



T.Y.B.A.
HISTORY PAPER -VIII
CONTEMPORARY WORLD
(1945-2000 AD)

Dr. Sanjay Deshmukh

Vice Chancellor,
University of Mumbai

Dr. Dhaneswar Harichandan

Professor-Cum-Director IDOL,
University of Mumbai

Programme Co-ordinator

: Anil R. Bankar

Asst. Prof. of History & Asst. Director
IDOL, University of Mumbai

Course Writer

: Dr. Eugene J.D'Souza

M.A., Ph.D, Former Principal,
Asmita College of Arts & Commerce
for women,
Kannamwar Nagar - 2,
Vikhroli (E), Mumbai - 400083

**Re Printed, August 2015, TYBA, History, Paper VIII,
Contemporary World (1945-2000 AD)**

Published by

**: Professor cum Director
Institute of Distance and Open Learning ,
University of Mumbai,
Vidyanagari, Mumbai - 400 098.**

DTP

**: Ashwini Art's
Guru Krupa Chawl, M.C.Chagla Marg, Bamanwada,
Vile Parle (East), Mumbai - 400 099.**

Printed By

:

CONTENTS

Unit No.	Title	Page No.
1.	Origin of the Cold War and its manifestations (1945-62)	01
2.	Reconstruction of Europe (1945-62)	16
3.	Reconstruction of the USSR (1945-62)	27
4.	Reconstruction of Eastern Europe (1945-62)	36
5.	Decolonization : Development of free nations (1945-62)	45
6.	Decolonization : Development of free nations (1945-62) French - Dutch-Belgian - Spanish - Portuguese and Italian	61
7.	Afro - Asian Movement : Bandung Conference and Non-aligned Movement	73
8.	Cold War (1962-1989): Arms Race	86
9.	Cold War (1962-1989): Space Race	100
10.	Cold War (1962-1989): Vietnam	112
11.	Ferment in West Asia : Arab - Israeli Conflict	121
12.	Ferment in West Asia - Revolution in Iran	137
13.	Ferment in West Asia - Iran - Iraq Conflict	146
14.	Collapse of Communism and It's Aftermath in Soviet Union (1989-2000)	154
15.	Collapse of Communism and It's Aftermath in Central and Easter Europe (1989-2000)	168
16.	USA as a Unipolar Power (1989-2000)	188
17.	Economic Transformation in Asia (1962-2000) Economic Miracle in Japan	193
18.	Economic Transformation in Asia (1962-2000) a) ASEAN b) Open Market Economy in China	202
19.	Development in Africa : OAU (Organization of Africa Unity)	214
20.	South Africa - End of Apartheid	221
21.	Dvelopment in Latin America : OAS (Organization of American States)	233
22.	The UNO and its functioning	243
23.	Human Rights Movement and Civil Rights Movement	262
24.	Globalization and its impact	277
25.	(a) Population Explosion (b) Problem of Poverty	287
26.	(a) Development and Environment (b) Women's Liberation Movement	296



SYLLABUS:

TYBA –HISTORY- PAPER VIII: CONTEMPORARY WORLD (1945 -- 2000 AD)

1. (a) Origin of the Cold war and its manifestation (1945 - 62)
(b) Reconstruction of Europe, USSR and Eastern Europe (1945-1962)
2. (a) Decolonization - Development of free nations (1945 - 1962)
(b) Afro - Asian movement - Non Aligned Movement and the Third World.
3. Cold War (1962 - 1989):(a) Arms race and space race
(b) Vietnam
4. (a) Ferment in West Asia; Arab - Israeli conflict
(b) Revolution in Iran; Iran - Iraq conflict.
5. (a) Collapse of Communism and its aftermath in Soviet Union, Central, Eastern Europe (1989 - 2000) - its world wide impact.
(b) USA as a Uni-polar Power (1989 - 2000)
6. Economic transformation in Asia 1962 - 2000 (a) Economic Miracle in Japan
(b) ASEAN (c) Open market Economy in China
7. (a) Developments in Africa; OAU (Organization of African Unity), South Africa - End of Apartheid.
(b) Developments in Latin America: OAS (Organization of American States
8. (a) The UNO and its functioning.
(b) Human Rights Movement and Civil Rights Movement
9. (a) Globalization and its impact,
(b) Population explosion, problem of poverty, Development And Environment.
(c) Women's Liberation Movement



ORIGIN OF THE COLD WAR AND ITS MANIFESTATIONS (1945-62)

Objectives:

1. To understand the meaning and origin of the Cold War.
2. To examine how the Cold War politics manifested in different aspects.

Introduction:

The Cold War was the post-Second World War phenomenon that led to the formation of two major power blocs – the Capitalist bloc and the Communist bloc. With the end of the Second World War in 1945, the Fascist and Nazi dictatorship in Europe, and Japanese military dictatorship in Asia came to an end. The Western democracies led by the U.S.A. and the Communist regime of the U.S.S.R. joined to defeat the Axis Powers - Germany, Italy and Japan. With the defeat of the fascist forces, both the super powers tried to dominate the world and tried to spread their own brand of ideology. This led to an age of suspicion, rivalry and conflict between these two superpowers. The strained relations that developed between these two superpowers following the Second World War came to be known as the 'Cold War'. Thus, the Cold War was post-1945 struggle between two blocs of nations led by the United States and the Soviet Union. The Cold War was waged on political, economic, and propaganda fronts and had only limited recourse to weapons. Intense economic and diplomatic struggles erupted between the two rival power blocs, including the extension of the contest across the world through proxy conflicts in the Third World. Different interests led to mutual suspicion and hostility in an escalating rivalry rooted in ideology. Paradoxically, the Cold War secured military peace in Europe for almost 50 years.

1.1. Origin of the Cold War:

The American financier and presidential adviser, Bernard Baruch has been considered as the originator of the term 'Cold War'. During a congressional debate on 16 April 1947, Bernard Baruch first used the term. He remarked: "Let us not be deceived today that we are in the midst of a Cold War." Walter Lippmann who through his book entitled 'Cold War' popularized it picked up the term. Following this, the term Cold War has been used to

describe the relations between the Western democratic capitalist bloc led by the United States and the Eastern Communist bloc led by the Soviet Union since the end of the Second World War.

Cold War was not a state of armed conflict but a state in which the rivals, while maintaining their peaceful diplomatic relations, continued their hostility. According to *A Dictionary of Politics*, the Cold War was “a state of tension between two countries or group of countries in which each side adopts policies designed to strengthen itself and weaken the other, the line falling short of actual hot war.” The Cold War had various facets. It comprised of the whole complex of political, psychological, economic, subversive and indirectly military measures used by one side to extend its influence in the world and to weaken that of the other. The Cold War was an ideological war or propaganda war or a diplomatic war. It was neither a condition of war nor a condition of peace. It was a state of uneasy peace. Ideological conflict, political distrust, diplomatic manoeuvring, military competition and armed race, espionage and psychological warfare were the symptoms of the Cold War. Thus, the Cold War, though was not an actual war, had all the potentialities of a war. Some writers had described the Cold War as ‘hot peace’. Kennedy described it as ‘hard and bitter peace’.

Different authors in various ways have defined the term ‘Cold War’. However, these definitions point out the tension and conflict between the two rival blocs in international relations. According to R.K. Garthoff the Cold War is “the conflict between the Communist Powers and the rest of the world waged by means short of overt major war.” Prof. Young Hum Kim maintains, “Though the term Cold War defies precise definition, it may be described as the international environment characterized by persistent tensions and conflicts between the free world and the Communist camp in general and between the United States and the Soviet Union in particular. This new war of cold realities in international politics has been waged in every conceivable field of international life, especially in national defense, economic growth, diplomacy and ideology.”

1.2. Manifestation of the Cold War:

1.2.1. Conflicting Ideology:

Though the Cold War manifested itself after the Second World War, the differences between the Soviet Union and the Western powers could be traced to the establishment of the Communist rule in Russia following the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. The basic cause of conflict lay in differences of principle between the communist states and the liberal capitalist-democratic states. The communist system has been based on organizing the state and society in line with the ideas of Karl Marx. Marxism embodied the principle that the wealth of a country should be

collectively owned and shared by everybody. The economy should be centrally planned and the interests and well-being of the working classes safeguarded by the state. The capitalist system on the other hand, operates on the basis of private ownership and the driving forces behind capitalism have been private enterprise and *laissez faire* with a view of making profits.

Since the establishment of the world's first communist government in Russia in 1917, the governments of most capitalist states viewed it with mistrust and were afraid of communism spreading to their countries. The enmity of the Western powers with the Soviet Union was also manifested from the refusal of the Western powers to recognize the Bolshevik government in Russia. The USA did not recognize the Soviet Union until 1933. The Soviet Union could get the membership of the League of Nations only in 1934. Besides, Soviet Union did not get any cooperation from the Western powers in her attempt at collective security and disarmament programmes. She protested against the policy of appeasement followed by Britain and France towards Nazi Germany with a view to create a strong rival in Germany to check the Russia power. During the Second World War in September 1939, following the German invasion of Russia in 1941, the need for self-preservation against Germany and Japan prompted the USSR, the USA and Britain to forget their differences and work together. However, once the common enemy was defeated, the victors fought over the booty. And the Cold War became a reality. Thus, the Cold War was rooted in ideological differences between the capitalist West and communist Russia.

1.2.2. Dominance of Soviet Russia Over Eastern Europe:

When the defeat of Nazi Germany was imminent Stalin decided to take advantage of the situation to extend Soviet influence over large part of Europe. With the collapse of the military machine Stalin tried to acquire vast regions of Germany, Finland, Poland and Romania. The Soviet occupation of Eastern and Central Europe by Soviet forces was viewed with great apprehension by the Western powers. Stalin failed to honour the pledges included in the Yalta and Balkan Agreements. At Yalta (1945) the Western powers had acknowledged Russia's military authority over Eastern and Central Europe. However, it was agreed that in all the liberated countries of Europe democratic institutions would be created after holding free elections. In spite of these pledges, the Soviet Union established a communist regime in Poland. Similarly, Soviet supported regimes were established in other Central and Eastern European countries. These included Finland, Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany. Communist guerillas were dispatched by the Soviet Union to Greece for the same purpose. Under these circumstances the Western powers took upon themselves the task of checking further expansion of Soviet influence in Europe.

1.2.3. The Truman Doctrine:

The Truman Doctrine, known after the US President, Harry S. Truman, was the outcome of the events in Greece. Britain had liberated Greece from the Nazis in 1944. Under a treaty the Soviet Union had acknowledged Greece as a British sphere of influence. However, when the elections in 1945 brought the Royalists into power, the communists started a guerilla war against the Greek government, which took the form of a civil war. The communist guerilla forces in Greece received outside help from Bulgaria, Albania and Yugoslavia. The Western powers were of the opinion that the Soviet Union was indirectly backing the communist insurgency in Greece.

Under these circumstances Britain decided to withdraw her troops from Greece and Turkey. This decision of the British Government determined the general direction to the American policy ever since. The journalists referred the US response to the developments in Greece and Turkey leading to the decision of the British Government to withdraw its troops from these two countries as the *Truman Doctrine*. The Truman Doctrine basically altered the role of the USA in world politics from that of 'isolation' after the First World War to that of 'active involvement' after the Second World War. The Truman Doctrine, though originated in the situation in Greece and Turkey, was important not because of those countries but as an announcement of American intentions towards the world in general. The formal decision-makers in this matter were President, Harry S. Truman, and the Secretary of State, General George C. Marshall. But the true originator of the Truman Doctrine was the under-secretary of state, Dean Acheson. He visualized a grim picture of a world dominated by the Soviet Union.

The Truman Doctrine was formulated as a message to the Congress, delivered by President Truman on 12 March 1947. The Truman Doctrine was based on the following basic postulates: "At the present moment nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one. One way of life is based on the will of the majority and it is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of speech and election and freedom from political oppression. The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed on the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections and the suppression of personal freedoms. I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures".

It is important to note that the Truman Doctrine was in no way a regional doctrine. It was not confined to Europe, much less confined to Greece and Turkey. It became a general policy of

containment of communism throughout the world. Besides, the notion of 'supporting free peoples' contained the germs of a military commitment, as well as an economic package. It was the precursor of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. According to the critics of the Truman Doctrine, it was a declaration of war: the Cold War. As to the defense of Greece and Turkey, the US Congress was asked to provide 400 million dollars from the period to June 1948. More funds were allocated later. The British troops in Greece remained till 1950. The Russian threat to Turkey retreated to its normal status of a reasonable speculation. Thus, the Truman Doctrine made it clear that the USA had no intention of returning to isolation as she had after the First World War. Through the Truman Doctrine the USA was committed to a policy of containing communism, not just in Europe, but also throughout the world, including Korea and Vietnam.

1.2. 4. The Berlin Blockade:

At the end of the Second World War, as agreed among the big powers at Yalta and Potsdam, Germany and Berlin were each divided into four zones. While the three western powers, the USA, Britain and France did their best to organize the economic and political recovery of their zones, Stalin, determined to make Germany pay for all the damage inflicted on Russia, treated the Soviet zone (East Germany) as a satellite, draining its resources away to Russia.

Early in 1948 the three Western Zones of Germany were merged to form a single economic unit. Its prosperity, thanks to Marshall Aid, was in marked contrast to the poverty of the Russian zone. The Western Powers wanted all four zones to be re-united and given self-government as soon as possible. However, Stalin had decided that it would be safer for Russia if he kept the Russian zone separate, with its own communist, pro-Russian government. The prospect of the three Western Zones re-uniting was alarming enough to Stalin, because he felt that the reunited Germany might become a part of the Western bloc. In June 1948 the West introduced a new currency and ended price controls in their zone and in West Berlin.

The Russian response was immediate. All road, rail and canal links between West Berlin and West Germany were closed. The Soviet aim was to force the West to withdraw from West Berlin by reducing it to starvation point. The Western powers, convinced that a retreat would encourage a Soviet attack on West Germany, were determined to hold on. They decided to airlift supplies to the residents of West Berlin. Over the next ten months two million tones of supplies were airlifted to the blockaded city in a remarkable operation, which kept the 2.5 million West Berliners fed and warm right through the winter. In May 1949 the Russians admitted failure by lifting the Berlin blockade.

The Berlin blockade was one of the significant manifestation of the Cold War. It was over Berlin that the Soviet Union and the United States came to their decisive trial of strength. During the blockade the United States moved its strategic bombers to Britain, and thus threatened Moscow with nuclear bombardment for the first time. When the blockade was lifted, the Soviet Union and the Western powers had come to a tacit understanding about Germany, which set the pattern for the future. Since there was no prospect of the Russians allowing a united Germany, the Western powers went ahead in uniting the three zones under their control and set up the German Federal Republic (FRG), also known as West Germany in August 1949. The Russians retaliated by setting up their zone as the German Democratic Republic (GDR), known as East Germany in October 1949. Germany remained divided until the collapse of communism in East Germany (November-December 1989) made it possible early in 1990 to reunite the two states into a single Germany.

1.2.5. Security Pacts:

1.2.5.a. North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO):

In the years after the Second World War, many Western leaders saw the policies of the Soviet Union as threatening the stability and peace of Europe. The forcible installation of Communist governments throughout Eastern Europe, territorial expansion by the Soviets, and its support of guerrilla war in Greece and regional separatism in Iran, appeared to many as the first steps in new aggression that might lead to another world war. Subsequent events, including deterioration of the situation in Greece and the near collapse of war-devastated European economies during the winter of 1946-1947, led the United States to two important initiatives: the European Economic Recovery Programme or Marshall Plan, which the Eastern Europeans rejected under Soviet compulsion; and the declaration of the Truman Doctrine. This, although directed at the situation in Greece and Turkey, contained a generalized pledge to help any nation defending its freedom and democracy.

Under these circumstances led by Britain and its foreign secretary, Ernest Bevin, Western European countries, especially France, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg formed the Western Union Defensive Alliance by the Brussels Defense Treaty of 1948 promising military collaboration in case of war. They were joined by the United States, Canada, Portugal, Denmark, Iceland, Italy and Norway. This willingness to stand together and the Soviet-instigated Blockade of Berlin, which began in March 1948, encouraged negotiations that culminated in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in April 1949. Greece and Turkey accepted the Treaty in 1952, and the new Federal Republic of Germany became the member of the NATO in May 1955.

The NATO is embodied in fourteen short articles. The main part of the treaty is contained in Articles 3 and 6. The parties to the treaty agreed to maintain their individual and collective capacity to resist armed attack against one or more of them in Europe and North America. An attack against any one of them was to be considered as an attack against all of them. The creation of NATO was an affirmation of the dissolution of the wartime alliance. It was based on the fear of Russian aggression, compounded by a strong resentment against the nature of Russian domination in Eastern Europe, frustration turning to hostility in German affairs, the exposure of Western Europe as a result of war damage and demobilization, and the failure to internationalize the control of atomic energy.

1.2.5.b. Baghdad Pact or Central Treaty Organization (CENTO):

The policy of containing communism was extended to other parts of the world as well. Thus, security pacts, similar to the NATO were established in other strategic areas. After the European security, the defense of the Middle East and its oil resources were considered to be vital from the point of view of the Western democracies.

In any future war, it was felt that the Middle East could serve as a base for striking at the lifeline of Russia's communication. The United States, thus, planned a new approach for the defense of the Middle East against any possible future advances of the Soviet Union. In a new strategy of security system for the Middle East, the United States encouraged Turkey, a member of the NATO and Pakistan, which had been promised military and economic aid from the United States to sign a pact of mutual defense in April 1954. Iraq, which was following a pro-western policy at that time, was suited as the base of a Middle Eastern defense and a link between Turkey and Pakistan. In February 1955 Turkey and Iraq signed the Baghdad Pact. Britain joined the Baghdad Treaty Organization and Pakistan also acceded to it. However, the United States did not join the Baghdad Pact. It was hoped that Afghanistan and Iran would eventually join the Baghdad Pact and thus complete the 'northern tier' strategy. Strained relations between Pakistan and Afghanistan kept the latter out of the Pact, but Iran joined it in September 1955.

The Baghdad Pact was viewed with suspicion by the Arab countries. As Nasser of Egypt refused to join the Baghdad Pact and attempt was made to his ouster. Thus, the Pact was seen as a threat to the Arab national movement. The Soviet Union denounced it and India also disapproved the U.S. aid to Pakistan. In 1958 following the fall of monarchy in Iraq and the establishment of a republican government under General Qasim led to the withdrawal of Iraq from the Baghdad Pact. Under these circumstances, the United States could no longer remain aloof from the security arrangement of the Middle East. The Baghdad Pact was replaced

by the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) and its headquarters were shifted from Baghdad to Turkey.

1.2.5.c. The Anzus Pact:

In an attempt to prevent the spread of communism in the Far East and South East Asia, the United States continued to support the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek in Formosa (Taiwan) and signed a security treaty with Japan in September 1951 recognizing that Japan had the right to enter into collective security arrangement. However, the possibility of a revival of Japan and the threat of communist expansion alarmed Philippines, Australia and New Zealand. Australia and New Zealand made it clear that their approval of the treaty between the United States and Japan depended upon an agreement for the defense of their territories by the United States. Though both these countries were the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the relative weakness of Britain prompted them to seek protection from the United States. In August 1951, the United States had signed a mutual defense pact with Philippines and it was followed by a tripartite agreement with Australia and New Zealand in September 1951.

This pact of security between the United States on the one side and Australia and New Zealand on the other was known as the Anzus Pact. The provisions of the treaty directed the parties to develop by self-help and mutual aid their capacity to resist armed attack. They agreed to consult each other in case of any such attack in the Pacific area.

1.2.5.d. South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO):

The renewed threat of the expansion of the communist influence in South East Asia engaged the immediate attention of the Eisenhower administration for the need of setting up of collective security organization in that region. With this view a conference was convened at Manila which was attended by eight Western and Asian governments in September 1954. Representatives of these eight governments signed the South East Security Pact. The signatories were the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan and Philippines. Neutral Asian countries including India refused to attend the conference. By a separate declaration, the United States undertook upon herself the task of defending the area not only from communist aggression but also to mutual consultation in case of other aggression or armed attack. The treaty also provided for co-operation in the economic field. The headquarters of the SEATO was established at Bangkok, capital of Thailand.

1.2.5.e. Warsaw Pact:

The response of the Soviet Union to the Western attempt at security pacts, as instruments of containing communism was the

conclusion of the Warsaw Pact in May 1955. The signatories to this pact were the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, East Germany, Poland, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. The signatories decided to set up a united command of armed forces of the signatory states with Moscow as its headquarters. The members of the Warsaw Pact agreed to resist jointly the attacks of the imperialist and capitalist powers, to establish peace and security by a united resistance to any foreign attack upon any member state. They also agreed to participate in mutual economic and cultural collaboration. Essentially, the Warsaw Pact was a counterpart of the NATO. Its chief object was to meet any challenge from the NATO powers.

1.2.6. The Korean War (1950-53):

At the end of the Second World War, the Allies agreed that Soviet forces would accept the surrender of Japanese troops in Korea north of the 38th degree of parallel, while American troops would accept the Japanese surrender south of that line. As far as the Americans were concerned, it was not intended to be a permanent division. The United Nations wanted free elections for the whole country. However, the prospects of the unification of Korea, like that of Germany, soon became part of Cold War rivalry.

No agreement could be reached between the Soviet Union and the United States on the issue of the unification of Korea and the artificial division of Korea continued. Elections were held in the south under the supervision of the United Nations, and the independent Republic of Korea or South Korea was set up with Seoul as the capital, in August 1948. The following month, the Russians created the Democratic People's Republic of Korea or North Korea under the communist government of Kim Il Sung, with its capital at Pyongyang. In 1949 Russian and American troops were withdrawn, leaving a potentially dangerous situation. Most Koreans bitterly resented the artificial division of their country by outsiders, but both leaders claimed the right to rule the whole country.

In June 1950, the North Korean troops, without warning invaded South Korea. The North Koreans might have had the tacit approval of the Soviet Union, perhaps wanting to test Truman's determination. The Russians had supplied the North Koreans with tanks and other equipments. A communist takeover of the south would strengthen Russia's position in the Pacific and might have made up the Soviet failure in West Berlin. The communists claimed that South Korea had started the war, when troops of the 'bandit traitor' Syngman Rhee crossed the 38th parallel.

Truman held Stalin responsible for the invasion of South Korea by North Korea. He saw the invasion as part of a vast Russian plan to spread communism as widely as possible. The policy of the United States therefore changed decisively. Instead of

just economic help and promises of support, Truman decided it was essential for the West to take a stand by supporting South Korea. American troops were ordered to proceed from Japan to Korea even before the UN had decided what action to take. The UN Security Council called on North Korea to withdraw her troops, and when this was ignored, asked member states to send help to South Korea. This decision was reached in the absence of the Russian delegates, who were boycotting meetings in protest against the UN refusal to allow Mao's new Chinese regime to be represented, and who would certainly have vetoed such a decision. Heeding the call of the UN, the USA and fourteen other countries sent troops, though the vast majority were Americans. All forces were under the command of American General MacArthur.

The arrival of the Western troops was just in time to prevent the whole of South Korea from being overrun by the communists. By September 1950 communist forces had captured the whole country except the southeast, around the port of Pusan. UN reinforcements poured into Pusan, which consequently led to the sudden collapse of the North Korean forces. By the end of September UN troops had entered Seoul and cleared the south of communists. Instead of calling for a cease-fire now that the original UN objective had been achieved, Truman ordered an invasion of North Korea, with the approval of the UN, aiming to unite the country and hold free elections. Chou En-lai, the Chinese foreign minister had warned that China would resist if UN troops entered North Korea. However, the warning was ignored. By the end of October 1950 UN troops had captured Pyongyang, occupied two-thirds of North Korea and reached the Yalu River, the frontier between North Korea and China.

These developments alarmed the Chinese government. There seemed every possibility of the UN troops invading Manchuria, the part of China bordering on North Korea. In order to pre-empt the Western strategy, the Chinese launched a massive counter-offensive and by mid-January 1951 the Chinese succeeded in driving the UN troops out of North Korea, crossed the 38th parallel and captured Seoul again.

Meanwhile, MacArthur was demanding the authority to blockade China's coastline and bomb its Manchurian bases. Truman refused, feeling that such a course would bring the Soviet Union into the war and thus lead to a global conflict. In response, MacArthur appealed over Truman's head directly to the American public in an effort to enlist support for his war aims. In April 1951, President Truman relieved MacArthur as UN commander and as commander of American forces in the Far East. In June UN troops cleared the communists out of South Korea again and fortified the frontier. In July 1951, peace talks began while the North Koreans and Chinese vainly tried to score further success on the battlefield. The negotiations dragged on for months, until after the U.S.

presidential elections in 1952 and the victory of Dwight D. Eisenhower, who had criticized the unpopular war and announced his intention to visit Korea if elected. After a brief renewal of hostilities in June 1953, an armistice was concluded in July 1953 with an agreement that the frontier between North and South Korea should be roughly along the 38th parallel line. The exchange and repatriation of prisoners soon followed.

The Korean War brought a new dimension to the Cold War. American relations were permanently strained with China as well as with Russia and the familiar pattern of both sides trying to build up alliances appeared in Asia as well as Europe. China supported the Indo-Chinese communists in their struggle for independence from France. She also offered friendship and aid to under-developed Third World countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America. China also signed 'peaceful co-existence' agreements with India and Burma. Meanwhile the Americans tried to encircle China with bases. In 1951 defensive agreements were signed with Australia and New Zealand (ANZUS Pact), and in 1954 these three states together with Britain and France set up the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). However, the USA was disappointed when only three Asian states-Pakistan, Thailand and Philippines-joined SEATO. It was clear that most of the states in Asia wanted to keep away from the Cold War and remain uncommitted. Relations between the USA and China were also poor because of the Taiwan question. The communists still hoped to capture the island and destroy Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist party (KMT). However, the Americans were committed to defend Chiang and wanted to keep Taiwan as an American military base.

1.2.7. The U-2 Incident:

In 1956, the US president Eisenhower had put forward his 'open skies' plan under which powers would allow 'spy planes' from other countries to over fly their territory in order to verify the size of opposing military forces. The Soviet Union did not agree to the US proposal as she saw this as an attempt by Western powers to intrude on Russian affairs. Meanwhile, Khrushchev, who had succeeded Stalin in Russia in 1953, in an opening speech at the 20th Party Congress had outlined his 'revision' of Russian foreign policy. War was not inevitable with the capitalists; co-existence was desirable; in the age of the hydrogen bomb there would be no winners. But Khrushchev spoke also of co-existence 'between states having different social systems', which, inevitably, would continue their struggle for supremacy.

In 1959 Khrushchev visited the USA, partly to address the UN General Assembly, partly to meet Eisenhower at Camp David. In spite of US revulsion at the suppression of the Hungarian revolution in 1956 and Dulles's hesitations, it was agreed that a summit meeting should be held in 1960. Apart from disarmament,

the summit would, it was hoped, lead to a settlement of the German question. The summit was arranged for May 1960 in Paris.

As soon as the Conference opened at Paris, Khrushchev announced that an American U-2 'spy plane' had been shot down over Russia and that he was no longer prepared to discuss the German problem with the untrustworthy Americans. Eisenhower refused to accept that such a plane had been shot down. Khrushchev then produced the unfortunate Gary Powers, the pilot of the ill-fated U-2, as evidence not only of US spying activity but also of Eisenhower's lying. Khrushchev called the summit off and cancelled the invitation, which had been extended to Eisenhower to visit Moscow. Khrushchev could claim a 'triumph' for having shown up the Americans, while his supporters could argue that progress to co-existence had been halted only by US behaviour.

1.2.8. The Berlin Wall:

In the first weeks after the Paris fiasco there was a widespread feeling that it marked a decisive turn for the worse in East-West relations. In September 1960, Khrushchev gave an angry speech at the UN General Assembly. Further confirmation of the apparent end of the 'Thaw' was provided in 1961 when he met President Kennedy at Vienna. He threatened Kennedy that if the Western powers did not sign a peace treaty with East Germany 'in the next six months', he would do so unilaterally. Kennedy's response was to accept the threat as serious one. The communists were embarrassed at the large number of refugees escaping from East Germany into West Berlin. When Kennedy refused the suggestion of Khrushchev that the West should withdraw from Berlin, the Berlin Wall was erected. It was a twenty-eight mile long barricade across the entire city, effectively blocking the escape route. The building of the Berlin Wall in August 1961 set off an acute phase in the East-West conflict over Germany.

1.2.9. The Cuban Missile Crisis:

When Fidel Castro took over power from the discredited dictator Batista at the beginning of 1959, he was far from admitting that he was a Marxist, let alone a communist. He visited the USA in April 1959, and during his visit gave assurances that foreign investments in Cuba, especially American, would not be confiscated. However, Castro embarked on a policy of increasing his economic links with the Soviet Union and with the Soviet bloc in general. This put a severe strain on his relations with the United States.

Convinced that Cuba was now a communist state in all but name, the new US President John F. Kennedy, approved a plan by a group of Batista supporters to invade Cuba from American bases in Guatemala (Central America). The American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), a kind of secret service, was deeply involved in this operation. The small invading force of about 1400 men landed at

the Bay of Pigs in April 1961. But the operation was so badly planned and carried out that Castro's forces and his two jet planes had no difficulty crushing it. Later the same year Castro announced that he was now a Marxist and that Cuba was a socialist country.

