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1.0 Objectives

This Unit highlights the origin and achievements of the United Nations Organisation during the post Second World war era. After going through this Unit you will be able to learn:

- about the formation and functions of the UNO, a world body dedicated to the cause human peace and security; its objectives and its different branches;
- about UNO’s role in safeguarding human rights throughout the world;
- about its role in dealing with the vital issues of international politics like the Kashmir crisis, Congo crisis, Cyprus crisis and the Korean crisis arose soon after the World War II was over; and
- how far this world body of international peace and security was successful in restoring peace and justice in the world from 1945 to 2000.

1.1 Introduction

The trauma of the World War I was still fresh in human minds. The horrors and worthless destruction of the war reached high. Estimation of human as well as property loss was beyond the reach of human brain. Post war efforts to forge alliances among belligerent nations to save the world from the scourge of further war could be betrayed. Mutual distrust, aggressive nationalism and imbalanced power structure drove the world towards a logical front. The World War II was the ultimate reality. For the second time the intensity of the war, the use of new types of destructive weapons, the vast scale of casualties and destruction of property made the nations believe in the efficacy of truth and not on power struggle. The whole world now was anxious to scan the utility of establishing a well organized and more powerful world organization on the line of the League of Nations, of course, with a bigger dimension to infuse new hopes and confidence in the teeming millions for everlasting peace and security. The United Nations Organisation (UNO) was but the natural corollary to all such hopes.

1.2 The UNO

It is the nineteenth century world politics which facilitated the great realization of establishing an international organization dedicated to the cause of peace. The Congress System, Hague System, Peace Movement and Proliferation of the Universal Organizations created a climate for
formation of a League of Nations. As the horrors and worthless
destruction of the war reached high, there arose confirming notion among
the allied powers that to save the succeeding generation from the scourge
of cataclysmic world war, some sort of international organization should
be established for the preservation of international peace and cooperation. And the United Nations of Organization (UNO) was created by
meetings, declarations and conferences after the holocaust of the World
War II. The tempo came in the Opera House of San Francisco where the
fifty nations agglomerated, agreed and signed the UN Charter.

1.3 Formation

The League of Nations almost became ineffective by 1938. Due to
the aggressive activities of Japan, Italy and Germany and the
indifferent attitude of the other big powers the league became completely a defunct body. With a view to maintaining balance of
power, the big powers again divested to the Pre-War policy of alliances and regional pacts. The World War II broke out in 1939. For
the second time the intensity of the war, the use of new types of
destructive weapons, the vast scale of casualties and destruction of
property had made the people all over the world anxious for peace
and security and they felt the necessity of establishing a well
organized and more powerful world organization. Some people had
thought of the revival of the League of Nations. But most of the statesmen
of the world resolved to form such an organization which would be
able to infuse new hopes and confidence in the teeming millions for
everlasting peace and security. The United Nations was born out of
such anxiety and determination.

Few years before the end of the World War II efforts had already
begun for the establishment of an international organization in the name
of United Nations. In June 1941 the representatives of Britain, Canada,
New Zealand, Australia and South Africa proposed for the first time in the
London Declaration the establishment of an international organization in
place of regional pacts as the means of enduring permanent peace and
security. President Roosevelt and the British Prime Minister Churchill
issued a declaration known as the Atlantic Charter.

1.4 Objectives

The objectives of this UN Charter were to maintain international
peace and security; to encourage international cooperation in the sphere
of social, economic and cultural development of the world; to develop
friendly relations among nations on the principle of equal rights and self-determination of pupils and to recognize the fundamental rights and status of all people.

To achieve these purpose it was declared in the Charter that - (i) all the signatories to the Charter will recognize sovereignty and equality of all states big and small, (ii) they will peacefully settle all sorts of disputes instead of war or threats of war, (iii) they will help the UNO against secret treaties or violating treaties or engagements, (iv) in the case of determining the frontiers of a foreign country the signatories will not dishonour the opinion of the people of that state, (v) the people of each state will enjoy the right of drafting their constitution according to their own desire, (vi) in the sphere of trade and commerce and economy equal rights of all countries will be recognized, (vii) all the signatories will try to create a favourable condition for all nations so that after the fall of Nazi Germany they can devote themselves to the task of interval reconstruction in freedom from fear and want and (viii) all nations will equally try to preserve peace and security in the world by reducing armaments and ammunition.

In January 1942 representatives of 26 nations signed the United Nations Declaration at Washington which subscribed to the principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter. The signatories pledged to continue war against the enemy collectively and not to conclude separately any armistice with the enemy. In the Moscow Declaration of 1943, the Foreign ministers of Britain, USA, Russia and China confirmed the necessity of forming a general international organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace loving nations for the preservation of international peace and security. The Moscow Communiqué declared for the first time that "the signatories recognized the necessity of establishing at the earliest practical date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security". This Article laid down the foundation of the UNO. This was followed by the Teheran Declaration in December 1943 which welcomed all nations into a world family of Democratic Nations.

The next collective stage in foundation laying was done in the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in February 1944. After preliminary negotiations an informal conference of the major powers was called. The UN in its main features outlined the most difficult question with concern to Great Veto Power. In this conference an agreement was
reached on the principle but soon differences arose as to the extent to which veto should be allowed in the Security Council where a great power was a party to the dispute. There were other gaps on trusteeship and colonial territories as also Soviet claim to include all sixteen constituent republics of USSR as members of UN. These were referred to the view that the Big Three in impending conference at Yalta should take. At Yalta it was agreed that the veto would not apply to procedural matters, and that a party in dispute would not veto where peaceful adjustment of view was involved. But all the decisions involving enforcement of measures required Great power unanimity.

The San Francisco Conference was important in this direction for the second time in human history an attempt was made to recreate an international organization. The decisions were openly arrived at and were accepted by majority of two-thirds vote. The question of colonies was not resolved at Dumbarton Oaks. In the Yalta conference the Big Three had agreed that all existing mandatory territories, ex-World War II colonies and other territories should be placed under trusteeship. At San Francisco it came under fire and the result of the agreement ultimately reached is embodied in Chapter XI-XIII of the Charter. The veto came under fire of criticism of the smaller powers led by Australia and New Zealand. It seemed that this question of veto would ultimately wreck the whole conference. Fortunately, a compromise was found and this compromise did not change even a word of the Yalta Formula. Finally after overcoming few more hurdles, the U.N. Charter was ready for signature and by October 24, 1945 this was attained. The name United Nations was fixed upon to stress the continuity of the wartime alliance and the first meeting of the General Assembly followed in London on January 10, 1946.

1.5 Structure

In the beginning, the membership of the UN was 50 which increased to 159 in February 1985 with the inclusion of Brunei. On September 17, 1991 the UN General Assembly admitted seven new members whose entry into the UN would have been unthinkable at the right of the cold war. The new members were North Korea, South Korea, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania (Baltic States), Micronesia, and the Marshal Islands (Pacific Island Nations). The admission of these 7 states marked the biggest single influx since 1960, when 17 countries were admitted to the world body. Six joined in 1962 and another six in 1975. The three Baltic republics joined the UN within days of their gaining independence from the USSR. North
Korea opposed separate UN membership for the two Korean states on the ground that it would perpetrate their separation.

In 1991, however, the atmosphere had changed and both got admitted smoothly. The federated states of Micronesia and the republic of the Marshall Islands are the two Pacific Island-nations previously administered by the US as part of a UN Trust Territory.

Membership is open to all peace-loving states, whose admission is effected by the General Assembly upon recommendation of the Security Council. All members are obliged under both international Law and Article 2 of the UN Charter to fulfill in good faith their obligations under the Charter. Non-members have no obligation but may find themselves subjected to UN action if they disturb world peace. The UN is to enjoy in the territory of each of its members such privileges and amenities as are necessary for the fulfillment of its purposes; it has been given a legal capacity under Article 104 and has its own emblem and flag. The expenses of the regular UN budget are shared by member governments broadly according to their capacity to pay; the percentage of each member is decided by the Assembly. With the march of years the UN has been put under serious financial strain and its operations in the such crisis (1956) and in the Congo (1960-63), rendered the organization almost bankrupt.

The United Nations is composed of six chief organs. They are (1) the General Assembly (2) the Security Council, (3) the Secretariat (4) the Trusteeship Council, (5) the Economic and Social Council, and (6) the International Court of Justice.

1.5.1 The General Assembly

One of the principal organs of the UN is the General Assembly which consists of all the members of the UN. Each state sends five representatives but can cast only one vote. Each member may have advisor and experts as may be required. The Assembly meets in regular sessions and for each session one President and seven Vice-Presidents are elected. Special sessions could be convened at the request of the majority of the members or of the Security Council. Each member of the General Assembly has got one vote. The Assembly meets through seven main committees in which every member is represented by one delegate- Political; Security; Economic and Financial; Social, Humanitarian and Cultural; Trusteeship; Administrative and Budgetary; Legal and a Special Political Committee, a General Committee
charged with the task of coordinating the proceedings of the Assembly, and a credentials committee which verifies the credentials of the delegates. The General Committee consists of 21 members - the President of the General Assembly, 13 Vice-Presidents and the Chairman of the 7 Main Committees. The Assembly has also two Standing Committees - an Advisory Committee on administration and budget and a committee on contributions. The Adhoc bodies could be set up when necessary to deal with specific questions - e.g. the Disarmament Commission, the Interim Committee of the General Assembly, the International Law Commission, the Peace Observation Commission etc.

The Assembly is entitled to discuss any matter within the scope of the Charter. For decisions on important questions a two-third majority is required and on other questions a simple majority of members present and voting. The Assembly also receives and considers reports from organizations of the UN including the Security Council. The Secretary General also makes our annual report to it on the working of the organization.

1.5.2 The Security Council

The Security Council consists of 15 members, each of which has one representative and one vote. There are five permanent members (China, France, the Soviet Union, Britain and USA), and 10 non-permanent members elected for two-year term and by two-thirds majority of the General Assembly. Retiring members are not eligible for immediate re-election. In electing non-permanent members, the Assembly pays due attention to representation from various geographical regions and to the contribution of members to the fulfillment of the aims of the Charter. Any member of the UN, not a member of the Council, is invited to participate without vote in the discussion of questions specially affecting its interests. The Council bears the primary responsibility for the maintenance of peace and security; it is also responsible for the functions of the UN in trust territories classed as strategic areas.

In the maintenance of international peace and security the Council can, in accordance with the special agreements to be concluded call for the armed forces, assistance and facilities for the member-states. It was to be assisted by a Military Staff Committee consisting of the Chiefs of Staff of the permanent members of the Council or their representatives. The Military Staff Committee, however, has not been established because of disagreement among major powers. The
The chairmanship of the Council is held for one month in rotation in alphabetical order by member states. The Council functions continuously and its members are permanently represented at the seat of the UN; it may, however, meet at any place that will best facilitate its work. The Council functions through two Standing Committees of Experts and on the admission of new members - and certain Adhoc Committees and Commissions such as the Subcommittee on Laws and the Truce Supervision in Palestine.

1.5.3 The Secretariat

The Secretariat of the UN is instituted on the model of the League Secretariat. The U.N. Charter has attached special significance to the Secretariat. Chapter XV (Articles 97 to 101) of the UN Charter deals with the Secretariat composed of the Secretary-General the Chief Administrative Officer of the organization and an International Staff appointed by him under regulations established by the General Assembly. While the Covenant said nothing about the functions of the Secretariat, the Charter is more explicit. The constitutional basis of the secretariat is thus the same as of other organs. It may be called as the executive and administrative arm of the UN.

The Secretariat prepares the ground for the meetings of deliberative organs (the General Assembly and the three Councils and carries out those decisions and policies "in the most efficient possible manner". Its importance lies in the fact that it is a continuing organ, a permanent body of career officials. It represents the permanent element in a constantly shifting society made up of conferences, Councils, boards and committees. The Secretariat, therefore, "transforms the UN from a series of periodic meetings of Assembly and Councils into a permanent and cohesive organization. Without the Secretariat the UN would be deprived of its centre of communication and coordination, its international core as distinct from the national character of the delegations which make up the Assembly and the Councils". The UN Secretariat may be said to be the all-pervasive cylinder on which the UN machine functions. On the efficiency and honesty of the Secretariat largely depends the efficiency of the UN and the extent to which the objectives of the Charter are realized.

The Secretary-General is the Chief Administrative Officer appointed by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council. He is assisted by eleven Under-Secretaries-General and five Assistant
Secretaries-General. According to the UN Charter, the Security Council recommends and the General Assembly appoints the Secretary-General by a simple majority of those present and voting. In the Security Council a person to be recommended must be supported by at least nine out of fifteen members of the Security Council. Thus, the 10 non-permanent members collectively hold what is called as "the hidden veto" - the power to prevent action by any seven of them withholding support for a resolution and thus denying it the minimum of nine votes necessary for adoption. In the General Assembly, the recommendation of the Security Council must be supported by a simple majority, declares a matter "important" which under its rules would require a two-third majority to pass without which the appointment of the nominee of the Security Council would be blocked.

The procedure of nomination of the Secretary-General by Security Council was outlined in a confidential secretariat note issued in September 1991. At the formal meeting of the Council, the President submits list of candidates. The candidates are listed in the English alphabetical order. Representatives receive one ballot paper for each candidate, with the name of the candidate inscribed there on by the secretariat. Five ballot papers are marked "Permanent Member" and 10 "Non-Permanent Member". Members mark each ballot with a black pen provided by the Secretariat, putting a 'X' in one of the boxes marked Yes, No or Abstain. The vote begins with the first candidate on the list and continues until the Council has voted on all candidates. The President announces the total result of the voting on each candidate after counting.

The UN Secretariat has eight departments: Political and Security Council Affairs; Economic Affairs; Social Affairs; Trusteeship and Non-Governing Territories; Administrative and Financial Services; Conferences and General Services; Public Information; and Legal. In addition, there is an Executive Officer for the Secretary-General to coordinate his work. The Department of Technical Assistance Administration (DTAA) was created in 1950. Each of these departments has sub-divisions.

Six basic features characterize the Secretariat of the UN. First is the international loyalty of the personnel, or an international outlook. Secondly, the Secretariat personnel is independent otherwise they would not be loyal to the UN. Thirdly, the staff positions are sufficiently spread among countries, races and regions of the world. Fourthly, the International Civil Service has security of tenure which attracts talents and is not unresponsive to changing world
conditions. Fifthly, it is governed by rules of conduct enjoining dignity, integrity, impartiality, independence, reserve and fact so that international status may not be undermined. Finally, the Secretariat staff enjoys certain immunities and privileges but, at the same time, each member has to perform his or her private obligations, observe laws and public regulations.

1.5.4 The Trusteeship Council

Article 86 of the Charter established a Trusteeship Council to look after the interests of the people in Trust territories. On the Council are all the UN members that hold the Trusteeships and as many other members elected for three-year terms by the General Assembly as may be necessary or ensure that the total number of members of the Trusteeship Council is equally divided between these members of the United Nations which administer Trust territories and those which do not.

The powers of the Trusteeship Council as defined by Articles 87 and 88 are three-fold. Firstly, it submits questionnaires and accepts reports from administering authorities. Secondly, it accepts petitions, and thirdly, it provides for periodic visits to the respective Trust territories. Since it began its work the Trusteeship Council has successfully increased its right of supervision. This has been however, a gradual shifting from the original anti-colonialism to an acceptance of "a positive responsibility". The Assembly under whose authority the Council works is however, influenced by the Afro-Asian states. They exert a growing pressure for anti-colonialism and gradual independence of the Trust territories. Of the eleven Trust territories British Togoland, French Cameroon and Togoland and Italian Somaliland achieved freedom in 1960. Tanganyika and Western Samoa achieved independence by the end of 1961 and the independence of Rumania and Southern Cameroons followed shortly. Some of the former administering states, like Italy, no longer remained members of the Council and the non-administering members naturally gained preponderance in the Council. Each territory is held under a Trusteeship Agreement directed by Article 77 of the Charter. The terms of the Trusteeship agreement vary, but they all conform to Article 76. They confer the right of supervision on the U.N. These agreements are to be approved by the General Assembly. The strategic Trust territory of Samoa was however, under U.S.A. And it was excluded from Assembly supervision. U.S.A. has excluded UN Observers from this territory.
The Trusteeship Council which is under the authority of the General Assembly is entrusted with greater authority in the supervision of administered territories than the permanent mandates commission. The commission was under the League Council. But excepting the strategic areas all other administered areas are supervised by the Assembly through the Trusteeship Council. The UN has right to send missions to look over the Trust territories. This right did not exist under the League mandate system. The Trusteeship system is considerably broader in scope and gives the administration of these territories a much more expensive supervision than under the League.

1.5.5 Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

The Economic and Social Council was conceived as co-coordinator of the activities of the several specialized agencies which are created to undertake economic and social welfare activities. The ECOSOC is itself a specialised agency. It has therefore a dual role to play. It has been placed under the supervision of the General Assembly to which it must submit draft conventions. It covers virtually the same sphere of activities which falls under the jurisdiction of the Economic and Financial Committee and the Social Committee of the Assembly. Thus instead of a policy framing body it has become a duplicate organization.

The ECOSOC is made up of 18 members elected by the Assembly. Each year the Assembly elects six members for a term of 3 years. In the first election the term of six members expired after one year and of six others at the end of two years. A retiring member is eligible for immediate re-election.

The ECOSOC may make or initiate studies and reports with respect to economic, social, cultural, educational and health related matters and make recommendations to the General Assembly and the U.N. members and to the specialized agencies. These recommendations may concern promotion of human rights. According to the Article 62 of the Charter "It may call in accordance with the rules prescribed by the United Nations, international conferences on matters falling within its competence".

Much of its work is carried on by a number of commodities commissions and sub-commissions. In 1952 some of these were reduced or eliminated but since then others have expanded so that its work has remained as complex as before. First, it has a member of committees composed of members of the Council.
Secondly, it has functional commissions on such varying subjects as Human Rights, Narcotic Drugs, Transport and Communications, Fiscal, Statistical and Social Affairs, Status of Women, Population and International commodity. These commissions are mostly composed of experts. The studies and recommendations of the commissions are submitted to the General Assembly through the ECOSOC. Thirdly, there are regional commissions. The first of these the Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) was set up in 1947. In the same year the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East (ECAFE) was established. In 1948 a third one, the Economic Commission for Latin America (ECLA) came into being.

The ECOSOC coordinates the work of the specialized agencies. Article 63 states that the ECOSOC may coordinate the activities of the specialized agencies through consultation and recommendations. It obtains report from these agencies and communicates its observation on these reports to the General Assembly. With regard to ECOSOC’s right of supervision and control over these specialized agencies the Charter shows a tender regard to the sovereignty of these organizations some of which antedate the UN. Article of the Charter directs the ECOSOC to consult with non-governmental organizations concerned with matters within its competence. There are three categories. Category 'A' has about a dozen organizations whose field of activities coincides with the activities of the ECOSOC. In category 'B' there are about hundred organizations and in category 'C' almost twice as many have been admitted on a mere 'register' for adhoc consultation. The Rotary International falls in the last category.

1.5.6 International Court of Justice (ICJ)

The International Court of Justice has been constituted on the model of the earlier world court. Practically all members of the UN are its members. Any non-member of the UN may join it on conditions to be set up by the General Assembly upon Security Council’s recommendations. Each member of the UN undertakes to comply with the decision of the court in any case to which it is a party. If its judgment does not go to the satisfaction of a party to a dispute. Then the aggrieved party may appeal to the Security Council. The court has jurisdiction over all international legal disputes and the legal cases of the member states. The International Court is composed of 15 judges elected for a nine-year term. Judges retire in groups of five every three years. Re-election is permissible. A state which is a party in dispute may demand that one of its nationals should be in the
panel of judges. The judges elect their president and vice-president and give decision by a majority vote. Nine judges constitute the quorum. The president casts his vote only in case of a tie.

The jurisdiction of the court extends only to states which agree to submit to its decision. States may or may not accept the optional clause. If they do so they promise in general to submit certain types of cases to the court if an opposing state also agrees to the court's jurisdiction. Thirty-eight states agreed to accept this clause by 1958, but many had done so with reservation. The United States has consented to adhere to this clause but at the same time declared that it should be the sole judge about what matters it will submit. The standard agreements however, include dispute about treaty interpretations, application of international law, existence about facts that may lead to breach of an obligation and damages payable for a breach of obligation.

The court has already decided a number of cases. For instance, in the dispute between Iran and Britain over the Anglo-Iranian oil company and the court decided that though Iran had signed the optional clause it was within its right in refusing to bring the oil dispute before the court. In another dispute between France and USA, the court decided against the claim of U.S. citizens to be tried by their Consul in any dispute with the Moroccans. In 1957 Egypt accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes that might arise out of the Canal Convention of 1888 or other treaty provisions regarding the Suez Canal. The court gave its ruling regarding the Right of Passage dispute between Portugal and India through Dadra and Nagar Haveli. The court gave Portugal right of sending civilians and goods but not military force or arms.

1.6 Specialised Agencies

The UNO encouraged certain other specialised agencies to come up under its fold. They were:

1.6.1 International Labour Organisation (ILO)

In 1946, the ILO was recognized as the UN specialized Agency responsible for international action in the field of improving labour conditions raising living standards and promoting economic and social stability. In the ILO each country sends four representatives; two of the government, one of labour and the other of the employers.
Representatives from the same country may not agree on an issue and cast votes opposing or supporting a resolution. Thus the votes from same country may be divided. The ILO was established in 1919 and is inherited by the UN from the League. The Annual conferences of the ILO accept conventions to protect labour and send them to different governments for ratification. Since 1919 it has promoted more than 300 such conventions and recommendations and received nearly two thousand ratifications. The ILO also submits reports on different matters concerning labour. Important among its activities in 1959-60 was the establishment of an Institute of Labour at Geneva.

1.6.2 International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD)

The IBRD popularly known as the World Bank was conceived at the Bretton Woods Conference in July, 1944 and began operations in June 1946. It provides funds and technical assistance to facilitate economic development of the developing nations. Its funds are derived from subscriptions from member countries, sales of its own securities, sales of part of its loans repayments and net earnings. It is primarily meant to be a lending agency to encourage productive investments. The bank is insufficiently financed. Its activities are influenced by political consideration and it has been affected by the cold war.

Its first loans were geared toward the post-war reconstruction of Western Europe. Beginning in the mid-1950s, it played a major role in financing investments infrastructural projects in developing countries, including roads, hydroelectric dams, water and sewage facilities, maritime ports, and airports.

The World Bank Group comprises five constituent institutions: the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), and the International Centre for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID). The IBRD provides loans at market rates of interest to middle-income developing countries and creditworthy lower-income countries. The IDA, founded in 1960, provides interest-free long-term loans, technical assistance, and policy advice to low-income developing countries in areas such as health, education, and rural development. Whereas the IBRD raises most of its funds on the world’s capital markets, the IDA’s lending operations are financed through contributions from developed countries. The IFC, operating in partnership with private investors, provides loans and loan guarantees and equity financing to business
undertakings in developing countries. Loan guarantees and insurance to foreign investors against loss caused by non-commercial risks in developing countries are provided by the MIGA. Finally, the ICSID, which operates independently of the IBRD, is responsible for the settlement by conciliation or arbitration of investment disputes between foreign investors and their host developing countries.

From 1968 to 1981 the president of the World Bank was former U.S. Secretary of Defence Robert S. McNamara. Under his leadership the bank formulated the concept of “sustainable development,” which attempted to reconcile economic growth and environmental protection in developing countries. Another feature of the concept was its use of capital flows (in the form of development assistance and foreign investment) to developing countries as a means of narrowing the income gap between rich and poor countries. The bank has expanded its lending activities and, with its numerous research and policy divisions, has developed into a powerful and authoritative intergovernmental body.

The World Bank and the IMF played central roles in overseeing free-market reforms in eastern and central Europe after the fall of communism there in the 1980s and ’90s. The reforms, which included the creation of bankruptcy and privatization programs, were controversial because they frequently led to the closure of state-run industrial enterprises. “Exit mechanisms” to allow for the liquidation of so-called “problem enterprises” were put into place, and labour laws were modified to enable enterprises to lay off unneeded workers. The larger state enterprises often were sold to foreign investors or divided into smaller, privately owned companies. In Hungary, for example, some 17,000 businesses were liquidated and 5,000 reorganized in 1992–93, leading to a substantial increase in unemployment. The World Bank also provided reconstruction loans to countries that suffered internal conflicts or other crises (e.g., the successor republics of former Yugoslavia in the late 1990s). This financial assistance did not succeed in rehabilitating productive infrastructure, however. In several countries the macroeconomic reforms resulted in increased inflation and a marked decline in the standard of living.

The World Bank is the world’s largest multilateral creditor institution, and as such many of the world’s poorest countries owe it large sums of money. Indeed, for dozens of the most heavily indebted poor countries, the largest part of their external debt (in some cases constituting more than 50 percent) is owed to the World Bank and the multilateral regional development banks. According to some analysts, the burden of these debts which according to the bank’s statutes cannot be
cancelled or rescheduled has perpetuated economic stagnation throughout the developing world.

1.6.3 International Monetary Fund (IMF)

The IMF came up on December 27, 1945. The Fund’s constitution was first amended on 28th July, 1969 creating special drawing right (SDR) and again on April 1, 1978 increasing the power of the Managing Director of the IMF to supervise national exchange rate policies. The fund is intended to promote international monetary cooperation and the expansion of international trade and exchange stability; to assist in the removal of exchange restriction and the establishment of a multilateral system of payments; and to alleviate any serious disequilibrium in member’s international balance of payments by making the resources of the fund available to them under adequate safeguards. The IMF in their latest survey of the World Economic outlook for 1984, released on may 8, 1984 noted that the current account deficit of the non-oil developing countries, measured in relation to their exports of goods and services, declined from 18.7% in 1982 to 12.6% in 1983 and that it stabilized at around 10% from 1984 onwards. This is a lower figure than at any time since well before the first round of oil price increases. The real economic growth in these countries was an average of 4.5 % during 1985-90.

1.6.4 Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO)

The FAO is an organization like the bank and the fund. It was floated in U.S.A." as a trial run in United Nations postwar collaboration. All F.A.O members are not members of the UNO. It holds its own conference after every two years and elects its governing body. It is affiliated to the UN through an agreement with ECOSOC. The special problem of the FAO is 'Hunger'. It sends technical assistance to different countries to grow more food, to control more pests, to increase the yield of farms, fisheries and forests. The FAO has primarily three fold functions: firstly, to gather, analyse and distribute information; secondly, to promote improved methods of production and distribution and lastly to render technical assistance. The FAO activities have brought the United Nations in active contact with millions of men. These activities undertaken by FAO differentiate the UN from that of the League. But measured against the need the activities of the FAO leave much to be desired. The FAO was established in 1946 with its headquarters in Rome.
1.6.5 World Health Organisation (WHO)

The WHO came into existence on 7 April, 1948 with headquarters at Geneva. It seeks to fight disease and improve the mental and physical health of everyone. It aims at the attainment by all Peoples of the highest possible level of health - a state of complete physical, mental and social well-being. It cooperates with the FAO on many projects, for instance in anti-malaria campaigns and joint nutrition programs. Its reward in eradicating plague, cholera and malaria in some parts of the world is well known. In communicative disease control the certification of eradication of small pox in Bangladesh in December 1977 was a major event. It also keeps under surveillance the world-wide spread of influenza. Its principal organs are the World Health Assembly, the Executive Board and the Secretariat. Its budget is approved in the General Body or Assembly which also elects its Executive of twenty four members. The Assembly appoints its Director-General on the nomination of the Executive. Since 1977, the WHO has set "Health for all by year 2000" as its overdoing priority. The WHO is leading a worldwide campaign to provide effective immunization for all children, since 1990, against six major communicable diseases. Besides, it has a massive programme to control AIDS and other diseases.

1.6.6 Universal Postal Union (UPU)

The UPU was established long before the establishment of the UN, i.e. in 1875 with its headquarters at Berne. This Union was carried forward and finally came under the jurisdiction of the UNO in 1948. It aims to organize and improve postal service throughout the world and to ensure international collaboration in this area. Among the principles governing its operation as set forth in the Universal Postal Convention and the General Regulations, two of the most important were the formation of a single territory by all signatory nations for the purposes of postal communication and uniformity of postal rates and units of weight. The original agreement adopted in 1875 applied only to letter mail; other postal services, such as parcel post and international money orders, have been regulated by supplementary agreements that are binding only on signing members.

1.6.7 International Telecommunication Union (ITU)

The ITU as specialized agency of the United Nations was created on January 1, 1948 with its headquarters at Geneva (now at Bern, Switzerland) to encourage international cooperation in all forms of
telecommunication. Its activities include maintaining order in the allocation of radio frequencies, setting standards on technical and operational matters, and assisting countries in developing their own telecommunication systems. It works to co-ordinate the use of telephone, radio and telegraph with uniform regulations, cost and safety measures throughout the world and to facilitate the improvement and efficient use of them.

1.6.8 International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO)

The ICAO came up in 1944 with its headquarters at Montreal. Its activities have included establishing and reviewing international technical standards for aircraft operation and design, crash investigation, the licensing of personnel, telecommunications, meteorology, air navigation equipment, ground facilities for air transport, and search-and-rescue missions. The organization also promotes regional and international agreements aimed at liberalizing aviation markets, helps to establish legal standards to ensure that the growth of aviation does not compromise safety, and encourages the development of other aspects of international aviation law.

1.6.9 World Meteorological Organisation (WMO)

The WMO was established in 1947 with its headquarters at Lausanne. It seeks to promote the establishment of networks of meteorological stations, to encourage the establishment and maintenance of systems for the rapid exchange of weather information, to seek standardization of meteorological observations and uniform publication of statistics, and to further the application of meteorology to aviation, shipping, agriculture and other activities.

1.6.10 Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation (IMCO)

The Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organisation (IMCO), presently named International Maritime Organisation (IMO) is a UN specialized agency created to develop international treaties and other mechanisms on maritime safety; to discourage discriminatory and restrictive practices in international trade and unfair practices by shipping concerns; and to reduce maritime pollution. The IMO has also been involved in maritime-related liability and compensation cases. Headquartered in London, the IMO was created by a convention adopted at the UN Maritime Conference in 1948. The convention came into force on March 17, 1958, after it was ratified by 21 countries, 7 of which were
required to have at least 1 million gross tons of shipping. Its current name was adopted in 1982. The IMO has nearly 160 members and is headed by a secretary-general, who serves a four-year term and oversees a Secretariat staff of approximately 300—one of the smallest UN agency staffs.

1.6.11 International Finance Corporation (IFC)

It is a UN specialized agency affiliated with but legally separate from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). Founded in 1956 to stimulate the economic development of its members by providing capital for private enterprises, the IFC has targeted its aid toward less-developed countries and has been their largest multilateral source of private-sector equity financing and loans. The IFC is headed by a president, who also serves as president of the World Bank; governors and executive directors of the World Bank also serve at the IFC, though it has its own operational and legal staff. Headquartered in Washington, D.C., its original membership of 31 had grown to about 175 by the beginning of the 21st century.

In financing private enterprises, the IFC makes loans without government guarantee of repayment. Its primary activities include providing direct project financing and technical advice and assistance, mobilizing resources by acting as a catalyst for private investment, and underwriting investment funds. Between 1956 and the beginning of the 21st century, the IFC provided more than $25 billion to fund projects in nearly 125 countries and arranged for nearly $18 billion in additional financing. In 2000 alone the IFC invested more than $4 billion for 250 projects in nearly 80 countries.

1.6.12 International Development Association (IDA)

The IDA is a United Nations specialized agency affiliated with but legally and financially distinct from the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank). It was instituted in September 1960 to make loans on more flexible terms than those of the World Bank. IDA members must be members of the bank, and the bank’s officers serve as IDA’s ex officio officers. Headquarters are in Washington, D.C. Most of the IDA’s resources have come from the subscriptions and supplementary contributions of member countries, chiefly the 26 wealthiest. Although the wealthier members pay their subscriptions in gold or freely convertible currencies, the less developed nations may pay 10 percent in this form and the remainder in their own currencies.
1.6.13 UNDP, UNCTAD, UNIDO, UWHCR and UNICEF

The UN Development Programme (UNDP) was created on November 22, 1965 with the amalgamation of the programme of Technical Assistance and the special fund. The UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) was set up by the General Assembly on December 30, 1964. It consists of all those states which are members of the UN, its specialized agencies or the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA). The Trade and Development Board is its permanent organ which meets twice a year. Its headquarters are at Geneva. The UN Industrial Development Organisation (UNIDO) is an autonomous body intended to promote industrialization and coordinate activities undertaken by the UN family since 1967. Its principal organ is the Industrial Development Board which formulates UNIDO’s policy and its programme of activities. Its primary function is to help accelerate the promotional and operational activities of the developing nations and to support them by relevant studies and research.

The office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) was established with effect from January 1, 1951 and since 1954 its mandate has been renewed for five-year periods. The General Assembly in November 1977 prolonged it until December 31, 1983 and in 1983 it was again extended up to December 31, 1989. The UN International Children’s Emergency Fund (UNICEF) was set up early as December 11, 1946 to assist child health, nutrition and welfare programmes under the supervision of the Economic and Social Council. Its work is financed through voluntary contributions from governments and donations from the public. For the man on the street, of all the United Nations Organisation, UNICEF is undoubtedly the favourite. This high popularity for UNICEF stems not only from the fact that it is dealt with the most valuable sections of the population - children but somehow it seems to touch the lives of so many people. The entire period of the UNICEF has been of triumph and utter despair.

1.6.14 GATT, INCB, WIPO and UPOV

The General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) was negotiated in 1947 and entered into force on January 1, 1948. It functions both as a multilateral treaty that lays down a common code of conduct in international trade and trade relations as a forum for negotiations and consultation to overcome trade problems and reduce trade barriers. The International Narcotics Control Board (INCB) was set up in 1961, taking over the work of the Permanent Control Board and the Drug Supervisory
Body created in 1925 and 1931 respectively. It started functioning in March 1968 and the convention of 1961 was amended in 1972.

The World International Property Organisation (WIPO) was created in 1967 and became operative in April 1970 as a specialized UN agency. It promotes the protection of intellectual property libraries, artistic and scientific works, performances of artists, phonograms and broadcasts, inventions, scientific discoveries, industrial designs, trade works, service marks, and commercial names and designation throughout the world through international cooperation. It also renders legal technical assistance to developing nations for the improvement of their intellectual property system. In 1961, the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) was set up primarily to ensure fair remuneration to the breeder of a new plant variety for his work.

1.6.15 United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO)

It is a specialized agency of the United Nations (UN) that was created on November 4, 1946 to promote international collaboration in education, science, and culture. Its permanent headquarters are in Paris, France. It is based on the principle: “Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed.”

Each member state has one vote in UNESCO's General Conference, which meets every two years to set the agency’s budget, its program of activities, and the scale of contributions made by member states to the agency. The 58-member Executive Board, which is elected by the General Conference, generally meets twice each year to give advice and direction to the agency’s work. The Secretariat is the agency’s backbone and is headed by a director general appointed by the General Conference for a six-year term. National commissions, composed of local experts, have been set up by about 180 UNESCO members and serve as governmental advisory bodies in their respective states.

Its functions include a study of the tensions conducive to war; the study of racial problems and East-West tension; study of the problems of international contacts and international means of communication; planning of educational reconstructions; rendering relief and rehabilitation; promotion of cultural interchanges in order to develop in all peoples awareness of the solidarity of mankind and inculcate respect for
one another’s culture; and promotion of international collaboration in the scientific field.

UNESCO’s initial emphasis was on rebuilding schools, libraries, and museums that had been destroyed in Europe during World War II. Since then its activities have been mainly facilitative, aimed at assisting, supporting, and complementing the national efforts of member states to eliminate illiteracy and to extend free education. UNESCO also seeks to encourage the free exchange of ideas and knowledge by organizing conferences and providing clearinghouse and exchange services.

As many less-developed countries joined the UN beginning in the 1950s, UNESCO began to devote more resources to their problems, which included poverty, high rates of illiteracy, and underdevelopment. During the 1980s UNESCO was criticized by the United States and other countries for its alleged anti-Western approach to cultural issues and for the sustained expansion of its budget. These issues prompted the United States to withdraw from the organization in 1984, and the United Kingdom and Singapore withdrew a year later. After the election victory of the Labour Party in 1997, the United Kingdom rejoined UNESCO, and the United States followed suit in 2003.

Besides its support of educational and science programs, UNESCO is also involved in efforts to protect the natural environment and humanity’s common cultural heritage. For example, in the 1960s UNESCO helped sponsor efforts to save ancient Egyptian monuments from the waters of the Aswan High Dam, and in 1972 it sponsored an international agreement to establish a World Heritage List of cultural sites and natural areas that would enjoy government protection. In the 1980s a controversial study by UNESCO’s International Commission for the Study of Communication Problems, headed by the Irish statesman and Nobel Peace laureate Seán MacBride, proposed a New World Information and Communication Order that would treat communication and freedom of information as basic human rights and seek to eliminate the gap in communications capabilities between developing and developed countries.

Most work occurs in Special Commissions and Committees convened with expert participation. Prominent examples include the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission, the World Commission on Culture and Development and the World Commission on the Ethics of Scientific Knowledge and Technology. The findings of these commissions are regularly published by UNESCO.
1.7 UNO and the Human Rights

The Charter of the United Nations (1945) begins by reaffirming a “faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small.” Though the UN was established fundamentally on the basis to restore international peace and security, it was charged with the duty of promoting higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development; and universal respect for, and observance of human rights and fundamental freedom for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion (Article 45 of UN Charter). It is to be discussed what actually UN has achieved for human progress and development in the lathe of declaring the Human Rights and the UNESCO.

To render justice to human rights and freedom, the UN appointed a Commission on Human Rights which drafted a Universal Declaration of Human Rights, as a "common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations". And this declaration was approved by the third session of the General Assembly on December 10, 1948, the first part of which reaffirms the political and civil rights and freedoms embodied in the American Bill of Rights and others and the second part enumerates the newer economic, social and cultural rights and freedom which have come to be recognised as fundamental to men. It is a beacon light for all mankind living in the dungeon of an emaciated civilisation.

For the first 20 years of its existence (1947–66), the UN Commission on Human Rights concentrated its efforts on setting human rights standards, believing itself unauthorized to deal with human rights complaints. Together with other UN bodies such as the ILO, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the UN Commission on the Status of Women, and the Commission on Crime Prevention and Criminal Justice, it has drafted standards and prepared a number of international human rights instruments. Among the most important of these have been the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights together with its Optional Protocols (1966; 1989). Collectively known as the “International Bill of Human Rights,” these three instruments serve as touchstones for interpreting the human rights provisions of the UN Charter. Also central in this regard have been the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (CERD; 1965), the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of
Discrimination against Women (CEDAW; 1979), the Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1984), and the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989), each of which elaborates on provisions of the International Bill of Human Rights.

The commission continues to perform this standard-setting role. Beginning in 1967, however, it was specifically authorized to deal with violations of human rights, and since then it has set up elaborate mechanisms and procedures to investigate alleged human rights violations and otherwise monitor compliance by states with international Human Rights Law. Thus, much of the work of the commission is now investigatory, evaluative, and advisory in character. Each year it establishes a working group to consider and make recommendations concerning alleged “gross violations” of human rights, reports of which are referred to it by its Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities (on the basis of both “communications” from individuals and groups and investigations by the Sub-Commission or one of its working groups).

Also, on an ad hoc basis, the commission appoints Special Rapporteurs, Special Representatives, Special Committees, and other envoys to examine human rights situations—both country-oriented and thematic—and report back to it on the basis of trustworthy evidence. These fact-finding and implementation mechanisms and procedures were the focus of the commission's attention during the 1970s and '80s. In the 1990s the commission increasingly turned to economic, social, and cultural rights, including the right to development and the right to an adequate standard of living. Increased attention has been paid also to the rights of minorities, indigenous peoples, women, and children.

In 1949 the UNESCO inaugurated a major programme of studies of racial discrimination which has attracted considerable attention and praise. Over the years the General Assembly, the ECOSOC, the Commission on Human Rights and other UN agencies have adopted stronger resolutions against racial discrimination in general and apartheid in South Africa in particular. In 1962 the Assembly established a special committee on Apartheid which has kept a vigilant eye on developments in South Africa and has recommended strong measures against the South African Government. The UNESCO seeks to stimulate a worldwide attack on illiteracy, encourage fundamental education, foster scientific research and promote the discrimination of scientific knowledge,
promote the cultural activities, improve facilities for mass communication and in general promote international understanding.

To reduce the rate of illiteracy world-wide the UNESCO in 1965 started its work on Pilot Mass Literacy Projects in eight countries. It was, in its major policies, assisting many countries to provide universal primary education for some 250 million children up to 1980. To help raise educational standards throughout the world it sends teams to various countries to plan with educational leaders of those countries long-term conferences on educational matters. In 1963 it established an Institute for educational planning in Paris.

UNESCO’s cultural activities extend from theatre, music, painting, sculpture, literature, architecture and other arts to philosophy and creative thought. It has sponsored campaigns to preserve historic and natural rights. Its role in the preservation of ancient monuments threatened by Aswan High Dam Projects in the UAR is really remarkable.

The UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) held at Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (June 3–14, 1992), generally known as the Earth Summit, to reconcile worldwide economic development with protection of the environment is noteworthy in terms of protection of human rights. The Earth Summit was the largest gathering of world leaders in history, with 117 heads of state and representatives of 178 nations in all attending. By means of treaties and other documents signed at the conference, most of the world’s nations nominally committed themselves to the pursuit of economic development in ways that would protect the Earth's environment and nonrenewable resources.

1.8 Achievements and Failures of the UNO

The responsibility of the UN is very wide as its ideals. Maintenance of world peace and security, settlement of disputes among the nations through mediation and peaceful means, conclusion of armistice among the warring nations, codification of international laws and their amendments, advancement of the human society etc. come within its purview.

During the first decade of its creation the UN did not achieve much by intervening in the international disputes. Yet it cannot be denied that the UN has earned credit in the midst of adverse situation immediately after the Second World War. It was proved in case of the League of Nations that no international organisations could achieve success unless the
members particularly the major members of an international organisation display an attitude of patience and cooperation. This norm is no exception with the U.N.

All important activities of the UN are being operated by the Security Council either independently or in collaboration with the General Assembly. The chief obstacle in the better functioning of the Security Council is its member’s right of veto. At the beginning, Soviet Russia created obstacles in the way of smooth functioning of Security Council by exercising the right of veto indiscriminately. By 1954 Soviet Russia had exercised this right in 57 cases whereas during that period France had exercised this right only on two occasions. The UN played its major role in the solution of the crises of Kashmir, Congo, Cyprus, and Korea.

Let us review the role of UNO in the following crisis.

1.8.1 Kashmir

The "Two-Nation Theory" of M. A. Jinnah, culminating in the partition of India was 'short, nasty and brutish'. Pakistan was a nation born in hurry, amidst crisis and carnage. However, M. A. Jinnah, the architect of Pakistan was betrayed of his dream. To him, it was only a moth-eaten Pakistan because it excluded Kashmir. But, M. A. Jinnah did not want to lose Kashmir out of Pakistan's hegemony. Kashmir was a prime economic prize. But on the other hand, the Independence Act of 1947 empowered the princely states to merge themselves at their own accord either with India or Pakistan. Hari Singh, the Maharaja of Kashmir, anticipated a civil war to break out between India and Pakistan if his state got merged with either of the countries. Hence, he followed a conciliatory agreement with both.

But towards the end of 1947, the chauvinistic attitude of Pakistan found its blatant manifestation in raging Kashmir. While the Maharaja could not decide whether to opt for India or Pakistan, his Kashmir was raided by the tribal raiders who were supported by the Pakistani soldiers. This fact has been corroborated by Sisir Gupta's book "Kashmir: A Study in Indo-Pak Relations". The strategy of the bellicose Pakistan was to force the Maharaja of Kashmir to join his hands with the former. The situation changed. The Maharaja, supported by Shaikh Abdullah, the leader of the National Conference, asked for Indian help. Since there was no constitutional tie, the Maharaja signed the 'Agreement of Accession' of Kashmir with India on October 26, 1947. But the Indian leadership
committed there a folly by outlining a condition of plebiscite to be held after the restoration of peace.

The inclusion of Kashmir with India rankled the air in Pakistan and the latter’s Government declared that it was “a fraud perpetuated on the people of Kashmir by its cowardly ruler with the aggressive help of the Government of India”. Furthermore, as Indians had promised to hold plebiscite, M. A. Jinnah took the claim of accession provisional. The issue of Kashmir, all of a sudden, became the cornerstone and keystone of Pakistan’s foreign policy. The Pakistanis attacked on the borders and the Indian forces were sent to Srinagar.

In November 1947 Lord Mountbatten, Viceroy of Independent India held a meeting with Jinnah to settle the issue of Kashmir, but failed. Again, on 8th December 1947, a meeting of the Joint Defence Council was held at Lahore in which J. L. Nehru and Lord Mountbatten participated, but the problem of Kashmir could not be solved. Finally, in January 1948 India took the case to the United Nations under the caption "Jammu and Kashmir Question" by P. Pillai, the Indian representative to UNO. He asked the Security Council to throw light on the Kashmir issue under Article 39 of the UN Charter and to tackle the some which was likely to endanger international peace and security.

The Security Council debated the issue and on 20th January 1948 passed a resolution in which there was a provision of the constitution of commission of three UN members, one Indian, the other a Pakistani and third one of the UNO itself, to look into the issue. The commission was to investigate the facts, according to the article 34 of the Charter and to smooth away the difficulties. After some preliminary investigations, the commission appealed to the Governments of India and Pakistan to issue ceasefire orders and withdraw their troops. It also suggested a plebiscite to decide the future status of the state. According to the proposals of the Commission:-

- Pakistan was to withdraw its troops stationed in the state of Kashmir;
- Pending a final solution, the territory to be evacuated by the local authorities under the surveillance of the commission;
- On notification by the commission that Pakistan was complying with these terms, India was to begin the withdrawal of the bulk of her forces in stages to be agreed with the commission; and
- Pending the acceptance of the conditions for the final settlement, the Indian Government was to maintain within the lines existing at
the moment of ceasefire, forces which were absolutely necessary to assist local authorities in the maintenance of law and order.

However, though India accepted the proposals, Pakistan turned down. India felt that washing of dirty linen in public would embitter the nations and lower the prestige of both the nations. Moreover, India thought that the world public opinion would stand by her side and the Security Council would dispose the dispute in a fortnight's time. Pakistan took a fortnight to reply the charges. In document II, Pakistan leveled fantastic counter charges against India complaining that the latter was guilty of genocide and of making persistent efforts to undo the scheme of partition. She also alleged that India had not given military shares and cash balances to her and the same had been occupied by India by fraud.

In the UNO, India's case was pleaded by Gopalaswami Ayyanger, assisted by M. C. Setalvad, Attorney General of India. However, the presentation of the case was tactless. The Indian representative instead of emphasizing Pakistani hand in the aggression, continued dilating on the Pakistani complicity and indulged in legal sophistry of differentiations between Pakistan and the invader and failed to secure the sympathy of the Security Council. Again reference to the plebiscite weakened the strong case, making it appear the accession was conditional. But so far as the Independence Act of 1947 was concerned that accession was quite upright since no provision of holding a plebiscite was there in it. The Indian representative failed to underline this point with weak argument. On the other hand, Mohammed Zafrullah Khan, the representative of Pakistan to the UNO with his dynamic oratory advocated for the Pakistani cause and convinced the members of the Council that Kashmir issue was the direct outcome of the scheme of partition. While India could not be clear that the Pakistanis were raiders, Zafrulla Khan could win the case.

The Security Council appointed a Five member United Nation's Commission for India and Pakistan (UNCIP) consisting of the representatives of Argentina, Belgium, Columbia, Czechoslovakia and USA to suggest acceptable solution. It submitted its first report on 13th August 1948 which was accepted by India but rejected by Pakistan. It made fresh negotiations with the representatives of India and Pakistan and made fresh proposals on 11th December 1948. Both the countries accepted proposals of the commission. In the meantime, the UNO changed the nomenclature of the resolution from the "Kashmir
issue” to “India-Pakistan issue” to which Indian delegate opposed. On the midnight of 1st January 1949, both of them went to ceasefire.

The UNCIP submitted three interim reports and in the third report it suggested that as the military situation had changed, the task of solving the entire issue be entrusted to one person who would act as a mediator instead of a commission. On recommendation of the commission, the Security Council appointed its President General McNaughton as mediator. He forwarded various proposals which could not make any breakthrough. On the 12th April 1950 the Security Council appointed Sir Owen Dixon of Australia to implement McNaughton’s proposals for the demilitarization of the state, but he too failed. Dixon’s proposals were not accepted. He submitted his report on 15th September 1950 suggesting the partition of Kashmir rather than holding on overall plebiscite which was rejected.

Towards 1950 it became a major crisis and ultimately the Kashmir crisis degenerated into a cold war. In the meantime, the NATO and CENTO had already come into existence and the membership of Pakistan in the NATO and CENTO brought much military aids to Pakistan and Pakistan wanted to exploit the western help in the UNO.

The discussion of Kashmir issue was once again resumed in the Security Council on 21st February 1951 with the submission of a joint draft resolution by the U.K and USA which curtailed the freedom of the wishes of Kashmir regarding its future occasion and left it completely on the mercy of the Council. Pakistan agreed to accept while India considered it as "extraordinarily objectionable". Again the Security Council appointed Frank P. Graham, Senator from Northern Carolina as the UN representative for India and Pakistan who suggested a direct negotiation between India and Pakistan. From 1953 to 1956, various futile discussions were held, but nothing tangible came out because of USA’s military aid to Pakistan.

But the year 1956 made a definite watershed on the Kashmir issue. India made a categorical statement that it cannot stand to the acid testing of holding the plebiscite. Pakistan exploited that situation asking the UNO to ask India to withdraw from Kashmir. It was also a crucial time for India for it had disapproved the Soviet intervention of Hungary and because of its role of a peacemaker in Suez crisis and so it was alienated from USSR’s and USA’s sympathy respectively. But on the wake of Bulgarian and Khrushchev’s tours to India, India won the sympathy of USSR.
While Pakistan firmed turned the international politics, for India there came Krishna Menon in 1957 who pleaded the case of India in the marathon session. Of course, the UNO was proposing to attempt to force upon India a highly unplayable resolution which sought the induction of UN force for holding plebiscite. The mischief was scotched by the Soviet veto. However, Krishna Menon made a strong plea and brought the UNO to the duck. The famous Four Power’s resolution was tabled by Australia, Cuba, UK and USA in February 1957 in 768th meeting of UNO. It was opposed by USSR. On December 2, 1957 one meeting was held which requested P. Graham to make recommendations and he submitted his report in March, 1958 suggesting a conference at the Prime ministerial level which was rejected by India.

In 1962, Zafrrullah Khan again in a letter to the UN wanted to draw the attention of the Security Council but Indian representative warned that the debate in UNO should be postponed considering the ensuing General Election. However, the Pakistani representative once again demanded the immediate session of the Security Council, and debates were held from 27th April to 4th May and from 15th June to 22nd June 1962. But USSR vetoed in the Security Council and so, no resolution could be moved.

The Sino-Indian war of 1962, the Indo-Pak war of 1965, further deteriorated the relations and Kashmir became a lingering issue. In 1964, the Kashmir issue was discussed from 1087th to 1093th, 1104th to 1105th and again from 1172nd to 1177th meetings. After two fruitless debates of 1964 of the Security Council, Pakistan felt that "without creating crisis in and around Kashmir the West was not prepared to oblige Pakistan by supporting her cause”.

After 1965's and 1971's war, Pakistan signed with India the Simla Agreement (Agreement made between the respective Prime Ministers Z. A. Bhutto and Smt. Indira Gandhi) on 3rd July, 1972, but the issue of Kashmir has remained a problem without any viable solution. In the post Simla Agreement period also Pakistan continued to harp on the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir. It also raised the Kashmir issue at various international forums including NAM Summits, UN Meetings, commonwealth Meetings and SAARC Summit etc. Pakistan too concluded agreements with China to gain support in her favour.

India’s relations with Pakistan showed some improvement in the first quarter of 1999 whereby the Indian Premier A. B. Vajpayee paid visit
to Pakistan through a bus journey to Lahore. The euphoria of Lahore Declaration to solve differences through dialogue lasted only for few months. The Kargil war of May 2000 between two countries was another manifestation of such differences over the line of control. In the subsequent years also Kashmir continues to be the key issue in India’s relations with Pakistan. While Pakistan on the one hand continues making efforts to internationalise the Kashmir issue, on the other hand continues to send terrorists to Kashmir and promote proxy war.

In short, the Kashmir problem became one of the monumental proofs to the partial attitude and failure of the UNO. The UN reports and debates on it add up to a fair-sized library. But nothing came out of it, except adding to the cacophony on the subject, making the confusion worse confounded. At the same time, not only has much water flowed down the Jhelum, but this and several other rivers have been rendered red in colour because of blood spilled in wars in 1965 and 1971. The UNO, instead of bringing a viable settlement, added fuel to the burning crisis of Kashmir and always pursued a Pro-Pakistani aptitude. As if, sometimes it gave the impression that the parties to dispute over Kashmir were not Pakistan and India, but India and West, trying to fan that Indo-Pak hostility. Really, it is a matter of great shock that the UNO, which should have stood as a solid bedrock of international peace to withstand all the disputes which should have acted as a beacon of hope and light hour of peace, has become a failure, and a ben of international rivalry. Had it not been so, Kashmir crisis might have been solved by the impartial stand of UNO. In fact, Kashmir has been a ‘prestige issue’ for both India and Pakistan.

1.8.2 Congo

In case of Congo crisis, though the UNO succeeded to little extent, in the long run, it had to tread a long and tortuous path. As if, the crisis of Congo was of the greatest acid tests for the United Nations. Congo was under the colonial bondage of Belgium. Independence was granted to the Republic of Congo on June 30, 1960. Politically backward, economically perished and bankrupt and socially diffused, this nascent Republic was threatened with dangers. It was an infant Republic combining all the backward physiognomies of a typical African backward state.

A month before the independence of Congo, elections were held to the Chamber of Representatives, the Lower House of the Congolese Parliament. Elections for six provincial legislatures were held at the same time. Even before holding of the elections, violence had
erupted in Congo and in the post-election era, the same trend continued. It was doubted that the Belgian Governor, Christopher Cornelis was intentionally creating disorder and fanning peace in the province of Katanga. Powerful Belgian business houses and Catholic Church interfered in the elections on the side of those personalities and political parties which were favourably inclined towards Belgium.

However, after the elections, though no single party could secure the majority, the Congolese Nationalist Party led by Patrice Lumumba emerged as the strongest single party in the Chamber of Representatives. But from the province of Katanga, the Congo Kat party led by Moise Tshombe could not get a single seat in the parliament. On 23rd June, 1960 ministry was formed under the new premier Lumumba and Joseph Kasavubu was appointed as President. But shortly civil disorder followed. Being dissatisfied on the trends of elections in his own area, Moise Tshombe, a puppet of foreign monopolies and 'self-styled' President of Katanga proclaimed "secession" of the rich mineral region of his province in contravention of the Congolese constitution.

To make the matter worse, Albert Kalonji also declared himself as the king of the independent South Kasai state. Added to these, as soon as the independence was proclaimed and a national government formed under Lumumba, the Belgian government launched a series of provocations and the organised an armed intervention against the New Republic with support from its NATO allies. Thus, the nascent nation was tottering on the brink of fragmentation and the crisis of Congo became burning towards the end of June 1960 and the civil war threatened the entire nation. Hence, the highhandedness of Belgium, drastic attempts of Kalonji and Moise Tshombe who only proved to be lackey of foreign monopolies went a long way to sing the swan song of Congolese independence.

On July 11, 1960 Lumumba appealed to the UNO for help and requested the Belgian government to withdraw her troops immediately which was blatantly turned down. The premier asked help from both American and Ghana governments but got no response in this regard. On July 13, 1960 the Soviet government condemned the imperialist aggression in Congo which was aimed at undermining Congo's sovereignty and trampling its independence. The USSR asserted that "any attempt to detach any province from the Republic of Congo is an unlawful and criminal act," dictated
by the mercenary interests of a handful of finance and industrial magnates of the colonial powers". Thus, when the Soviet Russia unconditionally condemned aggression against the Republic of Congo, the Secretary General of the United Nations Mr. Dag Hammarskjold called an urgent session of the security Council on the same day on July 13, 1960, but it failed to take any decision. The Secretary General used for the first time his powers under Article 99 of the UN Charter "to bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security".

On July 14, 1960 the Council met once again and passed a resolution asking the Belgian government to withdraw all its troops and promised military help to Congo to maintain law and order. It also authorised the UN Secretary General in agreement with the Congolese government to do everything to provide Congo "with much military assistance as may be necessary". The Secretary General proceeded to organise a United Nations Operation in Congo (UNOC) under the field command of Dr. Ralph. The Secretary General visited Congo and Katanga, but he returned to use the troops of the United Nations to suppress the Katangan secession.

The UN Secretary General Dag Hammarskjold and the UN command on the Congo headed by Andrew W. Cordier of USA, ignored the Security Council's decision and helped the colonialists. Hammarskjold refused to cooperate with the lawful Congolese government in restoring the latter's authority in Katanga province. Rather, the UN command obstructed the struggle of the Congolese government against the insurgents. It took over the government Radio station, Leopoldville Air port was occupied and capital's means of communication with other regions were made open in contravention of the Security Council's resolution and sanctioned Congo's division for the puppet authorities of Katanga who had the backing of the Belgian and other colonialists.

The USSR denigrated and debunked the Secretary General and deplored the attempts to depict the separatist actions of the foreign installed puppet regime of Tshombe which had usurped powers in Katanga by means of an uprising by imperialist interventionists against the lawful government of the Republic. On September 6, 1960, Lumumba told the foreign ambassadors in Congo that "from the very beginning Hammarskjold had been engaged in criminal subversion of the Security Council decisions of
the Republic of Congo”. In its statement of September 9, 1960 the Soviet Government qualified the actions of the UN command as in fact paralysing the normal functioning of the central Congolese government, as an attempt to replace some colonialists in Congo with others in the form of collective colonialism of the NATO states under the symbol of the Blue Flag of the UNO.

The Congolese Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba condemned the actions of the Secretary General and sent a memorandum to the Security Council urging it to recommend that the Secretary General and his associates in the Congo cease on direct or indirect interference in the Republic’s internal affairs.

The Security Council met several times to thrash out charges of unwarranted UN interference in internal Congolese affairs, but when all substantive resolutions were blocked by use of the veto, it was decided under the "Unite for Peace" resolution to hold an emergency special session of the General Assembly, only four days before the opening of the regular session. Finally, on September 20, a 17-power Afro-Asian resolution was adopted by 70 votes to none with 11 abstentions (Soviet bloc, France and South Africa) by which all previous Security Council resolutions were reaffirmed, an appeal was made for contributions to a United Nations Fund for the Congo (UNFC), all states were asked to channel all military assistance through the United Nations, and an African-Asian advisory committee was proposed to help the Congolese solve their political conflicts. The UN had never been confronted with an international salvage operation of such magnitude before.

On January 17, 1961 the crisis deepened when the deposed Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba was transferred to Elizabethville. The announcement by the Katanga Government on February 13, 1961 that he and two of his companions had been "massacred" by villagers after escaping from custody led to demonstrations in Afro-Asian and Soviet-bloc countries and several of them expressed their disapproval by extending recognition to the regime which Lumumba's political heir Antoine Gizenga, had set up in Stanleyville as the legal government of Congo. In February, 1961 the security Council met to discuss the continuing crisis. The Soviet Union submitted a resolution demanding sanctions against Belgium, the arrest of Katanga, Premier Tshombe and General Mobotu, the termination of the UN operations in the Congo within one month and the dismissal of the Secretary General. Despite intensive Soviet pressure the
Council rejected this resolution and on February 21 adopted without a dissenting vote a resolution sponsored by the United Arab Republic, Sri Lanka and Liberia which urged that all appropriate measures be taken including the use of force "if necessary in the last resort" to prevent the occurrence of civil war. The resolution also called for the immediate withdrawal from the Congo of all Belgian and other foreign military personnel and political advisors not under UN command.

Initial attempts to implement that part of the resolution dealing with the withdrawal of foreign advisers led to a deterioration in the UN relations with the Central Government. Clashes occurred between the UN troops and elements of the Congolese National Army notably at the Port of Matadi from which the UN personnel, including some Canadian communication troops were eventually forced to withdraw. The atmosphere gradually improved, however, and on April 17, 1961, President Kasavubu and special UN mission signed an agreement whereby the Central Government accepted the Security Council's resolution of February 21 and undertook to re-examine appointments of foreign personnel under their authority.

During 1962, most member states and the Acting Secretary General showed a growing awareness of the need for early action to improve the situation in the Congo. In consultation with a member of interested governments, U. Thant, the Acting Secretary-General developed a plan for national reconciliation which was pursued vigorously with the Congolese political leaders. The crucial issue continued to be the reintegration of Katanga and in view of instability in other parts of the Congo and the growing financial difficulty in which the UN found itself, it was desirable to bring about the reconciliation of the Congolese views. It was particularly disturbing, therefore, that just before the end of the year, fighting erupted in Elizabethville after the Katangese gendarmerie opened fire on UN troops. In 1963, the UN operations in the Congo continued. In the wake of the Chinese aggression on India, New Delhi was obliged to withdraw its troops from the Congo.

Ultimately on December 30, 1964, the Security Council passed a resolution binding all countries to refrain from the interference in Congolese internal affairs and prescribing the withdrawal of mercenaries from that country.
Thus, the role of UNO in the Congo crisis is somewhat mixed. If at the outset, it supported Congo's independence, in the middle, its modus operandi was dictated by power politics. However, to the relief and succour of humanity it could ultimately play an effective role under the secretary General U. Thant in bringing peace in the Congolese heartland. However, the cost to UNO was very great because it had to undergo a heavy financial burden, the death of its Secretary General, Dag Hammarskjold, bitter difference of opinion among the UN members. The hope of the whole world that it would act as an El Dorado for global peace, has been belied.

1.8.3 Cyprus

Along with the Congo crisis the UNO also played a significant role in bringing about a substantial solution in the Cyprus issue. Cyprus, a republic in eastern Mediterranean was annexed to Britain in 1914 by Turkey. Between the two world wars British rule was challenged by the partisans of 'enosis' or 'Union with Greece' but was never seriously threatened. The population of Cyprus included 77% Greeks and 18% Turks. The Turkish minority was a spectator of Anglo-Greek conflict, sometimes worried and sometimes not. At the end of the Second World War the British estimate of the value of Cyprus rose as a result of the retreat from Palestine and the British position in Egypt. The British assumed therefore that they would and should stay in Cyprus. The Greek Cypriots assumed the opposite. Discussions for a constitutional advance towards limited self-government were abortive. To the Greeks they were irrelevant.

In 1946 the exiled Bishop of Kyrenia returned to the island and in 1950 he was elected to the throne of 'autocephalous church' of Cyprus, which had been vacant during the years 1937-47. He took the regional name of Makarios III, and he became at the same time the national leader of the Greek community. Makarios was thus both the head of one of the most venerable of the Churches within the orthodox communion and also the leader of a modern nationalist movement which had challenged the Turks for a century and a half and was now to fight both Turks and British on this last remaining battlefield. In 1950, a plebiscite organised by the church returned the inevitable response in favour of 'enosis' and the Greek Prime Minister General Nikolaos Plastiras, equally inevitably responded to it in a tone of mixed encouragement and moderation. About the Greekness of Cyprus no Greek bothered to think twice. Four Cypriots in five were Greek by race, tongue and religion, and called themselves Greek.
The Turkish section of the population was no less active to the Greekness of the island but it naturally drew opposite conclusions. The Turkish state also feared ‘enosis’ because Cyprus was only forty miles away from the southern Turkey. The Turkish Governments showed, however little inclination to intervene in Cypriot affairs until encouraged to do so by Britain.

In 1954 Makarios went to Athens to try to get the Greek government to raise the Cypriot question at the UNO. The British Prime Minister, Sir Anthony Eden told that no discussion was possible; a junior British minister with a lamentable sense of history declared that Cyprus would never be fully independent; and the colonial secretary affronted the Greek government by advancing as an extra reason for the maintenance of British rule the argument that Greek was too unable to be allowed safely to extend its sway to Cyprus. The Greek government then raised the question of self-determination for Cyprus at the UN but half-heartedly and without pressing the case, which was shelved. The enotists, disappointed by this effort, reverted to the local scene and organised demonstrations which evoked an excessive British counter reaction including measures against school children. In 1955 Eden and his Foreign Secretary Harold Macmillan decided to fortify the British opposition in Cyprus by bringing the Turkish government officially into the matter. The Greek and Turkish governments were invited to a conference in London. The result was the collapse of the Greco-Turkish alliance.

In Cyprus the governor and the archbishop met for the first time. At the end of the year the governor was replaced by Sir John Harding, a field-marshal and a former chief of the Imperial General staff. The Harding-Makarios negotiations were proceeding early in 1956 towards a promising conclusion when the British government intervened and decreed the deportation of the archbishop to the Seychelles. But Makarios was released in the following year, much to the annoyance of the Turks and without any compensating advantage since the archbishop refused to return to Cyprus and took up residence in Athens.

The British attempt to quell the insurrection, in the meantime was equally unsuccessful. This revolt was led by Colonel Georgios Grivas of the Greek army, a Cypriot by birth. He was outraged to discover the fact that despite the UN Charter and frequent British promises in the past, Britain had no intention of allowing the Cypriots to choose how and by whom they should be governed. Like Count Cavour of Italy after the Crimean War of 1854, Grivas took the view that his compatriots
had paid for self-determination with their blood and when he saw that the British view was different he set about shedding more blood. He decided according to his own account, to resort to violence in 1951. He launched his revolt in April 1955, survived a drive against him at the time of Makarios’s deportation in March 1956 and immediately struck back. His main weapons were bush craft, discipline and terrorism. He provoked the British into retaliatory measures which failed. He defeated the policy which Harding had been sent to implement.

Later in the year while Makarios was in the Seychelles and the Harding-Grivas duel was taking place, the first Greco-Turkish riots also occurred and the British government began, although unintentionally to transfer the initiative from London to Ankara and Athens. During 1956 Eden produced a plan by which Cyprus would be allowed self determination after ten years of self-government. The Turkish government rejected the plan. Later in the same year new constitutional proposals, elaborated by an eminent British judge, Lord Radcliffe, were submitted to the Turkish and Greek governments. The Radcliffe plan rejected self-determination and mentioned partition. It was this time rejected by the Greeks, while Turkey was emboldened to suggest that either half of Cyprus or the whole of it should be annexed to Turkey.

The Greeks thoroughly alarmed, threatened to leave the western camp. In 1957 General Dismay, the Secretary-General of NATO, offered to mediate, but although the Turks were willing the Greeks were not. The Turks believed that a majority of the members of NATO were sympathetic to Turkey; the Greeks believed that their cause would prevail in the UN but not in NATO. There was deadlock internationally and continuing disorder and murder locally. The government of Harold Macmillan reviewed Eden’s Cyprus policy and decided that Britain no longer needed to be sovereign in the whole of Cyprus. He realized that sovereign bases would do and the Greek and Turkish governments must be brought to accept independence for the rest of the island. For Turkey independence was acceptable since it automatically excluded enosis. Upon Greece independence might be forced, since Greece abominated partition and was afraid that in the absence of a settlement Greeks in Istanbul and other parts of Turkey would be stripped of their property and either killed or expelled.

In December 1957 Harding was replaced by Sir Hugh Foot who produced a new plan: self-government as a colony for a period followed by self-determination with the provision that enosis would need Turkish approval. The mention of enosis was too much for the Turks and
demonstrations were organised in Ankara. The Foot plan disappeared. It was succeeded by the Macmillan plan which was a further step away from undiluted British rule. Macmillan proposed to introduce representatives of the Greek and Turkish governments alongside the British governor and to create a mixed cabinet and separate Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot local administrations. The last provision was unacceptable both to Makarios and to the Greek Prime minister, Constantine Karamanlis. Their rejection of it led to fresh riots in Cyprus.

The spreading communal hatred shocked and alarmed the Greek and Turkish governments into an accord. After exploratory contacts at the UN and NATO between their foreign ministers they conferred together in Zurich in February 1959 and announced that they had agreed that Cyprus should be independent. Britain would be accorded sovereign rights in certain areas which would be British military bases. The new state would have a Greek President, a Turkish Vice-President with a veto in certain matters, and a cabinet of seven Greeks and three Turks; this 7-3 proportion would be repeated right down the administrative ladder. The Greek and Turkish states would station small armies of 950 and 600 men respectively in Cyprus. The scheme was accepted with reluctance by Makarios, who declared it unworkable. He was threatened and on 1 March 1959 he returned to Cyprus. Grivas, infuriated by the politicians’ betrayal of the cause of enosis, was set back to Athens. Instead of driving the British out and making Cyprus part of Greece, his campaign had ended with the British still in possession of sovereign bases and Cyprus still not part of the Greek Kingdom. Cyprus became independent in August 1960, a member of the UNO in September 1960 and a member of the Commonwealth in 1961.

The issue of Cyprus first came before the UN in 1955 when Greece insisted that the island be transferred to her. Greece made every possible effort to place the question of Cyprus on the agenda of the General Assembly, but she did not succeed. On the other hand, the Britishers made the plea that they were trying their best to afford to the people of the Cyprus the self-government. Ultimately the issue came before the session of the General Assembly and it adopted a resolution calling for continued negotiations.

The island got independence in 1960, but in view of the complex character of the population of the island, a number of safeguards were introduced. Three states- Greece, Turkey and Britain were given specific responsibility for the maintenance of tranquility
and internal peace. The USSR cordially welcomed the proclamation of the independence of Cyprus following a selfless struggle of the island’s population against the British colonial rule. However, the Russians deployed over Cyprus forced acceptance of the Zurich agreement which substantially limited the Cyprus Government’s rights by giving Britain, Greece and Turkey, some reserved right to interfere in the new republic’s internal affairs.

Towards the December 1963 the tensions between the Greek and the Turkish Cypriots burst out in the shape of riots which posed a serious threat to the world peace and created a confrontation between Greece and Turkey, the two NATO allies. Efforts were made to resolve the deadlock and in 1964, the representatives of Greece, Turkey, Cyprus and the United Kingdom met in London. But the conference could bring no viable solution.

On March 4, 1964 at the request of Cyprus and United Kingdom, the Security Council took initiatives and recommended the resolution of establishing a peace-keeping force and appointing a mediator. However, mindful of the Congo experience the Council suggested that all the costs be met by the states. In April the UN Force in Cyprus (UNFICYP) was constituted under an Indian General Gianni and subsequently under his compatriot General Thimayya and after his death in 1966, this was led under the Finnish General A. E. Martola. This force gradually asserted control, but due to its limited members and limited authority, the UNFICYP was unable to stop the fighting or to disarm the irregular forces. Two UN mediators tried but failed, where upon the Turkish and Greek governments insisted on assuming the role but did very little about it.

Year after year, and twice in each year, the mandate of the peacekeeping force was renewed by the UN who feared the consequences of saving money by removing it. Talks between the two communities were started and stopped more than once. A further complication developed in Cyprus when the General Grivas, leader of the Greek Cypriots returning to Nicosia in 1971 and his staunch advocacy of enosis brought him into the conflict with the President Makarios, who was regarded as a troublesome red priest combining the Presidential and archiepiscopal offices within his own hand. However, he was once again re-elected to the presidential office without opposition in 1973. In July 15, 1974, Makarios was attacked in his palace by the National Guard and action military junta. He escaped in a helicopter with British help and was flown
to England. The insurgents proclaimed Nikos Samson as the next President, a choice as unwise as it was unsuitable as Samson had been a notorious gunman and had to resign at the end of a week. Consequently Turkey invaded Cyprus five days after the coup against Makarios. A ceasefire was imposed two days later and the next day the junta in Athens collapsed.

The three guarantors- Greece, Turkey and Britain met at Geneva. Turkey's attitude was threatening but realistic: either there must be a new constitution acceptable to Turkey or Cyprus would remain de facto partitioned. The constitution proposed was a loose confederation not far short of independence. The talks were broken off. The Turks attacked again, occupied 40 percent of the island in two days and turned 200,000 Greeks into homeless refugees. The American ambassador in Nicosia was murdered by Greeks. The British too were criticized violently in Cyprus and in Greece for not doing more as a guarantor to restore peace in Cyprus. Makarios returned at the end of year, 1974. Cyprus was in effect partitioned but nobody was prepared to say so and its affairs were therefore back to inter-community talks, hampered by the emotions of war, charges and counter-charges of atrocities, the plight of refugees, economic disruption and the unreality of any attempt to restore the integrity and independence of Cyprus with a Turkish army in control of a large part of it. Makarios, who died in 1977, was succeeded by Spyros Kyprianou.

The UN had dispatched its peace-keeping force in Cyprus in 1974 to prevent fighting between the Greeks and the Turks. The force consisted of 2,348 troops and civilian police from Australia, Britain, Canada, Denmark, Finland, Ireland and Sweden. The UN committed itself to full support for sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity, unity and nonalignment of Cyprus. The 1979 General Assembly called for cessation of all foreign interference in its affairs. On November 20, 1979 it supported the ten-point agreement of May 19, 1979 concluded under the auspices of the UN Secretary General and demanded immediate implementation of UN resolutions.

On November 15, 1983 the Turkish Cypriots declared their sector of the divided island independent (UDI) and rename it as "the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus". Cyprus, as stated earlier, had been divided between Greek and Turkish sectors since, 1975. The Turkish troops had invaded and occupied the northern part of the island on July 20, 1974 after a Greek Cypriot coup that toppled the government of Makarios. On February 13, 1975, the
Turkish Cypriot Federated state was proclaimed. But its new President, Denktash had said that he would not seek international recognition of the entity. For ten years (1975-85) the two communities have held intermittent talks under the UN auspices to try to work out a settlement through a new constitution.

On November 18, 1983 the UN Security Council condemned the Unilateral Declaration of Independence (UDI) and declared the self-styled Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus as "legally invalid" and called for its withdrawal. While the Greeks welcomed the Security Council resolution, the Turks condemned it. On December 15, 1983 the Council extended the period of UNFICYP stationing upto June 15, 1984.

Early in May 1984, Turkey and the so-called Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus exchanged ambassadors. The President of Cyprus, Spyros Kyprianou moved the Security Council again. On May 11, 1984 the Council in a resolution condemned all secessionist actions and declared the aforesaid exchanges of ambassadors as illegal and called for their immediate withdrawal. India took the stand that while the legitimate right of the Turkish Cypriots must be respected, the UDI and the exchange of ambassadors was unacceptable. The role of the UN in Cyprus has, therefore, been one of mediation between two warring communities. The trouble however, continued.

Kyprianou lost his bid for a third term in 1988 to an independent candidate, George Vassiliou. He in turn lost by a narrow margin in 1993 to Clerides, a rightist, who was re-elected in 1998. At first Clerides showed no willingness to deal with the Turkish Cypriot leader Denktash, but the two eventually met in New York City under UN auspices. The government of the Republic of Cyprus (composed solely of Greek Cypriots) began applying for membership to the European Union (EU) in 1990, though its admittance was repeatedly blocked by Turkey and its supporters.

In late 2002 the European Union (EU) offered Cyprus membership in its organization on the condition that reunification talks conclude by March 2003 (barring reunification, membership would go to the Greek Cypriot portion of the country only). Just weeks before the March deadline, Tassos Papadopoulos defeated Clerides and assumed the presidency of the Republic of Cyprus, but no agreement was reached. The following month TRNC leaders relaxed restrictions along the Green Line that divided the island, and, for the first time in some 30 years, Cypriots moved with relative freedom throughout the country. Led by Papadopoulos, in 2004 the Greek Cypriot community overwhelmingly
rejected a UN-backed reunification plan; as a result, Greek Cyprus alone was admitted to the EU in May 2004.

Hence, in case of issue of Cyprus the role of UNO was somewhat beneficial. To quote Palmer and Perkins, “The United Nations’ force has been helpful in spite of the difficulties which it has encountered in preventing a major explosion on Cyprus and the UN has done what it can to persuade the powers most directly concerned to avoid intervention and to resolve their differences peacefully.”

1.8.4 Korea

While the world focused high hope on UNO, the UNO became a mere spectator and in various crises it played only limited role. It was in case of the Korean crisis that the UNO exhibited a lukewarm effort and recorded failures. Though the Korean crisis started as a cold war, it escalated into a hot war later on and for the first time to implement the idea of collective security, the UNO used its armed intervention which was paradoxically contrary to UNO Charter. For the first time after Second World War it showed the dimension of a cold war that undermined the prestige of UNO to a degree.

The history of Korea is like the history of any small country which finds itself wedged between more powerful neighbours. Korea is a peninsula which stretches into the sea from the South eastern corner of Manchuria until it nearly reaches the southern most of Japan’s principal islands. For a thousand years it was ruled by two dynasties separated by a brief Mongol conquest. It suffered Japanese and Manchu incursions in the 16th and 17th centuries but survived until the end of the 19th, by which time it had become a pawn in Sino-Japanese-Russian conflicts. Japan’s victories in the war with China in 1894-95 and with Russia in 1904-05 gave Japan a free hand in Korea which was annexed in 1910. It failed in 1919 to recover its independence although a provisional government was established under the Presidency of Syngman Rhee, a Korean who had acquired a doctorate in philosophy at Princeton.

While the Second World War was going on, the question of the future of Korea was discussed and at the war-time Cairo Declaration of 1943, the USA, China and Great Britain represented respectively by Roosevelt, Chiang Kai-shek and Churchill agreed that Korea, in due course, should become independent. When the USSR entered the war, it also accepted the aforesaid provision and her entry to war hastened the Japanese militarism. As for military convenience it was
decided that USSR should accept the military defeat of Japan in Korean north of the 38th parallel and USA should accept the defeat of Japanese forces in Korean south of 38th parallel. However, the very line, which was drawn for military convenience became a dividing line for Korea, an anathema for their unity and thus were created two Koreas, north and south under the Soviet and United States occupation respectively. The unification of Korea became a problem and presence of the superpowers on two sides of Korea escalated the confrontation and cold war.

When therefore the war came to an end in 1945 there was no dispute over the status of Korea, but at the moment of independence an accident deprived it of unity. The Japanese having surrendered partly to the Americans and partly to the Russians, Korea was divided into two pieces along the 38th parallel. This famous line came into existence as a result of negotiations between army officers of relatively junior rank, it was not a creation of ministerial decisions. But administrative convenience hardened into political fact and thereafter all attempts to equip Korea with a single government failed. The cause of this failure was the presence of Russian as well as American troops.

To solve the problems, a conference of the ministers of the USSR, USA and Britain was held in December, 1945 at Moscow. The conference decided that a joint commission consisting of representatives of the American military regime of South Korea and North Korea should be instituted. The commission will be responsible for the formation of a temporary government of United Korea. It would also consider proposals for the formation of a four-power mandate in Korea for five years. Though majority of Koreans passionately wanted for independence, USSR was hell-bent on implementing the decisions of the Moscow conference. However, because of USA’s opposition, the plan could not work effectively. Even the Soviet-US joint commission formed in 1946 could not tackle this issue. This resulted in the continuance of deadlock and finally, the matter was referred to the United States.

In 1947 the United States took the problem to the United Nations which appointed a commission (UN Temporary Commission on Korea- UNTCOK) to supervise elections on all Korea, to effect the establishment of a native government and withdrawal of all occupation forces. Moscow outrightly rejected the plan, forbade the UNTCOK to enter North Korea. However, elections were held in the South in May 1948 under the supervision of the Commission and
consequently, the Republic of Korea was established in South late in 1948 and soon won the recognition of most of the UN members.

Meanwhile, Moscow set up in the North the Democratic People's Republic of Korea along with the usual communist satellite lines. Throughout 1949 and 1950, situation in Korea worsened and that is why the relation between North Korea and South Korea deteriorated day by day.

Both parts of Korea uttered belligerent statements and threatened each other to bring unification by force. The UN Commission in 1949 reported that there had been military posturing on both sides of the parallel line. According to the Commission many of the minor attacks were from the side of North Korea and the Government of South Korea was maintaining restraint in its conduct. Thus, the stage for war was already ready and according to the report of UNO, North Korea exhibited its bellicose temperament on June 25, 1950 invading South Korea. However, in the opinion of USSR, it was the aggression of South Korea at the direction of USA and the US imperialists wanted a war in Korea in order to produce a general aggravation of international situation and use the resultant tense situation to strengthen the North Atlantic bloc and restore militarism in West Germany and Japan.

