of production.

Core/periphery

The difference between developed and developing countries, characterized, e.g., by power or wealth. The core refers to developed countries, the periphery to the dependent developing countries. The main reason for the position of the developed countries is economic power.

Semi-periphery

States that are located between core and periphery and who benefit from the periphery through unequal exchange relations. At the same time, the core benefits from the semi-periphery through unequal exchange relations.

Quasi-monopolies

A kind of monopoly where there is more than one service provider for a particular good/service. Wallerstein claims that quasi-monopolies are self-liquidating because new sellers go into the market by exerting political pressure to open markets to competition.

Kondratiev waves

A cyclical tendency in the world's economy. It is also known as a *super cycle*. Wallerstein argues that global wars are tied to Kondratiev waves. According to him, global conflicts occur as the summer phase of a wave begins, which is when the production of goods and services worldwide is on an upswing.

CHAPTER-1

तिश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणको ऐतिहासिक सन्दर्भ

(THE HISTORICAL CONTEXT OF WORLD-SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE)

1. 2020, Q. No. 6

What are the reasons for the possible future demise of the world-system? Discuss with reference to Immanuel Wallerstein.

(विश्व-व्यवस्थाको सम्भाव्य आगामी अवसानका कारणहरू के-के छन् ? इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनको सन्दर्भका साथ छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्त एउटा बृहत् समाजशास्त्रीय दृष्टिकोण हो, जसले एउटा समग्र सामाजिक व्यवस्थाका रूपमा विश्व पूँजीवादी अर्थतन्त्रका गतिशीलताहरू वर्णन गर्नेतर्फ हेर्दछ । यो एक राजनैतिक र बौद्धिक प्रयत्नमा आधारित समाजशास्त्रीय दृष्टिकोण हो । विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्त ऐतिहासिक समाजशास्त्र र आर्थिक इतिहासको क्षेत्रअन्तर्गत पर्दछ । यसका अतिरिक्त विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तले विभिन्न देशहरूमा कायम रहेका विकासका अवस्थाहरू र असमान अवसरहरूमा जोड दिने भएकाले यसलाई विकास सिद्धान्तकार र विकासका अभ्यासकर्ताहरूले विशेष महत्त्व दिन्छन् ।

विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तसँग अमेरिकी समाजशास्त्री इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनको नाम जोडिएको छ । उनले सर्वप्रथम आफ्नो कार्य *The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis* (1974) लेखन गरेर यस सिद्धान्तको प्रारम्भिक अवधारणा अगाडि सारेका थिए । त्यसपछि उनले *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (1974, 1980, 1989) पुस्तक लेखी । विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणलाई थप फराकिलो गरेका थिए । वालेस्टीइनद्वारा समाजशास्त्रीय र ऐतिहासिक चिन्तनमा आधारित रहेर गरिएको यस महत्त्वपूर्ण योगदानले विगत सात दशकदेखि इतिहास, समाज र अर्थतन्त्रलाई विश्वव्यापी दृष्टिकोणबाट बुझ्ने एउटा महत्त्वपूर्ण अन्तर्दृष्टि प्रदान गरेको छ । वालेस्टीइनको यो कार्य विधिगत रूपमा मार्क्स र बेबरको मध्यमार्गी छ ।

विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्त थुप्रै रूपबाट परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तको अनुग्रहण (Adaptation of dependency theory) हो । वालेस्टीइनले परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तबाट थुप्रै अवधारणाहरू समेटेर आफ्नो सिद्धान्त विकास गरेका छन् । परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्त विकासशील जगतका सन्दर्भमा लोकप्रिय विकास प्रक्रियाहरूको एक नव-मार्क्सवादी व्याख्या (A neo-Marxist explanation of development processes) हो । परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तले मुख्य-पृष्ठ सम्बन्ध हेरी पृष्ठ क्षेत्रको बुझाइमा जोड दिन्छ र ल्याटिन अमेरिकी क्षेत्रहरू जस्ता पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका अल्पविकासलाई केन्द्रविन्दुमा राख्छ । परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तलाई केही आलोचनात्मक स्वरूपमा विकास गरी विश्वव्यापी पूँजीवादको बुझाइ प्राप्त गर्न विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोण विकास गरिएको हो । वालेस्टीइनका

- कार्यहरूमा कार्ल पोलायी र जोसेफ स्कुम्प्टर जस्ता समकालीन विचारहरूका बाबू।
- छ।
- इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीनको सन्दर्भका साथ विश्व-व्यवस्थाको आगामी सम्भाव्य अवसानका केही कारणहरू (Some reasons for the possible future demise of the world system with reference to Immanuel Wallerstein)
- वालेस्टीनका अनुसार विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको अवसान मूलभूत रूपमा समकालीन सामाजिक विज्ञानहरू अन्तर्गत एक गतिशीलता हो, जुन विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणमा भएका अन्तर्विरोधहरू र यसको उपयोगिताको घटनावद्ध पलायनद्वारा चलायमान हुने पुगेको छ। वालेस्टीनका अनुसार विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणलाई विघटन वा अवसान गराउनेतरफ केन्द्रित यसअन्तर्गतका केही अन्तर्विरोधहरू निम्नानुसार छन् :
- i. विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण एउटा स्तरीय सिद्धान्त वा सेढानीकरणको विधि होइन बरु एउटा दृष्टिकोण र अरू दृष्टिकोणहरूको आलोचना हो। वालेस्टीन व्यक्तिगत रूपबाट विश्वास गर्दथे कि यस्तो आलोचना थुप्रै सामाजिक विज्ञानहरू सञ्चालित हुने दूलो सद्ख्याका समाजशास्त्रीय मान्यताहरूमा भयावह वा विनाशकारी हुन सक्दछ। अतः यसबाट विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण त्यति स्वीकार्य हुन नसकि अवसान हुने स्थितिमा पुग्दछ।
 - ii. वालेस्टीनका अनुसार विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको आलोचनासँग जोडिएको दोस्रो समस्या पनि रहेको छ, जुन यसको अवसानको कारक बन्न सक्दछ। आलोचनाहरू प्रारम्भिक चिन्ता वा प्रवलताका विगत घटनाहरू हुन्छन्। यिनले दोहोरो-हस्तक्षेप (Pseudo-coopt) उत्पन्न गराउँदछन्।
 - iii. वालेस्टीन तर्क गर्दछन् कि हामी विश्व-अर्थतत्रका पृष्ठ क्षेत्रहरूको समकालीन परिस्थितिलाई विश्लेषण गर्न आलोचनाहरूका तौरतरिकाहरूमा विगत धेरै समयदेखि परिवर्तन हुन्दै आएका छौं। आधुनिक विश्वको जुन इतिहास लेखिएको छ, त्यसलाई आलोचना गर्ने तौरतरिकाहरू पनि बदलिन्दै आइरहेका छन्। यसका अतिरिक्त आधुनिक विश्व व्यवस्थालाई व्याख्या गर्ने सिद्धान्तहरू र ऐतिहासिक सामाजिक विज्ञानहरूमा प्रयुक्त गरिएका पद्धतिहरूको आलोचना गर्ने शैलीहरू पनि परिवर्तित हुन पुगेका छन्। यी सम्पूर्ण परिवर्तनहरूका कारण विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण अवसान हुने अवस्थासम्म पुग्दछ।

1. 2020, Q. No. 6

What are the reasons for the possible future demise of the world-system?
Discuss with reference to Immanuel Wallerstein.

Ans: World-system theory is a macro-sociological perspective that explains the “capitalist world economy” dynamics as a “total social system.” World-system theory is both a political and an intellectual endeavor. It simultaneously falls into the fields of historical sociology and economic history. In addition, because of its emphasis on development and unequal opportunities across nations, it has been embraced by development theorists and practitioners.

Immanuel Wallerstein’s name is associated with this approach. He first published *The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis* (1974). Then, his most important work—*The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (1974, 1980, 1989) further expanded the world-system perspective. This work is his landmark contribution to sociological and historical thought and spawned

...विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोण (World-System Perspective)

debates lasting seven decades over the best way to interpret history, society, and economy from a global perspective. His work is methodologically somewhere between Marx and Weber, both of whom were important inspirations for his work.

World-system theory is in many ways an adaptation of dependency theory. Wallerstein draws heavily from dependency theory, a neo-Marxist explanation of development processes, popular in developing countries. Dependency theory focuses on understanding the "periphery" by looking at core-periphery relations, and it has flourished in peripheral regions like Latin America. From a dependency theory perspective, many contemporary critiques of global capitalism come. Karl Polanyi and Joseph Schumpeter are other important influences in Wallerstein's work, still present in contemporary world system research. From the latter comes world system interest in business cycles, and from the former, the notion of three basic modes of economic organization—reciprocal, redistributive, and market modes. These are analogous to Wallerstein's concepts of mini-systems, world empires, and world economies.

- Some of the reasons for the possible future demise of the world-system analysis with reference to the key text of Immanuel Wallerstein

According to Wallerstein, the demise of a world-system analysis has been essentially a movement within contemporary social sciences, derived from its contradictions and the eventual exhaustion of its utility. The possible contradictions within world-system analysis, which leads to demise it, according to Wallerstein, are as follows:

- i. World-system analysis is not a theory or model of theorizing but a perspective and a critique of other perspectives. It is a potent critique, and Wallerstein personally believes the critique is devastating for many of the premises on which much of social science presently operates.
- ii. There is a second problem with critiques, especially, according to Wallerstein, critiques past the moment of initial shock or vigor. Critiques are not that difficult to pseudo-coopt.
- iii. Wallerstein argues that we have shifted over the years from criticizing how we analyze the contemporary situation in peripheral zones of the world economy to criticizing the following facts:
 - a. how the history of the modern world has been written,
 - b. how the theories are supposed to explain the modern world system,
 - c. how the methodologies used in the historical, social sciences,
 - d. how knowledge institutions have been constructed.

Above mentioned problems are another reason for the demise of world-system analysis.

- इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीनका मुख्य लेखनका सन्दर्भका साथ विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको सम्बाध्य आगामी अवसानका केही कारणहरू (Some of the reasons for the possible future demise of the world-system analysis with reference to the key text of Immanuel Wallerstein)

वालेस्टीनका अनुसार विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको अवसान मूलभूत रूपमा समकालीन सामाजिक विज्ञानहरू अन्तर्गत एक गतिशीलता हो, जुन विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणमा भएका अन्तर्विरोधहरू र यसको उपयोगिताको घटनावद्ध पलायनद्वारा चलायमान हुन पुगेको छ । वालेस्टीनका अनुसार विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणलाई विघटन वा अवसान गराउनेतरफ केन्द्रित यसअन्तर्गतका केही अन्तर्विरोधहरू निम्नानुसार छन् :

 - विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण एउटा स्तरीय सिद्धान्त वा सैद्धान्तिकरणको विधि होइन बरु एउटा दृष्टिकोण र अरू दृष्टिकोणहरूको आलोचना हो । वालेस्टीन व्यक्तिगत रूपबाट विश्वास गर्दथे कि यस्तो आलोचना थुप्रै सामाजिक विज्ञानहरू सञ्चालित हुने दूलो सद्धर्ख्याका समाजशास्त्रीय मान्यताहरूमा भयावह वा विनाशकारी हुन सक्छ । अतः यसबाट विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण त्यति स्वीकार्य हुन नसकि अवसान हुने स्थितिमा पुग्दछ ।
 - वालेस्टीनका अनुसार विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको आलोचनासँग जोडिएको दोस्रो समस्या पनि रहेको छ, जुन यसको अवसानको कारक बन्न सक्छ । आलोचनाहरू प्रारम्भिक चिन्ता वा प्रवलताका विगत घटनाहरू हुन्छन् । यिनले दोहोरो-हस्तक्षेप (Pseudo-coopt) उत्पन्न गराउँदछन् ।
 - वालेस्टीन तर्क गर्दछन् कि हामी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रका पृष्ठ क्षेत्रहरूको समकालीन परिस्थितिलाई विश्लेषण गर्न आलोचनाहरूका तौरतरिकाहरूमा विगत धेरै समयदेखि परिवर्तन हुँदै आएका छौं । आधुनिक विश्वको जुन इतिहास लेखिएको छ, त्यसलाई आलोचना गर्ने तौरतरिकाहरू पनि बदलिंदै आइरहेका छन् । यसका अतिरिक्त आधुनिक विश्व व्यवस्थालाई व्याख्या गर्ने सिद्धान्तहरू र ऐतिहासिक सामाजिक विज्ञानहरूमा प्रयुक्त गरिएका पद्धतिहरूको आलोचना गर्ने शैलीहरू पनि परिवर्तित हुन पुगेका छन् । यी सम्पूर्ण परिवर्तनहरूका कारण विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण अवसान हुने अवस्थासम्म पुग्दछ ।

2. 2019,*Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

What are some of the main reasons of the rise of the world-system analysis? Likewise, what are some of the reasons for the possible future demise of the world-system analysis? Discuss reference to the key text of Immanuel Wallerstein.

Ans: *World-system analysis* is a sociological perspective forwarded by famous neo-Marxian sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein—Professor and sociologist at United States Columbia University. In his book *World-System Analysis* (1974, 1980, 1989), Immanuel Wallerstein provides a concise and accessible introduction to the comprehensive approach he pioneered 50 years ago to understanding the history and development of the modern world system. Since Wallerstein first developed the world-system analysis, it has become a widely utilized methodology within the historical, social sciences and a common point of reference in discussions of globalization. For the first time in Volume One (1974), Wallerstein offers a concise summary of world-systems analysis and a clear outline of the modern world system, describing the structure of knowledge upon which it is based, its mechanism, and its future.

Wallerstein outlined the defining characteristics of world-system analysis as follows:

- i. World-system analysis emphasis on world-systems rather than nation-states.
- ii. World-system analysis focuses on considering historical processes as they unfold in more extended periods ever.
- iii. Its main emphasis on combining a single analytical framework body of knowledge is usually viewed as distinct from one another—such as history, political science, economics, and sociology.
- **Main Reasons for the Rise of the World-system Analysis with Reference to the Key Text of Immanuel Wallerstein**

Wallerstein argues that the world-system analysis took shape in the 1970s. It was because conditions for its emergence were ripe within the world system. The prime factor of world-system analysis can be summarized as the world revolution of 1968, both the events themselves and the underlying conditions that gave rise to them. The most significant change in world social science in the 25 years after 1945 was discovering the contemporary reality of the Third World. This geographical discovery had the effect of undermining the 19th-century construction of social science, which has created different theories and disciplines for studying Europe/North America on the one hand and that of the rest of the world on the other. After 1945, social science became, was forced to become, geographically integrated. Along with these political implications and the industrial revolution consequences, Wallerstein outlined the following four thrusts as reasons for the rise of the world-system analysis:

i. Globality

Globality followed from the famous concern with the unit of the analysis called a world-system rather than a society/state. To be sure, modernization theory had been international in that it insisted on comparing all states systematically. Nevertheless, it had never been global since it posited no emergent characteristics of a world system. Indeed, it never spoke of a world-system. World-systems analysis insisted on seeing all parts of the world-system as a part of a "world," the parts being impossible to understand or analyze separately. It is necessary to analyze the characteristics of any given state at T (2) that were said to be not the result of some "primordial" features at T (1), but rather the outcome of processes of the system, the world-system. In this way, Wallerstein sees globality as an essential thrust of the rise of world-system analysis.

ii. Historicity

The second significant thrust for the rise of world-system analysis, according to Wallerstein, is historicity. If the processes were systemic, then the entire history of the system (as opposed to the history of subunits, taken separately and comparatively) was the crucial element in understanding the system's present state. To be sure, for this purpose, one had to decide on the temporal boundaries of the system.

iii. Unidisciplinary

The third thrust for rising world-system analysis is 'unidisciplinary,' followed by the second. According to Wallerstein, if there were historically emergent and historically evolving processes in the world system, what would lead us to assume that sociologists could separate these processes into different and segregated streams with specific (even opposed) logics? The burden of proof was indeed on those who argued the distinctiveness of the economic, political, and sociocultural arenas.

iv. Holism

According to Wallerstein, the fourth thrust or significant reason for rising world-system analysis is 'holism.' The arguments of world-systems analysis led advocates to be dubious of, even opposed to, the boundary lines within the social sciences, as they had been historically constructed between 1850 and 1945. Holism leads to rethinking and the historically constructed and now consecrated great divide between the Sciences and the humanities, and perhaps unthinking it.

- **Some of the reasons for the possible future demise of the world-system analysis with reference to the key text of Immanuel Wallerstein**

According to Wallerstein, the demise of a world-system analysis has been essentially a movement within contemporary social sciences, derived from its contradictions and the eventual exhaustion of its utility. The possible contradictions within world-system analysis, which leads to demise it, according to Wallerstein, are as follows:

- i. World-system analysis is not a theory or model of theorizing but a perspective and a critique of other perspectives. It is a potent critique, and Wallerstein personally believes the critique is devastating for many of the premises on which much of social science presently operates.
- ii. There is a second problem with critiques, especially, according to Wallerstein, critiques past the moment of initial shock or vigor. Critiques are not that difficult to pseudo-coopt.
- iii. Wallerstein argues that we have shifted over the years from criticizing how we analyze the contemporary situation in peripheral zones of the world economy to criticizing the following facts:
 - a. how the history of the modern world has been written,
 - b. how the theories are supposed to explain the modern world system,
 - c. how the methodologies used in the historical, social sciences,
 - d. how knowledge institutions have been constructed.

Above mentioned problems are another reason for the demise of world-system analysis.

iii. मुख्य क्षेत्रहरूको विकास (Development of core states)

विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागम उदयको ऐतिहासिक सदर्भअन्तर्गत तेस्रो अवस्थामा राजनैतिक विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागम उदयको विकास हुने प्रक्रिया समावेश हुन्छ । यस अवस्थामा विभिन्न आर्थिक समूहहरूले आफ्ना हितहरूको संरक्षण र सम्बर्धन गर्नका लागि कसरी राज्य संरचनाको प्रयोग गर्ने भने सम्बन्धमा चिन्तन गर्ने प्रवृत्ति उत्पन्न हुन्छ । पूँजीवाद विकास भएकै समयमा पश्चिमेली यूरोपमा निरपेक्ष राजतन्त्र (Absolute monarchies) को उदय हुन पुग्दछ । 16औं देखि 18औं शताब्दीको समयमा यूरोपभर राज्यहरू आर्थिक क्रियाकलापका केन्द्रहरूको रूपमा स्थापित भए । मुख्य क्षेत्रहरूमा रहेका शक्तिशाली राज्यहरूले पूँजीवादको विकासमा प्रमुख भूमिका निर्वाह गरे । कर्मचारीतन्त्र वा नोकरशाली प्रणालीको विकास, समाजमा शक्तिको एकाधिकार, आन्तरिक स्थिरताका लागि सैन्य क्षमताको विस्तार र सुदृढीकरण जस्ता कार्यहरू गरेर 16औं शताब्दीको समयमा यूरोपीयन राज्यहरूले राज्यशक्तिलाई थप बलियो रूपमा उभ्याए । मुख्य क्षेत्रका राज्य वा देशहरूले सबल राजनैतिक व्यवस्था विकास गरे भने पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका राष्ट्रहरूले त्यति सबल व्यवस्था विकास गर्न नसकी कमजोर बन पुगे । यसबाट विश्व-व्यवस्था उदय हुन पुग्यो ।

iv. पछिल्ला विकासक्रमहरू (Later developments)

वालेस्ट्याइनले आफ्टुटारा लिखित पुस्तक *The Modern World-System Vol. 2 (1980)* मा सन् 1600 देखि 1750 को समयमा विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको सुदृढीकरणका बारेमा सविस्तारित विश्लेषण समेटेका छन् । उनका अनुसार सन् 1600-1750 को समयावधि यूरोपीयन विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको महत्त्वपूर्ण विस्तार र त्यहाँको अर्थव्यवस्थामा व्यापक परिवर्तनहरू भएको अवधि हो । यस समयमा नेदरल्याण्ड एउटा मुख्य क्षेत्रको रूपमा स्थापित भई तुरुन्तै अवसान हुन पुग्यो । इङ्गल्याण्ड र फ्रान्स जस्ता शक्तिशाली राष्ट्रबीच हुन्दूको सुरुआत भयो । अर्धपृष्ठ क्षेत्रको रूपमा स्पेन र स्वीडेनको उदय भयो । औपनिवेशीकरणको प्रभावका कारण अफ्रिकी र एशियाली भु-भागका कतिपय देशहरू पृष्ठ क्षेत्रकारूपमा सीमित हुन पुगे । यसै क्रममा सन् 1945-1990 को समयमा संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिकाले विश्व-व्यवस्थामा प्रभूत्वशाली शक्ति कायम राख्न सफल भयो । यस विभिन्न कालक्रमहरू पुरा गरी विश्व-व्यवस्था वर्तमान समयमा एक आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमका रूपमा उदय हुन पुग्यो ।

3. 2016, Q. No. 5

Discuss the historical context in the rise of world-system approach.

Ans: The world-systems approach (also known as world-systems analysis or the world-systems perspective) is a multidisciplinary approach to world history and social change which emphasizes the world-system (and not nation-states) as the primary (but not exclusive) unit of social analysis. For Wallerstein, a world-system is a social system with boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimization, and coherence. Its life is made up of the conflicting forces which hold it together by tension and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remodel it to its advantage. It has the characteristics of an organism in that it has a lifespan over which its characteristics change in some respects and remain stable in others.

According to Wallerstein, the modern world-system as capitalist-world systems came during the long 16th century. After that, it was a further rise by overcoming the following historical contexts:

i. Geographical expansion through exploration and colonization

In Wallerstein's view, geographical expansion is the first and most important historical context to the rise of the world-system approach. By the mid-1400s, the European nation Portugal had begun to subjugate overseas countries, and other European nations had followed Portugal's policies. Later, such practice expanded into political and military domination. European nations maintained their subordination and economic dominance over the underdeveloped and especially overseas countries, keeping in view their immediate interests. The labor system based on slavery helped lay the foundations of the capitalist economy. This phenomenon paved the way for the rise of the world-system.

ii. Worldwide Division of Labor

The global division of labor played an essential role as another historical context for the rise of the world-system approach after completing the phase of geographical expansion through subjugation, domination, and colonization. Capitalism replaced nationalism as a system of world domination during the 16th century. However, capitalism did not develop uniformly around the world. According to Wallerstein, the strengthening of the capitalist system encouraged development based on inequality. The various parts of the capitalist world system are becoming specialized based on specific functions such as the supply of labor, use of labor, agricultural production, production and supply of raw materials, and management of industrial organizations. Besides, different world regions became specialized in producing certain types of workers. In Africa, for example, workers lived as slaves, while in Western and Southern Europe, workers were produced and supplied as peasants and small farmers.

In particular, the three sections of the international division of labor also differed based on the mode of labor control. The core areas were divided into free labor, the periphery areas in forced labor, and the semi-periphery areas were divided into sharecropper labor. Thus, Wallerstein argues that capitalism developed in the core areas through the free labor market for skilled workers and periphery areas for less-skilled workers through the forced labor market. These processes and events laid the groundwork for the emergence of a world-system.

iii. Development of core states

The third stage in the historical context of the rise of the world-system approach involves developing the political sphere and the core spheres. In this situation, various economic groups tend to use the state structure to protect and promote their interests. Absolute monarchies emerge in Western Europe as capitalism develops. During the 16th to 18th centuries, states throughout Europe were established as economic activity centers. Powerful states in core regions played a significant role in developing capitalism. During the 16th century, European states strengthened state power by developing bureaucracies, monopolizing power in society, expanding and consolidating military capabilities for internal stability. While the states or countries of the core areas developed effective and politically robust systems, the periphery region's nations became weak due to the inability to develop such robust systems. This process led to the rise of the world-system.

iv. Later developments

The book *The Modern World-System* Vol. 2 (1980) contains a detailed analysis of the consolidation of the world-economy between 1600 and 1750. According to Wallerstein, 1600–1750 was a period of significant expansion of the European world-economy and extensive changes. During this time, the Netherlands was established as a powerful region and ended immediately. Conflict broke out between powerful nations such as England and France. Spain and Sweden emerged as semi-periphery regions. Because of colonization, some countries in Africa and Asia were limited to the periphery area. Meanwhile, during 1945–1990, the United States succeeded in maintaining a dominant power in the world system. By completing these various chronologies, the world-system has emerged as a modern world-system approach in the present time.

4. 2015, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

Describe about the historical contexts in the rise of world-system approach.

(विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमको उदयअन्तर्गतका ऐतिहासिक सन्दर्भहरूबाटे व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागम विश्व इतिहास र सामाजिक परिवर्तन अध्ययन एवम् विश्लेषणको एक बहुविधागत र बृहत् स्केल उपागम (Multidisciplinary and macro-scale approach) हो, जसले समग्र विश्व-व्यवस्था (वा विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र) लाई सामाजिक विश्लेषणको प्राथमिक एकाई मान्दछ। विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमले अन्तर्क्षेत्रीय र बहुराष्ट्रिय तहमा हुने श्रम विभाजनद्वारा सिर्जित मुख्य क्षेत्र, पृष्ठ क्षेत्र र अर्धपृष्ठ देशहरूका आर्थिक तथा राजनैतिक पक्षहरूको अध्ययन गर्नुपर्नेमा जोड दिन्छ। अमेरिकाको कोलम्बिया विश्वविद्यालयका समाजशास्त्री र प्राध्यापक इम्मानुएल वालेस्टाइनलाई विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमका प्रमुख विकासकर्ता मानिन्छ। जर्मन-अमेरिकन समाजशास्त्री एण्ड्रे गुण्डर फ्रान्क (1966, 1975, 1978, 1980) र इजिप्टियन फ्रेन्च मार्क्सवादी अर्थशास्त्री समीर अमिन (1973, 1971, 1997, 2003) ले समेत यसको विकासमा महत्वपूर्ण योगदान दिएका छन्।

वालेस्टाइनले आफ्नो पुस्तक *The Modern World-System* (Vol. 1) मा विश्व-व्यवस्थाको प्रारम्भिक उदय सन् 1450–1640 को बीचमा भएको उल्लेख गरेका छन्। त्यस अवधिमा राजनैतिक (वा सैन्य) प्रभूत्व आर्थिक प्रभूत्वमा स्थानान्तरित हुन पुगेको थियो। त्यसपछि निम्नलिखित ऐतिहासिक सन्दर्भहरू पुरा गर्दै विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागम पूर्ण रूपमा उदय हुन पुगेको हो :

i. नवीन अभ्यास र औपनिवेशीकरण मार्फत भौगोलिक विस्तार (Geographical expansion through exploration and colonization)

वालेस्टाइनको अभिमतमा भौगोलिक विस्तारलाई विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागम उदयको पहिलो र महत्वपूर्ण ऐतिहासिक सन्दर्भ मानिन्छ। सन् 1400 को मध्यतिर यूरोपीयन देश पोर्जुगलले समुद्रपारका देशहरूलाई अधिनस्थ राख्ने र अन्य यूरोपीयन राष्ट्रहरूले पोर्जुगलको त्यस्तो अभ्यासलाई अवलम्बन गर्ने प्रवृत्ति बढयो। पछि यस्तो अभ्यास राजनैतिक र सैन्य प्रभूत्वको रूपमा विस्तारित हुदै गयो। यूरोपीयन राष्ट्रहरूले आफ्ना तत्कालीक हितहरूलाई ध्यानमा राखी अल्पविकसित र विशेषगरी समुद्रपारका देशहरूउपर अधिनस्थता र आर्थिक प्रभूत्व कायम राखे। दास प्रथामा आधारित श्रमिक व्यवस्थाले पूँजीवादी अर्थतन्त्रको आधारशीलता तयार गर्न मद्दत गच्छो। यसबाट विश्व-व्यवस्था उदय हुन मार्गप्रसस्त हुन पुगयो।

राष्ट्रबीच दृन्घको सुरुआत भयो । अर्धपृष्ठ क्षेत्रको रूपमा स्पेन र स्वीडेनको उदय भयो । उपनिवेशीकरणको प्रभावका कारण अफ्रिकी र एशियाली भु-भागका क्तिपय देशहरू पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका रूपमा सीमित हुन पुगे । यस ऋममा सन् 1945-1990 को समयमा संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिकाले विश्व-व्यवस्थामा प्रभूत्वशाली शक्ति कायम राख सफल भयो । यी विभिन्न कालक्रमहरू पुरा गरी विश्व-व्यवस्था वर्तमान समयमा एक आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमका रूपमा उदय हुन पुग्यो ।

4. 2015, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

Describe about the historical contexts in the rise of world-system approach.

Ans: The world-systems approach (also known as world-systems analysis or the world-systems perspective) is a multidisciplinary approach to world history and social change which emphasizes the world-system (and not nation-states) as the primary (but not exclusive) unit of social analysis. For Wallerstein, *a world-system is a social system with boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimization, and coherence*. Its life is made up of the conflicting forces which hold it together by tension and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remodel it to its advantage. It has the characteristics of an organism in that it has a lifespan over which its characteristics change in some respects and remain stable in others.

Immanuel Wallerstein's name is associated with this approach. He first published *The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis* (1974). Then, his most important work—*The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (1974, 1980, 1989) further expanded the world-system perspective. His landmark contribution to sociological and historical thought works and spawned debates lasting seven decades over the best way to interpret history, society, and economy from a global perspective. His work is methodologically somewhere between Marx and Weber, both of whom were important inspirations for his work.

According to Wallerstein, the modern world-system as capitalist world-systems came during the long 16th century. After that, it was a further rise by overcoming the following historical contexts:

i. Geographical expansion through exploration and colonization

In Wallerstein's view, geographical expansion is the first and most important historical context to the rise of the world-system approach. By the mid-1400s, the European nation Portugal had begun to subjugate overseas countries, and other European nations had followed Portugal's policies. Later, such practice expanded into political and military domination. European nations maintained their subordination and economic dominance over the underdeveloped and especially overseas countries, keeping in view their immediate interests. The labor system based on slavery helped lay the foundations of the capitalist economy. This phenomenon paved the way for the rise of the world-system.

ii. Worldwide Division of Labor

The global division of labor played an essential role as another historical context for the rise of the world-system approach after completing the phase of geographical expansion through subjugation, domination, and

colonization. Capitalism replaced nationalism as a system of world domination during the 16th century. However, capitalism did not develop uniformly around the world. According to Wallerstein, the strengthening of the capitalist system encouraged development based on inequality. The various parts of the capitalist world system are becoming specialized based on specific functions such as the supply of labor, use of labor, agricultural production, production and supply of raw materials, and management of industrial organizations. Besides, different world regions became specialized in producing certain types of workers. In Africa, for example, workers lived as slaves, while in Western and Southern Europe, workers were produced and supplied as peasants and small farmers.

In particular, the three sections of the international division of labor also differed based on the mode of labor control. The core areas were divided into free labor, the periphery areas in forced labor, and the semi-periphery areas were divided into sharecropper labor. Thus, Wallerstein argues that capitalism developed in the core areas through the free labor market for skilled workers and periphery areas for less-skilled workers through the forced labor market. These processes and events laid the groundwork for the emergence of a world-system.

iii. Development of core states

The third stage in the historical context of the rise of the world-system approach involves developing the political sphere and the core spheres. In this situation, various economic groups tend to use the state structure to protect and promote their interests. Absolute monarchies emerge in Western Europe as capitalism develops. During the 16th to 18th centuries, states throughout Europe were established as economic activity centers. Powerful states in core regions played a significant role in developing capitalism. During the 16th century, European states strengthened state power by developing bureaucracies, monopolizing power in society, expanding and consolidating military capabilities for internal stability. While the states or countries of the core areas developed effective and politically robust systems, the periphery region's nations became weak due to the inability to develop such robust systems. This process led to the rise of the world-system.

iv. Later developments

The book *The Modern World-System Vol. 2 (1980)* contains a detailed analysis of the consolidation of the world-economy between 1600 and 1750. According to Wallerstein, 1600–1750 was a period of significant expansion of the European world-economy and extensive changes. During this time, the Netherlands was established as a powerful region and ended immediately. Conflict broke out between powerful nations such as England and France. Spain and Sweden emerged as semi-periphery regions. Because of colonization, some countries in Africa and Asia were limited to the periphery area. Meanwhile, during 1945–1990, the United States succeeded in maintaining a dominant power in the world system. By completing these various chronologies, the world-system has emerged as a modern world-system approach in the present time.

5. 2015, Q. No. 4

Briefly discuss about the various stages of European world economy (Wallerstein, 1974).

Ans: The book *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-economy in the Sixteenth Century* (1974) by Emmanuel Wallerstein, a major advocate of the world-system approach, presents a theoretical framework for the changes involved in the rise of the modern world-system. This book points out that the modern world-system is fundamentally capitalist. The feudal system's crisis and the consolidation of the European world-economy from 1450-1670 played an essential role in the emergence of the modern world-system.

According to Wallerstein, Europe continued to establish a capitalist world-economy to ensure sustainable economic growth. However, in Western Europe, different labor control and strong state machinery were adopted. The division of labor at the international level led to the development of various regions as core, periphery, and semi-periphery. The European world economy was also gradually focused on growth and development in this process. Wallerstein argues that the growth of the European world-economy also played an important role in shaping the modern world-system.

Wallerstein points out that there are four stages in the rise and development of the European world-economy. Out of four phases, the first two phases are included in the same joint phases based on the same symptoms of economic growth and the last two in the common phases, which are as follows:

- **Stages-1 & 2**

This phase covers the period of the rise of the modern world-system between 1450-1670. When the Hapsburg Empire failed to transform the emerging world economy into a world empire, Western European countries could strengthen their relative position in the new world economy. To further strengthen it, most European cities focused on mobilizing the following internal political economies and social resources:

- i. **Bureaucratization**

The system of bureaucracy had helped to facilitate tax collection. It strengthened the internal economies of European countries. As the domestic economy strengthened, the king's limited but growing power emerged in most European countries. As the power of the state to collect taxes increased, the king emphasized the practice of using collected taxes to increase state power and expand the bureaucracy. By the end of this phase, the monarchy had become the supreme power, and the absolute monarchy had become institutionalized.

- ii. **Homogenisation of the local population**

To include the state in the new capitalist system and encourage the primitive capitalist groups, some major European nations even expelled the minority groups. With the rise of the absolute monarchy, Jews were expelled from England, Spain, and France. Protestant followers of the Catholic Church were also further strengthened as centers of the Catholic Church.

- iii. Emphasis was placed on expanding military power to protect the new state from interference and support a centralized monarchy.
- iv. Diversification of economic activities was done to increase the profits of the local bourgeoisie and to elevate their position.

Emphasis on the above functions enabled Northwestern European states to become the **core states** of the emerging economy by 1640. Spain and northern Italy remained as semi-periphery regions. Northeastern Europe was limited to the periphery region. On the other hand, England turned to the nation of the core region.

- **Stages -3 & 4**

- Agricultural capitalism was given more space in Europe than industrial capitalism at this stage. As the economy shifted from agricultural production to industrial one, the following effects occurred at this stage:
 - i. European states participated in active market exploration to utilize their new markets.
 - ii. Attempts to integrate a competitive world-system, such as the Indian system, into the European world-system have penetrated the interior of the Latin American continent. It also isolated regions of the world in the past. Similarly, in the 19th century, Asia and Africa also entered the periphery areas.
 - iii. The fact that most regions of Africa and Asia were limited to the periphery area increased the available surplus, helping the United States and Germany elevate their core region status.
 - iv. At this stage, the core areas shifted from the diverse interests of both agricultural and industrial to purely industrial concerns. By the 1700s, England had become the leading industrial producer in Europe and the leading agricultural one. By 1900, England had developed rapidly to limit its agricultural activity to 10%.
 - v. By the 1900s, the European economy had expanded to include the construction of industrial and multinational corporations in the periphery and semi-periphery areas.

Thus, in Wallerstein's view, the center of the capitalist world-economy is the product of the European world-economy. The European world-economy has undergone many changes since the 1500s. The dynamic system of the European world economy led to the emergence of Northwestern Europe as a center of economic power. The growing global profits from international trade and the trend of importing raw materials from the periphery region at low cost and exporting at higher cost strengthened the European world-economy.

6. What are the views of Immanuel Wallersten in the context of social change? Discuss with reference to *On the Study of Social Change* (1974). (Long Answer Question) (Additional Question)

(सामाजिक परिवर्तनका सन्दर्भमा इम्मानुएल वालेर्स्टीनका दृष्टिकोणहरू के-के छन् ? 'सामाजिक परिवर्तनको अध्ययनमा' (1974) का आधारबाट छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका प्रतिपादक इम्मानुएल वालेर्स्टीनले आफूद्वारा लिखित पुस्तक *The Modern World-system: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (1974) को पहिलो अध्यायमा **On the**

औपनिवेशिकता र प्रभूत्वबाट सिर्जित अन्तर्निर्भरता (Interdependence) लाई पनि विश्व-व्यवस्थामा सामाजिक परिवर्तनको एउटा एकाई मानिन्छ । औपनिवेशिक क्षेत्रहरूको अध्ययनका रूपमा राजनैतिक व्यवस्थामा आएको फूटलाई विशेष महत्त्वका साथ विश्लेषण गरिन्छ । वालेस्टीइन सामाजिक परिवर्तनका लागि विभिन्न ऐतिहासिक प्रणालीहरूलाई विभेद वा अन्तर गरिनुपर्ने मान्यता राख्दछन् । प्रत्येक ऐतिहासिक प्रणाली श्रमको एउटा खास प्रकारको विभाजनमा आधारित हुन्छ । त्यस्तो विशिष्ट किसिमको श्रम विभाजनले समाजमा सामाजिक, सांस्कृतिक, राजनैतिक र आर्थिक संस्थाहरू विकास गर्दछ । यी संस्थाहरूले एउटा व्यवस्थाको कार्यान्वयन एवम् व्यक्तिको सामाजिकीकरणलाई निर्धारित गर्दछन् । वालेस्टीइनको तर्क रहेको छ कि विभिन्न प्रकारका ऐतिहासिक पद्धतिहरूको अध्ययन गर्नु सम्भव हुन्छ र त्यस्तो अध्ययनद्वारा मात्रै सामाजिक परिवर्तनबाटे बुझाइ प्राप्त गर्न सकिन्छ । उनका अनुसार एउटा वास्तविक सामाजिक परिवर्तन तब हुन्छ जब एउटा ऐतिहासिक विश्व प्रणाली अको विश्व प्रणालीतर्फ सङ्क्रमित हुन्छ ।

- 6.** What are the views of Immanuel Wallersten in the context of social change? Discuss with reference to *On the Study of Social Change* (1974). (Additional Question)

Ans: Immanuel Wallerstein, a proponent of the world-system approach, wrote a topic entitled *On the Study of Social Change* in the first chapter of the book *The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (1974). In this text, he has presented different perspectives on social change. According to him, change is an eternal or indestructible process. On the other hand, no such process or structure cannot be changed. Both facts are valid in the context of social change. Structures that are primarily associated with human relationships last a long time. Nevertheless, over time, creating, developing, and destroying new structures continues.