Khrushchev, the Soviet leader, decided to set up nuclear missile launchers in Cuba aimed at the USA, whose nearest point was less than a hundred miles from Cuba. He intended to install missiles with a range of up to 2000 miles, which meant that all the major cities of central and eastern USA such as New York, Washington, Chicago and Boston would be under threat. This was a risky decision taken by Khrushchev.

The Cuban missile crisis, properly speaking, began on Tuesday, 16 October 1962, when President Kennedy received a report that Soviet missile sites had been identified on the island. Once the original U2 pilots' reports had been confirmed by further reconnaissance, Kennedy convened a small group of advisers who were to meet in almost permanent session during the thirteen-day crisis, and whose first task was to decide on the American response.

President Kennedy had three options before him – to remain inactive, to carry out an immediate bombing raid to destroy the missiles, and to establish a naval blockade to prevent further missiles being imported into Cuba. In spite of the pressure from the military advisers to launch air strikes against the missile bases in Cuba, Kennedy opted for the third alternative, the course of action recommended by the Secretary of Defense, Robert McNamara, and accepted by the majority of Kennedy's advisers. He alerted the American troops and began a blockade of Cuba to keep out 25 Russian ships, which were bringing missiles to Cuba. Further, Kennedy demanded the dismantling of the missile sites and the removal of those missiles already in Cuba.

Castro and Khrushchev argued that the missiles were defensive in character and cited the US-supported attack at the Bay of Pigs as evidence of the threat to Cuba. Kennedy refused to accept the argument. Khrushchev then claimed that the US was threatening Russia with its missile based in Turkey and elsewhere in Europe. Kennedy insisted that these were part of the 'containment package' and had no offensive purpose, unlike the Cuban-based missiles.

Leaders of the two superpowers maintained contact by means of letters and telephone messages. Neither wanted the world to be plunged into war. Both were under a lot of pressure. Kennedy consulted Macmillan, the British prime minister and Charles de Gaulle, the French president, who was, however, angered by the President's apparent willingness to consider a nuclear war without asking the advice of European leaders.

Leftwing and liberal groups in Europe held demonstrations, claiming that the US had brought the world to the brink of war.

In the next few days, as a number of merchant ships carrying Soviet missiles approached the ring of the United States warships, the world held its breath and waited for what appeared to be an inevitable US-Soviet clash, which might lead in a matter of hours to all-out thermo-nuclear war. The Secretary general of the Un, U Thant, appealed to both sides for restraint. President Kennedy, at the same time as making his firm military response to the situation, was however, seeking means to leave open a loophole in order to make it as easy as possible for Khrushchev to climb down without much loss of face. While ships were stopped and searched, those, which had no missiles, were allowed to enter Cuban waters. Khrushchev took advantage of the weeklong period of tension to order Russian ships, carrying additional missiles, to turn back on 27 October 1962. He also promised to remove the missiles and dismantle the launching sites from Cuba. In return Kennedy promised that the USA would not invade Cuba again and undertook to disarm the Jupiter missiles in Turkey.

The Cuban Missile Crisis had only lasted for a few days, but it was extremely tense and it had important results. Both sides could claim to have gained something. However, the most important aspect of the entire episode was that both sides realized how easily a nuclear war could have started and how terrible the results would have been. It seemed to bring them both to their senses and produced a marked relaxation of tension. For the future of the relationship between the superpowers, the missile crisis was important because it caused both Khrushchev and Kennedy to take steps to improve contact between Moscow and Washington. A new telephone link was established and on this 'hot line' the leaders could be in more immediate contact. The letters, which passed between them during the crisis, also indicated a will, on both sides, to try to ensure that their future policies would be more evidently defensive in character. There would be no more 'brinkmanship on the one side or the other. For Europe, the crisis had been the plainest evidence that there was now a bi-polar world, in which decisions would be reached by the superpowers without Europe being taken into account.

Although Kennedy's handling of the crisis was highly praised at first, later historians have been more critical. It has been suggested that he ought to have called Khrushchev's bluff, attacked Cuba and overthrown Castro. On the other hand some historians have criticized Kennedy for allowing the crisis to develop in the first place. They argue that since Soviet long-range missiles could already reach the USA from Russia itself, the missiles in Cuba did not exactly pose a new threat.

Questions:

1. Explain the meaning of the Cold War and trace its origin.
2. With examples examine how Cold War manifested between 1945 and 1962.
3. How far the Truman Doctrine became the instrument of Cold War politics in Europe?
4. Examine the role of the Security Pacts in Cold War politics.
5. Comment on the following: (a) Korean War (1950-53) (b) Cuban Missile Crisis (1962)
6. Write short notes on:
 - (a) Truman Doctrine
 - (b) Berlin Blockade
 - (c) NATO
 - (d) Korean War (1950-53)
 - (e) Cuban Missile Crisis (1962)



RECONSTRUCTION OF EUROPE (1945-62).

Objectives:

1. To understand the economic recovery of Western Europe through various programmes such as the Marshall Plan.
2. To trace the growth of European Unity through various stages.

Introduction:

The recovery of Western Europe following the end of the Second World War was quite impressive. Economic recovery, which required the restoration of severely damaged but essentially sound and skilled economies, was made possible through American financial aid. This was prompted by American generosity towards the Western European countries. Besides, the fear of the collapse of these countries and the possibility of their going under the influence of the Soviet Union induced the United States to involve itself in the economic recovery of Western Europe. The American initiative in the economic reconstruction of Western Europe was manifested through the Marshall Plan.

2.1. Problems of European Recovery:

When the Second World War ended the countries of Western Europe were in a state of physical and economic collapse. To this was added the fear of Russian dominance by frontal attack or subversion. Large parts of the European continent had been devastated by war. The imperial powers had largely exhausted their overseas reserves in the struggle against the Fascist powers. They lacked capital for rebuilding industry and converting to peacetime production. Shortages were acute, particularly of food, fuel and raw materials. The situation in Britain was serious. The special American loan of \$ 3,750 million in 1946 provided valuable short-term relief, but did little to stabilize the long-term situation. During the war plans had been made for the relief of immediate needs of Europe. The UN Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA) was created in 1943 and functioned until 1947. A European Central Inland Transport Organization, a European Coal Organization and an Emergency Committee for Europe were established and merged

in 1947 in the UN's Economic Commission for Europe (ECE). These organizations assumed that Europe's post-war economic problems could be solved on a continental basis. However, the Cold War destroyed this assumption. Although the CEC continued to exist and issued valuable *Economic Surveys* from 1948 onwards, Europe became divided for economic as well as political purposes.

2.2. The Marshall Plan:

Descent of the Iron Curtain across Europe aggravated post-war problems. The European economy was divided into two artificial units, symbolized by divided Germany. In both 1946 and 1947 industrial and agricultural production fell below pre-war levels. This was inadequate for the needs of a population that was greater than before in spite of severe losses during the war years. Even nature seemed to be working against the European recovery. The terrible winter of 1946-47 was followed first by floods and then by drought. A major consequence of economic dislocation was political instability. The circle was completed when political weakness contributed to economic tension. Insecure governments were unable to take the stern measures, which were necessary to bring about economic restoration and reconstruction.

At the time when the Truman Doctrine was taking shape the Council of Foreign Ministers was meeting in Moscow in March and April 1947. In spite of high hopes of positive achievements the meeting ended in a failure. The four great powers failed to agree on the future of Germany. After private conversations with Stalin on 15 April 1947, the Secretary of State, George Marshall, became convinced that the Soviet Union was playing for time and awaiting a European economic collapse. Hence, George Marshall came to the conclusion that the only solution was immediate American action. Positive planning of an aid programme had already begun in the Department of State under the direction of the under-secretary, Dean Acheson. In a speech on 8 May 1947 Acheson publicly advocates such a programme in the interests of American economy. George Marshall's speech at Harvard University on 5 June 1947 forcefully expressed American interest in the rehabilitation of Europe, and is generally regarded as the official launching of the Marshall Plan.

From the beginning it was assumed that positive initiatives must come from Europe, and that participation in the plan would be opened to all countries in Europe, including the Soviet Union, although there was little expectation that the Russians would join. The Plan envisaged economic aid up to 1951 on the basis that the European governments would accept responsibility for administering the programme and would themselves contribute to European recovery by some degree of united effort. The Marshall plan was a bridge back to normality, to be financed with \$ 17 billion of American money to regenerate industry, modernize agriculture

and ensure financial stability. It required the creation of a European organization. The Russian refusal of the offer turned the organization into a Western European one. The leading Western European nations established a Committee for European Economic Co-operation (CEEC), and on 22 September 1947 CEEC presented to the United States government a report advocating a four-year programme for economic recovery embracing sixteen countries of Europe including West Germany. Four objectives were outlined: an increase in industrial and agricultural productivity at least up to pre-war levels, the establishment of financial stability, economic co-operation between the participating countries, and a solution of the problem of dollar deficits through expansion of exports. Members pledged co-operation, reduction of tariffs, and ultimate convertibility of currencies.

Within five months of Marshall's Harvard speech the preparatory work on Marshall Aid had been done, and on 19 December 1947 President Truman sent a message to Congress on American support to European recovery. Following a debate on the issue in Congress the recovery legislation was introduced and was passed on 3 April 1948. The act envisaged a four-year plan to implement the recovery programme and authorized an appropriation of \$4,300 million for the first year. To implement the programme the Economic Co-operation Administration was established. An administrator responsible to the President and of equal status to heads of the executive departments headed it.

During the life of the Marshall Plan between 1948 and 1952 Congress appropriated a total of \$13,150 million for the European recovery programme. Initial emphasis was placed upon the provision of food, animal feedstuffs, and fertilizers to relieve immediate shortages in Europe and increase agricultural productivity. Later emphasis shifted to industrial raw materials and semi-finished products, with machinery, vehicles, and fuel also forming significant proportions of the total volumes of supplies. Britain received the largest share of the Marshall aid, followed by France and West Germany.

The effects of the Marshall Plan were quickly felt in all recipient countries and in all branches of industry and agriculture. It contributed to land reclamation projects in Italy, shipbuilding in Britain, and agricultural improvements in Germany. During the first two years of Marshall Aid industrial production in Western Europe as a whole rose by more than twenty-five per cent. The output of steel went up by seventy per cent, of cement by eighty per cent, while the output of oil-based products as trebled. By the end of 1951 European output was thirty-five per cent above the 1939 level, exports were up by ninety-five per cent and Europe could pay its way in the economic world.

One reason for the growth in exports was the devaluation of European currencies against the dollar. This lowered the price of exports to the USA and led to increased sales. On the other hand devaluation was inflationary since it put up the price of imports such as food and raw materials. This led to demands for wage increases and to widespread strikes, often instigated on Stalin's orders by the European communist movement. The inflationary spiral was given further twist by the onset of the Korean War. The USA and Britain increased their defense spending. Materials, which might have gone to make peacetime goods, had to be used to make weapons and munitions. The demand for and price of raw materials rose sharply which led to an immediate increase in the cost of living.

By the time Marshall Aid had accomplished its primary objectives the general environment of international politics had changed. This was to be expected. The problem of the European recovery was a short term one. Although the war had left the economies of Western Europe shattered, it had not destroyed the capacities for self-help. These only needed stimulation in order to achieve their own momentum. The new vitality, which quickly appeared found expression in a European Payments Union in 1950, and the European Coal and Steel Community, comprised of six countries in 1952. After the ratification of the NATO treaty in 1949, there was a change of emphasis away from economic recovery to military security. The Marshall Plan had ensured that the countries of Western Europe could now play their part in the defense of their own territory. It could not return Europe to her former greatness. It did prevent the shadow of communism darkening the entire continent.

2.3. The Growth of European Unity:

One of the most revolutionary movements in post-war Europe was the progress made in integrating the states of Western Europe. The ultimate object of those in favour of this movement was a united European state. There had been different ideas about exactly what sort of unity would be best. Some simply wanted the nations to co-operate more closely; others, known as federalists, wanted to have a federal system of government like that of the United States. The reasoning behind this thinking was the following:

1. The best way for Europe to recover from the ravages of war was for all the states to work together and help each other by pooling their resources.
2. The individual states were too small and their economies too weak for them to be economically and militarily viable separately in a world dominated by superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union.
3. The more the countries of Western Europe worked together, the less chance there would be of war breaking out between

them again. It was the best way for a speedy reconciliation between France and Germany.

4. Joint action would enable Western Europe more effectively to resist the spread of communism from the Soviet Union.
5. The Germans were especially keen on the idea because they thought it would help them to gain acceptance as responsible nation more quickly than after the First World War.
6. The creation of a third force in the world would counter-balance the strength of the United States and the Soviet Union

The first steps in economic, military and political co-operation were soon taken, though the federalists were bitterly disappointed that a United States of Europe had not materialized by 1950.

2.3.1. The Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC):

This was set up officially in 1948, and was first initiative towards economic unity. It began as a response to the American offer of Marshall Aid. Ernest Bevin, the British Foreign Secretary, took the lead in organizing sixteen European nations to draw up a plan for the best use of American aid. This was known as the European Recovery Programme (ERP). The committee of sixteen nations became the permanent OEEC. Its first function, successfully achieved over the next four years was to distribute the American aid among its members. It also encouraged trade among its members by reducing restrictions. It was helped by the United Nations General Agreement on Tariff and Trade (GATT) whose function was to reduce tariffs and by the European Payments Union (EPU). This encouraged trade by improving the system of payments between member states, so that each state could use its own currency. The OEEC was so successful that trade between its members doubled during the first six years. When the USA and Canada joined in 1961 it became the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Later Australia and Japan joined.

2.3.2. The Council of Europe:

The Council of Europe, which was set up in 1949 was the first attempt at some kind of political unity. Its founder members were Britain, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Norway and Sweden. By 1971 all the states of Western Europe, except Spain and Portugal had joined. Turkey, Malta and Cyprus joined later making eighteen members in all. The Council of Europe consisted of the Foreign Ministers of the member states, and an Assembly of representatives chosen by the parliaments of the states. It had no powers, however, since several

states, including Britain, refused to join any organization, which threatened their own sovereignty. It could debate pressing issues and make recommendations. It did useful work such as sponsoring human rights agreements.

2.3.3. The European Community:

The European Community was known in its early years as the European Economic Community (EEC) or the Common Market. The European Community was officially set up under the terms of the Treaty of Rome (1957), signed by the six founder-members – France, West Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Belgium and Luxembourg.

2.3.4. Evolution of the European Community

2.3.4.a. Benelux: In 1944 the governments of Belgium, Netherlands and Luxembourg, meeting in exile in London because their countries were occupied by the Germans, began a plan for when the war was over. They agreed to set up the Benelux Customs Union, in which there would be no tariffs or other customs barriers, so that trade could flow freely. The driving force behind the Benelux was Paul-Henri Spaak, the Belgian socialist leader who was Prime Minister of Belgium from 1947 to 1949. It was put into operation in 1947.

2.3.4.b. The Treaty of Brussels (1948): By this treaty Britain and France joined the three Benelux countries in pledging ‘military, economic, social and cultural collaboration’. While the military collaboration eventually resulted in NATO, the next step in economic co-operation was the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC).

2.3.4.c. The European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC): Since the Europeans believed that the power of the Council of Europe was too limited, they aimed at setting up European organizations for particular functions. Their hope was that these functional organizations, while beneficial in themselves, would help to create the essential feeling of working together in a community, which was necessary for political unity. In 1950 two such organizations were proposed: the European Defence Community (EDC) and the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC). Both of these were opposed by Britain, and in 1954 EDC was finally rejected by France. However, despite British refusal to take part, ECSC was founded in 1951.

The ECSC was the brainchild of Robert Schuman, who was the Foreign Minister of France from 1948 to 1953. Like Spaak, he was strongly in favour of international co-operation, and he hoped that involving West Germany would improve relations between France and Germany and at the same time make European industry more efficient. The six countries, which had joined the ECSC, were: France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Netherlands

and Luxembourg. All duties and restrictions on trade in coal, iron and steel between the six countries were removed, and a High Authority was created to run the community and to organize a joint programme of expansion. The British refused to join the ECSC because they believed it would mean handing over control of their industries to an outside authority. The ECSC was such an outstanding success, even without Britain that the six ECSC countries decided to extend it to include production of all goods.

2.3.4.d. The European Economic Community (EEC): Following the unprecedented success of the European Coal and Steel Community it was felt desirable to expand it to include free competition in all industries in order to achieve comprehensive economic integration. It was also felt that further progress towards European unification should be made. In 1954 the Assembly of ECSC urged the Community to widen its activities, and in June 1955 the foreign ministers of six member countries met at Messina in Sicily. A committee under Spaak, Foreign Minister of Belgium, was set up to plan further economic integration. Following the submission of the report by the Spaak Committee, the six countries that belonged to ECSC signed the Treaty of Rome in March 1957 which established the European Economic Community (EEC, or the Common Market). In addition the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) was set up. Both treaties were ratified by the member countries before the end of the year and came into effect in January 1958.

The six countries agreed that trade barriers in the form of customs and quotas should gradually be removed so that there would be free competition and a common market. Tariffs would be kept against non-members, but even these were reduced. The treaty also mentioned improving living and working conditions, expanding industry, encouraging the development of the world's backward areas, safeguarding peace and liberty, and working for a closer union of European peoples.

2.3.5. The Machinery of the European Community:

The European Commission was the body, which ran the day-to-day work of the Community. Based in Brussels (Belgium), it was staffed by civil servants and expert economists who took the important policy decisions. It had strong powers so that it would be able to stand up against possible criticism and opposition from the governments of the six members, though in theory its decisions had to be approved by the Council of Ministers.

The Council of Ministers consisted of government representatives from each of the member states. Their job was to exchange information about their governments' economic policies and to try and co-ordinate them and keep them running on similar lines.

The European Parliament, which met at Strasbourg, consisted of 198 representatives chosen by the parliaments of the member states. They could discuss issues and make recommendations, but had no control over the Commission or the Council. In 1979 a new system of choosing the representatives was introduced. Instead of being nominated by parliaments, they were to be directly elected by the people of the Community.

The European Court of Justice was set up to deal with any problems, which might arise out of the interpretation and operation of the Treaty of Rome. It soon became regarded as the body to which people could appeal if their government was thought to be infringing the rules of the Community.

Also associated with the EEC was EURATOM, an organization in which the six nations pooled their efforts towards the development of atomic energy. In 1967 the EEC, the ESCS and EURATOM formally merged and, dropping the word 'economic', became simply the European Community (EC).

2.3.6. Refusal of Britain to Join the EEC:

It was ironic that, although Churchill had been one of the strongest supporters of the idea of a unified Europe, when he became Prime Minister again in 1951, he seemed to have lost any enthusiasm he might have had for Britain's membership of it. Atlee's Labour governments (1945-51) held back from joining the ECSC, and the Conservative governments of Churchill (1951-55) and Eden (1955-57) viewed with great suspicion the activities of people like Spaak and Monnet, a French economist who was Chairman of the ECSC High Authority. Thus, Britain decided not to sign the 1957 Treaty of Rome.

One of the chief reasons for the refusal of Britain to join the European Community was that she was apprehensive that she would no longer be in complete control of her economy. The European Commission in Brussels would be able to make vital decisions affecting Britain's internal economic affairs. Although the governments of other six states were prepared to make this sacrifice in the interests of greater overall efficiency, the British government was not prepared to make that sacrifice.

Britain had a great deal of trade with Commonwealth countries, and there were fears that her relationship with the Commonwealth would be ruined if Britain was no longer able to give preference to Commonwealth goods such as New Zealand lamb and butter. The Commonwealth, with its population around 800 million, seemed a more promising market than the EEC, which had only 165 million.

Britain had what was described as 'a special relationship' with the USA, which was not shared by other states of Europe. If the British became involved too deeply in economic integration with

Europe, it might damage their special relationship with the Americans.

Most British politicians were deeply suspicious that economic unity would lead to the political unity of Europe, and that was even less appealing to the British, who were determined that British sovereignty must be preserved.

On the other hand Britain and some of the other European states outside the EEC were worried about being excluded from selling their goods to EEC members because of the high duties on imports from outside the Community. Consequently in 1959 Britain took the lead in organizing a rival group, the European Free Trade Association (EFTA). Britain, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, Austria and Portugal agreed gradually to abolish tariffs between themselves. Britain was prepared to join an organization like EFTA because there was no question of common economic policies and no Commission to interfere with the internal affairs of states.

2.3.7. Britain Joins the EEC:

Within less than four years from the signing of the Treaty of Rome, the British had changed their minds, and in 1961 Conservative Prime Minister Harold Macmillan announced that Britain wished to join the EEC. The chief reasons as to why Britain decided to join the EEC were the following:

1. By 1961 it was obvious that the EEC was an outstanding success even without Britain. Since 1953 French production had risen by seventy-five per cent while German production had increased by almost ninety per cent.
2. Over the same period British production had risen only about thirty per cent. The British economy seemed to be stagnating in comparison with those of the six, and in 1960 there was a balance of payment deficit of nearly 270 million pounds. This means that imports had cost Britain 270 million more than was earned from British exports. When this happens, a country has to spend some of its gold and foreign currency reserves to make up the difference.
3. Although the EFTA had succeeded in increasing trade among its members, it was nothing like as successful as the EEC.
4. The Commonwealth, in spite of its huge population, had nothing like the same purchasing power as the EEC. Macmillan now thought that there need not be a clash of interest between Britain's membership of the EEC and trade with the Commonwealth. There were signs that the EEC was prepared to make special arrangements to allow Commonwealth countries and some other former European colonies to become associate members. Britain's EFTA partners might be able to join as well.

5. Another argument in favour of Britain joining the EEC was that once Britain was in, competition from other EEC members would stimulate British industry to greater effort and efficiency. Macmillan also made the point that Britain could not afford to be left out if the EEC developed into a political union. He seems to have some idea that Britain could take over the leadership and build the Community up into a strong defensive unit against the Soviet Union, and in partnership with the USA.

2.3.8. French Opposition to Britain's Joining EEC:

Macmillan assigned the task of negotiating Britain's entry into the EEC to Edward Heath, who had been an enthusiastic supporter of European unity since he first entered parliament in 1950. Talks opened in October 1961, and although there were some difficulties, it came as a shock when the French President, de Gaulle broke off negotiations and vetoed Britain's entry. De Gaulle claimed that Britain had too many economic problems and would only weaken the EEC. He also objected to any concessions being made for the Commonwealth, arguing that this would be a drain on Europe's resources. Yet the EEC had just agreed to provide economic and technical aid to France's former colonies in Africa. On the other hand the British believed that de Gaulle's real motive was his desire to continue dominating the Community, and he saw a serious rival in Britain. Besides, de Gaulle was not happy with Britain's 'American connection'. He was apprehensive that because of their close ties, Britain's membership might lead the USA to dominate European affairs.. He was probably annoyed that Britain, without consulting France, had just agreed to receive Polaris missiles from America. He was annoyed that President Kennedy had not made the same offer to France. He was determined to prove that France was a great power and had no need of American help. It was this friction between France and the USA, which eventually led de Gaulle to withdraw France from NATO in 1966. Finally there was the problem of French agriculture. The EEC protected its farmers which high tariffs so that prices were much higher than in Britain. Britain's agriculture was highly efficient and subsidized to keep prices relatively low. If this continued after Britain's entry into the EEC, French farmers with their smaller and less efficient farms would be exposed to competition from Britain and perhaps from the Commonwealth.

Meanwhile the EEC success story continued, without Britain. The Community's exports grew steadily, and the value of its exports was consistently higher than its imports. Britain on the other hand usually had a balance of trade deficit, and Harold Wilson's Labour government (1964-70) was forced to begin its term in office by borrowing heavily from the IMF to replenish rapidly dwindling gold reserves. This convinced Wilson that the only solution was for Britain to join the EEC, although until then the Labour party had

opposed it. However, de Gaulle again vetoed the British application.

Finally, on 1 January 1973, Britain along with Ireland and Denmark was able to enter the EEC and the six became the nine. Britain's entry into the EEC was made possible by two chief factors: President de Gaulle had resigned in 1969 and his successor Georges Pompidou was friendlier towards Britain. Secondly, Britain's Conservative Prime Minister, Edward Heath, was in a good position to press Britain's claim strongly. He negotiated with great skill and tenacity, and it was fitting that, having been a committed European for so long, he was the Prime Minister who finally took Britain into Europe. From this period onwards the EEC came to be known as the European Community (EC). By 1986, three additional members—Spain, Portugal and Greece—had been added to the European Community. The economic integration of the members of the EC led to co-operative efforts in international and political affairs as well.

Nevertheless, the EC was still primarily an economic union, not a political one. By 1992, the EC comprised 344 million people and constituted the world's largest single trading entity, transacting almost one-fourth of the world's commerce. In the 1980's and 1990's, the EC moved toward even greater economic integration. A Treaty on European Union (also called the Maastricht Treaty, after the city in the Netherlands where the agreement was reached) represented an attempt to create a true economic and monetary union of all EC members. The treaty did not go into effect until all members agreed on 1 January 1994, when the European Community became the European Union. One of its first goals was achieved in 1999 with the introduction of a common currency, called the 'euro'.

Questions:

1. Evaluate the role of the Marshall Plan in the reconstruction of Western Europe.
2. Trace briefly the growth of the European Economic Community (EEC).
3. Critically examine the role of Britain and France in the European Economic Community (EEC).
4. Write short notes on:
 - (a) The Marshall Plan
 - (b) The Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC)
 - (c) The European Economic Community (EEC)
 - (d) Role of Britain in the EEC



RECONSTRUCTION OF THE USSR (1945-1962)

Objectives:

1. To understand the economic reconstruction of the USSR in post-Second World War era under the leadership of Stalin.
2. To analyze the role of Nikita Khrushchev in post-Stalinist Russia

Introduction:

The USSR emerged as a victorious power along with other Allies in the Second World War. The collapse of Nazism, Fascism and Japanese militarism during the War enabled the USSR and the USA to emerge as two super-powers in the world. As a result of the war, Stalin and his Soviet colleagues were now in control of a vast empire that included Eastern Europe, much of the Balkans, and new territory gained from Japan in East Asia.

3.1. State of Soviet Economy at the end of the War:

The Soviet economy faced disastrous consequences due to the Second World War. The War practically devastated the Soviet Union. The War resulted in the loss of twenty million Russian lives. A number of cities such as Kiev, Kharkow, and Leningrad and countryside of Western Russia had been devastated due to enormous physical destruction. Both industry and agriculture were in terrible state when the war ended. Although there was some industry to the east of the Urals, elsewhere factories had been destroyed, machinery was worn out, mines were flooded, and the labour force was weary and depleted. In the immediate post-war years, many Russians endured what has been termed 'a crisis of faith'. The returning soldiers, with their tales of German 'wealth' and with captured booty to prove it, hoped that life in post-war Russia would be different to what it had been.

3.2. Stalin's Plans for Economic Revival:

Stalin was faced with the enormous task of re-building the Soviet economy, especially industry. However, Stalin had other ideas in the revival of Soviet industry. By re-building Russian industry, Stalin aimed at building a strong military machine. His policy for reconstruction of the Soviet Union was to restore the aims and methods of the 1930's. The emphasis again was on producer rather than consumer goods, and heavy rather than light industry. By using old method Stalin extracted development capital from

Soviet labour. Working hard for little pay and for precious few consumer goods, Soviet labourers were expected to produce goods for export with little in return for themselves. The incoming capital from abroad could then be used to purchase machinery and Western technology. The loss of millions of men in the war meant that much of this tremendous workload fell upon Soviet women, who performed almost forty per cent of the heavy manual labour. Due to these harsh methods employed by Stalin, the targets in the fourth Five Year Plan (1946-50) were achieved well within the allotted period.

3.3. Industrial Progress:

During the fourth Five Year Plan old industrial centers were rebuilt and new industrial areas opened up and developed. These new industrial centers attracted millions of people from the countryside. Sverdlovsk became a major center; Revda a major mining town; Polevskoi a new manufacturing center. For the immigrants, life was hard with a shortage of housing and food. But for Stalin these new centers were signs of Soviet Success, also reflected in the output of Russian industry. Economic recovery in the Soviet Union was nothing less than spectacular. By 1947, Russian industrial production had attained 1939 levels; three years later, it had surpassed those levels by forty per cent. Steel production increased from 9 million tons in 1945 to 38 million in 1950 and 53 million in 1953; coal production from 149 million tons in 1945 to 260 million in 1950 and 320 million in 1953; oil production from 19 million tons in 1945 to 38 million in 1950 and 53 million in 1953. New power plants, canals, and giant factories were built, while new industrial enterprises and oil fields were established in Siberia and Soviet central Asia.

3. 4. Poor Condition of the People:

The success of the industrial development was due largely to the massive aid from the West—the raw materials taken at nominal prices from the satellites in Eastern Europe, the contribution of the two million German prisoners of war, and the goods and equipment taken from Germany, Manchuria and other places as reparations. Without this ‘aid’ the Russian recovery would have been much slower. Although Stalin’s economic recovery policy was successful in promoting growth in heavy industry, primarily for the benefit of the military, consumer goods remained scarce. While the development of thermonuclear weapons, MIG fighters, and the first space satellite (*sputnik*) in the 1950’s elevated the Soviet state’s reputation as a world power abroad, domestically the Russia people had to pay heavily for the concentration on heavy industry. In the expanding towns, millions of people lived in shanty suburbs and the housing shortage remained the biggest social problem in Russia. Conditions were no better in older cities and towns. A British Military Attaché in Moscow reported “all

houses, practically without exception, show lights from every window after dark. This seems to indicate that every room is both a living room by day and a bedroom by night. There is no place in overcrowded Moscow for the luxury of eating and sleeping in separate rooms." Throughout Stalin's last years and for years after, the standard of living for the majority of people in Russia hardly improved. Housing, food, clothing and other necessities of life were both difficult to obtain and poor in quality. One reason for this was the investment in heavy industry, which grew twice as fast as the Gross National Product and three times as quickly as did personal consumption.