By the request of USA, the issue was taken to The Security Council. With Russians absenting and Yugoslavia abstaining, the Security Council charged North Korea to be aggressive. It asked the invading forces for withdrawal from the northward and urged the UN members to render help to its emission of keeping peace. However, the rapid headway of forces of North Korea induced the American President Truman to mobilize the forces of the United States and urged the members of UNO to help restoring peace. Thus, the Security Council's resolution acted as a cover for the armed interference in Korea for keeping peace. Of course, Yugoslavia voted against it and India and Egypt abstained.

Finally, on July 7, 1950 the Security Council passed another resolution which authorized the interventions in Korea under "UN armed forces" and General Douglas MacArthur was named the Commander-in-chief. For the collective security 53 members extended their help and while 10 members sent military units of one sort or another the rest offered medical supplies, food, clothing and transport bases. However, predominantly, the large part of the armed forces was contributed by USA.
The UNO’s army was virtually USA’s army which drove the North Koreans as far as 38th parallel line. At that point, the UN should have stopped because its primary objective was achieved and South Korea was free of North Korean clutches. But the USA’s administration did not stop there. Military mission and mutual negotiations should have gone simultaneously, but it was not done. Meanwhile, the Red China interfered and the Chinese foreign minister admonished that if the UNO’s army would not stop, China would fight tooth and nail against it. But the Americans underestimated the admonition and while the army proceeded on, China sent the wars of human sea and the result was that the army was driven back. It was a military debacle of UNO, a discredit to its prestige which brought the glory of UNO at the lowest ebb.

In August 1950, Russia had returned to the Council meeting with her delegate as chairman under the regular rotation. When with the entry of Red China in October, the Korean war assumed Himalayan dimension and became a Bohemian crisis in its essence the Korean dispute was taken to the General Assembly. There it remained even after the UN forces once again acquired the initiative and pushed the battle line a short distance north of the 38th parallel. In February 1951, the Assembly condemned Red China as aggressor and called for an embargo on shipments of strategic materials to the Maoist Government. Russia, however, freely gave aid to the communists.

However, after a year of fighting, Russia suggested negotiations for an armistice. Then over a period of two years (July 10, 1951 to July 2, 1953) during which men and boys were killed, misery set in and Stalin passed from the scene, negotiations resumed were broken off, were resumed and again broken off. Decision was made difficult and prolonged by the unwillingness of the Seoul Government to accept any agreement that did not presage a united, noncommunist Korea. Syngman Rhee eventually ceased his position, when the United States promised to rehabilitate his country, sign a mutual security pact and intervene once more if communist aggressions were renamed after the armistice.

The dramatic dismissal of General MacArthur by the American President Truman on 11 April 1951 caused such a stir that its significance was not immediately assimilated. What it meant was that the Korean war must be brought to an end by compromise and mediation. The American government rejected the alternative of complete victory obtainable only by the military defeat of China. Yet
it took more than two years more of fighting and negotiation before an armistice was eventually signed in July 1953, more than three years after the initial act of aggression in June 1950.

Meanwhile, fresh Chinese attacks in April 1951 were soon held and both sides, began to feel their way towards a true. A broadcast in the United States at the end of June by the Russian member of the Security Council, J. A. Malik, led to truce negotiations which were began at Kaesong in July and later transferred to Panmunjom (both about 50 kilometres northwest of Seoul). These negotiations were tedious, long, fruitless and punctuated by fears of a renewal of full-scale operations and by accusations against the Americans of recourse to bacteriological warfare. The most intractable issue was the fate of prisoners of war, many of whom in southern hands were alleged to be unwilling to return to the north but an exchange agreement was eventually signed in June 1953 (shortly after the death of Stalin, although no connection between the events can be definitely proved). The agreement was then wrecked by Syngman Rhee who released prisoners rather than turn them over to the North Koreans, whereupon the Chinese launched a major offensive. Notwithstanding these turbulent episodes an armistice agreement was signed in July 1953.

The Geneva conference which opened in April 1954 failed to produce a final settlement and Syngman Rhee then went to Washington to try to persuade the United states to sanction a joint invasion of China by South Koreans and Chiang Kai-shek's forces. He argued that the regime in China was on the verge of collapse but he failed to win over Congress or Eisenhower, the American President or John Foster Dulles, the Principal Republican Spokesman on foreign affairs, to his view. In the following year, American and Chinese troops were gradually withdrawn. Korea remained bisected but it was clear that the war was over. A military demarcation line was set up somewhat north of the 38th parallel.

A neutral nations Repatriation Commission (NNRC) composed of citizens from India, Sweden, Switzerland, Czechoslovakia and Poland was to take charge of those who refused repatriation. The military strength of both sides was frozen. A military armistice commission of five officers from each side was to supervise the implications of the truce, and consider and correct any violation. Thus, the long-term hostilities ended, though occasional quarrels did not end there.
The Korean dispute before the UN has been singular in more than one way. First, it involved a military attack against a protégé of the UN-South Korea. Secondly, the relative strength of the adversaries was so unequal that there was no time for mediation negotiation. Thirdly, it involved a clash of vital interests of three great powers - USA, USSR and China. And finally, in this case the UN applied the concept of collective security. There were three main reasons why the UN action proved to be so effective in Korea. First, the absence of the Soviet representative from the Security Council since January 1950 in protest against the refusal to seat the representatives of People's China permitted the Council to take action which might otherwise have been vetoed by the USSR. This made possible a UN basis for collective action without which many member states would have hesitated in giving approval and support. An effort to tap the Assembly would have involved delay which might have been decisive. Secondly, the presence of the UN Commission in Korea equipped with military observers and authorized to report on developments provided a basis for action by the Security Council. And thirdly, the presence of US forces in Japan and the readiness of USA to use this force within the UN framework facilitated the task.

However, the Korean crisis had very important repressions on the UN. First, it emphasized that absence of a permanent member from the Council's meeting amounted to abstention since absence could not be allowed to hinder the Council from functioning continuously. Secondly, it amplified "the conditions under which sanctions could be applied by the organisation". Thirdly, it modified the Charter provisions with regard to application of sanctions and made them voluntary. The Security Council simply recommended action as did the General Assembly. Fourthly, it led to the enhancement of the prestige and authority of the General Assembly, for "Unite for Peace Resolution" was only an outcome of Korea. Fifthly, it falsified the assumption of the Charter that sanctions to be effective must have the support of the permanent members of the Council. The Assembly could now recommend sanctions and they would be effective if majority of the members are in favour. Finally, it suggested that the decision to take collective measures in the UN and the effectiveness of such measures will be largely dependent upon the ability and willingness of one or more great powers to take the initiative.

It may be said that while the UN waged a war from 1950 to 1953 against the communist North Korea, and for many years
afterwards, North Korea opposed separate UN membership for the two Korean states on the ground that it would perpetuate their separation. On September 8, 1991 both North and South Korea were admitted to the UN as two distinct, sovereign, independent states, on the basis of their applications.

Thus, the UNO’s role in case of Korean issue is not spectacular. It was used by USA to camouflage her armed intervention. The superpower bouts blurred her conspicuous role and relegated her to the status of a debating dais. It is a shocking anecdote that such as world organisation could not prevent the massacre and butchery that took place in Korean crisis. However, despite this, it played no less an important role in restoring peace and up-keeping the banner of peaceful coexistence.

1.9 Accomplishments of the United Nations

Since its inception, the United Nations had been called upon to maintain international peace and security. Either it has been the issue of Balkans, Iran, Palestine, Kashmir, Berlin Blockade or Korea or the issue of U.S. hostages in Iran, UN has always heeded the call and has done its best to find solution to these problems.

Maintenance of international peace and security is the major responsibility of the UN. Generally, the UN comes into the picture whenever the disputes assume serious dimensions and pose a real danger to the world peace. Under the UN Charter, the countries are supposed to settle their disputes through peaceful means, but at the moment when these efforts fail, the General Assembly and the Security Council are called upon to maintain peace. The United Nations does not act only when the peace and security are in danger rather it ensures preventive measures to avoid such eventuality. We may study the accomplishments of the UN under three important aspects, viz. Maintenance of International peace and security; in the social and economic field.

1.9.1 Maintenance of International Peace and Security

Since its inception the UN has done a commendable job in the field of maintaining international peace and security. The United Nations has been instrumental in settling numerous controversies which could have proved a potential danger to world peace and security. In 1947 there arose a dispute between Holland and Indonesia when the Dutch troops resorted
to military action against the Indonesians. India and Austria on August 1, 1947 brought this case to the notice of the Security Council. After deliberations the Security Council urged both the parties to cease hostilities and settle the dispute through peaceful means. The Security Council supervised the peace operations and ultimately Indonesia became free.

Another controversial problem which has perplexed UN is that of Palestine. The problem of Palestine was first brought before the United Nations by UK in April 1947 when it wanted the General Assembly to take up the future set-up of Palestine. A special committee on Palestine was set up which submitted its report in August 1947 suggesting that Palestine should be divided into an Arab state, a Jewish state and a special area including Jerusalem under the international government. These recommendations were accepted by the General Assembly and a commission was constituted to implement these recommendations.

The Jews supported the move but the Arabs rejected it. The Palestine commission reported the matter to the Security Council and urged for the unanimous support to implement the recommendations. Accordingly, the Security Council in April 1948 urged all the concerned parties to desist from violence and set up a Truce commission. However, the violence did not stop. The advice and efforts of the United Nations fell flat because of non-cooperation of the concerned parties. That is why, the question of Palestine is still hanging.

Besides these, there were certain other issues where international peace and security had been at stake. The Kashmir crisis, the Korean crisis the Cyprus issue, the Congo riddle the such crisis, Cuban missile crisis, Arab-Israeli war of 1967, the Russian Intervention in Afghanistan, American hostages in Iran are such issues which have threatened world peace and security from time to time. Though UN failed to settle permanently majority of the disputes but it has not played a negative role as well. The UN has rather been instrumental in alleviating the tension. It provides an opportunity to the disputant parties to put across their viewpoint and thus evolve a world consensus in tackling the issue. It is the veto power, non-cooperative attitude of the member states which renders the UN action ineffective. UN itself is determined to discharge its duties as envisaged in the Charter. It is the custodian of world peace and security.
1.9.2 Social Accomplishments

The United Nations is not merely confining its activities in the domain of maintaining international peace and security. It is equally active to its responsibilities of promoting conditions which foster better economic, cultural, social and humanitarian character. In this realm UN is assisted by the ECOSOC and its commissions and other specialised agencies. The UN and its various specialised agencies have undertaken tremendous efforts to improve the living condition, housing, town and country planning family welfare etc. The UNO with the assistance of World Health Organisation has been rendering advice and necessary assistance to the member countries to fight epidemics like small pox, leprosy, yaws as well as diseases like malaria, tuberculosis, general disease etc. It also helped in rehabilitation of refugees subsequent to World War II, as well as during Palestine crisis, Indo-Pak wars, Bangladesh crisis and at numerous other occasions.

The UN has tried to establish control over narcotic drugs and set up a commission on Narcotic Drugs for this purpose. Though the commission is primarily concerned with the implementation of the various conventions adopted in this regard, it also advises regarding the changes needed in the existing machinery. It also advises the individual governments regarding the machinery they should evolve to control the supplies of narcotic drugs more effectively. It keeps a control over the production of narcotic drugs through various agencies to prevent its misuse. As the entire success in this direction is dependent on the willing co-operation of the member states, the UN has not been able to achieve much success in this regard.

UNO through its International Refugee Organisation has done a commendable job in assisting 1.6 million persons to resettle during the period from July 1, 1947 to January 1, 1952. Though the main activities of the UNO in this regard were confined to Europe especially in Germany, it looked after refugees in other parts of the world also. In Palestine the refugee problem created by the conflict between the Jews and Arabs over Palestine, UNO did a remarkable job through United Relief for Palestine Refugees established by the General Assembly in November 1948. During the Arab-Israeli war of 1967 the refugee problem again cropped up which was solved with the assistance of the UNO.
The UNO has also done a remarkable job in the direction of providing food, clothing and medical aid for needy children in the war devastated countries through the UNICEF. The funds for these activities were provided by voluntary contributions of money, goods and services from governments, private organisations and individuals. With the passage of time the activities of UNO in this regard went on assuming greater proportions and in 1964 the UNICEF approved programmes totaling $36 million to help children in 112 countries. It also undertook new services in the field of family and child welfare education and vocational training etc.

The UN has also made sincere efforts to eradicate illiteracy and raise educational standards throughout the world. It has encouraged fundamental education, fostered scientific research, promoted dissemination of scientific knowledge, helped exchange of persons to promote cultural activities and international understanding. The UN aims to provide universal primary education to about 250 million children by 1980. It has also devoted attention to the problem regarding recruitment and training of teachers, the development of suitable teaching methods and provides funds for school buildings. The UNO has tried to improve textbooks and other teaching materials to raise the standards of education. It held international conferences and research projects with a view to encourage people to understand each other. In the field of science, the UNO through UNESCO has taken steps to promote science teaching at the elementary level in these countries where it is almost nonexistent.

The UNO has also developed great attention to the promotion of universal respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms without any distinction of race, sex, language or religion. Its first achievement in this direction was the adoption of Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This declaration aimed at providing common standard of right to be achieved all over the world. The UN also adopted the convention on Genocide in December, 1948 though it came into force after it was ratified by 23 states in January, 1951. According to the convention the following constitute the genocide: (i) killing members of a group because of their group affiliation; (ii) causing bodily or mental harm to group members; (iii) deliberately inflicting physical destruction; (iv) importing measures to prevent births within the group; and forcibly transferring children from one group to another. The ratifying states agreed to implement
the convention and permit extradition of persons formally accused of genocide.

The United Nations has also devoted attention to the improvement of status of women throughout the world. To secure equal status for women the UNO set up a commission on the status of women. It tried to secure better protection for women under national laws, extension of national educational opportunities for women, equal pay for equal public service, and their increased participation with the work of government. The UNO has also taken steps for the suppression of traffic in women. It has laid down rules for provision of facilities to pregnant mothers, as well as passed numerous resolutions regarding nationality of women.

The UNO has also devoted attention to the protection of the interest of minorities. It has constantly pleaded for 'self-determination in non-self-governing territories' and severely condemned religion and social persuasion and discrimination. It particularly adopted strong attitudes towards racial discrimination in South Africa. In 1962, the General Assembly of the UNO established a special committee on apartheid (racial discrimination). This committee has kept a continuing watch on the developments in South Africa and has recommended strong measures against the South African Government.

Taking freedom of information as a fundamental human right and a touchstone of all other reforms, the UNO has attached great importance to the freedom of information and press. The General Assembly passed a resolution affirming the need of freedom of information and press and asserted that "Understanding and cooperation among nations are impossible without an alert and sound world opinion, which in turn, is wholly dependent upon freedom of information". For the implementation of this resolution the Economic and Social Council set up a sub-committee on Freedom of Information. The sub-committee convened a conference at Geneva in 1948 which adopted a number of resolutions and draft conventions. Some of these resolutions and conventions were ultimately incorporated in the convention on the International Transmission of News and Right of Correction adopted by the General Assembly in 1949. However, due to contradictory stands of the two rival powers, the UN could not make much progress in this direction.

The UN has also felt concerned with the right of self-determination of the people. In 1952, the General Assembly set up
a commission on Human Rights to make recommendations regarding the steps necessary to develop international respect for the rights of people to self-determination. The commission submitted two proposals. The first insisted on the right of the people and nations to permanent sovereignty over their natural wealth and resources. The second suggested the establishment of a commission to study any situation arising out of denial of right of self-determination to the people of any area. These resolutions did not find favour with the ECOSOC because the colonial members of the UN insisted on supplying the principle of self-determination to the people of the satellite states of the communist bloc. As a result, much progress could not be made.

1.9.3 Economic Accomplishments

The UN has realised the need to a more organised international cooperation in the economic and the financial fields to achieve the objective of promoting "higher standards of living, full employment and conditions of economic and social progress and development". It made efforts to reduce trade barriers through multilateral negotiations under the auspices of the General Agreement on Trade and (GATT) though much progress could not be achieved in this regard due to the attitude of the developed countries. It organised two International conferences in 1964 and 1968 through which effort was made to secure the interests and needs of the developing countries.

The UN has been giving technical assistance to the underdeveloped countries for economic development. Huge funds are allocated by the General Assembly to the Secretary-General for this purpose every year. Further funds for the purpose are voluntary contributed to the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) which came into existence in November, 1965. These funds are made available for activities in the field of agriculture, health service, resource surveys, technical education and training institutes and applied research in the developing countries.

The International Bank and its affiliate the International Development Association (IDA) on behalf of the UN advance substantial loans at market rate for economic development. The UN also invests in productive private enterprises in association with private investors in developing countries through the International Finance Corporation (IFC).
The UNO has greatly helped in making studies on finance and related problems. It has published reports on methods of increasing domestic saving, relative prices of exports and imports in underdeveloped countries. Conditions governing private investment in certain countries, formulation and execution of development projects, the effects of price fluctuations and the rise in raw material prices upon underdeveloped countries. Another important measure was the Report of "Measures for the Economic Development of Underdeveloped countries" which analysed the capital requirements for increasing national income and also recommended the creation of an International Development Authority in the UN with power to make grants to underdeveloped countries.

The United Nations has devoted lot of attention to the problem of food shortage. This aspect is looked after by the Food and Agricultural Organisation (FAO). It helped the member states by focusing their attention on the gravity of the crises. It supplies them essential statistical and technical information, organises conferences and helps them in a number of ways. It was an instrument in the drafting of the International Wheat Agreement which is adhered to by majority of the countries. In 1961, the UNO established the World Food Programme to explore the possibilities of stimulating economic and social development through aid in the form of food.

The FAO has played significant role in tackling problems like animal and plant disease control, storage of grains, conservation and prevention of soil evasion. The UNO has also paid attention to the production of fishery distribution of food fertilisers and agricultural machinery.

In the field of communication the UNO through the Transport and Communication Commission has devoted particular attention to problem like coordination of sea and air safety activities, simplifications of passport and frontier formalities, improvement of road and motor traffic regulations. The UN through the International Telecommunication Union has tried to secure agreement regarding regulations for the transmission of international telegraph and telephone communications as well as allocation of radio wavelength frequencies.

Another field which has received lot of attention from UNO pertains to the labour conditions. The International Labour Organisation (ILO) has drafted scores of conventions and recommendations regarding
employment, conditions of employment, vocational training, industrial health and safety, freedom of association, industrial relations, etc. The ILO also sends commissions of inquiry on request to look into specific problems.

In addition to the above functions there are numerous other economic and social fields where the United Nations has done a commendable job. Prof. Palmer and Perkins observe "Overshadowing the political and security activities of the United Nations, in scope, achievement and perhaps in ultimate significance, are its operations in economic and social fields".

1.10 Let Us Sum Up

The institution of the United Nations is a manifestation of human dreams having come true after centuries. The human folly led to the flop of the League of Nations and the result ensured in the devastation and annihilation following the outbreak of Second World War. The United Nations represents the collective determination of the mankind for a better world free from the scourge of war and fear. The UN, in short, is a mirror which reflects the reality of global politics at a given moment of history. So long as the two superpowers, USSR and USA, were in combat, locked in the cold war, the UN reflected that tension. At the end of the cold war in 1989-90, conflict situations terminated one by one, as the US and the USSR, by mutual consent, disengaged from their satellites. The UN was then galvanised into launching a variety of peace-keeping operations, ranging from observance of forces' withdrawal in Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, and Angola, to supervising elections in Namibia, western Sahara, Central America and elsewhere. It was also involved in acts which a few years ago were unthinkable - national reconciliation in Cambodia, monitoring human rights in El Salvador, providing humanitarian assistance to Kurds, and unearthing nuclear weapons projects in Iraq.

But in performing all these acts, the UNO only danced to the tune of the United States. While it authorised the US to wage a war against Iraq for the US policy objectives, its record elsewhere was pitiable. It has not been able to discipline Israel so far. The power behind the UNO today is that of the US and since the US politics rests on arrogant, imperialist expansion, exploitation of the Third world, the UN has already become an instrument of US aggression. This position would continue so long as there is no opposition to it
from any of the other four permanent members of the Security Council. France and Britain are close allies of Washington; Russia is a zero factor at present; China's role as the fifth wheel in the Council has so far been to make a virtue of its abstention rather than expose itself to the odium of casting its veto. But one thing is very clear at the present moment that the future of the world rests in the success of the United Nations.

1.11 Key Words

Ad hoc: Arranged for a particular purpose; informal.

Archiepiscopal: Of or relating to an archbishop.

Autocephalous church: Ecclesiastically independent, churches of the Eastern Orthodox communion.

Bellicose: Favoring or inclined to start quarrels or wars.

Belligerent: Belonging to or recognized as a state at war and protected by and subject to the laws of war.

Carnage: Bloody slaughter or injury (as in battle).

Complicity: Association or participation in or as if in a wrongful act.

Dilating: To describe or set forth at length or in detail.

El Dorado: A place of fabulous wealth or opportunity.

Embargo: An order of a government prohibiting the departure of commercial ships from its ports.

Enosis: A movement to secure the political union of Greece and Cyprus.

Gendarmerie: A body of soldiers.

Insurrection: An act or instance of revolting against civil authority or an established government rebellion.

Lackey: Servant.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modus operandi</td>
<td>A method of procedure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moth-eaten</td>
<td>Truncated/Dilapidated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiognomy</td>
<td>Appearance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plebiscite</td>
<td>A vote by which the people of an entire country or district express an opinion for or against a proposal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protégé</td>
<td>One who is protected or trained or whose career is furthered by a person of experience, prominence, or influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scourge</td>
<td>A cause of wide or great affliction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophistry</td>
<td>Subtly deceptive reasoning or argumentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan song</td>
<td>A farewell appearance or final act or pronouncement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veto Power</td>
<td>An authoritative power vested with USA, USSR (now Russia), England, France and China by the UNO to prevent permanently or temporarily the enactment of measures passed by it.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.0 Objectives

This Unit gives a detailed account of the post-Second World War bipolar international politics dominated by two ideologically different powers, the USA and the USSR. After going through this Unit you will be able to know:

- how the Cold War set in after the World War II and how it engulfed the whole world politics under its fold led by two Super Powers, the USA and the USSR;
- how such Super Power Rivalry continued in the world from 1945 till the collapse of the USSR in 1991;
- how the different crisis-points in the shape of the Berlin Crisis, the Cuban Crisis, the Suez Crisis and the Afghan Crisis put challenges before the world and the UNO and how such crises could be dealt strategically to avoid conflicts and clashes;
- how different disarmament attempts could be made under the aegis of the UNO to relieve the world of the constant fear of arms race and aggression;
- how the USA took measures to revive both political and economic conditions of the Western European nations, gone weaker during the Second World War through the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan;
- how the NATO came into being in 1949 under the USA’s initiative to save the Western Europe from the clutches of the USSR to go communist; and
- how France under its leader Charles de Gaulle developed rift with the NATO.

2.1 Introduction

The Cold War was an open yet restricted rivalry that developed after World War II between the United States and the Soviet Union and their respective allies. This Super Power Rivalry was waged on political, economic, and propaganda fronts and had only limited recourse to weapons. While the United States believed in the modern sense of capitalism and democracy, the Soviet Union believed in the communist ideology; and each started having a host of satellite nations opposing each other’s ideology, thereby challenging the oneness and bringing into effect mutual jealousy and distrust. This continued for almost four decades once the World War II came to an end. It was the disintegration of the USSR in 1991 which brought this rivalry to its logical end.
The four important crises like the Berlin Crisis, the Cuban Crisis, the Suez Crisis and the Afghan Crisis which could have pushed the then world to the vortex of another global war with a slightest lapse on the part of the UNO and the world statesmen, could be strategically dealt. The Super Powers with their “veto power” were ready to show off their potentialities independently in all such crises keeping the UNO a mute spectator. But things did not move the way they desired. The super powers stood at the loggerheads and with their ideological cleavage, abominable rat-race for world hegemony and mutual distrust they became the dreaded opponents of each other which dawned the era of cold war in the post-Second World War period. The super power rivalry kept the world under the grip of the Cold War and every one, with awe-wrapped suspense waited the moment of the world politics.

The devastation and destruction and the wholesale genocide caused by the World War II had a therapeutic effect on the world statesmen and it propelled them to form the UNO to avert the disastrous world of the war holocaust looming on the world’s horizon. The introduction of "star war weapons" escalated the arms race to an unprecedented degree. Therefore, ever since the abominable rat-race for escalation of the sophisticated weapons, the peace loving humanity strove hard with the endless efforts to eliminate war by ‘Disarmament’. Thus, the disarmament was thought to be an inevitable corollary to stop the world plunge into the vortex of a third world war.

The Western Europe in the post-Second World War era was prone to the Russian dominance. The Western European nations were badly hit by the war continued for six years (1939-45). Their economies got ruined and politics shattered. While they were under the constant threat of aggression from the Soviet Union to turn them communist, the USA developed almost a different kind of attitude towards them. Their only escape from these dangers was the American aid to enable them to restore their shattered economies and an American guarantee of their continued independence and integrity in the shape of a semi-permanent American occupation. For the purpose, the USA undertook some offensive measures to counteract the expansion of Soviet communism in the form of the Truman Doctrine of 1947 and Marshall Plan of 1948.

The extensive genocide and destruction of the World War II was probably at one time thought to be the end of mutual distrust and arms race. The peace loving humanity hence dreamt of the vision of a globe devoid of military alliances and warfare. But it was proved myopic. Soon appeared a polarized world with the regional alliances and organizations
on fray and dragged the world into the cockpit of the cold war, the NATO being one of them. The USA, to avert the communist threat, could mastermind the formation of the military bloc like NATO which escalated into the arsenal of military powers of the Western Europe.

France had been a major European land power and a major imperial power but had failed in the contest with England for sea power. In the 20th century the awful sacrifices of the World War I and the hardly less awful humiliation of the World War II, separated by incapacity to face up to the problems of the economic crisis or to Hitler's challenge to basic values brought France low in its own eyes until the exploits of the Resistance and the leadership of De Gaulle revived and personified the French spirit. De Gaulle's identification of himself with France and his constant use of the first person singular were precisely what was needed to restore it the glory it once claimed. De Gaulle followed a policy of increasing noncooperation towards NATO and NATO allies causing irritation within the NATO. Once his proposal for creation of a tripartite organization consisting of USA, UK and France to take joint decision on global problem was discarded, he started disengaging France from the NATO and its obligations.

2.2 The Cold War

The Cold War was an open yet restricted rivalry that developed after World War II between the United States and the Soviet Union and their respective allies. This was waged on political, economic, and propaganda fronts and had only limited recourse to weapons. The term was first used by the American financier and presidential adviser Bernard Baruch during a Congressional Debate in 1947.

Following the surrender of Nazi Germany in May 1945 near the close of World War II, the uneasy wartime alliance between the United States and Great Britain on the one hand and the Soviet Union on the other began to unravel. By 1948 the Soviets had installed left-wing governments in the countries of Eastern Europe that had been liberated by the Red Army. The Americans and the British feared the permanent Soviet domination of Eastern Europe and the threat of Soviet-influenced communist parties coming to power in the democracies of Western Europe. The Soviets, on the other hand, were determined to maintain control of Eastern Europe in order to safeguard against any possible renewed threat from Germany, and they were intent on spreading communism worldwide, largely for ideological reasons. The Cold War had solidified by 1947- 48, when the US aid provided under the Marshall Plan
to Western Europe had brought those countries under American influence and the Soviets had installed openly communist regimes in Eastern Europe.

2.3 **Background of the Cold War in 1945**

The most notable result of the Second World War was the emergence of the Soviet Union and the United States as the two most powerful countries in the world. United States believing in the modern version of capitalism and democracy and Soviet Union believing in the communist ideology, each was having a host of satellite nations opposing each other’s ideology. Both were victors in the War. Britain and France also emerged victorious but they lost much of their power and influence. At that time, there were three or at least four powerful states if we measure the power of states by military strength, economic power and political influence. The Soviet Union, United States and Britain qualified for a superior status. The other two countries, France and China, were also considered to be important. Their importance was recognized by granting them the status of permanent membership in the Security Council of the United Nations.

If one looks at the situation in 1945, the world appeared to be controlled by the three major powers as well as two not so powerful but important powers. The rest of the world consisted of defeated nations like Germany, Italy and Japan, colonies like India, and small independent countries with very little influence and generally under the control of one of the big powers.

During the Second World War the USA and Soviet Russia came closer to each other and entered into mutual relationships. The USA, Britain and France had carried the war against the Fascist powers in cooperation with Soviet Russia. Each and every one on the Allied side felt the necessity of forging unity and friendship among themselves in order to protect the world from the fascist barbarism. In fact, the Western powers including the USA and Soviet Russia forgot their ideological differences for the time being and entered into common bondage. There was complete concord and unity among the Allies including the USA and USSR not only on the issue of the War but also on the issue of the future of the post-war world. The United Nations Declaration of 1942 and the other war time conferences demonstrated unity and concord between the two divergent ideologies. "The optimists were certain that future peace would be assured by the continuance after hostilities ceased, of the unity that characterized the difficult War-years", says Langsam.
Even then, it cannot be claimed that till the end of the Second World War mutual suspicion between Soviet Russia and the Western powers was totally absent. Political and economic relations between the two were artificial and limited in scope. War-time alliances and post-war conditions of the world opened the way for a further improvement of relations between Soviet Russia and the western states, including the U.S.A. But disillusion however, followed soon after victory and in fact, all was not in harmony even during the war.

It was at Yalta and Potsdam that Soviet Russia and the Western powers for the first time sat across the conference table to negotiate over the international problems. Practically, Russia and the U.S.A. came closer to each other at that time. These two giants of the modern world had few contacts and conflicts with each other until the Second World War. Soviet Russia was a continental power while the USA was an oceanic one. As long as their interests remained confined to their own territories, there was the least possibility of dispute between them.

2.3.1 What is Cold War?

The Cold War has been defined by Florence Elliott and Michael Summer-skill in *A Dictionary of Politics* “as a state of tension between countries in which each side adopts policies designed to strengthen itself and weaken the other, the line falling short of actual hot war.” The cold war has been a predominant factor in determining the conduct of international affairs in the post-Second World War period. It envisaged an era of neither peace nor war between Soviet Union and her own allies on one hand, and USA and a score of its allies on the other.

The term "Cold War" was firstly used by Bernard Baruch, an American statesman who in a speech to South Carolina Legislature, on April 16, 1947 said "let us not be deceived, we are today in the midst of a cold war". Walter Lippmann popularized the term in 1947 describing the situation that had arisen between the Western powers and Soviet Union. The Western Powers and the Soviet Union had come together to fight against the Axis aggression during the Second World War, but however, their relations, though cordial were suffering from mutual distrust and jealousy. The delay on opening the second front, the secrecy over the atom bomb and refusal to invite the Polish provisional government to San Francisco made Soviet Union suspicious of the Anglo - American motives. The West had felt that Russia had annexed considerable territory by waging war against Japan at the last moment. This mutual distrust led to sharp rivalry as soon as the World War II came to an end.
2.3.2 Origin of the Cold War

The date of origin of cold war differs with the opinions of different writers. Some scholars like Desmond Domelly and Frederick L. Schuman in their respective books *Struggle for the World* and *The Cold War: Retrospect and Prospect*, place the origin as far back as the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. Evan Luard, editor of *The Cold War: A Reappraisal* dates the origin of it back to 1945 while Paul Seabury in his book *The Rise and Decline of the Cold War* holds that to "date its origin is to suggest its central meanings". The majority of authors treat the emergence of cold war as a post-Second World War phenomenon.

2.3.3 Basis of the Cold War

The Cold War was based on a number of assumptions. (1) It assumed that the real threat to the world peace was posed by the military strength of Soviet Union. It may be noted that Soviet Union's military strength was virtually destroyed during World War II. This assumption gave rise to the policy of strength which was responsible for the development of military theory of cold war on the basis of atomic bomb, hydrogen bomb, and nuclear warfare. (2) It assumes the inevitability of conflict between the socialist and capitalist states, which prompted the states of both the blocs to keep themselves in condition of constant preparedness for a final showdown. It assumes that no cooperation is possible between states with different social systems. It assumes that the struggle between the West and the East is a struggle between freedom and tyranny.

2.3.4 Causes of Cold War

The main factors which contributed to the rise of cold war were as follows:

Firstly, Soviet Union tried to increase its influence in Eastern Europe in violation of the terms of Yalta Agreement. Thus, Soviet Union established Lublin Government in Poland in violation of her commitment that the exiled Polish Government at London and the Soviet influenced Lublin Government would be duly represented in the future government of Poland. It also tried to liquidate the democratic parties and noncommunist population of Poland. In the Balkans also Soviet Union tried to establish communist governments despite an understanding with Britain regarding their spheres of influence in the Balkans. All this
aroused suspicion in the western powers and they decided to check further expansion of Soviet influence.

Secondly, Soviet Union refused to withdraw its forces from Iran and instigated a rebellion in Northern Ireland. Soviet Union also compelled Iran to sign a treaty on 4 April, 1946 which recognised Soviet interest over oil resources of North Ireland for 25 years. This was in complete contrast to the policy adopted by Britain and USA which withdrew their forces from Iran as per terms the agreement of 1942. The question of presence of Soviet forces in Iran was raised in the UN and ultimately Soviet Union was made to withdraw its forces from Iran. This policy of Soviet Union greatly contributed to sharpening of tension with Western powers.

Thirdly, Russia extended support to the communists to pull down legally constituted government in Greece which soon engulfed the country in a civil war. This was greatly resented by Britain and USA and they extended every possible assistance to save the democratic government.

Fourthly, Soviet Union brought undue pressure on Turkey to modify the Straits Convention and demanded certain territories. As Turkey refused to oblige, Soviet Union began to foment trouble in Turkey. Thereupon, USA came to the rescue of Turkey. The growing Communist threat in Greece and Turkey led to the enunciation of Truman Doctrine by USA which pledged support to people who were resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures.

Fifthly, the attitude adopted by Soviet Union towards Germany also greatly contributed to cold war. Soviet Union, unmindful of its commitments in the Potsdam Agreement and London Protocol, tried to put unnecessary burden and pressure on the German region under its occupation. It also deprived the people of Germany under Soviet Zone of their fundamental political freedom. All this was greatly resented by America and other Western powers.

Sixthly, refusal of United States and other western powers to accord recognition to the Governments of Bulgaria and Rumania also generated tension between the two blocs. The plan of the Western powers that they had refused to extend recognition to these countries on the ground that they lacked popular representation could not satisfy the Russians.

Seventhly, frequent use of veto powers by Soviet Union dominating the initial years of the working of United Nations was also responsible for
generating tension between Soviet Union and America. It convinced the Americans that the Soviet Union was bent upon flouting all their plans. On the other hand, the Soviet Union complained that since United States had manipulated majority in the Security Council it had no other choice but to make frequent use of its veto power. This sense of distrust towards each other greatly contributed to cold war.

Eighthly, the unnecessary obstacles put by Soviet Union in the way of conclusion of peace treaties also raised a good deal of suspicion in the minds of the American people about the ultimate intention of Soviet Union.

Ninthly, bitter criticism of the capitalist system and vociferous propaganda against United States also caused tension between the two countries. Soviet Union stopped its activities in United States and even tried to smuggle out some of the confidential and secret documents. This compelled United States to adopt stiff attitude towards Soviet Union.

Tenthly, the unnecessary delay by the Western powers in opening the Second Front during the Second World War, and the consequential losses suffered by Soviet Union made her suspicions about the true designs of the Western powers. The inadequate aid given by the Western powers to the Soviet Union during the war also raised doubts in the minds of Russian leaders. This suspicion was further heightened due to the attempt on the part of America and England to keep their program of atom bomb secret from Soviet Union and other East European countries.

Finally, the abrupt suspension of the land lease aid by United States to Soviet Union, soon after the surrender of Germany, convinced the Soviet leaders that the Western power were jealous of their progress.

Hence, the cold war started between the two super powers and it continued until the collapse of the Soviet Union.

2.4 Super Power Rivalry (1945-1980)

The emergence of a bipolar world and the beginning of the cold war both coincided. The cold war which is said to have started with the Berlin blockade by the Soviet Union became a constant theme in international relations.
The next major crisis erupted with the beginning of Korean War in 1950. This is important because of the original conflict which continued between North Korea with a socialist ideology and South Korea with a capitalist ideology. China and the United States took opposite sides in this conflict. The problem was finally sorted out with the help of the United Nations even though the Americans did not permit Communist China to assume its membership of the United Nations. The pre-Revolutionary government of China under Chiang Kai-shek was recognized by America and her allies as a member of the UN. The People’s Republic of China was excluded.

The important point to note is that a very bloody and wasteful war was finally brought to an end through the diplomatic efforts of not only the Five parties concerned directly or indirectly, that is, North Korea, South Korea, China, the United States and the Soviet Union, but also by the participation of neutral countries like India. The United States was directly involved merely because the Soviet Union had walked out of the World body before the conflict began in 1950. It was easy, therefore, for the Americans to dispatch a so-called UN force in Korea. The Russians never recognized this. The Chinese were outside the UN, but these were useful excuses which helped in finding an ultimate solution. What is significant in this episode is that the big powers never went beyond a certain limit in their hostility to each other a typical cold war behavior.

This was repeated even more clearly one year later in 1954 in Indo-China where again, the Soviet Union, the US, Britain and France along with China were able to work out a program. It was not a solution of the problem but a postponement of the crisis. The French willingness to have a compromise made the whole understanding possible. Britain also helped. Indian diplomacy was useful but the final decision on a positive solution was made by Moscow and Washington in 1954.

In 1955 came the Austrian development which has been already referred to. It was an example of a civilized solution. The method had been tried in Germany also but it did not work. There were many proposals of a naturalist and disarmed Germany outside the military pacts. This was not, however acceptable to the western sides which felt that such a weak, rich state would always be vulnerable to blackmail from Moscow.

In 1956 came three major events- first, the then Soviet leader, Khrushchev blamed Stalin for many of the cruelties and started a de-Stalinization campaign. Second, this led to a dramatic changes in some East European countries particularly Hungary. Things got out
of hand when the Soviet Union was forced to send armies to overthrow the elected government of Hungary. A bitter confrontation of ideas and propaganda began, reminding of the period of 1948 to 1949 and the Berlin blockade. Third, there was the Suez crisis in which, France, Britain and Israel invaded Egypt. This is important in any study of bipolarity because both the United States and the Soviet Union were generally agreed on the need irreparable breach in the western alliance but it showed that there were moments when the allies could think and act different due to the divergent perception of their individual national interests.

There was another major development of both ideological and strategic importance in Europe. Yugoslavia had refused some of Stalin’s demands and was, in effect, expelled from the communist bloc. She became, under Marshal Tito, a pioneer non-aligned country along with India under Nehru and Egypt under Nasser. This was the first hint that there could be differences within the socialist world. Towards the end of the fifties the communist bloc began to witness a breach as manifested in Sino-Soviet dispute. This came out into the open only in 1963.

Here comes a commonly used word ‘monolithic’, meaning a completely united group, almost like a single stone. The fear of monolithic communism motivated Truman and after his time, in the late fifties, John Foster Dulles, who was the Secretary of State of the President Eisenhower. Different forms of socialism began to emerge in Belgrade, Peking, to some extent in Poland, Hungary and also in the Soviet Union. These were also parallel developments in the western bloc. They had to tolerate all types of economic doctrines, political systems and peculiar ideological infirmity. There is, in fact, no evidence that either wanted it. It was always a very confused mixture of geographical dangers, economic competition, ideological risk to small vulnerable states, and the memories of old enmities. It was however, very useful for both sides to give a block of loyalty to "democracy" or "socialism". During the early sixties there were two examples of bitter hostility finally being permitted to end on a note of accommodation or compromise even though not reconciliation. The Cuban crisis of 1961 became much more important because it took the confrontation from Europe to another theatre, this time in west Atlantic near the United States homeland. The Soviet Union was forced to back out finally and take away the nuclear missiles which she had placed in Cuba. This was in fact, the last time when there was a genuine danger of the two giant powers showing down into actual physical conflict.
In 1963, the original ‘Big Three’ of the immediate post war period, the USSR, the US and the UK, agreed on a major disarmament measure. This is significant by itself and is also an example of how cooperation on some vital matters concerning their national interest was always there between the major powers. One can even argue that the Partial Test Ban Treaty was the inevitable result of the Cuban crisis. Both Moscow and Washington had seen nuclear war face to face and did not like it.

The Treaty’s real importance lies in the joint agreement of the three powers to limit the manufacture and possession of nuclear weapons to the absolute minimum. In October 1963 France refused to sign the Treaty even though she was an ally of the United States and also a democracy. Within one year, China had exploded her first bomb and she had also refused to sign the Treaty. Both France and China continued with their atmospheric tests. But both in fact, respected the wishes of the super powers in not giving help to other countries in preparing nuclear weapons. By the end of sixties, Britain, France and China formed a sort of a second line of nuclear weaponry. The two super powers went on accumulating enough weapons to destroy the world. The nuclear question had important implications for the limitations and strength of bipolarity. The United Nations had five permanent members, a class of superior nations. By 1965 all the five countries possessed nuclear weapons.

Here we come to the most essential basis of bipolarity in the sixties and later, the concept of nuclear deterrence. Bipolarity assumed the following forms by this time.

- In Europe it meant two huge armies facing each other, preventing either side from over-running the other side’s territory.
- Global nuclear confrontation based on near-parity-issue of missiles arose here as also the need for bases to have launching pads. This was the decade of the search for bases by either side to strengthen nuclear deterrence at the global level.
- At the ideological level new countries turned socialist or anti-socialist and sought patronage and support on their own terms. This phenomenon continued throughout the period, beginning in the fifties. In the fifties we had Cuba, in the sixties and seventies we had Ethiopia, Aden and Chile for example.

The Vietnam problem was the example of the failure of one of the two great poles to enforce its desires on a reluctant world. Both the Soviet
Union and China, gave moral and physical support to Vietnam. But it was really a war between the American intervention and Vietnamese nationalism. The supporters of Vietnam were never able to achieve permanent influence. This was true of both Soviet Union and China.

The important point about Vietnam from our study of bipolarity in the modern world is the strength of a small nation to stand up to the most powerful country of the world. It demonstrated the limits of power in the nuclear age.

While Vietnam was attracting the attention of the world, the Soviet Union and the United States avoided direct confrontation on most issues. This was the time when China under Mao retreated into an angry isolationist phase. Her policy was directed against both super powers. She saw not a bipolar world but a duopoly, a domination over the whole world by two imperialism, one "capitalists" and the other "social" (not socialist). The Chinese were outside the United Nations; they were a bitterly divided nation and this particular course of action did not lead to any permanent benefits for herself or for her allies but, like the Vietnam question, the Chinese assessment of the super power role in the world during the sixties had a certain permanent importance.

The sixties, in fact provided a comparative period of lulls in the relations between the two super powers. The conflicts which were raging in the world at that time in Vietnam and in Middle East could not be directly influenced this way or that way by either super power. They were both examples of the autonomy of the powerful motivated small nations in the world of the United Nations and nuclear deference.

Between the two super powers, there was a remarkable improvement in their relations between 1969 and 1975. The original term "cold war" which had been invented in the late forties in America to define the intensely armed hostility between the two power blocs was slowly becoming out of date. Detente had not yet come but it was round the corner in the seventies.

The three major developments in the early seventies were: (a) the non-proliferation Treaty; (b) the European detente; and (c) the admission of China to the United Nations and the gradual evolution of a triangular relationship between China, the United States and the Soviet Union.
The Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty was as important as the continuing authority of the Partial Test Ban Treaty. It was also important because it was the conformation of the shared interests of the nuclear weapon powers, particularly the super powers, in that most important strategic area.

In Europe dramatic changes were made. The conversations between Brezhnev and Brandt, the West German leader, led to a great improvement on the German question. Both Germanys recognized each other and were recognized by the super powers. There were also consequential agreements in which Poland was involved. Although United States was not directly concerned. All this could not have happened without her approval. In fact, this whole phenomenon is usually described under the label 'Ostopolitik', the German word for a policy for the East. This was the phrase used by Willy Brandt.

It should be noted that the improvement in East-West relations on Germany did not lead to a final legal solution. There was no peace treaty with Germany but the position on the ground became acceptable. This led to relaxation of the prevailing tensions.

The next five years saw the movement towards a European agreement. In this movement, both the Soviet Union and the United States played important roles. Equally crucial was the contribution of Germany, France and Britain. A continuing conference labeled CSCE (Conference for Security and Cooperation in Europe) met for the next fifteen years. In the first successful conference at Helsinki, very important agreements were made between the several countries of Europe in which the members of both the two blocs and the neutral and the non-aligned countries of Europe were involved. These agreements led to recognition of the post-war borders by all sides. This was very important to the Soviet Union and the allies. In the economic field there was a promise of greater co-operation. Each side accepted the right of the other side to demand the issuing of restrictions on the exercise of the individual human right like the right to travel, free speech etc. This was a small beginning but Helsinki marked the height of detente.

During this whole period two major developments had taken place outside the political and strategic fields. Their comparative freedom from military expenditure made West Germany and Japan major powers in the economic sense. The post war treaties have limited their military role. It became more and more clear that these two nations, and also Italy, to a smaller extent, would be behaving
more and more like equal partners than merely junior allies of one of the two super powers. There was, thus, a certain erosion of the old bipolarity in the non-strategic field.

Similar in character but entirely different in form was the third major development of the seventies i.e., the emergence of China as a third important power. She began to exercise her autonomy in decision making by first trying to work out almost a strategic relationship with the United States. The Sino-Soviet dispute was bitter during this period but it is important to note that both Moscow and Peking never permitted their hostility to go beyond a certain level. Very vaguely a third pole was emerging in the global framework. The combination of population, area and nationalist-cum-ideological autonomy along with its increasing nuclear capacity made China a natural rebel against the comfortable bipolar situation. Peking did not any longer speak indignantly of Duopoly of Great Power condominium but began to interact selectively with all powers, including the super powers. It is important to know that in doing so, she gave up her earlier ambition of becoming the leader of the world revolutionary forces.

The end of the decade of seventies saw the whole situation turned upside down because of the developments in Iran and Afghanistan. The Iranian Revolution was a great mass upsurge unleashed by a religious leader. It showed how weak, in a crisis, state power could be. It also demonstrated the comparative limits of the influence and authority of the great powers. The Soviet Union, an immediate neighbour, was able to do very little to restrain Iran. The US entered into a collision course with Iran. The hostage crisis showed the weakness of the US and, in fact led to the defeat of Jimmy Carter in the Presidential elections in the USA.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan led to the so-called second Cold War. President Carter was still in power. He and his adviser, Brzezinski, decided upon a series of economic and strategic measures. Apart from the economic embargo on many items, the most dramatic example was the boycott of the Moscow Olympics.

There were very significant domestic developments in many countries about the same time. Both in Britain and in America, the new correlative philosophy became triumphant. Reagan and Mrs. Thatcher represented this. In economic matters this meant a total opposition to nationalization, the expenses involved in the welfare state, social subsidies and also the black and white depiction of communism, socialism and social democracy as evils. The changes
in technology in sixties and the seventies led to the great powers entering the services sector in most countries. Manufacturing industries were shifted to the less developed parts of the developed countries and also to the developing states.

This did not however prevent America under Reagan from trying to cultivate communist China. It now became clear that the hostility towards the Soviet Union was more than ideological; it turned out to be one of great power hostility of a global rival.

This new hostility led to new tough policies by America in the strategic weapons field. Earlier in the seventies, during the period of détente, Richard Nixon and Henry Kissinger had worked out many disarmament agreements with the Soviet Union like SALT - I and SALT - II. These were intended to reduce expansion of nuclear weapons and missiles, though there was no serious attempt to reduce the existing stocks. This got changed under Reagan. He came out with a very expensive, new project called the Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) or otherwise dubbed as “Star Wars”, an attempt to protect the US completely from missiles getting through by constructing a veritable shield of counter missile weaponry.

During the first half of the eighties, the new cold war was at its bitterest. This was the time when Soviet Union witnessed many changes in its leadership. There was uncertainty at the top but the older policies continued in a more rigid form. Reagan’s description of the Soviet Union as "an evil empire" could be called the peak hour of the second cold war.

Along with this new confrontation between the super powers there were also many unpleasant developments which they could not control:

- In the Iran-Iraq war, neither side was interested in it but neither side could muster enough enthusiasm to stop it.
- The Arab-Israeli conflict spilled over to Lebanon. International terrorism started getting directed against the US as a result.
- The new Chinese leadership under Deng Xiaoping moved closer to the US in economic policy. However, as far as great power equations were concerned, they successfully, projected themselves as plausible third power.
- The United Nations which had been sidelined for many years became involved both in Afghanistan and in the Iran-Iraq war. Their success was only gradual, but slowly the world was willing to take the UN seriously. This was different from earlier occasions
when the Americans and the Russians preferred to dissolve things outside the UN.

- In the Vietnam-Cambodian problem in south East Asia, a new and vicious military confrontation began. Here, America and China were on one side with the Soviet Union and Vietnam on the other. The Cambodian and the Afghanistan problems became the "Proxy issues" of the decade.

### 2.5 Effects of the Cold War

The rivalry between giants had produced endless friction. The alternative to world-wide collective security had produced world-wide chain of alliances and counter alliances. The intensification of the cold war politics had enhanced the problem and difficulty of all the countries directly or indirectly whether or not they were a party to it.

The dream of creating 'one world' with all nations living in peace under the protection of one international system of collective security had faded. The power conflict had affected the UNO adversely. The UNO was the first casualty of the 'cold war'. It was reduced to a simple force of world opinion. In fact, the UN today is not even a representative body. The cold war prevented some of the states from becoming member of the world body and at least is one case is that of Indonesia to give up its membership. Another familiar instance of the effect of cold war on the UN was the exclusion of the communist China for a long time and inclusion of the representation of Formosa government as the representative of China. The effectiveness of the ‘cold war’ made the position of the United Nations similar to that of the League of Nations after 1930.

The competition among giants resulted in more freedom of action of the small and middle powers. The influence of neutrals, mostly Afro-Asian states was increasingly applied for fanning the cause of peace. The tension among great powers caused indeed conflict but did not result in global war. The influence of world opinion reflected in the UN had prevented either USA or USSR to take action short of war. Thus, even the Cuban crisis of 1962 averted tensions but did not produce any major conflict.

The disadvantages of cold war outweigh any advantage that has resulted from any international conflict. The military alliances like NATO, SEATO, Warsaw Pact and other such alliances created a sort of ‘alliance like situation’. It resulted in competition for armaments- conventional and nuclear. In the world then, approximately 85% of the total sum of Dollars was spent on armaments by U.K., USA, China, France, Germany, Britain
and Russia. Thirty-five percent of the total expenditure of the world on armament is made by in USA. Every time great powers were armed to the teeth. Any local quarrel or even misunderstanding could start the nuclear war and a war of guided missiles. Such a war would bring about the destruction of the whole world.

There is another important aspect to this problem. The diversion of human labour and resources for manufacturing destructive weapons has adversely affected economic development of the world. The advanced countries of the world, exploited backward areas for their own not due to their backwardness but also due to the deliberate policy pursued by the advanced countries. Had they diverted their resources for economic development it could have fed the world. If civilization was to survive such competition should have given way to cooperation. This war of nerves should have been stopped in the interest of world peace.

The 1981-90 decade witnessed the abandonment of the nuclear weapons at the Geneva Summit (1985) by USA and Soviet leaders. Both USA and USSR were now convinced of the futility of nuclear Arms which threatened to annihilate not only the target but the wielder as well. Most momentous changes took place during this period in Eastern Europe when Gorbachev’s Perestroika and Glasnost (1986) demolished dominant influence of the communism in Soviet Russia and Eastern Europe and initiated mass awakening. A new relationship between Moscow and breakaway Soviet states was still to emerge and the trend in the former world led to mixed economy. An offshoot of this evolution has been the transformation of Eastern Europe and the end of the cold war. Within Eastern Europe most significant development has been the unification of Germany. In China too the decade saw not only the downfall of Maoist order but a trend towards democratization (Tiananmen Square events).

The transformation of the cold war resulted either in unipolar or multipolar factions and signaled the shift in emphasis from military domination to high-tech hegemony in future of powers like Germany, Japan, USA and industrially advanced nations. It widened the gulf between north and the south. The end of the bipolar world syndrome led to the domination of the Security Council by the great powers, extended frontiers of freedom and strengthened democratic forces but at the same time threw for mankind new problems and challenges.
2.6 The Berlin Crisis

The collaboration of USSR with the Allied powers sang the swansong of the Japanese militarism and Hitlerism Fascism. While the atom bombs were dropped in Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the world cherished the hope that it would get rid of the tentacles of war and imperialism once for all. But to the disillusionment of the peace loving humanity, the world emerged from the trauma of the World War II only to witness the venomous cold war and the vision for peace proved to be myopic. While on one hand, the Americans were the arch-adversaries of the Russians and were determined to thrash the communist expansion and spread their Pax-American concept either through the Truman Doctrine or the Marshall Plan, on the other hand, Russia stood as the torchbearer of Marxism, Leninism and with a motto of its principle which assumed the form of world communism.

The super powers stood at the loggerheads and with their ideological cleavage, abominable rat-race for world hegemony and mutual distrust they became the dreaded opponents of each other which dawned the era of cold war in the post-Second World War period. The super power rivalry kept the world under the grip of the Cold War and every one, with awe-wrapped suspense waited the moment of the world politics. Whether it was the Berlin crisis, or Indo-China or Cuban missile crisis or Congo crisis or the Middle-East or Far East, there spread a vast blanket of cold war spearheaded by the super power rivalry.

However, the germs of the cold war were incubated in the question of Berlin crisis which became a haunting nightmare for humanity due to the power rivalry and highhandedness of two super powers of the world politics. Neither of the super powers exhibited a compromising tendency in the post war era which intensified the tempo of crisis and confrontation, making it a perpetual scenario.

In the Yalta conference of 1946, the Allied powers agreed to the idea of dividing Germany into four zones to be occupied and administered by USA, USSR, France and Britain respectively. The Potsdam conference had declared that Germany would be treated as a single economic unit despite its vivisection into four parts and would push forward the programs of de-notification, demilitarization and democratization and it also outlined the programming of setting up a Council of Foreign Ministers, consisting of representatives of USA, USSR, France and Britain.
In terms of above agreements Germany was divided into four zones and to regulate the activities of the Allied Armies of occupation in Germany, a control commission was set up. The commission was to follow a joint policy to the four zones of Germany. But it became apparently transparent that the unanimity of following a unanimous policy was a chimera. Soviet Union proposed the establishment of a four-power control over Ruhr, nationalization of all trust properties of Germany and introduction of foreign trade. These suggestions were not at all acceptable to Western powers and thus, the right became a foregone conclusion.

In 1947 Britain, USA and France brought the political and economic integration of the Western Europe and it was at the same time, the Marshall Plan was pronounced which promised the economic help to the Western Europe. This program precipitated the Berlin crisis of 1948.

The first move made by the three powers- France, Britain and USA was to carry out a much needed currency reform in West Germany. Now, Soviet Union wanted to use Berlin as a move to frustrate the plans of the Western power and by February 1948, the Soviet Union claimed that Berlin was a part of the Soviet zone and the Western powers were endangering their rights to stay there by "abusing their position". So she declared the blockade of Berlin and blocked all traffic to Berlin under the pretext of safeguarding the currency of the Soviet Union. The Western powers strongly protested against this blockade of Berlin of Soviet Union and took the issue to the Security Council. But Soviet Union continued with the blockade and during this period, USA resorted to the airlift of supplies to the West Berliners.

A conference was held in Moscow in August 1948 to settle the dispute by negotiations. When the attempt did not succeed, the matter was taken to UNO. A settlement was arrived on May 12, 1949, both the blockade and counter blockade were ended and both the parties agreed to meet together to discuss the future of Germany. The issues discussed were:

- The establishment of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) (West Germany) and the German Democratic Republic (GDR) (East Germany);
- The admission of FRG to NATO and rearms against the Potsdam declaration;
- The formation of Warsaw pact;
- On the Berlin conference of 1954, four ministers meeting would be held in order to discuss the condition for the strong feeling
of reunification and free election. Moreover, Soviet Union would take the full initiative for the formation of all German provisional government by taking the German representatives;

- The ideological cleavage; and
- In 1957, the Western nations planned for Berlin declaration, but Soviet Union insisted on the demand of the dissolution of NATO.

In November 1958, Khrushchev declared that East Berlin be transferred to East Germany and the Western powers would have to withdraw from the West Berlin. West Berlin was to have a status of a free city which was to be guaranteed by the United Nations. But Western powers declined. The Soviet Union accused the Western powers of using West Berlin as the propaganda and espionage centre. It was contented that West Berlin provided an easy escape to the West Germany. To put a check on it, the Soviet Union constructed a 35 mile long wall between East and West Berlin. As a result of the sealing of the border, all contacts were severed.

The four powers USA, UK, USSR and France were assembled to talk on the problem of German reunification and future of Berlin. Their new peace plan insisted on reunification of Germany by accomplishing the reunification of Berlin through free elections as the first step towards German unity. The four powers were to guarantee the independence of united Berlin. A Commission of 35 members (25 from West Germany and 10 from East Germany) was suggested, which would make the electoral laws. The united Germany was to be free from the NATO or Warsaw Pact’s tentacles. But this fell flat.

In 1960, USSR threatened that she would conclude a separate treaty with East Germany unilaterally and would concede sovereign rights to East Germany over the city of Berlin. However, the neutral powers intervened. After the two super powers failed West Germany made efforts for hastening the end of the cold war.

The members of the Warsaw Pact were in a hostile attitude towards West Germany. In 1970, West Germany and East German would be treated by one another in future. Moreover, in 1971 a peace treaty was signed between USSR and West Germany which signalized one step ahead in peace process. Accordingly, the citizens of West Berlin were permitted to travel through East Berlin.

In the concluding treaty of November 1977, territorial independence and integrity were recognized. However, in 1973 Germany was admitted to
UNO. In the year 1972 Berlin was declared the capital of West and East Germany (Federal Republic of Germany).

To sum up, the question of Berlin rather crisis precipitated the cold war which disturbed the peace of Europe to an extent. However, "A hot war" says Bertrand Russell "is not as demagogically harmful as the cold war, which keeps men, women and children always in a state of suspense. The suspense psychologically saps the entire mental and spiritual peace." So, the urgent need was to avert and dispel the cloud of cold war.

2.7 The Cuban Crisis

The Cuban crisis was the crisis-point of the Cold War. It was the time when the world came nearest to annihilating itself. It was the closest the world ever came to nuclear war. The United States armed forces were at their highest state of readiness ever and Soviet field commanders in Cuba were prepared to use battlefield nuclear weapons to defend the island if it was invaded. Luckily, thanks to the bravery of two men, President John F. Kennedy and Premier Nikita Khrushchev, war was averted.

Cuba, the "Pearl of the Antilles" and the largest island in Latin America, was a Spanish colony till it gained nominal independence after Spain was defeated by the USA in the Spanish-American war of 1897-98. It remained a virtual protectorate and an economic colony of the U.S.A. and was ruled over by brutal dictators till 1st January 1959, when the last of them, Fulgencio Batista, a protégé of USA was driven out of the island after a protracted and heroic struggle led by Fidel Castro. After establishing himself in power in 1959, Castro organized the administration and economy of the state on the communist lines and cultivated close relations with USSR. This was very threatening to the USA because it was right next to America. In 1960, Castro made a trade agreement with Russia, whereby Cuba sent sugar to Russia, in return for oil, machines and money. This frightened the Americans more, and in 1960 they stopped trading with Cuba. In retaliation, Cuba nationalised all American-owned companies.

In 1961 Fidel Castro declared that "The urban revolution has broken the chaos of imperialist oppression in Latin America and has led to the establishment of the first socialist state in the American continent, marking a historic turning point and opening in this region a new phase of Revolutionary movement". This was in reality, in striking difference to USA's policy of "America for Americans" which had virtually adopted the
policy of "Hands off" for Western powers and had placed the Latin America under the sway of "holder of big sticks".

The triumphant outcome of the Cuban revolution evoked the hate of the imperialists in the USA and they brought their entire means of political blackmail, and economic pressure into play, stage-managing and counter revolutionary conspiracies. A report drew up by the senate select committee on intelligence noted that in the period from 1960 to 1965 the CIA organized and tried to realize a series of plots and acts of terrorism aimed at ousting Fidel Castro.

In 1960, the USA cut the Cuban sugar purchase quota by 95 percent and placed an embargo on the sale of the industrial equipment and other items to Cuba. This put Cuba in extremely difficult position. Diplomatic and trade relations with Soviet could help them to withstand the USA’s economic pressure.

Having promised in May 1960 to defend Cuba with Soviet arms, the Soviet premier Nikita Khrushchev assumed that the United States would take no steps to prevent the installation of Soviet medium- and intermediate-range ballistic missiles in Cuba. Such missiles could hit much of the eastern United States within a few minutes if launched from Cuba. On April 17, 1961 Cuba was practically attacked by armed interventionists, who were given cover by the US warships and aircrafts. However, it failed, but the US President Kennedy’s administration never wanted to make Cuba a U.S.S.R’S satellite. In a statement of September 11, 1961 the Soviet government admitted that a certain amount of armaments was shipped from the USSR to Cuba and that some military specialists were also dispatched there for properly handling them.

In May 1962, Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev was persuaded by the idea of countering the United States' growing lead in developing and deploying strategic missiles by placing Soviet intermediate-range nuclear missiles in Cuba, despite the Cuban Ambassador Alexeyev’s argument that Castro would not accept the deployment of these missiles. He faced a strategic situation where the US was perceived to have a "splendid first strike" capability against the Soviet Union. In 1962, the Soviets had only 20 ICBMs capable of delivering nuclear warheads to the United States from inside the Soviet Union. The poor accuracy and reliability of these missiles raised serious doubts about their effectiveness. A newer, more reliable generation of ICBMs would only become operational after 1965. Therefore, Soviet nuclear capability in 1962 placed less emphasis on ICBMs than on medium and intermediate-range ballistic missiles (MRBMs
and IRBMs). These missiles could hit American allies and most of Alaska from Soviet territory but not the contiguous 48 states of the USA.

A second reason Soviet missiles were deployed to Cuba was because Khrushchev wanted to bring West Berlin—the American/British/French-controlled democratic zone within Communist East Germany—into the Soviet orbit. The East Germans and Soviets considered western control over a portion of Berlin a grave threat to East Germany. For this reason, among others, Khrushchev made West Berlin the central battlefield of the Cold War. Khrushchev believed that if the Americans did nothing over the missile deployments in Cuba, he could muscle the West out of Berlin using said missiles as a deterrent to western counter-measures in Berlin. If the Americans tried to bargain with the Soviets after becoming aware of the missiles, Khrushchev could demand trading the missiles for West Berlin. Since Berlin was strategically more important than Cuba, the trade would be a win for Khrushchev. President Kennedy recognized this: "The advantage is, from Khrushchev's point of view, he takes a great chance but there are quite some rewards to it."

From the very beginning, the Soviets' operation entailed elaborate denial and deception, known in the USSR as maskirovka. All of the planning and preparation for transporting and deploying the missiles were carried out in the utmost secrecy, with only a very few told the exact nature of the mission. Even the troops detailed for the mission were given misdirection, told they were headed for a cold region and outfitted with ski boots, fleece-lined parkas, and other winter equipment.

In early 1962, a group of Soviet military and missile construction specialists accompanied an agricultural delegation to Havana. They obtained a meeting with Cuban leader Fidel Castro. The Cuban leadership had a strong expectation that the US would invade Cuba again and they enthusiastically approved the idea of installing nuclear missiles in Cuba. However, according to another source, Fidel Castro objected to the missiles deployment that would have made him look like a Soviet puppet, but was persuaded that missiles in Cuba would be in the interests of the entire socialist camp.

Specialists in missile construction under the guise of "machine operators", "irrigation specialists" and "agricultural specialists" arrived in July. Marshal Sergei Biryuzov, chief of the Soviet Rocket Forces, led a survey team that visited Cuba. He told Khrushchev that the missiles would be concealed and camouflaged by the palm trees.
The Cuban leadership was further upset when in September the United States Congress approved US Joint Resolution 230, which expressed Congress's resolve to prevent the creation of an externally supported military establishment. On the same day, the US announced a major military exercise in the Caribbean, PHIBRIGLEX-62, which Cuba denounced as a deliberate provocation and proof that the US planned to invade Cuba.

Khrushchev and Castro agreed to place strategic nuclear missiles secretly in Cuba. Like Castro, Khrushchev felt that a US invasion of Cuba was imminent, and that to lose Cuba would do great harm to the communist cause, especially in Latin America. He said he wanted to confront the Americans "with more than words ... the logical answer was missiles". The Soviets maintained their tight secrecy, writing their plans longhand, which were approved by Khrushchev on July 7.

The Soviet leadership believed, based on their perception of Kennedy's lack of confidence during the Bay of Pigs Invasion in 1961, that he would avoid confrontation and accept the missiles as a fait accompli. On September 11, the Soviet Union publicly warned that a US attack on Cuba or on Soviet ships carrying supplies to the island would mean war. The Soviets continued their Maskirovka program to conceal their actions in Cuba. They repeatedly denied that the weapons being brought into Cuba were offensive in nature. On September 7, Soviet Ambassador to the United States Anatoly Dobrynin assured United States Ambassador to the United Nations Adlai Stevenson that the USSR was supplying only defensive weapons to Cuba. On September 11, the Soviet News Agency, Telegrafnoe Agentstvo Soverskogo Soyuza (TASS) announced that the Soviet Union had no need or intention to introduce offensive nuclear missiles into Cuba.

As early as August 1962, the United States suspected the Soviets of building missile facilities in Cuba. During that month, its intelligence services gathered information about sightings by ground observers of Russian-built MiG-21 fighters and Il-28 light bombers. U-2 spy planes found S-75 Dvina (NATO designation SA-2) surface-to-air missile sites at eight different locations.

Meanwhile, Fidel Castro was looking for a way to defend his island nation from an attack by the U.S. Ever since the failed Bay of Pigs invasion in 1961, Castro felt a second attack was inevitable. Consequently, he approved of Khrushchev's plan to place missiles on the
island. In the summer of 1962 the Soviet Union worked quickly and secretly to build its missile installations in Cuba.

For the United States, the crisis began on October 15, 1962 when reconnaissance photographs revealed Soviet missiles under construction in Cuba. Early the next day, President John Kennedy was informed of the missile installations. He immediately organized the EX-COMM, a group of his twelve most important advisors to handle the crisis. After seven days of guarded and intense debate within the upper echelons of government, Kennedy decided to impose a naval quarantine around Cuba. He wished to prevent the arrival of more Soviet offensive weapons on the island. On October 22, 1962 he announced the discovery of missile installations to the public and his decision to quarantine the island. He also proclaimed that any nuclear missile launched from Cuba would be regarded as an attack on the United States by the Soviet Union and demanded that the Soviets remove all of their offensive weapons from Cuba.

During the public phase of the Crisis, tensions began to build on both sides. Kennedy eventually ordered low-level reconnaissance missions once every two hours. On the 25th Kennedy pulled the quarantine line back and raised military readiness to DEFCON 2. Then on the 26th, EX-COMM heard from Khrushchev in an impassioned letter. He proposed removing Soviet missiles and personnel if the U.S. would guarantee not to invade Cuba. October 27 was the worst day of the crisis. A U-2 was shot down over Cuba and EX-COMM received a second letter from Khrushchev demanding the removal of U.S. missiles in Turkey in exchange for Soviet missiles in Cuba. Attorney General Robert Kennedy suggested ignoring the second letter and contacted Soviet Ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin to tell him of the U.S. agreement with the first.

Each side appealed to the Security Council and conflict followed between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. While the debate in the Security Council was carried on between the American and Soviet representatives on the usual acrimonious level of past Soviet-American exchanges, the communications sent by the President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev to each other were marked by dignity and a sincere attempt to appreciate each other’s position and avoid a nuclear war between the two countries.

Replying to the change that the missiles had been emplaced in Cuba with a view to securing a military advantage Mr. Khrushchev referred to the rockets stationed in Britain, Italy and Turkey. The USA
made a request to the Security Council to take decisions against the "latest threat of Soviet Union.

The UN Secretary General U. Thant prevailed upon USA and while Kennedy wanted to abandon the blockade, Khrushchev dismantled the Cuban missile sites and transported the missiles back to the Soviet Union and the same was actually done.

The danger pursued due chiefly to the good sense of Khrushchev, though it unleashed against him the fury of his enemies, including the Chinese and it contributed to the downfall of Khrushchev. Fidel Castro was angry at this, however, U. Thant could mediate between the two parties and here, the role of the UNO was definite.

Tensions finally began to ease on October 28 when Khrushchev announced that he would dismantle the installations and return the missiles to the Soviet Union, expressing his trust that the United States would not invade Cuba. Further negotiations were held to implement the October 28 agreement, including a United States demand that Soviet light bombers be removed from Cuba, and specifying the exact form and conditions of United States assurances not to invade Cuba.

In the following weeks both superpowers began fulfilling their promises and the crisis was over by late November. Cuba's communist leader, Fidel Castro, was infuriated by the Soviets' retreat in the face of the U.S. ultimatum but was powerless to act.

Khrushchev lost prestige because of his failure in this issue. Particularly, China broke from Russia. Kennedy gained prestige. He was seen as the men who faced down the Russians. Both sides had had a fright. They were more careful in future. The two leaders set up a telephone 'hotline' to talk directly in a crisis. In 1963, they agreed a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty. Cuba was the start of the end of the Cold War. Cuba remained a Communist dictatorship, but America left it alone.

The Cuban missile crisis marked the climax of an acutely antagonistic period in U.S.-Soviet relations. The crisis also marked the closest point that the world had ever come to global nuclear war. It is generally believed that the Soviets' humiliation in Cuba played an important part in Khrushchev's fall from power in October 1964 and in the Soviet Union's determination to achieve, at the least, a nuclear parity with the United States.
2.8 The Suez Crisis

The partition of Palestine did not end the Arab-Israeli tension. The Arab states, after their defeat in 1948, passed through a period of political unrest. The most critical change occurred in Egypt, where in 1952 a cabal of young army officers backed by the Muslim Brotherhood forced the dissolute King Farouk into exile. In 1954 Nasser emerged to assume control. Nasser envisioned a pan-Arab movement led by Egypt that would expel the British from the Middle East, efface Israel, and restore Islamic grandeur. Egypt began sponsoring acts of violence against Israel from the Gaza Strip and cut off shipping through the Strait of Tiran. The British were understandably hostile to Nasser, as were the French, who were battling Islamic nationalists in Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia. Nasser turned to Soviet bloc for arms which were forthcoming in great quantity. This in turn upset the delicate arms equilibrium between Arab and Jews. Nasser's assistance to Algerian rebels further upset his relations with France.

Israel had used the years since 1948 to good effect, developing the arid country and training a reserve force of 200,000 men and women armed primarily with French weapons. Ben-Gurion, the Prime Minister of Israel, believed that the Arabs would never accept the existence of Israel except by force. U.S. policy was to play down the Arab–Israeli dispute and alert all parties to the danger of Communist penetration. To this end, Eisenhower dispatched a futile mission in January 1956 in hopes of reconciling Cairo and Tel Aviv. In addition, the United States agreed to contribute $56,000,000, and $200,000,000 through the World Bank, to Egypt's project for a new dam on the Nile at Aswan. Nasser's flirtations with Moscow, however, alienated Dulles, the US Secretary of State.

In 1954 Nasser compelled Britain to conclude an agreement relating to the evolution of the Suez Canal. But ill feelings between the two grew very strong. Meanwhile, the Baghdad Pact was signed. Nasser looked upon his pact as a sort of western challenge to the Egyptian leadership in the Middle East. At the same time, Egypt had the fear of Israel. Under such circumstances Nasser procured armaments from Czechoslovakia and Soviet Russia. Consequently, the British and the US interests in the Middle East were threatened. The negotiations which the United States had with Egypt over the construction of the Aswan Dam closed down abruptly. The material progress of Egypt depended largely upon the Aswan Dam. But in the face of the Anglo-French opposition Egypt gave up her hope of securing foreign loans.
At this opportune movement Soviet Russia extended an offer of financial assistance to Egypt and the Russian Foreign Minister Shepilov came to Egypt to negotiate over the matter. The Anglo-US bloc became alarmed. President Nasser nationalized the Suez Canal on July 26, 1956 to defray the cost of the construction of the Aswan Dam. Adequate compensations were given to the foreign owners of the Suez Canal company and the right of free passage of the ships of all countries through the Suez canal was also recognized. Britain and France (major stock holders of the Suez Company) and the United States strongly reacted against the nationalization of the canal. The starting dues to Egypt were withheld in Britain; all deposits of the Egyptian government in Britain, France and the USA were freezeed and Egypt’s trade in sterling area was closed. The Western powers proposed to form an international agency for the administration of the Suez Canal. But Egypt rejected it. Britain and France raised the canal issue in the United Nations. Britain and France supported the resolutions sponsored by the UN for settlement of the problem.

Britain and France, prepared to use force were persuaded by American pressure to try diplomacy first. Dulles, the USA Secretary of State arrived in London, told there that Eisenhower "was emphatic upon importance of negotiation. The president did not rule out the use of force... but he felt that every possibility of peaceful settlement must be exhausted before this was done." Dulles urged that Nasser must be asked to "discuss" on the canal. Only at this point, was the matter presented to UNO. On September 23, 1956, Britain and France urged to the Security Council which discussed the matter in nine meetings on October 13, 1956. It adopted six principles to which Egypt agreed as the base of negotiations.

- Passage and shipping through this canal should be free and open, subject to no political and technical discrimination;
- Egypt’s sovereignty should be respected;
- Operation of canal should be insulated from politics of all countries;
- Egypt’s users were to fix polls and charges by arrangements;
- Fair proportion of the bill was to be set aside for the development of the canal; and
- Disputes between old Suez Company and Egypt should be settled by negotiation or arbitration.

Tedious and prolonged negotiations followed the next months. All ended in fiasco, foundering on the rock of Egypt’s unwillingness to agree
to any form of international administration of the canal. Britain and France pushed ahead with the military preparation but the first military action was launched by Israel. As Israel forces started heading towards the canal, the British and France gave an ultimatum to Israel and Egypt to cease fighting within twelve hours and withdraw all troops within ten miles radius of the canal. The Anglo-French forces were to occupy Port Said, Ismailia and Suez temporarily. Egypt rejected the ultimatum and the Anglo-French air attacks on military targets began on October 31, 1956 as a prelude to landings.

Meanwhile, the ceasefire resolutions in the UN Security Council were deadlocked. The General Assembly acting under the “uniting for peace” resolution, met at a special emergency session from November 1 to 10, 1956. It called for a ceasefire. The idea of an "emergency force", United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF) was proposed by Lester Pearson of Canada as it quickly became conspicuous that the US was not willing to back the Anglo-French action. Meanwhile Soviets were preparing to send volunteers to aid Egypt, and talking of bombing and ravaging London and Paris by rocket-missiles.

On November 5 and 6, British and French forces landed at Port Said and Port Fuad and began occupying the Canal Zone. This move was soon met by growing opposition at home and by U.S.-sponsored resolutions in the UN (made in part to counter Soviet threats of intervention), which quickly put a stop to the Anglo-French action. On 6th November 1956 Britain yielded; France followed the Soviet; and Israel then reluctantly withdrew. By 10th November, the first UNEF troops were at a staging area in Italy. On 15th November, they landed in Egypt with Egyptian consent. Their duty was not to fire on any party, but to separate all parties in order that hostilities would end. On December 22 the UN evacuated British and French troops, and Israeli forces withdrew in March 1957. Egypt’s resistance, though enough still in isolated instances, failed to repel the invaders. Egypt did effectively block the canal, however, by sinking the floating complements of the canal company and smashing much of the machines used in the canal.

Coming to the significance of this crisis it is seen that the initial assault by Israel followed a series of raids on Egyptian territory which compelled Egypt to acquire large quantities of arms and ammunitions to be based against Israel. Moreover, Egypt closed for years the Suez Canal to Israeli shipping. This was naturally to disturb the international peace in the coming years. Britain and France had been focusing more on Suez whereby the status of an international canal got unilaterally altered. Thus,
when the three nations resorted to force against Egypt, it was not unprovoked whether or not it was actually rectified.

The only one who gained in the Suez muddle was the USSR. With the West in disarray and involved in a campaign that looked very much like old-fashioned imperialism, Soviet tanks returned to Budapest on November 4, crushed the Hungarians fighting with their homemade weapons, and liquidated their leaders. In 1957 the Soviets declared a new policy of “centralism” for the satellites and denounced both “dogmatism” (a code word for Stalinism) and “revisionism” (a code word for liberty).

The events of October 1956 nevertheless helped to renew momentum for European integration. Hungary reminded western Europeans of the nature and proximity of the Soviet regime; Suez made them resentful of American tutelage. Inspired by Jean Monnet, the first president of the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) and the Belgian economist Paul-Henri Spaak, “the Six” (Belgium, France, West Germany, Italy, Luxembourg and the Netherlands) drafted the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) Treaty for a joint nuclear energy agency and the Treaty of Rome to expand the coal and steel community into a full-fledged Common Market. The treaties were signed on March 25, 1957, and went into effect on January 1, 1958. The European Economic Community provided for internal and external tariff coordination, free movement of labour and capital, and a common agricultural pricing policy. Integration theorists hoped that international economic institutions would sustain a momentum leading to political unity as well.

Nasser emerged from the Suez Crisis a victor and a hero for the cause of Arab and Egyptian nationalism. Israel did not win freedom to use the canal, but it did regain shipping rights in the Straits of Tiran. Britain and France, less fortunate, lost most of their influence in the Middle East as a result of the episode.

For the UNO, under such circumstances, to have condemned the three nations for aggression, quite apart from considerations that Britain and France were super power, would have been unwarranted. The Anglo-French action was exploited based upon the protection of the canal and there was obviously no mention to retain Egyptian territory. Given the Soviet threat, the situation was potentially capable of escalation to an unprecedented degree. However, once the UN decided to intervene to settle the dispute, situations at the international level could be brought to control. With the UN supervision, an arrangement was reached under
which Egypt agreed to allow free passage of the ships in the canal and compensated the stock holders of the canal company.

2.9 The Afghan Crisis

Among all the cold war crises of the post-Second World War era, the Afghan crisis assumed an alarming and frail proportion. No crisis of the decade evoked so much varied opinions, yet so much excuse, like the crisis of Afghanistan. No doubt the cold war and crises went on in Cuba, Nicaragua, El Salvador, West Asia especially Palestine, Indian Ocean and in the South East Asia. But the Afghan crisis of South West Asia, considering from the national, international and regional perspectives, took the dimension of a hot war. If Russia made her plea that she had sent troops to Afghanistan only to fulfill the treaty obligations, the USA viewed it as a blatant violation of international law and dubbed it as a naked aggression. As a protest, USA supplied sophisticated armaments to Pakistan, the neighboring state of Afghanistan and therefore, USA's imperialism and neo-colonialism became an admitted fact so far as the Afghan crisis was concerned.

To a great aghast, April 14, 1988 ushered in a unique historic day in the Asian sub-continent when Pakistan and Afghanistan, at loggerheads for several years, at last signed an agreement with the collaboration of the USA, UN and Russia and hoped to bring about peace over the crisis-stricken Afghanistan.

Afghanistan is very much a strategic prize in the South-west Asia. In 1953, Muhammed Daud was designated as the Prime Minister by the King Zahir Shah. During Daud's time Afghanistan started receiving aid from both Soviet Union and the United States. Daud was dismissed in 1963. However, the beginning of the present troubled phase in the history of Afghanistan could be traced back to July 17, 1973 when Zahir Shah, the last king of the country was deposed and the responsibility for running the country was taken over by General Muhammed Daud as the president of a republican regime. A special Loya Jirgah (Grand Assembly) approved a new constitution according to which Daud was elected as president of the Republic for six years. But with the crackdown of his political opponents he lost popularity. The death of Mir Ali Khaiber, the left-wing leader, was followed by massive anti-Daud demonstrations in Kabul. On April 27, 1977, Daud was ousted in a military coup and killed along with members of his family. The military administration released the leaders of the left wing People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) who were put into power with
Nur Muhammed Taraki as the head. On April 30, 1977, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan came to be set up and Nur Muhammed Taraki became the president.

Within a short time, the new regime came up against opposition from tribal and religious groups. On top of that, it got involved in a power struggle between two of its factions Khalq and Parcham. The turbulence in the country also began to attract the attention of the USA through its surrogate Pakistan. But Taraki strove hard to build up a strong state and his foreign policy was based on the principles of non-alignment, opposing imperialism, colonialism, Zionism, racialism and apartheid. Soviet Union firmly stood for the cooperation with Afghanistan.

