CONTENTS

❄ ❄ ❄ ❄ ❄

Q.1 What do you know about International Relations? What is its scope? Discuss.

Ans.   International relations

International relations occasionally referred to as international studies is the study of relationships between countries, including the roles of states, inter-governmental organizations, international nongovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and multinational corporations . It is both an academic and public policy field, and can be either positive or normative as it both seeks to analyze as well as formulate the foreign policy of particular states. It is often considered a branch of political science, but an important sector of academia prefer to treat it as an interdisciplinary field of study. Aspects of international relations have been studied for thousands of years, since the time of Thucydides, but International Relations became a separate and definable discipline in the early 20th century.

Apart from political science, International Relations draws upon such diverse fields as economics, history, international law, philosophy, geography, social work, sociology, anthropology, psychology, women's studies/gender studies, and cultural studies / culturology. It involves a diverse range of issues including but not limited to: globalization, state sovereignty, international security, ecological sustainability, nuclear proliferation, nationalism, economic development, global finance, terrorism, organized crime, human security, foreign interventionism and human rights.

History

The history of international relations can be traced thousands of years ago; Barry Buzan and Richard Little, for example, consider the interaction of ancient Sumerian city-states, starting in 3,500 BC, as the first fully-fledged international system.

The history of international relations based on nation-states is often traced back to the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, where the modern state system was developed. Prior to this, the European medieval organization of political authority was based on a vaguely hierarchical religious order. Westphalia instituted the legal concept of sovereignty, that didn't exist in classical and medieval times, which essentially meant that rulers, or the legitimate sovereigns, had no internal equals within a defined territory and no external superiors as the ultimate authority within the territory's sovereign borders. A simple way to view this is that sovereignty says, "I'm not allowed to tell you what to do and you are not allowed to tell me what to do."

Westphalia encouraged the rise of the independent nation-state, the institutionalization of diplomacy and armies. This particular European system was exported to the Americas, Africa, and Asia via colonialism and the "standards of civilization". The contemporary international system was finally established through decolonization during the Cold War. However, this is somewhat over-simplified. While the nation-state system is considered "modern", many states have not incorporated the system and are termed "pre-modern".

Further, a handful of states have moved beyond the nation-state system and can be considered "post-modern". The ability of contemporary International Relations discourse to explain the relations of these different types of states is disputed. "Levels of analysis" is a way of looking at the international system, which includes the individual level, the domestic nation-state as a unit, the international level of transnational and intergovernmental affairs, and the global level.

What is explicitly recognized as International Relations theory was not developed until after World War I, and is dealt with in more detail below. International Relations theory, however, has a long tradition of drawing on the work of other social sciences. The use of capitalizations of the "I" and "R" in International Relations aims to distinguish the academic discipline of International Relations from the phenomena of international relations. Many cite Sun Tzu's The Art of War , Thucydides' History of the Peloponnesian War , Chanakya's Arthashastra , as the inspiration for realist theory, with Hobbes' Leviathan and Machiavelli's The Prince providing further elaboration.

Similarly, liberalism draws upon the work of Kant and Rousseau, with the work of the former often being cited as the first elaboration of democratic peace theory. Though contemporary human rights is considerably different than the type of rights envisioned under natural law, Francisco de Vitoria, Hugo Grotius and John Locke offered the first accounts of universal entitlement to certain rights on the basis of common humanity. In the twentieth century, in addition to contemporary theories of liberal internationalism, Marxism has been a foundation of international relations.

Study of International Relations

Initially, international relations as a distinct field of study was almost entirely British-centered. International Relations only emerged as a formal academic 'discipline' in 1918 with the founding of the first 'chair' in International Relations - the Woodrow Wilson Chair at Aberystwyth, University of Wales , from an endowment given by David Davies, became the first academic position dedicated to International Relations . This was rapidly followed by establishment of International Relations at US universities and Geneva, Switzerland. In the early 1920s, the London School of Economics' department of International Relations was founded at the behest of Nobel Peace Prize winner Philip Noel-Baker.

The first university entirely dedicated to the study of International Relations was the Graduate Institute of International Studies, which was founded in 1927 to form diplomats associated to the League of Nations, established in Geneva some years before. The Graduate Institute of International Studies offered one of the first Ph.D. degrees in international relations. Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service is the oldest international relations faculty in the United States, founded in 1919. The Committee on International Relations at the University of Chicago was the first to offer a graduate degree, in 1928.

Concepts in international relations

Conjuncture

In decision making in international relations, the concept of, together with freedom of action and equality are important elements. Decision makers must take into

account the set of international conditions in taking initiatives that would create different types of responses.

Systemic level concepts

International relations is often viewed in terms of levels of analysis. The systemic level concepts are those broad concepts that define and shape an international milieu, characterised by Anarchy.

Power

The concept of power in international relations can be described as the degree of resources, capabilities, and influence in international affairs. It is often divided up into the concepts of hard power and soft power, hard power relating primarily to coercive power, such as the use of force, and soft power commonly covering economics, diplomacy and cultural influence. However, there is no clear dividing line between the two forms of power.

Polarity

Polarity in International Relations refers to the arrangement of power within the international system. The concept arose from bipolarity during the Cold War, with the international system dominated by the conflict between two superpowers, and has been applied retrospectively by theorists. However, the term bipolar was notably used by Stalin who said he saw the international system as a bipolar one with two opposing power bases and ideologies. Consequently, the international system prior to 1945 can be described as multi-polar, with power being shared among Great powers.

The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 had led to what some would call unipolarity, with the United States as a sole superpower. However, due to China's continued rapid economic growth , combined with the respectable international position they hold within political spheres and the power that the Chinese Government exerts over their people, there is debate over whether China is now a superpower or a possible candidate in the future.

Several theories of international relations draw upon the idea of polarity. The balance of power was a concept prevalent in Europe prior to the First World War, the thought being that by balancing power blocs it would create stability and prevent war. Theories of the balance of power gained prominence again during the Cold War, being a central mechanism of Kenneth Waltz's Neorealism. Here, the concepts of balancing and bandwagonning are developed.

Hegemonic stability theory also draws upon the idea of Polarity, specifically the state of unipolarity. Hegemony is the preponderance of power at one pole in the international system, and the theory argues this is a stable configuration because of mutual gains by both the dominant power and others in the international system. This is contrary to many Neorealist arguments, particularly made by Kenneth Waltz, stating that the end of the Cold War and the state of unipolarity is an unstable configuration that will inevitably change.

This can be expressed in Power transition theory, which states that it is likely that a great power would challenge a hegemon after a certain period, resulting in a major war. It suggests that while hegemony can control the occurrence of wars, it also results in the

creation of one. Its main proponent, A.F.K. Organski, argued this based on the occurrence of previous wars during British, Portuguese and Dutch hegemony.

Interdependence

Many advocate that the current international system is characterized by growing interdependence; the mutual responsibility and dependency on others. Advocates of this point to growing globalization, particularly with international economic interaction. The role of international institutions, and widespread acceptance of a number of operating principles in the international system, reinforces ideas that relations are characterized by interdependence.

Dependency

Dependency theory is a theory most commonly associated with Marxism, stating that a set of Core states exploit a set of weaker Periphery states for their prosperity. Various versions of the theory suggest that this is either an inevitability, or use the theory to highlight the necessity for change .

Systemic tools of international relations

1. Diplomacy is the practice of communication and negotiation between representatives of states. To some extent, all other tools of international relations can be considered the failure of diplomacy. Keeping in mind, the use of other tools are part of the communication and negotiation inherent within diplomacy. Sanctions, force, and adjusting trade regulations, while not typically considered part of diplomacy, are actually valuable tools in the interest of leverage and placement in negotiations.
2. Sanctions are usually a first resort after the failure of diplomacy, and are one of the main tools used to enforce treaties. They can take the form of diplomatic or economic sanctions and involve the cutting of ties and imposition of barriers to communication or trade.
3. War, the use of force, is often thought of as the ultimate tool of international relations. A widely accepted definition is that given by Clausewitz, with war being "the continuation of politics by other means". There is a growing study into 'new wars' involving actors other than states. The study of war in International Relations is covered by the disciplines of 'War Studies' and 'Strategic studies'.
4. The mobilization of international shame can also be thought of as a tool of International Relations. This is attempting to alter states' actions through 'naming and shaming' at the international level. This is mostly done by the large human rights NGOs such as Amnesty International, or Human Rights Watch. A prominent use of was the UN Commission on Human Rights 1235 procedure, which publicly exposes state's human rights violations. The current Human Rights Council has yet to use this Mechanism
5. The allotment of economic and/or diplomatic benefits. An example of this is the European Union's enlargement policy. Candidate countries are allowed entry into the EU only after the fulfillment of the Copenhagen criteria.

Nature of International Relations

International Relations, like the world community itself are in transition. In a rapidly changing and increasingly complex world, it encompasses much more than

relations among nation states and international organization and groups. It includes a variety of transitional relationships at various levels, above and below the level of the nation states. International relations are a multidisciplinary field gathering together the international aspects of politics, economics, geography, history, law, sociology, psychology , philosophy and cultural studies.It is a meta-discipline.

Scope of International Relations

It is known by now that international relations encompass a myriad of discipline. Attempts to structure and intellectualize it have often been thematically and analytically confined to boundaries determined by data.

The core concepts of international relations are International Organization, International Law, Foreign Policy, International Conflict, International Economic Relations and Military Thought and Strategy. International/Regional Security, Strategic Studies, International Political Economy, Conflict/War and Peace Studies, Globalization, International Regimes.

Moreover it covers , state sovereignty, ecological sustainability, nuclear proliferation, nationalism, economic development, terrorism, organized crime, human security, foreign interventionism and human rights.

These have been grounded in various schools of thought notably Realism and Idealism.

The scope of international relations has greatly expanded in modern times. Initially international relations were concerned only with the study of diplomatic history. It concentrated on the study of contemporary foreign affairs with a view to draw certain lessons. Later on emphasis began to be laid on the study of international law and international relations began to be studied within the framework of international law. The field of the study of international relations was further widened with the establishment of the League of Nations after the First World War and the study of international organizations and institutions was also included within its purview.

The scope of international relations in the post World War II period got further widened due to significant changes which took place, viz., the emergence of USA and USSR as two superpowers; the entry of a large number of non-European states into the society of nations; the danger of thermo-nuclear war; increasing interdependence of states and rising expectations of the people in the under developed world, etc. Greater emphasis began to be placed on scientific study of international relations, which led to development of new methodologies and introduction of new theories in the study of international relations.

Example:

International relations are thus concerned with every form of interaction between and amongst nations. Such interactions can also occur between corporation and social groups. Examples are interactions between member states of the OPEC or the International Human Rights Commissions. The moment such interactions cross a state boundary it is of interest to the study of International Relations. International relations recognize and respond to the fact that the foreign policy goals that nations pursue can be a matter of permanent consequences to some or all of the others.

✺ ✺ ✺ ✺ ✺

Q.2   What is realism in International Relation? What is its importance in the study of International Relation?

Ans.   Realism

In the study of international relations, Realism or political realism prioritizes national interest and security over ideology, moral concerns and social reconstructions. This term is often synonymous with power politics.

Realism is the view that world politics is driven by competitive self-interest

Common assumptions

Realist theories tend to uphold that:

1. The international system is in a constant state of antagonism.
2. There is no actor above states capable of regulating their interactions; states must arrive at relations with other states on their own, rather than it being dictated to them by some higher controlling entity.
3. In pursuit of national security, states strive to attain as many resources as possible.
4. States are unitary actors each moving towards their own national interest. There is a general distrust of long-term cooperation or alliance.
5. The overriding national interest of each state is its national security and survival.
6. Relations between states are determined by their levels of power derived primarily from their military and economic capabilities.
7. The interjection of morality and values into international relations causes reckless commitments, diplomatic rigidity, and the escalation of conflict.
8. Sovereign states are the principal actors in the international system and special attention is afforded to large powers as they have the most influence on the international stage. International institutions, non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, individuals and other sub-state or trans-state actors are viewed as having little independent influence.

In summary, realists believe that mankind is not inherently benevolent but rather self-centered and competitive. This perspective, which is shared by theorists such as Thomas Hobbes, views human nature as egocentric and conflictual unless there exist conditions under which humans may coexist. This view contrasts with the approach of liberalism to international relations.

Realists believe that states are inherently aggressive and/or obsessed with security , and that territorial expansion is only constrained by opposing powers. This aggressive build-up, however, leads to a security dilemma whereby increasing one's security may bring along even greater instability as an opposing power builds up its own arms in response . Thus, security becomes a zero-sum game where only relative gains can be made.

Realists believe that there are no universal principles with which all states may guide their actions. Instead, a state must always be aware of the actions of the states around it and must use a pragmatic approach to resolve problems as they arise.

History and branches

Historic antecedents

While Realism as a formal discipline in international relations did not arrive until World War II, its primary assumptions have been expressed in earlier writings:

1. Sun Tzu, an ancient Chinese military strategist who wrote the Art of War.
2. Thucydides, an ancient Greek historian who wrote the History of the Peloponnesian War and is also cited as an intellectual forebearer of realpolitik.
3. Chanakya early Indian statesman, and writer on the Arthashastra.
4. Han Feizi, Chinese scholar who theorised Legalism and who served in the court of the King of Qin - later unifier of China ending the Warring States Period. His writings include The Two Handles . He theorised about a neutral, manipulative ruler who would act as Head of State while secretly controlling the executive through his ministers - the ones to take real responsibility for any policy.
5. Niccolò Machiavelli, a Florentine political philosopher, who wrote Il Principe in which he held that the sole aim of a prince was to seek power, regardless of religious or ethical considerations.
6. Cardinal Richelieu, French statesman who destroyed domestic factionalism and guided France to a position of dominance in foreign affairs.
7. Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher who wrote Leviathan in which he stated the state of nature was prone to a "war of all against all".
8. Frederick the Great, Prussian monarch who transformed Prussia into a great European power through warfare and diplomacy.
9. Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, French diplomat who guided France and Europe through a variety of political systems.
10. Prince Klemens Wenzel von Metternich, Koblenz-born Austrian statesman opposed to political revolution.
11. Carl von Clausewitz, 18-19th century Prussian general and military theorist who wrote On War .
12. Otto von Bismarck, Prussian statesman who coined the term balance of power. Balancing power means keeping the peace and careful realpolitik practitioners try to avoid arms races.
13. 20th century proponents of realism include Henry Kissinger, the National Security Adviser and Secretary of State to President Richard Nixon, French General and President Charles de Gaulle, and Soviet leader Joseph Stalin.

Classical realism

Classical realism states that it is fundamentally the nature of man that pushes states and individuals to act in a way that places interests over ideologies. Classical realism is defined as the "drive for power and the will to dominate held to be fundamental aspects of human nature".

Modern realism began as a serious field of research in the United States during and after World War II. This evolution was partly fueled by European war migrants like Hans Morgenthau.

1. George F. Kennan - Containment
2. Nicholas Spykman - Geostrategy, Containment
3. Herman Kahn - Nuclear strategy
4. E.H. Carr

Liberal realism or the English school or rationalism

The English School holds that the international system, while anarchical in structure, forms a "society of states" where common norms and interests allow for more order and stability than what might be expected in a strict realist view. Prominent English School writer Hedley Bull's 1977 classic entitled The Anarchical Society is a key statement of this position.

Prominent liberal realists:

1. Hedley Bull - argued for both the existence of an international society of states and its perseverance even in times of great systemic upheaval, meaning regional or so-called "world wars".
2. Martin Wight
3. Barry Buzan

Neorealism or structural realism

Neorealism derives from classical realism except that instead of human nature, its focus is predominantly on the international system. While states remain the principal actors, greater attention is given to the forces above and below the states through levels of analysis or structure-agency debate. The international system is seen as a structure acting on the state with individuals below the level of the state acting as agency on the state as a whole.

While neorealism shares a focus on the international system with the English School, neorealism differs in the emphasis it places on the permanence of conflict. To ensure state security, states must be on constant preparation for conflict through economic and military build-up.

Prominent neorealists:

1. Robert J. Art- Neorealism
2. Robert Jervis - Defensive realism
3. Kenneth Waltz - Neorealism
4. phen Walt - Defensive realism
5. John Mearsheimer - Offensive realism
6. Robert Gilpin - Hegemonic theory

Neoclassical realism

Neoclassical Realism can be seen as the third generation of realism, coming after the classical authors of the first wave , and the neorealists . Its designation of "neoclassical", then, has a double meaning:

1. It offers the classics a renaissance;
2. It is a synthesis of the neorealist and the classical realist approaches.

Gideon Rose is responsible for coining the term in a book review he wrote.

The primary motivation underlying the development of neoclassical realism was the fact that neorealism was only useful to explain political outcomes, but had nothing to offer about particular states' behavior . The basic approach, then, was for these authors to "refine, not refute, Kenneth Waltz", by adding domestic intervening variables between systemic incentives and a state's foreign policy decision. Thus, the basic theoretical architecture of Neoclassical Realism is:

Neoclassical realism is particularly appealing from a research standpoint because it still retains a lot of the theoretical rigor that Waltz has brought to realism, but at the same time can easily incorporate a content-rich analysis, since its main method for testing theories is the process-tracing of case studies.

Prominent neoclassical realists:

1. Randall Schweller
2. Thomas J. Christensen
3. William Wohlforth
4. Aaron Friedberg
5. Norrin Ripsman

Realism in statecraft

Modern realist statesmen

1. Henry Kissinger
2. Zbigniew Brzezinski
3. Brent Scowcroft

The ideas behind George F. Kennan's work as a diplomat and diplomatic historian remain relevant to the debate over American foreign policy, which since the 19th century has been characterized by a shift from the Founding Fathers' realist school to the idealistic or Wilsonian school of international relations. In the realist tradition, security is based on the principle of a balance of power and the reliance on morality as the sole determining factor in statecraft is considered impractical. According to the Wilsonian approach, on the other hand, the spread of democracy abroad as a foreign policy is key and morals are universally valid. During the Presidency of Bill Clinton, American diplomacy reflected the Wilsonian school to such a degree that those in favor of the realist approach likened Clinton's policies to social work. According to Kennan, whose concept of American diplomacy was based on the realist approach, such moralism without regard to the realities of power and the national interest is self-defeating and will lead to the erosion of power, to America's detriment.

Symbiotic realism

Nayef Al-Rodhan's Symbiotic Realism theory of international relations is based on four interlocking dimensions of the global system:

1)   interdependence;
2)   instant connectivity;
3)   global anarchy; and
4)   the neurobiological substrates of human nature.

He defines the neurobiological substrates of human nature that motivate behavior as basic needs, ego, and fear. When basic survival needs met, Nayef Al-Rodhan argues

that humans can aspire to higher things such as morality. Thus, in order for society to prosper, the state of nature among individuals must be mitigated. This has historically been done through the establishment of states and of domestic governments.

Internationally, however, the relations between states have historically and continue to be dominated by anarchy. With no overarching authority to regulate state behavior and ensure the safety and prosperity of all, international life could be considered somewhat precarious. Nayef Al-Rodhan argues that increased integration brought about by globalization helps to mitigate the consequences of global anarchy. However, globalization is also undermining the capacities of states to act as viable sites for collective action and credible commitments. This is because the states are becoming more intertwined in webs of power that are linked to shifts in the material distribution of power and authoritative resources. In other words, the state's domestic role is being transformed by the increasingly important interests of transnational capital. Because of these new emerging dynamics of the international system, Nayef Al-Rodhan maintains that in order for societies to prosper materially and morally, humanity needs some form of governance that can ensure that the basic survival needs of human beings and states are satisfied in the context of increased interdependence and instant connectivity. This conception of international relations allows for absolute rather than just relative gains, and stresses that all states can benefit from cooperation and non-conflictual competition. Symbiotic realism goes beyond the state-centrism of realism, integrating a number of actors that have often been underemphasized or ignored by the realist paradigm, such as large collective identities, multi-national corporations, international organizations, the biosphere, and women. This is vital, since these, too, are all important actors that help to reproduce the global order and, as such, have a bearing on its relations and dynamics.

Criticisms

Democratic peace

Democratic peace theory advocates also that Realism is not applicable to democratic states' relations with each another, as their studies claim that such states do not go to war with one another. However, Realists and proponents of other schools have critiqued both this claim and the studies which appear to support it, claiming that its definitions of 'war' and 'democracy' must be tweaked in order to achieve the desired result.

Federalism

The term refers to the theory or advocacy of federal political orders, where final authority is divided between sub-units and a centre. Unlike a unitary state, sovereignty is constitutionally split between at least two territorial levels so that units at each level have final authority and can act independently of the others in some area. Citizens thus have political obligations to two authorities. The allocation of authority between the sub-unit and centre may vary. Typically the centre has powers regarding defence and foreign policy, but sub-units may also have international roles. The sub-units may also participate in central decision-making bodies.

The basic idea behind federalism is that a unifying relationship between states should be established under a common system of law. Conflict and disagreement should be resolved through peaceful means rather than through coercion or war. Its most

important aspect is in recognizing that different types of institutions are needed to deal with different types of political issues.

Common assumptions

Realist theories tend to uphold that:

1. The international system is in a constant state of antagonism.
2. There is no actor above states capable of regulating their interactions; states must arrive at relations with other states on their own, rather than it being dictated to them by some higher controlling entity.
3. In pursuit of national security, states strive to attain as many resources as possible.
4. States are unitary actors each moving towards their own national interest. There is a general distrust of long-term cooperation or alliance.
5. The overriding national interest of each state is its national security and survival.
6. Relations between states are determined by their levels of power derived primarily from their military and economic capabilities.
7. The interjection of morality and values into international relations causes reckless commitments, diplomatic rigidity, and the escalation of conflict.
8. Sovereign states are the principal actors in the international system and special attention is afforded to large powers as they have the most influence on the international stage. International institutions, non-governmental organizations, multinational corporations, individuals and other sub-state or trans-state actors are viewed as having little independent influence.

In summary, realists believe that mankind is not inherently benevolent but rather self-centered and competitive. This perspective, which is shared by theorists such as Thomas Hobbes, views human nature as egocentric and conflictual unless there exist conditions under which humans may coexist. This view contrasts with the approach of liberalism to international relations.

Realists believe that states are inherently aggressive and/or obsessed with security , and that territorial expansion is only constrained by opposing powers. This aggressive build-up, however, leads to a security dilemma whereby increasing one's security may bring along even greater instability as an opposing power builds up its own arms in response . Thus, security becomes a zero-sum game where only relative gains can be made.

Realists believe that there are no universal principles with which all states may guide their actions. Instead, a state must always be aware of the actions of the states around it and must use a pragmatic approach to resolve problems as they arise.

History and branches

Historic antecedents

While Realism as a formal discipline in international relations did not arrive until World War II, its primary assumptions have been expressed in earlier writings:

Sun Tzu , an ancient Chinese military strategist who wrote the Art of War.

1. Thucydides, an ancient Greek historian who wrote the History of the Peloponnesian War and is also cited as an intellectual forebearer of realpolitik.
2. Chanakya early Indian statesman, and writer on the Arthashastra.
3. Han Feizi, Chinese scholar who theorised Legalism and who served in the court of the King of Qin - later unifier of China ending the Warring States Period. His writings include The Two Handles . He theorised about a neutral, manipulative ruler who would act as Head of State while secretly controlling the executive through his ministers - the ones to take real responsibility for any policy.
4. Niccolò Machiavelli, a Florentine political philosopher, who wrote Il Principe in which he held that the sole aim of a prince was to seek power, regardless of religious or ethical considerations.
5. Cardinal Richelieu, French statesman who destroyed domestic factionalism and guided France to a position of dominance in foreign affairs.
6. Thomas Hobbes, an English philosopher who wrote Leviathan in which he stated the state of nature was prone to a "war of all against all".
7. Frederick the Great, Prussian monarch who transformed Prussia into a great European power through warfare and diplomacy.
8. Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord, French diplomat who guided France and Europe through a variety of political systems.
9. Prince Klemens Wenzel von Metternich, Koblenz-born Austrian statesman opposed to political revolution.
10. Carl von Clausewitz, 18-19th century Prussian general and military theorist who wrote On War .
11. Otto von Bismarck, Prussian statesman who coined the term balance of power. Balancing power means keeping the peace and careful realpolitik practitioners try to avoid arms races.
12. 20th century proponents of realism include Henry Kissinger, the National Security Adviser and Secretary of State to President Richard Nixon, French General and President Charles de Gaulle, and Soviet leader Joseph Stalin.

Classical realism

Classical realism states that it is fundamentally the nature of man that pushes states and individuals to act in a way that places interests over ideologies. Classical realism is defined as the "drive for power and the will to dominate that are held to be fundamental aspects of human nature".

Modern realism began as a serious field of research in the United States during and after World War II. This evolution was partly fueled by European war migrants like Hans Morgenthau.

1. George F. Kennan - Containment
2. Nicholas Spykman - Geostrategy, Containment
3. Herman Kahn - Nuclear strategy
4. E.H. Carr

Liberal realism or the English school or rationalism

The English School holds that the international system, while anarchical in structure, forms a "society of states" where common norms and interests allow for more order and stability than what might be expected in a strict realist view. Prominent English School writer Hedley Bull's 1977 classic entitled The Anarchical Society is a key statement of this position.

Prominent liberal realists:

1. Hedley Bull - argued for both the existence of an international society of states and its perseverance even in times of great systemic upheaval, meaning regional or so-called "world wars".
2. Martin Wight
3. Barry Buzan

Neorealism or structural realism

Neorealism derives from classical realism except that instead of human nature, its focus is predominantly on the international system. While states remain the principal actors, greater attention is given to the forces above and below the states through levels of analysis or structure-agency debate. The international system is seen as a structure acting on the state with individuals below the level of the state acting as agency on the state as a whole.

While neorealism shares a focus on the international system with the English School, neorealism differs in the emphasis it places on the permanence of conflict. To ensure state security, states must be on constant preparation for conflict through economic and military build-up.

Prominent neorealists:

1. Robert J. Art- Neorealism
2. Robert Jervis - Defensive realism
3. Kenneth Waltz - Neorealism
4. Stephen Walt - Defensive realism
5. John Mearsheimer - Offensive realism
6. Robert Gilpin - Hegemonic theory

Neoclassical realism

Neoclassical Realism can be seen as the third generation of realism, coming after the classical authors of the first wave , and the neorealists . Its designation of "neoclassical", then, has a double meaning:

1. It offers the classics a renaissance;
2. It is a synthesis of the neorealist and the classical realist approaches.

Gideon Rose is responsible for coining the term in a book review he wrote.

The primary motivation underlying the development of neoclassical realism was the fact that neorealism was only useful to explain political outcomes ,but had nothing to offer about particular states' behavior . The basic approach, then, was for these authors to "refine, not refute, Kenneth Waltz", by adding domestic intervening variables between systemic incentives and a state's foreign policy decision. Thus, the basic theoretical architecture of Neoclassical Realism is:

Neoclassical realism is particularly appealing from a research standpoint because it still retains a lot of the theoretical rigor that Waltz has brought to realism, but at the same time can easily incorporate a content-rich analysis, since its main method for testing theories is the process-tracing of case studies.

Prominent neoclassical realists:

1. Randall Schweller
2. Thomas J. Christensen
3. William Wohlforth
4. Aaron Friedberg
5. Norrin Ripsman

Realism in statecraft

Modern realist statesmen

1. Henry Kissinger
2. Zbigniew Brzezinski
3. Brent Scowcroft

The ideas behind George F. Kennan's work as a diplomat and diplomatic historian remain relevant to the debate over American foreign policy, which since the 19th century has been characterized by a shift from the Founding Fathers' realist school to the idealistic or Wilsonian school of international relations. In the realist tradition, security is based on the principle of a balance of power and the reliance on morality as the sole determining factor in statecraft is considered impractical. According to the Wilsonian approach, on the other hand, the spread of democracy abroad as a foreign policy is key and morals are universally valid. During the Presidency of Bill Clinton, American diplomacy reflected the Wilsonian school to such a degree that those in favor of the realist approach likened Clinton's policies to social work. According to Kennan, whose concept of American diplomacy was based on the realist approach, such moralism without regard to the realities of power and the national interest is self-defeating and will lead to the erosion of power, to America's detriment.

Symbiotic realism

Nayef Al-Rodhan's Symbiotic Realism theory of international relations is based on four interlocking dimensions of the global system:

1) interdependence;
2) instant connectivity;
3) global anarchy; and
4) the neurobiological substrates of human nature. He defines the neurobiological substrates of human nature that motivate behavior as basic needs, ego, and fear. When basic survival needs met, Nayef Al-Rodhan argues that humans can aspire to higher things such as morality. Thus, in order for society to prosper, the state of nature among individuals must be mitigated. This has historically been done through the establishment of states and of domestic governments.

Internationally, however, the relations between states have historically and continue to be dominated by anarchy. With no overarching authority to regulate state behavior and ensure the safety and prosperity of all, international life could be considered

somewhat precarious. Nayef Al-Rodhan argues that increased integration brought about by globalization helps to mitigate the consequences of global anarchy. However, globalization is also undermining the capacities of states to act as viable sites for collective action and credible commitments. This is because the states are becoming more intertwined in webs of power that are linked to shifts in the material distribution of power and authoritative resources. In other words, the state's domestic role is being transformed by the increasingly important interests of transnational capital. Because of these new emerging dynamics of the international system, Nayef Al-Rodhan maintains that in order for societies to prosper materially and morally, humanity needs some form of governance that can ensure that the basic survival needs of human beings and states are satisfied in the context of increased interdependence and instant connectivity. This conception of international relations allows for absolute rather than just relative gains, and stresses that all states can benefit from cooperation and non-conflictual competition. Symbiotic realism goes beyond the state-centrism of realism, integrating a number of actors that have often been underemphasized or ignored by the realist paradigm, such as large collective identities, multi-national corporations, international organizations, the biosphere, and women. This is vital, since these, too, are all important actors that help to reproduce the global order and, as such, have a bearing on its relations and dynamics.

Criticisms

Democratic peace

Democratic peace theory advocates also that Realism is not applicable to democratic states' relations with each another, as their studies claim that such states do not go to war with one another. However, Realists and proponents of other schools have critiqued both this claim and the studies which appear to support it, claiming that its definitions of 'war' and 'democracy' must be tweaked in order to achieve the desired result.

Federalism

The term refers to the theory or advocacy of federal political orders, where final authority is divided between sub-units and a centre. Unlike a unitary state, sovereignty is constitutionally split between at least two territorial levels so that units at each level have final authority and can act independently of the others in some area. Citizens thus have political obligations to two authorities. The allocation of authority between the sub-unit and centre may vary. Typically the centre has powers regarding defence and foreign policy, but sub-units may also have international roles. The sub-units may also participate in central decision-making bodies.

The basic idea behind federalism is that a unifying relationship between states should be established under a common system of law. Conflict and disagreement should be resolved through peaceful means rather than through coercion or war. Its most important aspect is in recognizing that different types of institutions are needed to deal with different types of political issues.

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.3   What were the main causes of World War I? What were its aftermath? Discuss.

Ans.   World War I

The First World War, known as the Great War before 1939 and as World War One after 1950, lasted from August 1914 to the final Armistice with Germany on November 11, 1918. During the war, it was referred to as the war to end all wars. Some question the appropriateness of the term "world war" because it was largely a European, North African, and Middle Eastern war. However, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, India, and other British dominions and colonies contributed troops, and the United States also entered the conflict. Much of Asia and South America were not directly involved. The Allies of World War I, led by the United Kingdom, France, Russia, and the United States, defeated the Central Powers, led by the German Empire, the Austro-Hungarian Empire, and the Ottoman Empire. The war caused the disintegration of four empires: Austro-Hungarian, German, Ottoman, and Russian. It also brought about radical change in the European and Middle Eastern maps. The Allied Powers before 1917 are sometimes referred to as the Triple Entente and the Central Powers are sometimes referred to as the Triple Alliance. Many people believed that this would be the last European conflict and that in the future, diplomacy and detente would resolve differences. Many question whether the war was necessary, suggesting that it could have been avoided. The legacy of the war, in many respects, was World War II, which was rooted in the punitive sanctions that the World War I's victors placed on Germany. The war can be represented as totalitarian regimes verses democratic regimes, but that is a somewhat simplistic analysis because rivalry and jealousy between the two sides was a fundamental issue. Germany felt that it was entitled to an empire; Britain, France, and even Belgium possessed extensive overseas territory while Germany had just a few colonies. The democratization process, though, was more advanced among the Allies than in Germany and her main ally, the Ottoman Empire. Humanity should learn from the legacy of this war that war cannot end war—it can only lead to more violence. The higher principle of peaceful resolution of differences attracted much interest after 1918 when the League of Nations was formed, but the nations of the world were unwilling to establish this as an effective body, being reluctant to give it any real power. President Woodrow Wilson had been one of its chief architects but the U.S.A. did not join and league members tended to act in their own interest, rather than in that of all members.

Causes

Bosnia and Herzegovina On June 28, 1914, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, heir to the Austrian throne, was assassinated in Sarajevo by Gavrilo Princip of Young Bosnia, a group whose aims included the unification of the South Slavs and independence from Austria. This assassination set in motion a series of fast-moving events that escalated into a full-scale war. The cause of the conflict, however, is complex. Historians and political scientists have grappled with this question for nearly a century without reaching a consensus. The treaty that ended the war required Germany to admit to being the aggressor but this was achieved in the context of Germany's defeat, economic sanctions,

and the threat of renewed hostilities. The damage this caused to national pride would help Adolf Hitler's rise to power.

Alliances

Political scientists regard the building of alliances as a cause, specifically the formation of the Triple Entente and Triple Alliance. Alliances emboldened participating nations, leading each to believe that they had powerful backing. Both camps functioned in unique ways that contributed to the spread of war. For the Triple Alliance, the strong relationship between Germany and Austria expanded the conflict to a level where it would include at least four participants. Russia, France, and Britain had a relationship that was much less certain in 1914, contributing to the fact that each made the decision to go to war without collaborative consultation and with their own interests in mind.

Arms races

The German-British naval arms race drastically intensified after the 1906 launch of the HMS Dreadnought, a revolutionary battleship that made all previous battleships obsolete. A major naval arms race in shipbuilding developed, related to the concept of new imperialism, furthering the interest in alliances. Kennedy argues that both nations adopted U.S. Rear Admiral Alfred Thayer Mahan's conclusion that control of the oceans was vital to a great nation. Additionally, this concentration kept related industries active and unemployment down while minimizing internal strife through the focus on a common, patriotic goal. Different scholars have different opinions about the degree to which the arms race was itself a cause of the war. Ferguson points out that Britain easily maintained her advantage. On the other hand, both sides were prepared for war.

Plans, distrust, and mobilization: The First out of the Gate theory

Many political scientists argue that the German, French, and Russian war plans automatically escalated the conflict. Fritz Fischer and his followers emphasized the inherently aggressive nature of Germany's Schlieffen Plan, which outlined German strategy if at war with both France and Russia. Conflict on two fronts meant that Germany had to eliminate one opponent quickly before attacking the other, relying on a strict timetable. France's well defended border with Germany meant that an attack through Belgian territory was necessary, creating a number of unexpected problems. In a greater context, France's own Plan XVII called for an offensive thrust into Germany's industrial Ruhr Valley, crippling Germany's ability to wage war. Russia's revised Plan XIX implied a mobilization of its armies against both Austria-Hungary and Germany. All three created an atmosphere where generals and planning staffs were anxious to take the initiative and seize decisive victories using these elaborate mobilization plans with precise timetables. Once the mobilization orders were issued, it was understood by both generals and statesmen alike that there was little or no possibility of turning back or a key advantage would be sacrificed. The problem of communications in 1914 should also not be underestimated; all nations still used telegraphy and ambassadors as the main form of communication, which resulted in delays from hours to even days.

Militarism and autocracy

U.S. President Woodrow Wilson and other observers blamed the war on militarism. The idea was that aristocrats and military elites had too much control over Germany, Russia, and Austria, and the war was a consequence of their thirst for military

power and disdain for democracy. This was a theme that figured prominently in anti-German propaganda, which cast Kaiser Wilhelm II and Prussian military tradition in a negative light. Consequently, supporters of this theory called for the abdication of such rulers, the end of the aristocratic system, and the end of militarism—all of which justified American entry into the war once Czarist Russia dropped out of the Allied camp. Wilson hoped the League of Nations and universal disarmament would secure a lasting peace, although he failed to secure U.S. support for the league. He also acknowledged variations of militarism that, in his opinion, existed within the British and French political systems.

Economic imperialism

Lenin famously asserted that the worldwide system of imperialism was responsible for the war. In this he drew upon the economic theories of English economist John A. Hobson, who, in his 1902 book entitled Imperialism had earlier predicted that the outcome of economic imperialism, or unlimited competition for expanding markets, would lead to a global military conflict. This argument proved persuasive in the immediate wake of the war and assisted in the rise of Marxism and Communism. Lenin's 1917 pamphlet "Imperialism: The Highest Stage of Capitalism" made the argument that large banking interests in the various capitalist-imperialist powers had pulled the strings in the various governments and led them into the war.

Nationalism and romanticism

Civilian leaders of European powers found themselves facing a wave of nationalist zeal that had been building across Europe for years as memories of war faded or were convoluted into a romantic fantasy that resonated in the public conscience. Frantic diplomatic efforts to mediate the Austrian-Serbian quarrel simply became irrelevant, as public and elite opinion commonly demanded war to uphold national honor. Most of the belligerents envisioned swift victory and glorious consequences. The patriotic enthusiasm, unity and ultimate euphoria that took hold during the Spirit of 1914 was full of that very optimism regarding the post-war future. Also, the Socialist-Democratic movement had begun to exert pressure on aristocrats throughout Europe, who optimistically hoped that victory would reunite their countries via the consolidation of their domestic hegemony. However, Lord Kitchener and Erich Ludendorff were among those who predicted that modern, industrialized warfare would be a lengthy excursion.

Culmination of European history

A localized war between Austria-Hungary and Serbia was made possible due to Austria-Hungary's deteriorating world position and the Pan-Slavic separatist movement in the Balkans. The expansion of such ethnic sentiments coincided with the growth of Serbia and the decline of the Ottoman Empire, as the latter had previously ruled much of the region.

Imperial Russia also supported the Pan-Slavic movement, motivated by ethnic loyalties, dissatisfaction with Austria , and a centuries-old dream of a warm water port. For the Germans, both the Napoleonic Wars and Thirty Years' War were characterized by incursions which had a lasting psychological effect; it was Germany's precarious position in the center of Europe that ultimately led to the decision for an active defense, culminating in the Schlieffen Plan. At the same time, the transfer of the contested Alsace and Lorraine territories and defeat in the Franco-Prussian War influenced France's policy,

characterized by revanchism. However, after the League of the Three Emperors fell apart, the French formed an alliance with Russia and a two-front war became a distinct possibility for Germany.

Aftermath of First World War:

The First World War ended with Europe scarred by trenches, spent of its resources, and littered with the bodies of the millions who died in battle. The direct consequences of World War I brought many old regimes crashing to the ground, and ultimately, would lead to the end of three hundred years of European hegemony in the world.

No other war had changed the map of Europe so dramatically—four empires were shattered—the German, the Austro-Hungarian, the Ottoman, and the Russian. Their four dynasties, the Hohenzollerns, the Habsburgs, the Ottomans, and the Romanovs, who had roots of power back to the days of the Crusades, all fell during or after the war. After the war, Germany's overseas colonies were placed under Allied control and provinces of the former Ottoman Empire were mandated to France, Italy, and the United Kingdom. The size of Germany was also reduced. Heavy reparations were written into the treaty, together with restrictions on the manufacture of arms.

In Australian and New Zealandpopular legend, the First World War is known as the nation's "baptism of fire," as it was the first major war in which the newly established countries fought, and it is one of the first cases where Australian troops fought as Australians, not just subjects of the British Crown. Anzac Day is thus held in great reverence by many Australians and New Zealanders.

Similarly, Anglo-Canadians believe that they proved they were their own country and not just subjects of the British Empire. Indeed, many Canadians refer to their country as a nation "forged from fire," as Canadians were respected internationally as an independent nation from the conflagrations of war and bravery. Like their British counterparts, Canadians commemorate the war dead on Remembrance Day. Indian troops had also fought in the war and now felt that they should have a greater say in running India.

Social trauma

The experiences of the war led to a collective national trauma afterwards for all the participating countries. The optimism for world peace of the 1900s was entirely gone, and those who fought in the war became what is known as "the Lost Generation" because they never fully recovered from their experiences. For the next few years, much of Europe began its mourning; memorials were erected in thousands of villages and towns.

This social trauma manifested itself in many different ways. Some people were revolted by nationalism and what it had supposedly caused and began to work toward a more internationalist world, supporting organizations such as the League of Nations. Pacifism became increasingly popular. Others had the opposite reaction, feeling that only strength and military might could be relied upon for protection in a chaotic and inhumane world that did not respect hypothetical notions of civilization. "Anti-modernist" views were a reaction against the many changes taking place within society.

The rise of Nazism and fascism included a revival of the nationalistic spirit of the pre-war years and, on principle, a rejection of many post-war changes. Similarly, t

popularity of the Dolchstosslegende was a testament to the psychological state of the defeated, as acceptance of the scapegoat mythos signified a rejection of the "lessons" of the war and therefore, a rejection of its popular resulting perspective. Also, the extreme economic hardship in Germany that developed after the war helped breed conditions for Hitler's rise to power there.

Certainly a sense of disillusionment and cynicism became pronounced, with Nihilism growing in popularity. This disillusionment towards humanity found a cultural climax with the pessimistic existentialism of Sartre and Camus and Dadaistartistic movement. Many people believed that the war heralded the end of the world as they had known it, including the collapse of capitalism and imperialism. Communistand socialist movements around the world drew strength from this theory and enjoyed a level of popularity they had never known before. These feelings were most pronounced in areas directly or particularly harshly affected by the war, especially within Europe.

✳ ✳ ✳ ✳ ✳

Q.4 What do you know about World War II? What were its causes and effects? Discuss.

Ans. World War II

World War II, was a global military conflict that took place between 1939 and 1945. It was the largest and deadliest war in history. The date commonly given for the start of the war is September 1, 1939, when Nazi Germany invaded Poland. Within two days the United Kingdom and Francedeclared war on Germany, although the only European battles remained in Poland. Pursuant to a then-secret provision of its non-aggression Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact, the Soviet Union joined with Germany on September 17, 1939, to conquer Poland and to divide Eastern Europe.

The Allies were initially made up of Poland, the British Empire, France, and others. In May, 1940, Germany invaded western Europe. Six weeks later, France surrendered to Germany. Three months after that, Germany, Italy, and Japansigned a mutual defense agreement, the Tripartite Pact, and were known as the Axis Powers. Then, nine months later, in June 1941, Germany betrayed and invaded the Soviet Union, forcing the Soviets into the Allied camp . In December 1941, Japan attacked the United Statesbringing it into the war on the Allied side. China also joined the Allies, as eventually did most of the rest of the world. From the beginning of 1942 through August 1945, battles raged across all of Europe, in the North Atlantic Ocean, across North Africa, throughout Southeast Asia, and China, across the Pacific Ocean and in the air over Germany and Japan.

After World War II, Europe was split into western and Soviet spheres of influence. Western Europe later aligned as NATOand Eastern Europe as the Warsaw Pact. There was a shift in power from Western Europe and the British Empireto the two post-war superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union. These two rivals would later face off in the Cold War. In Asia, Japan's defeat led to its democratization. China's civil war continued into the 1950s, resulting eventually in the establishment of the People's Republic of China. European colonies began their road to independence. Disgusted at the human cost of war, as people had been after World War I, a commitment to diplomacy to resolve differences was written into the charter of the new international

body that replaced the failed League of Nations, the United Nations, which this time attracted U.S. support. The real effectiveness of this body has been subsequently compromised because member states act when it suits them, and sometimes by-pass it altogether. The victory, though, of the Allies over the Axis powers is usually regarded as having safeguarded democracy and freedom. The Holocaust represented one of the most evil incidents in human history. Even still, the Allies cannot be said to have conducted the war according to the highest standards of combat, using mass bombings that provoked one leading British Bishop, George Bell to withdraw his support for the just cause of the war.

Causes

Commonly held general causes for WWII are the rise of nationalism, militarism, and unresolved territorial issues. In Germany, resentment of the harsh Treaty of Versailles—specifically article 231, the belief in the Dolchstosslegende, and the onset of the Great Depression—fueled the rise to power of Adolf Hitler's militarist National Socialist German Workers Party . Meanwhile, the treaty's provisions were laxly enforced due to fear of another war. Closely related is the failure of the British and French policy of appeasement, which sought to avoid war but actually gave Hitler time to re-arm. The League of Nations proved to be ineffective.

Japan, ruled by a militarist clique devoted to becoming a world power invaded China to bolster its meager stock of natural resources. This angered the United States, which reacted by making loans to China, providing covert military assistance, and instituting increasingly broad embargoes of raw materials against Japan. These embargoes would have eventually wrecked Japan's economy; Japan was faced with the choice of withdrawing from China or going to war in order to conquer the oil resources of the Dutch East Indies. It chose to proceed with plans for the Greater East Asia War in the Pacific.

War breaks out in Europe: 1939

Pre-war alliances

In March 1939, when German armies entered Prague then occupied the remainder of Czechoslovakia, the Munich Agreement—which required Germany to peacefully resolve its claim to the Czech territory—collapsed. On May 19, Poland and France pledged to provide each other with military assistance in the event either was attacked. The British had already offered support to the Poles in March; then, on August 23, Germany and the Soviet Union signed the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact. The pact included a secret protocol which would divide eastern Europe into German and Soviet areas of interest. Each country agreed to allow the other a free hand in its area of influence, including military occupation. Hitler was now ready to go to war in order to conquer Poland. The signing of a new alliance between Britain and Poland on August 25, deterred him for only a few days.

Invasion of Poland

On September 1, Germany invaded Poland. Two days later, Britain and France declared war on Germany. The French mobilized slowly, then mounted a token offensive in the Saar, which they soon abandoned, while the British could not take any direct action in support of the Poles in the time available. Meanwhile, on September 9, the Germans reached Warsaw, having slashed through the Polish defenses.

On September 17, Soviet troops occupied the eastern Poland, taking control of territory that Germany had agreed was in the Soviet sphere of influence. A day later the Polish president and commander-in-chief both fled to Romania. The last Polish units surrendered on October 6. Some Polish troops evacuated to neighboring countries. In the aftermath of the September Campaign, occupied Poland managed to create a powerful resistance movement and Poles made a significant contribution to the Allies' cause for the duration of World War II.

After Poland fell, Germany paused to regroup during the winter of 1939-1940 until April 1940, while the British and French stayed on the defensive. The period was referred to by journalists as "the Phony War," or the "Sitzkrieg," because so little ground combat took place.

Battle of the Atlantic

Meanwhile in the North Atlantic, German U-boats operated against Allied shipping. The submarines made up in skill, luck, and daring what they lacked in numbers. One U-boat sank the British aircraft carrier HMS Courageous, while another managed to sink the battleship HMS Royal Oakin its home anchorage of Scapa Flow. Altogether, U-boats sank more than 110 vessels in the first four months of the war.

In the South Atlantic, the German pocket battleship Admiral Graf Spee raided Allied shipping, then was scuttled after the battle of the River Plate. About a year and a half later, another German raider, the battleship Bismarck, suffered a similar fate in the North Atlantic. Unlike the U-boat threat, which had a serious impact later in the war, German surface raiders had little impact because their numbers were so small.

War spreads: 1940

Soviet-Finnish War

The Soviet Union attacked Finland on November 30, 1939, starting the Winter War. Finland surrendered to the Soviet Union in March 1940 and signed the Moscow Peace Treaty in which the Finns made territorial concessions. Later that year, in June the Soviet Union occupied Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, and annexed Bessarabia and Northern Bukovina from Romania.

Invasion of Denmark and Norway

Germany invaded Denmark and Norway on April 9, 1940, in part to counter the threat of an impending Allied invasion of Norway. Denmark did not resist, but Norway fought back, assisted by British, French, and Polish forces landing in support of the Norwegians at Namsos, Åndalsnes, and Narvik. By late June, the Allies were defeated, German forces were in control of most of Norway, and what remained of the Norwegian Army had surrendered.

Invasion of France and the Low Countries

On May 10, 1940, the Germans invaded Luxembourg, Belgium, the Netherlands, and France, ending the "Phony War." The British Expeditionary Force and the French Army advanced into northern Belgium, planning to fight a mobile war in the north while maintaining a static continuous front along the Maginot Line, built after World War I, further south.

In the first phase of the invasion, Fall Gelb, the Wehrmacht's Panzergruppe von Kleist raced through the Ardennes, broke the French line at Sedan, then slashed across

northern France to the English Channel, splitting the Allies in two. Meanwhile Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands fell quickly against the attack of German Army Group B. The BEF, encircled in the north, was evacuated from Dunkirk in Operation Dynamo. On June 10, Italy joined the war, attacking France in the south. German forces then continued the conquest of France with Fall Rot advancing behind the Maginot Line and near the coast. France signed an armistice with Germany on June 22, 1940, leading to the establishment of the Vichy France puppet government in the unoccupied part of France.

Battle of Britain

Following the defeat of France, Britain chose to fight on, so Germany began preparations in summer of 1940 to invade Britain , while Britain made anti-invasion preparations. Germany's initial goal was to gain air control over Britain by defeating the Royal Air Force . The war between the two air forces became known as the Battle of Britain. The Luftwaffeinitially targeted RAF Fighter Command. The results were not as expected, so the Luftwaffelater turned to terror bombing London. The Germans failed to defeat the Royal Air Force, thus Operation Sea Lion was postponed and eventually canceled.

North African Campaign

Italy declared war in June 1940, which challenged British supremacy of the Mediterranean, hinged on Gibraltar, Malta, and Alexandria. Italian troops invaded and captured British Somaliland in August. In September, the North African Campaign began when Italian forces in Libya attacked British forces in Egypt. The aim was to make Egypt an Italian possession, especially the vital Suez Canaleast of Egypt. British, Indian, and Australian forces counter-attacked in Operation Compass, but this offensive stopped in 1941 when much of the Commonwealth forces were transferred to Greece to defend it from German attack. However, German forces under General Erwin Rommellanded in Libya and renewed the assault on Egypt.

Invasion of Greece

Italy invaded Greece on October 28, 1940, from bases in Albania after the Greek Premier John Metaxas rejected an ultimatum to hand over Greek territory. Despite the enormous superiority of the Italian forces, the Greek army forced the Italians into a massive retreat deep into Albania. By mid-December, the Greeks occupied one-fourth of Albania. The Greek army had inflicted upon the Axis Powers their first defeat in the war, and Nazi Germany would soon be forced to intervene.

War becomes global: 1941

European theater

Lend-Lease

U.S. President Roosevelt signed the Lend-Lease Act on March 11. This program was the first large step away from American isolationism, providing for substantial assistance to the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and other countries.

Invasion of Greece and Yugoslavia

Yugoslavia's government succumbed to the pressure of the Axis and signed the Tripartite Treaty on March 25, but the government was overthrown in a coup which replaced it with a pro-Allied government. This prompted the Germans to invade

Yugoslavia on April 6. In the early morning, Germans bombarded Belgrade with an estimated 450 aircraft. Yugoslavia was occupied in a matter of days, and the army surrendered on April 17, but the partisan resistance lasted throughout the war. The rapid downfall of Yugoslavia, however, allowed German forces to enter Greek territory through the Yugoslav frontier. The 58,000 British and Commonwealth troops who had been sent to help the Greeks were driven back and soon forced to evacuate. On April 27, German forces entered Athens which was followed by the end of organized Greek resistance. The occupation of Greece proved costly, as guerilla warfarecontinually plagued the Axis occupiers.

Invasion of Soviet Union

Operation Barbaròssa, the largest invasion in history, began June 22, 1941. An Axis force of over four million soldiers advanced rapidly deep into the Soviet Union, destroying almost the entire western Soviet army in huge battles of encirclement. The Soviets dismantled as much industry as possible ahead of the advancing forces, moving it to the Ural Mountains for reassembly. By late November, the Axis had reached a line at the gates of Leningrad, Moscow, and Rostov, at the cost of about 23 percent casualties. Their advance then ground to a halt. The German General Staff had underestimated the size of the Soviet army and its ability to draft new troops. They were now dismayed by the presence of new forces, including fresh Siberian troops under General Zhukov, and by the onset of a particularly cold winter. German forward units had advanced within distant sight of the golden onion domes of Moscow's Saint Basil's Cathedral, but then on December 5, the Soviets counter-attacked and pushed the Axis back some 150-250 kilometers which became the first major German defeat of World War II.