3.5. Condition of Agriculture:

The condition of agriculture in 1945 was probably worse than that of industry. Cattle had been slaughtered, stocks of seed and fertilizers depleted, the labour force reduced, the organization of collective farms had deteriorated, and horses and tractors were in such short supply in some places that women were harnessed to ploughs. Improvement in agricultural sector was very slow. Between 1948 and 1952 the grain harvest averaged 80 million tons annually, and half the population were required to produce this inadequate amount. In 1950 Khrushchev was put in charge of agriculture, a subject in which he showed great interest. Under his there was a reduction in the number of collectives. These were merged into much larger units. In 1947 there were 250,000 collective farms, by 1950 only 125,000 and by 1952 only 94,000. The planners assumed that the larger units would be more efficient and productive.

3.6. Stalin's Despotism:

This failure to match Western progress was one of the reasons for the post-war 'crisis of faith' and for the resurgence of Stalinist terrorism. In 1937-38 some thousand men and women had been shot each day in Moscow alone; after the war Stalin, now corrupted by power, once more revitalized the secret police and gave Beria, the chief of the secret police a free hand. During these years Stalin behaved like an oriental despot. There was no Party Congress between 1939 and 1952, there were few meetings of the Central Committee and the Politburo was his tool.

Stalin continued to be an all-powerful and awe-inspiring figure. Although he rarely appeared in public or made public pronouncements, he was given an almost god-like status. Praised for all the Russian successes in war and peace, statues of him appeared all over Russia, cities were called after him, and on his seventieth birthday in 1949 the Museum of revolution in Moscow staged an exhibition of his birthday gifts. He was undisputed leader. There was no question of independence or criticism. All forms of art and literature were censored, and all contacts with the West were forbidden. He suffered from chronic suspicion. Increasingly

distrustful of competitors, Stalin exercised sole authority and pitted his subordinates against each other. His suspicion extended to even his closest colleagues. The Leningrad party organization was purged of several top leaders, many of whom were charged with traitorous connections with Western intelligence agencies. In succeeding years, Stalin directed his suspicion at other members of the inner circle, including foreign minister Molotov, who had been Stalin's loyal lieutenant since the early years of Stalin's rise to power. Stalin distrusted Molotov and had his Jewish wife placed in Siberian concentration camp. At the same time, a new purge seemed to be planned. There were rumours that a number of Jewish doctors had poisoned some of the now dead Russian leaders.

3.7. Death of Stalin:

Before that purge could get underway, Stalin died on 5 March 1953. The death of the man who had dominated life for so many years, who had controlled the vast empire for so long came as a shock to many Russians. His body was embalmed and was placed next to Lenin's in the mausoleum in Red square. There is no doubt of the magnitude of his achievement and the ruthlessness of his methods. His biographer, Deutscher, says that he "found Russia working with a wooden plough and left her equipped with atomic piles." Djilas, a Yugoslavian, considered that Stalin was "one of the cruelest and most despotic figures in history." And according to Khrushchev, "like Peter the Great, Stalin fought barbarism with barbarism, but he was a great man."

3.8. Rise Nikita Khrushchev:

On the day following the official announcement of the death of Stalin, Malenkov, a veteran administrator and ambitious member of the Politburo came to power and became both Prime Minister and Secretary of the Party's Central Committee. He had a clear agenda. In foreign affairs, he hoped to promote an easing of Cold War tensions and improve relations with the Western powers. For Moscow's Eastern European allies, he advocated a 'new course' in their mutual relations and a decline in Stalinist methods of rule. Inside the Soviet Union, he hoped to reduce defense expenditure and improve the standard of living. Such goals were laudable and probably had the support of the majority of the Russian people, but they did not necessarily appeal to key groups including the army, the party, the managerial elite, and the security services. In 1953, Malenkov's position was restricted to that of the head of the government and his rival Nikita Khrushchev was made the head of the Party. For two years this partnership continued. However, the struggle for power continued between the two. Khrushchev appointed his own supporters to important posts and Malenkov, who lacked Khrushchev's keen political sense, was gradually weakened. During his struggle for power with Malenkov,

Khrushchev had outmaneuvered him by calling for heightened defense expenditures and continuing emphasis on heavy industry. Being overshadowed by Khrushchev, Malenkov resigned his position as the head of the government in 1955 and was succeeded by Bulganin, one of Khrushchev's supporters.

3.9. Eclipse of Malenkov, Molotov and Bulganin:

For the next three years, from 1955 to 1958, Bulganin and Khrushchev were theoretically joint leaders. Together they went to Geneva Conference, to Yugoslavia, India and Britain. But in fact Khrushchev was the senior partner. However, Khrushchev was not popular amongst the old Stalinists in the government. While he and Bulganin were on a visit to Finland in June 1957 his opponents planned his dismissal. But the majority of the Central Committee, with the backing of the army, supported Khrushchev, and his critics, who included Malenkov and Molotov, were dismissed to minor posts far from Moscow. In 1958 Bulganin resigned and went into obscurity. He was replaced by Khrushchev himself who became head of both the government and the Party.

3.10. Nature of Khrushchev:

After assuming full control of the government and Party machinery, Khrushchev resumed the efforts of his predecessor to reduce tensions with the West and improve the standard of living of the Russian people. He moved vigorously to improve the performance of the Soviet economy and revitalize Soviet society. By nature Khrushchev was a man of enormous energy as well as an innovator. He was a jovial and quick-witted person. While he was impatient and impulsive and did not think sufficiently of the consequences of his actions, he was at the same time tough, adaptable and shrewd with enough ability and common sense to give up an unsuccessful or dangerous policy. His power was never as great as Stalin's and he reasserted the control of the Communist Party over policy.

3.11. De-Stalinization:

Khrushchev was probably best known for his policy of de-Stalinization. Khrushchev had risen in the party hierarchy as a Stalin protégé. However, he had been deeply disturbed by his mentor's excesses. Once in a position of authority, Khrushchev decided to wipe out Stalinist legacy from Soviet society. The years from 1953 to 1956 saw the steady reversal of Stalin's policies. The use of persecution and terror was ended. The arrested doctors were released. Beria, the minister in charge of the powerful political police, was shot at the end of a cabinet meeting, and the power of the political police was curtailed. Many of the labour camps were dissolved and conditions in the remaining ones were improved. The control over intellectuals such as novelists was relaxed. In 1956, following the denunciation of Stalin, Boris Pasternak was completing *Dr Zivago*, and Dudintsev's novel *Not By Bread Alone*

was about to be published-with its condemnation of the new Soviet middle class with all its graft, greed, careerism and corrupt privileges. Students at universities throughout the Soviet Union were publishing critical articles in magazines and putting up wall posters condemning the system. The Russian youth not only sought to imitate Western youth not only in dress but also in critical questioning of their elders and of authority. Russian leaders made visits abroad, and foreign tourists were allowed to visit Russia. In 1957, Moscow was the scene of an International Youth Festival, and Russian youth learned to imitate the Americanism of pop culture. Tourism was increased under a more liberal regime. There was more emphasis on the production of consumer goods and on financial incentives for farmers.

The more drastic changes, however, followed the twentieth Congress of the Russian Communist Party in February 1956, when Khrushchev gave a long secret speech criticizing some of Stalin's major shortcomings. The speech had apparently not been intended for public distribution, but it was quickly leaked to the Western press and created a sensation throughout the world. In one of the most sensational speeches given before an audience of 1,400 delegates and foreign representatives Khrushchev did not condemn anything Stalin did before 1934, including the forced collectivization of agriculture, but bitterly criticized three major aspects of Stalin's policy after that date. Firstly, in connection with the purges of the 1930's, he questioned the necessity for the execution of Stalin's early rivals. He revealed that confessions were the result of torture, and said that thousands of innocent communists had been murdered. Secondly, he criticized the leadership of Stalin during the war. Thirdly, he condemned Stalin's personal dictatorship as 'self-deification' and 'flagrant misuse of power'. More positively Khrushchev said that peaceful co-existence with the West was possible and that there were different ways by which a country could achieve socialism.

'In three hours Khrushchev turned Stalin from the benevolent leader of genius, in whom every Soviet child was brought up to believe, into a sinister despot, proper heir to the Tsars who had terrified and tormented Russia in her dark past.' Khrushchev's speech had a shattering effect, both in Russia and in other communist countries. Stalin's economic policy was criticized much less than his purges and his dictatorship, but in subsequent years all of Stalin's policies were changed enormously. In addition, statues of the late dictator were removed, Stalingrad was renamed Volgograd, and Stalin's body was removed from the mausoleum to an obscure position inside the Kremlin wall. Thereafter Russia very slowly became a freer country. The terror was ended and the tension relaxed. After the bitter cold of Stalin's regime, a thaw was set in, and the Soviet people began to breathe more easily.

But Khrushchev was unwilling to allow 'liberalism' to run anything like a full course. In his condemnation of Stalin he had said: "We cannot let this matter get out of the Party, especially not to the press. We should know the limit. We should not give ammunition to the enemy." And when things looked like getting out of control, Khrushchev was as ruthless as any Stalinist could have wished. The students at Moscow University were quickly silenced; Pasternak's *Dr Zivago* was never published in Russia. In Hungary, he was cold-blooded and ruthless. He personally ordered the seizure of the Hungarian leader, Imre Nagy, and his subsequent execution. He did little to reduce the pervasive influence of the KGB in Russia, although he tried to bring it more firmly under his control.

3.12. Industrial Progress:

Industry continued to be centrally planned through Five Year Plans. However, after 1957 Moscow's control was less rigorous than it had been. Khrushchev believed that over-centralization had produced inefficiency and therefore in 1957 he divided Russia into about a hundred regions, each of which had the power to plan and organize its own industry under the general supervision of Moscow. In 1962 the number of regions was halved. In an attempt to release the stranglehold of the central bureaucracy over the national economy, Khrushchev abolished dozens of government ministries and split up the government and party apparatus.

3. 13. Efforts to Improve the Standard of Living of the People:

Khrushchev was keen that the standard of living in Russia should rise. Thus, he devoted more resources to light industry and the production of consumer goods. He believed that an increased production of consumer goods would make the system more acceptable to the Russian people. Defense plants were made to turn out motorcars and radio sets. The production of leather shoes, woolen fabrics and knitted clothes doubled between 1953 and 1963. The output of refrigerators rose from 49,000 to nearly one million. These large increase still left Russia very far behind the West in terms of production of such goods. In housing there was a similarly limited improvement.

The Chinese condemned Khrushchev's development of consumer-oriented society. Khrushchev also led Russia into the second industrial revolution. Stalin had concentrated on the old staple industries, especially coal, iron and steel. Khrushchev started the switch to an economy based on oil, natural gas and waterpower. By 1961, the Soviet Union was the world's second largest oil producer behind the USA; by 1963 she was producing 243 million tons, of which 66 million tons were being exported. The vast reserves of natural gas discovered in Siberia were exploited, and in 1963 the first huge pipeline was constructed from the fields near Bukhara to the industrial towns of the Urals.

3.14. Agricultural Development:

But the well-being of the Soviet economy depended, as always, on the agricultural sector. Khrushchev played an important role in formulating agricultural policy because of his genuine interest in farming and because agriculture remained the weakest and most sluggish sector of the economy. He tried to increase agricultural production in various ways. Khrushchev launched his campaign to promote the growing of maize, to plough up grassland, to popularize peat compost and to 'catch up the United States in the production of meat and milk'. The Virgin Lands in southern Siberia, an area equal in size to the entire cultivated area of Canada produced two massive harvests. The Ten Year Plan, inaugurated in 1959, called for impossible rates of growth. Undaunted, Khrushchev unveiled in 1961 plans to surpass America 'in all fields' and promised that some goods and services would be provided free in 1980. He continued with his earlier schemes for the consolidation of collectives into huge farms and by 1964 there were only some 50,000 agricultural complexes. While he tried to ensure an increased delivery of machinery and fertilizers, he also reduced collective farm quotas and paid a higher price for their deliveries, and relaxed restrictions on the private plots. The result was certainly an increase in grain production, which rose from 82 million tons in 1953 to 147 million tons in 1962. But this was mainly because of the cultivation of land, which many believed was capable of growing crops for a short time only. The Virgin Lands project suffered from mismanagement, insufficient use of fertilizers and soil erosion as the top fertile soil was swept away. Because of exhausted land and bad weather the 1963 harvest was reduced to 110 million tons, and Russia was forced to buy grain from North America. Despite Khrushchev's reforms, Russia's farming remained inefficient. With five times the labour force, the Russians produced less than three-quarters of American output, and the privately-owned plots of land produced greater yields than the state-owned land.

3.15. Downfall of Khrushchev:

After about 1961 opposition to Khrushchev within the top ranks of the Party began to increase. A number of factors were responsible for the unpopularity of Khrushchev. The military insisted on increased spending on defense, which was increased by one-third between 1959 and 1963. In the competition for resources between 'guns' and 'butter', the 'guns' won. Thus, there was a lack of resources for the implementation of Khrushchev's bolder plans for consumer goods industries. The rate of industrial growth declined from 13 per cent in 1954 to 10 per cent in 1958 and to 7.5 percent in 1964. The fall in the rate of growth of the GNP was even more significant. There was a fall in agricultural production and prices of agricultural and consumer goods began to rise. The military was angered by the reduction in the size of the

armed forces, there being three million fewer servicemen in 1963 than in 1956. The call for increased spending on space development and new missiles led to this fall in manpower. The navy was, relatively, neglected as more attention was paid to rocket development and missile construction. The military were determined to switch leaders in the hope that this would lead to a change of policies.

The party ideologists had been angered by Khrushchev's re-definition of Marxism and his hopes for 'peaceful co-existence' with the West. They argued that his de-Stalinization had brought about the crisis in Poland and Hungary. Besides, the Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 led to the loss of face for Khrushchev. The growing differences between the Soviet Union and Communist China had developed into a personal vendetta between Mao tse Tung and Khrushchev who seemed determined to force a showdown. It is probable that by 1964 Khrushchev was becoming increasingly difficult to work with. His methods were too autocratic, and the other leading Russian leaders disliked this one-man rule. He promised President Nasser of Egypt a huge loan without consulting his fellow ministers in Moscow. In addition, the appointment of his son-in-law as Editor of *Pravda* was not popular.

In October 1964, Khrushchev was away on vacation in Crimea. He was summoned back to find the Soviet Politburo in session. Leonid Brezhnev, who had been a 'trusted supporter' of Khrushchev, as acting Chairman, told him that the Politburo had decided that he should resign for the good of the Party. As in 1957, Khrushchev took the fight to the Central Committee. Here the vote was unanimously against him. He was succeeded by Kosygin as Prime Minister and Leonid Brezhnev, as Party Secretary.

Questions:

1. Examine the economic reconstruction in the USSR under Stalin and Khrushchev.
2. Discuss the political development in the Soviet Union from 1945 to 1962.
3. Give an account of Stalinist despotism.
4. Why did Khrushchev undertake the process of De-Stalinization? What was its impact on the Soviet Union?
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Industrial development in post-Second World War Russia
 - (b) Stalin's Despotism
 - (c) Nikita Khrushchev
 - (d) De-Stalinization



RECONSTRUCTION OF EASTERN EUROPE (1945-1962)

Objectives:

1. To understand as to why the Soviet Union established control over Eastern Europe.
2. To study the various methods through which the Soviet Union tried to maintain control over Eastern Europe and bring about political and economic reconstruction Eastern Europe.

Introduction:

During the Second World War the Soviet Union occupied a major part of Eastern and Central Europe. The Soviet policy of establishing control over Eastern Europe was both a cause and an effect of the Cold War. Stalin wanted a 'ring fence' territory in Eastern Europe under Russian control. The Allies in view of the fact that Germany had attacked Russia twice in 1914 and 1941 accepted his claim to such as buffer zone. While making this concession, the Western Allies put their faith in the Declaration on Liberated Europe and in their hope that Stalin would honour this and other similar agreements. However, these hopes dashed before the end of the war by Stalin's organization of the Communist take over of Poland.

4.1. Suspicion of the Soviet Union against the West:

Soviet Union's suspicion of the West was deep-rooted. During the Russian Civil War (1918-21), Churchill had led the demands for an anti-Bolshevik crusade. Besides, for many years, most Western governments had refused to recognize the Soviet government after 1917. Again, the Western powers had signed a series of treaties at Locarno in 1925. The Soviet Union believed that these treaties were aimed at winning Germany away from the Treaty of Rapallo, which she had signed, with Russia in 1922, and bringing her into alliance with Britain, France and the other Western powers. The Locarno Treaties guaranteed the boundary arrangements made at Versailles only as regards the western boundaries of Germany. While such a guarantee satisfied France, Belgium and Holland, it increased Russian fear that the Western powers were encouraging Germany to look to the east for *Lebensraum* and raw materials.

4. 2. Fear of German Invasion:

The Soviet Union lived with this fear of a Western invasion. When Hitler came to power in January 1933, Stalin tried to cooperate with the Western powers. Russia joined the League of Nations in 1934, the year after Hitler withdrew Germany from the League. But Stalin saw how the Western powers took no action when Hitler tore up the Treaty of Versailles. Britain and France did not act when Hitler remilitarized the Rhineland in 1936 in defiance of both the Versailles and Locarno Treaties, nor when Mussolini attacked Abyssinia. The Western powers passively accepted the *Anschluss*, when Hitler brought Austria into the greater Reich in March 1938. But Russian suspicion of the Western powers was finally confirmed by the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia in 1938. Britain and France forced the Czechs to hand over the Sudetenland, thus weakening Czechoslovakia both economically and militarily.

4.3. Non-Aggression Pact with Hitler:

Stalin's suspicion of the West and his fear of a German attack prompted him to sign a non-aggression pact with Hitler in August 1939. This left Hitler free, first to dismember Poland in September 1939, allowing Russia to take her share of that unhappy country, and then to turn his attention to the West again. Stalin may have hoped that there would be a major conflict between Germany and the two major Western powers, which would serve to weaken these powers and Germany, and thus provide additional breathing space for Russia's industrial and military development.

4.4. German Attack on the Soviet Union:

Following Germany's attack on Russia in June 1941, Stalin constantly appealed for the opening of a second front in Western Europe. Allied failure to open that second front, coupled with the high level of Russian losses confirmed Stalin that the Western powers wanted to watch Russia bleed to death. On the other hand the Western powers were equally suspicious of the Soviet Union.

4.5. Division of Europe:

It has been argued that the division of Europe and the resulting in Soviet control over Eastern Europe were the consequence not of historical accident but of agreement, notably agreement at Yalta by Roosevelt and Churchill to give Stalin a position of power, which otherwise he could not have achieved. However, this argument cannot be sustained. Roosevelt and Churchill conceded at Yalta nothing that it was in their power to withhold. The Russian armies were already in occupation of positions in Europe from which they could not be expelled. Thus, Stalin's post-war dominance in Eastern Europe derived from his victories and not from any bargain with his Allies. The most that Roosevelt and Churchill could do was to try to get Stalin to accept

certain rules governing the exercise of the power that was his. This they succeeded in doing by persuading him to endorse a Declaration on Liberated Countries, which promised free election and other democratic practices and liberties. When, later, Stalin ignored the engagements contained in this declaration, Western governments could do no more than protest. They were in no position to take action against the Soviet Union.

4.6. Establishment of 'People's Republics':

Because of the need to recoup their enormous industrial losses and their fears of further invasions, the Soviets were determined to maintain political, economic and military control of those countries in Eastern Europe that they had liberated from the Nazi Control. They employed diplomatic pressure, political infiltration and military terrorism to establish 'people's republics' in Eastern Europe sympathetic to the Soviet regime. In country after country the process repeated itself: at first all-party coalition governments from which only fascists were excluded; then further coalitions in which communists predominated; and finally, one party states. By 1948, governments that owed allegiance to Moscow were established in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Albania. The nations of Eastern Europe did not all succumb without a struggle. Greece, which the Soviets wished to include within their sphere of influence, was torn by a civil war until 1949, when with Western aid its monarchy was restored. A direct challenge to the Yalta guarantee of free, democratic election occurred in Czechoslovakia, where in 1948, the Soviets crushed the coalition government of liberal leaders Eduardo Benes and Jan Masaryk.

4.7. The US Attempt to Counter the Soviet Move in Europe:

The United States countered the moves of the Soviet Union in Eastern Europe with massive programme of economic and military aid to Western Europe. In 1947, President Truman proclaimed the Truman Doctrine, which provided assistance programmes to prevent further communist infiltration into the governments of Greece and Turkey. The following year the Marshall Plan provided funds for the reconstruction of Western European industry. At the same time the United States moved to build up the military defenses of the West. In April 1949, a group of representatives of Western European states, together with Canada and the United States, signed an agreement providing for the establishment of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Subsequently Greece, Turkey, and West Germany were included as members of the NATO.

4.8. Communist Unity in Eastern Europe:

The communist countries of Eastern Europe were joined in a kind of unity under the leadership of the Soviet Union. The main difference between the unity in Eastern Europe and that in the West

was that the countries of Eastern Europe were forced into it by the Soviet Union whereas the members of the European Community joined voluntarily. By the end of 1948 there were nine states in the communist bloc: the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia.

Stalin set about making all the states into carbon copies of the Soviet Union with the same political, economic and educational systems, and the same five year plans. All had to carry out the bulk of their trade with the Soviet Union and their foreign policies and armed forces were controlled from Moscow.

4.9. The Molotov Plan:

This was the first Soviet sponsored step towards an economically united Eastern bloc. The idea of the Soviet Foreign minister, Molotov, it was a response to the American offer of Marshall Aid. Since the Soviets refused to allow any of their satellites to accept American aid, Molotov felt they had to be offered an alternative. The plan was basically a set of trade agreements between the Soviet Union and its satellites negotiated during the summer of 1947. It was designed to boost the trade of Eastern Europe.

4.10. The Communist Information Bureau (Cominform):

This was set up by the Soviet Union at the same time as the Molotov Plan. All the communist states had to become members and its aim was political: to make sure that all the governments followed the same line as the government of the Soviet Union in Moscow. To be communist was not enough, it had to be Russian-style communism.

4.11. The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON):

It was founded in 1949 as a counter to Marshall Plan. Its founding members were the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania and Bulgaria, which were joined almost at once by Albania and a year later by East Germany. The aim of COMECON was to help plan the economies of the individual states. All industry was nationalized, and agriculture was collectivized. Later, Khrushchev, tried to use COMECON to organize the communist bloc into a single integrated economy. He wanted East Germany and Czechoslovakia to develop as the main industrial areas, and Hungary and Rumania to concentrate on agriculture. However, this provoked hostile reactions in many of the states and Khrushchev had to change his plans to allow more variations within the economies of the different countries. The eastern Bloc enjoyed some success economically, with steadily increasing production. However, the average GDP and general efficiency were below

those of the European Community. Albania had the doubtful distinction of being the most backward country in Europe.

4.12. *The Warsaw Pact:*

This was signed by the Soviet Union and all the satellite states except Yugoslavia. They promised to defend each other against any attack from outside. The armies of the member states came under overall Soviet control from Moscow. Ironically, the only time Warsaw Pact took part in joint action against one of their own members, Czechoslovakia, when the Soviet Union disapproved of Czech internal policies.

Although there were some disagreements in the European Community about problems like the Common Agricultural Policy and the sovereignty of the individual state, these were not as serious as the tension, which occurred between the Soviet Union and some of her satellite states. In the early years of the Cominform, Moscow felt that it had to clamp down on any leader or movement, which seemed to threaten the solidarity of the communist bloc. Sometimes the Russians did not hesitate to use force.

4.13. *Differences Between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union:*

In Yugoslavia, the communist leader, Marshal Tito, owed much of his popularity to his successful resistance against the Nazi forces occupying Yugoslavia during the Second World War. In 1945 he was legally elected as leader of the new Yugoslav republic and so he did not owe his position to the Russians. By 1948 he had fallen out with Stalin. He was determined to follow his own brand of communism. He was against over centralization. He objected to Stalin's plan for the Yugoslav economy and to the constant Russian attempts to interfere in Yugoslavia's affairs. He wanted to be free to trade with the West as well as with the Soviet Union. Stalin therefore expelled Yugoslavia from the Cominform and cut off economic aid, expecting that the country would soon be ruined economically and that Tito would be forced to resign. However, Stalin had miscalculated: Tito was much too popular to be toppled by outside pressures, and so Stalin decided it would be too risky to invade Yugoslavia. Tito was able to remain in power and he continued to operate communism in his own way. This included full contact and trade with the West and acceptance of aid from the International Monetary Fund (IMF).

The Yugoslavs began to reverse the process of centralization: industries were denationalized, and instead of being state-owned, they became public property, managed by workers' representatives through councils and assemblies. The same applied in agriculture: the communes were the most important unit in the state. These were groups of families each containing between 5000 and 100,000 people. The elected Commune Assembly organized matters concerning the economy, education,

health, culture and welfare. The system was a remarkable example of ordinary people playing a part in making the decisions, which closely affected their own lives, both at work and in the community. It achieved much because workers had a personal stake in the success of their firm and their commune. Many Marxists thought this was the way a genuine communist state should be run, rather than the over-centralization of the Soviet Union.

However, there were some weaknesses in the system developed in Yugoslavia. One was workers' unwillingness to sack colleagues; another was a tendency to pay themselves too much. These led to over employment and high costs and prices. Nevertheless, with its capitalist elements, like wage differentials and a free market, this was an alternative Marxist system which many developing African states, especially Tanzania, found attractive.

Khrushchev decided that his wisest course of action was to improve relations with Tito. In 1955 he visited Belgrade, the Yugoslav capital, and apologized for Stalin's actions. The breach was fully healed the following year when Khrushchev gave his formal approval to Tito's successful brand of communism.

4.14. Suppression of Anti-Stalinist Leaders:

As the rift with Yugoslavia widened, Stalin arranged for the arrest of any communist leaders in the other East European states who attempted to follow independent policies. He was able to do this because most of these other leaders lacked Tito's popularity and owed their positions to Russian support.

In Hungary the Foreign Minister Laszlo Rajk and Interior Minister Janos Kadar, both anti-Stalin communists, were arrested. Rajk was hanged, Kadar was put in prison and tortured, and about 200,000 people were expelled from the party in 1949. In Bulgaria the Prime Minister, Traichko Koslov, was arrested and executed in 1949. In Czechoslovakia the Communist party general secretary, Rudolph Slansky, and ten other cabinet ministers were executed in 1952. In Poland Communist party leader and Vice-President Wladislaw Gomulka was imprisoned because he had spoken out in support of Tito. In Albania communist premier Koze Xoxe was removed and executed because he sympathized with Tito.

4.15. Khrushchev's dictum of 'Different Roads to Socialism':

After Stalin's death in 1953 there were signs that the satellite states might be given more freedom. In 1956 Khrushchev made a famous speech at the Twentieth Communist Party Congress in which he criticized many of Stalin's policies and seemed prepared to concede that there were 'different roads to socialism'. He soon healed the rift with Yugoslavia and in April 1956 he abolished Cominform, which had been annoying Russia's partners ever since it was set up in 1947. However, it was not long before events in

Poland and Hungary showed that there were sharp limits to Khrushchev's new toleration.

4.16. Demand of 'Bread and Freedom' in Poland:

There was a general strike and a massive anti-government and anti-soviet demonstration in Posen in June 1956. The banners demanded 'bread and freedom' and the workers were protesting against poor living standards, wage reductions and high taxes. Although they were dispersed by Polish troops, tension remained high throughout the summer. In October 1956, Russian tanks surrounded Warsaw, the Polish capital, but they took no action. In the end the Russians decided to compromise: Gomulka, who had earlier been imprisoned on Stalin's orders, was allowed to be reappointed as First Secretary of the Communist Party. It was accepted that Polish communism could develop in its own way provided that the Poles went along with Russia in foreign affairs. The Russians obviously felt that Gomulka could be trusted not to stray too far. Relations between the two states continued reasonably smoothly, although the Polish version of communism would definitely not have been acceptable to Stalin. For example they introduced the collectivization of agriculture only very slowly, and probably only about ten per cent of farmland was ever collectivized. Poland also traded with countries outside the communist bloc. Gomulka remained in power until he resigned in 1970.

4.17. Revolution in Hungary (1956):

The situation in Hungary ended very differently from the one in Poland. After Stalin's death in 1953, a more moderate communist leader, Imry Nagy, replaced the pro-Stalin leader, Rakosi. However, Rakosi continued to interfere in the government affairs and overthrew Nagy in 1955. From then on resentment steadily built up against the government until it exploded in a full-scale rising in October 1956. The student led popular riots broke out in the capital of Budapest and soon spread to other towns and villages throughout the country. The causes of the Hungarian revolution were many: There was a strong hatred of Rakosi's brutal and repressive regime under which at least 2000 people had been executed and 200,000 others had been put in prisons and concentration camps; living standards of ordinary people were getting worse while hated Communist party leaders were living comfortable lives; there was an intense anti-Russian feeling among the Hungarians; Khrushchev's speech at the Twentieth Congress and Gomulka's return to power in Poland encouraged the Hungarians to resist their government.