In December 1978 Taraki paid an official visit to USSR and on December 5, 1978 a treaty of friendship and good neighbourhood between the USSR and People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) was signed. Article 4 of the treaty contained the provisions that the USSR and PDPA will consult together and with the agreement of both sides, will take appropriate steps to guarantee the security, independence and territorial integrity of both countries.

In September 1979, Nur Muhammed Taraki was ousted by Hafizullah Amin by means of internal intrigues and plots. At this unsettled condition, the USA began to extend more and more clandestine support to Afghan guerilla forces that fanned out to neighbouring areas in Pakistan and built their bases of operation in those countries and started raiding government positions within the Afghan borders. On December 27, 1979 Russian forces were sent into Afghanistan to prevent interference by outside powers. The Russians installed in Kabul a new regime headed by Babrak Karmal. This provoked the Afghan guerilla groups or the Mujahideen to step up their attacks. But the US condemned this as a naked aggression or an armed intervention in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. Thus, a tug of cold war started between the Soviet Union and the leftist forces in Afghanistan on one hand and the Afghan rightists or fundamentalists, and Pakistan and the USA on the other hand.

While the counter revolutionaries and guerillas fought against the Babrak's Government, the number of Afghan refugees in Pakistan and Iran gradually swelled to nearly four million. Simultaneously, the Soviet troops began to increase in Afghanistan and by the end of 1987 it grew upto nearly 1, 15,000. The presence of Soviet troops was resented by the western bloc and that is why, they also boycotted the Moscow Olympic of 1980. However, Soviet Russia argued that the presence of the Soviet
military forces would be withdrawn when the peace would be restored and the supply of arms and ammunitions to Afghan guerillas by USA, China, Pakistan, and Egypt etc. would cease to function.

On the other hand, Jimmy Carter, former President of USA denounced the Soviet military intervention. USA’s argument was that Soviet Union wanted to expand its hegemonism in the oil-bearing Gulf region. As a challenge, the US deployed large US naval force in this area and the Indian Ocean. It also raised the RDF and developed its bases in Egypt, Kenya, and Somalia apart from its key base in Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean.

It also sold sophisticated arms like F-16 and AWACS (Airborne Warning and Control System) to Pakistan and Saudi Arabia, supplied all sorts of arms to the Mujahideen rebels to fight against the Karmal’s regime in Afghanistan. In a message to the Afghans, the then President Ronald Reagan told “We, in the US share with the belief in God and in his blessings.” He also said, “we also share a common love of freedom and a desire to live our lives as we determine free of outside interference”. This was nothing but sheer hypocrisy if we look at the record of the Reagan administration in El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua and Chile.

On the other hand, Pakistani military head General Zia-ul-Haq played his 'American card' with shrewdness. Under the false mask of threat from Soviet Russia through Afghanistan, he played ducks and drakes with people's money by buying dreaded weapons from the US. That posed a threat to India. In an interview to the correspondent of All India Radio (AIR) Babrak Karmal told, "It is the Pakistani soil, which is being used as a spring-board and logistics centre for counter revolutionaries and for conduction of anti-Afghan activities.

Meanwhile, there was another change of government in Kabul. In November 1986, Babrak Karmal made way for Dr. Muhammed Najibullah, formerly head of the Afghan secret police. In an effort to conciliate opposition groups Dr. Najibullah announced in January 1987 that the Kabul government would observe ceasefire for six months and pursue a policy of national reconciliation. But the Mujahideen rejected the ceasefire and decided to continue the armed struggle against the Kabul government and the Russian forces. They called for the formation of a government in exile to continue the war.

While the war proximity talks were going on in Geneva the parties involved were holding consultations behind the scenes. By September
1987 the five years old Geneva talks had already produced agreement on three points of a four point peace plan:

- Mutual assurances of noninterference between Pakistan and Afghanistan;
- Return of refugees; and
- International guarantees to enforce the settlement and the fourth point related to the time-table for Russian troops withdrawal. Another issue that remained to be settled was as to who would wield power in Kabul after the Russians had gone home.

Meanwhile, the USA adopted a deliberately ambiguous policy clothed in flexibility in order to gain the several objectives it had in view. They were:

- Getting the Russians out of Afghanistan;
- The need to give the Pakistanis and the guerillas moral support without encouraging any rigid instance which may interfere with the primary goal of Soviet withdrawal; and
- Not giving the impression that the USA was not behind Pakistan or the guerillas at a time when the terms were yet to be finalized etc.

But April 14, 1988 marked a unique watershed in the history of the Asian sub-continent when Pakistan and Afghanistan formally signed in Geneva a US and Soviet guaranteed accord that was to lead to a pull out of all Soviet troops from Afghanistan within a maximum period of nine months from May 15, 1988. Half of the estimated strength of 1, 15,000 troops was to be back home by August 15, 1988.

The indirect tough negotiations were conducted for six years under the supervision of the UN Secretary-General’s special envoy, Mr. Diego Cordovez who had to settle between the two rooms. The principal signatories to the accord were the Foreign Ministers of Afghanistan and Pakistan, Abdul Wakil and Zain Noorani respectively. The representatives of the two super powers, George Shults, the US Secretary of State, and Eduard Shevardnadze, the USSR Foreign Minister, also put their signatures to the accord, not as parties to the agreement, but as guarantors.

The Soviet Union and the USA subscribed separately to an instrument undertaking to refrain from any interference in the affairs of Afghanistan and Pakistan and asking all the countries to act likewise.
Under the terms of another document signed by Pakistan and Afghanistan only, the two vowed to respect each other’s “sovereignty, territorial integrity, national unity, security and nonalignment”. They also undertook to prevent their territories being used for the training, equipping, financing and recruitment of mercenaries. They also signed an agreement undertaking to facilitate the return of refugees to their homes in freedom. The agreement also provided that a senior UN military officer will be stationed in the area to check on ground of any violations of the accord. It also provided that the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR) would help the repatriation of refugees from Pakistan. The accord also made no mention, however, of the estimated two million Afghan refugees in Iran. For a period of eighteen months starting from May 15, 1988 joint commissions were set up to organize and supervise the repatriation process.

2.10 Problems of Disarmament

The Second World War inserted the last nail in the coffin of the League of Nations, plunging the mankind into the worst catastrophe of humanism. The devastation and destruction and the wholesale genocide caused by the World War II had a therapeutic effect on the world statesmen and it propelled them to form the UNO to avert the disastrous world of the war holocaust looming on the world’s horizon. But the prophets of peace were betrayed and belied of their hopes for peaceful co-existence because once again, the world began to oscillate between the two conflicting poles, peace and war. On one side, there gleamed the distant beacon of hope for peace while on the other hand, the dark cloud of war hovered over the horizon. No one ever predicted the future of mankind whether it was to survive or get extinct in a "thermo nuclear" or a "star war".

The introduction of "star war weapons" escalated the arms race to an unprecedented degree. The peace loving humanity of the world lived in a perpetual phobia of the world war, third. “The third world war” as said by Bertrand Russell, “if at all breaks out, would be a thermo-nuclear war that might cease the very existence of human life from earth”. Moreover, Gerald Wendt opined, “If World War III comes, which we pray will never happen, it will be a war in which most people may die from silent, insidious anti-human weapons that make no sound, give as warning, destroy no forests or ships of cities but can wipeout human beings by millions.”
Therefore, ever since the abominable rat-race for escalation of the sophisticated weapons, the peace loving humanity also strove with the endless efforts to eliminate war by "Disarmaments". If the war -mongering chauvinists gave the slogan, "if you want war, be prepared for war", the champions of peace with their programs of disarmament and arms control gave the slogan "if you want peace, be prepared for peace". Thus, the disarmament and the mad race for arms had two long histories and the disarmament was only an inevitable corollary of the escalation of the arsenals of the nuclear weapons.

However, with the escalation of the arm race the "Disarmament" itself became a problem and rightly from Willy Brandt’s Ostpolitik to SALT, the disarmament conferences had been in pen and paper producing war-ridden and the volatile globe, the disarmament seemed to be the only way.

The history of disarmament dates back to 1816 when the Czar of Russia outlined a proposal to the British government to reduce all types of armed forces. However, the vociferous demand for disarmament was once again expressed by the czar of Russia at the Peace Conference of Hague in 1899. The Second Peace Conference of Hague in 1907, the treaty of Versailles, the League of Nations, the Washington Conference of 1921-22, the Geneva Naval Conference of 1927, the London Naval conference of 1930, the Atlantic Charter of 1944, all these highlighted to the reduction of armament, which was deemed to be the indispensable bedrock of peaceful co-existence.

However, after the termination of the Second World War, the peace loving humanity of the world evinced great hopes and enthusiasm about general disarmament. In the optimistic moods of the post-war era, the powers argued on the basic principles of the disarmament. The hope for peace and disarmament was very much crystallized in the United Nations’ Charter, signed on the June 26, 1946. The Charter made United Nations action on disarmament, the responsibility of two separate bodies, the General Assembly and the Security Council. Soon after the signing of the Charter at San Francisco, the explosion of the atomic bomb over Hiroshima on August 6, 1945, brought to the fore the entire problem of the regulation of armaments.

The first move to implement the disarmament provisions of the Charter came on November 15, 1945 when the United Kingdom, Canada and the United States issued a declaration (known as the Truman-Attlee-King declaration) proposing the establishment of a United Nations Commission to deal with the international control of the atomic energy.
The Security Council and the General Assembly were vested with powers to make provisions and armaments for the disarmament programs.

2.11 Disarmament Conferences (1946-1972)

Disarmament has become a more urgent and complicated issue with the rapid development of nuclear weapons capable of mass destruction. Since the explosion of the first atomic bombs in 1945, the previous contention that armaments races were economically inexpedient and led inevitably to war was replaced by the argument that the future use of nuclear weapons in quantity threatened the continued existence of civilization itself. During the post-World War II period, there were discussions at several levels with a view to the limitation and control of armaments. Efforts ranged from continuous talks at the United Nations to such discussions among nuclear powers as the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) of the 1970s and the Strategic Arms Reduction Talks (START) of the 1980s.

2.11.1 Atomic Energy Commission (1946)

Soon after the adoption of the UN Charter the Atom Bomb was exploded on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Japan in August 1945. The untold suffering caused by the bombardment of these two towns of Japan led to a widespread demand for devising a system of control to prevent the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes, and use for humanitarian and peaceful purposes. Accordingly, on January 26, 1946 the General Assembly decided to set up an Atomic Energy Commission consisting of all the permanent members of the Security Council and Canada. The commission was expected to enquire in to all aspects of the problem and make recommendations with specific proposals for:

- Extending between all nations the exchange of basic scientific information for peaceful ends;
- Control of atomic energy to the extent necessary to ensure its use only for peaceful purposes;
- The elimination from national armaments of atomic weapons and of all other major weapons adoptable to mass destruction; and
- Effective safeguards by way of inspection and other means to protect complying states against the hazards of violations and evasions. The commission was subordinate to the Security Council and was expected to submit its reports and recommendations to it. And both the super powers offered their cooperation in the establishment of this commission.
On June 14, 1946 at the first meeting of the commission differences cropped up between the two major powers. Bernard Baruch of USA presented a plan in which he insisted on managerial control or ownership of all atomic energy activities potentially dangerous to world security; power to control, impact and license of atomic activities; fostering beneficial uses of atomic energy; and research and development offered to destroy all atom bombs of USA and to stop them further manufacture after an adequate system of international control had been established. The Baruch plan was uniquely significant because it came from the only country which had atomic weapons at that time, it aimed at submitting energy to a very extensive system of international administration.

Since Soviet Union had not tested nuclear weapons by that time, she was reluctant to support any agreement that would preclude Soviet development of nuclear capacity. Therefore, at the second meeting of the commission on 19 June 1946 she submitted two proposals suggesting the prohibition of the production, storing and employment of weapons based on the use of atomic energy for the purpose of mass destruction within three months of the convention; and suggesting the establishment of two committees concerned with exchange of scientific information and making of recommendations for the prevention of the use of atomic energy respectively.

A comparison of the proposals submitted by Soviet Union and USA shows that while USA insisted on effective international control and inspection before the abolition of atomic weapons, Soviet Union insisted on first outlawing the atomic weapons and their destruction. She argued that subsequently an appropriate inspection system could be evolved. The main plea taken by the Soviet Union against international inspection was that it violated the sovereign rights of the states. In view of this divergent stand of the two super powers the Atomic Energy Commission could not accomplish anything.

2.11.2 Commission on Conventional Armaments (1947)

In pursuance of the General Assembly resolution of December 1946, the Security Council set up a commission on conventional Armaments in February 1947 which was expected to prepare and submit to the council within three months proposals for the general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces and to suggest practical and effective safeguards. This commission was specifically debarred from discussing issues concerning atomic weapons and their control.
It held its first meeting on 24 March, 1947 and finally adopted a resolution on 12 August 1948 in which it recommended:

- A system for the regulation and reduction of armaments of states, initially only those having substantial military resources;
- Measures for reduction and regulation of armaments to encourage further regulation and reduction;
- The establishment of an adequate system of international control of atomic energy and conclusion of peace settlement with Japan and Germany;
- Regulation and reduction of armaments to make possible the least diversion for armaments of the world human and economic resources and maintenance of armaments and armed forces which are indispensable for the maintenance of international peace and security; and
- Adequate method of safeguards and provision for effective enforcement action in case of violation.

When the resolution came up for discussion before the Assembly the Soviet Union strongly opposed it. She came forward with a new proposal requiring all the permanent members of the Security Council to reduce their land, naval and air forces by one third during one year and establishment of a control body within the frame work of the Security Council to supervise the reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons. However, the Russian proposal was rejected by the western nations. In view of the differences the Assembly adopted a resolution urging the commission for conventional armaments to continue its work and formulate proposals for the receipt, checking and publication by international organ of control of full information to be supplied by member states with regard to their conventional armaments. However, the Soviet Union refused to cooperate with the commission. Ultimately, Soviet Union withdrew from both the commissions (Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission for Conventional Armaments) in 1950 on the question of the representation of Red China on it.

2.11.3 President Truman's Suggestion and Disarmament Commission (1952)

When the failure of two commissions could not make any headway in the direction of reductions or regulation of armaments, president Truman of USA came forward with proposal of merging the Atomic Energy Commission and the Conventional Armament which was created on 11th January 1952 consisting of all the members of the Security Council and
Canada. The commission took up a variety of issues concerning arms reduction and continued to grapple with the problem of disarmament, but it was handicapped by the potential conflict between USA and USSR. The UNO appointed a great power sub-committee to work out the plans for disarmament which worked privately till 1953.

2.11.4 Atoms for Peace (1953)

In December 1953 president Eisenhower of the USA put forward his "Atoms for peace proposal", which envisaged the creation of an International Atomic Energy to which all the nations possessing atomic energy, would contribute their materials for the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The USSR wanted to accept the proposal giving the condition that all the states should assume a solemn and unconditional obligation to employ atomic, hydrogen, or other weapons of mass destruction.

2.11.5 Anglo-French Plan (1954)

In June 1954, Britain and France took an initiative and submitted a memorandum, outlining a comprehensive plan for disarmament. During the first phase, a control organ was to be set up and the man power of the member states was to be frozen at specific levels. During the second phase, after the establishment of the control organ, first half of the reduction of the armed forces, conventional weapons and military expenditures were to be carried out. Further production of the nuclear weapons was to be stopped and the final stage envisaged the second phase of the agreed reduction and elimination of the nuclear weapons. However, because of the USSR's reluctance it could not be implemented but subsequently in September 1954 she communicated her willingness to the General Assembly to accept the Anglo- French Memorandum as a basis for the step by step approach to the nuclear problem. Thus it looked that the plan would be able to make much headway. However, in March April 1955 Soviet Union reverted to its earlier position.

2.11.6 Soviet Proposal of May 1955

In May 1955 Soviet Union suddenly submitted new proposal which was quite identical to the Anglo- French memorandum in so far as it accepted the same force levels. However this proposal was quite distasteful to USA because it insisted on dismantling of all United States’ overseas bases and a ban on nuclear tests. Though the proposal
fell down, it certainly contributed to the spirit of detente and paved the way for the Geneva Summit of 1955.

2.11.7 The Geneva Summit and Open Skies Plan (1955)

In July 1955 the chiefs of states from France, UK, USA and USSR met at Geneva to discuss among others the problem of disarmament. At this meeting USA, proposed the ‘open skies’ plan. Under the plan both USA and USSR were to exchange military information which could be verified by mutual aerial reconnaissance. However, Russia did not feel convinced as to how inspection of the concealed nuclear weapons shall be possible. She also insisted that all actions in this regard should be subject to Security Council’s decisions. As these conditions were not acceptable USA, the plan fell.

2.11.8 Six Points Plan of USA (1957)

In 1957 the USA representatives made an announcement of six points program in the UN General Assembly which envisaged for the reduction of trends towards larger stockpiles of nuclear weapons; provision against surprise attack; lessening of the economic burden due to armaments and utilization of money thus to save for the improvement of the living standards, reduction of political tension among nations and to help in settlement of political issues. The Plan envisaged the establishment of inspection posts at strategic points in the eastern half of United States and western border regions of Russia. After a favourable initial response, Soviet Union turned down the plan.

However, in November 1957 the General Assembly endorsed this proposal and insisted on:

- Immediate suspension of testing of nuclear weapons with prompt installation of effective international control;
- Cession of production of fissionable materials for purpose of weapons and its future utilisations for peaceful purposes;
- Reduction of stocks of nuclear weapons through a program of transfer of stocks of fissionable material for peaceful purposes;
- Reduction of armed forces and armaments with adequate safeguards;
- Progressive establishment of open inspection to guard against the possibility of surprise attack; and
• Establishment of an inspection system to ensure that the sending of objects through outer space was exclusively for peaceful and scientific purposes.

The General Assembly also adopted two other resolutions emphasizing the need of an accord on disarmament and the enlargement for the disarmament commission. Soviet Union however insisted on the program and she withdrew when her proposal to include all the members of the UN in the commission was jettisoned.

Besides these, President Eisenhower’s Proposal for a conference, Khrushchev’s proposal of 1959 and the Camp David Accords etc. met with dismal failures.

2.11.9 Ten Nations Disarmament Conference (1960)

In 1960 the question of disarmament was once again discussed in the Ten Nations Disarmament Conference held at Geneva consisting of five members from the Western bloc (USA, UK, Canada, France & Italy) and five from the Soviet bloc (USSR, Yugoslavia, Poland, Rumania and Bulgaria). As a result of prolonged deliberations the differences between the rival camps were considerably narrowed down. Soviet Union announced that she would prohibit atomic weapons and even offer to destroy the atomic and hydrogen bomb, if the Western powers reciprocated. She proposed a four year plan of complete disarmament spread over three phases. During the first phase the forces of the powers were to be reduced. During the second stage the forces of all states were to be dissolved and military bases dissolved. At the final stage all the nuclear weapons were to be destroyed. The Western nations did not respond favourably to the Soviet Plan and came forward with their own plan on 15 March 1960 suggesting publication of data before the release of atom bomb or missile; formation of central organization for collection of data relating to army, navy and air force of all countries; system of verification of information supplied by different states; assessment of military budgets of different countries; installation of the system for controlling outer space; and provision of adequate measure to ward against surprise attacks. This Plan was not acceptable to the Soviet Union and her allies. Hence, because of the polemic ideology between the USA and the USSR this was met with failure.
2.11.10 Nuclear Test Ban Conference (1961)

In April 1961 the three nuclear powers like USA, USSR and France in a Conference held at Geneva made long deliberations regarding the disarmament and agreed to suspend forthwith all tests in the earth's atmosphere in outer space, in ocean and underground. This was to be ensured through a worldwide detective system to be operated by a single neutral administrator and international staff. However, this Nuclear Test Ban Treaty became pen and paper agreement when the USSR exploded the Sputnik Bomb.

2.11.11 Seventeen Nations Disarmament Conference (1962)

However, the monumental milestone in the entire history of the disarmament was the Seventeen Nations Conference at Geneva in March 1962. Originally it was to be consisted of eighteen members, but France boycotted the conference. In this Conference the USA proposed a cut of thirty percent in the nuclear delivery vehicles and major conventional armaments, within three years and also a ban on the production of the nuclear weapons. On the other hand, Soviet Union proposed complete disarmament within four years under strict international control. The Neutral Nations came forward with their own plan and suggested for the establishment of a International Commission of Scientists to process the data received from the observation posts and to report on all nuclear explosions. However, it could not achieve any substantial and tangible results.

2.11.12 Moscow Ban Treaty (1963)

Then came the Moscow Ban Treaty of 1963 which became a sort of light that poured into the darkness of the cold war and became a beacon of hope to guide the ship of human civilization, tossing up and down in the tumultuous sea of cold war. This treaty signed by USSR, USA and UK which postulated the prohibition of the nuclear tests, aimed at the achievement of an agreement on the general and complete disarmament and prohibited the nuclear test explosion in atmosphere or outer space or the ocean, but not underground.

However in 1964 China went ahead with the first atom bomb explosion which greatly stirred the General Assembly and it decided to convene a Conference of the five nuclear powers. In November 1965 it adopted a resolution urging all the nations to suspend all tests of unclear and thermonuclear weapons. It even
sought to extend the ban to the underground tests which were permitted under the Moscow Treaty of 1963. However, USA and UK reduced to comply with the General Assembly resolution unless a guarantee was provided against similar explosions by other states.

2.11.13 Seven Points Plan (1966)

Seven Points Plan was presented by President Johnson of USA at the Geneva Conference in February 1966 which called for a treaty to halt the spread of nuclear weapons to non-nuclear countries and demanded international safeguards over peaceful nuclear activities. It suggested the strengthening of the international security organization and the establishment of a system of inspection. It gave a call for freezing all "offensive and defensive" strategic bombers and missiles designed to carry nuclear weapons. However, the plan was not favorably received by other powers and was abandoned. The progress of disarmament suffered a further setback following nuclear tests by France.

2.11.14 Outer Space Treaty (1967)

This treaty was formally signed on 27 January 1967 and came into force on 10 October 1967. It laid down the principles governing peaceful activities of the state in outer space and prohibited nuclear weapons and their landing on the moon and other celestial bodies for military bases. Under the treaty the signatory states agreed not to place in orbit around the earth any objectives carrying nuclear weapons or other kinds of weapons of mass destruction. It also forbade the use of military personnel for scientific research of peaceful purposes. It was agreed that all stations, installations, equipment and space vehicles on the moon and other celestial bodies shall be open to the representatives of other states parties to the Treaty on the basis of reciprocity. The treaty was thrown open to other states for signatures, who could accede to it.

2.11.15 Treaty of Tlatelolco (1967)

In 1967 the Tlatelolco Treaty was concluded by Mexico and El Salvador at Mexico which prohibited the testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition by any means, as well as receipt, storage, installation, deployment and any form of possession of nuclear weapons in Latin America. Under the Additional Protocol II, the nuclear weapon states undertook to respect the statute of military
denuclearization of Latin America and not to contribute to acts involving a violation of the Treaty, nor to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons, against the parties to the treaty. However, the treaty permitted the explosion of nuclear devices for peaceful purposes.

2.11.16 Conference of Non-Nuclear Weapon States (1968)

In August-September 1968 a conference of the Non-nuclear Weapon States was held at Geneva at the initiative of the General Assembly which was attended by 96 states including the four nuclear powers (USA, USSR, France and UK). The Conference in all adopted fourteen resolutions and declarations concerning four subjects, viz. Security of the non-nuclear weapon states, establishment of nuclear weapons free zones, effective measures for prevention of proliferation of nuclear weapons and peaceful uses of nuclear energy.

With regard to the security of the non-nuclear weapon states, the conference reaffirmed the principle of non-use or threat of use force between states. It asserted that every state had right to equality, sovereignty, territorial integrity, non-intervention in internal affairs, collective defence, etc.

With regard to the establishment of the nuclear-weapon free zones, the Conference recommended that the non-nuclear weapons states should examine the possibility and desire of establishing military denuclearization of their respective zones.

On the question of effective means for the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the cessation of the nuclear arms race and nuclear disarmament, the Conference recommended to the General Assembly to urge the Eighteen Nations Disarmament Committee to undertake negotiations for prevention of further development and improvement of nuclear weapons, reduction and subsequent elimination of all stockpiles for nuclear weapons, conclusion of comprehensive test ban treaty, etc.

On the issue of peaceful uses of nuclear energy, the Conference favoured the idea of examining possibility of establishing an internationally financed “Special Nuclear Fund”, which could give grants and look at low-rates to finance such nuclear projects in the non-nuclear states. These recommendations of the conference were accepted by the General Assembly and it requested the concerned
international bodies like IAEA, IBRD and UNDT to take action for the implementation of these recommendations.

2.11.17 Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968)

The treaty on the Non-Proliferation of the Nuclear weapons was simultaneously signed at London, Moscow and Washington on July 1, 1968 and actually came into force on 5 March 1970. The treaty, based on the draft submitted by the Seventeen Nations Disarmament Committee, prohibited the transfer by nuclear weapon states to any recipient whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over them. The signatory states were not to encourage or induce any non-nuclear weapon state to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons. The non-nuclear states acceding to the treaty were also not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. However, the treaty granted the right to the member states to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without disorientation. However, this left the issue of inspection and control unresolved.

2.11.18 Sea-Bed Treaty (1971)

In February 1971, the treaties on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, was concluded by UK, USA and Soviet Union. The treaty actually came into force on 18 May, 1972 and the treaty provided that the signatory states would not implant or emplace on the seabed and the ocean-floor and in the subsoil thereof, beyond the outer limit of a seabed zone, any nuclear weapons or any other type of weapons of mass destruction as well as structures. The members were also given the right to verify through observations, the activities of other states.

2.11.19 Biological Weapons Convention (1972)

An effort to check the use of bacteriological and chemical weapons was made in 1972 by signing the "Convention of the Prohibition of the Development, Production and stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin weapons and on their destruction". The convention signed on 10 April 1972 at London, Moscow and Washington actually came into force on 26 March, 1975 and the Convention impressed the need of achieving effective progress towards general and complete disarmament,
including the prohibition and elimination of all types of weapons of mass destruction. It needed that the prohibition of development, production and stockpiling of chemical and bacteriological weapons and their elimination will facilitate the achievement of the objective of complete disarmament under strict and effective international control.

The signatory states agreed not to develop, produce, stockpile or otherwise acquire or retain microbial or other biological agents or toxin, weapons, equipment of means of delivery. If a signatory to the Convention found other signatory member violating the provisions of the Convention, it could lodge a complaint with the Security Council.

2.12 Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) - I (1972)

In order to achieve the objective of disarmament attention was also paid to the limitation of the strategic arms. The two Super Powers - USA and USSR held prolonged negotiations at Geneva and finally agreed to meet at Helsinki. This was indeed a significant step in the direction of disarmament because the two powers agreed in principle to restrain and put a stop to the fierce competition for the acquisition of sophisticated weapons. Though the talks did not prove fruitful, they indicated the willingness of the two Super Powers to reduce armaments and other hazards without jeopardizing their security and prestige. The negotiations continued for nearly four years before the conclusion of Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty of 1972. It is said that the two countries held as many as 127 plenary meetings before the conclusion of the above treaty.

The SALT-I was formally signed on 26 May 1972 to curb the race in nuclear arms between the two super powers. In fact, the agreement broadly consisted of two separate treaties viz. Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile System and the Interim Agreement on certain Measures with respect to the limitation of the strategic offensive arms. While the former was concluded for an unlimited period, the later was of a five year duration.

The Anti-Ballistic Missile System Treaty permitted the two super powers to have only two sites for ballistic missile defences, one for the protection of their national capital area and the other for the protection of the field of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs). The treaty also laid down details regarding the dimensions of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) system the two countries were to have. Each system was to have
not more than six ABM launchers and 100 ABM interrupter missiles at
launching sites.

The national capital area was not to have more than 133 ABM radar
complexes, each with a diameter not executing three kilometers. The
complex around the Missile launching region was not have more than
18 ABM radars and two large-phased ABM radars. The two powers also
agreed not to develop, test or deploy ABM launchers which could
launch more than one interceptor missile at a time. The treaty
also prohibited the testing and development of automatic,
semiautomatic or other similar systems for rapid reloading of ABM
launchers. The two powers were permitted to modernize their ABM
systems through replacement, but this was to be done strictly
within the quantitative ceiling provided under the treaty.

The Interim Agreement with regard to the limitation of the
strategic offensive arms was a very complex agreement. It covered
both land-based ICBMs and submarine launched ballistic missiles. The
strength of ICBMs for Soviet Union and USA was fixed at 1618
and 1054 respectively. On the basis of their actual strengths on 1
July, 1971 the two powers undertook not to convert their land-
based launches into light ICBMs. The two powers were permitted
to undertake modernization and replace their strategic offensive
arms, but they had to scrupulously follow the numerical limits
prescribed by the treaty. An agreement regarding the procedure of
agreement was also reached between the two powers.


A further accord for checking the armament race was reached
between USA and Soviet Union in 1973 when they concluded a
formal agreement regarding permanent limitation of nuclear weapons
by the end of 1974. They emphasized that an effort by either of
the two powers to obtain a nuclear advantage would be inconsistent
with the peaceful relations between the two countries. They agreed to
adequate verification measures. The significance of this accord lies in
the fact that it made an effort to control nuclear fission as well as
research on the fundamental properties of physical matter.


In the direction of disarmament a development took place in
July 1974 when USA and Soviet Union signed a ten-years pact,
stipulating not only the limitation of the offensive nuclear weapons but also the stoppage of all underground tests of more than 150 milestones. New limits of missile defence systems were agreed by the countries. But probably the most significant feature of this agreement was that a formal understanding was reached by the two countries to permit each observer to ensure that the terms of the agreement were being completed with. The same year in November the two countries concluded another agreement regarding limiting of nuclear arsenals. It was decided that the nuclear arsenals of the two countries shall be equal to overall number of delivery vehicles. The new treaty also incorporated the relevant provisions of the existing interim agreement which was due to expire in 1977.

2.12.3 Final Act of the Conference of Security and Cooperation in Europe

In July-August 1975, USA, UK, Soviet Union and a number of other European states held a conference at Helsinki with a view to find out the means for strengthening peace and security of the world. After due deliberations they signed the final act of conference of security and cooperation in Europe on 1 August 1975. Under this act the signatory states agreed to resist from use of force in their mutual as well as international relations. With a view to promoting mutual understanding they agreed to exchange observers by invitation, at military manoeuvres. However, for such a purpose a 21-day notice was to be served. In order to build mutual confidence among the states, the signatory states agreed to notify their major military movements. To strengthen European security the signatory states agreed to avoid military confrontation and promote disarmament. However, complete disarmament under strict and effective international control was to be accomplished through stages.

2.12.4 Convention on Prohibition of Military or other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques

A convention was signed at Geneva in May 1977 to strengthen world peace and bring about complete disarmament through prohibition of military or other hostile uses of the environmental modification techniques. The signatory states agreed not to engage in military or other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. They were not to assist, encourage or induce any state, group of states or international organization to engage in activities contrary to the provisions of the treaty. However, the convention did not impose any restrictions on the use of environmental modification techniques
for peaceful purposes. The member states agreed to participate in the fullest possible exchange of scientific and technological information on the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes. They were to contribute individually or in co-operation with other states to the preservation, improvement and peaceful unitization of the environments with due consideration for the needs of the developing areas of the world.

2.13 SALT II (1979)

The SALT I signed by USA and USSR lapsed in October 1977. Both the powers continued to observe its provisions and continued efforts for a new agreement. After prolonged negotiations they signed at Vienna on June 1, 1979 the SALT II treaty to limit the strategic offensive weapons for period up to 31 December 1985. While concluding this treaty both the powers reaffirmed their desire to take further measure for further limitations and reduction of strategic arms with a view to achieving general and complete disarmament. As this agreement was in the nature of a treaty, it was sent to the US Senate for ratification as required under the constitution. But before the senate could ratify the same the cordial atmosphere was disturbed by the Soviet intervention in Afghanistan which jeopardized the ratification of SALT II.

An analysis of the various efforts made so far to control the arms race shows two basic features. First, priority was given to partial measures aimed at preventing the arms race from moving into certain new direction; and second, an emphasis was laid on detente, on the assumption that relieving suspicion and fear would not only diminish the risk of war but would also remove one of the main factors fueling the arms race. The important steps in the first direction include conclusion of a number of agreements like, Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapons Test in the atmosphere in outer space and underwater; the Treaty on Principles governing the activities of states in the Exploration and use of outer space including the Moon and other celestial Bodies; the Treaty on Non-prohibition of nuclear weapons; the Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of Mass Destruction on the sea-bed and ocean-floor and in subject thereof; the convention on the prohibition of the development, production and stockpiling of Bacteriological and Toxin weapons and on their Destruction; the Soviet-American Agreement on the limitation of strategic Arms etc. These treaties not only created a new climate of understanding but also proved helpful in slowing down the arms race.
Similarly, detente also helped in relaxing the international climate and reducing the prospects of conflicts by relieving the cold war atmosphere between and within the main military alliances and helping to relax the rigid bipolarity of former years. Detente also helped to promote exchanges of all kinds and provided conditions for useful exchanges between various states in the economic, scientific, technological and cultural spheres.

However, despite these bright points, the arms race still continued and the progress in this regard could not become satisfactory. However, one positive outcome which could be visible as a result of the prolonged process of negotiations was that a consensus emerged among the states regarding the need of bringing the arms race to an end.

2.14 Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START)

On July 31, 1991, President Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush signed the historic Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) to reduce their strategic nuclear arsenals by about 30 percent and hailed it as a signal dispelling five decades of mutual mistrust. This treaty was the result of nearly a decade’s efforts and it effected the first real cuts in long-range nuclear weapons.

2.14.1 Terms and Condition of START

The Soviet Union was to end up with a 35 percent cut in their strategic warheads from around 11,000 to 7,000 and the U.S. with a 25 percent reduction from about 120,000 to 90,000. The treaty limited the Strategic Nuclear Delivery Vehicles (SNDVs) to 1,700 each. The SNDVs comprised deployed ICBMs and their launchers, deployed Submarine-Launched Ballistic Missiles (SIBMs) and their launchers and heavy bombers. Both sides agreed to give the other side a politically binding declaration on long range (more than 600 kms) nuclear Sea-launched Cruise Missiles (SLCMs). It included – nuclear armed launched cruise missiles with a range of over 600 kms.

Since the Soviets had their warheads on their land based ballistic missiles, considered by the US as most threatening to it, they were to make deeper cuts than the Americans. The US got away with relatively smaller cuts since it kept more of its strategic nuclear force in submarine and on bombers rather than ballistic missiles.
The treaty did not cover Sea-launched Cruise Missiles (SLCMs). The Soviets were insisting on their inclusion in the START ambit but gave up following the US president’s refusal. Even with the proposed cut, the two sides were to have 4,900 ballistic missiles each.

The great achievement of this treaty was that verification was much less of a problem in reaching arms control in future. Although START ended a nine year long quest for a reduction of the nuclear arsenal on a happy note, it was greatly the improved prospects as a result of the Gorbachev-Bush Resolution of an early end to the politics of deadly confrontation that held out the promise of an end to the nuclear nightmare. After all, the US and the Soviet Union were still to have a formidable array of nuclear warheads. START reduced the strategic weapons by only 30 per cent. The remainder had the potential many times over to devastate the planet.

In June 1992 President George Bush had asked the Senate to approve changes in the still-unratified strategic arms reduction treaty. A proposed amendment to the treaty incorporated a pledge by Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine, the three States of the former Soviet Union that had nuclear arms on their territories that they were to give up those weapons by the end of the decade and not seek nuclear arms again. The pledge was signed by them in an agreement with Russia and the United States during their meeting in Lisbon, Portugal on May 23, 1992.

The Lok Sabha of India welcomed the START and appealed for early multilateral negotiations for a new treaty “eliminating all nuclear and other weapons within a time bound framework”. Endorsing India’s position on the elimination of nuclear and other weapons of mass destruction the resolution called upon the government to pursue the various proposals and initiatives for ushering in a nuclear weapon free world. The START was a strong reminder that the superpowers considered as far-fetched India’s three phase arms control proposal under which nuclear threshold States would undertake not to go nuclear if the nuclear weapons States cut the size of their arsenals end nuclear testing and production of weapon usable materials and agree to work towards complete nuclear disarmament by 2010. The Indian proposal was presented to the United Nations with the support of the six nations, five continent peace initiatives. It is ironical that the Indian Parliament should have hastily passed a resolution applauding START as a “historic treaty”.

2.14.2 Bush-Yeltsin Agreement on Arms Reduction

President George Bush and Boris Yelstin on June 17, 1992 agreed on dramatic two thirds reductions in strategic nuclear arms by the year 2000 and complete elimination of multiple warhead land based missiles on both sides by the year 2003. The two sides also agreed to work for a joint ballistic missile defence for the whole world, as proposed by the Russian President. Both countries were to cut their nuclear warheads to no more than 3,000, to 3,500 each.

If the START signed by Bush and ex-Soviet President Gorbachev envisaged a hefty reduction in the number of nuclear warheads in the two countries possession from over 22,000 to 85,000 by the year 2000, this US-Russian agreement aimed at a further slashing of the warheads to 6,500 by 2000 or 2003.

2.14.3 Critical Evaluation

The efforts to lessen international tension by limiting and reducing armaments have been many. The record of achievements in arms control is rather spectacular, indicating that limitations on the number and destructiveness of weapons have been, and remain, feasible. But these accomplishments covertly hint at many of the drawbacks and the lack of meaningful controls of armaments in many other areas. Actually these gains might even enhance rather than remove, the dangers posed by contemporary weapons. Critics have remarked, for instance, that arms control measures may give a false sense of security by encouraging us to think that the arms race is being meaningfully controlled when in reality, it is not.

Commentators like Brahma Chellaney have found serious fault even with the latest agreements on arms control. No arms control measure has sizably lessened the threat or results of nuclear confrontation or stopped the continued modernization and expansion of nuclear arsenals. Indeed the latest agreement, START, helps to underline that comprehensive disarmament even in stages is a utopian idea and that the very concept of disarmament remains unacceptable to superpower strategic planners. START points out that the superpowers see the primary aim of arms control is not disarmament, but regulating the nuclear arms race and making deterrence less risky and more stable. Since deterrence strategies of the nuclear states are based on assured and massive retaliation to first strike weapons that are vulnerable to a first strike are seen as “destabilizing” and their removal is viewed as necessary to enhance
stability. These weapons include heavy and soil based missile systems, which are seen as “sitting duck”. Multiple independently–targetable reentry vehicles (MIRVs) system with multiple warheads are also considered “bad” because they allow to first strike force to infect very heavy damage and this capability weakens deterrence. It is precisely such weapons that START seeks to reduce. But sophisticated submarine based weapons, which are least vulnerable to energy attack, or modern cruise missiles and strategic bombers, whose first strike offensive capabilities are limited because they travel slowly, are “good” and “stabilizing” weapons and START sanctions their continued production and modernization.

It should be mentioned that START requires merely outdated weapons to be eliminated or reduced. Many of the weapons covered by START were in any case to be retired, and the treaty will only hasten their removal a few years ahead of schedule. The no-destruction requirement allows the superpowers to recycle old weapons as new weapons. Some of the warheads eliminated under INF have been re-packaged into new weapons by the United States, and the continued recycling of retired warheads and launchers was discussed at length during the START negotiations. It may happen again that obsolescent weapons were retired and rebuilt as sophisticated, lightweight, high yield weapons. Pact more fissile material per unit than older designs of it the same mired system are “downloaded” and redeployed with fewer warheads. Almost evidently START encourages the superpower to technologically upgrade their arsenals.

More significantly, START permits the deployment of a new generation of long distance weapons still in the pipeline and some kinds of strategic systems covered by the treaty are actually projected to carry more warheads than they do now. By late nineties, nuclear weapons on strategic bombers were to rise from 2608 to 2736 in the case of the United States and from 616 to 960 in the Soviet case. The treaty also permits the Soviet Union to increase its sea launched cruise missiles by a whopping 780 percent and its air launched cruise missiles by 81 percent, while allowing 140 percent and 19 percent increases to the United States in similar weapons.

Instead of making the world safer, the START institutionalizes and legitimizes the nuclear arms race. Like two other more recent arms control agreements INF and the Reduction of Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) – it seeks to respond to and ratify previous or emerging political and security changes. CFE, for instance, seeks to make virtue out of necessity by providing a legal framework to the destruction of redundant pieces of
equipment and Soviet pullout from Eastern Europe which had already commenced before the treaty was signed. START in comparison, however, is clearly an inadequate response to previous changes, permitting more long-range nuclear weapons after the Cold War than what had been proposed during the height of superpower tensions. In fact, it merely acknowledges the status quo because the superpowers had long ago readjusted their strategic modernization plans in anticipation of the treaty.

With its elaborate and intrusive verification regime, START was expected to be a model for reaching nuclear arms agreements in future. After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, there is no immediate Soviet threat to the US for the time being. Thus START may be regarded as the last major arms control Pact directly between the superpowers.

2.15 The United States and Western Europe

The Western Europe in the post-Second World War era became a haunting ground of Russian dominance. The countries of the Western Europe were badly hit by the cataclysmic war continued for six years (1939-45). Their economies got shattered beyond imagination and politics was in the utter state of instability. While they were under the constant threat of aggression from the Soviet Union to turn them communist, the USA developed almost a different kind of attitude towards them. Their only salvation from these dangers was American aid to enable them to restore their shattered, but advanced economies and an American guarantee of their continued independence and integrity in the shape of a semi-permanent American occupation. For the purpose, the USA undertook some offensive measures to counteract the expansion of Soviet communism. The Truman Doctrine of March 1947 and the Marshall Plan of 1948 could be launched by the USA to save the European continent from the ever growing influences of communist ideology and pressure. The detail discussion on all such issues follows.

2.16 Revival of Western Europe

When the World War II ended in 1945 the countries of Western Europe were in a state of physical and economic collapse, to which was added the fear of Russian dominance by frontal attack or subversion. As a result of six years of struggle (1939-45) between the Axis powers and the Allied powers the countries of Europe suffered heavy losses in men and money. All the countries, whether victor or vanquished, were economically exhausted and were determined to prevent the repetition of another war.
The shattered economy of the countries of Europe had resulted in political instability in the continent and encouraged USA and USSR to step in to cover the power vacuum.

While the Western European nations were under the constant threat of aggression from the Soviet Union to turn them communist, the USA developed almost a different kind of attitude towards them. Their only salvation from these dangers was American aid to enable them to restore their shattered, but advanced economies and an American guarantee of their continued independence and integrity in the shape of a semi-permanent American occupation. During the war plans were made for the relief of immediate needs in Europe. The UN Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA) was created in 1943 and functioned until a European Control Inland Transport Organization, a European Coal Organization and an Emergency Committee for Europe were established and merged in 1947 in the UN’s Economic Commission for Europe (ECE). These organizations assumed that Europe's ills could be treated on a continental basis, but the cold war destroyed this assumption and although the ECE continued to exist and issued valuable 'Economic Surveys' from 1948 onwards, Europe became bisected for economic as well as political purposes.

But the European movement for unity and integrity is said to have certainly weakened the American hold on the area. However, some scholars believe that the emergence of Europe is a testimonial to the success of American policy in this region. The reemergence of Europe and its reassertion of freedom of action are traceable paradoxically, to the success of American policies in Europe. For nearly a decade the postwar 'grand alliance' between Europe and America rested on two foundation stones of mutually identical interests. Europe's recovery and its military security were underwritten and guaranteed by American power. Its recovery was due to the immense vitality and vigour of the Europeans, stimulated by the most creative single act of western statesmanship "the Marshall Plan".

But the first significant western offensive to counteract the expansion of Soviet communism is the Truman Doctrine which came in March 1947 and the Marshall Plan being the second step in the economic field, taken by the USA to save the European continent from the ever growing influences of communist ideology and pressure.
2.16.1 The Marshall Plan

The Marshall Plan was a second step, in the economic field, taken to save the European continent from the ever-growing influence of the communist ideology and pressure. The Marshall Plan, as it is known by name of its architect, General George Marshall, the US Secretary of State in the post Second World War era, and formally known as the 'European Recovery Program (April 1948 to December 1851) was a US sponsored program designed to rehabilitate the economies of 17 western and southern European nations in order to create stable conditions in which democratic institutions could survive. The United States feared that the poverty, unemployment and dislocation of the post war period were reinforcing the appeal of the communist parties to voters in western Europe. The US proceeded to the rescue of Europe under the apprehension that the economic crisis in Britain, France, Belgium, Italy and West Germany would help the spread of communist influence in the "free world". The Marshall Plan stands as a most significant event in post war international relations.

On 5 June 1947, General Marshall propounded at the Harvard University the plan which bears his name and which offered to all Europe (including the USSR) economic aid up to 1951 on the basis that the European governments would accept responsibility for administering the program and would themselves contribute to European recovery by some degree of united effort. Analyzing the plan Marshall said that as long as poverty, economic depression and scarcity of food would remain in Western Europe, "there will steadily develop social unease and political confusion on every side.... Our national security will be seriously threatened. But if we furnish effective aid to support the now visibly reviving hope of Europe, the prospect would speedily change". The Marshall Aid plan apparently was meant for all the European communities. The underlying aim of the Marshall plan was to save Europe from communism. It was a plan actually meant to fight communism. Naturally the communist states did not attend the second conference called by Britain and France, to discuss the Marshall plan program. In the words of G. C. Smith, "To believe that American aid would be forthcoming for countries which remained communist, was to misunderstand the significance of the Marshall Plan". It was the American policy of containment in the economic field. The Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine needed USA's Isolationism.

Soviet Russia and both the communist and non-communist countries of Eastern Europe were invited to accept this plan. The
Soviet Union forthwith rejected the offer. The arguments put forward by Soviet Russia were, firstly, the Soviet Union as well as Eastern Europe could not accept such a plan which aimed at giving economic help to Europe as a whole instead of giving such help individually to the countries accepting the plan. Secondly, this plan was fully opposed to the basic principles of the United Nations Charter. Thirdly, in the opinion of the Soviet Union the United States under the cover of this plan aimed at creating an economic empire taking advantage of Europe's economic plight. Czechoslovakia first accepted the plan but later she rejected it under Soviet pressure. According to Friedman, "This shattered the idea of a joint European economic plan". Not only that, Russia's negative attitude towards the plan led to the continuance of the struggle and dispute between eastern and western Europe which in turn made all attempts in the direction of achieving economic cooperation between eastern and western Europe abortive.

Only seventeen countries - Austria, Belgium, Britain, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Luxemburg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Trieste, Turkey and West Germany accepted the Marshall Plan. The American offer required the creation of a European organization, the Russian refusal of the offer, turned the organization into a western European one. Sixteen countries established a committee for European economic cooperation which assessed their requirements in goods and foreign exchange for the years 1948 - 52 and was converted in April 1948 into the more permanent Organization for European Economic Cooperation (OEEC).

The formation of the OEEC was an important step in the direction of economic integration of Europe. Most of the European countries emerged out of World War II with shattered economies and chaos. The US offered enormous financial help under the Marshall plan which put the European countries on way to recovery. But as the USA was keen to extend financial assistance to the European countries on continental basis, rather than bilateral basis, she suggested to the European governments to form some organization for the purpose. The idea was greatly appreciated by Britain and France and they took the initiative in chalking out a program for European recovery. As discussed above, Soviet Union declined to go by the program. Therefore, Britain and France decided to go ahead with the plans.

In July 1947 they sent an invitation for a meeting at Paris to all the European powers, except Spain. The Eastern European countries declined the invitation and only sixteen western countries attended the conference.
A Committee of European Economic Cooperation (CEEC) was set up to prepare a report outlining a joint European recovery program. In this task the US government also took keen interest and rendered valuable service. A draft convention prepared by the CEEC was submitted at a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of sixteen European countries. The Commander-in-Chief of the western zones of occupation in Germany also participated in this meeting. Ultimately, on 16 April 1948 they signed the convention for European economic cooperation. Initially there were sixteen members of the OEEC, but subsequently the number rose to 18. By virtue of this convention each member government undertook:

- To promote with vigour the development of production through efficient use of the resources at their command;
- To develop in mutual cooperation, the maximum possible interchange of goods and services and achieve as soon as possible a multilateral system of payments among themselves, and cooperate in relaxing restrictions on trade and payments between one another;
- To study the possibility of ‘customs Unions’ or analogous arrangements such as free trade area;
- To reduce tariff and other barriers to the expansion of trade;
- To achieve or maintain the stability of its currency and of its internal financial position sound rates of exchange and, generally, confidence in its monetary system; and
- To make the fullest and most effective use of available manpower.

At the time of the formation of the OEEC high hopes were expressed in certain quarters that the organization would ultimately lead to European Political Union (EPU). However, these hopes were belied. The member states were not willing to go beyond the economic sphere. They cooperated with each other and agreed to remove quantitative restrictions which proved helpful in the expansion of intra-European trade. They achieved greater flexibility in inter European payments by founding the European Payments Union (EPU) and introducing the principle of multilateralism. The EPU played a dual role as a clearing house for intra-European payments and as institution for financing the Foreign trade of its members. According to Prof. Florinsky, these two agencies (EEC and EPU) cleared the channels of trade and eased the flow of intra-European payments. But these organizations certainly could not reach anywhere near the goal of economic integration of Europe.
As the American aid the Foreign Assistance Act of 1948 created the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA) to supervise the European Recovery Program (ERP). In the following years the OEEC, using American funds, became the principal instrument in Western Europe's transition from war to peace. It revived European production and trade by reducing quotas, creating credit and providing mechanism for the settlement of accounts between countries. While it was a government to government and not super-national organization, it nevertheless inculcated international attitudes and fostered habits of economic cooperation which survived the ending of the ERP. It was replaced in 1960 by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in which the United States, Canada and Japan were full members and which extended the work of the OEEC into the developing areas of the world.

The establishment of OEEC coincided with the signing in March 1948 of the Treaty of Brussels by Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg (the last three compendiously referred to as Benelux from the time when they formed a customs Union in 1947). This treaty, like the Anglo-French treaty of Dunkirk of 1947, was a military alliance ostensibly directed against a revival of the German threat. It contained in addition provisions for political, economic and cultural cooperation through standing committees and a central organization, and it was also seen by at least some of its promoters as a first step towards a yet broader military alliance with the United States. President Truman, speaking of the need for universal military training and selective military service in the United States, so interpreted it and the leader of the Republicans in the Senate Arthur H. Vandenberg, proposed and carried a motion in favour which served the purposes of American policy: the senator was in essence advocating a military pact between the United States and Western Europe, a military counterpart to General Marshall's economic plan.

The North Atlantic Treaty, signed in April 1949 by the US, Canada and ten European countries, gave the latter for at least twenty years a guarantee of their continuing independence and integrity against Russian attack by formalizing and institutionalizing the American intention to remain in Europe and play the role of a European power. At this date the Russians like the Chinese fifteen years later had large and frightening land forces which weighed heavily on all those within their reach but lacked a diversified, modern armament capable of engaging the United States. The North Atlantic Treaty was
therefore, a way of bringing American air power, including nuclear weapons, to bear in order to inhibit the use of Russian land forces in the area designated by the treaty.

The European members of this new alliance were at first comparatively passive beneficiaries who, in spite of the fact that they provided 80 percent of its forces in Europe were dependent on the far more significant American contribution, without which their own contribution was irrelevant to their main needs and fears. Although in terms, the treaty was a collective security arrangement, in fact, it was to begin with more like the protectorate treaties of an earlier age whereby a major power had taken weaker territories under its wing. The treaty created a permanent organization NATO for political discussion and military planning and some of its makers and later devotees envisaged growth of something more than a military alliance an entente or community or Union. But nothing of the kind emerged for a variety of reasons. Mention may be made that the treaty of Brussels played a vital role in strengthening the unity and security of the western countries.

In spite of non cooperation of the Eastern European countries, the Marshall plan got spectacular success. Within four years of its launching, the Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA), a specially created bureau under Paul G. Hoffman distributed some $ 13 billion worth of economic aid, helping to restore industrial and agricultural production, establish financial stability and expand trade. Direct grants accounted for the vast majority of the aid with the remainder in the form of loans. The several western European countries experienced rise in their gross national products of 15 to 25 percent during this period. The plan contributed greatly to the rapid renewal of the western European chemical engineering and steel industries. The Marshall plan concept of economic aid was so successful that president Harry S. Truman extended it to less developed countries throughout the world under the Point four program, initiated in 1949.

In the words of Friedman, "when the Marshall Plan program came to an end in June 1952, it had achieved triumphantly what it had set out to do". By 1951 the volume of industrial products excepting coal in the aided countries exceeded the pre-war level. Except France and Italy the economic plans in other aided countries achieved tremendous success. In the case of hydroelectric power almost a revolutionary improvement was made. Even West Germany, a war ravaged country, was able to recover
her pre-war economic solvency. Apart from unexpected improvement in agriculture and industry, the political, social and economic stability returned to the disturbed and war ravaged Western Europe as a whole and the same Western Europe traded a long way to progress and development.

2.16.2 The Truman Doctrine

In 1946, the American newspaper used the phrase "Balance of Terror" which prognosticated the existing rivalry between two rival factions, the US and the USSR. In the same year, Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of England announced "From the Baltic to the Adriatic there is an iron curtain", mentioning the Soviet's attitude to the nations of the world which revealed that whatever defensive and offensive measure USSR was taking within her boundary, that would not be known to other nations except herself. On February 28, 1946, the American Secretary of State, James Byrnes declared, “The US cannot remain aloof to any threat of use of force contrary to the UN Charter” which was further countered by Molotov, the Soviet Foreign Minister on November 3, 1946 who criticized the US Foreign policy by announcing, “US is trying absolutely to infringe in the world affairs in order to bring the nations under her imperialist umbrella so that she would be the monopolistic master over exercising the atomic energy which would by far satisfy her imperial thirst”.

It was true that Stalin of Russia had recognized Greece as a British sphere of influence, but he had done so only with the understanding that Britain too would recognize the Eastern Europe as the Soviet sphere of influence. But Britain did not comply to it. It was the commanding military position of the Soviet Union in the eastern Europe that had prevented Britain or even her allies, from resorting to military means against the Soviet Union. Hence, Stalin was determined not to let either the British army enter Greece, or the UN resort to enforcement measures.

In view of this attitude of Stalin towards Greece, it appeared certain that Greece would go communist. In case of Greece going communist the threat to an anti-communist west and particularly from Britain was instant. But Britain was too weak a country to afford to be a rival of the powerful Soviet Union in any part of the world. It was this realization on the part of the British Government that led it to request its Trans-Atlantic ally, the USA to come to Europe for containing the expansion of Russia and communism.
The President Harry S. Truman of USA immediately responded and at 1 PM on March 12, 1947 he addressed a joint session of the American congress in which he said, “I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support the free peoples who are resisting the attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure. I believe that we must resist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. I believe that our help should be primarily through economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes” which revealed that the threat of freedom of any nation was done either externally by the foreign aggression or internally by the armed minorities inside the country. Therefore, the US had an altruistic and humanitarian role to play to support the peoples who were free and resisting against the pocket regime of any foreign country or internal squabbles of some armed minorities.

On March 12, 1947, the famous Truman Doctrine was proposed to the American Congress. The president asked the congress to sanction $ 400,000,000 by June 1948 for the help of Greece and Turkey and added: "If we falter in our leadership we may endanger the peace of the world and we shall surely endanger the welfare of our nation". Early in May, 1947, the Congress approved of the bill which was signed by the president on May 22, 1948.

The Truman Doctrine marked the turning point in its way and intended to ignore the US and the UN alike. What Truman wanted to defend, therefore, was not democracy of freedom or peace or the UN but the vast deposits of oil in the near and the Middle-East. If the Russians were to control Iran's oil either directly or indirectly, the raw material balance of the world was expected to undergo serious change, and put a serious loss for the economy of the western world. This objective was covered up by phrases like "the rights of a small nation, defence of freedom" and "the permanent peace of the world".

The result that followed the announcement of the Truman Doctrine was the beginning of the cold war between the US and the Soviet Union. Although the germs of the cold war had been laid long before the coming of the Truman Doctrine, yet it was this Doctrine which put them in action. Professor Toynbee, in this context says, “The Truman Doctrine might have given the whole course of international affairs an impulse away from the new cooperative method of fighting out the last round in the struggle of power politics"
The true impact of this doctrine was immediately perceptible at Moscow where the council of Foreign Ministers was holding its session. At the moment, Truman enunciated his anti-communist policy, the council of Foreign ministers was dealing with the problem of the German peace treaty. Whatever chances there were of reaching agreements had completely vanished. Molotov's attitude had unusually hardened. Therefore, the Soviet claims to reparation from Germany and for fixing the Oder-Neisse line as the Eastern frontier of Germany were firmly rejected by the Western nations which led to the close of the Moscow conference.

By 1949 Truman Doctrine had become eminent with its two pretexts. Firstly, Russian pressure on Turkey had come to be liquidated. Secondly, the civil war in Greece that had been led to abrogate the Communist threat had come to an end. And Turkey like Iran had become the cockpit of the cold war which lost its manpower to an unprecedented degree. By the civil war in Greece, 700,000 people were rendered helpless, 25,000 children kidnapped and 70,000 were killed by the communist guerillas.

The historical controversies have been developed regarding the US aid and assistance to Greece and Turkey. Daniel Boorstin, the American historian in his monument "The American Democratic Experience" opined that the foreign aid program of the US was the byproduct of the World War II on a coherent basis. However, it was an innovative policy of Truman who rather was following the footsteps of President Roosevelt who had declared the policy of aid and assistance to free the peoples from the tentacles of any foreign power.

On September 2, 1947, 21 nations including the US and other 20 of North and South America and Caribbean countries met at Rio de Janeiro to sign the pact known as Rio pact in which they decided to make the Monroe Doctrine multilateral which was indirectly directed against the Socialization. On April 18, 1947 the USSR denounced the Truman Doctrine publicly and on 5th October, 1947 COMINFORM - (Communist Information Bureau) was created by Soviet Union.

On June 11, 1948 the American Congress passed the Vandenberg Resolution which revealed that certain types of regional collective security arrangements should be formed according to the Article 51 of the UN Charter that authorizes the member states of the UN to individually or
collectively defend its integrity or freedom against foreign aggression. The Vandenberg Resolution that was confined virtually for the enlargement of the Rio de Janeiro Pact was the last resolution for the militarization of the cold war.

However, the Truman Doctrine too failed in its very purpose. The Ankara regime, after half a year's American sponsorship remained lesser 'democratic'; and progress towards democracy, recovery and peace in Greece was equally disheartening. President Truman himself felt when he said, "The continued support of the guerillas by Greece's northern neighbours... has resulted in an overall worsening of the military situation... The economic situation has not basically improved. Therefore, the vision goes against Truman that "To err is Truman".

To conclude it was this Truman doctrine of the president Truman, as integrated defence system directed against the Socialization which led to the signing of various pacts like the Rio de Janeiro pact, NATO pact signed originally among fifteen countries on 4th April 1949 to which Greece and Turkey entered in 1952 and the ANZUS pact among Australia, New Zealand and the US and etc. Therefore, the scholars designate the year following the proclamation of the Truman Doctrine as the Truman years. To the western European powers he was the liberator on one hand as he protected them from the possible aggression of communism through his doctrine and on the other was imperialist towards the Soviet leaders as they thought that Truman, by his doctrine was aiming at extending the power and influence of the US in Europe. Whatever might be the ideas of the other nations, Truman was right, as an American, so far his doctrine was concerned.

2.17 Formation of the NATO - Its Objectives and Implications

When the atom-bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki in August 1945 the peace loving humanity dreamt of the vision of a globe which would make no room for military alliances and warfare and save the peaceful coexistence. But the hope of the humanity was short-lived and myopic. No sooner had the world emerged from the trauma and cataclysm of the World War II, to the utter despair and disillusionment of the world statesmen, it became a polarized world where the cankering teeth of the regional alliances and regional organizations ate into the vitals of the world peace and dragged the world into the dreaded nightmare of the cold war. No doubt, the UNO was expected to become bedrock of world peace, however, a charter of the UNO accorded patronage to regional
arrangement for the safeguard of the regional interests. Thereby, various regional organizations, in the plea of regional security sprang up, reflecting the changing and conflicting geographical, social, economic, ideological order. These regional organizations were, more or less, military alliances which once again sealed the fate of the peaceful coexistence. These regional organizations were like NATO, Warsaw Pact, SEATO, CENTO, ASEAN etc.

Among these various regional organizations the NATO deserves a most dispassionate review. Using the Soviet military threat, USA could mastermind the formation of the military bloc like NATO which escalated into the arsenal of military powers of the Western Europe. Though the champions of the NATO claimed that it aimed at averting the "communist threat" and preserving the peace of the western Europe in reality, NATO became a mere byproduct of a political strategy of the west aimed at whipping up an atmosphere of cold war a scapegoat to the imperialistic and war-mongering programs of the White House. Margaret Thatcher, ex-Prime Minister of England asserted at the 35th anniversary of NATO that NATO has not only stopped nuclear war, it has stopped conventional war too. But as a matter of fact, the nominal striving for military superiority by USA seems to be the raison d'être of NATO and despite its peace rhetoric, NATO has been pursuing a policy of arms buildup from its inception, which caused ever-growing concern for the world.

To understand the true objectives and ideology of NATO and role in the world of today, we must understand the circumstances which led to the formation of such a military bloc.

After the Second World War the cold war was spearheaded because the concepts of the Pax-American and the Pax-Russian could not compromise with each other. The world once again was polarized and the powers sought for the military alliances. And NATO was the culmination of the power politics.

However, the Western powers assign some definite cause for the rise of the NATO and for it these hold the Soviet expansionism to be responsible. After the World War II the entire east Europe was converted into the Red revolutionary belt and kept them under its "iron curtain". According to them, U.S.S.R. has been formatting insurrection in Greece, menacing Turkey and encouraging the communist parties in the Western Europe to seize power in the wake of post war economic disorder. So USA, wanted to pursue the containment policy.
Russian empathy for Turkey and support for the communist guerilla in Greece emphasizes the need for averting the Soviet threat.

In these situations, Truman, the president of US dictated the policy of military aid for the recovery of the Western Europe. However, in 1948, when the coup took place in Czechoslovakia and in 1949 when Tito was pressurized by Stalin and above all, the Berlin Decree, all dictated the necessity of military defence. So under the master plans of the USA, on April 4, 1949, the North Atlantic Treaty was signed by the twelve countries of western Europe and this alliance was known as NATO. Later on, Greece and Turkey joined. Arthur Vandenberg, one of the architects of NATO expressed the objectives of the organization in the senate debate in the following words, "This is the logical evolution of one of our greatest American idioms, united we stand, divided we fall."

The aims of NATO can be highlighted by analyzing the provisions enshrined in the constitution of NATO. The preamble of the treaty reaffirmed their faith in the principles of the United Nations and for the promotion of stability in the Atlantic dungeons, the members of NATO resolved to unite their efforts for collective self defence. The treaty contained 14 articles in total. The article 1 of the NATO constitution affirms that parties of the NATO, as set forth in the Charter of NATO shall settle international disputes by peaceful means and to refrain from the use of force. Through Article 2 the members of NATO aspire to cement their political and economic co-operation and collaboration. Through Article 3, they wanted to resist armed attack by collective efforts and by Article 4, they resolved to consult together in the event of any treaty.

However, Article 5 is most important which states that in the event of any armed attack on any member of NATO, all its members will come to her rescue only to maintain peace in the North Atlantic area. Article 7 emphasizes the fact that the charter of NATO does not effect the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security. Article 8 affirmed the declaration of the members that none of them should enter any other international engagement to the utter dismay of that treaty. Article 9 established a Council as the final body for the implementation of the provisions of the treaty. Article 10 invited, by unanimous agreement, and other European state in a position to further the cause of NATO. Article 13 states that any party may be ceased to be a member of NATO one year after its notice of denunciation has been given to the Government of the United states.
Thus, NATO came to limelight with the signing of the treaty by U.K, USA, France, Canada, Norway, Italy, Portugal, Belgium, Netherland, Iceland, Denmark and Luxembourg. Later on, Greece, Turkey and West Germany joined and its total membership increased to 18. The leaders of NATO may make demagogic plea that it was purely a defensive alliance, yet in reality, it was directed against USSR though its sugar-coated objective was to maintain peace in the North Atlantic dungeon. The facts and figures of the NATO can be best known if its structure is known.

The NATO held its first session in Washington on September 17, 1949. As regards the anatomy of NATO, the Council is the Supreme body consisting of the foreign ministers of the signatory nations and its duty was to make arrangements for the implementation of the treaty. It was at least to meet once in a year and at such other times, as deemed to be expedient. The Council established a Defence committee with the objective of collective defences. It was to be composed of one representative from each party and three representatives normally were to be defence ministers. According to the decision of the NATO Council the Defence Committee set up a Military Committee composed of one military representative from each party. These representatives should be the chiefs of staff as their representatives. In order to facilitate the rapid and efficient conduct of the work of the military committee they also set up a sub-committee, known as "Standing Group" consisting of representatives of UK, France and USA. In order to ensure speedy and efficient planning united defence, Regional Planning groups on regional basis were also set up.

Thus, NATO was expected to play a conspicuous role for maintaining the collective defence of Western Europe. However, while NATO was converting itself into a strong citadel of the Western European Security, the president De Gaulle of France considered NATO to be ineffective and redundant.

After 1949 the scene changed and the purpose for which NATO was formed no longer existed. Soviet Union no more remained a threat to the Western Europe. The nuclear balance between the Soviet Union and the United States, replacing the monopoly wielded by the latter changed the overall conditions for the defence of the West Europe was no longer the centre of international crisis and the centre had already moved elsewhere notably in Asia, where all countries of the Atlantic alliance were not obviously involved. Germany got herself rearmed too. That is why, France also wanted to exercise her full sovereignty over her own territory.
However, though the French President De Gaulle wanted to break away from the NATO, still NATO's role in various fields can hardly be overlooked. Rightly from its first session on September 17, 1949 to its spring session, the council and the Defence Committee have discussed various issues. In their fifth session in 1950 they set up an integrated force under the centralized command under a supreme commander to deter aggression. In the Berlin crisis and Korean crisis the NATO could play a matching role compared to that of Russia. In 1956 in case of the Suez crisis, it wanted to bring peace in the Western Asia. In 1957, the NATO evinced interest and appreciated the formation of SEATO, CENTO and OAS etc.

But the most important thing is that the escalation of arms race was spearheaded by USA. At the outset, for the common defence of Western Europe, it developed the conventional armaments and the nuclear armaments. Their opinion was that the "interests of west are indivisible" and that is why using the "Soviet military threat bogey" to scare the west European public, the United States was able to start the deployment of its medium range nuclear missiles in western Europe. It deployed the medium range nuclear missiles in the Western Europe and it was very much demurred by the USSR. Especially, during the days of Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, the two American Presidents the defence budget of the NATO was increased year after year.

However, many western European countries raised their serious objections. Beside France, the Danish Parliament on the eve of NATO's spring session in 1984 passed the decision obliging the Government to stop financing the deployment of US missiles in Europe. Greece also demurred against the citing of crushing and perishing missiles in Europe. But it was Netherlands’s position that was giving serious concern to the USA. The anti-war sentiment in Holland assumed such a dimension that the stationing of 48 cruise missiles in Holland was opposed very much by the parliament. So, NATO faced a “crisis deployment”.

On April 13, 1964, President Johnson of USA made remarks on NATO by saying that "proven in danger, strengthened in freedom, and resolute in purpose, we will go on". They argued that the Russians might have occupied Washington long ago, had not Washington and its partners formed a military bloc. Margaret Thatcher, the British Prime Minister once said, "NATO has not only stopped the nuclear war, it has stopped the conventional war too". The Defence Minister of West Germany asserted that "NATO is the only means of keeping our freedom and keeping peace
in Europe”. They argued that they were bound by the string of defensive alliance and their determined interest and objective was to maintain peaceful dialogue for a stable constructive relation between the east and the west. But the fact is that the NATO came into existence only for danger from the Russian side and later, the White House’s strong desire for military superiority, its ever new plans for launching effective and hazardous new arms and above all, its program of deployment of "missiles" and the most famous "star war" program under the president Ronald Reagan, demonstrated once again that despite its peace rhetoric, the NATO continued to pursue the same old policy of arms buildup which caused ever growing concern not only among the peace forces, but also within the bloc itself.

2.18 De Gaulle’s France and Rift in NATO

France had been a major European land power and a major imperial power but had failed in the contest with England for sea power. In the nineteenth century the decline of France’s position in Europe had been matched by the acquisition of a second overseas empire to replace the territories lost to Britain in the war of the 18th century, but by the beginning of the 20th century France, slipping back in the demographic and industrial race and spiritually still divided between the heirs of the enlightenment and the Revolution and those who accepted neither, was becoming discouraged and unnerved and unresponsive to central government. The awful sacrifices of the World War I and the hardly less awful humiliation of the Second World War, separated by incapacity to face up to the problems of the economic crisis or to Hitler's challenge to basic values brought France low in its own eyes until the exploits of the Resistance and the leadership of De Gaulle revived and personified the French spirit. De Gaulle’s identification of himself with France and his constant use of the first person singular were precisely what was needed to restore it the glory it once claimed.

2.18.1 France in the Post-War Period

France, after German occupation, was ruled by the Vichy government, headed by Marshal Petain, Pierre Laval and Francois Darlan. But free France continued to fight on the Allied side did not go unchallenged. General Charles de Gaulle, whose leadership did not go unchallenged, General Darlan who joined the Allies in the end of 1942 and General Henri Giraud at one time or other, claimed the leadership, but in the end, De Gaulle won power and became the head of the French provisional government. Yet after the liberation of France and her
adoption of the constitution of the Fourth Republic, De Gaulle, who had hoped for a strengthened executive" was disappointed.

The French policy in the post World War II period is marked by a strange dilemma of either accepting the realities of the post World War II situation persisting with France’s greatness without physical and economic resources. After the world war France emerged as a weak power both militarily and economically. She was so completely dependent on Britain and United States for her social and economic reconstruction that she could hardly carry out any commitment without the help of these two powers. Thus, in the post World War II period while framing her foreign policy, France had to take four factors into account. The primary factor was France’s own reduced importance. The second was the decline of Europe in general and of Germany in particular. The third was the emergence of Soviet colossus as the foremost continental power. The fourth was the appearance of the United States as the prime force in western Europe. Due to all these factors France had to be constant with a lesser role in Europe.

Among the parties that came into prominence in the post war period, mention must be made of the communist party which became the largest single party in the French Chamber of Deputies. The Rally of the French People (RFP) or the De Gaullist party played more or less the role of a third force, between the left and the right. The Movement Republican Popularize (MRP) was a party born during resistance to the Nazis and the socialists came next in importance. In the first election, the socialists, communists and MRP controlled nearly 80 percent of the notes. But the desire to exclude the communists made the formation of a stable government quite difficult. After the election of 1951 (the second post war election) France had the same difficulty and the French government remained in flux under the pressure of a multiparty system. In the 1956 elections there was a definite gain of the communists.

Meanwhile, French foreign policy’s dilemma was influencing her domestic policy. The exhaustion of France in the World War II, her fear of a German revival and the Soviet expansion in Europe, her inability to cope with the colonial revolts in Indo-China and North Africa all combined together to produce not only foreign policy riddles but also changes in the internal policy. In May, 1958 the situation took a dramatic change. The army leaders in Algeria fearing that the French government under Pierre Pflimlin would grant independence to Algeria suddenly took all authority in their own hand and demanded that General Charles De Gaulle should be placed in power. France was now threatened with
civil war to avoid which De Gaulle was accepted as premier with emergency power for six months. He drafted a new constitution in which the power of the executive was strengthened at the cost of the legislature. It was put to referendum in October, 1958, and received approval both in France and in her colonies. Thus the fourth Republic came to an end. De Gaulle became the head of the fifth republic coming to existence with him.

After solving the problem of Algeria successfully De Gaulle again appealed to the French people through a second referendum in 1962 for a further increase of the presidential power. In this he again received overwhelming support from the French people. Thus General de Gaulle established in France after many years a strong government. In the French general election held in March, 1967 the De Gaullists retained their command of the National Assembly by a hair breadth but in the next election which followed after a violent student unrest in May 1967 De Gaulle secured a comfortable majority. After the election Georges Pompidou gave way to Maurice Couve de Murville as prime minister.

But no sooner had France emerged from the social storm she was hit by another crisis. In November 1967 France found herself in the throes of currency crisis. France was saved by credit from other countries, and De Gaulle set his face against any further devaluation of the French currency, Franc. Following, however, a defeat in a referendum for senate reform President of the French Republic was Pompidou. Georges Pompidou died on April 2, 1974 and in May of the same year, Giscard d’Estaing was elected to step into his shoes.

2.18.2 France under De Gaulle and the Rift in NATO

The failure of the fourth Republic was translated so rapidly and effectively into action that the fifth Republic was the need of the hour. France’s diminished status in the world, the successive defeats or withdrawal in the country and elusive colonial wars, the failure of France and Great Britain in Suez, the growing strength of west Germany in NATO and in West Europe under stable political leadership were all factors in the growth of a spirit of nationalism in the country, contrasting sharply with governmental instability. Parliament and coalition cabinets continued to mirror the perennial and multiple divisions of the body politics at the very time when the public demanded unity and the realization of national objectives.
There was a complete recognition of the French foreign policy under General De Gaulle. He established in France a strong government for the first time in post World War II period. After bringing the strife in Algeria to a successful end he further increased the power of the French president through a referendum in 1962. He brought France out of chaos and disorder. He established a stabilized currency in France. De Gaulle decided to raise France to her former status of greatness and visualized a Europe free from the tutelage of USA. The challenge of the French Franc to Dollar was a concrete manifestation of the new policy of creating a 'Third Force' in Europe.

General Charles de Gaulle was equally determined on his occasion to power to invest France with independent control of the 'A' and 'H' Bombs. The French explosion of the 'A' Bomb in Sahara caused much discontent in the Arab world. The first 'H' bomb explosion of the French in Fangataufa Atoll lagoon on August 24, 1968 (fifth country to test thermonuclear device after the US, Soviet Union, UK and China) expressed French determination to gain full control of nuclear arms. France looked down upon Britain for her dependence upon USA. De Gaulle was skeptical about Britain which had become dependent upon U.S. support and had reached an understanding about nuclear weapons with USA in the Bahamas conference. About Anglo-American nuclear Chile he expressed his opinion in the following caustic remark. "In the Bahamas Britain has given to the Americans what she had of the poor nuclear force. She could have given it to Europe. She has thus made her choices". De Gaulle acquired an independent nuclear capability, weakened ties with Britain and the United States. He took a series of steps which seriously endangered the effectiveness of the French alliance. France no longer sought close cooperation with NATO and the French fleet was no longer a part of the NATO naval forces. De Gaulle refused to allow the United States to have bases for missiles and atomic weapons. The French also failed to supply their share of the NATO troops. The French insistence forced the NATO command to remove its forces from France. France thus made a definite bid to eliminate American influence in French politics. The creation of a Franco-German force independent of NATO translated Gaullist idea into reality in 1992.

De Gaulle aimed at a revival of French prestige to enable France to predominate in the councils of the west. Her relations with Britain were allowed to suffer. The most successful of Europe's unification ventures is the European Common Market (ECM) which eliminated trade barrier among Benelux countries (Belgium, The Netherlands and Luxembourg); and France, Italy and Germany). It envisaged a closer cooperation and
coordination of fiscal policy. At a counter weight Britain and other European countries including Sweden, Denmark, Norway, Austria, Switzerland and Portugal organized a European Free Trade Area. It was a defensive measure against the inner ‘six’. Yet Britain moved to join the common market. It was due to French objection that the British move was frustrated in 1963. De Gaulle refused admission to Britain in spite of the insistence of USA. French voice in the European common market was predominant and France refused to admit Britain in the organization. For British it was a blow which she hardly expected from France. British reaction to this refusal was expressed by Mr. Duncan’s study when he commented that, “This is a very dark day, as dark for Europe as it is for Britain”. In May, 1967 Britain applied for European Common Market membership for the second time. The British application was again rejected on French insistence. De Gaulle said in December, 1967 that in rejecting British application France was in fact saving the common market from a period of analysis. After De Gaulle’s resignation on April 28, 1969 following his defeat in the referendum, the way was open for Britain to enter the common market and UK, Ireland, Norway and Denmark signed a treaty at Brussels to join the ECM in 1973.

In fact, De Gaulle brought a diplomatic revolution by reversing the French policy of building up anti-German alliance in Europe. Instead De Gaulle now chose a policy of close cooperation with west Germany to produce a European ‘Third force’. On January 22, 1963 De Gaulle signed a treaty of friendship with Konrad Adenauer, First Chancellor of West Germany which resulted in close cooperation between France and West Germany in diplomacy, defence, education and culture. De Gaulle thus reversed the policy so far followed in Franco-German relationship. It caused anxiety in Britain and constrained the American policy makers. Not only the French relations with Anglo-American powers suffered, the Soviet Union also harboured fear of a revived Germany. But the success of this policy was yet to be tested. Adenauer's retirement might have affected it but all anticipation of change of attitude in West Germany after Adenauer was falsified because his successors were toeing the policy of close cooperation with France.

A question could obviously crop up whether in future De Gaulle’s policy would be defended by his successors and whether even if they desired, they could maintain it. In the meanwhile, the French policy under De Gaulle has resulted to a large extent in the elimination of US patronage in non communist Europe. Outside Europe De Gaulle was not prepared to toe the American policy of recognizing the Formosa
government. He extended recognition to the communist China in February 1964. De Gaulle has pointed out that one of the main reasons of the weakness of the UNO is the elimination of the communist China from the UNO. He therefore, advocated the cause of including the communist China instead of nationalist China in the UNO. France disagreed from the US policy of escalation in Vietnam. Her interest in the South East Asia was revived. Even in the American continent, De Gaulle pleaded for the rights of the French Canadians.

De Gaulle followed a policy of increasing noncooperation towards NATO and NATO allies. This caused a lot of irritation within the NATO. Immediately after assuming power in 1958, De Gaulle submitted a proposal for creation of a tripartite organization consisting of USA, UK and France to take joint decision on global problem. But the proposal was not accepted. As a result, he started disengaging France from the NATO and its obligations. In 1959, French naval forces in the Mediterranean were withdrawn from the NATO command. In 1964 he withdrew the French naval forces from the Atlantic. Then he started demanding structural changes in NATO. Soon after he forced NATO to remove headquarters of the supreme headquarters of Allied powers in Europe (SHAPE) and the General European command from the French soil. All these actions of De Gaulle were mainly guided by the desire to exercise complete sovereignty on the French territory.

In 1966, De Gaulle formally declared that France wished to withdraw from NATO's integrated military structure and the next year he actually pulled out of NATO integrated military structure. After withdrawal from NATO's integrated structure France began to increase her military power independently.

In May 1968, France was shaken by an outbreak of revolutionary violence in Paris. The causes were not peculiar to France. All over western Europe there were deep sources of discontent which overlapped and fused urban squalor, revulsion against the horrors of the war in Vietnam, overcrowded universities and schools, the fight for higher wages in a period of inflation in prices. In France De Gaulle's government irritated the youth by its tone of paternalism and the liberals by its attempts to direct radio and television and to control the press. The progressive elements in Gaullism had grown dimmer during the ten years since De Gaulle had returned to save France from fascism and military rule. The position in French universities and schools was far from being the worst in Europe, but it was bad enough to inflate a generation which had been attuned to political activism by the Algerian war and was politically
better organized than anywhere else in Europe. Since the war the number of university entrants had been quadrupled by the rise in the birth rate and because no government had dared to change the rule that any boy or girl achieving the bachelor degree was entitled to go to a university.

New universities came up in Paris but got started too late. The resulting chaos got further increased by bureaucratic centralization, the discontent due to outdated syllabi and outdated rules about personal conduct (sometimes enforced by the police). The new University at Nanterre on the edge of Paris became notorious centre for clashes between students and staff. It was trouble at the Suburban in the heart of Paris which eventually converted such clashes into something like a revolution. At the same time workers in Paris and other cities went on strike, occupied factories and set up action communities which began to look like a new government in embryo. The authority of the legitimate government was badly shaken. The Prime Minister Georges Pompidou was so alarmed at such developments that he advised Dr. Gaulle to resign. There was talk of a new French Revolution to set in. But a month later De Gaulle went to the polls and won a sweeping victory.

There were several reasons for this. Although a nucleus among the students had revolutionary political aims, many of them wanted no more than University reform and the strikers were not revolutionary at all. They were not trying to overthrow the government but to get better wages out of it and less unemployment. The leaders of the communist party were too much part of the system to want to risk its disruption, were afraid of the more left wing groups and had no sympathy with students. Above all, De Gaulle never held responsibility. Although he had to hurry back from a state visit to Romania, he did not let himself be hustled when he got back.