According to Wallerstein, unless the study of social change is used synonymously with the entire social sciences, it is limited to the study of long-term phenomena. However, with historical times and places, such long-term structures of society are also changing. Therefore, social change cannot be defined based on which structure lasts for a long time.

Two main structural changes can illustrate the process of social change in the world social sciences. The *first* is the Neolithic or agricultural revolution, and the *second* is the creation of the modern world-system. Instead, creating the world-system and its study are areas of greater importance in terms of social change. The emergence of world-system is considered an important topic in contemporary social science. According to Wallerstein, the rise of the world-system was studied under a primary subject until the 19th century. Various debates have arisen regarding the definition of social change in modern times. In addition, there are differences among sociologists regarding the critical elements of social change. Nevertheless, over the last few hundred years, there has been a great deal of structural change in the world. This change has made today's world qualitatively different from the past world.

Wallerstein points out that a unit of analysis must be identified to study the changes that make today's world different from the world of the past. He argues that it is necessary to analyze the various processes of social change in the modern world. Political conflict is considered the principal basis of social change in the modern world. However, Wallerstein has shown interest in two debates on political conflict and change. The *first* is a change guided by the philosophy that '*overall history is a history of class struggle*', and the second, '*a change guided by the essential consciousness within the society*'.

Wallerstein also suggested that the characteristics of the colonial situation should be linked to social change and the world-system. He argues that colonialism is also a key element in some of the stable elements of the world-system. Thus, a special place should be given to colonialism, expanded by the European power nations during the 19th and 20th centuries. Wallerstein argues that the colonial power will impact the social life and the overall system of the colonized nation. Therefore, **he suggested that social change and colonialism in the world-system should be taken as a unit of analysis.**

Interdependence created by colonialism and domination is also considered a unit of social change in the world-system. As a study of the colonial spheres, the shift in the political system is analyzed with particular importance. Wallerstein believes that different social systems need to be discriminated against for social change. Each historical system is based on a particular type of division of labor. Such a special kind of division of labor develops social, cultural, political, and economic institutions in society. These institutions determine the implementation of a system and the individual's socialization. He further argues that it is possible to study a variety of historical methods and that only through such studies can an understanding of social change be obtained. According to him, a real social change occurs when one historical world-system transitions to another one.

CHAPTER- 2

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका मुख्य प्रसङ्गहरू

(KEY THEMES OF THE WORLD-SYSTEM PERSPECTIVE)

1. 2020, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

“A capitalist system cannot exist within any framework except that of a world economy.” Substantiate this argument with reference to Immanuel Wallerstein.

(“एउटा पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र बाहेको अन्य कुनै पनि स्वरूपमा कायम राख्न सक्दैन।” इम्मानुएल वालेस्टाइनको सन्दर्भका साथ यस तर्कलाई पुष्टि गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: इम्मानुएल वालेस्टाइनका अनुसार हामीहरू वर्तमानमा आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था (The modern world-system) अन्तर्गत रहेका छौं। यस व्यवस्थाका उदगमहरू 16औं शताब्दीमा देखिएका वा अस्तित्वमा आएका थिए। आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्वको एउटा भागमा मात्र उदय भएको थियो। प्रारम्भमा यूरोप र अमेरिका यसका प्रमुख भाग थिए। समयको ऋमसँगै यस व्यवस्थाले समग्र विश्वलाई समेदन पुयो। आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था एक विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र हो जुन पूँजीवादी विश्व-व्यवस्था (Capitalist world-system) मा कायम रहिरहन्छ।

विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रले एउटा निश्चित आकारको भौगोलिक क्षेत्रलाई जनाउँदछ, जहाँ श्रम विभाजन कायम रहेको हुन्छ। त्यस्तो श्रम विभाजनका कारण विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा आधारभूत वस्तु तथा सेवाहरूको आदानप्रदान भइ पूँजी र श्रमको प्रवाह भइरहन्छ। कुनै एकात्मक राजनैतिक संरचनामा मात्रै सीमित वा बन्धित भएको नहुनु विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको एक प्रमुख विशेषता हो। बरु यसअन्तर्गत थुप्रै राजनैतिक एकाइहरू हुन्छन्। ती एकाइहरू एकअर्कोसँग संयोजित भइ अन्तर्राज्य प्रणाली (Interstate system) मा हाम्रो आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थासँग जोडिएका हुन्छन्। यसका अतिरिक्त विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा विभिन्न धर्महरूको अभ्यास गर्ने धार्मिक समुदाय, विभिन्न भाषिक समुदाय र विविध पारिवारिक संरचना भएका थुप्रै संस्कृति तथा समूहका व्यक्तिहरू रहन्छन्। यसको तात्पर्य विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा राजनैतिक र सांस्कृतिक समानताको अपेक्षा गरिन्छ वा त्यस्तो समानता पाइन्छ भन्ने होइन। बरु विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको संरचनालाई त्यहाँ कायम रहेको श्रम विभाजन (The division of labor) ले सङ्गठित/एकत्रित गर्दछ।

वालेस्टाइनका अनुसार मुनाफा प्राप्त गर्नका लागि बजारमा वस्तु तथा सेवाहरू बिक्री गर्ने व्यक्ति वा फर्महरू मौजुद रहनु मात्र पूँजीवाद होइन। त्यस्ता व्यक्ति तथा फर्महरू त संसारभर हजारौं वर्ष अगाडिदेखि नै मौजुद रहेका थिए। विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको परिभाषाका लागि ज्यालामा श्रम गर्ने व्यक्ति वा श्रमिकको उपलब्धता पनि पर्याप्त हुँदैन। श्रम ज्याला पनि संसारमा हजारौं वर्ष अगाडिदेखि प्रचलनमा रहेको थियो। हामी तब मात्रै पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थामा हुँछौं जब कुनै व्यवस्थाले पूँजीको अन्तहीन सञ्चयीकरण (Endless accumulation of capital) लाई मूल प्राथमिकता दिएको

हुन्छ। यस परिभाषाले केवल आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था मात्र पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था हो भने इदिगत गर्दछ। अन्तहीन सञ्चयीकरण एक सरल अवधारणा हो, जसे अनुसार व्यक्ति तथा फक्त बढीभन्दा बढी पूँजी सञ्चय गर्नका लागि अझै अधिक पूँजी आर्जन गर्न चाहीरहन्छन्। यो प्रक्रिया निरन्तर र अन्तहीन रूपमा चल्दै जान्छ। यदि कुनै व्यवस्थाले त्यस्तो निरन्तर सञ्चयीकरण व्यापक प्राथमिकता दिन्छ भने त्यहाँ संरचनागत संयन्त्रहरू (Structural mechanisms) कायम रहन्छन् जसले त्यस्तो कार्य र सम्बन्धित कर्ताहरूलाई उत्प्रेरित गर्दछन्। उपयुक्त उत्प्रेरणाका कार्य गर्ने कर्ताहरू प्रोत्साहित हुन्छन् भने पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थामा योगदान पुऱ्याउन नस्कियाहरूलाई सामाजिक व्यवस्थाबाट हटाइन्छ।

वालेस्टाइनका अनुसार विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र र पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था एकसाथ सञ्चालित हुन्छन् वा आफ्नै बद्दछन्। विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा समग्र राजनैतिक संरचनालाई संयोजित गर्ने तत्वहरू वा समानताएँ संस्कृतिको कमी हुने भएकोले श्रम विभाजनले मात्र समाजमा स्थिरता र व्यवस्था कायम राखेत हुन्छ। यसका अतिरिक्त श्रम विभाजनको उपयोगिता सम्पत्तिको निरन्तर विस्तारको कार्यको निर्धारित हुने गर्दछ, जसलाई पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाले प्रदान गर्दछ। आधुनिक समयसम्म आइपुऱ्याहरू विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रले सैन्य शक्तिलाई विश्व-साम्राज्य (World-empires) मा रूपान्तरित गरी अप्तु सुदृढ अर्थतन्त्र निर्माण गरेको छ। ऐतिहासिक रूपमा विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र मात्रै दीर्घकालसम्म कि सकेको छ, जुन आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था हो किनभने पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था नै अर्थतन्त्रको मूल हो पूँजीद्वारा नै विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रका परिभावित विशेषताहरू सुदृढ भएका छन्।

यसप्रकार, अन्तमा, वालेस्टाइन दाबी गर्दछन् कि पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको संरचनाको बाहेक अन्यत्र कायम रहन सक्दैन। पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाका लागि आर्थिक उत्पादनकर्ताहरू राजनैतिक शक्तिशाली व्यक्तिहरूबीचको प्रभावकारी र सुदृढ सम्बन्ध आवश्यक पर्दछ। उत्पादनकर्ताहरू विश्व-साम्राज्यका जस्तै सबल/शक्तिशाली छन् भने तिनका चाहनाहरूले आकिं उत्पादनकर्ताको हैसियतलाई अझै गतिशील तुल्याउँदछन्। यस्तो अवस्थामा अन्तहीन सञ्चयीकरण प्राथमिकताभन्दा केही पर जान्न सक्दछ। पूँजीवादीहरूका लागि ठूलो बजार आवश्यक पर्दछ। अलघु-व्यवस्थाहरू तिनका लागि अत्यन्त साना हुन्छन् तर तिनलाई राज्यको सहयोग र सहकार्य भने महत्त्वपूर्ण हुन्छ। राज्य र सरकारको प्रोत्साहनमा नै पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था थप सुदृढ हुने गर्दछ।

माथि प्रस्तुत गरिएको सम्पूर्ण विवेचना र वालेस्टाइनद्वारा प्रस्तुत गरिएका तर्कहरूलाई आधार माने निष्कर्ष दिन सकिन्छ कि पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको सीमाभित्र बाहेक अन्य कुनै पर्याप्त संरचनामा कायम रहन सक्दैन।

1. 2020, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

"A capitalist system cannot exist within any framework except that of a world economy." Substantiate this argument with reference to Immanuel Wallerstein.

Ans: Immanuel Wallerstein contends that the world we live in is the modern world-system, and it had its origins in the 16th century. This world-system was in only a part of the globe, primarily in parts of Europe and the Americas. It expanded over time to cover the entire globe. It has always been a world-economy and a capitalist world-system.

The world-economy implies a sizeable geographic zone within which there is a division of labor and hence significant internal exchange of basic or essential goods and flows of capital and labor. A defining feature of a world-economy is that a unitary political structure does not bound it. Instead, there are many political units inside the world-economy, loosely tied together in our modern world-system in an interstate system. Furthermore, a world-economy contains many cultures and groups—practicing several religions, speaking many

languages, and differing in their familiar patterns. It does not mean that neither political nor cultural homogeneity is expected or found in a world-economy. What unifies the structure most is the division of labor constituted within it.

According to Wallerstein, capitalism is not the mere existence of persons or firms producing for sale on the market to obtain a profit. Such persons or firms have existed for thousands of years across the world. Nor is the existence of persons working for wages sufficient as a definition. Wage labor has also been known for thousands of years. We are in a capitalist system only when the system prioritizes the endless accumulation of capital. This definition implies that **only the modern world-system has been a capitalist system**. Endless accumulation is a simple concept. It means that people and firms are accumulating capital to accumulate still more capital, a continual and endless process. If we say that a system "gives priority" to such endless accumulation, it implies that there exist structural mechanisms by which those who act with other motivations are penalized in some way and are eventually eliminated from the social scene. In contrast, those who act with the appropriate motivations are rewarded and, if successfully enriched.

Wallerstein argues that a world-economy and a capitalist system go together. Since world economies lack the unifying cement of an overall political structure or a homogeneous culture, what holds them together is the efficacy of the division of labor. Moreover, this efficacy is a function of constantly expanding the wealth that a capitalist system provides. Until modern times, the world economies constructed either fell apart or were transformed military into world-empires. **Historically, the only world-economy to have survived for a long time has been the modern world-system**, and that is because the capitalist system took root and became consolidated as its defining feature.

Thus, Wallerstein finally contends that a capitalist system cannot exist within any framework except the world-economy. A capitalist system requires an exceptional relationship between economic producers and the holders of political power. If the producers are too strong, as, in the world-empire, their interests will override those of the economic producers, and the endless accumulation of capital will cease to be a priority. Capitalists need a large market (hence mini-systems are too narrow for them), but they also need a multiplicity of states to gain the advantages of working with states and circumvent states hostile to their interest in favor of states friendly to their interests.

From the above discussion and thoughts put forward by Wallerstein, it could be concluded that a capitalist system cannot exist within any framework except that of a world-economy.

2. 2020, Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)

Sovereignty is said to be a concept that was invented in the modern world-system. Discuss how disputes on sovereignty are best resolved?

(सार्वभौमिकतालाई आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा खोज गरिएको अवधारणा मानिन्छ । सार्वभौमिकताका बारे उत्पन्न भएका विवादहरू कसरी उत्तम ढङ्गबाट समाधान गर्न सकिन्छ भन्ने सम्बन्धमा छलफल गर्नुहोस ।)

- सार्वभौमिकताका विवादहरू कसरी उत्तम ढड्गबाट समाधान गर्न सकिन्छ? (How are disputes on sovereignty best resolved?)
निम्नानुसारका तरिका वा रणनीतिहरू अवलम्बन गरेर सार्वभौमिकताका विवादहरूलाई उत्तम ढड्गबाट समाधान गर्न सकिन्छ :
 - साभा सार्वभौमिकता (Shared sovereignty)**
केही अवस्थाहरूमा अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय समुदायले अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय स्तरबाट ज्ञात गरिएको कुनै राज्यसँग साभा सार्वभौमिकताको अभ्यास गर्न सक्छ। प्रायः सबै दृष्ट्यन्तहरूमा अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय संस्थाले त्यस्तो अभ्यासका अधिकार र कार्यहरू अनुगमन गर्ने गर्दछन्।
 - संस्थागत क्षमता विकास (Institution building)**
साभा सार्वभौमिकताको अवधिमा अन्तिम हैसियत निर्धारण गर्नुभन्दा पूर्व यस उपाय/रणनीतिलाई उपयोग गरिन्छ। यहाँ उप-राज्यको कुनै पनि क्षेत्रले अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय समुदायको सहयोगमा स्वशासनका लागि संस्थागत क्षमता विकास गर्नुपर्दछ। यस्तो क्षमताबाट राज्यलाई स्वतन्त्रतापूर्वक र सार्वभौम अधिकारको प्रयोग गरी सञ्चालन गर्ने कुशलत प्राप्त हुन्छ।
 - उप-राज्यको अन्तिम हैसियत र त्यसको अरु राज्यसँगको सम्बन्धलाई आकस्मिक रूपमा निर्धारण गर्ने। (Eventual determination of the final status of the sub-state entity and its relationship to the state)**
कतिपय अवस्थामा कुनै राज्यको हैसियतलाई कुनै सन्दर्भका साथ निर्धारण गरेर सार्वभौमिकताको आधार तयार गरिन्छ। केही अवस्थामा अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय निकायलाई निष्पक्षतापूर्वक अनुगमन गर्न लगाइ सार्वभौमिकताका विवादहरू समाधान गर्न सकिन्छ।
 - चरणबद्ध सार्वभौमिकता (Phased sovereignty)**
यस रणनीतिअनुसार कुनै उप-राज्य वा विवादित राज्यको सार्वभौमिकतालाई क्रमबद्ध रूपमा लागु गरी सार्वभौम तुल्याइने प्रयत्न गरिन्छ।
 - अवस्थाजन्य सार्वभौमिकता (Conditional sovereignty)**
बहदो सार्वभौम प्राधिकारको सञ्चयीकरण गरेर अवस्थाजन्य माध्यमद्वारा सार्वभौमिकताका विवादहरू समाधान गर्ने प्रयत्न यसमा अवलम्बन गरिन्छ।
 - अवरोधमूलक सार्वभौमिकता (Constrained sovereignty)**
सार्वभौमिकता, प्राधिकार र कार्यहरूमा सीमितता ल्याइ कुनै नयाँ राज्यको सार्वभौमिकताका विवादहरू समाधान गर्ने उपाय यसमा अवलम्बन गरिन्छ।

2. 2020, Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)

Sovereignty is said to be a concept that was invented in the modern world-system. Discuss how disputes on sovereignty are best resolved?

Ans: Sovereignty is a term used to refer to the independence and autonomy of modern nation-states. Until earlier ears where kings ruled countries in historical times and by colonial powers in the 18th and 19th centuries, sovereignty refers to the absolute independence and autonomy that nation-states have concerning their citizens' decisions. It implies that nation-states are free to decide for themselves about the kind of rulers they want and their policies internally and externally. Often, the concept of *sovereignty* is invoked to delineate the distinction between taking decisions on their own by nation-states and resisting external pressures to sway the decision-making process.

According to Immanuel Wallerstein, the modern state is sovereign. He contends that **sovereignty is a concept invented in the modern world-system**. The modern state exists within a larger circle of states, called the interstate system. At just the onsetting modern world-system, the historians talk of the emergence of the "new monarchies" in England, France, and Spain during the end of the 15th century. As for the interstate system, its ancestry has usually been attributed to the development of Renaissance diplomacy.

Wallerstein argues that sovereignty was an internal and external claim of authority. It was first a claim of fixed boundaries, within which a given state was sovereign and therefore within which no other state had the right to assert any authority—executive, legislative, judicial, or military. The states' claims that other states should not "interfere" in their domestic affairs have always been more honored in the breach than sedulously observed.

There is one other fundamental feature of sovereignty—claim. The claims have little meaning unless others reorganize them. Others may not respect the claims, but that is in many ways less important than that they recognize them formally. Sovereignty is more than anything else a matter of legitimacy. Moreover, in the modern world-system, the legitimacy of sovereignty requires reciprocal recognition.

According to Wallerstein, sovereignty, thus, is a legal claim with significant political consequences. Because of these consequences, sovereignty issues are central to political struggle, both internally within states and internationally between states. From the point of view of entrepreneurs operating in the capitalist world-economy, the sovereign states assert authority in at least **seven main areas** of direct interest to them:

- i. States set the rules on whether and under what conditions commodities, capital, and labor may cross their borders.
 - ii. They create the rules concerning property rights within their states.
 - iii. They set rules concerning employment and the compensation of employees.
 - iv. They decide which costs firms must internalize.
 - v. They decide what kinds of economic processes may be monopolized and to what degree.
 - vi. They tax, and
 - vii. When firms based within their boundaries may be affected, they can use their power externally to affect the decision of other states.
- **How are disputes on sovereignty best resolved?**

Disputes on sovereignty may be best resolved by following ways/strategies:

- i. **Shared sovereignty**

The international community may exercise shared sovereignty with an internationally recognized state in some cases. In almost all instances, an international institution monitors the parties' exercise of their authority and functions.

ii. Institution building

This way is utilized during the period of shared sovereignty before the determination of final status. Here, the sub-state entity, frequently with the international community's assistance, undertakes to construct self-government institutions and build institutions capable of exercising increasing sovereign authority and functions.

iii. Eventual determination of the final status of the sub-state entity and its relationship to the state

In many instances, the status will be determined by a referendum, while in others, it may involve a negotiated settlement between the state and sub-state entity, often with international mediation. Invariably the determination of final status for the sub-state entity involves the consent of the international community in the form of international recognition.

iv. Phased sovereignty

Phased sovereignty entails the accumulation by the sub-state entity of increasing sovereign authority and functions over a specified period before determining final status.

v. Conditional sovereignty

Conditionality may be applied to increasing sovereign authority and functions by the sub-state entity, or it may be applied to determining the sub-state entity's final status. In either case, the sub-state entity must meet specific benchmarks before it may acquire increased. These benchmarks may include protecting human and minority rights, developing democratic institutions, instituting the rule of law, and promoting regional stability. While the relationship between the attainment of specific benchmarks and the devolution of authority or recognition as an independent state may be formally expressed, there may often be an informal relationship.

vi. Constrained sovereignty

It involves continued limitations on the sovereign authority and functions of the new state, such as continued international administrative and military presence and limits on the right of the state to undertake territorial association with other states.

In almost all instances, the state and sub-state entities adopt the elements of earned sovereignty by mutual agreement, but in some instances, the international community may support or initiate one or more of the elements of earned sovereignty against the interests of the state or sub-state entity.

3. 2019,*Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)

Discuss some of the key concepts used by world system perspective to account for the rise of the world capitalist system. What advantages does the world system perspective offer over other competing theories of development/ underdevelopment in the contemporary world?

(विश्व पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाको उदयका लागि उपयोगी हुने गरी विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणद्वारा प्रयोग गरिएका केही प्रमुख अवधारणाहरू छलफल गर्नुहोस् । समकालीन विश्वमा विकास/ अल्पविकासका प्रतिस्पर्धी अन्य सिद्धान्तहरूभन्दा माथि रहेर विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणले केकस्ता फाइदाहरू प्रस्ताव गर्दछ ?)

व्यवस्थालाई नै विश्लेषणको एकाइका रूपमा लिइनु आवश्यक भएको छ । पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था यसका आन्तरिक प्रक्रियाहरूबाट अभ थप परिष्कृत हुँदै गइरहेको छ भने यो हाल विश्वभर विस्तार हुन पुगेको छ । 19औं शताब्दीको समाप्तिदेखि वर्तमानसम्म सम्पूर्ण विश्व यस पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाद्वारा सञ्चालित हुन पुगेको छ । विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणको अध्ययनद्वारा राष्ट्र वा राज्यलाई सम्पूर्ण विश्व-व्यवस्था निर्मित गर्ने एकाइहरूको रूपमा लिइ सामाजिक विज्ञानहरूको अभ गहन बुझाइ एवम् अन्तर्दृष्टि प्राप्त गर्न सकिन्छ । सम्पूर्ण विश्व व्यवस्थामा नै प्रजातीयता, वर्ग, राष्ट्र घरधुरी आदि जस्ता एकाइ महत्वपूर्ण अंश रहेका हुन्छन् । यी सबै तत्त्वहरू पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रअन्तर्गतका वा तत्त्वहरू समावेश हुन्छन् । विश्व-व्यवस्थाको अध्ययनद्वारा नै त्यस अन्तर्गतका होक एकाइहरूको उदय, विकास प्रक्रिया र पतनका बारेमा सुक्ष्म ढड्गले बुझन सकिन्छ । यसी विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणले अन्य प्रतिस्पर्धी समाजशास्त्रीय सिद्धान्तहरूभन्दा माथि रहे केही भिन्न किसिमका फाइदाहरू चित्रण गरेको छ ।

3. 2019,* Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)

Discuss some of the key concepts used by world system perspective to account for the rise of the world capitalist system. What advantages does the world system perspective offer over other competing theories of development/ underdevelopment in the contemporary world?

Ans: The world-system perspective is a macro-sociological perspective that seeks to explain the dynamics of the *capitalist world economy* as a “total social system.” Its first significant articulation, and a classic example of this approach, is associated with Immanuel Wallerstein, who published a seminal paper, *The Rise and Future Demise of the World Capitalist System: Concepts for Comparative Analysis* (1974). After that, he published another two volumes, considered the central and vital foundations for the world-system perspective.

- **The Key Concepts used by World-system Perspective to Account for the Rise of the World Capitalist System**

In his book, *The Modern World System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World Economy in the Sixteenth Century*, Immanuel Wallerstein develops a theoretical framework to understand the historical changes involved in the rise of the modern world system. The modern world-system, essentially capitalist, followed the crisis of the feudal system and helped explain the rise of Western Europe to world supremacy between 1450 and 1670. According to Wallerstein, his theory makes it possible to comprehensively understand external and internal manifestations of the modernization process during this period and make possible analytically sound comparisons between different parts of the world.

(a) **Medieval Prelude**

Before the 16th century, when Western Europe embarked on capitalist development, “feudalism” dominated Western European society. Between 1150–1300, both populations and commerce expanded within the confines of the feudal system. However, from 1300–1450, this expansion ceased, creating a severe crisis. According to Wallerstein, the feudal crisis was probably precipitated by the interaction of the following factors:

- i. Agricultural production fell or remained stagnant. This stagnation meant that the burden of peasant producers increased as the ruling class expanded.
- ii. The economic cycle of the feudal economy had reached its optimum level; afterward, the economy began to shrink.
- iii. A shift in climatological conditions decreased agricultural productivity and increased epidemics within the population.

(b) The New European division of labor

Wallerstein argues that Europe moved towards establishing a capitalist world economy to ensure continued economic growth. However, this entailed the expansion of the geographical size of the world in question, the development of different modes of labor control, and the creation of relatively strong state pieces of machinery in the states of Western Europe. The world economic system emerged in response to the feudal crisis by the late 15th and early 16th centuries. This system was the first time an economic system encompassed much of the world with links that superseded national or other political boundaries.

The new world system was based on an international division of labor that determined relationships between different regions and the types of labor conditions within each region. In this model, the type of political system was also directly related to each region's placement within the world economy. As a basis for comparison, Wallerstein proposes four different categories—core, semi-periphery, periphery, and external into which all regions of the world economy can be placed:

i. *The Core*

The core regions benefited the most from the capitalist world economy. The states within this part of Europe developed strong central governments, extensive bureaucracies, and large mercenary armies. These developments permitted the local bourgeoisie to control international commerce and extract capital surplus from this trade for their benefit.

ii. *The Periphery*

On the other end of the scale lay the peripheral zones. These areas lacked a strong central government or were controlled by other states, exported raw materials to the core, and relied on coercive labor practices. The core expropriated much of the capital surplus generated by the periphery through unequal trade relations. Two areas, Eastern Europe and Latin America exhibited peripheral regions' characteristics.

iii. *The Semi-periphery*

Between the two extremes lie the semi-peripheries. These areas represented either core regions in decline or peripheries attempting to improve their relative position in the world economic system. They often also served as buffers between the core and the peripheries. According to Wallerstein, the semi-peripheries were exploited by the core but, as in the American empires of Spain and Portugal, often were exploiters of peripheries themselves.

iv. ***External Areas***

These areas maintained their economic system and managed to remain outside the modern world economy for the most part. Russia fits this case as well.

(c) **Stages of Growth**

The rise of the world capitalist system lasted centuries, during which time different regions changed their relative position within this system. Wallerstein divides the history of world capitalist into four stages, which can be simplified and divided into two primary phases:

1. ***Stages 1 and 2***

This period follows the rise of the modern world system between 1450–1670. When the Hapsburg Empire failed to convert the emerging world economy to a world empire, all the existing Western European states attempted to strengthen their respective positions within the new world system. To accomplish this move, leaders of most states consolidated their internal political, economic, and social resources by bureaucratization, homogenization of the local population, militia expansion, and diversification of economic activities.

2. ***Stages 3 and 4 (18th century and beyond)***

Industrial rather than agricultural capitalism represented this era. With the shifting emphasis on industrial production, the following reactions characterized this period:

- i. European states participated in active exploration to exploit new markets.
- ii. Competitive world systems such as the Indian Ocean system were absorbed into the expanding European World System.
- iii. The inclusion of Africa and the Asia continents as peripheral zones increased the available surplus, allowing other areas such as the US and Germany to enhance core states.

• **Some advantages which world-system perspective offer over other competing theories of development/ underdevelopment**

Unlike other perspectives on development/underdevelopment, the world-system perspective's main argument is that development and underdevelopment cannot be adequately explained without considering the global world system. Any understanding of development based on the market economy of the single nation-state would be incomplete and misleading. The central assertion of the world-system perspective provides a model for understanding both change in the global system and the relationship between its parts. This perspective was among the first to suggest that we depart from the relatively newly developed unit of nation-state analysis and study global interaction instead.

Wallerstein argued that 'we have lived in a "world-system." Since the beginning of modernity in the 16th century when the capitalist economy was born in an embryonic form in a small part of Europe. The world is, Thus, a unit of analysis vaster than the state. The capitalist system has

gradually succeeded, by its internal processes, in extending itself to the totality of the world. Since the end of the 19th century, the whole world has been governed by this capitalist system to this day. Studying this world-system perspective makes it possible to enrich the social sciences approach by considering states as elements constituting themselves within this system.

Nevertheless, they are not the only elements of the system in which races, classes, nations, and households exist. All are institutions within this capitalist world economy. Above all, the world-system perspective's core concept allows us to show that, like any structure, it has gone through various phases, initially its emergence and establishment, then its development, finally the moment of its structural crisis before that of its disappearance. We live in this moment of structural crisis, and the world-system perspective allows us to analyze the global inequality for maintaining overall development: In this way, "the world-system perspective offers different advantages over other competing theories of development/underdevelopment.

4. 2019. *Q. No. 5

How do you judge to the concept of sovereignty in the context of the rise of the state system? Is the modern state a sovereign state? What large scale and long term's history tells us about it?

(राज्य व्यवस्थाको उदयको सन्दर्भमा तपाइँ सार्वभौमिकताको अवधारणालाई कसरी लेखाजोखा गर्नुहुन्छ ? के आधुनिक राज्य सार्वभौम राज्य हो । बृहत् स्केलको तथा लामो कालको इतिहासको यसबाटे के बताउंदछ ?)

Ans: राजनैतिक सिद्धान्तहरूमा सार्वभौमिकता भनाले निर्णय-निर्माण प्रक्रियामा तथा व्यवस्था कायम गर्ने प्रक्रियामा राज्यसँग अन्तिम अधिकार निहित हुनु हो । सार्वभौमिकताको अवधारणा सामाजिक विज्ञानहरू तथा अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय कानूनमा सबैभन्दा विरोधाष्पूर्ण अवधारणा हो । यसको अवधारणा राज्य एवम् सरकार तथा स्वतन्त्रता एवम् प्रजातन्त्रका विभिन्न अवधारणाहरूसँग निकट रूपबाट सम्बन्धित छ । फ्रेन्च भाषाको *Souveraineté* मार्फत ल्याटिन भाषाको *superanus* शब्दद्वारा Sovereignty शब्द बनेको हो । यस शब्दलाई मौलिक रूपमा सर्वोच्च सत्ता वा शक्ति (Supreme power) को समानार्थी रूपमा बुझिन्थ्यो । यद्यपि अभ्यासमा यसको पर्याप्ताले सार्वभौमिकताको परम्परागत अर्थलाई निकै याढा छाडिएको छ ।

प्रयोगले सावधानकताका परम्परागत अधिलाइ निक दृष्टि आडवेसन उ।
 इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनका अनुसार राज्य व्यवस्थाको उदयका सन्दर्भमा सार्वभौमिकता केवल आन्तरिक मामिलाहरूको अधिकारप्रतिको दाबी मात्र होइन बरु अरू राज्यहरूमार्फत् बाह्य रूपमा अधिकारहरूको दाबीसमेत हो । सर्वप्रथम सार्वभौमिकता आफ्नो राज्यका निश्चित सीमाहरूको दाबी हो, जुन सीमाअन्तर्गत राज्य सार्वभौम हुन्छ र अतः अन्य राज्यहरूले त्यस राज्यमा कार्यकारी, वैधानिक, न्यायिक वा सेन्यमध्ये कुनै पनि अधिकार कायम राख्न सक्दैनन् । अन्य राष्ट्रहरूले कुनै राष्ट्रका आन्तरिक मामिलाहरूमा कुनै प्रकारको अधिकार वा हस्तक्षेप गर्न नपाउनु सार्वभौमिताप्रति कुनै राज्यको मूल दाबी हो तर वर्तमान समयमा यस्तो दाबी उल्लङ्घन हुँदै गइरहेको सहजै देख्न सकिन्छ । हस्तक्षेपको मात्रालाई अंवरोध गर्न सकेमा त्यस्ता दाबीहरू अभ प्रबल हुन्छन् । राज्यहरूबीचका सीमाहरू अपरिवर्तनीय हुन्छन् । राज्यबीचका सीमाहरूको दाबी स्थीर र पुनरावृत्तिजन्य (Constant and recurrent) हुन्छन् ।

पुनरावृत्तिजन्य (Constant and recurrent) हुन्छन्। वालस्टीनका अनुसार सार्वभौमिकताको एउटा अकों आधारभूत विशेषता पनि रहेको छ। सार्वभौमिकता एक दाबी (A claim) हो तर अरुद्धारा ज्ञात वा महसुस नगरिएसम्म त्यस्तो दाबीको चैरै ताता भएर छन्। यसले हाबीलाई सम्मान नगर्न सक्दछन् तर त्यस्तो सम्मान

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका प्रमुख वकालतकर्ता इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीनका अनुसार आधुनिक राज्य एक सार्वभौम राज्य हो। उनका अनुसार आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाअन्तर्गत नै सार्वभौमिकताले राज्य शक्तिको स्वायत्ता (Autonomous state power) लाई जनाउँदछ। आधुनिक राज्यहरू राज्यका बृहत परिधीअन्तर्गत कायम भएका हुन्छन्, जसलाई अन्तर्राज्य व्यवस्था (Interstate system) भनिन्छ। सार्वभौमिकताको वैधानिकता र राज्य व्यवस्था दुवैलाई एक अर्काका परिपूरक तथा पारस्परिक मानिन्छ। तसर्थ आधुनिक राज्य एक सार्वभौम राज्य हो।

सार्वभौमिकता मुख्य राजनैतिक परिणामहरू सहितको कानुनी वा वैधानिक दाबी (Legal claim) हो किनभने सार्वभौमिकतामा समावेश हुने ती राजनैतिक परिणामहरू राज्यअन्तर्गत र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय स्तरमा पनि राज्यहरूबीच दुवैका राजनैतिक सङ्घर्षका मुख्य परिणामको रूपमा रहेका छन्। पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा सञ्चालित विश्व व्यापार उद्यमशीलताका दृष्टिकोणबाट कुनै पनि सार्वभौम राज्यले आफ्नो प्रत्यक्ष रुचिबमोजिम निम्नलिखित सातबया सिङ्गान्तहरूमा अधिकार वा सत्ताको प्रयोग गर्न सक्दछ :

- i. राज्यले के-कस्ता अवस्थाहरूमा उत्पादन, पूँजी र श्रमलाई आफ्नो सीमा पारसम्म विस्तार गर्ने भन्ने सम्बन्धमा नियमहरू/प्रावधानहरू निर्धारण गर्न सक्दछ।
- ii. राज्यले आफ्नो राज्यअन्तर्गत सम्पत्ति अधिकारहरू (Property rights) सँग सम्बन्धित नियमहरू निर्माण गरी लागू गर्न सक्दछ।
- iii. रोजगारदाता र रोजगारीसम्बन्धी ऐन कानुन निर्माण गरी कार्यान्वयन गर्न राज्यलाई अखियारी प्राप्त हुन्छ।
- iv. राज्यले के-कस्ता लागत फर्महरू (Costs firms) लाई अवश्य पनि आन्तरीकीकरण गर्नुपर्दछ भन्ने सम्बन्धमा निर्णय गर्न सक्दछ।
- v. हरेक आधुनिक राज्यले कर व्यवस्थासम्बन्धी आवश्यक नियम, विनियम र ऐनहरू निर्माण गरी कार्यान्वयन गर्न सक्दछ।
- vi. कुनै एउटा राज्यअन्तर्गतका फर्महरूमा बाह्य प्रभाव पर्दा राज्यले अन्य राज्यद्वारा गरिएका निर्णयहरूलाई प्रभावित पार्ने गरी शक्तिको अभ्यास र प्रयोग गर्न सक्दछ।

इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीनका उपयुक्त तर्कहरूसँग सहमति जनाउँदै आधुनिक राज्य वस्तुतः एक सार्वभौम राज्य हो भन्ने मेरो विचार रहेको छ।

4. 2019,*Q. No. 5

How do you judge to the concept of sovereignty in the context of the rise of state system? Is the modern state a sovereign state? What large scale and long term's history tells us about it?

Ans: In political theory, sovereignty refers to the ultimate authority in the state's decision-making process and the maintenance of order. The concept of sovereignty—one of the most controversial ideas in social science and international law—is closely related to the different concepts of state and government and independence and democracy. Derived from the Latin '*superanus*' through the French '*souverainete*', the term was originally understood to mean the equivalent of supreme power. However, its application in practice often has departed from this traditional unlearning.

According to Immanuel Wallerstein (1974), in the context of the rise of the state system, sovereignty was a claim of authority internally and externally—that is, vis-a-vis other states. It was, first, a claim of fixed boundaries, within which a given state was sovereign and therefore within which no other state had the right to assert any authority—executive, legislative, judicial, or military. To be sure, these claims of the states that other states should not "interfere" in their

domestic affairs have always been more honored in the breach than sedulously observed. However, the mere claim has nonetheless served to constrain the degree of interference. Nor have borders been unchanging. Border claims between states have been constant and recurrent. Nonetheless, there are almost always de facto realities about the borders within which sovereignty is exercised at any given moment.

According to Wallerstein, there is one additional fundamental feature of sovereignty. It is a claim with little meaning unless others recognize it. Others may not respect the claims, but that is in many ways less important than that they recognize them formally. Sovereignty is more than anything else a matter of legitimacy. Furthermore, in the modern world system, the legitimacy of sovereignty requires reciprocal recognition. *Sovereignty* is a hypothetical trade in which two potentially (or really) conflicting sides, respecting de facto realities of power, exchange such recognitions as their least costly strategy.

Reciprocal recognition is the fundamant of the interstate system. There have often been entities that have proclaimed their existence as sovereign states but failed to recognize most other states. Nevertheless, the proclamation is relatively worthless without such recognition, even if the entity remains de facto control for a given territory. Such an entity is in a perilous condition. However, most states are recognized by all other states at any given time.

- **Is a Modern State a Sovereign State?**

According to Wallerstein, the modern state is a sovereign state. *Sovereignty* is a concept that was invented in the modern world system. Its *prima facie* meaning is autonomous state power. However, modern states exist within a larger circle of states, which we call the interstate system. So, we shall have to investigate this presumed autonomy's degree and content. The historians talk of the emergence of the "new monarchies" in England, France, and Spain at the end of the 15th century, at just the moment of onset of the modern world system. As an interstate system, its ancestry is usually attributed to the development of Renaissance diplomacy on the Italian Peninsula, and its institutionalization is usually thought to be the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. Here the Peace of Westphalia (1648) means a global system based on the principle of international law that each state has sovereignty over its territory and domestic affairs to the exclusion of all external powers, on the principle of non-interference in another country's domestic affairs and, that each state (no matter how large or small) is equal in international law. After the Peace of Westphalia, the doctrine was signed in 1648, which ended the Thirty Years' War (1618–1648) in central Europe.

Sovereignty, thus, a legal claim with significant political consequences. Because of the consequences, the issues involved are central to political struggle, both internally and internationally, between states. From the point of view of entrepreneurs operating in the capitalist world-economy, the sovereign states assert authority in at least **seven principal areas of direct interest to them**:

- i. States set the rules on what conditions commodities, capital, and labor may cross their borders.
- ii. They create the rules concerning property rights within their states.