The Continuation War between Finland and the Soviet Union began on June 25, with Soviet air attacks shortly after the beginning of Operation Barbarossa.

Allied conferences

The Atlantic Charter was a joint declaration by Cherchill and Roosevelt, August 14, 1941.

In late December 1941, Churchill met Roosevelt again at the Arcadia Conference. They agreed that defeating Germany had priority over defeating Japan. The Americans proposed a 1942 cross-channel invasion of France which the British strongly opposed, suggesting instead a small invasion in Norway or landings in French North Africa.

Mediterranean

Rommel's forces advanced rapidly eastward, laying siege to the vital seaport of Tobruk. Two Allied attempts to relieve Tobruk were defeated, but a larger offensive at the end of the year drove Rommel back after heavy fighting.

On May 20, the Battle of Crete began when elite German parachute and glider-borne mountain troops launched a massive airborne invasion of the Greek island. Crete was defended by Greek and Commonwealth troops. The Germans attacked the island's three airfields simultaneously. Their invasion on two airfields failed, but they successfully captured one, which allowed them to reinforce their position and capture the island in a little over one week.

In June 1941, Allied forces invaded Syria and Lebanon, capturing Damascus on June 17. In August, British and Soviet troops occupied neutral Iranto secure its oil and a southern supply line to Russia.

Pacific theater

Sino-Japanese war

A war had begun in East Asia before World War II started in Europe. On July 7, 1937, Japan, after occupying Manchuriain 1931, launched another attack against China near Beijing. The Japanese made initial advances but were stalled at Shanghai. The city eventually fell to the Japanese and in December 1937, the capital city Nanking fell. As a result, the Chinese government moved its seat to Chongqing for the rest of the war. The Japanese forces committed brutal atrocities against civilians and prisoners of war when Nanking was occupied, slaughtering as many as 300,000 civilians within a month. The war by 1940 had reached a stalemate with both sides making minimal gains. The Chinese had successfully defended their land from oncoming Japanese on several occasions while strong resistance in areas occupied by the Japanese made a victory seem impossible to the Japanese.

Japan and the United States

In the summer of 1941, the United States began an oil embargo against Japan, which was a protest to Japan's incursion into French Indo-China and the continued invasion of China. Japan planned an attack on Pearl Harbor to cripple the U.S. Pacific Fleet before consolidating oil fields in the Dutch East Indies. On December 7, a Japanese carrier fleet launched a surprise air attack on Pearl Harbor, Hawaii. The raid resulted in two U.S. battleships sunk, and six damaged but later repaired and returned to service. The raid failed to find any aircraft carriers and did not damage Pearl Harbor's usefulness as a naval base. The attack strongly united public opinion in the United States against Japan. The following day, December 8, the United States declared war on Japan. On the same day, China officially declared war against Japan. Germany declared war on the United States on December 11, even though it was not obliged to do so under the Tripartite Pact. Hitler hoped that Japan would support Germany by attacking the Soviet Union. Japan did not oblige, and this diplomatic move by Hitler proved a catastrophic blunder which unified the American public's support for the war.

Japanese offensive

Japan soon invaded the Philippines and the British colonies of Hong Kong, Peninsular Malaysia, Borneo, and Burma, with the intention of seizing the oilfields of the Dutch East Indies. Despite fierce resistance by American, Philippine, British, Canadian, and Indian forces, all these territories capitulated to the Japanese in a matter of months. The British island fortress of Singapore was captured in what Churchill considered one of the most humiliating British defeats of all time.

Aftermath of second World War:

Europe in ruins

At the end of the war, millions of refugees were homeless, the European economy had collapsed, and 70 percent of the European industrial infrastructure was destroyed.

Partitioning of Germany and Austria

Germany was partitioned into four zones of occupation. An Allied Control Council was created to co-ordinate the zones. The original divide of Germany was between America, Soviet Union, and Britain. Stalin agreed to give France a zone but it had to come from the American or British zones and not the Soviet zone. The American, British, and French zones joined in 1949 as the Federal Republic of Germany and the Soviet zone became the German Democratic Republic.

Austria was once again separated from Germany and it, too, was divided into four zones of occupation, which eventually reunited and became the Republic of Austria.

Reparations

Germany paid reparations to France, Britain and Russia, in the form of dismantled factories, forced labor, and shipments of coal. The U.S. settled for confiscating German patents and German owned property in the U.S., mainly subsidiaries of German companies.

In accordance with the Paris Peace Treaties, 1947, payment of war reparations was assessed from the countries of Italy, Romania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Finland.

Morgenthau Plan

The initial occupation plans proposed by the United States were harsh. The Morgenthau Plan of 1944 called for dividing Germany into two independent nations and stripping her of the industrial resources required for war. All heavy industry was to be dismantled or destroyed, the main industrial areas, were to be annexed.

While the Morgenthau Plan itself was never implemented per se, its general economic philosophy did end up greatly influencing events. Most notable were the toned-down offshoots, including the Potsdam Conference, Joint Chiefs of Staff Directive 1067 , and the industrial plans for Germany.

Marshall Plan

Germany had long been the industrial giant of Europe, and its poverty held back the general European recovery. The continued scarcity in Germany also led to considerable expenses for the occupying powers, which were obligated to try and make up the most important shortfalls. Learning a lesson from the aftermath of World War I when no effort was made to systematically rebuild Europe, and when Germany was treated as a pariah, the United States made a bold decision to help reconstruct Europe. Secretary of State George Marshall proposed the "European Recovery Program," better known as the Marshall Plan, which called for the U.S. Congress to allocate billions of dollars for the reconstruction of Europe. Also as part of the effort to rebuild global capitalism and spur post-war reconstruction, the Bretton Woods system for international money management was put into effect after the war.

Border revisions and population shifts

As a result of the new borders drawn by the victorious nations, large populations suddenly found themselves in hostile territory. The main benefactor of these border revisions was the Soviet Union, which expanded its borders at the expense of Germany, Finland, Poland, and Japan. Poland was compensated for its losses to the Soviet Union by receiving most of Germany east of the Oder-Neisse line, including the industrial regions

...Silesia. The German state of the Saar temporarily became a protectorate of France but it later returned to German administration.

The number of Germans expelled totaled roughly 15 million, including 11 million from Germany proper and 3,500,000 from the Sudetenland.

Germany officially states that 2,100,000 of these expelled lost their lives due to violence on the part of the Russians, Polish, and Czech, though Polish and Czech historians dispute this figure.

United Nations

Because the League of Nations had failed to actively prevent the war, in 1945 a new international body was considered and then created: The United Nations.

The UN operates within the parameters of the United Nations Charter, and the reason for the UN's formation is outlined in the Preamble to the United Nations Charter. Unlike its predecessor, the United Nations has taken a more active role in the world, such as fighting diseases and providing humanitarian aid to nations in distress. The UN also served as the diplomatic front line during the Cold War.

The UN also was responsible for the initial creation of the modern state of Israel in 1948, in part as a response to the Holocaust.

❄ ❄ ❄ ❄ ❄

Q.5   What was cold war? How it ended?
Ans.   Cold War

The Cold War was the protracted ideological, geopolitical, and economic struggle that emerged after World War II between the global superpowers of the Soviet Union and the United States, supported by their military alliance partners. It lasted from the end of World War II until the period preceding the demise of the Soviet Union on December 25, 1991.

The global confrontation between the West and communism was popularly termed The Cold War because direct hostilities never occurred between the United States and the Soviet Union. Instead, the "war" took the form of an arms race involving nuclear and conventional weapons, military alliances, economic warfare and targeted trade embargos, propaganda and disinformation, espionage and counterespionage, proxy wars in the developing world that garnered superpower support for opposing sides within civil wars. The Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962 was the most important direct confrontation, together with a series of confrontations over the Berlin Blockade and the Berlin Wall. The major civil wars polarized along Cold War lines were the Greek Civil War, Korean War, Vietnam War the war in Afghanistan, as well as the conflicts in Angola, El Salvador, and Nicaragua.

During the Cold War there was concern that it would escalate into a full nuclear exchange with hundreds of millions killed. Both sides developed a deterrence policy that prevented problems from escalating beyond limited localities. Nuclear weapons were never used in the Cold War.

The Cold War cycled through a series of high and low tension years .It ended in the period between 1988 and 1991 with the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, the emergence of Solidarity, the fall of the Berlin Wall, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact and the demise of the Soviet Union itself.

Historians continue to debate the reasons for the Soviet collapse in the 1980s. Some fear that as one super-power emerges without the limitations imposed by a rival, the world may become a less secure place. Many people, however, see the end of the Cold War as representing the triumph of democracy and freedom over totalitarian rule, state-mandated atheism, and a repressive communist system that claimed the lives of millions. While equal blame for Cold War tensions is often attributed both to the United States and the Soviet Union, it is evident that the Soviet Union had an ideological focus that found the Western democratic and free market systems inherently oppressive and espoused their overthrow, beginning with the Communist Manifesto of 1848.

Historical overview

Origins

Tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States resumed following the conclusion of the Second World War in August 1945. As the war came to a close, the Soviets laid claim to much of Eastern Europe and the Northern half of Korea. They also attempted to occupy Japanese northernmost island of Hokkaido and lent logistic and military support to Mao Zedong in his efforts to overthrow the Chinese Nationalist forces. Tensions between the Soviet Union and the Western powers escalated between 1945–1947, especially when in Potsdam, Yalta, and Tehran, Stalin's plans to consolidate Soviet control of Central and Eastern Europe became manifestly clear. On March 5, 1946 Winston Churchill delivered his landmark speech at Westminster College in Fulton, Missouri lamenting that an "iron curtain" had descended on Eastern Europe.

Historians interpret the Soviet Union's Cold War intentions in two different manners. One emphasizes the primacy of communist ideology and communism's foundational intent, as outlined in the Communist Manifesto, to establish global hegemony. The other interpretation, advocated notably by Richard M. Nixon, emphasized the historical goals of the Russian state, specifically hegemony over Eastern Europe, access to warm water seaports, the defense of other Slavic peoples, and the view of Russia as "the Third Rome." The roots of the ideological clashes can be seen in Marx's and Engels' writings and in the writings of Vladimir Lenin who succeeded in building communism into a political reality through the Bolshevik seizure of power in the Russian Revolution of 1917. Walter LaFeber stresses Russia's historic interests, going back to the Czarist years when the United States and Russia became rivals. From 1933 to 1939 the United States and the Soviet Union experienced détente but relations were not friendly. After the USSR and Germany became enemies in 1941, Franklin Delano Roosevelt made a personal commitment to help the Soviets, although the U. S. Congress never voted to approve any sort of alliance and the wartime cooperation was never especially friendly. For example, Josef Stalin was reluctant to allow American forces to use Soviet bases. Cooperation became increasingly strained by February 1945 at the Yalta Conference, as it was becoming clear that Stalin intended to spread communism to Eastern Europe—and then, perhaps—to France and Italy.

Some historians such as William Appleman Williams also cite American economic expansionism as one of the roots of the Cold War. These historians use the Marshall Plan and its terms and conditions as evidence to back up their claims.

These geopolitical and ideological rivalries were accompanied by a third factor that had just emerged from World War II as a new problem in world affairs: the problem of effective international control of nuclear energy. In 1946 the Soviet Union rejected a United States proposal for such control, which had been formulated by Bernard Baruch on the basis of an earlier report authored by Dean Acheson and David Lilienthal, with the objection that such an agreement would undermine the principle of national sovereignty. The end of the Cold War did not resolve the problem of international control of nuclear energy, and it has re-emerged as a factor in the beginning of the Long War declared by the United States in 2006 as its official military doctrine.

Global Realignments

This period began the Cold War in 1947 and continued until the change in leadership for both superpowers in 1953—from Presidents Harry S. Truman to Dwight D. Eisenhower in the United States, and from Josef Stalin to Nikita Khrushchev in the Soviet Union.

Notable events include the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan, the Berlin Blockade and Berlin Airlift, the Soviet Union's detonation of its first atomic bomb, the formation of NATO in 1949 and the Warsaw Pact in 1955, the formation of East and West Germany, the Stalin Note for German reunification of 1952 superpower disengagement from Central Europe, the Chinese Civil War and the Korean War.

The American Marshall Plan intended to rebuild the European economy after the devastation incurred by the Second World War in order to thwart the political appeal of the radical left. For Western Europe, economic aid ended the dollar shortage, stimulated private investment for postwar reconstruction and, most importantly, introduced new managerial techniques. For the U.S., the plan rejected the isolationism of the 1920s and integrated the North American and Western European economies. The Truman Doctrine refers to the decision to support Greece and Turkey in the event of Soviet incursion, following notice from Britain that she was no longer able to aid Greece in its civil war against communist activists. The Berlin blockade took place between June 1948 and July 1949, when the Soviets, in an effort to obtain more post-World War II concessions, prevented overland access to the allied zones in Berlin. Thus, personnel and supplies were lifted in by air. The Stalin Note was a plan for the reunification of Germany on the condition that it became a neutral state and that all Western troops be withdrawn.

Escalation and Crisis

A period of escalation and crisis existed between the change in leadership for both superpowers from 1953—with Josef Stalin's sudden death and the American presidential election of 1952—until the resolution of the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962.

Events included the 1956 Hungarian Revolution, the erection of the Berlin Wall in 1961, the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 and the Prague Spring in 1968. During the Cuban Missile Crisis, in particular, the world was closest to a third world war. The Prague Spring was a brief period of hope, when the government of Alexander Dubček started a process of liberalization, which ended abruptly when the Russian Soviets invaded Czechoslovakia.

Thaw and Détente, 1962-1979

The Détente period of the Cold War was marked by mediation and comparative peace. At its most reconciliatory, German Chancellor Willy Brandt forwarded the foreign

policy of Ostpolitik during his tenure in the Federal Republic of Germany. Translated literally as "eastern politics," Egon Bahr, its architect and advisor to Brandt, framed this policy as "change through rapprochement."

These initiatives led to the Warsaw Treaty between Poland and West Germany on December 7, 1970; the Quadripartite or Four-Powers Agreement between the Soviet Union, United States, France and Great Britain on September 3, 1971; and a few east-west German agreements including the Basic Treaty of December 21, 1972.

Limitations to reconciliation did exist, evidenced by the deposition of Walter Ulbricht by Erich Honecker as East German General Secretary on May 3, 1971.

Second Cold War

The period between the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 and the rise of Mikhail Gorbachev as Soviet leader in 1985 was characterized by a marked "freeze" in relations between the superpowers after the "thaw" of the Détente period of the 1970s. As a result of this reintensification, the period is sometimes referred to as the "Second Cold War."

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 in support of an embryonic communist regime in that country led to international outcries and the widespread boycotting of the 1980 Moscow Olympic Games by many Western countries in protest at Soviet actions. The Soviet invasion led to a protracted conflict; which involved Pakistan—an erstwhile U.S. ally—in locked horns with the Soviet military might for over 12 years.

Worried by Soviet deployment of nuclear SS-20 missiles, NATO allies agreed in 1979 to continued Strategic Arms Limitation Talks to constrain the number of nuclear missiles for battlefield targets, while threatening to deploy some five hundred cruise missiles and MGM-31 Pershing II missiles in West Germany and the Netherlands if negotiations were unsuccessful. The negotiations failed, as expected. The planned deployment of the Pershing II met intense and widespread opposition from public opinion across Europe, which became the site of the largest demonstrations ever seen in several countries. Pershing II missiles were deployed in Europe beginning in January 1984, and were withdrawn beginning in October 1988.

The "new conservatives" or "neoconservatives" rebelled against both the Richard Nixon-era policies and the similar position of Jimmy Carter toward the Soviet Union. Many clustered around hawkish Senator Henry "Scoop" Jackson, a Democrat, and pressured President Carter into a more confrontational stance. Eventually they aligned themselves with Ronald Reagan and the conservative wing of the Republicans, who promised to end Soviet expansionism.

The elections, first of Margaret Thatcher as British prime minister in 1979, followed by that of Ronald Reagan to the American presidency in 1980, saw the elevation of two hard-line warriors to the leadership of the Western Bloc.

Other events included the Strategic Defense Initiative and the Solidarity Movement in Poland.

"End" of the Cold War

This period began at the rise of Mikhail Gorbachev as Soviet leader in 1985 and continued until the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

Events included the Chernobyl accident in 1986, and the Autumn of Nations—when one by one, communist regimes collapsed. This includes the famous fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989), the Soviet coup attempt of 1991 and collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991.

Other noteworthy events include the implementation of the policies of glasnost and perestroika, public discontent over the Soviet Union's war in Afghanistan, and the socio-political effects of the Chernobyl nuclear plant accident in 1986. East-West tensions eased rapidly after the rise of Mikhail Gorbachev. After the deaths of three elderly Soviet leaders in quick succession beginning with Leonoid Breshnev in 1982, the Politburo elected Gorbachev Soviet Communist Party chief in 1985, marking the rise of a new generation of leadership. Under Gorbachev, relatively young reform-oriented technocrats rapidly consolidated power, providing new momentum for political and economic liberalization and the impetus for cultivating warmer relations and trade with the West.

Meanwhile, in his second term, Ronald Reagan surprised the neoconservatives by meeting with Gorbachev in Geneva, Switzerland in 1985 and Reykjavík, Iceland in 1986. The latter meeting focused on continued discussions around scaling back the intermediate missile arsenals in Europe. The talks were unsuccessful. Afterwards, Soviet policymakers increasingly accepted Reagan's administration warnings that the U.S. would make the arms race an increasing financial burden for the USSR. The twin burdens of the Cold War arms race on one hand and the provision of large sums of foreign and military aid, upon which the socialist allies had grown to expect, left Gorbachev's efforts to boost production of consumer goods and reform the stagnating economy in an extremely precarious state. The result was a dual approach of cooperation with the west and economic restructuring perestroika and democratization glasnost domestically, which eventually made it impossible for Gorbachev to reassert central control over Warsaw Pact member states.

Thus, beginning in 1989 Eastern Europe's communist governments toppled one after another. In Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria reforms in the government, in Poland under pressure from Solidarity, prompted a peaceful end to communist rule and democratization. Elsewhere, mass-demonstrations succeeded in ousting the communists from Czechoslovakia and East Germany, where the Berlin Wall was opened and subsequently brought down in November 1989. In Romania a popular uprising deposed the Nicolae Ceauşescu regime during December and led to his execution on Christmas Day later that year.

Conservatives often argue that one major cause of the demise of the Soviet Union was the massive fiscal spending on military technology that the Soviets saw as necessary in response to NATO's increased armament of the 1980s. They insist that Soviet efforts to keep up with NATO military expenditures resulted in massive economic disruption and the effective bankruptcy of the Soviet economy, which had always labored to keep up with its western counterparts. The Soviets were a decade behind the West in computers and falling further behind every year. The critics of the USSR state that computerized military technology was advancing at such a pace that the Soviets were simply incapable of keeping up, even by sacrificing more of the already weak civilian economy. According

to the critics, the arms race, both nuclear and conventional, was too much for the underdeveloped Soviet economy of the time. For this reason Ronald Reagan is seen by many conservatives as the man who 'won' the Cold War indirectly through his escalation of the arms race. However, the proximate cause for the end of the Cold War was ultimately Mikhail Gorbachev's decision, publicized in 1988, to repudiate the Leonid Brezhnev doctrine that any threat to a socialist state was a threat to all socialist states.

The Soviet Union provided little infrastructure help for its Eastern European satellites, but they did receive substantial military assistance in the form of funds, material and control. Their integration into the inefficient military-oriented economy of the Soviet Union caused severe readjustment problems after the fall of communism.

Research shows that the fall of the USSR was accompanied by a sudden and dramatic decline in total warfare, interstate wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, the number of refugees and displaced persons and an increase in the number of democratic states. The opposite pattern was seen before the end.

Arms race

Technology

A major feature of the Cold War was the arms race between the member states of the Warsaw Pact and those of NATO. This resulted in substantial scientific discoveries in many technological and military fields.

Some particularly revolutionary advances were made in the field of nuclear weapons and rocketry, which led to the space race .

Other fields in which arms races occurred include: jet fighters, bombers, chemical weapons, biological weapons, anti-aircraft warfare, surface-to-surface missiles, inter-continental ballistic missiles , anti-ballistic missiles, anti-tank weapons, submarines and anti-submarine warfare, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, electronic intelligence, signals intelligence, reconnaissance aircraft and spy satellites.

Mutually Assured Destruction (MAD)

One prominent feature of the nuclear arms race, especially following the massed deployment of nuclear ICBMs due to the flawed assumption that the manned bomber was fatally vulnerable to surface to air missiles, was the concept of deterrence via assured destruction, later, mutually assured destruction or "MAD." The idea was that the Western bloc would not attack the Eastern bloc or vice versa, because both sides had more than enough nuclear weapons to reduce each other out of existence and to make the entire planet uninhabitable. Therefore, launching an attack on either party would be suicidal and so neither would attempt it. With increasing numbers and accuracy of delivery systems, particularly in the closing stages of the Cold War, the possibility of a first strike doctrine weakened the deterrence theory. A first strike would aim to degrade the enemy's nuclear forces to such an extent that the retaliatory response would involve "acceptable" losses.

�֍ �֍ ✖ ✖ ✖

Q.6   What were the main effects of cold war?

Ans.   Effects of the Cold War

Following the Cold War, Russia cut military spending dramatically, but the adjustment was wrenching, as the military-industrial sector had previously employed one of every five Soviet adults and its dismantling left hundreds of millions throughout the former Soviet Union unemployed. After Russia embarked on capitalist economic reforms in the 1990s, it suffered a financial crisis and a recession more severe than the US and Germany had experienced during the Great Depression. Russian living standards have worsened overall in the post–Cold War years, although the economy has resumed growth since 1999.

The legacy of the Cold War continues to influence world affairs. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the post–Cold War world is widely considered as unipolar, with the United States the sole remaining superpower. The Cold War defined the political role of the United States in the post–World War II world: by 1989 the US held military alliances with 50 countries, and had 1.5 million troops posted abroad in 117 countries. The Cold War also institutionalized a global commitment to huge, permanent peacetime military-industrial complexes and large-scale military funding of science.

Military expenditures by the US during the Cold War years were estimated to have been $8 trillion, while nearly 100,000 Americans lost their lives in the Korean War and Vietnam War. Although the loss of life among Soviet soldiers is difficult to estimate, as a share of their gross national product the financial cost for the Soviet Union was far higher than that of the US.

In addition to the loss of life by uniformed soldiers, millions died in the superpowers' proxy wars around the globe, most notably in Southeast Asia. Most of the proxy wars and subsidies for local conflicts ended along with the Cold War; the incidence of interstate wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, as well as refugee and displaced persons crises has declined sharply in the post–Cold War years.

The legacy of Cold War conflict, however, is not always easily erased, as many of the economic and social tensions that were exploited to fuel Cold War competition in parts of the Third World remain acute. The breakdown of state control in a number of areas formerly ruled by Communist governments has produced new civil and ethnic conflicts, particularly in the former Yugoslavia. In Eastern Europe, the end of the Cold War has ushered in an era of economic growth and a large increase in the number of liberal democracies, while in other parts of the world, such as Afghanistan, independence was accompanied by state failure.

Nuclear legacies

Many specific nuclear legacies can be identified from the Cold War. Some are benign, such as the ensuing era of comparative peace and prosperity, the availability of new technologies for nuclear power and energy, and the use of radiation for improving medical treatment and health. Environmental remediation, industrial production, research science, and technology development have all benefited from the carefully managed application of radiation and other nuclear processes.

On the other hand, despite termination of the Cold War, military development and spending has continued, particularly in the deployment of nuclear-armed ballistic missiles and defensive systems.

Because there was no formalized treaty ending the Cold War, the former superpowers have continued to various degrees – depending on their respective economies – to maintain and even improve or modify existing nuclear weapons and delivery systems. Moreover, other nations not previously acknowledged as nuclear-weapons states have developed and tested nuclear-explosive devices. .

Some chemical and biological weapons that were developed during the Cold War are still around, although many are being demilitarized..

The risk of nuclear and radiological terrorism by possible sub-national organizations or individuals is now a major concern.

The international nonproliferation regime inherited from the Cold War still provides disincentives and safeguards against national or sub-national access to nuclear materials and facilities. Formal and informal measures and processes have effectively slowed national incentives and the tempo of international nuclear-weapons proliferation.

Numerous and beneficial uses of nuclear energy have evolved, all of which require structured safeguards to prevent malevolent use. Commercial nuclear-reactor operation and construction have persisted, with some notable increase in worldwide energy production. The management of nuclear waste remains somewhat unresolved, depending very much on government policies.

As nuclear weapons are becoming surplus to national military interests, they are slowly being dismantled, and in some cases their fissile material is being recycled to fuel civilian nuclear-reactors.

Radiation legacies

Because of — and during — the military and non-military exploitation of nuclear fission, the Cold War brought forth some significant involuntary exposures to high-level radiation. The atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki caused previously unimagined destruction through intense blast and fire, as well as acute and lingering radiation. Moreover, during many decades of nuclear weapons production and testing, exposure to radiation above normal background levels occurred to scientists, technicians, military personnel, civilians, and animals. Several significant radiation-related accidents occurred at military and civilian nuclear reactors and facilities, causing direct fatalities, as well as involuntary occupational and public exposures.

Because numerous diagnostic and epidemiological studies have since been conducted, the medical effects of radiation exposure are now better understood than they were during the Cold War. Comparatively large and involuntary doses and effects from radiation, chemical, and biological agents have been documented. Some exposures were from deliberate human medical experiments and some from residues of highly toxic materials at contaminated sites.

While the nuclear facilities and residual products of the Cold War are mostly contained within secure boundaries, that is not necessarily the case for nuclear-propelled submarines that have been sunk at sea.

Security legacies

Because of potential risk to national and international security, nuclear-weapons states have inherited substantial responsibilities in protecting and stabilizing their nuclear forces.

Not only must nuclear weapons and their delivery systems be secured and protected, other nuclear facilities and devices, such as reactors and propulsion systems, must be safeguarded. An appropriate continuing level of security is necessary through all life-cycle phases, from production to decommissioning. In addition, the entire military nuclear infrastructure requires protection, and that requires a commensurate allocation of funding.

Having once had widespread overseas nuclear bases and facilities, both the United States and the former Soviet Union have inherited particular responsibilities and costs. Moreover, all nuclear-weapons states had developed not only production and servicing facilities, but also sometimes extensive military staging and storage.

Although the Cold War has been defused, domestic basing and overseas deployment of nuclear weapons has not ended. Moreover, the nuclear-weapon states remain in various reduced but palpable conditions of defensive alert.

Risks of deliberate, accidental, or unauthorized nuclear devastation remain. Moreover, terrorists and hackers continue to interfere with nuclear stability and confidence.

World inventories of weapons-grade fissile materials are substantial, much greater than now needed for military purposes. Until these materials can be demilitarized, they need to be security safeguarded. Many production facilities are yet to be shut down.

In the meantime, sensitive materials have to be safely and securely stored, pending their conversion to non-military use. In particular, the successor states of the former Soviet Union were in no position to finance and maintain secure safeguards when the Cold War came to such an unprepared and relatively sudden end.

National security and defense for nuclear-weapons states must be frequently re-evaluated. The international arms-control treaty and verification regime inherited from the Cold War is only slowly being updated to reflect the realities of a new international security environment.

Military legacies

Internal national-security military postures still dominate behavior among sovereign nations. The former superpowers have not formally consummated their stand-down from Cold War military equipoise.

Strategic and tactical nuclear and conventional forces remain at levels comparatively high for a peacetime environment. Localized conflicts and tensions have replaced the former bilateral nuclear confrontation.

As a lingering result, large inventories of nuclear weapons and facilities remain. Some are being recycled, dismanted, or recovered as valuable substances.

Military policies and strategies are slowly being modified to reflect the increasing interval without major confrontation.

Because of large extant inventories of weapons, fissile materials, and rapid-response delivery systems, a mutual danger coexists for accidental, misjudged, or miscalculated incidents or warfare.

Other Cold War weapons states are only slowly reducing their arsenals. In the meantime, they have not abandoned their dependency on nuclear deterrence, while a few

more nations have attempted or succeeded in carrying out nuclear-explosive tests and thus creating their own nuclear deterrence.

During the Cold War, an international fabric of arms-control constraint had evolved, much of it carried over as a beneficial heritage with institutional mechanisms for multi-lateral or international function and verification. Little has since been done to modernize or expand the treaty regimes that were aimed at mutual agreement regarding production, testing, inventories, and stabilization.

Institutional legacies

Aside from tangible measures of national defense, such as standing military and security forces and hardware, are various institutional structures of government and functionality that have less to do directly with military or security factors, but more to do with underlying public attitudes and risks. These institutional structures and perceptions have had their own challenges and adjustments after the Cold War.

Strong impressions were made and continue to affect national psyche as a result of perilously close brushes with all-out nuclear warfare. In some cases this had resulted in aversion to warfare, in other cases to callousness regarding nuclear threats. Peaceful applications of nuclear energy received a stigma still difficult to exorcize.

Heightened fear of nuclear risk can result in resistance to military drawdown. What at one time was fastidious attention regarding nuclear security, secrecy, and safety could deteriorate to lax attitudes.

Public impressions and insecurities gained during the Cold War could carry over to the peace ime environment. Continuing support for the weapons establishment depends on public support despite diminished threats to national security. Agencies and departments created during a time of crisis no longer need to fill the same role.

In fact, these same institutional structures can be modified to carry out knowledgeable new missions associated with the cleanup and storage of highly dangerous and toxic materials. Some materials can be converted to non-military uses. Others need to be secured and safely stored almost indefinitely.

The policies and practices that relied on government secrecy are no longer operable in a peacetime environment.

Also, misunderstandings that were prominent during the Cold War now need clarification so that closure can be reached, especially about the ability to demilitarize and peacefully use nuclear materials.

Underhanded practices in the name of national security are no longer countenanced. The existence of many third-world insurgencies and interventions is now being uncovered as the former cloak of secrecy unveils or their perpetrators confess.

Economic legacies

Among the more specific consequences of the Cold War was a huge fiscal mortgage placed on many domestic economies. Financial obligations included those necessary to avoid further dislocations while the change took place from a wartime footing to a peacetime environment. National military establishments and alliances had to be reconfigured. Highly dependent institutional frameworks were to be restructured, and

new obligations were acquired by nations that were once bystanders to the East-West confrontation.

In the wake of the Cold War, freed or newly founded nations inherited expenses, commitments, and resources for which they were not prepared. The successor states also found themselves with contemporary national-security burdens and substantial environmental contamination legacies, all to be financed while new or revised civilian economies had to be instituted.

Since the superpowers carried much of the confrontational burden, both Russia and the United States ended up with substantial economic liabilities.

❀ ❀ ❀ ❀ ❀

Q.7   What is Nation State? Write down its characteristics.

Ans.   Nation state

The nation state is a state that self-identifies as deriving its political legitimacy from serving as a sovereign entity for a nation as a sovereign territorial unit. The state is a political and geopolitical entity; the nation is a cultural and/or ethnic entity. The term "nation state" implies that the two geographically coincide, which distinguishes the nation state from the other types of state, which historically preceded it.

The concept of a nation state is sometimes contrasted with city state.

History and origins

The origins and early history of nation states are disputed. A major theoretical issue is: "Which came first, the nation or the nation state?" For nationalists, the answer is that the nation existed first, nationalist movements arose to present its legitimate demand for sovereignty, and the nation state met that demand. Some "modernisation theories" of nationalism see the national identity largely as a product of government policy to unify and modernise an already existing state. Most theories see the nation state as an 1800s European phenomenon, facilitated by developments such as mass literacy and the early mass media. However, historians also note the early emergence of a relatively unified state, and a sense of common identity, in Portugal and the Dutch Republic.

In France, Eric Hobsbawm argues the French state preceded the formation of the French people. Hobsbawm considers that the state made the French nation, not French nationalism, which emerged at the end of the 19th century, the time of the Dreyfus Affair. At the time of the 1789 French Revolution, only half of the French people spoke some French, and 12-13% spoke it "fairly", according to Hobsbawm.

During the Italian unification, the number of people speaking the Italian language was even lower. The French state promoted the unification of various dialects and languages into the French language. The introduction of conscription and the Third Republic's 1880s laws on public instruction, facilitated the creation of a national identity, under this theory.

The theorist Benedict Anderson argues that nations are "imagined communities", and that the main causes of nationalism and the creation of an imagined community are the reduction of privileged access to particular script languages, the movement to abolish the ideas of divine rule and monarchy, as well as the emergence of the printing press

under a system of capitalism . The "state-driven" theories of the origin of nation states tend to emphasise a few specific states, such as England and its rival France. These states expanded from core regions, and developed a national consciousness and sense of national identity .

Both assimilated peripheral nations; these areas experienced a revival of interest in the national culture in the 19th century, leading to the creation of autonomist movements in the 20th century.

Some nation states, such as Germany or Italy, came into existence at least partly as a result of political campaigns by nationalists, during the 19th century. In both cases, the territory was previously divided among other states, some of them very small. The sense of common identity was at first a cultural movement, such as in the Volkisch movement in German-speaking states, which rapidly acquired a political significance. In these cases, the nationalist sentiment and the nationalist movement clearly precede the unification of the German and Italian nation states.

Historians Hans Kohn, Liah Greenfeld, Philip White and others have classified nations such as Germany or Italy, where cultural unification preceded state unification, as ethnic nations or ethnic nationalities. Whereas 'state-driven' national unifications, such as in France, England or China, are more likely to flourish in multiethnic societies, producing a traditional national heritage of civic nations, or territory-based nationalities.

The idea of a nation state is associated with the rise of the modern system of states, often called the "Westphalian system" in reference to the Treaty of Westphalia (1648). The balance of power, which characterises that system, depends for its effectiveness upon clearly defined, centrally controlled, independent entities, whether empires or nation states, which recognise each other's sovereignty and territory. The Westphalian system did not create the nation state, but the nation state meets the criteria for its component states .

The nation state received a philosophical underpinning in the era of Romanticism, at first as the 'natural' expression of the individual peoples. The increasing emphasis during the 19th century on the ethnic and racial origins of the nation, led to a redefinition of the nation state in these terms. Racism, which in Boulainvilliers's theories was inherently antipatriotic and antinationalist, joined itself with colonialist imperialism and "continental imperialism", most notably in pan-Germanic and pan-Slavic movements.

The relation between racism and ethnic nationalism reached its height in the 1900s fascism and Nazism. The specific combination of 'nation' and 'state' expressed in such terms as the Völkische Staat and implemented in laws such as the 1935 Nuremberg laws made fascist states such as early Nazi Germany qualitatively different from non-fascist nation states. Obviously, minorities, who are not part of the Volk, have no authentic or legitimate role in such a state. In Germany, neither Jews nor the Roma were considered part of the Volk, and were specifically targeted for persecution. However German nationality law defined 'German' on the basis of German ancestry, excluding all non-Germans from the 'Volk'.

In recent years, the nation state's claim to absolute sovereignty within its borders has been much criticised. A global political system based on international agreements and

supra-national blocs characterized the post-war era. Non-state actors, such as international corporations and non-governmental organizations, are widely seen as eroding the economic and political power of nation states, potentially leading to their eventual disappearance.

Before nation states

In Europe, in the 18th century, the classic non-national states were the multiethnic empires, and smaller states at what would now be called sub-national level. The multi-ethnic empire was a monarchy ruled by a king, emperor or sultan. The population belonged to many ethnic groups, and they spoke many languages. The empire was dominated by one ethnic group, and their language was usually the language of public administration. The ruling dynasty was usually, but not always, from that group.

This type of state is not specifically European: such empires existed on all continents, excepting Australia and Antarctica. Some of the smaller European states were not so ethnically diverse, but were also dynastic states, ruled by a royal house. Their territory could expand by royal intermarriage or merge with another state when the dynasty merged. In some parts of Europe, notably Germany, very small territorial units existed. They were recognised by their neighbours as independent, and had their own government and laws. Some were ruled by princes or other hereditary rulers, some were governed by bishops or abbots. Because they were so small, however, they had no separate language or culture: the inhabitants shared the language of the surrounding region.

In some cases these states were simply overthrown by nationalist uprisings in the 19th century. Liberal ideas of free trade played a role in German unification, which was preceded by a customs union, the Zollverein. However, the Austro-Prussian War, and the German alliances in the Franco-Prussian War, were decisive in the unification. The Austro-Hungarian Empire and the Ottoman Empire broke up after the First World War and the Russian Empire became the Soviet Union, after the Russian Civil War.

A few of the smaller states survived: the independent principalities of Liechtenstein, Andorra, Monaco, and the republic of San Marino.

Characteristics of the nation state

Nation states have their own characteristics, differing from those of the pre-national states. For a start, they have a different attitude to their territory, compared to the dynastic monarchies: it is semisacred, and nontransferable. No nation would swap territory with other states simply, for example, because the king's daughter got married. They have a different type of border, in principle defined only by the area of settlement of the national group, although many nation states also sought natural borders .

The most noticeable characteristic is the degree to which nation states use the state as an instrument of national unity, in economic, social and cultural life.

The nation state promoted economic unity, by abolishing internal customs and tolls. In Germany, that process, the creation of the Zollverein, preceded formal national unity. Nation states typically have a policy to create and maintain a national transportation infrastructure, facilitating trade and travel. In 19th-century Europe, the expansion of the rail transport networks was at first largely a matter for private railway companies, but gradually came under control of the national governments. The French

rail network, with its main lines radiating from Paris to all corners of France, is often seen as a reflection of the centralised French nation state, which directed its construction. Nation states continue to build, for instance, specifically national motorway networks. Specifically, transnational infrastructure programmes, such as the Trans-European Networks, are a recent innovation.

The nation states typically had a more centralised and uniform public administration than its imperial predecessors: they were smaller, and the population less diverse. After the 19th-century triumph of the nation state in Europe, regional identity was subordinate to national identity, in regions such as Alsace-Lorraine, Catalonia, Brittany, Sicily, Sardinia and Corsica. In many cases, the regional administration was also subordinated to central government. This process was partially reversed from the 1970s onward, with the introduction of various forms of regional autonomy, in formerly centralised states such as France.

The most obvious impact of the nation state, as compared to its non-national predecessors, is the creation of a uniform national culture, through state policy. The model of the nation state implies that its population constitutes a nation, united by a common descent, a common language and many forms of shared culture. When the implied unity was absent, the nation state often tried to create it. It promoted a uniform national language, through language policy. The creation of national systems of compulsory primary education and a relatively uniform curriculum in secondary schools, was the most effective instrument in the spread of the national languages. The schools also taught the national history, often in a propagandistic and mythologised version, and some nation states still teach this kind of history.

Language and cultural policy was sometimes negative, aimed at the suppression of non-national elements. Language prohibitions were sometimes used to accelerate the adoption of national languages, and the decline of minority languages, see Germanisation.

In some cases, these policies triggered bitter conflicts and further ethnic separatism. But where it worked, the cultural uniformity and homogeneity of the population increased. Conversely, the cultural divergence at the border became sharper: in theory, a uniform French identity extends from the Atlantic coast to the Rhine, and on the other bank of the Rhine, a uniform German identity begins. To enforce that model, both sides have divergent language policy and educational systems, although the linguistic boundary is in fact well inside France, and the Alsace region changed hands four times between 1870 and 1945.

Examples
The nation state in practice

In some cases, the geographic boundaries of an ethnic population and a political state largely coincide. In these cases, there is little immigration or emigration, few members of ethnic minorities, and few members of the "home" ethnicity living in other countries.

Clear examples of nation states include the following:

1. Albania: The vast majority of the population is ethnically Albanian at about 98.6% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities.

1. **Armenia:** The vast majority of Armenia's population consists of ethnic Armenians at about 98% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities.

2. **Bangladesh:** The vast majority ethnic group of Bangladesh are the Bengali people, comprising 98% of the population, with the remainder consisting of mostly Bihari migrants and indigenous tribal groups. Therefore, Bangladeshi society is to a great extent linguistically and culturally homogeneous, with very small populations of foreign expatriates and workers, although there is a substantial number of Bengali workers living abroad.

3. **Egypt:** The vast majority of Egypt's population consists of ethnic Egyptians at about 99% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities, as well as refugees or asylum seekers. Modern Egyptian identity is closely tied to the geography of Egypt and its long history, its development over the centuries saw overlapping or conflicting ideologies. Though today an Arabic-speaking people, that aspect constitutes for Egyptians a cultural dimension of their identity, not a necessary attribute of or prop for their national political being. Today most Egyptians see themselves, their history, culture and language as specifically Egyptian and not "Arab."

4. **Hungary:** The Hungarians or the Magyar people consist of about 95% of the population, with a small Roma and German minority: see Demographics of Hungary.

5. **Iceland:** Although the inhabitants are ethnically related to other Scandinavian groups, the national culture and language are found only in Iceland. There are no cross-border minorities, the nearest land is too far away:

   - **Japan:** Japan is also traditionally seen as an example of a nation state and also the largest of the nation states, with population in excess of 120 million. It should be noted that Japan has a small number of minorities such as Ryūkyū peoples, Koreans and Chinese, and on the northern island of Hokkaidō, the indigenous Ainu minority. However, they are either numerically insignificant , their difference is not as pronounced or well assimilated .

   - **Lesotho:** Lesotho's ethno-linguistic structure consists almost entirely of the Basotho , a Bantu-speaking people; about 99.7% of the population are Basotho.

   - **Maldives:** The vast majority of the population is ethnically Dhivehi at about 98% of the population, with the remainder consisting of foreign workers; there are no indigenous ethnic minorities.

   - Malta: The vast majority of the population is ethnically Maltese at about 95.3% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities.

   - **North and South Korea,** are one of the most ethnically and linguistically homogeneous in the world. Particularly in reclusive North Korea, there are very few ethnic minority groups and expatriate foreigners.

- **Poland:** After World War II, with the extermination of the Jews by the invading German Nazis during the Holocaust, the Expulsion of Germans after World War II and the loss of eastern territories , 96.7% of the people of Poland claim Polish nationality, and 97.8% declare that they speak Polish at home .
- **Several** Polynesian countries such as Tonga, Samoa, Tuvalu, etc.
- **Portugal:** Although surrounded by other lands and people, the Portuguese nation has occupied the same territory since the romanization or latinization of the native population during the Roman era. The modern Portuguese nation is a very old amalgam of formerly distinct historical populations that passed through and settled in the territory of modern Portugal: native Iberian peoples, Celts, ancient Mediterraneans invading Germanic peoples like the Suebi and the Visigoths, and Muslim Arabs and Berbers. Most Berber/Arab people and the Jews were expelled from the Iberian Peninsula during the Reconquista and the repopulation by Christians.
- **San Marino:** The Sammarinese make up about 97% of the population and all speak Italian and are ethnically and linguisticially identical to Italians. San Marino is a landlocked enclave, completely surrounded by Italy. The state has a population of approximately 30,000, including 1,000 foreigners, most of whom are Italians.
- **Swaziland:** The vast majority of the population is ethnically Swazi at about 98.6% of the population, with the remainder consisting of a few small ethnic minorities.

The notion of a unifying "national identity" also extends to countries that host multiple ethnic or language groups, such as India and China. For example, Switzerland is constitutionally a confederation of cantons, and has four official languages, but it has also a 'Swiss' national identity, a national history and a classic national hero, Wilhelm Tell.

Innumerable conflicts have arisen where political boundaries did not correspond with ethnic or cultural boundaries. For one example, the Hatay Province was transferred to Turkey from Syria after the majority-Turkish population complained of mistreatment. The traditional homeland of the Kurdish people extends between northern Iraq, southeastern Turkey, and western Iran. Some of its inhabitants call for the creation of an independent Kurdistan, citing mistreatment by the Turkish and Iraqi governments. An armed conflict between the terrorist Kurdistan Workers Party and the Turkish government over this issue has been ongoing since 1984.

After WWII in the Tito era, nationalism was appealed to for uniting South Slav peoples. Later in the 20th century, after the break-up of the Soviet Union, leaders appealed to ancient ethnic feuds or tensions that ignited conflict between the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, as well Bosnians, Montenegrins and Macedonians, eventually breaking up the long collaboration of peoples and ethnic cleansing was carried out in the Balkans, resulting in the destruction of the formerly communist republic and produced the civil wars in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1992–95, resulted in mass population displacements and segregation that radically altered what was once a highly diverse and intermixed ethnic makeup of the region. These conflicts were largely about creating a

new political framework of states, each of which would be ethnically and politically homogeneous. Serbians, Croatians and Bosnians insisted they were ethnically distinct although many communities had a long history of intermarriage. All could speak the common Serbo-Croatian Language. Presently Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia could be classified as nation states per se, whereas Macedonia, Montenegro and Bosnia and Herzegovina are multinational states.

Belgium is a classic example of an artificial state that is not a nation state. The state was formed by secession from the United Kingdom of the Netherlands in 1830, whose neutrality and integrity was protected by the Treaty of London 1839; thus it served as a buffer state between the European powers France, Prussia, the United Kingdom and the Kingdom of the Netherlands until World War I. Belgium is divided between the Flemings, the French-speaking and the German-speaking. The Flemish population in the north speaks Flemish, the Walloon population in the south speaks French and/or German. The Brussels population speaks French and/or Flemish.

The Flemish identity is also ethnic and cultural, and there is a strong separatist movement espoused by the political parties, Vlaams Belang and the Nieuw-Vlaamse Alliantie. The Francophone Walloon identity of Belgium is linguistically distinct and regionalist. There is also s unitary Belgian nationalism, several versions of a Greater Netherlands ideal, and a German-speaking community of Belgium annexed from Prussia in 1920, and re-annexed by Germany in 1940–1944. However these ideologies are all very marginal and politically insignificant during elections.

China covers a large geographic area and uses the concept of "Zhonghua minzu" or Chinese nationality, in the sense of ethnic groups, but it also officially recognizes the majority Han ethnic group, and no fewer than 55 ethnic national minorities.

The United Kingdom

The United Kingdom is a complex example of a nation state, due to its "countries within a country" status. The UK is a unitary state formed initially by the merger of two independent kingdoms, the Kingdom of England and the Kingdom of Scotland, but the Treaty of Union that set out the agreed terms has ensured the continuation of distinct features of each state, including separate legal systems and separate national churches.

In 2003, the British Government described the United Kingdom as "countries within a country". While the Office for National Statistics and others describe the United Kingdom as a "nation state", others, including a then Prime Minister, describe it as a "multinational state", and the term Home Nations is used to describe the four national teams that represent the four nations of the United Kingdom .

Estonia

Although Estonia is a country with very diverse demographic situation with over 100 different ethnic groups whereas only 68.7% are Estonians and the biggest minority group being Russians, the constitution defines as one of the main reasons of the Estonian independence the goal to preserve the Estonian language, nation and culture, therefore Estonia could be still seen as a nation state despite the demographic situation.

The constitution reads:

The Estonian state which shall guarantee the preservation of the Estonian nation, language and culture through the ages.

Israel

Israel's definition of a nation state differs from other countries as its concept of a nation state is based on the Ethnoreligious group rather than solely on ethnicity, while the ancient mother language of the Jews, Hebrew, was revived as a unifying bond between them as a national and official language.

Israel was founded as a Jewish state in 1948, and the country's Basic Laws describe it as both a Jewish and a democratic state. According to the Israel Central Bureau of Statistics, 75.7% of Israel's population is Jewish. Large numbers of Jews continue to emigrate to Israel. Arabs, who make up 20.4% of the population, are the largest ethnic minority in Israel. Israel also has very small communities of Armenians, Circassians, Assyrians, Samaritans, and persons of some Jewish heritage. There are also some non-Jewish spouses of Israeli Jews. However, these communities are very small, and usually number only in the hundreds or thousands.

Minorities

The most obvious deviation from the ideal of 'one nation, one state', is the presence of minorities, especially ethnic minorities, which are clearly not members of the majority nation. An ethnic nationalist definition of a nation is necessarily exclusive: ethnic nations typically do not have open membership. In most cases, there is a clear idea that surrounding nations are different, and that includes members of those nations who live on the 'wrong side' of the border. Historical examples of groups, who have been specifically singled out as outsiders, are the Roma and Jews in Europe.

Negative responses to minorities within the nation state have ranged from cultural assimilation enforced by the state, to expulsion, persecution, violence, and extermination. The assimilation policies are usually enforced by the state, but violence against minorities is not always state initiated: it can occur in the form of mob violence such as lynching or pogroms. Nation states are responsible for some of the worst historical examples of violence against minorities: minorities not considered part of the nation.

However, many nation states accept specific minorities as being part of the nation, and the term national minority is often used in this sense. The Sorbs in Germany are an example: for centuries they have lived in German-speaking states, surrounded by a much larger ethnic German population, and they have no other historical territory. They are now generally considered to be part of the German nation and are accepted as such by the Federal Republic of Germany, which constitutionally guarantees their cultural rights. Of the thousands of ethnic and cultural minorities in nation states across the world, only a few have this level of acceptance and protection.

Multiculturalism is an official policy in many states, establishing the ideal of peaceful existence among multiple ethnic, cultural, and linguistic groups. Many nations have laws protecting minority rights.

When national boundaries that do not match ethnic boundaries are drawn, such as in the Balkans and Central Asia, ethnic tension, massacres and even genocide, sometimes has occurred historically .

Irredentism

Ideally, the border of a nation state extends far enough to include all the members of the nation, and all of the national homeland. Again, in practice some of them always

live on the 'wrong side' of the border. Part of the national homeland may be there too, and it may be governed by the 'wrong' nation. The response to the non-inclusion of territory and population may take the form of irredentism: demands to annex unredeemed territory and incorporate it into the nation state.

Irredentist claims are usually based on the fact that an identifiable part of the national group lives across the border. However, they can include claims to territory where no members of that nation live at present, because they lived there in the past, the national language is spoken in that region, the national culture has influenced it, geographical unity with the existing territory, or a wide variety of other reasons. Past grievances are usually involved and can cause revanchism.

It is sometimes difficult to distinguish irredentism from pan-nationalism, since both claim that all members of an ethnic and cultural nation belong in one specific state. Pan-nationalism is less likely to specify the nation ethnically. For instance, variants of Pan-Germanism have different ideas about what constituted Greater Germany, including the confusing term Grossdeutschland, which, in fact, implied the inclusion of huge Slavic minorities from the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Typically, irredentist demands are at first made by members of non-state nationalist movements. When they are adopted by a state, they typically result in tensions, and actual attempts at annexation are always considered a casus belli, a cause for war. In many cases, such claims result in long-term hostile relations between neighbouring states. Irredentist movements, typically circulate maps of the claimed national territory, the greater nation state. That territory, which is often much larger than the existing state, plays a central role in their propaganda.

Irredentism should not be confused with claims to overseas colonies, which are not generally considered part of the national homeland. Some French overseas colonies would be an exception: French rule in Algeria unsuccessfully treated the colony as a department of France.

Future

It has been speculated by both proponents of globalization and various science fiction writers that the concept of a nation state may disappear with the ever-increasingly interconnected nature of the world. Such ideas are sometimes expressed around concepts of a world government. Another possibility is a societal collapse and move into communal anarchy or zero world government, in which nation states no longer exist and government is done on the local level based on a global ethic of human rights.

This falls into line with the concept of internationalism, which states that sovereignty is an outdated concept and a barrier to achieving peace and harmony in the world, thus also stating that nation states are also a similar outdated concept.

If the nation state begins to disappear, it may well be the direct or indirect result of globalization and internationalism. The two concepts state that sovereignty is an outdated concept and, as the concept and existence of a nation state depends on 'untouchable' sovereignty, it is therefore reasonable to assume that.

Globalization especially has helped to bring about the discussion about the disappearance of nation states, as global trade and the rise of the concepts of a 'global

citizen' and a common identity have helped to reduce differences and 'distances' between individual nation states, especially with regards to the internet.

❉ ❉ ❉ ❉ ❉

Q.8 What do you know about the balance of power in International Relation? Write down its significance.

Ans. **Balance of power in international relations**

In international relations, a balance of power exists when there is parity or stability between competing forces. The concept "describes a state of affairs in the international system and explains the behaviour of states in that system" .As a term in international law for a 'just equilibrium' between the members of the family of nations, it expresses the doctrine intended to prevent any one nation from becoming sufficiently strong so as to enable it to enforce its will upon the rest.