Having assured himself by a secret expedition to military headquarters that he had nothing to fear from the army, he correctly weighed up the situation, waited for the university authorities and the trade Unions to begin to recover their control in their respective spheres and then, disdaining Francois Mitterrand's bid to replace him in the presidency, won a sweeping victory by the votes of frightened Frenchmen at the end of June 1968 and dismissed Pompidou. He then backed his minister of education, Edgar Faure, who made a radical attack on the problem of higher education in spite of some of his colleagues and of much conservative opinion. Faure introduced joint teacher student management; abolished the centralized system under which France had in effect a single university and substituted for it 65
universities (13 in Paris), none of which was to have more than 20,000 students; and further decentralized control within each university by creating joint councils for each nucleus of 2,500 students.

But De Gaulle’s days were numbered. One of his aversions was the French senate. One of his preoccupations at this point was to reform the machinery of government by the creation of regional assemblies. He proposed to link this reform with the abolition of the Senate and put the two issues together to the electorate by referendum. But the Senate was not unpopular and De Gaulle’s use of referendum, coupled as it was with the implication that the rejection of what was proposed entailed his own resignation, was widely regarded as unfair tactics. A majority voted negative. De Gaulle at once resigned on April 28, 1969. He died the next year on November 9, 1970. The president of the Senate, Alain Poher assumed the functions of the presidency. In accordance with the constitution, a presidential election was held, and the Gaullist candidate George Pompidou won comfortably in the second round.

To sum up, under General Charles de Gaulle the French policy underwent complete reorientation. He made all efforts to increase the strength of France and free her from the tutelage of USA. France exploded both ‘A’ and ‘H’ bombs. With a view to reducing the US influence in the area he created a confederation of six countries, known as the European Common Market (ECM). The trade barriers among the members were eliminated. In 1963 and 1967 when Britain wanted to join ECM, France blocked her entry. De Gaulle reversed the French policy towards Germany. Instead of policy of hostility he started a policy of close cooperation with West Germany. By the treaty of friendship the two countries agreed to cooperate in diplomacy, defence, education and culture. De Gaulle tried to follow an independent policy and recognized Red China and pleaded for her membership in the UNO. Under him France followed the policy of increasing non-cooperation towards the NATO and NATO Allies. Under Georges Pompidou who succeeded De Gaulle, changes were brought towards the USA and France. However, he failed to provide the vigour to French policy which it enjoyed under De Gaulle.

2.19 Let Us Sum Up

The post-Second World War rivalry between the two Super Powers produced endless friction. The alternative to world-wide collective security produced world-wide chain of alliances and counter alliances. The intensification of the cold war politics enhanced the problem and difficulty
of all the countries directly or indirectly whether or not they were a party to it. The dream of creating 'one world' with all nations living in peace under the protection of one international system of collective security got faded. The UNO was the first casualty of the 'cold war'. It was reduced to a simple force of world opinion. The germs of the cold war got incubated in the questions of Berlin, Suez, Cuban and Afghan crises which obliterated the scope of a unified world. The Super Power rivalry led to the division of Germany- West and East with Berlin as capital and the Cuban crisis to the closest point of a global nuclear war. Luckily, war could be averted due to farsighted statesmanship of the US President Kennedy and the USSR Premier Khrushchev. There was a deadlock both in Suez and Afghanistan because of the cold war strife. However, situations with UNO intervention could be brought to control to the satisfaction of the world.

After the World War II the peace loving humanity lived in a constant fear of another global war. The introduction of "star war weapons" escalated the arms race to an unprecedented degree. Everybody knew, if at all a war broke out, it would be a thermo-nuclear war that might wipe off the very human existence. There were discussions at several levels to limit and control race for armaments. Efforts were taken that ranged from continuous talks at the United Nations to such discussions among nuclear powers as the SALT and START. The START was expected to be a model for reaching nuclear arms agreements in future.

The post war Western European countries were in a state of physical and economic collapse, to which was added the fear of Russian dominance by frontal attack or subversion. The shattered economy of the countries of Europe resulted in political instability in the continent and encouraged USA and USSR to get involved to cover the power vacuum. The USA came up with two of its policies, the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan to set such countries back to their track. The Marshall Plan achieved triumphantly what it had set out to do by 1952 and the Truman Doctrine saved the Western European countries getting trapped from the clutches of the Russian communism.

The UNO after the World War II was expected to become bedrock of world peace and a charter of the UNO accorded patronage to regional arrangement for the safeguard of the regional interests. Thereby, various regional organizations, in the plea of regional security sprang up, reflecting the changing and conflicting geographical, social, economic, ideological order. These regional organizations were, more or less, military alliances which once again sealed the fate of the peaceful coexistence. These regional organizations were like NATO, Warsaw Pact, SEATO,
The NATO came into existence with the US initiative only for danger from the Russian side and later the White House’s strong desire for military superiority, its highhandedness in launching hazardous arms and its president Ronald Reagan’s famous “star war” program proved beyond doubt the same old policy of arms buildup which caused ever growing concern for the entire world. The French Premier Charles de Gaulle got no respite despite his country France being a strong member of the NATO. Hence, he decided to drift away from the same to get rid of the US control on his country. He created a confederation of six countries, known as the European Common Market (ECM) to eliminate the trade barriers among the members and in due course gave France its honour.

### 2.20 Key Words

- **Abominable:** Offensive/Awful.
- **Beacon:** Inspiration/Guiding Light.
- **Catastrophe:** Disaster/Devastation.
- **Cleavage:** Difference.
- **Colossus:** A person or thing of immense size or power.
- **Concord:** Agreement/Accord.
- **Condominium:** A government operating under joint rule.
- **Détente:** A policy adopted by the US in 1970’s not meant to replace the abiding postwar American strategy of containment, but was meant to be a less confrontational method of containing Communist power through diplomatic accords and a flexible system of rewards and punishments by which Washington might moderate Soviet behaviour.
- **Duopoly:** Preponderant influence or control by two political powers.
- **Espionage:** Spying/Intelligence.
- **Fissile:** Capable of undergoing fission.
- **Flirtation:** To show superficial or casual interest or liking.
- **Genocide:** The deliberate and systematic destruction of a racial, political, or cultural group.
Holocaust: A thorough destruction involving extensive loss of life.

Khalq and Parcham: In April 1978 the government of President Mohammad Daud Khan in Afghanistan was overthrown by a left-wing military officer Nur Mohammad Taraki. Power was thereafter shared by two Marxist-Leninist political groups, the People’s (Khalq) Party and the Banner (Parcham) Party—which had earlier emerged from a single organization, the People’s Democratic Party of Afghanistan- and had reunited in an uneasy coalition shortly before the coup.

Loya Jirgah: Grand Assembly of Afghanistan.

Muddle: Disorder/Bewilderment/Mess.

Oscillate: Swing/Vacillate.

Ostpolitik: In 1967 as Chancellor of West Germany, Willy Brandt concentrated on foreign affairs, and he particularly sought to improve relations with East Germany, other communist countries in Eastern Europe, and the Union, formulating a policy known as Ostpolitik (“eastern policy”).

Pax-American: Supporting or favouring America.

Pax-Russian: Supporting or favouring Russia.

Polemic: An aggressive controversialist.

Quarantine: A term during which a ship arriving in port and suspected of carrying contagious disease is held in isolation from the shore.

Raison d’être: Reason or justification for existence.

Repatriation: To restore or return to the country of origin, allegiance, or citizenship.

Sitting duck: Easy target.

Squalor: Immorality/Dirtiness.

Tutelage: Sponsorship/Protection.

Utopian idea: An imaginary and impractical idea.
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3.19 Key Words
3.0 Objectives

This Unit deals with variety of international issues emerging towards the last phase of the cold war. After going through this unit you will be able to learn:

- about the political and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the Eastern Europe;
- about the Warsaw Pact and its objectives;
- about the relations developed between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia;
- how the Soviet Union started intervening in the internal politics of Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968;
- about Glasnost and Perestroika under the Gorbachev era and how there was the collapse of Soviet Union;
- about the disintegration of the socialist bloc and the end of the cold war;
- about the economic and political implications of the globalisation; and
- about the regional security and alliances and how there were the emergence of the CENTO, SEATO, ASEAN and SAARC.

3.1 Introduction

After the end of the Second World War the USSR required the support of the Eastern European countries to struggle against the west. In initial stages after 1945 the Soviet Union created effective and unified Communist Government in practically all the East European countries. It accelerated the process of industrialization and social change which had developed only feebly in the inter-war period. It created new political consciousness in the class drawn from the most ambitious and probably the most ruthless in each of the East European societies.

The world soon after the trauma of the Second World War got polarised and came once again under the threat of the cold war that haunted the peace loving humanity with the strain of nightmare. The competitive alliance of the pre-First World War and pre-Second World War once again got revived. The bipolar politics surged with vengeance and mutual distrust became the ordeal of the world scenario. Hence various regional organizations like NATO, CENTO, SEATO, and Warsaw Pact etc. sprang up to restore the regional security, reflecting the changing and conflicting geographical, social, economic and ideological order.
The relations between USSR and Yugoslavia after the Second World War provide a fascinating study in the international politics. Yugoslavia under Marshal Tito slipped out of the Soviet grip and strived to become a socialist state on its own right. While the USSR prognosticated that Yugoslavia could not withstand the onslauts and refused to come back ultimately to the communist camp, Yugoslavia marched with its own strength without becoming a minor satellite or the puppet of USSR.

The Hungarian revolt of October 1956 was essentially a liberal nationalist uprising against Stalinist communism. The revolt was led by the workers and youth and was ultimately crushed by a combination of such factors as lack of honest local leadership, the enormous might of the Soviet troops and tanks, general panic and presidential election year in the United States and the general ineffectiveness of the United Nations. During 1945-52, Hungary had grown into a People’s Democracy. By January 1968 the Russians had apparently decided to replace Novotny by Dubcek in Czechoslovakia. Dubcek proclaimed the solidarity of Czechoslovakia with USSR and visited Moscow immediately after his appointment. Intervention in the affairs of a neighbour was neither new nor ideologically entirely unjustifiable, but the extreme form of military invasion was to be avoided if possible. And Russia did it with Czechoslovakia in 1968.

After years of Soviet military buildup at the expense of domestic development, economic growth was at a standstill. Failed attempts at reform, a stagnant economy and war in Afghanistan led to a general feeling of discontent, especially in the Baltic republics and Eastern Europe, greater political and social freedoms, instituted by the last Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, created an atmosphere of open criticism of the Moscow regime. Several Soviet Socialist Republics began resisting central control, and increasing democratization with the launching of glasnost and perestroika led to a weakening of the central government. The USSR’s trade gap progressively emptied the coffers of Union, leading to eventual bankruptcy and it headed towards its final collapse in 1991.

Globalisation in its literal sense is the process of transformation of local or regional things or phenomena into global ones. It can also be used to describe a process by which the people of the world are unified into a single society and function together. This process is a combination of economic, technological, socio-cultural and political forces. Globalisation is often used to refer to economic globalisation, that is, integration of
national economies into the international economy through trade, foreign
direct investment, capital flows, migration, and the spread of technology.

The emergence of the concept of regional security has been an
important feature of international relations in the post World War II
period. The main factors which contributed to the rise of regional
security or regionalism were the emergence of a large number of sovereign
independent states and the lack of self-sufficiency of these states which
compelled them to look for cooperation with other states to meet
basic needs of their citizens. This naturally led to the formation of
a large number of regional organization like the CENTO, SEATO, ASEAN
and SAARC etc.

3.2 The Soviet Union and Eastern Europe

If there were Russians who had believed at the war’s end that
victory would lead to an era in which the wartime collaboration with
western democracies would be perpetuated and the rigid domestic
controls relaxed, they were disenchanted. Stalin reverted to the line of
policy he had followed before the world war and this tendency continued.
The Russian leaders preached that Soviet Union was ringed about
by the capitalist enemies on the destruction of communism. In
February 1946 Stalin restated the thesis that war was inevitable as
long as the capitalists existed and hitherto there had been a
virulent campaign against those who had succumbed to the lure of
bourgeois culture. To struggle against the west the USSR required the
support of the Eastern European countries. Therefore, a queer analysis
of the USSR-Eastern Europe relationship is necessary to understand the
foreign policy of USSR. Between 1945 and 1948 almost a hundred million
Eastern Europeans were brought under the communist rule, as people's
democracies were established in Albania, Poland, Rumania, Bulgaria,
Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany and Yugoslavia.

3.3 Political and Economic Relations

The partition of Europe after the Second World War was the
consequence of a trend and an accident. The trend was the decline
of the European nation states precipitated by the war. Europe was
a continent which had functioned in the form of comparatively small
and strong entities, capable of maintaining separate existences because
of the principles of self-determination and industrial development.
During the Stalin era, the Soviet relation with the East European
Countries could in essence be described as unilateral. Moscow enjoyed a
dominating position. With the departure of Stalin from the scene the
trends released by Marshal Tito, even during the time of Stalin, began to
have wider reactions. After 1954, the East European countries could no
more be described as satellite states of USSR. This, of course, did not
mean that Moscow ceased to exercise the most powerful influence in the
area. Even today the Soviet Union (now Russia) is the most major force in
East Europe.

In initial stages after 1945 the Soviet Union created effective and
unified Communist Government in practically all the East European
countries. It accelerated the process of industrialization and social change
which had developed only feebly in the inter-war period. It created new
political consciousness in the class drawn from the most ambitious and
probably the most ruthless in each of the East European societies.

It has been argued that the division of Europe and the resulting of
Russian overlordship in Eastern Europe of agreement notably the
agreement at Yalta by Roosevelt and Churchill gave Stalin a position of
power which otherwise he could not have achieved. This agreement does
not hold good. Roosevelt and Churchill conceded at Yalta that the Russian
armies were already in occupation of positions in Europe in which
they could not be expelled and Stalin's poor war dominance in Eastern
Europe was derived from his victories and not from any bargain with
his allies. The most that Roosevelt and Churchill could do was to get
Stalin to accept certain rules governing the exercise of the power. They
succeeded in doing by persuading him to endorse a declaration on
liberated countries which promised free elections and other democratic
practices and liberties.

Three kinds of bond explain the relations of the USSR with the East
European States: Political, Economic and Military.

3.3.1 Political

Within the Russian sphere Stalin’s problem was the nature of
Russian control and its mechanisms. He created a satellite empire in
which the component states retained their separate juristic identities
separated from each other and from the USSR but were subjected
to Russian purposes by the realities of Russian military power and
the modalities of communist party and police rule and unequal
economic treaties. There soon began differences between former forces
like Hungary, Romania and Bulgaria, and wartime allies like Poland,
Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia. This difference was manifested at an
early stage in Poland by the Lublin committee, a communist dominated group of leaders formed in July 1944. From among the Polish resistance and then groomed in Moscow, was established to frustrate the London Poles who had conducted the fight against the Germans from exile; in Romania the king was compelled to appoint a government controlled by the communists in March 1945.

By the conclusion of peace treaties in February 1947 and of further treaties between each of them and the USSR during 1948, the defeated enemies were equated with the allies. The peace treaties cost Hungary Transylvania which went to Romania, and a smaller piece of territory awarded to Czechoslovakia; confirmed Romanian loss of Bessarabia and northern Bukovina to USSR, and southern Bukovina to Bulgaria; and gave the USSR and Petsamo area of Finland and a fifty year lease of the naval base at Porkala with an access corridor. The treaties of 1948 provided for mutual assistance against Germany and prescribed any alliance by the one signatory which might be construed as directed against the other.

But Stalin aimed at more than formal arrangements and by the end of the forties he had, except in Yugoslavia and Finland, transferred the machinery of government into the hands of obedient communists who were not merely conscious of the realities of Russian power but determined to save it. This transfer involved the suppression or emasculation of non-communist parties and the elimination from the communist ranks of communists who were national.

This process was successfully achieved in the short run, unsuccessful in the longer run in that it failed to secure for Moscow a trouble free zone of influence round the USSR’s European borders. Yugoslavia rejected Russian dominance in 1948, Poland and Hungary kicked against it in 1956 and Romania led a campaign against it in the mid-sixties.

In 1946 Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria and Albania had communist Prime Ministers—Marshal Tito, Klement Gottwald, G. M. Dimitrov and Enver Hoxhan respectively. In Hungary and Romania the postwar election was owned by peasant party leaders, in Poland and Finland by socialists. All these countries had coalition governments, although only the governments in France and Helsinki gave the appearance of a real distribution of power. In Finland the communists were left out of a new government formed after elections in July 1948, in which they formed badly. Elsewhere communist control was
intensified during 1947-48, although in Yugoslavia the communist monopoly of power worked against and not for the Russian interest and culminated in June 1948 in the eviction of Yugoslavia from the fraternity of communist states.

Hence, during the Stalin era, the Soviet relations with the East European countries could be described as unilateral. Moscow enjoyed a dominating position. With the departure of Stalin from the scheme the trends released by Marshal Tito even during the time of Stalin began to have wider reactions. After 1954 the East European countries could be described as satellites of the USSR.

The post Stalin leadership of the Soviet Union attempted to develop through the institutional framework for the regaining of the Soviet relations with Eastern Europe the framework which Stalin had neglected. This was done along three lines political, economic and military. This triangular approach largely developed by Khrushchev had not been abandoned even by all his successors after 1964. Thus there has been a great change in the Soviet policy towards Eastern Europe after Stalin, and this change continued even in 1985.

As far as political approach is concerned, it may be mentioned that in the early post Stalin era the Cominform was not revived, it was indeed abolished in 1956. The economic institutional framework regulating the Soviet relations with Eastern Europe may be said to the far more developed and far more improved. Khrushchev had reactivated the Committee for Economic Mutual Assistance (CEMA) with a view to achieving close coordination between the Soviet and East European economics. By 1964, when Khrushchev left the scene, a degree of coordination of national economic plans in East Europe had been achieved.

In 1962 the Soviet Union supported by Czechoslovakia and East Germany proposed a kind of super national authority with powers to allocate resources and adjust national economic plans with the CEMA. This proposal was, however, opposed by Rumania, which also differed from the Soviet Union on the questions of China and East West trade. This unexpected resistance from Rumania had the effect of halting the movement towards the Soviet dominating supra-nationalist. But in 1964 a multilateral bank was setup; and in 1966-67 the general price level in the CEMA area came to be integrated. But this integration was certainly not to the advantage of the Soviet Union.
3.3.2 Economic

The economic bonds included several trade agreements between the USSR and the East European countries, the existence of joint mixed companies, and the so-called Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon). These economic bonds were not uniform in the case of all East European countries. We have seen that the eight East European States belonged to two categories- those that had fought against Germany and those that had fought on the side of Germany. In the case of the latter, the Soviet Union realized reparations in kind and the costs of occupation together with the confiscation of the German and the Italian assets there. In the case of the former (and later on, in the case of the latter also) trade agreements were concluded under which goods were to be delivered during a specific period. In this way the economy and the economies of the East European countries were more or less integrated. The so-called Molotov Plan given out in the summer of 1947 aimed at the hastening of the economic recovery, increasing industrialization, raising living standards of the East European States and reducing their trade with Western Europe whereas the total value of the trade between western and eastern Europe in 1938 was 3.4 billion and after raising to 1.9 billion in 1944 it fell down again in 1950 to the level of 1947. Conversely, the Soviet Union’s share of the trade of these States rose from less than 2% in 1938 to more than 50% in 1947 and to 80% in 1952.

This decline of the Western trade and the increase in the Russian was partly due to obstacles created by the East and partly to those created by the West. So far as the Soviet created obstacles are concerned it may be briefly stated, first, that the Communist economic system was peculiarly apathetic to trade relations with the non-Communist world. Secondly, the existence of centrally controlled economies in Eastern Europe led to low level of East-West trade as it involved the extra costs of long negotiations, the fear of arbitrary changes in terms, the problems of a fairly competitive group of suppliers dealing with “monopolistic” buyers and the constant interference of political factors. Finally, the capacity of the East European States or their willingness to export to the West failed to expand commensurately with their desire for imports.

On the western side it may be broadly said that the Western countries led and pressed by the United States, adopted measures to cut off from the Soviet Union products that might have contributed directly to its war making potential. From 1948 onwards, as we will note later, the American policy was to reverse the co-operative trend and to restrict its exports to the East. It may be mentioned that in 1947 when the Marshall Plan was launched it was expected that the west would obtain 17% of
their imports from East Europe and sell 19% of their exports to them. When the Cold War began in 1948 this hope was completely belied.

The trade agreements to which we have referred were concluded with Poland on 6th March, 1941 providing for a loan to Poland of $27.875 million in gold for the purchase of foreign food, machinery and raw materials, and with Czechoslovakia on 12th July, 1947 providing for delivery of Russian grains, cotton, fertilizers, metals, etc. in exchange for Czech machinery and manufactured goods. In 1948 the Soviet Union agreed to make a loan to Czechoslovakia in gold and convertible currency. On 13th July, a trade agreement was signed with Hungary and it was followed by another agreement on 2nd October, 1948. Under them Soviet Union supplied raw textile materials in exchange for manufactured textile, oils and bauxite. Similarly agreements were concluded with other countries of the foreign and all of them were based on the same pattern.

Another economic bond of unity between the Soviet Union and the East European States were the joint or mixed companies set up in the People’s Democracies. In Rumania, for instance, the oil fields came to be owned by a mixed Soviet-Rumania company and the Russian representatives in the company board seem to control the majority of votes and are even now in a position to decide policies. Similarly in other States companies were established. And finally in 1949 the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (Comecon) was established as a reply to the European Recovery Programme (ERP) and as an economic counterpart of the Communist in order to facilitate economic cooperation among the Soviet Union and the East European States.

The sources of friction in the economic sphere should now be obvious. In the first place, East-West trade became the subject “of a constant barrage of propaganda, accusations and counter-accusations, and restrictive action by Governments”. Secondly, Since East Europe has been a traditional exporter of food and industrial raw materials to Western Europe, the Soviet control of this region naturally created grave economic problems for West Europe. From 1945 to 1950 the ability to get timber, coarse grain and coal from East Europe was a major factor in the economies of some Western European countries. Several of the western European nations were dependent to a large extent on imports from the East including some strategically important commodities like nickel. Thirdly, friction had been caused by the process of nationalization of industries, banks, factories, foreign trade and agriculture in East Europe. And finally, tension had resulted from the failure of efforts to promote general East-West economic cooperation.
3.3.3 Military

In the military sphere the bonds of relations were largely provided by the treaties of friendship and mutual alliance with the East European States, as a result of which there emerged the Soviet Bloc. With its war-time allies—Poland, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union had concluded alliances even during the war; on 12th December, 1943 with Czechoslovakia, on 21st April, 1945 with Poland and on 11th April, 1945 with Yugoslavia. With other States treaties were concluded between 1945 and 1948. From 18th March, 1946 to 16th April, 1949 as many as 17 bilateral treaties were concluded among the East European States. All these treaties represented a consistent pattern. They were apparently directed against Germany and were apparently based on Article 53 of the United Nations Charter. All the Soviet alliances with the East European States were, therefore, operative in case of an attack by Germany or by its allies. These military links were supplemented, during the period under review, by the exchange of civilities on such occasions as the anniversaries of the Bolshevik Revolution on the singing of the several treaties of friendship- by attacks on the Western powers and their diplomatic representatives in the capitals of these countries, and by the exploitations of the disputes between these countries and the western powers extorted the western reaction regarding “the Process of lowering the iron curtain which prevented normal intercourse after the manner of civilized States.”

As far as military integration is concerned, reference may be made to the Warsaw pact. It was a multilateral defence agreement originally made to counter the West German Disarmament and her inclusion in NATO. It supplemented existing bilateral agreements and, in the initial stage only provided a legal justification for keeping the Soviet troops in Poland, Hungary and East Germany. The Soviet troops had left Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and Bulgaria shortly after 1945, they had been withdrawn from Rumania and Albania in 1958 and 1961 respectively. Earlier a Warsaw Pact General staff had been formed; it was located in Moscow and always headed by a Soviet General. In 1962, joint military exercises were held for the first time for the rest there was very little genuine military integration. Nuclear arms were only the monopoly of the USSR and were completely controlled even when such arms were established on the territory of any East European country. In NATO the situation was different.
It was in the spring of 1966 that Moscow began to propose closer military integration in order to meet the treaty of West Germany equipped with nuclear weapons. Poland and Czechoslovakia were the most directly threatened by West German revisionism and they strongly supported the Soviet proposal. But Rumania offered the greatest resistance. On May 7, 1966, Nicholas Ceausescu, the Rumanian Party chief, condemned military blocs and foreign bases as anachronistic and as gross violation of national independence of the people concerned. Rumania even proposed that the top Warsaw Pact command posts must rotate among all the member states and that all states must have a veto over the use of the nuclear weapons in their territories. Extensive negotiations started between Brezhnev and Ceausescu; foreign ministers of the Warsaw pact countries also met in Moscow to consider the question; and still later heads of Governments met in Bucharest to trash out the differences. But Rumania won the day. The second Bucharest meeting only condemned the US policy in Vietnam, called west Germany revisionist and proposed an all European conference to consider European security. The issue of closer military aggression was quietly dropped.

Yugoslavia was another challenge to the Soviet policy in Eastern European countries. Ever since the resumption of Soviet-Yugoslavia relation by Khrushchev after his bid to end Stalinist policy of outcasting Tito, Yugoslavia had followed its own road to socialism and freely opened dialogue with the West in an attempt and follow a neutralist policy. Yugoslavia’s reaction to Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956 was hostile and when the Warsaw Pact powers sent their armed forces to Czechoslovakia on August 21, 1968, Yugoslavia was alarmed for a possible Soviet interference in the internal affairs of that country. But in the case of Yugoslavia too, the initial suspicion that Russia might act against Yugoslavia was believed.

In Czechoslovakia a new wind of change was introduced under the leadership of Alexander Dubcek, the first secretary of the Czech communist party. It resulted in the toppling down of president, inviting an old guard Stalinist, and the election of Ludvik Svoboda in his place. The liberalizing policy of the Czech leaders was frowned upon by the Russians and their allies, who on July 14-15, met in Warsaw and in their better addressed to the Czech party, pointed out that hostile forces were seeking to turn her away from her socialist path and to place her in danger of being severed from the socialist community. “Each of our parties”, stated the Warsaw letter, “is responsible not only to its own working class and its own
people, but also to the international working class, the world, communist movement and it cannot evade the obligations arising there from”. In Poland the Lenin shipyard strike led by solidarity leaders such as Lech Walesa and worker's discontent resulted in a military labour movement and the imposition of ban on solidarity by General Jaruzelski, the Head of the Polish Government on 1981.

Evidently there were certain sources of tension between the USSR and East European states. While immediately after 1945 the various communist powers in East European countries were rather immature in the exercise of political power and also lacked public support and were, for that reason, uncertain about their future. Gradually they acquired maturity, developed confidence and, therefore, a degree of self assertiveness.

Another source of tension was the revival of nationalism among the leadership of the East European countries. The people were already imbued with national spirit right from the very beginning.

Moreover, the economic factor provided another fertile source of trouble between the Soviet Union and the East European countries. The economic exploitation during the Stalin era created bitter memories. In the early Khrushchev era, the Soviet emphasis on rapid heavy industrialization also evoked feelings of hostility. There has been a great divergence too in economic interest. By 1989 all the East European countries insisted that any agreement between themselves and the Soviet Union must be based on the principles of mutual interests. On November 29, 1990 it was announced that the Warsaw pact would cease to exist as a Soviet. But in September 1991, it ceased to exist even as a political forum.

3.4 The Warsaw Pact and its Objectives

When the Allied powers signed the Atlantic charter and USA dropped the atom bomb on Hiroshima the death knell of the Japanese militarism, barbaric fascism and the Hitlerite Nazism was sounded. The world predicted that the era of "detente" and military alliances" which had sparked the two world wars, would end and the world would tread with a canvas of peaceful co-existence. But the hope of the world was short and myopic. No sooner did the world emerge from the traumatic catechism of the Second World War, to the utter despair and disillusionment of the world statesmen, it became once again a polarised world where the world came once
again under the threat of the cold war that haunted the peace loving humanity with the strain of nightmare. The competitive alliance of the pre-First World War and pre-Second World War once again got revived. The bipolar politics surged with vengeance and mutual distrust became the ordeal of the world scenario. Hence various regional organizations, to restore the regional security sprang up, reflecting the changing and conflicting geographical, social, economic and ideological order. Those regional military pacts were like NATO, CENTO, SEATO, Warsaw Pact and world was once again involved in the hydra-headed cold war.

3.4.1 Signing of the Pact

However, among those various regional organizations the NATO and Warsaw Pact deserve special assessment. They were two parallel military pacts which went on acquiring more and more sophisticated weapons. While NATO was the military arsenal of the western capitalistic world, established under US patronage to frustrate the communist expansion, the Warsaw Pact set up a counter military fortress of the monolithic communist world under USSR to meet any threat from NATO. Thus the world came to be balanced on a balance of power. The Warsaw Pact was practically a duplicate copy of the NATO with some minor difference. It was signed in Warsaw on May 14, 1955. The Warsaw Pact- the treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance was signed by representatives of States- Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, the Soviet Union, the Germany Democratic Republic, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia.

The formation of the Warsaw pact acted as a ‘safety valve’ for the militarism of NATO, reminded the world statesmen about the formation of the Triple Alliance vis-a-vis Triple Entente and thus, as if, the history came to be repeated itself once again. The circumstances under which the Warsaw pact came to be set up, can be discussed as follow.

The Charter of the United Nations had provided that the regional organization could be set up and on the 4th April, 1949 the NATO was setup with a marked plea of the “treat from the East”. The treat from the East emptied the treat from communism and this was a potent fact. The communist bloc denigrated the NATO as the manifestation of the desire of the Anglo-American for world hegemony and its inevitable subsequent development was the Warsaw pact.
Secondly, the Paris peace treaties were signed on 23 October 1954 which made provisions to include Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) in NATO. In the view of the USSR, it was the danger of rearming the FRG and whetting up its militarist appetites and the socialist bloc could not accept it with alacrity. In December 1954 a conference of eight European nations, viz, Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Rumania, Albania, USSR with an observer from the communist China was held in Moscow to consider their attitude to the Paris peace conference. The conference opposed the rectification of the treaties and declared that in the event of their ratification, the participating countries would adopt joint measure of defence. It was further declared that they would meet again to consider concrete measures for a Joint Defence command. A Soviet statement on January 1, 1955 which had a wide response throughout the world, convincingly showed the danger of rearming the FRG and its inclusion in NATO to all the European peoples. It noted that there was the clear violation of the Potsdam principles FRG's admission still untapped possibilities for reaching agreement on the reunification of Germany, an agreement for holding all German powers that the talk on Germany's reunification would lose all significance and become impossible if the Paris agreements were verified.

But the western power paid no need to warnings and admonition of the Soviet Russia and the Paris agreements, came into force on 5th May, 1955. This gave the west German militarists a free hand and created a threat to the European nations. In response to this, a conference of the representatives of eight countries such as Albania, Bulgaria Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic (GDR), Hungary, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union opened in Warsaw, the capital of Poland on May 11, 1955 and on May 14, 1955 they signed a treaty on friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance which came to be known as the Warsaw treaty.

Thus, while the Western bloc, under the Washington centric leadership formed the NATO with the marked plea of danger from east and further aggravated the situation by bringing the FRG into the orbit of the NATO, the eastern powers formed the Warsaw pact. It was just a parallel military alliance to NATO and its formation reminded the formation of the Triple Entente and Triple Alliance before the First World War. The signatories under this treaty decided to set up a unified command of their armed forces and agreed that several questions relating to the strengthening of the
defence capacity and the organization of united armed forces of participating countries would be examined by political and consultative committees. The parties undertook to abstain in their international relations from threats of violence or its use, to settle international disputes by peaceful means, and to consult mutually on all important international problems affecting their common interests and to consult each other in the event of a threat of armed attack against one or several states.

3.4.2 Objectives

The aims and objectives of the Warsaw pact could be learnt particularly through the analysis of the articles of the same.

The article 1 of the Pact records the commitment of its signatories, in accordance with the United Nations charter, to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force and to settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner as not to affect international peace and security.

Article 2 affirmed the readiness of the contracting action with the purpose of assuring international peace and security. Article 3 provided that the contracting parties were to consult mutually on all important international problems affecting their common interests strengthening international peace and security as a principle and "guideline". However, the commitment on mutual assistance in the event of an armed attack on Europe or one of its signatories of the treaty by any state or by any group is recorded in an unambiguous language in Article 4, which declare that in the event of such an attack, every signatory of the treaty will, in the exercise of the right to individual and collective self defence, immediately go to its rescue. This provision safeguarded the right to individual or collective self-defence, in accordance with Article 51 of the UN charter, it was also agreed that the parties would "immediately take joint measures necessary to establish and preserve international peace and security, and that these measures will be stopped as soon as the Security Council takes measures necessary for establishing and preserving international peace and security".

Article 5 provided the decision of the signatory states to set up a joint command for the armed forces which would by agreement among them be placed under this command and adopt other measures to strengthen their defence capacity. A political consultative
committee, in which each signatory state was represented by a member government on other specially appointed representative, was set up according to the Article 6, for the consultations envisaged in the treaty and for the examination of any question arising from the implementation of the treaty. The committee was authorised to set up "any auxiliary organs it considers necessary".

Under the Article 7, the signatories pledged to refrain from taking part in any coalitions on alliances and from concluding agreements running counter to the purpose of Warsaw Treaty. Article 8 contained the aspirations of its signatories to continue developing and strengthening economic and cultural relations with each other in the spirit of friendship and cooperation. Article 9 declared that the Warsaw Treaty was often, to the accession of other states, regardless of their social and state system, which expressed readiness through participation in it, to contribute to the uniting efforts of the peace loving countries. Article 11 noted that the Warsaw treaty would end when a system of collective security in Europe would be setup.

3.4.3 Working of the Pact

The treaty was to continue in force for 20 years and "in the event of a system of collective security being set up in Europe and a Pact to this effect being signed to which each party to this treaty will direct its efforts, the present treaty will lapse from the day such a collective security comes in to force". It was also provided that from 1975, for 10 years the treaty would be automatically extended so that in 1985, its reaffirmation is due.

The Marshal of the Soviet Union Konev was the commander-in-chief of the United Armed Forces and the ministers of defence and military leaders of the participating states, who would command the armed forces of each participating country contributing to the strength of the United Armed Forces. It was agreed that the commander-in-chief would set up his headquarters at Moscow and that the location of the United armed forces on the territories of the participating states would be decided in accordance with the needs of mutual defence by agreement between these states.

In content, objectives and character, the Warsaw treaty was purely a defensive treaty directed towards asserting peace and
security of the nations of Europe and the world as a whole. It was the response of the peace loving nations to the aggressive activities of the NATO and other imperialist blocs. The apologists of the Warsaw Treaty viewed that it were the bourgeoisie propaganda of the west which equaled the Warsaw with the NATO.

While analyzing the anatomy of the Warsaw Treaty organization (WTO), we find that its essential features were the carbon copy of the NATO. However, there were certain differences. The Warsaw pact was open to any state where as unanimity was required to extend the membership of NATO. Moreover the Warsaw pact was provisional in the sense that it was to remain in force only until a European collective security system came in to existence. However, the Warsaw pact accepted the dominance of Soviet Union and it provided the "institutional framework for the stationing of the Soviet troops" in East Europe. Though in the NATO, USA occupied a focal point, this did not overbalance the others so overwhelmingly as was the case with the Soviet Union, in the Warsaw pact.

The major hurdle for the Warsaw pact came from the element of opposition from Rumania. Mr. Ceausescu and De Gaulle of France brought a rift in the Warsaw pact. The view of Mr. Ceausescu was that the military pacts were an "anachronism" incompatible with the national dependence and the sovereignty of every country.

Albania also finally left the WTO in 1968 and despite Albania's departure, the WTO seemed to be a monolithic unity of the communist world. Of course, Rumania followed a more independent policy. However, the Soviet Union strengthened its links with the pact member countries through bilateral treaties of friendship and mutual assistance. The Pact was believed to be more cohesive and united than the NATO.

From loosely organized "socialist military coalition", created to counter "possible aggression", the Warsaw pact demonstrably consolidated itself during the 27 years of existence. Evidently, there were certain sources of tension between USSR and the East European states. While immediately after 1945 the various communist parties in East European countries were rather immature in the exercise of political power and also lacked public support and were for that reason, uncertain about their future, gradually they acquired maturity, developed confidence and therefore,
a degree of self assertiveness. Another source of tension was the revival of nationalism among the leadership of the East European countries. The people were already imbued with national spirit right from the very beginning.

The Political Consultative Committee (PCC), which met thrice during the first five years of existence decided to hold more military takeovers and the meetings became more significant which showed interest in the crisis of Berlin and Czechoslovakia etc. In 1969 when the PCC met at Budapest it created three new coordinating committee, the first, the Committee of Defence Ministers (CDM), second the pacts, Supreme Military Council which was responsible for planning and the third being the Technical Council which dealt with the development and moderation of technology.

The PCC in Bucharest in 1976 created a new political institution, a committee of Foreign ministers with an associated secretariat which asked the foreign ministers to meet annually. The secretariat with its headquarters at Moscow was to handle the administrative matters and implement the decision taken by the foreign ministers. However, there were no unanimity of opinion in certain controversial issues like Rumania's opposition on Soviet policy on China, Camp David, Cold war detente, increase of the defence budget of NATO member.

Moreover, the economic factor also provided another fertile source of trouble between the Soviet Union and the East European countries. The economic exploitation during the Stalin era created bitter memories. In the early Khrushchev era, the Soviet emphasis upon rapid heavy industrialization also evoked feelings of hostility. There has been a great divergences too in economic interests. By 1989 all the East European countries insisted that any agreement between themselves and the Soviet Union must be based on the principles of mutual interests. On November 29, 1990 it was announced that the Warsaw pact would cease to exist as a Soviet led military alliance. In June 1991, it was announced that it could continue only as "a political forum". But in September 1991, it ceased to exist even as a political forum.

Hence, the Warsaw treaty organization was one of the two principal organs of Eastern European integration. The Warsaw pact was little more than an expression and deployment of Russian commander in-chief and its headquarters were a departmental office
of the USSR's high command. It had been created in opposition to NATO and its principal function was to face NATO's forces in Europe. But whatever might be their avowed purpose, the pact's forces had other potentialities of which the invasion of Czechoslovakia was an uncomfortable reminder. The defence of Eastern Europe included, according to Brezhnev doctrine, firing shots in anger against enemies within the gates. The doctrine raised questions not about power but about sovereignty. All Eastern European countries knew that they had to live with Russian power and observe the limitations which it imposed on their own freedom of action, but they wished at the same time to maintain, even if they might not always exercise, their sovereign right. This was a vain aspiration, a kicking against the pricks exemplified by Rumania's continued refusal (maintained in spite of a visit to Bucharest by Marshal Andrey Grechko in 1973) to take part in Warsaw pact activities and by Ceausescu's symbolic visit to Peking in 1971 and his reception in Bucharest in 1972 of the presidents of USA and western Germany.

3.5 The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia

The relations between USSR and Yugoslavia after the Second World War provide a fascinating study in the international politics. While after the Second World War the USSR searched for a window to Europe and kept the Balkan Peninsula or supposedly the Eastern Europe under its control, some states could not appreciate the “Big brother attitude” of Stalinist Russia and in this direction, Yugoslavia under Marshal Tito slipped out of the Soviet grip and strived to become a socialist state on its own right. While the USSR prognosticated that Yugoslavia could not withstand the onslaughts and refused to come back ultimately to the communist camp, Yugoslavia marched with its own strength without becoming a minor satellite or the puppet of USSR. The history of Yugoslavia is a unique history of a socialist state which became nonaligned finally, a communist neutral in the world, in collaboration with Nehru's India and Nasser's Egypt. And in this context, the role played by Tito, the Yugoslavian hero, an anti-Stalinist, but a socialist is beyond any question.

The superb acumen and matchless valour exhibited by the Russian army in vanquishing Hitler, gave Stalin's Russia, an upper hand in the region of the East Europe, extending from Baltic to the Balkan. A number of small countries like East Germany, Hungary, Albania, Poland, Rumania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Finland rallied behind Stalinist Russia and thus, the Eastern
Europe turned red and became satellites of USSR. The western world suffered from the phobia of this monolithic unity of the Eastern Europe. However, while USSR tried to make them all the minor satellites, more puppet like on more correctly, Soviet surrogates, certain states in Eastern Europe demurred the dominance of Russia in Eastern European region. Yugoslavia’s Tito was more a national than a cosmopolitan, more a Yugoslav than a Muscovite, more a pragmatist than a Marxist Leninist. Like Mao of China, breaking away from the Moscow centric Marxism- Leninism, Tito could break away from Moscow and neither Stalin nor Khrushchev could handicap Tito’s deviation, as they could do it in Czechoslovakia and Hungary. So what was Mao to China, was Tito to Yugoslavia and for him, ideology was remarkably malleable which rarely impeded pragmatism.

Tito’s breakaway from Moscow and pursuing Marxism-Leninism in the Yugoslavian context was branded as "Euro-communism", whether it was an Euro-communism or deviation from Marxism-Leninism it was undoubted that Tito had a de-Stalinist aptitude and therefore, he advocated that the East European and communist party need not necessarily be Moscow’s apron strings.

Against the backdrop of Russian feats of performance in signing the swansong of the downfall of the Hitlerite Germany, the states of Balkan Peninsula wanted to tread on the Russian line. But when Stalin tried to crush and efface independence of the minor states, Yugoslavia did not want to oblige to Moscow. Yugoslavia was led by Tito. To quote Peter Calvocoressi, “Tito in his younger days had been disturbed by the Russian purges of thirties, had been shaken by the Russo-German pact of 1939, and had experienced during the war of differences with Stalin and of Stalin’s attitude to lesser communist leaders”.

In 1948 Tito also abandoned international communism for nationalism and nonaligned reluctantly as a victim of ostracism and as a result of contradictions between practical Yugoslav needs and general communist doctrines. The dispute between Russia and Yugoslav leaders was conducted by the correspondence in the months of March, April and May of 1948. The crux of the matter was that Yugoslavia demurred to accept the Moscow directions, strictly according to the Marxist-Leninist doctrines. They wanted to bring solution to their own problems in their own context. They also raised questions on the topics as to organization of the
communist party, the role of the communist party, agrarian policies, Yugoslavia’s laxity in liquidating capitalism and the person of the Yugoslavian foreign ministry Vladimir Velebit, whom the Russians accused of being a Russian agent.

The Russians also wanted to withdraw its support and technicians from Yugoslavia. Of course, the Yugoslavs were anxious to avoid a breach but when Yugoslavia refused to accept the states of a pupil it was expelled from the Cominform in June 1948, the international association of the communist parties, which had been formed in the previous September to ensure ideological unity and conformity. Thus, in the arena of the communist International, Yugoslavia became an anomaly and now, Yugoslavia went to pursue an independent policy, yet showing loyalty to Stalin.

Marshal Tito, who was a pragmatist like Mao, turned towards USA for financial help. Yugoslavia also joined the Balkan Pact of 1953 as neutralism of Nehru and Nasser and thus, the Polemic distance between Moscow and Belgrade became the major rebuff to the European communist solidarity.

The Russians on their part, on the occasion of their annual days, began to criticize the Yugoslavian government and Marshal Tito. Here was the gross miscalculation of Joseph Stalin who overrated his capacity to discipline the Yugoslav part. Little did he realize that he might be inflexible in his own doctrines but less doctrinal western powers would come to Tito’s help economically. On the other hand, Tito had a deep passion for Yugoslav nationalism and thus, Tito could survive.

The Yugoslav session not only entailed the end of the schemes for a Balkan Union round a Yugoslav Bulgarian core but also for diplomatic and economic breaches with the reminding satellites and shifts in Yugoslavia’s relations with its non-communist neighbours were brought about. It contributed to the defeat of the communist rebellion in Greece and the settlement by partition in 1954 of the problem of Trieste. It seemed as if, Yugoslavia was the predecessor of Maoist China.

The hostile relationship between USSR and Yugoslavia continued till Stalin’s death. However, after Stalin’s death in 1953, the new administration of Malenkov was settled which jettisoned the Stalinian preoccupation of denigrating the Yugoslavs as
"deviationists". The May Day Celebration passed in a becalmed climate, without any calumny for the Yugoslavs. Since then the continuous efforts were made for the restoration and revival of good USSR - Yugoslavia relations.

For the first time in 1953, Molotov received the changed affairs of Yugoslavia for normalizing relationship between the two countries. The gesture was followed by the exchange of the ambassadors. In the meantime, certain congenial situations also developed for restoring the good relations, which was founded on the rock and buffeted by hostility. The introduction of the worker's management in the industry in 1950 and the abandonment of collectivization in the countryside in 1953 were evidence of lessening the doctrinal rigidity which other countries were keen to imitate. Thus, in 1954, Russian blockade of Yugoslavia came to an end. The Soviet efforts to join the Yugoslavia broadcast was given up and thus a very great extent, relations between the two countries were normalized. Ultimately, the Russians agreed that they would pay proper attention to the ideas of Tito.

In the meantime, Khrushchev and the Bulgarians of Russia paid visit to Belgrade in 1955 and this acted as a healing factor in normalizing the relations between USSR and Yugoslavia. Khrushchev's visit first to Tito's Yugoslavia was tantamount to a confession of error and apology for the Russian stand in 1948.

At the 20th CPSU Congress in February 1956 Khrushchev outlined various programmes which included denunciation of Stalinism, peaceful co-existence and above all, peaceful completion of socialism and the peaceful completion with capitalism. In April 14, 1956, the Cominform, the body which had pronounced the excommunication of Tito for doctrinal backsliding and obduracy was dissolved. This step virtually proclaimed to all communist parties and not merely to Yugoslavia, that there might be different ways to socialism and the men on the spot might be the best placed to decide which way to take.

Khrushchev also paid his second visit to Yugoslavia in 1956 and thus the relation between them was accelerated. But to the dismay, there came a sudden stalemate in the Soviet - Yugoslav relationship because the Yugoslavs punished two communists of the Cominform and there was much criticism of this action in Russia even the visit of Khrushchev could not produce any viable solution.
When the revolts in Hungary and Poland sparkled, Russians thought that Tito had a hand in it, but this was only a myopic version. For about six months, the efforts continued, but towards the end of 1957, moves were made for better understanding.

The Yugoslav representative attended 40th birth anniversary of Soviet Russia in 1957 and agreed to sign peace manifesto. When Russia's relation with Albania and the communist China aggravated, the two countries came closer in the beginning of the sixty. In 1967 Yugoslavia gave a wonderful base to its relationship with the communist countries because it declared that VISA would not be required between Yugoslavia and the communist countries of Europe. The Russians also promised greater help to Yugoslavia and Russia ensured that its independence would be respected. The Czechoslovakia intervention in 1968 alarmed Tito and therefore, out of fear, he came to become more closed.

During the Brezhnev era, Brezhnev strove hard to efface the acrimony and hatred that existed between Yugoslavia and USSR. However, it was an exercise in futility because, if in the earlier decade they had their tentative base, in the post sixties and seventies they found the Euro-communism and nonalignment to be best suited to their East European needs. Tito never deplored over his apostasy from Marxism-Leninism. Tito breathed his last in 1980 and after it, Yuri Andropov also tried to build up a surface of relations between Yugoslavia and USSR. The Vice President of both the countries paid visits to each other’s country and thus, the relations could be normalized. But Yugoslavia remained no more a puppet but became a nation in its own right. Stalin’s prognosis about Yugoslavia to ultimately come back was belied and he proved himself to be a negative Cassandra.

3.6 Soviet Intervention in Hungary-1956

Hungary showed her restlessness in the wake of de-Stalinization. The intensification of the cold war following Korean war and passions of nationalist revolt contributed to Hungarian revolt. In between 1949 - 1953, opposition to official policy dictated from Moscow was strangled. The Soviet Union had already achieved stability as a great power on the eve of the events that touched off winds of seeking relaxation in cold war and was advancing several proposals for German unification. The US state department, under the guidance of Dulles had decided that, “The only way to stop a head-on-collision with the Soviet Union is to break it up from
within”. The west, therefore, fanned anti-Soviet and ultra-nationalist feelings in Eastern Europe.

### 3.6.1 Background of the Hungarian Revolt

The Hungarian revolt of October 1956 was essentially a liberal nationalist uprising against Stalinist communism and foreigner’s control. The revolt was led by the workers and youth and was ultimately crushed by a combination of such factors as lack of honest local leadership, the enormous might of the Soviet troops and tanks, general panic and presidential election year in the United States and the general ineffectiveness of the United Nations. During 1945-52, Hungary had grown into a People’s Democracy. Laszlo Rajk had been executed in 1949 as a Titoist and the Stalin constitution had been adopted in 1950. When Stalin died, there emerged a spontaneous urge for relaxation and the new course was at once adopted. Ten days after the Berlin revolt on June 27-28, 1953 the principle of collective leadership was accepted.

To trace the gradual development of the dramatic events of 1956 it is essential to analyze the causes of the fall of Imre Nagy’s ministry in 1955. The Nagy administration under the influence of the Malenkov and Khrushchev achieved a great deal of liberalization and progress. In 1954, liberalization process went ahead, crop quotas were reduced and the peasants were granted cut in income-tax. But the fall of Malenkov and the opposition of the old guard Stalinist Matyas Rakosi resulted in the fall of his ministry.

By March 1955 Rakosi prevailed on the Soviet Union to dismiss Nagy for “having gone too far with his new course”. This was followed by tightening of control except that criticism within the party and comparative freedom of expression continued. In November 1955, Nagy was expelled from the party. In February 1956, the 20th party congress unleashed powerful forces. The first effect of these forces was visible on March 29, 1956 when Rajk’s name was restored to Grace and Janos Kadar, a former ally of Rajk, was released from prison. In May, 1956 anti-Stalinism had gone so far ahead that Rakosi was openly criticized in the press and on July 18, he was replaced as party chief by Ernoe Geroe. Although Geroe was no less rigid Stalinist than Rakosi the former at once called for reconciliation with Tito.

In June the Poznan riots had occurred and on July 21, 1956 Mikoyan the Deputy Premier off the USSR came to Budapest in order
to curb a further extension of the Poznan spirit. In September, a directive was sent by the Soviet government emphasizing the leading role of USSR. This annoyed Tito this in turn brought Khrushchev to Belgrade and then Tito to Yalta on September 30 for talks in which Geroe also joined. Meanwhile the intellectual climate of the revolt was being prepared and the Petofi circle (after the name of the Hungarian poet and patriot Alexander Petofi, 1823-49) evolved the demand for the rehabilitation of Nagy who had become the symbol of reforms and freedom. Vladyslaw Gomulka’s advent in Poland gave a further impetus to the revolutionary tendencies and the progress of de-Stalinization. In October, the revolt began.

3.6.2 Phases of the Revolt

Four clear phases of the Hungarian revolt can be easily traced:

(a) From October 23 to October 29, 1956 when the Soviet attempt to crush the revolt was asked to withdraw;
(b) From October 29 to November 3, when Hungary had freed itself from the Soviet control;
(c) From November 4 to November 11, when the second Soviet intervention began and ended;
(d) From November 11, 1956 to early January 1957 when the passive resistance stage of the revolution came to an end and the pre-revolt pattern was restored.

The disturbances which began in Budapest on October 23 rapidly spread to the entire country. Geroe’s broadcast of October 23, protesting against nationalist excesses and defending the Soviet Hungarian relations, and the police firing at the demonstrators converted the demonstrations into “violent and uncontrollable riots”. In the night of October 23-24, the Hungarian central Committee met and decided to call in Nagy to head the Government. At the same time, without Nagy’s knowledge, Geroe requested the Russians for help under Warsaw Pact. On October 24, Andras Hegedus resigned and was replaced by Nagy. Nagy and the Soviet-Hungarian troops were sent to suppress the riots. On October 25, Mikoyan and Suslov, leading Soviet Communist ideologue flew into Budapest, ousted Geroe as party Secretary and acceded to Nagy’s assumption of office. Kadar Janos was appointed as party Secretary. It was decided that “Nagy would announce a series of concessions promising withdrawal of Soviet troops from the city of Budapest” and a review of Soviet-Hungarian treaties.
On October 26, Nagy recognized the justice of some of the demands of demonstrations and ascribed the unrest to “mistakes and crimes” of the last ten years, and promised complete Soviet military withdrawal from Hungary. On October 27, he announced his new coalition Cabinet including Zoltan Tildy and Kovacs and next day he conceded victory to the rebels and announced that negotiations had begun with the Soviet Union about the withdrawal to Soviet troops. On October 29, the political police was dissolved and the Soviets began to withdraw from Budapest as requested. On October 30, Nagy denied responsibility for calling in the Russian troops on October 24 and announced that they would completely withdraw from Budapest on October 31. The Hungarian Air Force command published an ultimatum giving the Soviet troops 12 hours to leave Budapest. Free elections were promised by Nagy.

On October 30, it must have been realized in Moscow that the dispatch of Soviet troops on October 24 had aggravated the situation in Hungary. That day a remarkable statement was drafted and released the next day under the caption “settlement of Relations between socialist States”. In this the Soviet government expressed readiness “to discuss together with the governments of other Socialist States measures ensuring further development and strengthening of economic ties among the Socialist countries in order to remove any possibility of violation of the principles of national sovereignty, mutual benefit and equality in economic relation”. The Soviet government also raised the point of recalling its advisers from the People’s Democracies and expressed its readiness “to review with the other Socialist countries which are members of the Warsaw Treaty the question of Soviet troops stationed in the territory of the above-mentioned countries”. Referring to the Hungarian situation the statement said: “Having in mind that the further presence of Soviet military command instructions to withdraw the Soviet military units from the city of Budapest (and) is prepared to enter into negotiations with Hungary and other members of the Warsaw Treaty on the question of the presence of Soviet troops on the territory of Hungary.”

On October 31, it was confirmed that the Soviet troops had left Budapest. On the same day Cardinal Mindszenty was released. From October 29 to November 3, Hungary had come to its own. Nagy formed his new coalition cabinet including the representatives of the Socialist Democrats and the Petofi Party. Local Councils were formed in every factory, municipality, city and country. Worker’s Councils had taken over the factories and demands for independence of the Soviet control were raised and old political parties were re-established. The Communists were feeling isolated. Press censorship was removed. But the rift between Nagy
and Kadar was widening, the cleavage between people and party had became final and “Nagy had chosen the people, and Kadar the party.”

The Hungarian crisis of 1956 even became an international question and was brought before the Security Council by joint Anglo-French and American effort. It is surprising that even while the Anglo-French powers were plotting the violation of UN Charter in the Security Council with the connivance of the United States which had some inkling of Suez invasion, it would be erroneous to think that the United States was ignorant of Anglo-French plan for Suez invasion because as has been pointed out by Mr. David Horowitz the CIA informed the White House at least one day in advance about the coming events. The Security Council resolution sponsored by the three powers involved the Charter provisions under Chapter 41 dealing with settlement of the dispute.

3.6.3 The Renewed Soviet Intervention

On October 31, Mikoyan and Suslov again came to Budapest and discovered that the revolution in Hungary was almost complete. On November 1, Nagy demanded of Soviet Ambassador to Hungary that Soviet troops newly arrived be immediately withdrawn, gave notice to terminate Hungarian adherence to the Warsaw Pact, declared Hungarian neutrality, and requested the UN Secretary-General to place the question of Hungarian revolt on the next agenda of the General Assembly. On the same day Tildy told Mikoyan that the Warsaw Pact would in any case be repudiated by Hungary and Mikoyan and Suslov met Kadar. It was, presumably, in this meeting that the decision to form a new government by Kadar which would invite Soviet military intervention, was taken. This decision must have also been induced by the diversion of world opinion to events in the Middle East.

On October 30, the Anglo-French ultimatum was delivered to Cairo and in the context of the possible reactions in the United States and in Afro-Asian Countries to this ultimatum the Soviet leaders could be sure that the shock which the use of force in Hungary would cause would be substantially mitigated throughout the world. Possibly Eden’s own decision to attack Egypt at this time might have been influenced by the same logic. In any case the two events seem to be inter-related and acted and reached on each other. On November 2-3 substantial additional Soviet forces moved into Hungary. The Austrian border was sealed as late as November 3, Radio Budapest announced that in a joint Committee of Soviet military leaders and the representatives of the Hungarian Government on that day the Soviet delegation had promised that no
further moves of Soviet troops would take place across the Hungarian frontier.

On November 4, the Soviet troops attacked Budapest. Nagy was deposed and took refuge in the Yugoslav Embassy. Kadar was appointed Prime Minister. He made promises of amnesty of coalition and popular front governments and withdrawal of Soviet troops. The armed resistance of Hungarian troops lasted for six days. From November 11 onwards, passive resistance was offered by the industrial workers. Kadar could not fulfill the promises he made. On November 22, Nagy was abducted by the Soviet authorities in spite of safe conduct Kadar gave him. On December 8, 1956 the Revolutionary Councils were dissolved and the Worker's Councils were made illegal. On December 28, the Writer's Union was suspended. On January 11, 1957 the Csepel armed rising was suppressed.

**3.6.4 Hungary (1957-58)**

In January, Khrushchev, Malenkov and Chou En-lai visited Budapest and in order to allay the World opinion roused against the USSR, a policy of compromise was laid down. The Government was still too weak to ignore the mood of the masses. The Yugoslavs had been shocked by recent events. But by March 1957 there came a shift and regimentation and Soviet control was re-established. On March 20, 1957 a Hungarian delegation led by Kadar came to Moscow and held talks with the Soviet leaders for a week.

A Soviet-Hungarian Treaty was signed on March 27 under which the Soviet Union agreed to deliver goods valued at 1,010 million roubles, a long term credit for 1957 amounting to 750 million roubles of which 200 million was in convertible currency. On March 28, a joint declaration was issued which affirmed that the two governments deemed it “absolutely necessary that Soviet troops should be temporarily stationed in Hungary and that negotiation on the subject would soon begin”. On May 27, a Soviet delegation led by Gromyko and Zhukov came to Budapest and signed with Hungary the agreement the same day. It reaffirmed the Moscow Declaration of March 28 and provided for the Hungarian court's jurisdiction over Soviet soldiers in the cases of civil and criminal offences.

It makes no reference to the number or location of Soviet troops on to the date of their withdrawal. The agreement was to remain in force as long as Soviet troops were stationed in Hungary. On April 2, Kadar left no doubt on the point and declared that “Soviet troops will remain here as
long as their presence is needed”. The Russian language was to again become compulsory in schools. Collective farms were to be revived and taxes on the peasantry to be increased. On August 1, 1957, a flat 10% cut in industrial wages was effected and the workers in a number of factories were ordered to pay back. The rebels were arrested and under the martial law decrees of December 8 and December 12, 1956 hundreds of them were executed. In September 1957, Hungarian diplomatic offensive in the Near East began to forestall the United Nations General Assembly debate. In November, elections were held and the Communists won 99.77% Votes. On December 18, 1957 Hungary and the Soviet Union signed a new agreement on economic and technical aid, under which Hungary received long term credit of 300 million roubles. On April 2, 1958, a Soviet Party and Government Delegation led by Khrushchev came to Budapest to attend the 13th anniversary of the Country’s liberation from Nazi invaders. Khrushchev declared on April 3 that “the October – November events in Hungary were a test of the Soviet – Hungarian friendship, and Kadar and Premier Ferenc Muennich assured his guests that “Hungary will remain loyal to Proletarian internationalism”.

3.6.5 The Soviet View of Hungarian Revolt

The Soviet view of the events in Hungary is entirely different. They argue that the formed leadership of Hungary was responsible for gross mistakes and abuses in general political questions and economic policies, that the demonstrations of October 23 against these mistakes were “quite legitimate but that soon reactionary fascist elements tried to exploit this healthy movement for their purposes in an attempt to wreck the people’s democratic system and to overthrow it. The use of Soviet troops stationed in Hungary under the Warsaw Treaty at the request of the Hungarian Government was proper and valid. Nevertheless, to prevent an aggravation of the situation the Soviet Union decided to withdraw their troops on October 29, 1956. Soon after, however, the reactionaries, “hanging up right patriots on the lamp posts in the streets of Budapest”, and pushed the Nagy Government which had lost control of the situation further and further on to the road of conniving at the rebellion. A ‘Hungarian Committee’ was set up in Vienna to render assistance to the rebels. Nagy being a traitor, honest patriots like Kadar quitted his Government and supported by the people formed a popular Government which requested the Soviet Union, on November 4, for assistance in repulsing the onslaught of the fascist forces.

The USSR justified its intervention in Hungary because:
• It had been sought by a friendly country;
• The Soviet Union had treaty obligation under the Hungarian Peace treaty to which USA and UK were parties, to suppress fascism in Hungary; and
• Because the Soviet Union could not have allowed the victory of reaction on her border. It is further argued that the role of the USA in these events has been abominable, that US congress had authorized the training of special personnel for guiding the resistance movement, for propaganda and infiltration in East Europe and had sanctioned "hundreds of millions of dollars" not for refusing relief but for "feeding the subversive activities".

The Soviet Union, therefore, rejected the allegations of aggression, genocide, and deportation as raised against her.

### 3.6.6 The UNO Intervention

But the Hungarian government claimed that as the affair fell entirely under the domestic jurisdiction of Hungary, the council had no right to intervene. This contention was supported by Mr. Sobolov, the Soviet representative to the council matters, however, moved very rapidly in Hungary following the declaration of Imre Nagy on October 31, that he had negotiations with the Soviet Union for the withdrawal of Soviet troops and dissociation with the Warsaw pact. But on November 2, the Security Council was again convened to consider the appeal from Imre Nagy for Soviet troops were re-entering his country. The Security Council adopted a US sponsored resolution in which the Soviet Union was asked to withdraw its troops from Hungary without delay.

Despite the UN resolution, Soviet troops occupied Hungary on November 4, 1956. The Kadar government was formed with the help of the Soviet army. The Security Council was at once convened in an emergency session. Nagy had taken refuge in Yugoslavia resolution condemning Soviet action and urging the Soviet Union to refrain from military intervention in Hungary. As the resolution was vetoed by the Soviet Union, the Security Council failed to take any action and the matter was referred to the General Assembly which under US-sponsored 'Unite for Peace' resolution had acquired the right to consider such questions.

The General Assembly adopted nearly fourteen resolutions relating to different aspects of the Hungarian problem including Soviet intervention and violation of the charter, investigation and relief. The
General Assembly condemned the action of the Soviet Union for sending troops in Hungary. A Special Committee was appointed by the General Assembly on January 7, 1957. The members included Austria, Ceylon, Tunisia, Denmark and Uruguay. The committee in its report categorically stated that the establishment of the Kadar government was made possible solely owing to the military intervention of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union rejected the report as fabricated and Hungary and the Warsaw Pact countries considered the UN action as direct violation of sovereign rights of nations. But even neutral nations like India, which at the early stage considered that the Hungarian episode was a "civil conflict" came to regard it as a national uprising which failed to gain success owing to the intervention of the Soviet Union. India desired above all, to institute a proper investigation and the withdrawal of foreign troops from Hungary.

Thus UN was a mere spectator in the Hungarian crisis of 1956 and failed to take any action against a super power. The USSR and the communist states alleged that the events in Hungary were the outcome of a conspiracy of western powers who simultaneously arranged for Suez invasion. In the latter case UN could impose peace owing to agreement between the two super powers but in the case of Hungary such agreement was lacking UN, like the League of Nations before, could act only if there was a Big power agreement.

The suppression of the Hungarian revolution was one of those brutal acts of policy which did grave damage to the perpetrators but were undertaken none the less upon the calculation that graver damage would otherwise result. Communist parties lost members on a considerable scale and even communist governments which reckoned that Nagy had gone imprudently far shuddered at the display of Russian night before long found a new cause for restiveness in the Russo-Chinese split. The Chinese were judged to have given the Russian the right advice on Poland and Hungary to acquiesce in changes and in Hungary, to use force only after Nagy had given the resolution as anti-communist course.

3.7 Soviet Intervention in Czechoslovakia - 1968

On August 20, 1968, the Soviet Union led Warsaw Pact troops in an invasion of Czechoslovakia to crack down on reformist trend in Prague. Although the Soviet Union’s action successfully halted the peace of reform in Czechoslovakia, it had unintended consequences for the unity of the Communist bloc.
3.7.1 Historical Background

Before the Second World War, the nation of Czechoslovakia had been a strong democracy in Central Europe, but beginning in the mid-1930s it faced challenges from both the West and the East. In 1938, the leadership in Great Britain and France conceded the German right to take over the Sudetenland in the Munich Agreement, but the Czech government condemned this German occupation of its western-most territory as a betrayal. In 1948, the Czech attempts to join the U.S. sponsored Marshall Plan to aid postwar rebuilding was thwarted by Soviet take over and the installation of a new Communist government in Prague. For the next twenty years Czechoslovakia remained a stable state within the Soviet sphere of influence; unlike in Hungary or Poland, even the rise of de-Stalinization after 1953 did not lead to liberalization by the fundamentally conservative Czech government.

Yugoslavia had proved itself in 1948 a communist state with a difference, so was too Czechoslovakia a communist state with a difference, though less obviously so. Before the Second World War, the communist party of Czechoslovakia was unlike its neighbours, neither illegal nor underground. It was the second largest political party in the country. It escaped being compromised by the general communist alliance with Hitler in 1939 - 41 because Czechoslovakia was already occupied by the Germans and its parties were banned of playing a patriotic role during the war and emerged after it as the biggest party owing to the prescribing of the collaborationist Agrarian party. Its leader, Klement Gottwald, was therefore, the natural Prime Minister. He and his colleagues had operated before the war in a democratic system and they now cooperated with other parties in what was at first a genuine coalition of all anti-fascist groups. The first post-war elections endorsed Gottwald's position by giving the communists 39 percent of the vote in a free election, the highest percentage.

Moreover, when in 1948 the non-communist parties tried to undermine communist authority by resigning from the government and forcing President Banes to install a government of officials, Banes backed Gottwald and the scheme collapsed. But so too did genuine coalition government. The communists began to make a mockery of it and to govern increasingly through tyranny and terror. Czechoslovakia became a police state. The Yugoslav secession gave Gottwald a motive and an excuse for tightening his control. More and more extensions in Czechoslovakia than anywhere else began. Although the government was distrusted, it was not seriously opposed;
fear of the police stifled talk and prevented organization. Within the
governing party debate after debate continued. Even the events of 1956 in
Poland and Hungary brought no visible spark in Czechoslovakia, which
came to be rated as the most docile of the satellites.

3.7.2 Development in Czechoslovakia

The man presiding over this inertia was Antonin Novotny, first
Secretary of the Czechoslovakia Communist Party from 1953 and
President of the Republic from 1957. Novotny was a Czech who despised
Slovaks. This became one of the issues in a movement against his
leadership which led to his removal from his party post in January
1968, from the presidency in March and from the party in May. He
was succeeded in the first office by the first secretary of the Slovak
Communist Party, Alexander Dubcek, and in the second by General
Jan Svoboda. The first and more important of these changes was
effectuated by a special meeting of the central committee of the party
called to resolve a deadlock in the presidium party, largely instigated
by Slovaks. But it was much more than this. Two larger themes were
coming to surface.

The first was the state of the economy. Czechoslovakia was an
industrial state which was specially hampered by the drawing of the iron
curtain where it was drawn. Economically, its western half belonged
to the western world, even if Slovakia did not. Its main role in the
Comecon was to produce heavy industrial goods but in order to
fulfill this role it needed supplies and know-how from the west.
Overcentralization had caused confusion. Following some ineffective
reforms initiated in 1958 a more far reaching program for
decentralizing industrial management proposed by Professor Ota Sik
was adopted by the central committee in 1965. Similar idea had
been discussed in the neighboring countries, including USSR itself,
and more far-reaching measures had been adopted in Hungary.
There was no serious reason to suppose that Russians would
oppose them and there was an added incentive to radical change in
the declining productivity of Czech industry in the mid-sixties.

3.7.3 View of USSR

Soviet leaders were concerned over these recent developments in
Czechoslovakia. Recalling the 1956 uprising in Hungary, leaders in
Moscow worried that if Czechoslovakia carried reforms too far, other
satellite States in Eastern Europe might follow, leading to a widespread
rebellion against Moscow’s leadership of the Eastern Bloc. There was also
a danger that the Soviet Republics in the East, such as the Ukraine, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia might make their own demands for more liberal policies. After much debate, the Communist party leadership in Moscow decided to intervene to establish a more conservative and pro-Soviet government in Prague.

But pressure for such changes was accompanied by a second kind of ferment. Decentralization of economic management was equated with liberalization of controls and worker participation and these trends overlapped naturally with demands for more freedom generally, notably freedom of expression in the press and on the radio and the democratization of party politics and the parliament all of which posed more serious problems for the Russian guardians of the established order. Whereas in January 1968 the Russians had apparently decided that Novotny had lost his grip and was expendable, and that Dubcek was acceptable in his place, Dubcek proclaimed the solidarity of Czechoslovakia with USSR and visited Moscow immediately after his appointment. A couple of months later Brezhnev and his colleagues were becoming worried by Dubcek's reform program and perhaps also by the livelihood of Dubcek being forced further in a liberal direction by the enthusiasm released by the change of government in Prague. This change had been followed by a considerable relaxation of the censorship, by a number of ministerial changes and by the prospect of political democratization as well as economic liberalization.

There was talk of election and popular pressure on Dubcek to make such radicals internal reforms that these would be bound to raise questions about Czechoslovakia's external relations. Dubcek had taken care to make personal contacts with Russian, Polish and Hungarian leaders before meeting the slightly suspect Romanians and for a couple of months his neighbours evinced no distrust of him or his new course, but from the end of March criticisms began to appear in East Germany and Poland. The reformers were growing in confidence and were excited with greater popular expectation. Their action program, produced at the beginning of April, made radical proposals concerning the reorganization of the respective functions of party and the government, the rehabilitation of victims of the Purges of 1949, the position of Slovakia, the revival of the parliament and some freedom for minor parties.

To the Russians the action program was objectionable in itself and doubly objectionable in the context of central and eastern Europe. It brought personal and political freedom to the centre of a
debate which could hardly be confined to Czechoslovakia. The first major upheaval in the post-war communist bloc had been caused by the example of Yugoslavia in 1948, the second by the examples of Poland and Hungary in 1956. Both had required recourse to violent measures including judicial assassination and force of arms which was a justified in the eyes of Moscow. It was most important to prevent Dubcek from setting a third bad example. Czechoslovakia under Klement Gottwald and Novotny had been a key element in the western sector of USSR’s European dominions, aligned with Poland and Eastern Germany. The prospect of Dubcek’s Czechoslovakia sliding out of this sub-block and into alliance with Yugoslavia and Romania was both strategically alarming and an unacceptable display of political independence.

If the Russians were becoming uneasy about Czechoslovak actions, so were the Czechoslovaks about possible Russian reactions, particularly in view of the fact that popular pressure had induced Dubcek to agree to accelerate to early September the party congress which would presumably acclaim and entrench the reform program. At the beginning of May, 1968 Dubcek and other leader of the new course went to Moscow. Two weeks later Kosygin went to Prague and so too at the same time but separately did Marshal Grechko, accompanied by General Epishev, the chief of the Soviet army’s political intelligence. In June, 1968 the forces of the Warsaw pact held manoeuvres in Czechoslovakia. These had been arranged a long time earlier, but they were considerably enlarged and the Russian tanks which came with them seemed in no hurry to leave. This hint or demonstration by the Russians conceded with publication of new liberal manifesto the two thousand words which put further reformist pressure on Dubcek and sharpened the tension between democratic and counter reformist elements in Prague.

The situation was so dangerously charged that the French and Italian communist parties tried to mediate and the West Germans, equally alarmed by the turn of events, withdrew their forces from Czechoslovak border in order to belie rumours that they and their allies were instigating a secession from the Warsaw block or were opposing to take advantage of the rifts within it.

3.7.4 Invasion of Czechoslovakia

Intervention in the affairs of a neighbour was neither new nor ideologically entirely unjustifiable, but the extreme form of military
invasion was to be avoided if possible. A first meeting at Warsaw, not attended by the Czechs, produced a better warning to them that their proposed reforms were tantamount to allowing power to escape from the communist party. This meeting was following by a Russo-Czechoslovak meeting at Cierna-nad-Tisou on the Slovak border on 29 July, 1968. It lasted for four days and was immediately followed by a meeting at Bratislava attended by all the members of the Warsaw pact except Romania. These meetings seemed to clear the air. Before the first meeting the Russians had issued a threatening statement saying that a cache of American arms had been found on Czech soil. After the second the Russian troops in Czechoslovakia moved out and Moscow's propaganda against Prague stopped. But on August 20, 1968 the Russians accompanied by the East German, Polish, Hungarian and Bulgarian units, invaded.

It is not possible to say whether the decision to do so had been taken in principle before the July meetings or whether it was taken at short notice after them. If there was a change of plan during August, then the event most likely to have caused it was the publication on 10 August of the statutes of the Czechoslovak Communist Party which amounted to the emergence of democratic centralism and the granting of substantial rights to minor parties. These statutes were to be considered at the party congress a month later and were certainly to be adopted unless drastic steps were taken to change the party leadership once more and prevent the holding of the congress. That the Russians invaded at short notice rather than after long and concealed premeditation is suggested by the fact that this political program was only partially fulfilled. Although the invasion was militarily precise and efficient, its political tactics were palpably confused and its political aims only partially achieved.

On the other hand, Czechoslovak armed forces offered no resistance and the Dubcek government had said they would not do so. Dubcek was not overthrown. He was seized, flown to Moscow under arrest, possibly tortured, but then reinstated. There were many suppositions that Russians expected the Presidium in Prague to displace the Dubcek and his associates install a new government and issue an invitation to the Russians. To validate the invasion, they were ill informed and their disposition insufficient. They came as blatant conquerors and although their power was irresistible they had to negotiate with Dubcek and Svoboda.
But if Dubcek remained in office the Russians had to remain in the country. In October the Czechs signed a treaty permitting Russian troops to be stationed in Czechoslovakia, in undefined numbers. Thereafter, the Russians and their allies in Czechoslovak Party worked slowly to demote Dubcek, who was first sent to Turkey as ambassador and the recalled to be expelled from the party. The reformers and their reforms were, progressively eliminated, but the Russian shrank from installing their extreme supporters in power and preferred instead a relatively neutral government under the Slovak Dr. Gustav Husak. Whether impressed by the spirit and discipline of the Czechs and Slovaks, or by the damaging comments of the world at large, or by the hostility within the communist world to Brezhnev’s doctrine that USSR had the right to intervene in a communist state to safeguard communism generally, the Kremlin used its victory with more circumspection than might have been expected.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia was from the Russian point of view a regrettable necessity and a well calculated action. It created no threat to international peace and it did not halt the course of Russo-American detente. There was no more than a brief interruption in the talks that led to the opening of SALT in 1969 and the agreement was born in 1970. As a crisis manager Brezhnev proved to have many of the qualities which had served Kennedy well in the Cuban crisis of 1962. But the invasion forced Moscow to proclaim an extreme doctrine about the limit of sovereign independence within the communist bloc. The invasion and the doctrine unsettled eastern Europe by the violence of the action and the implications of the doctrine and the use of the ostensibly anti-western Warsaw pact against one of its own members emphasized the strains prevailing within the block twenty years after its consolidation.

The considerations that prompted Moscow to intervene in Czechoslovakia were many. What hurt and alarmed Moscow was a genuine doubt about Czechoslovakia’s military ability to keep the southwestern part of the communist frontier with west secure. The tremendous striking power of the NATO forces and the rejuvenation of the military might of West Germany enhanced the Warsaw pact powers’ anxiety for security. Secondly, the rapid changes in Czechoslovakia initiated by Dubcek leadership, equalized with open declaration of men like General Perchlik for equal voice in Warsaw pact organization, convinced the Soviet Union of a danger to communism in Czechoslovakia. Thirdly, the example set by the Czechs was a dangerous precedence for the future.
The Soviet Union and four Eastern European countries—Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria and East Germany sent troops to Prague on August 21, 1968. All the important state functionaries of Czechoslovakia including Alexander Dubcek, President Svoboda and the Prime minister Oldrich Cernik were taken into custody and sent to Moscow. On August 22, a massive demonstration took place in Prague against Soviet intervention and an one hour general strike spread throughout the country. On August 22, the Security Council met to consider the situation arising out of the intervention of the Soviet Union and four Eastern European countries in Czechoslovakia.

3.7.5 The role of the UNO

A meeting of the UNO was called at the joint request of Britain, Canada, the United States, France, Denmark and Paraguay. The Soviet bid to stall Czech crisis debate was rebuffed by a majority of the council members. The resolution condemning the Soviet Union and its Warsaw pact allies for armed intervention in Czechoslovakia was introduced by Danish ambassador Otto Rose Borch. In its operative part the resolution demanded that the political independence and territorial integrity of Czechoslovakia must be fully respected. The resolution called upon the intervening communist countries to take no action or violence or reprisal that could result in further suffering or loss of life and to withdraw their forces forthwith. The resolution called upon all UN members to exercise their diplomatic influence on the Soviet Union and its allies with a view to bring about prompt implementation of the resolution. On August 23, 1968 a Soviet veto prevented the Security Council resolution. The resolution obtained ten affirmative votes and two negative votes of the Soviet Union and Hungary. India, Algeria and Pakistan abstained.

3.7.6 Reaction in Socialist Countries outside Warsaw Pact

Beijing radio charged the Soviet Union and the Warsaw pact nations for invading Czechoslovakia and said that "The Soviet revisionists brutally committed the worst crime against the people of Czechoslovakia". Cuban Prime Minister Fidel Castro, in a radio-television address said that while the military action of the Soviet Union and its Warsaw pact allies was a "flagrant violation" of Czech sovereignty, it was "politically" right. Bucharest demanded an immediate end of military intervention in Czechoslovakia. Marshal Tito had warned the world about the danger of a world war III the day before the military intervention in
Czechoslovakia had taken place. Yugoslavia had sent its support to the new Czech leadership. Subsequently, Tito condemned the military intervention in Czechoslovakia and warned that Yugoslavia, if threatened by any foreign interventionist force, was fully prepared to meet the threat. No country was more alarmed than Yugoslavia as Soviet claimed to intervene in any socialist country.

3.7.7 Effects of the Intervention

Because of the Soviet intervention more occupation troops were flown to Prague on August 25, 1968 and the number reached about 500,000. In Moscow a summit meeting of the Czechoslovak leaders and the leaders of the Soviet Union and the four East European allies was held. Alexander Dubcek, President Ludvik Svoboda, and Prime Minister Oldrich Cernik agreed in Kremlin talks to pay a heavy political price to rid Czechoslovakia of Soviet bloc occupation forces. The terms of the agreement and the subsequent treaty signed between USSR and Czechoslovakia in October provided for withdrawal of all Soviet troops from Czechoslovakia. During ratification proceedings on October 18, 1968 Premier Oldrich Cernik told the Czechoslovak Parliament that though Red Army troops would be there to thwart the revisionist aspirations of West German militarists, the border between the two countries would "continue to be guarded solely by the Czechoslovak Army".

The events in Czechoslovakia disturbed the relations between the East and West. The NATO powers were profoundly disturbed largely owing to their own failure in gaining the information about Soviet intervention in Czechoslovakia before it actually took place. The NATO power, however, warned the Soviet Union against the recurrence of any such action to upset the balance of power in Europe. About the effect of the August events in Czechoslovakia Mr. E. B. Brooke wrote in Vienna on September 12, 1968 that, "Czechoslovakia itself has suffered setback in development that will probably take years to offset. There has been no mass exodus of population as there was from Hungary.... And it is doubtless untrue that the Czechoslovak premier was so unwise as to suggest that the best brains leave the country". This report can quite safely be laid to the inventive minds of West Germany’s “Springer newspapers".

The Russian action in Czechoslovakia no doubt provoked long statements of condemnations but no government took any effective step to help the Czech people in their hour of calamity. The inaction on the part of the United Nations also showed the incapacity of its members to cope with situations from the violation of its own charters. It was another
demonstration of the fact. The UNO was ineffective against the big powers who had a veto and happened to be directly interested in oppression.

3.8 Gorbachev Era

The Soviet Union’s collapse into independent nations began early in 1985. After years of Soviet military buildup at the expense of domestic development, economic growth was at a standstill. Failed attempts at reform, a stagnant economy and war in Afghanistan led to a general feeling of discontent, especially in the Baltic republics and Eastern Europe, greater political and social freedoms, instituted by the last Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, created an atmosphere of open criticism of the Moscow regime.