- iii. They set rules concerning employment and the compensation of employees.
- iv. They decide which costs firms must internalize.
- v. They decide what kinds of economic processes may be monopolized and to what degree.
- vi. Modern states determine their tax system autonomously.
- vii. Finally, when firms based within their boundaries may be affected, they can use their power externally to affect the decisions of other states.

Hence, from the above discussion and the arguments presented by Wallerstein, we can conclude that modern states are sovereign states

5. 2019,*Q. No. 6

Why and how modern world-system is a capitalist world economy? How it goes through cycles of contraction?

(आधुनिक विश्व व्यवस्था किन र कसरी पूँजीवादी विश्व अर्थव्यवस्था हो ? किन यो सद्कुचनका चक्रहरू मार्फत भएर गुञ्छ ?)

Ans: अमेरिकी समाजशास्त्री एवम् इतिहासकार इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनद्वारा प्रकाशित पुस्तकहरू *The Modern World-system* (Vol. 1, 1974; Vol. 2, 1980 र Vol. 3, 1989) लाई आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणका प्रमुख र मार्गदर्शक आधारहरू मानिन्छ। यी पुस्तकहरूमा उनले समग्र व्यवस्थाका दुईवटा मुख्य प्रकारहरू हुने उल्लेख गरेका छन्। पहिलो-प्राचीन रोमको जस्तो विश्व साम्राज्य व्यवस्था र दोस्रो-आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था। यहाँ पहिलो प्रकारको विश्व-व्यवस्थाको आधार राजनैतिक र सैनिक प्रभूत्व तथा दोस्रो अर्थात् आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको आधार आर्थिक वा पूँजीवादी प्रभूत्व रहेको हुन्छ। तसर्थ आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा राजनैतिक, सैन्य, साँस्कृतिक र धार्मिक आधारहरूको त्यति महत्त्व नभई विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको मुख्य आधार क्रियाशील रहेको छ। यसरी आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको रूपमा रहेको हुन्छ भन्ने तर्क वालेस्टीइनको रहेको छ।

अहिलेको आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाका प्रारम्भिक चरणहरू 16औं शताब्दीमा उदय भएका हुन्। त्यस समयमा यूरोप र अमेरिकामा मात्र सीमित रहेको यो विश्व-व्यवस्था विभिन्न समयक्रमानुसार विश्वभर बिस्तारित हुन पुग्यो। विशेष गरी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र (World economy) को रूपमा विश्व-व्यवस्थाले आफ्नो प्रभाव कायम राख्दै गयो। पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र (Capitalist world economy) को रूपमा विश्व-व्यवस्थाले परिपक्व स्वरूप प्राप्त गरेको थियो। यहाँ विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र भन्नाले एउटा त्यस्तो क्षेत्र हो, जहाँ अत्याधिक श्रम विभाजन भएको हुन्छ र त्यसले गर्दा आधारभूत वस्तु वा सेवाहरूको पर्याप्त आन्तरिक विनियम भई पूँजी तथा श्रमको बढी मात्रामा प्रवाह भएको हुन्छ। कुनै एकात्मक राजनैतिक संरचनाद्वारा मात्र बन्धित नभई एउटा अन्तर्राज्यीय प्रणालीमा धेरै राजनैतिक एकाइहरूद्वारा सञ्चालित हुनु विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको मुख्य विशेषता रहेको हुन्छ।

अधिक र निरन्तर श्रम विभाजनको परिणामस्वरूप सामाजिक रूपबाट निर्मित एक व्यवस्था नै आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था हो। पूँजीको बढी मात्रामा सञ्चय गर्ने प्रवृत्ति बद्नु आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको मुख्य प्रेरक सिद्धान्त हो। यस सिद्धान्तलाई यथार्थतामा परिणत गर्नका लागि पूँजीवादी विकसित रूप धारण गरेको छ। बहुराष्ट्रीय तहमा हुने उत्पादनहरू, विश्व बजारमा प्रभूत्वशाली देशहरूको एकाधिकार, ज्याला र श्रमको प्रयोग, श्रम नियन्त्रण गर्नका लागि बढी बाध्यात्मक वा सस्ता प्रविधिहरू, दरीद्रीकरण, अतिरिक्त मूल्य सञ्चय जस्ता क्रियाकलापहरूले विश्व पूँजीवादी

आउने निश्चित प्राय: देखिन्छ । परिस्थितिकीय सङ्कट (Ecological crisis), राज्यको शक्ति (Power of the state), आर्थिक-राजनैतिक व्यवस्थामा आउने उतारचढावहरू (Fluxuations in the economic-political-system) आदि जस्ता प्रक्रियाहरू आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको सङ्कुचनसँग प्रत्यक्ष जोडिएका छन् । यी प्रक्रियाहरूका कारण नै आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था सङ्कुचनका चक्रहरू मार्फत भएर गुज्ञन्छ भन्ने निष्कर्ष दिन सकिन्छ ।

5. 2019, *Q. No. 6

Why and how modern world-system is a capitalist world economy? How it goes through cycles of expansion to contraction?

Ans: As elaborated by Wallerstein, the world-system perspective starts with the proposition that the appropriate unit of analysis of macrosocial inquiry in the modern world is neither class nor state/society or country but the more extensive historical system in which these categories are located. The defining boundaries of a historical system are those within which the system and its people are regularly reproduced through ongoing division of labor. Wallerstein distinguished between two types of world systems. *First-world* empires and the *second-world* economies. In world-empires, there is a single political boundary. Therefore, the Roman world-system was a world-empire. On the other hand, a world economy is a world system that has multiple political centers rather than a single political center or boundary. Hence the modern world-system is a capitalist economy because Wallerstein argues that the peculiar strength of the modern or capitalist world-system is that it has not transformed into a world-empire, which would imply a single political system or center.

According to Wallerstein, the world we live in, the modern world-system, had its origins in the 16th century. This world-system was then located in only a part of the globe, primarily in Europe and the Americas. It expanded overtime to cover the whole globe. It is and has always been a 'world-economy' and a *capitalist world-economy*. Here 'world-economy' is a large geographic zone within which there is a division of labor and hence significant internal exchange of basic or essential goods and flows of capital and labor. A defining feature of a world economy is that a unitary political structure does not bind it. Rather, there are many political unities inside the world economy, loosely tied together in our modern world-system in an interstate system. A world economy contains many cultures and groups, practicing many religions and speaking many languages, differing in familiar patterns. Another term associated with the capitalist world economy is 'capitalism.' According to Wallerstein, 'capitalism' is not the mere existence of persons or firms producing for sale on the market to obtain profit. Such persons or firms have existed for thousands of years across the world. Nor is the existence of persons for wages sufficient as a definition. Wage labor has also been known for thousands of years. We are in a capitalist system only when the system prioritizes the endless accumulation of capital. Wallerstein argues that only the modern world-system has been a capitalist system using such a definition.

A world economy and a capitalist system go together. Since world economies lack the unifying cement of an overall political structure or a homogenous culture, what holds them together is the efficacy of the division of labor. Furthermore, this efficacy is a function of the constantly expanding wealth that

a capitalist system provides. Until modern times, the world economies constructed either fell apart or were transformed into world empires. Historically, the only world economy to have survived for a long time has been the modern world system, and that is because the capitalist system took root and became consolidated as its defining feature.

- **How Modern World-System goes through Cycles of Expansion to Contraction?**

The modern world-system as a capitalist world-economy emerged from Circa 1500 and expanded to cover the entire globe, absorbing all existing mini-systems and world-empires, establishing market and production networks that eventually brought all peoples around the world into its logic and a single worldwide structure. Hence, by the late 19th century, there was but one historical system that had come to encompass the entire globe, the capitalist world system.

As Wallerstein lays out in Vol. 1 of *The Modern World-System*, the modern world-system as a capitalist world-system came into being during the 'long sixteenth century' of 1450–1640 out of the general crisis of European feudalism that began in the 14th century. Along with these phases of expansion, some sociologist argues that, soon, its contraction will exist. Due to various crises associated with the modern world system, stages of its contraction will occur. The ecological crisis, power of the state, and fluctuations in the economic-political system are some processes related to the contraction of the modern world system.

6. 2019, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

Explain how the modern world-system is a capitalist world economy.

(आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था कसरी पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र हो भने सम्बन्धमा वर्णन गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: अमेरिकी समाजशास्त्री एवम् इतिहासकार इम्मानुएल वालेस्टाइनद्वारा प्रकाशित पुस्तकहरू *The Modern World-system* (Vol. 1, 1974; Vol. 2, 1980 र Vol. 3, 1989) लाई आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणका प्रमुख र मार्गदर्शक आधारहरू मानिन्छ। यी पुस्तकहरूमा उनले समग्र व्यवस्थाका दुईवटा मुख्य प्रकारहरू हुने उल्लेख गरेका छन्। पहिलो- प्राचीन रोमको जस्तो विश्व साम्राज्य व्यवस्था र दोस्रो- आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था। यहाँ पहिलो प्रकारको विश्व-व्यवस्थाको आधार राजनैतिक र सैनिक प्रभूत्व तथा दोस्रो अर्थात् आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको आधार आर्थिक वा पूँजीवादी प्रभूत्व रहेको हुन्छ। तसर्थ आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा राजनैतिक, सैन्य, सांस्कृतिक र धार्मिक आधारहरूको त्यति महत्त्व नभई विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको मुख्य आधार क्रियाशील रहेको छ। यसरी आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको रूपमा रहेको हुन्छ भने तर्क वालेस्टाइनको रहेको छ।

अहिलेको आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाका प्रारम्भिक चरणहरू 16औं शताब्दीमा उदय भएका हुन्। त्यस समयमा यूरोप र अमेरिकामा मात्र सीमित रहेको यो विश्व-व्यवस्था विभिन्न समयक्रमानुसार विश्वभर विस्तारित हुन पुग्यो। विशेष गरी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र (World economy) को रूपमा विश्व-व्यवस्थाले आफ्नो प्रभाव कायम राख्दै गयो। पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र (Capitalist world economy) को रूपमा विश्व-व्यवस्थाले परिपक्व स्वरूप प्राप्त गरेको थियो। यहाँ विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र भन्नाले एउटा त्यस्तो क्षेत्र हो, जहाँ अत्याधिक श्रम विभाजन भएको हुन्छ र त्यसले गर्दा आधारभूत वस्तु वा सेवाहरूको पर्याप्त आन्तरिक विनिमय भई पूँजी तथा श्रमको बढी मात्रामा प्रवाह भएको हुन्छ। कुनै एकात्मक राजनैतिक संरचनाद्वारा मात्र बन्धित नभई एउटा अन्तर्राज्यीय

प्रणालीमा धेरै राजनैतिक एकाइहरूद्वारा सञ्चालित हुनु विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको मुख्य विशेषता रहेको हुन्छ।

अधिक र निरन्तर श्रम विभाजनको परिणामस्वरूप सामाजिक रूपबाट निर्मित एक व्यवस्था नै आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था हो। पूँजीको बढी मात्रामा सञ्चय गर्ने प्रवृत्ति बढ्नु आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको मुख्य प्रेरक सिद्धान्त हो। यस सिद्धान्तलाई यथार्थतामा परिणत गर्नका लागि पूँजीवादी अर्थव्यवस्थाले विभिन्न क्रियाकलापहरूको श्रृङ्खला अड्गीकार गर्दै वर्तमान समयमा एक विकसित रूप धारण गरेको छ। बहुराष्ट्रीय तहमा हुने उत्पादनहरू, विश्व बजारमा प्रभूत्वशाली देशहरूको एकाधिकार, ज्याला र श्रमको प्रयोग, श्रम नियन्त्रण गर्नका लागि बढी बाध्यात्मक वा सस्ता प्रविधिहरू, दरीद्रीकरण, अतिरिक्त मूल्य सञ्चय जस्ता क्रियाकलापहरूले विश्व पूँजीवादी अर्थतन्त्रको उदय हुन पुग्यो। प्रतिफल वा लाभ आर्जनका गतिविधिहरू भौगोलिक रूपबाट विश्व अर्थव्यवस्थाका केही सीमित क्षेत्रहरूमा केन्द्रित हुन पुगे। यी क्षेत्रहरू मुख्य क्षेत्र (Core) का रूपमा स्थापित भए। न्यूनतम लाभ प्राप्त गर्ने क्षेत्रहरूका आर्थिक गतिविधिहरू भौगोलिक रूपबाट क्रमबद्ध हुन्छन्, जसलाई पृष्ठ क्षेत्र (Peripheral zone) भनिन्छ। केन्द्र क्षेत्र र पृष्ठ क्षेत्रबीचको सम्बन्धले एकातर्फ उत्पादनको एकाधिकारी क्षेत्र तथा दोस्रोतर्फ प्रतिस्पर्धी क्षेत्रहरूबीचको सम्बन्धलाई प्रकट गर्दछन्। त्यस्तो सम्बन्ध अधिकतम लाभमा आधारित हुन्छ भने यसमा विश्व पूँजी र विश्व श्रमबीचको असमान सम्बन्ध पनि कायम हुन्छ। पृष्ठ क्षेत्रबाट केन्द्र क्षेत्रसम्म हुने अतिरिक्त मूल्य (Surplus value) को स्थानान्तरणले विश्व-व्यवस्थामा पूँजीको महत्त्व अभ वृद्धि हुन पुग्दछ।

वालेस्ट्राइनका अनुसार विश्व सांस्कृत्य र विश्व-व्यवस्था घटनाहरू ऐतिहासिक व्यवस्थाका अड्ग हुन तर आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको उदय विश्व अर्थव्यवस्थाहरूको एकीकरणद्वारा भएको हो। आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको चरित्र पुरातन विश्व-व्यवस्थाबाट भिन्न रहेको छ। उनको अभिमतमा आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था पूँजीवादमा आधारित छ, जसको उदय 19औं शताब्दीमा भएको हो। यस आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाका तीनवटा प्रमुख लक्षणहरू हुन्छन्। पहिलो- राष्ट्रीय स्तरका तुलनामा विश्वस्तरमा पूँजीवादको विकास एवम् सङ्गठन हुन्छ। दोस्रो- मुख्य आन्तरिक क्षेत्रहरूले उन्नत औद्योगिक व्यवस्थाहरूको विकास गर्दछन्। तेस्रो- आधुनिक विश्वका आधारहरू एक अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय अर्थव्यवस्थामा खडा भएका हुन्छन्। उनको अभिमतअनुसार आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको उद्भवमा राजनीतीको भन्दा पनि अर्थव्यवस्थाको महत्त्वपूर्ण भूमिका रहेको छ। आर्थिक शोषणले अतिरिक्त मूल्यलाई निम्न वर्गबाट उच्च वर्गातर्फ र पृष्ठबाट केन्द्रतर्फ प्रवाह गर्न सम्भव बनाइदिन्छ। आधुनिक कालमा पूँजीवादले विश्व अर्थव्यवस्थाको विकास र वृद्धिको एक आधार प्रस्तुत गरेको छ तथा यो कुनै पनि सङ्गठित राजनैतिक व्यवस्थाको सहायताबिना पनि सम्भव हुन सक्दछ। अब पूँजीवादलाई राजनैतिक प्रभूत्वको एउटा आर्थिक विकल्पका रूपमा लिइन थालिएको छ। सामन्तवादी युगको पतन पाश्चात् उत्पन्न पूँजीवादी विश्व-व्यवस्थाको विकासका लागि आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाले श्रम नियन्त्रणका विभिन्न विधिहरूको विकास, पूँजीवादी राज्य व्यवस्था र औपनिवेशिकताद्वारा भौगोलिक विस्तार गरी तीनवटा आवश्यक आधारहरू आवश्यक पर्ने औल्याएको छ। उपर्युक्त सम्पूर्ण विवेचनाबाट आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था विशुद्ध रूपमा एक पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र हो भन्ने निष्कर्ष दिन सकिन्छ।

6. 2019, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

Explain how the modern world-system is a capitalist world economy.

Ans: The three-volume books *The Modern World-System* (1974, 1980, and 1989), published by the American sociologist and historian Immanuel Wallerstein, are the primary and guiding foundations of modern world-system analysis. In these books, he mentions two main types of the overall world-

system. The *first* is the world empire system of ancient Rome, and the *second* is the modern world-system. Here, the first type of world-system is based on political and military domination, and the second one, i.e., the modern world-system, is based on economic or capitalist domination. Therefore, in the modern world-system, the political, military, cultural, and religious bases are not so important as capital, but the principal basis of the world-economy is too significant. Thus, Wallerstein argues that a modern world-system is a form of a capitalist world-economy.

The earliest stages of the modern world-system date back to the 16th century. This world-system, which was limited to Europe and America, spread worldwide according to different timelines. Especially as a form of world-economy, the world-system continued to maintain its influence. The world-system had matured as the capitalist world-economy. The world-economy here is an area where a sharp division of labor prevails, and as a result, there is a substantial internal exchange of essential goods or services and a greater flow of capital and labor. **The main feature of the world-economy is that it is not bound by a single unitary political structure but is governed by several political units in an interstate system.**

The modern world-system is socially constructed because of labor's extensive and continuous division. The growing tendency to accumulate large amounts of capital is one of the main motivating principles of the modern world-system. Ensuring this theory is a reality, the capitalist economy has adopted a series of different activities and has assumed a developed form at present. Multinational products, the monopoly of the dominant countries in the world market, wages and labor, more compulsory or cheaper technologies to control labor, poverty, and surplus value led to the rise of the world capitalist economy. Furthermore, such activities became geographically concentrated in a limited area of the world-economy. These areas were established as **core areas**. The economic activities of the least profitable areas are geographically arranged, called the **peripheral zone**. The relationship between the core area and the periphery area reveals the relationship between the monopoly area of production on the one hand and the competing areas on the other. If such a relationship is based on maximum profit, it also has an unequal relationship between world capital and labor. **The transfer of surplus value from the periphery area to the core area further increases the importance of capital in the world-system.**

According to Wallerstein, world-empires and world-system are part of the historical system, but the rise of the modern world-system is due to the unification of world economies. **The character of the modern world-system is different from the ancient world-system. In his view, the modern world-system is based on capitalism, which emerged in the 19th century.** There are three significant features of this modern world-system. *First-* compared to the national level, capitalism develops and organizes at the global level. The *second* major internal sectors develop advanced industrial systems and exploit the periphery area based on the low cost of raw materials, and the third, the foundations of the modern world, lie in an international economy. Wallerstein argues that the economy has played a more critical role in the emergence of the modern world-system than politics. Economic exploitation makes it possible for surplus value to flow from the lower class to the upper class and from the periphery to the core. In modern times, capitalism has

provided a basis for the development and growth of the world economy, which can be possible without the help of any organized political system. Capitalism is now seen as an economic alternative to political domination. For the development of the post-feudal era capitalist world-system, the modern world-system has pointed out the need for three necessary bases—the development of various methods of labor control, capitalist state system, and geographical expansion through colonialism.

In this way, we may conclude that the modern world-system is a capitalist world economy.

7. 2019, Q. No. 2; 2017, Q. No. 3; 2016, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer)

Question)

Explain how the modern world-system eventually goes into crisis?

(आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था कसरी घटनावद्ध रूपबाट सङ्कटमा पर्दछ भने सम्बन्धमा व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

OR :

Explain how the modern world-system eventually falls into crisis?

(आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था कसरी घटनावद्ध रूपबाट सङ्कटमा पर्दछ भने सम्बन्धमा व्याख्या

Ans: कुनै पनि व्यवस्था एक निश्चित समय कालखण्डमा विकास र प्रगतिको उच्च विन्दुमा पुग्दछ। तर समाजिक परिवर्तनशीलता र गतिशीलताका कारण त्यस्तो व्यवस्था सधै उहाँ अवस्थामा रहन सक्दैन। त्यसमा पनि राजनैतिक, वातावरणीय र परिवेशजन्य घटनाक्रमहरूले कुनै समयमा कायम सामाजिक व्यवस्थामा सङ्कट उत्पन्न गराइदिन्छन्। हामीले वर्तमान समयमा जीवनयापन गरीरहेको आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था अर्थात् पूँजीबादी विश्व-अर्थतत्रमा पनि विभिन्न सङ्कटहरू उत्पन्न हुन पुगेका छन्। त्यस्तो सङ्कट आगामी आधा दशकसम्म पनि कायम हुन सक्ने ठहर इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनको रहेको छ।

आगामी आधा दशकसम्मको सङ्क्रमणकालीन समयमा वर्तमान समाजले सामाजिक संरचना र प्रक्रियाहरूमा निकै उतारचढावको सामना गर्नुपर्ने अवस्था छ। त्यस्तो परिवर्तन र रूपान्तरणले विश्व-व्यवस्थाका महत्वपूर्ण भागहरूमा प्रभाव पार्न सक्दछन्। तीव्र सामाजिक परिवर्तनका कारण मानिसका अल्पकालीन अपेक्षा र आवश्यकताहरू अस्थिर बन पुगेका छन्। यस्तो अस्थिरताले सामाजिक संरचनाहरूको सामज्जस्यतामा जटिलता उत्पन्न हुन गइ विरोधाभाष र ढन्डसमेत उत्पन्न हुने जोखिम बढाउँदछ। विश्व-व्यवस्थामा प्रभूत्वशाली स्थापित भएका देशहरूको शक्तिमा बिस्तारै कमी आउने बढाउँदछ। यी सम्पूर्ण परिघटनाहरूबाट आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था सङ्कटमा पर्न सक्ने देखिन्छ।

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका प्रमुख विकासकर्ता इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनद्वारा प्रकाशित पुस्तक *The Modern World System (1974)* को अध्याय पाँचमा आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था घटनावद्ध रूपबाट सङ्कटमा पर्ने सम्बन्धमा निम्नलिखित तथ्यहरू प्रस्तुत गरिएको छ:

- i. पूँजीबादीहरूले जहिले पनि आफ्नो उत्पादनको बिक्रि मूल्य वृद्धि गर्नेतर्फ जोड दिइरहेका हुन्छन् भने उत्पादनको लागत मूल्य कम गर्ने प्रयत्न गरिरहेका हुन्छन्। बजारमा प्रतिस्पर्धाको अवस्था र प्रभावकारी मागको स्तरका आधारबाट बिक्रि मूल्य निर्धारित गर्ने गरिन्छ। यहाँ वस्तु वा सेवाको प्रभावकारी माग आम्दानीको विश्व वितरण (World distribution of labor) बाट प्रभावित हुन पुग्दछ। आम्दानी र उपभोगको अवस्थामा आउने परिवर्तनहरूबाट पूँजी बजार निरन्तर प्रभावित भइरहन्छ।

माथि उल्लेख गरिएभन्दा अतिरिक्त समकालीन आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था घटनावद्ध रूपमा सङ्कटर्फ जानुमा निम्नलिखित कारकहरू समेत उत्तरदायी भएः

- i. सम्प्रभूता र विश्वव्यापी शासनको सङ्कट (A crisis of hegemony and global governance)
- ii. असमानता र प्रजातन्त्रका सङ्कट (A crisis of inequality and democracy)
- iii. मानव समूदाय र प्राकृतिक वातावरणबीचको सम्बन्धमा सङ्कट (A crisis in the relationship between humans and the natural environment)
- iv. विश्वव्यापी पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थामा सङ्कट (A crisis in the global capitalist system)
- v. नवीन वैश्विक बाजिचतीकरणमा सङ्कट (A crisis in the New Global Left)

7. 2019, Q. No. 2; 2017, Q. No. 3; 2016, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer)

Question)

Explain how the modern world-system eventually goes into crisis?

OR

Explain how the modern world-system eventually falls into crisis?

Ans: Any system reaches the highest point of development and progress in a certain period. However, due to the processes of social change and mobility, such a system cannot always remain the same. Even then, political, environmental, and contextual developments create a crisis in the social system that has existed for some time. The modern world-system, the capitalist world-economy also faces various crises throughout time. Immanuel Wallerstein believes such a crisis could last for another half-decade.

During the transitional period of the next half a decade, the present society must face many ups and downs in the social structure and processes. Such changes and transformations can affect essential parts of the world-system. Rapid social change has made people's short-term expectations and needs unstable. Such instability complicates the integration of social structures and increases the risk of conflict and even contradictions. The potential for a gradual decline in the power of the world's dominant nations is also increasing. From all these developments, the modern world-system seems to be in crisis.

Chapter Five of *The Modern World-System*, by Immanuel Wallerstein, a leading developer of the world-system approach, presents the following facts regarding the eventual crisis of the modern world-system:

- i. Capitalists are constantly pushing to increase the sales value of their products while trying to reduce the cost of production. The selling price is determined based on the level of competition in the market and the level of effective demand. Here, the world distribution of labor affects the effective demand for goods or services. Capital markets continue to be affected by changes in income and consumption. As the modern world-system is a capitalist world-economy, the modern world-system is in crisis due to the adverse effects on the capitalist economy.
- ii. Factors such as rising wages of workers, rising cost prices, tax hikes, reduction in surplus-value savings, environmental problems caused by industrialization, increasing competition may harm the world-

economy. This process directly leads to various crises in the modern world-system.

- iii. Agreements between employers and employees, terms of service, and facilities are influenced by economic, political, and cultural aspects. It is difficult to balance skilled technicians and unskilled workers, high-level managers, and middle-level employees. These instances put the modern world-system in crisis.
- iv. The renewal of raw materials is also becoming a matter of crisis in the world-economy. The high demand and consumption of various raw materials have been occurring for the last 500 years, but alternative ways of such materials have not been explored. Increasing exploitation of natural resources has also increased environmental risks. These activities affect the world capitalist system, and the modern world-system is in crisis.
- v. Infrastructure issues are also on the rise in the world today. Infrastructure is an essential part of the production and distribution process, such as roads, transportation services, communication networks, security systems, and water supply. Currently, the cost of these infrastructural elements is increasing. Due to the trend of improving taxation, taxes are also increasing. In the modern world, taxation has two fundamental causes. *First*, to provide security services to the state structure, and *second*, to collect revenue for infrastructure construction. To provide funds to provide education, health, and other essential services to the citizens provided by the second state. Currently, instability in the tax system and rising rates have created a situation where the entire world-system is in crisis.
- vi. The post-1945 world-economy saw a massive expansion in productive structures throughout the history of the modern world-system. Extensive reforms were made in the cost of the laborer, cost of inputs, and taxation. At the same time, liberalization movements in Europe and East Asia complicated the implementation of such reforms. From these instances, the modern world-system system had to face a crisis.
- vii. New trends in areas such as the ecological crisis created by rapid development, the decline in the state's power, and the economic-political system led to the modern world-system in crisis.

Besides, the following factors were also responsible for the contemporary modern world-system moving towards crisis:

- i. A crisis of hegemony and global governance
- ii. A crisis of inequality and democracy
- iii. A crisis in the relationship between humans and the natural environment
- iv. A crisis in the global capitalist system
- v. A crisis in the New Global Left

- iii. रोजगारदाता र रोजगारीसम्बन्धी ऐन कानून निर्माण गरी कार्यान्वयन गर्ने राज्यलाई अखियारी प्राप्त हुन्छ।
- iv. राज्यले के-कस्ता लागत फर्महरू (Costs firms) लाई अवश्य पनि आन्तरीकीकरण गर्नुपर्दछ भने सम्बन्धमा निर्णय गर्ने सक्दछ।
- v. हरेक आधुनिक राज्यले कर व्यवस्थासम्बन्धी आवश्यक नियम, विनियम र ऐनहरू निर्माण गरी कार्यान्वयन गर्ने सक्दछ।
- vi. कुनै एउटा राज्यअन्तर्गतका फर्महरूमा बाह्य प्रभाव पर्दा राज्यले अन्य राज्यहरू गरिएका निर्णयहरूलाई प्रभावित पार्ने गरी शक्तिको अभ्यास र प्रयोग गर्ने सक्दछ।

इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनका उपयुक्त तर्कहरूसँग सहमति जनाउँदै आधुनिक राज्य वस्तुतः एक सार्वभौम राज्य हो भन्ने मेरो विचार रहेको छ।

8. 2019, Q. No. 4

In your opinion, is the modern state a sovereign state? Substantiate your arguments with appropriate examples.

Ans: The state is the party, entity, or institution of a society with a legitimate monopoly authority of political power in each territory. Max Weber (1918) defined the state as a specific area with legitimate power. The state's government must have a military force; civil service, bureaucracy, judicial system, and elected representatives to run the government to exercise such power.

With the rise of nationalism in Europe from the 15th and 16th centuries, the landlords' power and religious rights had declined. In addition to the new economic ties, citizens began to associate as temporary groups with ideas such as the unity of the national language and culture and the country's natural boundaries. Thus, France, Spain, Britain, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Russia; Italy, and Germany were the first to develop into modern states. After that, autocratic monarchies were established in most of the world's countries. During the 18th and 19th centuries, there was a growing tendency to subjugate various countries through colonization. Colonialism ended at present. In place of the traditional monarchical system of governance, the collective interest has been emphasized by adopting a democratic system. Therefore, **the developed states at present are called modern states.**

On the other hand, the supremacy of power, group, or judicial system is called sovereignty. This concept is often used in the context of political sovereignty. The idea of sovereignty is used in a state giving supreme or ultimate power over its citizens.

According to Immanuel Wällerstein, a leading advocate and the founder of the world-system approach, a **modern state is a sovereign state**. He argues that, under the modern world-system, sovereignty refers to the autonomous state power. A broad range of perimeters governs modern states, called the interstate system. The legitimacy of sovereignty and the state system are considered complementary and reciprocal. Therefore, the modern state is a sovereign state.

Sovereignty is a legal claim with major political consequences because the political consequences of sovereignty are the main outcomes of political struggles between states, both within and internationally. From the point of view of world trade entrepreneurship operating in the capitalist world-economy, any

sovereign state can exercise its power or authority on the following **seven principles** as per its direct interest:

- i. The state may prescribe rules/provisions regarding the conditions under which production, capital, and labor can be extended beyond its limits.
- ii. The state can make and enforce rules related to property rights within its state.
- iii. The state has the authority to make and implement employers and employment-related laws.
- iv. The state can decide which cost firms must be internalized.
- v. Every modern state can implement the rules, regulations, and acts related to the tax system.
- vi. When there is an external influence on firms within a state, the state can exercise and use force to influence decisions made by other states.

Agreeing with the appropriate arguments of Immanuel Wallerstein, I believe the modern state is, in fact, a sovereign state.

Q. 2017, Q. No. 4; 2016, Q. No. 4

Whether or not modern state is a sovereign state in your opinion? What insights can be drawn from Nepal experience historically?

(तपाईंको अभिमतमा आधुनिक राज्य एठय सार्वभौम राज्य हो वा होइन ? नेपालले ऐतिहासिक रूपबाट गरेका अनुभवबाट के अन्तर्दृष्टि चित्रण गर्न सकिन्छ।)

OR

What is your opinion on modern state as a sovereign state? Critically assess it from Nepali experience.

(आधुनिक राज्य एठय सार्वभौम राज्य हो भन्ने सम्बन्धमा तपाईंको अभिमत के हो ? यसलाई नेपाली अनुभवका आधारबाट आलोचनात्मक ढण्डगले लेखाजोखा गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: आधुनिक राज्यलाई पूर्णतया सार्वभौम वा सत्ताधारी राज्य मानिन्छ। आधुनिक राज्य व्यवस्थाको संवैधन्दा महत्वपूर्ण र अभिन्न तत्त्व सार्वभौमिकता (Sovereignty) हो। सार्वभौमिकताले नै आधुनिक राज्यलाई समाजका अन्य सङ्घ सङ्गठनहरूभन्दा भिन्न रूपमा अस्तित्व कायम गरेको हुन्छ। सार्वभौम शक्ति (Sovereign power) विना राज्यको कल्पना गर्न नसकिने तथ्यमा समाजशास्त्रीहरू जोड दिन्छन्।

सार्वभौमिकताका दुईवटा पक्षहरू हुने गर्दछन्। पहिलो- आन्तरिक सार्वभौमिकता (Internal sovereignty) र दोस्रो- बाह्य सार्वभौमिकता (External Sovereignty) आन्तरिक सार्वभौमिकताको सम्बन्ध त्यस्तो उच्च अधिकारशक्तिसँग रहेको हुन्छ, जसलाई राज्यले आफ्नो नियन्त्रणको क्षेत्र भित्र लागू गर्दछ। राज्यअन्तर्गतका सबै व्यक्तिहरू वा सङ्घ-सङ्गठनहरू राज्यको अधिन रहनु र तिनलाई आदेशद्वारा परिचालन गर्ने अधिकार रहन आन्तरिक सार्वभौमिकता हो। अर्कोतर राज्य अन्य कुनै पनि शक्ति वा अन्य राज्यको दबाव वा हस्तक्षेपबाट स्वतन्त्र हुनु बाह्य सार्वभौमिकता हो।

15 औं र 16औं शताब्दीबाट यूरोपमा राष्ट्रवादको उदय भएसँै जमीनदारहरू र धार्मिक अधिकारहरूको शक्ति क्षीण भइसकेको थियो। त्यसपछि नयाँ आर्थिक सम्बन्धका अतिरिक्त नागरिकहरू राष्ट्रिय भाषा र संस्कृतिको एकता तथा देशको प्राकृतिक सीमा जस्ता विचारहरूमा अस्थायी समूहको रूपमा जोडिन थालेका थिए। यसरी सर्वप्रथम फ्रान्स, स्पेन, बेलायत,

स्थानका नागरिकहरूले राज्यबाट पाउनुपर्ने विभिन्न न्यूनतम सेवा सुविधाहरू पनि प्राप्त गर्न नसकिरहेको अवस्था छ । तसर्थ नेपाल र नेपालीका सन्दर्भमा आधुनिक राज्यको अवधारणा अभ्यासमै रहेको अवस्था छ तर यस्तो अवस्था हुँदैमा नेपालको सार्वभौमिकता मिथ्या हो भन्न मिल्दैन । बाह्य मूलकहरूसँगको विशेष सम्बन्ध र निर्भरताका आधारमा मात्र सार्वभौमिकताको लेखाजोखा गरिनु अहिलेको विश्वव्यापीकरणको युगमा उपयुक्त हुँदैन । यदि सार्वभौमिकतालाई त्यसरी लिइने हो भने संसारमा लगभग 10/12 वटा जति मुलुकहरू बाहेक अरु देशलाई सार्वभौम मुलुक कहलाउन मिल्दैन । यति हुँदाहुँदै पनि सार्वभौमिकताको सही अभ्यासमा नेपाल निरन्तर अगाडी बढीरहेको र यो अझै परिपक्वतातर्फ अग्रसर भइरहेको निष्कर्ष चित्रण गर्न सकिन्छ ।

9. 2017, Q. No. 4; 2016, Q. No. 4

Whether or not modern state is a sovereign state in your opinion? What insights can be drawn from Nepal experience historically?

OR

What is your opinion on modern state as a sovereign state? Critically assess it from Nepali experience.

Ans: The modern state is considered a completely sovereign state. Sovereignty is the most important and integral element of the modern state system. Sovereignty sets the modern state apart from other organizations in society. Sociologists emphasize that a state cannot be imagined without sovereign power.

There are two sides to sovereignty—*first*, internal sovereignty, and *second*, external sovereignty. Internal sovereignty is the right of all individuals or organizations under the state to be subject to the state and to operate it by order. On the other hand, the state being free from the pressure or interference of any other's power or other state is external sovereignty.

With the rise of nationalism in Europe from the 15th and 16th centuries, the landlords' power and religious rights had declined. Besides the new economic ties, citizens began to associate as temporary groups with ideas such as the unity of the national language and culture and the country's natural boundaries. Thus France, Spain, Britain, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Russia, Italy, and Germany were the first to develop into modern states. After that, autocratic monarchies were established in most of the world's countries. During the 18th and 19th centuries, there was a growing tendency to subjugate various countries through colonization. At present, colonialism has come to an end, and the collective interest has been emphasized by adopting a democratic system instead of the traditional monarchical system of governance. Therefore, the developed states at present are called modern states.

On the other hand, the attribute of the supremacy of any power, group, or judicial system is called sovereignty. This concept is often used in the context of political sovereignty. The concept of sovereignty is used in a state giving supreme or ultimate power over its citizens.

The modern state is a sovereign state, according to Immanuel Wallerstein, a leading advocate of the world-system approach. According to him, sovereignty refers to the autonomous state power under the modern world-system. A broad range of states governs modern states, called the interstate system. The legitimacy of sovereignty and the state system are considered complementary and reciprocal. Therefore, the modern state is a sovereign state.

Sovereignty is a legal claim with major political consequences because the political consequences of sovereignty are the main outcomes of political struggles between states—both within and internationally. From the view of world trade entrepreneurship operating in the capitalist world-economy, any sovereign state can exercise its authority or power in the following seven principles as per its direct interest.

- i. The state may prescribe rules/provisions regarding the conditions under which production, capital, and labor can be extended beyond its limits.
- ii. The state can make and enforce rules related to property rights within its state.
- iii. The state has the authority to make and implement employers and employment-related laws.
- iv. The state can decide which cost firms must be internalized.
- v. Every modern state can implement the rules, regulations, and acts related to the tax system.
- vi. When there is an external influence on firms within a state, the state can exercise and use force to influence decisions made by other states.

Agreeing with the arguments mentioned above of Immanuel Wallerstein, I believe that the modern state is, in fact, a sovereign state.

The Constitution of Nepal (2072) considers two irrevocable subjects. The first is Nepal's geographical integrity, and the second is its sovereignty. This constitution states that the source of sovereignty lies with the people. The concept of a modern state is not very old for Nepal. Although Western nations have a long experience of formal Nepalese institutions, the spirit of the state has not been firmly established among the masses. Citizens in remote areas of Nepal cannot get even the basic services required by the state. Therefore, in the context of Nepal, the concept of a modern state is still in practice, but in such a situation, Nepal's sovereignty cannot be said to be false. In today's age of globalization, it is not appropriate to assess sovereignty solely based on special relations and dependence on external factors. If sovereignty is to be taken in that way, then no other country can be called a sovereign country except about 10/12 countries in the world. Despite this, the conclusion can be drawn that Nepal is constantly moving forward in the right exercise of sovereignty, and it is still moving towards maturity.

10. 2016, Q. No. 8

Describe the key themes of the modern world-system.

(आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाका मुख्य प्रसङ्गहरू व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोण एक वामपन्थी सिद्धान्त हो तथा विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण भूमण्डलीय व्यवस्थामा आधारित विश्लेषण हो। कार्ल मार्क्स (1845, 1847, 1848) ले आफ्नो सिद्धान्तलाई घेरेतु वर्गसम्म मात्र सीमित राखेका थिए तर अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय सम्बन्धका मार्क्सवादी सामाजिक चिन्तकहरूले मार्क्सको सोही तर्कलाई आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागमका रूपमा प्रस्तुत गर्दछन्। आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको मूलभूत मान्यताअनुसार तृतीय विश्वका देशहरू (वा अनौद्योगिक देशहरू) सामान्यतया कच्चा पदार्थहरू उत्पादन गर्दछन्। जसमा कृषि उत्पादन पनि

iv. आर्थिक चक्र र विश्व-व्यवस्थाअन्तर्गत राजनैतिक, आर्थिक र सैन्य सद्कटहरू (Economic cycles and political, economic and military crises in World system)

विश्व-व्यवस्थाअन्तर्गत मुख्य क्षेत्र, पृष्ठ क्षेत्र र अर्धपृष्ठ क्षेत्रबीच निश्चित स्वरूपको आर्थिक चक्र सञ्चालन भइरहन्छ। विश्व-व्यवस्थामा आर्थिक सञ्चाल (Economic network) एक चक्रिय प्रक्रियाबाट सञ्चालित भएको हुन्छ। विभिन्न देशहरूमा आउने राजनैतिक परिवर्तनहरूले त्यस्तो आर्थिक चक्रको क्रमिकतामा सद्कट उत्पन्न गराउँदछन्। यसका अतिरक्ति विश्व-व्यवस्थामा राजनैतिक, आर्थिक र सैन्य सद्कटहरू उत्पन्न भइरहेका हुन्न। अतः आर्थिक चक्र र विश्व-व्यवस्थाअन्तर्गत राजनैतिक, आर्थिक तथा सैन्य सद्कटहरू उत्पन्न भइरहनु आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको एक मुख्य प्रसङ्ग हो।

v. अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय श्रम विभाजन, विकास र अपविकास (International division of labor, development and underdevelopment)

आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाले ऐतिहासिक प्रणालीको रूपमा पूँजीवादलाई विकास र अपविकासको मुख्य मान्दछ। समाजहरूलाई पृथक् गराउन विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रले मुख्य क्षेत्र, पृष्ठ क्षेत्र र अर्धपृष्ठ क्षेत्र गरी त्रीपक्षीय रूपमा अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय श्रम विभाजन गराउँदछ। मुख्य क्षेत्रका देशहरूले आफ्नो राज्यान्तर्गतका व्यावसायिक एवम् व्यापारिक कार्य सञ्चालनद्वारा श्रम विभाजनका सबैभन्दा बढी क्रियाकलापहरूमा एकाधिकार कायम गर्दछन्। कालान्तरमा उनीहरूको त्यस्तो प्रवृत्तिले पृष्ठ क्षेत्र र अर्धपृष्ठ क्षेत्रमा प्रभाव पारी मुख्य क्षेत्रका देशहरू निरन्तर विकासको पथमा आगाडि बढ्दै र अरु देशहरू अपविकासबाट ग्रासित हुँदै जाने मान्यता आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको रहेको छ। यसलाई आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको एक मुख्य प्रसङ्ग मानिन्छ।

10. 2016, Q. No. 8

Describe the key themes of the modern world-system.

Ans: The modern world-system approach is a communism theory, and world-system analysis is based on the global system. Karl Marx (1845, 1847, 1848) confined his idea to the domestic class, but Marxist social thinkers in international relations presented Marx's same argument as an approach to the modern world-system. Third-World countries (or non-industrialized countries) generally produce raw materials according to the basic values of the modern world-system, which also includes agricultural production. These products require many human resources. However, a large amount of capital is not required. Farmers engaged in agricultural production and workers in rural areas are paid very low wages. Most industrialized countries produce manufactured goods. If more capital is needed, trained human resources will be employed to get a higher wages facility. Countries that produce more manufactured goods are called core areas/nations, while countries that depend on raw materials and agricultural products are called periphery areas/nations. Inequality and conflict between the core and the periphery are considered the main theme of the modern world-system.

Other major themes of the modern world-system are as follows:

i. **The modern world-system as a capitalist world-economy: Production, surplus value, and polarization**

Wallerstein's book *The Capitalist World-Economy* (1979) analyzes the role of class, ethnic group, and national group in developing the capitalist world. He argues that the modern world-system includes all spheres of the capital accumulation began in the 16th century. Therefore, the modern world-system is a capitalist world-economy, which has given dynamism to the world-system. Surplus-value plays an important role in capitalism. Due to capitalism and surplus-value, core, periphery, and semi-periphery areas are created, increasing polarization between those areas.

ii. **The rise of state-system**

According to the modern world-system, the main power center is the capitalist state system. In the capitalist state system, production is related to capitalist economic enterprises. Wallerstein argues that these states' internal and international economic policies include various operating economic activities, but his economic and political-institutional organizations tend to be isolated. As a result, business institutions have access to a wide range of activities worldwide. In this way, these specialized states can establish their bases and even achieve other territorial partnerships.

iii. **Expression of the mode of production perspective**

In the late 1960s, an attempt was made to reestablish Marxist ideology to understand the transition process of the Third World. The methods of production were accepted as an important concept. According to the advocates of this ideology, many forms of production/capitalism persisted in social consolidation in the Third-World. These advocates also strengthened social empowerment and differentiated between production methods. The mode of production determines the level of economic structures. This process leads to the division of the world-economy into the periphery. Thus, the modern world-system expresses the mode of production. Therefore, the expression of the production method approach is considered a major theme of the modern world-system.

iv. **Economic cycles and political, economic, and military crises in World-system**

Under the world-system, a certain form of the economic cycle continues between the core, periphery, and semi-periphery regions. In the world-system, the economic network is governed by a cyclical process. Political changes in different countries create a crisis in the sequence of such economic cycles. Besides, there are political, economic, and military crises in the world-system. Therefore, the emergence of political, economic, and military crises under the economic cycle and the world-system is one of the main themes of the modern world-system.

v. **International division of labor, development, and underdevelopment**

The modern world-system considers capitalism the main issue of development and underdevelopment as a historical system. The world-economy divides international labor into the core, periphery, and semi-

periphery regions, isolating societies. Countries in the core regions monopolize most of the division of labor through the operation of business and commerce within their states. Their tendency has affected the periphery area and the semi-periphery area in the long run. This instance is considered as one of the main themes of the modern world-system.

11. 2016, Q. No. 6

Explain the basic institutions of capitalist world-economy.

Explain the basic institutions of the Constitution of India. (प्राचीनतमि विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रका आधारभूत संस्थाहरू वर्णन गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र का आधारभूत संस्थाएँ अधिकारी विद्यमान व्यक्ति द्वारा बनाये गये हैं। इनमें से एक उदाहरण यह है कि विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र का आधारभूत संस्थाएँ अधिकारी विद्यमान व्यक्ति द्वारा बनाये गये हैं। इनमें से एक उदाहरण यह है कि विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र का आधारभूत संस्थाएँ अधिकारी विद्यमान व्यक्ति द्वारा बनाये गये हैं।

i. बजार (The Market)

बजारलाई पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाको आधारभूत संस्था मानिन्छ । बजारको ठोस स्थानीय संरचना (Concrete local structure) हुन्छ, जहाँ व्यक्तिहरूले विभिन्न चिजवस्तुहरू खरिदबिक्रि गर्दछन् । अर्कोतरफ बजार कुनै स्थानभन्दा पर अवास्तविक वा काल्पनिक संस्था (Virtual institution) को रूपमा समेत रहेको हुन्छ, जहाँ विभिन्न प्रकारका विनिमयहरू उत्पन्न हुन्छन् । कुनै काल्पनिक बजार कति विशाल एवम् विस्तार भएको हुने भन्ने सवाल दिइएको समयअन्तर्गत क्रेता र विक्रेताहरू समक्ष उपलब्ध वास्तविक विकल्पहरूमा निर्भर गर्दछ । सैद्धान्तिक रूपमा पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रअन्तर्गत काल्पनिक बजार समग्र रूपबाट विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा कायम भएको हुन्छ । यसप्रकार बजारलाई पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको एक प्रमुख संस्था मानिन्छ ।

ii. फर्महरू (Firms)

फर्महरूलाई बजार सक्रिय राखे महत्वपूर्ण एकाइहरू मानिन्छ । एउटै काल्पनिक बजारका फर्महरू कुनै अन्य प्रकारका फर्महरूभन्दा सामान्य रूपमा बढी प्रतिस्पर्धी हुन्छन् । साथै लगानीहरू खरीद गर्ने र उत्पादन बिक्रि गर्ने सन्दर्भमा पनि फर्महरूमा द्वन्द्व सिर्जना भइरहेको हुन्छ । वस्तु तथा सेवाहरूलाई प्रतिस्पर्धात्मक रूपमा बजारमा उपलब्ध गराउन फर्महरूको महत्वपूर्ण योगदान रहेको हुन्छ । त्यसैले फर्महरू विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रका आधारभूत संस्थाहरू मानिन्छन् ।

iii. राज्य (State)

अन्तर्देशीय व्यवस्था अन्तर्गत का विभिन्न देश वा राज्यहरू लाई पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र का मुख्य संस्थाहरू मानिन्छ। उत्पादनमूलक प्रक्रियाहरू का आधारमा हरेक राज्यहरू को भूमिका फरक-फरक हुन्छ। मुख्य-पृष्ठ प्रक्रियाहरू मा निर्भर रहेर हरेक देशले अन्तर्देशीय व्यवस्था को रूपमा विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा पार्ने प्रभाव पनि फरक हुन्छ। मुख्य क्षेत्रका जस्ता उत्पादन प्रक्रियाहरू लाई अङ्गालन न सकिरहेका सबल अर्थतन्त्र भएका देशहरूले आफ्नो भूमिकालाई अर्ध-एकाधिकारी (Quasi-monopolies) बनाइ पूँजीवादी अर्थतन्त्र सुदृढ गरीरहेका हुन्छन्। त्यसैगरी कमजोर राज्यहरू आफ्नो पृष्ठ-क्षेत्रीय उत्पादन प्रक्रियामा पनि सुधार ल्याउने कोशिस

गरिहेका हुन्छन्। यद्यपी श्रमको अक्षीय विभाजन (Axial division of labor) ले पृष्ठ क्षेत्रीय उत्पादनको प्रक्रियालाई बाध्यतापूर्वक स्वीकार गर्नसमेत प्रेरित गर्दछ। कुनै देशको अर्थतन्त्रलाई विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा कसरी गतिशील बनाउने भने सम्बन्धमा राज्यले स्पष्ट मार्गचित्र निर्धारण गरेको हुन्छ। अतः राज्यलाई पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको मुख्य आधारभूत संस्था मानिन्छ।

iv. घरधुरी (Households)

पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा घरधुरीलाई उत्पादन र उपभोगको एक आधारभूत र अत्यावश्यक संस्था मानिन्छ। एउटा घरधुरीले आफ्ना आवश्यकताहरू पुरा गर्न आम्दानीका बहुभौतहरू (Multiple sources of income) को प्रबन्ध गर्नुपर्ने हुन्छ। घरधुरीहरू समानतापूर्ण सरचनाका हुदैनन्। एउटा घरधुरीमा भएका सदस्य सङ्ख्याहरूको हेरफेर भइरहन्छ, जन्म हुन्छ, कुनै सदस्य वृद्ध हुन्छ भने आम्दानीको स्तरका आधारबाट समेत घरधुरीहरूबीच भिन्नता रहेको हुन्छ। आम्दानीको आधारमा हरेक घरधुरीले उपभोगलाई आफ्ना सदस्यहरूमा साभा रूपबाट वितरण गर्दछ। घरधुरीको आम्दानीका पौँचवट्य प्रकारहरू हुने गर्दछन्। पहिलो-ज्याला आम्दानी (Wage income), दोस्रो- निर्वाहजन्य क्रियाकलाप (substance activity), तेस्रो- लघुजन्य वस्तु उत्पादन (Petty commodity production), चौथो- भाड (Rent) र पाँचौ- स्थानान्तरण भुक्तानीहरू (Transfer payments)। घरधुरीले विश्व-व्यवस्थामा प्राथमिक सामाजिकीकरणको निकाय (Primary socializing agency) को रूपमा टेवा पुन्याइरहेको हुन्छ।

v. हैसियत समूह (Status group)

जाति, प्रजाति, पूर्वज परम्परा र उपभोगका ढाँचाहरूमा आधारित भएर निर्माण भएको समान प्रतिष्ठाका व्यक्तिहरूको समूहलाई हैसियत समूह भनिन्छ। विभिन्न घरधुरीहरूमा समेत हैसियत समूहका सदस्यहरूको जीवनशैली प्रायः समान हुन्छ भने समाजमा यिनलाई समान किसिमको सम्मान प्राप्त हुन्छ। जन्मजात रूपमा निर्धारित हुने हैसियत समूह वर्तमान विश्व-व्यवस्थामा पूँजीवादको प्रभावले एक महत्वपूर्ण आर्थिक गतिविधिको माध्यम बन्न पुगेको छ। अतः हैसियत समूहलाई पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको एक प्रमुख संस्था मानिन्छ।

11. 2016, Q. No. 6

Explain the basic institutions of capitalist world-economy.

Ans: The world-economy is a larger geographical area under which the division of labor leads to the more internal exchange of basic or essential commodities and the flow of capital and labor. The main feature of the world-economy is that it is not limited to a single political structure. However, it has many political units within one world-economy, and these units are interconnected in the modern world-system as an interstate system. The economic, social, and cultural diversity in all world regions is included in the world-economy. In the book, *The Capitalist World Economy* (1979), Immanuel Wallerstein analyzes the current world-economy as a capitalist world-economy and points out the following basic institutions:

i. The Market

The market is considered the basic institution of the capitalist system. The market has a concrete local structure, where people buy and sell various goods. On the other hand, the market exists beyond a single place, even as a virtual or imaginary institution, where different exchanges arise. How vast and expanding an imaginary market is depends on the real options available to buyers and sellers within the given time in a specific region.

In theory, under the capitalist world-economy, the entire imaginary market is established in the world-economy. Thus, the market is considered a major institution of the capitalist world-economy.

ii. Firms

Firms are considered important units to keep the market active. Firms in the same fictitious market are generally more competitive than any other type of firm. At the same time, there is a conflict between firms regarding buying investments and selling products. Firms have an important role in making goods and services competitively available in the market. Therefore, firms are considered as the basic institutions of the world-economy.

iii. State

The various countries or states under the interstate system are considered the main institutions of the capitalist world-economy. The role of each state is different depending on the productive processes. Depending on the core processes, each country's impact on the world-economy as an interstate system also varies. Countries with strong economies that have not embraced production processes, such as the main sector, strengthen their capitalist economies by making their role quasi-monopolies. Similarly, weaker states are trying to improve their periphery production. However, the axial division of labor also leads to the forced acceptance of periphery production. The state has set a clear roadmap for making a country's economy dynamic in the world-economy. Therefore, the state is considered the main basic institution of the capitalist world-economy.

iv. Households

In the capitalist world-economy, the household is considered a basic and essential institution of production and consumption. A household must manage multiple sources of income to meet its needs. Households do not have a uniform structure. The number of members in a household is manipulated, births occur, a member grows old, and there is a difference between the households even based on income level. Based on income, each household distributes consumption among its members. There are five types of household income. The *first* is wage income, the *second* is substance activity, the *third* is petty commodity production, the *fourth* is rent, and the *fifth* is transfer payments. The household is supporting the world-system as the primary socializing agency.

v. Status group

A group of people of equal prestige formed based on caste, species, ancestral traditions, and consumption patterns is called a status group. Even in different households, the lifestyle of the status group members is often the same, and they get the same kind of respect in society. The innately determined status group, The influence of capitalism on the current world-system, has become an important means of economic activity. Therefore, the status group is considered as one of the major institutions of the capitalist world-economy.

12. 2015, Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)

Explain how the modern world-system is in crisis (Wallerstein, 2006).

Ans: Modern world-system analysis has taken capitalism as the main issue as a historical system. Therefore, the crises that arise in the capitalist system become the causes of the crisis of the world-system. At present, in different countries of the world, capitalism is being replaced by mixed forms of capitalism and a socialist economy. Because of globalization, nations are becoming increasingly interdependent. World trade has been strengthened by adhering to labor agreements and international labor values. All these innovative reform efforts have also improved the shape of the modern world-system.

The Chapter-Five of *Modern World-System in Crisis: Bifurcation, Chaos, and Choices* (2006), edited by Immanuel Wallerstein, explains the following facts as the causes of the modern world-system in crisis:

- i. The current modern world-system we live in, a capitalist world-economy, is currently in precisely such a crisis and has been for a while now. The crisis may go on another half-century. Since one central feature of such a transitional period is that we face wild oscillations of all those structures and processes we have come to know as an inherent part of the existing world-system, our short-term expectations are necessarily quite unstable. Such instability can lead to considerable anxiety and violence as people preserve acquired privileges and hierarchical rank in a volatile situation. This process can lead to social conflicts that may result in a crisis in the modern world-system.
- ii. In the ceaseless quest for accumulation, capitalists are constantly seeking ways to increase their products' sales prices and reduce production costs. However, producers cannot arbitrarily raise sales prices to just any level. Two considerations constrain them. The *first* is the existence of comparative sellers, and the *second* is the level of effective demand—how much money buyers have in total—and the choices consumers make because their buying power is limited. Thus, such a process leads to a world system crisis.
- iii. In any production area, the syndical power of workers will tend to increase over time by dint of organization and education. Repressive measures may be used to limit the effects of such an organization, but then there are costs attached to this too—perhaps higher taxes, higher remuneration to cadres, the need to employ and pay for repressive personnel. If one looks at the most profitable loci of production—oligopolistic firms in leading sectors—there is a further factor at play: highly profitable firms do not wish to lose production time because of workers' discontent. These all phenomena are related to the crisis of the modern world-system.
- iv. Agreements between employers and employees, terms of service, and facilities are influenced by economic, political, and cultural aspects. There is a complexity in balancing service facilities between skilled technicians and unskilled workers, high-level

managers, and middle-level employees. These instances put the modern world-system in crisis.

- v. The renewal of raw materials is also becoming a crisis in the world-economy. Various raw materials have been in high demand and consumption for 500 years. Alternative sources of raw materials have not been explored. Increasing exploitation of natural resources has also increased environmental risks. These activities affect the world capitalist system, and the modern world-system is in crisis.
- vi. At present, issues of infrastructure are increasing in the world. Infrastructure is an important part of the production and distribution process, such as roads, transportation services, communication networks, security systems, and water supply. Currently, the cost of these infrastructural elements is increasing. Taxation is also on the rise due to the trend of improving taxation. In the modern world, taxation has two basic causes. The first is to provide security services to the state structure and collect revenue for infrastructure construction. To provide funds to provide education, health, and other essential services to the citizens provided by the second state. Currently, the global system is in crisis due to instability in the tax system, and rising rates have been created.
- vii. The post-1945 world-economy saw a massive expansion in productive structures throughout the history of the modern world system. Extensive reforms were made in the cost of remuneration, cost of inputs, and taxation. At the same time, liberalization movements in Europe and East Asia complicated the implementation of such reforms. These processes led to a crisis in the modern world-system.
- viii. New trends in areas such as the **ecological crisis** created by rapid development, the decline in the state's power, and the economic-political system have led to the modern world-system crisis.

Besides, the following factors were also responsible for the contemporary modern world-system moving towards crisis:

- i. A crisis of hegemony and global governance
 - ii. A crisis of inequality and democracy
 - iii. A crisis in the relationship between humans and the natural environment
 - iv. A crisis in the global capitalist system
 - v. A crisis in the New Global Left.
13. What are the arguments of world-system theory on the issue of developed and underdeveloped societies? (Additional Question)
- (विकसित र अपविकसित समाजहरूका मुद्दाका सम्बन्धमा विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तका मुख्य तर्कहरू के-के छन्?)

Ans: विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्त वा विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोण विश्व इतिहास, पूँजीवादको विकास र सामाजिक परिवर्तनको बहुविधागत र बृहत् स्केलको दृष्टिकोण हो, जसले समग्र विश्व-व्यवस्थालाई सामाजिक विश्लेषणको प्राथमिक एकाई मान्दछ। व्यक्ति, फर्म वा संस्थालाई विश्लेषणको एकाई

यसप्रकार अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय पैंजीवाद र यसको विस्तारले मुख्य क्षेत्रका राष्ट्रहरू अन्तर्गतका समाजहरू अपविकासको चक्रमा फस्दै जाने मान्यता विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तले राख्दछ । उत्पादनमूलक प्रभूत्व (Productivity dominance), व्यापार प्रभूत्व (Trade dominance) र वित्तीय प्रभूत्व (Financial dominance) को माध्यमबाट मुख्य देश र ती अन्तर्गतका समाजहरू विकासका उच्चतम् प्रतिफलहरू हासिल गर्ने मान्यता विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तको रहेको छ । यसको ठिक विपरित पृष्ठ क्षेत्रहरूका राष्ट्रहरू कच्चा पदार्थ निर्यातको भरमा आधारित अर्थतन्त्र, सस्तो श्रम, महङ्गो मूल्यमा प्रशोधित उत्पादनहरूको आयात आदिका माध्यमबाट त्यहाँका समाजहरू अपविकासको अवस्थामा नै रहिरहने मुद्दालाई विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तले विकास र अपविकासको मुख्य मुद्दा मानिनुपर्ने औल्याएको छ ।

13. What are the arguments of world-system theory on the issue of developed and underdeveloped societies? (Additional Question)

Ans: The world-system theory or world-system approach is a multidimensional and large-scale approach to world history, the development of capitalism, and social change that considers the world-system a primary social analysis unit. This theory emphasizes the need to study the state, international relations, or the world as a unit of analysis without considering individuals, firms, or institutions as significant elements. Just as there is a division of labor in society, the world-system theory recognizes the division of labor at the inter-regional and global levels. It holds that the world is classified into core countries, semi-periphery countries, and periphery countries based on the global division of labor and production processes.

The world-system theory considers capitalism a historical system and the central issue of developed and underdeveloped societies. Capitalism combines the various forms of labor that play the role of division of labor under the world-economy. Even countries without strong economies are a part of the world-economy. The world-economy divides labor into a tripartite division into core regions, semi-periphery regions, and periphery regions to isolate societies. Countries and societies in the core monopolize most labor division through business and commerce within their peripheral states. Over time, the impact of such activities has been felt in the semi-periphery and periphery regions.

The countries of the core region perform a high level of productive work by basically owning and controlling the powerful means of production in the world. The nations of the periphery region (i.e., the semi-periphery region and the periphery region) own only a tiny part of the world's total means of production, like the Marxist notion of class inequality, the class location of nations and societies in the world-economy results in the unequal distribution of resources.

Countries in the core receive a large share of surplus-value, while countries in the periphery receive only a tiny share. Besides, they could purchase raw materials and by-products from the periphery nations at minimal prices. By processing the same raw materials and resources and producing more valuable goods or materials, the countries of the core region export to the countries of the periphery region at a higher price. The world-system theory points out that inequalities continue to grow in core countries, with the following five crucial benefits to the dominant countries in the periphery region, and those developed nations will move further towards development. Other countries will fall into the cycle of underdevelopment.

- i. Access to the large quantity of raw material
- ii. Cheap labor
- iii. Enormous profit from direct capital investments
- iv. A market for exports
- v. Migration of these people from the periphery to core nations

Thus, the world-system theory holds that international capitalism and its expansion lead societies under the core nations into a cycle of underdevelopment. The principle of the world-system is that through productivity dominance, trade dominance, and financial dominance, the core countries and the societies under them achieve the highest returns of development. In contrast, the nations of the periphery region, based on raw material exports, economies based on cheap labor, imports of expensive and processed products constitute their societies remain in a state of underdevelopment.

14. Pulling ideas from World-system perspective, analyze the role played by NGOs and INGOs in the context of core and peripheral societies. (Additional Question)

(विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणबाट विचारहरू लिई मुख्य र पृष्ठक्षेत्रीय समाजहरूको सन्दर्भमा गैरसरकारी संस्था र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय गैरसरकारी संस्थाहाँद्वारा निर्वाह गरिएको भूमिका विश्लेषण गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: इमानुएल वालेर्स्टाइनले आफ्नो पुस्तक *The Capitalist World-system (1979)* मा पूँजीवादी विश्वका विभिन्न संस्थाहरूको बारेमा विश्लेषण प्रस्तुत गरेका छन्। यी सबै संस्थाहरूले पूँजीवादी विश्व विकासका सन्दर्भमा कुनै न कुनै भूमिका निर्वाह गरीरहेका हुन्छन्। वर्ग, हैसियत समूह, घरधुरी, बजार, उत्पादन, श्रम आदि विश्व पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाका प्रमुख संस्थाहरू हुन्। वालेर्स्टाइनको अधिमतअनुसार वर्तमान विश्व-व्यवस्था सम्पत्ति सञ्चयीकरणको परिणाम हो। सम्पत्ति र पूँजी सञ्चयीकरणको प्रक्रिया 16औं शताब्दीबाट प्रारम्भ भएको थियो। त्यसै समयदेखि संसारमा गैरसरकारी संस्था र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय गैरसरकारी संस्थाहरूको प्रारम्भिक उदय भएको हो।

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणको वर्तमान सन्दर्भमा विश्वका विभिन्न देशहरूमा हाल गैरसरकारी संस्था र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय गैरसरकारी संस्थाहरूको भूमिका पनि महत्वपूर्ण मानिन्छ। विशेष गरी मुख्य र पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका समाजहरूको सन्दर्भमा विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणले गैरसरकारी संस्थाहरू र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय गैरसरकारी संस्थाहरूद्वारा निर्वाह गरिएका भूमिकाहरूबाटे विशिष्ट विचारहरू अगाडि सारेको छ। त्यसमा पनि हाल विश्वमा मानव समस्या र सरोकारका साभा मुद्दाहरूमा विश्वव्यापी पहलकदमी गर्न नगर्न NGO र INGOहरूको विकास एवम् विस्तार हुने प्रसस्त सम्भावनाहरू छन्।

विश्वव्यापीकरणको परिणामस्वरूप अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय सम्बन्ध, विभिन्न देशहरूको एकअर्को देशप्रति निर्भता, सञ्चार र आर्थिक क्रियाकलापहरू विश्वभर प्रसारण हुने क्रम बढ्दो छ। विश्वका केन्द्रीय निकायहरू विश्व बैंडक, संयुक्त राष्ट्रसङ्घ, एमनेष्टी इन्टरनेशनल, अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय मुद्रा कोष आदिले विश्व हितका निमित्त कार्यक्रमहरू कार्यान्वयन गर्न महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निर्वाह गरिरहेका छन्। मुख्य राष्ट्रहरूमा स्रोतसाधनहरूको प्रचुरता, सबल अर्थतन्त्र र विकासको उच्चतम गतिको परिणामले लोक कल्याणका लागि विभिन्न NGO र INGO हरू पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका देशहरूमा विस्तार भइरहेका छन्। समग्र विश्व-व्यवस्थामा नै केन्द्र क्षेत्रका समाज (वा राष्ट्रहरू) बाट गैरसरकारी संस्थाहरू अन्य विकसित वा पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका समाजहरू (वा राष्ट्रहरू) मा आगमन र प्रवेश हुने क्रम बढ्दो छ। विभिन्न देशहरूमा उदय भएका प्रजातान्त्रीकरण, उदारीकरण र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय सम्बन्ध विस्तारले विकसित राष्ट्रहरूमा गैरसरकारी संस्थाहरू अल्पविकसित राष्ट्रहरूमा स्थानान्तरण हुने क्रम निरन्तर बढ्दै गइरहेको छ।

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका विचारहरूबाट मुख्य र पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका समाजहरूको सन्दर्भमा गैरसरकारी संस्था र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय गैरसरकारी संस्थाहरूको भूमिकालाई निमानुसार प्रस्तुत गर्न सकिन्छ :

- i. NGO र INGO हरूले विकासशील राष्ट्रहरूमा राहत र विकासात्मक सहयोग प्रदान गर्दछन्।
- ii. NGO र INGO हरूले आफ्ना नागरिकहरूलाई अत्यावश्यक सेवा दिन नसकेका पृष्ठ क्षेत्र (अर्थात् विकासशील) राष्ट्रहरूमा अत्यावश्यक सेवा र गरीबी निवारण कार्यक्रमहरू सञ्चालन गर्दछन्।
- iii. NGO र INGO हरूले विकासशील राष्ट्रहरूमा स्वास्थ्य, एच.आइ.भी./ ऐझ रोकथाम र नियन्त्रण, स्वस्थ खानेपानी, सद्क्रामक रोगहरू नियन्त्रण, शिक्षा र सामाजिक सेवा जस्ता साभा हितका कार्यक्रमहरू सञ्चालन गर्दछन्।
- iv. प्राकृतिक प्रकोपहरूमा उद्धार कार्य गर्ने पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका समाजहरूमा NGO र INGO हरूको महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका रहन्छ।

यद्यपी विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणले NGO र INGO हरूको भूमिकालाई मुख्य राष्ट्रहरूले पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका राष्ट्रहरूमा अधिपत्य र प्रभाव कायम गराउने भूमिकाबाट समेत विश्लेषण गर्दछ। कतिपय धार्मिक, सामाजिक आर्थिक र सांस्कृतिक स्वार्थहरू पुरा गराउन मुख्य क्षेत्रका राष्ट्रहरूले पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका राष्ट्रहरूमा पूँजी एवम् आर्थिक स्रोतका बलमा NGO र INGO हरूलाई उपयोग गरिरहेको तर्क विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणको रहेको छ।

14. Pulling ideas from World-system perspective, analyze the role played by NGOs and INGOs in the context of core and peripheral societies. (Additional Question)

Ans: In his book *The Capitalist World-System (1979)*, Immanuel Wallerstein presents an analysis of the various institutions of the capitalist world. All these institutions are playing some role in the context of capitalist world development. Class, status group, household, market, production, and labor are the central institutions of the world capitalist system. According to Wallerstein, the current world-system results from capital and asset accumulation. Such a trend began in the 16th century. Since that time, there has been an early rise of NGOs and international NGOs worldwide.

In the current context of the world-system approach, the role of NGOs and international NGOs in different countries of the world is also considered essential. The world-system approach, especially regarding core and periphery societies, offers specific ideas about the roles played by NGOs and international NGOs. At present, there is ample potential for the development and expansion of NGOs and INGOs to take global initiatives on common issues of human concern and concern.

Because of globalization, international relations, the interdependence of different countries, communication, and economic activities are increasingly being broadcast worldwide. The central bodies of the world, such as the World Bank, the United Nations, Amnesty International, the International and Monetary Fund, are playing an essential role in implementing programs for the welfare and wellbeing of the people around the world. An abundance of resources in major nations, a strong economy, and a high development speed have resulted in various NGOs and INGOs for public welfare expanding in the region's countries. There is a growing influx of non-governmental organizations from core societies (or nations) throughout the world-system to other developed or backward societies (or nations). With the emergence of democratization, liberalization, and expansion of international relations in various countries, the

relocation of NGOs from developed countries to underdeveloped countries is on the rise. The role of NGOs and international NGOs concerning core and periphery societies can be presented from the perspective of the world-system approach as follows:

- i. NGOs and INGOs provide relief and development assistance to developing nations.
- ii. NGOs and INGOs run emergency services and poverty alleviation programs in the back region (i.e., developing) countries that cannot provide essential services to their citizens.
- iii. IGOs and INGOs run programs of common interest in developing countries such as health, HIV / AIDS prevention and control, safe drinking water, infectious diseases control, education, and social services.

- iv. NGOs and INGOs have a vital role in the rescue of natural disasters. However, the world-system approach also analyzes the role of NGOs and INGOs from the role of powerful nations in dominating and influencing countries in the region. The world-system view is that the core nations are using NGOs and INGOs to strengthen capital and economic resources in the backward and developing nations to fulfill religious, socio-economic, and cultural interests.

15. What are the core components of dependency and world-system debates? Compare the similarity and differences in the arguments of Frank and Wallenstein. (Additional Question)

Ans: • परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तका मुख्य तत्वहरू- फ्रान्कका तर्कहरू (Core components of dependency theory– Arguments of Frank)

परनिर्भरताको सिद्धान्तले विकासका मामिलामा तृतीय विश्वका देशहरू (वा अनौद्योगिक देशहरू) विकसित देशहरूमा बढी मात्रामा आश्रित भएको विचार प्रतिपादन गर्दछ । यस सिद्धान्तअनुसार तृतीय विश्वका देशहरूमा भइरहेको आर्थिक विकासलाई बुझका लागि ती देशको औद्योगिक देशहरूसँग रहेको निर्भरतापूर्ण सम्बन्धलाई गहन ढड्गबाट विश्लेषण गर्नुपर्दछ । परनिर्भता सिद्धान्तअनुसार तृतीय विश्वका देशहरू (अनौद्योगिक देशहरू) विकासको एक समूचित र निर्वाहयोग्य स्तर प्राप्त गर्न असफल रहनुको कारण ती देशहरू उन्नत औद्योगिक पूँजीवादी देशहरूमा निर्भर रहनु हो । यस सिद्धान्तका मुख्य प्रतिपादक जर्मन-अमेरिकी इतिहासविद् तथा समाजशास्त्री एन्ड्रे गुण्डर फ्रान्क हुन् । गरीब देशहरू अभ दरिद्र (वा शक्तिहीन) हुँदै जाने तथा धनी देशहरू एउटा 'विश्व-व्यवस्था' मा संयोजित भई अभ बढी सम्पन्न र विकसित हुँदै जाने प्रवृत्तिमा जोड दिनु परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तको मुख्य तत्त्व (वा सार तत्त्व) हो ।

(वा सार तत्त्व) हो। परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तलाई आधुनिकीकरण सिद्धान्त (Modernization theory) र पूर्ववर्ती विकासको सिद्धान्त (Theory of development) को प्रतिक्रियास्वरूप विकास गरिएको हो। यी दुवै सिद्धान्तले अगाडि सारेको 'सबै समाजहरूले विकासका समान चरणहरूमार्फत प्रगति र समृद्धि हासिल गर्दछन्' भने मुलभूत मान्यतालाई परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तले अस्वीकार गर्दछ। परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तअनुसार अल्पविकसित राष्ट्रहरू केवल विकसित देशहरूका प्राचीन स्वरूपहरू मात्र होइनन्, बरु ती अल्पविकसित देशहरूसँग आफ्ना पृथक् विशेषताहरू तथा

प्रान्क र वालेस्टीनका तर्कहस्तीच भिन्नता

- i. निर्भरता सिद्धान्तले विश्वव्यापी राजनैतिक-आर्थिक व्यवस्थासँग सम्बन्ध राख्छ भने विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तले अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय श्रम विभाजनसँग सम्बन्ध राख्छ।
- ii. विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्तलाई निर्भरता सिद्धान्तकै विस्तारित र बृहत् स्वरूपको सिद्धान्त मानिन्छ।
- iii. परिनिर्भरता सिद्धान्त ल्याटिअमेरिकी देशहरूको औपनिवेशिक कालमा विकसित गरिएको हो भने विश्व-व्यवस्था सिद्धान्त चाही नवउदारवादी युग (Neoliberal era) मा विकास गरिएको हो।

15. What are the core components of dependency and world-system debates? Compare the similarity and differences in the arguments of Frank and Wallenstein. (Additional Question)

Ans: • Core components of dependency theory- Arguments of Andre Gunder Frank

According to Frank's arguments, the dependency theory suggests that Third-World countries (or non-industrialized countries) are more dependent on developed countries in development affairs. According to this theory, to understand the economic growth in the Third-World countries, one must analyze the dependent relations of the least developed nations with developed ones. According to the dependency theory, Third-World countries (non-industrialized countries) have failed to achieve a proper and sustainable level of development because they are dependent on advanced industrial capitalist countries. The leading proponent of this theory is the German-American historian and sociologist Andre Gunder Frank. Emphasis on the tendency of developing countries to become poorer (or powerless) and for rich countries to become more prosperous and developed by uniting in a 'world-system' is a crucial element (or essence) of dependency theory.

The dependency theory has been developed in response to the modernization theory of development. It rejects the fundamental premise that 'all societies progress and thrive through the same stages of development.' It holds that the Least Developed Countries are lower in the world market economy. According to Frank (1970), the dependency theory is based on the Marxist view of the world. According to him, globalization should be seen as an expansion of market capitalism and providing cheap labor for the technological development of nations in the West.

• Core Components of World-System Perspective- Arguments of Wallerstein

The world-system theory or world-system approach is a multidimensional and large-scale approach to world history, the development of capitalism; and social change, which considers the overall world-system as the primary unit of social analysis. This theory emphasizes that individuals, firms, or institutions should be studied, not as a unit of analysis but as a unit of analysis that constitutes the state, international relations, or the world. Just as there is a division of labor in society, world-system theory

recognizes the division of labor at the inter-regional and global levels. The world-system theory is based on the worldwide division of labor and production processes, categorized into the core, semi-periphery, and periphery countries.

The world-system theory considers capitalism as a historical system as the central issue of developed and underdeveloped societies. Capitalism combines the various forms of labor that play the role of division of labor under the world-economy. According to Wallerstein, even countries without strong economies are a part of the world-economy. The world-economy divides labor into the core, semi-periphery, and periphery areas to isolate different societies. Countries and societies in the core monopolize most of the division of labor through the operation of business/commerce within their states. Over time, the impact of such activities has been felt in the semi-periphery and periphery region countries. The countries of the core region are moving forward on the path of continuous development, and other countries are suffering from underdevelopment.

From all the above considerations, the similarities and differences between Frank and Wallerstein's arguments for dependency and the world-system debate can be summarized as follows:

- **Similarities between Frank and Wallerstein's arguments**

- i. Both analyze the issues of development and underdevelopment with equal importance.
- ii. Both have taken the concept of core and periphery areas equally.
- iii. The influence of capitalism is given equal importance by the dependency theory and the world-system theory.

- **Differences between Frank Wallerstein's arguments**

- i. Dependence theory relates to the global political-economic system, while world-system theory relates to the international division of labor.
- ii. The world-system theory is considered an extended and comprehensive form of the dependency theory.
- iii. The dependency theory was developed during the colonial period of Latin American countries, while the world-system theory was developed during the Neoliberal era.

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका विमेदहरू/आलोचनाहरू

(VARIANTS/CRITIQUES OF WORLD-SYSTEM PERSPECTIVES)

1. 2020, Q. No. 3; 2017, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

What value does the world-systems analysis add to contemporary understandings of the economic, political, and social relationships amongst the various nation-states in the world with varying levels of development? Discuss with relevant examples.

(विकासका विविध तहहरूका साथ विश्वमा विभिन्न राष्ट्र-राज्यहरूबीचका आर्थिक, राजनैतिक र सामाजिक सम्बन्धहरूको समकालीन बुभाईंका लागि विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणले के मूल्य थप गरेको छ ? सान्दर्भिक उदाहरणहरू सहित छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

OR

In, your opinion, what value does the world-system analysis add to contemporary understandings of the economic, political, and social relationships amongst various nation-states in the world with varying levels of development? Discuss with relevant examples.