Rakosi was forced to resign and was replaced by Imry Nagy, a 'National Communist'. The popular Roman Catholic Cardinal Mindszenty, who had been in prison for six years for anti-communist views, was released. Until this point the Russians

seemed prepared to compromise, as they had done in Poland. But then Nagy went too far: he announced plans for a government including members of other political parties and talked of withdrawing Hungary from the Warsaw Pact. This was too much for the Russians. They believed that if Nagy had his way, Hungary might become a non-communist state and would cease to be an ally of the Soviet Union. The Soviets were also apprehensive that the Hungarian move might encourage people in other Eastern bloc states to do the same. Khrushchev decided to act and dispatched Russian tanks, which surrounded Budapest, the Hungarian capital, and opened fire in November 1956. The Hungarians resisted bravely and fighting lasted two weeks before the Russians brought the country under control. About 20,000 people were killed and another 20,000 were imprisoned. Nagy was executed although he had been promised a safe-conduct. As many as 200,000 Hungarians fled the country and went to the West. The Russians installed Janos Kadar as the new Hungarian leader. Although he had once been imprisoned on Stalin's orders, he was now a reliable ally of Moscow, and he stayed in power until 1988.

4.18. Impact of the Crises in Poland and Hungary:

The dramatic events in Poland and Hungary graphically demonstrated the vulnerability of the Soviet Satellite system in Eastern Europe, and many observers throughout the world anticipated that the United States would intervene on behalf of the freedom fighters in Hungary. After all, the Eisenhower administration had promised that it would 'roll back' communism, and radio broadcasts by the United States sponsored Radio Liberty and Radio Free Europe had encouraged the peoples of Eastern Europe to rise up against Soviet domination. In reality, the United States was well aware that any intervention in Eastern Europe could lead to nuclear war, and limited itself to protest against Soviet brutality in crushing the uprising.

However, the year of discontent was not without consequences. Soviet leaders now recognized that Moscow could maintain control over its satellites in Eastern Europe only by granting them some freedom to adopt domestic policies appropriate to local conditions. Khrushchev had already embarked on this path in 1955, when he assured Tito that there were 'different roads to socialism'. Eastern European communist leaders now took Khrushchev at his word and adopted reform programmes to make socialism more palatable to their subject populations. Even Janos Kadar, derisively labeled the 'butcher of Budapest', managed to preserve many of Nagy's reforms to allow a measure of capitalist incentive and freedom of expression in Hungary.

Questions:

1. Trace the circumstances that led to the establishment of the Soviet hegemony over Eastern Europe.
2. Examine the various ways through which the Soviet Union attempted to bring about the political and economic reconstruction of Eastern Europe.
3. Give an account of the differences between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union in their approach towards communism.
4. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Communist unity in Eastern Europe
 - (b) Marshall Tito
 - (c) Hungarian Revolution (1956)



DECOLONIZATION - DEVELOPMENT OF FREE NATIONS (1945-62)

BRITISH DECOLONIZATION

Objectives:

1. *To study the process of decolonization.*
2. *To understand the various factors that led to the development of free nations.*
3. *To study the decolonization process that took place in the British colonies.*

Introduction:

Decolonization was a process by which the non-self-governing territories including colonies and protectorates of Western imperial powers gained independence. The term decolonization came to be used for the emergence of independence states after the end of the Second World War. At the end of the Second World War in 1945, the nations of Europe claimed ownership of vast areas of the rest of the world, particularly in Asia and Africa. Britain's empire was the largest in area, consisting of India, Burma, Ceylon, Malaya, enormous tracts of Africa, and many assorted islands and other territories such as Cyprus, Hong Kong, the West Indies, the Falklands and Gibraltar. The problems involved in the process of decolonization were often complex. In India there were bitter religious differences to resolve. In some British colonies such as Algeria, Kenya, Tanganyika, Uganda and Rhodesia-large numbers of whites had settled, and they were quite hostile to independence, which would place them under black rule. Britain was prepared to grant independence when it was felt that individual territories were ready for it, and most of the new states retained a link with Britain by remaining in the British Commonwealth.

5.1. Causes of Decolonization:

Three interconnected factors led to the process of large-scale decolonization in the years after 1945. Opposition developed within the non-self-governing territories to the continuation of colonial rule. Some colonial powers introduced political and constitutional changes that aimed eventually at transferring political power to the native people. Also post-Second World War developments leading to the Cold War also compelled the imperial

power to undertake the process of decolonization and gradually grant independence to their former colonies.

5.1.1. Freedom Struggles:

Organized opposition to colonial rule, often referred to as nationalist movements, emerged at different times and took different forms in different colonies. Nationalists were people who had a natural desire to get rid of their foreign rulers so that they could have a government run by people of their own nationality. Although the European powers claimed to have brought the benefits of western civilization to their colonies, there was a general feeling among colonial peoples that the Europeans, who took most of the profits from their partnership, were exploiting them. The development and prosperity of the colonies were being held back in the interests of Europe, and most of the colonial peoples continued to live in poverty. In India, the Indian National Congress Party had been agitating against British rule since 1885, and in Southeast Asia, Vietnamese nationalists began to campaign against French rule during the 1920s. However, nationalism was not so strong in other areas, and progress towards independence would have been much more slow without the boost of the Second World War.

Initially, political pressure for self-government or independence came from elite groups, but in India, the Indian National Congress had become a mass movement challenging British rule by 1918. In Africa, conversely, no anti-colonial party capable of appealing to broad sections of the population emerged until after the Second World War. The origins of such movements often lay in the social and economic changes taking place within the colonial territories, and in the desire to replace traditional sources of authority, which had often benefited from collaboration with colonial rulers.

5.1.2. Impact of the Second World War:

The Second World War gave a great stimulus to nationalist movements in a number of ways. Before the Second World War, colonial peoples believed it would be impossible to defeat the Militarily superior Europeans by force of arms. However, Japanese successes in the early part of the war showed that it was possible for non-Europeans to defeat European armies. Japanese forces captured the British territories of Malaya, Singapore, Hong Kong and Burma, the Dutch East Indies and French Indo-China. Although the Japanese were eventually defeated, the nationalists, many of whom had fought against the Japanese, had no intention of tamely accepting European rule again. If necessary they would continue to fight against the Europeans, using the guerrilla tactics they had learned fighting the Japanese. This is exactly what happened in Indo-China, the Dutch East Indies, Malaya and Burma.

Asians and Africans became more aware of social and political matters as a result of their involvement in the war. Many

Africans, who had left their homeland for the first time to fight in the Allied armies, were shocked at the contrast between the primitive conditions in Africa and the relatively comfortable conditions they experienced even as members of the armed forces. Some Asian nationalist leaders worked with the Japanese, thinking that after the war there would be a possibility of independence being granted by the Japanese than by the Europeans. Many of them, like Dr Sukarno in the Dutch East Indies, gained experience helping to govern the occupied areas. Sukarno later became the first President of Indonesia (1949).

Some European policies during the war encouraged colonial peoples to expect independence as soon as the war was over. The Dutch government, shocked that people were so ready to cooperate with the Japanese in the East Indies, offered them some degree of independence as soon as the Japanese were defeated. The 1941 Atlantic Charter outlined a joint Anglo-American thinking about how the world should be organized after the war. Two of the points mentioned were: Nations should not expand by taking territory from other nations, and all peoples should have the right to choose their own form of government. Though Churchill later clarified that this only applied to victims of Hitler's aggression, the hopes of Asian and African peoples had been raised by the principles of the Atlantic Charter.

The Second World War weakened the European states, so that in the end, they were not militarily strong enough to hold on to their empires in the face of determined struggle for independence. The British were the first to recognize this, and they responded by giving independence to India (1947). After that, British policy was to delay independence as long as possible, but to give way when the pressure became irresistible. It was a further ten years before the Gold Coast became the first British territory in Africa to win independence. As Iain Macleod, the British Colonial Secretary later put it: "We could not possibly have held by force our territories in Africa; the march of men towards freedom cannot be halted; it can only be guided." The French, Dutch, Spanish and Portuguese reacted differently and seemed determined to hold on to their empires. But this involved them in costly military campaigns, and eventually they all had to admit defeat.

5.1.3. International Pressure:

There were international pressures on the colonial powers to initiate the process of decolonization. The United States being the earliest part of the British Empire to declare independence as early as in 1776 was hostile to imperialism. During the Second World War, President Roosevelt made it clear that he took the Atlantic Charter to apply to all peoples, not just those taken over by the Germans. He and his successor, Truman, pressurized the British government to speed up independence for India. One reason given

by the United States for wanting to bring about the decolonization and of the European colonial empires was that any delay in granting independence to European colonies in Asia and Africa would encourage the development of communism in those areas. Another important factor was that the Americans looked on the newly independent nations as potential markets into which they could step and establish both economic and political influence.

The United Nations Organization, under influence of the United States, came out firmly against imperialism and demanded a step-by-step programme for decolonization. The Soviet Union also prompted the process of decolonization by constantly denouncing imperialism. While putting the European states under pressure, this encouraged nationalists all over the world to intensify their struggle for independence.

In the post-1945 period, the new international order also influenced the decolonization process. The weakening of all the Western powers apart from the United States also made it more difficult for colonialism to be maintained by force. By and large, those powers that tried to defeat anti-colonial movements by military means had only limited success. Their efforts were usually justified in terms of the Cold War and the overall Western interest in containing the Communist threat. Yet, while the Cold War could be a reason for maintaining colonial rule, from the mid-1950's it could also be a reason for ending it. The creation of independent states with pro-Western leaders was an important Cold War goal. It could mean a speeding up of the transfer of power in order to prevent more radical groups from gaining influence. In economic terms, new patterns of international trade emerged in the 1940's and 1950's that were based more on trade between the developed nations and less on the exchange of manufactured goods for produce and raw materials. While this was not necessarily a reason for decolonizing, it certainly provided no incentive to oppose it.

5.2. BRITISH DECOLONIZATION

As the Second World War approached, Britain had already granted independence to the white dominions of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. This experience made it acceptable for the Colonial Secretary, Malcolm MacDonald, to state in December 1938 that Britain's ultimate aim was to bring its colonies to self-government.

5.2.1. South Asia:

5.2.1.a. India: Indian national movement had begun in an organized manner with the establishment of the Indian National Congress in 1885. The national movement proceeded on moderate lines up to 1905 and militant lines up to 1920. From 1920, Mahatma Gandhi became the supreme leader of the Indian freedom struggle. He used the methods of *Satyagraha*, non-cooperation and civil disobedience as weapons of the national movement. On the

outbreak of the Second World War the Viceroy of India, Linlithgow, declared war on Germany in the name of India. This step, taken without consulting Indian leaders, alienated Gandhi and important sections of the Indian National Congress. Influential groups within Congress, supporting Gandhi's position, intensified the campaign for immediate self-government, naming it as their price for cooperation in the war effort. At the end of October 1939 the ministries of eight provinces resigned in protest against the adamant attitude of the British. The Indian National Congress resumed the civil disobedience campaign in October 1940. Meanwhile the Muslim League, many of the princely states, and certain members of the Indian National Congress had endorsed the British war effort.

In December 1941 the British authorities in India released the Congress leaders who had been placed under arrest in 1940. A new wave of anti-British agitation followed, and in March 1942 the British government dispatched Sir Stafford Cripps, to India with proposals designed to satisfy nationalist demands. These proposals contained the promise of full independence for India after the end of the war and called for the establishment of an interim Indian government responsible for all matters except national defence and foreign affairs. Because the leaders of both the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League had basic objections to various sections of the proposals, the Cripps mission ended in failure.

The civil disobedience movement in the form of Quit India movement was resumed in August 1942. Gandhi, Nehru, and thousands of their supporters were rounded up and imprisoned, and the Indian National Congress was outlawed. Encouraged by Indian disunity and with the help of Subhaschandra Bose, who had organized a 'provisional Indian government' in Burma, the Japanese promptly intensified military operations along the Burmese-Indian frontier. The Japanese invasion of India began along the eastern front in March 1944. After initial successes, the Japanese were gradually forced back into Burma by Anglo-Indian troops.

In June 1945 India became a charter member of the UN. In the same month Nehru was released from jail, and shortly thereafter the British government issued a white paper on the Indian question. The proposals closely resembled those of the Cripps programme. Another deadlock developed and during the second half of 1945 a new wave of anti-British riots and demonstrations swept India. The British government sent a three-member Cabinet Mission to India. It made another attempt to negotiate an agreement with Indian leaders in the spring of 1946. Although the Muslim League temporarily withdrew its demands for the partition of India along religious lines, wide differences developed with respect to the character of an interim government.

The negotiations were fruitless, and in June the British viceroy Wavell announced the formation of an emergency 'caretaker' government. An interim executive council, headed by Nehru and including representatives of all major political groups except the Muslim League, replaced this government in September 1946. The following month, the Muslim League agreed to participate in the new government. Nonetheless, communal strife between Muslims and Hindus increased in various parts of India.

By the end of 1946 the Indian political situation verged on anarchy. The British prime minister Clement Attlee announced in February 1947 that his government would relinquish power in India not later than 30 June 1948. Political tension mounted in India following the announcement, creating grave possibilities of a disastrous Hindu-Muslim riot. After consultations with Indian leaders, Louis Mountbatten, who succeeded Wavell as Viceroy in March 1947, recommended immediate partition of India to the British government as the only means of averting catastrophe. A bill incorporating Mountbatten's recommendations was introduced into the British parliament on 4 July 1947, which secured speedy and unanimous approval in both houses of parliament.

Under the provisions of the Indian Independence Act, which became effective on 15 August 1947, India and Pakistan were established as independent states within the Commonwealth of Nations, with the right to withdraw from or remain within the Commonwealth.

The new states of India and Pakistan were created along religious lines. Areas inhabited predominantly by Hindus were allocated to India; those with a predominantly Muslim population were allocated to Pakistan. Because the overwhelming majority of people on the Indian subcontinent are Hindus, partition resulted in the inclusion within the Union of India, as the country was then named, of most of the 562 princely states in existence prior to 15 August 1947, as well as the majority of the British provinces.

5.2.b. Burma: After establishing full control over Burma by 1885, the British moved the capital from royal Mandalay to the port city of Rangoon in 1886, and developed it as a sub-station of the British Empire in India. This led to large-scale Indian immigration. Rangoon thus became the hub of a 'steel frame' of administration spreading out into the hinterland, where district officers maintained law and order, collected revenue, and administered justice. As the country was opened up to the world market, it became the world's major exporter of rice. British rule and economic penetration gradually engendered social disintegration and provoked a nationalist movement. This movement used modern institutions, such as the Young Men's Buddhist Association, student strikes, and political participation in partial self-government to agitate for

immediate reforms, including separation from India, and later for independence. In the countryside, the unrelated anti-modern Saya San rebellion of 1930-1932 drew widespread support, but the British crushed the rebellion.

The political leaders who eventually linked capital and countryside into a truly independent Burma had started as student leaders who used the title Thakin, meaning 'master', a term that had previously been applied to the British. The Thakin movement, led by U Aung San and U Nu, formed a Burma Independence Army (BIA), which supported the successful Japanese invasion of Burma in 1942, during the Second World War. This political movement later took advantage of the strains of wartime occupation and the weakness of the Japanese-installed government at the end of the war to resist Japanese rule under the name of the Anti-Fascist People's Freedom League (AFPFL).

After the end of the war, the returning British found the AFPFL, led by Aung San, had nearly monopolized indigenous political power. The AFPFL negotiated with Britain to gain Burma's independence by 1948. It also compelled the inclusion into a 'federal' republic of such peripheral groups as the Shan and Karen, thought to have had special British protection. In elections held in April 1947, Aung San's AFPFL won an overwhelming majority of seats in the constitutional assembly. In July 1947 U Saw, a nationalist political rival of Aung San, had him and six ministers of the new government assassinated, reportedly with the connivance of British former-officials angered by Aung San's wartime collaborationism. U Nu, former Foreign Minister in the wartime puppet government of Ba Maw, was asked to head the AFPFL and the government. The country became independent as the Union of Burma on 4 January 1948. Burma's new independence confronted the AFPFL government of U Nu with a series of political and ethnic insurrections, which continued over the next three decades.

5.2.c. Ceylon (Sri Lanka): Ceylon (Sri Lanka) had been a British colony since the last decade of the eighteenth century. In the nineteenth century Ceylonese nationalist consciousness began to manifest in the social, religious, and educational fronts. Revivalist movements in Buddhism and Hinduism sought to modernize their institutions and to defend themselves against Christian inroads by establishing schools to impart Western education unmixed with Christianity.

Gradually, this consciousness spread to the political field. Regional and communal associations were founded in the educationally advanced parts of the country and began to voice proposals for reform. They asked for Ceylonese participation in the executive branch, a wider territorial representation in the legislature, and the adoption of the elective principle in place of nomination. These demands showed a common ideology and

approach and revealed a desire to advance within the framework of the colonial constitution.

During the First World War the forces of Nationalism in Ceylon gathered momentum. Civil disturbances in 1915 and subsequent political repercussions helped the growth of national political consciousness. In 1919 the Ceylon National Congress was formed, uniting Sinhalese and Tamil organizations. The Congress drafted proposals for constitutional reforms, demanding an elected majority in the legislature, control of the budget, and partial control of the executive branch.

A new constitution was promulgated in 1920 and then modified in 1924 to satisfy nationalist demands. The country attained representative government, but no share was given in the executive, which remained under the governor and the official Executive Council. Another constitution, framed in 1931 on the recommendations of a commission appointed to examine constitutional reform, gave Ceylonese leaders opportunities to exercise political power and to gain governmental experience with a view toward eventual self-government.

In response to Ceylonese nationalist leaders, who exerted pressure behind the scenes while cooperating with the war effort--the British in 1945 appointed the Soulbury Constitutional Commission, which drafted a constitution that gave Ceylon internal self-government, retaining some imperial safeguards in defense and external affairs. In 1947 the Ceylon Independence Act conferred dominion status on the colony. The British granted complete independence to Ceylon on 4 February 1948.

5.3. West Indies, Malaya and Cyprus:

5.3.a. The West Indies: Britain's West Indian possessions consisted of a large assortment of islands in the Caribbean Sea. The largest among them were Jamaica and Trinidad, and others included Grenada, St Vincent, Barbados, St Lucia, Antigua, the Seychelles and the Bahamas. There was also British Honduras on the mainland of Central America and British Guiana on the northeast coast of South America. Together these territories had a population of around six million. Britain was prepared in principle to give them all independence. However, there were certain problems, which had to be taken care of. Some of the islands were very small, and there were doubts about whether they were viable as independent states. Grenada, St Vincent and Antigua, for example, had populations of only about 100,000 each, while some were even smaller: the twin islands of St Kitts and Nevis had only about 60,000 people between them. The British Labour government felt that a federation could be the ideal way of uniting such small and widely scattered territories. However, many of the territories themselves objected to the idea of federation. Some, like Honduras and Guiana, wanted nothing to do with the federation and preferred to

remain completely separate independent states. This left Jamaica and Trinidad worried about whether they would be able to cope with the problems of the smaller islands. Some islands did not like the prospect of being dominated by Jamaica and Trinidad, and some of the smallest were not even sure whether they wanted independence at all. They preferred to remain under British guidance and protection.

In spite of these problems Britain went ahead and established the West Indies Federation in 1958. This federation excluded British Honduras and British Guiana. However, this federation did not function successfully. There were constant quarrels among the federating units about how much each island should pay into the federal budget and how many representatives they should each have in the federal parliament. When Jamaica and Trinidad withdrew in 1961, the federation no longer seemed viable.

In 1962 Britain decided to abandon the federation and grant independence separately to all those islands, which desired to be independent. Thus, by 1983 all parts of the British West Indies, except a few tiny islands, had become independent. Jamaica and Trinidad and Tobago were first to gain independence in 1962, and the islands of St Kitts and Nevis were the last in 1983. British Guiana became known as Guyana (1966) and British Honduras took the name Belize (1981). All of them became members of the British Commonwealth.

5.3.b. Malaya: Malaya was liberated from Japanese occupation in 1945, but there were two problems to be faced before the British were prepared to withdraw. Malaya was a complex area, which was difficult to organize. It consisted of nine states each ruled by a sultan, two British settlements, Malacca and Penang, and Singapore, a small island less than a mile from the mainland. The population of Malaya was multi-racial. It comprised mostly of Malays and Chinese. There were also some Indians and Europeans. In preparation for independence it was decided to group the states and the settlements into the Federation of Malaya (1948), while Singapore remained a separate colony. Each state had its own legislature for local affairs; the sultans retained some power, but the central government had firm overall control. All adults had the vote and this meant that the Malays, the largest group, usually dominated the political affairs of the confederation.

Chinese communist guerrillas led by Chin Peng, who had played a leading role in the resistance to the Japanese during the war, began to stir up strikes and violence against the British. His aim was to organize an independent communist state. The British declared a state of emergency in 1948, and eventually the communists were successfully suppressed. However, the campaign against the communist took quite a long time, and the state of

emergency remained in force until 1960. Their tactics were to re-settle all Chinese suspected of helping the guerrillas, into specially guarded villages. It was made clear that independence would follow as soon as the country was ready for it; this ensured that the Malays remained firmly pro-British and gave very little help to the communists, who were Chinese.

The move towards independence was accelerated when the Malay party, under their able leader Tunku Abdul Rahman, joined forces with the main Chinese and Indian groups to form the Alliance Party, which won 51 out of the 52 seats in the 1955 elections. This seemed to suggest stability and the British were persuaded to grant full independence in 1957 when Malaya was admitted to the Commonwealth.

Malaya was running well under the leadership of Tunku Abdul Rahman, and its economy, based on exports of rubber and tin, was the most prosperous in Southeast Asia. In 1961 when Tunku Abdul Rahman proposed that Singapore and three other British colonies, North Borneo (Sabah), Brunei and Sarawak, should join Malaya to form the Federation of Malaysia, Britain agreed. After a United Nations investigation team reported that a large majority of the populations concerned was in favour of the union, the Federation of Malaysia was officially proclaimed in September 1963. Brunei decided not to join the proposed federation, and eventually became an independent state within the Commonwealth (1984). Although Singapore decided to leave the federation to become an independent republic in 1965, the rest of the federation continued successfully.

5.3.c. Cyprus: The British Labour government (1945-51) considered giving Cyprus independence, but progress was delayed by complications, the most serious of which was the mixed population - about 80 per cent were Greek-speaking Christians of the Orthodox Church, while the rest were Muslims of Turkish origin. The Greek Cypriots wanted the island to unite with Greece, but the Turks were strongly opposed to the Greek demand. Churchill's government (1951-55) inflamed the situation in 1954 when their plans for self-government allowed the Cypriots far less power than Labour had had in mind. There were hostile demonstrations, which were dispersed by British troops.

Sir Anthony Eden, Churchill's successor, decided to drop the idea of independence for Cyprus, believing that Britain needed the island as a military base to protect her interests in the Middle East. He announced that Cyprus must remain permanently British, though the Greek government promised that Britain could retain her military bases even if Cyprus joined Greece.

The Greek Cypriots, led by Archbishop Makarios, pressed their demands, while a guerrilla organization called *Eoka*, led by General Grivas, waged a terrorist campaign against the British, who

declared a state of emergency (1955) and deployed about 35,000 troops to maintain law and order in the island. British policy also involved deporting Makarios and executing terrorists. The situation became even more difficult in 1958 when the Turks set up a rival organization in support of dividing the island.

Eventually, to avoid possible civil war between the two groups, Harold Macmillan, Eden's successor, decided to arrive at a compromise plan. He appointed the sympathetic and tactful Hugh Foot as governor and he negotiated a deal with Makarios. The Archbishop dropped the demand to unite the island with Greece and in return Cyprus was granted full independence. Turkish interests were safeguarded. Britain retained two military bases on the island, and along with Greece and Turkey, guaranteed the independence of Cyprus. Makarios became the first President with a Turkish Cypriot, Fazil Kutchuk, as Vice-President (1960).

5.4. British Withdrawal From Africa:

African nationalism spread rapidly after 1945. This was because more and more Africans were being educated in Britain and the USA, where they were made aware of racial discrimination. Colonialism was seen as the humiliation and exploitation of blacks by whites, and working-class Africans in the new towns were particularly receptive to nationalist ideas. The British, especially the Labour government of 1945-51, was quite willing to grant independence to the British colonies in Africa. It was confident that the British would still be able to exercise influence over their former colonies through trade links and by including the new states as members of the Commonwealth. The British colonies in Africa fell into three distinct groups, which had certain differences in character, which were to affect progress towards independence.

5.4.1. West Africa:

5.4.1.a. The Gold Coast: The Gold Coast was the first black African state south of the Sahara to win independence after the Second World War with the new name Ghana (1957). The nationalist leader, Kwame Nkrumah, who was educated in London and the USA became the leader of the *Convention People's Party* (CPP) in 1949 and organized the campaign for independence. There were boycotts of European goods, violent demonstrations and a general strike (1950), and Nkrumah and other leaders were imprisoned for a time. But the British, realizing that he had mass support, soon released him and agreed to allow a new constitution, which included adult franchise, and an elected assembly. In the 1951 elections, the first under the new constitution, the CPP won 34 seats out of 38. Nkrumah was released from prison, invited to form a government and became Prime Minister in 1952. This was self-government but not yet full independence. The Gold Coast had a small but well-educated group of politicians and other professionals, who, for the next five years, gained experience of

government under British supervision. In 1957 Ghana, as it became known, received full independence.

5.4.1.b. Nigeria: Nigeria was the largest of Britain's African colonies, with a population of over 60 million. Due to its enormous size and regional differences between the vast Muslim north, dominated by the Hausa and Fulani tribes, the western region inhabited by the Yorubas and the eastern region of the Ibos, the task of granting independence to Nigeria was more difficult than that of Ghana. The leading Nigerian nationalist was Nnamdi Azikiwe, popularly known to his supporters as 'Zik'. After his return to Nigeria in 1937 he soon gained enormous popular support and prestige. To press for the independence of Nigeria in 1945 Nnamdi Azikiwe organized a general strike. This prompted the British to think in terms of preparing Nigeria for independence. It was decided that a federal system would be most suitable for the country. In 1954 a new constitution introduced local assemblies for the three regions with a federal government in Lagos, the capital. The regions assumed self-government first and the country as a whole became independent in 1960.

5.4.1.c. Sierra Leone and the Gambia: These were the other two British colonies in West Africa, which achieved independence without serious incident. Sierra Leone became independent in 1961 and the Gambia in 1965.

5.4.2. East Africa:

Granting independence to their colonies in East Africa was not on the priority list for the British as for West Africa. However, it was presumed that when independence would come, it would be in the form of multi-racial governments, in which the European and Asian settlers would play a significant part. But during Harold Macmillan's government (1957--63) an important change took place in British policy towards both East and Central Africa. Macmillan had come to realize the strength of black African nationalist feeling. In a famous speech in Cape Town in 1960, he said: "The wind of change blowing through the continent. Whether we like it or not, this growth of national consciousness is a political fact, and our national policies must take account of it."

5.4.2.a. Tanganyika: In Tanganyika the nationalist movement was led by the *Tanganyika African National Union* (TANU) led by Dr. Julius Nyerere. He had been educated at the Edinburgh University. He insisted that the government must be African, but he also made it clear that whites had nothing to fear from the black rule. Harold Macmillan's government, impressed by Nyerere's ability and sincerity, granted independence to Tanganyika with black majority rule (1961). The island of Zanzibar was later united with Tanganyika, and the country came to be known as Tanzania (1964). Nyerere was the President of Tanzania until his retirement in 1985.

5.4.2.b. Uganda: In Uganda independence was delayed for a time by tribal conflicts. The ruler, known as the Kabaka of the Buganda area objected to the introduction of democracy. Eventually a solution was found in a federal constitution, which allowed the Kabaka to retain some powers in Buganda. Uganda itself became independent in 1962 with Dr Milton Obote as Prime Minister.

5.4.2.c. Kenya: Kenya was the most difficult area to deal with because the 66,000 white settlers were violently opposed to black majority rule. They refused to negotiate with the African nationalist leader Jomo Kenyatta and his *Kenya African Unity Party* (KAU) and were determined to prolong white settler rule. The white settlers provoked a confrontation, hoping that violence would destroy the African party. The British government was under pressure from both sides, and certain big business interests in Britain supported the white settlers. KAU was able to make little progress towards self-government. The only British concession extended to the Kenyans was that a provision was made for six of them to join the Legislative Council of fifty-four members.

African impatience burst out in a campaign of terrorist attacks on European owned farms and on black workers. It was organized by the *Mau Mau* secret society, whose members were mainly from the Kikuyu tribe, who had been deprived of much of their best land by the white settlers. The British declared a state of emergency in Kenya in 1952. Kenyatta and other nationalist leaders were arrested. Kenyatta was kept in prison for six years from 1953-59 although he had publicly condemned terrorism. The British used military force to suppress the terrorists. Over the next eight years some around ten thousand Kenyans were killed, and about ninety thousand Kikuyu tribesmen were imprisoned.