Several Soviet Socialist Republics began resisting central control, and increasing democratization led to a weakening of the central government. The USSR’s trade gap progressively emptied the coffers of Union, leading to eventual bankruptcy. The Soviet Union finally collapsed in 1991 when Boris Yeltsin seized power in the aftermath of a failed coup that had attempted to topple reform-minded Gorbachev.

3.8.1 Rise of Gorbachev

Although reform in the Soviet Union stalled between 1969 and 1975, a generational shift gave new momentum for reform. The war in Afghanistan, often referred to as the Soviet Union’s “Vietnam”, led to increased public dissatisfaction with the Moscow regime. Also the Chernobyl disaster of 1986 added impetus to Gorbachev’s glasnost and perestroika reforms which eventually spiralled out of control and caused the Soviet system to collapse.

After years of stagnation, the “new thinking” of younger Communist began to emerge. Following the death of Konstantin Chernenko, the Politburo elected Mikhail Gorbachev to the position of General Secretary of the Soviet Union in March 1985, marking the rise of a new generation of leadership. Under Gorbachev, relatively young, reform-oriented technocrats, who had begun their careers in the heyday of “de-Stalinization” under Nikita Khrushchev (1953–1964), rapidly consolidated power within the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) providing new momentum for political and economic liberalization, and for cultivating warmer relations and trade with the west.

By the time Gorbachev ushered in the process that would lead to the dismantling of the Soviet administrative command economy through his programmes of Glasnost (political openness), Perestroika (economic restructuring), and Uskorenie (speed up of economic development) announced in 1986, the Soviet economy suffered from both hidden
inflation and pervasive supply shortages aggravated by an increasingly open black market that undermined the official economy. Additionally, the costs of Superpower status— the military, space programme, subsidies to client States— were out of proportion to the Soviet economy. The new wave of industrialization based upon information technology had left the Soviet Union desperate for Western technology and Credits in order to counter its increasing backwardness.

3.8.2 Glasnost

The term ‘glasnost’ on the other hand is drawn from the Russian word ‘golos’, which means voice. Thus, it implies that the people should be given voice in the affairs concerning them. It also implies grant of freedom of expression, which had been denied to the Soviet people for long. In other words it is equated with ‘openness’. It may be noted that even Lenin used the term glasnost. But he imparted a different meaning to it. He interpreted it as a struggle against bureaucracy and wanted the people to have right to reveal corruption, red tape or official abuse. Gorbachev imparted a new meaning to the concept of glasnost. He implied by it that the society should be open to scrutiny and criticism from all directions. Thus he made a sharp deviation from the earlier arrangements when the social system was characterized by secretiveness, and uniformity. Instead he laid emphasis on socialist pluralism.

Along with the concepts of perestroika and glasnost Gorbachev also put forth the concept of Democratisation which laid emphasis on release of people jailed for political reasons, the gradual disengagement of the media, and cultural establishment, form state and party control, the reform of the electoral system and the growth of informal or unofficial political groups. In short, Gorbachev laid emphasis on all round restructuring, renovation and rebuilding of the Soviet socialist society.

3.8.3 Perestroika

Perestroika means reconstructing of Society and economy. This concept was evolved to provide a new thrust to the Bolshevik Revolution of October 1917. Gorbachev argued that like all major revolutions in the world, a second revolution was needed in Soviet Union to accelerate the progress of society and supplement the achievements of the 1917 revolution. Even in other countries the objectives of the original revolution could be achieved only through supplementary revolutions for example in France, the Great French Revolution of 1789-93 was followed by revolutions in 1830, 1848 and 1871. Likewise in England the Cromwellian Revolution of 1649 was followed by the Glorious Revolution of 1688-89.
Justifying the need of second revolution in Soviet Union, Gorbachev argued that the good work done by Lenin had been lost as a result of actions of Stalin. Even the leaders who followed Stalin in Soviet Union failed to bring about any worthwhile reforms and the country was stagnating. It was only through Perestroika that the Russian Society could be brought out of this stagnation and converted into true socialist society. Unless this was done serious social, economic and political crises could confront the Russian people. Thus, the term perestroika has come to be looked upon in the context of reorganization and renewal, even though Gorbachev preferred to use it for ‘restructuring’, which conveys the meaning of a profound and qualitative change.

3.8.4 Implementation of Perestroika and Glasnost

The proposals for socio-economic restructuring and political openness were unanimously approved by the 27th Congress of the Communist Party in 1985 and the process of implementation of these proposals commenced soon thereafter. People were associated with the decision making through the introduction of these proposals commenced soon thereafter. People were associated with the decision making through the introduction of free and democratic elections based on multi-candidate system (even though the proposal of multiparty system was rejected) in which non-party candidates were permitted to contest elections against official party-candidates; people were permitted to resort to criticism of official and political leaders, and organize open demonstrations. Effort was also made to separate government and the party and the Soviets of People’s Deputies were permitted to play more effective role in Soviet state. The constitution was amended to provide for a Congress of People’s Deputies as well as an executive President of the country.

The people by and large enthusiastically supported the concepts of perestroika and glasnost. Even the judiciary tried to implement the glasnost and tried to promote rule of law in the country. In June 1988 in a judgment the Supreme Court held that several persons were illegally condemned by the courts during Stalin- Brezhnev periods. In short the policy of perestroika and glasnost for the first time gave the Soviet people freedom to criticize their past as well as present rulers.

Changes were introduced in the political field by effecting amendments in the constitution. However, some of the important changes introduced in 1988 were adoption of new electoral law, denial of certain powers to Presidium, creation of Congress of People’s Deputies, indirect election of Supreme Soviet by Congress, creation of post of an executive President to be known as Chairman of Supreme Court. In accordance with
the new electoral laws elections were held in March in which people exercised their political rights without fear for the first time.

In the economic sphere also fundamental changes were introduced. The centralized management of the economy was radically transformed with the transfer of enterprises to complete cost-accounting, reform of price formation system and of financial and crediting mechanism. Changes were also introduced in the concept of planning and foreign economic ties were restructured. Concept of self-management was promoted and citizens were permitted individual ownership.

The policy of perestroika and glasnost was by and large welcomed by people. However, certain leaders like Yeltsin were not happy with these changes and favoured more radical changes. This was not acceptable to Gorbachev who removed Yeltsin from Secretaryship of Moscow City Committee. But when elections were held in Moscow City Constituency Yeltsin returned with 89 percent votes as against 7 percent votes polled by the official candidate. This clearly showed that a sizable number of people were interested in further accelerating the pace of reforms. They wanted more democracy. But it is also a fact a section of Communist leaders were opposed to these reforms and made a bid to overthrow Gorbachev. However, Yeltsin was able to consolidate the democratic forces and manage the return of Gorbachev to power. Subsequently, Gorbachev was forced by the turn of events to step down and Yeltsin emerged as the democratic leader, following disintegration of the Soviet Union.

3.8.5 Dissolution of the USSR

On February 7, 1990 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union agreed to give up its monopoly of power. Over the next several weeks the 15th Constituent Republics of the USSR had their first competitive elections. Reformers and ethnic nationalists won many of the seats. The Constituent Republics began to assert their national sovereignty over Moscow and started a war of laws with the Central government where in the governments of the Constituent Republics repudiated all-Union legislation where it conflicted with local laws, asserting control over their local economies and refusing to pay tax revenue to the Central Moscow Government. This strife caused economic dislocation as supply lines in the economy were severed, and caused the Soviet economy to decline further.

The pro-independence movement in Lithuania gained currency on June 3, 1988, caused a visit by Gorbachev in January 1990 to the Lithuania capital, Vilnius, which provoked a pro-independence rally of
around 250,000 people. On March 11, 1990 Lithuania, led by Chairman of the Supreme Court Vytautas Landsbergis, declared restoration of independence. However, the Soviet Army attempted to suppress the movement. The Soviet Union initiated an economic blockade of Lithuania and kept troops there “to secure the rights of ethnic Russian”.

In March 30, 1990, the Estonian Supreme Council declared Soviet power in Estonia since 1940 to have been illegal, and started a process to reestablish Estonia as an independent state. The process of restoration of independence of Latvia began on May 4, 1990, with a Latvian Supreme Council vote stipulating transitional period to complete independence. On January 13, 1991, Soviet troops, along with KGB Spetsnaz Alpha Group, stormed the Vilnius TV tower in Vilnius, Lithuania to suppress the nationalist media. This ended with 14 unarmed civilians dead and hundreds more injured. Later that month in Georgian SSR, anti-Soviet Protesters at Tbilisi demonstrated support for Lithuania independence.

On March 17, 1991, in a Union-wide referendum 78% of all Voters voted for the retention of the Soviet Union in a reformed form. The Baltic, Armenia, Georgia and Moldova boycotted the referendum. In each of the other nine republics, a majority of the voters supported the retention of the renewed Soviet Union. Following the results, Armenia indicated its desire to rejoin in Union. On June 12, 1991 Yeltsin won 57% of the popular vote in the democratic elections for the post of president of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic (SFSR- commonly referred to as Soviet Russia), defeating Gorbachev’s preferred candidate, Nikolay Ryzhkov, who won 16% of the vote. In his election campaign Yeltsin criticized the “dictatorship of the centre”. But he did not suggest the introduction of a market economy. Instead, he said that he would put his head on the rail track in the event of increased prices. Yeltsin took office on July 10, 1991.

On the night of July 31, 1991, Russian OMON from Riga, the Soviet military headquarter in the Baltic, assaulted the Lithuanian border post in Medininkai and killed seven Lithuanian servicemen. This further weakened the Soviet Union’s position, internationally and domestically.

### 3.8.6 The August Coup

On August 19, 1991, Gorbachev’s vice president Gennady Yanayev, prime minister Valentin Pavlov, defence minister Dmitry Yazov, KGB chief Vladimir Kryuchkov, and other senior officials acted to prevent the signing of the Union treaty by forming the “State Committee on the State Emergency”. The “Committee” put Gorbachev (vacationing in Foros Crimea) under house arrest, reintroduced political censorship, and attempted to stop the Perestroika. The coup leaders quickly issued an
emergency decree suspending political activity and banning most newspapers.

While coup organizers expected some popular support for their actions, the public sympathy in large cities and in republics was largely against them. Russian SFSR President Boris Yeltsin was quick to condemn the coup and grab popular support for himself. Thousands of people in Moscow came out to defend the “White House”, then the symbolic seat of Russian sovereignty. The organizers tried but ultimately failed to arrest Yeltsin, who rallied mass opposition to the coup. After three days, on August 21, the coup collapsed, the organizers were detained and Gorbachev returned as President of the Soviet Union. However, Gorbachev’s powers were now finally compromised, as neither Union nor Russian power structures heeded his commands.

3.8.7 Formation of the CLS and the end of the USSR

The final round of collapse of the Soviet Union took place following the Ukrainian popular referendum on December 1, 1991, wherein 90% of voters opted for independence. The leaders of Slavic republics agreed to meet for a discussion of possible forms of relationship, alternative to Gorbachev’s struggle for a Union. On December 8, 1991, the leaders of the Russian, Ukrainian, and Belarusian republics met at Belavezhskaya Pushcha in Belarus and signed the Belavezha Accords declaring the Soviet Union dissolved and replaced by the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Gorbachev described this as an unconstitutional coup, but it soon became clear that the development could not be halted.

On December 12, 1991, Russia’s secession from the Union was sealed, with the Congress of Soviets of RSFSR formally ratifying the Belavezha Accords and denouncing the 1922 Treaty on the Creation of the Soviet Union. On December 17, 1991, alongside 28 European countries, the European Community, and four non-European countries, twelve of the fifteen Soviet republics signed the European Energy Charter in the Hague as if they were Sovereign States.

Doubts remained over the authority of the Belavezha Accords to implement the dissolution of the Soviet Union, since they were signed by only five of the Soviet Republics. However, on December 21, 1991, representatives of all member republics except Georgia signed the Alma-Ata Protocol, in which they confirmed the dissolution of the Union. That same day, all former-Soviet republics agreed to join the CIS, with the exception of the three Baltic States. The documents signed at Alma-Ata also addressed several issues raised by the Union’s extinction. Notable, Russia was authorized to assume the role of the USSR in the United Nations, which meant inheriting its permanent membership on the
Security Council. On December 24, 1991, the Soviet Ambassador to the UN delivered to the Secretary General a letter by Russia’s president, Boris Yeltsin, informing him that, in virtue of that agreement, Russia was the successor state to the USSR for the purposes of UN membership. After being circulated among the other UN member States with no objection raised, the statement was declared accepted on December 31.

On December 25, 1991, Gorbachev resigned as President of the USSR, declaring the office extinct and ceding all the powers still vested in it to the president of Russia, Yeltsin. On the night of that same day, the Soviet flag was lowered for the last time over the Kremlin. Finally, a day later on December 26, 1991, the Council of Republics (a chamber) of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR recognized the dissolution of the Soviet Union and dissolved itself (another chamber of the Supreme Soviet had being unable to work during some months before this, due to absence to quorum). By December 31, 1991, all official Soviet institutions had ceased operations as individual republics assumed the central government’s role.

Gorbachev’s programmes of perestroika and glasnost produced radical unforeseen effects that brought that system down. As a means of reviving the Soviet, Gorbachev repeatedly attempted to build a coalition of political leaders supportive of reform and created new arenas and bases of power. He implemented these measures because he wanted to resolve serious economic problems and political inertia that clearly threatened to put the Soviet Union into a state of long-term stagnation. Gorbachev also made it possible for nationalist, orthodox Communist and populist forces to oppose his attempts to liberalize and revitalize Soviet Communism. Although some of the new movements aspired to replace the Soviet system altogether with a liberal democratic one, others demanded independence for the national republics. Still others insisted on the restoration of the old Soviet ways. Ultimately, Gorbachev could not forge a compromise among these forces and the consequence was the collapse of the Soviet Union.

3.9 Disintegration of Socialist Bloc and End of Cold War

With the creation of the USSR and the subsequent rise of communist parties within the world at large and in Central and Eastern Europe in particular the world entered a new era in the early 20th century. The socialist countries undertook to consult together on all international questions involving their common interests, and to set up a unified military command, with its headquarters in Moscow. Two formal alliances – NATO and the Warsaw Pact – now confronted one another in Europe. With the creation of the NATO alliance in 1949 it became
necessary to take steps by the socialist republics to consolidate their power. For this reason the Warsaw Pact was drafted and implemented in 1955. The member countries that later comprised part of the larger Socialist Bloc were: The Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania. These countries were later reinforced with the inclusion of other important nations such as China, Cuba, Vietnam, Afghanistan, etc.

The world, as it existed in the Cold War era, had attained a begrudging stability due to the existence of two opposing monoliths, i.e. the US and the USSR (and therefore NATO and Warsaw Pact countries). It is thus not without basis to say that both sides had to consider a far greater set of implications for pursuing their interests than is the case now, be it with the case of the Cuban Missile crisis or the Afghan crisis.

Mikhail Gorbachev cranked out a slew of slogans, including glasnost, perestroika and ‘new thinking’ in an effort to rescue socialism in the Soviet Union. Despite these shocking similarities of his policies to Khrushchev’s revisionism (Gorbachev was actually more revisionist than Khrushchev), Gorbachev was adamant in declaring himself to be a true Communist. The USSR collapsed in 1991. With it, there started the disintegration of the Socialist Bloc.

3.9.1 Change from Bipolar to Unipolar World System

In the late eighties the sequence of events took such a rapid turn that world scenario bears no resemblance with the World. In the wake of perestroika and glasnost a wind of change swept the Soviet Union. It was followed by collapse of Communism in all East European countries, crumbling of Soviet bloc and the eventual end of the Cold War. Gulf War (1991) rendered the USA as the only super power in the World and a New World order was claimed by it to be in the offing. By the end of 1991 the world witnessed disintegration of the USSR and secessionist civil war in Yugoslavia. In Europe the process of integration gained momentum after EEC’s decision to form single economic market by December 1992. The pattern of international relations that was conspicuous in Cold War days faded into oblivion. There was a complete transformation of world scenario and a new pattern of international relations started emerging.

3.9.2 New World Order

Amid the turmoil of the Persian Gulf War, President George Bush began talking hopefully of a “New World Order” - “a system of international understating that could restore stability and prevent future conflicts from breaking out”. After winning the Gulf war, President George Bush has reiterated his promise made in September 1990, to build a new
world order which would be based on “cooperation” between the US and the Soviet Union, and which will allow the UN an important role. He aimed at building a new world order bases on collective security and rule of law. Another significant element of Bush’s new world was nuclear non-proliferation. He did not want to miss the opportunity to “march forward”. He wanted his country-men to make maximum use of the opportunity provided by the Gulf war, to march forward on their proclaimed path of making the world better. For many Americans the “Vietnam Complex” was over and they were tempted to throw their now-found muscle power around to achieve their objectives. The spectacular success of Patriot missiles and other high-tech weapons seemed to have worked wonders for the US.

There was already a rush of third world countries for buying American arms. American arms industry that was facing slump after the end of the Cold War suddenly regained its lost confidence. According to an estimate, Kuwait was to spend $55 billion towards its reconstruction, and 70 percent of 200 contracts that it signed with foreign companies during the last few days after the war was over had gone to the United States. Besides these sudden and unexpected gains, Washington utilized this “opportunity” to wrest vital concessions from others in regard to trade and business. It tried to dominate the Uruguay Round of talks and forced the entry of its companies into Third World countries.

In mid-1970s, the nations of the South proposed a New International Economic Order (NIEO) intended to bridge the yawning gap between the rich and the poor worlds by instituting fairer international trading practices and increasing the order of magnitude of international assistance for rapid development of the South. Now the US adopted the slogan but the contents of the new concept were totally different. The components of the previous concept of new economic world order demanded by Third World countries of the South were: new economic order, new information order, international peace, and democratization of international Organisations including the U.N. Some of their main demands were removal of poverty in the Third World, and reduction of gap between North and South, elimination of information imperialism practiced by developed countries through multinationals, increasing the power of developing countries in UN, World Bank, IMF and GATT, checking the spread of nuclear weapons and gradually eliminating them, and removing war hysteria. None of these demands was accepted by the rich countries of the North. The US always used its dominance in different international bodies for thwarting efforts at fashioning a new economic order. The last decade of Reaganism and Thatcherism ridiculed the NIEO and put in its place new ideas such as “Structural adjustments”. 
The exposition of a New World order came from the President Bush. Ever since the Soviet went out of the Cold War business, he had been resorting to this catch phrase. Its scope was global not national as those of two former Presidents, Lyndon Johnson- “Great Society” and Kennedy – “New Frontier” were. All available evidence points to certain facts. The New world order remained to be dominated by the USA as the sole surviving super power. The mighty dollar was expected to be supreme again. The US was likely to have a subservient UN at its disposal. New power alignments were forged and a new world map of friends and enemies was charted. After the end of the Gulf war, if one was to go by Bush’s exposition the new world was not be the end of the old world order of guns and international power politics, it was to mark according to critics, the beginning of a new world disorder. As a cynic put it, the US was to have the whip hand. Moreover, the disappearance of the Soviet Union as a rival and challenger to be reckoned with, the US was free to do as it pleased. The new world order was to be designed and run by the Group of 7 (G-8) with the USA as the star and other cast in supporting roles. This was a world to be run by the rich for the rich with reasonable pickings for the middle class. The poorer countries could fend for themselves.

3.9.3 Unipolar World or Interdependent World

There are two views regarding the emerging world order. First, the world is described as more or less unipolar, clearly dominated by the sole super power USA. After the end of the Cold War, the world grew unipolar where the US mostly attempted to impose its political agenda on all regions. This extreme version claims that the US is a neo-imperial power wishing to force Third World countries into an exploitative global economic system. According to this viewpoint, after winning the Cold War, America is in the centre of world politics where its responsibility is to convert the “American leadership into increasingly institutionalized forms”. But American policy makers are realistic enough to assume, that the USA is hardly in a position to achieve this goal in an arbitrary manner. The military superiority alone provides only the frame for an envisaged system of “domination through partnership”.

The second viewpoint foresees a growing interdependence among the developed countries of the so-called north, based on shared values like democracy and free market economy and carried out through a concept of “partners in leadership among the three major centres of power, i.e. the USA, European Union (EU) and Japan or in other words, in securing the wealth of the north. Thus, the World today is not unipolar, but global power relationship is in a flux because different centres of power have different kind of power. In military affairs, the USA is pre-eminent. But in
economic affairs, Germany and Japan are the centres of power and they do not recognize American economic leadership.

Certain apprehensions were expressed throughout the world regarding Bush’s concept of new world order. Many scholars criticized it to the extent of dubbing it as a new type of pax-American. That is why Bush abruptly dropped the slogan as soon as the Gulf war was won. “People were trying to read too much into it”, one of his aides complained.

But the search for a new World order has continued, and in January 1992 it focused on an unusual summit meeting of the United Nations Security Council. The holding of this first ever summit meeting of the Security Council reflected the new realities of power in a world that is no longer dominated by the two superpowers of the Cold War. “It is symbolic of a world that isn’t bipolar but it is also not a simple unipolar world run by the United States”, said Professor Joseph S. Nye Jr. of Harvard University. He further said, “It’s symbolic of a world in which we are the biggest power, but we cannot do things alone- we need to leverage our power to get things done.”

Instead of leadership by one or two super powers, many scholars and government analysts predict the evolution of what some call “collegial power” – a loosely structured world in which leadership is shared among several key nations in different combinations depending on the nature of the issue. On economic issues, leadership is likely to gravitate to a financial Big Three: The United States, Europe and Japan. On issues of military security the United States is still likely to take the lead, as of Russia, France, Britain and other countries for joint police actions abroad.

With the disintegration of the Soviet Union the global power scenario underwent a radical change as the Soviet Union was not just a nation but a super power. The emergence of a large number of independent nations that formed part of the former USSR within such a short span of time had no doubt gone down as a momentous event in the history of international relations.

### 3.9.4 Impact on Third World

The break-up of the Soviet Union brought negative implications for the Third World especially the Socialist-Oriented ones. The demise of the Socialist Superpower, the USSR made many a Third World nation vulnerable to external interference, especially from the west. The developing countries had in the past looked at the Soviet Union for succour and moral support in times of need. The policies of new Republics especially the more prosperous ones like Russia and Ukraine became less
sympathetic towards the Third World because their primary concern was to attain national progress without ideological blinkers. The fall of the USSR added a whole new dimension to the question of separatism that had been plaguing many nations including a good number of developing countries. The thrust all across the globe soon concentrated on establishing bilateral contacts to gain maximum economic leverage. Many west European Governments started already courting Republics of Russia and Ukraine because these Republics could form an excellent market for their products and also a rich source for the supply of raw materials like coal, oil, timber and gas which these Slavic Republics have in abundance. The Third World might suffer another setback on account of greater inclinations of Western developed countries towards East European countries and newly independent Republics.

Both models – unipolar and interdependent World – discussed above usually tend to reduce the importance of the Third World to the status of a subordinated entity in world affairs. The reluctance to accept necessary changes in the world’s economy as well as the heated discussion on prevention of immigration from Third World countries illustrates that clearly. In the emerging pattern and centres of power Third World countries do only count if they serve direct and vital strategic interests of one of the centres of power. This relates not primarily to military interests but many very well served economic considerations, like controlling the oil-producing areas of the Middle East in order to put economic interests of the European Community (EC) and especially Japan to size without being dependent on the oil-like the USA made clear during the Gulf War.

The Third World is going to be excluded more and more from the benefit of integration in world market. Moreover, it is highly uncertain, whether a country like the USA is going to continue to float money without the slightest chance of returns to insignificant countries in the World anymore, as the need of aiding regimes in order to contain Communism has become obsolete.

The first ever summit meeting of the Security Council held on 31st January, 1992 to assign a new role and importance to the world organization. Although non-permanent members in the Council, including India and Zimbabwe, went along with the Summit declaration, there is no denying the fact that there is apprehension among many Third World countries that the pendulum of the Security Council may swing from one extreme of inaction witnessed in the Cold War days to the other extreme of excessive intervention.
The transformation of the third world into the neo-colonial appendage of the US could only be intensified if the strongest anti-neoliberal force was dismembered. Let us look at the case of the World Bank and the IMF’s structural adjustment programmes as they have been propagated after the Cold War. One would find that there is a great increase in the sheer number of cases of structural adjustment within the third world and as a consequence there has been a drastic rise in inequality within the same. Let us now compare this to the recent foreign policy of the US which, openly and without consideration to the UN’s own resolutions, targets all sovereign states that constitute a potential threat to itself or its allies. One can clearly see that if the USSR was still present then at least the absurd ‘David and Goliath’ situation, as it exists at this time, would not have been so. Needless to say, the world as a whole and its constituting countries (particularly the third world) has lost a great equalising force with the dismembering of the USSR.

3.9.5 Positive Developments

In the changed world scenario there are some positive developments which promised a bright and hopeful future. On the other hand there were some negative developments also shadowing them. The same are briefly discussed below.

3.9.5.1 US and Russia Allies

There is no denying the fact that with the demise of Cold War, the Super Powers in their historic summit in Moscow (July, 1991) signed the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) that promised the beginning of new era of understanding and peace. After that both the US and Russia have also twice made unilateral declarations for further cut in their nuclear and strategic weapons. In February 1992, Russian Federation President Boris Yeltsin and USA proclaimed the beginning of a new era in U.S. –Russian relations. New relations, US President Bush said were “based on trust”, based on a commitment to economic and political freedom”. Yeltsin said: “There has been written and drawn a new line and a cross out all of the things that have been associated with the Cold War...... From now on, we do not consider ourselves to be potential enemies”. Both the leaders hoped to unite the globe through their friendship and a new alliance of partners working against the common dangers that the World faces.

3.9.5.2 Unifications

Unlike the two Vietnams and two Germanys where public opinion and practical wisdom overcome divisive forces and roaring rhetoric and the dream of unification became a fait accompli, the government and
peoples of two Koreas may also go in for the much needed unification in the months or years to come. Notwithstanding the chronic hurling of charges and counter charges at each other, the two countries are more conciliatory and accommodating today than they were ever before. The day is not far off when this volatile and vulnerable region would become insulated against foreign intervention and interference.

3.9.5.3 Integration of Europe

If there is disintegration in the Soviet Union simultaneously there is a healthy trend of integration in Europe. The European Community (EC), formerly called European Economic Community (EEC) came into prominence on November 1, 1993 and started taking the most important step in its political history. While the German Chancellor Helmut Kohl accepted an initiative of the French President Mitterand to move towards political as well as economic and monetary union, the British Prime Minister John Major stood opposed to it. Rather he entailed a federation of European States. Paris envisaged political union as close cooperation between individual national governments. Germans argued for a considerable extension of the rights of the European Parliament.

3.9.5.4 Resolving of Outstanding Issues

The West Asian problems which had been hanging for the last many years and so engaged the attention of the world were thought to be resolved in the near future. The most significant gain of the Moscow Summit (July 1991) between big powers was an agreement to call a West Asia Peace Conference by October 1991. The West Asia Peace Conference which began in Madrid on October 31, 1991 erupted into bitter polemics on November 1 and ended without agreement on where to hold face to face Arab-Israeli talks vital to ending bloodshed in the region. Though peace conference adjourned amidst bitter exchanges, it did not distract from the fact that history was made at Madrid when Israel and its Arab neighbours met face to face for the first time in 43 years. The question, however, arose was why the US did put in all the efforts when chances of success were so slim.

First, Mr. Bush had honoured his commitment to the Arabs made at the time of the Gulf war. Second, even if the talks collapsed the ice could be broken for a possible success. The present political scenario offers a unique opportunity to hammer out a solution which safeguards the rights of Palestinians as much as the security of Israel. A lot of agreements and talks could be initiated between The Palestinian Liberation Army (PLA) led by Yasser Arafat and his Israeli counterpart to dissolve the political deadlock from 1988 to the close of the 20th century. The whole world witnessed a historic moment when Israel conceded to the
demands of Palestine and decided to withdraw its troops from the West Bank and Gaza Strip areas in 2002, the process off which could be completed in 2005 after the death of Yasser Arafat in 2004.

3.9.6 Negative Developments

There were some negative developments taking place too. They were:

3.9.6.1 Religious Fundamentalism

Religious fundamentalism has become a major threat to peace and freedom. Countries like India, Russia, China, and Balkan States are facing problem for France, and Turkish immigrants for Germany. In UK, Muslims want Muslim Law. And in France it has led to the popularity of French. USA also recognizes the dangers of Islamic fundamentalists.

3.9.6.2 Dismal Economic Front

On the economic front the Scenario is not hopeful especially for most of the Third World Countries. With inflation running riot and prices ruling the roost, the economies of these countries are in dismal state with very little leverage for manipulation and manoeuvrability. Most of them have been caught in a state of economic stagflation and heavy foreign debts. The Third World Countries owed $ 1096 trillion to their lenders towards the end of 1990. These alarming figures do not include the debts of the Republics of erstwhile Soviet Union, China and other countries of East Europe. West may be more inclined to offer all sorts of financial and technical assistance to East European countries and newly independent Republics than the Third World. This may aggravate the economic problems of the Third World Countries on the one hand and lead to increasing dependence of the East European Countries and newly independent Republics.

3.9.6.3 Arms Race

At the super power level no doubt some positive steps have been taken with regard to arms control and disarmament e.g. INF treaty, START, unilateral reductions. Yet arms race is still continuing with smaller powers and developing countries joining it. The Gulf war saw the resurgence in the fortunes of arms merchants from the US, France, Britain and Germany. While the Paris Peace Conference and the 34-Nations Treaty (1990) and the subsequent end of the Cold War has reduced the threat of war in Europe, they accentuated the danger in other trouble-spots around the globe, including Indian subcontinent.

International relations are at turning point. A new pattern of relation is emerging which is going to be different from the previous one that prevailed after the Second World War.
3.10 Globalisation- Its Economic and Political Implications

Globalisation in its literal sense is the process of transformation of local or regional things or phenomena into global ones. It can also be used to describe a process by which the people of the world are unified into a single society and function together. This process is a combination of economic, technological, socio-cultural and political forces. Globalisation is often used to refer to economic globalisation, that is, integration of national economies into the international economy through trade, foreign direct investment, capital flows, migration, and the spread of technology.

3.10.1 Definition

Tom G. Palmer defines globalisation “as the domination or elimination of state enforced restrictions on exchanges across borders and the increasingly integrated and complex global system of production and exchange that has emerged as a result.” This is the general definition given by economists, often, put more simply as global expansion of the division of labour.

Thomas L. Friedman examines the impact of the ‘flattening of the globe”, and argues that globalized trade, outsourcing, supply-chaining, and political forces have changed the world permanently, for both better and worse. He also argues that the pace of globalisation is quickening and will continue to have a growing impact on business organization and practice. Noam Chomsky argues that the word “globalisation” is also used in a doctrinal sense to describe the neo-liberal form of economic globalisation.

Herman E. Daly rightly argues that sometimes the terms internationalization and globalisation are used interchangeably. But there is a slight formal difference. The term “internationalization” refers to the importance of international trade, relations, treaties, etc. “International” means between or among nations and “Globalisation” means ‘erasure of national boundaries for economic purposes’. Here, international trade becomes inter-regional trade.

3.10.2 History of Globalisation

The term “globalisation” has been used by economists since the 1980’s although it was used in social sciences in the 1960’s. However, its concepts did not become popular until the latter half of the 1980’s and 1990’s. The earliest written theoretical concepts of globalisation were penned by an American entrepreneur-turned-minister Charles Taze Russell (1852-1916) who coined the term ‘corporate giants’ in 1897. Globalisation is viewed as a century’s long process, tracking the expansion of human population and the growth of civilization that has
accelerated dramatically in the past 50 years. Early forms of globalisation existed during the Roman Empire, the Parthian empire, and the Han Dynasty, when the Silk Road started in China, reached the boundaries of the Parthian empire, and continued onwards towards Rome. The Islamic Golden Age is also an example, when Muslim traders and explorers established an early global economy across the Old World resulting in a globalisation of crops, trade, knowledge and technology, and later during the Mongol Empire, when there was greater integration along the Silk Road.

Globalisation in a wider context began shortly before the turn of the 16th century, with Spain and especially Portugal. Portugal’s global explorations in the 16th century especially linked continents, economies and cultures to a massive extent. Portugal’s exploration and trade with most of the coast of Africa and the territory of India was the first major trade based form of globalisation. A wave of global trade, colonization, and enculturation reached all corners of the world. Global integration continued through the expansion of European trade in the 16th and 17th centuries, when the Portuguese and Spanish Empires expanded to the America followed eventually by France and Britain. Globalisation had had a tremendous impact on cultures, particularly indigenous cultures, around the world.

In the 17th century, globalisation became a business phenomenon when the Dutch East India Company, which is often described as the first multinational corporation was established. Because of the high risks involved with international trade, the Dutch East India Company became the first company in the world to share risk and enable joint ownership of companies through the insurance of shares of stock; an important driver for globalisation. Globalisation was also achieved by the British Empire (the second largest empire in history after the Spanish Portuguese Empire) due to its sheer size and power. British ideals and culture were imposed on other nations during this period. The 19th century is sometimes called “The First Era of Globalisation”. It was a period characterized by rapid growth of European imperial powers, their colonies, and, later, the United States. It was in this period that areas of sub-Saharan Africa and the Island Pacific were incorporated into the world system. The “First Era of Globalisation’ began to break down at the beginning of the 20th century with the First World War. John Maynard Keynes said “The inhabitant of London could order by telephone, sipping his morning tea, the various products of the whole earth, and reasonably expect their early delivery upon his doorstep. Militarism and imperialism of racial and cultural rivalries were little more than the amusements of his
daily newspaper. What an extraordinary episode in the economic progress of man was that age which came to an end in August 1914.”

### 3.10.3 Modern Globalisation

Globalisation in the era since World War II is largely the result of the planning by economists, business interests, and politicians who recognized the costs associated with protectionism and declining international economic integration. Their work led to the Bretton Woods Conference (July 1–22, 1944) and the founding of several international institutions intended to oversee the renewed processes of globalisation, promoting growth and managing adverse consequences.

These institutions include the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (the World Bank), and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Globalisation has been facilitated by advances in technology which have reduced the costs of trade, and trade negotiation rounds, originally under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), which led to a series of agreements to remove restrictions on free trade.

Since World War II, barriers to international trade have been considerably lowered through international agreements like GATT. It took initiatives for the promotion of free trade like: reduction of tariffs; creation of free-trade zones with small or no tariffs; reduction of transportation costs especially resulting from development of containerization for ocean shipping; reduction or elimination of capital controls; reduction, elimination, or harmonization of subsidies for local business; and harmonization of intellectual property laws across the majority of states with more restrictions.

The Uruguay Round (1984-1995) led to a treaty to create the WTO to mediate trade disputes and set up a uniform platform for trading. Other bilateral and multilateral trade agreements, including sections of Europe’s Maastricht Treaty (1991) and the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) (1992) have also been signed in pursuit of the goal of reducing tariffs and barriers to trade. Because of such initiatives taken world exports rose from 8.5% of gross world product in 1970 to 16.1% of gross world product in 2001.

### 3.10.4 Features of Globalisation

The concept Globalisation involves within its ambit the following features:

(i) Liberalization- It stands for the freedom of the entrepreneurs to establish any industry or trade or business venture, within their own countries or abroad.
Free Trade- It stands for free flow of trade relations among all the nations. Each state grants MFN (most favoured nation) status to other states and keeps its business and trade away from excessive and hard regulatory and protective regimes.

Globalisation of Economic Activity- Economic activities are to be governed both by the domestic market and also the world market. It stands for the process of integration of the domestic economy with world economies.

Liberalisation of Import-Export System- It stands for liberating the import-export activity and securing a free flow of goods and services across borders.

Privatisation- Keeping the state away from ownership of means of production and distribution and letting the free flow of industrial, trade and economic activity across borders.

Increased Collaborations- Encouraging the process of collaborations among the entrepreneurs with a view to secure rapid modernization, development and technological advancement.

Economic Reforms- Encouraging fiscal and financial reforms with a view to give strength to free world trade, free enterprise, and market forces.

Globalisation accepts and advocates the value of free world trade, freedom of access to world markets and a free flow of investments across borders. It stands for integration and democratization of the world’s culture, economy and infrastructure.

As globalisation is not only an economic phenomenon, a multivariate approach to measuring globalisation is the recent index calculated by the Swiss think-tank KOF. The index measures the three main dimensions of globalisation- economic, social and political. In addition to three indices measuring these dimensions, an overall index of globalisation and sub-indices referring to actual economic flows, economic restrictions, data on personal contact, data on information flows, and data on actual proximity is calculated. According to the index, the World’s most globalized country in Belgium, followed by Austria, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the Netherlands. The least globalized countries according to the KOF-index are Haiti, Myanmar the Central African Republic and Burundi.

A.J. Kearney and Foreign Policy Magazine jointly publish another Globalisation Index. According to the 2006 index, Singapore, Ireland, Switzerland, the US, the Netherlands, Canada and Denmark are the most
globalized, while Egypt, Indonesia, India and Iran are the least globalised among countries listed.

3.11 Economic Implications

The supporters of Globalisation argue that it alone can secure, for all the people of the world, development and help them to achieve sustainable development. However, the critics criticize it as the corporate agenda, the agenda of the big business and the ideology of the developed countries to dominate and control the international economic system in a bigger, deeper and more subtle and intensive manner.

3.11.1 Gains of Globalisation for Rich at the Cost of Poor

Under the process of Globalisation, big business has done well despite the slackened productivity growth. Globalisation also helped the corporate elites to keep wages down, to skim off a large fraction of the reduced productivity gains, thereby permitting elite incomes and stock market values to rise rapidly. As against it for the majority of countries, globalisation has not been productive of good and beneficial results. Income inequality has been rising markedly both within and between countries. The gap in incomes between the 20 percent of the world’s population in the richest and poorest countries grew from 30 in 1960 to 82 in 1995, and the Third World countries suffered deterioration in several aspects.

In the Third World, unemployment and underemployment remain rampant, massive poverty exists side-by-side with growing elite affluence, and 75 million people a year or more have been seeking asylum or employment in the North, as the Third World governments allow virtually unrestricted capital flight and seek no options but to attract foreign investment. Even the economies of the USA and Japan witnessed a trend towards recession in the Post-September 2001 months.

3.11.2 Source of Economic Crisis

The new global order has been experiencing increased financial volatility, and from the Third World debt crisis of the early 1980s to the Mexican breakdown of 1994-95 to the Southeast Asian debacle of the 1990s, financial crisis have become more and more threatening and extensive. With increasing privatization and deregulation, the discrepancy between the powers of unregulated financial forces has been increasing and the potential for a global break down has been steadily enlarging.

3.11.3 Globalisation as an Imposed Decision of the Rich

The critics of Globalisation even go to the extent of describing it as an imposed decision and not a democratic choice of the people of the
world. The process has been business driven, by business strategies and tactics and for business ends. Governments have helped by incremental policy actions, and by larger actions that often taken in secret, without national debates and discussions of where the entire process of globalisation was taking the community.

3.11.4 Unequal Distribution of Benefits

This undemocratic process, carried out within a democratic façade, has been inconsistent with the distribution of benefits and costs of globalisation. The fact has been that globalisation has been working as a tool designed to serve elite interests. Globalisation has also steadily weakened democracy. Partly as a result of unplanned effects, and partly because of the containment of labour costs and scaling down of the welfare state which enabled the business minority to establish firm control of the state and reduce its capacity to respond to the demands of the majority.

3.11.5 Strengthened Role of MNCs

Under the goals of globalisation, the business community, particularly the MNC brotherhood, has also mounted a powerful effort to dominate governments either by capture or by limiting their ability to serve ordinary citizens by enlarging business profits and power further towards business. The political parties in all countries have been getting decisively influenced by business money in elections.

3.11.6 Private Profits at the Cost of Social Security

The efforts of the corporate elite as aided and validated by international financial institutions and by media support, have been regularly causing social, democratic and social activists to retreat to policies acceptable to the dominant business elite. Thus, in all most all the countries, even the democratic parties, more particularly the social democratic parties have been accepting neo-liberalism, despite the opposed preferences of great majorities of their voting constituencies. Democracy is no longer able to serve ordinary citizens, making elections meaningless and democracy empty of substance. The fall in voter turnouts in various democracies reflects the growing alienation of the masses from the political process.

3.11.7 Increased Protectionism and Neo-colonialism

The business elites of various states have also been trying to push for such international agreements and policy actions by the IMF and World Bank that can enhance the ability of democratic policies to act on their behalf for securing their interests. The place of traditional protection on the part of the rich and developed countries, globalisation has been
giving birth to a new system of MNC protectionism, which is doubly injurious to the economies of all the countries, particularly of the Third World countries.

3.11.8 Unduly Increased Role of Big Business

Most of the agreements and demands of the international financial institutions are invariably tuned to the policies desired by the corporate elite. The conditions laid down by them often give primacy to budget constraint, the inflation control, in line with the neoliberal and corporate agenda. GATT, and the WTO, and the NAFTA also give top priority to corporate investor and intellectual property rights, to which all other considerations must give way. It forced a stress on exports, which was to help generate foreign exchange to allow debt repayment and was to more closely integrate the borrower's economy with the global system. It stressed privatization, allegedly in the interest of efficiency, but serving both to help balance the budget without tax increases and to provide openings for investment in the troubled economies. The IMF has been doing the same in Asia.

3.11.9 Working against Democratic Right of the Ordinary Citizens

Further, the IMF-World Bank actions are often a source of denial of democratic rights to non-corporate citizens and elected governments. These are mostly subordinated to the rights of corporate investors. In the NAFTA agreement, governments were denied in advance the right to take on new functions. Many non-asserted functions left to the private sector and to the superior class of citizens. In these agreements also, and even more aggressively in the multilateral agreement on investment, the global MNCs have little responsibilities and virtually no responsibility can be imposed on them. They can fire people, abandon communities, fatally damage the environment, push local companies out of business, and purvey cultural trash at their full discretion. They can sue governments, and disagreements are to be settled by unelected panels outside the control of democratic government.

3.12 Political Implications

The emergency and success of regional economy associations or unions, and the ongoing process of globalisation have together been a source of change in the concept of state sovereignty. Further, the presence of neo-colonialism in which the developing countries, despite being fully sovereign states, find themselves living under the economic, ideological and cultural control of the developed countries, has also been a source of limitation on the sovereignty of the state. Increasing global interdependence, neo-colonialism, globalisation, liberalization and
privatization have been together acting as a source of big limitation on sovereignty. In fact several factors have today been acting to place some practical limitations on the sovereignty of the state:-

(i) The acceptance and the process of liberalization-privatization have acted as a source of limitation on the role of the state in the economic sphere. The failure of the public sector to deliver the desired goods and services, the decline of faith in the ability of the state to organize and manage production of goods and services for the people have together led to a decline in the economic functions of the state.

(ii) The emergency of free trade, market competition, multinational corporations and international economic organizations and trading block like European Union, NAFTA, APEC, ASEAN and others have limited the scope of the operations of state sovereignty in the sphere of international economic relations. The member states of the European Union, for example, have to abide by the rules and policies made by the organization.

(iii) Increasing international inter-dependence has compelled the state to accept limitations on its external sovereignty. Each state now finds it essential to accept the rules of international economy system, the WTO, the World Bank and the IMF.

(iv) Globalisation has encouraged and expanded people-to-people socio-economic cultural relations among all the peoples of the world. Revolution and development of fast means of transport and communications have been together making the world a real global community which, now appears to be developing towards a global village. The people of each state now deal with people of other states as members of the world community. Now they do not hesitate to oppose those policies of their states which, they feel, are not in tune with the demands of globalisation. Even the movement for opposing globalisation has tended to bring the people of world on one platform and instill among them a feeling of community living at the global level.

(v) The state continues to maintain its military power as an important dimension of its national power. However, the strength being gained by movement for international peace and peaceful coexistence as the way of life has tended to reduce the importance of military power of the state.
(vi) Several international conventions and treaties have placed some limitations upon all the States. All the states are today bound by the rules and norms laid down by several such conventions. The need to fight the menace of terrorism and rogue nuclear proliferation as well as the shared responsibilities to protect the environment and guarantee all human rights of all have compelled all the states to accept such rules and regulations as are considered essential for the securing of these objectives.

Thus, Globalisation and several other factors have been together responsible for putting pressure on the sovereignty of the state. The role of the state in the economic relations has undergone a big change. It has got reduced. The operation of the new international economic system with globalisation as its objective has been further reducing the role of the state Sovereignty.

Several scholars hold that globalisation has essentially limited the concept of state sovereignty. While some of them, the ‘die-hard pluralists’ accept it as useful and ideal, some others, the ‘die-hard nationalists’ regard it as an undesirable and harmful development. Neither of these two views is however fully valid. State sovereignty of countries is to remain intact in its internal and external dimensions. The state continues to be sovereign state and its sovereignty continues to be comprehensive, permanent and absolute. While its functions have undergone a change, the world has now 191 sovereign independent and equal sovereign nations. People continue to live and enjoy their lives as citizens of their respective states. The new needs for global level economic and trade integration, protection of environment, protection and security of all human rights, the need to collectively fight the menace of international terrorism and the need to fight a collective war against poverty, hunger, disease and under-development have changed the role of state in the 21st century. It does not, however, mean either the end of sovereignty or a serious limitation on the sovereignty of state.

3.13 Regional Security and Alliances: Concept of Regional Security

The emergence of the concept of regional security has been an important feature of international relations in the post World War II period. The main factors which contributed to the rise of regional security or regionalism were the emergence of a large number of sovereign independent states and the lack of self-sufficiency of these states which compelled them to look for cooperation with other states to meet basic needs of their citizens. This naturally led to the formation of a large number of regional organization. According to Palmer and
Perkins, "In international relations a region is primarily an area embracing the territories of three or more states. These states are bound together by ties of common interest as well as of geography. They are not necessarily contiguous or even in the same continent”.

The essence of regional security is that the states situated in a particular area or region tend to react in a particular manner to various international situations, and therefore, tend to unite in order to face common threats to their political independence and territorial integrity. Regional alliances, in general terms, represent the attempt on the part of the signatories to strengthen their position through alignments with other like-minded powers and they also provide the means for carrying on their mutual relations. They are important instruments of cold war. The term “regional organization” is used to cover all non-universal associations like the British Commonwealth, the SEATO and the Arab League etc.

In other words, a regional organization is a sort of formal association of independent states with some sort of permanent organs. It is more than an alliance. It may be noted that the term 'regional organization' does not have any definite geographical connotation, because all the states of a particular geographical region may not be member of the organization. For example, the Arab League does not include all the Middle Eastern states. Similarly Canada and European dependencies in the Western Hemisphere are not included in the Organization of the American States. Again North Atlantic Treaty Organization is considered to be a regional organization even though Italy, Greece and Turkey which are its members, are not North Atlantic powers.

Prof. Padelford says, "Broadly speaking, a regional arrangement in the sphere of international politics may be described as an association of states, based upon location in a given geographical area, for the safeguarding or promotion of the participants. The terms of this association are fixed by the treaty or other agreement". It is not essential that regional organizations can be formed by the states of the concerned region alone and that the countries from outside the region cannot be admitted as members of these regional organizations. On the other hand, it is not essential that all the states of a region may be included as members of a regional organization. In fact, political rather than geographical ties have determined most groupings. The regional security organizations encompass states widely scattered over the globe. Some groups, paradoxically do not include states that are geographically
at the heart of the region. Consequently, these arrangements are more aptly described as instruments for selective, rather than regional security. They may unite any combination of states in ‘collective self – defence’ regardless of geographic location. In short, it can be said that regionalism is quite an elastic concept which cannot be assigned any definite and precise meaning.

Two types of organizations exist in the present world- the international organizations and regional organizations. The former is organized on global basis and the latter is organized on regional basis. It is believed that the two types of organizations cannot coexist. The regional organizations are bound to defeat from the effectiveness of the international organization. However, the supporters of the regional organizations do not subscribe to this view and hold that regionalism is a necessary and desirable intermediate stage in the slow process of world integration. They contend that just as the national state of today represents the consolidation of existing fragmentary units, it will be superseded by larger regional entities, which will in turn be united in a single global system. They claim that the regional organizations are certainly superior to the global organizations for the simple reason that a sense of involvement and joint responsibility cannot be developed amongst the people living in the extreme parts of the world.

The regional organizations may be helpful in so far as they provide a stepping stone to globalisation but would certainly be wrong to overemphasize that the regional organizations are more helpful to joint involvement of the states. Regional pacts are also concluded by states widely scattered over the globe. It is not at all essential that the states which enter into regional pacts must have a kind of persistent cultural, economic or political affinity among peoples. These alliances spring from a sense of expediency.

But some of the problems of the modern world are international in character and can be effectively treated only by global agencies. Thus the problem of control over armaments is pre-eminently a global problem which cannot be tackled by regional organizations. Therefore, the two must coexist side by side.

3.13.1 Regional Security Alliances and UNO

Regional security was allured and even encouraged under the league system. Chapter VII of the UN Charter provided for the regional arrangements or agencies to come up consistent with the purposes and
principles of the United Nations. The emergence of regional organizations made certain people feel that the international organization is bound to become less effective. This erroneous assumption seems to be based on the understanding that the regional arrangements are also concerned with all the problems which are the concern of the United Nations.

No doubt, both the regional organizations and UN are concerned with the problem of collective security, but they also differ from each other. Whereas the regional agencies concentrate on a particular target and confine themselves only to problems which are of international character, these are looked after by the international agency, the UNO alone. For example, the problem of the control of armaments is not a regional problem but preeminently an international problem which can be tackled by UN alone. Again the regional organizations involve more limited commitments than the UN. In fact considered from particular place, it would not be wrong to assume that regional arrangements instead of being incompatible with the international organization are an essential prelude to any kind of international or universal organization.

The UN charter has attached due importance to these regional arrangements and expects them to serve as adjuncts to the United Nations. However, these regional agencies have been subjected to a considerable words, these regional agencies are recognized subject to certain conditions and reservations. For example, Art 52 of the UN charter says:

(i) Nothing in the present charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

(ii) The members of the United Nations entering into such arrangements or constituting such agencies shall make every effort to achieve pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements or by such regional agencies before referring them to the Security Council.

(iii) The Security Council shall encourage the development of pacific settlement of local disputes through such regional arrangements
or by such regional agencies either on the initiative of the states concerned or by reference from the Security Council.

(iv) The above provisions of the charter specially authorize the use of regional arrangements. They are given a degree of priority as medium for peaceful settlement.

However Article 53 - 54 provide for the use of these regional arrangements only under the authority of the Security Council. They have an obligation to keep the Security Council informed of all such activities undertaken. To understand the full implications of these two articles let us examine these two articles.

Article 53 says:
1) The Security Council shall wherever appropriate, unites such regional arrangements or agencies for enforcement action under its authority. But no enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council with the exception of measures against any enemy states until such as the organization may, on request of the government concerned, be charged with the responsibility for preventing further aggression by such a state.

2) The term enemy state as used in paragraph 1 of this Article applies to any state which during the Second World War has been an enemy of any signatory of the present charter.

Article 54 provides:

The Security Council shall at all times be kept fully informed of activities undertaken or in contemplation under regional arrangement or by original agencies for the maintenance of international peace and security.

As a consequence of these provision of the UN charter there has been a mushroom growth of regional organizations during these years. Most of the regional arrangements have been made for security purposes under Article 51. Such organizations include the NATO, Dunkin Treaty, the Brussels treaty, Rio pact, the ANZUS pact, Manila pact, Balkan Pact, Warsaw pact, Baghdad pact, etc. Most of these security arrangements in their constitution have embodied a reference to Article 51. These organizations were formed mainly to resist aggression from outside the region.
They make very little provision for setting up machinery for adjusting difficulties and promoting co-operation among its members. They mainly concentrate on the problem of security, economic and military co-operation of the members.

However, this should not give us the impression that regional arrangements can be made solely for the purpose of security. There are a number of regional arrangements like the Colombo plan which have been concluded by the members to secure economic co-operation of the members. Through Colombo Plan the countries of South and South East Asia agreed to make maximum efforts towards their own development by providing such assistance to each other as they are in a position. All the members of the Colombo Plan (India, Pakistan, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia) with the exception of Pakistan belong to the bloc of neutral state. The other examples of such regional arrangements are the Benelux, Organization for European Economy Cooperation, Organization for American States, etc.

It is often complained that the regional organizations framed for collective security have undermined the UNO. However, the argument that these treaties run counter to the principles and aims of the UN cannot be accepted. If self-defence against an armed attack is permitted by the UN Charter, the treaties having the same effect have to be tolerated. Most of the treaties concluded for this purpose in fact, avoid inconsistency with the UN Charter by conceding paramount to the obligations under the charter. For example, Article 4 of NATO states, “The parties will consult together whenever, in the opinion of any of them, the territorial integrity, political independence or security of any of the parties are threatened”. This provision clearly shows that the obligations of the member under the NATO do not affect their obligation to the UN under the charter.

3.13.2 Advantages of Regional Alliances

As regards the advantages of the regional alliances under the UN system, the scholars ascribe three points. First, it is proper and natural for neighbours in any region to organize to meet their common problems. And the more these nations are able to deal with their own problems, the more the United Nations is relieved of its burden of handling the local problems and is able to concentrate its attention on problems of world concern. Second, the members of the United Nations, if they are regionally organized, are able to resist the threat more
effectively. Thirdly, the regional arrangements or alliances enabled the states to proceed without the obstructions of the Soviet Union.

3.13.3 Disadvantages of Regional Alliances

The regional alliances also pose certain dangers to the international organization. It might contain certain powers whose combined strength may overhand the world organization. For example, the NATO is composed of members whose collective population, industrial output etc. represent a disproportionate part of the world’s strength.

Secondly, the establishment of regional organizations (particularly in the military sphere) leads to the establishment of counter regional organizations, which instead of preserving peace and security threatens the same. The NATO and the Warsaw treaty demonstrate this fact.

3.13.4 Working of the Regional Security Alliances

Although the regional alliances were expected to act as a useful adjuncts of the UN system, due to East-West power struggle and disillusionment with the capacity of the UN to act as an effective instrument of general security, they have started working independently. This change in their role is justified on the plea that they have a primary responsibility for security, both within third spheres and against their outside enemies. They have openly flouted their accountability to the UNO, for example, during the Russian action in Hungary, the Warsaw group brushed aside the UN protests and the Russians installed Hungarian government rejected all the moves of the UN to hold an inquiry including the visitors on the plea that the matter pertained to their 'domestic jurisdiction'. Similarly, in the Guatemalan case the Jacobo Arbenz government applied to the United Nations but the O.A.S group associated that it should have a chance to act first. Due to the treat of US veto in the Security Council, the O.A.S. was able to enforce its demands. However, before it could take a decisive action the government was be noted that in spite of all this the regional organizations claim that their groups have no conflict of interest with the United Nations.

The UN has been able to intervene effectively only when the major regional alliances reached the actual point of war. For example, in Cuba, the USA and USSR agreed that the UNO should take up the responsibility for removal and dismantling of the Russian missiles before USA agreed to list the blockade and pledged not to attack
Cuba. It is a different matter that UNO did not succeed in its mission of dismantling the Russian missiles in Cuba, as Cuba prevented UNO from carrying out the mission.

Prof. Jacob and Atherton on this context hold the view that "the regional security alliances have not only bypassed the United Nations, they have deliberately prevented the United Nations from discharging its functions of maintaining peace and security both within and between the groups. The regionalization of security, whatever, its justification in terms of more adequate provision for the collective self-defence of some, has emasculated the global security commitments undertaken to provide for the defence of all". In short, we can say the regional alliances have posed threats to the existence of the UNO, violating their own objectives and prerogatives.

Hence, regional organization or regional security is not new. What is new is the stress that has come to be laid on it in recent years. A world divided into blocs is a world living under the shadow of war “bigger and bitterer” wars. There is very little that the smaller states can ultimately do to save the situation, even though they may be regarded as "active and vital agents of world politics". Power today, therefore, is not simply national power; it is group power that has been institutionalized. That explains the importance of these alliances both in the cold war and in the calculations of a final showdown. Finally, most of the regional alliances have now become irrelevant and obsolete and many of them have already died and some are facing disintegration.

### 3.14 Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) or the Baghdad Pact

The Central Treaty Organization popularly called the CENTO or the Baghdad Pact of 1955, is an important regional alliance in the Middle East. The post Second World War era witnessed the birth of the innumerable regional alliances like the NATO in the Atlantic regions, the SEATO in the south east Asian region which were created with a crafty objective of counter checking the communist expansion and make room for the pax-Americana. In the middle west or supposedly the west Asia, CENTO is also a military alliance to act as a safety valve for the spreading of the venomous influence of the communism. Though in its membership and orientation, it is not a carbon copy of NATO or archetype of SEATO, yet it is an important treaty in the middle East like the Arab League of states. Though USA is not the architect of the CENTO all the same, the Anglo-American Plan masterminded the creation of the CENTO. However, it is a great
conundrum that the Baghdad Pact which was intended to wear Middle East of the Soviet influence, invited the Soviet Union to take greater interest in it.

The USA had cherished the idea of the "Northern tier" concept and as a result of this concept, the camp followers of USA rightly from Turkey to Pakistan with the notable exception of Afghanistan came together in a series of bilateral treaties, notably the pacts between Turkey and Pakistan in August 1954 and between Turkey and Iraq in February 1955 which became multilateral Baghdad Pact when Britain adhered to the Turkey-Iraq Pact in October, 1955. In November 1955 the five members of the Pact met at Baghdad and set up a formal organization with a council of ministers, special committees for military planning and economic co-operation, communications and counter subversion. The CENTO had its headquarters at Baghdad with a secretariat headed by the Secretary General. For various reasons and specially with not a view to evoking the provocation of Saudi Arabia and Egypt, the USA did not collaborate in the pact, but sent only an observer and extended to participate fully in the economic and counter subversion committees and to permanently liaison with the military committee.

Iraq's adherence to the Baghdad Pact created a crisis in the Arab league and strained relations between Iraq and Egypt. After the revolution in Iraq in 1958, Iraq withdrew its support from the Baghdad Pact in March 1959 and the headquarter was shifted to Ankara in 1959 and the Baghdad Pact was renamed as the CENTO with its headquarters at Ankara. It may be noted that United States never joined this pact, although it continued to take part in the military staff committee as an observer.

In March, 1979 Iran, Pakistan and Turkey left CENTO. On 26 September 1979 with the closing of the headquarters in Sahara, the CENTO officially ceased to operate.

3.14.1 Provisions of the CENTO

The Baghdad pact consisted of a Preamble and 8 Articles. The chief purpose of the treaty was to counter the communist danger in the region. By this treaty the signatories agreed to cooperate for their security and defence, refrain from any interference in each other's internal affairs, settle mutual disputes peacefully, etc. The pact was open to other members and was to remain in force for
five years. However, it could be renewed for five years at a time. The members could withdraw by giving six month notice.

Article 1 of the Pact reveals that the high contracting parties will cooperate for their security and defence. Such measure as they agree to take give effect to this cooperation may form the subject of special agreement with each other.

Article 2 provided that in order to ensure the cooperation as above, the competent authorities of the high contracting parties will determine the measures to be taken as soon as the permanent pact enters into force. These measures became operative as soon as they have been approved by the governments of the high contracting parties.

Article 3 reveals that the high contracting parties will undertake to refrain from any interference whatsoever in the international affairs of each other. They will settle any dispute between themselves in a peaceful way in accordance with the UN Charter.

Article 4 upholds the provision that the high contracting parties declare that the provision of the present pact are not in contradiction with any of the interaction. They do not derogate from and cannot be interpreted as derogating from the said international obligations. The high contracting parties undertake not to enter into any international obligations incompatible with the present pact.

Article 5 unfolds the provision that any country of the Arab league or otherwise can become its member provided that it is interested with the peace and security of this region.

Article 6 deals with the establishment of a permanent council at ministerial level to run its functions.

Article 7 deals that the Pact shall remain in force for a period of five years renewable for other five years period.

Article 8 provides that this pact shall be verified by the contracting parties and ratification shall be exchanged at Ankara as soon as possible.

According to the provision of the pact of one or more contracting parties are threatened thereof by the internal dissension
and external aggression, this pact will provide them mutual military assistance. The pact also resolved that Russia should eschew her influence over this region but on the other hand it invited the Soviet Union to visualize the middle East. This was the greatest folly the CENTO committed in its lifetime. Arab vehemently criticized it saying that no other super power than the Arab collective security pact could intervene in the Arabian affairs, devastating the regional peace. It was further visualized that the CENTO had compelled Iraq to be an under-colony of Britain and a part of the British area of influence which was rightly and sarcastically condemned by the President Nasser of Egypt who strictly rejected any foreign help.

Iraq which was proclaimed a republic in the middle of July 1958, renounced military aid on 1st June, 1959 cancelled a supplement agreement signed in 1955 regarding the disposal of surplus military equipments, also the agreement of 1957 under which the US had agreed to provide assistance to the Baghdad pact countries to help establish a telecommunication network. Therefore, Iraq liked to withdraw herself from the entanglements with the US in order to establish international relations on new foundations based on friendship and neutral benefits.

Pakistan, gradually getting disinterested with this kind of pact simultaneously declared her formal withdrawal from the SEATO, although she continued to be a member of the CENTO. The reason as to why Pakistan liked to disengage herself from these pacts, was due to the fact that the military pacts had lost much of their validity. President Ayub Khan puts forth his ideas in his book 'Friends not Master' that the military pacts had isolated Pakistan from the mainstream of Asian nationalism. Though Pakistan had withdrawn, it did not remain totally isolated from other fellow Muslim countries like Iran, Turkey and Afghanistan who had helped her in the Indo-Pak conflicts. There she harmonized her relationship with Iran and Turkey through the Regional co-operation Development (RCW) which according to Pakistan is the only glaring example of developing regional co-operation among developing nations.

The pact has, in fact let loose various powers in the area against each other at the instance of both the big powers USA and the Soviet Union. The whole of middle East Asia resembled a huge chess board for economic and political manoeuvre system matched anywhere else. The complex struggle for post war economic
and political power was nowhere so potentially disrupting as in that part of the world. In the words of J.L. Nehru, the Baghdad Pact, "has already brought disruption, insecurity and discontent in western Asia". He added further, "The Baghdad Pact and the CENTO affect us intimately and in a sense tend to encircle us in two or three direction".

3.14.2 Reactions against CENTO

The first attempt of the western powers to form an anti-Soviet bloc in the middle east can be seen in the Baghdad Pact. Britain was the convener of this pact though at first she did not join it. In 1955 this pact was signed between Turkey and Iraq. It was a treaty of mutual security whereby the two signatories agreed to protect their security by joint measures. Iraq signed this pact in spite of the protest of the Arab league. Later Britain, Pakistan and Persia put their signature to it. Thus by giving military help to the states of the Baghdad Pact as well as by establishing a military base there the western states formed an anti-Soviet bloc in the middle East.

The Anglo-American bloc expected that other Arab countries would subscribe to this pact soon. But instead Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia took a neutral stand. As a reaction to this pact, the British position in Jordan suffered, the relations of the western nations with Egypt deteriorated. The Jewish coalition upon Egypt failed and in consequence of the Anglo-French influence in the middle East greatly suffered. In the words of Acheson, this pact "has given rise to differences and weakness instead of strength and unity. Moreover, it became impossible to put the Baghdad pact into operation against Soviet Russia as well as to hold in check the communist activities in the middle East". Soviet Russia did not fail to avail the opportunity of the reaction of the Arab league as well as of Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia against the Baghdad Pact. In short, the opposition of the Arab countries to the Baghdad Pact helped Russia to consolidate her position in the Middle East on a firm basis.

The continuous spread of Russian influence in the Middle East worried the United States. The entry of the United States into Middle Eastern politics gave rise to terrible rivalry between the two rival blocs in this area. By giving economic help at first and then military help to these countries of this region the United States succeeded in establishing herself there as a strong rival of Russia since then the United States stopped giving economic help to Egypt, Syria and Jordan.
The Baghdad Pact can be said to have failed in its objective. Firstly, in the Middle East this pact did not succeed in forming any kind of military bloc; secondly, it failed to check the infiltration of Russia as well as of the communists into the Middle East; and thirdly most of the Arab states assumed an anti-Western attitude.

Marshal Tito declared, "I consider, the Baghdad Pact does not consider the interests of the people and countries in this part of the world because it disunites them, it constitutes no kind of wall of defence whatever against any one". The pact has contrary to its profession given rise to an element of disruption of the Arab and other states. The present Middle East presents a new centre of world conflict.

However, CENTO like SEATO is tottering to its own feet. The lackadaisical attitude of its members is very much discernible. Pakistan wanted to exploit the issue of the Indo-Pak war, but its dream remained unfulfilled. So, unlike NATO and Warsaw pact, and very much like SEATO the CENTO is facing its own test. As a pact of collective security, the CENTO is a weak arrangement and the 'northern tie' concept is still more a dream than a reality.

3.15 South East Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO)

A search for regionalism in the sphere of security began almost immediately after the Communist victory in China in 1949. In July 1949 Chiang Kai-shek and President Elpidio Quirino of Philippines met at Baguio, called on the far-Eastern countries to organize themselves into Union for the purpose of achieving contain and counteract the common threat; the Communist menace.

In May 1950, the conference at Baguio was held to discuss some economic, social and cultural question. Its scope was so restricted that eventually Nationalist China and South Korea refused to participate and the conference was attended by Australia, Ceylon, India, Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand. The discussions were vague and indecisive and no foundation could be laid down for any permanent organization.

It was towards the end of 1952, that the United States, guided by the consideration of global strategy, took the lead in organizing a defensive coalition in South-East Asia. In the meantime, the French military position in Vietnam had deteriorated and the US decided to negotiate a South-East Asian defence arrangement. Burma, Ceylon, India, and Indonesia declined to associate themselves with the project.
Eight nations (America, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand) sent their representatives to Manila in the Philippines and they concluded the South-East Asian collective Defence Treaty on September 8, 1954. The Treaty is on the same pattern as the ANZUS. It has 11 Articles and it provided for peaceful settlement of disputes, effective self-help and mutual aid for the development of collective capacity to resist armed attack and counter subversive activities and for the strengthening of economic and technical cooperation. Under Article IV each party recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any state or territory which the parties by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes. If no armed attack takes place and there is only a threat to the peace of the area, the Treaty provides for immediate consultations among the signatories. It also provided for the rudiments of a regional organization and established a Council to consider matters concerning the implementation of the Treaty.

The Treaty is supposed to work under the United Nation’s Charter and is open to any other state in a position to further its object. The area covered by the Treaty is the general area of South-East Asia, including also the entire territories of the Asian parties, and the general area of the South-West pacific not including the pacific area north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude. But the parties can, by unanimous agreement, include within the treaty area any territory.

The Treaty is of defensive duration. It was supplemented by an understanding of the United States of America in accordance with which the United States would be bound to take military action only if Communist aggression in the event of other aggression. The Treaty was accompanied by a pacific Charter promising aid to nations in achieving self-government and raising living standards, and restating the nation’s determination to stop any attempt in the treaty area to subvert freedom.

**3.15.1 Implications of the Treaty**

In the first place, none of the signatories was free from the existing military alliances sponsored by the United States since 1947. Britain, France, and USA were members of the NATO; Australia and New Zealand were partners in the ANZUS; Pakistan was a recipient of American military aid under the Mutual Defence Assistance Agreement of 1953; and the Philippines and Thailand were bound with the United States in several military and economic agreements.
Secondly, it was based on the concept of the containment of the Soviet Union and of Communist China and was intended to stop Communism at the line represented by the northern boundaries of Burma, Thailand, Laos, and Vietnam. It was also intended to serve as a reply to the Sino-Soviet challenge to the United States both in Asia and Europe in 1954.

Thirdly, the Treaty was intended to put pressure upon the neutralist countries in South-East Asia to give up sitting on the fence and to make up their minds. It increased the stresses and strains in the Indo-Pakistan relations. Whereas the United States was primarily guided by the desire of halting ‘Communism’, Pakistan while concluding this Treaty had obviously the so-called Indian aggression in mind.

Thus, the United States directly comes on the side of Pakistan in the latter’s conflict with India and to that extent the Treaty disturbs the balance of forces and was regarded by India as the Western attempt to blackmail her and to extent pressure on her to align herself with the Western powers.

Fourthly, although the South-East Asian Treaty contains references to the United Nations, it is hardly consistent with its principles.

Finally, it puts premium on colonialism and adds to the number of satellites. One of the useful contributions of the Geneva conference of 1954 was the loosening of the military blocs, the emergence of China as a power in her own right, for at Geneva the Soviet Union no longer held the centre of the stage and America’s associates were compelled, by sheer survival instinct, to evolve their own independent policies.

The South-East Asian Treaty reversed this process by binding down the minor countries of South Asia to the chariot-wheel of the United States. It sought to declare a kind of Monroe Doctrine unilaterally over the countries of South-East Asia and led to misunderstanding and tension. A major trend of our times has been the rise of the colonial people of Asia and Africa and their determination to Asia. Chou En-lai outlined his plan in the Geneva conference to consider and solve their problems themselves without the patronage of their former masters. The South-East Asian Treaty attempts to reverse even this trend by inviting the colonial powers to decide Asian problems- problems of security and peace. It was for these reasons that India so vehemently opposed it. In the phrase of Nehru, it brought Cold War right at the door of India.

In a sense the Manila Treaty of September 8, 1954 widened the rift, on the one hand, between the USA and India, and on the other, between India and Pakistan. Soon after the US-Pak Military Alliance, the Manila
Treaty followed. India took the stand that the entire context of the Kashmir issue had changed and the offer of plebiscite no longer held good. Hidden passions, jealousies, prejudices, fears and suspicions were aroused and a complete deadlock had reached in the Indo-Pak relations.

From 1955 to 1962, the SEATO functioned, comparatively speaking, quite smoothly, although Pakistan continued to oppose large-scale US economic assistance to India, a country which has spurned all American attempts to enlist India’s co-operation in containing Communism.

Not only trade relations between the two countries improved, but they also entered into a settlement on the boundary question and at one stage, the Pakistan Foreign Minister, Mr. Bhutto, openly stated that if even Pakistan was attacked by India, the largest country of Asia would not remain indifferent to it.

Now, the professed objective of the SEATO was containment of communism. When the Treaty was signed and India lodged a strong protest against it, New Delhi was informed at the highest level that its fear was unfounded and that American military assistance to Pakistan would never be permitted to be used against India. This, of course, might have been the American policy. But with this view, Pakistan never agreed. It was very clear even in 1955 that Pakistan was not so much interested in containment of Communism as it was concerned with mobilizing strength against India. The fact that an important member of the SEATO should seek the countership of the strongest Communist power next only to the USSR, was a clear evidence that the initial objective of the SEATO had been to throw wolves as far as Pakistan is concerned. All this naturally put the SEATO to a terrible strain. When the fifth meeting of the SEATO Council of Ministers was held in Paris in April 1963, most of the ministers emphasized that the Chinese aggression against India should serve as a warning to all countries of South-East Asia.

This development has led to a certain degree of looseness within the camp of the SEATO. In the opinion of some observers this Alliance has lost its raison d’être in as much as it was conceived as an instrument against Communism. The fact that Pakistan is now a close associate of Communist China has created serious misgivings among the Western powers; Washington’s response, however, has not been to withdraw help and assistance from Pakistan but to humour Pakistan’s rulers still more. In his message to the Congress early in 1967 President Johnson rated Pakistan as a better and more qualified applicant for America.

Another reaction of the United States has been to exert more pressure on India to settle with Pakistan all its outstanding issues, especially Kashmir. The US policy thus appears to be that Pakistan has
nothing in common with China basically and fundamentally that Pakistan, if satisfied on Kashmir, will be more amenable to the US pressures than India, and that Pakistan would be a more dependable ally within the framework of their global strategy against the USSR.

3.16 The Association of the South East Asian Nations (ASEAN)

The term South East Asia is used to describe the countries which lies between India, China, Australia and the open expanses of the Pacific Ocean. Diverse by race, religion and wealth they had before the Second World War a nearly common feature: with the solitary exception of Thailand all were ruled by foreigners. The British, French, and Dutch had appropriated varying amounts of it. This state of affairs was viewed with dissatisfaction within the region expanded into the Great East Asia Co-prosperity Scheme under the direction of a special ministry. When war brought the Japanese to South East Asia, they came as anti-imperialists and Pre-nationalistic liberations, promising to remove European control in the east. Three days after the attack on Pearl Harbour the Japanese sank the British Warships "Prince of Wales and Repulse" (10 December 1941); Singapore fell in February, 1942 and corridor in May 1942 and Western dominance got finished.

The strategic importance of South East Asia cannot be overemphasized. It provides the passage way from the Pacific to the Indian ocean and is the stepping stone between Asia and Australia. If this area goes completely under the influence of any one power it is bound to create imbalance in Asia. This area also provides important strategic material. Thailand, Burma and Indo-China have been considered for long as the rice-bowl of Asia. Malaya and Indonesia account for 90 percent of world’s natural rubber and 60 percent of tin.

The South East Asia includes Burma (now Myanmar), Thailand, Laos, Cambodia, Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia, Singapore, and the Philippines. It is inhabited by over 192 million people. Peasant families and village communities are the mainstay of the population. Among the newly independent states in South East Asia, Burma, Indonesia and Malaysia, the Philippines follow a neutral policy. Singapore and Thailand are pro-western and the rest are pro-communist in their alignment.

The birth of nationalism in this area is a product of western domination that caused the destruction of imperialism. The birth of
nationalist movement, in the post-World War II era resulted in the liberation of these countries from foreign domination. In fact, it is the struggle against foreign rule that strengthened the forces of nationalism in South-East Asia. Another factor which influenced South East Asia deeply was the October Revolution of Russia. In most of the countries of South East Asia the Russian Revolution had a tremendous influence. In many parts of this vast region communist has been married security with nationalism. The consequence of such an alliance has been disastrous for the west. The rise of communist China produced far-reaching consequences on the politics of South East Asia. The existence of 15 billion Chinese people in this area provided a likely source of friction in South East Asian politics.

A search for regionalism in the sphere of security began almost immediately after the communist victory in China in 1949. In July 1949 Chiang Kai-shek and president Quirino of the Philippines met at Baguio and pointing to the communist menace, called on the far-eastern countries to organize themselves into a Union for the purpose of achieving solidarity and mutual assistance to contain and counteract the common threat. Except Syngman Rhee, nobody supported this call and even the US was lukewarm. But Quirino went ahead with his plan and in order to induce some Asian powers to join the proposed gathering, he even modified it in some important respect so that communism and military cooperation were entirely excluded from its range. In May 1950 the conference met at Baguio to discuss some economic, social and cultural questions. Its scope was so restricted that eventually China and South Korea refused to participate and the conference was attended by Australia, Sri Lanka, India, Indonesia, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand. The discussions were verbal and indecisive and no foundation could be laid for any permanent organization. However, eight nations (America, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines and Thailand) sent their representative to Manila (Philippines) and they concluded the South East Asian Collective Defence Treaty on September 8, 1954. The treaty was on the same pattern as the ANZUS.

The association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) was formed on 8 August 1967 with the signing of the Bangkok Declaration by the Foreign ministers of Indonesia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand and Malaysia. Brunei became the sixth member of the ASEAN joining on January 7, 1984. The ASEAN was started with a view to help the growth of economic progress, foster cooperation, promote social progress and cultural development and ensure peace and stability in the
The headquarters of the central secretariat of the ASEAN is located at Jakarta. The post of the Secretary-General of the organization rotate among the member states every two years in alphabetical order and the officials remain in their post for three years.

The aim of ASEAN is to promote socio-economic and cultural growth of the region, to promote collaboration in matters of common interests to encourage trade, tourism, technological development and research through mutual cooperation, and to gain international as well as regional help in these matters.

From 1971 the member countries of the ASEAN have advocated, at least in public, the ideal of a Zone of Peace, Freedom and Neutrality in South East Asia (ZOPFAN). ASEAN’s response to the changes in the region has not laid much in military terms as in development efforts. Its members, of course, cooperate in defence and are on the whole, amongst the clients of US but ASEAN has held back from any military alliance. The 1973-74 OPEC oil price rise and the wage of worldwide inflation and recession which followed, had a social impact on the ASEAN economies. The communist victory in Vietnam in 1975 added urgency to their need for cooperation.

At their first meeting at Bali, in 1976, the ASEAN heads of government sought to demonstrate political solidarity and economic cooperation as principal elements in the concept of regionalism. They agreed to establish large scale regional industrial plants, preferential trading arrangements and measures to promote trade. They also agreed to assist one another in supplying basic commodities, particularly food and energy, and jointly to improve markets outside ASEAN by reducing barriers to trade and by developing joint approaches to international commodity problems. Accordingly, they revised the organizational structure of the ASEAN.

In August 1977, at their second summit held in Kuala Lumpur (capital of Malaysia), they made joint approaches to its external trading partners by meeting separately with the Prime ministers of Australia, Japan and New Zealand. In 1974-82, they opened "dialogue" relationships with Australia, the European Economic Community (EEC), Japan, New Zealand, Canada and USA. Over the years, the ASEAN has steadily gained international recognition as an important regional entity, prepared to take a united stand on economic issues as well as on political questions such as Kampuchea. On June 18, 1981 the ASEAN urged the UNO to dispatch a UN peace - keeping force; the withdrawal of all foreign armed forces
under the supervision of the UN force; and the disarming of all Khmer factions immediately after the troop withdrawal from Kampuchea. In September 1981, India and 13 other countries moved the General Assembly to unseat the Pol Pot regime but the move failed.

In 1983-84 the ASEAN and its five regional dialogue partners agreed to embark on a new pacific economic cooperative venture, initially through the launching of a full scale human resources development program. In June 1983 Burma again declined to be a member of the ASEAN because in its view, it was “visibly political”. On the contrary Sri Lanka also failed to secure admission into it despite earnest efforts. Meanwhile, the ASEAN members seriously discussed in September 1983 about a mutual defence pact. They decided to drop this for the time being but in February March 1984 all of them decided to revamp their air forces with US hardware. This was a move inspired by the Pentagon.

In 1990-91, most of the ASEAN members were engaged in major arms acquisition programs, involving the modernization and enhancement of air and maritime capabilities. They justified these programs as essential to keep their armed forces up to date with advanced military technology, to maintain regional stability, compensate for a decline in the presence of the US military forces, and to discourage regional powers like China, Japan and India from becoming more assertive. Both the Indonesian and Singaporean armies were equipped with the French arms or the US Harpoon anti-ship missiles which can give a small, fast attack craft a destructive capability comparable to a world war II cruiser. They also had F-16 squadrons in service. Thailand’s 7800 ton helicopter carrier was the first of its kind ordered by a regional navy. Malaysia acquired arms for two of its four frigates and its eight missile portal craft. By 1992, they acquired 28 British-made Hawk Light Attack Aircraft and two Missile-Armed Corvettes.

Hence, the Association of South East Asian Nations is a kind of regional alliance signed by Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Burma dedicated to the cause of security and integration of the South Asia. It aimed at eradicating of poverty from the region, promoting social progress and economic development and maintaining socio-cultural harmony among the member states. In order to bring about political stability in the region the ASEAN raised its voice and sought peace in Vietnam and Kampuchea. So, the role of the ASEAN in South East Asian politics seems unparallel.
3.17 South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC)

Taking the issue of the constant conflicts among the countries of the South Asia, scholars were quite pessimistic of cooperation between them. When France and England, which have been the traditional rivals for centuries together, could engage themselves in regional cooperation in terms of European Economic Committee (EEC), countries of the South Asia were hopeful of such cooperation. The growing rivalry between U.S.A. and Soviet Union, and Soviet Union and China encouraged the outside powers to intervene in the affairs of South Asia. The countries of the region, in due course, realized that they must cooperate with each other to prevent interference by outside powers. Moreover, they were economically too backward and thought of improving their bargaining powers vis-à-vis the developed countries provided they attained self-reliance through mutual cooperation. These were some of the reasons why the countries of the region went for negotiating with each other and hence an association among them could be felt necessary.

3.17.1 First SAARC Summit (Dhaka, 1985)

On 7-8 December, 1985 the heads of states and governments of seven South Asian countries, viz., Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka held a summit meeting in Dhaka. After few deliberations they unanimously decided to set up a Secretariat and adopted a Charter and a Declaration for the creation of South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC). The Charter had 10 articles and a preamble which contained pious platitudes about their desire for peace, amity, stability, progress and cooperation, an illustration of the realistic maxim that the road to hell is paved with good intentions. The Declaration states the objective of association as promotion of welfare of people; improvement in the quality of the life of people; acceleration of economic growth; promotion of collective self-reliance; promotion of mutual trust and understanding; promotion of collaboration in economic, social, cultural, technical and scientific fields; strengthening of cooperation with other developing countries and themselves besides cooperation with regional and international organizations with similar objectives.