(तपाईंको अभिमतमा, विकासका विविध तहहरूका साथ विश्वमा विभिन्न राष्ट्र-राज्यहरूबीचका आर्थिक, राजनैतिक र सामाजिक सम्बन्धहरूको समकालीन बुभाईंका लागि विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणले के मूल्य थप गरेको छ ? सान्दर्भिक उदाहरणहरू सहित छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: सन् 1970 को दशकमा अमेरिकी समाजशास्त्री इम्माएनुल वालेस्टाइनद्वारा विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको विकास/निर्माण गरिएको थियो। सतही रूपबाट हेर्दा यो विश्लेषण सरल छ तर गहन ढूँगावाट नियाल्दा यसअन्तर्गत थुप्रै तथ्यहरू रहेका छन्। वालेस्टाइनको विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण 16औं शताब्दीदेखि हालसम्म विकसित विश्व-ऐतिहासिकता विकासको एक बृहत् विवेचना हो। यस अन्तर्गत विश्व-ऐतिहासिकताका विभिन्न सीमा, संरचना, समूह सदस्यहरू, नियम, प्रावधान र तिनका सम्मिश्रित स्वरूपहरू समावेश छन्। विश्व-व्यवस्था द्वन्द्वात्मक शक्तिहरूका साथ गतिशील र निरन्तर उदयीमान छ भने यसअन्तर्गतका विचार र दृष्टिकोणहरूले थुप्रै बहसहरू पनि उत्पन्न गराएका छन्।

वालेस्टाइनको आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था विशेषतः एउटा पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र (A capitalist world-economy) हो, जहाँ पूँजीवादलाई पूँजीको अन्तहीन सञ्चयीकरण गर्ने प्रक्रियाका रूपमा परिभाषित गरिएको छ। स्कटिश अर्थशास्त्री एडम स्मिथ (1723-1790) द्वारा प्रतिपादित रूपकहरूको प्रयोग गरेर वालेस्टाइनले विश्व-व्यवस्थालाई एउटा भौगोलिक श्रम विभाजन (Geographical division of labor) का रूपमा परिभाषित गरेका छन्। विश्व-व्यवस्थाको

राष्ट्रहरू (Modern core nations) ले उच्च प्रविधि, वित्तीय संस्था र उच्च-मुनाफाजन्य उद्योगहरूमा प्रभुत्व कायम गरेका हुन्छन्।

पृष्ठ क्षेत्र (वा पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका राष्ट्रहरू) प्रायः 16औं देखि 20औं शताब्दीसम्मका औपनिवेशिक क्षेत्र रहेका थिए। यिनलाई 20औं शताब्दीको छोटो समयकालखण्डका अल्पविकसित वा अर्धविकसित राष्ट्रहरू मानिन्छ। पृष्ठ राष्ट्रहरूले मुख्य राष्ट्रका चाहनाहरू पुरा गर्न टेवा पुन्याउँदछन्। यी क्षेत्रमा रहेका राष्ट्रले कृषिजन्य वस्तु, विलासी वस्तु, कच्चा पदार्थ र श्रमका सस्ता स्रोतहरू प्रदान गर्दछन्।

विश्व-व्यवस्थाको त्रिपक्षीय तहमा अन्तिम तह अर्ध-पृष्ठ राष्ट्रहरू (Semi-periphery nations) ले ओगदछन्। यिनले मुख्य र पृष्ठ राष्ट्रहरूबीच व्यापारिक मध्यमार्गी भूमिका निर्वाह गर्दछन्। यी देशसँग आफ्नो सानो उत्पादनमूलक वा निर्माणजन्य क्षेत्र हुन्छ, जुन स्थानीय वा अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय व्यापारसँग जोडिएको हुन्छ। अर्ध-पृष्ठ राष्ट्रले सीमित मात्रै पूँजी सञ्चयीकरण गर्न सक्दछन्।

1. 2020, Q. No. 3; 2017, Q. No. 1 (Long Answer Question)

What value does the world-systems analysis add to contemporary understandings of the economic, political, and social relationships amongst the various nation-states in the world with varying levels of development? Discuss with relevant examples.

OR

In, your opinion, what value does the world-system analysis add to contemporary understandings of the economic, political, and social relationships amongst various nation-states in the world with varying levels of development? Discuss with relevant examples.

Ans: On the surface, world-system analysis appears deceptively simple, as eloquently formulated by the American sociologist Immanuel Wallerstein in the 1970s. Wallerstein's world-system analysis is a grand narrative of world-historical development from the 16th century to the present, with boundaries, structures, member groups, rules of legitimization, and coherence. The world-system is dynamic and constantly evolving, with "conflicting forces which hold it together by tension and tear it apart as each group seeks eternally to remodel it to its advantage."

Wallerstein's modern world-system is specifically a capitalist world economy with *capitalism* defined as "the *endless accumulation of capital*." Using a metaphor that recalls Scottish economist Adam Smith (1723–1790), Wallerstein defines the *world-system* as a geographical division of labor. While the essential linkage is economic, the system is reinforced by political and cultural factors.

- What value does the world-systems analysis add to contemporary understandings of the economic, political, and social relationships amongst the various nation-states in the world?

One other important concept plays a crucial role in the world-system is *hegemony*. One core nation accumulated sufficient power to dominate the other core nations during various historical times. According to Wallerstein, *hegemony* refers to those situations in which one static state, and therefore has military and cultural as well as economic and

political power." Because of its superior means of production and distribution, strong financial institutions that lend credit to both domestic industry and externally to peripheral and semi-peripheral areas, and the financial prowess to support military action, the hegemon dominates the world-system.

Wallerstein identifies three periods of hegemonic domination in the modern world: the United Provinces (Netherlands) in the mid-17th century, Great Britain in the mid-18th century, and the United States in the mid-twentieth century. In each of these cases, the hegemon advocated freer trade from a position of dominant economic power. The economic, military, and, at times, ideological burdens of maintaining a position of superiority threaten the hegemonic power, which must pour resources into retaining its dominant position in the world-system.

Wallerstein's argument that the Dutch were the first hegemonic power due to their application of science to agricultural production and their overseas dominance has generated lively scholarly debate. Moreover, the idea of hegemony has influenced the study of twentieth-century U.S. diplomatic historiography, particularly in interpreting the relationship between the United States and Latin America. For example, Historians Thomas J. McCormick and Thomas Schoonover have applied world-system theory to examine the means of U.S. hegemonic control and the rivalry between the United States and other core powers.

The subtitle of Wallerstein's first volume on developing the modern world-system is significant: *Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century* (1974). Not only does he date the advent of the modern world-system in the 16th century, but he emphasizes the idea that capitalism can be applied to agricultural economies. During this time, mercantilism, the economic nationalism revolving around trade, became the preferred European state policy.

Colonialism is one form of interstate relationship within the capitalist world-system. Colonialism emerged as a political method of incorporation of external areas. Wallerstein argues that "incorporation into the capitalist world-economy was never at the initiation of those being incorporated. The process derived rather from the need of the world-economy to expand its boundaries. A colony serves the economic interests of a core nation. It can be a source of needed raw materials for the core, such as the production of indigo in the North American colonies or silver in Spain's Latin American colonies; a source of luxury goods; a market for goods manufactured in the metropole; or any combination of the three."

Colonies also served as stations for commerce on the trade routes that linked the world-system and as bases to protect the trade routes or disrupt the commerce of rival core powers. A colony can also be one part of a broader trade system, such as the various 17th- and 18th-century triangular trade routes. One example is the India-China-Britain triangular trade of the 18th century. Britain purchased tea from China, which was paid for with Indian raw cotton, and later with opium imported into China. Britain curtailed Indian domestic production of finished cotton goods and encouraged the Indian merchants to import British cotton manufactures.

Incorporation into the world-system induced changes in the peripheral and colonial areas' economic and cultural patterns. The 19th century saw the famous competition of European core powers for colonies in Africa and the Middle East.

Colonialism took several forms between the 16th and the 20th centuries, ranging from settler colonies to political control by a small group of core citizens over a sizeable native population. While economic factors were central, the creation of colonies was buttressed and sanctified by the religious and ideological worldview of the core nations. This worldview included racism, which justified dominance and made peripheral populations feel culturally inferior. Both Catholic and Protestant colonizers sought to expand their religious spheres of domination.

Competition between core powers to consolidate areas external to the world-system was the catalyst to colonialism. At first, European powers competed for control of precious raw materials (i.e., the fabled gold and silver of the Americas and the fisheries and pelts on and off the coast of North America). Soon agricultural goods, such as sugar from the Caribbean and tobacco, indigo, and, later, cotton from North America, became valued imports to the core powers.

Struggles between core powers, and their attempts to maintain a balance of power without anyone power achieving hegemony, resulted in wars on the European continent. These wars expanded into the colonies. Treaties terminating such conflicts reflected the significance of the world-system. For example, the Treaty of Utrecht of 1713, which ended the War of the Spanish Succession (1701–1714), gave England access to the slave trade dominated by the Spanish.

In a careful study of India, Wallerstein traces the Mughal Empire colonization, which ruled much of the Indian Subcontinent during the 16th and 17th centuries. The decision to incorporate India as part of the British Empire illustrates the globalization dynamics of the world-system and the conflicts between the core powers. Britain's decision to colonize was competition with France, which also sought Indian riches.

• Varying Levels of Development

Wallerstein's world-system divides the nations and areas of the world into **three units**, designated *core*, *peripheral*, and *semi-peripheral* (in the past, some areas remained external to the system). These normative units are systemic and relational within the capitalist world economy. All parts of the system are dependent upon and interact with each other; any change in the system will impact the entire system.

Core nations dominate the economic structure of their historical time and strive to maintain or expand this authority. One fundamental element of a core nation is producing and distributing products. Another characteristic is vital to state machinery linked to a unified national culture. The state supports economic influence wielded by private businesspeople, merchants, and financial institutions, playing a vital role in core nations. Culture often serves as an ideological justification for dominance. The state also provides military force to protect and expand economic interests. Modern core nations dominate high technology, financial

institutions, and high-profit industries. Within the context of the world-system, core nations compete among themselves for economic advantage. Peripheral areas or nations (often colonies from the 16th to the 20th centuries and defined as underdeveloped or semi-developed for a brief time in the twentieth century) serve the interests of the core nations. Peripheral areas provide agricultural products, luxury goods, raw materials, and cheap sources of labor. At times peripheral areas gained prominence, serving as crucial geographically located posts to protect trade routes between the core and the periphery. Peripheral areas are dependent upon core nations and have often been a source of conflict between core nations. Here, core methods of domination range from various forms of colonialism to anticolonial imperialism and economic dependency.

Last in the tripartite world-system are semi-peripheral nations and areas. These serve as intermediate trading areas between the core and peripheral nations. They also have small manufacturing sectors geared to either local or international trade or capital accumulation.

Historically, some areas remained external to the world-system either by choice or neglect. By the twentieth century, virtually every region globally had been consolidated into the modern capitalist world-system.

2. 2020, Q. No. 5; 2015, Q. No. 8

How does Theda Skocpol criticize Wallerstein's notion of world capitalist system? What are the potentially important variables that that Wallerstein ignored in his world-system analysis?

(थेडा स्कोकपलले वालेस्टाइनको विश्व पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थासम्बन्धी अवधारणालाई कसरी आलोचना गरेका छन् ? वालेस्टाइनले आफ्नो विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणमा सम्भावित के-कस्ता महत्वपूर्ण चरहरूको उपेक्षा गरेका छन् ?)

OR

Summarize Theda Skocpol's critique of world capitalist system (Skocpal, 1997).

[विश्व पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थासम्बन्धी थेडा स्कोकपलको आलोचनालाई सारांशीकृत गर्नुहोस् । (स्कोकपल, 1997)]

Ans: थेडा स्कोकपल अमेरिकाको हावड्ह विश्वविद्यालयअन्तर्गत समाजशास्त्रका प्राध्यापक रहेका छन्। उनले आफ्नो लेख *Wallerstein's World Capitalist System: A Theoretical and Historical Critique* (1977) मा वालेस्टाइनद्वारा अगाडि सारिएको विश्व-पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाको अवधारणाको आलोचना गरेका छन्। स्कोकपलले वालेस्टाइनको विश्व-पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थासम्बन्धी प्रतिपादित धारणामा औल्याएका ती आलोचनाहरू निम्नानुसार छन्:

- i. स्कोकपलका अनुसार वालेस्टाइनको सिद्धान्तले यूरोपमा सामन्तवादी व्यवस्था पूँजीवादतर्फ सङ्क्रमण भएको सम्बन्धमा केही पनि वर्णन गरेको छैन। सामन्तवादको गतिशीलतामा सैद्धान्तिक अवधारणाको कमी हुनु वालेस्टाइनको विश्व-पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थासम्बन्धी प्रतिपादित धारणाको प्रमुख आलोचना हो। सामन्तवाद न त विश्व-सम्प्राज्य हो वा न त विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र नै। वालेस्टाइनका अनुसार सन् 1450 तिर सामन्तवादी व्यवस्थाको पतन भएको थियो। उनले सामन्तवादको पतनका लागि इतिहासविदहरूका तर्कलाई मात्र

अवलम्बन गर्नु उनीहुँदारा अगाडि सरिएको विश्व-पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाको अवधारणाको प्रमुख कमजोरी वा आलोचना रहेको स्कोकपलले औल्याएका छन्।

- ii. एकपटक विश्व-पूँजीवादी व्यवस्था स्थापित तथा विकास भइसकेपछि त्यसको विकासात्मक क्रम रोकिने वा पतनतर्फ उन्मुख हुने प्रक्रिया कसरी हुन्छ भन्ने सम्बन्धमा वालेस्टाइनले कुनै पनि सैद्धान्तिक व्याख्या प्रदान गरेका छैनन्। आफ्नो लेख *Rise and Demise (1974)* मा वालेस्टाइनले दाबी गरेका छन् कि औद्योगिक क्रान्ति (1760-1840) का समयमा हासिल गरिएका प्राविधिक नवप्रवर्तनहरूले सिर्जना गरेका थुप्रै परिणामहरू महत्त्वपूर्ण छन्। यद्यपि उक्त क्रान्तिका कारणहरूबारे भने वालेस्टाइनले केही पनि औल्याएका छैनन्।
- iii. वालेस्टाइनले विश्व पूँजीवादका महत्त्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रहरूको वर्ग संरचना (Class structure) मा विशेष जोड दिएका छन्। उनले विश्व-पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थाको आधारभूत आर्थिक गतिशीलतालाई उदारवादी अर्थशास्त्रीहरूद्वारा जोड दिएका स्पष्ट परिभाषित चरहरूका आधारबाट वर्णन गरेका छन्। त्यसै क्रममा वालेस्टाइनले कुनै पनि आर्थिक व्यवस्थाको विकासका लागि उत्पादनका सामाजिक सम्बन्धहरू र अतिरिक्त मूल्यहरूको उपयुक्तीकरणको महत्त्वपूर्ण भूमिका हुन्छ भन्ने माक्स्वादी दृष्टिकोणलाई उपेक्षा गरेका छन्। जहाँ माक्स्वादी विचारहरूले उत्पादनका प्रक्रिया र अतिरिक्त मूल्य उपयुक्तीकरण (Producing and surplus appropriation) बीचको संस्थागत सम्बन्धमा जोड दिएका छन्, वालेस्टाइनले भने त्यस्तो जोडका सट्टामा बजार व्यवस्थाका लागि श्रम नियन्त्रण (Labor control) लाई मात्र प्रभुत्वशाली वर्गको रणनीति मानेका छन्।
- iv. वालेस्टाइनले सैद्धान्तिक रूपमा तर्क गरेका छन् कि विश्व-पूँजीवादी अर्थतन्त्रका संरचना र प्रकार्य निहीतार्थ रूपबाट नै शोषण गर्ने (Inherently exploitative) किसिमको हुन्छ। प्रभुत्वमा राख्ने र प्रभुत्वमा राखिएका देशहरूबीचको अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय श्रेणीबद्धता (अर्थात् मुख्य विपरित पृष्ठ) का आधारमा उनले त्यस्तो तर्क गरेका छन्। यसप्रकार पूँजीवाद केवल स्वामित्वकर्ता वा मालिक वर्गबाट कामदार वर्गमा अतिरिक्त मूल्यको उपयुक्तीकरण मात्रै होइन बरु मुख्य क्षेत्रका राष्ट्रबाट पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका राष्ट्रमा पनि त्यस्तो मूल्य उपयुक्तीकरण गरिनु हो। यस तर्कका आधारबाट स्कोकपलले वालेस्टाइनको विश्व-पूँजीवादी व्यवस्थासम्बन्धीय आगाडि सारिएको धारणाको आलोचना गरेका छन्।
- v. स्कोकपल तर्क गर्दछन् कि वालेस्टाइनको विश्व-पूँजीवादी सिद्धान्त (World-capitalist theory) ले उनलाई प्रारम्भिक आधुनिक यूरोपमा भएका आर्थिक विकासका स्वरूपहरूको उपयुक्त व्याख्या गर्नबाट रोकेको छ। राज्य विकासको स्वरूप वा प्रकृतिलाई पनि वालेस्टाइनले प्रभावकारी ढण्डबाट समेतन सकेका छैनन्।
- vii. अन्तमा, उपर्युक्त आलोचनाका अतिरिक्त स्कोकपलले वालेस्टाइनको उपागमका दुईवट्य पद्धतिगत आलोचनाहरू (Methodological criticisms) पनि औल्याएका छन्। पहिलो, वालेस्टाइनले आफ्नो सिद्धान्त विकास गर्दा ऐतिहासिक प्रमाणहरूलाई मात्र आधार मानेका छन्। दोस्रो, वालेस्टाइनले राष्ट्र-राज्यलाई विशेष जोड दिइ आधुनिकीकरण सिद्धान्तलाई उपेक्षा गरेका छन् र उनी ऐतिहासिक नमूना निर्माण गर्नेतर्फ मात्रै प्रवृत्त छन्।

2. 2020, Q. No. 5; 2015, Q. No. 8

How does Theda Skocpol criticize Wallerstein's notion of world capitalist system? What are the potentially important variables that that Wallerstein ignored in his world-system analysis?

OR

Summarise Theda Skocpol's critique of world capitalist system (Skocpol, 1997).

Ans: Theda Skocpol is a Professor of Sociology at Harvard University, United States. In her academic article *Wallerstein's World Capitalist System: A Theoretical and Historical Critique* (1977), Skocpol criticizes Wallerstein's notion of the world-capitalist system as follows:

- i. According to Skocpol, Wallerstein's theory does not explain the transition from feudalism to capitalism in Europe. The most obvious difficulty is the lack of any theoretical conception of feudalism's dynamics, which is neither a "world empire" nor a "world economy" in Wallerstein's terms. To explain what he holds to be the demise of feudalism around 1450, Wallerstein employs an amalgam of historians' arguments about reasons for the crisis of feudalism.
- ii. As for how world capitalism develops once it is established, although Wallerstein argues that the system is dynamic, he provides no theoretical explanation of why developmental breakthroughs occur. In his article *Rise and Demise* (1974), Wallerstein contends that the momentous consequences of the technical innovations achieved in the Industrial Revolution are significant. However, not a word is said about the causes of the industrial revolution.
- iii. Even though Wallerstein seems to be placing a great deal of stress on the class structure of the significant zones of world capitalism, he explains the system's fundamental economic dynamics in terms of precisely the variable usually stressed by liberal economists. At the same time, he ignores the fundamental Marxist insight that the social relations of production and surplus appropriation are the sociological key to developing any economic system. The Marxist idea demands that one pay attention to institutionalized relationships between procuring and surplus-appropriating classes. Instead, Wallerstein treats "labor control" primarily as a market-optimizing strategy of the dominant class alone.
- iv. Wallerstein theoretically argues that the structure and functioning of the world-capitalist economy are inherently exploitative. He contends so by assigning the international hierarchy of dominating and dominated states (especially core vs. periphery) a crucial mediating role in exacerbating and sustaining overall inequalities in the entire system. Thus, capitalism involves not the only appropriation of surplus-value by an owner from a laborer but an appropriation of a surplus of the whole world-economy by core areas. In this way, Theda Skocpol criticizes Wallerstein's notion of the world capitalist system.
- v. Skocpol argues that Wallerstein's world-market theory prevents him from adequately explaining patterns of economic development in early modern Europe; it leaves him even less able to make sense of the patterns of state development.
- vi. Finally, aside from the critique mentioned above of Wallerstein's approach, Skocpol points out two methodological criticisms. The *first* has to do with the way Wallerstein handles historical evidence regarding his theory-building work. The *second* is that Wallerstein hoped to overcome. The worst faults of modernization theories by breaking with their overemphasis on nation-states and their tendency toward a historical model building.

गिल्सका अनुसार मेसोपोटामियन, लेवनन्टीन र इजिप्टियन शहरहरूबीच इशापूर्व 2700-2500 को समयदेखि अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय व्यापारमार्फत अतिरिक्त मूल्यको शहर-केन्द्रित विनियम (City-centered exchange of surplus via international trade) हुन प्रारम्भ भएको थिए। त्यसपछि यी शहरहरूको इन्डुस उपत्यकाका शहरहरूसँग सम्बन्ध कायम भयो भने इशापूर्व 1500 को शताब्दीको प्रारम्भमा यी शहरहरू चिनीयाँ शहरहरूसँग पनि जोडिन पुगे। यस समयमा इजिप्टमा चीनबाट आयात गरिएका रेशमी कपडा र चीनबाट इजिप्टमा रेशम निर्यात गरिएका प्रमाणहरू पाइएका छन्। इशापूर्व 1000 को समयसम्म पनि इजिप्ट र चीनका शहरहरूबीच आयात-निर्यात व्यापार हुने गर्दथ्यो। यस आधारबाट बेरी के गिल्सले स्पष्ट पारेका छन् कि मध्य एशियाका शहरहरू जस्तै : ब्याक्ट्रीन र सोग्डियन शहरहरू (Bactria and Sogdian Cities) १ टेक्सालीया समेत अस्तित्वमा आए तथा पछि "वेस्टनर" अलेक्जेण्डर ("Westener" Alexander) ले ती शहरहरूलाई पर्सियन व्यापारिक क्षेत्रहरूमा समावेश नगरन्जेलसम्म अभ्य विस्तार हुँदै गए। या शहरहरू रेशम मात्रै नभइ अन्य विविध वस्तु तथा सामग्रीहरूको व्यापार-व्यवसाय गर्न स्वतन्त्र थिए।

अबु-लग्हुड (1989) ले स्पष्ट तर्क गरेका छन् कि 13औं र 14औं शताब्दीहरूसम्म युरेशियन विश्व-आर्थिक व्यवस्था कहिल्यै पनि वास्तविक गिरावट आएन। विभिन्न सङ्कटका अवस्थाहरूबाट गुजिएर पनि युरेशियन विश्व-आर्थिक निरन्तर रूपबाट पुनर्संइगतित र पुनर्व्यवस्थित हुँदै आयो। यस अर्थतन्त्रलाई त्यस समयका तत्कालीन अन्य कुनै अर्थव्यवस्थाहरूले पनि विस्थापित गर्न सकेनन्।

उपर्युक्त सम्पूर्ण छलफल र बेरी के गिल्सका तर्कहरूका आधारमा स्पष्ट हुन्छ कि तीनवट करिडोरहरू— रेड सी, सिरिया-मेसोपोटामिया र उत्तरी काउकासस् मार्गहरू इशापूर्व 5औं वा 4औं शताब्दीका एथेन्स र यूरोपका अन्य क्षेत्रहरूको तुलनामा युरेशियाका अभ्य बढी महत्वपूर्ण क्षेत्रहरू (वा व्यापारिक मार्गहरू) रहेका थिए।

3. 2019,*Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)

How and why three corridors: Red Sea, Syria-Mesopotamia, and the Northern Caucasus routes were far more significant in Eurasian political and economic development compared to Athens and other parts of Europe in the 5th and 4th century B.C.E. with reference to Barry K. Gills?

Ans: Barry K. Gills is a Professor of Global Politics at Newcastle University, Newcastle UK. He has published widely in critical globalization studies, world-system theory, global history, and critical development studies. In the edited book *The Underdevelopment of Development* (1996), Gills has authored chapter-12 in the title, 'The Continuity Thesis in World Development.' In this little, Gills contends that the three corridors: Red Sea, Syria-Mesopotamia, and the Northern Caucasus were far more significant in the Eurasian political and economic development than Athens and other parts of Europe in the 5th or 4th century BCE.

i. Role of Red Sea trade route in the Eurasian political and economic development

According to Gills (1996), the Red Sea has played a pivotal role in global trade, especially in Asia. In the time of the pharaohs, it was the heart of the worldwide spice trade. Today, it is an essential global artery, feeding Western demand for hydrocarbons and facilitating the flow of goods between Europe and booming Asian markets. More than 10% of world trade moves through the Red Sea basin every year, a figure that is set to increase as Egypt doubles the capacity of the Suez Canal.

Since the 5th or 5th century BCE, the Red sea coastal area has been mentioned as an active trading zone supported by the navigation from Egypt to north-eastern Africa and Arabian Peninsula. While pilgrimage to Arab states accelerated the immigration of people, the passage between Egypt and Southern coastal areas became frequent by the trade of precious materials such as ivory, gold, myrrh, animal hides, and even slaves. This trade resulted in several important port cities, like Saukin (Sudan) and Massawa (Eritrea), which strengthened their port facilities during the Turkish reign between the 16th and the 19th century.

The Red Sea was favored for Roman trade with India beginning with the region of Augustus, when the Roman Empire gained control over the Mediterranean, Egypt, and the northern Red Sea. The route had been used by previous states but grew in traffic volume under the Romans. From Indian ports, suppliers introduced goods from China to the Roman world. Contact between Rome and China depended on the Red Sea but, the route was broken by the Aksumite Empire around the third century CE.

ii. **Role of Syria-Mesopotamia, and the northern Caucasus trade routes in the Eurasian political and economic development**

Indo-European nomads from the Eurasian steppe appeared in the northern Caucasus region in the 5th millennium BCE and the fourth millennium BCE. They established settlements in the area. The most important of those places is Maikop in the Northwest, and its culture flourished between 3700–3000 BCE. The rich grave goods that point at expensive trade relations, even with distant markets, illustrate its significance for the region. Two leading trade routes connected to the northern Caucasus with the South, Anatolia and Mesopotamia. One path can work across the Western part, from East Anatolia through Georgia and Abkhazia to Mikop. The other, eastern route, with connection to Mesopotamia, ended in Azerbaijan. The northern people traded metal (copper, silver, and gold) and turquoise for luxury goods from the southerners (ceramics and beads). Southern goods, sold by Maikop merchants, were found in sites as far north as the valleys of the Don and Volga.

Barry K. Gills argues that, in his view, the macroeconomic reality of most Eurasian history is somewhat close to what Abu-lughod (1989) found in the 13th century: a world economy centered around highly commercialized cities linked to each other through systemic exchange networks and economically dominated, or at least “driven,” by private merchants, albeit coexisting, with bureaucratic or imperial state structures. Nevertheless, these states were often a direct reflection of this same international commerce's location and ever-changing direction. The idea that empires have repeatedly tended to develop in crucial trading zones was reflected in the notion that three corridors (essentially the Red Sea, Syria-Mesopotamia, and the “northern” Caucasus routes) were pivotal geopolitical ground in Eurasian political and economic development precisely because they were physical during the trading crossroads of Eurasia. These same routes were in “competition” with each other. The rise and fall of empires and major metropoles reflect the rivalry among three corridors throughout several millennia.

According to Gills, the first systematic appearance of the interlinking of city-centered exchange of surplus via international trade began from 2700–2500 BCE between Mesopotamian cities, Levantine cities, and Egyptian cities, soon to be joined by Indus Valley cities. Later, Chinese “cities” joined the nexus by perhaps as early as 1500 BCE (according to new evidence found in Egypt of imported Chinese silk and Chinese evidence of silk trade at this date) or perhaps by 1000 BCE. On this basis, we assume that the cities of Central Asia—for example, the Bactrian and Sogdian cities and Taxila—also came into existence and flourished long before the Persians incorporated them into their empire, followed later by “Westerner” Alexander. These pivotal Central Asian cities could have flourished on commodities other than silk and therefore do not depend exclusively on the dating of the silk trade.

Precisely as Abu-Lughod (1989) argues for the Eurasian world economy/system of the 13th to 14th centuries (that the economic system of these interlinked cities does not “fall,” so much as how it is organized change), the Eurasian world economy never truly “falls.” Instead, it is continuous and is continuously rebuilt or reorganized, especially after each periodic “crisis.” Therefore, it is not the world system that falls, but only temporary configurations within the same world economic system, inevitably replacing new configurations on much the same foundation.

From the above discussion and arguments of Barry K. Gills, it is clear that how and why three corridors: Red Sea, Syria-Mesopotamia, and the northern Caucasus routes were more significant in the Eurasian political and economic development compared to Athens and other parts of Europe in the 5th or 4th century BCE.

4. 2019, *Q. No. 4

How does Andere Gunder Frank seem to be different from Immanuel Wallerstein in the case of world development with and without hyphen?

(विश्व विकासमा समास चिन्ह भएको र समास चिन्ह नभएको रूपका सन्दर्भमा एण्ड्रे गुण्डर फ्रान्क इमानुएल वालेस्टाइनभन्दा कसरी भिन्न देखिन्छन् ?)

Ans: बिना समास चिन्ह/विश्व र व्यवस्थाबीच - चिन्ह नभएको अर्थात् विश्व व्यवस्था (World system) ले समग्र विश्वलाई जनाउँदछ भने ती बीच - चिन्ह भएको अर्थात् विश्व-व्यवस्था (World-system) ले विश्लेषणको बृहत् एकाइलाई जनाउँदछ । विश्व व्यवस्था (बिना समास चिन्ह) ले विश्वको इतिहासमा केवल एउटा मात्र विश्व-व्यवस्था भएको सुझाउँदछ ।

एण्ड्रे गुण्डर फ्रान्क विश्व व्यवस्थाका वकालतकर्ता हुन् । तर इमानुएल वालेस्टाइन भने विश्व-व्यवस्थाका प्रतिपादक र समर्थक हुन् । फ्रान्कका अनुसार कुनै पनि ऐतिहासिक समय र स्थानभर एउटा मात्र विश्व व्यवस्था रहीआएको छ, रहन्छ । आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था (वा पूँजीवादी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र) थुप्रै व्यवस्थाहरूमध्येको केवल एउटा व्यवस्था हो, जुन हामीसमक्ष समास चिन्ह (-) सहित उदय भएको छ । वालेस्टाइन तर्क गर्दछन् कि उनको विश्व-व्यवस्था संसारभित्रको वा संसारको एउटा व्यवस्था मात्र होइन बरु यो एक व्यवस्था अर्थात् एउटा विश्व (A system i.e., a world) हो । ‘विश्व’ कुनै व्यवस्थाको विशेषता नहुने भएकोले विश्व-व्यवस्था शब्दले एकल आवधारणालाई मात्र जनाउँदछ । विशेषताजन्य अर्थबाट फ्रान्कको व्यवस्था समग्र विश्वलाई समेद्दै प्रवृत्त भएको एक विश्व व्यवस्था हो ।

फ्रान्कका अनुसार विश्व व्यवस्था इतिहासको चालक शक्ति सञ्चयीकरणको प्रक्रिया (Process of accumulation) हो । यसको ठिक विपरीत वालेस्टाइनले भने पूँजी सञ्चयीकरणलाई आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाको एक विशेष पक्ष मानेका छन् । यसरी आधुनिक विश्व व्यवस्था (समास चिन्हबिना) विगतको व्यवस्थाका तुलनामा भिन्न हुन्छ र थुप्रै शताब्दीसम्मका लागि यस विश्व व्यवस्थामा पूँजी सञ्चयीकरणको समान प्रक्रियाले महत्त्वपूर्ण भूमिका निर्वाह गरिरहन्छ । यद्यपी वालेस्टाइन यस तर्कसँग सहमत छैनन् । उनका अनुसार विगतका विश्व-व्यवस्थाहरू सहायक, अधिन वा विश्व-सप्राज्यहरू (Tributary or world-empires) थिए ।

हामीले वर्तमानमा जीवनयापन गरिरहेको विश्व-व्यवस्था आजभन्दा 5000 वर्ष अघि अस्तित्वमा आएको हो । यो उँही विश्व-व्यवस्था हो, जुन विगत 5000 वर्ष अगाडिदेखि क्रमिक रूपमा विकास हुँदै आइरहेको छ । वालेस्टाइनका अनुसार बिना - चिन्हको विश्व व्यवस्थाभन्दा भिन्न - चिन्हसहितको विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्वव्यापी हुनु आवश्यक छैन । फ्रान्क र वालेस्टाइन दुवैले विश्व व्यवस्था र विश्व-व्यवस्थाबीचको भिन्नतामा जोड दिएका छन् । विश्व व्यवस्था समग्र विश्वका सन्दर्भमा प्रयुक्त गरिने अभिव्यक्ति हो । अर्कोतरफ विश्व-व्यवस्थाले केवल विश्वको एउटा र आर्थिक रूपबाट स्वायत्त (स्वतन्त्र) खण्डसँग मात्र सम्बन्ध राख्छछ । वालेस्टाइनले हामीलाई बताएका छन् कि हामी विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रको सिद्धान्तमा आइपुगेका छौं, जहाँ मापनका दूला एकाइहरूलाई जोड दिइनु आवश्यक छ ।

उपर्युक्त तर्कहरूका आधारमा विश्व विकासमा समास चिन्ह भएको (विश्व-व्यवस्था) र समास चिन्ह नभएको रूपमा (विश्व व्यवस्था) का सन्दर्भमा एण्डे गुण्डर फ्रान्क इम्मानुएल वालेस्टाइनभन्दा भिन्न देखिन्छन् ।

4. 2019,*Q. No. 4.

How does Andre Gunder Frank seem to be different from Immanuel Wallerstein in the case of world development with and without hyphen?

Ans: World system (without a hyphen, i.e., – sign between world and system) refers to the entire world, whereas world-system (with a hyphen, i.e., – sign) is its fragment—the largest unit of analysis. The world system (without a hyphen) suggests that there has been only one world-system in the history of the world.

Andre Gunder Frank is an advocate of the world system, but Immanuel Wallerstein is a world-system. For Frank, there has only been a one-world system through historical time and space. For Wallerstein, there have been very many world-systems. The modern world-system (or the capitalist world-economy) is merely one system among many that bring us to the hyphen (i.e., – sign). Wallerstein argues that his world-system is “not a system” in the world or “of the world.” Instead, it is a system, i.e., a world. Hence the hyphen, since the “world” is not an attribute of the system, the two words constitute a single concept. Frank’s system is a world system in an attributive sense, in that it has been tending over time to cover the whole world.

According to Frank, accumulation is the motor force of world system history. In contrast, Wallerstein regards capital accumulation as specific to the modern world-system. In this regard, the modern world system (without hyphen) is different from than previous one, and the same process of capital accumulation has played a central role in the world system for several millennia. However, Wallerstein disagrees with this argument. He argues that previous world-systems were tributary or world empires.

The world system, we believe that the existence and development of the same world system in which we live stretch back 5000 years or more. According to Wallerstein, unlike the world system (without a hyphen), world-systems (with a hyphen) need not be even worldwide. Frank and Wallerstein both stress the difference between the world system and world-system. The world system is an expression applied to the whole world. On the other hand, the world-system only concerns the fragment of the world and economically autonomous section. Wallerstein tells us that we arrived at the theory of the world-economy while looking for the largest units of measurement which would still be coherent.

In the ways mentioned above and arguments, Andre Gunder Frank seems to be different from Immanuel Wallerstein in the case of world development with and without a hyphen.

5. 2019, Q. No. 5

Describe the critique of Wallerstein's theoretical perspective by William I. Robinson.