By 1960 the terrorists were gradually suppressed by the British in Kenya. However, by then, ironically, the British, encouraged by the 'wind of change' and by the expense of the anti-terrorist campaign, had had their change of heart. They realized that Kenyatta was, after all, a moderate, and allowed him to become Prime Minister when Kenya became independent in 1963. In spite of harsh treatment given to him by the British, Kenyatta favoured reconciliation. Whites who decided to stay on in Kenya after independence were fairly treated provided they took Kenyan citizenship.

5.4.3. Central Africa:

This was the most troublesome area for Britain to deal with because this was where the settlers were most numerous and most deeply entrenched, particularly in Southern Rhodesia. Another problem was that numbers of well-educated Africans were much smaller than in West Africa because the settlers had made sure that there was very little money spent on further and higher education for black Africans. Alarmed at the spread of nationalism,

the whites decided that their best policy was to combine resources. They persuaded Churchill's government in 1953 to allow them to set up a union of the three colonies - Nyasaland and Northern and Southern Rhodesia, to be known as the Central African Federation. Their aim was to preserve the supremacy of the white minority, about 300,000 Europeans out of a total population of about 8.5 million. The federal parliament in Salisbury, the capital of Southern Rhodesia was dominated by the whites. The whites hoped that the federation would soon gain full independence from Britain, with dominion status.

The Africans watched with growing distrust, and their leaders, Dr Hastings Banda (Nyasaland), Kenneth Kaunda (Northern Rhodesia) and Joshua Nkomo (Southern Rhodesia) began to campaign for black majority rule. As violence developed, a state of emergency was declared in Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia, with mass arrests of Africans (1959).

However, there was much support for the Africans in Britain, especially in the Labour party, and the Conservative Colonial Secretary, Iain Macleod, was sympathetic. The British government appointed the Monckton Commission, which made the following recommendations in 1960: The Africans were to be granted voting rights; racial discrimination should be ended and the territories were to be granted right to leave the federation if they so desired.

5.4.3.a. Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia: The British introduced new constitutions in Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia, which in effect allowed the Africans their own parliaments (1961-62). Both wanted to leave the Federation, which was therefore terminated in December 1963. This was considered to be a defeat for the white settlers. The following year Nyasaland and Northern Rhodesia became fully independent, taking the names Malawi and Zambia.

5.4.3.b. Southern Rhodesia: Southern Rhodesia took much longer time to gain independence and it was only in 1980 that the colony achieved independence with black majority rule. It was in Rhodesia that the white settlers fought most fiercely to preserve their privileged position. There were just over 200,000 whites, about 20,000 Asians, and four million black Africans, but the *Rhodesia Front*, a right-wing white racist party, was determined never to surrender control of the country to black African rule, and the black African parties were banned in Southern Rhodesia.

When Zambia and Malawi were given independence, the whites assumed that Rhodesia would get the same treatment and put forward a formal request for independence. The British Conservative government refused and made it clear that independence would be granted only if the constitution was changed to allow black Africans at least a third of the seats in parliament. Ian Smith, who became Prime Minister of Rhodesia in

April 1964, rejected this idea and refused to make any concessions. He argued that continued white rule was essential in view of the problems being faced by the new black governments in other African states, and because the Zimbabwe nationalists seemed bitterly divided. Harold Wilson, the new British Labour Prime Minister (1964-70), continued to refuse independence unless the constitution was changed to prepare for black majority rule. Since no compromise seemed possible, Smith declared Rhodesia independent, against the wishes of Britain. This was a unilateral declaration of independence in November 1965.

At first there seemed very little Britain could do about the unilateral declaration of independence by Ian Smith's government in Southern Rhodesia. The British government had decided not to use force against the illegal Smith regime. Britain decided to apply economic sanctions to bring the country to its knees and stopped buying sugar and tobacco from Rhodesia. The UN condemned the unilateral declaration of independence and called on all member states to place a complete trade embargo on Rhodesia.

South Africa, also ruled by a white minority government, and Portugal, which still owned neighbouring Mozambique, were sympathetic to the Smith regime and refused to obey the Security Council resolution. This meant that Rhodesia was able to continue trading through these countries. Many other countries, while publicly condemning the Smith regime, privately evaded the embargo and carried on secret trade with Southern Rhodesia. For example, the United States bought Rhodesian chrome because it was the cheapest available. Companies and business people in many countries, including British oil companies, continued to break sanctions, and although the Rhodesian economy suffered to some extent, it was not serious enough to topple the Smith regime.

The Southern Rhodesian question seriously shook the Commonwealth. Ghana and Nigeria wanted Britain to use force, and offered to supply troops to settle the Southern Rhodesian question. Zambia and Tanzania hoped that economic sanctions would be sufficient. When Wilson twice met Smith in 1966 and in 1968 to put new proposals, there was a strong protest fearing that he might betray the black Rhodesians. However, Smith rejected both sets of proposals.

In 1970 Rhodesia declared itself a republic, and the rights of black citizens were gradually taken away. The blacks in Rhodesia suffered disabilities as experienced by blacks in South Africa. However, in 1976 the first signs began to appear that the whites would have to compromise. This change in perception of the future of Rhodesia was chiefly due to the fact that Mozambique secured independence from Portugal in 1975 and the new Mozambican government applied sanctions against Rhodesia and allowed Zimbabwean guerillas to operate from Mozambique. The South

Africans became less inclined to support Rhodesia after their invasion of Angola was called off on American orders. The Americans were apprehensive that the Soviet Union and Cuba might become involved in Rhodesia unless some compromise could be found. Along with South Africa, the United States urged Smith to make concessions to the blacks before it was too late. By 1978 nationalist guerrillas controlled large areas of Rhodesia and the whites were on the verge of defeat.

Smith still tried to delay black majority rule as long as possible. Finally, he had no other option but to concede to the black majority rule. In the elections that were held in the early part of 1980, Robert Mugabe's Zimbabwe African National Union (ZANU) won a sweeping victory, taking 57 of the 80 black African seats. This gave him a comfortable majority enabling him to become Prime Minister, and Zimbabwe officially became independent in April 1980. All African and Commonwealth leaders welcomed the transfer of power to black majority as a triumph of common sense and moderation.

Questions:

1. Discuss the various factors that led to the process of decolonization.
2. Trace the process of British decolonization in Asia.
3. Describe briefly the emergence of India, Burma and Ceylon as free nations.
4. Examine the decolonization process in West Indies, Malaya and Cyprus.
5. Account for the dissolution of the British colonial empire in West and East Africa.
6. What problems did the British Government face in dealing with the decolonization process in Central Africa?



DECOLONIZATION: DEVELOPMENT OF FREE NATIONS (1945-62)

FRENCH-DUTCH-BELGIAN- SPANISH-PORTUGUESE AND ITALIAN

Objectives:

1. *To study the decolonization process in French, Dutch, Belgian, Spanish, Portuguese and Italian colonies.*
2. *To understand the complexities of the problems in their respective colonies.*

Introduction:

After England, France had the second largest empire, with territories in Africa, Indo-China and the West Indies. In addition, Britain and France still held land in the Middle East taken from Turkey at the end of the First World War. Britain held Transjordan and Palestine, and France held Syria. They were known as 'mandated' territories, which' meant that Britain and France were intended to 'look after' them and prepare them for independence. Other important empires were those of Holland (Dutch East Indies), Belgium (Congo and Ruanda Urundi), Portugal (Angola, Mozambique and Guinea), Spain (Spanish Sahara, Ifni, Spanish Morocco and Spanish Guinea) and Italy (Libya, Somalia and Eritrea).

6.1. FRENCH DECOLONIZATION

The main French possessions at the end of the Second World War were: Syria in the Middle East, from which they Withdrew in 1946; Guadeloupe and Martinique islands in the West Indies; French Guiana on the mainland of South America. Besides France had also acquired huge areas of north and West Africa. These included Tunisia, Morocco and Algeria, together known as the Maghrib; French West Africa; French Equatorial Africa and the large island of Madagascar off the southeast coast of Africa.

When there was movement for self-government and independence, the French began by trying to suppress all nationalist agitation. The French regarded any campaign for independence as high treason. The French manifested their attitude towards freedom struggle in their colonies through the Brazzaville Declaration of 1944, which stated: "The colonizing work of France makes it impossible to accept any idea of autonomy for the colonies or any possibility of development outside the French empire. Even at a distant date, there will be no self-government in

the colonies.” However, this profession of the French did not deter the people inhabiting the French colonies from demanding greater self-government and freedom. Gradually the French were influenced by Britain's moves towards decolonization, and after their defeat in Indo-China in 1954, they too were forced to bow to the 'wind of change' and begin the process of decolonization.

5.1.1. Indo-China:

Indo-China was one of the most cherished possessions of the French empire from 1884 until 1940. Indo-China was into the five territories - Cochin-China, Tonkin, Annam (these three making up modern Vietnam), Cambodia and Laos, under a French Governor-General, the colony was ruled almost entirely for the benefit of the French economy, and to the advantage of French settlers and a small class of native collaborators.

Resistance to the French started in the 1880's, but ruthless suppression crippled all attempts to set up a successful opposition movement until 1930, when Ho Chi Minh formed the Indo-China Communist Party and provoked widespread uprisings. During the war, the Japanese occupied the whole area, and resistance to the Japanese was organized by Ho Chi Minh through the League for Vietnamese Independence (Vietminh). When the Japanese withdrew in 1945, Ho Chi Minh declared Vietnam independent. This was unacceptable to the French, and an eight-year armed struggle began which culminated in the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu in May 1954. The defeat was a humiliating blow for the French and it caused a political crisis. The government resigned and the new and more liberal premier Pierre Mendes-France, realizing that public opinion was turning against the war, decided to withdraw from Indo-China.

At the Geneva Conference held in July 1954, it was agreed that Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia should become independent. Unfortunately this was not the end of the troubles. Although the French had withdrawn, the Americans were unwilling to allow the whole of Vietnam to come under the rule of the communist Ho Chi Minh, and an even bloodier struggle developed. Vietnam became the victim of a bitter Cold War and the struggle between the communist dominated North Vietnam supported by the Soviet Union and China and South Vietnam supported by the United States lasted up to 1976.

6.1.2. Tunisia:

In Tunisia the main nationalist group was the *New Destour* led by Habib Bourghiba. They had widespread support among both rural and townspeople who believed independence would improve their living standards. A guerrilla campaign was launched against the French, who responded by banning the *New Destour* and imprisoning Bourghiba (1952). Seventy thousand French troops were deployed against the guerrillas, but failed to crush them. The

French became aware of a disturbing trend. Bourghiba and other moderate leaders being in prison, the guerrilla movement was becoming more left wing and less willing to negotiate. Being under pressure at the same time in Indo-China and Morocco, the French realized that they would have to compromise. The French felt that by placing a moderate like Bourghiba at the head of the country, there would be more chance of maintaining French influence after independence. Under these circumstances Bourghiba was released from prison and Mendes-France allowed him to form a government. In March 1956 Tunisia became fully independent under Bourghiba's leadership.

6.1.3. Morocco:

The Moroccan case was not very different than that of Tunisia. The pattern of events in Morocco was remarkably similar. A period of genuine negotiation revealed to both sides the gap between the French programme of democratic gradualism and the nationalists' determination to get independence as soon as possible. The principal difference between the Moroccan and Tunisian cases lay in the temper of the ruler. Muhammad V had shown signs of allying himself with the *Istiqlal* (Independence) Party at the end of the war. The new trade unions also played an important role in the Moroccan freedom struggle. The French deposed Sultan Muhammad V in 1953, and placed the exiled sultan's uncle, Muhammad ben Arafa on the throne. This action of the French provoked violent demonstrations and a guerrilla campaign. Faced with the prospect of yet another long and expensive anti guerrilla war, the French decided to relent. In 1955, following the settlement with Tunisia, Sultan Muhammad V was brought back and before the end of the year France had agreed to concede full independence. It took effect on 2 March 1956. Both Tunisia and Morocco became full members of the Arab league in 1958.

6.1.4. Algeria:

It was in Algeria that the 'settler factor' had the most serious consequences. There were over a million French settlers, known as *colons* that controlled nearly one-third of all the most fertile land in Algeria, taken from the original Algerian owners during the century before 1940. The whites exported most of the crops they produced and also used some of the land to grow vines for winemaking. This made less food available for the growing African population whose standard of living was gradually declining. There was an active, though peaceful, nationalist movement led by Messali Hadj, but after almost ten years of campaigning following the end of the Second World War, they had achieved absolutely nothing. The French settlers were against making any concessions to the Algerians. The Algerians had no say in the government of their own country. Algeria continued to be treated not as a colony or a

protectorate, but as an extension or province of France itself. In spite of the developments in Indo-China, Tunisia and Morocco, no French government dared to consider independence for Algeria. It was feared that any such move would invite the anger of the settlers and their supporters in France.

Encouraged by the French defeat in Indo-China, a more militant nationalist group was formed in Algeria. The *National Liberation Front* (FLN), led by Ben Bella, launched a guerrilla war towards the end of 1954. The war gradually escalated as the French sent more troops to Algeria in order to suppress the guerilla activities of the National Liberation Front. By 1960 the French had around 700,000 troops engaged in a massive anti-terrorist operation in Algeria. The war was having profound effects in France itself. Many French politicians realized that even if the army won the military struggle, the National Liberation Front still had the support of most of the Algerian people, and while this lasted, French control of Algeria could never be secure. The war also split public opinion in France between those who wanted to continue supporting the white settlers and those who thought the struggle was futile.

In 1958 the war in Algeria caused the downfall of the French government and brought an end to the Fourth Republic in France, which had been in existence since France was liberated from Nazi Germany in 1944. Suspecting that the government was about to give way as it had in Tunisia and Morocco, some army officers organized demonstrations in Algiers and demanded that General de Gaulle should be called in to head a new government. De Gaulle agreed to become Prime Minister on condition that he could draw up a new constitution for France. This turned out to be the end of the Fourth Republic. De Gaulle soon produced his new constitution giving the President much more power, and was elected President of the Fifth Republic in December 1958, a position that he held until his resignation in April 1969.

With the tacit support of some paratroop regiments, the French settlers attempted an uprising in Algiers in January 1960. It failed when de Gaulle called the French army to order. Splits also appeared again between National Liberation Front leaders. Some, like Abbas, were ready for the negotiations offered by de Gaulle in June 1960. Unsuccessful talks took place in Paris, followed by renewed attacks in Algiers, forcing de Gaulle to state more clearly in November 1960 his eventual intention to emancipate Algeria. This proved too much for several French generals. With hard-line settlers, they formed the Secret Army Organization (OAS) to mount a second rebellion in February 1961. This time, the rebels took hold of Algiers and even threatened Paris. Once again, de Gaulle's oratorical skills silenced the dissidence, paving the way for a final political solution.

Despite continuing divisions, the National Liberation Front participated in secret negotiations with the French in Evian, Switzerland, from late 1961, culminating in a ceasefire agreement in March 1962. The Evian Accords also provided for a referendum, which was held on 1 July 1962. In this referendum the majority of Algerians voted for independence. Over the next few months, French settlers emigrated in large numbers, leaving Algeria under its first independent president, Ahmed Ben Bella. On the Algerian side, the war had cost nearly one million lives from a population of less than nine million.

6.1.5. *The Rest of the French Empire:*

The French possessions in Africa south of the Sahara were: French West Africa consisting of eight colonies: Dahomey, Guinea, Ivory Coast, Mauritania, Niger, Senegal, Sudan and Upper Volta; French Equatorial Africa consisting of four colonies: Chad, Gabon, Middle Congo and Oubangui-Shari; A third group consisted of Cameroon and Togo, former German colonies given to France to be looked after as mandates in 1919, and the island of Madagascar.

French policy after 1945 was to treat these territories as if they were part of France, and the French settlers opposed any moves towards more privileges for the Africans. In 1949 the French government decided to clamp down on all nationalist movements, and many nationalist leaders and trade unionists were arrested. Often they were denounced as communist agitators, though without much evidence to support the accusations.

Gradually the French were forced by events in Indo-China and the Maghrib, together with the fact that Britain was preparing the Gold Coast and Nigeria for independence, to change their policy. In 1956 the twelve colonies of West and Equatorial Africa were each given self-government for internal affairs, but they continued to press for full independence.

When de Gaulle came to power in 1958 he proposed a new plan, hoping to keep as much control over the colonies as possible. The twelve colonies were to have self-government, each with its own parliament for local affairs. They were to be the members of a new union, the French Community, and France was to take all-important decisions about taxation and foreign affairs. All members of the community were to receive economic aid from France. There was to be a referendum in each colony to decide whether the plan should be accepted or not. Further, the plan laid down that those colonies, which opted for full independence could have it, but would receive no French aid.

De Gaulle was confident that none of the colonies would be able to face the future without the French help. As visualized by de Gaulle eleven colonies voted in favour of his plan. The only colony,

Guinea, under the leadership of Sekou Toure, voted overwhelmingly (95 per cent) against de Gaulle's plan.

Guinea was granted independence immediately (1958) as per the referendum. However, all French aid was stopped to Guinea. The newly independent Guinea's withstood all the problems created by the denial of French aid and its brave stand encouraged the other eleven French colonies, as well as Togo, Cameroon and Madagascar. They all demanded full independence and de Gaulle agreed to grant the same. All of them became independent republics during 1960. However, this new independence was not quite so complete as the new states had hoped. De Gaulle was intent on neo-colonialism. All the states except Guinea found that France still influenced their economic and foreign policies, and any independent action was almost out of the question.

Three French possessions outside Africa, Martinique, Guadeloupe and French Guiana, were not given independence. They continued to be treated as extensions of the mother country and their official status was 'overseas departments'. Their peoples voted in French elections and their representatives sat in the French National Assembly in Paris.

6.2. DUTCH DECOLONIZATION

Before the war Holland had a huge empire in the East Indies including the large islands of Sumatra, Java and Celebes, West Irian (part of the island of New Guinea) and about two-thirds of the island of Borneo. They also owned some islands in the West Indies, and Surinam on the mainland of South America, between British and French Guiana.

It was in the valuable East Indies that the first challenge came to Dutch control even before the outbreak of the Second World War. The Dutch operated in a way similar to the French in Algeria. They grew crops for export and did very little to improve the living standards of the East Indians. Nationalist groups campaigned throughout the 1930's, and many leaders, including Ahmed Sukarno, were arrested.

When the Japanese invaded in 1942, they released Sukarno and others and allowed them to play a part in the administration of the country, promising independence when the war was over. With the Japanese defeat in 1945, Sukarno declared an independent republic of Indonesia, not expecting any resistance from the Dutch, who had been defeated and their country occupied by the Germans. However, Dutch troops soon arrived and made determined efforts to regain control. Although the Dutch had some success, the war dragged on, and they were still a long way from complete victory. The expense of the long drawn campaign in Indonesia was crippling the economy of a small country like Holland. Besides, an outright victory still seemed to be difficult. The

Dutch were under strong pressure from the UN to reach an agreement with the Indonesian nationalists. Other countries, including the USA and Australia, were pressing Holland to grant independence so that they could exert their influence over the country once the exclusive Dutch control ended. On the other hand the Dutch hoped that by making concessions, they would be able to preserve the link between Holland and Indonesia and maintain some influence over the country. Under these circumstances in 1949 the Dutch at last decided to negotiate with the Indonesian nationalist leaders.

Following deliberations at the Round Table Conference at the Hague, an agreement was signed by which Holland recognized the independence of the United States of Indonesia (1949) with Sukarno as president, but not including West Irian. Sukarno agreed to a Netherlands-Indonesia Union under the Dutch crown, and Dutch troops were withdrawn. However, the following year Sukarno broke away from the Union and began to pressurize the Dutch to hand over West Irian, seizing Dutch-owned property and expelling Europeans. Eventually in 1963 Holland gave way and allowed West Irian to become part of Indonesia.

Of the other Dutch possessions, Surinam was allowed to become an independent republic in 1975; the West Indian islands were treated as part of Holland, though allowed some control over their internal affairs.

6.3. BELGIAN DECOLONIZATION

Belgian control of their African possessions, the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, ended in chaos, violence and civil war. The Belgians used various dubious methods to preserve their control over their colonies. These methods included denying the Africans any advanced education by which they could be prevented from coming into contact with nationalist ideas and deprive them of an educated professional class who could lead them to independence. The Belgians also used tribal rivalries to their advantage by playing off different tribes against each other. This worked well in the huge Congo, which contained about 150 tribes. By using the typical policy of 'divide and rule' men from one tribe were used to keep order in another tribal area. In Ruanda-Urundi the Belgians used the Tutsi tribe to help them control the other main tribal group, the Hutu. In spite of all these efforts of the Belgians, nationalist ideas still began to filter in from neighbouring French and British colonies

6.3.1. *The Belgian Congo:*

Increasingly oppressive exploitation of the people of the Congo Free State caused continued unrest and finally led, early in the twentieth century, to international protest. Public opinion forced King Leopold of Belgium to establish a commission of inquiry in 1904. The report of the commission revealed that the local people

were victims of a slave-labour system and of other abuses. These findings compelled the king to institute certain reforms, which were not very effective. As a result, the Belgian parliament in 1908 voted to annex the Congo Free State, making it a colony that became known as the Belgian Congo. During the First World War, Congolese troops effectively aided the Allied cause in Africa, conquering the German territory of Ruanda-Urundi, modern-day Rwanda and Burundi, which was mandated by the League of Nations to Belgium in 1919.

Substantial expansion of the industrial facilities of the Congo took place during the Second World War. This process was particularly marked in the uranium, copper, palm oil, and rubber industries. During the post-war years further increases in the industrial productivity of the colony occurred, and a series of reforms, designed to prepare the Congolese for eventual self-government, were initiated.

On December 8, 1957, the Africans took part for the first time in voting for elective places on the township councils, winning 130 of 170 seats. The Belgians seemed taken by surprise when widespread rioting broke out in January 1959 in the capital of the Congo, Leopoldville. The crowds were protesting against unemployment and declining living standards, and disorders soon spread throughout the whole country. Following these riots the Belgian government announced a schedule for Congolese elections, which were to inaugurate self-rule. But a congress of leading nationalist parties insisted upon immediate full independence. The two principal parties were the *Abako (Association of the Lower Congo)*, led by Joseph Kasavubu, and the *Congolese National Movement*, led by Patrice Lumumba. Belgium then agreed to relinquish the colony. The Congo became independent on 30 June 1960 with Lumumba as Prime Minister and Joseph Kasavubu, the leader of a rival nationalist group, as President. Unfortunately everything went wrong shortly after independence and the country was plunged into a disastrous civil war. Order was not restored until 1964.

6.3.2. Ruanda-Urundi:

The other Belgian territory of Ruanda-Urundi was given independence in 1962 and divided into two states - Rwanda and Burundi, both governed by members of the Tutsi tribe, as they had been throughout the colonial period. Neither of the states had been properly prepared, and after independence, both had a very unsettled history of bitter rivalry and violence between the Tutsis and the Hutus.

6. 4. SPANISH DECOLONIZATION

Spain owned some areas in Africa. The largest was Spanish Sahara, and there were also the small colonies of Spanish Morocco, Ifni and Spanish Guinea. General Franco, the right-wing

dictator who ruled Spain from 1939 until 1975, showed little interest in the colonies. When nationalist movements developed in the Spanish colonies, General Franco did not resist long in the case of Spanish Morocco. When the French gave independence to French Morocco (1956), Franco followed suit and Spanish Morocco became part of Morocco. The other two small colonies had to wait much longer. Ifni was allowed to join Morocco only in 1969; and Guinea became independent as Equatorial Guinea in 1968.

6.4.1. Spanish Sahara:

In the case of Spanish Sahara Franco was reluctant to consider granting independence because it was an important source of phosphates. Only after Franco's death in 1975 did the new Spanish government agree to grant independence to Sahara. Unfortunately the process was badly managed. Instead of making it into an independent state ruled by its nationalist party, the *Polisario Front*, it was decided to divide it between its two neighbouring states, Morocco and Mauritania. The *Polisario Front*, under its leader, Mohamed Abdelaziz, declared the Democratic Arab Republic of Sahara (1976), which was recognized by Algeria, Libya, the communist states and India. Algeria and Libya sent help and in 1979 Mauritania decided to withdraw, making it easier for Sahara to struggle on against Morocco. However, the fact that Sahara had been officially recognized by the Soviet Union was enough to arouse American suspicions. Just when it seemed that the Moroccans too were prepared to negotiate peace, the new American president, Ronald Reagan, encouraged them to continue the fight, stepping up aid to Morocco. The war dragged on through the 1980's. Thus, another new Third World country had become a victim of super-power self-interest. In 1990 the UN proposed that a referendum should be held so that the people of Sahara could choose whether to be independent or become part of Morocco, but progress towards organizing this was painfully slow.

6. 5. PORTUGUESE DECOLONIZATION

6.5.1. Angola and Mozambique:

The main Portuguese possessions were in Africa: the two large areas of Angola and Mozambique, and the small West African colony of Portuguese Guinea. They also still owned the eastern half of the island of Timor in the East Indies. The right-wing Portuguese government of Dr Salazar ignored nationalist developments in the rest of Africa, and for many years after 1945 the Portuguese colonies seemed quiet and resigned to their position. They were mainly agricultural colonies. There were few industrial workers and the black populations were almost entirely illiterate. In 1956 there were only fifty Africans in the whole of Mozambique who had received any secondary education. Though nationalist groups were formed in all three colonies in 1956, they remained insignificant.

However, by 1960 the situation in the Portuguese colonies had considerably changed. The nationalists were greatly encouraged by the large number of other African states winning independence. The Salazar regime, having learned nothing from the experiences of the other colonial powers, stepped up its repressive policies, but this only made the nationalists in the colonies more determined to win independence.

Fighting broke out first in Angola (1961) where Agostinho Neto's, *People's Movement for Angolan Liberation* (MPLA) was the main nationalist movement. Violence soon spread to Guinea where Amilcar Cabral led the resistance, and to Mozambique, where Eduardo Mondlane organized the FRELIMO guerrillas. These nationalists, who had strong Marxist connections, received economic and military aid from the communist bloc. The Portuguese army found it impossible to suppress the nationalist guerrillas. The Portuguese troops became demoralized and the cost of fighting the colonial guerrillas escalated. Until by 1973 the government was spending forty per cent of its budget fighting three colonial wars simultaneously.

Still the Portuguese government refused to abandon its policy of suppressing nationalist movements in its colonies. However, the public opinion and many army officers were sick of the wars, and in 1974 the Salazar dictatorship was overthrown by a military coup. Soon all three colonies were granted independence. Guinea, which became independent in September 1974 took the name Guinea-Bissau. Mozambique and Angola became independent the following year. This caused a serious crisis for Rhodesia and South Africa. They were now the only states left in Africa ruled by white minorities, and their governments felt increasingly threatened.

6.5.2. East Timor:

East Timor was half of the small island in the East Indies; the western half belonged to Holland and became part of Indonesia in 1949. In 1975, East Timor's nationalist movement (FRETILIN) won a short civil war against the ruling group, which wanted to stay with Portugal. The USA denounced the new government as Marxist, which was not entirely true. After only a few weeks, Indonesian troops invaded East Timor, overthrew the government and incorporated it into Indonesia. The USA continued to supply military goods to the Indonesians, who were guilty of various atrocities both during and after the war. It is estimated that about 100,000 people were killed, which was nearly one-sixth of the population, while another 300,000 were put into detention camps. Resistance was still continuing in the early 1990s, but although the UN condemned Indonesia's action, East Timor was too small and, unlike Kuwait, too unimportant to warrant any sanctions being applied against Indonesia.

6. 6. ITALIAN DECOLONIZATION

It was officially decided in 1947 that Italy, having supported Hitler and suffered defeat in the Second World War, must lose her overseas empire. Her African possessions were to be administered by France and Britain until the UN decided about their future. The UN followed a policy of placing the territories under governments, which would be sympathetic to Western interests.

Ethiopia was handed back to the rule of the Emperor Haile Selassie, who had been forced into exile when the Italians invaded Ethiopia (Abyssinia) in 1935. Libya was given independence under King Idris (1951). Eritrea was made part of Ethiopia (1952) but it was to have a large measure of self-government within a federal system. Italian Somaliland was merged with British Somaliland to form the independent state of Somalia (1960).

Some of these arrangements did not prove to be very successful. Both Idris and Haile Selassie became unpopular with their peoples. The unpopularity of Idris was due to the fact that he was thought to be too close to the West, and Haile Selassie because he made no attempt to modernize Ethiopia and did little to improve the living standards of his people. He also made the mistake of denying Eritrea's rights of self-government (1962), which prompted the Eritreans into launching a war for independence. King Idris was overthrown in 1969 by a socialist revolutionary movement, which nationalized the oil industry and began to modernize the country. Haile Selassie was overthrown in 1974. Soon new leaders emerged in these countries-Colonel Gaddafi in Libya and Colonel Mengistu in Ethiopia, both of whom turned to the Soviet Union for economic aid.

6.7. An Assessment:

Decolonization and emergence of independent nations in Asia and Africa following the Second World War was an important chapter in the history of contemporary world. Although some states, particularly Britain, handled decolonization better than others, in general the decolonization was a painful process that led to violence, and terrorism on the part of the colonists and repression and violation of human rights on the part of the European colonial powers. Especially, the decolonization process was accompanied by long drawn wars in the African continent. With lack of infrastructural facilities, poor education and health services and shortage of trained political and administrative personnel, the newly emerged independent African nations became victims of chronic power struggle and civil wars. Though there were some gains for the new states, which had much more control over their internal affairs, and there were some gains for ordinary people, such as advances in education and social services, the new nations had to face a number of new problems.