Such kind of cooperation amongst the members was to base on respect for principles of sovereignty, equality, territorial integrity, political independence, non-interference in internal affairs of other states and mutual benefit. It was further agreed that cooperation among the member states should not be a substitute for bilateral and inconsistent with
bilateral and multilateral obligations. Article 3 to 7 listed the various agencies such as the meetings of Heads of State or Government, Foreign Ministers, Standing Committees, Technical Committees, Action Committees of Standing Committees, Secretariat, and financial arrangements. All these provisions are given a decent burial by the last article (X) which decrees that decisions shall be taken unanimously, so that each member has a veto. It also insists that bilateral and contentious issues shall be excluded from the formal discussion of the SAARC. In other words, this Association cannot take up issues for which alone such Associations must be set up.

The formation of SAARC was welcomed and a hope was expressed that it would contribute to the economic development of the region as a whole regardless of the size and geographical location of individual countries. Though SAARC is the youngest of the regional groupings, it is bigger in terms of number of people it represents (it represents over one billion people).

The formation of SAARC evoked mixed reaction. While the King of Bhutan described it as a manifestation of the collective wisdom and political will to bring about meaningful regional cooperation in spite of the differences on foreign policy and security perspectives, the President Zia-ul-Haq of Pakistan apprehended of the dominant position of India to deter the fulfillment of the objectives and ideals of SAARC. Despite such misgivings it cannot be denied that the formation of SAARC was a significant step forward because it could stimulate regional cooperation through collective approach and action. No doubt, the seven countries had different political systems, ideologies and links, but they were also beset with identical problems of growth and development which encouraged them to cooperate with each other and evolve a common approach for development.

3.17.2 Second SAARC Summit (Bangalore, 1986)

The Second Summit of SAARC was held at Bangalore on November 16-17, 1986 where the member-countries institutionalized the SAARC by establishing a permanent secretariat to coordinate the implementation of the SAARC programme. They also called for an offensive drug abuse, and expressed their concern over lack of progress towards disarmament. The Summit agreed in principle to extend cooperation among members in five additional fields, viz., launching of South Asian Broadcasting Programme covering both radio and television; promotion of tourism; provisions of facilities to students and academicians; and harnessing of idealism of
youth. It also decided to set up technical committees on women’s participation in the development activities. Above all, the Summit called upon the member states not to allow their territories to be used for terrorist activities against another state.

3.17.3 Third SAARC Summit (Kathmandu, 1987)

The Third Summit which was held in Kathmandu on November 2, 1987 greatly strengthened the process of consolidation of the gains of SAARC. The leaders here called for increasingly orienting SAARC to the people’s needs and aspirations so that the people of the region are drawn into the mainstream of its activities and contribute to its peace, friendship and cooperation in the area. They too expressed concern over structural disequilibrium in the world economy and emphasized the urgent need for resumption of North-South dialogue. They called for equitable participation of the developing countries in the international trading and economic system; and urged the developing countries to liberalize multilateral trading and to lower protectionist barriers. Apart from political issues they also stressed importance on preventing and eliminating terrorism drug trafficking in the region.

3.17.4 Fourth SAARC Summit (Islamabad, 1988)

The Fourth Summit was held in Islamabad on December 29-31, 1988 where once again the members expressed their pious intention to promote unity and understanding in South Asia, pledging themselves to take active steps to stamp out the menace of terrorism and drugs and draw up a regional perspective plan. It adopted 1990 as the year of the Girl Child. It proposed a regional economic plan which remained only on paper. They only agreed to prohibit attacks against their nuclear installations and facilities. The Islamabad Summit was remarkable in many ways. It provided a new impetus to SAARC by initiating a number of action-oriented plans with far-reaching consequences for the quality of the people of South Asia. It also encouraged the member states to re-orient their foreign policies in order to inject positive bilateralism. The signing of three important agreements between India and Pakistan bears ample testimony to this.

3.17.5 Fifth SAARC Summit (Male, 1990)

In 1989 no summit could be held and it was only on November 21-23, 1990 that they met in Male (Maldives) for the Fifth Summit. The Declaration made at Male proposed the creation of a fund for regional
projects and exchange of expertise in genetic conservation and maintenance of a germplasm bank. It signed a Convention on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances to deal effectively with the menace of drug abuse and suppression of illicit traffic in the region. The leaders agreed to initiate steps for launching Joint Ventures in cottage industries and handicrafts to ‘set the stage for promoting collective self-reliance in the region’. It directed the ministers to prepare a strategy for mobilizing regional resources which would strengthen individual and collective self-reliance in the region. It also noted inherent relationship between disarmament and development and stressed the need for early conclusion of a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. The new SAARC Chairman, M. A. Gayoom took the stand of a more informal setting to be created at the SAARC meetings to facilitate bilateral discussions.

3.17.6 Sixth SAARC Summit (Colombo, 1991)

The Sixth Summit was scheduled to take place in Colombo on 7 November, 1991. However, the summit had to be postponed the member states failed to reach at a consensus whether the same could be held without the King of Bhutan who had expressed his inability to attend the summit due to his sensitive domestic security situation. Noteworthy to mention that for the first time the SAARC summit was cancelled after pre-summit discussions had taken place. Despite the summit being cancelled, the Prime Ministers of Pakistan and Bangladesh reached Colombo and had a mini-summit with the Presidents of Sri Lanka and Maldives. On December 21, 1991 for one day the seven leaders of SAARC met at Colombo whereby they agreed to liberalise trade in the region and gave a call for greater cooperation and interaction among member states to combat terrorism in the region.

3.17.7 Seventh SAARC Summit (Dhaka, 1993)

The Seventh Summit was held in Dhaka on April 10-11, 1993 after being postponed twice in December 1992 and January 1993 due to aftereffects in Bangladesh of demolition issue of Babri Masjid at Ayodhya. The Summit endorsed the South Asian Preferential Trade Agreement (SAPTA) for the liberalization of trade among the seven member-nations of the Association. It emphasized upon larger activities to speed up economic, social and cultural cooperation in the SAARC regions. It also endorsed an Integrated Programme of Action (IPA) on eradication of poverty in South Asia, trade, manufacture and services, the environment, population, shelter, children, youth, disabled persons, women development, science and technology, terrorism, and drug trafficking, etc.
3.17.8 Eighth SAARC Summit (New Delhi, 1995)

The Eighth SAARC Summit held in New Delhi on May 2-4, 1995 agreed to operationalise SAPTA by 8 December 1995. It decided to establish a South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA) to promote intra-regional trade and designate 1995 as the ‘SAARC Year of Poverty Eradication’. The member states were asked to implement both the SAARC Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism and the 1993 SAARC Convention on Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances. The member states committed themselves to the global objective of shelter for all by 2000 A.D. It also stressed on international cooperation for building up national capabilities, transfer of technology and promotion of multilateral projects and research efforts in minimizing natural disasters; urged on negotiating an international convention barring the use of threat of use of nuclear weapons; and reiterated to strengthen the UN as the central instrument of peace, security and disarmament.

3.17.9 Ninth SAARC Summit (Male, 1997)

The Ninth Summit was held in Male on May 12-14, 1997 whereby the member states unanimously agreed to transform their region into a free-trade area by 2001 (instead of 2005, as earlier agreed) by removing all the trade barriers and structural impediments. The Summit asserted the sub-regional cooperation to gain further extension, instead of being abandoned. The members agreed to hold informal political consultations to reduce tension and asserted to combat terrorism. They also resolved to counter poverty in the region to foresee development.

3.17.10 Tenth SAARC Summit (Colombo, 1998)

The Tenth Summit was convened in Colombo on July 29-31, 1998. The heads of governments reiterated to promote mutual trust and understanding for solving bilateral and multilateral problems. They were hell-bent on accelerating process for concluding SAPTA. The summit also included extension of tariff concessions to products actively traded in the region; coordination of SAARC position before the WTO; and encouragement of sub-regional cooperation. Moreover, on the issue of nuclear weapons the summit criticized major nuclear powers for maintaining huge arsenals of nuclear weapons and urged the Geneva based Conference on Disarmament to start negotiations for prohibiting the use of such arsenals.
3.17.11 Eleventh SAARC Summit (Kathmandu, 2002)

The Eleventh Summit, which was initially scheduled to be held in November 1999, got postponed due to military takeover in Pakistan in October, 1999. Prior to that the 21st Meeting of the SAARC Foreign Ministers had already been held at Nuwara Eliya, a hill station of Sri Lanka on March 19, 1999 which had discussed wide range of common issues like the steps leading to SAFTA and vital development and social issues concerning the region. The conference also discussed and finalized the agenda for the next SAARC Summit to be held in Kathmandu.

Finally, the Eleventh Summit was held on January 4-6, 2002 in Kathmandu and reiterated its support to the UN Security Council Resolution on the issue of September 11, 2001 attacks in United States. The members emphasized upon international cooperation to fight terrorism in conformity with the UN Charter, international law and relevant international convention. The members agreed to take speedy steps to suppress the financing of terrorists, eliminate the supply of weapons to terrorists, halt cynical abuse of refuge and asylum status, and enact domestic legislation to deal with extensive international terrorist networks. It also emphasized the need of regional cooperation in the economic field to move quickly towards a South Asian Free Trade Area (SAFTA). Apart from this some other issues like poverty alleviation, cooperation in social and cultural sectors, women and children education, and international political and economic environment.

Other subsequent summits, 12th (Islamabad, January 2004), 13th (Dhaka, November 2005), 14th (New Delhi, April 2007), 15th (Colombo, August 2008), 16th (Thimpu, April 2010), and 17th (Male, November 2011) have focused on increasing political and economic cooperation among the member nations with Afghanistan inducted as the eighth SAARC members in the 14th Summit. Variety of other issues like strengthening of SAFTA; alleviation of poverty; food security and operationalisation of a SAARC Food Bank; agreement on Natural Disaster Rapid Response Mechanism; Multilateral Arrangement on Recognition of Conformity Assessment; Implementation of Regional Standards; and Seed Bank; liaising with various international forums like the UNCTAD, Non-Aligned Movement, the Group of 77; etc. have been given priorities to stabilize the South Asian region.
Achievements

The growth and progress of the SAARC through the years since its inception has been very challenging. To moot its objectives in South Asian region with its myriads socio-economic, political issues and lay down suggestions for their healthy discussions so as to reach an amicable conclusion has been an uphill task for the association. Terrorism has proved to be a challenging job for all the nations of the region to deal with. Despite policies and principles laid down by the SAARC in almost all its annual conferences, the problems have not been properly addressed. The unfavourable political climate, disparity in the regional resources, imbalanced economy, lack of confidence and interdependence, inadequacy in transport and communication, bilateral wrangles and institutional and procedural shortcomings have deprived the association from time to time of achieving its objectives.

But it cannot be said that SAARC is stripped of its success. It has tried consistently to bring about cooperation in a wide variety of areas. Its policies have encouraged both government and non-government organizations (NGOs) to promote mutual understandings among member nations. It has promoted people to people contacts through Audio-Visual Exchange (SAVE) to implement its policies down the beneficiaries. The SAARC Agricultural Information Centre (SAIC) at Dhaka promotes cooperation in the field of agriculture. Equally not out of place to mention about other institutional achievements like that of the Meteorological Research Centre and the Institute of Rural Technology and Regional Software Centre in this regard. Several projects have been carried out and several others are in the offing to cooperate for prevention and reduction of natural disasters, improvement of environment, impact on the region of the green house effect, and establishment of Centre of Human Resource Development, etc.

Other such achievements of SAARC include establishment of SAARC Food Security Reserve; Agreement and Ratification of Regional Convention on Suppression of Terrorism, including the provision for extradition; Agreement on SAARC Travel Document, enabling members of Parliament and Judges of Supreme Court and their families to travel freely within the region without the requirement of visa; Agreement on a draft on regional convention on prevention of narcotics and psychotropic substances. It is to be seen how far the SAARC leads all such agreements to their logical conclusion despite being teething problems faced.
Major areas of discord still exist among the member nations. There is tension between India and Pakistan over Kashmir, Siachen, Wular barrage and arms race (both nuclear and conventional). India and Bangladesh also do not go cordial over the issue of illegal Bangladeshi migration, safe havens in Bangladesh for the north-east insurgent groups, Farakka issue, dispute over New Moore Island and Teen Bigha Corridor, and other disputes over maritime and land boundaries. Relations between Nepal and India are also strained over trade and transit facilities, presence of Indian immigrants in Nepal’s Terrai region, and illegal Nepali immigrants in India. Even Indo-Sri Lanka strained relations persist over the Tamilian issue. So is the relation between Bhutan and Nepal over the Bhutani issue. All such issues are to be addressed due on time by the SAARC, otherwise the very purpose of construction of SAARC is at stake.

3.18 Let Us Sum Up

The partition of Europe after the Second World War was the consequence of an accident. Europe was a continent which had functioned in the form of comparatively small and strong entities, capable of maintaining separate existence because of the principles of self-determination and industrial development. In initial stages after 1945 the Soviet Union created effective and unified Communist Government in practically all the East European countries. It accelerated the process of industrialization, social change and political consciousness which had developed only feebly in the inter-war period. After 1954, the East European countries could no more be described as satellite states of USSR. There remained certain sources of tension between the USSR and East European states. While immediately after 1945 the various communist powers in East European countries were rather immature in the exercise of political power and also lacked public support and were, for that reason, uncertain about their future. Gradually they acquired maturity, developed confidence and, therefore, a degree of self assertiveness.

Among those various regional organizations the NATO and Warsaw Pact are known to be two parallel military pacts which went on acquiring more and more sophisticated weapons. While NATO was the military arsenal of the western capitalistic world, established under US patronage to frustrate the communist expansion, the Warsaw Pact set up a counter military fortress of the monolithic communist world under USSR to meet any threat from NATO. Thus the world came to be balanced in the era of cold war. The formation of the Warsaw pact acted as a 'safety valve’ for the militarism of NATO and reminded the world statesmen about the formation of the Triple Alliance vis-a-vis Triple Entente.
While after the Second World War the USSR searched for a window to Europe and kept the Eastern Europe under its control, Yugoslavia proved to be something different under Marshal Tito and desired to become a socialist state on its own right. It marched with its own strength without becoming a puppet of USSR and became nonaligned, finally a socialist in collaboration with Nehru’s India and Nasser’s Egypt. And in this context, the role played by Tito, the Yugoslavian hero, an anti-Stalinist, but a socialist is beyond any question. Yugoslavia opposed the USSR from the very beginning and it continued to prove it despite challenges. Both Hungary and Czechoslovakia could not resist themselves and hence faced the onslaughts in 1956 and 1968 respectively.

Gorbachev’s programmes of perestroika and glasnost produced radical unforeseen effects that brought his system down. As a means of reviving the Soviet, Gorbachev repeatedly attempted to build a coalition of political leaders supportive of reform and created new arenas and bases of power. He also made it possible for nationalist, orthodox communist and populist forces to oppose his attempts. Although some of the new movements aspired to replace the Soviet system altogether with a liberal democratic one, others demanded independence for the national republics. Still others insisted on the restoration of the old Soviet ways. Ultimately, Gorbachev could not forge a compromise among these forces and the consequence was the collapse of the Soviet Union. Despite the similarities of his policies to Khrushchev’s revisionism (Gorbachev was actually more revisionist than Khrushchev), Gorbachev was adamant in declaring himself to be a true Communist. The USSR collapsed in 1991. With it, there started the disintegration of the socialist bloc and end of the cold war. The world now exhibited the politics of a unipolar world with the US as the only super power.

Globalisation has encouraged and expanded people-to-people socio-economic cultural relations among all the peoples of the world. Several scholars hold that globalisation has essentially limited the concept of state sovereignty. Opinions and counter-opinions are still in the offing as regards the merits and demerits of globalisation. However, under globalisation the state continues to be sovereign state and its sovereignty continues to be comprehensive, permanent and absolute. The new needs for global level economic and trade integration, protection of environment, protection and security of all human rights, the need to collectively fight the menace of international terrorism and the need to fight a collective war against poverty, hunger, disease and under-development have changed the role of state in the 21st century. It does not, however, mean
either the end of sovereignty or a serious limitation on the sovereignty of state.

Regional organization or regional security is not new. What is new is the stress that has come to be laid on it in recent years. A world divided into blocs is a world living under the shadow of war “bigger and bitterer” wars. There is very little that the smaller states can ultimately do to save the situation, even though they may be regarded as "active and vital agents of world politics". Power today, therefore, is not simply national power; it is group power that has been institutionalized. That explains the importance of these alliances both during cold war and after that. It is often complained that the regional organizations framed for collective security have undermined the UNO. However, the argument that these treaties run counter to the principles and aims of the UN cannot be accepted. If self-defence against an armed attack is permitted by the UN Charter, the treaties having the same effect have to be tolerated. Hence, in this respect the role of the CENTO, SEATO, ASEAN and SAARC stands unparalleled.

3.19 Key Words

Acrimony: Bitterness.

Admonition: Warning.

Alacrity: Eagerness/Promptness.

Anachronism: A person or a thing that is chronologically out of place; esp: one from a former age that is irrelevant in the present.

Apostasy: Renunciation of a religious faith.

Cassandra: One that predicts misfortune or disaster.

Catechism: A summary of religious doctrine often in the form of questions and answers.

Circumspection: Careful to consider all circumstances and possible consequences.

Civilities: Civilized conduct.
Enculturation: The process by which an individual learns the traditional content of a culture and assimilates its practices and values.

fait accompli: Accomplished fact.

KGB: Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (Russian), Committee for State Security (English)- A foreign intelligence and domestic security agency of the Soviet Union.

Obduracy: Inflexibility/Obstinacy.

OMON: Otryad Mobilniy Osobogo Naznacheniya, (Special Purpose Mobile Unit) is a generic name for the system of special units of Politsiya (police) within the Russian and earlier the Soviet MVD (Ministry of Internal Affairs) originated in 1979.

Ostracism: Exclusion/Isolation.

Petofi Circle: (after the name of the Hungarian poet and patriot Alexender Petofi, 1823-49).

Presidium: A nongovernmental executive committee.

Purge: Clean/Remove.

Rhetoric: Expression/Idiom.

Roost: Sleep/Perch.

Spetsnaz Alpha Group: A group of the Russian military special forces under the Russian Intelligence Agency, KGB.

Stagflation: Persistent inflation combined with stagnant consumer demand and relatively high unemployment.

Surrogate: Substitute/Proxy.

*******
Unit – IV- International Affairs, 1945-80

Structure

4.0 Objectives

4.1 Introduction

4.2 Asia in World Affairs

4.3 Arab-Israeli Conflict (1948-1978)
   4.3.1 Conflict of 1948
   4.3.2 Conflict of 1956
   4.3.3 War of June 1967
   4.3.4 The War and the UN Charter
   4.3.5 US Plan of 1970
   4.3.6 War of October 1973
   4.3.7 Peace Treaty of 1979

4.4 The Palestine Problem and the PLO
   4.4.1 Camp David Accord (1979)
   4.4.2 Oslo Accords (1993)
   4.4.3 Camp David Summit (2000)
   4.4.4 Taba Summit (2001)
   4.4.5 Road Map for Peace
   4.4.6 Present Status

4.5 The Iranian Revolution, 1978-79
   4.5.1 Consequences

4.6 India in World Affairs

4.7 Indo-Pak Relations

4.8 Sino-Indian Relations

4.9 Indo-US Relations

4.10 Indo-Soviet Relations

4.11 India and Non-Alignment
   4.11.1 Non-alignment and National Interest
   4.11.2 Non-alignment and Neutrality
   4.11.3 Development of Policy of Non-alignment
4.12 South East Asia in World Affairs

4.13 The Bandung Conference – 1955

4.13.1 Emergence of Asian Consciousness
4.13.2 Purpose of the Conference
4.13.3 Issues Discussed and Decisions Pledged

4.14 The Vietnam War

4.14.2 The Vietnam Crisis, 1964
4.14.3 The US Stand

4.15 The Kampuchean Problem

4.15.1 First administration of Sihanouk
4.15.2 The Khmer Republic and the War
4.15.3 Democratic Kampuchea (the Khmer Rouge/ Red Khmer)
4.15.4 People’s Republic of Kampuchea
4.15.5 Modern Cambodia

4.16 Sino–Vietnam Conflict, 1979

4.16.1 Background of Sino-Soviet Dispute
4.16.2 Sino-Soviet Border Conflict
4.16.3 Sino-Soviet Relation and Vietnam in 1979
4.16.4 The 1979 Sino-Vietnam War

4.17 Let Us Sum Up

4.18 Key Words
4.0 Objectives

This Unit is on Asia and Southeast Asia getting involved in the post Second World War world affairs. Role of India in the same situation is also dealt. After going through this unit you will be able to learn:

- how a conflict arose between Israel and the Arab world in 1948 on Palestinian issue which disturbed peace in the West Asia;
- about the Palestine Problem vis-a-vis the role played by Palestine Liberation Organisation fighting for the cause of an independent Palestine state;
- about the Iranian Revolution of 1978-79;
- how India developed her own principles of foreign policy in the post World War II era and how she dealt with post war Pakistan, China, the USA and the USSR;
- about the Bandung Conference of 1955 opening new chapter in the foreign policies of the Southeast Asian countries; and
- about the Vietnam war, Kampuchean problem and the Sino-Vietnam conflict disturbing peace in the Southeast Asian zone.

4.1 Introduction

In the sphere of international relations the Asian countries have focused on the principle of peaceful coexistence and cooperation for their resources to be utilised for the national reconstruction and development plans. The rise of Asia also gave a deathblow to imperialism and racialism. The independence of some of the countries in Asia set the ball rolling for grant of independence to other colonial countries and thus put an end to the imperialist tradition. Oil was the source of attraction for the powers of the world. Persistent hostility between the Arabs and the Jews taking the Palestinian issue into consideration in the post Second World War era put the region into a deadlock. The Iranian Revolution of 1978-79 created a seismic tremor in the Middle East especially in the Islamic Republic of Iran signing the death warrant of autocracy of Shah and bringing an end to the Pahlavi dynasty. Originally the Iranian Revolution was a mass movement against a system which was autocratic, undemocratic, and subservient and stooge to the foreign control.

The independence of India marked the introduction of a new epoch in the struggle for liberation of colonial countries in Asia and Africa from foreign domination. The colonial countries in Asia and Africa on the basis
of the experience of India as well as other liberated countries realised that uncompromising struggle for national liberation and independence was the only road to emancipation. In the post World War II time India in her external relations has defined certain moral principles and political precepts. The main guiding principles of India's foreign policy are the achievements of world peace through independence of thought and action, *Panchsheel* and non-alignment opposition to colonialism and racialism and the need for peaceful coexistence. The same principles could be exhibited in case of her foreign policy with Pakistan, China, the USA and the Soviet Union.

Southeast Asia played no significant role in establishing its importance in the post second world war world politics. The Bandung Conference of 1955 held in Indonesia proved to be an eye-opener in this regard asking for promoting goodwill and cooperation among the nations of Asia despite experiencing strains in the social, economic and cultural spheres. Vietnam was the most important component of the French Indo-China Empire. During World War II, the French authority in Indo-China received a serious blow as a result of her humiliating defeat in Europe. In the meanwhile, a nationalist liberation movement started in Vietnam. In 1941 Ho Chi Minh, the veteran communist leader called a congress of Vietnamese nationalist from which the league for the Independence of Vietnam emerged. The state of Kampuchea was established as a French protectorate in 1863 at the request of King Ang Duong. In early 1940’s, the Japanese were in control of it. Following the Japanese surrender after World War II, Cambodia was recognized as an autonomous kingdom within the French Union with Norodom Sihanouk as the king. The Sino-Soviet conflict of 1979 also tried to disturb the peace in the Southeast Asian region.

### 4.2 Asia in World Affairs

Asia which holds more than fifty percent of the world population and covers approximately thirty percent of the earth surface, till the dawn of the present century was under western domination. This domination in the words of K. M. Panikkar took the form of "the dominance of maritime power over the land masses of Asia: the imposition of a commercial economy over communities whose economic life in the past had been based not on international trade, but mainly on agricultural production and international trade and the domination of the people of Europe who held the mastery of these as over the affairs of Asia".

With the turn of the century the Asian countries started aspiring for independence from foreign yoke. The First World War and the Russian
Revolutions had profound effect on Asia. The First World War upset the old equilibrium and the western powers in general and Great Britain in particular began to lose their dominant position on the world stage. The growing national consciousness of the Asian people also contributed to this. The Russian revolution also had profound impact on the Asian minds. After the World War II most of the countries of Asia gained independence and the vast empires held by Britain, France and the Netherlands were gone. The emergence of Asia in the mid-twentieth century became a major training point in the contemporary history. This development according to Prof. Jan Romein implied that Asian revolution had been accomplished and western domination was no longer feasible. Thus after centuries of impotence Asia at least started governing itself.

But Asia was not merely satisfied with political liberation. Soon it embarked on two other revolutions and the economic and social fields. In the economic sphere the Asian countries started the work of economic reconstruction with a view to strengthen the base of political independence. Countries like India, Burma and Sri Lanka adopted economic plans based on socialist ideology and are moving in the direction of extensive public investment on public sector. On the other hand, countries like Japan, Formosa, the Philippines and Pakistan have not been very active in planned economy. But even these countries have been deeply concerned about the economic development and growth.

In the sphere of international relations these countries have followed the policy of peaceful coexistence. This policy was imperative in view of the fact that they wanted to concentrate their resources for the national reconstruction and development plans. They were convinced that too much of attention on defence and security questions certainly leads to diversion of attention from development. In other words, they held faith in the policy of international peace and cooperation in the international sphere.

This attitude of the Asian countries has gone a long way in consolidating the forces of peace and stability in the world. The Asian countries also have great interest in preserving the international organisation because they can hope to gain immensely from the socio-economic and welfare activities of this organisation. Therefore, the Asian countries have proved to be the greatest supporters of the UN.

The rise of Asia also gave a deathblow to imperialism and racialism. The independence of some of the countries in Asia set the ball rolling for grant of independence to other colonial countries and thus put an end to the imperialist tradition. This inevitably gave a setback to the feeling of
racialism. Though the colonial powers were opposed to any outside interference in the racial matters on the plea that the matter fell within their domestic jurisdiction, the Asian countries through their persistent fight against racialism at the UN forums created an anti-racial feeling.

Another impact of the emergence of Asian countries is the growth of Pan-Asian movements. The common interests of the countries of Asia brought these countries together and a number of Asian Conferences were held. Two such conferences were held at New Delhi in 1947 and 1949. This was followed by conferences at Cairo and Bandung. The Bandung Conference in the words of Prof. Jan Romein, "marked the end of an era, the era of European ascendancy in Asia. Bandung formally rang out the old Asia and ushered in the new”.

But this feeling of Asianism did not last long. Soon the frontier problems and diverse national interests of the countries of Asia gave it a setback. This feeling of Asianism was further weakened by the politics of the two Great Powers and the alliances treated in this region. The two Super Powers (USA and Soviet Union) tried to win the favour of the Asian countries because they are a vital element in the international power, political and ideological struggle. The emergency of Asian countries also narrowed down the field of exploitation. Their independence not only deprived the imperialist powers of the areas which they had exploited for long, but also encouraged these states to cooperate with each other in the solution of their mutual problems and to work for their quicker development.

At the international level also the emergence of Asian countries produced far-reaching changes. The appearance of such a large number of independent states on the arena of international politics compelled both the Super Powers to seek their support. This was an evil in so far as it created new sources of tension and competition in the international relations, but this has nonetheless exploited the Afro-Asian countries to get the best from both the blocs. Prof. Vernon has noted the following evil effects of the emergence of Asian countries on international relations. “This striking increase obviously complicates international relations. It creates not only substantive problems but organisational difficulties for all the foreign office of the world. It brings forth a large group of untrained and inexperienced diplomats dealing with unfamiliar tasks”.

West Asia is the expression used for the Asian countries south of Soviet Union and west of Pakistan viz. it contains principally all the Arab countries from Syria to Egypt as well as Israel. Sometimes, the term middle-east is also used for this area. This area was transformed into a
dangerous cockpit of international politics since World War II because the people of almost all the ideologies made efforts to win over the people of this area to their side. This keen interest in the region was due to its unique geographic position. The strategic importance of the region lies in the fact that it is a land bridge which links three continents- Asia, Africa and Europe and thus gives to the occupant not only great land advantage but also a favourable position to defy the sea power. It is also the centre of international communication because some of the shortest sea and air routes between Europe and Africa and Asia lie through the region. The two most important water ways of the World War viz. the straits connecting the Black Sea and the Mediterranean and the Suez connecting the Red Sea and the Mediterranean are also located here. In short, the region is the "global centre of gravity".

But probably the most important factor which has contributed to the world importance of this region is the presence of large deposits of oil resources, practically 60 percent of the world’s oil deposits. In view of oil as a source of energy almost all the leading powers- USA, UK, USSR and France have been taking keen interest in the region. Above all the poverty and illiteracy of the people of the region makes it prone to the communist expansion. This naturally encouraged America and other western powers to power in huge amounts as aid to secure the region against the communist expansion.

Apart from the oil another factor which has made this region crucial is the persistent hostility between the Arabs and the Jews. It is a matter of common knowledge that the problem of Palestine had continued to elude a solution during the interwar period. During the war the Jews extended full support to the Allies in the hope that at the end of war they would be given their promised homeland. At the end of war, Britain announced her intentions to withdraw from Palestine and referred the matter to the U.N. General Assembly for decision. The General Assembly appointed a committee which recommended the partition of Palestine. It suggested the formation of the Jewish state and an Arab state with Jerusalem under international control. The three areas were to be linked by a common economic union. These recommendations were endorsed by the Assembly in November 1947. However, neither the Jews nor the Arabs were in favour of partition. Soon a civil war broke out which resulted in the death of a number of British soldiers. In view of the growing public pressure in England Britain terminated her mandate over Palestine on 15 May, 1948.

At this stage it shall be desirable to have an idea about the factors which prompted the West Asian conflict, specifically the Arab-Israeli conflict and the Palestinian problem.
### 4.3 Arab-Israeli Conflict (1948-1978)

The Arab-Israeli conflict has been one of the most persistent world order disputes of the contemporary international politics that escalated the proportions of the Middle Eastern threat to a world proportion. This conflict has been escalated into so much an explosive and persistent crisis in the Middle East that the "Middle East" holds greater risk of the world peace than any other area in the world and it has become the cockpit of international politics. It is a perpetuated conflict that had divided world peace and defined solutions since the commencement of British mandate over Palestine and since the termination of the British mandate in 1948 it has spearheaded wars and has become enormously volatile. The determined efforts of the Zionist Jews to safeguard Israel and deprive the Palestinians of Palestine, the Palestinian attempt to have their homeland and assert human right, the United efforts of Arab Nationalism fighting tooth and nail against the Zionism, the super-power involvement in the emergence of the PLO, the ineffective role of the UNO as a peace maker and above all the crafty manoeuvres of the USA to implement Israel as a check-post in West Asia have made the Arab-Israeli conflict as the crux of the peace of the Middle East.

Since the early part of the 20th century when Turkey showed the visible symptoms of the "Sickman of Europe", the Arab world became the target of the French civilizing mission. Of course, the policies arising from the international communism of the Soviets came later. However, the secret aspirations of all those powers got exposed when all the powers fought for the same spot and consequently the Middle East became the "global centre of gravity" where the proxy wars between the super powers went on. Added to this was a complex factor which witnessed the dramatic growth of both Arab and Jewish nationalism. While the Arab nationalism sought independent Arab states from the Turkish Jackboot and later from the French and British control, the Jewish nationalism sought a homeland and both were destined to collide over the territory of Palestine, aggravating the Arab-Israeli conflict. While the Israeli Jews fought to wipe up the Palestinians from Palestine the Arab world which witnessed emergence of Pan-Islamic and Pan-Arabic sentiments in the post Second World War, could not compromise the question of Palestine and so the Arab-Israeli conflict simmered on. It escalated itself into the explosive theatre of modem world's majority wars, incorporating the shriek of Arab nationalism, Zionism, the history of anti-Semitism, Colonialism, Islamic decolonisation and imperialism. It did not experience peace for decades together and gun instead of butter became the predominant slogan.
The genesis of the Arab-Israeli conflict dates back to the World War I era. While the national movements in Europe were sweeping away the people, the Jews embarked on a quest for their homeland and Palestine was their goal, the homeland for a people without homeland. Then began the crisis in 1917 when the Balfour Declaration outlined the broad framework of a Jewish national state. The Jews migrated to Palestine and the Jewish immigration and settlement in Palestine provoked anger and riot in 1920-21, 1929, 1933 and 1936-38. The Royal Commission under Peel in 1936 recommended the plan of partition and it was opposed by the Arab world. After the London Conference of 1939, the government published the white paper where it prohibited the influx of Jews to the territory of Palestine.

But the misfortune of the wholesale genocide that befell on the Jewish community of Germany under Hitler prompted them to migrate to Palestine and liberal attitudes were shown to them during the Second World War. So the number of the Jews increased manifold in Palestine.

On the other hand, under Anthony Eden’s plans and mastermind, the Arab League of states came to limelight in 1944. It represented the Pan-Arabic and Pan-Islamic sentiments and the concept of Arab nationalism could not compromise with Zionism in Palestine. So the clash became inevitable. Against this backdrop of simmering crisis, the British withdrawal of mediation from Palestine added fuel to the fire.

**4.3.1 Conflict of 1948**

Soon after the British announcement regarding termination of mandate over Palestine the Jews proclaimed the formation of the state of Israel. The new state kept its boundaries confined to the areas which were recognised by the UN Committee as Jewish areas. Soon USA, UK and Russia extended recognition to the new state. They were followed by other countries of the region like Turkey, Iran etc. However, the Arab countries (Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq) could not reconcile with the creation of an independent Jewish state and declared a war against it. In view of the situation the matter came up for discussion before the Security Council which called upon all parties to cease hostilities and arranged a four week truce. At the expiry of this period of truce the Security Council appealed to the parties to further prolong the same.

Though Israel agreed to do so, the Arabs turned down the appeal. As a result, fresh hostilities broke out which continued till the Security Council called upon both the parties to order ceasefire and come to some sort of agreement. Dr. Ralph Bunche was appointed as the US mediator to
put an end to the hostilities when the chief mediator, Count Folke Bernadotte, was assassinated in 1948. Bunche finally negotiated armistices between February and May 1949. As a result of his tactful handling, an agreement was signed by Israel and the Arabs (Egypt, Lebanon, Iran and Jordan) by which the central eastern parts of Palestine and Gaza were left in the Arab occupation while the rest of the territory went to Israel. In 1949 Israel was admitted as a member of the United Nations. However, the Arabs were able to reconcile with the changed situation and despite armistice frontier incidents continued unabated.

4.3.2 Conflict of 1956

In 1956 an open clash took place between Israel and Egypt in which Israel had an edge over Egypt. However, in view of the possible serious repercussion of such clashes in the region the UNO decided to station a UN force in the Gaza strip to prevent such clashes in future. The Arab countries however, continued to nourish hostility towards Israel and described it as a stage of impanels. The participation of Israel in the joint Anglo-French invasion of Egypt following nationalisation of the Suez Canal was interpreted by the Arab countries as a deep rooted conspiracy against them. The venture further strained the already bad relations between Israel and the Arab.

4.3.3 War of June 1967

The seeds of discord between the Arabs and the Israelis ultimately led to a great conflict in June 1967. The chief causes which contributed to this conflict were as follows.

1) As a result of Arab-Israeli conflict of the past years, about one million Arabs faced economic complication in the region.

2) The dispute over Jordan water between the Arab states and Israel increased the tension in the Middle East.

3) The Cold War also partly contributed to the hostilities between them and the Arab world could not tolerate Israel which received patronage from the western powers.

4) But the immediate cause of the conflict was the border dispute between the Arab states (especially Syria) and Israel.

President Nasser of Egypt came to the rescue of Syria and asked the UN Military Command to withdraw the peace keeping forces from the country's border with Israel. The UN Secretary General U. Thant complied with this request and ordered the withdrawal of the United Nations
Emergency Force (UNEF) from Arab-Israeli border. Massive military preparations were made by Egypt, Syria, Jordan and Iraq to average the defeat of 1956.

On May 23, 1967 the U.A.R. President declared that no ships flying the Israeli flag will be followed through the Straits of Tiran and no strategic cargo will be carried in other ships. Egypt blocked the Gulf of Aqaba by mining all approaches to it. This blockade greatly affected Israel's foreign trade. Israel considered this mining of the Gulf as a flagrant violation of the laws of the sea. Britain and USA supported the Israeli contention. Under the circumstances Israel decided to take the offensive. The struck on the air fields of the four Arab countries completely crippled the Arab Air Power. Within seven days the entire area east of Suez Canal was in Israeli hands. She occupied Jerusalem and reached the Jordan River.

U. Thant, the then Secretary General of UNO made an appeal for restraint during the war but it was completely ignored. Then USSR moved a resolution in the Security Council demanding a cease-fire. This resolution was unanimously approved by the Council and later accepted by UAR and Israel on June 9, 1967. However, Israel refused to surrender the gains of June war. She showed her willingness to vacate these areas only on the basis of a permanent peace settlement through direct talks between Israel and Arabs, unhindered by third party. During the war the Arab countries had imposed a ban on the export of oil to western countries. After the war the ban was continued and thus it created great revenue loss to these countries.

4.3.4 The War and the UN Charter

The UN Charter provided for various methods for peaceful settlement of disputes. Israel did not resort to any of them and struck the first blow on the plea of 'preventive way'. This conception was no doubt contrary to the UN charter. Israel refused to vacate the territories which ultimately belonged to the Arab countries. She wanted to bargain from a position of strength. Israel under the charter should not have claimed any right over these territories which were the fruits of her aggression. Territorial disputes could not be settled or boundaries could not be adjusted through armed conflicts under the charter. That could have jeopardized the very existence of the world organisation.

However, in fairness to Israel it may be said that her claim that 'parties must sit across the table to get the matters settled' is fair. Her
refusal to return the Arab territories occupied by her was the outcome of a fear of traditional Arab hostility towards Israel.

4.3.5 US Plan of 1970

With a view to reduce hostilities and enhance the prospects of peace in the Middle East, USA submitted a plan through its Secretary of State, Rogers in March, 1970 which aimed at:

- encouraging both the sides to adhere to the UN ceasefire resolution;
- calling upon the Arab and Israelis to reappraise positions;
- helping the UN Peace Representatives to launch a process of negotiations among the parties; and
- seeking upon talks with the Soviet Union and other major arm supplies in the hope of reaching an arm limitation agreement.

This plan was accepted by Israel as well as UAR. As a result the guns were silenced along the confrontation line and the war plans stopped their raids over the Suez Canal.

4.3.6 War of October 1973

In the face of failure to find a negotiated settlement of the problem the Arabs decided to make another bid to recover their areas from Israel through armed action. Realising that their defeat in 1967 was mainly due to the lack of concerted action on the part of the Arabs, Anwar Sadat, the President of Egypt, tried to patch up differences with the Arab nations. He modernised the army by equipping it with latest weapons from Soviet Union. While he was making all these preparations, he also made efforts to secure the Arab territories from Israel through negotiations. However, the Israeli leaders were not willing to part with the Arab territories in view of their long term security importance.

Ultimately, on 6 October 1973, when the Jews were busy celebrating their festival of ‘Yom Kippur’, the Arabs launched a surprise attack on Israel and penetrated a number of miles into the Sinai desert. Simultaneously, the Syrians launched an offensive in the Golan Heights and overran the Israeli outpost. Though the war started on these two fronts the other Arab countries like Morocco, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia, Tunisia, and Iraq etc. also deployed their troops. Thus for the first time the Israelis had to encounter the forces of the entire Arab community.

Israel retaliated and taking advantage of one of the weak points of the Egyptian troops pushed her tank force to the other side of Suez Canal and cut off the Egyptian Third Army’s communicated line with its base.
The Israelis threatened to move towards Cairo. In Syria too, the Israelis managed to occupy the strategically important Golan Heights.

Under such circumstances the Security Council passed a resolution on 22 October 1973 asking both the parties to come to a ceasefire. It created an emergency force with American and Soviet participation to carry out the resolution. The two parties agreed for a ceasefire although frequent violations of the same continued for some time. To ensure that the peace of the area was not disturbed Dr. Kurt Waldheim suggested a plan for the stationing of emergency force in West Asia, which was accepted by the Security Council. The forces were contributed by Australia, Sweden, Finland, Ireland, Ghana, Indonesia, Nepal, Panama, Peru, Poland and Canada.

A formal agreement between the two parties was reached on 11 November 1973 chiefly due to the ceaseless efforts of Dr. Henry Kissinger, the US Secretary of State by which both Egypt and Israel agreed to scrupulously observe the cease-fire called by the UN Security Council. They agreed to initiate discussion for return to 22 October positions within the framework of an agreement on disengagement and separation of forces under the auspice of the United Nations. It was to be ensured that the town of Suez received its daily supplies of food, water, and medicine etc. and the wounded civilians were vacated. There was to be no impediments to the movement of non-military supplies to the East Bank. The Israeli checkpoints on the Suez- Cairo points were to be replaced by the UN checkpoints. However, the Israeli officers were to be permitted to participate with the UN in the supervision of these checkpoints to ensure that the Cairo on the bank of the Canal was of a nonmilitary nature. As soon as the UN checkpoints were established both the countries were to exchange the prisoners of wars including the wounded.

Both Egypt and Israel reached an interim agreement on Sinai which was valid for three years. Under this agreement Israel agreed to withdraw from the Abu Rudeis oilfields on the Gulf of Suez on the condition that USA would compensate her for the loss of the oil. Israel was to withdraw from the eastern and of the Giddi and Mitla passes and the same were to be placed under the control of the UN forces. To keep a watch on the movements of the Egyptian troops an Alert System was to be set up which was to be manned and operated by the American technicians. The two parties also agreed not to link the agreement with the new partial Israeli withdrawal from the Golan Heights.
4.3.7 Peace Treaty of 1979

After the above settlement was reached the USA continued to make persistent efforts to evolve an agreement between the two countries to establish permanent peace. Finally, she succeeded in early 1979 when Egypt and Israel signed the historic treaty at the lawns of White House. The treaty was formally signed on 26 March, 1979 by Menachem Begin, the Israeli Prime Minister and Anwar Sadat, the Egyptian President, presided over by Jimmy Carter, President of USA. It may be noted that the framework for this peace treaty was agreed at the Camp David in September 1978. The treaty concluded at Washington was subsequently approved by the Cabinets and Parliaments of the two countries.

As a part of this treaty, while Israel agreed to dismantle Jewish settlement and return to Egypt the vast Sinai desert seized in the war of 1967, Egypt agreed to formally recognize the Jewish neighbours. Israel also agreed to return within seven months the oil fields of Sinai to Egypt. Israel was to evacuate the coastal town of El Arish within two months and pledged to give more freedom to the Palestinians living on the West Bank and in the Gaza. The treaty did not contain any provisions regarding the return of West Bank and the Golan Heights. It was hoped that once the Israelis were conceived of the peaceful intentions of Egypt they would eventually agree to give up these territories also.

Even if the treaty had some drawbacks it cannot be denied that the accord was a significant victory for President Carter who succeeded in persuading the leaders of Egypt and Israel to make some compromise with the situations.

However, the other Arab states did not like the treaty because it did not make any reference to the future of East Jerusalem and Golan Heights. They protested against the treaty by suspending Egypt from the 22 member Arab League and removed its headquarters from Cairo to Tunis. A large number of Arab countries even cut off their diplomatic relations with Egypt. Despite this President Sadat of Egypt went ahead with the implementation of the peace settlement. However, he also continued to insist on the solution of the Palestinian problem in the interest of permanent peace in the Middle East. Even the European Economic Community (EEC) insisted on association of PLO with West Asian peace negotiations and supported right of self determination for Palestinians.

The Arab-Israeli conflict did not end here. It got tagged with the Palestine problem the details of which are discussed here.
4.4 The Palestine Problem and the PLO

While in the post Second World War Era, the West Asia, the "hub of the Eastern Hemisphere" supposedly the "global centre of gravity" escalated into a dreaded cockpit of international politics, the Arab-Israeli conflict too became a Cold War, crux of the ongoing and kernel of West Asian problem. The problem of Palestine further bedeviled the problem of the West Asia. The solution of the problem thereby seemed to be the only way-out to the peace and stability of West Asia.

The cause of the problem of Palestine is that Palestine and the Palestinians are land and people separated from each other, trying to be together. Those who possess it today, the Zionist Jews are not the soul of the soil. They came from far off lands under the shadow of imperial bayonets and in course of time drove out all the Arab-Palestinians from their own homeland and usurped the land for themselves. Therefore, rightly since the emergence of Israel for Jews in 1948, the Arab Palestinians, the indigenous inhabitants of the land, became homeless in their own homeland and were settled over the Arabian Desert. They became no land's citizens moving from pillar to post, seeking refuge here and there. The Arab-Palestinians waged a relentless struggle to assert a homeland for them and since 1964 the Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) has been taking the baton in its hand to fight for their rights.

On the other hand, the Israelis basking under the sun of the western imperialist support snarl at the Palestinians. However, despite this Semitic chauvinism the Palestine Liberation Organisation under its dynamic leader Mr. Yasser Arafat, passing through much vicissitudes gained momentum and to its credit, it got recognised by the UNO, the non-aligned countries and by the world public opinion. Israel goes on ravaging Palestine while the world committed to the cause of human rights has become a silent spectator and the Palestinian story has emerged as a story of bloodshed and tear. Thus, the grimmest imbroglio of the present time forcibly expelling people from their homeland and perpetually subjecting them to genocide goes on as the helpless humanity watches sometimes with dismay and sometimes with indignation.

The Palestine problem which forms the axis of the Arab-Israel conflict is a story of long drawn battle, a battle between the Zionists and the Palestinians for the possession of the same territory. In historical perspective, it is an unparalleled injustice to drive the “sons of the soil”. To the Zionists it was the question of Israel while to the Arabians, the question of Palestine. This clash was projected as a clash between theocratic politics and indigenous nations - the Zionist Jews representing
the racial unity and the Arabians representing the secular and nationalistic ideal.

The kernel of the issue is that the Jews claim this territory as of theirs on the ground that several thousand years ago in the 12th century B.C., their ancestors had come and occupied the territory of Palestine then called Canaan. They had established two small kingdoms - Judea and Israel under the surrounding of Canaan. However, after 500 years they could not withstand the successive onslaughts and assaults of the Assyrians, Babylonians and the Ancient Romans. They left the areas and scattered throughout the world.

However, while in the 19th century the unification movements were spearheaded in Europe and Germany for Germans and Italy for Italians became the popular watchwords, the Jews found no homeland for themselves. On the other hand, Jews were the trading community of Europe and now they aspired for a separate homeland in Palestine and that is why the real tragedy for Palestinians set in. The protagonists of the Jewish state called upon the Jews over the world to gather in Jerusalem and thus the movement came to be known as Zionism. It was a movement to set up a state through intensive colonialisation by driving out the local inhabitants and the process began under the leadership of Hirsch Kalischer. In 1870 the Mikveh Israel (Gathering) was established and the process of colonialisation was given conspicuous shape in the first Zionist Congress held at Basle in August in 1897 under the leadership of Theodor Herzl who described the programme as peaceful colonialisation of a land without people by the people without land. In 1901 the Jewish National Fund was set up and by the turn of the century the Jews population in Palestine grew from 24,000 to 50,000. The Zionist leaders approached to the Sultan of Turkey, the Kaiser of Germany and the Government of Great Britain for help, but were disappointed.

But with the outbreak of the First World War the Zionist leaders played their cards with rare shrewdness and collaborated with Great Britain. Dr. Chaim Weizmann, one of the Zionist leaders succeeded in convincing the British Foreign Secretary Mr. Arthur Balfour that a Zionist settlement in Palestine would be a political asset to the British Empire. So in 1917 came the Palestinian state which was to act as a ‘safety valve’ of British interests in Arab.

After 1917 Sir Herbert Samuel was appointed as a High Commissioner to Palestine and because of him, many Jews migrated to Palestine. Between 1922 and 1935 the Jewish population increased from 1, 50,000 to 3, 75,000 and the Jewish forces were used to put down the
popular Arab anti-nationalist movement. In this way the Zionism served as the executioner of the Arab National Liberation Movement for the benefit of imperialism and at the same time embarked upon the genocide of Arab-Palestinians. While by 1918 the Arabs outnumbered the Jews by ten to one, by the close of the Second World War, the Jews outnumbered the Arabs by two to one. During the Second World War because of the prosecution of Jews they fled to Jerusalem.

With the outbreak of the Second World War the Palestine problem not only remained unsettled but also continued to be more and more complicated. An Anglo-American Committee was appointed to settle the Arab-Israeli conflict. In 1946 this committee proposed in its report that:

- Palestine should be partitioned between the Arabs and the Jews;
- Imposition of one’s supremacy upon the other should not be permitted;
- Interests of all religious sects should be preserved; and
- Palestine would be administered as a mandate until the solution of the Arab-Jewish problem.

The Arabs having considered these proposals more favourable to the Jews, started agitation and demanded termination of British mandate and withdrawal of the British forces from Palestine. In such circumstances, a high power Anglo-American Commission was appointed. The Commission proposed formation of autonomous Jewish state and an Arabic state in Palestine. The Jewish and Arab representations were invited to a conference in London to consider the Commission's recommendations. But meanwhile, the Jewish strongly protested against the unlawful transfer of the new Jewish immigrants to Cyrons.

In the other hand, the Arabs recorded their demand for the termination of the British mandate and the removal of the British army from Palestine. As a result, neither of the contestants agreed to participate in the London Conference. The Arab-Jewish riot broke out again, and Britain having had no other way out appealed to the UN for the settlement of the problems. The UN General Assembly decided to send a commission of eleven states to solve the tangle of the Jewish homeland. Eight members of the Commission favoured the partition of the country while India, Iran, Yugoslavia recommended a federal state. However, the General Assembly on 29th November, 1947 passed a resolution envisaging an outlined scheme for the partition of Palestine and creation of Israel. But neither the Jews nor the Arabs were in favour of partition and never was it possible to realise their aims without force.
Under such circumstances on 15th May 1948, Britain declared the termination of her mandate over Palestine and withdrawal of her army from there. Immediately after the withdrawal of the British forces the state of Israel was officially proclaimed. The boundaries of the new Israel state were kept confined in Palestine which was recognised as Jewish area by the special committee of the UN. However, it was not a political solution, neither necessarily humanitarian nor legal. It was not humanitarian because it entailed the displacement of the Palestinians. It was not legal because no one had the rights to give them other people’s land. Within a few hours of the establishment of the state of Israel it received recognition from the United States and the United Kingdom followed closely by Russia. The Middle Eastern countries like Turkey and Iran etc. also accorded recognition to it.

While the British withdrawal from Palestine was completed, Jerusalem for Jews was proclaimed, and Jews usurpation of Palestine began with an accelerated tempo. The new state of Israel by dint of its troops which had long been secretly under training rapidly occupied the large areas of Palestine and simultaneously the Arab states like Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Jordan and Iraq created a great disturbance by sending troops instead of giving recognition. Thus the question of Palestine irked the first Arab-Israeli war of 1948 and the UNO ordered for cease-fire. It sent Count Folke Bernadotte for mediation. When he pleaded for a homeland for the Palestinians he was shot dead along with Col. André-Pierre Serot, Chief of the French observers on September 17, 1948 by members of the Jewish extremist Stern Gang. By the time this war was over, around 4, 80,000 Palestinians were driven out of Palestine and Israel incessantly pursued the policy of both stamping out Palestine and Palestinians. According to Toynbee, "The Palestinian Arabs did not leave their homes voluntarily. They fled from the 'fear of death'.” However, at last in 1949, an armistice between the two sides was signed. The central eastern part of Palestine and Gaza remained under Arab occupation. The rest went to Israel.

In spite of the fact that the state of Israel was founded, the Jewish-Arab struggle still continued. Border clashes between the two continued too. By the end of 1949, Israel gained control over 77 percent of Palestinian territory against the 55 percent originally assigned by the UN resolution to the proposed Jewish state. The Jews also successfully resisted the incessant attacks of the Arabs. Both the sides resorted to economic boycott against each other. In 1956 when Egypt nationalised the Suez Canal, Israel in collusion with Great Britain and France attacked Egypt and invaded the Sinai Peninsula. While the war proved that Israel
was only a western surrogate, the Palestinians were scattered over the Arabian deserts leading the life of refugees.

The simmering and undue current of Arab-Israeli conflict once again got a volcanic eruption in June 1967 as a consequence of which the Israelis occupied the remaining parts of Palestine, i.e. the West Bank of the river Jordan and Gaza strip in addition to the Sinai Peninsula of Egypt and the Golan Heights region of Syria. The area of the new lands grabbed by Israel was to take 24,000 square miles or three times the size of the Jewish state.

However, the shattering defeat of Arab world in 1967’s war had a therapeutic effect to prick the Palestinians from the cover of their self-complacent existence. Contrary to the Arab as well as to the Israeli expectations the trauma of defeat generated more defiance than defeatism in the Arab camp and the Palestinian question for a gigantic shape.

Prior to 1967, the question of Palestine was interlinked with the problem of the Arab leagues, but the Arab reverses of 1967 taught them to rely on their own strength, stamina and tenacious determination. This marked the beginning of the reawakening which eventually transferred the Palestine Liberation Organisation, founded in 1964 into an authentic national liberation movement and a potent revolutionary force. Since every day the Palestinians were expelled from their homeland and became homeless wanderers, various guerilla organisations sprang up to wage war for the liberation. But their isolated and scattered efforts did not bring them their desired result. After the trauma of 1967 there came the steadfast regeneration of the Palestinian nationhood. In 1968 the National Palestine Congress assumed its historic mission of unifying and consolidating the organizational structure of the resistance movement at its crucial session in the first week of June at the headquarters of the Arab Leagues. Out of it, emerged a unified leadership of guerilla organisations.

Within the mainstream of the PLO some predominant guerilla groups too developed like the Palestine Liberation Army, the People’s Liberation Army Vanguard, the Arab Liberation Front, the Palestinian Popular Struggle Front and the People’s Organisation for the Liberation of Palestine. The leadership of PLO went into the hands of Yasser Arafat in 1968 who launched a campaign for securing the sympathy and support of the world. It outlined its definite programme of restoring Palestine for Palestinians and when Yasser Arafat took the chairmanship of the PLO, he brought all the guerilla militant groups under the umbrella of PLO.
Gradually, the General Assembly of the UNO recognised the inalienable rights of the Palestinians. However, under the USA's pressure it just castigated the PLO as a terrorist organisation. But the year 1974 proved to be a watershed and the world public opinion increased gradually for the PLO and the Palestinians. In October 1974 the Arab Summit held at Rabat recognised PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinians. On November 22, 1974 the UN General Assembly under its Secretary General Dr. Kurt Waldheim accepted resolution recognising the Palestinians’ right to self-determination, national independence and sovereignty. The PLO was given an ‘observer status’ in the General Assembly. In 1974 Yasser Arafat addressed the UN General Assembly by saying that "I have come here bearing an olive branch and a fighter's gun. Do not let the olive branch fall from my hand".

The problem of Palestine came before the Security Council in January 1976. The proposal at the Council was to recognise the right of self-rule of the Palestinians and the creation of an independent Palestine state. But the United States applied veto against the proposal. Nine states including the Soviet Union and France supported the proposal. China and Libya abstained from voting. In support of the veto, the U.S. representative, however admitted that the United States was not against the hopes and aspirations of the Palestinians but the problem should be tackled cautiously.

In August 1977, the United States declared that she would try to remove the obstacles to reopening the Geneva Conference particularly with regard to Palestinian representation at the Arab-Israel talks. The PLO rejected the US proposals which suggested that they should stop opposing the Security Council guidelines as a condition to joining the new Arab-Israel peace talks. The PLO accused the USA for conspiring with Israel in ignoring Palestinian national rights. Syria took the lead of rallying the Arabs against the Arab-Israeli plans for reconvening the Geneva Peace Conference.

The visit of President Anwar Sadat of Egypt to Jerusalem on November 19–20, 1977 to place his plan for a peace settlement before the Israeli Knesset (parliament) despite strong opposition from most of the Arab world and the Soviet Union also evoked loud protest from the PLO. Its chief Yasser Arafat showed no interest on his visit but categorically indicated that the PLO leadership was still basically in favour of a negotiated end to the thirty years old dispute between Israel and the Arabs.
4.4.1 Camp David Accord (1979)

While the PLO was launching the movement and was gaining popularity, the Camp David Accord of 1978 came as a betrayal. The kernel of the Camp David Accord can be traced back to 1973 when Egypt and Syria, fully equipped with the Soviet weapons felt confident enough to launch the Ramadan war with the admittedly limited object of breaking stalemate on the Arab-Israeli conflict. However, in this war, the Israelis were unvictorious and the Arabs were unvanquished and the Arabs were cured of their inferiority complex.

The U.S. President Jimmy Carter and the Egyptian President Anwar Sadat jointly opened negotiations with Israel for achieving Middle East Peace and the outcome was the Camp David Accord in March 1979 signed by Carter, Sadat and the Israel Prime Minister Menachem Begin. In fact, the negotiations were completed on framework for settling all the major issues at the September Summit of 1978 which ended with Begin and Anwar Sadat signing two accords. The first was an outline of a Comprehensive Middle East Peace and the second was a general description of the peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. The terms of the Accord were:

- Most of the areas would be demilitarised;
- Egypt could only station a single division on the Peninsula;
- The UN would station troops along the Gulf of Aqaba and the eastern border of the Sinai;
- Egypt would end its economic boycott of Israel and would establish normal diplomatic relations with Israel; and
- Egypt and Israel would open their borders to each other’s citizens.

Negotiations on Palestinian self-rule on the West Bank and Gaza Strip was agreed upon to begin one month after the treaty was ratified. Elections of Palestinian local councils, the first step towards self-government were to be held though no date was fixed. One month after the working of the Palestinian self-rule, Israeli forces on the West Bank and Gaza would be withdrawn behind Israel's 1949 borders. Begin agreed orally for the establishment of self rule in Gaza. One of the trickiest issues, however, the status of Arab East Jerusalem was not even mentioned in the treaty or in the Camp David Agreement.

The entire Arab world including the Palestinians sharply reacted to the Camp David Agreement between Egypt and Israel. The Algerian government described the accord as "an act of treason." Syria commented it as humiliating concessions. The PLO chief Yasser Arafat was too highly
dissatisfied. While many Arab leaders talked of sanctions against Egypt, some called for reprisals against the United States as well. There was however, official silence from Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabian leaders in the past had expressed opposition to the Camp David Summit and to any separate peace agreement between Egypt and Israel but they have remained a force for moderation in the Middle East. The PLO described the Camp David Agreement as a dirty deal which does not decide our destiny and held that they should be consulted on any discussion regarding their own future.

The Sinai withdrawal was the first phase (which started from April 1982) in the Israel-Egypt agreement signed at Camp David. The next stage of the accord dealt with the ‘autonomy’ of the Palestinian population in the West Bank and the Gaza strip. But the changed political climate, the assassination of Anwar Sadat, the back to cold war ethos of the Reagan administration and growing Israeli intransigence made it improbable that it would take place in near future.

In the years since Camp David Summit, the Israeli position became more rigid and its strongest ally, the USA found the Begin government opposing more and more the Sinai withdrawal and favouring an invasion of Lebanon to wipe out all PLO bases completely. The US was unable to put pressure on Israel for implementing the next stage of the Camp David in fear of Soviet involvement. Besides, the influence of the Jewish lobby in America made it difficult for America to censure Jerusalem openly.

On 6th June 1982, Israel attacked the southern part of Lebanon and this happened to be the fifth war of the Arab-Israeli conflict. The most powerful base of the PLO in Lebanon was threatened. Israel raised the body of her own security against the activities of the Palestinian guerrillas entrenched in West Beirut. The Israeli representative (old the UN General Assembly on August 18, 1982) that Israel had no cause of conflict with the Palestinian Arabs and Israel was only against the PLO guerillas stationed at Beirut and resorting to all sorts of provocations against Israel. The Security Council adopted a resolution on August 18, 1982 for maintaining the international peace force in Lebanon till October 19. Israel demanded at the UN General Assembly that all the foreign troops were to be withdrawn from Lebanon as a condition of the withdrawal of Israeli forces there from. The US pressure and the stiff attitude of the Security Council at last bore fruit and the Israeli government agreed to allow the PLO guerillas including the PLO chief Arafat to evacuate Beirut peacefully and to take refuge in the neighbouring countries friendly to the PLO.
Meanwhile, President Ronald Reagan of the USA said on September 2, 1982 that Israel should leave its occupied West Bank and Gaza to Jordan for the establishment of the self-rule of the PLO and for permanent peace in West Asia. But Israel rejected the proposal. While efforts were taken for repatriation of the PLO guerillas from Lebanon under the supervision of the international force, there occurred a criminal massacre of Palestinians in West Beirut in September 1982. The UNO condemned the massacre of the civilians. This incident quickened the evacuation of the Palestinian fighters from Israeli besieged West Beirut. The Israeli Prime Minister Begin denounced in October 1982 the latest West Asia peace proposals of Reagan and reaffirmed his determination to annoy the West Bank and Gaza and reminded Washington that Israel was not a "vassal of the United States."

However, after 1982, the European Community sympathised with the misfortune of the Palestinians. In 1980 the European Economic Community (EEC) had passed resolutions to the effect of giving them the rights of self-determination. In 1982, France also supported the people's determination for the struggle. In the New Delhi Summit of the NAM in 1983, Indira Gandhi as the chairperson also championed their cause and on the 39th session of the General Assembly of October 1984, the foreign ministers of the NAM countries also presented the issue of Palestine for consideration.

The USSR also gave moral support especially after 1967. But the USA on the other hand took Israel as surrogate and a counter check for the entry of USSR in the West Asian region. Despite this adversity the PLO under the herculean leadership of Yasser Arafat marched forward with its goals and plans. But certain inherent difficulties handicapped Arafat at every step. After the Israeli invasion of Lebanon, the PLO headquarters got shifted to Tunisia. However, Yasser Arafat came across internal split there. Abu Musa and other Fatah (guerilla) groups challenged the leadership of Arafat. The eight groups which constituted the PLO were so divided among themselves that they no longer posed any danger to Israel. One of the guerilla organisations was a pet group of Syria and another of Libya.

The success of the PLO as well as the success of the Palestinians in regaining their homeland depended on the three basic factors:

- Unity should have existed within the Palestinian ranks;
- The Arab regimes should have also been prepared to generally recognise and help the cause of the Palestinian homeland; and
• To win the international support the Palestinians must have risen above the narrow thinking of Pan-Islamism and Pan-Arabism.

The first Palestinian uprising began in 1987 as a response to regional stagnation. By the early 1990s, international efforts to settle the conflict had begun in light of the success of the Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty of 1982. Eventually, the Israeli-Palestinian peace process led to the Oslo Accords of 1993.

4.4.2 Oslo Accords (1993)

In 1993, Israeli officials led by Yitzhak Rabin and Palestinian leaders from the Palestine Liberation Organization led by Yasser Arafat strove to find a peaceful solution through what became known as the Oslo peace process. A crucial milestone in this process was Arafat’s letter of recognition of Israel’s right to exist. In 1993, the Oslo Accords were finalized as a framework for future Israeli–Palestinian relations. The crux of the Oslo agreement was that Israel would gradually cede control of the Palestinian territories over to the Palestinians in exchange for peace. The Oslo process was delicate and took a turning point at the assassination of Yitzhak Rabin and finally unravelled when Arafat and Ehud Barak failed to reach agreement at Camp David in July 2000. Robert Malley, special assistant to US President Bill Clinton for Arab–Israeli Affairs, confirmed that while Barak made no formal written offer to Arafat, the US did present concepts for peace which were considered by the Israeli side yet left unanswered by Arafat. Consequently, there were different accounts of the proposals considered.

4.4.3 Camp David Summit (2000)

In July 2000, US President Bill Clinton convened a peace summit between Palestinian leader Yasser Arafat and Israeli Prime Minister Ehud Barak. Barak reportedly put forward the following as ‘bases for negotiation’, via the U.S. to the Palestinian leader; 92% of the West Bank and the entire Gaza Strip, as well as a Palestinian capital in East Jerusalem, and those 69 Jewish settlements (which comprise 85% of the West Bank’s Jewish settlers) would be ceded to Israel. He also proposed “temporary Israeli control” indefinitely over another 10% of the West Bank territory- an area including many more Jewish settlements.

Arafat rejected this offer. According to the Palestinian negotiators the offer did not remove many of the elements of the Israeli occupation regarding land, security, settlements, and Jerusalem. President Clinton reportedly requested that Arafat make a counter-offer, but he proposed
none. No tenable solution was crafted which would satisfy both Israeli and Palestinian demands, even under intense US pressure. Eventually Clinton’s plan, presented on 23 December 2000, proposed the establishment of a sovereign Palestinian state in the Gaza strip and 94–96 percent of the West Bank plus the equivalent of 1–3 percent of the West Bank in land swaps from pre-1967 Israel. On Jerusalem the plan stated that, "the general principle is that Arab areas are Palestinian and that Jewish areas are Israeli." The holy sites were to be split on the basis that Palestinians would have sovereignty over the Temple Mount/Noble sanctuary, while the Israelis would have sovereignty over the Western Wall. On refugees the plan suggested a number of proposals including financial compensation, the right of return to the Palestinian state, and Israeli acknowledgement of suffering caused to the Palestinians in 1948. Security proposals referred to a "non-militarized" Palestinian state, and an international force for border security. Both sides accepted Clinton’s plan and it became the basis for the negotiations at the Taba Peace summit the following January.

4.4.4 Taba Summit (2001)

The Israeli negotiation team presented a new map at the Taba Summit in Tabaa, Egypt in January 2001. The proposition removed the "temporarily Israeli controlled" areas, and the Palestinian side accepted this as a basis for further negotiation. With Israeli elections looming the talks ended without an agreement but the two sides issued a joint statement attesting to the progress they had made. The following month the Likud party candidate Ariel Sharon defeated Ehud Barak in the Israeli elections and was elected as Israeli Prime Minister on 7 February 2001. Sharon’s new government chose not to resume the high-level talks.

4.4.5 Road Map for Peace

One peace proposal, presented by the Quartet of the European Union, Russia, the United Nations and the United States on 17 September 2002, was the Road Map for Peace. This plan did not attempt to resolve difficult questions such as the fate of Jerusalem or Israeli settlements, but left that to be negotiated in later phases of the process. The proposal never made it beyond the first phase, which called for a halt to Israeli settlement construction and a halt to Israeli and Palestinian violence, none of which was achieved.
4.4.6 Present Status

The peace process has been predicted on a "two-state solution" thus far, but questions have been raised towards both sides’ resolve to end the dispute. Israel has had its settlement growth and policies in the Palestinian territories harshly criticized by the European Union citing it as increasingly undermining the viability of the two-state solution and running in contrary to the Israeli-stated commitment to resume negotiations. Following several years of unsuccessful negotiations the violence escalated into an open conflict between Palestine and Israel, lasted until 2004/2005 and led to nearly 6,000 fatalities. Following the uprising, Israeli Prime-Minister Sharon decided upon the Gaza disengagement plan, implemented in 2005, removing Israeli settlers, though not releasing the territory from Israeli occupation. One year later the Hamas party took power in Palestinian elections, while Israel responded it would not continue any peace negotiations as long as Hamas is taking part in the Palestinian government.

Clashes between Israel and Hamas in 2006 led Israel to impose a naval blockade on the Gaza Strip, and cooperation with Egypt allowed a ground blockade of the Egyptian border. After internal Palestinian political struggle between Fatah and Hamas erupted into the Battle of Gaza (2007), Hamas took full control of the area. The tensions between Israel and Hamas, who won increasing financial and political support of Iran, escalated until late 2008, when Israel launched operation Cast Lead (the Gaza War). By February 2009, a cease-fire was signed with international mediation between the parties, though small and sporadic eruptions of violence continued. In 2011, a Palestinian Authority attempt to gain UN membership as a fully sovereign state failed. In Hamas-controlled Gaza, sporadic rocket attacks on Israel and Israeli air raids still take place.

Both the Israeli and the Palestinian sides include both moderate and extremist bodies as well as dovish and hawkish bodies to resolve their problem. One of the primary obstacles to resolving the Israeli–Palestinian conflict is a deepest and growing distrust between its participants. Unilateral strategies and the rhetoric of hard-line political factions, coupled with violence and incitements by civilians against one another, have fostered mutual embitterment and hostility and a loss of faith in the peace process. Support among Palestinians for Hamas is considerable, and as its members consistently call for the destruction of Israel and violence remains a threat, security becomes a prime concern for many Israelis. The expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank has led the majority of Palestinians to believe that Israel is not committed to reaching
an agreement, but rather to a pursuit of establishing permanent control over this territory in order to provide that security.

However, the Palestine problem has not been solved till date. Since early eighties to the beginning of this new millennium many agreements and summits have been signed and attended by the political stalwarts of both Israel and Palestine, but no solution has been reached at. Tension in Jerusalem has not been out. Violence and sometime brutal killings continue to be a regular feature at the West Bank and Gaza strip. But the role of the PLO and its dynamic leader Mr. Yasser Arafat in restoring the Palestinians their homeland over the last few decades has been significant. The problem still continues at the respective government levels. Until there is a viable solution to the Palestine problem there can be no peace in the volatile West Asia.

**4.5 The Iranian Revolution, 1978-79**

The Iranian Revolution of 1978-79 that swept the whole of Iran with a unique upsurge was without any doubt, a volcanic eruption. It created a seismic tremor in the Middle East especially in the Islamic Republic of Iran signing the death warrant of autocracy of Shah and bringing an end to the Pahlavi dynasty. Originally the Iranian Revolution was a mass movement against a system which was autocratic, undemocratic, and subservient and stooge to the foreign control. In its causes, consequences, essence, aims and objectives the Iranian Revolution takes after the French Revolution of 1789. The Shah of Iran in his determined bid to become a crypto surrogate of the west took many reactionary programmes and thereby implanted social tensions which ultimately became suicidal for him making him a social and political outcast and *persona non grata* in Iran. The formidable state apparatus of Shah, reinvigorated by heavy doses of military reinforcements by the USA lost its significance in carrying on day to day administration in Iran.

Like the noxious conditions of the French Revolution the lava of discontent had long been smouldering which culminated in the mass movement where along with the socio-politico- economic causes the demagogic Islamic fundamentalism motivated and determined the course of the Iranian Revolution.

Like Louis XVI of France the man, who fell victim to the whirlwind of the revolution was the Shah of Iran. He ascended to the throne of Iran in 1941 when his father Reza Khan Pahlavi abdicated. The Shah had to leave the country in 1951 when Dr. Mussadiq formed a progressive government and nationalised the Anglo-Iranian oil company. However, the
Shah returned to Iran in 1953 and succeeded in recapturing power. Since then up to his ousting in January 1979 he dominated the Iranian scene, pursuing a ‘blood and iron’ policy. Shah did not respect any opposition to his government, so much so that he ruthlessly suppressed the anti-government agitation in 1963 resulting in inhuman butchering of about 5,000 Iranians. Even Shah with an iron hand, wanted to put down the popular movement of 1978-79 and more than 1000 persons were killed by Shah’s policy. Therefore, the Iranians launched a mass movement to checkmate the forces of autocracy and highhandedness of the Shah.

However, the important causes which spearheaded the Iranian revolution were more socio-economic in nature. Although Iran exported dry and fresh fruits, carpets, wool and hair, skins and leather, the most important wealth enriching the Iranian economy happened to be the oil. Iran was one of the largest oil producing countries in the world and since 1973 when the prices of the oil were raised almost four fold, it was flooded with petro dollars. The economic boom setting in as a result of high price of oils encouraged the Shah to launch an ambitious programme for modernising Iran and bringing in the White Revolution. In his avowed objective of bringing about a White Revolution Shah played ducks and drakes with the oil revenue in modernising the armed forces, constructing industrial estates, building road etc. Thus when Shah squandered away a lot of wealth, Iran's economic progress was handicapped giving rise to the problem of unemployment. Because of this "White Revolution", a lot of foreigners specifically the Americans migrated to Iran and as an inevitable consequence, many Iranians became unemployed in their own homeland.

The economic cause of bringing the "White Revolution" was coupled with the social cause. Primarily, Iran was not the first country to come under the spell of the modernisation and many other countries had withstood the onslaught of such oddity. Any process of development and modernisation whose benefits do not percolate down to the lower layers and remain locked up at the thinking upper most crust creates more enemies than friendly. So was the case with the programme of Shah’s westernization which never percolated to the poor. On the other hand, the administration instead of being successful in combating the attack, had struck because of the soul stirring poverty so fast that the Shah had no spot virtually left to plant his foot on and organise even a holding operation.

Thirdly, as a part of the modernisation process, thousands of foreigners came to Iran, most of whom were the Americans producing inevitably social and political tensions. This deprived a large section of the Iranians and this sense of alienation also sparked the revolution. Harold
J. Green in his book- "Revolution in Iran- the politics of continuous Mobilisation" highlights the same fact. Green outlines the Shah's efforts to socially mobilise the Iranians in the lathe of westernisation. However, the Iranians charged him of 'westoxification' due to his programme. The consequence of Shah's development did demand greater real political participation by the emerging urban classes, but Shah instead offered Iranians "pseudo-participation". Green opined, had political participation kept abreast with social mobilisation, political stabilisation might have been preserved. Hence, this crisis of participation which was socio-political in nature precipitated the revolution.

Fourthly, the political causes added fuel to the flames. The most reliable observers and analysts on the spot stressed that what was involved above all was accumulated discontent over the corruption in the regime's upper strata which the Shah only began to root out at a time when it was too late.

Fifthly, the religious cause and the Islamic fundamentalism set in motion the tempo of the Iranian Revolution, in Shah's high geared and hasty programme of 'White Revolution' and of bringing Iran upto modern lines, little room was left for the traditional people to socially adopt themselves to the changing situation. Above all, because of the Pan-Islamic sentiments and Pan-Arabic nationalism the Shia religious leaders in Iran got opportunity to settle their own scores with Shah's blasphemy which rested upon the west but desired by his subjects.

Therefore, when the US President Jimmy Carter declared in Tehran that "Shah shares values in humanitarian values and human rights", the Shia religious leader did not support Carter. In the eyes of the Persian spiritual nobility, these views were so sinful that they saw them as a mortal threat to the long-term influence of the Shiite religious leaders and organisations over Iran. Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini who was exiled to Paris from 1964 to 1979 gave stimulus and other Shia religious leaders and fundamentalists also gave support to this revolution to defend their traditional Islamic culture. In fact, the conflict flared up between the traditionalistic secular religious forces led by the Paris based exiled Shiite spiritual leader Khomeini on one hand and on the other, the secular liberal forces imbibed with the desire to propel Iran into the modern age led by the Shah himself. This revolution was a mass movement against an autocratic, anti-democratic and a cypher government of Shah which attempted to impose an alien culture on Iran against an age old tradition-bound Islamic society.
However, the international factors cannot be sidetracked so far this crisis was concerned. In this most delicate strategic plan the foreign interests of a global strategic nature was also clearly discernible while the West Asia became a vacuum in the post Second World War era, the duopoly of the two super powers, the USA and USSR tried to fill the vacuum. Because of the Arab-Islamic conflict USA was alienated from the sympathy and support of the Arab world. Now the U.S. President Jimmy Carter wanted to use Shah as a minor satellite and identified Shah with Iran and Iran with Shah. This threatened the traditional and crusted values of Iran. The USSR also wanted to gain the hold. This internal politics was but an undercurrent factor of the Iranian Revolution.

The opposition to the throne started surfacing since 1977. Since the beginning of 1978 the Iranian climate underwent a massive special as well as political upheaval and Iran became a troubled spot. Agitation started and to the virtue of this agitation, three parties were drawn - Mohammed Reza Pahlavi, Shah of Iran and his supporters; the second party a conglomeration of the secular opposition groups and the third party consisting of the religions leaders led by Ayatollah Khomeini.

With numerous loots, cases of arson and repeated police and military firings causing heavy loss of life and property, the Shah, the so called messiah became a helpless prophet and was in a virtual mess. The people of Iran seemed to have been determined to oust Shah despite his renewed efforts to set up a popular government and to become a constitutional head. There came a civil war in Iran for weeks. Markets downed their shutters, airlines grinded to halt, machines ceased to whirl, oil wells were shut down, pipelines became empty, electricity lines became the fickle transmitters of energy, universities became centres of resistance and people went in demonstrations for months together. Many murders were committed and by the end of 1978, Shah found himself sitting on the crater of a volcano. The situation in Iran assumed a dangerous proportion and even Shah's last trump card, the rule of martial law, evidently won him no trick. The Shah found fault with the religious fanatics. But no one except his august self was to be blamed. Finding situation to be too hot, Shah finally fled to USA on January 19, 1979.

Earlier he had appointed Shahpur Bakhtiar as the Prime Minister with a cabinet which was asked to associate with the Iranian government. But he could not control the situation and the people wanted Khomeini to come back from Paris. Khomeini came back on February 1, 1979 and thus Shah-ship was buffeted and Khomeini's religion based politics paid him off handsomely. On 11th February 1979 Bakhtiar abdicated the power and Khomeini appointed Mehdi Bazargan as the Prime Minister. When
Bakhtiar abdicated, the army surrendered all powers slipped into the hands of Khomeini and Jimmy Carter recognised the new regime on February 12, 1979.

The first referendum was held on March 31, 1979 which resulted in the ending of 2500 years old monarchy and on April 1, 1979, Iran was proclaimed as the "Islamic Republic". Khomeini described the referendum is unprecedented in history. Though majority supported it, a sizable minority did not favour such orthodoxy and reversion to the fanaticism of the middle ages. The Revolutionary Council executed hundreds of people including many generals. Reign of Terror was unleashed in plea of safeguarding the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Iran went to polls on August 3, 1979 for the first time to elect 73 members-Assembly to ratify the draft of the constitution. The electorate’s victory was overwhelming in favour of Khomeini and the Assembly was dominated by the Mullahs constituting 60 out of 73. However, the election was boycotted by Iran’s three largest secular political groups the National Front, the Muslim People’s Republican Party and the National Democratic Front.

In August 1979 there were reports of the clashes between the Kurds and the government forces. The Kurdistan Democratic Party was banned and the government ordered ban on the proliferation of the leftist forces. Twenty-two newspapers and magazines were closed down. Khomeini declared himself as the Commander-in-chief of the army and became the guide of the revolution. In October 1979, the Council of Experts passed a constitutional clause giving Ayatollah Khomeini the authority to name the chief of Armed Forces declare war and to veto candidates for Presidency. Earlier Ayatollah Khomeini had been named as Iran’s supreme political and spiritual leader and the President of the Republic of Iran was supposed to be a No. 2 figure in the country who was to be responsible in matters, not directly entrusted to the leader, i.e., Ayatollah Khomeini.

On November 5, 1979 the Iranian protesters seized the U.S. consulates and American cultural centre and the U.S. embassy in Tehran and held more than 50 American hostages. It outlined three demands:

- Appointment of the UN sponsored international commission to hear the grievances against the Shah;
- Apology from the United States helping in criminal activities to Shah to become a regional power and policeman of USA in Iran; and
- Shah’s return with money.
It also demanded that Britain should handover the former Prime Minister, Bakhtiar living in exile in Britain. On November 6, 1979 the Iranian Prime Minister, Bazargan resigned and the government was taken over by the Revolutionary Council and the Iranian Government cancelled treaties with the US and the USSR. The US retaliated and froze all Iranian assets in the USA and American banks abroad. On the request of the USA, the International Court of Justice at The Hague asked Iran to free hostages. But Iran refused to act accordingly. In January 1980, the U.S. took the issue to the General Assembly because of the Russian Veto.

In April 1980 the United States made a futile attempt to rescue the hostages. Some members of the rescue team were killed and the President Carter of USA seemed to stand on a helpless position. Negotiations continued, but failed. On November 20, 1980, Ronald Reagan was elected as the President who declared that he would use any means to restore the declining prestige of the USA. In the same day, Khomeini proposed a four point plan calling for return of Shah’s wealth and Iran’s frozen assets, a pledge of non-interference in Iran and dropping of claims against Iran resulting from the seizure of the American hostages. Iran asked for $ 24 billion as compensation and Americans rejected it.

However, it was pointed out that the attack of Iran on September 22, 1980 and the starting of the Persian Gulf issue forced Iran to settle the crisis. Other observers pointed out that the last minute warning of the President Carter that Iran would have to start all over again with the President Reagan, turned the side. Therefore, minutes before the President surrendered his presidency to Ronald Regan Iran released the 52 American hostages on the 444th day of their captivity in exchange for the return of $ 8 billion of Tehran’s assets.