(विलियम आई. रबिन्सनद्वारा वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणमा गरिएको आलोचनालाई व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: अमेरिकाको क्यालिफोर्निया विश्वविद्यालयका प्राध्यापक विलियम आइ रबिन्सनले 'International Sociology' पत्रिकामा लिखित लेख *Globalization and the Sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A Critical Appraisal (2011)* मा इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीइनद्वारा अगाडि सारिएका विश्व-व्यवस्थासम्बन्धी सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूको आलोचनात्मक विश्लेषण प्रस्तुत गरेका छन्।

रबिन्सनले सर्वप्रथम वालेस्टीइनद्वारा विकास गरिएको आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाका प्रमुख अवधारणाहरूको पुनरावलोकन गरेका छन् भने पछि ती सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणमा भएका कमीकमजोरीहरू औल्याई आलोचना प्रस्तुत गरेका छन्। वालेस्टीइनले आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा आधुनिक विश्वको बृहत् सामाजिक खोज (Macro social inquiry) का लागि उपयुक्त विश्लेषणको एकाइका रूपमा वर्ग, राज्य/समाज वा राष्ट्र नभइ ती अवस्थित हुने व्यापक ऐतिहासिक प्रणाली हुने तर्क राखेका छन्। अर्थात् आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा विश्लेषणको आधारभूत र महत्वपूर्ण एकाइ बृहत् ऐतिहासिक प्रणाली (Larger historical system) हुन्छ। त्यस प्रणालीमा व्यक्तिहरूले नियमित रूपमा पुनरुत्पादन गर्ने कुनै प्रकारको श्रम विभाजनलाई ऐतिहासिक प्रणालीको सीमाको रूपमा परिभाषित गरिन्छ। ऐतिहासिक प्रणालीको मुख्य विचारधारा श्रम विभाजन (Division of labor) हो। श्रम विभाजन कायम रहँदा व्यक्ति र समूहहरूले आ-आफ्ना आवश्यकता र क्षमताअनुरूप कामका विशिष्टीकृत क्षेत्रहरू अँगाल्दछन्। तसंर्थं श्रम विभाजनले प्राकृतिक रूपबाट कुनै पनि सामाजिक व्यवस्थाका बाह्य सीमाहरू निर्धारण गर्दछ भने सामाजिक सम्बन्ध र अन्तर्निभरताहरूका लागि समेत सीमाहरू निश्चित गर्दछ।

मानव इतिहासका सन्दर्भमा वालेस्टीइनले ऐतिहासिक व्यवस्थाका दुईवटा स्वरूपहरू हुने तर्क राखेका छन्। पहिलो- लघु-व्यवस्था (Mini-systems), दोस्रो- विश्व-व्यवस्था (World-System)। विश्व-व्यवस्थाका दुईवटा स्वरूपहरू छन् : विश्व-साम्राज्य (World-empires) र विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र (World-economies)। लघु-व्यवस्थाहरू पूर्व-कृषि युगसँग बढीमात्रामा सम्बन्धित हुन्छन्। लघु-व्यवस्थाहरू स्व-निर्देशित व्यवस्थाको रूपमा रहेका हुन्छन्, जहाँ यी व्यवस्थाको सानो क्षेत्र र कम अवधि हुने गर्दछ। लघु-व्यवस्थामा सामान्यतया निर्वाहमुखी अर्थतन्त्र हुन्छ र त्यस्तो अर्थतन्त्र पारस्परिक विनियमद्वारा सञ्चालित हुन्छ। लघु-व्यवस्थाहरू साँस्कृतिक र शासन संरचनाहरूको आधारबाट समानतायुक्त (Homogeneous) हुन्छन्। तर लघु-व्यवस्थाहरू बढ्दै जाँदा तिनको विभाजनसमेत हुने गर्दछ। तर रबिन्सनका अनुसार वालेस्टीइनको विश्व-व्यवस्थामा यस्तो

समानतालाई कुनै स्थान दिइएको छैन। यसलाई रबिन्सनले वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणको एउटा मुख्य आलोचना मानेका छन्।

पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका समाजको अल्पविकास केन्द्र वा मुख्य क्षेत्रका समाजका कारणहरूबाट हुन सकेको हो वा होइन भने सम्बन्धमा वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूले स्पष्ट पार्न सकेका छैनन्। पहिले देखि नै औद्योगिक र विकसित रहीआएका देशहरूबीच अधिकांश व्यापार एवम् लगानी हुँदै आएको थियो। तसर्थ मुख्य क्षेत्रहरूको पृष्ठ क्षेत्रको अल्पविकासमा कुनै भूमिका हुँदैन भने आधारमा वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूको रबिन्सनले आलोचना गरेका छन्। अर्कोतर्फ विश्व-व्यवस्थामा समाजवादी समाजहरूको कुन स्थिति हुन्छ र विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा त्यस्ता समाजको केकस्तो भूमिका हुन्छ भने सम्बन्धमा पनि वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूले स्पष्टता प्रदान गर्न सकेका छैनन्।

समाजिक परिवर्तनका लागि विश्व-व्यवस्थाको रूपमा बाह्य शक्तिहरू मात्र महत्वपूर्ण हुन्नन् वा यसमा आन्तरिक प्रक्रियाहरू (जस्तै: वर्ग व्यवस्था, जात व्यवस्था, राजनैतिक र सांस्कृतिक तत्वहरू) को पनि भूमिका रहन्छ भने सम्बन्धमा वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूले स्पष्टता प्रदान गर्न सकेका छैनन्। आर्थिक प्रक्रियाहरूमा आवश्यकताभन्दा बढी जोड दिनु; सामाजिक, सांस्कृतिक र राजनैतिक परिवर्तनहरूलाई उपेक्षा गर्नु पनि वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूको आलोचनात्मक पक्ष हुने तथ्य रबिन्सनले औल्याएका छन्। वालेस्टीइनका विश्व-व्यवस्थासम्बन्धी सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूमा अक्षीय श्रम विभाजन (An axial division of labor) को रूपमा अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय श्रम विभाजनलाई सबैभन्दा महत्वपूर्ण र केन्द्रीय पक्ष मानिन्छ। तर मुख्य क्षेत्रहरूमा हुने उच्च ज्याला, उच्च प्रविधि र उच्च उत्पादनशीलता तथा पृष्ठ क्षेत्रहरूमा हुने न्यून ज्याला, निम्नस्तरीय प्रविधि र निम्नस्तरीय उत्पादनशीलताका उत्पादन प्रक्रियाहरू भौगोलिक मुख्य क्षेत्र स्वयम् तथा भौगोलिक पृष्ठ क्षेत्रसँग समेत जोडिएका हुन्छ। अर्थात् आर्थिक प्रक्रियाहरूका आधारमा मात्र विभिन्न देशहरू मुख्य, अर्धपृष्ठ र पृष्ठ क्षेत्रमा विभाजन नभई भौगोलिक सामिप्यताका आधारबाट पनि विभाजित हुन्नन्। यस मान्यतालाई आत्मसात् नगर्नु वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूको मुख्य आलोचनाको विन्दु रहने तथ्य रबिन्सनले औल्याएका छन्।

रबिन्सनका अनुसार विश्वव्यापीकरणअन्तर्गत उत्पादन र भूगोल तथा स्थान र अन्तर्रियाहरूबीच परिवर्तनशील सम्बन्ध रहन्छ। यस मान्यतालाई वालेस्टीइनका दृष्टिकोणहरूले पूर्णतया उपेक्षा गरेका छन्। कुनै समाजको सामाजिक चरित्र बढी आर्थिक स्वरूपको नभई सामाजिक स्थानको ऐतिहासिक स्वरूपको हुने गर्दछ। यस आधारबाट पनि रबिन्सनद्वारा वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूको आलोचना गरिएको छ।

5. 2019, Q. No. 5

Describe the critique of Wallerstein's theoretical perspective by William I. Robinson.

Ans: William Robinson, a professor at the University of California, Los Angeles, has presented a critical analysis of the theoretical perspectives on world-system in International Sociology paper on the topic *Globalization and the Sociology of Immanuel Wallerstein: A Critical Appraisal (2011)*.

Robinson, first reviews the major concepts of the modern world-system developed by Wallerstein and criticizes the theoretical approach's shortcomings. Wallerstein argues that the modern world-system is a broad historical system that exists, not a class, state/society, or nation, as a unit of analysis suitable for macro social inquiry into the modern world. The basis of analysis in the modern world-system, the important unit is the larger historical system. In that system, any division of labor that individuals regularly reproduce is defined as the boundaries of the historical system. The main ideology of the historical system

lies in the division of labor. As the division of labor persists, individuals and groups embrace specialized work areas to suit their needs and abilities. Thus, the division of labor naturally determines the external boundaries of any social system and the boundaries for social relations and interdependencies. In terms of human history, Wallerstein argues that there are two forms of historical system. The *first* mini-systems, the second world-system.

Further, there are two forms of world-system—world-empires and the world economies. Micro-systems are more closely related to the pre-agricultural era. Short-term systems are self-directed systems with a smaller area and shorter duration in the micro-system. There is a subsistence economy, and such an economy is a mutual exchange. Micro-systems are homogeneous to cultural and governance structures.

Nevertheless, as micro-systems grow, so does their division. Nevertheless, according to Robinson, such similarities have no place in Wallerstein's world-system. Robinson sees this as a major critique of Wallerstein's theoretical approach.

Wallerstein's theoretical views have not been able to clarify whether the underdevelopment of the periphery region society is due to the causes of the center of the society in the core region. Most of the trade and investment was already between industrialized and developing countries. Robinson has therefore criticized Wallerstein's theoretical views because they do not play a role in the underdevelopment of the interstate. On the other hand, Wallerstein's theoretical views have not been able to clarify the position of socialist societies in the world-system and the role of such societies in the world-economy.

Wallerstein's theoretical views have not been able to clarify whether only external forces are important as a world-system for social change or whether internal processes (such as class system, caste system, political and cultural elements) also play a role. Putting too much emphasis on economic processes, Robinson points out those ignoring social, cultural, and political changes is also a critical aspect of Wallen's ideological views. The international division of labor is considered the most important and central aspect of Wallerstein's theoretical views on world-system as an axial division of labor. However, the production processes of high wages, high technology, and high productivity in the main areas and low wages in the periphery areas, low-level technology, and low-level productivity are also connected with the main geographical area itself and the geographical periphery area. It implies that different countries are divided based not only on economic processes but also on geographical proximity. Robinson points out that not assuming this belief is the main point of criticism of Wallerstein's theoretical views.

According to Robinson, globalization involves a changing relationship between production and geography and location and interaction. Wallerstein's views have completely ignored this view. The social character tends to be more historical rather than economic. On this basis, too, Robinson criticizes Wallerstein's theoretical views.

समग्र उत्पादनका साधनको थोरै मात्र अंशमा स्वामित्व लिएका हुन्छन्। यसबाट वर्गीय असमानता फैल्ने विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा सोतसाधन र पुरस्काहरूको असमान वितरण सिर्जना हुन पुगदछ। अतः विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणले विश्वव्यापी स्तरमा उत्पन्न हुने असमानताहरूको अध्ययन र विश्लेषणलाई सबैभन्दा प्राथमिक एवम् महत्वपूर्ण स्थान दिन्छ।

उपर्युक्त समपूर्ण विवेचनाबाट निष्कर्षमा भन्न सकिन्छ कि वस्तुतः विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणले धर्म, राष्ट्र, अल्पविकसित राष्ट्र र गरिब राष्ट्रहरूबीचको विश्वव्यापी असमानताको बुझाइमा महत्वपूर्ण मार्गनिर्देश गरेको छ। समग्र विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रलाई नै विश्लेषणको प्रारम्भिक र आधारभूत एकाइको रूपमा लिएर अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय श्रम, पूँजी बजार, उत्पादन र विनियमयको बुझाइ प्राप्त गर्न विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषण महत्वपूर्ण रहेको छ। अतः मेरो अभिमतमा विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणले विश्वव्यापी स्तरमा रहेका असमानताहरूको बुझाइमा महत्वपूर्ण र उपयोगी मूल्यहरू थपेको छ।

6. 2019, Q. No. 6

The world-systems analysis is a variant of Marxist theory. In your opinion, what value does the world-systems analysis add to our contemporary understandings of inequalities at the global level?

Ans: Just as the Marxist view emphasizes the theoretical concept of inequality created by exploiting the working class and the proletariat by the bourgeoisie and the capitalists, the world-system analysis emphasizes the doctrine of subordination, exploitation, and dependence core semi-periphery and periphery nations. The Marxist view is related to economic inequality at the micro-level, while the world-system approach is sociological to global inequality and discrimination. The world-system approach is based on basic values such as inequality, exploitation, surplus-value, subordination, and capitalist economy. Therefore, the world-system approach is considered a differentiated form of Marxist theory.

World-system analysis, developed by Immanuel Wallerstein, is a unique approach to analyzing social change and world history. Analysis of this approach suggests that some nations continue to benefit from the global economic system while others continue to be economically exploited. To analyze and understand the financial system of any country, we have necessary to examine the world economic system, which is a part of the world capitalist system. From such an analysis, the inequalities around the world can be understood. Therefore, world-system analysis has provided significant value in understanding global inequalities.

The world-system perspective divides the whole world into a three-level hierarchy. This hierarchy's first, second, and third levels consist of the core, periphery, and semi-periphery areas. Countries in the core regions keep subordinates and exploit periphery regions' nations for labor and capital. As a result, economic inequality between the core and periphery regions increases. Periphery nations are increasingly dependent on the core nations for capital. On the other hand, the nations of the semi-periphery region facilitate the features and activities of both the core and periphery regions. Thus, world-system analysis places special emphasis on understanding the socioeconomic structure of global inequality.

World-system analysis uses economic and political bases to understand global inequalities. Development and underdevelopment are not the natural processes of gradual modernization but the dimensions of power relations and colonialism. Thus, global inequalities can be understood based on power relations, sovereignty, and mobilization of capital, economic subordination, and international division of

labor. Thus, world-system analysis has added important values to understanding inequalities globally, not individuals, institutions, or societies.

Advocates of world-system analysis believe that global inequality should be viewed in the same way as Karl Marx (1845, 1847), that is, non-ownership of the means of production. Core nations own and control the world's major means of production and carry out high-level production activities. Periphery nations own only a small portion of the world's gross domestic product. This process leads to class inequality and unequal distribution of resources and rewards in the world economy. Therefore, world-system analysis gives the most primary and important place for studying and analyzing global inequalities.

From all the above considerations, it can be concluded that the world-system approach has provided important guidance in understanding global inequality between rich nations (core), underdeveloped nations (semi-periphery), and developing (periphery) nations. World-system analysis is important to understand international labor, capital markets, production, and exchange, with the global economy as the primary and fundamental unit of analysis. Therefore, in my opinion, world-system analysis has added important and useful values to the understanding of inequalities globally.

7. 2019, Q. No. 8; 2015, Q. No. 7

(विश्व विकासमा बेरी गिल्सको निरन्तरता वादलाई व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

Describe Barry Gills's continuity thesis in world development.

OR

Describe the continuity thesis in world development (Gills, 1996).

[विश्व विकासमा निरन्तरता वादलाई व्याख्या गर्नुहोस् (गिल्स, 1996)।]

Ans: विचारधाराहरूको इतिहास (History of ideas) मा निरन्तरता वाद भनाले मध्य युग, पुनर्जागरणको युग र प्रारम्भिक आधुनिक कालको बौद्धिक विकासको क्रममा कुनै दूलो आवधिक वा खण्डित अन्तर नहुने परिकल्पनालाई जनाउँदछे । सभ्यता र समाजको विकासक्रम निरन्तर रूपमा चक्रीय स्वरूपबाट भइरहन्छ तथा एउटा युग पछि दूलो समयको अन्तरविना नै स्वाभाविक रूपमा अको युगको बौद्धिक सामाजिक विकास हुन्छ भन्ने समाजशास्त्रीय परिकल्पना नै निरन्तरता वाद (Continuity thesis) हो ।

ब्रिटिश समाजशास्त्री बेरी के गिल्सले *The Development of Underdevelopment* (1996) पुस्तकमा समावेश गरी प्रकाशित गरेको लेख 'The Continuity Thesis in World Development' मा विश्व-व्यवस्थाको निरन्तरता वाद सम्बन्धी गहन र बौद्धिक विश्लेषण प्रस्तुत गरेका छन् । गिल्सका अनुसार विश्व-व्यवस्था इतिहासको निरन्तरता वादले विश्व-व्यवस्थाको विकास र प्रगतिमा दीर्घकालीन ऐतिहासिक निरन्तरता (Long-term historical continuity) प्रक्रियालाई जनाउँदछ । ऐतिहासिक भौतिकवादबाट प्रेरित भएर गिल्सले विश्व-व्यवस्थालाई पूँजीवादको सद्दर्कमणका रूपमा विश्लेषण गर्नुपर्ने अभिमत राखेका छन् । विश्वको कुनै एउटा क्षेत्रमा आउने परिवर्तन खण्डित रूपमा हुनसक्ने भएतापनि समग्र विश्व-व्यवस्थाको सद्दर्कमण निरिचित अवधिभर निरन्तर रूपबाट हुने उनको तर्क रहेको छ ।

गिल्सका अनुसार यूरोपीयन पुनर्जागरण, वैज्ञानिक क्रान्ति र 19औं तथा 20औं शताब्दीमा भएका औद्योगीकरण एवम् शहरीकरणका आगमनहरूमा प्रगतिको विचारधारा (The idea of progress) ऐतिहासिक र जीवन्त रूपबाट समेत एउटा महत्वपूर्ण अवधारणाको रूपमा रहेको पाइन्छ । यद्यपी यस्तो प्रगतिको विचारधारा समय र कालको पुनर्अवधारणाकरण (Reconceptualisation of time and space) सँग निकट रूपबाट सम्बन्धित थियो, जससँग आधुनिकता र पूँजीवाद जोडिएका थिए ।

गरिनुहुँदैन। तर गिल्सका अनुसार मानव-केन्द्रीयता विश्व इतिहासका लागि युरोकेन्द्रीयता मात्र अवरोध होइन। केन्द्रीयता यूरोपमा मात्रै थिएन बरु समयको कुनै निश्चित कालखण्डमा एशिया र अफ्रिकी इतिहासमा पनि 'केन्द्रीयता' थियो। कुनै खास क्षेत्रको इतिहासको निर्माणका क्रममा त्यस क्षेत्रअन्तर्गतका खास व्यक्तिहरूमा कुनै किसिमको केन्द्रीयता वा सभ्यता हुन्छ भने तथ्यलाई गिल्सले अस्वीकार गरेका छन्। विश्व विकासको बुझाइका लागि केन्द्रीयतालाई एउटै मात्र सीमित क्षेत्रको विशेषताका रूपमा लिइनुहुँदैन।

7. 2019, Q. No. 8; 2015, Q. No. 7

Describe Barry Gills's continuity thesis in world development.

OR

Describe the continuity thesis in world development (Gills, 1996).

Ans: Continuity thesis in the history of ideas refers to the notion that there is no tremendous periodic or fragmentary difference between the intellectual development of the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the early modern period. Continuity thesis is the sociological hypothesis that the development of civilization and society takes place in a continuous cyclical manner and that the intellectual and social development of another age naturally takes place without an extended interval after one age.

The sociologist Barry K. Gills, in the book *The Development of Underdevelopment* (1996), presented an in-depth and intellectual analysis of the continuity thesis of the world-system under the topic *The Continuity Thesis in World Development*. Inspired by historical materialism, Gills argues that the world-system should be analyzed to transition to capitalism. He argues that it will happen continuously for a certain period.

According to Gills, the idea of progress is historically and vitally important in the European Renaissance, the Scientific Revolution, and the advent of industrialization and urbanization in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, the ideology of such progress was closely related to the reconceptualization of time/space with which modernity and capitalism were associated. The processes of modernity and capitalism are geared towards linear change. Therefore, Gills believes that modernity, capitalism, and globalization are not the product of sudden changes in fragmented form but are tendencies that come through a continuous cycle.

Gills includes a detailed analysis and description of the continuity thesis in his specific world-system approach. He analyzes the historical development of the world in terms of its historical materialism, structuralism, and the continuum of cosmopolitan humanocentrism, which is explained here:

i. Historical materialism

According to Gills, the materialistic view is essential to understanding world-historical development. He argues that the production of commodities, commerce, trade (price-setting), markets, private enterprise, private capital, capital accumulation, and the international division of labor have all have played more critical roles much further 'back' in the world history than has usually been recognized or accepted. It is precisely on this basis to claim that capital accumulation has always been the driving force of world development, not merely the modern world political economy.

ii. Structuralism

Gills contends that world-system theory's structuralism rests upon a rejection of the "unipolar" model of center-periphery relations common in most approaches using this concept in favor of a multipolar model of center-periphery relations on a world scale. Therefore, the world-system is not viewed as having composed of a single core-periphery, instead of an interlinked center-periphery complex.

Thus, according to Gills, the world-system, first in Eurasia before 1500 and then globally after 1500, has been multicentric in structure. This fact includes even the supposed unipolar European or Western global hegemony in the modern world-system. This approach to structuralist analysis allows greater flexibility because distinct regional, imperial, or market-mediated center-periphery complexes are accepted yet are nevertheless seen as part of a single whole, given their systemic links to one another.

iii. Cosmopolitan humanocentrism

Gills rejects the concept of Eurocentrism in his continuity thesis in terms of the world-system cycle and economic activities. However, an equal rejection of any "centrism" in world history has not yet been made clear enough. Eurocentrism is not the only obstacle to humancentric world history. According to Gills, 'centrists' are found in Asian or African history circles and elsewhere. The fallacy is that centrist approaches do not only privilege a specific people or civilization in constructing their narrative of history.

8. 2017; Q. No. 2; 2016, Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)

What Barry Gills contends about the existence of world-system cycle and center gravity of economic activity and trade in this continuity thesis?

(बेरी गिल्सले आफ्नो निरन्तरता वादमा विश्व-व्यवस्था चक्र र आर्थिक क्रियाकलाप तथा व्यापारको मुख्य केन्द्रको अस्तित्वका सम्बन्धमा कस्तो दाबी गरेका छन् ?)

OR

Describe the Barry K. Gills's continuity thesis in world development.

(विश्व विकासमा बेरी गिल्सको निरन्तरतावादलाई व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: बेरी के. गिल्स संयुक्त अधिराज्यको Newcastle University अन्तर्गत भूगोल, राजनितिशास्त्र र समाजशास्त्र सङ्कायमा कार्यरत एक प्राध्यापक र वरिष्ठ समाजशास्त्री हुन्। सिड्. सी. चिउ र रोबर्ट ए. डिनिमार्कद्वारा सम्पादित पुस्तक *The Underdevelopment of Development (1996)* को 12औं अध्यायमा गिल्सको *The Continuity Thesis in World development* निबन्ध समावेश गरिएको छ। विश्व-व्यवस्था चक्रको निरन्तरता वादले कुनै आवधिक र खण्डित चरणहरूको रूपमा नभइ सामाजिक व्यवस्थाको दीर्घकालीन ऐतिहासिक निरन्तरताका रूपमा विकास एवम् सुधार हुने मान्यता राख्दछ। निरन्तरता वादका प्रमुख आधारहरू पश्चिमेली दर्शनशास्त्रीय परम्परामार्फत विकास गरिएका हुन्।

गिल्सले आफ्नो विशिष्ट विश्व-व्यवस्था उपागममा निरन्तरता वादको सविस्तारित विश्लेषण र वर्णन समेटेका छन्। उनले विश्वको ऐतिहासिक विकास (World historical development) मा त्यसको ऐतिहासिक भौतिकवाद, पृथक् संरचनावाद र विश्ववादी मानवकेन्द्रीयतावादको निरन्तरता वादका बारेमा विश्लेषण गरेका छन्, जसबाटे यहाँ व्याख्या गरिन्छ :

120...विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोण (World-System Perspective)

गिल्सका अनुसार बहुकेन्द्रीयता विश्व-व्यवस्थाअन्तर्गतका विभिन्न केन्द्र पृष्ठ जटिलताहरूबीच वा विभिन्न केन्द्रहरूबीचको 'समानता' होइन। बरू त्यस्तो बहुकेन्द्रीयता श्रेणीवद्ध रूपमा संरचनागत (Hierarchically structured) हुन्छ। त्यसमा महानगर र परिधी क्षेत्रबीच जटिल सम्बन्धको श्रेणी वा शृङ्खला हुन्छ। त्यस्तो शृङ्खलाबाट निरन्तर रूपमा समग्र विश्व-व्यवस्थामा अतिरिक्त मूल्य स्थानान्तरण भइरहेको हुन्छ। एण्डे गुण्डर फ्रान्क (1967, 1978a, 1978b) ले समेत प्रारम्भिक विश्व-अर्थत्रसम्बन्धी गरेका कार्यहरूमा उपर्युक्त तथ्यलाई स्वीकार गरेका छन्। तर गिल्सले भने यस प्रक्रियाका लागि प्रभूत्व (Hegemony) लाई बढी जोड दिएका छन्। प्रभूत्वलाई गिल्सले शक्तिद्वारा मध्यस्त गरिने कां र राज्यहरूबीचको श्रेणीवद्ध सञ्चयीकरणको संरचना (Hierarchical structure of accumulation between classes and states, mediated by force or power) का रूपमा लिएका छन्। तसर्थ विश्व-व्यवस्थाको केन्द्र-पृष्ठ संरचना क्रमवद्ध रूपमा आर्थिक श्रेणीवद्धता र राजनैतिक प्रभूत्वको निरन्तर प्रक्रियाको रूपमा रहेको हुन्छ।

iii. विश्ववादी मानवकेन्द्रीयतावादमा (Cosmopolitan humanocentrism)

गिल्सले आफ्नो निरन्तरता वादमा विश्व-व्यवस्था चक्र र आर्थिक क्रियाकलापका सन्दर्भमा युरोकेन्द्रीयता (Eurocentrism) को अवधारणालाई अस्वीकार गरेका छन्। यसका अतिरिक्त विश्व इतिहासको कुनै पनि 'केन्द्रीयता' लाई विश्व-व्यवस्थाको निरन्तरताका लागि स्वीकार गरिनुहुँदैन। तर गिल्सका अनुसार मानव-केन्द्रीयता विश्व इतिहासका लागि युरोकेन्द्रीयता मात्र अवरोध होइन। केन्द्रीयता यूरोपमा मात्रै थिएन बरू समयको कुनै निश्चित कालखण्डमा एशिया र अफ्रिकी इतिहासमा पनि 'केन्द्रीयता' थियो। कुनै खास क्षेत्रको इतिहासको निर्माणका क्रममा त्यस क्षेत्रअन्तर्गतका खास व्यक्तिहरूमा कुनै किसिमको केन्द्रीयता वा सभ्यता हुन्छ भने तथ्यलाई गिल्सले अस्वीकार गरेका छन्। विश्व विकासको बुझाइका लागि केन्द्रीयतालाई एउटै मात्र सीमित क्षेत्रको विशेषताका रूपमा लिइनुहुँदैन।

गिल्सका अनुसार विश्वको मानव-केन्द्रीयता इतिहासले नयाँ विश्ववादी अभ्यास (New cosmopolitan praxis) का लागि बौद्धिक आधार निर्माण गर्न सक्दछ। राजनैतिक आर्थिक संरचनाहरूमा निरन्तर परिवर्तन आइरहने हुँदा विश्व-व्यवस्थाको एक मात्र संरचनागत स्वरूपलाई स्थिर मान्न सकिदैन। हाल विश्व-व्यवस्था एक नवीन विश्ववादी अभ्यासका रूपमा निरन्तर अगाडी बढीरहेकोले विश्ववादी मानवकेन्द्रीयतावाद प्रगतिशील रूपबाट आफ्नो स्वरूप प्राप्त गर्दैछ।

8. 2017; Q. No. 2; 2016, Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)

What Barry Gills contends about the existence of world-system cycle and center gravity of economic activity and trade in this continuity thesis?

OR

Describe the Barry K. Gills's continuity thesis in world development.

Ans: Barry K. Gills is a professor of Global Politics at Newcastle University, UK. A former Fellow of the Transnational Institute, Amsterdam, and a present fellow of the World Academy of Art and Science, he has published widely in critical globalization studies, world-system theory, global history, and critical development studies. Gills's essay *The Continuity Thesis on World Development* (1996) was published in the book *The Underdevelopment of Development*, edited by Sing C. Chew and Robert A. Denemark.

In the history of ideas, the continuity thesis is the hypothesis that there was no radical discontinuity between the intellectual development of the Middle Ages and the developments in the Renaissance and the early modern period. Thus, the idea of an intellectual or scientific revolution following the Renaissance is a

myth. Some continuity theorists point to earlier intellectual revolutions occurring in the Middle Ages, usually referring to the European Renaissance of the 12th century as a sign of continuity. Despite the many points that proponents of the continuity thesis have brought up, most scholars still support the traditional view of the Scientific Revolution occurring in the 16th and 17th centuries.

Gills presented an extensive explanation of continuity thesis in his specific world-system approach. In the process of world development history, Gills analyzes its historical materialism, structuralism, and cosmopolitan humanocentrism as follows:

i. **Historical materialism**

According to Gills, the materialistic view is essential to understanding world-historical development. He argues that the production of commodities, commerce, trade (price-setting), markets, private enterprise, private capital, capital accumulation, and the international division of labor have all have played more critical roles much further 'back' in the world history than has usually been recognized or accepted. It is precisely on this basis to claim that capital accumulation has always been the driving force of world development, not merely the modern world political economy.

It is crucial to clarify that *ceaseless accumulation*, which according to Wallerstein, is a significant aspect of capitalism, is a feature of the world-system throughout its development and not unique to the modern period. However, there can be no doubt that industrialization played a crucial role in bringing about a qualitative change in the rate of ceaseless accumulation in the modern period. Gills argue that such change is essentially a matter of degree. Following Marx (1845, 1847), Gills contends that ceaseless accumulation implies that capital is constantly reinvested into the circuits of production to sustain capital/accumulation. This ceaselessness is imperative, especially given the facts of competition. According to Gills, historical evidence suggests that capital accumulation usually has been competitive and a process that involves a continuous reinvestment in the means of production in a whole social and political ensemble of sectors, including infrastructure.

ii. **Structuralism**

Gills contends that world-system theory's structuralism rests upon a rejection of the "unipolar" model of center-periphery relations common in most approaches using this concept in favor of a multipolar model of center-periphery relations on a world scale. Therefore, the world-system is not viewed as a single core-periphery but instead an interlinked set of center-periphery complexes.

Thus, according to Gills, the world-system, first in Eurasia before 1500 and then globally after 1500, has been multicentric in structure. This fact includes even the supposed unipolar European or Western global hegemony in the modern world-system. This approach to structuralist analysis allows greater flexibility because distinct regional, imperial, or market-mediated center-periphery complexes are accepted yet are nevertheless seen as part of a single whole, given their systemic links to one another.

The world-system, first in Eurasia before 1500 and then globally after 1500, has always been multicentric in structure. This process includes even the supposed unipolar European or Western global hegemony in the modern world-system. This approach to structuralist analysis allows greater flexibility because distinct regional, imperial, or market-mediated center-periphery complexes are accepted yet are nevertheless seen as part of a single whole, given their systemic links.

According to Gills, such a multicentricity is not a condition of "equality" between the various centers or between different center-periphery complexes in the world-system. This multicentricity is hierarchically structured. There is a very complex "chain" of "metropole-satellite" relations of extraction and transfer of surplus throughout the entire world-system. Andre Gunder Frank (1967, 1978a) has also discussed a similar schema in his early work on the world economy. However, Gills emphasizes hegemony to embody this notion of a hierarchical structure of surplus transfer. He defined *hegemony* as a hierarchical structure of accumulation between classes and states mediated by force. Thus, the center-periphery structure of the world-system is simultaneously an economic hierarchy and a political hierarchy, as hegemony embodies both.

iii. **Cosmopolitan humanocentrism**

Gills rejects the concept of Eurocentrism in his continuity thesis in terms of the world-system cycle and economic activities. However, an equal rejection of any "centrism" in world history has not yet been made clear enough. Eurocentrism is not the only obstacle to humanocentric world history. According to Gills, 'centrists' are found in Asian or African history circles and elsewhere. The fallacy is that centrist approaches do not only privilege a specific people or civilization in constructing their narrative of history.

According to Gills, such a humanocentric history of the world can form the intellectual basis for a new cosmopolitan praxis because he rejects essentialist views on ethnicity and civilization in favor of a structuralist approach to ever-changing political, economic configurations. Humanocentrism speaks directly to the present era of conflicting nationalism, localism, religious identities, and fragmentation.

9. 2017, Q. No. 5

What are the similarities and differences between 'world system' with and without hyphen?

[समास चिन्ह (-) सहितको र चिन्ह रहितको 'विश्व व्यवस्था' बीचका समानता र भिन्नताहरू के-के छन् ?]

Ans: बिना समास चिन्ह/विश्व र व्यवस्थाबीच - चिन्ह नभएको अर्थात् विश्व व्यवस्था (World system) ले समग्र विश्वलाई जनाउँदछ भने ती बीच - चिन्ह भएको अर्थात् विश्व-व्यवस्था (World-system) ले विश्वलेषणको बृहत् एकाइलाई जनाउँदछ । विश्व व्यवस्था (बिना समास चिन्ह) ले विश्वको इतिहासमा केवल एउटा मात्र विश्व-व्यवस्था भएको सुझाउँदछ ।

एप्टे गुण्डर फ्रान्क विश्व व्यवस्थाका वकालतकर्ता हुन् । तर इम्मानुएल वालेस्टाइन भने विश्व-व्यवस्थाका प्रतिपादक र समर्थक हुन् । फ्रान्कका अनुसार कुनै पनि ऐतिहासिक समय र स्थानभर एउटा मात्र विश्व व्यवस्था रहीआएको छ, रहन्छ । आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था (वा पूँजीवादी



What are the similarities and differences between 'world system' with and without hyphen?

Ans: World system (without a hyphen, i.e., – sign between world and system) refers to the entire world, whereas world-system (with a hyphen, i.e., – sign) is its fragment—the largest unit of analysis. The world system (without a hyphen) suggests that there has been only one world-system in the history of the world. Andre Gunder Frank is an advocate of the world system, but Immanuel Wallerstein is world-system. For Frank, there has only been a one-world system through historical time and space. For Wallerstein, there have been very many world-systems. The modern world-system (or the capitalist world-economy) is merely one system among many that bring us to the hyphen (i.e., – sign). Wallerstein argues that his world-system is "not a system" in the world or "of the world." Instead, it is a system, i.e., a world. Hence the hyphen, since the "world" is not an attribute of the system, the two words constitute a single concept. Frank's system is a world system in an attributive sense, in that it has been tending over time to cover the whole world.

According to Frank, accumulation is the motor force of world system history. In contrast, Wallerstein regards capital accumulation as specific to the modern world-system. In this regard, the modern world system (without hyphen) is different from than previous one, and the same process of capital accumulation has played a central role in the world system for several millennia. However, Wallerstein disagrees with this argument. He argues that previous world-systems were tributary or world empires.

- **Similarities between world-system (with a hyphen) and world system (without hyphen)**
 - i. Both trace the development of the same world capitalist system from its origins in Europe around 1450–1500, and it has spread from its European center to incorporate more and more of the world overseas.
 - ii. Both (i.e., the world-system, with a hyphen and world system without hyphen) are similar regarding center-periphery and West-East European relations and their impacts.
 - iii. Both are concerned with the international division of labor and unequal economic dependency between core-periphery notions.
- **Differences between world-system (with a hyphen) and world system (without hyphen)**
 - i. World-system assumes that there are several systems in a capitalist world economy, whereas the world system assumes there is only one system.
 - ii. The world-system focuses on the core/periphery/semi-periphery structure of the system, whereas the world system attempts to identify the system's cyclical dynamics.
 - iii. World-system implies the larger unit of analysis, but the world system implies one.

According to the world-system perspective, there have been many world-systems, while the world system assumes that there is one world system throughout the globe in all historical time and space.

विभाजनसमेत हुने गर्दछ । तर रबिन्सनका अनुसार वालेस्टीइनको विश्व-व्यवस्थामा यस्तो समानतालाई कुनै स्थान दिइएको छैन । यसलाई रबिन्सनले वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणको एउटा मुख्य आलोचना मानेको छून् ।

पृष्ठ क्षेत्रका समाजको अल्पविकास केन्द्र वा मुख्य क्षेत्रका समाजका कारणहरूबाट हुन सकेको हो का होइन भने सम्बन्धमा वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूले स्पष्ट पार्न सकेका छैन । पहिले देखि नै औद्योगिक र विकसित रहीआएका देशहरूबीच अधिकांश व्यापार एवम् लगानी हुँदै आएको थियो । तसर्थ मुख्य क्षेत्रहरूको पृष्ठ क्षेत्रको अल्पविकासमा कुनै भूमिका हुँदैन भने आधारमा वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूको आलोचना गरिन्छ । अर्कोतर्फ विश्व-व्यवस्थामा समाजबादी समाजहरूको कुन स्थिति हुन्छ र विश्व-अर्थतन्त्रमा त्यस्ता समाजको के-कस्तो भूमिका हुन्छ भने सम्बन्धमा पनि वालेस्टीइनका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूले स्पष्टता प्रदान गर्न सकेका छैन ।

समाजिक परिवर्तनका लागि विश्व-व्यवस्थाको रूपमा बाह्य शक्तिहरू मात्र महत्वपूर्ण हुन्छन् वा यसमा आन्तरिक प्रक्रियाहरू (जस्तै: वर्ग व्यवस्था, जात व्यवस्था, राजनैतिक र सांस्कृतिक तत्त्वहरू) को पनि भूमिका रहन्छ भने सम्बन्धमा विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणले स्पष्टता प्रदान गर्न सकेको छैन । आर्थिक प्रक्रियाहरूमा आवश्यकताभन्दा बढी जोड दिनु; सामाजिक, सांस्कृतिक र राजनैतिक आर्थिक परिवर्तनहरूलाई उपेक्षा गर्नु पनि आलोचनात्मक पक्ष हुने तथ्य रबिन्सनले औल्याएका छून् । विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणका सैद्धान्तिक दृष्टिकोणहरूमा अक्षीय श्रम विभाजन (An axial division of labor) को रूपमा अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय श्रम विभाजनलाई सबैभन्दा महत्वपूर्ण र केन्द्रीय पक्ष मानिन्छ । तर मुख्य क्षेत्रहरूमा हुने उच्च ज्याला, उच्च प्रविधि र उच्च उत्पादनशीलता तथा पृष्ठ क्षेत्रहरूमा हुने न्यून मुख्य क्षेत्रसंग समेत जोडिएका हुन्छ । अर्थात् आर्थिक प्रक्रियाहरूका आधारमा क्षेत्र स्वयम् र भौगोलिक पृष्ठ क्षेत्रसँग समेत जोडिएका हुन्छ । अर्थात् आर्थिक प्रक्रियाहरूका आधारमा मात्र विभिन्न देशहरू मुख्य, अर्धपृष्ठ र पृष्ठ क्षेत्रमा विभाजन नर्भई भौगोलिक सामियताका आधारबाट पनि विभाजित हुन्छन् । यस मान्यतालाई आत्मसात् नगर्नु विश्व-व्यवस्था विश्लेषणको मुख्य आलोचनाको विन्दु रहने तथ्य रबिन्सनले औल्याएका छून् ।

10. 2016, Q. No. 7

Describe the critique of world-system analysis.

Ans: World-system analysis has innovated in many aspects such as underdevelopment, the international division of labor, dependency, and strengthening of crucial sectors, global economy, globalization, and economic development. Therefore, it has a very high and important place in contemporary sociological theories. However, the world-system analysis has been criticized on various grounds.

Analyzing the overall world-system by emphasizing only the economy is considered the main critique of world-system analysis. With a strong emphasis on core-centric and state-centric, William I. Robinson (2011) has also criticized world-system analysis. Robinson argues that world-system analysis focuses only on nation-state centrism and the state-structuralist approach and does not effectively present the concept of globalization.

At present, the emerging transnational social forces and the relations between them, and the positive effects of global organizations have been ignored by world-system analysis. In today's era of globalization and industrialization, the relationship between developed and underdeveloped countries is not limited to the role of the core and periphery countries. The emerging powers, institutions, and trends must be considered in need of globalization. However, world-system analysis only explains these tendencies, institutions, powers, and relations based

only on the state system. This fact is considered as one of the main criticisms of world-system analysis.

World-system analysis has been widely criticized by positivists, classical Marxists, state autonomists, and even culturalists. According to positivist sociologists, world-system analysis lacks quantitative and empirical analysis. Therefore, world-system analysis has not given a generalized concept of world relations. According to classical Marxists, world-system analysis has not accommodated the social class adequately. According to state autonomists, the state should be considered the primary unit of analysis in social analysis. Nevertheless, state autonomists argue that recognizing the world-system as the basic unit of analysis in place of the state system is critical. According to culturalists, the world-system analysis has only emphasized the economy and neglected the cultural sectors.