"Balance of power is a central concept in neorealist theory. Within a balance of power system, a state may choose to engage in either balancing or bandwagoning behavior. In a time of war, the decision to balance or to bandwagon may well determine the survival of the state.

Kenneth Waltz, a major contributor to neorealism, expressed in his book, "Theory of International Politics" that "if there is any distinctively political theory of international politics, balance-of-power theory is it.". However, this assertion has come under criticism from other schools of thought within the international relations field, such as the constructivists and the political economists.

A doctrine of equilibrium

The basic principle involved in a balancing of political power, as Charles Davenant pointed out in his Essay on the Balance of Power, is as old as history, and was familiar to the ancients both as political theorists and as practical statesmen. In its essence it is no more than a precept of common sense, born of experience and the instinct of self-preservation.

More precisely, the theory of Balance of Power has certain key aspects that have been agreed upon throughout the literature on the subject. First of all, the main objective of states, according to the Balance of Power theory is to secure their own safety, consistent with political realism or the realist world-view. Secondly, states reach an equilibrium because of this objective of self-preservation. States, by trying to avoid the dominance of one particular state, will ally themselves with other states until an equilibrium is reached.

As Professor L. Oppenheim points out, an equilibrium between the various powers which form the family of nations is, in fact, essential to the very existence of any international law. In the absence of any central authority, the only sanction behind the code of rules established by custom or defined in treaties, known as 'international law', is the capacity of the powers to hold each other in check. If this system fails, nothing prevents any state sufficiently powerful from ignoring the law and acting solely according to its convenience and its interests.

Historical perspective

Preserving the balance of power as a conscious goal of foreign policy, though certainly known in the ancient world, resurfaced in post-medieval Europe among the Italian city states in the 15th century. Francesco Sforza, Duke of Milan, was the first ruler to actively pursue such a policy, though historians have generally attributed the innovation to the Medici rulers of Florence whose praises were sung by the well-known Florentine writers Niccolo Machiavelli and Francesco Guicciardini.

Universalism, which was the dominant direction of European international relations prior to the Peace of Westphalia, gave way to the doctrine of the balance of power. The term gained significance after the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713, where it was specifically mentioned.

It was not until the beginning of the 17th century, when the science of international law assumed the discipline of structure, in the hands of Grotius and his successors, that the theory of the balance of power was formulated as a fundamental principle of diplomacy. In accordance with this new discipline, the European states formed a sort of federal community, the fundamental condition of which was the preservation of a 'balance of power, i.e. such a disposition of things that no one state, or potentate, should be able absolutely to predominate and prescribe laws to the rest. And, since all were equally interested in this settlement, it was held to be the interest, the right, and the duty of every power to interfere, even by force of arms, when any of the conditions of this settlement were infringed upon, or assailed by, any other member of the community.

This 'balance of power' principle, once formulated, became an axiom of political science. Fenelon, in his Instructions, impressed the axiom upon the young Louis, duc de Bourgogne. Frederick the Great, in his Anti-Machiavel, proclaimed the 'balance of power' principle to the world. In 1806, Friedrich von Gentz re-stated it with admirable clarity, in Fragments on the Balance of Power. The principle formed the basis of the coalitions against Louis XIV and Napoleon, and the occasion, or the excuse, for most of the wars which Europe experienced between the Peace of Westphalia and the Congress of Vienna (1814), especially from the British vantage point .

During the greater part of the 19th century, the series of national upheavals which remodelled the map of Europe obscured the balance of power. Yet, it underlay all the efforts of diplomacy to stay, or to direct, the elemental forces let loose by the French Revolution. In the revolution's aftermath, with the restoration of comparative calm, the principle once more emerged as the operative motive for the various political alliances, of which the ostensible object was the preservation of peace.

England

It has been argued by historians that in the sixteenth century England came to pursue a foreign policy which would preserve the equilibrium between Spain and France, which evolved into a balance-of-power policy:

The continental policy of England was fixed. It was to be pacific, mediating, favourable to a balance which should prevent any power from having a hegemony on the continent or controlling the Channel coasts. The naval security of England and the balance of power in Europe were the two great political principles which appeared in the

reign of Henry VIII and which, pursued unwaveringly, were to create the greatness of England.

In 1579 the first English translation of Guicciardini's Storia d'Italia or History of Italy popularised Italian balance of power theory in England. This translation was dedicated to Elizabeth I of England and claimed that "God has put into your hand the balance of power and justice, to poise and counterpoise at your will the actions and counsels of all the Christian kings of your time".

Sir Esme Howard wrote that England adopted the balance of power as "a corner-stone of English policy, unconsciously during the sixteenth, subconsciously during the seventeenth, and consciously during the eighteenth, nineteenth and twentieth centuries, because for England it represented the only plan of preserving her own independence, political and economic".

Significance

The balance of power phenomenon pervades international politics and is the central feature in the power struggle. It is the net effect, or result, produced by a state system in which the independent state as sovereign members are free to join or to refrain from joining alliances and alignments as each seeks to maximize its security and to advance its national interest.

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.9 What do you know about colonialism? What is its justification by colonial powers?

Ans.   Colonialism

Colonialism is the extension of a nation's sovereignty over territory beyond its borders by the establishment of either settler colonies or administrative dependencies in which indigenous populations are directly ruled or displaced. Colonizing nations generally dominate the resources, labor, and markets of the colonial territory, and may also impose socio-cultural, religious and linguistic structures on the conquered population. Though the word colonialism is often used interchangeably with imperialism, the latter is sometimes used more broadly as it covers control exercised informally as well as formal military control or economic leverage. The term colonialism may also be used to refer to a set of beliefs used to legitimize or promote this system. Colonialism was often based on the ethnocentric belief that the morals and values of the colonizer were superior to those of the colonized; some observers link such beliefs to racism and pseudo-scientific theories dating to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. In the Western world, this led to a form of proto-social Darwinism that placed white people at the top of the animal kingdom, "naturally" in charge of dominating non-European indigenous populations.

Negatively, attitudes of racial, cultural, religious and civilization superiority of the colonizers over the colonized that developed, often as a justification for political domination during the colonial era, continue to impact the lives of many people in the world today, informing how people in the rich North view those in the poorer South as well as minorities within the South of migrant origin. On the other hand, the colonial

legacy is also one of close linguistic and cultural links between people across the globe. It has brought humanity together as members of a global community. Colonialism played a crucial role in helping to crease consciousness of an inter-dependent world community, in which responsibility for the welfare of all and for the health of the planet is shared by everyone. Humanity may be evolving to a stage when exploitation of others and promotion of self-interest is yielding to a new understanding of what it means to be human.

Types of colonies

Several types of colonies may be distinguished, reflecting different colonial objectives. Settler colonies, such as Hungary and Thailand and the later United States of America, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and Argentina were established by the movement of large numbers of citizens from a mother country or metropole to the new colony. The local people or tribes, such as the Aboriginal people in Canada and the United States, were usually far overwhelmed numerically by the settlers and were thus moved forcibly to other regions or exterminated. These forcible population transfers, usually to areas of poorer-quality land or resources often led to the permanent detriment of indigenous peoples. In today's language, such colonization would be called illegal immigration, and in most aforementioned cases, crime and terrorism.

In some cases, for example the Vandals, Matabeles and Sioux, the colonizers were fleeing more powerful enemies, as part of a chain reaction of colonization.

Settler colonies may be contrasted with Dependencies, where the colonizers did not arrive as part óf a mass emigration, but rather as administrators over existing sizable native populations. Examples in this category include the British Raj, Egypt, the Dutch East Indies, and the Japanese colonial empire. In some cases large-scale colonial settlement was attempted in substantially pre-populated areas and the result was either an ethnically mixed population , or racially divided, such as in French Algeria or Southern Rhodesia.

With Plantation colonies, such as Barbados, Saint-Domingue and Jamaica, the white colonizers imported black slaves who rapidly began to outnumber their owners, leading to minority rule, similar to a dependency.

Trading posts, such as Hong Kong, Macau, Malacca, Deshima and Singapore constitute a fifth category, where the primary purpose of the colony was to engage in trade rather than as a staging post for further colonization of the hinterland.

History of colonialism

The historical phenomenon of colonization is one that stretches around the globe and across time, including such disparate peoples as the Hittites, the Incas and the British, although the term colonialism is normally used with reference to discontiguous European overseas empires rather than contiguous land-based empires, European or otherwise, which are conventionally described by the term imperialism. Examples of land-based empires include the Mongol Empire, a large empire stretching from the Western Pacific Ocean to Eastern Europe, the Empire of Alexander the Great, the Umayyad Caliphate, the Persian Empire, the Roman Empire, the Byzantine Empire. The Ottoman Empire was created across the Mediterranean Sea, North Africa and into South-Eastern Europe and existed during the time of European colonization of the other parts of the world.

European colonialism began in the fifteenth century, with Portugal's conquest of Ceuta. Colonialism was led by Portuguese and Spanish exploration of the Americas, and the coasts of Africa, the Middle East, India, and East Asia. Despite some earlier attempts, it was not until the 17th century that England, France and the Netherlands successfully established their own overseas empires, in direct competition with each other and those of Spain and Portugal.

The end of the eighteenth and early nineteenth century saw the first era of decolonization when most of the European colonies in the Americas gained their independence from their respective metropoles. Spain and Portugal were irreversibly weakened after the loss of their New World colonies, but Britain , France and the Netherlands turned their attention to the Old World, particularly South Africa, India and South East Asia, where coastal enclaves had already been established. Germany, after being united under Prussia also sought colonies in Deutsch Ost Afrika.

The industrialization of the nineteenth century led to what has been termed the era of New Imperialism, when the pace of colonization rapidly accelerated, the height of which was the Scramble for Africa. During the twentieth century, the overseas colonies of the losers of World War I were distributed amongst the victors as mandates, but it was not until the end of World War II that the second phase of decolonization began in earnest.

Justification for Colonialism argued by Colonial Powers

Imperial and colonial powers from ancient to modern times have often regarded their rule over others as an aspect of their own destiny, which is to civilize, educate and bring order to the world. Although the Roman Empire more or less began as a result of defeating the Carthaginian Empire when it gained their extensive territories in North Africa, it soon developed the idea of extending Roman discipline and order and law to others as a reason d'etre for further imperial expansion.

Napoleon Bonaparte saw his role as a unifier and as spreading a common code of law, although he also simply wanted to conquer the world. The British Empire began as an extension of their trading interests, fueled by the need for raw materials as well as for markets. India, considered to be the jewel in the crown of their imperial project, was initially colonized by a commercial enterprise, the British East India Company which set up trading stations. Later, these expanded into whole provinces of India as conquest, subterfuge, treaties with Indian princes and other means of expansion added territory until the whole Sub-continent was under British control. A similar process took place in Africa. The Dutch Empire also began as a commercial enterprise. Later, however, a moral argument was used to justify the continuation and expansion of colonialism, famously expressed by Rudyard Kipling , winner of the 1907 Nobel Prize for Literature, in his 1899 poem, "The White Man's Burden." It was, the poem said, a moral responsibility to rule over people who were "half-devil and half child" who therefore needed the discipline, oversight and governance that only a superior race could provide. Some saw the task of Christianizing and civilizing imperial subjects as part and parcel of the same task. Religious motivation also lay behind the huge expanse of the Ottoman Empire; to extend Islamic governance to the rest of the world. Some in Britain saw it as their destiny to create a pax Brittanica as the Roman's had a pax Romana. The British,

they said, were by nature a ruling race. Much of the so-called moral justification of colonialism was predicated on racist assumptions; not only were some people better off being ruled by those who could bring order to their chaotic societies but they were genetically incapable of self-governance. Some people might, after an interval of time, be capable but meanwhile needed guidance; John Stuart Mill argued in 1858 after the First War of Indian Independence that "150 Asiatics" in India could not "be trusted to govern themselves".

Later, the argument developed that if the colonial power departed, ancient animosities and tribal rivalry would create a blood-bath; thus only colonial rule could keep the peace. Others would argue that the divide and rule policy pursued by many colonial powers either exacerbated existing rivalries or encouraged and even manufactured division that did not exist before. In post-colonial contexts, discussion of conflict, when this occurs, is often reduced to the concept that this it is always driven by inter-tribal hostility. As late as the end of World War I, when the great powers divided the Ottoman space among themselves as League of Nations mandated territories, they argued that these populations required oversight until they developed the capacity to exercise the responsibilities of government. The colonial and imperial projects did have their critics. One of the pioneer critics of European colonialism was Bartolomé de Las Casas. He praised the qualities of the indigenous peoples of the America's and condemned the greed and cruelty of their Spanish conquerors. Juan Ginés de Sepúlveda expressed the opposite view; the Spanish were in every respect superior to the natives, who lacked any trace of "humanity" and needed to be governed in the same way that children need to be parented. In fact, drawing on Aristotle he said that such people should be enslaved because slavery suited their natural state.. Aristotle wrote, "some people are naturally free, others naturally slaves, for whom slavery is both just and beneficial." Justification for colonialism echoed this, arguing that some people were better off being ruled by others, or even living as their slaves. Colonial expansion was also very often driven by competition with others; it was a battle - although blood was not always shed - to see whose empire would emerge as the most powerful in the world. The British, who had competed with France in many contexts, were very concerned with Russia's ambitions, thus Lord Curzon contemplating territories where Russia and Britain appeared to be competing, described them as "pieces on a chessboard upon which is being played out a game for the dominion of the world." Queen Victoria "put it even more clearly: it was, she said, 'a question of Russian or British supremacy in the world.". This was the "great game," which features in Kipling's Kim, where Britain vies with Russia. The game, of course, is played out in other people's territory. Much British expansion was in order to protect their route to India.

Neocolonialism

Despite the decolonization in the 1960s-1970s, former colonies still are today for the most part under strong Western influence. Critics of this continued Western influence talk of neocolonialism. The exception to this rule being in particular the East Asian Tigers, the booming economies of Hong Kong, Singapore, South Korea, and Taiwan and the emerging Indian and Chinese powers.

1900 Campaign poster for the Republican Party. "The American flag has not been planted in foreign soil to acquire more territory but for humanity's sake," president

William McKinley, July 12, 1900. On the left hand, we see how the situation allegedly was in 1896, before McKinley's victory during the elections: "Gone Democratic: A run on the bank, Spanish rule in Cuba." On the right hand, we see how the situation allegedly is in 1900, after four years of McKinley's rule: "Gone Republican: a run to the bank, American rule in Cuba" . The USA is becoming, as other European powers, an imperialist power. As did France before with its universalist doctrine, it claims that it acts for "Humanity"

U.S. foreign intervention

On the other hand, because of the Cold War, which led both Moscow and Beijing to sponsor, arm, and fund anti-imperialist movements, the U.S. interfered in various countries, by issuing an embargo against Cuba after the 1959 Cuban Revolution—which started on February 7, 1962—and supporting various covert operations for example. Theorists of neo-colonialism are of the opinion that the US—and France, for that matter—preferred supporting dictatorships in Third World countries rather than having democracies that always presented the risk of having the people choose to be aligned with the Communist bloc rather than the so-called "Free World."

For example, in Chile the Central Intelligence Agency covertly spent three million dollars in an effort to influence the outcome of the 1964 Chilean presidential election; supported the attempted October 1970 kidnapping of General Rene Schneider, part of a plot to prevent the congressional confirmation of socialist Salvador Allende as president ; the U.S. welcomed, though probably did not bring about the Chilean coup of 1973, in which Allende was overthrown and Augusto Pinochet installed and provided material support to the military regime after the coup, continuing payment to CIA contacts who were known to be involved in human rights abuses; and even facilitated communications for Operation Condor, a cooperative program among the intelligence agencies of several right-wing South American regimes to locate, observe and assassinate political opponents.

The proponents of the idea of neo-colonialism also cite the 1983 U.S. invasion of Grenada and the 1989 United States invasion of Panama, overthrowing Manuel Noriega, who was characterized by the U.S. government as a drug lord. In Indonesia, Washington supported Suharto's New Order dictatorship.

This interference, in particular in South and Central American countries, is reminiscent of the nineteenth century Monroe doctrine and the "Big stick diplomacy" codified by U.S. president Theodore Roosevelt. Left-wing critics have spoken of an "American Empire," pushed in particular by the military-industrial complex, which president Dwight D. Eisenhower warned against in 1961. On the other hand, some Republicans have supported, without much success since World War I, isolationism. Defenders of U.S. policy have asserted that intervention was sometimes necessary to prevent Communist or Soviet-aligned governments from taking power during the Cold War.

❈ ❈ ❈ ❈ ❈

Q.10 What do you know about New International Economic order? Analyse it critically.

Ans.   New International Economic Order

The New International Economic Order was a set of proposals put forward during the 1970s by some developing countries through the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to promote their interests by improving their terms of trade, increasing development assistance, developed-country tariff reductions, and other means. It was meant to be a revision of the international economic system in favour of Third World countries, replacing the Bretton Woods system, which had benefited the leading states that had created it–especially the United States.

History

The term was derived from the Declaration for the Establishment of a New International Economic Order, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly in 1974, and referred to a wide range of trade, financial, commodity, and debt-related issues .This followed an agenda for discussions between industrial and developing countries, focusing on restructuring of the world's economy to permit greater participation by and benefits to developing countries . Along with the declaration, a Programme of Action and a Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States were also adopted.

In the 1970s and 1980s, the developing countries pushed for NIEO and an accompanying set of documents to be adopted by the UN General Assembly. Subsequently, however, these norms became only of rhetorical and political value, except for some partly viable mechanisms, such as the non-legal, non-binding Restrictive Business Practice Code adopted in 1980 and the Common Fund for Commodities which came in force in 1989.

Tenets

The main tenets of NIEO were:

1.   Developing countries must be entitled to regulate and control the activities of multinational corporations operating within their territory.

2.   They must be free to nationalize or expropriate foreign property on conditions favourable to them.

3.   They must be free to set up associations of primary commodities producers similar to the OPEC; all other States must recognize this right and refrain from taking economic, military, or political measures calculated to restrict it.

4.   International trade should be based on the need to ensure stable, equitable, and remunerative prices for raw materials, generalized non-reciprocal and non-discriminatory tariff preferences, as well as transfer of technology to developing countries; and should provide economic and technical assistance without any strings attached.

Resource allocation mechanisms

Haggard and Simmons claimed that:

A number of social mechanisms are possible to effect resource allocation in any economic order. An authoritative allocation mechanism involves direct control of resources while, at the other end of the spectrum, more market-oriented private allocation

mechanisms are possible. Most of the debates within the NIEO occurred over allocation mechanisms, with the southern hemisphere countries favoring authoritative solutions.

Ideology

Mercantilist Ideas

NIEO is based on the mercantilist idea that international trade would be a zero-sum game ,and on the view that it benefits the rich at the expense of the poor. Some American economists challenge the idea of trade as a zero-sum game.

Central planning vs. free markets

NIEO also proposes central planning, as opposed to free markets.

Legacy

In Matsushita et al.'s World Trade Organization, the authors explained part of the legacy of the NIEO:

> ... tensions and disagreements between developed and developing countries continue: the latter expect a greater degree of special treatment than industrialized countries have afforded them. This demand was expressed comprehensively in the New International Economic Order and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States promoted by UNCTAD in the 1970s. Although the Charter was never accepted by developing countries and is now dead, the political, economic, and social concerns that inspired it are still present. The Charter called for restitution for the economic and social costs of colonialism, racial discrimination, and foreign domination. It would have imposed a duty on all states to adjust the prices of exports to their imports. The realization of the New International Economic Order was an impetus for developing country support for the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations. Critics of the WTO continue to state that little of substance for developing countries came out of either the Tokyo or Uruguay Rounds.

Criticism

Price regulation is inefficient

The powerful countries of North America and Western Europe felt threatened by the NIEO and continuously tried to criticize and minimize it; according to professor Harry Johnson, the most efficient way to help the poor is to transfer resources from those most able to pay to those most in need. Instead of this, NIEO proposes that those poor countries that have monopoly power should be able to extort these transfers. In practice such power has caused most harm to other poor countries.

Commanding prices above their natural level usually reduces consumption and thus causes unemployment among producers. Moreover, price regulation typically gives the extra income to those in control of who is allowed to produce, e.g., to governments or land-owners.

✳ ✳ ✳ ✳ ✳

Q.11 Write a comprehensive note on United States Foreign Policy.

Ans.   United States foreign policy

The foreign policy of the United States is officially conducted by the President and the Secretary of State. Less formal foreign policy is conducted through exchanges of citizens and other government officials, through commerce and trade, or through third party states or organizations. United States Foreign Policy is marked by the country's large economy, well-funded military, and notable political influence. According to the CIA World Factbook, the United States has the world's largest economy, the world's most well-funded military, and a large amount of political influence.

The officially stated goals of the foreign policy of the United States repeatedly mentioned and emphasized by government officials, are:

1. Protecting the safety and freedom of all American citizens, both within the United States and abroad;   ·

2. Protecting allied nations of the United States from attack or invasion and creating mutually beneficial international defense arrangements and partnerships to ensure this;

3. Promotion of peace, freedom , and democracy in all regions of the world;

4. Furthering free trade, unencumbered by tariffs, interdictions and other economic barriers, and furthering capitalism in order to foster economic growth, improve living conditions everywhere, and promote the sale and mobility of U.S. products to international consumers who desire them; and

5. Bringing developmental and humanitarian aid to foreign peoples in need.

The United States has frequently been criticized for not living up to these noble goals, as national self-interest, unilateral decisions, and projection of power frequently contradict stated goals in the pursuit of immediate and short-term objectives. Thus, while many people throughout the world admire the principles for which it stands, they do not trust the actual policies of the United States. This problem is derived from the lack of any checks and balances on the use of power in foreign affairs by the president. When the United States was a young and relatively powerless nation, this was not an issue. However, as its power in the world has grown, the use of that power unilaterally has become a problem similar to any other unchecked use of power that worried the United States founders.

Decision-making

The President negotiates treaties with foreign nations. The President is also Commander in Chief of the military, and as such has broad authority over the armed forces once they are deployed. The Secretary of State is the foreign minister of the United States and is the primary conductor of state-to-state diplomacy.

The Congress has the power to declare war, but the President has the ability to commit military troops to an area for 60 days without Congressional approval, though in all cases it has been granted afterward. The Senate also holds the exclusive right to approve treaties made by the President. Congress is likewise responsible for passing bills that determine the general character and policies of United States foreign policy.

The third arm of government is the Supreme Court, which has traditionally played a minimal role in foreign policy.

History

America's first century

During the American Revolution, the United States established relations with several European powers, convincing France, Spain, and the Netherlands to intervene in the war against Britain, a mutual enemy. After the Constitution provided for foreign policy to be conducted by the executive branch, President George Washington established the basis for U.S. foreign policy that was to last for nearly 100 years. In his farewell address he gave guidelines for foreign policy that included to act in "good faith and justice towards all nations," and to pursue a neutral stance, "steering clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the world."

After the Spanish colonies in Latin America declared independence, the U.S. established the Monroe Doctrine, a policy of keeping European powers out of the Americas. U.S. expansionism led to war with Mexico and to diplomatic conflict with Britain over the Oregon Territory and with Spain over Florida and later Cuba. During the American Civil War, the U.S. accused Britain and France of supporting the Confederate States and trying to control Mexico, but after that, the U.S. was unchallenged in its home territory, except by Native Americans. While, the U.S. strove to be the dominant influence in the Americas, it did not pursue the idea of becoming a world power until the 1890s.

Becoming a world power

The federal government was initially supported almost entirely through tariffs on foreign goods. Tariffs had the effect of protecting fledgling U.S. industries by giving them a competitive advantage in the United States, but as industrial and economic power grew in the second half of the nineteenth century, companies began to expand their markets to other countries. It was thought that a navy not unlike Britain's was required to protect the shipment of U.S. goods overseas.

The U.S. used its naval power to secure ports around the world. It occupied territories in the Pacific, such as Hawaii and the Philippines, demanded the opening of Japan to trade, and competed with other powers for influence in China. While the Republican Party supported tariffs at home, free markets overseas were more desirable for the sale of U.S. products and therefore became a foreign policy objective that eventually led to the idea of elimination of tariffs at home with the substitution of an income tax for domestic revenue.

The United States, and President Theodore Roosevelt, were strong supporters of the Hague Peace Palace and the International Court formed in 1899. Roosevelt was given a Nobel Prize in 1905 for helping to negotiate a dispute between Japan and Russia. However, the U.S. was unwilling to submit to the jurisdiction of the Court when a case was brought against the U.S. annexation of Hawaii.

As a growing military and economic power, the United States eventually joined the Allies in World War I, in part to protect huge economic loans by U.S. Banks to England and France. With many Americans feeling they had been duped by Washington after a huge number of causalities were incurred, the United States returned to more isolationist policies through the 1920s and 1930s.

The United States entered World War II in 1941, again on the Allied side, following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor and the subsequent declaration of war against the U.S. by Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy. After the war, the United Stated emerged as the leading world power. It was a major player in the establishment of the United Nations and became one of five permanent members of the Security Council. The Marshall Plan was a foreign policy strategy of nation building for defeated nations which had results unparalleled in history.

However, while United States citizens took a leading role in the creation of the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights under the chairmanship of Eleanor Roosevelt, and promoted the United Nations through the creation of citizen support groups, the U.S. Senate never ratified any U.N. covenants which could be viewed as compromising U.S. sovereignty. President Dwight D. Eisenhower, in 1952, warned of a growing military-industrial complex that exerted influence on U.S. foreign policy.

A bipolar world

During the Cold War, U.S. foreign policy sought to limit the influence of the Soviet Union around the world , leading to the Korean War and the Vietnam War. Alliances were sought with any regime that opposed the Soviet Union, regardless of whether it was democratic or maintained respect for human rights. The U.S. also sought to overthrow regimes friendly to the Soviet Union, regardless of whether they were democratically elected. In the West, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was established with the United States in a leadership role and the Eastern bloc responded with a collective security arrangement known as the Warsaw Pact. This created a bipolar world, and a nuclear arms race between the two blocs based on a doctrine of defense known as Mutually Assured Destruction .

Philosophically, the overarching military and security concerns of post-World War II led to a foreign policy of the United States heavily influenced by the doctrines of "national self-interest," "power politics," "strategic thinking," and "containment" of the Soviet Union. While U.S. citizens, churches, and other NGOs engaged in efforts to help the poor and disenfranchised throughout the world, and the U.S. government sponsored the Peace Corps initiated by President John F. Kennedy and United States Aid for International Development, these programs designed to help other nations were often preempted by strategic and security concerns.

In the 1980s the United States sought to fill the power vacuums left by the decline of Britain, by leading international economic organizations such as the WTO and GATT. The U.S. provided covert support to the Taliban in Afghanistan to drive out the Soviet Union, and it supported the Contras in Nicaragua to topple the government of Daniel Ortega which was friendly with Russia and Cuba. In the twilight of the Cold War, the United States invaded Panama, officially because Noriega was involved in drug trafficking, but in reality because the U.S. did not want to relinquish the Panama canal on Panama's terms. By the time of the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, the U.S. had military and economic interests in every region of the globe.

Sole superpower

In 1991, the United States emerged as the world's sole superpower. It organized and led the Gulf War against Iraq in response to its invasion of Kuwait. After the

September 11, 2001 attack, the country declared the "War on Terror," under which it has led invasions of Afghanistan and Iraq. The invasion of Afghanistan to capture the perpetrators of 9/11 was consider legitimate by most of the world. However, the unilateral decision of the administration of George W. Bush to preemptively invade Iraq without proof of weapons of mass destruction was generally viewed as greatly undermining the legitimacy of United States policy, as a move toward an empire of world domination rather than a republic among a community of nations. The war also eventually became widely discredited in the United States as was evidenced by the defeat of Republicans who supported the Bush war strategy in the congressional elections of 2006.

Diplomatic relations

The United States has one of the largest diplomatic forces of any nation. Almost every country in the world has both a U.S. embassy and an embassy of its own in Washington, D.C. Only a few nations do not have formal diplomatic relations with the United States. They are:

1. Bhutan
2. Cuba
3. Iran
4. North Korea
5. Somalia
6. Sudan
7. Republic of China
8. Sahrawi Arab Democratic Republic

In practical terms however, this lack of formal relations do not impede the U.S.'s communication with these nations. In the cases where no U.S. diplomatic post exists, American relations are usually conducted via the United Kingdom, Canada, Switzerland, or another friendly third-party. In the case of the Republic of China, de facto relations are conducted through the American Institute in Taiwan. The U.S. also operates an "Interests Section in Havana". While this does not create a formal diplomatic relationship, it fulfills most other typical embassy functions.

The U.S. maintains a Normal Trade Relations list and several countries are excluded from it, which means that their exports to the United States are subject to significantly higher tariffs.

Allies

Except for the alliance with France which existed after the Revolution, the United States did not enter into any peace-time alliances until April 1949, when it became a founding member of NATO, the world's largest military alliance. The 26 nation alliance consists of Canada and much of Europe. Under the NATO charter, the United States is compelled to defend any NATO state that is attacked by a foreign power. This is restricted to within the North American and European areas, for this reason the U.S. was not compelled to participate in the Falklands War between Argentina and the United Kingdom.

Originally, designed to protect the West against an invasion by the Eastern bloc during the Cold War, NATO opened the possibility for Eastern European nations to join after the collapse of the Soviet Union. New nations must meet standards of civil and economic liberty and be invited to join by existing members. Because NATO is a voluntary alliance of free nations, it has been considered by some to be a better foundation for future global organization than the United Nations and easier for the United States to serve a world leadership role.

The United States has also given major non-NATO ally-status to fourteen nations. Each such state has a unique relationship with the United States, involving various military and economic partnerships and alliances.

The country's closest ally is the United Kingdom, itself a major military and economic power. Other allies include South Korea, Israel, Canada, Australia, and Japan. The government of the Republic of China , does not have official diplomatic relations recognized and is no longer officially recognized by the State Department of the United States, but it is considered by some an ally of the United States.

In 2005, U.S. President George Bush and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh signed a landmark agreement between the two countries on civilian nuclear energy cooperation. The deal is significant because India is not a member of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty and detonated a nuclear device in 1974. The deal greatly increases strategic and economic cooperation between the world's two largest democracies.

Criticism and responses

U.S. foreign policy has been increasingly criticized by both foreign and domestic media. Critics of U.S. foreign policy tend to state that the principles promoted in foreign policy rhetoric contradict many foreign policy actions:

1. The rhetoric of peace, while a record of a long list of U.S. military interventions in practice.
2. The rhetoric of freedom and democracy, while supporting many former and current dictatorships.
3. The rhetoric of free trade abroad, while continuing to impose import tariffs to protect local industries, like wood, steel and agricultural products, from global competition.
4. The claim of U.S. generosity which, while high in absolute terms, is relatively low compared to other western countries when measured as percentage of GDP.
5. The rhetoric of environmental concern, while refusing to sign environmental treaties like the Kyoto Protocol.
6. The rhetoric of defending of human rights, while refusing to sign many international human rights treaties, or acceptance of the World Court of Justice.
7. The failure to act according to just war principles with the preemptive invasion of Iraq.

There are a variety of responses to these criticisms. Some argue that the U.S. is obligated to use its power to create a more peaceful world. Some argue that the increased American military involvement around the world is an outgrowth of the inherent

instability of the world state system as it existed in the late nineteenth Century. The inherent failings of this system of Great Powers led to the outbreak of World War I and World War II. The United States has assumed a prominent peacekeeping role, due to the easily demonstrable inter-state insecurity that existed before 1945.

Further, some experts have stated that since the U.S.-led invasion of Iraq was not a war to defend against an imminent threat, it was a war of aggression, and therefore under the Nuremberg Principles it constitutes the supreme international crime from which all other war crimes follow. For example, Benjamin Ferencz, a chief prosecutor of Nazi war crimes at Nuremberg said George W. Bush should be tried for war crimes along with Saddam Hussein for starting "aggressive" wars—Saddam for his 1990 attack on Kuwait and Bush for his 2003 invasion of Iraq.

Similarly, under the U.N. Charter, ratified by the U.S. and therefore binding on it, all U.N. member states including the U.S. are prohibited from using force against fellow member states except to defend against an imminent attack or pursuant to explicit U.N. Security Council authorization ."There was no authorization from the U.N. Security Council ... and that made it a crime against the peace," said Francis Boyle, professor of international law, who also said the U.S. Army's field manual required such authorization for an offensive war.

Other realist critics, such as the late George F. Kennan, have noted that the responsibility of the United States is only to protect the rights of its own citizens, and that therefore Washington should deal with other governments as just that. Heavy emphasis on democratization or nation-building abroad, realists charge, was one of the major tenets of President Woodrow Wilson's diplomatic philosophy. According to realists, the failure of the League of Nations to enforce the will of the international community in the cases of Nazi Germany, Fascist Italy, and Imperial Japan in the 1930s, as well as the inherent weakness of the new states created at the Paris Peace Conference, demonstrated the folly of Wilson's idealism.

There is also criticism of alleged human rights abuse, the most important recent examples of which are the multiple reports of alleged prisoner abuse and torture at U.S.-run detention camps in Guantánamo Bay at "Camp X-ray" in Cuba, Abu Ghraib (Iraq), secret CIA prisons , and other places, voiced by the Council of Europe and Amnesty International. Amnesty International in its Amnesty International Report 2005 says that: "the detention facility at Guantánamo Bay has become the gulag of our times." This Amnesty report also claimed that there was a use of double standards in the U.S. government: The U.S. president "has repeatedly asserted that the United States was founded upon and is dedicated to the cause of human dignity." .But some memorandums emerged after the Abu Ghraib scandal "suggested that the administration was discussing ways in which its agents could avoid the international ban on torture and cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment." Government responses to these criticisms include that Abu Ghraib, Guantánamo Bay, and the network of secret CIA jails in Eastern Europe and the Middle East were largely isolated incidents and not reflective of general U.S. conduct, and at the same time maintain that coerced interrogation in Guantánamo and Europe is necessary to prevent future terrorist attacks.

U.S. generosity is not demonstrated in the relatively low spendings on foreign developmental aid when compared to other western countries. However as far as measured by goods and monetary amounts the U.S is the most generous. The average U.S. citizen donates relatively more of his or her private, personal time and income to charity than any other nation's citizens. Religious tithes, emergency donations to relief organizations, and donations to medical research, for example, are common and frequent. The United States tax code structure is designed to provide incentives to private individuals and corporations for charitable donations.

Territorial disputes

The United States is involved with several territorial disputes, including maritime disputes over the Dixon Entrance, Beaufort Sea, Strait of Juan de Fuca, Northwest Passage, and areas around Machias Seal Island and North Rock with Canada. These disputes have become dormant recently, and are largely considered not to affect the strong relations between the two nations.

Other disputes include:

1. U.S. Naval Base at Guantánamo Bay is leased from Cuba and only mutual agreement or U.S. abandonment of the area can terminate the lease. Cuba contends that the lease is invalid as the Platt Amendment creating the lease was included in the Cuban Constitution under threat of force and thus is voided by article 52 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.
2. Haiti claims Navassa Island.
3. U.S. has made no territorial claim in Antarctica and does not recognize the claims of any other nation.
4. Marshall Islands claims Wake Island.

Illicit drugs

United States foreign policy is influenced by the efforts of the U.S. government to halt imports of illicit drugs, including cocaine, heroin, and marijuana. This is especially true in Latin America, a focus for the U.S. War on Drugs. Those efforts date back to at least 1880, when the U.S. and China completed an agreement which prohibited the shipment of opium between the two countries.

Over a century later, the Foreign Relations Authorization Act requires the President to identify the major drug transit or major illicit drug-producing countries. In September 2005, the following countries were identified: Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Burma, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, India, Jamaica, Laos, Mexico, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru and Venezuela. Two of these, Burma and Venezuela are countries that the U.S. considers to have failed to adhere to their obligations under international counternarcotics agreements during the previous twelve months. Notably absent from the 2005 list were Afghanistan, the People's Republic of China and Vietnam; Canada was also omitted in spite of evidence that criminal groups there are increasingly involved in the production of MDMA destined for the United States and that large-scale cross-border trafficking of Canadian-grown marijuana continues. The U.S. believes that The Netherlands are successfully countering the production and flow of MDMA to the U.S.

History of exporting democracy

In the history of the United States, presidents have often used democracy as a justification for military intervention abroad. A number of studies have been devoted to the historical success rate of the U.S. in exporting democracy abroad. Most studies of American intervention have been pessimistic about the history of the United States exporting democracy. Until recently, scholars have generally agreed with international relations professor Abraham Lowenthal that U.S. attempts to export democracy have been "negligible, often counterproductive, and only occasionally positive."

But some studies, such as a study by Tures find U.S. intervention has had mixed results, and another by Hermann and Kegley have found that military interventions have increased democracy in other countries.

U.S. intervention does not export democracy

Professor Paul W. Drake explains that the United States' first attempted to export democracy was in Latin America through intervention from 1912 to 1932. Drake argues that this was contradictory because international law defines intervention as "dictorial interference in the affairs of another state for the purpose of altering the condition of things." Democracy failed because democracy needs to develop out of internal conditions, and American leaders usually defined democracy as elections only. Further, the United States Department of State disapproved of rebellion of any kind, which were often incorrectly labeled "revolutions," even against dictatorships. As historian Walter LaFeber states, "The world's leading revolutionary nation in the eighteenth century became the leading protector of the status quo in the twentieth century."

Mesquita and Downs evaluate the period between 1945 to 2004. They state that the U.S. has intervened in 35 countries, and only in one case, Colombia, did a "full fledged, stable democracy" develop within 10 years. Factors included (1) limits on executive power, (2) clear rules for the transition of power, (3) universal adult suffrage, and (4) competitive elections. Samia Amin Pei argues that nation building in developed countries usually begins to unravel four to six years after American intervention ends. Most countries where the U.S. intervenes never become a democracy or become even more authoritarian after 10 years.

Professor Joshua Muravchik argues that while U.S. occupation was critical for Axis power democratization after World War II, America's failure to build democracy in the third world "proves...that U.S. military occupation is not a sufficient condition to make a country democratic." The success of democracy in former Axis countries may be due to these countries' per-capita income. Steven Krasner of the CDDRL states that a high per capita income may help build a democracy, because no democratic country with a per-capita income which is above $6,000 has ever become an autocracy.

U.S. intervention has exported democracy

Hermann and Kegley find that American military interventions which are designed to protect or promote democracy increase freedom in those countries. Penceny argues that the democracies created after military intervention are still closer to an autocracy than a democracy, quoting Przeworski "while some democracies are more democratic than others, unless offices are contested, no regime should be considered democratic." Therefore, Penceny concludes, it is difficult to know from the Hermann and

Kegley study whether U.S. intervention has only produced less repressive autocratic governments or genuine democracies.

Penceny states that the United States has attempted to export democracy in 33 of its 93 twentieth-century military interventions. Penceny argues that pro-liberal policies after military intervention have a positive impact on democracy.

U.S. intervention has mixed results

Tures examines 228 cases of American intervention from 1973 to 2005, using Freedom House data. A plurality of interventions, 96, caused no change in the country's democracy. In 69 instances the country became less democratic after the intervention. In the remaining 63 cases, a country became more democratic. Democracy requires people capable of self-direction and accepting of pluralism. Too often it is thought that elections, a free press, and other democratic political machinery will be sufficient for democratization. Many studies have shown that exporting democracy is not that easy.

U.S. legitimacy in the world

Because the United States Constitution stipulates that U.S. Foreign Policy is conducted by the executive branch of the government, there is no political-structural method in place to ensure that foreign policy actions reflect American ideals. George Washington set U.S. foreign policy in motion as a gentleman acting according to aristocratic codes of his day. However, as U.S. businesses grew, they advocated a navy that could help make a world safe for commerce. As the Soviet Union became a global power after World War II, partnerships with enemies of communism were sought. Accomplishing these goals was often easier, in the short term, by working with non-democratic regimes that would protect U.S. strategic and economic interests as client states. Other nations experience frequent U.S. foreign policy shifts every few years when new presidents are elected with different foreign policy priorities and goals. This makes it difficult for anyone to believe that the United States will use its power reliably.

Yet, many people subscribe to U.S. foreign policy ideals and would like to see them become reality and not just rhetoric. Developing consistency in foreign policy and asserting leadership without double standards in international affairs, and in organizations like the United Nations and NATO, will be necessary to help legitimize U.S. foreign policy in the eyes of the world.

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.12 Write a comprehensive note on North Korea and weapons of mass destruction.

Ans.   North Korea and weapons of mass destruction

North Korea claims to possess nuclear weapons, and the CIA asserts that it has a substantial arsenal of chemical weapons. North Korea, a member of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty before withdrawing in 2003, cited the failure of the United States to fulfill its end of the Agreed Framework, a 1994 agreement between the states to limit North Korea's nuclear ambitions, begin normalization of relations, and help North Korea supply some energy needs through nuclear reactors.

On October 9, 2006, the North Korean government issued an announcement that it had successfully conducted a nuclear test for the first time. Both the United States Geological Survey and Japanese seismological authorities detected an earthquake with a preliminary estimated magnitude of 4.2 on the Richter scale in North Korea, corroborating some aspects of the North Korean claims.

The world community left the MAD world of nuclear weapons at the end of the Cold War, only to enter the Terror world with rogue nations and terrorists groups eager to possess and use nuclear weapons. North Korea stands at the forefront of rogue nations seeking nuclear weapons and delivery systems along with Iran. The world community has been taking a unified stance, demanding a dismantling of nuclear programs in both nations. Six party talks have been conducted, including Russia, China, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, and the United States, with a measure of success to date. North Korea, although weakened by famine, drought, a lack of resources, and foreign reserves, still has the capacity to build and use nuclear weapons.

Nuclear weapons

Background

Korea has been a divided country since 1945, after Korea's liberation from Japan at the end of World War II. The Korean War began with North Korea's invasion of South Korea on June 25, 1950, and continues under truce to this day. The United States rejected North Korea's call for bilateral talks concerning a non-aggression pact, calling for six-party talks that include the People's Republic of China, Russia, Japan, and South Korea. The United States pointed out North Korea's violation of prior bilateral agreements while North Korea has insisted on them, leading to a diplomatic stalemate.

On November 19, 2006, North Korea's Minju Joson newspaper accused South Korea of building up arms to attack the North, claiming that "the South Korean military is openly clamoring that the development and introduction of new weapons are to target the North." Pyongyang accused South Korea of conspiring with the United States to attack the isolated and impoverished state, an accusation made frequently by the North and routinely denied by the U.S.

Chronology of events

Plutonium

Concern focuses around two reactors at the Yongbyon Nuclear Scientific Research Center, both of them small power stations using Magnox techniques. The smaller (5 MWe) reached completion in 1986, and has since produced possibly 8,000 spent fuel elements. Construction of the larger plant (50 MWe) commenced in 1984, but as of 2003 still stood incomplete. North Koreans constructed that larger plant based on the declassified blueprints of the Calder Hall power reactors used to produce plutonium for the UK nuclear weapons program. The smaller plant produces enough material to build one new bomb per year. If completed, the larger plant could produce enough for ten each year.[3] Small amounts of plutonium could have been produced in a Russian-supplied IRT-2000 heavy water–moderated research reactor completed in 1967, although safeguards violations at the plant have never been reported.

On March 12, 1993, North Korea said that it planned to withdraw from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), refusing to allow inspectors access to its nuclear sites. By 1994, the United States believed that North Korea had enough reprocessed plutonium to produce about ten bombs, with the amount of plutonium increasing. Faced with diplomatic pressure and the threat of American military air strikes against the reactor, North Korea agreed to dismantle its plutonium program as part of the Agreed Framework, in which South Korea and the United States would provide North Korea with light water reactors and fuel oil until those reactors could be completed. Because the light water reactors would require imported enriched uranium, the United States could easily track the amount of reactor fuel and waste, increasing North Korea's difficulty of diverting nuclear waste for plutonium reprocessing. With bureaucratic red tape and political obstacles from North Korea, the Korean Peninsula Energy Development Organization (KEDO), established to advance the implementation of the Agreed Framework, had failed to build the promised light water reactors. North Korea charged that the United States failed to uphold their end of the agreement by providing energy aid, and in late 2002, North Korea returned to using its old reactors.

Enriched uranium

With the abandonment of its plutonium program, United States officials charged North Korea with beginning an enriched uranium program. Pakistan, through Abdul Qadeer Khan, supplied key technology and information to North Korea in exchange for missile technology around 1997, according to U.S. intelligence officials. Pakistani President Pervez Musharaf acknowledged in 2005, that Khan had provided centrifuges and their designs to North Korea. The media publicized that program in October 2002, when North Korean officials admitted to the United States restarting the uranium enrichment program. Under the Agreed Framework North Korea explicitly agreed to freeze plutonium programs . The agreement also committed North Korea to implement the Joint Declaration on the Denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, committing both Koreas to abandon enrichment or reprocessing facilities. The United States called North Korea on the violation of its commitment to abandon enrichment facilities.

In December 2002, the KEDO Board followed through on threats to suspend fuel oil shipments in response to North Korea's violation, leading North Korea to the end of the Agreed Framework and announce plans to reactivate a dormant nuclear fuel processing program and power plant north of Pyongyang. North Korea soon thereafter expelled United Nations inspectors and withdrew from the Non-Proliferation Treaty. In 2007, reports emanating from Washington suggested that the 2002 CIA reports of North Korea developing uranium enrichment technology had been overstated or misread the intelligence. U.S. officials ceased making that a major issue in the six-party talks.

North Korea-United States relations

U.S. President George W. Bush's strategy with North Korea and Iran, the other nations named as a member of the "Axis of Evil" following the September 11, 2001 attacks differed from that against Saddam's Iraq. The United States officials sought diplomatic pressure with China, Japan, South Korea, Russia, joining to persuade North Korea to abandon it's nuclear ambitions. Although not ruling out military action as a last resort, the United States ruled immediate military action out. North Korea, maintaining

one of the largest standing armies in the world, and positioned to inflict enormous initial damage on the South, made the military option one of extreme last resort. The last resort would come with North Korea close to producing nuclear weapons. North Korea possession of nuclear weapons, as with Iran, would upset the balance of power. During the standoff between the USSR and the U.S. during the Cold War, a rational approach prevailed in the MAD . world. With North Korea and Iran, international policy thinkers doubt either nation would stop at the thought of total annihilation.

According to John Feffer, co-director of the think tank Foreign Policy in Focus,

The primary problem is that the current U.S. administration fundamentally doesn't want an agreement with North Korea. The Bush administration considers the 1994 Agreed Framework to have been a flawed agreement. It doesn't want be saddled with a similar agreement, for if it did sign one, it would then be open to charges of "appeasing" Pyongyang. The Vice President has summed up the approach as: "We don't negotiate with evil, we defeat evil."

As North Korea further inflamed American ire evidence of state-sponsored drug smuggling, money laundering, and wide scale counterfeiting. Diplomatic efforts at resolving the North Korean situation complicated by the differing goals and interests of the nations of the region. While none of the parties desire a North Korea with nuclear weapons, Japan and South Korea, especially, express concern about North Korean counter-strikes following possible military action against North Korea. The People's Republic of China and South Korea also worry about the economic and social consequences should this situation cause the North Korean government to collapse.

In early 2000, the Zurich-based company ABB won a contract to provide the design and key components for two light-water nuclear reactors to North Korea.

Nuclear deterrence

Some scholars and analysts have argued that North Korea has been using nuclear weapons primarily as a political tool, particularly to bring the U.S. to the table to begin reestablishing normal relations and end the long-standing economic embargo against North Korea. That argument contends that the threat of nuclear weapons has been the only North Korean policy that has brought the United States into negotiations on their terms. In a lecture in 1993, Bruce Cummings asserted that, based on information gathered by the CIA, the activity around the Yongbyon facility may have been done expressly to draw the attention of U.S. satellites. He also pointed out that the CIA had not claimed North Korea had nuclear weapons, but that they had enough material to create such weapons should they choose to do so.

North Korea's energy supply has been deteriorating since the 1990s, when Russian and China abandoned their communist commitment. North Korea, once a darling of the Soviet and Chinese communist powers, became an embarrassment. As Russia and China turned toward a free enterprise approach toward domestic and international economy, they sought to ween North Korea from their dependence upon their aid, especially Russian oil. That, coupled with a lack of foreign reserves to purchase oil on the open market, left North Korea in an energy crisis.

Although North Korea possesses an insignificant indigenous nuclear power capacity, the two light-water moderated plants, if built, would be an important source of

electricity in a nation with scarce resources. Although couched in a derisive statement, Donald Rumsfeld demonstrated the severe lack of electricity for the entire nation in a photograph released in October 2006. Many parties have a vested interest in the claim that North Korea has nuclear weapons.

Kim Jong-il, the North Korean communist dictator, inherited an economy devastated by the collapse of world communism. Kim fears that the fate of Romanian dictator, Nicolae Ceausescu, awaits him. If the North Korean communist government suddenly collapsed, Kim might find himself on trial for his life. At all costs, he intends to avoid that fate. The nuclear card, along with the near total control he has of North Korean society through the police and army, has served as both a protection of his power and a source of sorely needed revenue and natural resources.

The Grand National Party, currently the minority party in South Korea, has made review and revision of the Sunshine policy, in light of the history of North Korean non-compliance, a party platform plank. Leading politicians in Japan have called for discussion on removing Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution prohibiting a standing army beyond national security forces in light of North Korea's provocative missile tests in the Sea of Japan and noncompliance with ending nuclear weapons development. The United States has followed a bipartisan foreign policy war on terror, committed to take the war with terrorist groups and nations to the source rather than wait for terrorist attacks on home soil, since the September 11, 2001 attacks. Although the Iraq War has been hotly debated in the United States, neither the Democrat's nor the Republicans seek abandoning that foreign policy principle. The United States recently reduced its forces in South Korea from 40,000 to 30,000 troops in a commitment to turn over full defense of South Korea to the South Korean military. The reality of taking the lead in their own defense has sobered South Korean politicians of all parities to take the North Korean treat seriously, prompting an increased criticism of the Sunshine Policy.

On March 17, 2007, North Korea announced at international nuclear talks of preparing to shut down its main nuclear facility. The concession followed a series of six-party talks, involving North Korea, South Korea, China, Russia, Japan, and the United States, began in 2003. According to the agreement, North Korea will submit a list of its nuclear programs, disabling their nuclear facility in exchange for fuel aid and normalization talks with the United States and Japan. That was delayed in April when North Korean money laundering came to light in Banco Delta Asia incident, but on July 14, IAEA inspectors confirmed the shutdown of North Korea's Yongbyon nuclear reactor.

Biological and chemical weapons

North Korea acceded to the Biological Weapons Convention in 1987, and the Geneva Protocol on January 4, 1989, but refused to sign the Chemical Weapons Convention. Intelligence reports suggest that North Korea possesses a substantial arsenal of chemical weapons, reportedly acquiring the technology to produce tabun and mustard gas as early as the 1950s, and now possesses a full arsenal of nerve agents and other advanced varieties, with the means to launch them in artillery shells. North Korea has expended considerable resources on equipping its army with chemical-protection equipment.

Delivery systems

North Korea's missile technology limits its ability to deliver weapons of mass destruction to targets. As of 2005, North Korea's No Dong missiles travel 1,300 km, able to reach South Korea, Japan, and parts of Russia and China, but not the United States or Europe although the missile's capacity to carry nuclear weapons has been questioned. BM-25, a North Korean designed long-range ballistic missile with range capabilities of up to 1,550 miles (2493 km), has the potential of carrying a nuclear warhead. North Korea has been developing the Taepodong-1 missile with a range of 2,000 km. With the Taepodong-2 missile in development, North Korea soon will have a missile with an expected range of 5,000-6,000 km. With this North Korea could deliver a warhead to all countries in Southeast Asia, parts of Alaska, and the continental United States.

The North Koreans tested Taepodong-2 missile on July 4, 2005, unsuccessfully. United States intelligence estimates that the weapon take eleven years to become operational, although that production time could shorten. The Taepodong-2 could hit the western United States as well as other nations the Western hemisphere. The current model of the Taepodong-2 lacks the capacity to carry nuclear warheads to the United States. Former CIA director George Tenet has revealed that, with a light payload, Taepodong-2 could reach western parts of Continental United States, though with poor accuracy.