These new nations increasingly became victims of neo-colonialism by which Western European countries and the United States still exerted a great deal of control over them. These new states continued to need the markets and the investment that the west could provide. Many new states, especially in Africa, had been badly prepared or not prepared at all for independence. Their frontiers were often artificial ones forced on them by the Europeans and there was little incentive for different tribes to stay together. In Nigeria and the Belgian Congo tribal differences led to bitter civil wars. When the British withdrew from Nyasaland (Malawi) there were only three secondary schools for three million Africans, and not a single industrial factory. When the Portuguese were forced to withdraw from Mozambique, they deliberately destroyed installations and machinery in revenge.

In most cases, the local political elite groups ran the governments, which took over. There was no social revolution and no guarantee that ordinary people would be any better off. In countries where new governments were prepared to introduce socialist policies such as nationalizing resources or foreign businesses, or where governments showed any sign of being pro-communist, the Western countries disapproved such measures. They often responded by cutting off aid or helping to destabilize the government. This happened in Indo-China, Indonesia, East Timor, Chad, Angola, Mozambique, Zaire and Jamaica. Moreover, all the Third World states faced the problem of intense poverty. They were economically underdeveloped and often relied on exports of one or two commodities. Any fall in the world price of their product was a major disaster. Loans from abroad left them heavily in debt.

Questions

1. Examine the process of decolonization in the French colonial empire.
2. Give an account of the decolonization process in the Dutch and Belgian colonies.
3. Describe the emergence of independent nations out of the Spanish, Portuguese and Italian colonies.



AFRO-ASIAN MOVEMENT - BANDUNG CONFERENCE AND NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

Objectives:

- 1. To assess the role of the Afro-Asian nations in world politics in the era of Cold War.*
- 2. To understanding the initiative taken by the Afro-Asian countries in building up the solidarity of the third world nations as against the two dominant Powers Blocs.*

Introduction:

The emergence of two Power Blocs following the end of the Second World War and the resurgent Cold War proved to be detrimental to the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa. These nations, which had been liberated due to prolonged freedom struggles or liberations wars from the clutches of colonial powers had to reconstruct their economy and society. Hence, they were keen to seek material and moral support from any quarters without any ideological pre-conditions. Thus, the Afro-Asian nations did not want to become camp followers either of the Western or of the Communist Power Blocs. They desired to keep an equi-distance position from both these Power Blocs. The Bandung Conference was first of these attempts to build up the solidarity of Afro-Asian nations as against the two Power Blocs. Non-aligned Movement was the culmination of the solidarity of the third world countries during the age of Cold War politics.

7. 1. THE BANDUNG CONFERENCE

7.1.1. Characteristics of the Conference:

The Bandung Conference of April 1955 was a unique international gathering of nations. It was a unique in the sense that for the first time in modern history a group of former colonial nations, which were under the European colonial control, met to discuss their mutual interests and, as it turned out, mutual differences as well. Not a single European or American nation was represented at the Bandung Conference. The superpowers of the post-war period, the United States and the Soviet Union were deliberately kept out of this Afro-Asian gathering. Nearly all of the twenty-nine participating countries had recently emerged from colonial or semi-colonial status; and all participating countries were strongly nationalistic, anti-colonialist, and anti-imperialist. Nearly the

whole of Asia, except the Soviet Union, was represented at the conference.

7.1.2. Indonesian Initiative:

The initiative for holding an Afro-Asian conference in the first place came from Indonesia. The Prime Minister of Indonesia, Ali Sastroamidjojo, proposed that the Afro-Asian group in the United Nations should hold an international conference, and this proposal was raised at the meeting of the prime ministers of Burma, Ceylon, India, Pakistan, and Indonesia at Colombo in April 1954. Initially only Ceylon's Prime Minister Sir John Kotelawala was enthusiastic, but Jawaharlal Nehru of India and U Nu of Burma were skeptical of the value of holding such a conference. By September, however, Sastroamidjojo had his way and Jawaharlal Nehru accepted the proposal after the former came on a visit to New Delhi. At the end of December 1954, the five Colombo states met at Bogor in Indonesia to outline definite plans for the proposed Afro-Asian conference. It was decided that the invitations would not be restricted to the Afro-Asian states in the UN, in order to include as many nations as possible at the conference. Nehru's proposal that Communist China be invited to the conference was generally accepted, as all five Colombo states had recognized Peking rather than the Taipei government of Nationalist China. In addition to the UN Afro-Asian group, invitations were sent to Japan, Jordan, Libya, Nepal, North and South Vietnam, the Gold Coast (Ghana), Sudan, and the Central African Federation. Out of these invitees only the Central African Federation declined to attend the conference. It was never even suggested that any of the Soviet Asian republics or Mongolia be invited, and since the Korean War had only recently ended neither North nor South Korea were asked to attend. Israel was excluded since many of the Arab and Muslim states would have refused to attend the conference if Israel was invited. The Union of South Africa was also excluded because of its policy of racial discrimination.

7.1.3. Representing Countries

The participating countries from Asia were: Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and Yemen. Most of independent and nearly independent Africa was also represented: Egypt, Ethiopia, the Gold Coast (Ghana), Liberia, Libya, and the Sudan. The Koreas were omitted, as were Israel and Nationalist China (Taiwan), due to objections raised by a majority of participating nations for a number of reasons. It was clear that the participating countries had a great deal in common; the question was whether these unifying concepts would be enough for the Afro-Asian

nations, with vastly divergent histories and national interests, to stand together to form what some called a 'neutralist bloc'.

7.1.4. Objectives of the Bandung Conference:

The Bandung Conference visualized the following four main objectives: (1) To promote goodwill and co-operation among the Afro-Asian nations and to advance mutual interests; (2) to consider economic, social, and cultural problems and relations of the countries represented; (3) to consider problems of special interest to the peoples of Africa and Asia, such as racialism, colonialism, and problems affecting national sovereignty; (4) to examine the position of the peoples of Africa and Asia in the world and the contribution each nation could make to the promotion of world peace and international co-operation.

7.1.5. Other Issues to be taken up in the Conference:

The communiqué issued from Bogor by the five prime ministers also supported the case of Indonesia with respect of West Irian as well as the independence movements in Tunisia and Morocco against French rule. This final communiqué from Bogor indicates some of the real reasons for holding the conference, which cannot easily be found in the four-point proposal. In effect, the conference was to be a protest against the failure of the Western powers to consult or even seriously consider the points of view of the Afro-Asian nations. It was strongly felt that these states had a right to take a more active role in affairs, which dealt with their part of the world. Besides, the Colombo states were anxious to reduce tensions between communist China and the United States by attempting to influence the People's Republic of China at the conference and to develop China's political independence from the influence of the Soviet Union. India and Burma were particularly concerned with the aggressive attitude of China towards them and other countries in Asia, especially Vietnam, and therefore hoped to reduce tensions between themselves and China at the conference by championing the common cause of anti-imperialism and anti-colonialism.

7.1.6. Leading Personalities at the Bandung Conference:

From 18th to 24th April 1955, representatives of twenty-nine Afro-Asian states met at the Indonesian city of Bandung in West Java. At the outset Nehru appeared to be the most important figure at the conference, as at the time India was perceived to be the leader among the so-called non-aligned Afro-Asian states. However, other notable personalities such as Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia, Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt, Krishna Menon of India, Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines, Muhammad Ali of Pakistan, and U Nu of Burma were trying to get the maximum amount of publicity out of their respective roles at Bandung Conference. Sukarno, the President of Indonesia and the host of the Bandung

Conference held the spotlight at times. But all eyes were unquestionably on China's delegate, Chou En-lai. China's position as the most populous and potentially most powerful Asian nation was of vital interest to every participating Afro-Asian state.

7.1.7. Inaugural Speech of Dr. Sukarno:

Sukarno's inaugural speech to the conference on 18th April emphasized the differing political and social background of the nations attending the conference. On the other hand he also reiterated on the force, which unified them, that is anti-colonialism. He set the tone of the conference by saying: "Yes, we have so much in common; and yet we know so little of each other." Sukarno felt the conference would be a success if it could overcome this handicap. But even in the other speeches that followed Sukarno's, it became quite clear that the interests of the participating states were as divergent as the historical background of each of them. First of all, certain nations, such as the Philippines and Turkey were already members of one or another mutual security or regional pacts with the United States and her European allies such as NATO, the Baghdad Pact, or the South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO). Countries such as China and North Vietnam were to a greater or lesser degree aligned with the Soviet Union. Most of the rest of the countries attending the conference were non-aligned, and it appeared that Nehru was their spokesman.

7.1.8. Chou En-lai's Conciliatory Approach:

The conciliatory speech by Chou En-lai took many of the delegates by surprise. Although he asserted that most of the difficulties in achieving lasting peace in East Asia was due to the United States' support of the Taiwan government of Chiang Kai-shek, Chou En-lai tried to minimize China's differences with her neighbours. He stated that he had come to Bandung 'to seek unity and not to quarrel' and proved it by attempting to resolve the problem caused by the dual nationality of the ethnic Chinese in Thailand, Cambodia, and Indonesia. In fact, this question appeared to be resolved when China and Indonesia signed a treaty during the conference dealing with the nationality of the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. A similar agreement was offered to the Philippines, and assurances of amicable relations were made when Chou En-lai invited Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia to lunch. Chou En-lai sought to build diplomatic bridges between China and the Arab states as well. To their great surprise and delight, China supported the position of the Arab states over Palestine. Chou En-lai even suggested that there was a parallel between the problems of Palestine and Formosa (Taiwan), indicating that neither problem could be resolved unless intervention by outside forces (the United States) was excluded. Therefore, in Chou En-lai's view China was facing the same problem as those of the Arabs.

7.1.9. Resolutions:

The Bandung Conference next passed a resolution on the questions of West Irian supporting the position of Indonesia against Netherlands (Holland). The conference also approved a resolution proposed by Egypt supporting the right of national self-determination for the peoples of North Africa, specifically, Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco.

7.1.10. Differences Among the Delegates:

However, in the Bandung Conference, not only were China's position and the unity of the Afro-Asian bloc on trial, but the neutralist position of India and her role as leader of the non-aligned nations was on trial as well. Sir John Kotelawala of Ceylon raised the issue of non-Western imperialism before the delegates. He proposed that all type of colonialism should be condemned by the conference, when he asserted that there was another form of colonialism besides the traditional Western variety. "Think for example", he said "of those satellite states under communist domination in Central and Eastern Europe...Are these not colonies as much as any of the colonial territories in Africa or Asia?" He then suggested that the conference should specifically take a stand against Soviet as well as Western imperialism. One of the greatest debates of the conference then took place, which threatened to cause a serious deadlock.

Pakistan's Muhammad Ali supported the delegates from Ceylon, but he hastened to add that China could by no means be considered as an imperialist nation. Therefore, he asked Chou En-lai not to misinterpret his words, as Pakistan felt that resolution against Soviet imperialism be supported, but that it should in no way be construed that China was also being condemned as China had no satellites. Iraq and Turkey seconded Pakistan's position, and Turkey introduced a resolution, which condemned 'all types of colonialism including international doctrines resorting to methods of force, infiltration, and subversion'. This proposal was supported by Iraq, Iran, Japan, Lebanon, Pakistan, Libya, Liberia, the Sudan and the Philippines. This indicated that the pro-Western states successfully drew together as the resolution was indirectly aimed against the Soviet Union.

7.1.11. Nehru's Stand at the Conference:

Jawaharlal Nehru viewed these developments at the Bandung Conference with alarm. Not only this state of affairs disrupt the conference, but the Afro-Asian nations representing at Bandung, were in effect, being forced to commit themselves on the question of Soviet-American rivalry, thereby undermining India's leadership of the non-aligned states. Nehru tried to classify the counties of Eastern Europe as non-colonial and therefore outside the jurisdiction of the conference. But those who supported the

Turkish resolution were adamant and the matter was finally left to be debated in the sub-committee, which included China. Nehru asserted, meanwhile that because of India's size and geographical position she was in no danger of being conquered militarily, and therefore could rely on herself. He warned that 'if all the world were to be divided up between these two big power blocs...the inevitable result would be war'. He asserted, therefore, that any step, which reduced the number of non-aligned states, was a step towards war. Nehru also added that NATO was a protector of colonialism and barred the way to the independence of states like Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia.

Nehru's assertion met the strong opposition of Pakistan, Turkey, Iraq, Lebanon and the Philippines. Muhammad Ali of Pakistan objected to Nehru's criticism of Pakistan's membership of SEATO, and the others declared that their geographical position in the world did not allow them the luxury of maintaining a non-aligned position. Romulo charged that the Philippines had entered SEATO for self-defence, and added that almost half the budgets of India and Pakistan went for military preparations because of the Kashmir dispute.

7.1.12. Chou En-lai's Seven Principles:

Ironically, it was Chou En-lai who attempted to bridge the gap between the positions of the non-aligned and the Western-oriented states. He proposed seven principles whose aim was to safeguard peace in Asia. Among them were mutual respect for the national sovereignty of neighbouring states, abstention from aggression against one another, and abstinence from intervention in the internal affairs of other states. He added that China, of course, opposed military pacts such as NATO and SEATO, considering that they increased the possibility of general war, but he added that China did not fear aggression against her territory by Pakistan and the Philippines, both members of SEATO. Nehru supported Chou's speech of reconciliation, and general approval was given to the Chinese proposals. By the time the conference closed on 24th April, the participating nations had approved a series of platitudes which pleased everyone, including the assertion of the principle of mutual economic cooperation, cultural exchanges, the promotion of world peace, the right of national self-determination, and anti-colonialism in general. In addition the conference expressed its support of the Arab states against Israel, for the independence movements in French North Africa, for Indonesia's rights in West Irian, and for Yemen over Aden.

7.1.13. An Assessment of the Bandung Conference:

Despite the divergent opinions expressed at Bandung, it was apparent that the Afro-Asian nations had certain causes in common. Although the final communiqué of the conference drafted

over the great differences of opinion among the states, the Bandung Conference achieved a great deal. First of all, Nehru had entered the conference as the champion of the non-aligned nations; by the end his image was somewhat tarnished, and Chou En-lai now dominated the proceedings. Chou En-lai's conciliatory attitude, especially toward the delegates of Southeast Asia, India, and Pakistan had left China with a new image among the Afro-Asian states as a reasonable and peaceful neighbour. The political atmosphere was less tense after Bandung between China and the rest of Asia than perhaps at any time since the seizure of power in China by the Communists in 1949.

Secondly, despite the attacks made on her position, India still retained leadership of the neutralist bloc, and although her position was not strengthened, at least Nehru had withstood extreme pressures against his non-aligned position. But the greatest achievement of Bandung was the fact that the conference took place at all. Whatever the immediate results of the conference, it was clear that Bandung was to represent a watershed in the history of the Afro-Asian world. For the first time in modern history, the recently independent states had declared that they were, despite their differences, a factor to be reckoned with by the great powers. In fact they demonstrated that they were independent and represented a large portion of the population of the world; that despite their differences, all were anti-colonialist and anti-racialist; that they demanded to be treated as equals, not merely pawns in the international chess game. Furthermore, the Afro-Asian nations felt that their opinions could exercise a moral restraint upon China, and the fact that China had renounced aggression against or internal subversion of all the participating states was considered a major victory of the conference. Bandung also helped to develop the self-confidence of the Afro-Asian states, even if the complete solidarity of opinion originally hoped for was not fully achieved. Before the Bandung Conference, the Western nations and the Soviet Union had underestimated the role of Africa and Asia in forming world public opinion and in influencing the policy of the great powers. However, after Bandung the opinion of the Afro-Asian states had to be considered seriously by all nations.

7. 2. THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

The post-Second World War era witnessed two important phenomena, the Cold War politics between the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, and the process of decolonization and emergence of free nations in Asia and Africa. These newly independent nations decided to have their own system of governments, which were suitable to the needs, and aspirations of their people. When the world was being polarized in two power blocs, the newly liberated Afro-Asian nations decided to

steer clear of the bi-polar world and decided to chart their own course, the non-alignment.

7.2.1. Nehru's Initiative:

The decision of the new states of Asia and Africa, with few exceptions, to throw in their lot with neither superpower was much influenced by one man, Jawaharlal Nehru, the prime Minister of India. Nehru was a world figure even before he became the prime minister of the most populous of the new states, India, in 1947, and held that office without break for seventeen years. He was a pragmatic leader who had imbibed Western liberal and democratic values and was also attracted by the Soviet Union's record in auto-industrialization. He disliked Stalin's tyranny and police state, as well as the crudities of McCarthyism in the United States. Nehru was aghast at the arrogant and moralistic division of the world into communists and anti-communists.

7.2.2. Commonwealth of Nations:

Nehru was the chief creator of the post-imperial Commonwealth as an association of monarchies and republics of all races whose links were not ideological but historical and accidental. When he decided that India should remain in the British Commonwealth, he did so upon the conditions that India should become a republic and that she should have the right to conduct her own foreign policy distinct from, and even at odds with, the foreign policies of Britain and its other Commonwealth associates. Thus, Nehru stressed the political independence, which all other new states needed to assert, while retaining links, which had economic, cultural and sentimental value. Other members of the Commonwealth followed the example of India. Although Burma severed these links with Britain in 1948, no other British possession did so and at the end of the century the Commonwealth had 53 members, including Pakistan. Pakistan had resigned its membership of the Commonwealth in 1973, but rejoined in 1989 and was suspended, i.e., barred from meetings in 1999. The Commonwealth had members in every part of the world.

Nehru's insistence that each member of the Commonwealth should be free to pursue its own foreign policy meant that neither the Commonwealth as a whole nor its members need follow Britain's example in taking the American side in the Cold War. This was the beginning of the Third World's neutralism or non-alignment, to which France's former colonies also adhered in the 1960's.

7.2.3. Neutrality and Non-alignment:

The attitudes of non-alignment passed through a number of phases. They were rooted in the concept of neutrality. Neutrality was a general intent to remain out of any war, which might occur. However, it was not a practical stand as was proved during the

Second World War. The newly emerged independent states of Asia and Africa were not thinking of a shooting war and how to keep out of it, but of the Cold War and how to behave in regard to it. Neutralism and non-alignment, therefore, as distinct from neutrality, were the expression of an attitude towards a particular and present conflict. This involved, in the first place equivalent relations with both sides and, in the second place, positive neutralism, which means an attempt to mediate and resolve the dangerous quarrels of the superpowers. In its negative phase, non-alignment involved a condemnation of the Cold War, an assertion that there were more important matters in the world, an acknowledgement of the powerlessness of new states, and a refusal to judge between the two superpowers.

7.2.4. Positive Aspect of Neutralism:

The positive phase of neutralism represented the desires of new states to evade the Cold War but not to be left out of world politics. When Asia as well as Africa became independent the number of neutralists and the space they occupied round the globe became considerable. Through non-alignment these newly independent nations could at least prevent the spread of Cold War in their regions. Besides, these nations could exert influence by holding conferences to publicize their views or by debating and voting in the General Assembly of the United Nations.

To be effective, non-alignment, negative or positive, presupposed solidarity among the non-aligned. The newly emerged independent states in Asia and Africa were weak and were aware of their weakness. Their weakness made them apprehensive of too close an association with a single major power. This situation obliged these new states to seek strength by unity among them. Many of them were far from being nations.

7.2.5. The Asian-Relations Conference:

The search for solidarity preceded independence among both Asians and Africans. The first notable post-war Asian conference – the Asian Relations Conference held in New Delhi in March 1947, had twenty-eight delegates among whom only eight came from sovereign states. Its motive force was a desire to ensure that the United Nations should not become an organization dominated by European or white states and viewpoints. However, the tone of the discussions was not shapely anti-colonial. The conference was a gathering of Asians to discuss Asian problems including land reform, industrialization, Asian socialism and the application of non-violence in international affairs. Soon after the conference India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon became independent.

In January 1949 another Asian conference assembled in New Delhi. The immediate occasion for the conference was Indonesia, where the Dutch threatened the liberation movement. The conference demanded the release of Indonesian nationalist leaders who had been arrested and imprisoned by the Dutch authorities. It also demanded the establishment of an interim government and independence for Indonesia by 1950. The Indonesian issue gave the conference a clear anti-colonial voice, however, it was divided between friends of the West and neutralists. Asian leaders took up different attitudes towards two important events within few months. One was the victory of the communists under the leadership of Mao Tse Tung in China and the other was the Korean War. Asian solidarity was proving difficult to achieve even an anti-colonialist programme. The British and French campaigns in Malaya and Indo-China did not evoke the same united protest as the Dutch in Indonesia. This was chiefly due to the involvement of the communists in the anti-colonialist movements.

7.2.6. Cracks in the Asian Solidarity:

In 1950's Asian solidarity and neutralism were at the lowest ebb. Some Asian states, putting their economic and strategic needs before their neutralism, signed commercial and even defence treaties with the United States or the Soviet Union. By signing the treaty of 1954 with China embodying the *Pancha Sheel*, India maintained its principles. But in the same year Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines concluded military pacts with the United States, while Afghanistan became the first non-communist country to receive Russian aid. The Soviet Union, which had a trade agreement with India, was about to conclude another with Burma, and tried to befriend Indonesia, which led to the visit of Sukarno to Moscow in 1956. The superpowers were, thus, taking considerable interest in Asian affairs. These factors made it difficult for the Asians to maintain a common attitude towards the great powers or to keep their distance as pure neutralism required.

7.2.7. The Bandung Conference:

Another conference, originally suggested by Ceylon and taken up by Sukarno and Nehru, assembled at Bandung in April 1955. The background for convening this conference was the treaty between the United States and Taiwan, the Manila Pact creating SEATO, and the Baghdad Pact. The Soviet Union and China welcomed what looked at first like an anti-Western conference. Twenty-nine countries from Asia and Africa participated in the Bandung conference. Thus, Bandung became the prototype of Afro-Asian as opposed to purely Asian solidarity. The representatives at Bandung were divided among themselves even on the issue of non-alignment. The Soviets and the Chinese hoped to advance communism by exploiting anti-Western nationalisms, while the Americans hoped to exploit fears of communism and of

China and thus, create new, and if necessary heavily subsidized military groups. American policy, illustrated by the signing of the Manila Pact, ran counter to the spirit of Bandung. Chou En-lai, who attended the Bandung Conference, went some way towards showing that Chinese communism was reconcilable with other Asian nationalisms. The Soviets had already taken a number of steps, which brought them into closer accord with the Asian states.

For the neutralists themselves the chief achievements of the Bandung Conference were that they met and got to know each other; that they had laid the foundations for joint action at the UN and, through solidarity, increased their security, their status and their diplomatic weight in the world; and that they were making the superpowers take them seriously and treat their policies as respectable.

7.2.8. The Brioni Conference:

In the summer of 1956 Nehru and Nasser visited Tito at Brioni in Yugoslavia. With an Asian, an African and a European leading them, the neutralists became more ambitious in international affairs, and hoped to be able to bring pressure to bear on the superpowers in Cold War matters. The three leaders declared their adherence to the Bandung principles, determined to pursue the policy of non-alignment, expressed their serious concern over the division of the world into mutually hostile blocs, reiterated the need for speedy disarmament and urged for the suspension of nuclear tests. The three leaders emphasized their keen interest in promoting co-operation among nations in the sphere of peaceful uses of atomic energy and stressed the need for speeding up of development work in the underdeveloped countries.

7.2.9. The Belgrade Conference:

In September 1961 a conference of the non-aligned countries was held at Belgrade, capital of Yugoslavia. The Belgrade Conference was held in an atmosphere of crisis. The background included French nuclear tests in the Sahara and the resumption of Russian tests, the Bay of Pigs and the Berlin Wall, the Franco-Tunisian clash and crisis in the Congo. A new conflict between India and China seemed to be emerging. The heads of government of twenty-four countries attended the Belgrade non-aligned conference. Following lengthy deliberations the conference adopted resolutions on a number of problems. One of the important issues taken up was the nuclear explosion, which were unanimously condemned by the participating countries. The conference emphasized on the need of complete disarmament. A reference was made to the Congo crisis and insisted that it should not become a center of Cold War politics. The conference supported Algerian demand for freedom from France. A general resolution condemning imperialism was adopted. The delegates in the

conference reaffirmed their faith in the UN Charter and stressed that all the disputes should be settled by negotiations and other peaceful means.

7.2.10. The Summit Conferences:

In October 1964 the second summit conference of the non-aligned countries was held at Cairo. Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri represented India. The issues taken up at the conference included the problem of the termination of colonialism and neo-colonialism. Thereafter the summit conferences of the non-aligned countries were regularly held at intervals in different countries. The third conference was held at Lusaka in 1970, which was attended by fifty-four nations. This conference drafted a manifesto on neutrality and economic freedom. The fourth conference was held in Algeria in September 1973, which was attended by seventy-six countries. Next the non-aligned summit conference was held at Colombo in 1976. In 1979, ninety-two nations were represented at the non-aligned conference in Havana, capital of Cuba. In 1983, India hosted the non-aligned summit conference during the Prime Ministership of Mr. Indira Gandhi. An important aspect of this conference was the denunciation of the policy of apartheid followed by the white minority government of South Africa. Economic co-operation among the non-aligned nations was also emphasized at this conference. Harare, the capital of Zimbabwe hosted the next summit conference in 1986. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi of India inaugurated the eight non-aligned summit conference at Harare. It marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of the non-aligned movement. The movement since then had grown to embrace 101 countries as members.

7.2.11. An Assessment of the Non-aligned Movement:

The non-aligned movement was committed in keeping the member nations out of the military blocs. Promotion of world peace and economic development of the Third World countries through mutual co-operation had been the cornerstone of the movement. In the initial stages of the movement colonialism, and later neo-colonialism came under severe attack. The non-aligned nations sympathized with those countries struggling for their independence from the colonial control and passed resolutions in various conferences condemning colonialism. The armament race and nuclear explosions by nuclear powers came under severe criticism in the non-aligned movement. Invariably in every conference resolutions were passed in favour of disarmament and a moratorium on nuclear test emphasizing the need for harnessing the nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. The non-aligned movement strongly condemned the apartheid policy of South Africa and denial of political rights to the black majority in that country. Solution of chronic economic problems of the Third World countries was another grave concern of the non-aligned movement. In

successive conferences discussions on the need to have a new world economic order to save poor countries from exploitation by the industrialized countries were taken up.

Following the fall of communism and disintegration of the Soviet Union since early 1990's, the world has become increasingly uni-polar, the United States dominating the world scene. Under these circumstances, the non-aligned movement has lost its original characteristics. In the absence of the Cold War politics, the non-aligned movement has become redundant and its activities have become dormant.

Questions

1. Why was the Bandung Conference organized? What were its achievements?
2. Give an account of the Afro-Asian movement with special reference to the Bandung Conference (1955).
3. Write a detailed note on the Bandung Conference (1955).
4. Examine the background of the Non-aligned Movement. What were its achievements?
5. Explain the role of the non-aligned Movement in world politics.



COLD WAR (1962-1989)- ARMS RACE

Objectives:

1. To study the motivation behind the arms race between the two super Powers-the USA and the Soviet Union.
2. To understand the various attempts made by the international community in general and the USA and the Soviet Union in particular towards arms limitation.

Introduction:

Arms race had been one of the chief causes of the two World Wars. Following the end of the Second World War and the beginning of the Cold War politics between the two superpowers and the military alliances and security pacts between the Western bloc and the communist bloc, the arms race assumed a new dimension. Besides the conventional weapons, the two powers blocs, especially their leaders, the United States and the Soviet Union entered into a phase of nuclear armament race that brought the world on the brink of a nuclear holocaust. Tensions between the two superpowers over regional conflicts became a matter of concern to the rest of the world about the possibility of a nuclear war. The Korean War, the Berlin blockade and the Cuban missile crisis brought the world closer to the nuclear war. However, better senses prevailed on the part of the leaders of the two superpowers in averting the nuclear war for the fear of self-destruction. In spite of this the arms race in various types of nuclear weapons among the power blocs caused considerable damage to world peace and the fear of self-destruction prompted the leaders of the world, especially those of the superpowers to devise plans for disarmament.

8.1.Nuclear deterrent:

The development of nuclear weapons had revolutionized military thinking and the attitude of the nations towards warfare. When a nuclear bomb or warhead is allied with a long-range delivery system such as a bomber or missile, it becomes possible to threaten far-off states with destruction. This is the real basis of strategic deterrence. Deterrence means, a potential enemy is unlikely to attack if he believes that such a move could result in an unacceptable level of damage being inflicted on himself. If one state launches an attack on another, using strategic nuclear weapons, then that state is making a 'first strike'. The other state's nuclear forces are deployed so as to minimize the chances of their

being destroyed by the opponent's first strike. This can be achieved by mounting the nuclear weapons in a mobile vehicle such as a submarine or airborne bomber; by protecting them with steel and concrete in a hardened underground silo; or by defending them with weapons, which can intercept the incoming delivery vehicles. All three methods are in current use.