Thus, although Wallerstein's world-systems theory is influential, it has invited several criticisms. These are listed below:

- i. According to William I. Robinson, the world-systems theory is accused of being a Eurocentric approach to understanding the origin and expansion of the capitalist world economy. It begins with Europe, and it traces the spread of capitalism as a world system dominated by this core region. Some theories question the view that Europe was at the center of capitalism and its development. Many such theories claim that China, not Europe, was the core of the comprehensive Afro-Eurasian world system for a far more extended period. They hold that China was more advanced than most of Europe in the 18th century and remained a significant economic power into the 19th century. The rise of China in the 21st century does not indicate the emergence of a new financial core but the revival of an older power after a relatively brief period of decline.
- ii. There is a criticism of the world-systems theory because it attaches great significance to the economic processes and neglects cultural change. R. Robertson and F. Lechner, there is a world system of global culture which is entirely autonomous from the economic processes of capitalism.
- iii. The world-systems theory overlooks the significance of internal/endogenous factors like a class struggle in bringing about change. It overemphasizes the external forces and positioning in the world economy in determining the fate of a country.
- iv. It is not entirely evident from the world-systems theory that peripheral societies are underdeveloped by core regions because most trade and investment take place between societies that are already developed and industrialized.
- v. According to the world-systems theory, all activities and movements occur within the structural system, constituted by core, periphery, and semi-periphery. However, the concept of globalization since the 1990s has challenged this view. There are globalization theorists like Harvey and Appadurai. They advocate the notion of global flows, which take us beyond the conventional geographical understanding of space as structured and fixed as the world-systems

theory suggests. These flows can be of people, capital, technology, information, and ideas evident in notions of ethnoscapes, financescapes, technoscapes, mediascapes, and ideoscapes. These flows are suggestive of multiple cores and peripheries. No one core can be the center of all flows. A core may be central to one kind of flow and peripheral and semi-peripheral in status concerning other flows in the global system.

- vi. The theory does not provide an adequate framework to explain the position of socialist societies in the world system. Its primary focus has been on the rise of the modern capitalist economy.

Despite, criticisms we cannot override the relevance and significance of the world-systems theory and Wallerstein's work.

11. 2015, Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)

What are similarities and differences in the world-systems? Describe (Chase-Dunn, 1996).

[विश्व-व्यवस्था अन्तर्गतका समानता र भिन्नताहरू के-के छन् ? व्याख्या गर्नुहोस (चेज डन, 1996)]

Ans: समाजशास्त्रीद्वय सिङ्क सी. चिट र रोबर्ट ए. डिनीमार्कद्वारा सम्पादित पुस्तक *The Underdevelopment of Development* (1996) अन्तर्गत अध्याय-13 मा प्रसिद्ध अमेरिकी समाजशास्त्री क्रिस्टोफर चेज-डनद्वारा लिखित लेख **World-system: Similarities and Differences** प्रस्तुत गरिएको छ। उनले परनिर्भरता सिद्धान्तका वकालतकर्ता एण्ड्रे गुण्डर फ्रान्कद्वारा व्यक्त गरिएका विचारहरूको गहन पुनरावलोकन गर्दै विश्व-व्यवस्था अन्तर्गतका समानता र भिन्नताहरूको विवेचना गरेका छन्। चेज-डनका अनुसार प्रारम्भिक विश्व-व्यवस्था (Earlier world-system) र आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था (Modern world-system) बीच विभिन्न आधारहरूमा समानता र भिन्नताहरू रहेका छन्।

विश्व-व्यवस्था दृष्टिकोणका थुप्रै विद्वानहरूले समेत विगतदेखिका ऐतिहासिक विकासका प्रक्रियाहरूको गहन विश्लेषणद्वारा प्रारम्भिक र आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाबीचका महत्वपूर्ण समानताहरू पहिचान गरेका छन्। व्यवस्थित ऋम, विस्तार र विकासका चक्रिय प्रक्रिया, प्रभूत्वको महत्व र पृष्ठ क्षेत्रहरूको शोषण जस्ता परिघटनाहरू विगत 5000 वर्ष अगाडिदेखि नै हुँदै आएका छन्। तसर्थ उर्प्युक्त परिघटनां तथा प्रक्रियाहरू प्रारम्भिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा पनि कायम थिए भने आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा पनि ती प्रक्रियाहरू निरन्तर रूपबाट जारी छन्। मेसोपोटामिया क्षेत्र (आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा पनि ती प्रक्रियाहरू निरन्तर रूपबाट जारी छन्। मेसोपोटामिया क्षेत्र (करीब 3000 इशापूर्व पहिले मुखिया प्रथा र सिंचाइमा आधारित खेती प्रणाली भएको क्षेत्र) बाहेकका सबै क्षेत्रमा एकल राज्य-आधारित विश्व-व्यवस्था थियो। पछि त्यस्तो विश्व-व्यवस्था केन्द्रीय विश्व-व्यवस्था (Central world-system) को रूपमा विकसित हुन पुरयो। यी विश्व-व्यवस्थाका धेरै स्वरूपहरूमा समेत अधिकांश प्रक्रियाहरू निरन्तर रूपमा जारी रहेको तथ्य थुप्रै समाजशास्त्रीले औल्याएका छन्।

एण्ड्रे गुण्डर फ्रान्कले प्रारम्भिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा केवल वैचारिक रूपबाट मात्र उत्पादनका विधिहरूमा रूपान्तरण (वा सुधार) हुने मान्यता राखेका छन्। उनका अनुसार यस एकल विश्व-व्यवस्थाको विगत 5000 वर्षको इतिहासका अवधिमा उत्पादनका विधिहरूमा कुनै गुणात्मक रूपान्तरण (Qualitative transformation) हुन सकेको छैन। इम्मानुएल वालेस्टीनद्वारा आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाका सम्बन्धमा विश्लेषण गरिएका फरक पक्षहरू समेत विगतको प्रारम्भिक विश्व-व्यवस्थामा कायम थिए। तसर्थ प्रारम्भिक र आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाबीच धेरै समानता रहने तर्क चेज-डनको रहेको छ।

सञ्चयीकरण केही भिन्न किसिमको हुने गर्दथ्यो । तर त्यस्तो सञ्चयीकरण पूर्वप्रभूत्व (Predominance) मा कायम भने थिएन । सम्पत्तिका उपयोगजन्य स्वरूपहरू, वस्तु र श्रम केन्द्रीय विश्व-व्यवस्थाको विगत 5000 वर्ष अगाडिको इतिहासमा सबैभन्दा महत्त्वपूर्ण थिए । तर यूरोप केन्द्रीकृत उपक्षेत्रहरूमा 16औं शताब्दी पाश्चात् मात्र त्रिपक्षीय सञ्चयीकरणको पद्धतिपर पूर्वप्रभूत्वको रूपमा पूँजीवादको प्रारम्भ भएको थियो ।

- **मुख्य/पृष्ठ सम्बन्धहरू (Core/ periphery relations)**

औद्योगिकृत पूँजीवादको उदय हुनुभन्दा पूर्व आधुनिक विश्व-व्यवस्था र केन्द्रीकृत प्रारम्भिक विश्व-व्यवस्थाबीच मुख्य/पृष्ठ सम्बन्धका आधारबाट पनि भिन्नता थियो । त्यस्तो भिन्नता वा असमानता मुख्य/पृष्ठ श्रेणीवद्धता (Core/periphery hierarchy) का आधारमा कायम रहेको थियो ।

11. 2015, Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)

What are similarities and differences in the world-systems? Describe (Chase-Dunn, 1996).

Ans: The edited book by sociologists—Sing C. Chew and Robert A. Denemark—*The Underdevelopment of Development (1996)* consists of the chapter-13 on the topic *World-Systems: Similarities and Differences* by American Sociologist Christopher Chase-Dunn. He explains the similarities and differences in the world-systems by reviewing the ideas put forward by Andre Gunder Frank. According to Chase-Dunn, there are similarities and differences between the earlier world-system and modern world-system in several respects.

Chase-Dunn contends that several scholars working from a world-systems perspective have extended that perspective back in time because they perceive essential similarities in the processes and patterned phenomena operating in both modern and earlier periods of the world-system history. Andre Gunder Frank and his coauthor Barry K. Gills have stressed the continuities of systemic logic, cyclical waves of expansion and contraction, and the importance of hegemonic impacts and exploitation of peripheral regions in a single state-based world system over the last 5000 years.

Frank adds that the whole discussion of transformation (or transitions) in modes of production is only an ideological screen. According to him, there have been no qualitative transformations in the mode of production during the 5000-year history of this single world system. Thus, according to Frank, there was never a transformation to a uniquely capitalist world-system in Europe in the 16th century. Europe did rise to hegemony after the 18th century, but it is alleged that this was similar in form and content to earlier emergences of new hegemonic regions.

- **Comparing World-Systems**

Like Andre Gunder Frank, Chase-Dunn argues that it is crucial to compare the contemporary system empirically with itself at much earlier points in time. He contends that a comparative approach that looks at different world systems is vital for understanding similarities and differences. For this, it is necessary to modify Wallerstein's concepts of world-system, and core/periphery relations to make them more useful for a very long run and comparative theoretical scope.

The significant similarity across time in the central world-system is the existence of states and classes during the whole period. To look at a

different world-system, pick one with no states or classes. Chase-Dunn has closely examined a small world-system composed of sedentary foragers. The hierarchy between various regions has also existed similar fashion in the earlier and modern world-systems. However, core/periphery relations were still relatively unstable and mild.

- **Rise and Fall**

Frank and Gills conceptualized and studied the sequences of political centralization and decentralization in the central world system during the last 5000 years. This sequence is known as the *rise and fall of empires*. The political centralization/decentralization sequence is a prime example of continuity between the modern world system of the previous 500 years and the earlier central system. Indeed, even chiefdom-based world-systems exhibit a somewhat similar pattern, but these processes also exhibit substantial differences in different kinds of systems. Both chiefdom and state-based systems become centralized through military conquest, but the polities erected by chiefly conquerors must rely on kinship alliances to implement regional control, whereas states use specialized non-kin control institutions. In the modern world-system, the pattern of political centralization/decentralization takes the form of the rise and fall of hegemonic core powers. This process is analytically like the rise and fall of empires, but the differences are essential.

- **The Long Rise of Capitalism**

Capitalist accumulation, i.e., the appropriation of surplus value from the production and sale of commodities, is not unique to the modern world-system. Frank is correct to note that this activity existed well before the 16th century, but existence is nonexistent. Commodified forms of wealth, land, goods, and labor existed and became more critical during the 5000-year history of the central world system. However, capitalism only began to predominate over the tributary modes of accumulation in the Europe-centered subregion after the 16th century.

- **Core/periphery Relationship**

There is a significant structural difference between the modern world-system and the central system before industrial capitalism. This instance is like the core/periphery hierarchy. Important core/periphery relations have existed in all state-based world-systems but not stateless world-systems. The ability to extract resources from peripheral areas has almost always been an essential component of successful accumulation by using political coercion.

12. 2015, Q. No. 8

Summarize Theda Skocpol's critique of world capitalist system (Skocpal, 1997).

(विश्व पौर्जीवादी व्यवस्थाप्रति थेडा स्कोकपलको आलोचनालाई सारांशीकृत गर्नुहोस् (स्कोकपल, 1997)।

Ans: थेडा स्कोकपल अमेरिकाको हार्वर्ड विश्वविद्यालयकी समाजशास्त्री र समाजशास्त्रकी प्राध्यापक हुन्। उनले Chicago Journals मा प्रकाशित गरेको लेख *Wallerstein's World Capitalist System: A Theoretical and Historical Critique* (1997) मा इम्मानुएल वाल्टर्स्टीनद्वारा

नेपालसम्बन्धी छलफल (COLLOQUIUM ON NEPAL)

1. 2020, Q. No 7; 2019, *Q. No. 8

Based on the book *Cardamom and Class* by Ian Carlos Fitzpatrick, describe how cardamom production and foreign labor migration have contributed to increased economic integration of Mamangkhe into the national and global capitalist economy and the emergence of economic differentiation or class formation.

(इयान कालोस फिजप्याट्रिकको पुस्तक *Cardamom land Class* मा आधारित रहेर कसरी अलैची उत्पादन र वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनले मामाङ्खेको बद्दो आर्थिक एकीकरणलाई राष्ट्रिय तथा विश्वव्यापी पूँजीवादी अर्थव्यवस्था र वर्ग निर्माण वा आर्थिक विविधीकरणमा योगदान दियो ?)

OR

How does Ian Karlos Fitzpatrick account for relationship between changing mode of production (cardamom production and foreign labor migration) and class formation in Mamangkhe village in East Nepal?

[इयान कालोस फिजप्याट्रिकले पूर्वी नेपालको मामाङ्खे गाउँमा परिवर्तनशील उत्पादनको पद्धति (अलैची उत्पादन र वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासन) तथा वर्ग निर्माणबीचको सम्बन्धका बारेमा कसरी विवरणहरू दिएका छन् ?]

Ans: इयान कालोस फिजप्याट्रिक एक ब्रिटिश मानवशास्त्री, जनजैविकशास्त्री तथा सामाजिक अनुसन्धानर्मा हुन्। उनीद्वारा लिखित पुस्तक *Cardamom and Class: A Limbu Village and its Extensions in East Nepal (2011)* मा अलैची उत्पादन र वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनले पूर्वी नेपालको लिम्बु ग्रामीण क्षेत्र मामाङ्खेलाई बद्दो आर्थिक एकीकरण र आर्थिक विविधीकरण तथा वर्ग निर्माणको उदयका साथ कसरी राष्ट्रिय र विश्वव्यापी पूँजीवादी अर्थतन्त्रसँग समाहित गयो भने सम्बन्धमा गहन विश्लेषण प्रस्तुत गरिएको छ। निर्वाहमुखी कृषि (Subsistence agriculture), अलैची खेती (Cardamom cultivation) र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय प्रवासन (International migration) गरी तीनवटा खप्टिएका तथा ऐतिहासिक उत्पादन प्रक्रियाहरूको परीक्षण गरेर यस पुस्तकले यी प्रत्येक उत्पादन प्रक्रियाहरूद्वारा कसरी आर्थिक विविधीकरणको गति तथा ग्रामीण वर्ग निर्माणमा योगदान पुग्यो भन्ने सम्बन्धमा स्पष्ट पारेको छ। विशेष गरी यस पुस्तकमा फिजप्याट्रिकले लिम्बु गाउँमा सर्वप्रथम सन् 1968 देखि प्रारम्भ एवम् परिचित गरिएको अलैची उत्पादनका बारे विशेष जोड दिएका छन्। उनले तर्क गरेका छन् कि अलैची एक उच्च मूल्यको नगदे बाली हो, जसले लिम्बु समाजको दूलो हिस्साको जीवनस्तरलाई सार्थक रूपबन्द रूपान्तरण गर्ने माध्यम प्रदान गरेको छ। गाउँको राष्ट्रिय र विश्वव्यापी बजारसँग एकीकरण हुँदूहुँदै हालसम्म पनि लिम्बु भाषा र साँस्कृतिक प्रचलनहरूले गाउँलेहरूको वर्तमान अवस्थालाई आकारिति तुल्याउन निर्वाह गरेको भूमिका सम्बन्धमा यस पुस्तकले विशेष जोड दिएको छ।

- कसरी अलैची उत्पादनले मामाङ्खेको बद्दो आर्थिक एकीकरणलाई राष्ट्रिय तथा विश्वव्यापी पूँजीवादी अर्थव्यवस्था र वर्ग निर्माण वा आर्थिक विविधीकरणको उदयमा योगदान दियो? (How cardamom production have contributed to increased economic integration of Mamangkhe into the national and

फिजप्याट्रिकका अनुसार वेदाशक त्रम प्रवासनका पूर्वार्थतिरमा प्रारम्भ भएका सिविकम र भारतका अन्य भागहरूमा हुने गरेका मौसमी श्रम प्रवासनसँग लामो इतिहास जोड्दछ । सन् 1990 को उत्तरार्धतिर मामाङ्खे गाउँका गाउँलेहरू थुप्रै खाडी देशहरू र मलेशिया श्रम प्रवासनमा जान प्रारम्भ गरेका थिए । यसले ग्रामीण अर्थतन्त्र र त्यहाँको समाजमा सबैभन्दा महत्त्वपूर्ण प्रभाव यान्द्यो । आर्थिक आधारबाट हेर्दा सफल श्रम प्रवासीहरूले आय आर्जन गर्न, भाषापत्रिका क्षेत्रमा सम्पत्ति खरिद गर्न र निजी अद्येजी विद्यालयको शिक्षा तथा बजारका वस्तुहरूमा बढ्दो निर्भरता जस्ता नयाँ आर्थिक मागहरू सबल गरे । सामाजिक परिवर्तनका आधारबाट हेर्दा अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय श्रम प्रवासनको प्रभाव अलैंची उत्पादनबाट भएको मुनाफासँग जोडिन पुग्दछ । श्रम प्रवासनका कारण आर्जित आयबाट भाषापत्रिका पनि गाउँलेहरू बसोबास गरी एक किसिमको शहरी वा अर्धशहरी मामाङ्खे उदय हुन पुग्यो । यो विस्तारित गाउँ हाल सामाजिक सञ्जालहरूको केन्द्र बन पुगेको छ, जहाँ गाउँलेहरू सीमापार प्रवासनमा जान बढ्दो सम्पर्कमा रहन्छन् र अधिकांश गाउँलेहरूका लागि यो गाउँ आर्थिक सम्पन्नता एवम् सफलताद्वारा प्रस्तावित अवसरहरूको प्रतीक (Symbol of the opportunities offered by economic wealth and success) बन पुगेको छ ।

1. 2020, Q. No. 7; 2019, *Q. No. 8

Based on the book *Cardamom and Class* by Ian Carlos Fitzpatrick, describe how cardamom production and foreign labor migration have contributed to increased economic integration of Mamangkhe into the national and global capitalist economy and the emergence of economic differentiation or class formation?

OR

How does Ian Karlos Fitzpatrick account for relationship between changing mode of production (cardamom production and foreign labor migration) and class formation in Mamangkhe village in East Nepal?

Ans: Ian Carlos Fitzpatrick is an anthropologist and ethnobotanist, currently working in the UK as a campaigner, researcher, and writer on economic and environmental issues. In his Research-based book *Cardamom and Class: A Limbu Village and Its Extensions in East Nepal* (2011), he explains three historically overlapping productive processes—subsistence agriculture, cardamom cultivation, and international migration—this book shows how each production process has contributed to different ways to the acceleration of economic differentiation and rural class formation. It focuses on cardamom, introduced to the village in 1968, a high-value cash crop that has provided a means to significantly transform the lives of a large section of Limbu society. Despite the increased integration of the village with a national and global market, the continued existence of the Limbu language and cultural practices emphasizes the active role villagers have played in shaping their current condition.

- How has cardamom production contributed to the increased economic integration of Mamangkhe into the national and global capitalist economy and the emergence of economic differentiation or class formation?

Fitzpatrick argues that cardamom in Limbu village benefited large and small producers and non-producers who could sell their labor as porters or *Khetala*. However, the economic differences between households that

may previously exist (in terms of levels of subsistence production) were exacerbated by the introduction of cardamom. At this point, one can begin to describe an emerging process of rural class formation. Before cardamom, economic differences were both much less extreme—since less profit can be made from surplus subsistence-crop production—and tied much more directly to ethnic differences: the *Chhetri* controlled proportionally more land and could sell their surplus crop production or trade it in exchange for goods and labor.

The development of cardamom as a high-value cash crop had several effects. *First*, it provided both *Limbu* and *Chhetri* villagers with productive cardamom land—usually uncultivated forest land—access to cash and the market economy. Since many *Limbu* villagers owned forested land cultivated with cardamom, the earlier economic differentiation along ethnic lines (wealthy *Chhetri* and poor *Limbu* villagers) became increasingly economic differentiation along production lines (wealthy large cardamom producers and poor small or non-cardamom producers). *Second*, cardamom production led to the reevaluation of forested land. Such areas had previously offered little more than firewood and fodder but now became a lucrative source of income. This income meant that cardamom-producing land could be mortgaged in exchange for loans and the repayment of debts. This exchange resulted in the household taking on larger loans than they would have previously but encouraged households to increase access to capital to consider investing in land and property elsewhere. *Third*, the increased cash availability in Mamangkhe, because of cardamom and cardamom-related work in Sikkim, led directly to the development of the dispersed or extended village in Jhapa is tied to the development of the third productive process: international labor migration.

- How has foreign labor migration contributed to the increased economic integration of Mamangkhe into the national and global capitalist economy and the emergence of economic differentiation or class formation?

According to Fitzpatrick, this more recent shares a long history with seasonal labor migration to Sikkim and other parts of India in the early 1950s. Beginning in the late 1990s, villagers from Mamangkhe began to travel for work to several Gulf countries and Malaysia, perhaps the most profound effect on the village economy and society. In economic terms, successful labor migrants have been able to repay debts, purchase property in Jhapa and support a new set of economic demands—paying for private English-medium education and supporting the costs associated with an increased dependence on market goods. In terms of social changes, international migration, paired with the profits from cardamom production, has led to the emergence of a dispersed village in Jhapa, an urban or peri-urban Mamangkhe. This dispersed village has become both a hub for the social networks that villagers increasingly rely on for migration abroad and, for many villagers, a symbol of the opportunities offered economic wealth and success.

Explain how Chaitanya Mishra assesses Nepal's development and underdevelopment from world-system approach.

OR

Critically discuss the major arguments emphasized by Chaitanya Mishra in his essay "Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective."

OR

What are some of your major critiques of Chaitanya Mishra's essay "Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective?"

The article *Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective* (2007) by Chaitanya Mishra includes an in-depth analysis concerning several dimensions of Nepal's development of underdevelopment. This article was published by Fine Print Inc. on the book title *Essay on the Sociology of Nepal*, authored by Mishra.

Mishra argues that a valid conceptualization of the "developmental problem" would enable three principal aspects. *First*, shed the mystery embedded in the notions of development and underdevelopment. *Second*, assess current developmental practice more objectively, and the *third*, a valid conceptualization of the "development problem" would help us enumerate and analyze constraints against, and option for, what might be a good design for future development.

Mishra uniquely describes the question of what we mean when we say that we are underdeveloped or Nepal's underdevelopment? According to him, the underdevelopment of Nepal and other third-world nations may be characterized as follows:

- i. Increasing incorporation within the capitalist world and regional system in labor, commodities, and capital/finance.
- ii. Increasing loss of capacity to reproduce indigenous means of subsistence production, combined with a diminishing or deficient capacity to carry out expanded reproduction.
- iii. Emergence and growth of the comprador bourgeoisie (whose interests are closely tied with the world and regional capitalism) and the state class, which contains nationalist components. However, which cannot lead to a national transformation because of its strong political alliance with the feudal and other traditional, i.e., pre-capitalist structures and its fast-growing economic and financial ties with bourgeoisies.
- iv. Considerable and severe familial, community-based, regional, and national integration arising from peripheralization and marginalization. On the one hand, the successful resistance kept up by the state, the feudal elements, and the bourgeoisie to mass-based political development forms the other.

Chaitanya Mishra analyzes Nepal's development of underdevelopment based on the following historical phases:

Past and Present: 1700–1884

i. According to Mishra, 1700–1884 is considered when modern Nepal was created. At that time, there were pre-capitalist economies all over the world. Nevertheless, there was a wide variety of economic and political forms during this period in Nepal. At this time, Nepal has been divided into four economic zones: the Himalayan region, Eastern and Central hills, Western Hills, and Terai. These four sectors differed in primary production and land ownership, resource base, labor organization, economic system, market expansion, class diversity, and production relations. In the Himalayas, the economy was more dependent on Tibet. Reliance on import-oriented economies has also increased in the Terai and hilly areas. Due to the inability to increase production and strengthen the political system, the proper development of Nepal could not be ensured during this period.

Past and Present: 1845–1949

During this period, Nepal's economy and development were somewhat more mature than before. At this time, competitive capitalism flourished in Nepal's urban areas. During this time, Britain emerged as a world power. Nepal's socio-political system was also adapting to the world-system. The impact of this process had far-reaching regional implications in Nepal. Rana Prime Minister Beer Shamsher assumed power to give the British-Indian government access to the Nepalese labor force. In addition to strengthening this provision, he had adopted a provision barring certain individuals from joining the Nepal Army at the request of the British government. The rulers after Beer Shamsher also laid special emphasis on labor flow and migration of workers abroad. This trend reduced productivity and increased Nepal's interdependent relationship.

Past and Present: 1950–1985

During this period, diplomatic relations with Nepal were extended to many countries besides the United Kingdom and India. During the rise and expansion of world domination, Nepal also had diplomatic relations with the United States. By 1950, Nepal had established itself as a major recipient of foreign aid, and the labor force was put to good use as part of the global military. According to Mishra, the external flow of goods, labor, and capital led to deep peripheralization in Nepal. During this period, three-quarters of the households of hilly areas and two-quarters in the lowlands lived below the poverty line. During this period, some of the industrial giants of Nepal had established relations with the state machinery. According to Mishra, Nepal's political dependence increased after the Democratic Revolution of 1950, while economic openness and dependence were increasing.

From the above discussions, considerations, and facts, Mishra concluded that the facts of Nepal's development of underdevelopment at present, as one of its historical structural characteristics, are manifold and multilayered.

How would you use the world-system analysis to explain the unequal economic and political relationship between Nepal and India in a historical perspective?

Ans: Nepal and India share a unique relationship of friendship and cooperation as close neighbors characterized by open borders and deep-rooted people-to-people contacts of kinship and culture. Nepal shares a border with five Indian states—Sikkim, West Bengal, Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, and Uttarakhand. Both countries benefit from the open borders and unhindered movement across them. This movement helps the citizens of both countries in both livelihoods and have strong people contact and close bonds through marriages and familial ties. The unique relations between the two nations date back to the **Nepal-India Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1950**.

India is considered Nepal's largest trade partner and the largest source of foreign investments. India also provides transit for almost the entire trade of Nepal. Nepal uses Kolkata port for its sea trade.

Nepal and India officially established diplomatic relations in 1947. Nepal-India relation is primarily directed by the 1950 Nepal-India Treaty of Peace and Friendship, which the Nepalese side considers unequal. India has a more significant and unnatural influence on Nepal's internal politics, which is not liked by the Nepalese nationals.

The world has now become a global village because the country is dependent on each other. For example, the United States and China are dependent on each other. For China, America is a vast market, and for America, China is a cheap labor source. Due to that, American companies manufacture their goods in China because of cheap labor and other hand, giving employment to China. More than 80% of the foreign investment is in China. For India and China, Nepal falls to the periphery. Nepal is a supplier of raw materials to both neighboring countries. Nepal has a vast water source, produce energy, and irrigation for India and Nepal. Nepal sells various raw materials to India and neighboring countries and buys the finished product at a high price.

On the other hand, there is an unequal trade treaty between India and Nepal. Due to that, India is getting more benefits from Nepal's resources than Nepal is getting from India. From Wallerstein's point of view, it is called capitalism and inequalities.

According to Blaikie, Cameron, and Seddon (2005), the growth of trade and, to some extent, small industries could not be maintained in the New Terai towns after the extension of the Indian railways across the border. Grain surplus passing through the new towns increased, but at a decreasing rate over the years. This process was bound to happen for three socio-economic reasons:

- i. Agricultural technology was then even more primitive than it is now. Therefore, once the potential agricultural surplus for the given level of technology was exploited, further production increases were at best very slow and came primarily through the reclamation of wasteland and forest areas.
- ii. Economic development was not then a national goal. The socio-economic structure was essentially feudalistic, and entrepreneurship among the people has frowned upon feudal. The ruling class was

afraid of technical innovation and feared changes in the values and aspirations of the ordinary person.

- iii. A trade treaty was signed with British India in 1923. The treaty allowed the practically free import of British goods into Nepal. Naturally, it had the effect of discouraging the establishment of new industries and the continued operation of ancient handicrafts and cottage industries.

The Treaty of Sugauli contracted in 1816 after the war with British India, obliged Nepal to relinquish all her acquisitions west of the Mahakali river and east of the Mechi river; these rivers were then fixed as Nepal's boundaries. A British resident was appointed for Kathmandu, and Nepal was forbidden from direct communications with any Western power except Great Britain. It was not until 1923 that this treaty was abrogated, and the British government fully recognized the independence of Nepal. For nearly a century, then Nepal was a kind of political dependency of Great Britain, an arrangement that benefited both the British and Nepal's rulers.

The 1920s were notable for the first tentative steps by the Nepalese rulers to develop the productive potential for their situation by purchasing foreign expertise. The first modern college was set up, a ropeway was constructed linking the Kathmandu valley with India, and some mineral exploration was undertaken. The British proved willing to remove the restrictions on Nepalese diplomatic relationships with other nations, and with this formal alteration of Nepal's political status (in 1923) came the removal of all restrictions on trade between Nepal and India. Thus, the presence of a captive Nepalese market capable of absorbing over one % of total Indian exports and over 5 % in sectors such as cotton, fabrics, transport equipment, and pharmaceutical products is, thus, not insignificant. However, it can only be an element in resolving such a crisis.

The idea of economic planning had been accepted early, and the First Five Year Plan was drawn up for the period 1956 to 1961. However, no new industrial venture of any significance came during this period. Indeed, several of those industries established in the terai under the extraordinary conditions of the Second World War (1939–1945) had gone into liquidation immediately after the war. In 1950, Nepal signed a Trade and Transit Treaty with India, which assured virtual domination of Nepal's economic life by India and perpetuated the unequal relationship between the two countries. For example, between 1956–1963, Nepal's imports from India rose by about Rs. 430,000,000 while exports rose in the same period by only about Rs. 190,000,000, increasing the balance of trade deficit from Rs. 72,000,000 to Rs. 310,000,000. In agriculture, attempts were made to alter the very complex structure of land tenure, essential with a view to maximizing revenue from the land by removing land grants which had been exempted from tax by the *Ranas* (and thereby attempting to erode their economic base) and only incidentally to improving productivity and the condition of the producers.

4. 2019, Q. No. 3 (Long Answer Question)

Based on the book "Nepal in Crisis" by Blaikie, Cameron and Seddon; and the essay "Development and Underdevelopment" by Mishra; describe how Nepal has historically evolved into a peripheral, and underdeveloped country.

Ans: The research book *Nepal in Crisis: Growth and Stagnation at the Periphery* (2005) by sociologists Piers Blaikie, John Cameron, and David Seddon, provides an in-depth analysis of how Nepal has historically emerged as a peripheral, dependent, and underdeveloped country.

According to Seddon et al., Nepal's poverty, unemployment, increasing dependence on agriculture, exploitation, and caste discrimination are the main factors of underdevelopment. Although Nepal has made remarkable progress over the past few decades, it has not risen above the vicious cycle of underdevelopment. However, some development has been achieved through Nepal's development efforts over the past 60 years, various structural elements that hinder development remain. By the end of the Rana period, the literacy rate in Nepal was only 2%, but now it has reached 68%. However, Seddon et al. argue that due to the growing trade deficit, dependency, Nepal's subordinate political economy, and political instability, the full benefits of development have not been achieved.

Nepal's economy has been primarily agricultural. In the 1990s, agriculture accounted for about 40% of GDP. Although the share of agriculture in the country's GDP has been declining in the last few decades, it is still higher than any other country in South Asia. Nepal's economy is mainly based on tourism, foreign aid, and remittances. The distribution of development and progress of Nepal so far has been unequal in different groups. Dalits, women, backward groups, disadvantaged groups, or citizens of a certain geographical area have not been able to reap the full benefits of development. There has been some development in transportation networks, hydropower, and community forestry, but overall living standards have not significantly improved.

Seddon, Blaikie, and Cameron have historically analyzed the trend and instances of underdevelopment and dependency in Nepal. According to them, Nepal was divided into various fragmented petty states during the 17th and 18th centuries, several states being in war and conflict; thus, not paying attention to the proper development of the education system is the main reason for underdevelopment. During the 19th century, agricultural production in Nepal increased significantly in proportion to population growth, but instead of modernizing the overall sector, the agricultural sector could not flourish due to excessive taxes and revenue limits.

After the unification of Nepal in the 18th and 19th centuries, modern Nepal was built. The Sugauli Treaty of 1815–16 changed the situation in Nepal. To withstand the pressure of British India, Nepal was forced to sign the Treaty of Sugauli for the protection of geography. The treaty protected independence but also increased its economic dependence on India. At present, India accounts for 90% of the trade. As a result, Nepal's trade with China has gradually shrunk. After that, Nepal began to import many industrially produced goods from India. As a result, Nepal's development remained stable. Instead of promoting the country's internal trade, business, and industry, clearing forests,

distributing *birta*, and adopting traditional agriculture were established during the Rana period. Newar traders also became active in traditional farming instead of doing modern business. The ruling classes also established the system of land by taxing agriculture instead of benefiting from industry and commercialization. From then on, a kind of feudal practice in agriculture began to intensify. The country shifted towards feudalism instead of industrialization. Internally, after the Rana rule, the Shah's autocratic system and external dependence on India became the main factors of Nepal's underdevelopment.

In the book, *Nepal in Crisis*, Seddon, Blaikie, and Cameron pointed out that Nepal is heavily dependent on foreign aid. Specifically, India plays a role as a center, while Nepal is a periphery nation. There is a growing reliance on foreign loans and assistance for development work and foreign missions and their development principles for planned development. In that too, the political and economic priorities of the Indian government have a disproportionate impact.

India's monopoly on transit and trade has deprived Nepal of trade relations with other countries. In this context, Nepal had to sign an international trade agreement which it did not want to accept easily. It made Nepal realize the need to improve its capacity to promote exports internationally based on Indian industrial production. Due to such an unbalanced trade structure, Nepal's underdevelopment and dependence became wider.

On the other hand, the essay *Development and Underdevelopment*, included in the Essays on the Sociology of Nepal (2007) by the famous Nepalese sociologist Chaitanya Mishra, analyzes the historical process of Nepal's peripheral, dependency, and underdevelopment in a slightly different way. According to this essay by Mishra, the period from 1700–1884 was the period of construction of modern Nepal. Agriculture was considered the main source of Nepal's economy, but due to increasing political instability and unification campaigns, the country could not focus much on development. Competitive capitalism, introduced from Britain during 1895–1949, succeeded in maintaining worldwide influence. Even the British-dominated government continued to maintain its influence in Nepal. As a result, the regional socio-economic effects in Nepal increased.

Chaitanya Mishra has analyzed the development of Nepal's underdevelopment based on the following historical stages:

i. Past and Present: 1700–1884

According to Mishra, 1700–1884 is considered when modern Nepal was created. At that time, there were pre-capitalist economies all over the world. Nevertheless, there was a wide variety of economic and political forms during this period in Nepal. At this time, Nepal has been divided into four economic zones: the Himalayan region, Eastern and Central hills, Western Hills, and Terai. These four sectors differed in primary production and land ownership, resource base, labor organization, economic system, market expansion, class diversity, and production relations. In the Himalayas, the economy was more dependent on Tibet. Reliance on import-oriented economies has also increased in the Terai and hilly areas. Due to the inability to increase production and strengthen the political system, the proper development of Nepal could not be ensured during this period.

ii. Past and Present: 1845–1949

During this period, Nepal's economy and development were somewhat more mature than before. At this time, competitive capitalism flourished in Nepal's urban areas. During this time, Britain emerged as a world power. Nepal's socio-political system was also adapting to the world-system. The impact of this process had far-reaching regional implications in Nepal. Rana Prime Minister Beer Shamsher assumed power to give the British-Indian government access to the Nepalese labor force. In addition to strengthening this provision, he had adopted a provision barring certain individuals from joining the Nepal Army at the request of the British government. The rulers after Beer Shamsher also laid special emphasis on labor flow and migration of workers abroad. This trend reduced productivity and increased Nepal's interdependent relationship.

iii. Past and Present: 1950–1985

During this period, diplomatic relations with Nepal were extended to many countries besides the United Kingdom and India. During the rise and expansion of world domination, Nepal also had diplomatic relations with the United States. By 1950, Nepal had established itself as a major recipient of foreign aid, and the labor force was put to good use as part of the global military. According to Mishra, the external flow of goods, labor, and capital led to deep peripheralization in Nepal. During this period, three-quarters of the households of hilly areas and more than two-quarters in the lowlands lived below the poverty line. During this period, some of the industrial giants of Nepal had established relations with the state machinery. According to Mishra, Nepal's political dependence increased after the Democratic Revolution of 1950, while economic openness and dependence were increasing.

Chaitanya Mishra has concluded that Nepal's underdevelopment is manifold and multilayered through the above chronological events and various analyses. Even the state machinery from the past to the present has failed to overcome the underdevelopment obstacles for development. Mishra argues that Nepal's underdevelopment cannot be easily remedied by the current development pattern and expanded capital accumulation.

5. 2019, Q. No. 7

Based on your readings of various texts related to foreign labor migration in Nepal, discuss some of the positive and negative effects of foreign labor migration and remittance on the Nepali economy.

(नेपालमा वैदेशिक श्रम स्थानान्तरणसँग सम्बन्धित तपाईंका विभिन्न पाठ्यसामग्रीका अध्ययनहरूमा आधारित रही नेपाली अर्थतन्त्रमा वैदेशिक श्रम स्थानान्तरण र विप्रेषणका केही सकारात्मक तथा नकारात्मक प्रभावहरूको छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: बन्दिता सिजापति र अमृता लिम्बुद्वारा लिखित एवम् हिमाल बुक्स काठमाडौंबाट प्रकाशित पुस्तक *Governing Labour Migration in Nepal: An Analysis of Existing Policies and Institutional Mechanisms (2012)* मा नेपालमा श्रम स्थानान्तरणको इतिहास, आप्रवासन, आन्तरिक बसाइंसराइ, वर्तमान समयको श्रमिक स्थानान्तरणको अवस्था, श्रम स्थानान्तरणसँग सम्बन्धित तथ्याङ्कहरूको तथ्याङ्कशास्त्रीय विवरण, वैदेशिक रोजगारका मुख्य गन्तव्यहरू, विदेशमा कामका लागि स्थानान्तरित भएका व्यक्तिहरूको जनसाङ्गिक प्रोफाइल; उनीहरूको उमेर,

तत्कालीन रूपमा सकारात्मक प्रभावहरू उत्पन्न गराएतापनी दीर्घकालीन रूपबाट हेर्दा थुप्रै नकारात्मक प्रभावहरू आगमन हुनसक्ने निष्कर्ष दिन सकिन्छ।

5. 2019, Q. No. 7

Based on your readings of various texts related to foreign labor migration in Nepal, discuss some of the positive and negative effects of foreign labor migration and remittance on the Nepali economy.

Ans: The book *Governing Labor Migration in Nepal: An Analysis of Existing Policies and Institutional Mechanisms* (2012), written by Bandita Sijapati and Amrita Limbu and published by Himal Books Kathmandu, presents an in-depth analysis on statistical descriptions of data related to labor migration, main destinations of foreign employment, demographic profiles of persons who have migrated for work abroad, their age, gender and the effects of education, remittances, and foreign labor migration.

According to Sijapati and Limbu, about 50% of households in Nepal have one person from each household engaged in foreign labor. The human resources to be active in foreign employment has increased over the past two decades. As the number of youths going for foreign employment and labor increases every year, remittance has also increased. During the conflict in Nepal, a significant number of foreign workers were transferred. In the financial year 2010/11 alone, 3,54,716 people were allowed to work abroad, out of which 10,416 were women.