❀ ❀ ❀ ❀ ❀

Q.13 What do you know about Nuclear proliferation. Give your answer in full detail.

Ans.   Nuclear proliferation

Nuclear proliferation is a term now used to describe the spread of nuclear weapons, fissile material, and weapons-applicable nuclear technology and information, to nations which are not recognized as "Nuclear Weapon States" by the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, also known as the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty or NPT.

Proliferation has been opposed by many nations with and without nuclear weapons, the governments of which fear that more countries with nuclear weapons may increase the possibility of nuclear warfare , de-stabilize international or regional relations, or infringe upon the national sovereignty of states.

Four nations besides the five recognized Nuclear Weapons States, none of which signed or ratified the NPT, have acquired, or are presumed to have acquired, nuclear weapons: India, Pakistan, North Korea, and Israel. One critique of the NPT is that it is discriminatory in recognizing as nuclear weapon states only those countries that tested nuclear weapons before 1968 and requiring all other states joining the treaty to forswear nuclear weapons.

Nuclear proliferation

Research into the development of nuclear weapons was undertaken during World War II by the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan, and the USSR. The United States was the first and is the only country to have used a nuclear weapon in war,

when it used two bombs against Japan in August 1945. With their loss during the war, Germany and Japan ceased to be involved in any nuclear weapon research. In August 1949, the USSR tested a nuclear weapon. The United Kingdom tested a nuclear weapon in October 1952. France developed a nuclear weapon in 1960. The People's Republic of China detonated a nuclear weapon in 1964. India exploded a nuclear device in 1974, and Pakistan tested a weapon in 1998. In 2006, North Korea conducted a nuclear test.

Non-proliferation efforts

Early efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation involved intense government secrecy, the wartime acquisition of known uranium stores, and at times even outright sabotage—such as the bombing of a heavy-water facility thought to be used for a German nuclear program. None of these efforts were explicitly public, owing to the fact that the weapon developments themselves were kept secret until the bombing of Hiroshima.

Earnest international efforts to promote nuclear non-proliferation began soon after World War II, when the Truman Administration proposed the Baruch Plan of 1946, named after Bernard Baruch, America's first representative to the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. The Baruch Plan, which drew heavily from the Acheson–Lilienthal Report of 1946, proposed the verifiable dismantlement and destruction of the U.S. nuclear arsenal after all governments had cooperated successfully to accomplish two things: (1) the establishment of an "international atomic development authority," which would actually own and control all military-applicable nuclear materials and activities, and (2) the creation of a system of automatic sanctions, which not even the U.N. Security Council could veto, and which would proportionately punish states attempting to acquire the capability to make nuclear weapons or fissile material.

Although the Baruch Plan enjoyed wide international support, it failed to emerge from the UNAEC because the Soviet Union planned to veto it in the Security Council. Still, it remained official American policy until 1953, when President Eisenhower made his "Atoms for Peace" proposal before the U.N. General Assembly. Eisenhower's proposal led eventually to the creation of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in 1957. Under the "Atoms for Peace" program thousands of scientists from around the world were educated in nuclear science and then dispatched home, where many later pursued secret weapons programs in their home country.

Efforts to conclude an international agreement to limit the spread of nuclear weapons did not begin until the early 1960s, after four nations had acquired nuclear weapons . Although these efforts stalled in the early 1960s, they renewed once again in 1964, after China detonated a nuclear weapon. In 1968, governments represented at the Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee (ENDC) finished negotiations on the text of the NPT. In June 1968, the U.N. General Assembly endorsed the NPT with General Assembly Resolution 2373 (XXII), and in July 1968, the NPT opened for signature in Washington, DC, London and Moscow. The NPT entered into force in March 1970.

Since the mid-1970s, the primary focus of non-proliferation efforts has been to maintain, and even increase, international control over the fissile material and specialized technologies necessary to build such devices because these are the most difficult and expensive parts of a nuclear weapons program. The main materials whose generation and distribution is controlled are highly enriched uranium and plutonium. Other than the

acquisition of these special materials, the scientific and technical means for weapons construction to develop rudimentary, but working, nuclear explosive devices are considered to be within the reach of industrialized nations.

Since its founding by the United Nations in 1957, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) has promoted two, sometimes contradictory, missions: on the one hand, the Agency seeks to promote and spread internationally the use of civilian nuclear energy; on the other hand, it seeks to prevent, or at least detect, the diversion of civilian nuclear energy to nuclear weapons, nuclear explosive devices or purposes unknown. The IAEA now operates a safeguards system as specified under Article III of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1968, which aims to ensure that civil stocks of uranium, plutonium, as well as facilities and technologies associated with these nuclear materials, are used only for peaceful purposes and do not contribute in any way to proliferation or nuclear weapons programs. It is often argued that proliferation of nuclear weapons to many other states has been prevented by the extension of assurances and mutual defence treaties to these states by nuclear powers, but other factors, such as national prestige, or specific historical experiences, also play a part in hastening or stopping nuclear proliferation.

Dual use technology

Dual use technology refers to the possibility of military use of civilian nuclear power technology. Many technologies and materials associated with the creation of a nuclear power program have a dual-use capability, in that they can be used to make nuclear weapons if a country chooses to do so. When this happens a nuclear power program can become a route leading to the atomic bomb or a public annex to a secret bomb program. The crisis over Iran's nuclear activities is a case in point.

A fundamental goal for American and global security is to minimize the nuclear proliferation risks associated with the expansion of nuclear power. If this development is "poorly managed or efforts to contain risks are unsuccessful, the nuclear future will be dangerous". For nuclear power programs to be developed and managed safely and securely, it is important that countries have domestic "good governance" characteristics that will encourage proper nuclear operations and management:

These characteristics include low degrees of corruption , high degrees of political stability, high governmental effectiveness scores and a strong degree of regulatory competence.

International cooperation

Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty

At present, 189 countries are States Parties to the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons, more commonly known as the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty or NPT. These include the five Nuclear Weapons States (NWS) recognized by the NPT: the People's Republic of China, France, Russian Federation, the UK, and the United States.

Notable non-signatories to the NPT are Israel, Pakistan, and India . North Korea was once a signatory but withdrew in January 2003. The legality of North Korea's withdrawal is debatable but as of 9 October 2006, North Korea clearly possesses the capability to make a nuclear explosive device.

International Atomic Energy Agency

The IAEA was established on 29 July 1957 to help nations develop nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. Allied to this role is the administration of safeguards arrangements to provide assurance to the international community that individual countries are honoring their commitments under the treaty. Though established under its own international treaty, the IAEA reports to both the United Nations General Assembly and the Security Council.

The IAEA regularly inspects civil nuclear facilities to verify the accuracy of documentation supplied to it. The agency checks inventories, and samples and analyzes materials. Safeguards are designed to deter diversion of nuclear material by increasing the risk of early detection. They are complemented by controls on the export of sensitive technology from countries such as UK and United States through voluntary bodies such as the Nuclear Suppliers Group. The main concern of the IAEA is that uranium not be enriched beyond what is necessary for commercial civil plants, and that plutonium which is produced by nuclear reactors not be refined into a form that would be suitable for bomb production.

Scope of safeguards

Traditional safeguards are arrangements to account for and control the use of nuclear materials. This verification is a key element in the international system which ensures that uranium in particular is used only for peaceful purposes.

Parties to the NPT agree to accept technical safeguard measures applied by the IAEA. These require that operators of nuclear facilities maintain and declare detailed accounting records of all movements and transactions involving nuclear material. Over 550 facilities and several hundred other locations are subject to regular inspection, and their records and the nuclear material being audited. Inspections by the IAEA are complemented by other measures such as surveillance cameras and instrumentation.

The inspections act as an alert system providing a warning of the possible diversion of nuclear material from peaceful activities. The system relies on;

1. Material Accountancy – tracking all inward and outward transfers and the flow of materials in any nuclear facility. This includes sampling and analysis of nuclear material, on-site inspections, and review and verification of operating record.

2. Physical Security – restricting access to nuclear materials at the site.

3. Containment and Surveillance – use of seals, automatic cameras and other instruments to detect unreported movement or tampering with nuclear materials, as well as spot checks on-site.

All NPT non-weapons states must accept these full-scope safeguards. In the five weapons states plus the non-NPT states, facility-specific safeguards apply. IAEA inspectors regularly visit these facilities to verify completeness and accuracy of records.

The terms of the NPT cannot be enforced by the IAEA itself, nor can nations be forced to sign the treaty. In reality, as shown in Iraq and North Korea, safeguards can be backed up by diplomatic, political and economic measures.

While traditional safeguards easily verified the correctness of formal declarations by suspect states, in the 1990s attention turned to what might not have been declared.

While accepting safeguards at declared facilities, Iraq had set up elaborate equipment elsewhere in an attempt to enrich uranium to weapons grade. North Korea attempted to use research reactors and a reprocessing plant to produce some weapons-grade plutonium.

The weakness of the NPT regime lay in the fact that no obvious diversion of material was involved. The uranium used as fuel probably came from indigenous sources, and the nuclear facilities were built by the countries themselves without being declared or placed under safeguards. Iraq, as an NPT party, was obliged to declare all facilities but did not do so. Nevertheless, the activities were detected and brought under control using international diplomacy. In Iraq, a military defeat assisted this process.

In North Korea, the activities concerned took place before the conclusion of its NPT safeguards agreement. With North Korea, the promised provision of commercial power reactors appeared to resolve the situation for a time, but it later withdrew from the NPT and declared it had nuclear weapons.

Additional Protocol

In 1993 a program was initiated to strengthen and extend the classical safeguards system, and a model protocol was agreed by the IAEA Board of Governors 1997. The measures boosted the IAEA's ability to detect undeclared nuclear activities, including those with no connection to the civil fuel cycle.

Innovations were of two kinds. Some could be implemented on the basis of IAEA's existing legal authority through safeguards agreements and inspections. Others required further legal authority to be conferred through an Additional Protocol. This must be agreed by each non-weapons state with IAEA, as a supplement to any existing comprehensive safeguards agreement. Weapons states have agreed to accept the principles of the model additional protocol.

Key elements of the model Additional Protocol:

1. The IAEA is to be given considerably more information on nuclear and nuclear-related activities, including R & D, production of uranium and thorium, and nuclear-related imports and exports.

2. IAEA inspectors will have greater rights of access. This will include any suspect location, it can be at short notice ,and the IAEA can deploy environmental sampling and remote monitoring techniques to detect illicit activities.

3. States must streamline administrative procedures so that IAEA inspectors get automatic visa renewal and can communicate more readily with IAEA headquarters.

4. Further evolution of safeguards is towards evaluation of each state, taking account of its particular situation and the kind of nuclear materials it has. This will involve greater judgement on the part of IAEA and the development of effective methodologies which reassure NPT States.

As of 20 December 2010, 139 countries have signed Additional Protocols, 104 have brought them into force, and one is implementing its protocol provisionally. The IAEA is also applying the measures of the Additional Protocol in Taiwan. Among the leading countries that have not signed the Additional Protocol are Egypt, which says it

will not sign until Israel accepts comprehensive IAEA safeguards, and Brazil, which opposes making the protocol a requirement for international cooperation on enrichment and reprocessing, but has not ruled out signing.

Limitations of Safeguards

The greatest risk from nuclear weapons proliferation comes from countries which have not joined the NPT and which have significant unsafeguarded nuclear activities; India, Pakistan, and Israel fall within this category. While safeguards apply to some of their activities, others remain beyond scrutiny.

A further concern is that countries may develop various sensitive nuclear fuel cycle facilities and research reactors under full safeguards and then subsequently opt out of the NPT. Bilateral agreements, such as insisted upon by Australia and Canada for sale of uranium, address this by including fallback provisions, but many countries are outside the scope of these agreements. If a nuclear-capable country does leave the NPT, it is likely to be reported by the IAEA to the UN Security Council, just as if it were in breach of its safeguards agreement. Trade sanctions would then be likely.

IAEA safeguards, together with bilateral safeguards applied under the NPT can, and do, ensure that uranium supplied by countries such as Australia and Canada does not contribute to nuclear weapons proliferation. In fact, the worldwide application of those safeguards and the substantial world trade in uranium for nuclear electricity make the proliferation of nuclear weapons much less likely.

The Additional Protocol, once it is widely in force, will provide credible assurance that there are no undeclared nuclear materials or activities in the states concerned. This will be a major step forward in preventing nuclear proliferation.

Other developments

The Nuclear Suppliers Group communicated its guidelines, essentially a set of export rules, to the IAEA in 1978. These were to ensure that transfers of nuclear material or equipment would not be diverted to unsafeguarded nuclear fuel cycle or nuclear explosive activities, and formal government assurances to this effect were required from recipients. The Guidelines also recognised the need for physical protection measures in the transfer of sensitive facilities, technology and weapons-usable materials, and strengthened retransfer provisions. The group began with seven members – the United States, the former USSR, the UK, France, Germany, Canada and Japan – but now includes 46 countries including all five nuclear weapons states.

According to Kenneth D. Bergeron's Tritium on Ice: The Dangerous New Alliance of Nuclear Weapons and Nuclear Power, tritium is not classified as a 'special nuclear material' but rather as a 'by-product'. It is seen as an important litmus test on the seriousness of the United States' intention to nuclear disarm. This radioactive super-heavy hydrogen isotope is used to boost the efficiency of fissile materials in nuclear weapons. The United States resumed tritium production in 2003 for the first time in 15 years. This could indicate that there is a potential nuclear arm stockpile replacement since the isotope naturally decays.

In May 1995, NPT parties reaffirmed their commitment to a Fissile Materials Cut-off Treaty to prohibit the production of any further fissile material for weapons. This aims to complement the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty of 1996 and to codify

commitments made by the United States, the UK, France and Russia to cease production of weapons material, as well as putting a similar ban on China. This treaty will also put more pressure on Israel, India and Pakistan to agree to international verification.

On 9 August 2005, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei issued a fatwa forbidding the production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons. Khamenei's official statement was made at the meeting of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna. As of February 2006 Iran formally announced that uranium enrichment within their borders has continued. Iran claims it is for peaceful purposes but the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and the United States claim the purpose is for nuclear weapons research and construction.

Unsanctioned nuclear activity

NPT Non-Signatories

India, Pakistan and Israel have been "threshold" countries in terms of the international non-proliferation regime. They possess or are quickly capable of assembling one or more nuclear weapons. They have remained outside the 1970 NPT. They are thus largely excluded from trade in nuclear plant or materials, except for safety-related devices for a few safeguarded facilities.

In May 1998 India and Pakistan each exploded several nuclear devices underground. This heightened concerns regarding an arms race between them, with Pakistan involving the People's Republic of China, an acknowledged nuclear weapons state. Both countries are opposed to the NPT as it stands, and India has consistently attacked the Treaty since its inception in 1970 labeling it as a lopsided treaty in favor of the nuclear powers.

Relations between the two countries are tense and hostile, and the risks of nuclear conflict between them have long been considered quite high. Kashmir is a prime cause of bilateral tension, its sovereignty being in dispute since 1948. There is persistent low level military conflict due to Pakistan backing an insurgency there and the disputed status of Kashmir.

Both engaged in a conventional arms race in the 1980s, including sophisticated technology and equipment capable of delivering nuclear weapons. In the 1990s the arms race quickened. In 1994 India reversed a four-year trend of reduced allocations for defence, and despite its much smaller economy, Pakistan was expected to push its own expenditures yet higher. Both have lost their patrons: India, the former USSR, and Pakistan, the United States.

But it is the growth and modernization of China's nuclear arsenal and its assistance with Pakistan's nuclear power programme and, reportedly, with missile technology, which exacerbate Indian concerns. In particular, Pakistan is aided by China's People's Liberation Army, which operates somewhat autonomously within that country as an exporter of military material.

India

Nuclear power for civil use is well established in India. Its civil nuclear strategy has been directed towards complete independence in the nuclear fuel cycle, necessary because of its outspoken rejection of the NPT. This self-sufficiency extends from

uranium exploration and mining through fuel fabrication, heavy water production, reactor design and construction, to reprocessing and waste management. It has a small fast breeder reactor and is planning a much larger one. It is also developing technology to utilise its abundant resources of thorium as a nuclear fuel.

India has 14 small nuclear power reactors in commercial operation, two larger ones under construction, and ten more planned. The 14 operating ones (2548 MWe total) comprise:

1. two 150 MWe BWRs from the United States, which started up in 1969, now use locally-enriched uranium and are under safeguards,
2. two small Canadian PHWRs , also under safeguards, and
3. ten local PHWRs based on Canadian designs, two of 150 and eight 200 MWe.
4. two new 540 MWe and two 700 MWe plants at tarapore

The two under construction and two of the planned ones are 450 MWe versions of these 200 MWe domestic products. Construction has been seriously delayed by financial and technical problems. In 2001 a final agreement was signed with Russia for the country's first large nuclear power plant, comprising two VVER-1000 reactors, under a Russian-financed US$3 billion contract. The first unit is due to be commissioned in 2007. A further two Russian units are under consideration for the site.

Nuclear power supplied 3.1% of India's electricity in 2000 and this was expected to reach 10% by 2005. Its industry is largely without IAEA safeguards, though a few plants are under facility-specific safeguards. As a result India's nuclear power programme proceeds largely without fuel or technological assistance from other countries.

Its weapons material appears to come from a Canadian-designed 40MW "research" reactor which started up in 1960, well before the NPT, and a 100MW indigenous unit in operation since 1985. Both use local uranium, as India does not import any nuclear fuel. It is estimated that India may have built up enough weapons-grade plutonium for a hundred nuclear warheads.

It is widely believed that the nuclear programs of India and Pakistan used CANDU reactors to produce fissionable materials for their weapons; however, this is not accurate. Both Canada and the United States supplied India with the technology necessary to create a nuclear weapons program, dubbed CIRUS. Canada sold India the reactor on the condition that the reactor and any by-products would be "employed for peaceful purposes only.". Similarly, the United States sold India heavy water for use in the reactor "only... in connection with research into and the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes". India, in violation of these agreements, used the Canadian-supplied reactor and American-supplied heavy water to produce plutonium for their first nuclear explosion, Smiling Buddha. The Indian government controversially justified this, however, by claiming that Smiling Buddha was a "peaceful nuclear explosion."

The country has at least three other research reactors including the tiny one which is exploring the use of thorium as a nuclear fuel, by breeding fissile U-233. In addition, an advanced heavy-water thorium cycle is under development.

India exploded a nuclear device in 1974, the so-called Smiling Buddha test, which it has consistently claimed was for peaceful purposes. Others saw it as a response

to China's nuclear weapons capability. It was then universally perceived, notwithstanding official denials, to possess, or to be able to quickly assemble, nuclear weapons. In 1999 it deployed its own medium-range missile and has developed an intermediate-range missile capable of reaching targets in China's industrial heartland.

In 1995 the United States quietly intervened to head off a proposed nuclear test. However, in 1998 there were five more tests in Operation Shakti. These were unambiguously military, including one claimed to be of a sophisticated thermonuclear device, and their declared purpose was "to help in the design of nuclear weapons of different yields and different delivery systems".

Indian security policies are driven by:

1. its determination to be recognized as a dominant power in the region
2. its increasing concern with China's expanding nuclear weapons and missile delivery programmes
3. its concern with Pakistan's capability to deliver nuclear weapons deep into India

It perceives nuclear weapons as a cost-effective political counter to China's nuclear and conventional weaponry, and the effects of its nuclear weapons policy in provoking Pakistan is, by some accounts, considered incidental. India has had an unhappy relationship with China. After an uneasy ceasefire ended the 1962 war, relations between the two nations were frozen until 1998. Since then a degree of high-level contact has been established and a few elementary confidence-building measures put in place. China still occupies some territory which it captured during the aforementioned war, claimed by India, and India still occupies some territory claimed by China. Its nuclear weapon and missile support for Pakistan is a major bone of contention.

American President George W. Bush met with India Prime Minister Manmohan Singh to discuss India's involvement with nuclear weapons. The two countries agreed that the United States would give nuclear power assistance to India.

Pakistan

Nuclear power supplies only 2.34% of Pakistan's electricity. It has one small (125 MWe) Canadian PHWR nuclear power reactor from 1971 which is under international safeguards, and two 300 MWe PWRs supplied by China under safeguards, which started up in June 2000 and May 2011. China is supplying the low-enriched uranium fuel for these PWRs, along with two additional reactors.

Pakistan also has a 9 MW research reactor of 1965 vintage, and there are persistent reports of another "multipurpose" reactor, a 50 MW PHWR near Khushab, which is presumed to have potential for producing weapons plutonium.

Pakistan has also produced nuclear weapons, using indigenous uranium to produce both highly enriched uranium and, more recently, plutonium. It has at least one small centrifuge enrichment plant. In 1990 the United States cut off military assistance to Pakistan because it was unable to certify that Pakistan was not pursuing a policy of manufacturing nuclear weapons. This was relaxed late in 2001.

Pakistan made it clear in early 1996 that it had done the basic development work, and that if India staged a nuclear test, Pakistan would immediately start assembling its own nuclear explosive device. It is assumed to now have enough highly-enriched

uranium for up to forty nuclear warheads. In May 1998, within weeks of India's nuclear tests, Pakistan announced that it had conducted six underground tests in the Chagai Hills, five on the 28th and one on the 30th of that month. Seismic events consistent with these claims were recorded.

In the 1970s, Pakistan first focused on the plutonium route, expecting to obtain the fissile material from a reprocessing plant to be provided by France. This plan failed due to U.S. intervention. Pakistan, not wanting to give up, redoubled its efforts to obtain uranium enrichment technology. The main efforts towards this direction were done under Dr. Abdul Qadeer Khan. Dr. Khan had earlier worked with Fysisch Dynamisch Onderzoekslaboratorium (FDO). FDO was a subsidiary of the Dutch firm VMF-Stork based in Amsterdam. From 1972 to 1975 Dr. Khan had access to classified data used to enrich ordinary uranium to weapons grade concentrations. FDO was working on the development of ultra high-speed centrifuges for URENCO.

In 1974 while he was on secondment for 17 days as a translator to the URENCO plant in Almelo, he obtained photographs and documents of the plant. Dr. Khan returned to Pakistan in 1976 and initiated the Uranium enrichment program on the basis of the technology he had stolen from his previous employer. After the British Government stopped the British subsidiary of the American Emerson Electric Co from shipping the nuclear technology to Pakistan, Dr. Khan describes his frustration with a supplier from Germany as "That man from the German team was unethical. When he did not get the order from us, he wrote a letter to a Labour Party member and questions were asked in British Parliament."

A.Q Khan's efforts made him into a national hero. In 1981, as a tribute, the president of Pakistan, General Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq, renamed the enrichment plant the A. Q. Khan Research Laboratories.

In 2003, the IAEA unearthed a nuclear black market with close ties to Pakistan. It was widely believed to have direct involvement of the government of Pakistan. This claim could not be verified due to the refusal of the government of Pakistan to allow IAEA to interview the alleged head of the nuclear black market, who happened to be no other than Dr. Khan. Dr. Khan later confessed to his crimes on national television, bailing out the government by taking full responsibility. He confessed to nuclear proliferation from Pakistan to Iran and North Korea. He was immediately given presidential immunity. Exact nature of the involvement at the governmental level is still unclear, but the manner in which the government acted cast doubt on the sincerity of Pakistan.

North Korea

North Korea joined the NPT in 1985 and had subsequently signed a safeguards agreement with the IAEA. However it was believed that North Korea was diverting plutonium extracted from the fuel of its reactor at Yongbyon, for use in nuclear weapons. The subsequent confrontation with IAEA on the issue of inspections and suspected violations, resulted in North Korea threatening to withdraw from the NPT in 1993. This eventually led to negotiations with the United States resulting in the Agreed Framework of 1994, which provided for IAEA safeguards being applied to its reactors and spent fuel rods. These spent fuel rods were sealed in canisters by the United States to prevent North

Korea from extracting plutonium from them. North Korea had to therefore freeze its plutonium programme.

During this period Pakistan-North Korea cooperation in missile technology transfer was being established. A high level Pakistani military delegation visited North Korea in August–September 1992, reportedly to discuss the supply of Scud missile technology to Pakistan. In 1993, PM Benazir Bhutto traveled to China and North Korea. The visits are believed to be related to the subsequent acquisition of Ghauri (North Korean No-dong) missiles by Pakistan. During the period 1992–1994, A.Q. Khan was reported to have visited North Korea thirteen times. The missile cooperation program with North Korea was under Dr. A. Q. Khan's Kahuta Research Laboratories. At this time China was under U.S. pressure not to supply the M series of missiles to Pakistan. This forced the latter to approach North Korea for missile transfers. Reports indicate that North Korea was willing to supply missile sub-systems including rocket motors, inertial guidance systems, control and testing equipment of Scud SSMs for US$ 50 million.

It is not clear what North Korea got in return. Joseph S. Bermudez Jr. in Jane's Defence Weekly reports that Western analysts had begun to question what North Korea received in payment for the missiles; many suspected it was nuclear technology and components. Khan's KRL was in charge of both Pakistan's uranium enrichment program and also of the missile program with North Korea. It is therefore likely during this period that cooperation in nuclear technology between Pakistan and North Korea was initiated. Western intelligence agencies began to notice exchange of personnel, technology and components between KRL and entities of the North Korean 2nd Economic Committee .

A New York Times report on 18 October 2002 quoted U.S. intelligence officials having stated that Pakistan was a major supplier of critical equipment to North Korea. The report added that equipment such as gas centrifuges appeared to have been "part of a barter deal" in which North Korea supplied Pakistan with missiles. Separate reports indicate that U.S. intelligence had as early as 1999 picked up signs that North Korea was continuing to develop nuclear arms. Other reports also indicate that North Korea had been working covertly to develop an enrichment capability for nuclear weapons for at least five years and had used technology obtained from Pakistan .

Israel

Israel is also thought to possess an arsenal of potentially up to several hundred nuclear warheads based on estimates of the amount of fissile material produced by Israel. This has never been openly confirmed or denied however, due to Israels policy of deliberate ambiguity.

An Israeli nuclear installation is located about ten kilometers to the south of Dimona, the Negev Nuclear Research Center. Its construction commenced in 1958, with French assistance. The official reason given by the Israeli and French governments was to build a nuclear reactor to power a "desalination plant", in order to "green the Negev". The purpose of the Dimona plant is widely assumed to be the manufacturing of nuclear weapons, and the majority of defense experts have concluded that it does in fact do that. However, the Israeli government refuses to confirm or deny this publicly, a policy it refers to as "ambiguity".

Norway sold 20 tonnes of heavy water needed for the reactor to Israel in 1959 and 1960 in a secret deal. There were no "safeguards" required in this deal to prevent usage of the heavy water for non-peaceful purposes. The British newspaper Daily Express accused Israel of working on a bomb in 1960. When the United States intelligence community discovered the purpose of the Dimona plant in the early 1960s, it demanded that Israel agree to international inspections. Israel agreed, but on a condition that U.S., rather than IAEA, inspectors were used, and that Israel would receive advanced notice of all inspections.

Some claim that because Israel knew the schedule of the inspectors' visits, it was able to hide the alleged purpose of the site from the inspectors by installing temporary false walls and other devices before each inspection. The inspectors eventually informed the U.S. government that their inspections were useless due to Israeli restrictions on what areas of the facility they could inspect. In 1969, the United States terminated the inspections.

In 1986, Mordechai Vanunu, a former technician at the Dimona plant, revealed to the media some evidence of Israel's nuclear program. Israeli agents arrested him from Italy, drugged him and transported him to Israel, and an Israeli court then tried him in secret on charges of treason and espionage, and sentenced him to eighteen years imprisonment. He was freed on 21 April 2004, but was severely limited by the Israeli government. He was arrested again on 11 November 2004, though formal charges were not immediately filed.

Comments on photographs taken by Mordechai Vanunu inside the Negev Nuclear Research Center have been made by prominent scientists. British nuclear weapons scientist Frank Barnaby, who questioned Vanunu over several days, estimated Israel had enough plutonium for about 150 weapons. Ted Taylor, a bomb designer employed by the United States of America has confirmed the several hundred warhead estimate based on Vanunu's photographs.

Nuclear arms control in South Asia

The public stance of the two states on non-proliferation differs markedly. Pakistan appears to have dominated a continuing propaganda debate.

Pakistan has initiated a series of regional security proposals. It has repeatedly proposed a nuclear free zone in South Asia and has proclaimed its willingness to engage in nuclear disarmament and to sign the Non-Proliferation Treaty if India would do so. It has endorsed a United States proposal for a regional five power conference to consider non-proliferation in South Asia.

India has taken the view that solutions to regional security issues should be found at the international rather than the regional level, since its chief concern is with China. It therefore rejects Pakistan's proposals.

Instead, the 'Gandhi Plan', put forward in 1988, proposed the revision of the Non-Proliferation Treaty, which it regards as inherently discriminatory in favor of the nuclear-weapon States, and a timetable for complete nuclear weapons disarmament. It endorsed early proposals for a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty and for an international convention to ban the production of highly enriched uranium and plutonium for weapons purposes, known as the 'cut-off' convention.

The United States for some years, especially under the Clinton administration, pursued a variety of initiatives to persuade India and Pakistan to abandon their nuclear weapons programs and to accept comprehensive international safeguards on all their nuclear activities. To this end, the Clinton administration proposed a conference of the five nuclear-weapon states, Japan, Germany, India and Pakistan.

India refused this and similar previous proposals, and countered with demands that other potential weapons states, such as Iran and North Korea, should be invited, and that regional limitations would only be acceptable if they were accepted equally by China. The United States would not accept the participation of Iran and North Korea and these initiatives have lapsed.

Another, more recent approach, centers on 'capping' the production of fissile material for weapons purposes, which would hopefully be followed by 'roll back'. To this end, India and the United States jointly sponsored a UN General Assembly resolution in 1993 calling for negotiations for a 'cut-off' convention. Should India and Pakistan join such a convention, they would have to agree to halt the production of fissile materials for weapons and to accept international verification on their relevant nuclear facilities. It appears that India is now prepared to join negotiations regarding such a Cut-off Treaty, under the UN Conference on Disarmament.

Bilateral confidence-building measures between India and Pakistan to reduce the prospects of confrontation have been limited. In 1990 each side ratified a treaty not to attack the other's nuclear installations, and at the end of 1991 they provided one another with a list showing the location of all their nuclear plants, even though the respective lists were regarded as not being wholly accurate. Early in 1994 India proposed a bilateral agreement for a 'no first use' of nuclear weapons and an extension of the 'no attack' treaty to cover civilian and industrial targets as well as nuclear installations.

Having promoted the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty since 1954, India dropped its support in 1995 and in 1996 attempted to block the Treaty. Following the 1998 tests the question has been reopened and both Pakistan and India have indicated their intention to sign the CTBT. Indian ratification may be conditional upon the five weapons states agreeing to specific reductions in nuclear arsenals. The UN Conference on Disarmament has also called upon both countries "to accede without delay to the Non-Proliferation Treaty", presumably as non-weapons states.

NPT Signatories

Egypt

In 2004 and 2005, Egypt disclosed past undeclared nuclear activities and material to the IAEA. In 2007 and 2008, high enriched and low enriched uranium particles were found in environmental samples taken in Egypt. In 2008, the IAEA states Egypt's statements were consistent with its own findings. In May 2009, Reuters reported that the IAEA was conducting further investigation in Egypt.

Iran

In 2003, the IAEA reported that Iran had been in breach of its obligations to comply with provisions of its safeguard agreement. In 2005, the IAEA Board of Governors voted in a rare non-consensus decision to find Iran in non-compliance with its

NPT Safeguards Agreement and to report that non-compliance to the UN Security Council, In response, the UN Security Council passed a series of resolutions in response to concerns about the program. Iran's representative to the UN argues sanctions compel Iran to abandon its rights under the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty to peaceful nuclear technology. Iran says its uranium enrichment program is exclusively for peaceful purposes and has enriched uranium to "less than 5 percent," consistent with fuel for a nuclear power plant and significantly below the purity of WEU typically used in a weapons program. The director general of the International Atomic Energy Agency, Yukiya Amano, said in 2009 he had not seen any evidence in IAEA official documents that Iran was developing nuclear weapons.

Iraq

Up to the late 1980s it was generally assumed that any undeclared nuclear activities would have to be based on the diversion of nuclear material from safeguards. States acknowledged the possibility of nuclear activities entirely separate from those covered by safeguards, but it was assumed they would be detected by national intelligence activities. There was no particular effort by IAEA to attempt to detect them.

Iraq had been making efforts to secure a nuclear potential since the 1960s. In the late 1970s a specialised plant, Osiraq, was constructed near Baghdad. The plant was attacked during the Iran–Iraq War and was destroyed by Israeli bombers in June 1981.

Not until the 1990 NPT Review Conference did some states raise the possibility of making more use of provisions for "special inspections" in existing NPT Safeguards Agreements. Special inspections can be undertaken at locations other than those where safeguards routinely apply, if there is reason to believe there may be undeclared material or activities.

After inspections in Iraq following the UN Gulf War cease-fire resolution showed the extent of Iraq's clandestine nuclear weapons program, it became clear that the IAEA would have to broaden the scope of its activities. Iraq was an NPT Party, and had thus agreed to place all its nuclear material under IAEA safeguards. But the inspections revealed that it had been pursuing an extensive clandestine uranium enrichment programme, as well as a nuclear weapons design programme.

The main thrust of Iraq's uranium enrichment program was the development of technology for electromagnetic isotope separation of indigenous uranium. This uses the same principles as a mass spectrometer. Ions of uranium-238 and uranium-235 are separated because they describe arcs of different radii when they move through a magnetic field. This process was used in the Manhattan Project to make the highly enriched uranium used in the Hiroshima bomb, but was abandoned soon afterwards.

The Iraqis did the basic research work at their nuclear research establishment at Tuwaitha, near Baghdad, and were building two full-scale facilities at Tarmiya and Ash Sharqat, north of Baghdad. However, when the war broke out, only a few separators had been installed at Tarmiya, and none at Ash Sharqat.

The Iraqis were also very interested in centrifuge enrichment, and had been able to acquire some components including some carbon-fibre rotors, which they were at an early stage of testing.

They were clearly in violation of their NPT and safeguards obligations, and the IAEA Board of Governors ruled to that effect. The UN Security Council then ordered the IAEA to remove, destroy or render harmless Iraq's nuclear weapons capability. This was done by mid 1998, but Iraq then ceased all cooperation with the UN, so the IAEA withdrew from this work.

The revelations from Iraq provided the impetus for a very far-reaching reconsideration of what safeguards are intended to achieve.

Myanmar

A report in the Sydney Morning Herald and Searchina, a Japanese newspaper, report that two Myanmarese defectors saying that the Myanmar junta was secretly building a nuclear reactor and plutonium extraction facility with North Korea's help, with the aim of acquiring its first nuclear bomb in five years. According to the report, "The secret complex, much of it in caves tunnelled into a mountain at Naung Laing in northern Burma, runs parallel to a civilian reactor being built at another site by Russia that both the Russians and Burmese say will be put under international safeguards." In 2002, Myanmar had notified IAEA of its intention to pursue a civilian nuclear programme. Later, Russia announced that it would build a nuclear reactor in Myanmar. There have also been reports that two Pakistani scientists, from the AQ Khan stable, had been dispatched to Myanmar where they had settled down, to help Myanmar's project. Recently, the David Albright-led Institute for Science and International Security rang alarm bells about Myanmar attempting a nuclear project with North Korean help. If true, the full weight of international pressure will be brought against Myanmar, said officials familiar with developments. But equally, the information that has been peddled by the defectors is also "preliminary" and could be used by the west to turn the screws on Myanmar—on democracy and human rights issues—in the run-up to the elections in the country in 2010. During an ASEAN meeting in Thailand in July 2009, US secretary of state Hillary Clinton highlighted concerns of the North Korean link. "We know there are also growing concerns about military cooperation between North Korea and Burma which we take very seriously," Clinton said.

North Korea

The Democratic People's Republic of Korea acceded to the NPT in 1985 as a condition for the supply of a nuclear power station by the USSR. However, it delayed concluding its NPT Safeguards Agreement with the IAEA, a process which should take only 18 months, until April 1992.

During that period, it brought into operation a small gas-cooled, graphite-moderated, natural-uranium (metal) fuelled "Experimental Power Reactor" of about 25 MWt (5 MWe), based on the UK Magnox design. While this was a well-suited design to start a wholly indigenous nuclear reactor development, it also exhibited all the features of a small plutonium production reactor for weapons purposes. North Korea also made substantial progress in the construction of two larger reactors designed on the same principles, a prototype of about 200 MWt (50 MWe), and a full-scale version of about 800 MWt (200 MWe). They made only slow progress; construction halted on both in 1994 and has not resumed. Both reactors have degraded considerably since that time and would take significant efforts to refurbish.

In addition it completed and commissioned a reprocessing plant that makes the Magnox spent nuclear fuel safe, recovering uranium and plutonium. That plutonium, if the fuel was only irradiated to a very low burn-up, would have been in a form very suitable for weapons. Although all these facilities at Yongbyon were to be under safeguards, there was always the risk that at some stage, the DPRK would withdraw from the NPT and use the plutonium for weapons.

One of the first steps in applying NPT safeguards is for the IAEA to verify the initial stocks of uranium and plutonium to ensure that all the nuclear materials in the country have been declared for safeguards purposes. While undertaking this work in 1992, IAEA inspectors found discrepancies which indicated that the reprocessing plant had been used more often than the DPRK had declared, which suggested that the DPRK could have weapons-grade plutonium which it had not declared to the IAEA. Information passed to the IAEA by a Member State supported that suggestion by indicating that the DPRK had two undeclared waste or other storage sites.

In February 1993 the IAEA called on the DPRK to allow special inspections of the two sites so that the initial stocks of nuclear material could be verified. The DPRK refused, and on 12 March announced its intention to withdraw from the NPT . In April 1993 the IAEA Board concluded that the DPRK was in non-compliance with its safeguards obligations and reported the matter to the UN Security Council. In June 1993 the DPRK announced that it had "suspended" its withdrawal from the NPT, but subsequently claimed a "special status" with respect to its safeguards obligations. This was rejected by IAEA.

Once the DPRK's non-compliance had been reported to the UN Security Council, the essential part of the IAEA's mission had been completed. Inspections in the DPRK continued, although inspectors were increasingly hampered in what they were permitted to do by the DPRK's claim of a "special status". However, some 8,000 corroding fuel rods associated with the experimental reactor have remained under close surveillance.

Following bilateral negotiations between the United States and the DPRK, and the conclusion of the Agreed Framework in October 1994, the IAEA has been given additional responsibilities. The agreement requires a freeze on the operation and construction of the DPRK's plutonium production reactors and their related facilities, and the IAEA is responsible for monitoring the freeze until the facilities are eventually dismantled. The DPRK remains uncooperative with the IAEA verification work and has yet to comply with its safeguards agreement.

While Iraq was defeated in a war, allowing the UN the opportunity to seek out and destroy its nuclear weapons programme as part of the cease-fire conditions, the DPRK was not defeated, nor was it vulnerable to other measures, such as trade sanctions. It can scarcely afford to import anything, and sanctions on vital commodities, such as oil, would either be ineffective or risk provoking war.

Ultimately, the DPRK was persuaded to stop what appeared to be its nuclear weapons programme in exchange, under the agreed framework, for about US$5 billion in energy-related assistance. This included two 1000 MWe light water nuclear power reactors based on an advanced U.S. System-80 design.

In January 2003 the DPRK withdrew from the NPT. In response, a series of discussions among the DPRK, the United States, and China, a series of six-party talks were held in Beijing; the first beginning in April 2004 concerning North Korea's weapons program.

On 10 January 2005, North Korea declared that it was in the possession of nuclear weapons. On 19 September 2005, the fourth round of the Six-Party Talks ended with a joint statement in which North Korea agreed to end its nuclear programs and return to the NPT in exchange for diplomatic, energy and economic assistance. However, by the end of 2005 the DPRK had halted all six-party talks because the United States froze certain DPRK international financial assets such as those in a bank in Macau.

On 9 October 2006, North Korea announced that it has performed its first-ever nuclear weapon test. On 18 December 2006, the six-party talks finally resumed. On 13 February 2007, the parties announced "Initial Actions" to implement the 2005 joint statement including shutdown and disablement of North Korean nuclear facilities in exchange for energy assistance. Reacting to UN sanctions imposed after missile tests in April 2009, North Korea withdrew from the six-party talks, restarted its nuclear facilities and conducted a second nuclear test on 25 May 2009.

Russia

Security of nuclear weapons in Russia remains a matter of concern. According to high-ranking Russian SVR defector Tretyakov, he had a meeting with two Russian businessman representing a state-created Chetek corporation in 1991. They came up with a project of destroying large quantities of chemical wastes collected from Western countries at the island of Novaya Zemlya using an underground nuclear blast. The project was rejected by Canadian representatives, but one of the businessmen told Tretyakov that he keeps his own nuclear bomb at his dacha outside Moscow. Tretyakov thought that man was insane, but the "businessmen" replied: "Do not be so naive. With economic conditions the way they are in Russia today, anyone with enough money can buy a nuclear bomb. It's no big deal really".

South Africa

In 1991, South Africa acceded to the NPT, concluded a comprehensive safeguards agreement with the IAEA, and submitted a report on its nuclear material subject to safeguards. At the time, the state had a nuclear power programme producing nearly 10% of the country's electricity, whereas Iraq and North Korea only had research reactors.

The IAEA's initial verification task was complicated by South Africa's announcement that between 1979 and 1989 it built and then dismantled a number of nuclear weapons. South Africa asked the IAEA to verify the conclusion of its weapons programme. In 1995 the IAEA declared that it was satisfied all materials were accounted for and the weapons programme had been terminated and dismantled.

South Africa has signed the NPT, and now holds the distinction of being the only known state to have indigenously produced nuclear weapons, and then verifiably dismantled them.

Syria

On September 6, 2007, Israel bombed an officially unidentified site in Syria which it later asserted was a nuclear reactor under construction . The alleged reactor was

not asserted to be operational and it was not asserted that nuclear material had been introduced into it. Syria said the site was a military site and was not involved in any nuclear activities. The IAEA requested Syria to provide further access to the site and any other locations where the debris and equipment from the building had been stored. Syria denounced what it called the Western "fabrication and forging of facts" in regards to the incident. IAEA Director General Mohamed ElBaradei criticized the strikes and deplored that information regarding the matter had not been shared with his agency earlier.

United States cooperation on nuclear weapons with the United Kingdom

The United States has given the UK considerable assistance with nuclear weapon design and construction since the 1958 US-UK Mutual Defence Agreement. In 1974 a CIA proliferation assessment noted that "In many cases Britain's sensitive technology in nuclear and missile fields is based on technology received from the United States and could not legitimately be passed on without U.S. permission."

The U.S. President authorized the transfer of "nuclear weapon parts" to the UK between at least the years 1975 to 1996. The UK National Audit Office noted that most of the UK Trident warhead development and production expenditure was incurred in the United States, which would supply "certain warhead-related components". Some of the fissile materials for the UK Trident warhead were purchased from the United States. Declassified U.S. Department of Energy documents indicate the UK Trident warhead system was involved in non-nuclear design activities alongside the U.S. W76 nuclear warhead fitted in some U.S. Navy Trident missiles, leading the Federation of American Scientists to speculate that the UK warhead may share design information from the W76.

Under the Mutual Defence Agreement 5.37 tonnes of UK-produced plutonium was sent to the United States in return for 6.7 kg of tritium and 7.5 tonnes of highly enriched uranium over the period 1960–1979. A further 0.47 tonne of plutonium was swapped between the UK and United States for reasons that remain classified. Some of the UK produced plutonium was used in 1962 by the United States for a nuclear weapon test of reactor-grade plutonium .

The United States has supplied nuclear weapon delivery systems to support the UK nuclear forces since before the signing of the NPT. The renewal of this agreement is due to take place through the second decade of the 21st century.

Arguments in favor of proliferation

There has been much debate in the academic study of International Security as to the advisability of proliferation. In the late 1950s and early 1960s, Gen. Pierre Marie Gallois of France, an adviser to Charles DeGaulle, argued in books like The Balance of Terror: Strategy for the Nuclear Age that mere possession of a nuclear arsenal, what the French called the force de frappe, was enough to ensure deterrence, and thus concluded that the spread of nuclear weapons could increase international stability.

Some very prominent neo-realist scholars, such as Kenneth Waltz, Emeritus Professor of Political Science at UC Berkeley and Adjunct Senior Research Scholar at Columbia University, and John Mearsheimer, R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, continue to argue along the lines of Gallois. Specifically, these scholars advocate some forms of nuclear proliferation, arguing that it will decrease the likelihood of war, especially in troubled regions of the

world. Aside from the majority opinion which opposes proliferation in any form, there are two schools of thought on the matter: those, like Mearsheimer, who favor selective proliferation, and those such as Waltz, who advocate a laissez-faire attitude to programs like North Korea's.

Total proliferation

In embryo, Waltz argues that the logic of mutually assured destruction should work in all security environments, regardless of historical tensions or recent hostility. He sees the Cold War as the ultimate proof of MAD logic – the only occasion when enmity between two Great Powers did not result in military conflict. This was, he argues, because nuclear weapons promote caution in decision-makers. Neither Washington nor Moscow would risk nuclear Armageddon to advance territorial or power goals, hence a peaceful stalemate ensued . Waltz believes there to be no reason why this effect would not occur in all circumstances.

Selective proliferation

John Mearsheimer would not support Waltz's optimism in the majority of potential instances; however, he has argued for nuclear proliferation as policy in certain places, such as post–Cold War Europe. In two famous articles, Professor Mearsheimer opines that Europe is bound to return to its pre–Cold War environment of regular conflagration and suspicion at some point in the future. He advocates arming both Germany and the Ukraine with nuclear weaponry in order to achieve a balance of power between these states in the east and France/Britain in the west. If this does not occur, he is certain that war will eventually break out on the European continent .

Another separate argument against Waltz's open proliferation and in favor of Mearsheimer's selective distribution is the possibility of nuclear terrorism. Some countries included in the aforementioned laissez-faire distribution could predispose the transfer of nuclear materials or a bomb falling into the hands of groups not affiliated with any governments. Such countries would not have the political will or ability to safeguard attempts at devices being transferred to a third party. Not being deterred by self-annihilation, terrorism groups could push forth their own nuclear agendas or be used as shadow fronts to carry out the attack plans by mentioned unstable governments.

Arguments against both positions

There are numerous arguments presented against both selective and total proliferation, generally targeting the very neorealist assumptions its proponents tend to make. With respect to Mearsheimer's specific example of Europe, many economists and neoliberals argue that the economic integration of Europe through the development of the European Union has made war in most of the European continent so disastrous economically so as to serve as an effective deterrent. Constructivists take this one step further, frequently arguing that the development of EU political institutions has led or will lead to the development of a nascent European identity, which most states on the European continent wish to partake in to some degree or another, and which makes all states within or aspiring to be within the EU regard war between them as unthinkable.

As for Waltz, the general opinion is that most states are not in a position to safely guard against nuclear use, that he under-estimates the long-standing antipathy in many regions, and that weak states will be unable to prevent – or will actively provide for – the

disastrous possibility of nuclear terrorism. Waltz has dealt with all of these objections at some point in his work; though to many, he has not adequately responded .

The Learning Channel documentary Doomsday: "On The Brink" illustrated 40 years of U.S. and Soviet nuclear weapons accidents. Even the 1995 Norwegian rocket incident demonstrated a potential scenario in which Russian democratization and military downsizing at the end of the Cold War did not eliminate the danger of accidental nuclear war through command and control errors. After asking: might a future Russian ruler or renegade Russian general be tempted to use nuclear weapons to make foreign policy? the documentary writers revealed a greater danger of Russian security over its nuclear stocks, but especially the ultimate danger of human nature to want the ultimate weapon of mass destruction to exercise political and military power. Future world leaders might not understand how close the Soviets, Russians, and Americans were to doomsday, how easy it all seemed because apocalypse was avoided for a mere 40 years between rivals, politicians not terrorists, who loved their children and did not want to die, against 30,000 years of human prehistory. History and military experts agree that proliferation can be slowed, but never stopped .

Proliferation begets proliferation

Proliferation begets proliferation is a concept described by Scott Sagan in his article, Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons? This concept can be described as a strategic chain reaction. If one state produces a nuclear weapon it creates almost a domino effect within the region. States in the region will seek to acquire nuclear weapons to balance or eliminate the security threat. Sagan describes this reaction best in his article when he states, "Every time one state develops nuclear weapons to balance against its main rival, it also creates a nuclear threat to another region, which then has to initiate its own nuclear weapons program to maintain its national security" . Going back through history we can see how this has taken place. When the United States demonstrated that it had nuclear power capabilities after the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the Russians started to develop their program in preparation for the Cold War. With the Russian military buildup, France and Great Britain perceived this as a security threat and therefore they pursued nuclear weapons.

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.14 What do you know about the concept of the clash of civilization? Write your answer in detail.

Ans.   The Clash of Civilizations

The Clash of Civilizations is a theory, proposed by political scientist Samuel P. Huntington, that people's cultural and religious identitieswill be the primary source of conflict in the post-Cold War world.

This theory was originally formulated in a 1992 lecture at the American Enterprise Institute, which was then developed in a 1993 Foreign Affairsarticle titled "The Clash of Civilizations?", in response to Francis Fukuyama's 1992 book, The End of History and the Last Man. Huntington later expanded his thesis in a 1996 book The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order.

The phrase itself was first used by Bernard Lewisin an article in the September 1990 issue of The Atlantic Monthlytitled "The Roots of Muslim Rage".

This expression derives from clash of cultures, already used during the colonial period and the Belle Époque.

Overview

Huntington began his thinking by surveying the diverse theories about the nature of global politics in the post-Cold War period. Some theorists and writers argued that human rights, liberal democracyand capitalist free market economy had become the only remaining ideological alternative for nations in the post-Cold War world. Specifically, Francis Fukuyamaargued that the world had reached the 'end of history' in a Hegelian sense.

Huntington believed that while the age of ideologyhad ended, the world had only reverted to a normal state of affairs characterized by cultural conflict. In his thesis, he argued that the primary axis of conflict in the future will be along cultural and religious lines.

As an extension, he posits that the concept of different civilizations, as the highest rank of cultural identity, will become increasingly useful in analyzing the potential for conflict.

In the 1993 Foreign Affairs article, Huntington writes:

It is my hypothesis that the fundamental source of conflict in this new world will not be primarily ideological or primarily economic. The great divisions among humankind and the dominating source of conflict will be cultural. Nation states will remain the most powerful actors in world affairs, but the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics. The fault lines between civilizations will be the battle lines of the future.

In the end of the article, he writes:

This is not to advocate the desirability of conflicts between civilizations. It is to set forth descriptive hypothesis as to what the future may be like.

Major civilizations according to Huntington

Huntington divided the world into the "major civilizations" in his thesis as such:

1. Westerncivilization, comprising North America, Western Europe, Australia and Oceania. Whether Latin America and the former member states of the Soviet Union are included, or are instead their own separate civilizations, will be an important future consideration for those regions, according to Huntington.

2. Latin America. Includes Central America, South America ,Cuba, the Dominican Republic, and Mexico. May be considered a part of Western civilization, though it has slightly distinct social and political structures from Europe and Northern America. Many people of the Southern Cone, however, regard themselves as full members of the Western civilization.

3. The Orthodoxworld of the former Soviet Union, Armenia, Georgia, the former Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Greece, Ukraine and Romania.

4. The Eastern world is the mix of the Buddhist, Chinese, Hindu, and Japonic civilizations.

- The Buddhist areas of Bhutan, Cambodia, Laos, Mongolia, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, and Thailandare identified as separate from other civilizations, but Huntington believes that they do not constitute a major civilization in the sense of international affairs.
- The Sinic civilization of China, the Koreas, Singapore, Taiwan, and Vietnam. This group also includes the Chinese diaspora, especially in relation to Southeast Asia.
- Hindu civilization, located chiefly in India, Bhutan and Nepal, and culturally adhered to by the global Indian diaspora.
- Japan, considered a hybrid of Chinese civilization and older Altaic patterns.

5. The Muslim world of the Greater Middle East , northern West Africa, Albania, Bangladesh, Brunei, Comoros, Indonesia, Malaysia, Pakistan, and Maldives.