But the Iranian crisis still lingered on. The leftist elements were opposed to the theocratic character of the government because Ayatollah Khomeini and the Mullahs surrounding him shattered the vision of a liberal democratic Iran and made it a theocratic one.

4.5.1 Consequences

The consequences of the Iranian revolution were of far-reaching importance. Firstly, no doubt, it spelt the doomsday of the Shah monarchy; but all the same in place of an autocratic Shah, it enthroned an autocratic Shia religious Khomeini whose decrees were but infallible laws. So, the autocratic politics changed into a theocratic-cum- autocratic game.
Secondly, though it was a mass movement, yet it derailed into excesses. Though an unarmed people could disarm an armed and well equipped Shah's army, yet it degenerated into religious obscurantism and bigotry. There was no definite programme and definite hierarchy of government and thus it did not possess any definite characteristic of the revolution. There came the reign of terror, unprecedented bloodletting, and thousands were executed which roused the conscience of the world.

Because of this revolution economic ills were seemed discernible. The export of petroleum, the backbone to Iranian economy got reduced sharply. The soaring unemployment, acute poverty and skyrocketing of prices made people homeless. Every aspect of social, economic and even judicial fields became almost paralytic. In place of judges, there came the Islamic judges, trained in the Koranic laws. Holy Mobile Courts were setup, speedy justice was dispensed and many went to crucification. In educational sphere, the schools and colleges were closed down, newspapers were banned and intellectual life stood tottering on the edge of collapse.

To conclude, the Iranian Revolution substituted the pro-west capitalist regime of Shia with a regime of the Shiite religious fanatics. The whole fluency of building up of any state equipped with sophisticated arms by one super power in order to wield influence in a region was exploded. The Americans had put eggs in Shah's fragile basket and though he pretended to be a messiah, he was exposed as a pseudo messiah and a crypto cypher of the West. By his programmes of “White Revolution”, he boomeranged his own downfall and the “White Revolution” was like a Frankenstein monster which devoured its author i.e. Shah. Khomeini with his Islamic tempo made capital out of the situations and set the Islamic Revolution go, like Mao Tse-tung's Red Army launching a revolution to foresee a cultural revolution. What was Mao to China, was Khomeini to Iran. However, Khomeini was not cast in the magic mould and the objectives of two of the personalities were very much different.

4.6 India in World Affairs

The independence of India marked the introduction of a new epoch in the struggle for liberation of colonial countries in Asia and Africa from foreign domination. Liberation struggle of the numerous countries against the colonial rule was the dominating phenomenon of the political happenings taking in course over the last few decades. The colonial countries in Asia and Africa on the basis of the experience of India as well as other liberated countries realised that uncompromising struggle for national liberation and independence was the only road to emancipation.
From 1947 to 2000, India in her external relations has defined certain moral principles and political precepts. The main guiding principles of India’s foreign policy are the achievements of world peace through independence of thought and action opposition to colonialism and racialism and the need for peaceful coexistence.

Jawaharlal Nehru, the first Prime Minister of independent India had correctly read the pulse of world politics. He was clear in his mind that the proclaimed friendship between China and USSR in 1949-55 was only skin deep that there were currents of rivalry, tensions and hostility between them and that their perceptions of Asia and the world were different. Secondly, he had correctly understood the nature of the Chinese revolution in 1948-49 and had anticipated clashes on the border between India and China. His stand on Tibet was generally appreciated even by Britain, USA and USSR. Thirdly, Nehru realised that for sheer survival, India must work hard to preserve world peace for which it was necessary to provide a bridge between the East and the West then locked in the Cold War. Very rightly, he wanted India to steer between the two blocs and remain non-aligned. Non-alignment as a policy was regarded by him as an exercise of one’s national sovereignty in foreign affairs the position that every issue must be judged and dealt carefully across impartial lines. India should choose its course of action within the framework of India’s national interest safeguarding its political independence, territorial integrity, national prestige and economic prosperity.

Nehru also advocated preservation of world peace, extension of freedom to colonies, freeing the world from racial discrimination, securing economic emancipation of the underdeveloped areas, opposition to all forms colonialism, imperialism or no colonialism, friendly relations with all countries especially the then shortly emancipated states of Asia, Africa and Latin America, strengthening the processes of the United Nations and promoting the goal of universal disarmament both nuclear and conventional. These were the basic principles of India’s foreign policy as elaborated by Nehru in his seventeen years of continuous Prime Ministership.

Nehru’s voice counted in world politics. He was not prepared to let the big powers hog all the decision making authority over world issues and they knew it. In his time, India could not be taken for granted even by Stalin, Truman, Churchill or Eden. He did not wait for a polite invitation from the powerful and affluent capitals of the world, and took effective initiatives and intervened on his own, as in the matter of recognition of people’s China, the Korean War, the Indo-Chinese conflict, the Suez crisis and so on. Indeed, in the war in the Tonkin Gulf, there was a deliberate
attempt by Washington to keep India out, but New Delhi would not suffer
that insolence and was determined to have its way on the issue. In the
event, India had to be asked to chair both the commissions on Korea and
Indo-China. India then developed a special sort of prestige in world
politics, a prestige which was not backed up by military power but rested
on the basis of its culture and tradition and the national consciousness
which Nehru forged on his foreign policy formulation.

He was not even free from mistakes. Although the basic thrust of
his Chinese policy was sound, he miscalculated Chinese intentions first in
1959 and then in 1962. But then, he quickly recovered his margins and
his success recaptured initiative and dynamism on our foreign policy.
India remained a very active factor in world politics even after Nehru's
demise. It continued to retain its autonomy in world affairs and its wider
national interests. It continued to keep foreign intervention at bay in
South Asia and more determinedly in the Indian subcontinent and the
Indian Ocean. It also continued to forge common cause with other
nonaligned and developing countries in our common interests. It not only
created nonalignment as a policy, but also as a movement (NAM) and it
fostered it throughout the period 1955-1989. Lal Bahadur Shastri in his
short stint and later Mrs. Indira Gandhi for a longer term let the world
know that India mattered and mattered a great deal.

From 1966-69 the international scene was undergoing transformation. The developed countries were on the verge of a second
economic take off and a second industrial and informational revolution
while the developing countries were facing acute economic difficulties.
Mrs. Gandhi's terms in office (1966-77 and 1980-84) spawned the
ushering in of the first detente in 1970’s and the onset of the Second Cold
War in early 1980's. Initially, she did hesitate on the issue of the entry of
the Soviet troops in Afghanistan presumably because she had just begun
her second turn. But she lost little time to come to a sounder track when
she proposed settlement of the Afghan question on the basis of ending
foreign interference (i.e. US interference) and military intervention (i.e.
Soviet intervention). And she privately advised Moscow to withdraw their
troops as early as possible. She also kept up an active interest in the
developments in the Indo- China region and strengthened India's relations
with Vietnam. It was Mrs. Gandhi who took the initiative to ease relations
with Beijing and strike for normalisation of relations. With the Indian
underground nuclear test in 1974 at Pokhran in Rajasthan, even if for
peaceful purposes, she set India on a course that eventually enabled the
country to meet any threat of nuclear blackmail from Pakistan. She had to
contend with the lengthening shadow of wars in South-West and South
East Asia, the rapid rearming of Pakistan, with US largesse, as a front line state and the ethnic explosion in Sri Lanka with its immediate fallout in India. Pakistan’s hostility had assumed a more sinister dimension with Islamabad’s growing nexus with the Punjab terrorists.

While Pakistan was a continuing problem for Indian foreign policy, Mrs. Gandhi had fewer answer for the ethnic conflict in Sri Lanka, involving the two million Tamil populations there. On the one hand, there was the campaign of intimidation and elimination against the Tamil population by the Sinhalese chauvinists, an aspect often ignored by the self-styled critics of India’s policy- and on the other there was the involvement of the Sri Lankan Tamil problem in the politics of Tamil Nadu with both M.G. Ramachandran and M. Karunanidhi alternately becoming patrons of the LTTE. Finally, Mrs. Gandhi reinforced the NAM and helped the course of the freedom of Namibia, the fight against apartheid and took the initiative for nuclear disarmament.

Rajiv Gandhi continued to pursue an activist foreign policy and to assert India’s place in the world community. He had the following objectives:

- world peace;
- friendship with all nations on the basis of reciprocity and mutual benefit;
- nonalignment;
- new world economic order based on justice, mutual cooperation, peace and development;
- respect for the independence of other states and for the principles of sovereign equality of nations, non-interference and non-intervention in their internal affairs;
- strengthening the "deep historical and cultural links" with our immediate neighbours in South Asia;
- peaceful coexistence ; and
- adherence to the twin principles of continuity and change, stability and dynamism in the changing context of world politics.

He called for the nuclear disarmament. In June 1985, he visited the USA and made a fervent appeal to US Congress and pleaded with Ronald Reagan to drop his Star War Project. Throughout the period he was India's Prime Minister and his effort against the war went relentless, from the Nassau Commonwealth Summit in October 1985 to the NAM Declaration of April 1986 and the Six Nations Summit at Mexico in August 1986 which opened with a poignant appeal to the world leaders from 18
children representing the five continents to help them keep on living without anybody trying to kill them.

In his tour to Zambia, Zimbabwe, Angola and Tanzania of May 1986 he encouraged the people to fight against apartheid, colonialism and state terrorism and to strengthen the struggle for Namibian independence. In his fight for sanctions against the Pretoria regime, he made history at the 7-Nations Commonwealth mini-summit at London in August 1986 and in a spectacular press conference there on August 5, he declared that it was not the Commonwealth but Britain which stood alone on the issue of imposing sanctions, and is no longer a leader. He was the first in the world to accord formal diplomatic recognition to SWAPO as the sole representative of the Namibians.

He consistently fought with great passion for a New World Economic Order. To the traditional policy of non-alignment, he added in October 1983 a new dimension by extending the provisions of Article 9 of the Indo-Soviet Treaty of August 1971 to cover the nuclear threat posed by Pakistan and Israel. But for his dynamism, the SAARC would not have come into existence. The Harare NAM Summit of September 1986 was the proving ground for Rajiv Gandhi in the leadership of world politics. Here his statesmanship flashes of intelligence and vision lent to NAM a pointed edge which made it a more credible world movement.

He also wanted to change the state of India’s relationship with the USA while keeping intact our special relations with the USSR. In order to release tensions between India and China he visited China in December 1988. After the five rounds of talks held from December 1981 to September 1984 during the time of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Rajiv Gandhi pushed forward the process. The sixth round of talks was held in November 1985 at Delhi, where for the first time after 1962 they began to discuss substantive issues. The seventh round of talks was held at Beijing in July 1986 followed by the eighth round at Delhi in November 1987. In May 1988 a cultural agreement was signed between India and China at Beijing. On December 19, 1988 Rajiv Gandhi reached Beijing and for five days he held extensive discussion with Li Peng, Deng Xiao Ping, and Zhao Ziyang. They discussed to resolve the boundary issue peacefully. They set up an India-China Joint Working Group (JWG) on the boundary question with a definite time frame to respond to the challenges.

On June 30-July 4, 1989 the first meeting of the JWG was held at Beijing where both India and China discussed the border issue in a friendly, frank and sincere atmosphere. On July 8, they agreed to make confidence building arrangement and push forward the process of
normalisation of relations. In September 1989, they signed a trade protocol providing for a significant increase of exports from India.

In short, Rajiv Gandhi achieved brilliant success in at least three areas. First, he took up as a virtual crusade the cause of Africa and helped focus world's attention on the grim struggle in Namibia and South Africa. Secondly, he gave a tremendous push to the process of normalisation of relations with China and thirdly, by taking dynamic interest on all world issues and the UN system, he forced the world to continue to take India seriously and regard it as a factor of vital importance in world affairs. The problems of Pakistan and Sri Lanka were of course of a different order. His message to Pakistan was loud and clear that India could not be trifled with but he was no more successful than Mrs. Gandhi in bringing about an end to Pakistan's intervention in the terrorist campaign in the Punjab. However, his approach was quite flexible and he was willing to reach agreements with Pakistan as he did with Zia-ul-Haq on the commitment to refrain from attacking each other's nuclear installations. He also held negotiations with Benazir Bhutto.

His Sri Lankan Policy was sound and correct, even though it can be arranged that the diplomatic and army leadership had perhaps underestimated the real nature and the fighting capacity of LTTE. It was on July 29, 1987, that Rajiv Gandhi and J. R. Jayewardene signed at Colombo, the famous Indo-Sri Lanka Accord under which India agreed to send its peace keeping force to Sri Lanka to help her fight the menace of LTTE. Two days after the agreement was signed on July 31, 1987 a determined attempt at Rajiv Gandhi's assassination was made at Colombo by a Sri Lankan extremist who hit him with the butt of his gun during the farewell inspection of a guard of honour. Rajiv Gandhi suffered bruises on his head and shoulder and could have been killed had he not ducked in a quick reflex action.

Throughout the period 1987-89 the agreement was attacked by the Sri Lankan authorities as well as the opposition leaders in India who had their own selfish interest in the politics of South India. The Indian Peace Keeping Force (IPKF) did a marvellous job in Sri Lanka in the midst of gravest difficulties. They were fighting with one hand tied behind its back, so to say, for they were being attacked not only by the LTTE but also by the Sinhalese politicians and the opposition leaders in India. Their problem was compounded by the duplicity of LTTE and the political compulsions of Premdasa, the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka to get the IPKF out, no matter what the consequences, Rajiv's position was that the IPKF could be withdrawn only when the Accord was fully implemented by Sri
Lanka. But the government of V. P. Singh pulled out the IPKF on 24 March 1990, nearly three months after Rajiv Gandhi lost the election.

Elsewhere, Rajiv Gandhi followed a dynamic foreign policy. On 3 November 1988, an attempt was made by a group of mercenaries to force the removal of Mammon Abdul Gayoom, President of Maldives Republic. He at once rang up Rajiv Gandhi who promptly dispatched Indian Air Force planes carrying para-commandos which unnerved the terrorists. On November 6, in a commando operation, Indian naval forces stormed the Cargo boat- "progress light" hijacked by the mercenaries fleeing after their abortive coup, and free the hostages. The mercenaries were brought to go for trial and the residents of the capital turned out in full force to greet the Indian troops and booed the rebels and mercenaries. All the Indian troops returned home by November 3, 1989, the first anniversary of the coup.

He also acted dynamically in another sphere on Burma (Myanmar). Nehru had visited Burma in 1950, Shastri in 1965 and Mrs. Gandhi in 1969 after 18 years it was the Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi who reached Rangoon on 15 December, 1987 on a two day visit. General Ne Win who was extremely selective about meeting foreign dignitaries chose to have three rounds of talks with Rajiv Gandhi. These talks centred on the problems of stateless people of Indian origin in Burma, trans-border insurgency, drug trafficking, preservation of historical monuments, trade relations, promotion of tourism and Burma’s membership of the SAARC and their return to NAM.

In Fiji, a paradise resort in the South Africa, the British colonial policies had sowed the seeds of organised ethnic trouble from the 19th century onwards. In Fiji imported Indian labour was largely confined to the booming sugar industry. Between 1879 and 1916, large members of Indians came and stayed on after the expiration of their contracts. Fiji got its independence in 1947. In 1985, the Fijian Labour Party (FLP) was formed which challenged European capitalists and the authority of the Fijian chiefs and obtained mass support. In 1987 out of a total population of 7, 20,000, Indians accounted for 50%, Melanesians 47% with Europeans and Chinese, the rest 3%.

In the elections of 1987 the ruling Alliance Party lost. Of the members of the Parliament, 18 belonged to the Indian community as against only 7 native Melanesians. The new Cabinet had 11 ministers of whom 7 were Indians. The Fijian chiefs aided by the European colonialists, incited anti-Indian demonstration and eventually the coup of May 14, 1987. The Indians remained second class citizens more than a
hundred years after they settled there as migrants. But the Indians in Fiji fought hard for survival and for restoration of democracy.

At the Vancouver Commonwealth Summit (October 13-17, 1987) India obtained expulsion of Fiji from the Commonwealth on October 16, 1987. On May 24, 1990, Fiji closed down India's diplomatic mission and asked all Indian nationals employed in the mission to peace, on the plea that India was intentionally campaigning against Fiji that New Delhi now banned trade with the Island, that India was opposing Fiji’s reentry into the Commonwealth and that the Indian mission was interfering in Fiji’s internal affairs. Rajiv Gandhi, throughout his Prime Ministership urged the world community to derecognise the illegal Fijian regime and had requested Australian and New Zealand to put an economic embargo on Fiji. He also requested the World Human Rights Commission to recommend to the UN, the suspension of Fiji’s membership for violation of human rights.

The advent of V. P. Singh’s National Front Government in 1989 put India’s role in world affairs in cold storage. Interested only in internal squabbles, concentrating on imaginary Bofors Scandal and lacking commitment to India’s traditional values and utterly ignorant of international realities, they lost sight of all the bases and premises of India’s foreign policy from 1947 to December 1989. The two governments headed by V. P. Singh (December 2, 1989 to November 9, 1990) and Chandrasekhar (November 10, 1990 to June 20, 1991) shook the foundations of Indian Foreign Policy.

P. V. Narasimha Rao (June 21, 1991- May 16, 1996) came to power at a time when the world had undergone miraculous changes due to the collapse of Soviet Union and end of Cold War. The US was just emerging as the only super power. He made diplomatic overtures to Western Europe, the United States, and China. India during his time tried to forge closer relations with USA and responded favourably to US proposals for military cooperation. He openly declared that his government would use foreign policy as a dynamic instrument for promotion of national interest in the changed global context. Under Rao, India played more active role in the process of restoration of peace, security and stability in different parts of the world. Indian peace-keeping forces took leading role in the socio-economic development of Somalia.

He decided in 1992 to bring into the open India’s relations with Israel, which had been kept covertly active for a few years during his tenure as a Foreign Minister, and permitted Israel to open an embassy in New Delhi. He ordered the intelligence community in 1992 to start a
systematic drive to draw the international community’s attention to alleged Pakistan’s sponsorship of terrorism against India and not to be discouraged by US efforts to undermine the exercise. Rao launched the ‘Look East’ foreign policy, which brought India closer to ASEAN. He decided to maintain a distance from the Dalai Lama in order to avoid aggravating Beijing’s suspicions and concerns, and made successful overtures to Tehran. The ‘cultivate Iran’ policy was pushed through vigorously by him. These policies paid rich dividends for India in March 1994, when Benazir Bhutto’s efforts to have a resolution passed by the UN Human Rights Commission in Geneva on the human rights situation in Jammu and Kashmir failed, with opposition by China and Iran.

Rao’s crisis management after the 12 March 1993 Bombay bombings was highly praised. He personally visited Bombay after the blasts and after seeing evidence of Pakistani involvement in the blasts, ordered the intelligence community to invite the intelligence agencies of the US, UK and other West European countries to send their counter-terrorism experts to Bombay to examine the facts for themselves.

The United Front Government coming to power under H. D. Deve Gowda (1996 to 1997) and I. K. Gujral (1997 to 1998) laid emphasis on developing good relationship with neighbours. It put forth ‘Gujaral Doctrine’ under which unilateral concessions were granted to countries with regard to travel and trade without expecting reciprocity. Effort was also made to promote free trade among the SAARC countries and to convert it into an economic union. India during this period refused to accept the offer of mediation by USA, Britain and Iran in Kashmir dispute.

The BJP led government under Atal Behari Vajpayee assumed power in 1998 and emphasized on exercising one’s nuclear option in the interest of national security. It opposed all attempts to impose a hegemonistic nuclear regime by means of CTBT, CMCR and MTCR. It also tried to promote closer regional relations through SAARC; persuade Pakistan not to support insurgent and terrorist groups to disturb India’s internal affairs; solve by bilateral means the Sino-Indian border issues; support the legitimate aspirations of Tamil people in Sri Lanka; and consolidate friendly ties with Bhutan, Myanmar and Bangladesh. This government, in short, reiterated its commitment to peace among all nations and prosperity of the nations of the world till the UPA led Dr. Manmohan Singh’s ministry coming to power in May 2004.

To conclude, we can say that India’s role in world affairs all along since its independence has been great and admiring taking into stocks its centuries long subjugation under the British hegemony at its backdrop. It has combined the twin principles of idealism and pragmatism while
developing nexus with the nations under a changed international scenario with a deviation on the issue of Indo-Chinese conflict of 1962. The Governments have tried to follow the Nehruvian model while professing their respective foreign policies with the outside world. Controversy has all along been away from her.

### 4.7 Indo-Pak Relations

It is a great paradox of Indian foreign policy that while in the arena of international politics India has jettisoned the idea of confrontation and as the chairperson of NAM, it has been championing the cause of the peaceful coexistence, its relations with the neighbouring nations is characterised by never-ceasing hostility and hatred. And this proposition seems to be more logical when we highlight the history of the Indo-Pak relations. The relation of India vis-a-vis Pakistan has been a shocking story. Despite the geographical, cultural and economic unity of the Indian subcontinent which was the legacy of many a millennia, M. A. Jinnah, the leader of the Muslim League, frantically advocated the ‘Two-nation Theory’ and both India and Pakistan were carved out as independent entities of the same land mass, same stock and the same historic cultural heritage, which shattered the Gandhian dream of the ‘Akhand Bharat’.

The nationalist leaders accepted the partition of the country in 1947 as a political solution to the communal acrimony. But they were betrayed and belied of their hopes for peaceful co-existence because the Kashmir issue became the bone of contention between them. Right from 1947 till the Simla Accord of 1972, the Indo-Pak relation was a bitter saga of hostility and distrust which produced two wars, once in 1965 and second time in 1971. The relation in the later stage also did not become cordial. India’s foreign policy towards Pakistan passed through several tensions and adverse during the Prime Ministership of Zia-ul-Haq, Benazir Bhutto and Nawaz Sharif yielding to the Kargil war in 1999. And the hostility still lingers on.

The year 1947 awoke a historic twilight, a twilight that brought about the eminent dawn of two Republics, India and Pakistan. However, the dawn was not a happy go lucky one. The partition was bad, short, brutish and nasty and Pakistan was born amidst crisis and carriage. But Jinnah, the architect of the ‘Two-nation Theory’ became a disillusioned prophet because he thought that he had been duped away by a westerner-Pakistan which excluded Kashmir. But for Jinnah, Kashmir was an economic prize, a key position in the Asian heartland touching India, Pakistan, Russia and China. At any cost, Jinnah did not want to lose Kashmir.
But on the other hand, the Independence Act of 1947 envisaged that the princely states were left at their own accord to remain either free or opt for Pakistan or India. The Maharaja Hari Singh of Kashmir signed a neutral kind of agreement with both India and Pakistan. But towards the end of 1947 the aggressiveness of Pakistan was nakedly exhibited on the soil of Kashmir. While the Maharaja was in between devil and deep sea, Kashmir was raided by the tribal raiders who happened to be the Pakistani soldiers who wanted to exert pressure on the Maharaja to submit to Pakistan. But the Maharaja supported by Sheikh Abdullah, the leader of the National Front signed the agreement of accession with India and Kashmir joined India on 26th October 1947. The Indian leader out of spontaneous sympathy promised the holding of plebiscite whenever peace would return.

However, the inclusion of Kashmir with India created tremor in Pakistan and the Pakistan government declared that it was a fraud perpetuated on the people of Kashmir by its cowardly ruler with the aggressive help of Government of India. Further as Indians had promised to hold the plebiscite so Jinnah took the accession to be provisional. Pakistan had no underlined policy and no such formal principles, but all of a sudden, Kashmir became the cornerstone of its foreign policy where there was no foreign policy. And thus, Kashmir issue became the bone of contention of the Indo-Pak discord.

Thus, the first Indo-Pak hostility was spearheaded when the Pakistani forces attacked the borders of Kashmir in October 1947 and the bellicosity of Pakistan was translated into right aggression against Kashmir in October 1947 by the way of organised raid. India sent its warring Air forces. India lodged a complaint with UNO in 1948 under the Article 34 and 35 of its charter that dealt with the settlement of area in dispute and not under charter 7 which dealt with acts of aggression. It was for this reason that the United States considered the Kashmir question as an area under dispute. The Anglo-American bloc exploited the Indian makers and under the protest that its business was not to pronounce the judgements, but restore peace and security, it never called Pakistan as aggressor and even the peace and order could not be maintained.

A ceasefire came into force on January 1, 1949 in which a No-war Pact was signed to end the hostilities. The Security Council debated the issue and on 17th January 1949 it passed its first resolution asking for ceasefire and for maintaining status quo. In the UNO, the case of Pakistan was pleaded by Zafrulla Khan and India’s case was pleaded by Gopal Swami Ayyanger. However, India lost the ground and the western world
took the pro-Pakistani stand which disillusioned Nehru and his belief on UNO as a mediator of peace. In the meantime, the UNO changed the nomenclature of the resolution to India-Pakistan issue which added fuel to the flame of the issue and towards 1950 it escalated into a major cold war in the South East Asia.

While the question of Kashmir was still a boiling one and the Indo-Pak relation was in a cauldron of confrontation in 1949-50 a crisis was precipitated between India and Pakistan by a trade war when Pakistan refused to follow other commonwealth nations in devaluing currency. The Hindus were expelled from Assam and the communal frenzy enveloped the subcontinent. In 1951, tensions began to escalate and the Pakistani leaders tried to upset the psychological equilibrium of the Pakistani citizens by declaring the holy war against India. Thus, the Pakistani war-mongers, by dint of their outfit manoeuvres, made capital out of the grievances of the people and exploited the religious sentiments which became an obstacle to the harmony of the Indo-Pak relation.

Towards 1953 the Pakistani leaders wanted to enter into the tie of friendship with the west and in 1954, a U.S.-Pak treaty was signed. Pakistan got military help from USA to use it against India and thus, the Indo-Pak relations marched on a tortuous road. Between 1954 and 1965 the total American military investment in Pakistan was $1500 million. The Pakistanis received more than 250 ton Patton tanks, a squadron of supersonic F-104A fighters, 4 squadrons of F-86F fighters and 2 squadrons of B-57B Canberra bombers.

In 1954 Pakistan also became the member of the SEATO with an inherent motto of using its membership of SEATO for the Kashmir issue. But India could never appreciate the policy of alignment and bloc politics because non-alignment epitomised the haemoglobin contents of India's foreign policy. However, in 1953 the Russian Premier Khrushchev came in a tour to India which augmented for the Russian support on the side of the Indians.

In 1956 India went a step forward and withdrew its promise to uphold the plebiscite by a policy statement. Pakistan finely timed this situational event and to exploit it took the issue to the UNO. However, to the rescue of India, Krishna Menon pleaded and his nine-hour speech at the UNO’s Security Council turned the tide and the opposition was silenced. On 21st November, 1957 the UNO passed a resolution asking the two countries to refrain from anything that would lead to confrontation. The role of the UNO was somewhat partial and its masked support to Pakistan brought a sense of disillusionment in Nehru. In 1959, Ayub
Khan became the Prime Minister of Pakistan and he rejected Nehru’s No-war Pact and instead advocated for the joint defence. In 1960, Nehru and Ayub Khan met, but the talk was futile. Rather, Pakistan raised serious objections against the Farakka Barrage Scheme in West Bengal.

While the President of Pakistan lost all the hopes of reviving Kashmir in 1961 he asked the President Kennedy of USA to take initiatives in this direction. President Kennedy wrote to Nehru to accept the plans of Eugene Black, President of the International Bank, but Nehru wanted no mediation. In 1962 Sino-Indian war broke out, but Pakistan maintained neutrality. Had Pakistan supported India in the days of her challenge India might have become liberal in her stand in Kashmir. From 1962 onwards Pakistan started ‘Hate India’ campaign which was pursued vehemently and relentlessly about two years. The Pakistani leaders infused a sense of jingoism and chauvinism into the minds of their people.

Further, there also came a rapprochement between Peking and Islamabad after 1963 which was the handwork of Z. A. Bhutto, the Pakistani Foreign Minister. This Peking-Islamabad treaty further strained and deteriorated the Indo-Pak relation. In the meantime, in May 1964 J. L. Nehru died and Lal Bahadur Shastri became the Prime Minister of India.

At such complex situation both China and USA wanted to exploit and Pakistan getting support from them invaded the borders of Kashmir in September 1965. So far as Pakistan was concerned it was a General’s war and from Indian side J. N. Choudhury fought the war. China, USA and even Great Britain justified the actions of Pakistan and accused India as an aggressor.

However, at the instance of the USSR’s President Kosygin, Lal Bahadur Shastri and Ayub Khan met at Tashkent on January 11, 1966 and signed the Tashkent Declaration, where they resolved "to restore normal and peaceful relations between their countries and to promote understanding and friendly relations between their people". It became bedrock of Indo-Pak harmony and both pledged to a peaceful co-existence. Of course, in Peking’s eye, it was a conspiracy but it opened up the horizon of good Indo-Pak relations. In India while the people cordially invited the declaration of peace and eulogized Shastri as the martyr of peace, in Pakistan Ayub Khan was culminated as a betrayer. People castigated Ayub Khan because they believed that he had a plan to sell out Pakistan to India. The students of Lahore University went in demonstrations and thus the Tashkent Declaration only became a lid on a boiling kettle and now Ayub Khan fell to the pressure. In the meantime,
India and Pakistan wanted to acquire as much weapon as they could and began to throw calumny at each other. Once again, the situation became tense and even Pakistan tried to get help from the USSR, China and USA.

In the General Election of 1970, Sheikh Mujib-ur-Rehman of the Awami League won by a sweeping and landslide victory in East Pakistan (East Bengal after the partition of Bengal in 1905) and out of six points programme, the most important one that he highlighted was the scheme of the independence and autonomy of East Pakistan from the clutches of West Pakistan (original Pakistan created in 1947). But Yahya Khan, who had come to power after Ayub Khan, wanted a military clash against East Pakistan. The military junta of Yahya Khan perpetrated atrocities and heinous crimes against the innocent Bengalis, the inhabitants of East Pakistan. Thousands of Bengalis fled to India as refugees.

The tremendous influx of refugees posed an intolerant burden on India’s resources and placed threat to her security. The then Defence Minister of India Jagjivan Ram observed thus, "By driving 9 million refugees into India, Pakistan has committed an aggression which is more dangerous than an armed aggression". Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Prime Minister of India observed, “It is sheer injustice that our people shall suffer for Pakistan's blunder”. In order to stop the colossal genocide in East Pakistan, hence named Bangladesh, after Mujibur Rehman came to power and to give it recognition, Mrs. Gandhi on behalf of the Government of India visited some of the European capitals so that pressure could be built on Pakistan. But nothing tangible came out. On the contrary, Pakistan began to concentrate its armed forces close to Indian borders both in the East and the West. Regarding Mrs. Indira Gandhi, Yahya Khan told, “If that woman thinks that she is going to cow me down, I refuse to take it. If she wants war, I will fight her”.

While Indira Gandhi desired to sympathize with the misfortune, Pakistan considered it to be an intervention in its internal affairs and in December 1971 Pakistan Air Force launched attacks in India without formally declaring war at Amritsar, Pathankot, Srinagar, Ambala and Agra. But India could take up the challenge and finally the Pakistani army was defeated. On 6 December 1971 the Government of India accorded recognition to Bangladesh. The Foreign Minister of Bangladesh expressing gratitude to the Government of India said, “We want to proclaim to the world that Bangladesh stands solidly united with 550 million people of India to fight shoulder to shoulder the monstrous enemy of democracy, secularism and socialism upto the point of its complete annihilation.” Within a few hours of India’s grant of recognition to Bangladesh, Pakistan broke off diplomatic ties with India.
Pakistan’s repeated attacks forced India to take up the challenge and by this a full-fledged war started. By the middle of December 1971 the resistance of the Pakistani army completely collapsed in Bangladesh and on 16 December 1971 General Niazi of Pakistan surrendered at Dacca. Thus, the rule of Pakistan in Bangladesh came to an end. At this juncture, USA and China came to the rescue of Pakistan. In the Security Council, USA brought two resolutions for the withdrawal of troops and for a cease-fire. But the USSR vetoed the resolutions. Sometimes before the adoption of resolution on 22 December 1971 by the Security Council, Indian troops with the liberation forces of Bangladesh captured Dacca and Niazi practically surrounded. This brought the war between India and Pakistan in the Eastern Sector to an end.

Though the Indians had the upper hand in the war, they unilaterally declare the cease-fire and in July 1972 the Simla Agreement was signed by which both of them agreed to resolve their differences mutually without asking a third party to mediate. The issue of Kashmir was kept in cold storage.

The Indo-Pak war was really a watershed and it was a war to end all the Pakistani wars against India. The traumatic experience of the war made Pakistan grapple with the harsh realities and consequences of the continued confrontation and Pakistan reluctantly realised that India was a power to be reckoned with. Z. A. Bhutto himself, the man who spoke of the thousand years war with India, started the process by signing the Simla Agreement of 1972 and never looked back. After 1972 the relations began to improve and with the first summit of 1972 the way was opened. Further, the signing of an Agreement between India, Pakistan and Bangladesh on April 4, 1974 on reparations of prisoners; Agreement on Postal Services and VISA signed in September 1974; Agreement on Pilgrimage Protocol signed in 1974; Trade Protocol and Shipping Protocol signed on January 23, 1975 led to good relations.

In 1976 the relations seemed to be harmonious because:

- Z. A. Bhutto had realised the benefit of Indo-Pak friendship;
- China was interested in good relations; and
- the super powers had also good reason and above all, Shah of Iran was supporting the cause. But in 1977, in India Mrs. Gandhi went out of the government. Shah faced opposition within his country and, Zia-ul-Haq came to the politics by a coup-de-etat.

However, in India the Janata Party was voted to power after Mrs. Gandhi’s rule and the same government wanted to pursue the policy of
continuing with change and believed in the normalisation of relations. In the February of 1978 A. B. Vajpayee paid visit to Pakistan which facilitated the free flow of visit between the people of the two countries besides the free flow of information. In 1980 Mrs. Indira Gandhi of the Congress Party once again came to power and she wanted to normalize the relations. In November 1982 on his way to Malaysia, Zia-ul-Haq, the President of Pakistan stopped at New Delhi and had a mini-summit with Mrs. Gandhi. They wanted to set up an Indo- Pak Joint Commission which was proposed in January 1983.

It was on 10th March 1983 that India and Pakistan signed an agreement for a Joint Commission to give an institutional framework for their efforts for cooperation. There was the visit of the Foreign Ministers and the foreign secretaries to each other’s capital which finally resulted in Indo-Pak Joint Commission. However, even after Zia-ul-Haq’s meet with Mrs. Gandhi, there could not be any crystal possibility of peace because Pakistan in violation of the Simla Agreement adhered to the principle of raising the question of Kashmir.

After Indira Gandhi’s assassination on 31st October 1984, Zia-ul-Haq came to India and condemned such heinous activity. He and the Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi pledged to the maintaining of good relations and peaceful cooperation and coexistence. The Pakistan ruler while giving importance to no-war pact started buying the sophisticated weapons from the west which further strained the relations between India and Pakistan. In December 1985, President Zia of Pakistan and Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi declared that they had agreed to give mutual undertaking no to attack the nuclear installations of each other. This was done set at rest the misgivings prevailing in Pakistan that India may attack Pakistan’s nuclear installations.

In the economic sphere the relations showed an improvement. In January 1986 they reached an agreement whereby Pakistan agreed to lift an eight years long embargo on private sector trade with India and permitted private sector in Pakistan to import 42 items from India. The two countries agreed to double their trade in public sector. The presence of Soviet troops in Afghanistan also obliged the Pakistan leaders to improve relations with India. In this task the U.S. leadership also played an important role and executed necessary pressure on Pakistan to improve relations with India.

With the emergence of democracy in Pakistan under Benazir Bhutto, it was expected that relations between two countries would improve. This impression was further confirmed by the visit of Indian
Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi to Pakistan in 1988. During their meeting the two leaders affirmed their resolve not to attack each other’s nuclear installation and to promote and develop relations in the realm of art, culture, education, sports etc. India also supported Pakistan’s entry into the Commonwealth (Pakistan had withdrawn in 1973). But this spirit of understanding did not last long and soon Pakistan started supply of arms to terrorists. It also took irrational stand on the Siachen issue and raised the Kashmir issue at the international forums in violation of the Simla Agreement. Above all, the issue of nuclear bomb also generated tension in relations between the two countries.

India’s relations with Pakistan improved in the early part of 1999. In February 1999 Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee undertook a bus journey to Lahore whereby three bilateral documents viz. Lahore Declaration, Joint Statement and Memorandum of Understanding were signed to resolve differences through dialogue. However, the euphoria of Lahore Declaration was myopic. Just after three months in May 1999 there was the Kargil misadventure. Some 500 heavily armed Pakistan backed intruders occupied the Indian side of the line of control along a stretch north of Kargil and started attacking the strategic highway linking Srinagar to Leh. India countered them with an entire army division along the Kargil-Dras sectors. The Pakistani forces were routed to defeat. Countries like the US, UK, Germany and Russia asked the Pakistan Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif to exercise restraint and withdraw Pakistan based insurgents from Kashmir. Sharif offered for an open talk to dissolve differences. But India agreed to go for talks only after complete sanctity of the line of control was restored and Pakistan stopped sponsoring cross-border terrorism.

During the next few years the process of conformation and amicable settlement proceeded side by side. However, by and large relations between India and Pakistan are quite strained at present. The main factors which continue to contribute to these strained relations are Pakistan’s support to the terrorists in Kashmir, the nuclear programme of Pakistan, induction of sophisticated arms into Pakistan, question of Siachen Glacier and the issue of Kashmir. However, the terrorist attack of the WTC twin towers on September 11, 2001 compelled President Musharaf to join his voice with Washington to counter terrorism. The issue of Kashmir stood no exception to it.

To conclude, the Indo-Pak relation is originally a Kashmir centric dissension and Kashmir is the rock on which the attempts to normalize the Indo-Pak relations have been founded again and again. However, the political leaders have created jingoism. Nazia Hussain or Nurjahan may be
famous in India as Lata Mangeshkar or Kishore Kumar in Pakistan but people to people relationship has hardly shown any evidence of warmth. Spectators in an India-Pakistan hockey or cricket match visualize the defeat or victory in the context of national honour and still in its hard-core sense of Hindu-Muslim cleavages. However, time has come when the leaders of the two countries should come forward to establish genuine friendship so that their harmony would be an asset to international politics.

4.8 Sino-Indian Relations

The relation of India with China is of hoary antiquity. The history of Sino-Indian relation even dates back to the time of Harshavardhana when Huen Tsang came from far off China to India to learn the Buddhist principles. When India became free, she pursued a definite foreign policy where peaceful coexistence became the hallmark. It also perpetuated its age old link with China under the cementing tie of ‘Panchsheel’. But the Chinese committed naked aggression which was an unprecedented treachery in the history of two neighbouring nations. No doubt, the Sino-Indian boundary dispute stood as one of the most dramatic passages of international relations in the mid-twentieth century. The century witnessed the world’s two most populous neighbouring states getting convulsed in a border war in 1962.

While India was under the British rule the Indian boundaries with her neighbouring countries had been only their concern and British strategists and statesmen had seen the interests there. But after independence India pursued a definite policy regarding the boundaries. However, continuity with change became the literal principle of India’s foreign policy.

Right from independence, the Indian Government continued and retained the British Policy in Tibet. The communist China considered Tibet to be its integral part. But the Tibetans launched a war against the Chinese and in 1949 they expelled the Chinese mission from their capital, Lhasa. The Tibetans also requested India for some arms and ammunition which was favourably received. Thus, the Tibet issue became the core of hostility between India and China. While on October 1, 1949, the Chinese occupied Tibet by sending their army, New Delhi thought over the invasion. To it, the answer of China was that Tibet was an integral part of China and the problem of Tibet was an integral part of China and the problem of Tibet was entirely a domestic problem of China. Thus the attempt of India to maintain the Tibetan independence poisoned the Sino-Indian relations for a moment. Further, the friendship with China had
always been the core of Nehru’s foreign policy and therefore, India did not support the Tibet issue in UNO. India nominally accepted China’s interests in Tibet. But the arrival of China on Tibet alarmed India and its political opinion. Now, the border issue became vital for India. She had taken McMahon Line on her North-East as her border and by this time China of course did not want a demur in it.

In 1954 the Chinese Premier Chou En-lai visited India and an agreement was signed between him and Nehru which unequivocally recognised Chinese sovereignty in Tibet referring to the latter as the ‘Tibet region of China’. Though according to this treaty India renounced her sovereign right over Tibet yet at the same time it was stipulated that China would never interfere in the authority of Dalai Lama as well as in the internal affairs of the Tibetans. The signatories endorsed the famous ‘Panchsheel’ or the ‘Five Principles of Peaceful Co-existence’ at the same time which were:

- Mutual respect for each other’s territorial integrity and sovereignty;
- Mutual nonaggression;
- Mutual non-interference in each other’s internal affairs;
- Equality and mutual benefit; and
- Peaceful co-existence.

This became a new starting point of India’s relation with China. Of course, opposition and criticism of Nehru’s foreign policy continued in India but it continued only as an undercurrent. The vision of the two great new republics of Asia, marching towards a reformed future had a powerful appeal to Indian nationalism and the ‘Panchsheel’ was felt to be not only the guide for India’s relation with China, but a beacon for all nations.

But soon began the expansionist activities of China. The Tibetans rose in revolt when attempt was made to impose Chinese imperialism on Tibet. Tibet revoked the treaty with China concluded in 1951 and announced complete independence of Tibet. The Chinese forces ruthlessly suppressed the upsurge and occupied the whole of Tibet. Dalai Lama along with some of his followers took shelter in India. Later on, the question of the independence of Tibet became an important issue. The question of China’s authority over Tibet or that of Tibet’s autonomous right became rather less significant. At this situation, India aimed at:

- ensuring her own security;
- maintaining friendship with China; and
- preserving the autonomous right of a Tibet.
In support of giving asylum to Dalai Lama it could be said that it was within the exclusive right of a state to grant asylum to a political leader. Of course, according to international law no political exile was permitted to indulge in activities against the home country from his exile. So, according to international law India had every right of granting asylum to Dalai Lama and China had nothing to protest against it. After the World War I Kaiser William of Germany was also given shelter in Holland and the Paris Peace Conference did not raise the question of violation of international law on that score.

In October 1959 the UN General Assembly debated on the issue of Tibet. A resolution of the Assembly endorsed the human rights of the Tibetans and their cultural and religious freedom. It was also pointed out in the resolution that the affairs of Tibet had been increasing international tension at the time when attempts for world peace had been proceeding. The resolution scored forty-five votes. Britain and some other states obtained from voting and they argued that there was enough doubt about the question whether the UN General Assembly had the legal right of discussing the Tibetan affair according to the UN Charter.

Meanwhile, there arose boundary disputes between India and communist China. Already the Chinese forces had made incursions into Indian Territory and in 1958 the Indian government officials were made prisoners in Aksai-Chin. India refrained from making this information public under the expectation of the settlement of border disputes through mutual discussions. But after grabbing Tibet, China came to an open clash with India. Some maps were published in China at that time showing NEFA of India, some part of her northern territories and Ladakh as parts of China. India made strong protests. In its reply China informed that she would not accept the McMahon Line demarcated by the British imperialists as to be the frontier between India and China. While the two countries were in dispute over McMahon Line issue, China made a surprise attack upon India in October 1962 by taking advantage of the latter’s unpreparedness. Thus began China’s unholy war on India, a most peace loving nation of the world. After overrunning large areas of Indian Territory China announced on 21st November, 1962 a unilateral ceasefire. The government of India proposed that the position prior to 8th September 1962 should be restored all along the frontier before talks could be held between the two sides.

On 10th December 1962, the Prime Minister of Sri Lanka called a conference at Colombo of six non-aligned Afro-Asian countries- Burma, Cambodia, Sri Lanka, Ghana, Indonesia and the UAR to discuss Indo-Chinese conflict. With a view to paving the way for a peaceful settlement
the conference unanimously made the following proposals viz. in the Western sector, the Chinese should carry out their twenty kilometres withdrawal and India should keep its existing military position. Pending a final solution of the dispute, the area vacated by the Chinese would be a demilitarised zone to be administered by civilians of both sides. In the Eastern sector the line of actual control in areas recognised by both governments should serve as a ceasefire line to their respective positions. The problem of the Middle Sector should be solved by peaceful means without resorting to force.

The proposals taken at the Colombo conference were welcomed by the Government of India and accepted. The Chinese government however, rejected essential features of the proposal. They insisted that they alone should have the right to re-establish the seven posts that they claimed they had maintained in this area prior to 7th September 1962 and that there should be no Indian presence of any kind in this demilitarised zone.

Since the conclusion of Indo-Chinese conflict in 1962 India has been trying its best to normalise her relations with China. But there has been little progress during the last few years in this direction. Indian leaders from the Prime Minister downwards have time and again spoken of India’s desire to normalise relations with China. Contrary to India’s expectation China remains enigmatic. The Chinese have no doubt occasionally made a gesture or two. The first shift in the Chinese attitude towards India after the conflict of 1962 was symbolised in the presence of the Chinese envoy at receptions given for the late President Zakir Hussain in Kathmandu in 1968. Next Mao Tse-tung made handshake with Mr. Brajesh Mishra, then Indian charge of affairs in China at a May Day reception in Peking in 1970. Mao Tse-tung expressed the hope that mutual ties between India and China would improve soon.

Visitors from India have gone to China over the years but contact between the two governments has been seen minimum. The first message in years at the head of government levels was exchanged last in 1971 when Mrs. Gandhi wrote to Chou En-lai congratulating China on its admission to the United Nations. Chou was quick in reciprocating the questions. Chou in his reply to Mrs. Gandhi expressed his hope that the friendship between China and India would become stronger.

Whatever little hope the exchange of greetings had aroused was wrecked by the events that followed. China denounced India as aggressor in its conflict with Pakistan in December 1971. The breakup of Pakistan and the emergence of Bangladesh drove a new wedge in India-China relations. In order to take revenge against India, China even blocked the
entry of Bangladesh into the UN within two years since the emergence of Bangladesh. China’s attitude towards India appears to have mellowed down. China had appreciated the tripartite agreement between India, Pakistan and Bangladesh over the issue of Pak Prisoners of War (POWS). After this China did not veto Bangladesh’s admission into the UN.

The diplomatic uproar over Kashmir notwithstanding the Indian nuclear test had introduced a new element in India-China relations. Although China did not openly condemn India’s nuclear test, she did not approve in either. In April 1976, India and China resumed their diplomatic relations for the first time since the 1962 war. The change of leadership in China after the death of Chou En-lai and the ousting of Deng Xiaoping made this a propitious moment for a fresh make for friendliness in relations. Both started exchanging their ambassadors since then. Connecting on the reasons for such exchange in the relationship of India and China a BBC commentator said that normalisation of relations between India and China demonstrated greater flexibility on the part of both countries. Another interpretation was that India wanted to strengthen its position in the non-aligned world on the eve of the Colombo Summit in August 1976. The Japanese daily ‘Asahi Shimbun’ observed that to take traditional peace in the non-aligned world, India was now diversifying its diplomatic relations.

In August 1977, some disputes cropped up between India and China over the issue of the Tibetans in India. A group of Tibetans protested in New Delhi and demanded secession of Tibet from China. The latter charged India that she was conniving at the so-called anti-Chinese activities with the Tibetans in India. India strongly refuted the charge by replying that India’s traditional policy in the Tibetan question was well known and there was no question of India directed against another country. However, the tussle did not proceed further. India still hoped that the process towards normalisation and improvement of bilateral relations on the basis of the five principles would continue.

The China’s new activism in world affairs in its post-Mao period had certain bearings on Sino-Indian relations. Peking had already given an encouraging response to the fact that India took the initiative in restoring ambassadorial level relations. After the death of Mao Tse-tung China got refrained from indulging in anti-Indian propaganda and welcomed cultural, scientific and economic exchanges. China at last took a realistic view of India’s ties with the Soviet Union. Later on October 3, 1962, the Chinese official spokesman the ‘Sinuha’ observed that the Chinese Premier Zhao Ziyang would take active part in solving the border issues with India.
The border problems between India and China have been hanging till the present days. As late as 1981 the Chinese Government offered to India a number of proposals for a peaceful settlement of the boundaries of the two countries both in the north-eastern and north-western frontiers as well as for greater economic and cultural co-operation. On the basis of these proposals Indian and Chinese officials met across the table on seven different occasions. But these negotiations have till remained unfruitful. The main reason for these abortive negotiations was India's insistence on having Aksai-chin as within Indian Territory. In 1985 the Indian delegates at a meeting with the Chinese counterparts demanded that the frontier problem should be considered sector-wise. In reply to this demand, the Chinese delegates again raised the claims of China over an area of 90,000 kilometers in northern Assam which they claimed to have had been once included in the Manchu empire. They however, assured the Indian delegates that in the event of China's claim on Aksai-Chin being accepted by India, China would give up her claim on some parts of Ladakh in the north-west and Arunachal Pradesh in the north-east.

Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev met each other at New Delhi in November 1986 and discussed the regional issues. So far as Sino-Indian border issues were concerned there was no commitment or support from the Soviet side to India's claims on the border but a decided encouragement to India to settle the issue politically. As a matter of fact, China agreed to accept the McMahon Line in exchange for India agreeing to China's continued occupation of Aksai-Chin. But this offer was found unacceptable to India. China still is in occupation of several thousand miles of territory in the frontiers claimed by India as its own.

In May 1987 once again border tension mounted and China lodged a strong protest with the Indian Government for military personnel crossing the border and concentrating troops. India denied the allegation. On September 19, 1991 the Indian President R. Venkataraman while welcoming Mr. Chang, China's ambassador who presented his credentials to the Rashtrapati expressed his desire to resolve all outstanding issues with China including the boundary question in a fair and reasonable manner in conformity with national interests and sentiments. He said that cooperation and mutual exchanges in aviation, agriculture, science and technology including peaceful use of space should be concretised. Earlier on September 11, 1991 Mr. Li Peng, the Chinese Premier had said that in view of the new world situation, India and China should put aside past grievances and live in peace and friendship. He reiterated his faith on the five principles of peaceful coexistence. He said while it was true that
China and Pakistan enjoyed sound relations, it was in no way an impediment to normal relations with India. The Chinese Prime Minister came to visit India as a mark of cordial Sino-Indian relations. Unfortunately, the Chinese sympathy towards Pakistan and her attempt on opening of communication across mountain passes violating Indian claim of territory in the process kept alive an unnecessary dispute.

In September 1993 both India and China signed an agreement for the maintenance of peace and tranquility along the line of control and decided to complete the task of full delineation of the line of actual control. In July 1994 they agreed for cooperation in oil sector in respect of technology, equipment and lucrative contracts. India’s Vice President’s visit to China the same year provided new impetus to trade and economic cooperation between them. In August 1995 both of them agreed to pull back their troops in close proximity to the Sumdoring Chu Valley in the eastern sector. Their relations further developed when in November 1996 the Chinese President Zemin paid visit to India (the first ever visit by a Chinese President). They committed themselves not to use force against each other; not to cross the line of control; to reduce their respective army strength along the border; avoid large scale military exercises near the border line; and provide a network for exchanging information to deal with drug trafficking and other related crimes.

In December 1997 the two countries agreed to provide a new push to their economic relations. But deterioration surfaced in May 1998 following explosions at Pokhran. China condemned it as ‘outrageous contempt’ for the international community. India’s relations with China showed some improvement in the beginning of 1999 when India sent a delegation to Beijing under 1997 agreement. Two countries agreed to cooperate in the field of culture, human resources and environments. The June 1999 visit of India’s External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh to China brought about healthy relations between the two. Both sides reaffirmed their commitment to the principles of Panchsheel for a peaceful co-existence. In April 2000 both of them celebrated the 50th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries. In May-June 2000 President K. R. Narayanan paid a visit to China and signed an agreement to set up an Eminent Persons’ Group (EPG) to help develop the bilateral relationship.

Since then initiatives have been taken by both of them to normalise their relations and considerable progress has been experienced in this regard. However, the task of normalisation of relations has not been felt to be all that smooth because still frictions on several grounds exist between the two countries.
To sum up, boundary dispute became the theme of the Sino-Indian problem and it has been continuing so. Despite the fact that India since her independence, pursued and followed a definite foreign policy where peaceful coexistence became the hallmark, she could not be understood by her neighbouring countries and China stood no exception to it. The agreement on *Panchsheel* between India and China and the popular catchword ‘Hindu-China Bhai Bhai’ failed to catapult both of them to a permanent tie of friendship. Soon there started a shift in the Chinese policy. The Chinese contempt for neutralism became more and more obvious. The Chinese with their vast resources hoary past and tradition of armed revolution started dreaming like Japan of a co-prosperity sphere in Asia. They expected in each country in Asia an armed revolution or at least a confirmation to their policy. Nehru stood unwilling to this sort of Chinese dream. Hence the Sino-Indian war of 1962 was the ultimate outcome taking the border incidents multiplying in between 1955 and 1962, i.e., from Bandung treaty to occupation of Bomdila in present Arunachal Pradesh by China including within more than thirty clear cases of the violation of the Indian frontier. But the relation between the two countries improved after 1970’s when peaceful dialogues could be exchanged. In the recent days, though there has not been any ominous danger from China towards India but the fear of the same is not completely ruled out.

### 4.9 Indo-US Relations

India’s relations with USA were very cordial during the period following her independence. In fact India was obliged to the American President Roosevelt for his efforts to bring out independence in India. India was greatly impressed by the democratic ideals of USA. However, America took no interest in the South Asian countries, including India till the emergence of the communist China. After the communist victory in China America began to realise the importance of South Asia and tried to cultivate friendly relations with India. America wanted India to counter balance the rise of communist China. Henry Grady, the U.S. Ambassador to India said on December 1, 1947 that it was tremendously important to keep India on our side in the world struggle.

But the Indo-American relations had a bad start. The two countries clashed on various international issues. When India took the Kashmir issue to the Security Council of the UNO in January 1948, USA along with Great Britain opposed India. The USA wanted India to join military alliances of the western powers, but India preferred to the policy of non-alignment. Consequently, the US administration decided to give military aid to Pakistan. This embittered the relations between the two countries.
The views of the two countries on colonialism came to clash. For example, on the issue of Indonesia the views of the two countries were diametrically opposite. In China, while the Indian government accorded recognition to the Red Government as the legitimate government of China, the USA did not recognise the People’s Government and instead continued to support the government of Chiang Kai-shek.

The opposite stand taken by the two on the question of Korea also strained relations. During the Korean crisis of 1950, India maintained strict neutrality even though she agreed with America that North Korea had committed aggression. India also refused to contribute combat troops to fight in Korea under the UN banner. The opposition of India to the US sponsored resolution branding China as an aggressor also contributed to the straining of relations. Further friction was caused in between 1952-54 on account of Indian stand on the composition of the political conference in Korea.

Although differences continued to exist between the USA and India on the political issues, India continued to receive aid from the USA in the economic and technical fields. Under the Indo-American Technical Cooperation Agreement of 1951 although economic aid was sanctioned but the President was authorised to terminate any aid if he found it inconsistent with the national interests and security of the country. USA also gave generous contribution to India in her fight against the food problem. It was interested in turning India into a bulwark against the commission. Americans saw India as helpless vulnerable to the fold of communism and foolishly rejecting the advances of the west.

The United States took a serious view about the Sino-Indian war of 1962. The American military aid and air-umbrella was at once assured to India to check the tide of Chinese advance inside Indian Territory. The US agreed to help India and American arms aid to this country increased in spite of the protest lodged by Pakistan. Non-alignment and the attempt to play an independent role in world politics by the policy-makers of India did not however, suit American policy of containment and confrontation. This became amply clear during the Korean War. India's opposition to any extension of the fighting line beyond the 38th Parallel and the Indian resolution on the prisoners of war issue in 1952 was disliked by the United States. The protest lodged by India's Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri against the use of gas in north Vietnam angered the policy makers of the US. The unilateral decision of President Johnson to postpone the proposed visit of India's Prime Minister to the US in the year 1965 was perhaps the outcome of India’s protest against American policy of confrontation in Vietnam.
The American policy in this subcontinent patronising Pakistan as a member of the western military alliance and supplying Pakistan with fighter planes, bombers, tanks and submarines caused much anxiety and concern in India. All these American armies were used by Pakistan against India in the 1965 and 1971 wars. In the Lok Sabha discussion on the 1965 Pakistani aggression in Kutch, Prof. Hiren Mukherjerji pointed out that America was really playing China's game by sending aid to Pakistan. In her aggression on India, Pakistan used American tanks and planes against India, although American government had given definite assurance that American arms would not be used by Pakistan against India. But in face of the undoubted proof of Pakistan's aggression with American tanks and planes no step was taken to prevent such misuse of the military aid. Smt. Indira Gandhi accused America of breach of faith and contrasted American policy towards India with Russian friendliness.

The Indo-US relation took a different turn since people's upsurge in Bangladesh in 1971 against the military Junta of Pakistan. Despite India's best endeavours to place before the US government all the relation of the situation, the US Government under Richard Nixon took a hostile attitude not only towards the people of East Pakistan (Bangladesh) but towards India. The United States’ more and more tilt towards the military junta of Pakistan brought about a setback in India-US relation. The Nixon Government even threatened India and the people of Bangladesh by dispatching the seventh fleet in the Bay of Bengal. The Nixon Government suspended all US foreign aid to India and Pakistan until hostilities ceased or President Nixon declared the aid to be in America’s own interest.

However, in the USA there began a rising crescendo of the demand for improving that country’s relations with India. While speaking of a dialogue with India, Mr. Nixon had been blowing hot and cold in the same breath. He continued to accuse India of aggression against Pakistan. The critics of Mrs. Indira Gandhi’s foreign policy however, point out that there was a clear departure from India's proclaimed policy of non-alignment (during the regime of Mrs. Indira Gandhi, who had tilted towards Soviet Russia and embittered India's relations with the United States). Meanwhile Indo-US relation reached its lowest point. In October 1974 the two countries agreed to promote cooperation with each other on the basis of equality, mutual respect and understanding. Since then the two countries agreed to set up a joint council to promote trade and commerce. India and USA then planned to promote cooperation in science and technology as also in the field of culture.

In the 1977 elections the Janata Party scuttled the Congress majority in the Lok Sabha and Sri Morarji Desai replaced Smt. Gandhi as
Prime Minister. Sri Desai had promised to restore proper non-alignment and to establish friendly relations with all countries. American President Jimmy Carter had published his hope for a major power withdrawal from the Indian Ocean. India’s policy of neutrality in cold war politics was misread by the US policy makers who treated her as a runaway child to be brought to book.

When Smt. Indira Gandhi again came to power in 1980 she pursued consistently the policy of non-alignment. Her visit to the US in July 1982 had aroused a great public interest and enthusiasm both in India and the United States. On the first of August 1982 in New York she spelt out India’s view point on the subject when she said, “there have been many ups and downs in the curve of Indo-US relations. Two vibrant and plural societies cannot possibly agree on all matters and especially on details. But if we concentrate on a shared perception of global welfare, respect for the same human values we have a base on which to build understanding and cooperation. I believe that such an understanding exists between our two countries and that in the coming decades we can cooperate creatively”. The visit of US Secretary Shultz in 1983 and Vice-President George Bush after him was recognition of US of the truth of this fact.

Mrs. Gandhi described her visit as an adventure in search of understanding and friendship. Her initiative in establishing a new understanding with the US government and her people was acclaimed by the people of the two countries. Building on groundwork that had been carefully set in place by Indian and American diplomats, Mrs. Gandhi and President Ronald Reagan reached a settlement of the Tarapur fuel supply problem and concluded a far-reaching agreement for scientific cooperation. They explored new avenues of co-operation in the field of trade and culture. President Reagan assured Mrs. Gandhi that the people of the United States desire the peace and stability of the Indian Ocean area and the early end of the occupation of Afghanistan.

There had been a series of jolts to Indo-US relations in the mid 1984 which according to the US officials had been misunderstood, misrepresented, twisted and for the most part not based on fact. The jolts in the relations between India and America were due to the reports of the CIA. The CIA reported that Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi had been advised by some of her aids to authorise a preemptive attack on Pakistan's nuclear installation to prevent her from going ahead with developing nuclear weapons. The second part of the CIA briefing was that Indira Gandhi had rejected this recommendation. But the fat was already in fire. A few days later in October 1984, the US Ambassador to Pakistan, Deane Hinton declared that the USA would be responsive should India
ever attack Pakistan. It is to be noted that the 1959 US Security treaty with Pakistan obligated the USA only to consult in the event of a communist aggression. It did not involve the USA coming to the defence of Pakistan in any light with India. However, after the CIA report was made public the US tried to re-assure India that the USA had no plans to side with Pakistan against India.

Although India and the US differed on their respective approach to the Afghan issue the two countries made efforts to come closer to each other, particularly in the spheres of trade, commerce and technology. In March 1985, India and the USA concluded a major deal on the transfer of advanced technology to India which doubtlessly indicated a significant development in the relations between the two countries. Included in the deal were the American technology parks to be set up in India, to facilitate the transfer parks to be set up in India, to facilitate the transfer of technology and the so-called super computers. The agreement was hailed by business and diplomatic circles as signalling a major breakthrough in trade relation between India and the USA. In the view of senior diplomats in America a major irritant had thus been removed in Indo-US relations. Of course, in the past the USA had reservations about exporting high technology to India fearing that exporting high technology might be put to military use or diverted to the countries of the Soviet bloc. The Indo-American Capital and Technology Corporation commenting on the agreement observed thus: “This historic understanding opens up new doors for Indo-US trade. Thus a major hurdle in the way of Indo-US trade was removed”.

In June 1985, Indian Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi and the US President Ronald Reagan in a joint communiqué at New Delhi reaffirmed their desire to broaden bilateral ties and in this regard pointed to the wide range of programmes and co-operative ventures. They agreed that the science and technology programmes already initiated since 1982 would be extended for another three year period, beginning October 1985. The two leaders looked forward to the possibility of high level trade and investment missions visiting each country in the near future, in the joint communiqué, President Reagan welcomed steps being taken so far to promote regional stability and cooperation through the initiatives of the SAARC (South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation).

With Rajiv Gandhi efforts for good relations started. He paid visit to USA to thrash out the various issues. But much progress could not be made due to supply of highly sophisticated arms, AWACS (Advanced Warning and Control System) to Pakistan by the USA. The fears in New Delhi that the $500 million arms deal which Pakistan had been
negotiating with Washington coupled with the supply of AWACS could give Pakistan a distinct military advantage could no longer be discussed as unnecessarily alarmist. On the other hand, the USA refused to supply to India certain military items which had been approved earlier. Moreover, India's condemnation on bombardment of Libya by Reagan also produced tension in their relations.

But in 1990 the US aid to Pakistan was stopped because of her clandestine nuclear project and that country was advised to make up her differences with India on the basis of Simla agreement. In view of the change in the political climate that developments in the USSR brought about the Soviet Union was not able to help India as in the past and USA Ambassador to India Mr. William Clerk hinted on September 12, 1991 that the USA was rethinking about its balance of power theory and policy towards Pakistan. The USA policy, it seems has tilted in India's favour with which country Washington is eager to improve its relations. But the USA desires India and Pakistan should settle their differences bilaterally. “It is for the two countries”, said Clerk, “to bring down the tensions between them. If they want help from us we would not mind it”.

The end of the cold war and disintegration of the USSR in 1991 asked India to go closer to the US in view of the dominant role it was expected to play in the international arena. The US exerted pressure on India to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) despite her resistance on the plea of security threats from China and Pakistan. Differences also persisted between the two on New International Economic Order (NIEO), Nuclear Disarmament and other issue issues. But despite these differences both of them were convinced of the need of strengthening their bilateral relations. In fact, in May 1992 they held joint naval exercises in the Indian Ocean, which marked the beginning of a new era of increased defence cooperation between them.

The Indian budget of 1992 encouraged the policy of economic liberalisation and market economy and the American administration welcomed it. They visualized in it a big opportunity for the export of American goods and flow of US expertise to India. In fact India was obliged to welcome western aid, technology, imports and capital because India's trade had badly suffered after the disintegration of Soviet Union. The US in the mean time felt that in the changed scenario the geo-strategic significance of Pakistan had greatly decreased and it no longer needed Pakistan to channelize military supplies into Afghanistan. In June 1994 US decided to not to take any action against India under US Trade Law Special 301, and preferred to enter into negotiations with India. In December 1994 both of them signed accords for promotion of cooperation
in the energy sector. In 1995 a special body known as US-India Commercial Alliance was created to expand commercial and business relations between them.

The two countries had also differences over Tarapur reactor, the cryogenic engine sale, intellectual property rights, imposition of the Super 301 clause on India, India’s favour to time-bound programme of reduction of nuclear arsenals of the nuclear states, India’s opposition to the NPT and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). Despite differences, economic relations between them went cordial. They also reached an agreement regarding cooperation in the military and naval exercises. Relations between the two countries during subsequent years took new turns due to combination of several factors. Growing international terrorism made US closer to India. US also appreciated India’s commitment to free markets. Moreover, the rejection of the CTBT by the American Senate led to release of pressure on India to sign the CTBT, an issue which had greatly strained their relations.

The Indian visit of President Clinton in March 2000 was remarkable in establishing cordial bilateral relations. Indian Prime Minister A. B. Vajpayee and Clinton went for three rounds of talks and signed a document “India-US Relations: A Vision for 21st Century.” This ‘Vision Statement’ included the issues like regular holding of bilateral talks; dialogue on security and non-proliferation; dialogue on Asian Security; dialogue on strengthening ties between Indian and American business communities; and joint research on eradication of AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis. President Clinton also announced partial easing of sanctions imposed on India in the wake of explosions of May 1998.

In September 2000 the Indian Prime Minister A. B. Vajpayee paid a return visit to New York and held wide-ranging discussions covering political, economic and commercial fields. They went for signing five commercial pacts worth six billion dollar for projects in power, e-commerce, banking etc. The USA supported the Indian stand on the resumption of Indo-Pak dialogue only after the end of cross-border terrorism in Jammu and Kashmir. Apart from these, both of them also agreed to continue dialogue on security and non-proliferation with a narrow difference on these issues. India too continued to remain a high priority zone for the foreign policy activities of US during George W. Bush’s period of Presidency (2001-09).

From the above discussion it shows that the Indo-US relations did not pull on cordial due to their different foreign policy perceptions on international relations. Several irritants worked underneath. US did not
like India refusing to join the US sponsored military pacts and adopting the policy of non-alignment. India’s stands on recognition of People’s Republic of China and subsequent advocacy for her admission into the United Nations, on Korean issue, US Peace Treaty with Japan and Vietnam were not liked by US. On the other hand, US support to Pakistan on Kashmir issue, anti-Indian stand on the issue of Goa, open hostility during Indo-Pak war of 1971 and supply of sophisticated weapons to Pakistan also aggrieved India to a significant degree. However, both the countries continued to have good relations among them in the economic and cultural spheres.

4.10 Indo-Soviet Relations

Until 1950 Indo-Soviet relation was far from satisfactory. The Soviet Union had never believed that India or any other colonial country could achieve a real independence from a foreign rule without an armed revolution. During the World War II the Soviet Union regarded the Indian National Congress as an organisation of the Indian bourgeoisie trying to come to an unholy agreement with the British imperialists with a view to exploiting the Indian people under the camouflage of a false freedom. The transfer of power to India in 1947 could not even alter the Soviet view of the Indian situation in Moscow. The Soviet statesmen reiterated their earlier view that India had not achieved real independence. So far, the Soviet vision was in favour of a proletarian revolution in India.

However, from 1950 relations between India and Soviet Union began to improve. In 1950, a commercial treaty was signed between the two where both of them agreed to uphold the principle of co-existence for strengthening Indo-Soviet friendship. The former Soviet Premier Marshal Nikolay Bulganin and the Chief of the Communist Party, Nikita Khrushchev openly declared Kashmir an integral part of India. They also strongly condemned the imperialist policy of Portugal over Goa. They paid much tribute to the success of India’s First Five Year Plan. Since that time top leaders of both the countries have been visiting each other’s country.

Pandit J. L. Nehru also paid a visit to Moscow in 1955. Highlighting the importance of the Bolshevik Revolution in India he said, “Almost contemporaneously with your October Revolution under the leadership of the great Lenin we in India started a new phase of our struggle for freedom. Our people were engrossed in this struggle for many years and faced heavy repression with courage and endurance. Even though we pursued a different path in our struggle under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi we admired Lenin and were influenced by his example. In spite of
this difference in our methods there was at no time an unfriendly feeling among our people towards the people of the Soviet Union”.

But in the early years of independence several factors prevented a cordial relationship between India and the Soviet Union. The developments in Greece and Korea caused difference between India and the Soviet Union. The suppression of the communist party in India provoked the Soviet Press to suspect that the Government of India was making deal with Anglo-American imperialists. The decision to maintain commonwealth membership as also the opposition to the revolt of the communists in Malaya combined together to create suspicion in the Soviet Union about India’s role in the cold war. Indian capitalism it was believed by the Soviet Union would side with Anglo-American imperialism. The relations between the USSR and India however improved gradually. The death of Stalin and the consequent change in the Soviet foreign policy improved indo-Soviet relations. The close ties established by Pakistan with western military alliance drew India closer to the Soviet Union. The support given by the Soviet Union to India on the Kashmir issue cemented this friendship.

The Soviet Union earned India’s gratitude by the support given to India on Goa issue. The friendship of the people of India towards the people of the Soviet Union was demonstrated by the warm reception given to Khrushchev and Bulganin during their visit to India in 1955-56. The Sino-Indian war of 1962 did not affect Indo-Soviet cordiality; on the other hand, the Soviet Union agreed to cooperate with India in building Mig Fighter planes. This aspect of the Soviet Policy demonstrated Soviet support to India’s stand in the dispute with Red China. Indo-Soviet technical cooperation during these years beginning with the establishment of the Bhilai Iron and Steel Workshop in February 1955 has been fruitful to the extreme. The aim of Indian planning was to make India self-sufficient by establishing heavy industries. In this respect, the cooperation of the Soviet Union was of utmost importance. The Ranchi Heavy Engineering Works, the Bokaro Iron Works, the Thermal Stations at Hirakud, Korba, Bhakra and several other places, the Petroleum Refineries in Barauni and Koyali, the Madras Surgical Instruments Factory, the Manikpur Open Cast Mine are some of the instances of Indo-Soviet cooperation in the economic field. Nearly 66 major industrial projects were undertaken under Indo-Soviet agreement for cooperation in the economic field.

Indo-Soviet friendship was of utmost value to both the countries. India did not belong to the Soviet camp and firmly believed in non-alignment. But the one camp which she firmly adhered to was the peace
Soviet friendship in peace had strengthened India to pursue her peace policy and to impose peace upon those who wanted to disturb it. The proof of Soviet friendship to India was demonstrated by the Soviet support to India against Pakistan’s aggression in the Kutch area. Mr. Kosygin offered also to mediate in the India-Pakistan dispute. On September 7, 1965 the Russian Premier Kosygin offered her good offices and prepared to convene a meeting at Tashkent to enable the two countries to begin talks. The offer was accepted and four days later the cease-fire was announced. President Ayub Khan of Pakistan and Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri of India finally met at Tashkent from January 3 to 10, 1966. The two countries got convinced that their outstanding problems could be solved through negotiations only. As Russia was deeply interested in preserving peace in the sub-continent, she refrained from blaming either side responsible for starting the conflict and tried her level best to bring peace between two.

On January 10, 1966 the Tashkent Declaration in which both the countries agreed to restore friendly relations was signed; unfortunately Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Sastri breathed his last at Tashkent on January 11, 1966. It was largely due to the herculean efforts of Kosygin that the Tashkent talks which were leading towards failure achieved a major success. But in 1968 the decision of the Soviet Union to supply arms to Pakistan caused constraint in India. Mrs. Indira Gandhi said that India’s foreign policy would not undergo any change as a result or Russian arms bid to Pakistan although we are not happy about it.

The leaders of the two countries acknowledged with deep appreciation and gratitude of the friendly and noble past played by Soviet Union in arranging the Tashkent meeting. In 1968 with the Russian decision to supply arms to Pakistan the relations between India and Soviet Union became little cold. The public opinion in India was much agitated over these developments. The Government of India made no change in her policy towards Soviet Union though it was made clear that India was not happy with Soviet Union.

India was not happy about it yet it did not war her relations with USSR. The strength of Indo-Soviet friendship and cooperation and its qualitative development to a higher plane resulted in the twenty years treaty of peace, friendship and co-operation signed on August 9, 1971 between India and the Soviet Union. Here again the Soviet policy was just the opposite of the power game and balance of power approach of Washington-Beijing axis which utilised Pakistan as a countervailing factor against India and threatened the peace of this sub-continent in 1971. The emerging Beijing-Washington axis towards which Islamabad also
contributed its write encouraged the Pakistani rulers to continue their bloody reprisals against the freedom loving people of Bangladesh and to take a rigid posture of hostility towards India.

According to its terms the Soviet Union would come to India's help in case of an attack or threats of an attack by Pakistan, China or any other country. The manner of help would be settled after mutual consolations. This treaty would remain valid for twenty years and would be automatically extended for each successive five years unless either party would give a twelve month notice of termination. Other articles of the treaty include subjects like respect for independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity, efforts to halt arm race and achieve disarmament measure against colonialism and racialism, mutual economic, scientific and technological cooperation.

While surprised by the signing of a formal Soviet-Union Pact, the USA expressed the uncertain hope that the accord would reduce the threat of war between India and Pakistan. The U.S. officials admitted their puzzlement about just what the new pact warmed. They conceded that it automatically score-points for the Soviet Union in its relations with India. According to American view, this treaty was a multiplication of risks for the Soviet Union rather than of assured benefits.

Both India and the Soviet Union described the treaty as a landmark in the field of Indo-Soviet collaboration. The friendship assumed more importance when war broke out between India and Pakistan in December of the same year. The Soviet Union came to the rescue of India when the former vetoed each U.S. proposal in the Security Council. The Soviet Union took a great risk by dispatching a Soviet war-fleet in the Indian Ocean when the U.S. sent her seventh fleet in the Bay of Bengal during the Indo-Pak war. This perhaps deterred the USA to push the matter to any extreme. The Indo-Soviet ties were further strengthened by the visit of the Indian Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi to the Soviet Union in September 1982 preceded by the Soviet President Mr. Leonid Brezhnev’s visit to India in 1980.

Since the assumption of office as Prime Minister, Rajiv Gandhi had been making efforts in the direction of improving India’s ties with USSR. Doubtless, it was with the Soviets that there had been considerable movement forward because of substantial convergences of interests. Mikhail Gorbachev’s visit to India in November 1986 was another landmark in the Indo-Soviet relationship and did credit to India’s diplomacy. In a special document called the Delhi Declaration, the Soviet Union and India proposed that an international convention banning the
use of or threat to use nuclear weapons be concluded immediately pending the elimination of nuclear weapons altogether. The two leaders said, the expansion of nuclear arsenals and development of space weapons undermine the universally accepted conviction that a nuclear war should never be fought and can never be won. Then they set forth ten principles to achieve the objective of a nuclear weapons free world. As a matter of fact, the approach to nuclear disarmament and world security of these two leaders were almost identical. Indian and Soviet Union leaders spoke as one such issue as non-proliferation of nuclear arms and nuclear tests in West Asia and South Africa. On the question of Afghanistan, the Soviet position was restated in the declaration with India reiterating its hope that an early solution be found and that all foreign interference in that country to be ceased.

The Delhi declaration continued unexceptionable principles that were clearly the handwork of the Indian diplomats. Indian negotiations had also taken a close look at even economic and technological cooperation efforts made by Moscow, be it the construction of atomic power stations or of a space centre. The economic and trade agreements concluded with the Soviet Union raised cooperation to a higher stage.

The Indo-Soviet relations were further strengthened by the signing of the Indo-Soviet Pact on science and technology on 3 July 1987. India and Soviet Union signed a long term comprehensive agreement for cooperation in science and technology. The agreement which envisaged the transfer of state of the art technology to India till 2000 AD was initiated by Rajiv Gandhi and Mikhail Gorbachev. Eight specific areas identified for cooperation between the two countries included space science, electronics and computers, immunology, material science and technology etc. Speaking on the signing ceremony of the agreement, Gorbachev observed that the Soviet Union fully appreciated the concern of India and its people over the hostile anti-India campaign designed to undermine the country's unity and erode its international potential. Gorbachev said there is no place for mistrust in relations between the Governments and peoples of the Soviet Union and India.

In 1989 the rouble was devalued ten times as compared to the dollar. This affected India too because of an artificially high rouble for core sector projects to be supported by Soviet credit. The Janata Dal carried forward the tradition of Indo-Soviet friendship when it came to power by a wide range of agreement which included cooperation in science, technology and production. But with the adoption of the new constitution in the Soviet Union in 1991 after the failure of the coup to oust Gorbachev the character of the trade changed following the decision of the republics
to conduct foreign trade on their own. Every republic was allotted its quota of exports to India. From the rupees thus earned, the republic was allowed trade directly with Indian firms. India had already rendered its trade agreement with some. On December 21, 1991 eleven republics of the former Soviet Union signed an agreement at Alma Ata (Kazakhstan) declaring USSR dead and forming into a Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) of which Russia agreed to grant rocket booster to India.

India’s relations with the CIS improved following President Boris Yeltsin’s visit to India in January 1993. Both of the countries resolved the long standing issue of Rupee-Rouble exchange rate and signed a new treaty of friendship and cooperation in economic, political and other fields. Russia also offered full support to India on the Kashmir issue and agreed to implement the agreement on space cooperation, including supply of cryogenic engines. The July 1994 visit of India’s Prime Minister P. V. Narasimha Rao to Russia cemented agreements on various subjects like defence, science, technology and environments etc. Russia also agreed to provide India a credit of 830 million for the purchase of arms. In December 1994 the Russian Prime Minister while visiting India signed eight agreements on protection of investments; merchant shipping; long-term purchase of certain Indian commodities by Russia; and cooperation in the exploration and use of outer space for peaceful purposes etc.

Both the countries also signed an agreement in October 1996 by which they agreed to exchange information on military interests and hold joint military exercises. In March 1997 Indian Prime Minister Deve Gowda paid a visit to Moscow and signed agreements relating to avoidance of double taxation; extradition; mutual assistance in custom matters; cooperation in physical culture and sports, etc. In April 2000 Russia ratified the Extradition Treaty which aimed at alienating terrorism. In June 2000 Indian External Affairs Minister Jaswant Singh visited Moscow and held a series of high-level meetings to forge a strategic partnership. India expressed support for Moscow’s stand in opposing US plans to build National Missile Defence in contravention of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty.

In October 2000 President Vladimir Putin visited India and signed with India four key defence agreements totaling three billion dollars. Russia also agreed to provide two cryogenic engines to power the Indian GSLV rocket. Both Putin and Indian Prime Minister A. B. Vajpayee signed a “Declaration on Strategic Partnership” under which two countries agreed to consult each other to neutralise any threat to the other side. They discussed on the need for multipolar world order; democratisation of international relations; global elimination of nuclear weapons; peaceful
use of nuclear energy; non-participation in any military-political or other alliance or armed conflict; fighting against terrorism, separatism, organised crime and drug trafficking; and cooperation in the field of metallurgy, fuel and energy, information technology and communications.

Since then till the recent past India’s relations with Russia have been basing upon friendly bilateral lines with mutual trust, cooperation and peaceful co-existence being the guiding factors.

4.11 India and Non-Alignment

In the tornado of the post Second World War international politics followed by the polarised cold war game, the voice of a small power was decided and hardly recognised. The military pacts and regional groupings like NATO, Warsaw Pact, SEATO and CENTO etc. were relegated to backdrop and above all, the normal situations here aggravated by the threat or use of force, acts of aggressions and intervention by the deepening economic crisis and spiralling arms race and by the policy of imperialism, colonialism, apartheid and racialism etc. At such a crossroad the Non-alignment Movement (NAM) emerged as a pillar of hope for the world with India playing a pioneering role. The NAM has been a level cap in the achievements of India’s foreign policy right from the Belgrade Conference of 1961 down to these days. Despite being the US denigrating J. L. Nehru as a crypto-communist and the USSR branding him as a lackey of imperialism and despite all cynicism, setbacks, rebuffs, failures and frustrations that the NAM gained the NAM has expanded into a broad-based multi-ethnic, multi-regional, cross-cultural and trans-political movement symbolising the hopes and aspirations of the developing world community.