The World Bank's report (2009) on the migration of Nepali workers shows that about 867,000 workers have gone to India for labor alone. According to the report, 41% of Nepal's total workable workforce of 2.1 million has gone to foreign labor. Of this, 38% or 8 lakh 10 thousand labor forces has been shifted to Gulf countries, and 12% or 2 lakh 45 thousand labor force has been shifted to Malaysia.

- Some positive and negative effects of foreign labor migration and remittances on the Nepalese economy

Remittances sent to Nepal by workers in foreign employment have become the Nepalese economy and foreign exchange. Remittances accounted for 20% of Nepal's gross domestic product (GDP) in 2010 and 2011, and remittances to Nepal currently amount to US Dollar Four billion (approximately Rs. 400 billion) each year. According to the data, there are indications that remittances will increase in the coming years.

An unexpected increase in foreign labor migration significantly impacts various aspects of Nepal's economy and society. The dependency on remittances of the national economy is increasing. Poverty alleviation of about 50% of Nepal's households has also been made possible due to foreign labor migration and remittances. Therefore, Nepal's policymakers need to promptly consider the long-term effects of such an impact. Due to the increasing tendency of Nepal's young workforce to migrate abroad, there is a growing risk that there may be a shortage of workforce for labor, that wages may increase, and that the productive sector may be negatively impacted. Likewise, there may be negative effects of imbalances in the local labor market. An example of such an effect is the presence of about 40,000 Bangladeshi and Indian workers in the brick industries in Nepal's Terai region.

In addition to the destination countries where Nepali workers go to work, there are many problems faced by human resources companies and agents. Problems have arisen such as non-receipt of salary facility as mentioned in the labor agreement, fraud by charging more than required fee, various losses incurred by the working company, non-receipt of salary on time. Negative effects such as the exploitation of women workers and human trafficking have also occurred in the Nepali economy and society. Nepal's economy has not become productive as people returning from foreign employment have not been easily reintegrated into society. With less human resources in the agricultural sector, agricultural production is declining, imports are increasing, and trade is expected to increase sharply. The tendency of qualified, educated, and skilled workforce to migrate abroad seems to be a great loss to the country. Although foreign labor remittances and remittances have had immediate positive effects on the Nepalese economy, many negative effects can be seen in the long run.

6. 2017, Q. No. 7

Critically engage with the book “*Cardamom and Class*” by Ian Karlos Fitzpatrick to describe how changes in agricultural productivity and mode of production can lead to socio-economic differentiation and new class formation?

(इयान कालोस् फिजप्याट्रिकद्वारा लिखित पुस्तक *Cardamom and Class* सँग आलोचनात्मक रूपमा अभ्यस्त भइ कृषि उत्पादकत्व र उत्पादनका पद्धतिमा आएका परिवर्तनहरूले कसरी सामाजिक-आर्थिक विभिन्नता र नयाँ वर्ग निर्माण गराए भन्ने सम्बन्धमा व्याख्या गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: इयान कालोस् फिजप्याट्रिक एक मानवशास्त्री तथा जनजातीयता विशेषज्ञ हुन्। उनी ब्रिशिअ अधियन्ता, अनुसन्धानकर्ता र लेखकका रूपमा सक्रिय छन्। आर्थिक तथा वातावरणीय मुद्दाहरू फिजप्याट्रिकका विशेष रूचि भएका क्षेत्र हुन्। *Cardamom and Class: A Limbu Village and Its Extension in East Nepal (2011)* उनको एक अनुसन्धानमा आधारित पुस्तक हो। यस पुस्तकमा फिजप्याट्रिकले कृषि उत्पादकत्व र उत्पादन पद्धति वा उत्पादन व्यवस्थामा आएका परिवर्तनहरूले कसरी सामाजिक-आर्थिक विभिन्नता र नयाँ वर्गको निर्माण गर्ने परिणाम उत्पन्न गराए भन्ने सम्बन्धमा विवेचना गरेका छन्। पूर्वी नेपालको एउटा लिम्बु गाउँमा यो अध्ययन गरिएको थियो।

- कसरी कृषि उत्पादकत्व र उत्पादन पद्धतिमा आएका परिवर्तनहरूले सामाजिक-आर्थिक विभिन्नतातर्फ अग्रसर गराए?

फिजप्याट्रिकका अनुसार लिम्बु गाउँभरी सबै घरधुरीहरूको पहिलो र खास प्रकारको उत्पादन पद्धति निर्वाहमुखी कृषि (*Subsistence agriculture*) थियो। यसअन्तर्गत अन्नबालीको घरेलु उत्पादन र गाइवस्तुका लागि आहारा जुटाउनु प्रमुख कार्य रहेका थिए। दोस्रो उत्पादन प्रक्रिया अलैंची खेती (*Cardamom Production*) हो। पहिलो उत्पादनको तरिका/पद्धति वा प्रक्रियाका तुलनामा दोस्रो उत्पादन पद्धति बजार-उन्मुख र नगदे बालीको रूपमा थियो। सर्वप्रथम स्थानीय बजारमा र पछि बाह्य बजारमा अलैंचीको खपत भयो। गाउँमा स्थापित भएको तेस्रो उत्पादनको पद्धति श्रम ज्याला (*Wage labor*) हो। गाउँबाट युवाहरू वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनमा जाने प्रवृत्ति बढनाले परिवारहरूको आम्दानी बढ्नुका साथै आवश्यकता परिपूर्तिमा पनि सहजता भयो। यी तीनवटै उत्पादनका पद्धतिहरू ऐतिहासिक रूपबाट ऋमबद्ध स्थापित भए। गाउँको सामाजिक-आर्थिक विभिन्नतामा सार्थक परिवर्तन ल्याउन यी त्रिपक्षीय उत्पादन पद्धतिहरूको महत्वपूर्ण गतिशीलता रह्यो।

उच्च-मूल्यको नगदे बालीको रूपमा अलैंची खेतीको विकासका थुप्रै प्रभावहरू उत्पन्न भए। **पहिलो-** यसले लिम्बु र क्षेत्री गाउँलेहरूलाई अलैंची उत्पादन हुने जग्गा उपलब्ध गरायो। प्रायः खेतीविहीन जद्गल छेउछाउको जग्गा समेत अलैंची खेतीद्वारा बजार अर्थतन्त्र र नगदको पहुँचमा रूपान्तरण हुन पुग्यो। थुप्रै लिम्बु गाउँलेहरूले जद्गलयुक्त जग्गा (Forested land) को स्वामित्व प्राप्त गरेकाले त्यहाँ अलैंची खेती गर्न सकिने भयो। अतः जनजातीय धारका साथ कायम पहिलेको आर्थिक भिन्नता (धनी क्षेत्री गाउँलेहरू र गरीब उत्पादनकर्ताहरू र गरीब/साना वा गैर-अलैंची उत्पादनकर्ताहरू) बन्न पुग्यो। अर्थात् अलैंची खेती प्रारम्भ हुनुभन्दा पूर्व लिम्बु गाउँ मामाङ्खेमा आर्थिक भिन्नताको आधार जनजातीय थियो र आर्थिक आधारमा गाउँ धनी क्षेत्री गाउँलेहरूर गरीब लिम्बु गाउँलेहरूमा विभाजित थियो। तर अलैंची खेती परिचित गरिएपछि जनजातीय भिन्नताको आधार उत्पादनको आर्थिक आधारमा बदलिन पुग्यो, जहाँ गाउँलेहरूलाई उच्च अलैंची उत्पादनकर्ता र न्यून उत्पादनकर्ताका रूपमा विभाजन गरिन थालियो। **दोस्रो-** अलैंची उत्पादनले जग्गाको पनि पुनर्मूल्यांकन गर्नुपर्नेतर्फ उन्मुख गरायो, जबकि त्यस्तो जग्गालाई पहिले दाउरा र घासपातका लागि मात्रै उपयोगी ठान्ने गरिन्थ्यो। अब जग्गालाई आम्दानीको एउटा भरपर्दो स्रोतका रूपमा लिइन थालियो। यसको तात्पर्य अलैंची उत्पादन हुने जग्गालाई ऋण लिन तथा लिइएको रकम तिर्नका लागि उपयोग गर्न सकिने भयो। यसबाट घरधुरीहरूले दूला ऋणहरू लिनका साथै जग्गामा लगानी गर्न प्रोत्साहित गन्यो। **तेस्रो-** अलैंचीको परिणामस्वरूप मामाङ्खेमा बढ्दो नगद उपलब्धता हुन थाल्यो तर सिक्किमतिर हुने अलैंची-सम्बन्धित कार्यले गाउँलेहरूलाई श्रम प्रवासनमा जान प्रेरित गरी त्यहाँका गाउँलेहरू भाषाका क्षेत्रसम्म छरिन पुगे। गाउँबाट अलैंची खेतीमा दक्ष व्यक्तिहरू सिक्किम गइ आयआर्जन गरेर भाषाका क्षेत्रमा प्रवासित हुन थाल्नाले लिम्बु गाउँ अब शहरतिर पनि विस्तारित हुन पुग्यो।

- कसरी कृषि उत्पादकत्व र उत्पादन पद्धतिमा आएका परिवर्तनहरूले नयाँ वर्ग निर्माणतर्फ अग्रसर गराए?

फिजप्याट्रिकका अनुसार अलैंची उत्पादन, ज्याला श्रम र वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनले घटनाबद्ध रूपमा लिम्बु गाउँको नयाँ वर्ग निर्माणमा महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निर्वाह गरे। मामाङ्खे (लिम्बु गाउँ) बढी मात्रामा अलैंची खेतीमा संलग्न हुदै गयो। अर्कोतर्फ वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनमा लिम्बु युवाहरूको आकर्षण बढ्दै गयो। गाउँमा बढ्दो आर्थिक विविधीकरण हुनु नै नयाँ वर्ग निर्माणको प्रमुख आधार हो। गाउँको सम्बन्ध राष्ट्रिय र अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय बजारसम्म जोडिन पुगेकाले त्यहाँका थुप्रै घरधुरीहरू आर्थिक रूपबाट लाभान्वित भए। अब गाउँका बासिन्दाहरूको परम्परागत निर्वाहमुखी कृषिमा संलग्नता घट्दै गयो। उनीहरू बजारबाट खरिदविक्रि गरी आफ्ना आवश्यकता परिपूर्ति गर्न सक्षम भए। यसबाट गाउँमा धनी, मध्यम र निम्न मध्यम वर्गहरू उदय हुन पुगे। अतः फिजप्याट्रिकले तर्क गरेका छन् कि वर्तमानमा भइरहेका उत्पादनका प्रक्रियाहरूले गाउँलाई नयाँ आर्थिक-सामाजिक वर्गहरूको निर्माणतर्फ अग्रसर गराए।

6. 2017, Q. No. 7

Critically engage with the book “*Cardamom and Class*” by Ian Karlos Fitzpatrick to describe how changes in agricultural productivity and mode of production can lead to socio-economic differentiation and new class formation?

Ans: Ian Karlos Fitzpatrick is an anthropologist and ethnobotanist currently working in the UK as a campaigner, researcher, and writer on economic and environmental issues. In his research-based book *Cardamom and Class: A*

Limbu Village and Its Extensions in East Nepal (2011), he analyzed how changes in agricultural productivity and mode of production resulted in socio-economic differentiation and new class formation. This study was carried out in the eastern Limbu village of Nepal.

- How can changes in agricultural productivity and mode of production lead to socio-economic differentiation?

According to Fitzpatrick, the *first* typical production process for all households throughout the village is subsistence agriculture—the domestic production of crops and animals to feed the household. The *second* productive process is cardamom cultivation. In contrast to the first, the products of which circulate within the village, cardamom cultivation is market-oriented or cash-crop production, and the products—dried cardamom pods—circulate both inside and outside the village. Finally, the third productive process is wage labor, focusing on international labor migration. It is considered a productive process because, through labor migration and the wages that result from this, families can procure or supplement their material means of existence. Since each of these processes has its history, the focus on a tripartite mode of production is most significant for dynamics of change and socio-economic differentiation.

The development of cardamom as a high-value cash crop had several effects. *First*, it provided both *Limbu* and *Chhetri* villagers with productive cardamom land—usually uncultivated forest land—access to cash and the market economy. Since many *Limbu* villagers owned forested land cultivated with cardamom, the earlier economic differentiation along ethnic lines (wealthy *Chhetri* and poor *Limbu* villagers) became increasingly economic differentiation along production lines (wealthy large cardamom producers and poor small or non-cardamom producers). *Second*, cardamom production led to the reevaluation of forested land. Such areas had previously offered little more than firewood and fodder but now became a lucrative source of income. This income meant that cardamom-producing land could be mortgaged in exchange for loans and the repayment of debts. This exchange resulted in the household taking on larger loans than they would have previously but encouraged households to increase access to capital to consider investing in land and property elsewhere. *Third*, the increased cash availability in *Mamangkhe*, because of cardamom and cardamom-related work in *Sikkim*, led directly to the development of the dispersed or extended village in *Jhapa* is tied to the development of the third productive process: international labor migration.

- How can changes in agricultural productivity and mode of production lead to new class formation?

According to Fitzpatrick, cardamom production, wage labor, and foreign labor migration eventually played a crucial role in new class formation in *Limbu* village. *Mamangkhe* village is marked by a continued reliance on cash crop cardamom production and increased involvement of younger *Limbu* villagers in international labor migration. It is also marked, primarily due to these two activities, by increased economic differentiation between households in the village. While many households have benefited from the effects of the increased integration of the village in the national and international market, a certain proportion of the households are becoming burdened by debt, are losing agricultural land through mortgages, are increasingly having to purchase their food from the market as a supplement to their subsistence production and are

dependent on wage labor within the village or extremely low-paid work abroad. While distinct classes with distinct roles in production have yet to emerge from this—in large part because all households are involved in some form of agricultural work (be it subsistence or cash crop production)—it seems likely that soon, the degree of economic and social differentiation in the village will become increasingly marked. Thus, Fitzpatrick suggests that today's production processes led to the formation of different economic and social classes.

7. 2017, Q. No. 8]

Based on your readings of various texts related to foreign labor migration in Nepal, discuss with relevant examples, how foreign labor migration and remittances have further exacerbated Nepal's status as a dependent country?

(नेपालमा वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनसँग सम्बन्धित तपाईंका विभिन्न अध्ययनहरूमा आधारित रहेर कसरी वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासन र विप्रेषणले नेपाललाई अभ वर्निर्भर देशको रूपमा कायम गरिरहेका छन् भन्ने सम्बन्धमा सान्दर्भिक उदाहरणहरूसहित छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: नेपालमा वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनको वर्तमान मात्रा अभूतपूर्व रहेको छ। नेपालभित्र नै कुनै सन्तोषजनक रोजगारी प्राप्त गर्न नसकेका वा रोजगारीबाट बच्चित रहेका लाखौं युवाहरूलाई काम र रोजगारीको वैकल्पिक माध्यम बनेको छ—अन्तर्राष्ट्रिय श्रम प्रवासन। सन् 1993 को उत्तरार्थतिरबाट नेपाल सरकारले श्रमका लागि विदेश प्रवासित हुने श्रमिक र कामदारहरूको अभिलेख राख्ने कार्य प्रारम्भ गरेको थियो। नेपाली युवाहरू कार्यरत रहेका थुप्रै देशहरू, विशेष गरी खाडी, पूर्वी तथा दक्षिणपूर्वी एशियाका देशहरूमा नेपाली श्रमशक्तिको उच्च माग रहेको देखिएको छ।

बन्दिता सिजापति र अमृता लिम्बु (2012) का अनुसार वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनले गरिबी निवारणमा महत्वपूर्ण योगदान पुऱ्याएको छ। व्यक्तिगत घरधुरीहरू र राष्ट्रिय अर्थतन्त्रमा सार्थक योगदान पुऱ्याएको स्पष्ट प्रमाण हो। यद्यपि वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनमा भइरहेको अनपेक्षित र अभूतपूर्व वृद्धिले नेपाली समाज र अर्थतन्त्रका थुप्रै पक्षहरू प्रभावित भएका छन्। विप्रेषणमा राष्ट्रिय अर्थतन्त्रको निर्भरता बढ्दै गइरहेको छ। जहाँ देशमा आप्रवाह भइरहेको पैसा गरिबी न्यूनीकरण र लाखौं परिवारहरूको जीवन निर्वाहको माध्यम बन्न पुगेको छ, त्याँही यसले उत्पन्न गराउने दीर्घकालीन प्रभावहरूसम्बन्धी नीतिनिर्माताहरूमा महत्वपूर्ण सवाल पनि उत्पन्न गराएको छ। गन्तव्य देशमा उत्पन्न हुने अर्थिक विचलनबाट देशमा प्रभाव पर्न सक्नु, श्रमशक्तिको वैदेशिक र बाह्य पलायनले देशभित्र श्रमशक्ति अत्याधिक महड्गो हुनु, दक्ष र सीपयुक्त जनशक्तिको अभाव हुनु यसका प्रमुख सवाल हुन्। वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासन र विप्रेषणले स्थानीय बजारमा असन्तुलन उत्पन्न गराएको छ। उदाहरणको लागि नेपाली इट्यै उद्योगहरूमा रुपैयै 30,000 जना बांगलादेशी कामदारहरूले श्रम अभाव परिपूर्ति गरिरहेका छन्। केही भारतीय श्रमिकहरू पनि नेपालका ग्रामीण उद्योगहरूमा संलग्न रहेका छन्। यसका अतिरिक्त नेपालका थुप्रै प्रवासी कामदारहरूले वैदेशिक श्रम प्रवासनमा रहेदा विभिन्न समस्याहरू भोग्नुपर्ने स्थिति उत्पन्न भएको छ।

मानव इतिहासभर, आर्थिक तथा सामाजिक विकासका लागि श्रम चलायमानता वा श्रम गतिशीलता एक महत्वपूर्ण विशेषताको रूपमा रहदै आएको छ। सन् 2006 मा औद्योगिक देशहरूमा कार्यरत प्रवासी कामदारले आफ्ना देशमा 300 अर्ब अमेरिकी डलर रकम पठाएका थिए। जबकी विकासशील देशहरूले सोही वर्ष केवल 104 अर्ब अमेरिकी डलर मात्र वैदेशिक सहयोग प्राप्त गरेका थिए। यसरी विप्रेषणको अंश वैदेशिक सहायताभन्दा तीन गुना बढी कायम हुन पुगेको छ। विकासशील देशहरूमा वैदेशिक प्रत्यक्ष लगानी 167 अर्ब अमेरिकी डलर रहेको छ। भारतले सबैभन्दा बढी विप्रेषण भित्र्याउने गर्दछ। भारतले प्रतिवर्ष रुपैयै 24.5 अर्ब अमेरिकी डलर विप्रेषण प्राप्त गर्दछ। भारतपाश्चात् मेक्सिको, चीन, फिलिपिन्स र रूसले क्रमशः 24.2, 21, 14.6 र 13.7 अर्ब अमेरिकी डलर विप्रेषण भित्र्याउने गर्दछन्। विश्वव्यापीकरणको उदय भएपाश्चात् (अर्थात्

सन् 1990 पछि) समुद्रपार रोजगारीका निम्नि प्रवासनमा जाने क्रम तीव्र गतिमा वृद्धि भएको पाइन्छ। नेपालको अर्थतन्त्र पनि हाल प्रवासी श्रम कामदारले पठाउने विप्रेषणमा अत्याधिक निर्भय बन पुगेको छ। जहाँ नेपालका प्रमुख आर्थिक सूचकहरूले राम्रो अवस्था प्रदर्शित गरेका छैनन्, त्याँही विप्रेषणले देशको आर्थिक स्थितिलाई गतिशील तुल्याउन महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निर्वाह गरिरहेको छ। अर्थ मन्त्रालय (2007) का अनुसार अस्थिरता (विशेष गरी राजनैतिक अस्थिरता) र असुरक्षा जस्ता प्रमुख समस्याहरूका कारण 2.5% को न्यून आर्थिक वृद्धि मात्र हुन सकेको अवस्था थियो। समुद्रपार प्रवासन र विप्रेषणले गरीबी न्यूनीकरण र जनताहरूको जीवनस्तर माथि उकास्नमा महत्वपूर्ण भूमिका निर्वाह गरेको छ।

7. 2017, Q. No. 8

Based on your readings of various texts related to foreign labor migration in Nepal, discuss with relevant examples, how foreign labor migration and remittances have further exacerbated Nepal's status as a dependent country?

Ans: The current scale of foreign labor migration from Nepal is unprecedented, providing an alternative to millions of youths who cannot find satisfactory or even any employment within the country. In terms of documenting the number of Nepali labor migrant workers, it was only as late as 1993 that the Government of Nepal first began keeping official records of Nepalese migrating abroad for employment. Many Nepalese working in foreign countries indicates a high demand for Nepali labor force among employers in the destination countries, particularly in the Gulf, East, and Southeast Asia.

According to Bandita Sijapati and Amrita Limbū (2012), foreign labor migration has contributed to poverty alleviation, as evidenced by the significant contribution of remittances to individual households and the national economy. However, the unprecedented increase in foreign labor migration from Nepal has impacted various aspects of the economy and society. The national economy is increasingly becoming dependent on remittances. While the inflow of money is helping reduce poverty and has become a means of sustenance for millions of families, it has brought with it central questions for policymakers regarding its long-term effects. Such impacts may be mainly in the forms of remittances being susceptible to economic downturns in destination countries, the rise in national wages due to outmigration of the labor force, and diseases. Foreign labor migration and remittances have also seemed to create an imbalance in the local market. For instance, it has been reported that 30,000 Bangladeshi workers today fulfill the labor shortage in the brick industry in the eastern Tarai when earlier it used to be Nepalese a few Indians who worked in these factories. Moreover, as a significant labor-sending country, a matter of greater concern for Nepal has also been the increasing number of problems faced by Nepalese migrant workers in destination countries.

Labor mobility has been an essential feature of economic and social development throughout human history. In 2006, migrant workers in the industrial countries sent home more than \$300 billion, nearly three times the \$104 billion received as foreign aid by the developing countries. This figure exceeds the foreign direct investment to developing countries which stands at \$167 billion. Among the recipients, India ranks at the top with the remittance inflow of \$24.5 billion, followed by Mexico (\$24.2 billion), China (\$21 billion), the Philippines (\$14.6 billion), and Russia (\$13.7 billion). Labor migration for overseas employment has rapidly increased, particularly after globalization. The Nepalese economy is increasingly dependent on remittance sent home by

migrant workers. When the country's major economic indicators do not display a good picture, remittances have played a vital role in keeping the economy afloat. According to the Ministry of Finance (2007), instability and insecurity are crucial problems for the low economic growth of 2.5%. Overseas migration and remittances have been instrumental in poverty alleviation and improving people's living standards.

8. 2016, Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)

Briefly Discuss about Nepal's Development of Underdevelopment with reference Chaitnya Mishra.

(चैतन्य मिश्रको सन्दर्भका साथ नेपालको अपविकासको विकासका बारे सङ्क्षेपमा छलफल गर्नुहोस्।)

Ans: Fine Print Inc. द्वारा प्रकाशित तथा चैतन्य मिश्रद्वारा लिखित पुस्तक *Essay on the Sociology of Nepal* अन्तर्गत समावेश लेख *Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective* (2007) मा नेपाल को अपविकासको विकासका विविध आयामहरूबाट गहन विश्लेषण समेटिएको छ।

चैतन्य मिश्रका अनुसार विकासलाई हाल सबै देशहरूले साभा र सबैभन्दा महत्त्वपूर्ण विषयमा रूपमा अझिगिकार गरेका छन्। राजनीति तथा अभ्यास दुवैको क्षेत्रमा विकासका सवालहरूलाई उच्च प्राथमिकता दिइएको छ।

विकासात्मक मुद्दाहरूको बुझाइ र अध्ययनबाट व्यक्तिलाई मुख्यता तीनवटा पक्षहरूमा सक्षमता प्राप्त हुने मिश्रको ठहर रहेको छ। **पहिलो-** त्रिकांस र अपविकासअन्तर्गत कायम कायम रहेका महत्त्वपूर्ण अवधारणाहरू बुझन मद्दत मिल्दछ। **दोस्रो-** वर्तमानमा थालिएका विकासका अभ्यासहरूमा अभ बढी पहुँच प्रदान गर्दछ र **तेस्रो-** विकासका वैकल्पिक आधारहरू खोज गर्ने सुझाव प्राप्त हुन्छ। विकासात्मक समस्याहरूको वैध अवधारणा निर्माण र बुझाइद्वारा भविष्यको विकासका अवरोधहरू पहिल्याइ उपयुक्त विकल्प निर्धारण गर्न समेत सहजता हुन्छ।

पहिल्याइ उपयुक्त विकल्प निर्धारण गर्न समेत सहजता हुन्छ।
‘हामी अपविकासको अवस्थामा छौं’ भने प्रसङ्ग वा तथ्यबाट हामीले के बुझ्नुपर्दछ? वा नेपालको अपविकास के हो? भने सवाललाई मिश्रले विशिष्ट ढङ्गबाट व्याख्या गरेका छन्। उनका अनुसार नेपाललगायत तेस्रो विश्व-अर्थतन्त्र भएका देशहरू (वा अनौद्योगिक देशहरू) को अपविकासलाई निमानुसार चरित्रीकरण गर्न सकिन्छ:

- i. श्रम, वस्तु वा सेवा तथा पूँजी/वित्तका आधारमा पूँजीवादी विश्व र क्षेत्रीय व्यवस्थामा बद्दो अन्तर्धुलन वा संयोजन।
 - ii. निर्वाहमूखी उत्पादनका परम्परागत साधनहरूको उत्पादन गर्ने क्षमतामा बद्दो कमी वा उत्पादन विस्तार गर्ने अति न्यून क्षमता।
 - iii. एजेन्ट बुझुआहरूको उदय र वृद्धि।
 - iv. राष्ट्रवादी तत्त्वहरू समावेश भएका तथा सामन्तवादी र अन्य परम्परावादी अर्थात् पूर्वपूँजीवादी संरचनाहरूसँग जोडिएका सबल राजनैतिक बन्धनका कारण राष्ट्रिय रूपान्तरण गर्ने दृष्टिकोण नभएका राज्य वर्गहरू।
 - v. पृष्ठक्षेत्रीयता र सिमान्तकृतताका कारण उत्पन्न भएका पारिवारिक, समूदाय-आधारित क्षेत्रीय र राष्ट्रिय एकताका सार्थक र संवेदनशील समस्याहरू।
- नेपालको अपविकासको विकासलाई चैतन्य मिश्रले निम्नलिखित ऐतिहासिक चरणहरूका आधारबाट विश्लेषण गरेका छन्:

उपर्युक्त सम्पूर्ण कालक्रमका घटना र विभिन्न विश्लेषणहरूद्वारा चैतन्त्र मिश्रले निष्कर्ष औल्याएका छ। नेपालको अपविकासको विकास बहुआयामी र बहुतहरूयुक्त (Manifold and multilayered) छ। विगतदेखि हुँदै वर्तमानसम्मका राज्य संयन्त्रले समेत अपविकासको विकासका अवरोधहरूलाई पार गर्न असफल भएको अवस्था छ। वर्तमान समयमा अभ्यास गरिएको विकासको नमूना र विस्तारित पूँजी सञ्चयीकरणले नेपालको अपविकासलाई सहजै निराकरण गर्न नसकिने तर्क मिश्रको रहेको छ।

8. 2016, Q. No. 2 (Long Answer Question)

Briefly Discuss about Nepal's Development of Underdevelopment with reference Chaitanya Mishra.

Ans: The article *Development and Underdevelopment: A Preliminary Sociological Perspective* (2007) by Chaitanya Mishra includes an in-depth analysis concerning several dimensions of Nepal's development of underdevelopment. This article was published by Fine Print Inc. on the book title *Essay on the Sociology of Nepal*, authored by Mishra.

According to Mishra, "development" is a notion that has enjoyed, at least for several decades, a seeming universal currency and legitimacy. It is also embedded in politics and a practice that has acquired a nearly universal exhortatory potential. Mishra argues that a valid conceptualization of the "developmental problem" would enable three principal aspects. *First*, shed the mystery embedded in the notions of development and underdevelopment. *Second*, assess current developmental practice more objectively, and the *third*, a valid conceptualization of the "development problem" would help us enumerate and analyze constraints against, and option for, what might be a good design for future development.

Mishra uniquely describes the question of what we mean when we say that we are underdeveloped or Nepal's underdevelopment? According to him, the underdevelopment of Nepal and other third-world nations may be characterized as follows:

- i. Increasing incorporation within the capitalist world and regional system in labor, commodities, and capital/finance.
- ii. Increasing loss of capacity to reproduce indigenous means of subsistence production, combined with a diminishing or deficient capacity to carry out expanded reproduction.
- iii. Emergence and growth of the comprador bourgeoisie (whose interests are closely tied with the world and regional capitalism) and the state class, which contains nationalist components. However, which cannot lead to a national transformation because of its strong political alliance with the feudal and other traditional, i.e., pre-capitalist structures and its fast-growing economic and financial ties with bourgeoisies.
- iv. Considerable and severe familial, community-based, regional, and national integration arising from peripheralization and marginalization. On the one hand, the successful resistance kept up by the state, the feudal elements, and the bourgeoisie to mass-based political development forms the other.

Chaitanya Mishra analyzes Nepal's development of underdevelopment based on the following historical phases:

i. **Past and Present: 1700–1884**

According to Mishra, 1700–1884 is considered when modern Nepal was created. At that time, there were pre-capitalist economies all over the world. Nevertheless, there was a wide variety of economic and political forms during this period in Nepal. At this time, Nepal has been divided into four economic zones: the Himalayan region, Eastern and Central hills, Western Hills, and Terai. These four sectors differed in primary production and land ownership, resource base, labor organization, economic system, market expansion, class diversity, and production relations. In the Himalayas, the economy was more dependent on Tibet. Reliance on import-oriented economies has also increased in the Terai and hilly areas. Due to the inability to increase production and strengthen the political system, the proper development of Nepal could not be ensured during this period.

ii. **Past and Present: 1845–1949**

During this period, Nepal's economy and development were somewhat more mature than before. At this time, competitive capitalism flourished in Nepal's urban areas. During this time, Britain emerged as a world power. Nepal's socio-political system was also adapting to the world-system. The impact of this process had far-reaching regional implications in Nepal. Rana Prime Minister Beer Shamsher assumed power to give the British-Indian government access to the Nepalese labor force. In addition to strengthening this provision, he had adopted a provision barring certain individuals from joining the Nepal Army at the request of the British government. The rulers after Beer Shamsher also laid special emphasis on labor flow and migration of workers abroad. This trend reduced productivity and increased Nepal's interdependent relationship.

iii. **Past and Present: 1950–1985**

During this period, diplomatic relations with Nepal were extended to many countries besides the United Kingdom and India. During the rise and expansion of world domination, Nepal also had diplomatic relations with the United States. By 1950, Nepal had established itself as a major recipient of foreign aid, and the labor force was put to good use as part of the global military. According to Mishra, the external flow of goods, labor, and capital led to deep peripheralization in Nepal. During this period, three-quarters of the households of hilly areas and more than two-quarters in the lowlands lived below the poverty line. During this period, some of the industrial giants of Nepal had established relations with the state machinery. According to Mishra, Nepal's political dependence increased after the Democratic Revolution of 1950, while economic openness and dependence were increasing.

From the above discussions, considerations, and facts, Mishra concluded that the facts of Nepal's development of underdevelopment at present, as one of its historical structural characteristics, are manifold and multilayered. It should be noted that these are facets only when underdevelopment is analyzed in a static frame, in a processual term. The constraints under which the present state alliance lives and the options it exercises or fails to exercise constitute a vital facet of the development of underdevelopment.

प्रशोधन गर्ने कार्य गर्दछन्। नेपालको कूल ग्राहस्थ उत्पादनमा औद्योगिक क्षेत्रको हिस्सा 10% मात्र रहेको छ।

iii. राज्य र अर्थतन्त्र (The State and the Economy)

ब्लाइकी, क्यामरून र सेडनका अनुसार नेपालको अर्थतन्त्रमा राज्यको उच्च महत्वपूर्ण र सार्थक भूमिका रहेको छ। राज्यले कर सङ्कलन गर्ने र राजस्व प्रशासनलाई व्यवस्थित गर्ने भूमिका निबार्ह गर्दछ। यद्यपी आर्थिक प्रशासन, कर र राजस्वका सन्दर्भमा राज्यले विगतदेखि वर्तमानसम्म (विशेष गरी वि.सं. 2007 को प्रजातन्त्र पुनर्स्थापना पाश्चात) समयसापेक्ष विभिन्न नीतिहरू निर्माण गरी कार्यान्वयन गर्दै आइरहेको छ। अर्थतन्त्र र सामाजिक व्यवस्थाको सुदृढीकरणका लागि राज्यहरू अवलम्बन गरिएका उपायहरूमा आर्थिक योजनाको प्रारम्भ, भूमिसूधार विकास निकायहरूको विस्तार, सडक यातायातको विकास आदि समावेश छन्। यद्यपी सन् 1956 मा औपचारिक रूपबाट प्रारम्भ भएका आर्थिक योजनाले उत्पादनमा पर्याप्त वृद्धि भने गर्न सकेको थिएन। प्रथम पञ्चवर्षीय योजना (1956–1961 AD) को समग्र परिणाम त्यति सन्तोषजनक रहेको थिएन। दोस्रो पञ्चवर्षीय योजना (1961–1965 AD) ले समेत सर्वसाधारण नागरिकहरूको आर्थिक अवस्थामा उल्लेख्य सुधार ल्याउन सकेको थिएन। यसरी नेपालका पञ्चवर्षीय योजनाहरूले समेत आर्थिक विकास र उत्पादनमा सार्थक प्रभाव पार्न सक्नेन्। यद्यपी शिक्षा, स्वास्थ्य, सञ्चारलगायतका क्षेत्रमा विगतदेखि वर्तमानसम्मको अवधिमा निकै सुधार आइसकेको अवस्था छ।

iv. अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीति र सहयोगी (International Politics and Aid)

ब्लाइकी, क्यामरून र सेडनका अनुसार विगत केही दशकदेखि नेपालको वैदेशिक सहयोग बढ्दो रहेको छ। भारत, चीन र संयुक्त राज्य अमेरिका मुख्य आर्थिक अनुदानकर्ता देशहरूको रूपमा रहेका छन् भने केही अन्य देशहरूले पनि नेपाललाई वैदेशिक सहायता उपलब्ध गराउने गर्दछन्। नेपालको वैदेशिक अनुदानको बढ्दो निर्भरताले अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय राजनीतिसँग, पनि नेपालको अनपेक्षित सम्बन्ध रहेको छ।

उपर्युक्त सम्पूर्ण विवेचनाका आधारमा निष्कर्षमा भन्न सकिन्छ कि ब्लाइकी, क्यामरून र सेडनले नेपाली अर्थतन्त्र र समाजको प्रकृतिलाई आर्थिक, सोमाजिक तथा राजनीतिक आयामका आधारबाट चित्रण गरेका छन्।

9. 2015, Q. No. 6

Discuss the nature of economy and society of Nepal from world-system approach with reference to Blaikie, Cameron and Seddon.

The research-based work by sociologist Piers Blaikie, John Cameron, and David Seddon *Nepal in Crisis: Growth and Stagnation at the Periphery* (2005) have analyzed Nepal's economy and nature of society through a world-system approach. This book's chapter three presents the nature of the economy and society of Nepal as follows:

i. Landlords and Peasants

According to Blaikie, Cameron, and Seddon, Nepal today remains overwhelmingly an agrarian economy with only about 5% of total employment outside agriculture. Most of the production in agriculture is undertaken by peasant producers whose primary objective is to provide enough for their consumption, the seed for next year, and pay their taxes to the state. The vast land grants made to nobles, victorious generals, and other favored state functionaries were abrogated during the last century.

and limited land reform was introduced in the 1960s. Nevertheless, there may require more prominent landowners to extract from those who work the land surpluses in the form of rent, a share of the crop, or occasionally labor. However, the independent peasantry is by far the largest producer category. Wealthier peasants and large landowners employ labor, usually on a seasonal or casual basis, or maintain tenants and sharecroppers, about 20% of the peasants being involved in sharecropping or renting some or all their land from a more prominent landowner.

With the increasing population pressure in Nepal and the small size of most farms, particularly in hills, income from agricultural production alone is often insufficient to maintain the household. Therefore, local peasant production is supplemented by selling some of the household's labor, either on the other's farms or outside the agricultural sector. Whether in production or exchange, market relations remain of secondary importance within the Nepalese agrarian society.

ii. Commodity Production

Blaikie, Cameron, and Seddon contend that, even in Nepal's Terai, where large quantities of grain and other crops (e.g., mustard) are exported either to the hills of India, the number of farmers produced exclusively for the market is small. Among those producing for the market, there is a significant analytical distinction between the petty commodity producer, predominantly household labor to produce commodities on a small scale, and the large commodity producer employing wage labor to produce agricultural commodities on a large scale. The peasant household may have members outside Nepal in various forms of employment, which serve to support the household and enable peasant production to be maintained. However, commodity production in rural areas is not confined to agriculture alone. Small commodity producers in the countryside include producing crops for sale and industrial goods, like metalware, bamboo goods, and pots. The latter tend to be from specific groups of former artisans of so-called low caste status (tailor, blacksmiths, and leatherworkers in the hills), while the former came from a wide range of social backgrounds in terms of ethnic and caste origins. In rural areas, the larger non-agricultural enterprises are overwhelmingly involved in processing agricultural products, the vast majority being rice and oil mills. Generally, industrial production accounts for just over 10% of Nepal's GDP.

iii. The state and the economy

According to Blaikie, Cameron, and Seddon, the state's role is significant in the Nepalese economy. The state plays the role of collecting taxes and managing revenue administration. However, in terms of economic administration—taxes/revenue—, the state has been formulating/ implementing various policies from the past to the present (especially after establishing democracy in 2007 B.S.). Measures taken by the state to strengthen the economy and social system include the introduction of economic planning, expansion of land reform development bodies, and development of road transport. However, the economic plan, formally launched in 1956, did not significantly increase production. The First Five Year Plan (1956–1961 AD) was unsatisfactory. Even the Second Five Year Plan (1961–1965 AD) did not significantly improve the economic

condition of people. Thus, even Nepal's five-year plans will not have a meaningful impact on economic development and production. However, there has been much improvement in education, health, and communication from the past to the present.

iv. **International Politics and Aid**

According to Blaikie, Cameron, and Seddon, Nepal's foreign aid has grown over the past few decades. India, China, and the United States are the prominent donors, while some other countries provide foreign aid to Nepal. Due to Nepal's growing dependence on foreign aid, Nepal has also had an unexpected relationship with international politics.

Based on all the above considerations, it can be concluded that Blaikie, Cameron, and Seddon have sketched the nature of the Nepali economy and society from economic, social, and political dimensions.