8.2. 'Mutual Assured Destruction' (MAD):

The weapons, which survive the first strike, can be used to deliver a second strike against the aggressor. This is 'massive retaliation'. If both states in such a potential interchange believe that the other could ride out a first strike and still inflict unacceptable damage with its second strike, then they are in a position of 'mutual assured destruction' (MAD). The United States and the Soviet Union have been in this position since the early 1960's, although the balance is constantly tipping one way and then the other as new weapons are developed. This leads to instability, because there is a constant fear that 'the other side' is seeking the ability to destroy the opponent's retaliatory forces before they could be launched, or to intercept them before impact.

8.3. Other Nuclear Powers:

In addition to the two superpowers, the United States and the Soviet Union, China, France and Britain possess strategic nuclear weapons. At present they are counter value rather than counterforce weapons. They can damage or destroy large, 'soft' targets such as cities but are not sufficiently accurate to knock out the opponent's retaliatory forces. These nuclear deterrents are deployed for varying reasons. Britain was heavily involved with development of nuclear weapons during the Second World War and had acquired a nuclear deterrent before she realized that her world role had changed dramatically. Once acquired, nuclear weapons are notoriously difficult to renounce. France has traditionally regarded the United States with some suspicion, and the French nuclear deterrent was developed as a symbol of national pride and independence after weapon information was withheld by Britain and the United States under the terms of the McMahon Act. China is probably working towards superpower status, and in the modern world nuclear weapons is a central part of the acquisition of the superpower status.

8.4. Tactical weapons:

All the five nuclear states also possess tactical nuclear weapons, as do most members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the Warsaw Pact. However, only the five strategic-nuclear states have independent control of their own tactical weapons. The rest are at least partially controlled by the United States or the Soviet Union. Most tactical nuclear weapons are employed in a similar manner to that used with conventional

weapons. Aircraft, missile or gun delivers them over comparatively short ranges. The major advantage of nuclear weapons to the commander in the field is that they have far greater destructive effect than conventional weapons of the same weight.

8.5. Origin of the Atom Bomb:

The first nuclear weapons, and many of those deployed today, derive their explosive power from the fission of uranium atoms. Hence, such weapon is known as atomic bomb, or A-bomb. In 1939 it was discovered that if atoms of the isotope uranium 235 were bombarded with neutrons, the uncharged particles, which together with positively charged protons form atomic nuclei, then a chain reaction, could result. This occurred because disintegration of the nucleus produced neutrons which themselves went on to split other atoms, and in a fraction of a second the uranium charge was converted into an immense pulse of energy. In the spring of 1940 two European physicists who had moved to Britain, Otto Frisch and Rudolph Peierls, wrote a memorandum showing that uranium 235 could be separated industrially and that a U235 bomb would have immense destructive power and produce fatal residual radiation.

The Maud Committee was set up as a result of the Peierls-Frisch memorandum, and in the summer of 1941 its report showed that an atomic bomb was possible. At this time the United States was still neutral and the British resisted American suggestions that work on nuclear weapons should be transferred to the United States. The United States therefore launched its own project, which accelerated after Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor in December 1941, and it was not until Anglo-US Quebec Agreement was signed in August 1943 that physicists working in Britain transferred to the United States to collaborate on the Manhattan Project, as atomic-bomb development was known.

8.6. Hiroshima and Nagasaki:

The first atomic bomb was tested at Alamogordo in the New Mexico desert in July 1945, and on 6th August 1945 the first operational weapon, *Little Boy*, was dropped on the Japanese city of Hiroshima by a B-29 Super fortress bomber. Three days later a second device, *Fat Man*, destroyed Nagasaki, forcing Japan to sue for peace. With the use of atomic bombs for the first time in human history the nature of warfare and international politics had changed overnight.

8.7. Soviet Union Enters the Nuclear Age:

In 1946 the US Congress passed the Atomic Energy Act, commonly known as the McMahon Act after the senator who proposed it. This prevented classified atomic information from being passed on to other countries, including Britain. The British Atomic Energy Authority and France's *Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique*

had already been established, and work on atomic weapons and nuclear energy continued separately in the three countries. Development was also being carried out in the Soviet Union, and in August 1949 the four-year US monopoly of nuclear weapons ended when the first Russian nuclear device was detonated.

8.8. Deployment of Nuclear Weapons:

Deployment of US weapons had proceeded steadily but slowly. By the time of the Berlin crisis in 1948 only thirty-two B-29s had been converted to take nuclear bombs, and they were not deployed to Britain until the summer of 1949. The B-29 was followed by the up rated B-50 and the giant B-36, then by the all-jet B-47 in 1951. The B-47 was based in Britain and Morocco and the B-47E variant, which first flew in 1952, could carry two early nuclear weapons over a radius of more than 1,600 miles, or further with aerial refuelling.

The US Navy also began to deploy nuclear weapons in the Mediterranean from 1951, using AJ-1 *Savage* and P2V *Neptune* bombers flying from bases in Morocco and from two *Midway*-class aircraft carriers. These early weapons took about twenty-four hours to assemble aboard ship. The US Navy gradually built up its nuclear forces, however, and later deployed up to twelve *Savages* or A3D *Sky warriors* on each carrier as strategic nuclear bombers.

8.9. The Hydrogen Bomb:

The first fusion device or hydrogen bomb, which used an atomic bomb as a core to trigger fusion of hydrogen into helium, was detonated by the United States in May 1951. The first test device weighed sixty-five tons. The development of operational thermonuclear weapons made small payloads possible. A megaton H-bomb was smaller and lighter than the Hiroshima weapon but was more than fifty times as powerful. Tactical nuclear weapons made their appearance in the form of shells for 280-mm and 203-mm artillery, *Honest John* rockets, *Red Stone* missiles and atomic mines. Small fighter-bombers and light naval bombers such as the F-100 *Supersabre* and A-4 *Skyhawk* could now also carry nuclear weapons.

8.10. Avoidance of Nuclear Weapons in Korea and Vietnam:

The Korean War of 1950-53 was the first major conflict after the Second World War and was fought entirely with conventional weapons, although the UN theatre commander, General Douglas MacArthur, asked for thirty to fifty nuclear weapons to be used at his discretion. President Truman refused MacArthur's request. However, President Eisenhower is reported to have offered four nuclear bombs to the French just before the Viet Minh at Dien Bien Phu defeated them in 1954. However, the French commander in the field declined the offer.

8.11. The Guided Missile:

As the size of nuclear weapons decreased, the guided missile came into its own as a delivery vehicle. The first three nuclear powers developed standoff air-launched missiles, enabling their bombers to launch an attack without penetrating heavily defended airspace. The US Air Force deployed *Hound Dog* on B-52s, and the Royal Air Force armed its *Vulcan* B-2s with the *Blue Steel*, which had a range of 200 miles. The 1,000-mile *Skybolt* being developed by the United States was ordered by Britain in 1960 but was subsequently cancelled. This led to Britain's adoption of the submarine launched *Polaris* missile at Nassau in 1962. The Soviet Union also developed a family of standoff weapons and continued their refinement. The West also developed the air-launched, air breathing *cruise* missiles.

8.12. Ballistic Missiles:

Ballistic missiles made it possible to deliver warheads rapidly over long distances, and both the US and the Soviet Union poured money into developing ICBMs (intercontinental ballistic missiles) and their shorter-ranged counterparts. The US Air Force deployed the intermediate-range *Thor* in Britain from 1958 to 1963, with the Royal Air Force retaining partial control of the weapons, and the US Army's *Jupiter* equivalent was based in Turkey and Italy. The US Navy pioneered the use of solid propellants in large ballistic missiles with the 1,200-mile *Polaris* A1, which went to sea operationally for the first time in November 1960 aboard the USS *George Washington*. As more *Polaris* submarines became operational they relieved carrier based aircraft as the US Navy's primary nuclear strike force, although the USS *Coral Sea* reached a peak of eighty-three capable aircraft as late as 1960-61.

The US Air Force also operates 1,000 ICBMs and fifty-four *Titan* 2s. They are installed in hardened silos making them difficult to destroy, and can be launched at short notice by crews in neighbouring bunkers. The US Navy has constantly upgraded its submarine-launched missiles force, deploying *Poseidon* to follow *Polaris*. The Soviet Union's massive SS-9 ICBM was first deployed in 1967, and has been followed by the new generation ICBMs. China has a small number of operational ballistic missiles although the pace of development has been slow. In Britain the *Polaris* force assumed the nuclear deterrent role from the surviving V-bombers in July 1969. The Royal Navy had a force of four *Polaris*-equipped submarines in service.

8.13. Multiple Re-entry Vehicles (MRV):

Modern ballistic missiles launched both from land sites and from submarines usually carried warheads in separate re-entry vehicles. The Royal Navy's *Polaris*, for example, was fitted with three MRVs (Multiple Re-entry Vehicles) each of 200 kilotons yield.

This allowed three different targets to be attacked with the same missile. More advanced weapons carry MIRVs (Multiple Independently Targeted Re-entry Vehicles). By this means one missile can attack a variety of widely separated targets. Future weapons are expected to carry manoeuvring R-entry Vehicles, which can fly within the atmosphere, thereby further complicating the task of the defenses and giving additional flexibility to an attacker.

Nuclear weapons should therefore be examined in the context of delivery methods employed, since the refinement of strategic deterrence could not have taken place so quickly without the development of the long-range ballistic missile. Equally, however, tactical weapons can be delivered by better-established means, which have evolved from conventional warfare. In either case the resulting nuclear detonation is both quantitatively and qualitatively different from a conventional explosion.

8.14. Disarmament

Throughout this century disarmament and the international control of armaments have been major elements in the foreign policies of most great powers. But since the Second World War extraordinary efforts have been made to control military technology and to achieve disarmament. The initial spur to this activity was the atomic bombing, in August 1945, of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, which demonstrated the tremendous destructive power of nuclear weapons. The concern felt at the time is reflected in the United Nations Charter. The Security Council was made responsible for formulating plans for 'the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments'. Unfortunately, this task was never fulfilled.

'Disarmament' normally means a reduction in total numbers of existing weapons by the traditional methods of international negotiations, leading to a multilateral treaty. "Arms control" normally refers to negotiated measures leading to slowing down, and eventual halting of arms race. In other words, disarmament refers to the elimination of armaments, either specific armaments, such as nuclear weapons in the case of nuclear disarmament, and arms control refers to restraining the acquisition of new weapons.

The promoters of arms control argue that, in a world of security-conscious sovereign states, disarmament can be achieved through a lengthy process. The initial stage in this process involves banning certain weapons of little or no military value such as biological, seabed, outer space and Antarctica weapons. It was believed that such measures would establish a degree of mutual confidence between the powers and improve the climate of

international affairs. Following this, in due course of time, far reaching disarmament may be possible.

8.14.1. The Baruch Plan:

The development of the fission bomb by the United States towards the end of the Second World War brought with it the capability of wreaking devastation on an entirely new scale. While the United States still maintained a monopoly on nuclear weapons, it made overtures in the UN for the control and elimination of nuclear energy for military purposes. In June 1946, Bernard Baruch presented a plan to the UN Atomic Energy Commission calling for the abolition of nuclear weapons, international control over the processing of nuclear materials, full sharing of all scientific and technological information concerning atomic energy, and safeguards to ensure that atomic energy would be used only for civilian purposes. The Soviet government, which was working on its own nuclear weapons programme and was certainly not willing to trust the United States not to maintain a covert monopoly, vetoed the Baruch Plan in the Security Council, objecting to the UN's authority over disarmament and citing the domination of that body by the United States and Western Europe.

8.14.2. Various Proposals for Limitation of Armaments:

In 1949, the year of the conclusion of the North Atlantic Treaty, the Soviet Union exploded its first nuclear weapon and in the next year it abandoned the UN Disarmament Commission. In 1952-53 the United States and the Soviet Union exploded their first thermonuclear or hydrogen bombs within nine months of each other. Both rapidly developed their means of delivery. The Soviet Union continued to oppose anything, which could be construed as international intervention in its affairs. The United States, Britain and France proposed in 1952 quantitative limits for the armed manpower of all states, and two years later Britain and France produced a new graduated plan designed to reconcile the differing American and Russian priorities in a step-by-step disarmament process. The Soviet Union proposed a new programme, which began with a reduction in conventional forces and then in nuclear stocks and led to the elimination of bases on foreign soil, a cut-off in nuclear weapons production and a conference on a test ban treaty. The Soviet Union also accepted quantitative manpower ceilings, thereby embarrassing the United States whose worldwide commitments demanded larger forces than those envisaged. The United States proposed in return higher ceilings and an 'open skies' inspection license, whereby each side would keep the other under permanent observation from aircraft or satellites in orbit round the globe, but continued to press for an international control organ - even if subject to a veto - and rejected the idea of a ban on the use of nuclear weapons and destruction of existing stocks.

8.14.3. Eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee:

In order not to lose their tactical advantages both the United States and the Soviet Union were not prepared to go ahead with any concrete proposals aimed at nuclear disarmament. In an attempt to infuse new life into deadlocked negotiations, an eighteen-nation Disarmament Committee was set up in 1962 in Geneva as a main forum for multilateral negotiations. Its membership increased to twenty-six in 1970 and thirty-one in 1974. Its name was changed to the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament (CCD). But in spite of these efforts, no progress could be made in controlling the Soviet-American nuclear arms race. A major reason for lack of progress towards nuclear disarmament was related to the decision taken by politicians in the early 1960's to abandon attempts at the direct negotiation of general and complete disarmament and instead to work for partial arms control measures. The idea was to move towards general disarmament, including nuclear, by small steps.

8.14.4. Attempts to Limit Nuclear Weapons:

The need for nuclear disarmament had been most keenly felt by those who believed that governments might not always manage their power with the restraint necessary to avoid nuclear war, especially in times of severe international crisis. There had been a fear that any war might escalate into a general nuclear war. A nuclear war might also be started by a political leader when in an irrational mental state, or may come about by accident. The advocates of nuclear disarmament argued that if war could not be abolished, at least nuclear weapons should be abolished, because the probability of their being used, sooner or later, had been quite high. Generally speaking, the probability of nuclear war is greater when more powers acquire nuclear capability. The fact that the spread of peaceful nuclear technology has been spreading, the capability to produce nuclear weapons had been a matter of considerable concern.

8.14.5. International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA):

In 1957 the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was established. Its main objectives were to supervise the development and spread of nuclear technology and materials, and to safeguard the peaceful use of nuclear technology under safeguards to prevent the diversion of nuclear materials to military applications. Two years later a one of the first multilateral treaties, the Antarctic Treaty (1959) was negotiated prohibiting the militarization of the Antarctic was to be used exclusively for peaceful purposes. Both the United States and the Soviet Union were among the signatories. The veteran disarmament advocate, Lord Philip Noel-Baker, commented, "while disarming Antarctica, we put 7,000 nuclear weapons in Europe. We should have disarmed Europe and put those weapons in Antarctica."

8.14.6. Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty:

In 1961 the UN General Assembly passed the Joint Statement of Agreed Principles for Disarmament Negotiations. The Partial Test Ban Treaty followed it in 1963. It was signed by the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union. The Partial Test Ban Treaty (1963) prohibited nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, in outer space and under water. This treaty is considered by some to be a singular success. But it has functioned mainly as an anti-pollution measure and, as such, it can be regarded as the first modern international treaty to control the contamination of the earth's environment.

8.14.7. Outer Space Treaty:

In 1967 the Outer Space Treaty was concluded between the United States, Britain, and the Soviet Union. This treaty was meant to control military activity in space and prohibits the placing in orbit round the earth of any objects carrying weapons of mass destruction.

8.14.8. The Treaty of Tlatelolco:

A second treaty in 1967, the Treaty of Tlatelolco, banned nuclear weapons from Latin America. This regional nuclear agreement was followed later by others covering other areas: South East Asia (Treaty of Bangkok, 1995), Africa (Pelindaba, 1996), and the South Pacific (Raratonga, 1985). While most countries have joined these agreements many have done so with reservations. Thus the Britain has excluded the transit of weapons from its version of Raratonga while the US has not ratified it at all.

8.14.9. The Seabed Treaty:

In 1971 the Seabed Treaty prohibited the placement of nuclear weapons or any other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed.

8.14.10. Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty:

Another fundamental agreement was the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) of 1968. This treaty prohibited the non-nuclear states from acquiring nuclear weapons. On the other hand the treaty prohibited the nuclear-weapon states, that is, the United States, Britain, China, France, and the Soviet Union from assisting or encouraging non-nuclear-weapon states to acquire nuclear weapons. The nuclear states were also supposed to make efforts to bring about the complete abolition of nuclear weapons. Under the NPT the non-nuclear-weapon states were entitled to receive assistance in developing nuclear technology for peaceful purposes. Since that time four countries were generally believed to have acquired nuclear weapons: India and Pakistan, explicitly, and Israel; South Africa claims to have developed but later destroyed nuclear weapons.

8.14.11. Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty:

One of the most important treaties of this period was the 1972 US-Soviet Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems. It permitted anti-ballistic missile (ABM) deployments around two areas in the United States and the Soviet Union: one for the defense of each national capital (Washington, D.C. and Moscow) and the other for the defense of an intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) site. The deployment of ABMs for the defence of the whole territory of the United States and the Soviet Union was banned. Later, each country agreed to have only one site and in practice the United States abandoned the programme.

8.15. Bilateral Arms Control Agreements Between the United States and the Soviet Union:

8.15.1. 'Hot Line' Between Washington and Moscow:

Bilateral arms control agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union date back to 1963, when a direct communication link between Washington and Moscow, the 'hot line', was established. A second hot line agreement came into force in 1971 to improve the reliability of the link by use of the communications satellites. The hot line, intended for the exchange of messages in times of emergency, was first used by the two great powers for serious business in the 1967 Middle East War. A rapid communications link between the superpowers was undoubtedly of important value in clarifying the intentions of the powers at times of severe crisis and thus minimizes the risk of unintended war between these powers.

8.15.2. Agreement on the Prevention of Nuclear War:

The agreement on the prevention of nuclear war provided that if at any time relations between the United States and the Soviet Union appeared to involve the risk of nuclear war between them, then the two powers would immediately enter into consultations with each other and make every effort to avert the risk. However, as the United States put its forces on nuclear alert during the 1973 Middle East War, this raised doubts about the effectiveness of the agreement.

8.15.3. Treaty on the Limitation of Underground Nuclear Tests:

After the Partial Test Ban Treaty, the Soviet Union and the United States continued testing nuclear weapons underground at about the same rate as they had tested nuclear weapons before 1963. The Partial Test Ban has not, therefore, significantly slowed down the nuclear arms race between the United States and the Soviet Union. In fact since 1963 substantial progress had been made by underground testing in developing very small nuclear weapons and multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRVs). In July 1974, the United States and the Soviet Union signed a treaty on the limitation of underground nuclear tests,

banning the underground testing of nuclear weapons with a yield exceeding that of the explosion of 150,000 tons TNT. But this could not be considered as a substitute for a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests.

8.15.4. Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT-I):

The most well known bilateral agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union were those that had arisen out of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) between the two powers. The first SALT agreement (SALT-I), which came into force in October 1972, included an Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty and an Interim Agreement on offensive weapons. The ABM Treaty limited the deployment of ABM systems. ABM systems were allowed only for the defence of the national capital and one area where intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs) were deployed.

The 1972 Interim Agreement on offensive weapons provided for a freeze of total number of fixed land-based ICBM launchers and submarine-launched ballistic missiles (SLBM) launchers on modern submarines until 30th October 1977. The actual numbers of ICBM and SLBM launchers allowed to each power were specified in a protocol to the agreement.

A major weakness of SALT-I was a total lack of any restriction on the improvement of the quality-accuracy, penetrativeness and range-of ballistic missiles and their launchers. The technological arms race was encouraged and even legitimized, and better weapons could be substituted for those, which would become obsolete. Most significant was the lack of control on the number of nuclear warheads each missile could carry. Since SALT I the number of nuclear warheads deployed by the United States and the Soviet Union had increased, and had been increasing, considerably. The nuclear arms race had moved from one for quantity of strategic nuclear delivery systems (ICBMs, SLBMs and strategic bombers) to a race for quality of these delivery systems, including the number of warheads each could carry.

8.15.5. SALT-II:

The second round of negotiations, called SALT-II, resulted in the Vladivostok Accord of November 1974 between the United States and the Soviet Union and the SALT-II Treaty, signed on 18 June 1979. The former placed limits, for the first time, on the total numbers of strategic launchers and of US strategic bombers.

The SALT-II Treaty set precise limits on the numbers of each type and subtype of strategic launcher and specifically defined each type. It provided for destruction of all launchers beyond the number allowed, but permitted the testing and development of certain kinds of launchers. Verification was provided once again by national

technical means, with no on-site inspection. The SALT-II Treaty met with stiff resistance when it was presented to the US Senate for ratification, and in January 1980 the Senate debate was postponed at the request of President Jimmy Carter in retaliation for Soviet intervention in Afghanistan.

8.15.6. Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START):

Although the treaty never entered into force, both the United States and the Soviet Union pledged to abide by its limits. In May 1982 President Ronald Reagan, an opponent of SALT-II, advanced his own proposal for a Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START), calling for deep cuts in land-based missiles, in which the Soviet Union was believed to hold an advantage. This became the US negotiating position at Geneva, but the Soviets broke off the talks in late 1983 to protest the deployment of US intermediate-range missiles in Europe. When formal negotiations resumed in January 1985, the United States continued to focus on land-based weapons, while the Soviet Union demanded that space weaponry, as visualized in the United States Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI), be the leading item on the agenda. The Soviets eventually dropped this demand, and direct talks between President Reagan and Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev led to the signing of the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces Treaty in December 1987. Negotiations continued after George Bush was elected US president in 1988, and in July 1991 he and Gorbachev signed the START-I Treaty, by which it was agreed to reduce the number of nuclear warheads by about 25 per cent. This treaty was not fully implemented until 1993, when the Ukrainian parliament ratified it. The START-II Treaty, signed by Bush and Russian President Boris Yeltsin in January 1993 but subject to legislative ratification on both sides, called for the elimination of almost three-quarters of the nuclear warheads still held by the United States, Russia, Ukraine, Belarus, and Kazakhstan. The United States Senate ratified the agreement in 1996, and Vladimir Putin got it ratified in the Russian *Duma* in 2000.

8.15.7. Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty:

During the early 1980's, controversy surrounded the placement by the United States of ballistic missiles on the territory of some of its Western European allies. This United States policy in response to Soviet deployment of large numbers of SS-20 intermediate range missiles proved highly controversial. US-Soviet arms negotiations resumed in 1985. At a summit meeting in Washington in December 1987, President Reagan and the Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev signed a treaty abandoning intermediate-range nuclear missiles altogether, including many deployed long before the latest dispute. The treaty called for the destruction of all US and Soviet missiles with ranges of about 500 to 5,500 km and

established a 13-year verification programme. The US Senate and the Soviet Presidium ratified the INF treaty in May 1988.

8.15.8. Non-Nuclear Weapons Agreements:

In addition to nuclear weapons, technology enabled the production of chemical and bacteriological weapons capable of mass destruction, as well as more lethal conventional weapons. Many as a disruptive feature of international life had regarded trade in the latter, particularly when it absorbed the resources of poorer nations. In 1977 a resolution of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development of Humanitarian Law Applicable to Armed Conflict banned the use of certain conventional weapons, such as booby traps, landmines, and napalm against civilians. In 1972 the Biological Convention was signed by the United States, the Soviet Union, and most other nations to prohibit the development, production, and stockpiling of biological and toxic weapons. Despite the treaties, however, both the United States and the Soviet Union were accused of continuing research and development in this area, and at least eight other nations were suspected of developing such weapons. A well-documented escape of anthrax modified for military purposes took place at Yekaterinburg in the Soviet Union in 1979. Prompted by the use of poison gas by Iraq in its war against Iran in 1987 and 1988 and by US allegations of the building of a chemical weapons plant in Libya in 1988, representatives of more than 140 nations met in Paris in January 1989. They reaffirmed the previous conventions and called for a treaty that would ban all such weapons. The office of the Secretary-General of the UN was empowered to investigate suspected chemical weapons use.

8.15.9. Environmental Modification Convention:

The Environmental Modification Convention, signed in 1977, prohibits military or other hostile use of genetic engineering or environmental modification techniques, although it does not ban genetic engineering as such. The convention is regarded by some as essentially meaningless in that the environmental modifications envisaged—generating tidal waves, hurricanes, and so on—are not technically feasible and may not be in the foreseeable future. However, as advances are made in these fields, the importance of such agreements will increase.

Questions

1. Give an account of the arms race between the USA and Soviet Union between 1962 and 1989.
2. Trace the nuclear arms race between the two superpowers.
3. Examine the various proposals put forward to achieve disarmament between 1962 and 1989.

4. Review the bilateral arms control agreements between the USA and Soviet Union.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Nuclear deterrent and Mutually Assured Destruction
 - (b) Guide Missiles
 - (c) Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty
 - (d) Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT)
 - (e) Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START)



COLD WAR (1962-1989) - SPACE RACE

Objectives:

1. To understand the complications of space flight and quest for adventure of Mankind.
2. To study the various attempts made by the Soviet Union and the United States in conquering the space and try to establish a lead in the Space Race over each other.

Introduction:

Along with the arms race the Cold War politics between the United States and the Soviet Union also led to the space race. Both the superpowers used their resources and intelligence and skill to conquer the space and to gather knowledge of the remote planets in the Solar system. The space race was initiated by the Soviet Union by placing the first man made object into the space, the Soviet Union was also ahead of the United States in manned space flights. However, the United States, which took up the Soviet challenge succeeded in landing the man on the Moon, a feat that could not be achieved by the Soviets so far. Both the Soviet Union and the United States succeeded in placing various types of satellites in space, conducting a number of manned flights and building space stations. However, it is important to note that the space race between the two superpowers was not as bitter as the arms race. It goes to the credit of both superpowers that realizing the potentiality of the space research and the futility of any rivalry or conflict, both the Soviet Union and the United States co-operated with each other during the later part of the space exploration. Following the disintegration of the Soviet Union, there had been greater international co-operation in building the International Space Station.

9.1. Beginning of the Space Age:

The initiative in space age was taken with the preparations for the International Geophysical Year (IGY, 1957-58), which stimulated discussion of the possibility of launching artificial Earth satellites for scientific investigations. As a result, the planning committee for the IGY in 1954 passed a formal resolution calling attention to the desirability of using artificial satellites in the IGY program. Both the United States and the Soviet Union responded with announcements that they would prepare scientific satellites for launching during the IGY. While the United States was still

developing a satellite launch vehicle, the Soviet Union surprised the world by placing *Sputnik 1* in orbit.

9. 2. First Step of the Soviet Union in Space Race:

The Russian *Sputnik 1*, launched on 4 October 1957, was the first artificial satellite put into orbit around the earth. It was named *Sputnik Zemli*, meaning 'travelling companion of the world'. This historic launch began an era of intensive space programmes by both the Soviet Union and the United States, a surge of interest sometimes called the 'space race'. In the next three decades, hundreds of probes, satellites, and other missions were to follow Sputnik on the quest to explore both the wonders and the practical potential of space. In the 1950's and 1960's Sergei Korolyov served as chief designer of Soviet space vehicles, including the first artificial orbiting Earth satellite, Sputnik 1. Because of his role in developing Soviet rockets during the Cold War, many of his accomplishments remained secret until his death in 1966.

Sputnik 1 was an aluminum sphere, 58 cm in diameter and weighed 83 kg. It orbited the Earth in 96.2 minutes. The sphere contained instruments, which, for 21 days, radioed data concerning cosmic rays, meteoroids, and the density and temperature of the upper atmosphere. At the end of 57 days the satellite re-entered the atmosphere of the Earth and was destroyed by aerodynamic frictional heat.

9. 3. Rocket Technology:

The first step that the Soviet Union took in space shattered the myth that in any new and highly sophisticated branch of technology it was the United States that took the lead. Many people refused to believe that the Russian satellite was there, until they saw the large rocket, which accompanied it into orbit, and which was easily visible as it crossed the night sky. In retrospect, it seems strange that the Sputnik came as a surprise. It was the culmination of nearly thirty years of Russian interest and activity in rocket launching. The interest began with the pioneer work of Konstantin Eduardovich Tsiolkovsky (1857-1935). Before 1910 he had propounded most of the basic principles of space travel, had made detailed designs of multi-stage rockets, and had written numerous space-fiction stories to popularize the subject. Tsiolkovsky's dream was realized when the Soviet scientists began the work in developing practical rocket motors in Leningrad in May 1929. Their first liquid-fuel rocket, burning kerosene and liquid oxygen, was successfully fired to a height of about three miles in 1933, and a two-stage rocket was fired in 1939.

9.4. Migration of German Rocket Scientists to the US:

In Germany a somewhat similar rocket programme was being pursued in the 1930's, and during the Second World War the

Germans took over the lead in rocket technology with the V2, the weapons used to bombard Britain in 1944. When the war was over, most of the German rocket scientists migrated to the United States, the country that held the lead in atomic weapons. The Russians, it seems, decided that rockets with atomic warheads would be the weapons of the future. Being alarmed by the American superiority in both, the Russians pushed forward rapidly with work of their own, to such an extent that the military rockets that they developed in the early 1950's were available to bring Tsiolkovsky's visions to reality in 1957, the centenary of his birth.