6. The civilization of Sub-Saharan Africa located in Southern Africa, Middle Africa , East Africa , Cape Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Liberia, and Sierra Leone. Considered as a possible 8th civilization by Huntington.

7. Instead of belonging to one of the "major" civilizations, Ethiopia and Haiti are labeled as "Lone" countries. Israel could be considered a unique state with its own civilization, Huntington writes, but one which is extremely similar to the West. Huntington also believes that the Anglophone Caribbean, former British colonies in the Caribbean, constitutes a distinct entity.

8. There are also others which are considered "cleft countries" because they contain large groups of people identifying with separate civilizations. Examples include India , Ukraine, France , Benin, Chad, Kenya, Nigeria, Tanzania, and Togo, Guyana and Suriname , China, and the Philippines. Sudan was also included as "cleft" between Islam and Sub-Saharan Africa; this division became a formal split in July 2011 following an overwhelming vote for independence by South Sudan in a January 2011 referendum.

Huntington's thesis of civilizational clash

Russia, Japan, and India are what Huntington terms 'swing civilizations' and may favor either side. Russia, for example, clashes with the many Muslim ethnic groups on its southern border but—according to Huntington—cooperates with Iran to avoid further Muslim-Orthodox violence in Southern Russia, and to help continue the flow of oil. Huntington argues that a "Sino-Islamic connection" is emerging in which China will cooperate more closely with Iran, Pakistan, and other states to augment its international position.

Huntington also argues that civilizational conflicts are "particularly prevalent between Muslims and non-Muslims", identifying the "bloody borders" between Islamic and non-Islamic civilizations. This conflict dates back as far as the initial thrust of Islam into Europe, its eventual expulsion in the Iberian reconquest, the attacks of the Ottoman Turkson Eastern Europe and Vienna, and the European imperial division of the Islamic nations in the 1800s and 1900s.

Huntington also believes that some of the factors contributing to this conflict are that both Christianity and Islam are:

1. Missionary religions, seeking conversion of others
2. Universal, "all-or-nothing" religions, in the sense that it is believed by both sides that only their faith is the correct one
3. Teleologicalreligions, that is, that their values and beliefs represent the goals of existence and purpose in human existence.
4. Irreligious people who violate the base principles of those religions are perceived to be furthering their own pointless aims, which leads to violent interactions.

More recent factors contributing to a Western-Islamic clash, Huntington wrote, are the Islamic Resurgenceand demographic explosion in Islam, coupled with the values of Western universalism—that is, the view that all civilizations should adopt Western values—that infuriate Islamic fundamentalists. All these historical and modern factors combined, Huntington wrote briefly in his Foreign Affairsarticle and in much more detail in his 1996 book, would lead to a bloody clash between the Islamic and Western civilizations. The political party Hizb ut-Tahriralso reiterate Huntington's views in their published book, The Inevitability of Clash of Civilisation.

Core state and fault line conflicts

In Huntington's view, intercivilizational conflict manifests itself in two forms: fault line conflicts and core state conflicts.

Fault line conflicts are on a local level and occur between adjacent states belonging to different civilizations or within states that are home to populations from different civilizations.

Core state conflictsare on a global level between the major states of different civilizations. Core state conflicts can arise out of fault line conflicts when core states become involved.

These conflicts may result from a number of causes, such as: relative influence or power , discrimination against people from a different civilization, intervention to protect kinsmen in a different civilization, or different values and culture, particularly when one civilization attempts to impose its values on people of a different civilization.

Modernization, westernization, and "torn countries"

Critics of Huntington's ideas often extend their criticisms to traditional culturesand internal reformers who wish to modernize without adopting the values and attitudes of Westernculture. These critics sometimes claim that to modernize is necessarily to become Westernized to a very large extent.

In reply, those who consider the Clash of Civilizations thesis accurate often point to the example of Japan, claiming that it is not a Western state at its core. They argue that it adopted much Western technology, parliamentary democracy, and free enterprise, but has remained culturally very distinct from the West.

China is also cited by some as a rising non-Western economy. Many also point out the East Asian Tigers or neighboring states as having adapted western economics, while maintaining traditional or authoritarian social government.

Perhaps the ultimate example of non-Western modernization is Russia, the core state of the Orthodox civilization. The variant of this argument that uses Russia as an example relies on the acceptance of a unique non-Western civilization headed by an Orthodox state such as Russia or perhaps an Eastern European country.

Huntington argues that Russia is primarily a non-Western state although he seems to agree that it shares a considerable amount of cultural ancestry with the modern West. Russia was one of the great powers during World War I. It also happened to be a non-Western power.

According to Huntington, the West is distinguished from Orthodox Christian countries by the experience of the Renaissance, Reformation, the Enlightenment, overseas colonialismrather than contiguous expansion and colonialism, and a recent re-infusion of Classicalculture through Rome rather than through the continuous trajectory of the Byzantine Empire.

The differences among the modern Slavicstates can still be seen today. This issue is also linked to the "universalizing factor" exhibited in some civilizations.

Huntington refers to countries that are seeking to affiliate with another civilization as "torn countries." Turkey, whose political leadership has systematically tried to Westernize the country since the 1920s, is his chief example.

Turkey's history, culture, and traditions are derived from Islamic civilization, but Turkey's elite imposed western institutions and dress, embraced the Latin alphabet, joined NATO, and is seeking to join the European Union. Mexico and Russia are also considered to be torn by Huntington. He also gives the example of Australia as a country torn between its Western civilizational heritage and its growing economic engagement with Asia.

According to Huntington, a torn country must meet three requirements to redefine its civilizational identity. Its political and economic elite must support the move. Second, the public must be willing to accept the redefinition. Third, the elites of the civilization that the torn country is trying to join must accept the country.

As noted in the book, to date no torn country has successfully redefined its civilizational identity, this mostly due to the elites of the 'host' civilization refusing to accept the torn country, though if Turkey gained membership of the European Union it has been noted that many of its people would support Westernization. If this were to happen it would be the first to redefine its civilizational identity.

Criticism

Huntington has fallen under the stern critique of various academic writers, who have either empirically, historically, logically or ideologically refuted his claims . In another article explicitly referring to Huntington, Amartya Sen to the fact that "diversity is a feature of most cultures in the world. Western civilization is no exception. The practice of democracy that has won out in the modern West is largely a result of a consensus that has emerged since the Enlightenment and the Industrial Revolution, and particularly in the last century or so. To read in this a historical commitment of the West—over the millennia—to democracy, and then to contrast it with non-Western traditions would be a great mistake" .

In his Terror and Liberalism, Paul Berman proposes another criticism of the civilization clash hypothesis. According to Berman, distinct cultural boundaries do not exist in the present day. He argues there is no "Islamic civilization" nor a "Western civilization", and that the evidence for a civilization clash is not convincing, especially when considering relationships such as that between the United States and Saudi Arabia. In addition, he cites the fact that many Islamic extremists spent a significant amount of time living and/or studying in the Western world. According to Berman, conflict arises because of philosophical beliefs various groups share , regardless of cultural or religious identity.

Edward Saidissued a response to Huntington's thesis in his "The Clash of Ignorance".Said argues that Huntington's categorization of the world's fixed "civilizations" omits the dynamic interdependency and interaction of culture. A long time critic of the Huntingtonian paradigm, and an outspoken proponent of Arab issues, Edward Said also claimed that not only is the Clash of Civilisations thesis a "reductive and vulgar notion" , but it is also an illustration "of the purest invidious racism, a sort of parody of Hitlerian science directed today against Arabs and Muslims".

As early as the 1970s, scholars such as Abu Zahra argued that Islam vastly varies contextually and historically. Sections from the Koran that assert equality for men and women have been pointed out and warnings have been issued regarding the very significant gaps that may exist between erudite, theologically nuanced readings of the Koran on one hand, and widely held popular views and practices on the other. Embracing an already problematic "bulk" of Islam as an explanation for social and cultural phenomena might not only prove unproductive, but is arguably a flawed course of reasoning, since it ignores or neglects specific state policies and interventions .

Fundamental questions such as what Islam means for Muslims themselves in the modern world are equally "an issue for debate and action in the context of the politics of nation states, the struggle for energy supplies, superpower rivalry, and dependency. What is the umma, the Islamic community, and how and where is ijma, or consensus to be formed?"

Similar anti-Huntingtonian arguments have been woven around the term 'fundamentalism', a "slippery concept , and word that has come to be associated almost automatically with Islam, although it has a flourishing, usually elided, relationship with Christianity, Judaism and Hinduism" .It has been suggested that "the deliberately created associations between Islam and fundamentalism ensure that the average reader comes to see Islam and fundamentalism as essentially the same thing" . Indeed, Muslim countries such as Indonesia and Tunisia hardly fit into Huntington's fierce Weltanschauung, while his prediction that Turkey might decide to follow some sort of imperial past becomes less plausible by the day, as even newly elected "Islamic" Turkish conservative leaders turn towards Brussels, and not Tashkent, when contemplating foreign affairs.

Opposing concepts

In recent years, the theory of Dialogue Among Civilizations, a response to Huntington's Clash of Civilizations, has become the center of some international attention. The concept, which was introduced by former Iranian president Mohammad

Khatami, was the basis for United Nations' resolution to name the year 2001 as the Year of Dialogue among Civilizations.

The Alliance of Civilizations(AOC) initiative was proposed at the 59th General Assembly of the United Nations in 2005 by the President of the Spanish Government, José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero and co-sponsored by the Turkish Prime Minister Recep Tayyip Erdogan. The initiative is intended to galvanize collective action across diverse societies to combat extremism, to overcome cultural and social barriers between mainly the Western and predominantly Muslim worlds, and to reduce the tensions and polarization Letween societies which differ in religious and cultural values.

The Intermediate Region

Huntington's geopolitical model, especially the structures for North Africa and Eurasia, is largely derived from the "Intermediate Region" geopolitical model first formulated by Dimitri Kitsikis and published in 1978. The Intermediate Region, which spans the Adriatic Sea and the Indus River, is neither western nor eastern but is considered distinct.

Concerning this region, Huntington departs from Kitsikis contending that a civilizational fault line exists between the two dominant yet differing religions, hence a dynamic of external conflict. However, Kitsikis establishes an integrated civilization comprising these two peoples along with those belonging to the less dominant religions of Shiite Islam, Alevism and Judaism. They have a set of mutual cultural, social, economic and political views and norms which radically differ from those in the West and the Far East.

In the Intermediate Region, therefore, one cannot speak of a civiliational clash or external conflict, but rather an internal conflict, not for cultural domination, but for political succession. This has been successfully demonstrated by documenting the rise of Christianity from the hellenized Roman Empire, the rise of the Islamic caliphatesfrom the Christianized Roman Empireand the rise of Ottomanrule from the Islamic caliphates and the Christianized Roman Empire.

❉ ❉ ❉ ❉ ❉

Q.15 What is diplomacy in International Relation? Give its historical analysis. Also discuss the various kinds of diplomacy.

Ans. **Diplomacy**

Diplomacy is the art and practice of conducting negotiations between representatives of groups or states. It usually refers to international diplomacy, the conduct of international relations through the intercession of professional diplomats with regard to issues of peace-making, trade, war, economics, culture, environment and human rights. International treaties are usually negotiated by diplomats prior to endorsement by national politicians. In an informal or social sense, diplomacy is the employment of tact to gain strategic advantage or to find mutually acceptable solutions to a common challenge, one set of tools being the phrasing of statements in a non-confrontational, or polite manner.

The scholarly discipline of diplomatics, dealing with the study of old documents, derives its name from the same source, but its modern meaning is quite distinct from the activity of diplomacy.

History

Asia

Ancient China

One of the earliest realists in international relations theory was the 6th century BC military strategist Sun Tzu (d. 496 BC), author of The Art of War. He lived during a time in which rival states were starting to pay less attention to traditional respects of tutelage to the Zhou Dynasty (c. 1050–256 BC) figurehead monarchs while each vied for power and total conquest. However, a great deal of diplomacy in establishing allies, bartering land, and signing peace treaties was necessary for each warring state, and the idealized role of the "persuader/diplomat" developed.

From the Battle of Baideng (200 BC) to the Battle of Mayi (133 BC), the Han Dynasty was forced to uphold a marriage alliance and pay an exorbitant amount of tribute to the powerful northern nomadic Xiongnu that had been consolidated by Modu Shanyu. After the Xiongnu sent word to Emperor Wen of Han (r. 180–157) that they controlled areas stretching from Manchuria to the Tarim Basin oasis city-states, a treaty was drafted in 162 BC proclaiming that everything north of the Great Wall belong to nomads' lands, while everything south of it would be reserved for Han Chinese. The treaty was renewed no less than nine times, but did not restrain some Xiongnu tuqi from raiding Han borders. That was until the far-flung campaigns of Emperor Wu of Han (r. 141–87 BC) which shattered the unity of the Xiongnu and allowed Han to conquer the Western Regions; under Wu, in 104 BC the Han armies ventured as far Fergana in Central Asia to battle the Yuezhi who had conquered Hellenistic Greek areas.

The Koreans and Japanese during the Chinese Tang Dynasty (618–907 AD) looked to the Chinese capital of Chang'an as the hub of civilization and emulated its central bureaucracy as the model of governance. The Japanese sent frequent embassies to China in this period, although they halted these trips in 894 when the Tang seemed on the brink of collapse. After the devastating An Shi Rebellion from 755 to 763, the Tang Dynasty was in no position to reconquer Central Asia and the Tarim Basin. After several conflicts with the Tibetan Empire spanning several different decades, the Tang finally made a truce and signed a peace treaty with them in 841.

In the 11th century during the Song Dynasty (960–1279), there were cunning ambassadors such as Shen Kuo and Su Song who achieved diplomatic success with the Liao Dynasty, the often hostile Khitan neighbor to the north. Both diplomats secured the rightful borders of the Song Dynasty through knowledge of cartography and dredging up old court archives. There was also a triad of warfare and diplomacy between these two states and the Tangut Western Xia Dynasty to the northwest of Song China .After warring with the Lý Dynasty of Vietnam from 1075 to 1077, Song and Lý made a peace agreement in 1082 to exchange the respective lands they had captured from each other during the war.

Long before the Tang and Song dynasties, the Chinese had sent envoys into Central Asia, India, and Persia, starting with Zhang Qian in the 2nd century BC. Another

notable event in Chinese diplomacy was the Chinese embassy mission of Zhou Daguan to the Khmer Empire of Cambodia in the 13th century. Chinese diplomacy was a necessity in the distinctive period of Chinese exploration. Since the Tang Dynasty (618–907 AD), the Chinese also became heavily invested in sending diplomatic envoys abroad on maritime missions into the Indian Ocean, to India, Persia, Arabia, East Africa, and Egypt. Chinese maritime activity was increased dramatically during the commercialized period of the Song Dynasty, with new nautical technologies, many more private ship owners, and an increasing amount of economic investors in overseas ventures.

During the Mongol Empire the Mongols created something similar to today's diplomatic passport called paiza. The paiza were in three different types depending on the envoy's level of importance. With the paiza, there came authority that the envoy can ask for food, transport, place to stay from any city, village, or clan within the empire with no difficulties.

From the 17th century the Qing Dynasty concluded a series of treaties with Czarist Russia, beginning with the Treaty of Nerchinsk in the year 1689. This was followed up by the Aigun Treaty and the Convention of Peking in the mid-19th century.

As European power spread around the world in the 18th and 19th centuries so too did its diplomatic model, and Asian countries adopted European diplomatic systems.

Ancient India

Ancient India, with its kingdoms and dynasties, had a long tradition of diplomacy. The oldest treatise on statecraft and diplomacy, Arthashastra, is attributed to Kautilya , who was the principal adviser to Chandragupta Maurya, the founder of the Maurya dynasty who ruled in the 3rd century BC. Arthashastra is a complete work on the art of kingship, with long chapters on taxation and on the raising and maintenance of armies. It also incorporates a theory of diplomacy, of how in a situation of mutually contesting kingdoms, the wise king build alliances and tries to checkmate his adversaries. The envoys sent at the time to the courts of other kingdoms tended to reside for extended periods of time, and Arthashastra contains advice on the deportment of the envoy, including the trenchant suggestion that 'he should sleep alone'. The highest morality for the king is that his kingdom should prosper.

Modern Asia

Diplomatic relations within the Early Modern era of Asia were depicted as an environment of prestige and Status. It was maintained that one must be of noble ancestry in order to represent an autonomous state within the international arena. Therefore the position of diplomat was often revered as an element of the elitist class within Asia. A state's ability to practice diplomacy has been one of the underlying defining characteristics of an autonomous state. It is this practice that has been employed since the conception of the first city-states within the international spectrum. Diplomats in Asia were originally sent only for the purpose of negotiation. They would be required to immediately return after their task was completed. The majority of diplomats initially constituted the relatives of the ruling family. A high rank was bestowed upon them in order to present a sense of legitimacy with regards to their presence. Italy, the Ottoman Empire, and China were the first real states that perpetuated environments of diplomacy.

During the early modern era diplomacy evolved to become a crucial element of international relations within the Mediterranean and Asia.

Ancient roots

The ability to practice diplomacy is one of the defining elements of a state, diplomacy has been practiced since the inception of civilization. In Europe, diplomacy begins with the first city-states formed in ancient Greece. Diplomats were sent only for specific negotiations, and would return immediately after their mission concluded. Diplomats were usually relatives of the ruling family or of very high rank in order to give them legitimacy when they sought to negotiate with the other state.

The origins of diplomacy are in the strategic and competitive exchange of impressive gifts, which may be traced to the Bronze Age and recognized as an aspect of Homeric guest-friendship. Thus diplomacy and trade have been inexorably linked from the outset. "In the framework of diplomatic relations it was customary for Byzantine emperors and Muslim rulers, especially the 'Abbāsids and the Fātimids, as well as for Muslim rulers between themselves, to exchange precious gifts, with which they attempted to impress or surpass their counterparts," remarks David Jacoby, in the context of the economics of silk in cultural exchange among Byzantium, Islam and the Latin West: merchants accompanied emissaries, who often traveled on commercial ships. At a later date, it will be recalled that the English adventurer and trader Anthony Sherley convinced the Persian ruler to send the first Persian embassy to Europe .

Ancient Greece

The Greek City States on some occasions sent envoys to each other in order to negotiate specific issues, such as war and peace or commercial relations, but did not have diplomatic representatives regularly posted in each other's territory. However, some of the functions given to modern diplomatic representatives were in Classical Greece filled by a proxenos, who was a citizen of the host city having a particular relations of friendship with another city – a relationship often hereditary in a particular family.

Modern Europe

In Europe, early modern diplomacy's origins are often traced to the states of Northern Italy in the early Renaissance, with the first embassies being established in the 13th century. Milan played a leading role, especially under Francesco Sforza who established permanent embassies to the other city states of Northern Italy. Tuscany and Venice were also flourishing centres of diplomacy from the 14th century onwards. It was in the Italian Peninsula that many of the traditions of modern diplomacy began, such as the presentation of an ambassador's credentials to the head of state.

From Italy the practice was spread to other European regions. Milan was the first to send a representative to the court of France in 1455. However, Milan refused to host French representatives fearing espionage and that the French representatives would intervene in its internal affairs. As foreign powers such as France and Spain became increasingly involved in Italian politics the need to accept emissaries was recognized. Soon the major European powers were exchanging representatives. Spain was the first to send a permanent representative; it appointed an ambassador to the Court of England in 1487. By the late 16th century, permanent missions became customary. The Holy Roman

Emperor, however, did not regularly send permanent legates, as they could not represent the interests of all the German princes .

During that period the rules of modern diplomacy were further developed. The top rank of representatives was an ambassador. At that time an ambassador was a nobleman, the rank of the noble assigned varying with the prestige of the country he was delegated to. Strict standards developed for ambassadors, requiring they have large residences, host lavish parties, and play an important role in the court life of their host nation. In Rome, the most prized posting for a Catholic ambassador, the French and Spanish representatives would have a retinue of up to a hundred. Even in smaller posts, ambassadors were very expensive. Smaller states would send and receive envoys, who were a rung below ambassador. Somewhere between the two was the position of minister plenipotentiary.

Diplomacy was a complex affair, even more so than now. The ambassadors from each state were ranked by complex levels of precedence that were much disputed. States were normally ranked by the title of the sovereign; for Catholic nations the emissary from the Vatican was paramount, then those from the kingdoms, then those from duchies and principalities. Representatives from republics were ranked the lowest . Determining precedence between two kingdoms depended on a number of factors that often fluctuated, leading to near-constant squabbling.

Ambassadors, nobles with little foreign experience and no expectation of a career in diplomacy, needed to be supported by large embassy staff. These professionals would be sent on longer assignments and would be far more knowledgeable than the higher-ranking officials about the host country. Embassy staff would include a wide range of employees, including some dedicated to espionage. The need for skilled individuals to staff embassies was met by the graduates of universities, and this led to a great increase in the study of international law, modern languages, and history at universities throughout Europe.

At the same time, permanent foreign ministries began to be established in almost all European states to coordinate embassies and their staffs. These ministries were still far from their modern form, and many of them had extraneous internal responsibilities. Britain had two departments with frequently overlapping powers until 1782. They were also far smaller than they are currently. France, which boasted the largest foreign affairs department, had only some 70 full-time employees in the 1780s.

The elements of modern diplomacy slowly spread to Eastern Europe and Russia, arriving by the early 18th century. The entire edifice would be greatly disrupted by the French Revolution and the subsequent years of warfare. The revolution would see commoners take over the diplomacy of the French state, and of those conquered by revolutionary armies. Ranks of precedence were abolished. Napoleon also refused to acknowledge diplomatic immunity, imprisoning several British diplomats accused of scheming against France.

After the fall of Napoleon, the Congress of Vienna of 1815 established an international system of diplomatic rank. Disputes on precedence among nations persisted for over a century until after World War II, when the rank of ambassador became the

norm. In between that time, figures such as the German Chancellor Otto von Bismark were renowned for international diplomacy.

Middle East

Ancient Egypt, Canaan, and Hittite Empire

Some of the earliest known diplomatic records are the Amarna letters written between the pharaohs of the Eighteenth dynasty of Egypt and the Amurru rulers of Canaan during the 14th century BC. Following the Battle of Kadesh in c. 1274 BC during the Nineteenth dynasty, the pharaoh of Egypt and ruler of the Hittite Empire created one of the first known international peace treaties which survives in stone tablet fragments.

Ottoman Empire

Relations with the government of the Ottoman Empire were particularly important to Italian states. The maritime republics of Genoa and Venice depended less and less upon their nautical capabilities, and more and more upon the perpetuation of good relations with the Ottomans. Interactions between various merchants, diplomats, and religious men between the Italian and Ottoman empires helped inaugurate and create new forms of diplomacy and statecraft. Eventually the primary purpose of a diplomat, which was originally a negotiator, evolved into a persona that represented an autonomous state in all aspects of political affairs. It became evident that all other sovereigns felt the need to accommodate themselves diplomatically, due to the emergence of the powerful political environment of the Ottoman Empire. One could come to the conclusion that the atmosphere of diplomacy within the early modern period revolved around a foundation of conformity to Ottoman culture.

Diplomatic strategy

Real world diplomatic negotiations are very different from intellectual debates in a university where an issue is decided on the merit of the arguments and negotiators make a deal by splitting the difference. Though diplomatic agreements can sometimes be reached among liberal democratic nations by appealing to higher principles, most real world diplomacy has traditionally been heavily influenced by hard power.

The interaction of strength and diplomacy can be illustrated by a comparison to labor negotiations. If a labor union is not willing to strike, then the union is not going anywhere because management has absolutely no incentive to agree to union demands. On the other hand, if management is not willing to take a strike, then the company will be walked all over by the labor union, and management will be forced to agree to any demand the union makes. The same concept applies to diplomatic negotiations.

There are also incentives in diplomacy to act reasonably, especially if the support of other actors is needed. The gain from winning one negotiation can be much less than the increased hostility from other parts. This is also called soft power.

Many situations in modern diplomacy are also rules based. When for instance two World Trade Organization countries have trade disputes, it is in the interest of both to limit the spill over damage to other areas by following some agreed-upon rules.

Diplomatic immunity

The sanctity of diplomats has long been observed. This sanctity has come to be known as diplomatic immunity. While there have been a number of cases where

diplomats have been killed, this is normally viewed as a great breach of honour. Genghis Khan and the Mongols were well known for strongly insisting on the rights of diplomats, and they would often wreak horrific vengeance against any state that violated these rights.

Diplomatic rights were established in the mid-17th century in Europe and have spread throughout the world. These rights were formalized by the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, which protects diplomats from being persecuted or prosecuted while on a diplomatic mission. If a diplomat does commit a serious crime while in a host country he may be declared as persona non grata .Such diplomats are then often tried for the crime in their homeland.

Diplomatic communications are also viewed as sacrosanct, and diplomats have long been allowed to carry documents across borders without being searched. The mechanism for this is the so-called "diplomatic bag" .While radio and digital communication have become more standard for embassies, diplomatic pouches are still quite common and some countries, including the United States, declare entire shipping containers as diplomatic pouches to bring sensitive material into a country.

In times of hostility, diplomats are often withdrawn for reasons of personal safety, as well as in some cases when the host country is friendly but there is a perceived threat from internal dissidents. Ambassadors and other diplomats are sometimes recalled temporarily by their home countries as a way to express displeasure with the host country. In both cases, lower-level employees still remain to actually do the business of diplomacy.

Diplomats as a guarantee

In the Ottoman Empire, the diplomats of Persia and other states were seen as a guarantee of good behavior. If a nation broke a treaty or if their nationals misbehaved the diplomats would be punished. Diplomats were thus used as an enforcement mechanism on treaties and international law. To ensure that punishing a diplomat mattered rulers insisted on high-ranking figures. Diplomats as a guarantee were also employed sometimes in pre-modern Europe and other parts of Asia.

Diplomacy and espionage

Diplomacy is closely linked to espionage or gathering of intelligence. Embassies are bases for both diplomats and spies, and some diplomats are essentially openly acknowledged spies. For instance, the job of military attachés includes learning as much as possible about the military of the nation to which they are assigned. They do not try to hide this role and, as such, are only invited to events allowed by their hosts, such as military parades or air shows. There are also deep-cover spies operating in many embassies. These individuals are given fake positions at the embassy, but their main task is to illegally gather intelligence, usually by coordinating spy rings of locals or other spies. For the most part, spies operating out of embassies gather little intelligence themselves and their identities tend to be known by the opposition. If discovered, these diplomats can be expelled from an embassy, but for the most part counter-intelligence agencies prefer to keep these agents in situ and under close monitoring.

The information gathered by spies plays an increasingly important role in diplomacy. Arms-control treaties would be impossible without the power of

reconnaissance satellites and agents to monitor compliance. Information gleaned from espionage is useful in almost all forms of diplomacy, everything from trade agreements to border disputes.

Diplomatic resolution of problems

Various processes and procedures have evolved over time for handling diplomatic issues and disputes.

Arbitration and mediations

Nations sometimes resort to international arbitration when faced with a specific question or point of contention in need of resolution. For most of history, there were no official or formal procedures for such proceedings. They were generally accepted to abide by general principles and protocols related to international law and justice.

Sometimes these took the form of formal arbitrations and mediations. In such cases a commission of diplomats might be convened to hear all sides of an issue, and to come some sort of ruling based on international law.

In the modern era, much of this work is often carried out by the International Court of Justice at the Hague, or other formal commissions, agencies and tribunals, working under the United Nations. Below are some examples.

Hay-Herbert Treaty Enacted after the United States and Britain submitted a dispute to international mediation about the US-Canadian border.

Conferences

Other times, resolutions were sought through the convening of international conferences. In such cases, there are fewer ground rules, and fewer formal applications of international law. However, participants are expected to guide themselves through principles of international fairness, logic, and protocol.

Some examples of these formal conferences are:

- Congress of Vienna (1815) – After Napoleon was defeated, there were many diplomatic questions waiting to be resolved. This included the shape of the map of Europe, the disposition of political and nationalist claims of various ethnic groups and nationalities wishing to have some political autonomy, and the resolution of various claims by various European powers.
- The Congress of Berlin (June 13 – July 13, 1878) was a meeting of the European Great Powers' and the Ottoman Empire's leading statesmen in Berlin in 1878. In the wake of the Russo-Turkish War, 1877–78, the meeting's aim was to reorganize conditions in the Balkans.

Negotiations

Sometimes nations convene official negotiation processes to settle an issue or dispute between several nations which are parties to a dispute. These are similar to the conferences mentioned above, as there are technically no established rules or procedures. However, there are general principles and precedents which help define a course for such proceedings.

Some examples are:

1. Camp David accord Convened in 1978 by President Jimmy Carter of the United States, at Camp David to reach an agreement between Prime Minister Mechaem

Begin of Israel and President Anwar Sadat of Egypt. After weeks of negotiation, agreement was reached and the accords were signed, later leading directly to the Israel-Egypt Peace Treaty of 1979.

2. Treaty of Portsmouth Enacted after President Theodore Roosevelt brought together the delegates from Russia and Japan, to settle the Russo-Japanese War. Roosevelt's personal intervention settled the conflict, and caused him to win the Nobel peace prize.

Diplomatic recognition

Diplomatic recognition is an important factor in determining whether a nation is an independent state. Receiving recognition is often difficult, even for countries which are fully sovereign. For many decades after its becoming independent, even many of the closest allies of the Dutch Republic refused to grant it full recognition. Today there are a number of independent entities without widespread diplomatic recognition, most notably the Republic of China (ROC) on Taiwan. Since the 1970s, most nations have stopped officially recognizing the ROC's existence on Taiwan, at the insistence of the People's Republic of China. Currently, the United States and other nations maintain informal relations through de facto embassies, with names such as the American Institute in Taiwan. Similarly, Taiwan's de facto embassies abroad are known by names such as the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office. This was not always the case, with the US maintaining official diplomatic ties with the ROC, recognizing it as the sole and legitimate government of all of China until 1979, when those relations were broken off as a condition for establishing official relations with Communist China.

The Palestinian National Authority has its own diplomatic service, however Palestinian representatives in most Western countries are not accorded diplomatic immunity, and their missions are referred to as Delegations General.

Other unrecognized regions which claim independence include Abkhazia, Transnistria, Somaliland, South Ossetia, Nagorno Karabakh, and the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus. Lacking the economic and political importance of Taiwan, these nations tend to be much more diplomatically isolated.

Though used as a factor in judging sovereignty, Article 3 of the Montevideo Convention states, "The political existence of the state is independent of recognition by other states."

Informal diplomacy

Informal diplomacy has been used for centuries to communicate between powers. Most diplomats work to recruit figures in other nations who might be able to give informal access to a country's leadership. In some situations, such as between the United States and the People's Republic of China a large amount of diplomacy is done through semi-formal channels using interlocutors such as academic members of thinktanks. This occurs in situations where governments wish to express intentions or to suggest methods of resolving a diplomatic situation, but do not wish to express a formal position.

Track II diplomacy is a specific kind of informal diplomacy, in which non-officials engage in dialogue, with the aim of conflict resolution, or confidence-building. Sometimes governments may fund such Track II exchanges. Sometimes the exchanges

may have no connection at all with governments, or may even act in defiance of governments; such exchanges are called Track III.

On some occasion a former holder of an official position continues to carry out an informal diplomatic activity after retirement. In some cases, governments welcome such activity, for example as a means of establishing an initial contact with a hostile state of group without being formally committed. In other cases, however, such informal diplomats seek to promote a political agenda different from that of the government currently in power. Such informal diplomacy is practiced by former US Presidents Jimmy Carter and Bill Clinton and by the former Israeli diplomat and minister Yossi Beilin .

Paradiplomacy

Paradiplomacy refers to the international relations conducted by subnational, regional, local or non-central governments. The most ordinary case of paradiplomatic relation refer to co-operation between bordering political entities. However, interest of federal states, provinces, regions etc., may extend over to different regions or to issues gathering local governments in multilateral for a worldwide. Some non-central governments may be allowed to negotiate and enter into agreement with foreign central states.

Cultural diplomacy

Cultural diplomacy is a part of diplomacy. It alludes to a new way of making diplomacy by involving new non governmental and non professional actors in the making of diplomacy. In the frame of globalization, culture plays a major role in the definition of identity and in the relations between people. Joseph Nye points out the importance of having a soft power besides a hard power. When classical diplomacy fails, a better knowledge can help bridging the gap between different cultures.

Cultural diplomacy becomes a subject of academic studies based on historical essays on the United States, Europe, and the Cold War.

Small state diplomacy

Small state diplomacy is receiving increasing attention in diplomatic studies and international relations. Small states are particularly affected by developments which are determined beyond their borders such as climate change, water security and shifts in the global economy. Diplomacy is the main vehicle by which small states are able to ensure that their goals are addressed in the global arena. These factors mean that small states have strong incentives to support international cooperation. But with limited resources at their disposal, conducting effective diplomacy poses unique challenges for small states.

Patron Saint of Diplomacy

Archangel Gabriel, the Deliverer of the Word of God, is a communicator and emissary par excellence. He brings good news and his prophecies of love unveil secrets and reveal the hidden truth. He connects not only the Divine with the Human, but also three monotheistic religions, as he is one of the figures respected by Judaism, Christianity and Islam alike. On that account, perhaps, he is the patron saint of diplomats. He appears both in Old and New Testaments, as well as in the Qur'an, in each case as the God's courier.

✾ ✾ ✾ ✾ ✾

Q.16 Define globalisation. Discuss on the various aspects of globalisation.

Ans.   Globalization

Globalization, as a concept, refers both to the "shrinking" of the world and the increased consciousness of the world as a whole. It is a term used to describe the changes in societies and the world economy that are the result of dramatically increased cross-border trade, investment, and cultural exchange. The processes and actions to which the concept of globalization now refers have been proceeding, with some interruptions, for many centuries, but only in relatively recent times has globalization become a main focus of discussion. The current or recently-past epoch of globalization has been dominated by the nation-state, national economies, and national cultural identities. The new form of globalization is an interconnected world and global mass culture, often referred to as a "global village."

In specifically economic contexts, globalization is often used in characterizing processes underway in the areas of financial markets, production, and investment. Even more narrowly, the term is used to refer almost exclusively to the effects of trade, particularly trade liberalization or "free trade."

Between 1910 and 1950, a series of political and economic upheavals dramatically reduced the volume and importance of international trade flows. Globalization trends reversed beginning with World War I and continuing until the end of World War II, when the Bretton Woods institutions were created . In the post-World War II environment, fostered by international economic institutions and rebuilding programs, international trade and investment dramatically expanded. By the 1970s, the effects of the flow of trade and investment became increasingly visible, both in terms of the benefits and the disruptive effects.

As with all human endeavors, globalization processes are strongly affected by the values and motivation of the people involved in the process. In theory, globalization should benefit all people because it can produce greater overall economic value. Achieving an equitable distribution of the added value, however, would require the people who dominate the market to embody the virtue of sacrificing themselves to serve the higher purpose of the good of all. However, the legacy of colonialism, which causes a lingering arrogance among the powers in the Group of Eight and creates suspicion in the developing world, means that for many people, globalization is feared and resisted as a negative. Corporatist culture is seen as trampling upon local values and local economies. The Western, secular value system of the major economic actors is seen as a neo-colonial affront to people with non-Western religious and cultural values.

Thus, resistance to globalization is growing in many places, manifesting in the early twenty-first century with rise of Islamic terrorism. That al-Qaeda's target on September 11, 2001, was New York City's World Trade Center was no coincidence.

To be successful, the leaders of the globalization process need to practice the virtues of respect for religious and cultural values, and sacrifice their economic self-interest for the benefit of people suffering poverty and want. It is a challenge whose

resolution requires world leaders to pay heed to the religious and cultural dimensions of life and to develop a global world view that lifts up the shared values of all cultures.

Aspects of Globalization

"Globalization" carries multiple meanings, nuances, and applications. These include:

The formation of a global village through closer contact between different parts of the world, with increasing possibilities of personal exchange, mutual understanding, and friendship between "world citizens," and creation of a global civilization. The World Bank defines globalization as the "Freedom and ability of individuals and firms to initiate voluntary economic transactions with residents of other countries." Marshall McLuhan's idea of "the global village," was introduced in his book Explorations in Communication (1960). The United Nations has coined the term "Our Global Neighborhood" to describe an emerging world-political context.

Globalization Theory aims to understand complex connectivity proliferating at the global level considering both its sources and its implications across the various spheres of social existence.

In political science and international relations, the current unit of analysis as the nation state. Globalization has brought forth supranational organizations and international regimes, that is, commonly accepted laws and commonly accepted practices. The loss of sovereignty by the nation state to transnational and supranational organizations is of greatest concern. A world system perspective is a world with a common political system (with a common social and cultural system), linked by a common language, cultural practices, and institutions.

In sociology and communications, globalization is understood as global mass culture dominated by the modern means of cultural production. Mass communication produces images that cross and re-cross linguistic frontiers more rapidly and easily than goods and services, and speaks across languages in an immediate way. Global mass culture is dominated by the ways in which the visual and graphic arts have entered directly into the reconstitution of popular life, of entertainment, and of leisure with the image, imagery, and styles of mass advertising. This is dominated by Western cultural values and techniques. This process is homogenizing but also enormously absorptive of techniques and practices.

Economic globalization refers to free trade and increasing relations among members of an industry in different parts of the world (globalization of an industry), with a corresponding erosion of national sovereignty in the economic sphere. The IMF defines globalization as "the growing economic interdependence of countries worldwide through increasing volume and variety of cross-border transactions in goods and services, free international capital flows, and more rapid and widespread diffusion of technology" .

The negative effects of for-profit multinational corporations are exerted through such actions as the use of substantial and sophisticated legal and financial means to circumvent the bounds of local laws and standards, in order to leverage the labor and services of unequally-developed regions against each other.

The spread of capitalism from developed to developing nations.

"*The concept of Globalization* refers both to the compression of the world and the intensification of consciousness of the world as a whole".

"*The process* by which the world becomes a single place".

Globalization shares a number of characteristics with internationalization and is used interchangeably, although some prefer to use globalization to emphasize the erosion of the nation-state or national boundaries.

Globalism, if the concept is reduced to its economic aspects, can be said to contrast with economic nationalism and protectionism. It is related to laissez-faire capitalism and neoliberalism.

History of globalization

The term globalization was apparently first published in a 1962 article in Spectator magazine, but it began to enter everyday English usage after the 1962 publication of Marshall McLuhan's Gutenberg Galaxy. "Globalism" is an even more recent term and appeared for the first time in the 1986 second edition of the Oxford English Dictionary.

Globalization has both technical and political meanings. As such, different groups will have different histories of "globalization." In general use within the field of economics and political economy, globalization is a history of increasing trade between nations based on stable institutions that allow individuals and organizations in different nations to exchange goods with minimal friction.

The term "liberalization" came to mean the combination of laissez-faire economic theory with the removal of barriers to the movement of goods. This led to the increasing specialization of nations in exports, and the pressure to end protective tariffs and other barriers to trade.

There were several eras of intense cross-cultural encounters in pre-modern times (pre-1500 C.E). The first important era to mention here is the time of the Roman and Han empires. This is the era of the ancient silk-road, roughly 200 B.C.E. to 400 C.E. The consolidation of large imperial states pacified enough of Eurasia that trading networks could safely link the extreme ends of the landmass. Nomadic peoples played an especially prominent role in the economy of the silk roads, since they both consumed the finished products of settled lands and transported them to other customers. So long as the silk roads remained active, they facilitated not only the exchange of trade goods but also the communication of cultural and religious traditions throughout much of the Eastern Hemisphere. This era came to an end with the collapse of the Roman and Han empires, which had anchored and sustained much of the interregional commerce in goods and ideas, and with the outbreak of devastating epidemic diseases that disrupted societies and economies throughout Eurasia.

Beginning about the sixth century, however, a revival of long-distance trade underwrote a second round of intense cross-cultural encounters. The revival of cross-cultural dealings depended again on the foundation of large imperial states, such as the Tang, Abbasid, and Carolingian empires, which pacified vast stretches of Eurasia and gained the cooperation of nomadic peoples who provided transportation links between settled regions. But, long-distance trade in the sixth century benefited also from much more frequent use of sea lanes across the Indian Ocean. Merchants once again linked the

Eurasian landmass, while impressive numbers of missionaries and pilgrims traveled in their company. In an era often labeled a dark age—quite inappropriately—literacy and religions of salvation (particularly Buddhism, Islam, and early forms of Christianity) extended their influence to most parts of Eurasia.

The development of a consciousness of the world as a whole first came with the conquest of most of Eurasia, the biggest and long the most populous and culturally and technologically advanced continent, by the Mongols in the thirteenth century. Economist Ronald Findlay (2002) argues that:

For the first and only time in history, a single regime presided over the entire length of the overland trade routes linking China and the Near East. This made it possible for merchants and goods to move safely over these vast distances, facilitating the transmissions of ideas and techniques. Since China was substantially ahead of both Islam and the West in the general level of its technology, this flow chiefly benefited the lands at the western ends of the trade routes and beyond.

The first era of globalization, according to Findlay, began with "the unification of the central Eurasian land mass by the Mongol conquests and the reactions this aroused in the sedentary civilizations that they were launched against." Among other things, it brought awareness to the Europeans of the civilizations of East Asia and a stronger desire to reach them by going around the Islamic world that had for so long stood in between. That, in turn, brought forth the effort to improve naval technology which enabled the European voyages of discovery of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. So, instead of being the first, this can rightfully be called the second state on the way to globalization—first Eurasia, then the world.

The unraveling of the Mongol state in China coincided with a phenomenon of much larger impact: the spread of bubonic plague, known in the West as the Black Death, throughout Eurasia. The pacified vast regions that facilitated overland travel throughout the empire made it possible for humans and their animal stock to transport microorganisms across long distances much more efficiently than ever before. Long-distance trade probably did not disappear completely, but its volume certainly declined precipitously during the late fourteenth century.

The period of the gold standard and liberalization of the nineteenth century is often called "The Second Era of Globalization." Based on the Pax Britannica and the exchange of goods in currencies pegged to specie, this era grew along with industrialization. The theoretical basis was Ricardo's work on comparative advantage and Say's Law of General Equilibrium. In essence, it was argued that nations would trade effectively, and that any temporary disruptions in supply or demand would correct themselves automatically. The institution of the gold standard came in steps in major industrialized nations between approximately 1850 and 1880, though exactly when various nations were truly on the gold standard is a matter of a great deal of contentious debate.

This "Second Era of Globalization" is said to have broken down in stages beginning with the first World War, and then collapsing with the crisis of the gold standard in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Globalization in the era since World War II has been driven by multilateral Trade Negotiation Rounds, originally under the auspices of GATT and the WTO, which led to a series of agreements to remove restrictions on "free trade." The Uruguay round led to a treaty that created the World Trade Organization, to mediate trade disputes. Other bilateral trade agreements, including sections of Europe's Maastricht Treaty and the North American Free Trade Agreement, have also been signed in pursuit of the goal of reducing tariffs and barriers to trade and investment.

Signs of globalization

Although globalization has touched almost every person and locale in today's world, the trend has spread unevenly. It is most concentrated among propertied and professional classes, in the North (industrialized nations), in towns (urban areas), and among younger generations.

Globalization has not displaced deeper social structures in relation to production (capitalism), governance (the state and bureaucratism more generally), community (the notion and communitarianism more generally), and knowledge (rationalism). But, globalization has prompted important changes to certain attributes of capital, the state, the nation, and modern rationality.

Contemporary globalization has had some important positive consequences with respect to cultural regeneration, communications, decentralization of power, economic efficiency, and the range of available products.

But state government policies (pro-market) toward globalization have had many negative consequences in regard to increased ecological degradation, persistent poverty, worsened working conditions, various cultural violence, widened arbitrary inequalities, and deepened democratic deficits.

As such, globalization has become identified with a number of trends, most of which may have developed since World War II. These include greater international movement of commodities, money, information, and people; and the development of technology, organizations, legal systems, and infrastructures to allow this movement. The actual existence of some of these trends is debated.

Trends associated with globalization

1. Increase in international trade at a faster rate than the growth in the world economy
2. Increase in international flow of capital including foreign direct investment
3. Increase in world production and output and consumption
4. Greater trans-border data flow, using such technologies as the Internet, communication satellites, and telephones
5. The push by many advocates for an international criminal court and international justice movements .
6. Greater international cultural exchange, for example through the export of Hollywood and Bollywood movies
7. Some argue that terrorism has undergone globalization through its use of global financial markets and global communication infrastructure

8. Spreading of multiculturalism and increased individual access to cultural diversity, with on the other hand, reduction in diversity through assimilation, hybridization, Westernization, Americanization, or Sinosization of cultures.

9. Erosion of national sovereignty and national borders through international agreements leading to organizations like the WTO, OPEC, and EU

10. Greater international travel and tourism

11. Greater immigration, including illegal immigration

12. Development of global telecommunications infrastructure

13. Development of global financial systems

14. Increase in the share of the world economy controlled by multinational corporations

15. Increased role of international organizations such as WTO, UN, IMF that deal with international transactions

16. Increase in the number of standards applied globally, for example, copyright laws

Regional economic integration (regionalism)

Economic integration is concerned with the removal of trade barriers or impediments between at least two participating nations and the establishment of cooperation and coordination between them. Economic integration helps steer the world toward globalization. Globalization refers to the growing economic interdependencies of countries worldwide through the increasing volume and variety of cross-border transactions in goods and services and of international capital flows, as well as through the rapid and widespread diffusion of technology and information.

The following forms of economic integration are often implemented:

1. **Free Trade Area:** Involves country combination, where the member nations remove all trade impediments among themselves but retain their freedom concerning their policy making vis-à-vis non-member countries. The Latin American Free Trade Area, or LAFTA, and the North American Free Trade Agreement, or NAFTA are examples of this form.

2. **Customs Union:** Similar to a free trade area except that member nations must conduct and pursue common external commercial relations such as common tariff policies on imports from non-member nations. The Central American Common Market (CACM) and the Caribbean Community and Common Market (CARICOM) are examples of this form.

3. **Common Market:** A particular customs union that allows not only free trade of products and services but also free mobility of production factors (capital, labor, technology) across national member borders. The Southern Common Market Treaty (MERCOSUR) is an example of this form.

4. **Economic Union:** A particular common market involving the unification of monetary and fiscal policies. Participants introduce a central authority to exercise control over these matters so that member nations virtually become an enlarged single "country" in an economic sense.

5. **Political Union:** Requires the participating nations to become literally one nation in both an economic and political sense. This union involves the establishment of a common parliament and other political institutions.

Along with the above sequence from 1 to 5, the degree of economic integration increases. One form may shift to another over time if all the participating nations agree. For example, the European Union (EU) started as a common market and shifted over the years to an economic union and now to a partially political union.

The above forms reflect economic integration between or among nations within a region. Global economic integration also occurs through "multilateral cooperation" in which participating nations are bound by rules, principles, or responsibilities stipulated in commonly agreed upon agreements. Unlike the preceding five forms that all lead to regional economic integration, multilateral agreements are largely used to promote worldwide economic exchanges. They may be designed to govern general trade, service, and investments (for example, the World Trade Organization), capital flow and financial stability (for example, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund), or specific areas of trade, such as dealing with particular commodities (for example, the International Coffee Agreement).

International economic integration is propelled by three levels of cooperation: Global, regional, and commodity. Global-level cooperation occurs mainly through international economic agreements or organizations ; regional-level cooperation proceeds through common markets or unions ; and commodity-level cooperation proceeds through multilateral commodity cartels or agreements .

Barriers to international trade and investment have been considerably lowered since World War II at the multilateral level through international agreements such as the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Particular initiatives, carried out as a result of GATT and the WTO, for which GATT is the foundation, have included:

*   Promotion of free trade
*   Of goods: Reduction or elimination of tariffs; construction of free trade zones with small or no tariffs
*   Of capital: Reduction or elimination of capital controls
*   Reduction, elimination, or harmonization of subsidies for local businesses
*   Intellectual Property Restrictions
*   Harmonization of intellectual property laws across nations
*   Supranational recognition of intellectual property restrictions .

Anti-globalization

Various aspects of globalization are seen as harmful by public-interest activists as well as strong state nationalists. This movement has no unified name. "Anti-globalization" is the media's preferred term. Activists themselves, for example Noam Chomsky, have said that this name is as meaningless as saying the aim of the movement is to globalize justice. Indeed, "the global justice movement" is a common name. Many activists also unite under the slogan "another world is possible," which has given rise to names such as altermondisme in French.

There is a wide variety of different kinds of "anti-globalization." In general, critics claim that the results of globalization have not been what was predicted when the attempt to increase free trade began, and that many institutions involved in the system of globalization have not taken the interests of poorer nations and the working class into account.

Economic arguments by fair trade theorists claim that unrestricted free trade benefits those with more financial leverage (that is, the rich) at the expense of the poor.

Many "anti-globalization" activists see globalization as the promotion of a corporatist agenda, which is intent on constricting the freedoms of individuals in the name of profit. They also claim that increasing autonomy and strength of corporate entities increasingly shapes the political policy of nation-states.

Some "anti-globalization" groups argue that globalization is necessarily imperialistic, that it is one of the driving reasons behind the Iraq War (2003), and that it has forced investment to flow into the United States rather than to developing nations.

Some argue that globalization imposes credit-based economics, resulting in unsustainable growth of debt and debt crises.

Another more conservative camp in opposition to globalization are state-centric nationalists that fear globalization is displacing the role of nations in global politics and point to NGOs as impeding the power of individual nations. Some advocates of this warrant for anti-globalization are Pat Buchanan in the U.S. and Jean-Marie Le Pen in France.

The main opposition is to unfettered globalization (neoliberal; laissez-faire capitalism), guided by governments and what are claimed to be quasi-governments (such as the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank) that are supposedly not held responsible to the populations that they govern and instead respond mostly to the interests of corporations. Many conferences between trade and finance ministers of the core globalizing nations have been met with large, and occasionally violent, protests from opponents of "corporate globalism."

The anti-global movement is very broad, including church groups, national liberation factions, left-wing parties, environmentalists, peasant unionists, anti-racism groups, libertarian socialists, and others. Most are reformist and a strong minority is revolutionary. Many have decried the lack of unity and direction in the movement, but some, such as Noam Chomsky, have claimed that this lack of centralization may in fact be a strength.

Protests by the global justice movement have now forced high-level international meetings away from the major cities where they used to be held, and off into remote locations where protest is impractical.

Some "anti-globalization" activists object to the fact that the current "globalization" globalizes money and corporations and at the same time refuses to globalize people and unions. This can be seen in the strict immigration controls that exist in nearly all countries and the lack of labor rights in many countries in the developing world.

Pro-globalization (globalism)

Supporters of democratic globalization can be labeled pro-globalists. They consider that the second phase of globalization, which was market-oriented, should be

completed by a phase of building global political institutions representing the will of world citizens. The difference with other globalists is that they do not define in advance any ideology to orientate this will, which should be left to the free choice of those citizens via a democratic process.

Supporters of free trade point out that economic theories of comparative advantage suggest that free trade leads to a more efficient allocation of resources, with all countries involved in the trade benefiting. In general, they claim that this leads to lower prices, more employment, higher output, and greater consumption opportunities.

Libertarians and other proponents of laissez-faire capitalism say higher degrees of political and economic freedom in the form of democracy and market economies in the developed world produce higher levels of material wealth. They see globalization as the beneficial spread of democracy and market mechanisms.

Critics of the anti-globalization movement argue that it is not elected and as such does not necessarily represent or is not held accountable to a broad spectrum of people. Also, anti-globalization movement uses anecdotal evidence to support its view while worldwide statistics strongly support globalization instead. Statistics show that: The percentage of people in developing countries living below $1 per day has halved in only 20 years; life expectancy has almost doubled in the developing world since WWII and is starting to close the gap with the developed world, where the improvement has been smaller; child mortality has decreased in every developing region of the world; and income inequality for the world as a whole is diminishing.

Many pro-market are also critical of the World Bank and the IMF, arguing that they are corrupt bureaucracies controlled and financed by states, not corporations. These critics point out that many loans have been given to dictators who never carried out promised reforms, but instead left the common people to pay the debts later. Such corrupted loan partners cause "moral hazard" or hidden detrimental action by the lenders. The pro-capitalists see here an example of too little use of markets, not too much. They also note that some of the resistance to globalization comes from special interest groups with conflicting interests like Western world unions.