Non-alignment was never a dogmatic creed rather it was the need of the hour. It crystallised in it the quintessence of India’s foreign policy. J. L. Nehru as the architect of India’s foreign policy fathered the NAM and was dictated by the imperative needs of the time. Nehru could find that the countries of Asia, Africa and Central America which were emerging as liberated nations faced the acute problems of social development and economic independence. They were someway or rather tried with the colonial countries and thus isolated from the mainstream of international politics. To put an end to this situation, it was necessary for them to map out an effective foreign policy and to implement it through joint efforts.

Non-alignment is one of the most significant features of India’s foreign policy. When India gained independence the world was divided into two camps headed by two super powers namely Soviet Union and USA. As
India was keen to play an effective role in the international arena, it thought it proper to keep her away from these power blocs. Emphasising this point Pandit Nehru said, “If by any chance we align ourselves definitely with one power group we may perhaps from one point of view do some good, but I have not the shadow of doubt that from a larger point of view not only of India but of world peace it will do harm. Because then we lose that tremendous vintage ground that we have of using such influence as we possess and that influence is going to grow from year to year in the cause of world peace”.

He further asserted, “I feel that India can play a big part and may be an effective part in helping the avoidance of war. Therefore, it becomes all the more necessary that India should not be lined up with any groups of power which for various reasons are in a sense full of fear of war and prepare for war”.

4.11.1 Non-alignment and National Interest

It may be observed that the policy of non-alignment was dictated by the consideration of national interest. Because of its liberal traditions India could not align itself with Soviet Union which believed in ideology of violence and revolution. On the other hand, here geographical location (with Soviet Union and China close to her borders) demanded that she should not join the Western Alliance. The traditional attitude of tolerance also impelled India to remain non-aligned. Above all, the interests of the country demanded that India should pursue policy of non-alignment. This point was emphasised by Nehru thus: “By aligning ourselves with one power, you surrender your opinion, give up the policy you would normally pursue because somebody else wants you to pursue another policy. I do not think that it would be a right policy for us to adopt. If we did align ourselves we would only fall between two stools. We will neither be following the policy based on our ideals inherited from our past or the one indicated by our present nor will we be able to adapt ourselves to the new policy consequent on such alignment.” Nehru could conclude that if the newly liberated nations would not keep themselves aloof from the tentacles of bloc politics they would fail at their attempts to safeguard their political freedom and economic interest. So to Nehru, NAM was the only way, the only alternative left.

Nehru, soon assuming the portfolio of foreign affairs in the Interim Government of India made a statement on September 7, 1946 which was probably the first more or less clear enunciation of the policy that subsequently got developed into the concept of non-alignment. He asserted, “We propose as far as possible to keep away from the power
politics of groups, aligned against one another which have led two world wars and which may again lead to disasters on even vaster scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and denial of freedom everywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere and lead to conflict and war”.

This declaration of Nehru might have appeared romantic, idealistic and impracticable to the world but Nehru was not the man to be frustrated. In December 1947 he as the Prime Minister of India delivered an important speech in New Delhi in which he defined his concept of non-alignment of not belonging to blocs and declared India’s firm intention to pursue a non-aligned foreign policy. Thus Nehru can justifiably be called the father of the concept and policy of non-alignment and India, the birth place of non-alignment movement.

4.11.2 Non-alignment and Neutrality

The term non-alignment is often mistaken for neutrality which does not convey the real nature of India’s foreign policy. Nehru took strong exception to the use of ‘neutral’ for India’s foreign policy. To Nehru non-alignment did not mean isolationism, non-commitment, neutrality or non-involvement. It was positive neutralism which meant independence in foreign policy, active opposition to aggression and keeping oneself aloof from bloc politics.

Until 1954 the Soviet Union as well as the leaders of the world socialist movement considered the NAM to be something fake. On the other hand, the US policy makers took this as a deviation from the well-established terms of international relations. But the adoption of non-alignment as the main principle of India’s foreign policy has not in any way hampered India’s friendly cooperation with other countries. It has concluded number of agreements for economic, cultural as well as political cooperation. Again it has also not prevented her from taking an unbiased view of the various political events and expressing her views. It is well known that India strongly condemned the North Korea aggression against South Korea in 1950, Anglo-French invasion of Suez in 1956, the Soviet intervention in Hungary in 1956 and the US use of force in Vietnam in 1954. In short, India has tried to judge the various international issues on merit and taken definite stand on these issues.

4.11.3 Development of Policy of Non-alignment

The Non-aligned Movement (NAM) is a group of states which are not formally aligned with or against any major power bloc. As of 2012, the movement has 120 members and 17 observer countries. Though the basic
principles of policy of non-alignment were formulated during the early years of Indian independence these were further elaborated and supplemented during the subsequent decades.

In 1956 Marshall Tito, the President of Yugoslavia, J. L. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India and Nasser, the President of Egypt met at the Brijamini Islands of Yugoslavia and outlined ways for the further development of NAM as a political trend in international life. By 1960, there were nearly 20 non-aligned countries. In 1960, Nehru, Nasser, Tito and Sukarno (the Indonesian President) who were attending the session of the UN General Assembly in New York, reached an agreement to convene a conference of all the non-aligned countries.

However, the long cherished aspiration of Nehru was translated into reality in 1961 at the first NAM Summit held at Belgrade in Yugoslavia where 25 members participated. It was largely conceived by India's first prime minister, Jawaharlal Nehru; Indonesia's first president, Sukarno; Egypt's second president, Gamal Abdel Nasser; Ghana's first president Kwame Nkrumah; and Yugoslavia's president, Josip Broz Tito. All five leaders were prominent advocates of a middle course for states in the Developing World between the Western and Eastern blocs in the Cold War. The phrase itself was first used to represent the doctrine by Indian diplomat and statesman Vengalil Krishna Menon in 1953, at the United Nations.

Thus, under the pioneering role of the Indian Prime Minister, Mr. J. L. Nehru, the first conference of the NAM was held and NAM emerged as a movement fighting for 4 D’s – détente, decolonialisation, development and disarmament. It started fighting for the economic development of the developing nations, liberation of the subjugated states and above all the mutual understanding of the two super powers.

The Chinese attack of 1962 gave a traumatic shock to the Indians and specifically to J. L. Nehru. Nehru faced many a criticism but never got disappointed. He once said that the people of India had been living in a dreamland of their own creation. But India did not abandon the policy of non-alignment. For Nehru, it was in nature of an article of faith, a basic principle almost akin to national independence which could not be bartered away by certain momentary difficulties.

The second summit of NAM was held at Cairo of Egypt in 1964 with its 47 members. For the next six years no summit of the NAM was held. But Indira Gandhi after assuming the office of the Prime Minister continued this policy. The preparatory committee for the third summit
also convened a meeting at New Delhi in June 1970 and finally the third summit was held at Lusaka in Zambia in 1970 where 53 members participated. Mrs. Indira Gandhi represented it from India. In the documents of this conference, the terms like non-aligned movement and non-aligned states were for the first time used and thus NAM ushered in a new era. They took decisions to meet at regular times and set up machineries for cooperation and coordination among themselves.

Since 1972 periodical meetings of the foreign ministers of the non-aligned countries took place and thus the NAM grew in its size and stature. The subsequent non-alignment summits - fourth was held at Algiers in 1973 with 75 members, fifth at Colombo of Sri Lanka in 1976 with 85 members, sixth at Havana of Cuba in 1979 with 92 members and seventh at New Delhi in 1983 with 101 members. In all these conferences India played a dynamic role and predominantly a key role in getting its seventh summit convened at New Delhi.

At the Havana Summit, the NAM tilted towards the Soviet Union but it was India which maintained a non-aligned stand. From Havana summit the NAM echoed the idea of preservation of national sovereignty, independence, territorial integrity of non-aligned countries; aimed at struggling against imperialism, colonialism, racialism, apartheid and all forms of foreign expansionism; maintaining the international peace and security; promotion of detente worldwide; and above, all ending the arms race especially nuclear arms race. It supported Vietnam in her struggle against the US imperialism and favoured the cause of Palestine against the jingoism of Israel. It refused to recognise the Camp David accords, condemned USA’s Middle East Policy and in all those resolutions there was the echo of Indian voice which was very much distinct.

In its struggle to eliminate neocolonialism and colonialism, it also took steps for the establishment of a new international economic order and India also played a role here at. However, in holding the seventh summit at New Delhi in March 1983, India showed to the world her desire to encourage NAM as a vociferous movement in International politics. At this summit Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India became the chairperson and wanted to give the NAM a renewed vigour. The summit included 99 members and two National Liberation Organisations (PLO and SWAPO). Like the sixth summit this summit was convened at a time when the international situations had been aggravated and economic conditions of the developing countries had been in deterioration.

As the chairperson, Indira Gandhi urged the world community to avoid war and aggression. They also condemned the use of threat of force,
acts of aggression, intervention, bloc rivalries and confrontations etc. They asserted that the quintessence of the policy of NAM, based on its original principles and character consisted of the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, apartheid, and racism etc. It also rejected the polarization of blocs or formation of military blocs or alliances. They urged for disarmament and international security; condemned the apartheid in South Africa and Namibia; supported the cause of Palestine; wanted to make India a zone of peace; withdrawal of foreign troops from Afghanistan and Kampuchea; and gave stress on peaceful settlement of mutual disputes among the non-aligned nations.

The economic declaration asked for immediate steps for the creation of a new international economic order, cancellation of debts of the less developed countries (LDCs), substantial increase in the International Development Association (IDA) finance for developing nations, creation of another trust fund financed by the sale of IMF gold to meet developing countries needs for additional development finance, and respect for the right of every state to unrestricted access to nuclear technology for peaceful purposes under non-discriminatory conditions etc. The action programme for economic corporation called upon the member countries and other developing countries to coordinate their efforts at the UN Conference to promote international cooperation in the uses of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes.

In 1985-91 NAM increasingly lost its lustre which had been lent to it by the ceaseless struggle waged by Mrs. Indira Gandhi and Rajiv Gandhi on behalf of the backward countries. Their efforts did eventually lead to a ceasefire between Iran and Iraq in October 1984 after intense backstage negotiations conducted by the Indian Ambassador at the UN. The eighth summit was held at Harare of Zimbabwe on September 1-7, 1986 attended by nearly 100 heads of states. In his survey of the international scene, the outgoing chairman of NAM, Rajiv Gandhi assailed governments which had refused to impose sanctions against Pretoria tried to undermine the UN system that had not responded to the plea for a moratorium on nuclear tests. He also proposed a package of assistance for the frontline African states and committed India's help to all Africans states that would have to bear the brunt of Pretoria's retaliations. While he commended the Soviet response to the 6-Nations initiative with a unilateral moratorium extended three times he condemned the negative US attitude.

Referring to the blackmail tactics of the West on NAM countries, Rajiv Gandhi told them bluntly that no country, no super power could ascribe to itself the right to unilateral action which transgressed
international law. “We are prepared to consider deliberate negotiation but shall not submit”, he warned. He spoke of the valiant struggle of Namibian people for their freedom from the South African thraldom and he pledged total support to the PLO, the sole authentic representative of Palestine in its struggle to secure for its people their inalienable national rights. He assured of NAM’s full support to the people of Nicaragua whose unflinching bravery and passionate commitment to freedom was an inspiration to all. Zimbabwe’s Prime Minister Robert Mugabe who assumed the chairmanship of NAM called on the Third World countries to break the shackles of apartheid and poverty and advised all concerned to end speedily foreign intervention in Afghanistan.

In 1987-88 the ‘Africa Fund’ was set up under the inspiring chairmanship of Rajiv Gandhi who presented his report on it at the 9th NAM summit held on September 4-7, 1989 at Belgrade (Yugoslavia) attended by 102 member states. It exhorted all concerned to press for early North-South dialogue to correct the economic balances threatening world peace and society and to take steps to end the regional conflicts involving many NAM countries. The US Secretary General, Javier Pérez de Cuéllar stressed the importance of the NAM in the changed international environment. The summit called for a political solution to the Afghanistan problem, the Kampuchean question, early independence of Namibia, democratisation in Latin America and restoration of legitimate rights of the Palestinian people. Rajiv Gandhi made history by proposing on September 5, 1989 the creation of an $18 billion-a-year-international environmental fund (Planet Protection Fund) highlighting the growing NAM concern at the increasing global pollution. He suggested that if all UN members contributed one thousand of their gross domestic products, the fund would receive $18 billion a year. The summit also constituted a 15 member summit level group of NAM including India to take measures to enhance South-South Cooperation and to open a dialogue with the developed countries of the North.

In December 1989, Rajiv Gandhi lost the election and India seemed to have been suddenly engulfed by the dark period. Both the Prime Ministers of India, V. P. Singh and Chandrasekhar failed to cater their attention justifiably on foreign relations and world politics. The NAM became a distant chapter. Added to this vacuum were the breakup of the Soviet State system and the eclipse of the USSR as one of the two independent factors in world politics in 1990-91. The USA suddenly found itself in almost complete monopoly of world power. The Gulf war countered the course of the ‘African Fund’ and undermined not only the NAM but also the UN system.
It is unfortunate that the tenth ministerial meeting of the NAM held in Accra of Ghana in September-October 1991 failed to make a proper assessment of the relevance of NAM in the merely emerging international system. Nor did it make a candid evaluation of the strengths and weaknesses of the movement. Of course, it turned down and rightly so the suggestion made by some members that it should convert itself into the Third World Movement as the concept of Third World stood no longer a scientifically valid concept. It also gave a call for enlarging the Security Council but it made no reference to the role of the peace keeper forces or the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

In 1991 it appeared that it had no longer a voice a direction or even agenda. Nothing exposed its debilitated state more dramatically than the meeting of NAM foreign ministers in Belgrade in February 1991 which was then the chairman of NAM and a country which even then had been shaken down to its roots by a series of implosions whose very existence was under severe challenge and from which to expect any sort of leadership of NAM was tantamount to self-delusion of a particularly stupefied kind. Here, India was represented by her foreign minister, Vidya Charan Shukla who was never an expert in diplomacy. He had to seek refuge in the clever drafting of consensus texts which were rejected even before the ink on the paper on which they were written had dried.

The Indian paper "The Nonaligned Peace Initiative (NAPl)" was based on high innocuous principles- end of the war through a peaceful solution, protection of the civilian population from the devastation caused by war involvement of the Security Council at every phase leading to a negotiated settlement, adjuring the use of chemical weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. The paper also called for the immediate cessation of all hostilities simultaneously with the commencement by Iraq of an equivocal commitment to pull back its forces from Kuwait as well as an announcement of a time frame for complete withdrawal. It also urged the foreign troops to withdraw from the region simultaneously with the withdrawal of Iraqi forces and their replacement by a UN Peace Keeping Force. The concluding part of the paper consisted of two specific suggestion: to send a small team of NAM foreign ministers to Baghdad and Washington to discuss the cessation of hostilities and the schedule for the Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait and to hold an emergency session of the Security Council to discuss the medium and longer range issues listed in the document. Now the Indians knew in advance that their proposals would be summarily rejected not only by Washington but also by Baghdad. But they felt that the reiteration of the principles of NAM would vindicate its purpose.
The P. V. Narasimha Rao Government which came to power in 1991 reaffirmed its faith in non-alignment. In the 1992 NAM Summit at Jakarta India too played a dominant role in highlighting various issues like disarmament, terrorism etc. The Deve Gowda Government that came to power in June 1996 and the new United Front Government which succeeded it in 1997 also worked on the principle of non-alignment. The Governments under A. B. Vajpayee and Dr. Manmohan Singh assuming power in 1998 and 2004 respectively continued to pursue the same while dealing their foreign policies.

This policy of nonalignment proved immensely beneficial to India. She not only kept the option open to develop its relations with various countries, but was also able to secure all types of aid from countries of both the blocs. No doubt, in the initial years the country had to face lot of difficulties because the two super powers did not look at India’s non-alignment with favour and interpreted it as extending support to the rival power. However, slowly this hostility towards non-alignment died and most of the countries of Asia and Africa after their independence preferred to adopt this policy. This policy apart from serving the national intersects of India also went a long way to the strengthening of the cause of world peace.

Nonalignment both as a policy and as a movement has not become entirely irrelevant and this is despite the eclipse of the USSR. The smaller members of the NAM must however, have some great country to look to for leadership for inspiration and encouragement. That country is still India not China or Japan. The background of Sino-US and US-Japanese relations is not free from trouble spots and Washington would not eventually support either Beijing or Tokyo for that central role in the NAM. It is only India which can fill in the vacuum caused by the collapse of the Soviet power and thus provide an alternative centre of power for the non-aligned nations.

4.12 South East Asia in World Affairs

The vast region of Asia situated east of the Indian subcontinent and south of China. It consists of two dissimilar portions: a continental projection (commonly called mainland Southeast Asia) and a string of archipelagos to the south and east of the mainland (insular Southeast Asia). Extending some 700 miles (1,100 kilometres) southward from the mainland into insular Southeast Asia is the Malay Peninsula; this peninsula structurally is part of the mainland, but it also shares many ecological and cultural affinities with the surrounding islands and thus functions as a bridge between the two regions.
Mainland Southeast Asia is divided into the countries of Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar (Burma), Thailand, Vietnam, and the small city-state of Singapore at the southern tip of the Malay Peninsula; Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, which occupy the eastern portion of the mainland, often are collectively called the Indochinese Peninsula. Malaysia is both mainland and insular, with a western portion on the Malay Peninsula and an eastern part on the island of Borneo. Except for the small sultanate of Brunei (also on Borneo), the remainder of insular Southeast Asia consists of the archipelagic nations of Indonesia and the Philippines.

Southeast Asia’s population includes a wide variety of ethnic groups and cultures. This diversity is related to its position as a focus of converging land and sea routes. On the mainland the Khmer peoples of Cambodia remain as ancestors of earlier Pareoean peoples. Similarly, remnants of the Mon group are found in parts of Myanmar and Thailand; the ethnic mixture there has been produced by overlaying Tibeto-Burman and Tai, Lao, and Shan peoples. The contemporary Vietnamese population originated from the Red River area in the north and may be a mixture of Tai and Malay peoples. Added to these major ethnic groups are such less numerous peoples as the Karens, Chins, and Nāgas in Myanmar, who have affinities with other Asiatic peoples. Insular Southeast Asia contains a mixture of descendants of Proto-Malay (Nesiot) and Pareoean peoples who were influenced by Malayo-Polynesian and other groups. In addition, Arabic, Indian, and Chinese influences have affected the ethnic pattern of the islands.

The incorporation of Southeast Asia into the world economy had a major impact on the distribution of the region’s economic development, and it created more uneven patterns of population growth and economic activity. It also brought about a stronger sense of class distinction and resulted in a larger discrepancy between the wealthy and poor. The worldwide economic depression of the 1930s severely affected the commercialized areas most dependent on the world economy. Unemployment rose, and the period produced the seeds of political change and activism that culminated in the independence of most of the region’s countries after World War II.

Since the 1950s the economic development strategies of virtually all the capitalist Southeast Asian states have emphasized urban industrialization, while agricultural development generally has been viewed as subsidiary to industrial growth. These strategies have met with mixed success. Indeed, the trading pattern of the region by and large has continued to be one of producing and exporting raw materials and importing manufactured goods. Only Singapore has reached an advanced
level of industrialization, in the process becoming one of the world’s great centres of industry and commerce. There is great disparity in development rates within the region, especially between the member and non-member countries of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Those belonging to this grouping—Brunei, Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand—generally have experienced significant economic development since the mid-1960s; the exception has been the Philippines, the economy of which has grown at a much slower rate. Development has been extremely slow or nonexistent in the non-ASEAN countries of Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Vietnam, and these are among the poorest nations in the world.

Industrialization in Southeast Asia is a relatively recent phenomenon, much of the development having occurred only since the early 1960s. As mentioned above, industrialization policies have been critical goals in the market economies of the ASEAN countries; and, in all of them except Brunei, industry’s share of the GDP has grown considerably. The most significant increases have occurred in Singapore, Thailand, and the Philippines. Manufacturing in particular has accounted for the greatest changes, with Indonesia, Malaysia, and Thailand making especially large gains during the 1980s.

Given Southeast Asia’s strategic location and the early development of trade there, it is not surprising that trade is especially important to all nations in the region. The value of regional trade is about one-third that of the United States. Most striking is the almost total dominance of trade by the market economies. Exports, as a percentage of the GDP, are small in Cambodia, Myanmar, Vietnam, and Laos and moderately so in Thailand, the Philippines, and Indonesia. Countries with a relatively large proportion of export trade are Singapore, Malaysia, and Brunei. Intraregional trade among the ASEAN members, while important, accounts for only about one-fifth of Southeast Asia’s total trade. Philippine trade within the region is especially small, reflecting its long-term orientation toward the United States. Far more important, therefore, is the trade with countries outside the region, dominated by that with Japan, Europe, and the United States; increasingly significant, however, is the trade with Taiwan, China (especially Hong Kong), and South Korea.

4.13 The Bandung Conference - 1955

War and Peace, like two buds in a stem or two sides of a coin are two synonyms that can never be separated from each other. Though most of the nations of the world, in the winter of 1939, plunged and relapsed themselves to the catastrophe of the Second World War bringing about a collapse in the international power politics. Still after the war,
despite bi-polarisation of the world, most of the devastated nations involved themselves in various treaties to become the harbinger of peace and pacifism. One of the most outstanding developments in the post World War II era has been the emergence of the Asians and Africans from the shackles of the colonial rule and the obscurity imposed by foreign domination. The Bandung Conference took peace in response to a persistent and widespread effort among the peoples of Asia and Africa to play their proper role in solving international tension and promoting world peace.

4.13.1 Emergence of Asian Consciousness

The Bandung conference is the outcome of the desire of the Afro-Asian countries to cooperate in the international field. The first Asian Relations conference held at New Delhi in 1947 was attended by delegates of 28 Asian countries who emphasized the identity of interests of the Asian countries and need of close collaboration among them. When Dutch took police action against Indonesia in 1949, nineteen delegates from the Afro-Asian Nations met at New Delhi and called upon the Dutch troops to withdraw from the areas under the control of Indonesia. This group protested against racialism in South Africa and supported the UN resolution for self-determination in Tunisia and Morocco, and above all, played a prominent role in preparing the basis of peace when the Korean War was going on.

4.13.2 Purpose of the Conference

The Colombo powers including India, Pakistan, Indonesia, Burma and Sri Lanka decided in their Bogor (Indonesia) meeting in December 1954 to call a full-fledged meeting of the Afro-Asian states in April, 1955 to be held at Bandung in Indonesia. The purpose of the meeting was fourfold:

- to promote goodwill and cooperation among the nations of Asia and Africa;
- to consider social, economic and cultural problems in relation to the countries represented;
- to consider problems of special interests of the Asian and African people, problems reading national sovereignty, racialism and colonialism; and finally
- to view the position of Asia and Africa and their contradiction which the Asian and African could make towards world peace and cooperation.
The conference invited the Foreign ministers of all independent states of Asia and Africa but South Korea, Formosa, South Africa and Israel were excluded from the conference. Russia taken to be primarily an European power was not invited to it.

The conference met from 18-24 April, 1955 chaired by Ali Sastroamidjojo. It was also attended by the Chinese Prime Minister Chou En-lai. At her first appearance, China demanded solving of her dispute with USA and Indonesia. Pt. J. L. Nehru, India's Prime Minister attended the meeting and proved himself to be the most matured statesman of the conference. The principle of coexistence and 'Panchsheel' found acceptance in the conference. There was no voting on any topic and an agreed communiqué was issued at the end of the conference. "The conference revealed" as Palmer and Perkins observe, "that there is no such thing such as an ‘Afro-Asian bloc’ and certainly no alignment of East vs. West. On almost every issue the delegates at Bandung showed many variations of view points and emphasis”.

4.13.3 Issues Discussed and Decisions Pledged

However two most important issues discussed and decided by the Bandung conference were- colonialism of Soviet Russia was criticized by many countries but the Ceylonese representative was the most outspoken. There was sharp reaction from the Chinese representative Chou En-lai and Pandit Nehru of India was highly perplexed but ultimately the issue was amicably solved but without heat and agitation.

The right of collective defence was put forwarded by Pakistan but was opposed by India. Many similar issues were put forward like the admission of China in the UNO and the question of double nationality of Chinese in Burma, Indonesia and Thailand. The issues were ultimately solved but it did show gap between the view points of various countries.

The participant countries at the end of the conference agreed to provide technical assistance to one another in the form of experts, trainees, pilot projects for demonstration purposes. The conference recommended an early establishment of a special United Nations fund for economic development and the allocation by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) of a greater part on its resources to the countries of Asia and Africa. It emphasized the
need for stability in international prices of and demand for primary commodities through unilateral and multilateral arrangements.

The conference attached considerable importance to shipping and to the development of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes for Asia and Africa. It agreed to the appointment of liaison officers in the participating countries for the exchange of opinion and matters of mutual interest and also deplored the policies and practices of racial segregation and discrimination which had led to the denial of fundamental rights and impeded cultural development in Africa and other parts of the world. It was mainly due to the efforts of the Afro-Asian Group in the United Nations that the racialism in South Africa and Rhodesia etc. was debated and the powers practicing racialism were censored.

Despite the fact that colonialism "in all its forms could not be condemned but the conference declared that colonialism "in all its manifestation" is an evil and should speedily be brought to an abrupt end. It extended assistance to the people of Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia in their struggle for self determination. It also championed the cause of the rights of the Arabians of Palestine and emphasized the resolutions of UNO on peaceful settlement of Palestine questions to come to effect soon.

It emphasized the need for promoting cultural co-operation among the countries of Asia and Africa. It held that the best results in cultural cooperation would be achieved by pursuing bilateral arrangements to implement its recommendations and each country taking action on its own wherever possible.

This conference consistently supported the UN intervention in the various political issues to ensure that the world peace was not disturbed. It was mainly due to the insistence of this conference that United Nations set up special fund and launched various technical aid programmes in the various under-developed countries with a view to expanding the development of the economics of these countries. It also pledged full support to the rights set forth in the UN Charter and took note of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights as a common standard of achievement for all people and all nations.

The conference also recommended the principle of universal membership in the United Nations to enable Cambodia, Ceylon, Japan,
Jordan, Libya, Nepal and United Vietnam to be admitted to the world body. For the first time the attending states demanded a number of amendments in the charter of UNO to give better representation of the Afro-Asian states in the General Assembly and the Security Council.

It also considered that disarmament and the prohibition of production, experimentation and use of nuclear and thermo nuclear weapons of destruction were imperative to save mankind and civilization from the fear and prospect of complete destruction. It was also for the first time that neutrality was accepted as a basic principle for all Afro-Asian problems to keep up better economic and political relationship among various states.

It also agreed that sovereignty and integrity of all nations must be honoured and they should all be treated as equals for all intents and purposes without any considerations or economic development. Interference in any form in the internal affairs of any country was regarded as a denial of a right of a state. They also agreed that mutual differences would be sorted out through collective security arrangements or by the UNO or by special arbitration and consolation agencies. Non-aggression was adopted as the motto of the conference and respect for mutual interests and international justice was accepted as a basic principle of Afro-Asian international policy.

The Bandung conference opened the eyes of the white rulers of Europe and America and it was abundantly clear to them that the countries of the two continents were capable enough to demonstrate their sense of unity, solidarity and integrity of purpose against new colonialism as indirectly adopted by Russia and America. It was also exhibited by this conference that they could rise to meet a situation in future.

The Bandung conference was an event of great significance because for the first time in history the independent countries of Asia and Africa met for discussion of their common interests. In other words, Bandung marked the recession of Europe in Asia. In the words of Prof Ian Thomson, "Bandung marks one of the greatest and most crucial turning points of modern history. It amounted to more than a declaration of sovereign independence for the continent of Asia and from the bondage of Europe. It was not a postmortem on what had gone before so much as an expression of a new vitality which had inspired half of Asia and most of North Africa. It was an outburst of racialism for the moment
elapsing even the force of nationalism, and it marked a new solidarity between a vast group of emancipated nations”.

On the disadvantages of the Bandung conference Prof. Vernon Mucky observes, “This has complicated the international relations. It creates not only substantive problems but organisation difficulties for all the foreign offices of the world. It brings forth a large group of untrained and inexperienced diplomats dealing with unfamiliar task”. However, it is not possible to agree with this criticism because the Afro-Asian countries did not complicate the international relations, rather they strengthened the same. Moreover, these countries contributed to world peace not only by keeping out of the two power blocs but also by avoiding war if possible and keeping out of all wars except those undertaken in self- defence; by opposing military pacts because these led to insecurity; and through collective action in right direction.

To conclude, the resurgence of Afro-Asian nations to the thrilling heart of Bandung marked a turning point in the history of world politics and the conference found its culmination rightly in the situation when the "ill- fed, ill- clothed, ill- housed, illiterate and ill" inhabitants of these countries, from the dungeon of irrationality, inhumanity, racialism, colonialism and imperialism were brought to the limelight of carte blanche of a new world. As if, the conference had its therapeutic effects on the abolition of the so-called hatred prejudices- racialism and colonialism from the Afro-Asian periphery. This was by far the first ever conference after the cataclysmic World War II under which the Afro-Asian countries drew the attention of the United Nations to the tentacles of various world problems and simultaneously demanded the radical solution of these problems which had since long impeded the path of development of human race and by far the world peace. Therefore, it can be said that the Bandung Conference truly marked a unique importance in the subsequent conferences and treaties of the post Second World War era.

4.14 The Vietnam War

Vietnam extends roughly 1,000 miles along the eastern side of an Indo-China peninsula between the deltas of Red River and Mekong. In the east is the Gulf of Tonkin and the South China sea; in the west the mountains of Annahute Chain separate it from Kampuchea and Laos. It has also a long border with the People’s Republic of China. The population of Vietnam comprises mixed ethnic groups of high land tribes, Chinese, Kampuchean and other non- Vietnamese communities. Majority of the people are Buddhists and Taoists.
Vietnam was the most important component of the French Indo-China Empire, the other parts being Laos and Cambodia. During World War II, the French authority in Indo-China received a serious blow as a result of her humiliating defeat in Europe. After the fall of French in 1940 the Japanese moved in Indo-China. After the war, Britain and China took over Indo-China from Japan. Under the Potsdam agreement China occupied northern Indo-China down to the 16th parallel and the British occupied the remainder.

In the meanwhile, a nationalist liberation movement started in Vietnam. In 1941 Ho Chi Minh, the veteran communist leader called a congress of Vietnamese nationalist from which the league for the Independence of Vietnam emerged. He also set up an underground organization and built an army. When Japan surrendered, he set up the people’s liberation committee of Vietnam. Ultimately he succeeded in setting up a provisional government on August 22, 1945.

As France was anxious to regain her control over the Indo-China Empire, the French after their installation in southern Indo-China started re-conquering Vietnam from the South north ward. However, the Chinese allowed Ho Chi Minh to control the administration and consolidate his position. The Vietnamese demanded complete freedom and demanded the unification of the three provinces of Vietnam- Tonkin, Annam and Cochin China. The French, however, refused to concede this demand of the Vietnamese and were willing to give them freedom within the French Union. In the series of negotiations with Ho Chi Minh no agreement could be reached and ultimately it developed into a crisis. The actual fighting broke out with the French bombardment on Haiphong in November 1946. In December, Giap launched an offensive against the French in Tonkin. Thus the first Indo-China war broke out.

In the course of the war the French opened negotiations with Bao Dai, who agreed to the French proposal for independence within the French Union. Bao Dai was appointed the head of the new French dominion composed of Tonkin, Annam and Cochin-China. Great Britain and the USA recognized the government of Bao Dai. But on the other hand, the People’s Republic of China as well as Russia recognized the Ho Chi Minh’s Viet Minh (league trained in the ideals of the Russian ideology government. Thus the situation in Vietnam took a new turn by 1950, and Vietnam became a theatre of cold war.
Now onwards the French continued the war in Vietnam with the American money and American pressure. The hope of French victory in Vietnam became very dim as the war progressed. The public opinion in France turned against the bloody and expensive war. A campaign started for ending the war and opening negotiations with Ho Chi Minh. However, USA insisted on France to adopt a bolder plan to crush the Viet Minh. France tried to build up “military superiority based upon massive development”. But the plan was wrecked by the brilliant offensive of Giap at Dien Bien Phu. Giap won a decisive victory on the night of May 6, 1954. This also meant a military disaster for France.

USA was not in favour of ending the war and wanted "to use air and naval power in Indo-China because she felt that the loss of Indo-China would mean loss of entire South East Asia. In the meanwhile Mendes Frame came to power in France and in view of the prevailing public opinion decided to put an end to this colonial war.


Repeated defeat and huge waste in men and materials had made France eager for peace in Indo-China. But the policy makers in USA were unwilling to shake hand with the representatives of communist China and Ho Chi Minh at Geneva. Foster Dulles, Secretary of State of the United States advocated strong policy and threatened the use of 'A' Bomb. His policy of brinkmanship was however, unacceptable. Premier Mendes Frame fixed 20 July as the deadline within which he announced his intention of establishing peace in Indo-China, otherwise he proposed to resign. The Geneva conference met on April 23, 1954 to conclude armistice agreements covering Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. It was attended by Cambodia, Laos, Democratic Republic of Vietnam, Soviet Russia, and People’s Republic of China, Vietnam, United States and Great Britain. In all eleven documents were signed at the Geneva conference.

This conference decided for the partition of Vietnam into North and South and the dividing boundary line, decided to be the 17th Parallel. The North went to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the south went to the Saigon government. The partition was only a provisional arrangement. To unify Vietnam in July 1956, a freed general election by secret ballot was to take place under the supervision of the international commission. The two smaller states of Laos and Cambodia were to be free of all foreign troops. In the two zones of Vietnam also there were to be no foreign military basis. France was to withdraw her troops from Cambodia,
Laos and Vietnam. The governments of Cambodia and Laos were not to request for foreign aid. The members of the conference also agreed to "respect the sovereignty, independence, unity and the territorial integrity" of Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. An International Control Commission consisted of India, Poland and Canada was set up to supervise and control Vietnam. India was to preside over this Commission.

The United States by a unilateral declaration agreed not to take any action to subvert the agreement of Geneva. As a result of this declaration hopes for a peaceful settlement of the problem of Vietnam brightened. According to the agreement the country got partitioned into two- North Vietnam comprising Handi and Haiphong under the communists and south Vietnam comprising Cochin-China, the port of Saigon and parts of Annam under the tutelage of the western power. Since partition, the two states of north Vietnam and south Vietnam had been living in hostile co-existence. Indo- China was supported by a major power, North Vietnam by the communist China and South Vietnam by the western powers particularly by the United States. Like Germany and Korea, the partition of Indo- China had almost become a familiar pattern of postwar international politics. South Vietnam was an important bastion of western defence.

The withdrawal of the French from Indo- China and the partition of the country had brought about the independence of two small states Laos and Cambodia which were under constant threats from the communist China.

4.14.2 The Vietnam Crisis, 1964

There was nothing new about the Vietnam crisis of 1964. Several factors led to the origin of the crisis viz. the Geneva Agreement of 1954, the movement of the Viet Cong in South Vietnam and the intervention of the United States and China in Vietnam (North and South Vietnam and Laos). The Geneva Agreement of 1954 provided that elections throughout Vietnam should be held two years later in 1956 to ascertain whether the people wanted re-unification of the two Vietnams. The former president, Ngo Dinh Diem flouted the provision on the ground that his government was no party to it and that an agreement signed by the French could not bind him. The inability of the French to fill adequately the power vacuum in South Vietnam and the inability of moderate nationalism to carry out the tasks of a social revolution allowed North Vietnam to inspire a revolutionary agrarian movement in South Vietnam.
not only on the basis of social and economic demands but on the basis of the political slogan of national unification as well. The situation in what was once French Indo-China had been unstable since the Geneva agreement of 1954. Since that time there had been a steady infiltration of guerillas from North into South Vietnam and the Vietcong gained considerable strength. It was at this movement that the US stepped in.

It is to be noted that South Vietnam had so long been a narrow oligarchic government confined to the family of the former president Ngo Dinh Diem supported by 10% Catholic minority and was in power with liberal financial and military aid from USA. The tortures of the Diem government and the minority Catholics on the Buddhists who formed 80% of South Vietnam’s population, led to the Buddhists upheaval in September-October in 1963. The situation assumed very grave and ultimately president Diem fell a victim to the clique of military junta and lost his life in the closing months of 1963. It was at this stage that the United States had speeded up her military aid to the South Vietnamese government on the pretext of fighting communist menace in South East Asia.

According to American way of thinking unification of North and South Vietnams had to be prevented and this could be done by helping those conservative forces in South Vietnam to remain in power who had everything to lose by a communist inspired change in the social structure. This, in fact, was the core of the problem whose latest manifestation was the crisis of 1964. Washington’s complaint at the Security Council against north Vietnamese naval action against U.S. warships close to the North Vietnamese shores in the gulf of Tonkin led to its retaliatory bombings of North Vietnamese territory.

The Vietnam crisis was a post-cold war problem. China and the United States were the principal main parties to this crisis and Moscow had been maintaining a caution. Moscow’s policy of arriving at a working ideological conflict with Peking influenced Moscow’s caution.

### 4.14.3 The US Stand

The foremost foreign policy faced by the United States was the war in Vietnam. The decision facing the United States was of two fold characters; whether to extend the scope of military operations beyond South Vietnamese borders to north Vietnam, Cambodia or even to China; and whether to advise and supply armaments. Since the US
government had ruled out withdrawal from South Vietnam the only alternative was to intensify its effort of supplying more armaments and more specialists fighting the war from behind.

The war which started in Vietnam in June 1965 assumed a dangerous proportion later. The USA in collaboration with South Vietnam openly entered in the scene and thereby had given a new turn in the so-called cold war. Indiscriminate air raids on Hanoi and Haiphong in North Vietnam by America caused widespread resentment and apprehension throughout the world. In February 1966 at the conclusion of the Hawaii conference President brought a joint declaration which contained a suppressed threat of war in North Vietnam and this declaration, doubtless, aggravated the situation. To meet the situation the Americans concluded treaties of friendship and mutual assistance with some of the Asian states. The region of SEATO at which centre almost Vietnam stands, was the scene of acute tension. America’s growing interference in the internal affairs of south Vietnam evoked much protest and indignation in China, Russia and other countries of the world. The Soviet Union and China extended their moral support to the cause of North Vietnam although they had not yet then taken any active participation in the Vietnam war. For a peaceful solution of the Vietnam crisis India and other neutral countries proposed a conference like that of the Geneva Conference of 1954. China accepted it in principle.

The peace in Vietnam at the beginning of 1967 was as far away as it was at the beginning of 1966. The reason why it was so was of course military. Either side was no nearer defeating the opponent at that time than it was one year ago. U. Thant was the only individual who was charged with a peace mission, from Hanoi’s four-points proposal made in the summer of 1965 as well as from Hanoi’s willingness to meet the US representatives in Rangoon, as arranged by U. Thant and declined by Washington. It was clear that there could be peace talks even before the physical withdrawal of the US forces from South Vietnam. But this proposal was rejected by the US.

Since the planned assault of the revolutionary communists, called Viet Cong, on Saigon and South Vietnam in February 1968, a new and a complicated situation had arisen there. The widespread attacks of the Vietnam on forty provincial towns of South Vietnam and Soviet Russia’s open support to the Vietnam gave rise to a new crisis in Asia.
However, the representatives of USA, North Vietnam, South Vietnam and the Viet Cong (National Liberation Front) agreed to meet at a conference in Paris. In January 1969, the conference started. In May 1969, the US President announced his Eight-Points Peace Plan which laid emphasis on the withdrawal of the US, North Vietnamese and Viet Cong troops from South Vietnam and affording all opportunities to the people of South Vietnam to decide their future. South Vietnam endorsed the plan. But the peace plan completely ignored the essential point in the Viet Cong’s ten-points program about replacing the then Saigon government by a provisional coalition government to organize a general election for the future setup. In June, 1969, the Viet Cong announced the establishment of a provisional government in the occupied regions in South Vietnam. This government was subsequently empowered to join the Paris conference. In a way the USA and the Republic of South Vietnam recognized the Provisional Revolutionary Government (PRG) which established diplomatic relations with all communist countries and with such non-communist countries as Algeria, Cambodia, Congo, Iraq, Sudan, Syria, Mali and UAR.

Being advised by his official that a negotiated settlement rather than a military one was the next solution, the US President Johnson announced his partial bombing phase in North Vietnam in March 1968. Peace talks began in Paris in May of that year and by January 1969, the US, South Vietnam, North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front sat round a table. But progress was very little. Meanwhile, Ho Chi Minh died in September of 1969. President Nixon expressed his determination to reduce and eventually to end the US Military commitment in South East Asia. To this end a program of ‘Vietnamisation’ was launched by which South Vietnamese were given the means to shoulder on a greater share of the burden of the war. In January 1972, Nixon made a new 8-point peace offer which proposed complete withdrawal of American troops, release of prisoners of war and neutrally organized election in south Vietnam. But this offer was rejected outrightly by North Vietnam mainly because the plan did not provide for discarding the President Nguyen Van Thieu of South Vietnam.

In March 1972, the North Vietnamese began massive offensive action and occupied the provincial capital Quang Tri. President Nixon announced the mining of Haiphong and other North Vietnamese ports. The south Union and China strongly denounced it. The failure of the North Vietnamese offensive made the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese negotiations more accommodating at the Paris peace talks. The negotiations
did at last lead to the signing of a ceasefire agreement in January 1973. According to its terms, the US forces were to withdraw from Vietnam within sixty days and there would be an exchange of prisoners of war. The Vietnamese forces were to remain within their present territory. An international commission would supervise the observance of the agreement.

The agreement in fact did give non-communist South Vietnam a chance of existence. But the agreement did not provide for the withdrawal of the North Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam. Neither did it define what territory was controlled by whom. The agreement was not applied to Cambodia or Laos. President Nixon of America claimed "Peace with honour" and assured, South Vietnam continued support. Both Vietnamese governments claimed the agreement as a victory. President Thieu derived the satisfaction that Hanoi had been forced to recognize North and South Vietnam as two independent sovereign states.

In spite of the agreement, the parties concerned became more active in violating rather than honouring it. Saigon alleged large-scale infiltration of North Vietnamese troops and munitions into South Vietnam. The attempts of the International Commission of Control and Supervision to enforce the ceasefire proved unsuccessful. The talks between the South Vietnam government and the Provisional Revolutionary Government (which came into being in South Vietnam) on a political settlement did not develop.

Since January 1974 large-scale communist offensive against South Vietnam began and as such the President Thieu put his army on war-footing again. A total war began between Thieu’s government and the PRG. The Saigon government continued to face reverses and disaster. In rapid succession, the provinces of South Vietnam fell into the hands of the PRG forces. Neither American dollar nor American weapons could help Saigon government. On April 21 Thieu resigned and flew to Taiwan. Saigon made unconditional surrender to PRG forces on 30 April 1975. The remaining Americans escaped in a series of frantic air- and sealifts with Vietnamese friends and coworkers. A military government was instituted.

One phase of the Vietnam war ended almost exactly 21 years ago when the French surrendered at Dien Bien Phu in 1954. The American phase of the war had ended with the Geneva agreements of 1973, but a substantive involvement continued till the final American evacuation and the Saigon’s government’s surrender. Now
the stage was ready for political unification of the two Vietnams. On 8th June 1975, the National Council of North Vietnam passed a resolution in favour of making Hanoi as the future capital of the whole of Vietnam. The military forces of North and South Vietnam were unified in June 1975 and on July 2, 1976 the country was officially united as the Socialist Republic of Vietnam with its capital in Hanoi. Ton Duc Thang was renamed as the new President. Saigon was renamed Ho Chi Minh City. The 30-year struggle for control over Vietnam was over. Hence, the long drawn war came to an end.

4.15 The Kampucheian Problem

Kampuchea, formerly known as Cambodia, is the smallest state in Indo-China peninsula. It shares border with Thailand on the west and northwest, Laos on the north and Vietnam on the east and south-east. Around 85 percent of its population constitutes Khmers (Cambodians). Ethnic minorities were estimated in 1975 to include 453,000 Chinese, 80,000 Cheem- Malays, 50,000 Khmer Lachs (the locals) and 20,000 Vietnamese etc.

During the World War II, the Japanese allowed the French government (based at Vichy) that collaborated with the republican opponents and attempted to negotiate acceptable terms for Independence for the French. Cambodia’s situation at the end of the war was chaotic. The free French, under General Charles de Gaulle, were determined to recover Indo-China, though they offered Cambodia and the other Indo-Chinese protectorates a carefully circumscribed measure of self-government. Convinced that they had a “civilizing mission” they envisioned Indo-China’s participation in a French Union of former colonies that shared in the common experience of French culture.

Sihanouk’s “royal crusade for independence” resulted in grudging French acquiescence to his demands for a transfer of Sovereignty. A partial agreement was struck in October 1953. Sihanouk then declared that independence had been achieved and returned in triumph to Phnom Penh.

The state of Kampuchea was established as a French protectorate in 1863 at the request of King Ang Duong. In early 1940’s, the Japanese were in control of it. Following the Japanese surrender after World War II, Cambodia was recognized as an autonomous kingdom within the French Union with Norodom Sihanouk as the king. Sihanouk had been in negotiating with the French to get independence for Cambodia, which was formally announced on November 9, 1953. The Geneva agreement of 1954
reinforced troops from Cambodia. However, Sihanouk abdicated in favour of his father in 1955. Then called as Prince Sihanouk, he organized his party ‘Songkum’ and fought elections in September 1955 winning all the seats in the National Assembly. The Lon Nol region prompted Sihanouk to establish "counter government of moderates and leftists".

4.15.1 First administration of Sihanouk

As a result of Geneva Conference on Indo-China, Cambodia was able to bring about the withdrawal of the Viet Minh troops from its territory and to withstand any residual impingement upon its sovereignty by external powers.

Natural was the central element of Cambodian foreign policy during the 1950s and 1960s. By the mid-1960s, parts of Cambodia’s eastern provinces were serving as bases for North Vietnamese Army and Viet Cong (NVA/VC) activity grew, the United States and South Vietnam became concerned, and in 1969, the United States began a fourteen month long series of bombing raids target at NVA/VC elements contributing to destabilization. Prince Sihanouk, fearing that the conflict between Communist North Vietnam and South Vietnam might spill over to Cambodia, steadfastly opposed the bombing campaign by the United States along the Vietnam–Cambodia border and inside Cambodian territory. Prince Sihanouk wanted Cambodia to stay out of the North Vietnam–South Vietnam conflict and was very critical of the United States government and its allies (the South Vietnamese government).

The United States claims that the bombing campaign took place no farther than ten, and later twenty miles (32km) inside the Cambodian border areas where the Cambodian population had been evicted by the NVA. Prince Sihanouk, facing internal struggle of his own, due to the rise of the Khmer Rouge, did not want Cambodia to be involved in the conflict. Sihanouk wanted the United States and its allies (South Vietnam) to keep the war away from the Cambodian border. Not only did Sihanouk try to keep the Communist North Vietnamese soldiers from entering Cambodia territory, but he also did not allow the United States to use Cambodian air space and airports for military purposes. This upset the United States greatly. The United States saw Prince Sihanouk as a North Vietnamese sympathizer and a thorn on the United States, and using the CIA, it began plans to get rid of Sihanouk.

Throughout the 1960s domestic Cambodian politics polarized opposition to the government grew within the middle class and leftist including Paris-educated leaders like Son Sen, Leng Sary, and Saloth Sar (later known as Pol Pot), who led an insurgency under the clandestine Communist Party of Kampuchea (CPK). Sihanouk called these insurgents

4.15.2 The Khmer Republic and the War

In March 1970, while Prince Sihanouk was absent, General Lon Nol deposed Prince Sihanouk in a coup d'état [a Military coup] planned by the CIA. Lon Nol assumed the power after the military coup and allied Cambodia with the United States. Son Ngoc Thanh announced his support for the new government. On October 9, the Cambodian monarchy was abolished, and the country was renamed the Khmer Republic.

Hanoi rejected the new republic’s request for the withdrawal of NVA troops – 2,000-4,000 Cambodians who had gone to North Vietnam in 1954 reentered Cambodia, backed by North Vietnamese soldiers. In response, the United States moved to provide material assistance to the new government’s armed forces, which were engaged against both CPK insurgents and NVA forces.

In April 1970, US President Nixon announced to the American public that the US and South Vietnamese ground forces had entered Cambodia in a campaign aimed at destroying NVA base areas in Cambodia. The US had already been bombing Cambodia for well over a year by that point.

Although a considerable quantity of equipment was seized or destroyed by US and South Vietnamese forces, containment of North Vietnamese forces proved elusive. The North Vietnamese moved deeper into Cambodia to avoid US and South Vietnamese raids. NVA units overran many Cambodian army positions while the CPK expanded their small-scale attacks on lines of communication.

The Khmer Republic’s leadership was plagued by disunity among its three principal figures: Lon Nol, Sihanouk’s cousin Sirik Matak, and National Assembly leader In Tam. Lon Nol remained in power because none of the others were prepared to take his place. In 1972, a constitution was adopted, a parliament elected, and Lon Nol became president. But disunity, the problems of transforming a 30,000–man army into a national Combat force of more than 200,000 men and spreading corruption weakened the civilian administration and army.

The Communist insurgency inside Cambodia continued to grow, decided by supplies and military support from North Vietnam. Pol Pot and
Leng Sary asserted their dominance over the Vietnamese-trained Communists, many of whom were purged. At the same time, the Communist Party of Kampuchea forces became stronger and more independent of their Vietnamese Patrons. By 1973, the CPK were fighting battles against government forces with little or no North Vietnamese troop support, and they controlled nearly 60% of Cambodia’s territory and 25% of its population.

The government made three unsuccessful attempts to enter into negotiations with the insurgents, but by 1974, the CPK were operating openly as divisions, and some of the NVA combat forces had moved into South Vietnam. Lon Nol’s control was reduced to small enclaves around the cities and main transportation routes. More than 2 million refugees from the war lived in Phnom Penh and other cities.

On New Year’s Day 1975, Communist troops launched an offensive which in 117 days of the hardest fighting of the war, collapsed the Khmer Republic. Simultaneous attacks around the perimeter of Phnom Penh pinned down Republican forces, while other CPK units overran fire bases controlling the vital lower Mekong resupply route. A US funded airlift of ammunition and rice ended when Congress refused additional aid for Cambodia. The Lon Nol government in Phnom Penh surrendered on April 17, five days after the US mission evacuated Cambodia.

4.15.3 Democratic Kampuchea (the Khmer Rouge/ Red Khmer)

Immediately after its victory, the CPK ordered the evacuation of all cities and towns, sending the entire urban population into the countryside to work as farmers as the CPK was trying to reshape society into a model that Pol Pot had conceived.

Thousands starved or died of disease during the evacuation and its aftermath. Many of those forced to evacuate the cities were resettled in newly created villages, which lacked food, agricultural implements, and medical care. Many who lived in cities had lost the skills necessary for survival in an agrarian environment. Thousand starved before the first harvest. Hunger and malnutrition—bordering on starvation—were constant during those years. Most military and civilian leaders of the former regime who failed to disguise their pasts were executed.

Within CPK, the Paris-educated leaders- Pol-Pot, Leng Sary, Nuon Chea and Son Sen- were in control. A new constitution in January 1976 established Democratic Kampuchea as a Communist Representatives of the People of Kampuchea (PRA) was selected in March to choose the collective leadership of a State Presidium, the Chairman of which became the head of state.
Prince Sihanouk resigned as head of state on April 4. On April 14, after its first session, the PRA announced that Khieu Samphan would chair the State Presidium for a 5-year term. It also picked a 15-member cabinet headed by Pol Pot as Prime Minister. Prince Sihanouk was put under virtual house arrest.

The new government sought to completely restructure Cambodian society. Remnants of the old Society were abolished and religion, particularly Buddhism and Catholicism, was suppressed. Agriculture was collectivized, and the surviving part of the industrial base was abandoned or placed under state control. Cambodia had neither a currency nor a banking system.

Life in “Democratic Kampuchea” was strict and brutal. In many areas of the country people were rounded up and executed for speaking a foreign language, wearing glasses, scavenging for food, and even crying for dead loved ones. Former business men and bureaucrats were ruthlessly hunted down and killed along with their entire families. The Khmer Rouge feared that they held beliefs that could lead them to oppose their regime. A few Khmer Rouge loyalists were even killed for failing to find enough “Counter-revolutionaries” to execute.

Solid estimates of the numbers who died between 1975 and 1979 are not available, but it is likely that hundreds of thousands were brutally executed by the regime. Hundreds of thousands died of starvation and disease (both under the CPK and during the Vietnamese invasion in 1978). Some estimates of the dead range from 1 to 3 million, out of a 1975 population estimated at 7.3 million. The C.I.A. estimated 50,000 – 100,000 were executed and 1.2 million died from 1975 to 1979.

Democratic Kampuchea’s relations with Vietnam and Thailand worsened rapidly as a result of border clash and ideological differences while Communist the CPK was fiercely pro-Cambodia, and most of its members who had lived in Vietnam were purged. Democratic Kampuchea established close ties with the People’s Republic of China, and the Cambodian- Vietnamese conflict became part of the Sino-Soviet rivalry, with Moscow backing Vietnam. Border clashes worsened when Democratic Kampuchea military attacked villages in Vietnam. The regime broke off relations with Hanoi in December 1977, protesting Vietnam’s alleged attempt to create an Indo-China Federation. In mid-1978, Vietnamese forces invaded Cambodia, advancing about 30 miles (48km) before the arrival of the rainy season.

The reason for Chinese support of the CPK was to prevent a pan-Indo-China movement and maintain Chinese military superiority in the region. The Soviet Union supported a strong Vietnam to maintain a
second front against China in case of hostilities and to prevent further Chinese expansion. Since Stalin’s death relations between Mao-controlled China and the Soviet Union were lukewarm at best. In the late 1970s and early 1980s China and Vietnam would fight the brief Sino-Vietnamese war over the issue.

In December 1978, Vietnam announced formation of the Kampuchean United Front for National Salvation (KUFNS) under Heng Samrin, a former DK Division Commander. It was composed of Khmer Communists who had remained in Vietnam after 1975 and officials from the eastern sector-like Hing Samrin and Hun Sen- who had fled to Vietnam from Cambodia in 1978. In late December 1978, Vietnamese forces launched a full invasion of Cambodia, capturing Phnom Penh on January 7, 1979 and driving the remnants of Democratic Kampuchea’s army west and toward Thailand.

4.15.4 People’s Republic of Kampuchea

The Khmer and Vietnamese people had traditional hostility and in 1978 it reached the climax leading to the launching of full scale war by Vietnam on December 25, 1978. On January 10, 1979, Communist Vietnam installed Heng Samrin as head of state in the new People’s Republic of Kampuchea (PRK). The guerrilla warfare had been going on between the Heng Samrin forces, supported by the Vietnamese forces and the supporters of Pol Pot. The Vietnamese troops were in Kampuchea to support the Samrin government. The Pol Pot forces launched offensives against the Samrin government. Pol Pot forces were supported by China. Both Samrin and Pol Pot groups claimed as the real government. The Samrin government was recognized by Moscow, East European and a host of other countries. The Indians also recognized it in the beginning of August 1980. The non-aligned conference held in New Delhi in February 1981, attended by the Foreign Minister of many countries adopted a resolution on Kampuchea, calling upon the withdrawal of foreign troops from Kampuchea and allowing the people of Kampuchea to form their own government free from outside influence.

In 1982 an uneasy alliance was reached among the three groups opposing the Vietnamese-backed regime in Phnom Penh, and a government-in-exile was established with Sihanouk as president and Son Sann as prime minister. This government, despite UN recognition, received little support from Cambodians inside the country and was largely ineffectual. The member groups of the coalition continued independently to resist the Phnom Penh regime, the larger and better-equipped forces of the Khmer Rouge being the most effective.
The Vietnamese army continued its pursuit of Pol Pot’s Khmer Rouge forces. At least 600,000 Cambodians displaced during the Pol Pot era and the Vietnamese invasion began streaming to the border in search of refuge. The international community responded with a massive relief effort coordinated by the United States through UNICEF and the world Food Programme. More than $400 million was provided between 1979 and 1982 of which the United States contributed nearly $100 million. At one point, more than 500,000 Cambodians were living along the Thai-Cambodian border and more than 100,000 in holding centres inside Thailand.

4.15.5 Modern Cambodia

Vietnam whose troops were stationed in Kampuchea since 1979, had declared its intention to withdraw by early 1990 even if there was no political solution to the conflict. The ASEAN nations, however, feared that a unilateral Vietnamese withdrawal would open the gates for bloody clashes among the warring factions to gain control of the country.

On October 23, 1991, the Paris Conference reconvened to sign a comprehensive settlement giving the UN full authority to supervise a cease-fire, repatriate the displaced Khmer along the border with Thailand, disarm and demobilize the factional armies, and prepare the country for free and fair elections. Prince Sihanouk, President of the Supreme National Council of Cambodia (SNC), and other members of SNC returned to Phnom Penh in November 1991, to begin the resettlement process in Cambodia. The UN Advance Mission for Cambodia (UNAMIC) was deployed at the same time to maintain liaison among the factions and begin determining operations to expedite the repatriation of approximately 370,000 Cambodians from Thailand.

On March 16, 1992, the UN Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) arrived in Cambodia to begin implementation of the UN settlement plan. The UN High Commissioner for Refugees began full scale repatriation in March 1992. UNTAC grew into a 22,000 strong civilian and military peace keeping force to conduct free and fair elections for a constituent assembly.

Over 4 million Cambodians (about 90% of eligible voters) participated in the May 1993 elections, although the Khmer Rouge or Party of Democratic Kampuchea (PDK), whose forces were never actually disarmed or demobilized, barred some people from participating. Prince Ranariddh’s FUNCINPEC party was the top vote recipient with a 45.5% vote, followed by Hun Sen’s Cambodian people’s Party and the Buddhist
Liberal Democratic Party, respectively. FUNCINPEC then entered into a coalition with the other parties that had participated in the election. The parties represented in the 120 member assembly proceeded to draft and approve a new constitution, which was promulgated on September 24, 1993. It established a multiparty liberal democracy in the framework of a constitutional monarchy, with the former prince Sihanouk elevated to king. Prince Ranariddh and Hun Sen became first and second Prime Ministers, respectively, in the Royal Cambodian Government (RGC). The constitution provides for a wide range of internationally recognized human rights.

On October 4, 2004, the Cambodian National Assembly ratified an agreement with the United Nations on the establishment of a tribunal to try senior leaders responsible for the atrocities committed by the Khmer Rouge. Donor countries have pledged the $43 million international share of the three-year tribunal budget, while the Cambodian government's share of the budget is $13.3 million. The tribunal plans to begin trial of senior Khmer Rouge leaders in 2008.

China still remained as the complicated constant riddle in the Kampuchean crisis. China itself got engaged in the delicate task of restricting its relations with the Soviet Union and Sino-Soviet interaction in economic, political, cultural and other areas expanded during later years. What was still more encouraging was that the Sino-Vietnamese border became relatively quiet. Beijing also gave hints that it did not encourage the return of the universally discredited Pol Pot to power as a desirable alternative. What was of equal interest was that, the ASEAN had been prodding the US to influence China to drop its rigid stance of non-negotiation and also its diplomatic leverage to find a peaceful settlement.

To sum up, war weariness within Kampuchea, combined with flexible approaches both by the regional and global powers, were good auguries for a settlement of the Kampuchean problem. The new configuration of relations was expected to pave the way of peaceful existence and enable Kampuchea to reoccupy its position as a nonaligned peace loving country in South East Asia.

4.16 Sino-Vietnam Conflict, 1979

One should recall that on Feb 14, 1950 Beijing and Moscow signed a 30 year treaty that included secret protests supporting the USSR’s role as the leader of the world Communist movement. When Moscow later refused to renegotiate Sino-Soviet territorial disputes, this led to Sino-Soviet border clashes, most importantly during late 1960. Western
Scholars have all too often overlooked that even during this period of Sino-Soviet tensions the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty of friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance remained fully in force throughout the entire period of unrest. From Beijing viewpoint at least, the 1950 Sino-Soviet treaty was a major instrument through which Moscow tried to exert its hegemony over China.

Moscow was clearly concerned what might happen when the Sino-Soviet treaty reached its 30 years term. Beginning in 1969, the USSR frequently urged China to replace the 1950 treaty with a new agreement. During 1978, Soviet forces were increased along Sino-Soviet and Sino-Mongolian borders. Moscow also sought to force Beijing to come to terms by intensifying diplomatic relations with Hanoi, signing a twenty-five year defense treaty with Vietnam on November 3, 1978.

Instead of backing down, however, China announced its intention to invade Vietnam on February 15, 1979, the very first day that it could legally terminate the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty and it attacked three days later. When Moscow did not intervene, Beijing publicly proclaimed that the USSR had broken its numerous promises to assist Vietnam. The USSR’s failure to support Vietnam emboldened China to announce. On April 3, 1979 that it intended to terminate the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance.

### 4.16.1 Background of Sino-Soviet Dispute

Sino-Soviet relations through the late 1960s were marred not only by sharp disagreement over the status of Outer Mongolia, but also by numerous territorial disputes along the Sino-Soviet border. In fact, these conflicts had festered beneath the surface of Russo-Chinese relations for over a century, ever since imperial Russia forced China to sign a series of treaties ceding it vast territories. Following China’s 1949 revolution, Mao Zedong journeyed to Moscow to negotiate a formal treaty with Stalin. After two months, the Sino-Soviet treaty of Friendship, Alliance and Mutual Assistance was completed and was signed on February 14, 1950. The duration of this treaty was thirty years, and clause number six specifically stated that if neither signatories announced their intention to terminate the treaty during its final year, then the alliance would automatically be extended for a further five years.

In fact, published versions of this Sino-Soviet treaty did not include many secret protocols. The winter 1995 edition of *Cold War International History Project Bulletin* includes an account of Mao’s description of the Secret Sino-Soviet negotiations. During the negotiations, at Stalin’s initiative there was undertaken an attempt by the Soviet Union to assume sole ownership of the Chinese Changchun (i.e. Harbin) Railway.
Subsequently, however, a decision was made about the joint exploitation of the Railway, besides which the People’s Republic of China (PRC) gave the USSR the naval base in Port Arthur, and four joint stock companies were opened in China. At Stalin’s initiative, Manchuria and Xinjiang were practically turned into spheres of influence of the USSR.

On February 15, 1950, Mao grudgingly agreed to recognize the “independent status” of the MRP. This admission was a far cry from recognizing Mongolia’s complete independence from China. However, since Mao firmly believed that the Soviet government had earlier promised to return Mongolia to China, based on Mao’s later complaints, Mao must have received assurance from Stalin that Mongolia’s status, as well as the exact location of the Sino-Mongolian and Sino-Soviet borders would be discussed at future meetings. Thus, it was Moscow’s refusal to open negotiations with Beijing eventually led to border clashes during the 1950s and 1960s. Although the Sino-Mongolian border was resolved in 1962, Mao publicly denounced Soviet encroachments on Chinese territory and he protested Soviet control of Mongolia. The Soviet Union under the pretext of assuring the independence of Mongolia actually placed the country under domination”.

During the late 1960s in a series of border incidents along the Ussuri and Amur rivers the People’s Liberation Army (PLA) showed surprising tenacity against the Red Army. These conflicts were small in scope and the outcome proved to be inconclusive, but they led to later territorial conflicts in Xinjiang along China’s border with the USSR.

Although tension in Sino-Soviet relations was so great that many Western scholars referred to it as a “split”, the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty continued to exist. In fact, this treaty, including both the publicly released terms and the secret protocols, was still the foundation on which Sino-Soviet relations rested. This foundation was unstable from the very beginning, however, since the USSR refused to return Tsarist Russia’s ill-gotten gains to China’s Communist leadership. Arguably it was this issue, more than any other that led China’s leaders to condemn Soviet “hegemonism” in the Far East. It was also this issue that was destined to sour China’s relations with Vietnam during the 1970s.

4.16.2 Sino-Soviet Border Conflict

Sino-Soviet border disputes during the late 1960s were particularly disturbing to Moscow and Beijing, since both the USSR and China were now nuclear powers. These Sino-Soviet border conflicts had enormous social repercussions, however, forcing both countries to direct scarce resources to prepare for a possible nuclear war or for future military escalation along their mutual borders. The PLA’s new found confidence
that it could counter the Red Army also gave Beijing the opportunity during 1971 to adopt a new foreign policy initiative by promoting friendly relations with the United States.

In addition, China tried hard to improve its relations with Japan, signing a treaty in August 1978 which appeared to be critical of the Soviet Union’s foreign policy in Asia by specifically condemning ‘hegemonism’. Finally, Sino-Soviet tensions also spawned a number of Southeast Asian proxy wars, such as the late 1970s conflict between Cambodia and Vietnam to undermine the USSR’s growing influence.

Throughout the 1970s, Sino-Soviet tensions remained at height. During this period, Moscow tried to convince Beijing to negotiate a new agreement that would either support, or even replace, the 1950s Sino-Soviet Treaty. Beginning in 1969 and 1970, Moscow proposed that the two sides promise not to attack each other, and especially not to ever resort to the use of nuclear weapons. When Beijing did not show any interest in this Accord, however, Moscow suggested in 1971 that the two countries sign a new treaty that would disavow force altogether. For example, on 24 February 1978, Moscow publicly proposed that the two governments issue a statement of principles which would regulate Sino-Soviet relations. This statement of principles would include: (1) equality, (2) mutual respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity (3) noninterference in each other’s internal affairs, (4) the nonuse of force. Moscow clearly hoped that such a statement could be used in place of the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty to regulate Sino-Soviet relations. The ultimate goal of the USSR’s proposals, however, was clearly to limit, or perhaps even to reduce, China’s growing influence throughout Asia.

Beijing refused all of Moscow’s proposals, however, and throughout the 1970s China’s condemnation of the USSR became more vocal. For example, during February 1974, Mao Zedong publicly called for a “Third World” coalition against the so-called “First World”, in this case including both the USSR and the USA. Finally, on 26 March 1978, China’s Ministry of Foreign Affairs demanded that Moscow in addition to recognizing the existence of “disputed areas” along the Sino-Soviet border, must completely withdraw Soviet troops from the MPR as well as pulling them back from along the entire Sino-Soviet border.

In response to China’s demands, Leonid Brezhnev, the General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visiting Siberia during early April 1978, and announced that new and more advanced equipment had been provided to missile units stationed along the Sino-Soviet border. Soon afterwards, on 12 April 1978, Ulan Bator also publicly protested Beijing’s demands, stating that additional Soviet troops had been
stationed along the Sino-Mongolia border at Mongolia’s request in order to offset increased Chinese troop concentrations to the south of the border.

As these events quite clearly show, by 1978 Sino-Soviet border tensions had dramatically intensified, mainly due to increased Soviet troop concentrations along the Sino-Soviet border and in the MPR. China not only did not buckle under the USSR's diplomatic and military pressure, but Beijing tried to exert diplomatic pressure on Moscow in turn by working hard to solidify its relations with both the United States and Japan. The USSR response was to strengthen its diplomatic relations with all of the Southeast Asian countries bordering on China, and most importantly among them with Vietnam.

4.16.3 Sino-Soviet Relation and Vietnam in 1979

Although China may not have a participant in the Vietnam conflict during the 1960s and 1970s, China’s economic and material support for Vietnam played a crucial role. Not only did China send troops to Vietnam to help maintain supply lines, but Beijing’s estimate of its support for Hanoi between 1950 and 1978 exceeded $20 billion. It is not hard to understand, therefore, why Beijing might be miffed at improving relations between Moscow and Hanoi during the late 1970s. This was especially true after the two countries signed a mutual defense treaty on 3 November 1978 that was specially aimed at China. According to one scholar, this Soviet-Vietnamese alliance made Vietnam the “linchpin” in the USSR’s “drive to contain China”.

Although diplomatic relations between Beijing and Hanoi during the 1960s and early 1970s were generally good, policy differences between China and Vietnam widened after the April 1975 fall of Saigon. In September of that year, Le Duan, the Secretary-General of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) travelled to Beijing and during the series of meetings that followed Le Duan’s arrival it became clear that China was very concerned about Vietnam’s close relations with the USSR. In addition, territorial disputes over the separately Islands, as well as over Vietnam’s recent invasion of Cambodia, also increased Sino-Vietnamese tensions.

Meanwhile, increasing signs of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation also appeared. During September 1978, the USSR began carrying out increased arms shipments to Vietnam, both by air and by sea which include “aircraft, missiles, tanks and munitions”. Finally, all of these signs of improving Soviet-Vietnamese relations came to fruition on 3 November 1978, when Vietnam and the USSR signed a Treaty of Friendship and Cooperation. There was no doubt that this treaty was aimed at China, since the Sixth clause stated that Vietnam and the USSR would
“immediately consult each other” if either is attacked or threatened with attack with a view to “eliminating that threat”. Reportedly, this treaty also included a secret protocol granting Soviet military forces access to Vietnam’s “airfields and ports”.

Although Vietnam claimed that it signed this treaty with the USSR to stop Chinese “adventurist” acts. Chinese leaders in Beijing undoubtedly saw this as part of Moscow’s efforts to pressure China into backing down and newing the unequal terms of the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty. If the USSR were able to establish a foothold in Southeast Asia, it could flank China on both its northern and Southern borders. Beijing also warned that Moscow’s ultimate goal was to “bring the whole of Indo-China under its control”.

By signing the Soviet-Vietnamese defense treaty on 3 November 1978, the USSR hoped to use its relations with Vietnam to outmanoeuvre and outflank China. China’s main concern was that if the USSR’s policies in Vietnam were successful, then the Soviet government might achieve a strategic and military stranglehold over China. Ever since the Sino-Soviet rift, and especially since the Sino-Soviet border conflicts of the late 1960s Beijing’s primary goal had been to build up its own military potential in order to face off the Soviet Red Army, a goal which it had largely achieved during the middle to late 1960s, early 1970s, when the PLA’s strength reportedly reached 3.6 million men. Diplomatically, Beijing continued to try to flank Moscow by officially normalizing its relations with Washington on 1 January 1979.

In the final analysis however, Vietnam was a relatively small country both in terms of population and military strength, and it was probably the sudden arrival of large numbers of Soviet advisors an estimated 5,000-8,000 by mid- 1979 and enormous quantities of military supplies that boded ill for China’s immediate strategic security, thus, according to King C. Chen: “Had there been no Soviet-Vietnamese alliance, the sixteen day war between China and Vietnam might not have been fought. In a clear admission that the USSR’s military cooperation with Vietnam deeply concerned China, Deng Xiaoping publicly acknowledged that this new Soviet –Vietnamese “military alliance” was really just part of the USSR’s longtime goal of wanting to “encircle China”.

Following the signing of the 3 November 1978 Soviet-Vietnamese Treaty, Beijing had to find a way to break this Soviet attempt to encircle China. Thus, it was fear of being outflanked by Moscow that was instrumental in pushing Beijing into action. Clearly, China’s first step was to test the USSR’s resolve to see whether it would stand by its treaty with Vietnam or whether it would back down and accept defeat.
4.16.4 The 1979 Sino-Vietnam War

Chinese forces invaded Vietnam on 17 February 1979. Although the exact motives underlying China’s attack are still open to interpretation. Beijing’s concern was that Moscow’s twenty-five year defense treaty with Hanoi might lead to the Soviet militarization of the Sino-Vietnamese border was certainly a major factor. Moscow probably also hoped that its treaty with Hanoi would divert Chinese troops away from the north, thus weakening China’s military defense along the Sino-Soviet border.

Moscow’s hopes were dashed, however, when Beijing decided to attack Vietnam. After only three weeks of fighting, China withdrew and disputes over the Sino-Vietnamese border remained unresolved. To most outsiders, China’s military action thus appeared to be a failure. But, if the real goal behind China’s attack was to expose Soviet assurances of military support to Vietnam as a fraud, then the USSR’s refusal to intervene effectively terminated the Soviet –Vietnamese defense treaty. Thus, Beijing did achieve a clear strategic victory by breaking the Soviet encirclement and by eliminating Moscow’s threat of a two-Front war.

As promised, China’s military offensive against Vietnam began on 17 February 1979, within three days of the 29th anniversary of the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty. As Deng had announced, from the very beginning China conducted a limited action against Vietnam. Not only were many of China’s best troops stationed along the Sino-Soviet border, but Beijing decided not to deploy the estimated 500 fighters and bombers its had stationed in the area. In response to China’s attack, the USSR sent several naval vessels and initiated a Soviet arms airlift to Vietnam. On 22 February 1979 Colonel N. A. Trarkov, the Soviet military attack Hanoi, even threatened that the USSR would “carry out its obligations under the Soviet-Vietnam treaty”, elsewhere, however, Soviet diplomatic made it clear that the USSR would not intervene as long as the conflict remained limited.

After three weeks of intense fighting, China could claim that it captured three of Vietnam’s six provincial capitals- Cao-Bang, Lang Son and Lao Cai- that bordered on China. Although the Chinese forces totaled over a quarter million men, the Vietnamese turned to guerrilla tactics to rob China of a quick victory. When Beijing announced its intention to withdraw its troops on 5 March 1979, therefore, it appeared that the primary goals of this offensive had yet to be achieved, namely, Vietnam’s military potential had not been seriously damaged by China. Thereafter, the Sino-Vietnamese border remained tense when after less than three weeks of fighting, China withdrew from Vietnam.
To many outside observers, it appeared that China’s attack against Vietnam was a complete and total failure. But as Banning Garrett has correctly observed, the “Chinese demonstrated that they could attack a Soviet ally without retaliation from the paper polar bear”.

In fact by proving that the USSR would not actively intervene on Vietnam’s behalf, China was convinced that its termination of the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty would also not lead to war. As a result on 3 April 1979, Beijing announced its intentions to terminate the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance. Thereafter, although Sino-Soviet negotiations were officially opened during October 1979, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan gave China a pretense for calling off further meetings, thereby precluding any immediate need to negotiate a new Sino-Soviet diplomatic treaty.

Because the exact motives underlying China’s 1979 invasion of Vietnam have remained unclear perhaps the most common has been that China wanted to “punish” Vietnam for invading Cambodia, an area which had formerly been considered a tributary state to the Chinese empire. Other Sino-Vietnamese problems, such as territorial of Chinese national from Vietnam, have also been portrayed as playing a major role.

Moscow, by contrast, was clearly concerned what might happen when the Sino-Soviet Treaty reached its 30 year term. Beginning in 1969, the USSR frequently urged China to replace this treaty with a new agreement. To force Beijing to retreat, Moscow not only fortified the Sino-Soviet and Sino-Mongolian borders, but it also exerted pressure on China from the south, by completing a treaty of alliance with Vietnam. Thus, the improvement in Soviet–Vietnamese relations, culminating in the signing of the 3 November 1978 Sino-Vietnamese defense treaty can be directly linked to China’s worsening relations with the USSR during the late 1970s. Instead of backing down, however, China invaded Vietnam on 17 February 1979, just three days after the 29th anniversary of the signing of the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty. When Moscow refused to intervene on Hanoi’s behalf Beijing decided that the Soviet politburo would not resort to war to force China to retain the 1950 Sino-Soviet Treaty and so was emboldened to announce on 3 April 1979 that it intended to terminate this treaty.

One of Beijing’s primary goals in attacking Vietnam was to ensure that China was not surrounded by Soviet forces. China’s 1979 invasion of Vietnam did achieve these strategic objectives since the USSRs refusal to intervene on Vietnam’s behalf undermined the threat of a two front war with the USSR and Vietnam.
Diplomatically, China also won a clear victory against Soviet attempts to pressure her into signing a new treaty to replace or augment the Sino-Soviet Treaty of Friendship, Alliance, and Mutual Assistance of 14 February 1950. Finally, in hindsight, China’s claim that the USSR was really just a “paper polar bear” appears to have the first outside indicator that the Soviet empire threatened by internal collapse, a collapse that only became evident ten years later with the 1989 fall of the Berlin Wall and with the 1991 dissolution of the USSR.

4.17 Let Us Sum Up

After the World War II most of the countries of Asia gained independence and the vast empires held by Britain, France and the Netherlands were gone. The emergence of Asia in the mid-twentieth century became a major training point in the contemporary world history. After centuries of subjugation Asia started governing itself. In the sphere of international relations these countries followed the policy of peaceful coexistence, mutual progress and cooperation. This attitude of the Asian countries went a long way in consolidating the forces of peace and stability in the world. The Arab- Israeli conflict has been one of the most persistent world order disputes of the contemporary international politics disturbing the Middle Eastern peace to an unprecedented degree. The issue of Palestine added dimensions to such tremor. The Middle East escalated itself into the explosive theatre of modern world’s majority wars, incorporating the shriek of Arab nationalism, Zionism, the history of anti-Semitism, colonialism, Islamic decolonialisation and imperialism. And the Iranian Revolution substituted the pro-west capitalist regime of Shia with a regime of the Shiite religious fanatics. By his programmes of “White Revolution”, the Shah boomeranged his own downfall and the “White Revolution” was like a Frankenstein monster which devoured its author i.e. Shah. Khomeini with his Islamic tempo made capital out of the situations and set the Islamic Revolution go.

The role of India being a nascent independent state after the end of the Second World War to see the world march on the path of peace, harmony, mutual cooperation, racial parity, economic self-reliance and non-alignment across the cold war politics was significant. Opposition to all forms colonialism, imperialism or no colonialism, friendly relations with all countries especially the then shortly emancipated states of Asia, Africa and Latin America were too some of the issues India highly stressed upon. She combined in herself the twin principles of idealism and pragmatism while developing nexus with the nations under a changed international scenario. Her foreign policy with Pakistan, the USA, USSR and China developed all along based on these ethics.
Southeast Asia even having borne the brunt of the World War II never lagged behind to forge the path of progress despite being hit by a score of problems inviting troubles from the Super Power rivalry. The Bandung conference of 1955 opened the eyes of the white rulers of Europe and America. It was an event of great significance because for the first time the independent countries of Asia and Africa met for discussion of their common interests. This was by far the first ever conference after the cataclysmic World War II under which the Southeast Asian nations demanded the radical solution to their problems. It marked truly a unique importance in the subsequent conference and treaties of the post Second World War era. Vietnam in the post war period demanded complete freedom from the French hegemony and demanded the unification of the three provinces of Vietnam- Tonkin, Annam and Cochin- China. The French, however, refused. Series of negotiations opened up with Ho Chi Minh, but no agreement could be reached and ultimately it developed into a crisis. Finally, the military forces of North and South Vietnam were unified in June 1975 and on July 2, 1976 the country was officially united as the Socialist Republic of Vietnam with its capital in Hanoi. Kampuchea was under the French in 1863 and under the Japanese in early 1940’s. Following the Japanese surrender after World War II, Cambodia was recognized as an autonomous kingdom on November 9, 1953 with Norodom Sihanouk as the king. As discussed above, one of Beijing’s primary goals in attacking Vietnam in 1979 was to ensure that China was not surrounded by Soviet forces. China’s invasion of Vietnam did achieve such strategic objectives.

4.18 Key Words

Anti-Semitism: Hostility toward or discrimination against Jews as a religious or racial group.

Bellicosity: Favoring or inclined to start quarrels or wars belligerent.

Blasphemy: Sacrilege/Wickedness.

Brinkmanship: The art or practice of pushing a dangerous situation or confrontation to the limit of safety.

Calumny: A misrepresentation intended to harm another’s reputation.

Carte blanche: Full discretionary power.

Chauvinism: Excessive or blind patriotism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crescendo</td>
<td>Increase/Climax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crypto</td>
<td>A person who adheres or belongs secretly to a party, sect, or other group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypher</td>
<td>One that has no weight, worth, or influence/nonentity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks and drakes</td>
<td>To use recklessly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frankenstein Monster</td>
<td>A work or agency that ruins its originator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genocide</td>
<td>The deliberate and systematic destruction of a racial, political, or cultural group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imbroglio</td>
<td>Problem/Embarrassment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indignation</td>
<td>Resentment/Annoyance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intransigence</td>
<td>Inflexibility/Obstinacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largesse</td>
<td>Generosity/Charity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obscurantism</td>
<td>Opposition to the spread of knowledge / a policy of withholding knowledge from the general public.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper polar bear</td>
<td>Term used for USSR.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plebiscite</td>
<td>A vote by which the people of an entire country or district express an opinion for or against a proposal especially on a choice of government or ruler.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vintage</td>
<td>Classic/Traditional.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westoxification</td>
<td>Getting influenced by the western ideology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zionism</td>
<td>Jewish nationalist movement that has had as its goal the creation and support of a Jewish national state in Palestine, the ancient homeland of the Jews. The protagonists of the Jewish state called upon the Jews all over the world to gather in Jerusalem and thus the movement came to be known as Zionism. It was a movement started in the latter part of the 19th century to set up a state through intensive colonialisation by driving out the local inhabitants.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**********