Globalization in question

The principle policy concern of globalization is usually put in terms of issues of economic efficiency. Economists tend to judge globalization largely in terms of the gains or losses that it brings to the productive development of scarce world resources. However, many would argue that economic growth should always be secondary to, and in service of, security, justice, and democracy.

On these issues the evaluations have been both positive and negative. In some respects, globalization has promoted increased human security, for example, with disincentives to war, improved means of humanitarian relief, new job creation opportunities, and greater cultural pluralism. However, in other ways globalization has perpetuated or even deepened warfare, environmental degradation, poverty, unemployment, exploitation of workers, and social disintegration. Thus, globalization does not automatically increase or decrease human security. The outcomes are positive or negative depending on the policies that are adopted toward the new geography.

Social justice can be looked at in terms of the distribution of life chances between classes, countries, sexes, races, urban/rural populations, and age groups. The bright side of globalization has in certain cases improved possibilities for young people, poor countries, women, and other subordinate social circles, allowing them to realize their potentials. More negatively, however, globalization has thus far sustained or increased various arbitrary hierarchies in contemporary society. For example, gaps in opportunities have tended to widen during the period of accelerated globalization on class lines as well as between the North and the South and the East (current and former communist state socialist countries).

The resultant increases in social injustice can be attributed at least partly to the spread of relations beyond territorial boundaries. The inequities have flowed largely from the policies that have been applied to globalization rather than from globalization per se.

In terms of the impact of globalization on democracy, the positives are through new information and communications technologies and an expansion of civil society. The downside is that there is a lack of mechanisms to ensure that post-sovereign governance is adequately participatory, consultative, transparent, and publicly accountable. Bold intellectual and institutional innovations are needed to refashion democracy for a globalized world.

There is much academic discussion about whether globalization is a real phenomenon or only a myth. Although the term is widespread, many authors argue that the characteristics of the phenomenon have also been seen at other moments in history. Also, many note that those features that make people believe we are in the process of globalization, including the increase in international trade and the greater role of multinational corporations, are not as deeply established as they may appear. The United States' global interventionist policy is also a stumbling point for those that claim globalization has entered a stage of inevitability. Thus, many authors prefer the use of the term internationalization rather than globalization. To put it simply, the role of the state and the importance of nations are greater in internationalization, while globalization in its complete form eliminates nation states. So these authors see that the frontiers of countries, in a broad sense, are far from being dissolved, and therefore this radical globalization process is not yet happening, and probably won't happen, considering that in world history, internationalization never turned into globalization—the European Union and NAFTA are yet to prove their case.

The world increasingly shares problems and challenges that do not obey nation-state borders, most notably pollution of the natural environment, poverty, and disease. As such, the movement previously known as the anti-globalization movement has transmogrified into a movement of movements for globalization from below; seeking, through experimentation, forms of social organization that transcend the nation state and representative democracy. So, whereas the original arguments of anti-global critique can be refuted with stories of internationalization, as above, the emergence of a global movement is indisputable and therefore one can speak of a real process towards a global human society of societies.

❉ ❉ ❉ ❉ ❉

Q.17 Write a comprehensive note on Non-Aligned Movement.

Ans.   **Non-Aligned Movement**

The Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) is a group of states considering themselves not aligned formally with or against any major power bloc. As of 2011, the movement had 120 members, and 17 observer countries. Generally speaking, the Non-Aligned Movement members can be described as all of those countries which belong to the Group of 77 (along with Belarus and Uzbekistan), but which are not observers in Non-Aligned Movement and are not Oceanian.

The organization was founded in Belgrade in 1961, and was largely the brainchild of Yugoslavia's President, Josip Broz Tito, India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru, Egypt's second President, Gamal Abdel Nasser, Ghana's first president Kwame Nkrumah, and Indonesia's first President, Sukarno. 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 V.K. Krishna Menon in 1953, at the United Nations.

The purpose of the organisation as stated in the Havana Declaration of 1979 is to ensure "the national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and security of non-aligned countries" in their "struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, racism, and all forms of foreign aggression, occupation, domination, interference or hegemony as well as against great power and bloc politics." They represent nearly two-thirds of the United Nation's members and 55% of the world population, particularly countries considered to be developing or part of the Third World.

Members have, at various times, included: SFR Yugoslavia, Argentina, SWAPO, Cyprus, and Malta. Brazil has never been a formal member of the movement, but shares many of the aims of Non-Aligned Movement and frequently sends observers to the Non-Aligned Movement's summits. While many of the Non-Aligned Movement's members were actually quite closely aligned with one or another of the super powers, the movement still maintained surprising amounts of cohesion throughout the Cold War. Additionally, some members were involved in serious conflicts with other members. The movement fractured from its own internal contradictions when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan in 1979. While the Soviet allies supported the invasion, other members of the movement condemned it.

Because the Non-Aligned Movement was formed as an attempt to thwart the Cold War, it has struggled to find relevance since the Cold War ended. After the breakup of Yugoslavia, a founding member, its membership was suspended in 1992 at the regular Ministerial Meeting of the Movement, held in New York during the regular yearly session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. At the Summit of the Movement in Jakarta, Indonesia, Yugoslavia was suspended or expelled from the Movement. The successor states of the SFR Yugoslavia have expressed little interest in membership, though some have observer status. In 2004, Malta and Cyprus ceased to be members and joined the European Union. Belarus remains the sole member of the Movement in Europe. Turkmenistan, Belarus and the Dominican Republic are the most recent entrants.

The applications of Bosnia and Herzegovina and Costa Rica were rejected in 1995 and 1998. SFR Yugoslavia had been suspended since 1992.

Origins

The Non-Aligned movement was never established as a formal organization, but became the name to refer to the participants of the Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries first held in 1961. The term "non-alignment" itself was coined by V.K. Krishna Menon in 1953 remarks at the United Nations. Menon's friend, Jawaharlal Nehru used the phrase in a 1954 speech in Colombo, Sri Lanka. In his speech, Nehru described the five pillars to be used as a guide for Sino-Indian relations, which were first put forth by Chinese Premier Zhou Enlai. Called Panchsheel, these principles would later serve as the basis of the Non-Aligned Movement. The five principles were:

1. Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty
2. Mutual non-aggression
3. Mutual non-interference in domestic affairs
4. Equality and mutual benefit
5. Peaceful co-existence

A significant milestone in the development of the Non-Aligned Movement was the 1955 Bandung Conference, a conference of Asian and African states hosted by Indonesian president Sukarno, who gave a significant contribution to promote this movement. The attending nations declared their desire not to become involved in the Cold War and adopted a "declaration on promotion of world peace and cooperation", which included Nehru's five principles. Six years after Bandung, an initiative of Yugoslav president Josip Broz Tito led to the first Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned Countries, which was held in September 1961 in Belgrade. The term non aligned movement appears first in the fifth conference in 1976, where participating countries are denoted as members of the movement.

At the Lusaka Conference in September 1970, the member nations added as aims of the movement the peaceful resolution of disputes and the abstention from the big power military alliances and pacts. Another added aim was opposition to stationing of military bases in foreign countries.

The founding fathers of the Non-aligned movement were: Sukarno of Indonesia, Jawaharlal Nehru of India, and Josip Broz Tito of Yugoslavia, Gamal Abdul Nasser of Egypt and Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana. Their actions were known as 'The Initiative of Five'.

Organizational structure and membership

The movement stems from a desire not to be aligned within a geopolitical/military structure and therefore itself does not have a very strict organizational structure. Some organizational basics were defined at the 1996 Cartagena Document on Methodology. The Summit Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-Aligned States is "the highest decision making authority". The chairmanship rotates between countries and changes at every summit of heads of state or government to the country organizing the summit.

Requirements for membership of the Non-Aligned Movement coincide with the key beliefs of the United Nations. The current requirements are that the candidate country has displayed practices in accordance with the ten "Bandung principles":

1. Respect for fundamental human rights and for the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations.
2. Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all nations.
3. Recognition of the movements for national independence.
4. Recognition of the equality of all races and of the equality of all nations, large and small.
5. Abstention from intervention or interference in the internal affairs of another country.
6. Respect for the right of each nation to defend itself singly or collectively, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
7. Refraining from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any country.
8. Settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations.
9. Promotion of mutual interests and co-operation.
10. Respect for justice and international obligations.

Policies and ideology

Secretaries General of the NAM had included such diverse figures as Suharto, an authoritarian anti-communist, and Nelson Mandela, a democratic socialist and famous anti-apartheid activist. Consisting of many governments with vastly different ideologies, the Non-Aligned Movement is unified by its commitment to world peace and security. At the seventh summit held in New Delhi in March 1983, the movement described itself as "history's biggest peace movement". The movement places equal emphasis on disarmament. NAM's commitment to peace pre-dates its formal institutionalisation in 1961. The Brioni meeting between heads of governments of India, Egypt and Yugoslavia in 1956 recognized that there exists a vital link between struggle for peace and endeavours for disarmament.

The Non-Aligned Movement espouses policies and practices of cooperation, especially those that are multilateral and provide mutual benefit to all those involved. Many of the members of the Non-Aligned Movement are also members of the United Nations and both organisations have a stated policy of peaceful cooperation, yet successes that the NAM has had in multilateral agreements tends to be ignored by the larger, western and developed nation dominated UN. African concerns about apartheid were linked with Arab-Asian concerns about Palestine and success of multilateral cooperation in these areas has been a stamp of moderate success. The Non-Aligned Movement has played a major role in various ideological conflicts throughout its existence, including extreme opposition to apartheid regimes and support of liberation movements in various locations including Zimbabwe and South Africa. The support these sorts of movements stems from a belief that every state has the right to base policy and practices with national interests in mind and not as a result of relations to a parti

power bloc. The Non-Aligned Movement has become a voice of support for issues facing developing nations and is still contains ideals that are legitimate within this context.

Role after the Cold War

Since the end of the Cold War and the formal end of colonialism, the Non-Aligned Movement has been forced to redefine itself and reinvent its purpose in the current world system. A major question has been whether many of its foundational ideologies, principally national independence, territorial integrity, and the struggle against colonialism and imperialism, can be applied to contemporary issues. The movement has emphasised its principles of multilateralism, equality, and mutual non-aggression in attempting to become a stronger voice for the global South, and an instrument that can be utilised to promote the needs of member nations at the international level and strengthen their political leverage when negotiating with developed nations. In its efforts to advance Southern interests, the movement has stressed the importance of cooperation and unity amongst member states, but as in the past, cohesion remains a problem since the size of the organisation and the divergence of agendas and allegiances present the ongoing potential for fragmentation. While agreement on basic principles has been smooth, taking definitive action vis-à-vis particular international issues has been rare, with the movement preferring to assert its criticism or support rather than pass hard-line resolutions. The movement continues to see a role for itself, as in its view, the world's poorest nations remain exploited and marginalised, no longer by opposing superpowers, but rather in a uni-polar world, and it is Western hegemony and neo-colonialism that the movement has really re-aligned itself against. It opposes foreign occupation, interference in internal affairs, and aggressive unilateral measures, but it has also shifted to focus on the socio-economic challenges facing member states, especially the inequalities manifested by globalisation and the implications of neo-liberal policies. The Non-Aligned Movement has identified economic underdevelopment, poverty, and social injustices as growing threats to peace and security.

Current activities and positions

Criticism of US policy

In recent years the organization has criticized US foreign policy. The US invasion of Iraq and the War on Terrorism, its attempts to stifle Iran and North Korea's nuclear plans, and its other actions have been denounced as human rights violations and attempts to run roughshod over the sovereignty of smaller nations. The movement's leaders have also criticized the American control over the United Nations and other international structures.

Self-determination of Puerto Rico

Since 1961, the group have supported the discussion of the case of Puerto Rico's self-determination before the United Nations. A resolution on the matter will be proposed on the XV Summit by the Hostosian National Independence Movement.

Self-determination of Western Sahara

Since 1973, the group have supported the discussion of the case of Western Sahara's self-determination before the United Nations. The Non-Aligned Movement reaffirmed in its last meeting the support to the Self-determination of the Sahrawi people

by choosing between any valid option, welcomed the direct conversations between the parts, and remembered the responsibility of the United Nations on the Sahrawi issue.

Sustainable development

The movement is publicly committed to the tenets of sustainable development and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals, but it believes that the international community has not created conditions conducive to development and has infringed upon the right to sovereign development by each member state. Issues such as globalisation, the debt burden, unfair trade practices, the decline in foreign aid, donor conditionalities, and the lack of democracy in international financial decision-making are cited as factors inhibiting development.

Reforms of the UN

The Non-Aligned Movement has been quite outspoken in its criticism of current UN structures and power dynamics, mostly in how the organisation has been utilised by powerful states in ways that violate the movement's principles. It has made a number of recommendations that would strengthen the representation and power of 'non-aligned' states. The proposed reforms are also aimed at improving the transparency and democracy of UN decision-making. The UN Security Council is the element considered the most distorted, undemocratic, and in need of reshaping.

Lately the Non-Aligned Movement has collaborated with other organisations of the developing world, primarily the Group of 77, forming a number of joint committees and releasing statements and document representing the shared interests of both groups. This dialogue and cooperation can be taken as an effort to increase the global awareness about the organisation and bolster its political clout.

Cultural diversity and human rights

The movement accepts the universality of human rights and social justice, but fiercely resists cultural homogenisation. In line with its views on sovereignty, the organisation appeals for the protection of cultural diversity, and the tolerance of the religious, socio-cultural, and historical particularities that define human rights in a specific region.

Working groups, task forces, committees

1. High-Level Working Group for the Restructuring of the United Nations
2. Working Group on Human Rights
3. Working Group on Peace-Keeping Operations
4. Working Group on Disarmament
5. Committee on Palestine
6. Task Force on Somalia
7. Non-Aligned Security Caucus
8. Standing Ministerial Committee for Economic Cooperation
9. Joint Coordinating Committee

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.18 What do you know about détente. What were its causes?

Ans. **Detente**

Détente is a French term, meaning a relaxing or easing; the term has been used in international politics since the early 1970s. Generally, it may be applied to any international situation where previously hostile nations not involved in an open war de-escalate tensions through diplomacy and confidence building measures. However, it is primarily used in reference to the general reduction in the tension between the Soviet Union and the United States and a thawing of the Cold War that occurring from the late 1960s until the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan in late December, 1979. In Russian, détente was known as "razryadka" .

Causes

The two sides in the Cold War, the NATO powers and the Warsaw Pact, both had pressing reasons to seek relaxation in tensions. Leonid Brezhnev and the rest of the Soviet leadership felt that the economic burden of the nuclear arms race was unsustainable. The American economy was also in financial trouble as the Vietnam War drained government finances at the same time as Lyndon Johnson's Great Society sought to expand the government welfare state.

In Europe, the Ostpolitik of Willy Brandt was decreasing tensions; the Soviets hoped that with Détente, more trade with Western Europe to bolster their sagging economy would be possible. Soviet thinkers also felt that a less aggressive policy could potentially detach the Western Europeans from their American ally.

Worsening relations with the People's Republic of China, leading to the Sino-Soviet Split, had caused great concern in the Soviet Union. The leadership feared the potential of a Sino-American alliance against them and believed it necessary to improve relations with the United States. Improved relations with China had already thawed the general American view of Communism.

Rough parity had been achieved in stockpiling nuclear weapons with a clear capability of mutually assured destruction (MAD). There was also the realization that the "relative gains" theory as to the predictable consequences of war might no longer be appropriate. A "sensible middle ground" was the goal.

Brezhnev and Nixon each hoped improved relations would boost their domestic popularity and secure their power.

Several anti-nuclear movements supported détente.

Summits and Treaties

The most obvious manifestation of Détente was the series of summits held between the leaders of the two superpowers and the treaties that resulted from these meetings. Earlier in the 1960s, before Détente, the Partial Test Ban Treaty had been signed in 1963.

Partial Test Ban Treaty

The Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests In The Atmosphere, In Outer Space And Under Water, often abbreviated as the Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT), Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT), or Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (NTBT) is a treaty prohibiting all test detonations of nuclear weapons except underground. It was developed both to slow the

arms race (nuclear testing is necessary for continued nuclear weapon advancements), and to stop the excessive release of nuclear fallout into the planet's atmosphere.

It was signed by the Governments of the USSR (represented by Andrei Gromyko), the UK (represented by Douglas Home) and the USA (represented by Dean Rusk), named the "Original Parties," at Moscow on August 5, 1963 and opened for signature by other countries. There were 113 signatories. It entered into force on October 10, 1963.

Later in the decade, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and Outer Space Treaty were two of the first building blocks of Détente. However, these early treaties did little to curb the superpowers' abilities, and served primarily to limit the nuclear ambitions of third parties that could endanger both superpowers.

SALT

The most important treaties were not developed until the advent of the Nixon Administration, which came into office in 1969. The Political Consultative Committee of the Warsaw Pact sent an offer to the West, urging to hold a summit on "security and cooperation in Europe." The West agreed and talks began towards actual limits in the nuclear capabilities of the two superpowers. This ultimately led to the signing of the SALT I treaty in 1972.

SALT I

SALT I is the common name for the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty Agreement, but also known as Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty. SALT I froze the number of strategic ballistic missile launchers at the then existing levels, and provided for the addition of new submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) launchers only after the same number of older intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and SLBM launchers had been dismantled.

The strategic nuclear forces niche of the Soviet Union and the United States were changing in character in 1968. The U.S.'s total number of missiles had been static since 1967 at 1054 ICBMs and 656 SLBMs, but an increasing number of missiles with multiple independently targetable reentry vehicle (MIRV) warheads had been deployed. One clause of the treaty required both countries to limit the sites protected by an anti-ballistic missile (ABM) system to one. The Soviet Union had deployed such a system around Moscow in 1966 and the United States announced an ABM program to protect twelve ICBM sites in 1967. A modified two-tier Moscow ABM system is still used, probably with missile interceptors equipped with conventional instead of nuclear warheads. The U.S. built only one ABM site to protect a Minuteman base in North Dakota where the "Safeguard Program" was deployed. Due to the system's expense and limited effectiveness, the Pentagon disbanded "Safeguard" in 1975.

Negotiations lasted from November 17, 1969 until May 1972 in a series of meetings beginning in Helsinki, with the U.S. delegation headed by Gerard C. Smith, director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Subsequent sessions alternated between Vienna and Helsinki. After a long deadlock, the first results of SALT I came in May 1971, when an agreement was reached over ABM systems. Further discussion brought the negotiations to an end on May 26, 1972 in Moscow when Richard Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev signed the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty and the Interim Agreement

Between The United States of America and The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on Certain Measures With Respect to the Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms. A number of agreed statements were also made which helped to initiate the period of detente between the USA and the Soviet Union. In the same year that SALT I was signed, the Biological Weapons Convention and the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty were also concluded. Talks on SALT II also began in 1972.

SALT II

SALT II was a second round of talks from 1972 to 1979 between the U.S. and the Soviet Union, which sought to curtail the manufacture of strategic nuclear weapons. It was a continuation of the progress made during the SALT I talks. SALT II was the first nuclear arms treaty which assumed real reductions in strategic forces to 2250 of all categories of delivery vehicles on both sides. SALT II helped the U.S. to discourage the Soviets not to arm their third generation ICBMs of SS-17, SS-19 and SS-18 types with much more MIRVs. The USSR's missile design bureaus had developed in the late 1970s experimental versions of these missiles equipped with anywhere from 10 to 38 thermonuclear warheads each. Additionally, the Soviets secretly agreed to reduce Tu-22M production to thirty aircraft per year and not to give them an intercontinental range. It was particularly important for the US to limit Soviet efforts in the INF forces rearmament area. The SALT II Treaty banned new missile programs (a new missile defined as one with any key parameter five percent better than in currently deployed missiles), so both sides were forced to limit their new strategic missile types development although US preserved their most essential programs like Trident and cruise missiles. In return, the USSR could exclusively retain 308 of its so-called "heavy ICBM" launchers of the SS-18 type.

An agreement to limit strategic launchers was reached in Vienna on June 18, 1979, and was signed by Leonid Brezhnev and President of the United States Jimmy Carter. Six months after the signing, the Soviet Union deployed troops to Afghanistan, and in September of the same year some senators like (Henry M. Jackson) unexpectedly discovered the so-called "Soviet brigade" on Cuba. As such, the treaty was never ratified by the United States Senate. Its terms were, nonetheless, honored by both sides until 1986 when the Reagan Administration withdrew from SALT II after accusing the Soviets of violating the pact.

START

Subsequent discussions took place under the (START) and the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

The Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties refers to two rounds of bilateral talks and corresponding international treaties between the Soviet Union and the United States—the Cold War superpowers—on the issue of armament control. There were two rounds of talks and agreements: SALT I and SALT II. SALT II later became START. Negotiations started in Helsinki, Finland, in 1969 and focused on limiting the two countries' stocks of nuclear weapons. These treaties led to the START (Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty). START I (a 1991 agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union) and START II (a 1993 agreement between the United States and Russia) placed specific caps on each side's number of nuclear weapons.

Helsinki Accords

In 1975, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe met and produced the Helsinki Accords, a wide ranging series of agreements on economic, political, and human rights issues. In July of the same year, the Apollo-Soyuz Test Project became the first international space mission, with three American astronauts and two Russian cosmonauts docking their spacecraft and conducting joint experiments. This mission had been preceded by five years of political negotiation and technical co-operation, including exchanges of U.S. and Russian engineers between the two countries' space centers.

Trade relations between the two blocs increased substantially during the era of detente. Most significant were the vast shipments of grain that were sent from the West to the Soviet Union each year, which helped make up for the failure of kolkhoz, Soviet collectivized agriculture.

At the same time, the Jackson-Vanik amendment, signed into law by Gerald Ford on January 3, 1975, after a unanimous vote by both houses of the United States Congress, was designed to leverage trade relations between the U.S. and the USSR, making them dependent upon improvements of human rights within the Soviet Union.

Continued Conflicts

Despite the growing amicability, heated competition continued between the two superpowers, especially in the Third World. Wars in South Asia in 1971 and the Middle East in 1973 saw the superpowers back their sides with material and diplomatic support. In Latin America the United States continued to block any leftward shift in the region with military coups. For much of the Détente period, the Vietnam War continued to rage. Neither side trusted the other fully and the potential for nuclear war remained. Each side continued to have thousands of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) pointed at the other's cities, SLBM submarines in the oceans of the world, hundreds of nuclear-armed aircraft deployed, and forces guarding disputed borders in Korea and Europe. The espionage war continued unabated as defectors, reconnaissance satellites, and signal interceptions were still a priority for both sides.

End of Détente

Détente began to unravel in 1979 due to a series of events. The Iranian Revolution and the subsequent hostage crisis embarrassed the United States and led much of the American public to believe their nation had lost its international power and prestige.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan that was launched to shore up a struggling allied regime, led to a swift denunciation by the United States and its Western allies and a boycott of the 1980 Summer Olympics, which were to be held in Moscow. American President Jimmy Carter boosted the U.S. defense budget and began financially aiding the President of Pakistan General Muhammad Zia-ul-Haq heavily, who would in turn subsidize the anti-Soviet Mujahideen fighters in the region.

The 1980 American presidential election saw Ronald Reagan elected on a platform opposed to the concessions of Détente. Negotiations on SALT II were subsequently abandoned.

❄ ❄ ❄ ❄ ❄

Q.19 What do you know about the congress of Vienna? Give your answer in detail.

Ans. **Congress of Vienna**

The Congress of Vienna was a conference of ambassadors of European states chaired by Klemens Wenzel von Metternich, and held in Vienna from September, 1814 to June, 1815.[1]The objective of the Congress was to settle the many issues arising from the French Revolutionary Wars, the Napoleonic Wars, and the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire. This objective resulted in the redrawing of the continent's political map, establishing the boundaries of France, Napoleon's Duchy of Warsaw, the Netherlands, the states of the Rhine, the German province of Saxony, and various Italian territories, and the creation of spheres of influence through which Austria, Britain, France and Russia brokered local and regional problems. The Congress of Vienna was the first of a series of international meetings that came to be known as the Concert of Europe, which was an attempt to forge a peaceful balance of power in Europe, and served as a model for later organizations such as the League of Nations and United Nations.

The immediate background was Napoleonic France's defeat and surrender in May 1814, which brought an end to twenty-five years of nearly continuous war. Negotiations continued despite the outbreak of fighting triggered by Napoleon'sdramatic return from exile and resumption of power in France during the Hundred Days of March–July, 1815. The Congress's "Final Act" was signed nine days before his final defeat at Waterloo on June 18, 1815.

In a technical sense, the "Congress of Vienna" was not properly a Congress: it never met in plenary session, and most of the discussions occurred in informal, face-to-face, sessions among the Great Powers of Austria, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and sometimes Prussia, with limited or no participation by other delegates. On the other hand, the Congress was the first occasion in history where, on a continental scale, national representatives came together to formulate treaties, instead of relying mostly on messengers and messages between the several capitals. The Congress of Vienna settlement, despite later changes, formed the framework for European international politics until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914.

Preliminaries

Partial settlements had already occurred at the Treaty of Paris between France and the Sixth Coalition, and the Treaty of Kiel which covered issues raised regarding Scandinavia. The Treaty of Paris had determined that a "general congress" should be held in Vienna, and that invitations would be issued to "all the Powers engaged on either side in the present war." The opening was scheduled for July 1814.

The Four Great Powers and Bourbon France

The Four Great Powers had previously formed the core of the Sixth Coalition. In the verge of Napoleon's defeat they had outlined their common position in the Treaty of Chaumont (March 1814), and negotiated the Treaty of Paris (1814) with the Bourbons during their restoration:

1. Austria was represented by Prince Metternich, the Foreign Minister, and by his deputy, Baron Johann von Wessenberg. Given the Congress's sessions were in Vienna, Emperor Francis was kept closely informed.

2. The United Kingdom was represented first by its Foreign Secretary, Viscount Castlereagh; then by the Duke of Wellington, after Castlereagh's return to England in February 1815; and in the last weeks, by the Earl of Clancarty, after Wellington left to face Napoleon during the Hundred Days.

3. Although Russia's official delegation was led by the foreign minister, Count Karl Robert Nesselrode, Tsar Alexander I was also in Vienna and regarded himself - in fact as well as in name - its own sole plenipotentiary.

4. Prussia was represented by Prince Karl August von Hardenberg, the Chancellor, and the diplomat and scholar Wilhelm von Humboldt. King Frederick William III of Prussia was also in Vienna, playing his role behind the scenes.

5. France, the "fifth" power, was represented by her foreign minister, Charles Maurice de Talleyrand-Périgord as well as the Minister Plenipotentiary the Duke of Dalberg. Talleyrand had already negotiated the Treaty of Paris (1814) for Louis XVIII of France; the king, however, distrusted him and was also secretly negotiating with Metternich, by mail.

The four other signatories of the Treaty of Paris, 1814

These parties had not been part of the Chaumont agreement, but had joined the Treaty of Paris (1814):

1. Spain – Marquis Pedro Gómez de Labrador

2. Portugal – Plenipotentiaries: Pedro de Sousa Holstein, Count of Palmella; António de Saldanha da Gama; Joaquim Lobo da Silveira.

3. Sweden and Norway – Count Carl Löwenhielm

4. Republic of Genoa - Marquise Agostino Pareto, Senator of the Republic

Others

1. Denmark – Count Niels Rosenkrantz, foreign minister. King Frederick VI was also present in Vienna.

2. The Netherlands – Earl of Clancarty, the British Ambassador at the Dutch court,[9][10] and Baron Hans von Gagern

3. Switzerland – Every canton had its own delegation. Charles Pictet de Rochemont from Geneva played a prominent role.

4. The Papal States – Cardinal Ercole Consalvi

5. On German issues,
    - Bavaria - Maximilian Graf von Montgelas
    - Württemberg - Georg Ernst Levin Graf von Wintzingerode
    - Hanover, then in a personal union with the British crown –
    - Mecklenburg-Schwerin - Leopold von Plessen

Virtually every state in Europe had a delegation in Vienna – more than 200 states and princely houses were represented at the Congress. In addition, there were representatives of cities, corporations, religious organizations and special interest groups

e.g. a delegation representing German publishers, demanding a copyright law and freedom of the press.

Course of the Congress

Initially, the representatives of the four victorious powers hoped to exclude the French from serious participation in the negotiations, but Talleyrand managed to skillfully insert himself into "her inner councils" in the first weeks of negotiations. He allied himself to a Committee of Eight lesser powers to control the negotiations. Once Talleyrand was able to use this committee to make himself a part of the inner negotiations, he then left this committee, once again abandoning his allies.

The major Allies' indecision on how to conduct their affairs without provoking a united protest from the lesser powers led to the calling of a preliminary conference on protocol, to which Talleyrand and the Marquis of Labrador, Spain's representative, were invited on September 30, 1814.

Congress Secretary Friedrich von Gentz reported, "The intervention of Talleyrand and Labrador has hopelessly upset all our plans. Talleyrand protested against the procedure we have adopted and soundly be rated us for two hours. It was a scene I shall never forget." The embarrassed representatives of the Allies replied that the document concerning the protocol they had arranged actually meant nothing. "If it means so little, why did you sign it?" snapped Labrador.

Talleyrand's policy, directed as much by national as personal ambitions, demanded the close but by no means amicable relationship he had with Labrador, whom Talleyrand regarded with disdain. Labrador later remarked of Talleyrand: "that cripple, unfortunately, is going to Vienna." Talleyrand skirted additional articles suggested by Labrador: he had no intention of handing over the 12,000 afrancesados - Spanish fugitives, sympathetic to France, who had sworn fealty to Joseph Bonaparte - nor the bulk of the documents, paintings, pieces of fine art, and works of hydrography and natural history that had been looted from the archives, palaces, churches and cathedrals of Spain.

Final Act

The Final Act, embodying all the separate treaties, was signed on June 9, 1815. Its provisions included:

1. Russia was given most of the Duchy of Warsaw (Poland) and was allowed to keep Finland.

2. Prussia was given two fifths of Saxony, parts of the Duchy of Warsaw, Danzig, and the Rhineland/Westphalia.

3. A German Confederation of 38 states was created from the previous 360 of the Holy Roman Empire, under the presidency of the Austrian Emperor. Only portions of the territory of Austria and Prussia were included in the Confederation.

4. The Netherlands and the Southern Netherlands were united in a constitutional monarchy, the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, with the House of Orange-Nassau providing the king.

5. To compensate for the Orange-Nassau's loss of the Nassau lands to Prussia, the United Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg were

to form a personal union under the House of Orange-Nassau, with Luxembourg inside the German Confederation.

6. Swedish Pomerania, ceded to Denmark a year earlier, was ceded to Prussia.

7. The neutrality of Switzerland was guaranteed.

8. Hanover gave up the Duchy of Lauenburg to Denmark, but was enlarged by the addition of former territories of the Bishop of Münster and by the formerly Prussian East Frisia, and made a kingdom.

9. Most of the territorial gains of Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, Hesse-Darmstadt, and Nassau under the mediatizations of 1801–1806 were recognized. Bavaria also gained control of the Rhenish Palatinate and parts of the Napoleonic Duchy of Würzburg and Grand Duchy of Frankfurt. Hesse-Darmstadt, in exchange for giving up the Duchy of Westphalia to Prussia, was granted the city.

10. Austria regained control of the Tirol and Salzburg; of the former Illyrian Provinces; of Tarnopoldistrict (from Russia); received Lombardy-Venetia in Italy and Dubrovnik in Dalmatia. Former Austrian territory in Southwest Germany remained under the control of Württemberg and Baden, and the Austrian Netherlands were also not recovered.

11. Habsburg princes were returned to control of the Grand Duchy of Tuscany and the Duchy of Modena.

12. The Papal States were under the rule of the pope and restored to their former extent, with the exception of Avignon and the Comtat Venaissin, which remained part of France.

13. The United Kingdom was confirmed in control of the Cape Colony in Southern Africa; Tobago; Ceylon; and various other colonies in Africa and Asia. Other colonies, most notably the Dutch East Indies and Martinique, were restored to their previous owners.

14. The King of Sardinia was restored in Piedmont, Nice, and Savoy, and was given control of Genoa.

15. The Duchies of Parma, Piacenza and Guastalla were given to Marie Louise, Napoleon's wife.

16. The Duchy of Lucca was created for the House of Bourbon-Parma, which would have reversionary rights to Parma after the death of Marie Louise.

17. The Bourbon Ferdinand IV, King of Sicily was restored to control of the Kingdom of Naples after Joachim Murat, the king installed by Bonaparte, supported Napoleon in the Hundred Days and started the Neapolitan War by attacking Austria.

18. The slave trade was condemned.

19. Freedom of navigation was guaranteed for many rivers, notably the Rhine and the Danube.

Polish-Saxon crisis

The most controversial subject at the Congress was the so-called Polish-Saxon Crisis. The Russians and Prussians proposed a deal in which much of the Prussian and Austrian shares of the partitions of Poland would go to Russia, which would create a

Polish Kingdom in personal union with Russia and Alexander as king. In compensation, the Prussians would receive all of Saxony, whose King was considered to have forfeited his throne as he had not abandoned Napoleon soon enough. The Austrians, French, and British did not approve of this plan, and, at the inspiration of Talleyrand, signed a secret treaty on January 3, 1815, agreeing to go to war, if necessary, to prevent the Russo-Prussian plan from coming to fruition.

Though none of the three powers was ready for war, the Russians did not call the bluff, and an amicable settlement was set on October 24, 1814, by which Russia received most of the Napoleonic Duchy of Warsaw as a "Kingdom of Poland" - called Congress Poland - but did not receive the district of Poznań, Grand Duchy of Poznań, which was given to Prussia, nor Kraków, which became a free city. Prussia received 40% of Saxony - later known as the Province of Saxony, with the remainder returned to King Frederick Augustus I - Kingdom of Saxony.

Other changes

The Congress's principal results, apart from its confirmation of France's loss of the territories annexed between 1795–1810, which had already been settled by the Treaty of Paris, were the enlargement of Russia, and Prussia, which acquired Westphaliaand the northern Rhineland. The consolidation of Germany from the nearly 300 states of the Holy Roman Empire into a much more manageable thirty-nine states was confirmed. These states were formed into a loose German Confederation under the leadership of Prussia and Austria.

Representatives at the Congress agreed to numerous other territorial changes. By the Treaty of Kiel, Norway had been ceded by the king of Denmark-Norway to the king of Sweden. This sparked the nationalist movement which led to the establishment of the Kingdom of Norway on May 17, 1814 and the subsequent personal Union with Sweden. Austria gained Lombardy-Venetia in Northern Italy, while much of the rest of North-Central Italy went to Habsburg dynasties. The Papal States were restored to the Pope. The Kingdom of Piedmont-Sardinia was restored to its mainland possessions, and also gained control of the Republic of Genoa. In Southern Italy, Napoleon's brother-in-law, Joachim Murat, was originally allowed to retain his Kingdom of Naples, but his support of Napoleon in the Hundred Days led to the restoration of the Bourbon Ferdinand IV to the throne.

A large United Kingdom of the Netherlands was created for the Prince of Orange, including both the old United Provinces and the formerly Austrian-ruled territories in the Southern Netherlands. There were other, less important territorial adjustments, including significant territorial gains for the German Kingdoms of Hanover and Bavaria. The Duchy of Lauenburgwas transferred from Hanover to Denmark, and Swedish Pomerania was annexed by Prussia. Switzerland was enlarged, and Swiss neutrality was established. Swiss mercenaries had played a significant role in European Wars for a couple of hundred years, and the intention was to put a stop to these activities permanently.

During the wars, Portugal had lost its town of Olivença to Spain and moved to have it restored. Portugal is historically the oldest ally of the United Kingdom, and with its support succeeded in having the re-incorporation of Olivença decreed in Article 105 of

the Final Act, which stated that the Congress "understood the occupation of Olivença to be illegal and recognized Portugal's rights". Portugal ratified the Final Act in 1815 but Spain would not sign and this became the most important hold-out against the Congress of Vienna. Deciding in the end that it was better to become part of Europe than stand alone, Spain finally accepted the Treaty on May 7, 1817; however, Olivença and its surroundings were never returned to Portuguese control and this question remains unresolved. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland received parts of the West Indies at the expense of the Netherlands and Spain and kept the former Dutch colonies of Ceylon and the Cape Colony as well as Malta and Heligoland. Under the Treaty of Paris, Britain obtained the protectorate over the United States of the Ionian Islands and the Seychelles.

Later criticism

The Congress of Vienna was frequently criticized by nineteenth-century and more recent historians for ignoring national and liberal impulses, and for imposing a stifling reaction on the Continent. It was an integral part in what became known as the Conservative Order, in which the liberties and civil rights associated with the American and French Revolutions were de-emphasized, so that a fair balance of power, peace and stability, might be achieved.

In the 20th century, however, many historians have come to admire the statesmen at the Congress, whose work prevented another widespread European war for nearly a hundred years . Among these is Henry Kissinger, who wrote his doctoral dissertation, A World Restored (1957), on it. Prior to the opening of the Paris peace conference of 1918, the British Foreign Office commissioned a history of the Congress of Vienna to serve as an example to its own delegates of how to achieve an equally successful peace. Besides, the main decisions of the Congress were made by the Four Great Powers and not all the countries of Europe could extend their rights at the Congress. The Italian peninsula became a mere "geographical expression" as divided into eight parts: Lombardy, Modena, Naples-Sicily, Parma, Piedmont-Sardinia, Tuscany, Venetia and the Papal States under the control of different powers. Poland was under the influence of Russia after the Congress. The arrangements made by the Four Great Powers sought to ensure future disputes would be settled in a manner that would avoid the terrible wars of the previous twenty years. Although, the Congress of Vienna preserved the balance of power in Europe, it could not check the spread of revolutionary movements across the continent some 30 years later.

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.20 What is disarmament? What are to disarmament barriers?

Ans. Disarmament

Disarmament is the act of reducing, limiting, or abolishing weapons. Disarmament generally refers to a country's militaryor specific type of weaponry. Disarmament is often taken to mean total elimination of weapons of mass destruction, such as nuclear arms. General and Complete Disarmament refers to the removal of all weaponry, including conventional arms.

Definitions of disarmament

Disarmament can be contrasted with arms control, which essentially refers to the act of controlling arms rather than eliminating them. A distinction can also be made between disarmament as a process, and disarmament as an end state. Disarmament has also come to be associated with two things:

- Nuclear disarmament, referring to the elimination of nuclear weapons.
- Unilateral disarmament, the elimination of weapons outside of the framework of an international agreement, i.e., they are not bound by a treaty such as START.

Philosophically, disarmament may be viewed as a form of demilitarization; part of an economic, political, technical, and military process to reduce and eliminate weapons systems. Thus, disarmament may be part of a set of other strategies, like economic conversion, which aim to reduce the power of war making institutions and associated constituencies.

History

An example on the feasibility of the elimination of weapons is the policy of gradual reduction of guns in Japan during the Tokugawa shogunate. In two centuries, Japan passed from being the country with more guns per capita to producing none.

In the early 1930s, US President Franklin D. Roosevelt sent this message to the World Disarmament Conference: "If all nations will agree wholly to eliminate from possession and use the weapons which make possible a successful attack, defences automatically will become impregnable and the frontiers and independence of every nation will become secure."

In 1961, US President John F. Kennedy gave a speech before the UN General Assembly where he announced the US "intention to challenge the Soviet Union, not to an arms race, but to a peace race - to advance together step by step, stage by stage, until general and complete disarmament has been achieved." He went on to call for a global general and complete disarmament, offering a rough outline for how this could be accomplished:

The program to be presented to this assembly - for general and complete disarmament under effective international control - moves to bridge the gap between those who insist on a gradual approach and those who talk only of the final and total achievement. It would create machinery to keep the peace as it destroys the machinery of war. It would proceed through balanced and safeguarded stages designed to give no state a military advantage over another. It would place the final responsibility for verification and control where it belongs, not with the big powers alone, not with one's adversary or one's self, but in an international organization within the framework of the United Nations. It would assure that indispensable condition of disarmament - true inspection - and apply it in stages proportionate to the stage of disarmament. It would cover delivery systems as well as weapons. It would ultimately halt their production as well as their testing, their transfer as well as their possession. It would achieve under the eyes of an international disarmament organization, a steady reduction in force, both nuclear and conventional, until it has abolished all armies and all weapons except those needed for internal order and a new United Nations Peace Force. And it starts that process now, today, even as the talks begin. In short, general and complete disarmament must no

longer be a slogan, used to resist the first steps. It is no longer to be a goal without means of achieving it, without means of verifying its progress, without means of keeping the peace. It is now a realistic plan, and a test - a test of those only willing to talk and a test of those willing to act.

Disarmament conferences and treaties

1899: Hague Conferences

1932-34: World Disarmament Conference

1960: Ten Nation Disarmament Committee

1962-1968: Eighteen Nation Disarmament Committee

1969-1978: Conference of the Committee on Disarmament

1979-present: Conference on Disarmament (CD)

1908-1909: London Naval Conference

1921-1922: Washington Naval Conference

1927: Geneva Naval Conference

1930: London Naval Conference leading to the London Naval Treaty

1935: London Naval Conference leading to the Second London Naval Treaty

Nuclear disarmament

Nuclear disarmament refers to both the act of reducing or eliminating nuclear weapons and to the end state of a nuclear-free world, in which nuclear weapons are completely eliminated.

Proponents of nuclear disarmament say that it would lessen the probability of nuclear war occurring, especially accidentally. Critics of nuclear disarmament say that it would undermine deterrence.

Major nuclear disarmament groups include Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Green peace and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. There have been many large anti-nuclear demonstrations and protests. On June 12, 1982, one million people demonstrated in New York City's Central Park against nuclear weapons and for an end to the cold war arms race. It was the largest anti-nuclear protest and the largest political demonstration in American history.

Disarmament barriers

The political and economic barriers to disarmament are considerable, mostly based on the concentrated power of those supporting militaristic approaches to foreign policy. One key barrier is ideological. Many foundations and universities have failed to support research in disarmament, instead favoring more ad hoc and limited approaches like arms control, conflict resolution, and limits on weapons systems in specific countries. Part of this may be pragmatism, but often it is the result of a limited understanding of the history of disarmament. Attempts to restrict nuclear proliferation are of course a necessity. Bolstering these efforts would be assisted by checking the link between military intervention and nuclear proliferation. Many countries fearful of being invaded, particularly by the U.S., have tried to secure or develop nuclear weapons. As a result, policies to limit military interventions may be part of a larger demilitarization program.

Misconceptions about disarmament

In his definition of "disarmament", David Carlton writes in the Oxford University Press Political dictionary, "But confidence in such measures of arms control, especially when unaccompanied by extensive means of verification, has not been strengthened by the revelation that the Soviet Union in its last years successfully concealed consistent and systematic cheating on its obligations under the Biological Weapons Convention." He also notes, "Now a freeze or a mutually agreed increase is not strictly speaking disarmament at all. And such measures may not even be intended to be a first step towards any kind of reduction or abolition. For the aim may simply be to promote stability in force structures. Hence a new term to cover such cases has become fashionable since the 1960s, namely, arms control."

Disarmament by definition involves inspection and verification procedures. Thus, the book by Seymour Melman, Inspection for Disarmament, addresses various problems related to the problem of inspection for disarmament, evasion teams, and capabilities and limitations of aerial inspection. Gradually, as the idea of arms control displaced the idea of disarmament, the weaknesses of the present arms control paradigm have created problems for the idea of disarmament itself.

❊ ❊ ❊ ❊ ❊

Q.21 What do you know about nuclear disarmament? What is the U.S nuclear policy?

Ans.   Nuclear disarmament

Nuclear disarmament refers to both the act of reducing or eliminating nuclear weapons and to the end state of a nuclear-free world, in which nuclear weapons are completely eliminated.

Major nuclear disarmament groups include Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament, Green peace and International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. There have been many large anti-nuclear demonstrations and protests. On June 12, 1982, one million people demonstrated in New York City's Central Park against nuclear weapons and for an end to the cold war arms race. It was the largest anti-nuclear protest and the largest political demonstration in American history.

Proponents of nuclear disarmament say that it would lessen the probability of nuclear war occurring, especially accidentally. Critics of nuclear disarmament say that it would undermine deterrence.

History

After the Partial Test Ban Treaty(1963), which prohibited atmospheric testing, the movement against nuclear weapons somewhat subsided in the 1970s.

In the 1980s, a popular movement for nuclear disarmament again gained strength in the light of the weapons build-up and aggressive rhetoric of US President Ronald Reagan. Reagan had "a world free of nuclear weapons" as his personal mission, and was largely scorned for this in Europe. His officials tried to stop such talks but Reagan was able to start discussions on nuclear disarmament with Soviet Union. He changed the name "SALT" (Strategic Arms Limitation Talks) to "START".

After the 1986 Reykjavik summit between U.S. President Ronald Reagan and the new Soviet General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev, the United States and the Soviet Union concluded two important nuclear arms reduction treaties: the INF Treaty (1987) and START I(1991). After the end of the Cold War, the United States and the Russian Federation concluded the Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty(2023) and the New START Treaty (2010).

In the Soviet Union (USSR), voices against nuclear weapons were few and far between since there was no widespread Freedom of speech and Freedom of the press as political factors. Certain citizens who had become prominent enough to safely criticize the Soviet government, such as Andrei Sakharov, did speak out against nuclear weapons, but that was to little effect.

When the extreme danger intrinsic to nuclear war and the possession of nuclear weapons became apparent to all sides during the Cold War, a series of disarmament and nonproliferation treaties were agreed upon between the United States, the Soviet Union, and several other states throughout the world. Many of these treaties involved years of negotiations, and seemed to result in important steps in arms reductions and reducing the risk of nuclear war.

Key treaties

- Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) 1963: Prohibited all testing of nuclear weapons except underground.

- Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty(NPT)—signed 1968, came into force 1970: An international treaty to limit the spread of nuclear weapons. The treaty has three main pillars: nonproliferation, disarmament, and the right to peacefully use nuclear technology.

- Interim Agreement on Offensive Arms(SALT I) 1972: The Soviet Union and the United States agreed to a freeze in the number of intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) and submarine-launched ballistic missiles(SLBMs) that they would deploy.

- Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty(ABM) 1972: The United States and Soviet Union could deploy ABM interceptors at two sites, each with up to 100 ground-based launchers for ABM interceptor missiles. In a 1974 Protocol, the US and Soviet Union agreed to only deploy an ABM system to one site.

- Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty(SALT II) 1979: Replacing SALT I, SALT II limited both the Soviet Union and the United States to an equal number of ICBM launchers, SLBM launchers, and heavy bombers. Also placed limits on Multiple Independent Reentry Vehicles (MIRVS).

- Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF) 1987: Created a global ban on short- and long-range nuclear weapons systems, as well as an intrusive verification regime.

- Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty(START I)—signed 1991, ratified 1994: Limited long-range nuclear forces in the United States and the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union to 6,000 attributed warheads on 1,600 ballistic missiles and bombers.

- Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty II(START II)—signed 1993, never put into force: START II was a bilateral agreement between the US and Russia which attempted to commit each side to deploy no more than 3,000 to 3,500 warheads by December 2007 and also included a prohibition against deploying multiple independent reentry vehicles (MIRVs) on intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs)

- Strategic Offensive Reductions Treaty(SORT or Moscow Treaty)—signed 2002, into force 2003: A very loose treaty that is often criticized by arms control advocates for its ambiguity and lack of depth, Russia and the United States agreed to reduce their "strategic nuclear warheads" (a term that remain undefined in the treaty) to between 1,700 and 2,200 by 2012.

- Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty(CTBT)—signed 1996, not yet in force: The CTBT is an international treaty that bans all nuclear explosions in all environments. While the treaty is not in force, Russia has not tested a nuclear weapon since 1990 and the United States has not since 1992.

- New START Treaty—signed 2010, into force in 2011: replaces SORT treaty, reduces deployed nuclear warheads by about half, will remain into force until at least 2021

- Only one country has been known to ever dismantle their nuclear arsenal completely—the apartheid government of South Africa apparently developed half a dozen crude fission weapons during the 1980s, but they were dismantled in the early 1990s.

Nuclear disarmament movement

In 1954 Japanese peace movements converged to form a unified "Japanese Council Against Atomic and Hydrogen Bombs". Japanese opposition to the Pacific nuclear weapons tests was widespread, and "an estimated 35 million signatures were collected on petitions calling for bans on nuclear weapons".

In the United Kingdom, the first Aldermaston Marchorganised by the Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament took place at Easter 1958, when several thousand people marched for four days from Trafalgar Square, London, to the Atomic Weapons Research Establishment close to Aldermaston in Berkshire, England, to demonstrate their opposition to nuclear weapons. The Aldermaston marches continued into the late 1960s when tens of thousands of people took part in the four-day marches.

In 1959, a letter in the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists was the start of a successful campaign to stop the Atomic Energy Commission dumping radioactive waste in the sea 19 kilometres from Boston. In 1962, Linus Pauling won the Nobel Peace Prize for his work to stop the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons, and the "Ban the Bomb" movement spread.

In 1963, many countries ratified the Partial Test Ban Treaty prohibiting atmospheric nuclear testing. Radioactive fallout became less of an issue and the nuclear disarmament movement went into decline for some years.

On June 12, 1982, one million people demonstrated in New York City's Central Park against nuclear weapons and for an end to the cold war arms race. It was the largest

anti-nuclear protest and the largest political demonstration in American history. International Day of Nuclear Disarmament protests were held on June 20, 1983 at 50 sites across the United States. In 1986, hundreds of people walked from Los Angeles to Washington DC in the Great Peace March for Global Nuclear Disarmament. There were many Nevada Desert Experience protests and peace camps at the Nevada Test Site during the 1980s and 1990s.

On May 1, 2005, 40,000 anti-nuclear/anti-war protesters marched past the United Nations in New York, 60 years after the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki. This was the largest anti-nuclear rally in the U.S. for several decades. In Britain, there were many protests about the government's proposal to replace the aging Trident weapons system with a newer model. The largest protest had 100,000 participants and, according to polls, 59 percent of the public opposed the move.

The International Conference on Nuclear Disarmament took place in Oslo in February, 2008, and was organized by The Government of Norway, the Nuclear Threat Initiative and the Hoover Institute. The Conference was entitled Achieving the Vision of a World Free of Nuclear Weapons and had the purpose of building consensus between nuclear weapon states and non-nuclear weapon states in relation to the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty.

US nuclear policy

Despite a general trend toward disarmament in the early 1990s, the George W. Bush administration repeatedly pushed to fund policies that would allegedly make nuclear weapons more usable in the post–Cold War environment,. To date the U.S. Congress has refused to fund many of these policies. However, some feel that even considering such programs harms the credibility of the United States as a proponent of nonproliferation.

Recent controversial U.S. nuclear policies

1. Reliable Replacement Warhead Program (RRW): This program seeks to replace existing warheads with a smaller number of warhead types designed to be easier to maintain without testing. Critics charge that this would lead to a new generation of nuclear weapons and would increase pressures to test. Congress has not funded this program.

2. Complex Transformation: Complex transformation, formerly known as Complex 2030, is an effort to shrink the U.S. nuclear weapons complex and restore the ability to produce "pits" the fissile cores of the primaries of U.S. thermonuclear weapons. Critics see it as an upgrade to the entire nuclear weapons complex to support the production and maintenance of the new generation of nuclear weapons. Congress has not funded this program.

3. Nuclear bunker buster: Formally known as the Robust Nuclear Earth Penetrator (RNEP), this program aimed to modify an existing gravity bomb to penetrate into soil and rockin order to destroy underground targets. Critics argue that this would lower the threshold for use of nuclear weapons. Congress did not fund this proposal, which was later withdrawn.

4. Missile Defense: Formerly known as National Missile Defense, this program seeks to build a network of interceptor missiles to protect the United States and

its allies from incoming missiles, including nuclear-armed missiles. Critics have argued that this would impede nuclear disarmament and possibly stimulate a nuclear arms race. Elements of missile defense are being deployed in Poland and the Czech Republic, despite Russian opposition.

Former U.S. officials Henry Kissinger, George Shultz, Bill Perry, and Sam Nunn proposed in January 2007 that the United States rededicate itself to the goal of eliminating nuclear weapons, concluding: "We endorse setting the goal of a world free of nuclear weapons and working energetically on the actions required to achieve that goal." Arguing a year later that "with nuclear weapons more widely available, deterrence is decreasingly effective and increasingly hazardous," the authors concluded that although "it is tempting and easy to say we can't get there from here, . . . we must chart a course" toward that goal." During his Presidential campaign, U.S. President Elect Barack Obama pledged to "set a goal of a world without nuclear weapons, and pursue it."

U.S. policy options for nuclear terrorism

The United States has taken the lead in ensuring that nuclear materials globally are properly safeguarded. A popular program that has received bipartisan domestic support for over a decade is the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program (CTR). While this program has been deemed a success, many believe that its funding levels need to be increased so as to ensure that all dangerous nuclear materials are secured in the most expeditious manner possible. The CTR program has led to several other innovative and important nonproliferation programs that need to continue to be a budget priority in order to ensure that nuclear weapons do not spread to actors hostile to the United States.

Key programs:

Cooperative Threat Reduction(CTR): The CTR program provides funding to help Russia secure materials that might be used in nuclear or chemical weapons as well as to dismantle weapons of mass destructionand their associated infrastructure in Russia.

Global Threat Reduction Initiative(GTRI): Expanding on the success of the CTR, the GTRI will expand nuclear weapons and material securing and dismantlement activities to states outside of the former Soviet Union.

Other states

While the vast majority of states have adhered to the stipulations of the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty, a few states have either refused to sign the treaty or have pursued nuclear weapons programs while not being members of the treaty. Many view the pursuit of nuclear weapons by these states as a threat to nonproliferation and world peace, and therefore seek policies to discourage the spread of nuclear weapons to these states, a few of which are often described by the US as "rogue states".

- Declared nuclear weapon states not party to the NPT:
- Indian nuclear weapons: 80–110 active warheads
- Pakistani nuclear weapons: 90–110 active warheads
- North Korean nuclear weapons: <10 active warheads
- Undeclared nuclear weapon states not party to the NPT:
- Israeli nuclear weapons: 75–200 active warheads

- Nuclear weapon states not party to the NPT that disarmed and joined the NPT as non-nuclear weapons states:
- South African nuclear weapons: disarmed from 1989–1993
- Former Soviet states that disarmed and joined the NPT as non-nuclear weapons states:
- Belarus
- Kazakhstan
- Ukraine
- Non-nuclear weapon states party to the NPT currently accused of seeking nuclear weapons:
- Iran
- Non-nuclear weapon states party to the NPT who acknowledged and eliminated past nuclear weapons programs:

❈ ❈ ❈ ❈ ❈

Q.22 What is Imperialism? Give your answer critically.
Ans.   Imperialism

Imperialism is the forceful extension of a nation's authority by territorial conquest or by establishing economic and political domination of other nations that are not its colonies. In various forms, imperialism may be as old as humanity. In the prehistorical world, clan groups extended their territory and dominated others, competing against them for food and resources. Negatively, many cultures have suffered due to imperial domination since the dominant have often regarded themselves as superior and have neglected, or even deliberately destroyed, indigenous cultures.

Yet, an interesting aspect of imperialism is that empires, both ancient and modern, have also tended to regard themselves as spreading order, morality, the true religion and civilization, and have even claimed to occupy the high moral ground. Imperial projects ranging from that of Alexander the Great, through the Roman Empire, to the British and Napoleonic empires saw themselves as instruments for good in the world, even though their expansion was usually violent. Imperialism is often linked with totalitarian enterprises, since the colonized rarely had much say in their governance. However, democracies have also engaged in imperial acts. The United States regards the defense of democracy and of freedom as fundamental to its identity and mission in the world, yet it has also engaged in imperial pursuits. As a matter of fact, Empires have established peace and stability for vast numbers of people. The world has been shaped and molded by the creation and break-up of Empires, forming linguistic and cultural alliances that have survived the negative aspects of cultural and political domination. That the world community can speak about shared values and of universal human rights to a large degree follows from the fact that huge portions of the planet formerly lived under imperial rule. Humanity may be evolving to a stage when exploitation of others and promotion of self-interest over—and against—that of others will yield to a new way

of being human, in which humanity seeks to promote the well-being of the whole, and to restore its broken relationship with the one planet on which all people live.

Overview

Imperialism is the domination of one people by another. Imperialism is found in the ancient histories of China, India, the Middle East, Egypt, Africa, and American Indian societies. West Europe was shaped by the Roman Empire, from which many of its laws and customs are derived. Small imperial projects vied for power throughout the Middle Ages within the European space but it was with the discovery of the New World and territorial conquest overseas that Spain and Portugal, followed by the British, the French, the Dutch, and others, that European powers began to encircle the globe. Although the practice dates thousands of years, the nineteenth century is the "Age of Imperialism" and refers to Europeans colonizing other countries. The term "Imperialism" was coined in the sixteenth century, reflecting the imperial policies of Spain, Portugal, Britain, France, and the Netherlands into Africa and the Americas.

What was called the Scramble for Africa saw the European powers literally divide a whole continent up among themselves, with no regard for the rights of its indigenous peoples. The Europeans were convinced that they were racially superior to the Africans and that their colonization of Africa would ultimately benefit Africans, who would be educated and "civilized." Religious motive also featured since, for many involved in the imperial project, the task of spreading Christianity as the only true religion was part and parcel of the process. Earlier, the Pope had divided the world into two on behalf of Spain and Portugal on the condition that missionaries accompany the conquerors. Religiously inspired imperialism also characterized the expansion of Muslim power throughout the world, which classical convention divided into the House of Islam, where true faith was practiced, and the House of Rebellion, where people lived in a state of unbelief.

Imperialism without conquest

Currently, "imperialism" applies to any instance of a greater power acting or being perceived to act at the expense of a lesser power. Including "perception" in the definition makes it circular, solipsistic, and subjective. Imperialism not only describes colonial, territorial policies, but also describes economic dominance and influence. This is also referred to as neo-colonialism. Neo-colonialism, too, may involve non-state actors. Huge multi or trans-national corporations, whose resources are many times larger than those of other nations, and even of several nations themselves, act in their own interests across the globe. In the nineteenth century, the European powers—especially Britain and France—sometimes pursued an imperial policy that imposed trade-treaties and carved out commercial concessions in, for example, China, Iran, and the Ottoman Empire, without actually assuming full political authority and without asserting or acquiring territorial domination.

The United States pursued a similar policy, although it did acquire some territories as well. Economic motivations mingled within the American imperial project with the ideals expressed in the concept of Manifest Destiny, that is, of spreading freedom and democracy around the world as it had across North America. The United States role in post-World War II Japan may be cited as an example of this role. The

concept of an American Empire was first spoken of following the Spanish-American War of 1898. In addition to the acquisition of certain overseas possessions, the phenomeron of military posts overseas has been associated with American imperialism. Post-World War I, the League of Nations created mandates, that is, territories that had belonged to the defeated powers but which were deemed unready for self-government and were entrusted to the victors, whose task it was to construct nation states that would eventually become independent. The way that the richer nations of the world dominate the global economic system, including international financial institutions such as the World Bank, is regarded as a form of neo-colonialism. The level of financial indebtedness of many developing nations to the West undermines their autonomy and perpetuates Western control. Inability to meet payments fuels the Western attitude that "these people cannot manage their own economies" and that they were better off when ruled by others. Yet, the West is largely unwilling to recognize that the impoverishment of parts of the developing world and its continued reliance on aid is a direct result of past imperial exploitation. Chaotic governance, too, is rarely recognized as the result of the failure of the former imperial powers to nurture mature indigenous leadership. Often, the imperial powers imprisoned the leaders of independence movements and did nothing to nurture them as genuine democratic politicians.

Lenin's theory of Imperialism

European intellectuals first developed formal theories of imperialism. In Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism (1916), Lenin said capitalism necessarily induced monopoly capitalism as imperialism to find new business and resources, representing the last and highest stage of capitalism. The necessary expansion of capitalism beyond the boundaries of nation-states—a foundation of Leninism—was shared by Rosa Luxemburg and liberal philosopher Hannah Arendt. Since then, Marxist scholars extended Lenin's theory to be synonymous with capitalist international trade and banking.

Although Karl Marx did not publish a theory of imperialism, he identified colonialism as an aspect of the prehistory of the capitalist mode of production. He analyzed British colonial rule in Ireland and India; it was good for India, being the progressive influence that shook it out from centuries-long stagnation and lethargy, thus ending some of the most brutal cultural practices in world history. Lenin's definition: "The highest stage of capitalism" addressed the time when monopoly finance capital was dominant, forcing nations and private corporations to compete to control the world's natural resources and markets.

Marxist imperialism theory, and the related dependency theory, emphasize the economic relationships among countries, rather than formal political and military relationships. Thus, imperialism is not necessarily direct formal control of one country by another, but the economic exploitation of one by another. This Marxism contrasts with the popular conception of imperialism, as directly-controlled colonial and neocolonial empires.

Per Lenin, Imperialism is Capitalism, with five simultaneous features: '

(1) Concentration of production and capital led to the creation of national and multinational monopolies—not as in liberal economics, but as de facto power over their markets—while "free competition" remains the domain of local and niche markets:

Free competition is the basic feature of capitalism, and of commodity production generally; monopoly is the exact opposite of free competition, but we have seen the latter being transformed into monopoly before our eyes, creating large-scale industry and forcing out small industry, replacing large-scale by still larger-scale industry, and carrying concentration of production and capital to the point where out of it has grown and is growing monopoly: cartels, syndicates and trusts, and merging with them, the capital of a dozen or so banks, which manipulate thousands of millions. At the same time the monopolies, which have grown out of free competition, do not eliminate the latter, but exist above it and alongside it, and thereby give rise to a number of very acute, intense antagonisms, frictions and conflicts. Monopoly is the transition from capitalism to a higher system.

(2) Finance capital replaces industrial capital (the dominant capital), (reiterating Rudolf Hilferding's point in Finance Capital), as industrial capitalists rely more upon bank-generated finance capital.

(3) Finance capital exportation replaces the exportation of goods.

(4) The economic division of the world, by multi-national enterprises via international cartels

(5) The political division of the world by the great powers, wherein exporting finance capital to their colonies allows their exploitation for resources and continued investment. This super exploitation of poor countries allows the capitalist industrial nations to keep some of their own workers content with slightly higher living standards.

Claiming to be Leninist, the U.S.S.R. proclaimed itself foremost an enemy of imperialism, supporting armed, national independence movements in the Third World while simultaneously dominating Eastern Europe. Marxists and Maoists to the left of Trotsky, such as Tony Cliff, claim the Soviet Union was imperialist. Maoists claim it occurred after Khrushchev's ascension in 1956; Cliff says it occurred under Stalin in the 1940s. Harry Magdoff's Age of Imperialism (1954) discusses Marxism and imperialism. Currently, Marxists view globalization as imperialism's latest incarnation.

Critique

Negative legacy

Imperial powers have often regarded themselves as superior to others, especially to those people who live in conquered territory. The Greeks, the Romans, the nineteenth century European powers, the German and Japanese imperial projects, all saw themselves as culturally, if not as racially, superior. It can be argued that Japan's imperial project was copied from the Western powers that tried to interfere in her own affairs and from Germany. From the latter, it borrowed the notion of that a great nation and civilization had the right to a breathing space. Like China, Japan had historically focused on internal unity. On the other hand, imperialism cannot be reduced to a Western phenomena copied by others. There were huge empires in Africa, the Americas, and the largest contiguous land empire in history was that of the Mongols. Imperialism appears to have been universally practiced, even though some nations have never had empires. Even smaller European countries, such as Denmark and Lithuania and the various Balkan states have had imperial episodes.

Often, the "enemy" or the "vanquished" were depicted as inferior. What people know about, for example, the Persians has often been filtered through Greek eyes, which saw them as barbarians. In the European context, the idea of the East as less moral, more chaotic than the West dates from ancient Greek attitudes. This bifurcation of the world into an ordered, moral, civilized West and a chaotic, immoral East has had a huge impact in politics, in the academy and on the popular mind. It feeds the notion of some sort of inevitable clash between the Muslim and Western worlds, with the former aided by "neo-Confucian states." Huntington argues that the clash of ideology that had resulted in the Cold War would in the future be replaced by clashes based on differences between civilizations.

Edward Said has explored how the imperial project resulted in a polarized view of the world in his Culture and Imperialism (1993) and other writings. This depiction of the East and of Africa as lacking order served as a moral justification for imperial projects. The non-Western world was territory that could be mapped, explored, exploited, evangelized, studied, conquered and governed, all for its own benefit! Careers, as well as wealth, could be made there. The European scholars and politicians and colonial administrators claimed to "know" the people they studied or ruled better than they knew themselves. Said argues that this produced a picture of the racial, religious, and cultural "Other" that rarely corresponded closely to the reality and that served the economic, political, and even academic interests of Europe. A sense of personal destiny sometimes motivated the imperial enterprise. Cecil Rhodes thought that the British Empire was willed by God. Alexander the Great and Napoleon appear to have believed in their own destiny to conquer the world. The European powers saw themselves as effortlessly superior, morally, to the Ottoman Empire, of which they were also very jealous; yet, a comparison of the realities of the Ottoman empire with European empires might suggest that this claim of moral superiority stood on very thin ground.

On the one hand, the technological and cultural achievements of those conquered might be praised but their morality or religion might be condemned. Either way, the logic was that the imperial power had some sort of moral or religious right to acquire other peoples' land. Obviously, even when some sort of so-called civilizing mission was embarked upon it was rarely, if ever, the case that the dominant power did not benefit from its imperial enterprise. In the case of Africa, European powers benefited enormously, using Africa to fuel the Industrial Revolution, but failing to build up vibrant economies, or viable and enduring infrastructures within their colonies. Colonial economies were constructed to serve the interests of the imperial powers, not to meet domestic needs. On the one hand, educational institutions were established and infrastructure such as roads and railways were constructed and these have been of some benefit to post-independent states. On the other hand, participation in governance was limited and the experience of rule by a colonial power, in its own interest, easily translated into rule by a "president for life," in his own interest. Reconstruction of what African societies were like at the time of European colonial expansion shows that in many respects they were as technologically advanced as Europe but that Europeans had more deadly weapons. African societies were also often governed with greater participation and wider consultation than European states at the time.

Notions such as Christopher Columbus "discovering" the Americas, that the only civilization produced by Africans was Ancient Egypt or of Australia as not really "belonging" to anybody until the British claimed, have become deeply embedded in Western thought. Even the naming of the indigenous peoples of the "Americas" is problematic—a term such as Native American imposes a European name, while the commonly used "Indian" arises from the original misconception that Europeans had reached India or islands in that vicinity, which they later termed the East Indies, having coined the term "West Indies" for the islands of the Caribbean. However named, indigenous peoples in many parts of the world where new nations arose as a result of imperialism are still invisible to the majority, or are simply despised. Their rights are often violated.

Positive legacy

On the other hand, such imperial projects as those of the Spanish, French, and British have spread language, and shared ideals, around much of the globe. Despite all the negative experiences of colonialism, communication and transportation infrastructures built during colonial times have brought more and more people into contact with each other. More and more people understand themselves as citizens of the world and realize that such challenges as the ecological crises, eradicating poverty, combating disease can only be met by global cooperation among the nations. Talk of universal human rights and the insight of many that shared values permeate the cultures and faiths of the world, despite their diversity and variety and some differences too, would be inconceivable but for the imperial enterprises that once crossed the globe.

Cultural traffic, despite the racist attitudes of many involved in the imperial project, too, was never one way. Many people in the West see deep and profound value in aspects of Chinese, Indian, indigenous peoples' religion, in Sufi Islam. Buddhism, Hinduism, and Islam have attracted many Western converts. New Age and New Religious Movements and other phenomena often fuse ideas from East and West. The non-Western world has also absorbed much from the West, keeping what it wants, adapting and adjusting technologies and ideas to suit local requirements, or to conform to local values. Imperial projects can be seen as essential to the process of creating a global consciousness of an inter-dependent world community in which the welfare of all people and the health of the planet itself is the responsibility of all. Humanity may be evolving to a stage when exploitation of others and promotion of self-interest over-and-against that of others will yield to a new way of being human in which humanity seeks to promote the well-being of the whole, and to restore its broken relationship with the one planet on which all people live, our common planetary home. on the one hand, talk of a "clash of civilizations" raises alarm bells but on the other this has been countered by the United Nations dialogue among civilizations, which includes exploration of the role that religions can play in promoting inter-civilizational harmony.

❀ ❀ ❀ ❀ ❀

Ans.   Decolonization

Decolonization refers to the undoing of colonialism, the establishment of governance or authority through the creation of settlements by another country or jurisdiction. The term generally refers to the achievement of independence by the various Western colonies and protectorates in Asia and Africa following World War II. This conforms with an intellectual movement known as Post-Colonialism. A particularly active period of decolonization occurred between 1945 to 1960, beginning with the independence of Pakistan and the Republic of India from Great Britain in 1947 and the First Indochina War. Some national liberation movements were established before the war, but most did not achieve their aims until after it. Decolonization can be achieved by attaining independence, integrating with the administering power or another state, or establishing a "free association" status. The United Nations has stated that in the process of decolonization there is no alternative to the principle of self-determination.

Partly, decolonization was overseen by the United Nations, with UN membership as the prize each newly independent nation cherished as a sign of membership in the community of nations. The United Nations Trusteeship Council was suspended in 1994, after Palau, the last remaining United Nations trust territory, achieved independence. From 1945 and the end of the twentieth century, the number of sovereign nation-states mushroomed from 50 to 192 and few stopped to ask if this was the right direction for human political organization to be moving. Decolonization may involve peaceful negotiation, non-violent protest or violent revolt and armed struggle. Or, one faction pursues one strategy while another pursues the opposite. Some argue because of neocolonialism many former colonies are not truly free but remain dependent on the world's leading nations. No one of principle wants to deny people their freedom, or perpetuate oppression, injustice and inequality. However, while many celebrate decolonization in the name of freedom and realization of the basic human rights of self-determination, others question whether equality, justice, peace, the end of poverty, exploitation and the dependency of some on others can be achieved as long as nation-states promote and protect their own interests, interests that are not always at the expense of others' but which often are. As freedom spreads around the world, as more people gain the liberty to determine their own futures, some people hope that a new world order might develop, with the nation state receding in significance. Instead, global institutions would consider the needs of the planet and of all its inhabitants.

Methods and stages

Decolonization is a political process, frequently involving violence. In extreme circumstances, there is a war of independence, sometimes following a revolution. More often, there is a dynamic cycle where negotiations fail, minor disturbances ensue resulting in suppression by the police and military forces, escalating into more violent revolts that lead to further negotiations until independence is granted. In rare cases, the actions of the native population are characterized by non-violence, India being an example of this, and the violence comes as active suppression from the occupying forces or as political opposition from forces representing minority local communities who feel threatened by the prospect of independence. For example, there was a war of independence in French Indochina, while in some countries in French West Africa decolonization resulted from a combination of insurrection and negotiation. The process

is only complete when the de factogovernment of the newly independent country is recognized as the de jure sovereign state by the community of nations.

Independence is often difficult to achieve without the encouragement and practical support from one or more external parties. The motives for giving such aid are varied: nations of the same ethnic and/or religious stock may sympathize with oppressed groups, or a strong nation may attempt to destabilize a colony as a tactical move to weaken a rival or enemy colonizing power or to create space for its own sphere of influence; examples of this include British support of the Haitian Revolution against France, and the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, in which the United Stateswarned the European powers not to interfere in the affairs of the newly independent states of the Western Hemisphere.

As world opinion became more pro-emancipation following World War I, there was an institutionalized collective effort to advance the cause of emancipation through the League of Nations. Under Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, a number of mandates were created. The expressed intention was to prepare these countries for self-government, but the reality was merely a redistribution of control over the former colonies of the defeated powers, mainly Germany and the Ottoman Empire. This reassignment work continued through the United Nations, with a similar system of trust territories created to adjust control over both former colonies and mandated territories administered by the nations defeated in World War II, including Japan. In 1960, the UN General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. This stated that all people have a right to self-determination and proclaimed that colonialism should be speedily and unconditionally brought to an end. When the United Nations was founded, some wanted to place oversight of the decolonization process of all non-self governing territories under the oversight of the Trusteeship Council. Not only was this resisted by the colonial powers, but the UN Charter did not explicitly affirm self-determination as a right; instead, Articles 1, 55 and 56 express "respect for the principle of self-determination." Although the Trusteeship Council was only responsible for supervising progress towards independence of Trust territories, the colonial powers were required to report to the UN Secretary-General on the "educational, social and economic conditions" in their territories, a rather vague obligation that did not specify progress towards independence.

In referendums, some colonized populations have chosen to retain their colonial status, such as Gibraltar and French Guiana. On the other hand, colonial powers have sometimes promoted decolonization in order to shed the financial, military and other burdens that tend to grow in those colonies where the colonial regimes have become more benign.

Empires have expanded and contracted throughout history but, in several respects, the modern phenomenon of decolonization has produced different outcomes. Now, when states surrender both the de facto rule of their colonies and their de jure claims to such rule, the ex-colonies are generally not absorbed by other powers. Further, the former colonial powers have, in most cases, not only continued existing, but have also maintained their status as Powers, retaining strong economic and cultural ties with their former colonies. Through these ties, former colonial powers have ironically maintained a

significant proportion of the previous benefits of their empires, but with smaller costs—thus, despite frequent resistance to demands for decolonization, the outcomes have satisfied the colonizers' self-interests.

Decolonization is rarely achieved through a single historical act, but rather progresses through one or more stages of emancipation, each of which can be offered or fought for: these can include the introduction of elected representatives, degrees of autonomy or self-rule. Thus, the final phase of decolonization may in fact concern little more than handing over responsibility for foreign relations and security, and soliciting de jurerecognition for the new sovereignty. But, even following the recognition of statehood, a degree of continuity can be maintained through bilateral treaties between now equal governments involving practicalities such as military training, mutual protection pacts, or even a garrison and/or military bases.

There is some debate over whether or not the United States, Canada and Latin America can be considered decolonized, as it was the colonist and their descendants who revolted and declared their independence instead of the indigenous peoples, as is usually the case. Scholars such as Elizabeth Cook-Lynn (Dakota) and Devon Mihesuah (Choctaw) have argued that portions of the United States still are in need of decolonization.

Decolonization in a broad sense

Stretching the notion further, internal decolonization can occur within a sovereign state. Thus, the expansive United States created territories, destined to colonize conquered lands bordering the existing states, and once their development proved successful allowed them to petition statehood within the federation, granting not external independence but internal equality as 'sovereign' constituent members of the federal Union. France internalized several overseas possessions as Départements d'outre-mer.

Even in a state which legally does not colonize any of its 'integral' parts, real inequality often causes the politically dominant component - often the largest and/or most populous part, or the historical conqueror - to be perceived, at least subjectively, as a colonizer in all but name; hence, the dismemberment of such a 'prison of peoples' is perceived as decolonization de facto.

To complicate matters even further, this may coincide with another element. Thus, the three Baltic republics - Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania - argue that they, in contrast with other constituent SSRs, could not have been granted independence at the dismemberment of the Soviet Union because they never joined, but were militarily annexed by Stalin, and thus had been illegally colonized, including massive deportations of their nationals and uninvited immigration of ethnic Russians and other soviet nationalities. Even in other post-Soviet states which had formally acceded, most ethnic Russians were so much identified with the Soviet 'colonization,' they felt unwelcome and migrated back to Russia.

When the UN was established, roughly one-third of the world was under some type of colonial rule. At the start of the twenty-first century, less than two million people live under such governance.

Decolonization before 1918

One of the most significant, and early, events in the history of pre-1918 decolonization was the rebellion of the 13 American colonies of the British Empire

against British rule. This established the principles that people have the right to rebel against what they perceive to be unjust rule and governance in which they have no participation. Britain recognized the independence of the United States in 1783. Determined not to totally lose other settler colonies and developed a system to grant self-rule within the Empire to such colonies as Canada, Australia and New Zealand, which became Dominions in 1867, 1901 and 1907 respectively. At the same time, Britain was much more reluctant to grant non-settler colonies very much participation in governance and after 1919 through the League of Nations mandate system expanded its empire by acquiring Iraq, British Mandate of Palestine and Jordan, territories that the great powers considered required oversight until they were ready for self-governance.

Decolonization also took place within the Ottoman imperial space, beginning with Greece whose independence was recognized in 1831. The great powers, who had much to say about the "Turkish yoke" and the "Turkish peril" supported Greece but were well aware of the ambiguity of their position. They also possessed Empires and theirs were no less oppressive than that of the Ottomans. Austria-Hungarywas especially reluctant to see the collapse of the Ottoman, thinking that the future of their own system, governed by a more or less absolute ruler, might be bound up with that of a similar polity. However, inspired by the new ideal of nationalism stimulated by the French and American revolutions, provinces in the Balkans revived memories of their medieval kingdoms and began freedom struggles. One by one, the Ottoman Empire lost its European possessions until by the start of World War I none were left. After the war, the rest of its empire was distributed among Britain, France and Italy.

Also spurred on by events further North, the American colonies in the South under mainly Spanish rule with Brazil under Portugal began a series of independence movements. The second county in the region to gain its freedom was Haiti, where a slave uprising started in 1791. The wars for the independence of South America began in 1806 to and continued until 1826.

- Venezuela declared independence from July 5, 1811. It was ten years before Simon Bolivar secured freedom.
- Argentina declared independence from July 9, 1816.
- Bolivia gained independence on August 6, 1822 after a war led by Simon Bolivar, after whom the new republic named itself.
- Chile declared independence September 8, 1811.
- Ecuador gained independence May 34, 1822.
- Colombia ended its independence war on July 20, 1819.
- Brazil became independent September 7, 1822.
- Paraguay became independent on May 15, 1811.
- Peru became independence July 28, 1821.
- Uruguay August 25, 1825.

Most Central American countries gained independence in 1821, namely Costa Rica, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama. Belize, a British colony, did not become independent until 1981. Guyana, also British, became independent in 1966 and Surinam, a Netherlands colony in 1975.

Decolonization after 1918
Western European colonial powers

The New Imperialism period, with the Scramble for Africa and the Opium Wars, marked the zenith of European colonization. It also marked the acceleration of the trends that would end it. The extraordinary material demands of the conflict had spread economic change across the world, and the associated social pressures of "war imperialism" created both peasant unrest and a burgeoning middle class.

Economic growth created stakeholders with their own demands, while racial issues meant these people clearly stood apart from the colonial middle-class and had to form their own group. The start of mass nationalism, as a concept and practice, would fatally undermine the ideologies of imperialism.

There were, naturally, other factors, from agrarian change, changes or developments in religion , and the impact of the depression of the 1930s.

The Great Depression, despite the concentration of its impact on the industrialized world, was also exceptionally damaging in the rural colonies. Agricultural prices fell much harder and faster than those of industrial goods. From around 1925 until World War II, the colonies suffered. The colonial powers concentrated on domestic issues, protectionism and tariffs, disregarding the damage done to international trade flows. The colonies, almost all primary "cash crop" producers, lost the majority of their export income and were forced away from the "open" complementary colonial economies to "closed" systems. While some areas returned to subsistence farming others diversified , and some began to industrialize. These economies would not fit the colonial strait-jacket when efforts were made to renew the links. Further, the European-owned and -run plantations proved more vulnerable to extended deflation than native capitalists, reducing the dominance of "white" farmers in colonial economies and making the European governments and investors of the 1930s co-opt indigenous elites — despite the implications for the future.

The efforts at colonial reform also hastened their end — notably the move from non-interventionist collaborative systems towards directed, disruptive, direct management to drive economic change. The creation of genuine bureaucratic government boosted the formation of indigenous bourgeoisie. This was especially true in the British Empire, which seemed less capable in controlling political nationalism. Driven by pragmatic demands of budgets and manpower the British made deals with the nationalist elites. They dealt with the white Dominions, retained strategic resources at the cost of reducing direct control in Egypt, and made numerous reforms in the Raj, culminating in the Government of India Act .

Africa was a very different case from Asia between the wars. Tropical Africa was not fully drawn into the colonial system before the end of the 19th century, excluding only the complexities of the Union of South Africa and the Empire of Ethiopia. Colonial controls ranged between extremes. Economic growth was often curtailed. There were no indigenous nationalist groups with widespread popular support before 1939.

The United States

At end of the Spanish-American War, at the end of the nineteenth century, the United States of America held several colonial territories seized from Spain, among them the Philippines and Puerto Rico. Although the United States had initially embarked upon

a policy of colonization of these territories , by the 1930s, the U.S. policy for the Philippines had changed toward the direction of eventual self-government. Following the invasion and occupation of the Philippines by Japan during World War II, the Philippines gained independence peacefully from the United States in 1946.

However, other U.S. possessions, such as Puerto Rico, did not gain full independence. Puerto Ricans have held U.S. citizenship since 1917, but do not pay federal income tax. In 2000, a U.S. District judge ruled that Puerto Ricans can vote in U.S. Presidential elections for the first time. Puerto Rico achieved self-government in 1952 and became a commonwealth in association with the United States. Puerto Rico was taken off the UN list of non-sovereign territories in 1953 through resolution 748. In 1967, 1993 and 1998, Puerto Rican voters rejected proposals to grant the territory U.S. statehood or independence. Nevertheless, the island's political status remains a hot topic of debate.

Japan

As the only Asian nation to become a colonial power during the modern era, Japan had gained several substantial colonial concessions in east Asia such as Taiwan and Korea. Pursuing a colonial policy comparable to those of European powers, Japan settled significant populations of ethnic Japanese in its colonies while simultaneously suppressing indigenous ethnic populations by enforcing the learning and use of the Japanese language in schools. Other methods such as public interaction, and attempts to eradicate the use of Korean and Taiwanese among the indigenous peoples, were seen to be used. Japan also set up the Imperial university in Korea and Taiwan to compel education.

World War II gave Japan occasion to conquer vast swaths of Asia, sweeping into China and seizing the Western colonies of Vietnam, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Burma, Malaya, Timor and Indonesia among others, albeit only for the duration of the war. Following its surrender to the Allies in 1945, Japan was deprived of all its colonies. Japan further claims that the southern Kuril Islands are a small portion of its own national territory, colonized by the Soviet Union.

French Decolonization

After World War I, the colonized people were frustrated at France's failure to recognize the effort provided by the French colonies. Although in Paris the Great Mosque of Paris was constructed as recognition of these efforts, the French state had no intention to allow self-rule, let alone independence to the colonized people. Thus, nationalism in the colonies became stronger in between the two wars, leading to Abd el-Krim's Rif War (1921-1925) in Morocco and to the creation of Messali Hadj's Star of North Africa in Algeria in 1925. However, these movements would gain full potential only after World War II. The October 27, 1946 Constitution creating the Fourth Republic substituted the French Union to the colonial empire. On the night of March 29, 1947, a nationalist uprising in Madagascar led the French government led by Paul Ramadier (Socialist) to violent repression: one year of bitter fighting, in which 90,000 to 100,000 Malagasy died. On May 8, 1945, the Sétif massacre took place in Algeria.

In 1946, the states of French Indochina withdrew from the Union, leading to the Indochina War (1946-54) against Ho Chi Minh, who had been a co-founder of the French

Communist Party in 1920 and had founded the Vietminh in 1941. In 1956, Morocco and Tunisia gained their independence, while the Algerian War was raging (1954-1962). With Charles de Gaulle's return to power in 1958 amidst turmoil and threats of a right-wing coup d'Etat to protect "French Algeria," the decolonization was completed with the independence of Sub-Saharan Africa's colonies in 1960 and the March 19, 1962 Evian Accords, which put an end to the Algerian war. The OAS movement unsuccessfully tried to block the accords with a series of bombings, including an attempted assassination against Charles de Gaulle.

To this day, the Algerian war — officially called until the 1990s a "public order operation" — remains a trauma for both France and Algeria. Philosopher Paul Ricoeur has spoken of the necessity of a "decolonization of memory," starting with the recognition of the 1961 Paris massacre during the Algerian war and the recognition of the decisive role of African and especially North African immigrant manpower in the Trente Glorieusespost-World War II economic growth period. In the 1960s, due to economic needs for post-war reconstruction and rapid economic growth, French employers actively sought to recruit manpower from the colonies, explaining today's multiethnic population.

The Soviet Union and anti-colonialism

The Soviet Union sought to effect the abolishment of colonial governance by Western countries, either by direct subversion of Western-leaning or -controlled governments or indirectly by influence of political leadership and support. Many of the revolutions of this time period were inspired or influenced in this way. The conflicts in Vietnam, Nicaragua, Congo, and Sudan, among others, have been characterized as such.

Most Soviet leaders expressed the Marxist-Leninist view that imperialism was the height of capitalism, and generated a class-stratified society. It followed, then, that Soviet leadership would encourage independence movements in colonized territories, especially as the Cold War progressed. Because so many of these wars of independence expanded into general Cold War conflicts, the United States also supported several such independence movements in opposition to Soviet interests.

During the Vietnam War, Communist countries supported anti-colonialist movements in various countries still under colonial administration through propaganda, developmental and economic assistance, and in some cases military aid. Notably among these were the support of armed rebel movements by Cuba in Angola, and the Soviet Union in Vietnam.

It is noteworthy that while England, Spain, Portugal, France, and the Netherlands took colonies overseas, the Russian Empire expanded via land across Asia. The Soviet Union did not make any moves to return this land.

The Emergence of the Third World (1945-)

The term "Third World" was coined by French demographer Alfred Sauvy in 1952, on the model of the Third Estate, which, according to the Abbé Sieyès, represented everything, but was nothing: "...because at the end this ignored, exploited, scorned Third World like the Third Estate, wants to become something too" . The emergence of this new political entity, in the frame of the Cold War, was complex and painful. Several tentatives were made to organize newly independent states in order to oppose a common front towards both the US's and the USSR's influence on them, with the consequences of

the Sino-Soviet split already at works. Thus, the Non-Aligned Movement constituted itself, around the main figures of Nehru, the leader of India, The Indonesian prime minister, Tito the Communist leader of Yugoslavia, and Nasser, head of Egypt who successfully opposed the French and British imperial powers during the 1956 Suez crisis. After the 1954 Geneva Conference which put an end to the French war against Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam, the 1955 Bandung Conference gathered Nasser, Nehru, Tito, Sukarno, the leader of Indonesia, and Zhou Enlai, Premier of the People's Republic of China. In 1960, the UN General Assembly voted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The next year, the Non-Aligned Movement was officially created in Belgrade(1961), and was followed in 1964 by the creation of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development which tried to promote a New International Economic Order . The NIEO was opposed to the 1944 Bretton Woods system, which had benefited the leading states which had created it, and remained in force until after the 1973 oil crisis. The main tenets of the NIEO were:

1. Developing countries must be entitled to regulate and control the activities of multinational corporations operating within their territory.
2. They must be free to nationalize or expropriate foreign property on conditions favorable to them.
3. They must be free to set up voluntary association of primary commodities producers similar to the OPEC to reduce oil prices and payments to producers; all other States must recognize this right and refrain from taking economic, military, or political measures calculated to restrict it.
4. International trade should be based on the need to ensure stable, equitable, and remunerative prices for raw materials, generalized non-reciprocal and non-discriminatory tariff preferences, as well as transfer of technology to developing countries; and should provide economic and technical assistance without any strings attached.

The UNCTAD however wasn't very effective in implementing this New International Economic Order (NIEO), and social and economic inequalities between industrialized countries and the Third World kept on growing through-out the 1960s until the twenty-first century. The 1973 oil crisis which followed the Yom Kippur War was triggered by the OPEC which decided an embargo against the US and Western countries, causing a fourfold increase in the price of oil, which lasted five months, starting on October 17, 1973, and ending on March 18, 1974. OPEC nations then agreed, on January 7 1975, to raise crude oil prices by ten percent. At that time, OPEC nations—including many who had recently nationalized their oil industries—joined the call for a New International Economic Order to be initiated by coalitions of primary producers. Concluding the First OPEC Summit in Algiers they called for stable and just commodity prices, an international food and agriculture program, technology transfer from North to South, and the democratization of the economic system. But industrialized countries quickly began to look for substitutes to OPEC petroleum, with the oil companies investing the majority of their research capital in the US and European countries or others, politically secure countries. The OPEC lost more and more influence on the world prices of oil.

The second oil crisis occurred in the wake of the 1979 Iranian Revolution. Then, the 1982 Latin American debt crisis exploded in Mexico first, then Argentina and Brazil, who were unable to pay back their debts, jeopardizing the existence of the international economic system.

The 1990s were characterized by the prevalence of the Washington neoliberal policies, "structural adjustment" and "shock therapies" for the former Communist states, to transform command economies into self-sustaining trade-based economies capable of participating in the free-trade world market.

Assassinated anticolonialist leaders

A non-exhaustive list of assassinated leaders includes:

1. Ruben Um Nyobé, leader of the Union of the Peoples of Cameroon , killed by the French army on September 13, 1958

2. Barthélemy Boganda, leader of a nationalist Central African Republic movement, who died in a plane-crash on March 29, 1959, eight days before the last elections of the colonial era.

3. Félix-Roland Moumié, successor to Ruben Um Nyobe at the head of the UPC, assassinated in Geneva in 1960 by the SDECE .

4. Patrice Lumumba, the first Prime minister of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, was assassinated on January 17, 1961.

5. Burundi nationalist Louis Rwagasore was assassinated on October 13, 1961, while Pierre Ngendandumwe, Burundi's first Hutu]prime minister, was also murdered on January 15, 1965.

6. Sylvanus Olympio, the first president of Togo, was assassinated on January 13, 1963. He would be replaced by Gnassingbé Eyadéma, who ruled Togo for nearly 40 years; he died in 2005 and was succeeded by his son Faure Gnassingbé.

7. Mehdi Ben Barka, the leader of the Moroccan National Union of Popular Forces and of the Tricontinental Conference, which was supposed to prepare in 1966 in Havanaits first meeting gathering national liberation movements from all continents — related to the Non-Aligned Movement, but the Tricontinental Conference gathered liberation movements while the Non-Aligned were for the most part states — was "disappeared" in Paris in 1965.

8. Nigerian leader Ahmadu Bello was assassinated in January 1966.

9. Eduardo Mondlane, the leader of FRELIMO and the father of Mozambican independence, was assassinated in 1969, allegedly by Aginter Press, the Portuguese branch of Gladio, NATO's paramilitary organization during the Cold War.

10. Pan-Africanist Tom Mboya was killed on July 5, 1969.

11. Abeid Karume, first president of Zanzibar, was assassinated in April 1972.

12. Amílcar Cabral was murdered on January 20, 1973.

13. Outel Bono, Chadian opponent of François Tombalbaye, was assassinated on August 26, 1973, making yet another example of the existence of the Françafrique, designing by this term post-independent neocolonial ties between France and its former colonies.

14. Herbert Chitepo, leader of the Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU), was assassinated on March 18, 1975.
15. Óscar Romero, prelate archbishop of San Salvador and proponent of liberation theology, was assassinated on March 24, 1980
16. Dulcie September, leader of the African National Congress (ANC), who was investigating an arms trade between France and South Africa, was murdered in Paris on March 29, 1988, a few years before the end of the apartheid regime.

Many of these assassinations are still unsolved cases as of 2007, but foreign power interference is undeniable in many of these cases — although others were for internal matters. To take only one case, the investigation concerning Mehdi Ben Barka is continuing to this day, and both France and the United States have refused to declassify files they acknowledge having in their possession. The Phoenix Program, a CIA program of assassination during the Vietnam War, should also be named.

Post-colonial organizations

Due to a common history and culture, former colonial powers created institutions which more loosely associated their former colonies. Membership is voluntary, and in some cases can be revoked if a member state loses some objective criteria. The organizations serve cultural, economic, and political purposes between the associated countries, although no such organization has become politically prominent as an entity in its own right.

Differing perspectives

Decolonization generates debate and controversy. The end goal tends to be universally regarded as good, but there has been much debate over the best way to grant full independence.

Decolonization and political instability

Some say the post–World War II decolonization movement was too rushed, especially in Africa, and resulted in the creation of unstable regimes in the newly independent countries. Thus causing war between and within the new independent nation-states.

Others argue that this instability is largely the result of problems from the colonial period, including arbitrary nation-state borders, lack of training of local populations and disproportional economy. However by the twentieth century most colonial powers were slowly being forced by the moral beliefs of population to increase the welfare of their colonial subjects.

Some would argue a form of colonization still exists in the form of economic colonialism carried out by U.S owned corporations operating across the globe.

Economic effects

Effects on the colonizers

John Kenneth Galbraith argues that the post-World War II decolonization was brought about for economic reasons. In A Journey Through Economic Time, he writes, "The engine of economic well-being was now within and between the advanced industrial countries. Domestic economic growth — as now measured and much discussed — came to be seen as far more important than the erstwhile colonial trade.... The

economic effect in the United States from the granting of independence to the Philippines was unnoticeable, partly due to the Bell Trade Act, which allowed American monopoly in the economy of the Philippines. The departure of India and Pakistan made small economic difference in Britain. Dutch economists calculated that the economic effect from the loss of the great Dutch empire in Indonesia was compensated for by a couple of years or so of domestic post-war economic growth. The end of the colonial era is celebrated in the history books as a triumph of national aspiration in the former colonies and of benign good sense on the part of the colonial powers. Lurking beneath, as so often happens, was a strong current of economic interest — or in this case, disinterest." Galbraith takes the view that the main drive behind colonial expansion was economic - colonies were a "rich source of raw materials" and "a significant market for elementary manufactured goods." Once "domestic economic growth" became a priority as opposed to "colonial trade," the colonial world became "marginalized," so "it was to the advantage of all to let it go." Galbraith says that combined with the cost of waging war to retain colonies, the shift in economical priority meant that the "practical course was to let the brothers go in peace." It was thus somewhat incidental that "erstwhile possessions" also had "a natural right to their own identity" and "to govern themselves."

Part of the reason for the lack of economic impact felt by the colonizer upon the release of the colonized was that costs and benefits were not eliminated, but shifted. The colonizer no longer had the burden of obligation, financial or otherwise, for their colony. The colonizer continued to be able to obtain cheap goods and labor as well as economic benefits from the former colonies. Financial, political and military pressure could still be used to achieve goals desired by the colonizer. The most obvious difference is the ability of the colonizer to disclaim responsibility for the colonized.

Effects on the former colonies

Settled populations

Decolonization is not an easy adjustment in colonies where a large population of settlers live, particularly if they have been there for several generations. This population, in general, may have to be repatriated, often losing considerable property. For instance, the decolonization of Algeria by France was particularly uneasy due to the large European and Sephardic Jewish population, which largely evacuated to France when Algeria became independent. In Zimbabwe, former Rhodesia, president Robert Mugabe has, starting in the 1990s, targeted white farmers and forcibly seized their property. In some cases, decolonization is hardly possible or impossible because of the importance of the settler population or where the indigenous population is now in the minority; such is the case of the British population of the Cayman Islands and the Russian population of Kazakhstan, as well as the settler societies of North America.

The Psychology of dependence and decolonizing the mind

Critics of the continued dependence of many former colonies on the developed world sometimes offer this as a defense of colonialism, or of neocolonialism as a necessary evil. The inability of countries in the former colonial empires to create stable, viable economies and democratic systems is blamed on ancient tribal animosities, congenital inability to order their affairs and on a psychology of dependency. In response, others point to how the artificial creation of boundaries, together with the way in which

colonial powers played different communities off against each other to justify their rule maintaining peace, as the causes of tension, conflict and authoritarian responses. They point out that the way in which Africa and Africans are depicted in works of fiction, too, perpetuates stereotypesof dependency, primitiveness, tribalism and a copy-cat rather than creative mentality. Those who argue that continued dependency stems in part from a psychology that informs an attitude of racial, intellectual or cultural inferiority are also speaking of the need to decolonize the mind, an expressed used by Ngugi wa Thiong'o. He argued that much that is written about the problems of Africa perpetuates the idea that primitive tribalism lies at their root:

The study of the African realities has for too long been seen in terms of tribes. Whatever happens in Kenya, Uganda, Malawi is because of Tribe A versus Tribe B. Whatever erupts in Zaire, Nigeria, Liberia, Zambia is because of the traditional enmity between Tribe D and Tribe C. A variation of the same stock interpretation is Moslem versus Christian, or Catholic versus Protestant where a people does not easily fall into 'tribes'. Even literature is sometimes evaluated in terms of the 'tribal' origins of the authors or the 'tribal' origins and composition of the characters in a given novel or play. This misleading stock interpretation of the African realities has been popularized by the western media which likes to deflect people from seeing that imperialism is still the root cause of many problems in Africa. Unfortunately some African intellectuals have fallen victims—a few incurably so—to that scheme and they are unable to see the divide-and-rule colonial origins of explaining any differences of intellectual outlook or any political clashes in terms of the ethnic origins of the actors .

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.24 What is Eurocommunism? Give your answer in detail.

Ans.   Eurocommunism

Eurocommunism was a trend in the 1970s and 1980s within various Western European communist parties to develop a theory and practice of social transformation that was more relevant in a Western European democracy and less aligned to the influence or control of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Origin of the term

The origin of the term "Eurocommunism" was subject to great debate in the mid-1970s, being attributed to Zbigniew Brzezinski and Arrigo Levi, among others. Jean-François Revel once wrote that "one of the favourite amusements of 'political scientists' is to search for the author of the term Eurocommunism." In April 1977, Deutschland-Archiv decided that the word was first used in the summer of 1975 by Yugoslav journalist Frane Barbieri, former editor of Belgrade's NIN Newsmagazine.

Theoretical foundations

The main theoretical foundation of Eurocommunism was Antonio Gramsci's writing about Marxist theory which questioned the sectarianism of the Left and encouraged communist parties to develop social alliances to win hegemonic support for social reforms. Eurocommunist parties expressed their fidelity to democratic institutions more clearly than before and attempted to widen their appeal by embracing public sector

middle-class workers, new social movements such as feminism and gay liberation and more publicly questioning the Soviet Union. Early inspirations can also be found in the Austromarxism and its seeking of a "third" democratic "way" to socialism.

Western European Communist Parties

Some Communist parties with strong popular support, notably the Italian Communist Party (PCI) and the Spanish Communist Party (PCE) adopted Eurocommunism most enthusiastically. The Communist Party of Finland was dominated by Eurocommunists. In the 1980s the traditional, pro-Soviet faction broke away, calling the main party revisionist. At least one mass party, the French Communist Party (PCF) and many smaller parties strongly opposed to Eurocommunism and stayed aligned to the positions of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union until the end of the USSR (although the PCF did make a brief turn toward Eurocommunism in the mid-to-late 1970s).

The PCE and its Catalan referent, the United Socialist Party of Catalonia, had already been committed to the liberal possibilist politics of the Popular Front during the Spanish Civil War. The leader of the PCE, Santiago Carrillo, wrote Eurocommunism's defining book Eurocomunismo y estado and participated in the development of the liberal democratic constitution as Spain emerged from the dictatorship of Franco. The Communist parties of Great Britain, Belgium the Netherlands and Austria also turned Eurocommunist.

Western European communists came to Eurocommunism via a variety of routes. For some it was their direct experience of feminist and similar action. For others its was a reaction to the political events of the Soviet Union, at the apogee of what Mikhail Gorbachev later called the Era of Stagnation. This process was accelerated after the events of 1968, particularly the crushing of the Prague Spring.

The politics of détente also played a part. With war less likely, Western communists were under less pressure to follow Soviet orthodoxy yet also wanted to engage with a rise in western proletarian militancy such as Italy's Hot Autumn and Britain's shop steward's movement.

Outside Western Europe

Eurocommunist ideas won at least partial acceptance outside of Western Europe. Prominent parties influenced by it outside of Europe were the Movement for Socialism (Venezuela), the Japanese Communist Party, the Mexican Communist Party and the Communist Party of Australia. Mikhail Gorbachev also refers to eurocommunism as a key influence on the ideas of glasnost and perestroika in his memoirs.

Results

Eurocommunism was in many ways only a staging ground for changes in the political structure of the European left. Some – principally the Italians – became social democrats, while others like the Dutch CPN moved into green politics and the French party during the 1980s reverted to a more pro-Soviet stance.

Eurocommunism became a force across Europe in 1977, when Enrico Berlinguer of the Italian Communist Party (PCI), Santiago Carrillo of the Communist Party of Spain (PCE) and Georges Marchais of the French Communist Party (PCF) met in Madrid and laid out the fundamental lines of the "new way". The PCI in particular had been

developing an independent line from Moscow for many years prior, which had already been exhibited in 1968, when the party refused to support the Soviet invasion of Prague. In 1975 the PCI and the PCE had made a declaration regarding the "march toward socialism" to be done in "peace and freedom". In 1976 in Moscow, Berlinguer, in front of 5,000 Communist delegates, had spoken of a "pluralistic system", and described PCI's intentions to build "a socialism that we believe necessary and possible only in Italy". The compromesso storico with Democrazia Cristiana, stopped by Aldo Moro's murder in 1978, was a consequence of this new policy.

The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War put practically all Leftist parties in Europe on the defensive, and made neoliberal reforms the order of the day, many Eurocommunist parties split, with the Right factions adopting social democracy more whole-heartedly, while the Left strove to preserve some identifiably Communist positions.

Criticism

Two main criticisms have been advanced against Eurocommunism. First, it is alleged by right-wing critics that Eurocommunists showed a lack of courage in definitively breaking off from the Soviet Union . This "timidity" has been explained as the fear of losing old members and supporters, many of whom admired the USSR, or with a real politik desire to keep the support of a strong and powerful country.

Other critics point out the difficulties the Eurocommunist parties had in developing a clear and recognisable strategy. They observe that Eurocommunists have always claimed to be different - not only from Soviet Communism but also from Social Democracy - while, in practice, they were always very similar to at least one of these two tendencies. Thus, critics argue that Eurocommunism does not have a well-defined identity and cannot be regarded as a separate movement in its own right.

From a Trotskyist point of view, Ernest Mandel in From Stalinism to Eurocommunism: The Bitter Fruits of 'Socialism in One Country' views Eurocommunism as a subsequent development of the decision taken by the Soviet Union in 1924 to abandon the goal of world revolution and concentrate on social and economic development of the Soviet Union, the Socialism in One Country. Thus the Eurocommunists of the Italian and French Communist parties are considered to be nationalist movements, who together with the Soviet Union abandoned internationalism. This is analogous to the Social democratic parties of the Second International during the First World War, when they supported their national governments in prosecution of the war.

From an Anti-Revisionist point of view, Enver Hoxha in Eurocommunism is Anti-Communism views Eurocommunism as the result of Nikita Khrushchev's policy of peaceful coexistence. Khrushchev was accused of being a revisionist who encouraged conciliation with the bourgeoisie rather than adequately calling for its overthrow. He also stated that the Soviet Union's refusal to reject Palmiro Togliatti's theory of polycentrism encouraged the various pro-Soviet Communist parties to moderate their views in order to join cabinets, which in turn forced them to abandon Marxism-Leninism as their leading ideology.

More generally, from the point of view of most revolutionary left-wing movements, Eurocommunism simply meant an abandonment of basic communist principles, such as the call for a proletarian revolution, which eventually led many Eurocommunists to abandon communism or even socialism altogether. Such critics felt strongly vindicated when several Eurocommunist parties scrapped their communist credentials following the fall of the Soviet Union.

�֎ �֎ ✖ ✖ ✖

Q.25 Define nationalism. Discuss also the varieties of nationalism.

Ans. Nationalism

Nationalism is a political ideology that involves a strong identification of a group of individuals with a political entity defined in national terms, i.e. a nation. In the 'modernist' image of the nation, it is nationalism that creates national identity. There are various definitions for what constitutes a nation, however, which leads to several different strands of nationalism. It can be a belief that citizenship in a state should be limited to one ethnic, cultural or identity group, or that multinationality in a single state should necessarily comprise the right to express and exercise national identity even by minorities.

It can also include the belief that the state is of primary importance, or the belief that one state is naturally superior to all other states. It is also used to describe a movement to establish or protect a 'homeland' for an ethnic group. In some cases the identification of a national culture is combined with a negative view of other races or cultures.

Conversely, nationalism might also be portrayed as collective identities toward imagined communities which are not naturally expressed in language, race or religion but rather socially constructed by the very individuals that belong to a given nation. Nationalism is sometimes reactionary, calling for a return to a national past, and sometimes for the expulsion of foreigners. Other forms of nationalism are revolutionary, calling for the establishment of an independent state as a homeland for an ethnic underclass.

Nationalism emphasizes collective identity - a 'people' must be autonomous, united, and express a single national culture. Integral nationalism is a belief that a nation is an organic unit, with a social hierarchy, co-operation between the different social classes and common political goals. However, liberal nationalists stress individualism as an important part of their own national identity.

National flags, national anthems, and other symbols of national identity are often considered sacred, as if they were religious rather than political symbols. Deep emotions are aroused. Gellner and Breuilly, in Nations and Nationalism, contrast nationalism and patriotism. "If the nobler word 'patriotism' then replaced 'civic/Western nationalism', nationalism as a phenomenon had ceased to exist."

History

In Europe before the development of nationalism, people were generally loyal to a city or to a particular leader rather than to their nation. Encyclopaedia Britannica

identifies the movement's genesis with the late-18th century American Revolution and French Revolution; other historians point specifically to the ultra-nationalist party in France during the French Revolution.

The term nationalism was coined by Johann Gottfried Herder during the late 1770s. Precisely where and when nationalism emerged is difficult to determine, but its development is closely related to that of the modern state and the push for popular sovereignty that surfaced with the French Revolution and the American Revolution in the late 18th century and culminated with the ethnic/national revolutions of Europe, for instance the Greek War of Independence. Since that time, nationalism has become one of the most significant political and social forces in history, perhaps most notably as a major influence or postulate of World War I and especially World War II. Fascism is a form of authoritarian nationalism which stresses absolute loyalty and obedience to the state, whose purpose is to serve the interests of its nation alone. Benedict Anderson argued that, "Print language is what invents nationalism, not a particular language per se".

Varieties

Civic nationalism

Civic nationalism defines the nation as an association of people who identify themselves as belonging to the nation, who have equal and shared political rights, and allegiance to similar political procedures. According to the principles of civic nationalism, the nation is not based on common ethnic ancestry, but is a political entity whose core identity is not ethnicity. This civic concept of nationalism is exemplified by Ernest Renan in his lecture in 1882 "What is a Nation?", where he defined the nation as a "daily referendum" dependent on the will of its people to continue living together".

Civic Nationalism is a kind of non-xenophobic nationalism compatible with liberal values of freedom, tolerance, equality, and individual rights. Ernest Renan and John Stuart Mill are often thought to be early liberal nationalists. Liberal nationalists often defend the value of national identity by saying that individuals need a national identity in order to lead meaningful, autonomous lives and that liberal democratic polities need national identity in order to function properly.

Civic nationalism lies within the traditions of rationalism and liberalism, but as a form of nationalism it is contrasted with ethnic nationalism. Membership of the civic nation is considered voluntary, as in Ernest Renan's "daily referendum" formulation in What is a Nation?. Civic-national ideals influenced the development of representative democracy in countries such as the United States and France .

Ethnocentrism

Whereas nationalism does not necessarily imply a belief in the superiority of one ethnicity over others, some nationalists support ethnocentric protectionism or ethnocentric supremacy. Studies have yielded evidence that such behaviour may be derived from innate preferences in humans from infancy.

The term ethnocentrism is a more accurate and meaningful term.

National purity

Some nationalists exclude certain groups. Some nationalists, defining the national community in ethnic, linguistic, cultural, historic, or religious terms, may then

seek to deem certain minorities as not truly being a part of the 'national community' as they define it. Sometimes a mythic homeland is more important for the national identity than the actual territory occupied by the nation.

Left-wing nationalism

Left-wing nationalism refers to any political movement that combines left-wing politics with nationalism. Many nationalist movements are dedicated to national liberation, in the view that their nations are being persecuted by other nations and thus need to exercise self-determination by liberating themselves from the accused persecutors. Anti-revisionist Marxist-Leninism is closely tied with this ideology, and practical examples include Stalin's early work Marxism and the National Question and his Socialism in One Country edict, which declares that nationalism can be used in an internationalist context, fighting for national liberation without racial or religious divisions. Other examples of left-wing nationalism include Fidel Castro's 26th of July Movement that launched the Cuban Revolution ousting the American-backed Fulgencio Batista in 1959, Ireland's Sinn Féin, Wales's Plaid Cymru, Scotland's SNP, the Awami League in Bangladesh and the African National Congress in South Africa.

Territorial nationalism

It assume that all inhabitants of a particular nation owe allegiance to their country of birth or adoption. A sacred quality is sought in the nation and in the popular memories it evokes. Citizenship is idealised by territorial nationalist A criterion of a territorial nationalism is the establishment of a mass, public culture based on common values and traditions of the population.

Ultranationalism

Ultranationalism is a zealous nationalism that expresses extremist support for one's nationalist ideals. It is often characterized by authoritarianism, efforts toward reduction or stoppage of immigration, expulsion and or oppression of non-native populations within the nation or its territories, demagoguery of leadership, emotionalism, scapegoating outsiders in socioeconomic crisis, fomenting talk of presumed, real, or imagined enemies, predicating the existence of threats to the survival of the native, dominant or otherwise idealized national ethnicity or population group, instigation or extremist reaction to crack-down policies in law enforcement, efforts to limit international trade through tariffs, tight control over businesses and· production, militarism, populism and propaganda. Prevalent ultranationalism typically leads to or is the result of conflict within a state, and or between states, and is identified as a condition of pre-war in national politics. In its extremist forms ultranationalism is characterized as a call to war against enemies of the nation/state, secession or, in the case of ethnocentrist ultranationalism, genocide.

Fascism is a form of palingenetic ultranationalism that promotes "class collaboration", a totalitarian state, and irredentism or expansionism to unify and allow the growth of a nation. Fascists sometimes promote ethnic or cultural nationalism. Fascism stresses the subservience of the individual to the state, and the need to absolute and unquestioned loyalty to a strong ruler.

Anti-colonial Nationalism

This form of nationalism came about during the decolonialisation of the post war period. It was a reaction mainly in Africa and Asia against being subdued by foreign

powers. This form of nationalism took many guises, including the peaceful passive resistance movement led by Gandhi in the Indian subcontinent. Benedict Anderson argued that anti-colonial nationalism is grounded in the experience of literate and bilingual indigenous intellectuals fluent in the language of the imperial power, schooled in its "national" history, and staffing the colonial administrative cadres up to but not including its highest levels. Post-colonial national governments have been essentially indigenous forms of the previous imperial administration.

Criticism

The main criticism of nationalism holds that some nationalists hold their own nation as a starting point for political practice, but consider the similar, nationalist, starting point of other nations, as erroneous. In this sense, nationalism, is self-contradictory .

Critics of nationalism have argued that it is often unclear what constitutes a "nation", or why a nation should be the only legitimate unit of political rule. A nation is a cultural entity, and not necessarily a political association, nor is it necessarily linked to a particular territorial area - although nationalists argue that the boundaries of a nation and a state should, as far as possible, coincide. Philosopher A.C. Grayling describes nations as artificial constructs, "their boundaries drawn in the blood of past wars". He argues that "there is no country on earth which is not home to more than one different but usually coexisting culture. Cultural heritage is not the same thing as national identity".

Nationalism is inherently divisive because it highlights perceived differences between people, emphasizing an individual's identification with their own nation. The idea is also potentially oppressive because it submerges individual identity within a national whole, and gives elites or political leaders potential opportunities to manipulate or control the masses. Much of the early opposition to nationalism was related to its geopolitical ideal of a separate state for every nation. The classic nationalist movements of the 19th century rejected the very existence of the multi-ethnic empires in Europe. Even in that early stage, however, there was an ideological critique of nationalism. This has developed into several forms of anti-nationalism in the western world. The Islamic revival of the 20th century also produced an Islamic critique of the nation-state.

At the end of the 19th century, Marxists and other socialists produced political analysis that were critical of the nationalist movements then active in central and eastern Europe were more sympathetic to national self-determination.

In the liberal political tradition there is widespread criticism of 'nationalism' as a dangerous force and a cause of conflict and war between nation-states. Nationalism has often been exploited to encourage citizens to partake in the nations' conflicts. Such examples include The Two World Wars, where nationalism was a key component of propaganda material. Liberals do not generally dispute the existence of the nation-states. The liberal critique also emphasizes individual freedom as opposed to national identity, which is by definition collective.

The pacifist critique of nationalism also concentrates on the violence of nationalist movements, the associated militarism, and on conflicts between nations inspired by jingoism or chauvinism. National symbols and patriotic assertiveness are in some countries discredited by their historical link with past wars, especially in Germany.

Famous pacifist Bertrand Russell criticizes nationalism of diminishing individual's capacity to judge his or her fatherland's foreign policy. William Blum has said this in other words: "If love is blind, patriotism has lost all five senses." Albert Einstein stated that "Nationalism is an infantile disease... It is the measles of mankind."

The anti-racist critique of nationalism concentrates on the attitudes to other nations, and especially on the doctrine that the nation-state exists for one national group to the exclusion of others. This view emphasizes the chauvinism and xenophobia that have often resulted from nationalist sentiment Norman Naimark relates the rise of nationalism to ethnic cleansing and genocide, including the Armenian Genocide, the Nazi Holocaust, the deportation of Chechens and Crimean Tartars under Stalin, the expulsion of Germans from Poland and Czechoslovakia at the end of the Second World War, and the ethnic cleansing during the Yugoslav Wars in the 1990s.

Political movements of the left have often been suspicious of nationalism, again without necessarily seeking the disappearance of the existing nation-states. Marxism has been ambiguous towards the nation-state, and in the late 19th century some Marxist theorists rejected it completely. For some Marxists the world revolution implied a global state (or global absence of state); for others it meant that each nation-state had its own revolution. A significant event in this context was the failure of the social-democratic and socialist movements in Europe to mobilize a cross-border workers' opposition to World War I. At present most, but certainly not all, left-wing groups accept the nation-state, and see it as the political arena for their activities.

Anarchism has developed a critique of nationalism that focuses on its role in justifying and consolidating state power and domination. Through its unifying goal it strives for centralization both in specific territories and in a ruling elite of individuals while it prepares a population for capitalist exploitation. Within anarchism this subject has been treated extensively by Rudolf Rocker in Nationalism and Culture and by the works of Fredy Perlman such as Against His-Story, Against Leviathan and "The Continuing Appeal of Nationalism".

In the Western world, the most comprehensive current ideological alternative to nationalism is cosmopolitanism. Ethical cosmopolitanism rejects one of the basic ethical principles of nationalism: that humans owe more duties to a fellow member of the nation, than to a non-member. It rejects such important nationalist values as national identity and national loyalty. However, there is also a political cosmopolitanism, which has a geopolitical program to match that of nationalism: it seeks some form of world state, with a world government. Very few people openly and explicitly support the establishment of a global state, but political cosmopolitanism has influenced the development of international criminal law, and the erosion of the status of national sovereignty. In turn, nationalists are deeply suspicious of cosmopolitan attitudes, which they equate with eradication of diverse national cultures.

While internationalism in the cosmopolitan context by definition implies cooperation among nations and states, and therefore the existence of nations, proletarian internationalism is different, in that it calls for the international working class to follow its brethren in other countries irrespective of the activities or pressures of the national government of a particular sector of that class. Meanwhile, most anarchists reject nation-

states on the basis of self-determination of the majority social class, and thus reject nationalism. Instead of nations, anarchists usually advocate the creation of cooperative societies based on free association and mutual aid without regard to ethnicity or race.

<p style="text-align:center">❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋</p>

Q.26 What do you know about conflict resolution? What are the ways of addressing conflicts?

Ans.   **Conflict resolution**

Conflict resolution is a wide range of methods of addressing sources of conflict - whether at the inter-personal level or between states - and of finding means of resolving a given conflict or of continuing it in less destructive forms than, say, armed conflict. Processes of conflict resolution generally include negotiation, mediation, diplomacy and creative peace building. The term "conflict resolution" is sometimes used interchangeably with the terms dispute resolution or alternative dispute resolution. The processes of arbitration, litigation, and formal complaint processes through an ombudsman, are part of dispute resolution, and therefore they are also part of "conflict resolution." The concept of conflict resolution can also encompass the use of non-violent methods such as civil resistance by a party to a conflict as a means of pursuing its goals, on the grounds that such means are more likely than armed struggle to lead to effective resolution of the conflict.

Culture-based

Conflict resolution as both a professional practice and academic field is highly sensitive to culture. In Western cultural contexts, such as Canada and the United States, successful conflict resolution usually involves fostering communication among disputants, problem solving, and drafting agreements that meet their underlying needs. In these situations, conflict resolvers often talk about finding the win-win solution, or mutually satisfying scenario, for everyone involved , Getting to Yes. In many non-Western cultural contexts, such as Afghanistan, Vietnam, and China, it is also important to find "win-win" solutions; however, getting there can be very different. In these contexts, direct communication between disputants that explicitly addresses the issues at stake in the conflict can be perceived as very rude, making the conflict worse and delaying resolution. Rather, it can make sense to involve religious, tribal or community leaders, communicate difficult truths indirectly through a third party, and make suggestions through stories , Conflict Mediation Across Cultures. Intercultural conflicts are often the most difficult to resolve because the expectations of the disputants can be very different, and there is much occasion for misunderstanding.

In animals

Conflict resolution has also been studied in non-humans, like dogs, cats, monkeys, snakes, elephants, and primates . Aggression is more common among relatives and within a group than between groups. Instead of creating a distance between the individuals, however, the primates were more intimate in the period after the aggressive incident. These intimacies consisted of grooming and various forms of body contact. Stress responses, like an increased heart rate, usually decrease after these reconciliatory

signals. Different types of primates, as well as many other species who are living in groups, show different types of conciliatory behaviour. Resolving conflicts that threaten the interaction between individuals in a group is necessary for survival and hence has a strong evolutionary value. These findings contradicted previous existing theories about the general function of aggression, i.e. creating space between individuals, which seems to be more the case in conflicts between groups than it is within groups.

In addition to research in primates, biologists are beginning to explore reconciliation in other animals. Up until recently, the literature dealing with reconciliation in non-primates have consisted of anecdotal observations and very little quantitative data. Although peaceful post-conflict behavior had been documented going back to the 1960s, it wasn't until 1993 that Rowell made the first explicit mention of reconciliation in feral sheep. Reconciliation has since been documented in spotted hyenas, lions, dolphins, dwarf mongoose, domestic goats, and domestic dogs.

Conflict resolution is an expanding field of professional practice, both in the U.S. and around the world. The escalating costs of conflict have increased use of third parties who may serve as an conflict specialists to resolve conflicts. In fact relief and development organizations have added peace-building specialists to their teams. Many of the major international Non-governmental organizations have seen a growing need to hire practitioners trained in conflict analysis and resolution. Furthermore, this expansion of the field has resulted in the need for conflict resolution practitioners to work in a variety of settings such as in businesses, court systems, government agencies nonprofit organizations, government agencies and educational institutions serving throughout the world.

Education

Universities worldwide offer programs of study pertaining to conflict research, analysis, and practice. The Cornell University ILR School houses the Scheinman Institute on Conflict Resolution, which offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional training on conflict resolution. Additional graduate programs are offered at Georgetown University, Eastern Mennonite University and Trinity College Dublin. George Mason University's Institute of Conflict Analysis and Resolution offers undergraduate, certificate and masters programs in Conflict Analysis and Resolution and a Ph.D. program in The Philosophy in Conflict and Conflict Resolution . Many students completing a doctoral program enter the field as researchers, theorists, analysts, policy makers and professors in higher education.

Furthermore, the Pax Ludens Foundation based in the Netherlands is an organization that puts together conflict resolution simulations set in an International Relations scenario to help students learn about the intricacies of where conflict emerges in the world of international politics.

Conflict resolution is a growing area of interest in UK pedagogy, with teachers and students both encouraged to learn about mechanisms that lead to aggressive action, and those that lead to peaceful resolution.

Ways of addressing conflict

Five basic ways of addressing conflict were identified by Thomas and Kilmann in 1976:

1. Accommodation – surrender one's own needs and wishes to accommodate the other party.
2. Avoidance – avoid or postpone conflict by ignoring it, changing the subject, etc. Avoidance can be useful as a temporary measure to buy time or as an expedient means of dealing with very minor, non-recurring conflicts. In more severe cases, conflict avoidance can involve severing a relationship or leaving a group.
3. Collaboration – work together to find a mutually beneficial solution. While the Thomas-Kilmann grid views collaboration as the only win-win solution to conflict, collaboration can also be time-intensive and inappropriate when there is not enough trust, respect or communication among participants for collaboration to occur.
4. Compromise – bring the problem into the open and have the third person present. The aim of conflict resolution is to reach agreement and most often this will mean compromise.
5. Competition – assert one's viewpoint at the potential expense of another. It can be useful when achieving one's objectives outweighs one's concern for the relationship.

The Thomas Kilmann Instrument can be used to assess one's dominant style for addressing conflict.

Conflict management

Conflict management refers to the long-term management of intractable conflicts. It is the label for the variety of ways by which people handle grievances—standing up for what they consider to be right and against what they consider to be wrong. Those ways include such diverse phenomena as gossip, ridicule, lynching, terrorism, warfare, feuding, genocide, law, mediation, and avoidance. Which forms of conflict management will be used in any given situation can be somewhat predicted and explained by the social structure—or social geometry—of the case.

Conflict management is often considered to be distinct from conflict resolution. In order for actual conflict to occur, there should be an expression of exclusive patterns, and tell why the conflict was expressed the way it was. Conflict is not just about simple inaptness, but is often connected to a previous issue. The latter refers to resolving the dispute to the approval of one or both parties, whereas the former concerns an ongoing process that may never have a resolution. Neither is it considered the same as conflict transformation, which seeks to reframe the positions of the conflict parties.

Counseling

When personal conflict leads to frustration and loss of efficiency, counseling may prove to be a helpful antidote. Although few organizations can afford the luxury of having professional counselors on the staff, given some training, managers may be able to perform this function. Nondirective counseling, or "listening with understanding", is little more than being a good listener—something every manager should be.

Sometimes the simple process of being able to vent one's feelings—that is, to express them to a concerned and understanding listener, is enough to relieve frustration and make it possible for the frustrated individual to advance to a problem-solving frame of mind, better able to cope with a personal difficulty that is affecting his work adversely.

The nondirective approach is one effective way for managers to deal with frustrated subordinates and co-workers.

There are other more direct and more diagnostic ways that might be used in appropriate circumstances. The great strength of the nondirective approach (nondirective counseling is based on the client-centered therapy of Carl Rogers), however, lies in its simplicity, its effectiveness, and the fact that it deliberately avoids the manager-counselor's diagnosing and interpreting emotional problems, which would call for special psychological training. Listening to staff with sympathy and understanding is unlikely to escalate the problem, and is a widely used approach for helping people to cope with problems that interfere with their effectiveness in their place of work.

❊ ❊ ❊ ❊ ❊

Q.27 What is NATO? Discuss its origin and future?

Ans.   NATO

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO); is a military alliance established by the signing of the North Atlantic Treaty on 4 April 1949. Headquartered in Brussels, Belgium, the organization constitutes a system of collective defense in which its member states agree to mutual defense in response to an attack by any external party.

For its first few years, NATO was not much more than a political association. However the Korean War galvanized the member states, and an integrated military structure was built up under the direction of two U.S. supreme commanders. The first NATO Secretary General Lord Ismay, famously described the organization's goal was "to keep the Russians out, the Americans in, and the Germans down". Throughout the Cold War doubts over the strength of the relationship between the European states and the United States ebbed and flowed, along with doubts over the credibility of the NATO defense against a prospective Soviet invasion—doubts that led to the development of the independent French nuclear deterrent and the withdrawal of the French from NATO's military structure from 1966.

After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the organization became drawn into the Balkans while building better links with former potential enemies to the east, which culminated with the former Warsaw Pact states—except Albania—joining the alliance in 1999 and 2004. Since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks, NATO has attempted to refocus itself to new challenges and has deployed troops to Afghanistan and trainers to Iraq.

History

Beginnings

The Treaty of Brussels, signed on March 17, 1948 by Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxembourg, France and the United Kingdom is considered the precursor to the NATO agreement. The treaty and the Soviet Berlin Blockade led to the creation of the Western European Union's Defense Organization in September 1948. However, participation of the United States was thought necessary in order to counter the military power of the USSR, and therefore talks for a new military alliance began almost immediately.

These talks resulted in the North Atlantic Treaty, which was signed in Washington, D.C. on April 4, 1949. It included the five Treaty of Brussels states, as well as the United States, Canada, Portugal, Italy, Norway, Denmark and Iceland. Support for the Treaty was not unanimous; Iceland suffered an anti-NATO riot in March 1949 which may have been Communist-inspired. Three years later, on 18 February 1952, Greece and Turkey also joined.

The Parties of NATO agreed that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all. Consequently they agree that, if such an armed attack occurs, each of them, in exercise of the right of individual or collective self-defense will assist the Party or Parties being attacked, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area.

Such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force does not necessarily mean that other member states will respond with military action against the aggressors. Rather they are obliged to respond, but maintain the freedom to choose how they will respond. This differs from Article IV of the Treaty of Brussels which clearly states that the response must include military action. It is however often assumed that NATO members will aid the attacked member militarily. Further, the article limits the organization's scope to Europe and North America, which explains why the invasion of the British Falkland Islands did not result in NATO involvement.

The outbreak of the Korean War in 1950 was crucial for NATO as it raised the apparent threat level greatly and forced the alliance to develop concrete military plans. The 1952 Lisbon conference, seeking to provide the forces necessary for NATO's Long-Term Defense Plan, called for an expansion to 96 divisions. However this requirement was dropped the following year to roughly 35 divisions with heavier use to be made of nuclear weapons. At this time, NATO could call on about 15 ready divisions in Central Europe, and another ten in Italy and Scandinavia. Also at Lisbon, the post of Secretary General of NATO as the organization's chief civilian was also created, and Baron Hastings Ismay eventually appointed to the post. Later, in September 1952, the first major NATO maritime exercises began; Operation Mainbrace brought together 200 ships and over 50,000 personnel to practice the defense of Denmark and Norway. Meanwhile, while this overt military preparation was going on, covert stay-behind arrangements to continue resistance after a successful Soviet invasion, initially made by the Western European Union, were being transferred to NATO control. Ultimately unofficial bonds began to grow between NATO's armed forces, such as the NATO Tiger Association and competitions such as the Canadian Army Trophy for tank gunnery.

In 1954, the Soviet Union suggested that it should join NATO to preserve peace in Europe. The NATO countries, fearing that the Soviet Union's motive was to weaken the alliance, ultimately rejected this proposal.

The incorporation of West Germany into the organization on May 9, 1955 was described as "a decisive turning point in the history of our continent" by Halvard Lange, Foreign Minister of Norway at the time. A major reason for Germany's entry into the alliance was that without German manpower, it would have been impossible to field

enough conventional forces to to resist a Soviet invasion. Indeed, one of its immediate results was the creation of the Warsaw Pact, signed on May 14, 1955 by the Soviet Union, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, and East Germany, as a formal response to this event, thereby delineating the two opposing sides of the Cold War.

The unity of NATO was breached early on in its history, with a crisis occurring during Charles de Gaulle's presidency of France from 1958 onward. De Gaulle protested the United States' strong role in the organization and what he perceived as a special relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom. In a memorandum sent to President Dwight D. Eisenhower and Prime Minister Harold Macmillan on September 17, 1958, he argued for the creation of a tripartite directorate that would put France on an equal footing with the United States and the United Kingdom, and also for the expansion of NATO's coverage to include geographical areas of interest to France, most notably Algeria, where France was waging a counter-insurgency and sought NATO assistance.

Considering the response given to be unsatisfactory, and in order to give France, in the event of a East German incursion into West Germany, the option of coming to a separate peace with the Eastern bloc instead of being drawn into a NATO-Warsaw Pact global war, de Gaulle began to build an independent defence for his country. On 11 March 1959, France withdrew its Mediterranean fleet from NATO command; three months later, in June 1959, de Gaulle banned the stationing of foreign nuclear weapons on French soil. This caused the United States to transfer two hundred military aircraft out of France and return control of the ten major air force bases that had operated in France since 1950 to the French by 1967.

In the meantime, France had initiated an independent nuclear deterrence programme, spearheaded by the "Force de frappe". France tested its first nuclear weapon, Gerboise Bleue, on February 13, 1960, in (what was then) French Algeria.

Though France showed solidarity with the rest of NATO during the Cuban missile crisis in 1962, de Gaulle continued his pursuit of an independent defence by removing France's Atlantic and Channel fleets from NATO command. In 1966, all French armed forces were removed from NATO's integrated military command, and all non-French NATO troops were asked to leave France. This withdrawal forced the relocation of the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) from Paris to Casteau, north of Mons, Belgium, by October 16, 1967. France remained a member of the alliance, and committed to the defense of Europe from possible Communist attack with its own forces stationed in the Federal Republic of Germany throughout this period. France rejoined NATO's Military Committee in 1995, and has since intensified working relations with the military structure. France has not, however, rejoined the integrated military command and no non-French NATO troops are allowed to be based on its soil. The policies of current French President Nicolas Sarkozy appear to be aimed at eventual re-integration.

The creation of NATO brought about some standardization of allied military terminology, procedures, and technology, which in many cases meant European countries adopting U.S. practices. The roughly 1,300 Standardization Agreements (STANAGs) codifies the standardization that NATO has achieved. Hence, the 7.62_51 NATO rifle

cartridge was introduced in the 1950s as a standard firearm cartridge among many NATO countries. Fabrique Nationale's FAL became the most popular 7.62 NATO rifle in Europe and served into the early 1990s. Also, aircraft marshalling signals were standardized, so that any NATO aircraft could land at any NATO base. Other standards such as the NATO phonetic alphabet have made their way beyond NATO into civilian use.

Détente

During most of the duration of the Cold War, NATO maintained a holding pattern with no actual military engagement as an organization. On July 1, 1968, the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty opened for signature: NATO argued that its nuclear weapons sharing arrangements did not breach the treaty as United States forces controlled the weapons until a decision was made to go to war, at which point the treaty would no longer be controlling. Few states knew of the NATO nuclear sharing arrangements at that time, and they were not challenged.

On May 30, 1978, NATO countries officially defined two complementary aims of the Alliance, to maintain security and pursue détente. This was supposed to mean matching defenses at the level rendered necessary by the Warsaw Pact's offensive capabilities without spurring a further arms race.

On December 12, 1979, in light of a build-up of Warsaw Pact nuclear capabilities in Europe, ministers approved the deployment of U.S. GLCM cruise missiles and Pershing II theater nuclear weapons in Europe. The new warheads were also meant to strengthen the western negotiating position in regard to nuclear disarmament. This policy was called the Dual Track policy. Similarly, in 1983–1984, responding to the stationing of Warsaw Pact SS-20 medium-range missiles in Europe, NATO deployed modern Pershing II missiles tasked to hit military targets such as tank formations in the event of war. This action led to peace movement protests throughout Western Europe.

KAL 007 and NATO deployment of missiles in W. Europe

With the background of the build-up of tension between the Soviet Union and the United States, NATO decided, under the impetus of the Reagan presidency, to deploy Pershing II and cruise missiles in Western Europe, primarily West Germany. These missiles were theater nuclear weapons intended to strike targets on the battlefield if the Soviets invaded West Germany. Yet, support for the deployment was wavering and many doubted whether the push for deployment could be sustained. But on Sept. 1, 1983, the Soviet Union shot down a Korean airliner, loaded with passengers, when it crossed into Soviet airspace–an act which President Reagan characterized as a "massacre." The barbarity of this act, as the United States and the world understood it, galvanized support for the deployment—which stood in place until the later accords between Reagan and Mikhael Gorbachev.

The membership of the organization in this time period likewise remained largely static. In 1974, as a consequence of the Turkish invasion of Cyprus, Greece withdrew its forces from NATO's military command structure, but, with Turkish cooperation, were readmitted in 1980. On May 30, 1982, NATO gained a new member when, following a referendum, the newly democratic Spain joined the alliance.

In November 1983, NATO manoeuvres simulating a nuclear launch caused panic in the Kremlin. The Soviet leadership, led by ailing General Secretary Yuri Andropov,

became concerned that the manoeuvres, codenamed Able Archer 83, were the beginning of a genuine first strike. In response, Soviet nuclear forces were readied and air units in East Germany and Poland were placed on alert. Though at the time written off by U.S. intelligence as a propaganda effort, many historians now believe that the Soviet fear of a NATO first strike was genuine.

Post Cold War

The end of the Cold War and the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact in 1991 removed the de facto main adversary of NATO. This caused a strategic re-evaluation of NATO's purpose, nature and tasks. In practice this ended up entailing a gradual expansion of NATO to Eastern Europe, as well as the extension of its activities to areas that had not formerly been NATO concerns. The first post-Cold War expansion of NATO came with the reunification of Germany on October 3, 1990, when the former East Germany became part of the Federal Republic of Germany and the alliance. This had been agreed in the Two Plus Four Treaty earlier in the year. To secure Soviet approval of a united Germany remaining in NATO, it was agreed that foreign troops and nuclear weapons would not be stationed in the east.

The scholar Stephen F. Cohen argued in 2005 that a commitment was given that NATO would never expand further east, but according to Robert B. Zoellick, then a State Department official involved in the Two Plus Four negotiating process, this appears to be a misperception; no formal commitment of the sort was made. On May 7, 2008, The Daily Telegraph held an interview with Gorbachev in which he repeated his view that such a commitment had been made. Gorbachev said "the Americans promised that NATO wouldn't move beyond the boundaries of Germany after the Cold War but now half of central and eastern Europe are members, so what happened to their promises? It shows they cannot be trusted."

As part of post-Cold War restructuring, NATO's military structure was cut back and reorganized, with new forces such as the Headquarters Allied Command Europe Rapid Reaction Corps established. The Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe agreed between NATO and the Warsaw Pact and signed in Paris in 1990, mandated specific reductions. The changes brought about by the collapse of the Soviet Union on the military balance in Europe were recognized in the Adapted Conventional Armed Forces in Europe Treaty, signed some years later.

The first NATO military operation caused by the conflict in the former Yugoslavia was Operation Sharp Guard, which ran from June 1993–October 1996. It provided maritime enforcement of the arms embargo and economic sanctions against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. On February 28, 1994, NATO took its first military action, shooting down four Bosnian Serb aircraft violating a U.N.-mandated no-fly zone over central Bosnia and Herzegovina. Operation Deny Flight, the no-fly-zone enforcement mission, had begun a year before, on April 12, 1993, and was to continue until December 20, 1995. NATO air strikes that year helped bring the war in Bosnia to an end, resulting in the Dayton Agreement, which in turn meant that NATO deployed a peacekeeping force, under Operation Joint Endeavor, first named IFOR and then SFOR, which ran from December 1996 to December 2004. Following the lead of its member nations, NATO began to award a service medal, the NATO Medal, for these operations.

Between 1994 and 1997, wider forums for regional cooperation between NATO and its neighbors were set up, like the Partnership for Peace, the Mediterranean Dialogue initiative and the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council. On 8 July 1997, three former communist countries, Hungary, the Czech Republic, and Poland, were invited to join NATO, which finally happened in 1999. In 1998, the NATO-Russia Permanent Joint Council was established.

A NATO bombing campaign, Operation Deliberate Force, began in August, 1995, against the Army of Republika Srpska, after the Srebrenica massacre. On March 24, 1999, NATO saw its first broad-scale military engagement in the Kosovo War, where it waged an 11-week bombing campaign, which NATO called Operation Allied Force, against what was then the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, in an effort to stop Serbian-led ethnic cleansing. A formal declaration of war never took place (in common with all wars since World War II). The conflict ended on 11 June 1999, when Yugoslavian leader Slobodan Milo_evi_ agreed to NATO's demands by accepting UN resolution 1244. During the crisis, NATO also deployed one of its international reaction forces, the ACE Mobile Force (Land), to Albania as the Albania Force (AFOR), to deliver humanitarian aid to refugees from Kosovo. NATO then helped establish the KFOR, a NATO-led force under a United Nations mandate that operated the military mission in Kosovo. In August–September 2001, the alliance also mounted Operation Essential Harvest, a mission disarming ethnic Albanian militias in the Republic of Macedonia.

The United States, the United Kingdom, and most other NATO countries opposed efforts to require the U.N. Security Council to approve NATO military strikes, such as the ongoing action against Yugoslavia, while France and some others claimed that the alliance needed U.N. approval. The U.S./U.K. side claimed that this would undermine the authority of the alliance, and they noted that Russia and China would have exercised their Security Council vetoes to block the strike on Yugoslavia, and could do the same in future conflicts where NATO intervention was required, thus nullifying the entire potency and purpose of the organization.

After the September 11 attacks

The September 11 attacks caused NATO to invoke Article 5 of the NATO Charter for the first time in its history. The Article says that an attack on any member shall be considered to be an attack on all. The invocation was confirmed on 4 October 2001 when NATO determined that the attacks were indeed eligible under the terms of the North Atlantic Treaty. The eight official actions taken by NATO in response to the attacks included : Operation Eagle Assist and Operation Active Endeavour. Operation Active Endeavour is a naval operation in the Mediterranean Sea and is designed to prevent the movement of terrorists or weapons of mass destruction as well as to enhance the security of shipping in general. It began on October 4, 2001.

Despite this early show of solidarity, NATO faced a crisis little more than a year later, when on February 10, 2003, France and Belgium vetoed the procedure of silent approval concerning the timing of protective measures for Turkey in case of a possible war with Iraq. Germany did not use its right to break the procedure but said it supported the veto.

On the issue of Afghanistan on the other hand, the alliance showed greater unity: On April 16, 2003 NATO agreed to take command of the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. The decision came at the request of Germany and the Netherlands, the two nations leading ISAF at the time of the agreement, and all 19 NATO ambassadors approved it unanimously. The handover of control to NATO took place on August 11, and marked the first time in NATO's history that it took charge of a mission outside the north Atlantic area. Canada had originally been slated to take over ISAF by itself on that date.

In January 2004, NATO appointed Minister Hikmet Çetin, of Turkey, as the Senior Civilian Representative (SCR) in Afghanistan. Minister Cetin is primarily responsible for advancing the political-military aspects of the Alliance in Afghanistan. In August 2004, following United States pressure, NATO formed the NATO Training Mission - Iraq, a training mission to assist the Iraqi security forces in conjunction with the U.S. led MNF-I.

On July 31, 2006, a NATO-led force, made up mostly of troops from Canada, Great Britain, Turkey and the Netherlands, took over military operations in the south of Afghanistan from a United States-led anti-terrorism coalition.

Expansion and restructuring

New NATO structures were also formed while old ones were abolished: The NATO Response Force (NRF) was launched at the 2002 Prague Summit on November 21. On June 19, 2003, a major restructuring of the NATO military commands began as the Headquarters of the Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic were abolished and a new command, Allied Command Transformation (ACT), was established in Norfolk, Virginia, USA, and the Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) became the Headquarters of Allied Command Operations (ACO). ACT is responsible for driving transformation (future capabilities) in NATO, while ACO is responsible for current operations.

Membership went on expanding with the accession of seven more Northern European and Eastern European countries to NATO: Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania and also Slovenia, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania. They were first invited to start talks of membership during the 2002 Prague Summit, and joined NATO on March 29, 2004, shortly before the 2004 Istanbul Summit. The same month, NATO's Baltic Air Policing began, which supported the sovereignty of Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia by providing fighters to react to any unwanted aerial intrusions. Four fighters are based in Lithuania, provided in rotation by virtually all the NATO states. Operation Peaceful Summit temporarily enhanced this patrolling during the 2006 Riga Summit.

The 2006 NATO summit was held in Riga, Latvia, which had joined the Atlantic Alliance two years earlier. It is the first NATO summit to be held in a country that was part of the Soviet Union, and the second one in a former COMECON country .Energy Security was one of the main themes of the Riga Summit.

At the April 2008 summit in Bucharest, Romania, NATO agreed to the accession of Croatia and Albania and invited them to join. Ukraine and Georgia were also told that they will eventually become members .

Involvement in Afghanistan: Taking over ISAF

In August 2003, NATO commenced its first mission ever outside Europe when it assumed control over International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan. However, some critics feel that national caveats or other restrictions undermine the efficiency of ISAF: For instance, political scientist Joseph Nye stated in a 2006 article that "many NATO countries with troops in Afghanistan have 'national caveats' that restrict how their troops may be used. While the Riga summit relaxed some of these caveats to allow assistance to allies in dire circumstances, Britain, Canada, the Netherlands, and the United States are doing most of the fighting in southern Afghanistan, while French, German, and Italian troops are deployed in the quieter north. Due to the intensity of the fighting in the south, France has recently allowed a squadron of Mirage 2000 fighter/attack aircraft to be moved into the area, to Khandahar, in order to reinforce the alliance's efforts. It is difficult to see how NATO can succeed in stabilizing Afghanistan unless it is willing to commit more troops and give commanders more flexibility." If these caveats were to be eliminated, it is argued that this could help NATO to succeed.

NATO missile defense talks controversy

For some years, the United States negotiated with Poland and the Czech Republic for the deployment of interceptor missiles and a radar tracking system in the two countries. Both countries' governments indicated that they would allow the deployment. The proposed American missile defense site in Central Europe is believed to be fully operational in 2015 and would be capable of covering most of Europe except part of Romania plus Bulgaria, Greece and Turkey.

In April 2007, NATO's European allies called for a NATO missile defense system which would complement the American National Missile Defense system to protect Europe from missile attacks and NATO's decision-making North Atlantic Council held consultations on missile defense in the first meeting on the topic at such a senior level.

In response, Russian president Vladimir Putin claimed that such a deployment could lead to a new arms race and could enhance the likelihood of mutual destruction. He also suggested that his country should freeze its compliance with the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE)—which limits military deployments across the continent—until all NATO countries had ratified the adapted CFE treaty.

Secretary General Jaap de Hoop Scheffer said the system would not affect strategic balance or threaten Russia, as the plan is to base only 10 interceptor missiles in Poland with an associated radar in the Czech Republic.

On July 14, 2007, Russia notified its intention to suspend the CFE treaty, effective 150 days later.

Future of NATO

NATO remains the key security structure in Europe. As such it has expansion plans to extend its security reach. Potential future members include the Republic of Macedonia/former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, which was under consideration to enter NATO in 2009. FYROM is likely to enter the alliance at some point, with Jane's Defence Weekly commenting on 16 April 2008 that resolution to the naming issue that is

holding up entry is "likely by the end of this year [2008] and no later than the 2009 summit." At the same 2008 summit in Bucharest, the communique explicitly said that Georgia and Ukraine "will become members of NATO."

Other potential candidate countries include, in South-eastern Europe, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia. Other possible, long neutral countries that might become members are Finland and Sweden.

Russia continues to oppose further expansion, seeing it as inconsistent with understandings between Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev and United States President George H. W. Bush which allowed for a peaceful unification of Germany. NATO's expansion policy is seen by Russia as a continuation of a Cold War attempt to surround and isolate Russia.

NATO began in an attempt to thwart feared Communist expansionism, and despite the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe, the relationship between Russia and NATO still remains problematic.

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.28 What do you know Warsaw Pact? What is its structure and history?

Ans.   Warsaw Pact

The Warsaw Treaty Organization of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance (1955–1991), or more commonly referred to as the Warsaw Pact, was a mutual defense treaty subscribed to by eight communist states in Eastern Europe. It was established at the Soviet Union's initiative and realized on 14 May 1955, in Warsaw.

In the Communist Bloc, the treaty was the military analogue of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance , the communist (East) European economic community. The Warsaw Pact was the Soviet Bloc's military response to West Germany's May 1955 integration to the NATO Pact, per the Paris Pacts of 1954.

Structure

The Warsaw Treaty's organization was two-fold: the Political Consultative Committee handled political matters, and the Combined Command of Pact Armed Forces controlled the assigned multi-national forces, with headquarters in Warsaw, Poland. Furthermore, the Supreme Commander of the Unified Armed Forces of the Warsaw Treaty Organization was also a First Deputy Minister of Defense of the USSR, and the head of the Warsaw Treaty Combined Staff also was a First Deputy Chief of the General Staff of the Armed Forces of the USSR. Therefore, although ostensibly an international collective security alliance, the USSR dominated the Warsaw Treaty armed forces.

Strategy

The strategy of the Warsaw Pact was dominated by the desire to prevent, at all costs, the recurrence of an invasion of Russian soil as had occurred under Napoleon in 1812 and Hitler in 1941–44, leading to extreme devastation and human losses in both cases, but especially in the second; the USSR emerged from the Second World War with the greatest total losses in life of any participant in the war. It was also dominated by the

Marxist-Leninist teaching that one way or the other, socialism ultimately had to prevail, which was taken to mean even in a nuclear war.

History

On 14 May 1955, the USSR established the Warsaw Pact in response to the integration of the Federal Republic of Germany into NATO in October 1954 – only nine years after the defeat of Nazi Germany (1933–45) that ended only with the Soviet and Allied invasion of Germany in 1944/45 during World War II in Europe. The reality, however, was that a "Warsaw"-type pact had been in existence since 1945, when Soviet forces were initially in occupation of Eastern Europe, and maintained there after the war. The Warsaw Pact merely formalized the arrangement.

The eight member countries of the Warsaw Pact pledged the mutual defense of any member who would be attacked; relations among the treaty signatories were based upon mutual non-intervention in the internal affairs of the member countries, respect for national sovereignty, and political independence.

The founding signatories to the Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation and Mutual Assistance consisted of the following communist governments:

1. People's Republic of Albania
2. People's Republic of Bulgaria
3. Czechoslovak Republic
4. German Democratic Republic
5. People's Republic of Hungary
6. People's Republic of Poland
7. People's Republic of Romania
8. Soviet Union

Nevertheless, for 36 years, NATO and the Warsaw Treaty never directly waged war against each other in Europe; but the United States and the Soviet Union and their respective allies implemented strategic policies aiming at the containment of each other in Europe, while working and fighting for influence within the wider Cold War on the international stage.

In 1956, following the declaration of the Imre Nagy government of withdrawal of Hungary from the Warsaw Pact, Soviet troops entered the country and removed the government.

The multi-national Communist armed forces' sole joint action was the Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia in August 1968. All member countries, with the exception of the Socialist Republic of Romania and the People's Republic of Albania participated in the invasion.

Beginning at the Cold War's conclusion, in late 1989, popular civil and political public discontent forced the Communist governments of the Warsaw Treaty countries from power – independent national politics made feasible with the perestroika- and glasnost-induced institutional collapse of Communist government in the USSR. In the event the populaces of Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Albania, East Germany, Poland, Romania, and Bulgaria deposed their Communist governments in the period from 1989–91.

On February 25, 1991 the Warsaw Pact was declared disbanded at a meeting of defense and foreign ministers from Pact countries meeting in Hungary. On the first of July 1991, in Prague, the Czechoslovak President Václav Havel formally ended the 1955 Warsaw Treaty Organization of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance and so disestablished the Warsaw Treaty after 36 years of military alliance with the USSR. Five months later, the USSR disestablished itself in December 1991.

Central and Eastern Europe after the Warsaw Treaty

Russia and some other post-USSR states joined in the Collective Security Treaty Organisation .

In November 2005, the Polish government opened its Warsaw Treaty archives to the Institute of National Remembrance who published some 1,300 declassified documents in January 2006. Yet the Polish government reserved publication of 100 documents, pending their military declassification. Eventually, 30 of the reserved 100 documents were published; 70 remained secret, and unpublished. Among the documents published is the Warsaw Treaty's nuclear war plan, Seven Days to the River Rhine – a short, swift attack capturing Western Europe, using nuclear weapons, in self-defense, after a NATO first strike. The plan originated as a 1979 field training exercise war game, and metamorphosed into official Warsaw Treaty battle doctrine, until the late 1980s – thus why the People's Republic of Poland was a nuclear weapons base, first, to 178, then, to 250 tactical-range rockets. Doctrinally, as a Soviet-style battle plan, Seven Days to the River Rhine gave commanders few defensive-war strategies for fighting NATO in Warsaw Treaty territory.

❊ ❊ ❊ ❊ ❊

Q.29 Write a comprehensive note on SEATO.

Ans.   Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO)

The Southeast Asia Treaty Organization was an international organization for collective defense in Southeast Asia created by the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, or Manila Pact, signed in September 1954 in Manila, Philippines. The formal institution of SEATO was established on 19 February 1955 at a meeting of treaty partners in Bangkok, Thailand. The organization's headquarters were also located in Bangkok.

Primarily created to block further communist gains in Southeast Asia, SEATO is generally considered a failure because internal conflict and dispute hindered general use of the SEATO military; however, SEATO-funded cultural and educational programs left long-standing effects in Southeast Asia. SEATO was dissolved on 30 June 1977 after multiple members lost interest and withdrew.

Origins and structure

SEATO was created by the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, or Manila Pact, signed on 8 September 1954 in Manila, as part of the American Truman Doctrine of creating anti-communist bilateral and collective defense treaties. These treaties and agreements were intended to create alliances that would contain communist powers . This policy was considered to have been largely developed by American diplomat and Soviet expert George F. Kennan. President Dwight D. Eisenhower's Secretary of State John

Foster Dulles was the primary force behind the creation of SEATO, which expanded the concept of anti-communist collective defense to Southeast Asia.

SEATO was planned to be a Southeast Asian version of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), in which the military forces of each member would be coordinated to provide for the collective defense of the members' country. Organizationally, SEATO was headed by the Secretary General, whose office was created in 1957 at a meeting in Canberra, with a council of representatives from member nations and an international staff. Also present were committees for economics, security, and information. SEATO's first Secretary General was Pote Sarasin, a Thai diplomat and politician who had served as Thailand's ambassador to the U.S. between 1952 and 1957, and as Prime Minister of Thailand from September 1957 to 1 January 1958.

Unlike the NATO alliance, SEATO had no joint commands with standing forces. In addition, SEATO's response protocol in the event of communism presenting a "common danger" to the member nations was vague and ineffective, though membership in the SEATO alliance did provide a rationale for a large-scale U.S. military intervention in the region during the Vietnam War (1955–1975).

Membership

SEATO's members included Australia, France, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Thailand, the United Kingdom, and the United States. The membership reflected a mid-1950s combination of anti-communist Western nations and such nations in Southeast Asia. The United Kingdom, Australia and the United States, the latter of which joined after the Senate ratified the treaty by a 82–1 vote, represented the strongest Western powers.

Because of the 1954 Geneva Conference settling the First Indochina War (1946–1954), South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos were not SEATO members. They were, however, granted military protection, though Cambodia rejected the protection in 1956. Canada considered joining, but decided against it in order to concentrate on its NATO responsibilities.

Military aspects

After its creation, SEATO quickly became insignificant militarily, as most of its member nations contributed very little to the alliance. While SEATO military forces held joint military training, they were never employed because of internal disagreements. SEATO was unable to intervene in conflicts in Laos because France and Britain rejected use of military action. As a result, the U.S. provided unilateral support for Laos after 1962. Though sought by the U.S., involvement of SEATO in the Vietnam War was denied because of lack of British and French cooperation.

Both the United States and Australia cited the alliance as justification for involvement in Vietnam. American membership in SEATO provided the United States with a rationale for a large-scale U.S. military intervention in Southeast Asia. Other countries, such as Great Britain and key nations in Asia, accepted the rationale. In 1962, as part of its commitment to SEATO, the Royal Australian Air Force deployed CAC Sabres of its No. 79 Squadron to Ubon Royal Thai Air Force Base, Thailand. The Sabres began to play a role in the Vietnam War in 1965, when their air defence responsibilities

expanded to include protection of USAF aircraft using Ubon as a base for strikes against North Vietnam.

Cultural effects

In addition to joint military training, SEATO member states worked on improving mutual social and economic issues. Such activities were overseen by SEATO's Committee of Information, Culture, Education, and Labor Activities, and proved to be some of SEATO's greatest successes. In 1959, SEATO's first Secretary General, Pote Sarasin, created the SEATO Graduate School of Engineering(currently the Asian Institute of Technology) in Thailand to train engineers. SEATO also sponsored the creation of the Teacher Development Center in Bangkok, as well as the Thai Military Technical Training School, which offered technical programs for supervisors and workmen. SEATO's Skilled Labor Project created artisan training facilities, especially in Thailand, where ninety-one training workshops were established.

SEATO also provided research funding and grants in agriculture and medical fields. In 1959, SEATO set up the Cholera Research Laboratory in Bangkok, later establishing a second Cholera Research Laboratory in Dhaka, Bangladesh. The Dhaka laboratory soon became the world's leading choleraresearch facility and was later renamed the International Centre for Diarrhoeal Disease Research, Bangladesh. SEATO was also interested in literature, and a SEATO Literature Award was created and given to writers from member states.

Criticism and dissolution

Though Secretary of State Dulles considered SEATO an essential element in American foreign policy in Asia, historians have considered the Manila Pact a failure and the pact is rarely mentioned in history books. In The Geneva Conference of 1954 on Indochina, Sir James Cable, a diplomat and naval strategist, described SEATO as "a fig leaf for the nakedness of American policy", citing the Manila Pact as a "zoo of paper tigers".

Consequently, questions of dissolving the organization arose. Pakistan withdrew in 1972 after the Bangladesh Liberation Warof 1971, in which East Pakistan successfully seceded with the aid of India. France withdrew financial support in 1975. After a final exercise on 20 February 1976, the organization was formally dissolved on 30 June 1977.

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋

Q.30 Write a comprehensive note on CENTO?

Ans.   Central Treaty Organization (CENTO)

The Central Treaty Organization was adopted in 1955 by Iran, Iraq, Pakistan, Turkey, and the United Kingdom. It was dissolved in 1979.

U.S. pressure and promises of military and economic aid were key in the negotiations leading to the agreement, although the United States could not initially participate "for purely technical reasons of budgeting procedures." In 1958, the United States joined the military committee of the alliance. It is generally viewed as one of the least successful of the Cold War alliances. The organization's headquarters were initially located in Baghdad (Iraq) 1955–1958 and Ankara (Turkey) 1958–1979. Cyprus was also

an important location for CENTO due to its positioning within the Middle East and the British Sovereign Base Areas situated on the island.

History

Modeled after the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), CENTO committed the nations to mutual cooperation and protection, as well as non-intervention in each other's affairs. Its goal was to contain the Soviet Union (USSR) by having a line of strong states along the USSR's southwestern frontier. Similarly, it was known as the 'Northern Tier' to prevent Soviet expansion into the Middle East. Unlike NATO, CENTO did not have a unified military command structure, nor were many U.S. or UK military bases established in member countries, although the U.S. had communications and electronic intelligence facilities in Iran, and operated U-2 intelligence flights over the USSR from bases in Pakistan. The United Kingdom had access to facilities in Pakistan and Iraq at various times while the treaty was in effect. In addition, Turkey and the U.S. agreed to permit American access to Turkish bases, but this was done under the auspices of NATO.

On July 14, 1958, the Iraqi monarchy was overthrown in a military coup. The new government was led by General Abdul Karim Qasim who withdrew from the Baghdad Pact, opened diplomatic relations with Soviet Union and adopted a non-aligned stance; Iraq quit the organization shortly thereafter. The organization dropped the name 'Baghdad Pact' in favor of 'CENTO' at that time.

The Middle East and South Asia became extremely volatile areas during the 1960s with the ongoing Arab-Israeli Conflict and the Indo-Pakistani Wars. CENTO was unwilling to get deeply involved in either dispute. In 1965 and 1971, Pakistan tried unsuccessfully to get assistance in its wars with India through CENTO, but this was rejected under the idea that CENTO was aimed at containing the USSR, not India.

CENTO did little to prevent the expansion of Soviet influence to non-member states in the area. Whatever containment value the pact might have had was lost when the Soviets 'leap-frogged' the member states, establishing close military and political relationships with governments in Egypt, Syria, Iraq, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, Somalia, and Libya. Indeed, by 1970, the U.S.S.R. had deployed over 20,000 troops to Egypt, and had established naval bases in Syria, Somalia, and P.D.R. Yemen.

The Iranian revolution spelled the end of the organization in 1979, but in reality, it essentially had been finished since 1974, when Turkey invaded Cyprus. This led the United Kingdom to withdraw forces that had been earmarked to the alliance, and the United States Congress halted Turkish military aid despite two Presidential vetoes. With the fall of the Iranian monarchy, whatever remaining rationale for the organization was lost. Future U.S. and British defense agreements with regional countries — such as Pakistan, Egypt, and the Persian Gulf states — were conducted bilaterally.

Google News reports of the Virgin Islands Daily News and Los Angeles Times indicate that with the withdrawal of Iran, the secretary-general of CENTO, a Turkish diplomat, called a meeting of the pact's council in order to formally dissolve the organization.

❋ ❋ ❋ ❋ ❋