In the United States the prehistory of space flight was very different. Their chief rocket pioneer, Robert H. Goddard (1882-1945) worked in isolation in the 1930's, and could arouse little official interest. The migration of German scientists after 1945 and firing of captured V2 rockets in New Mexico led only to the development of fairly small upper-atmosphere research rockets. The military were reluctant to adopt rocket weapons and it was not until 1950's that long-range military rockets began to be developed.

9.5. The United States Enters the Space Age:

Despite much lobbying behind the scenes, the first American space project was not begun until 1955, when President Eisenhower announced that a small scientific satellite, to be called *Vanguard*, would be launched during the International Geographical Year of 1957-58. A modest new launch vehicle based on the Viking rocket was to be constructed to send the Vanguard to the space. The first US Vanguard satellite, which in October 1957 was not ready for launch, was a sphere about six inches in diameter, weighing three pounds, whereas Sputnik 1 was 23 inches in diameter and weighed 184 pounds. Khrushchev made fun of the difference by called Vanguard a grapefruit.

9.6. Soviet Success with Sputnik Satellites:

Less than a month after the launch of Sputnik 1, the Soviet Union launched its second artificial Earth satellite called *Sputnik 2*. Launched on 3 November 1957 into somewhat higher orbit, Sputnik 2 was much larger and heavier than its forerunner. Most surprising of all was that it carried a live dog, a black and white mongrel terrier called Laika. Sputnik 2 remained in orbit for nearly six months.

9.7. The US Response:

The launching of the first two sputniks brought demands for an immediate response from the United States. An attempt was made to launch the first Vanguard in December 1957, in the full glare of publicity. At the end of the countdown, the rocket unfortunately caught fire instead of taking off. However, the United States was successful in its next attempt. This was chiefly due to the fact that the US Army had been allowed to prepare for a

launching, using a modified *Redstone* missile (Jupiter C), with a group of small solid-fuel rockets as the final stages of propulsion. This hastily prepared project was successful. While the Russian Sputnik 2 was still in orbit, the United States successfully launched its first Earth satellite, *Explorer 1*, on 1 February 1958, from Cape Canaveral, Florida, which was named Cape Kennedy in 1963.

9.8. Success of the Vanguard Project:

The Vanguard project reached fruition in March 1958 with the successful launching of *Vanguard 1*. Using solar power, the satellite transmitted signals for more than six years. This 'grapefruit' had completely confounded the critics who were sarcastic about its size. Scientifically it has proved to be perhaps the most useful of all satellites. It was the only satellite to sample the atmosphere at heights above three hundred miles in 1958, when the activity of the Sun rose to a level that may not be attained again for several centuries. Its orbit also revealed many details of the earth's figure and in particular the slight tendency towards a pear shape. Vanguard 1 was also the first satellite to generate electrical power from sunlight by means of silicon 'solar batteries'. Its sun-powered radio transmitter continued to function for several years.

9.9. Beginning of the Space Race:

The successful launching of the earth satellites by both the Soviet Union and the United States inaugurated not only the space age but also the 'space race', a phrase that was so popular in newspapers. Though the phrase was catchy it was not very apt. There had certainly been rivalry in space between the two superpowers. However, the Americans and the Russians pursued their chosen paths, and were not directly influenced by the actions of the others. A complex technological programme is unlikely to succeed if subjected to continual changes in response to extraneous events.

The term 'space race' has one virtue. It recalls the debt space exploration owes to the 'arms race'. Without the military rockets of the 1950's, the rapid advances in space exploration after 1957 would have been impracticable. This transfer of rivalry from the theatre of war to the theatre of space must be welcomed.

The Soviet Union launched the *Sputnik 3* in May 1958, which was as impressive as its predecessors. It was a massive and heavily instrumented scientific satellite, weighing 2,926 pounds, and accompanied by the same type of four-ton rocket as Sputnik 1 and 2. Then in December 1958, the Americans showed they were equally skilful by orbiting a four-ton rocket in space. It broadcast a Christmas message from President Eisenhower and was thus the first primitive communications satellite. Meanwhile, In October 1958

the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) was created in the United States.

9.10. The Race for the Moon:

1959 was a barren year for Russian satellites near Earth. Instead, the Russians aimed high towards the Moon. Their first spacecraft, *Luna 1*, missed the Moon and flew on to become the first artificial planet of the Sun. *Luna 2* was better aimed, and crashed on the Moon in September 1959. This was the first earthly object to travel to the Moon. *Luna 3*, launched in October 1959, swept round behind the Moon and sent fine pictures of the far side, which showed it to be mountainous and almost devoid of the flat plains so common on Moon's front side.

Nearer the Earth, 1959 was an all-American year, with two more Vanguards, larger than the first, and a series of six *Discoverer* military satellites. Other important American launchings included *Explorer 6*, with an orbit that took it up to the height of 26,000 miles, and *Pioneer 4*, which went into orbit round the Sun.

The year 1960 was full of promises for the future. The first successful weather satellite, *Tiros 1*, was launched in April. This was quickly followed by the first *Transit* navigation satellites, which were to provide a new standard of accuracy for the navigation of ships at sea. The *Echo 1* balloon, 100 feet in diameter, was launched in August and remained for several years the brightest and best-known satellite in the night sky. The next step in communication satellites was the *Courier 1B*, which could receive messages and re-broadcast them on command. All these satellites were American. Another notable achievement of the Americans was the first successful recovery of a capsule after re-entry into the atmosphere from *Discoverer 13*, in August 1960.

In 1960, the Russian returned nearer Earth for their space exploits. Their finest achievement was the orbiting and recovery of *Sputnik 5*, a four and a half ton satellite, which carried two dogs, Strelka and Belka. They were recovered unharmed after being in orbit for one day. This experiment paved the way for the manned space flights that were to follow in 1961

9.11. Manned Space Flights:

Manned space flight was an arena of intense national competition between the United States and the Soviet Union from the time of Yuri Gagarin's pioneering flight in 1961 until the dissolution of the Soviet Union 30 years later. Although the race visibly reached its climax with the first Apollo Moon landing in 1969, space flight continued to be a component of Cold-War rivalry for the following two decades.

Within a year of the successes of the first small artificial satellites in 1957 and 1958, both the United States and the Soviet Union were developing programmes to place people in Earth orbit. But first they sent carefully monitored dogs and primates into orbit to study the effects of weightlessness on living creatures.

9.12. Yuri Gagarin-the First Man in Space:

The United States selected seven astronauts for its Mercury project, and prepared to launch the first of them on trial flights from Cape Canaveral during 1961. But before they could do so, on 12 April 1961, the Russian Yuri Gagarin made one orbit of the Earth in the spacecraft *Vostok 1*, delivering another well-timed propaganda blow to the Americans.

9.13. Kennedy's Pledge to Land a Man on the Moon:

The month after Gagarin's flight, President John F. Kennedy committed the United States to landing a man on the Moon and returning him safely to Earth 'before this decade is out'. This, Kennedy believed, was the one achievement that would show undeniable US domination of space. However, for a while the American space programme continued to have problems. Under the Mercury programme On 5 May 1961, Commander Alan B. Shepard, Jr., of the US Navy, became the first American in space. On 20 February 1962, Lieutenant Colonel John H. Glenn, Jr. of the US Marine Corps became the first American astronaut to orbit the Earth, in a flight of three orbits.

9.14. Valentina Tereshkova-First Woman in Space:

As the first American astronauts struggled in space, the Soviet Union sent more men, and one woman, Valentina Tereshkova on even longer flights. The Soviet space travellers went even higher in the public's estimation in 1962 and 1963 by keeping two manned Vostok craft in the space at the same time. But soon the United States, having completed its Mercury series of flights, was ready with the two-man Gemini project. In a desperate effort to retain their propaganda lead, the Soviet space designers ripped equipment out of Vostok, renamed it *Voskhod*, and crammed three men into it. There was not even room for spacesuits, and the crew had no ejector seats to fling them to safety in a launch emergency.

When Voskhod 1 flew in October 1964, it seemed as though the Russians had jumped two stages in the space race, bypassing the two-man type of spaceship and roundly beating the three-man Apollo. The Russians achieved another feat in 1965 with Voskhod 2, a two-man craft with a makeshift airlock through which Alexei Leonov pushed his way as the world's first space walker.

But the Russians could not sustain their space exploits. They were believed to be considering further schemes in an attempt to retain their propaganda lead. However, by then Premier Khrushchev had been overthrown and new men held the reins of power in the Kremlin. This put an end to the Voskhod flights.

9.15. *The US Gemini Flights:*

During 1965 and 1966, the United States launched the brilliant series of Gemini flights. The two-man Gemini outwardly resembled an enlarged version of Mercury—a cone eleven feet long and seven and a half feet across the base. Inwardly, it was far more sophisticated, containing a computer to aid rendezvous and docking, and full steering controls by which the astronauts could move the spacecraft about in orbit. In ten manned flights, the Gemini astronauts practiced rendezvous and docking with other spacecraft, and walking and working in space-techniques that would be vital to the success of project Apollo.

9.16. *Survey of Moon's Surface:*

Simultaneously with the Gemini flights, the US began a series of shots with robot probes, which surveyed the Moon both from close-up and from its surface. In all, five Lunar Orbiter probes circled the Moon, making a full photographic map of both near and far sides in search of flat areas for manned landings. A total of five Surveyor crafts also touched down automatically on the Moon's surface to give an astronaut's eye view. By the time the first manned Apollo capsule flew in 1968, there was no doubt that men would be able to land safely on certain pre-selected sites on the Moon.

9.17. *First Space Tragedy:*

Tragedy struck both the US and Soviet space programmes. In January 1967, the crew for the first Apollo flight was burned to death when a fire swept through their spacecraft during a practice countdown on the launch pad. The Russians also had a new spacecraft, Soyuz, under test. Its first manned flight took place in April 1967 with Vladimir Komarov, a veteran of the Voskhod 1 flight, at the controls. After orbiting the Earth for a day in Soyuz, during which it became clear that the spacecraft was malfunctioning, Komarov was killed as the spacecraft crashed to the ground after re-entry. On both sides of the Iron Curtain, major design reviews took place before any further manned flights were considered.

In the event, Apollo was back in operation first, this time with new safety precautions to prevent fires. To launch Apollo to the Moon, a new giant rocket was designed. The rocket, called Saturn V, could launch 100 tons into orbit around the Earth or send over forty tons to the Moon, making it the most powerful rocket ever to

fly. A smaller version, the Saturn 1B, was used for flights of the Apollo capsule to Earth orbit.

9.18. First Man on the Moon:

In December 1968 the first men orbited the Moon in Apollo 9. Two more preparatory flights, including a complete dress rehearsal in Moon orbit, were needed before Apollo 11 set off with its crew of three on the first manned lunar landing. The Apollo 11 lunar module, nicknamed *Eagle*, made the first manned landing on the Moon on 20 July 1969, comfortably beating President Kennedy's deadline. As Commander Neil Armstrong stepped onto the lunar surface, he said: 'That's one small step for man; one giant leap for mankind'. Apollo 12 repeated the performance later in 1969. A total of twelve Americans walked on the Moon before the end of the Apollo programme.

9.19. Soviet Failure to Conquer Moon:

Meanwhile, Soviet cosmonauts could only look on in envy as their own Moon programme was cancelled and they concentrated instead on space stations during the 1970's. What was initially the strength of the Soviet space programme, its launch rockets, eventually turned out to be its weakness. The Soviet Union had succeeded with Sputnik, its first Luna probes, and the Vostok, because during the 1950's it had developed a large and powerful launch rocket for military purposes. The rocket in its basic form launched Sputnik I, and then with upper stages added it was used to launch lunar and planetary probes and manned craft. But the Soviet space engineers never succeeded in developing a larger successor, which was sufficiently safe to launch men. Even Soyuz still depended on the same rocket design used to launch Sputnik 1. Soyuz was intended to be the mainstay of Russia's own Moon programme. Had not Apollo progressed so smoothly, Soyuz craft with Soviet crew would probably have been sent to Moon by 1970. One thing that held back the Soviet challenge for the Moon was the Soviet failure to make their more powerful Proton booster safe enough to launch manned craft. Soyuz was best seen during the historic Apollo-Soyuz link-up in 1975, when the last Apollo met a Soyuz craft in orbit for a symbolic docking and exchange of crews. This was the first sign of ending the 'space race' between the two superpowers and the beginning of a new era of co-operation. Had not

9.20. Space Stations:

Proton rockets have been used to launch space stations, called *Salyut*. The first Salyut was orbited in 1971. It was later occupied for twenty-three days by three cosmonauts who were ferried up to it by Soyuz 2. But the cosmonauts, who wore no spacesuits died because of depressurization of the craft during re-entry. The *Mir* space station, which the Soviets designed as a

successor to the Salyut series, was launched on in February 1986. Described by the Soviets as the core of the first permanently staffed space station, it featured six docking ports and could accommodate two cosmonauts. In 1987, Colonel Yuri Romanenko spent 326 days aboard Mir, the longest space flight then on record.

9.21. Skylab:

In 1973, the US followed up its Apollo project with the *Skylab* space station. It was both bigger and heavier than the Soviet Salyut. In 1973 and 1974, three crews of three men spent up to eighty-four days living and working inside the Skylab. Among other work, they experimented with processing materials in weightlessness where, because of the absence of gravity, metals that do not normally mix can be blended to produce new alloys, and large, pure crystals of substances such as germanium can be grown for use in electronic devices. The Skylab astronauts also made extensive observations of the Sun and the Earth.

Although the popular emphasis has always been on manned space flight, it is the unmanned satellites and probes that have so far made the greatest contributions in space. Communications satellites were of immense service to mankind. In 1962, Telstar carried the first live television pictures across the Atlantic, and now a network of Intelsat satellites link the globe by telephone, telex and television. Intelsat is actually an international consortium that has made a commercial venture out of communications satellites. Various countries have installed their own satellite systems for domestic communications.

9.22. International Space Station:

In 1988 President Ronald Reagan gave approval for a new Space Station, called *Freedom*, to be built, in cooperation with several members of the European Space Agency, Canada, and Japan. It was designed to be the largest structure yet put into space, but to be assembled in orbit from separately launched components. Although plans for the station had begun in 1975, it was redesigned several times in the years following the official go-ahead, in response to progressive budget cuts. In 1993 the design named Alpha was chosen from among those submitted by three different NASA centers. It was later renamed the *International Space Station (ISS)* after Russia became a project partner, agreeing to supply many of the station modules and crewmembers. Assembly of the ISS in space began in 1998 with the launch of the first module, the Russian

9.23. Space Shuttles:

In the early 1980s, the Space Transportation System (STS), better known as the space shuttle, became the major American space programme. The shuttle, a manned, multi-purpose, orbital-

launch space plane, was designed to carry payloads of up to about 30,000 kg and up to seven crewmembers and passengers. Because of the shuttle's intended flexibility and its planned use for satellite deployment and the rescue and repair of previously orbited satellites, its proponents saw it as a major advance in the practical exploitation of space. Others, however, worried that NASA was placing too much reliance on the shuttle, to the detriment of other, unmanned, missions.

The first space shuttle mission aboard the orbiter *Columbia* was launched on in April 1981. It was a test flight flown without a payload in the orbiter's cargo bay. The fifth space shuttle flight was the first operational mission; the astronauts in the *Columbia* deployed two commercial communications satellites in November 1982. Other memorable early flights include: the seventh mission, whose crew included the first US woman astronaut, Sally K. Ride; the ninth mission, November-December 1983, which carried the first of the European Space Agency's Spacelabs; the 11th mission, April 1984, during which a satellite was retrieved, repaired, and redeployed; and the 14th mission, November 1984, when two expensive malfunctioning satellites were retrieved and returned to Earth.

Despite such successes, the shuttle was falling behind in its planned launch programme, was increasingly being used for military tests, and was meeting stiff competition from the European Space Agency's unmanned *Ariane* programme for the launching of satellites. In January 1986, the shuttle *Challenger* was destroyed about one minute after launch because of an explosion. Seven astronauts were killed in the disaster including Christa McAuliffe who had been selected the preceding year as the first 'teacher in space', a civilian representative of the shuttle programme. The tragedy brought an immediate halt to shuttle flights until systems could be analyzed and redesigned. A presidential commission headed by a former secretary of state, William Rogers, and the former astronaut, Neil Armstrong, placed much of the blame on NASA's administrative system and its failure to maintain an efficient system of quality control.

The shuttle launch programme resumed in September 1988, with the flight of *Discovery* and its crew of five astronauts. On this mission, a NASA communications satellite, TDRS-3, was placed in orbit and a variety of experiments were carried out. The success of this 26th mission encouraged the United States to resume an active launch schedule. The long-delayed \$1.5-billion Hubble Space Telescope was deployed by space shuttle in 1990 but, because of an optical defect, failed to provide the degree of resolution it was designed to have until it was repaired in December 1993.

9.24. Planetary Explorations:

The space race between the United States and the Soviet Union was not confined to the space around the Earth and Moon, but also beyond into the Solar system. The quest to know the nature of planets, both the superpowers sent unmanned spacecrafts to various planets. The United States sent *Mariner* spacecrafts to Mars. *Mariner 4* launched in November 1964 flew past Mars in July 1965 and transmitted to Earth the first close-up photographs of the Martian surface, which revealed the presence of craters. *Mariners 6* and *7*, which also flew past the planet and added to the previous data, followed it, in 1969. Then, in May 1971, *Mariner 9* was launched. It orbited Mars from November 1971 to October 1972, and transmitted enough photographs for an almost complete map of the planet. In August and September 1975, *Vikings 1* and *2* began an 11-month journey to Mars. Each spacecraft carried a lander equipped with life-detecting and chemical laboratories, two colour television cameras, weather and seismographic instruments, and a three-meter retractable claw designed to be manipulated from the Earth. Both functioned well for several years.

In May 1971, the Soviet Union launched *Mars 2* and *3*, two probes that crash-landed on Mars but transmitted data briefly. In August 1973, it launched *Mars 4*, *5*, *6*, and *7*, but various technical malfunctions plagued all these missions. In 1988 the Soviet Union sent two probes, *Phobos 1* and *2*, to land on the Martian moon *Phobos*; the first was lost through human error, and the second dropped out of radio contact.

The Soviet programme to penetrate the dense, cloud-covered atmosphere of Venus met with great success. The *Venera* probes launched in August 1970 continued till 1983 providing important information about the planet including pictures, temperature, atmosphere and chemical composition of the soil. The US probe *Mariner 10*, launched in November 1973, flew past Venus in February 1974, and transmitted to Earth the first detailed photographs of the top of the planet's thick atmosphere. It was followed by *Pioneer Venus 1*, an orbiter launched in May 1978. The orbiter mapped nearly the entire surface of Venus, using radar. The most recent US probe, *Magellan*, was launched towards Venus from the Space Shuttle *Atlantis* in May 1989 and transmitted high-resolution radar images of the planet's surface.

The planet nearest the Sun came under scrutiny when the United States sent *Mariner 10* on a journey through the inner solar system in October 1973, en route to Mercury. The spacecraft passed Venus in February 1974 and used the planet's gravity to enter a solar orbit. In March it came within 692 km of Mercury, providing the first views of the planet's Moon-like, cratered surface.

On its second encounter with Mercury in September 1974, the spacecraft detected a totally unsuspected magnetic field. On its third and final encounter in March 1975, Mariner 10 came within 317 km of the planet.

The US *Pioneer 10* and *11 spacecraft*, launched in 1972 and 1973, passed safely through the unexplored asteroid belt beyond the orbit of Mars and flew by Jupiter in December 1973 and December 1974. *Pioneer 11* passed by Saturn in September 1979, preparing the way for *Voyagers 1* and *2*. Launched in 1977, the spectacularly successful *Voyagers 1* and *2* encountered the Jovian system in March and July 1979 and took a variety of measurements and photographs. The spacecraft then flew by the Saturnian system in November 1980 and August 1981. The *Voyager* missions were followed by *Galileo*, launched in October 1989, which reached Jupiter in December 1995 and went into orbit around the planet after jettisoning an entry probe into its atmosphere.

After flying past Saturn, *Voyager 2* was directed towards Uranus. It passed within 80,000 km of the cloud-covered planet in January 1986, discovering four more rings as well as ten new moons. The spacecraft came even closer to one of the moons, Miranda, transmitting startling pictures of that icy body. *Voyager 2* then headed for Neptune, flying within 5,000 km of the planet in August 1989 and discovering six additional Neptunian moons before it headed into the depths of the solar system.

Questions

1. Examine the role of the Soviet Union in space exploration.
2. Describe the space exploration undertaken by the USA.
3. Give an account of the space race between the Soviet Union and the USA.
4. Write short notes on:
 - (a) Race for the Moon
 - (b) Manned space flights
 - (c) Space Stations
 - (d) Space Shuttles
 - (e) Planetary Exploration



COLD WAR (1962-1989) – VIETNAM

Objectives:

1. To understand political developments in Vietnam since 1962.
2. To analyze the factors that led to the victimization of Vietnam by Cold War politics.
3. To study the involvement and eventual humiliation of the USA in Vietnam.

Introduction:

Indo-China, which consisted of three areas, Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, was part of the French colonial empire in Southeast Asia. It was the scene of almost non-stop conflict from the end of the Second World War. In the first phase of the conflict the peoples of these areas fought for and won independence from the French. The second phase (1961-75) began with civil war in South Vietnam. The United States intervened in this conflict to prevent the further spread of communism, but eventually had to admit failure and withdraw from Vietnam. Thus, Vietnam became the victim of Cold War. In pursuing the policy of containment, the United States not only assisted the non-communist government in South Vietnam against the communist North Vietnam through financial and military assistance, but also eventually was dragged into conflict that caused death and destruction in Vietnam and humiliation to the United States.

10.1. Vietnam in Turmoil:

In the period following the Second World War, Vietnam, at that time known as French Indo-China, first caught the attention of the rest of the world through a long conflict with French colonial power. This lengthy guerrilla war appeared typical of the post-war struggle in the Far East for national independence. The Vietnamese example, however, differed significantly from others that were taking place at the time. The year 1948 will be remembered as a year of revolutions. Some of them, such as that in Malaya, dragged on for ten years or more before the granting of independence. However in China, Vietnam's neighbour, 1949 saw the culmination of a Communist movement, which had been active for over twenty years. This was an enormous encouragement for Communist led revolutions in neighboring countries, as the French found to their cost in Vietnam.

10.2. Ho Chi Minh's Leadership:

From 1946 until 1954, the Vietnamese were fighting for independence from France. The Japanese occupied Indo-China during the Second World War. Resistance to both Japanese and French was organized by the *League for Vietnamese Independence (Vietminh)*, led by the communist Ho Chi Minh, who had spent many years in Russia learning how to organize revolutions. Despite its broad nationalist leanings the *Vietminh* was communist controlled and its ultimate aim was the establishment of a communist regime in Vietnam. By 1945 the *Viet Minh* had consolidated their position in the North. In August 1945, following the surrender of the Japanese, Ho Chi Minh declared the whole of Vietnam as the independent Republic of Vietnam in September 1945, before the arrival of Allied soldiers in the North. After the withdrawal of the British forces of occupation the French returned not only to the South but also to the North.

10.3. Defeat of the French at Dien Bien Phu:

When it became clear that the French had no intention of allowing full independence, the Vietminh attacked them in Hanoi. This began an eight year struggle which ended with the French being defeated at Dien Bien Phu in May 1954. The Vietminh were successful partly because they were experts in guerilla tactics and had massive support from the Vietnamese people. Besides, the French, still suffering from the after-effects of the Second World War, failed to send enough troops. The decisive factor was probably that from 1950 the new Chinese communist government supplied the rebels with arms and equipment. The United States also became involved in Vietnam. Seeing the struggle as part of the Cold War and the fight against communism, she supplied the French with military and economic aid. But it was not enough.

10.4. The Geneva Agreement:

By the Geneva Agreement (1954), Laos and Cambodia were to be independent, and Vietnam was temporarily divided into two states at the 17th parallel. Ho Chi Minh's government was recognized in North Vietnam. South Vietnam was to have a separate non-communist government for the time being, but elections were to be held by 1956 for the whole country, which would then become united. Ho Chi Minh was disappointed at the partition, but was confident that the communists would win the national elections. As it turned out, the elections were never held, and a repeat performance of the Korean situation seemed likely. A civil war gradually developed in South Vietnam, which eventually involved the north, and the United States.

10.5. The Domino Theory:

The South Vietnamese government under President Ng Dinh Diem refused to make preparations for the elections for the whole of Vietnam. The United States, which was backing his regime, did not press him for fear of a communist victory if the elections were held for the entire country. The President of the United States, Eisenhower (1953-61) was just as worried as Truman had been about the spread of communism. He seemed to be obsessed with the *domino theory*. If there is a line of dominoes standing on end close to each other and one is pushed over, it will knock over the next one in the line, and so on. Eisenhower thought this could be applied to countries. If one country in a region 'fell' to communism, it would quickly 'knock over' all its neighbours.

10.6. Unpopularity of the Diem Regime:

Although Diem began energetically, his government soon lost popularity. He came from a wealthy Roman Catholic family, whereas three-quarters of the population were Buddhist peasants who thought themselves discriminated against. They demanded land reform of the type carried out in China and North Vietnam. In China and North Vietnam land had been taken away from wealthy landowners and redistributed among the poorer people. However, this did not happen in South Vietnam. Diem also gained a reputation, perhaps not wholly deserved, for corruption, and he was unpopular with nationalists who thought he was too much under American influence.

10.7. Sabotage and Terrorist Activity in South Vietnam:

In 1957 Russia, hoping to achieve wider international recognition for North Vietnam, proposed that both North and South should be admitted to the United Nations. However, the proposal infuriated the North and was hastily dropped. In 1959 the North Vietnamese, having decided that the economic progress and political stability of the South must be upset by guerrilla activity, gave orders for sabotage and terrorism to be resumed. Many of the guerrillas were South Vietnamese who had been trained in the North, and it soon became apparent that the newly organized South Vietnamese army was ill suited to combating this new threat.

10.8. Strict Security Legislation:

As the subversion and guerrilla activity moved from the remote to the more populated areas, Diem endeavoured to check their progress by stricter security legislation. The new measures proved irksome to the law-abiding but were evaded relatively easily by the guerrillas. Worse was to follow, for in order to combat terrorism Diem introduced even stricter laws, which made his government increasingly unpopular.

10.9. The National Liberation Front:

The news of the success of the insurgents, and the consequent embarrassment of Diem, was observed with considerable satisfaction by the North Vietnamese government, which now proceeded to build on these foundations. In December 1960 the *National Liberation Front* (NLF) for the South, closely resembling the former *Viet Minh*, was formed. The NLF demanded a democratic national coalition government, which would introduce reforms and negotiate peacefully for a united Vietnam. The Buddhist monks had their own special brand of protest - committing suicide in public by setting fire to themselves. Diem's credibility declined further when he dismissed all criticism, however reasonable, and all opposition as communist inspired. In fact the communists were only one section of the NLF. Diem also introduced harsh security measures. He was overthrown and murdered in an army coup (1963), after which the country was ruled by a succession of generals, of whom President Nguyen Van Thieu lasted the longest (1967-75). The removal of Diem left the basic situation unchanged and the guerrilla war continued.

10.10. American Involvement in South Vietnam:

As the situation in the South deteriorated the United States increased its military aid and sent more military advisers. By 1963 there were 20,000 advisers in South Vietnam. Under Eisenhower it had been supporting the regime since 1954 with economic aid and military advisers, and it accepted Diem's claim that communists were behind all the trouble. Having failed to defeat communism in North Korea and Cuba, the United States felt a strong stand against communism should be taken in Vietnam. Both Kennedy and his successor, Lyndon Johnson, were prepared to go further than just economic aid and advisers. In public the Americans said their intervention was to protect the independence of the Vietnamese people, but the real reason was to keep the country securely in the non-communist bloc. The Americans were strengthened in their resolve by the knowledge that the *Vietcong* (as the guerrillas were now known) were receiving supplies, equipment and troops from North Vietnam. Ho Chi Minh believed that such aid was justified. He argued that as South Vietnam refused to agree to national elections, only force could unite the two halves of the country.

10.11. 'Safe Village' Policy:

As the *Vietcong* guerrilla activities increased, President Kennedy (1961-3) tried to keep American involvement down to an anti-guerrilla campaign. He sent about 16,000 'advisers' along with helicopters and other equipment to South Vietnam and introduced the 'safe village' policy in which local peasants were moved en masse into fortified villages, leaving the *Vietcong* isolated outside. This was a failure because most of the *Vietcong* were peasants who simply continued to operate inside the villages.

10.12. Soviet Interest in Vietnam:

In 1964 there was a year of chaos in which order was barely preserved by the South Vietnamese army. The *Viet Cong* acquired control of increasingly large areas, and began to launch attacks on South Vietnamese airfields. Elements of the North Vietnamese army entered South Vietnam and the Americans were faced with the choice of abandoning South Vietnam to its fate or intervening with air support and US Marine garrisons to guard American bases. President Kosygin of the Soviet Union visited Hanoi, seeking Russian involvement in the impending takeover of South Vietnam, while President Johnson (1963-69) of the United States, having taken the decision to employ American troops, had to ensure that they were effectively used.

10.13. US Bombardment of North Vietnam:

President Johnson was not deterred by reports from American advisers in 1964 that the *Vietcong* and the NLF controlled about forty per cent of South Vietnamese villages and that the peasant population seemed to support them. He assumed that the *Vietcong* were controlled by Ho Chi Minh and decided to bomb North Vietnam (1965) in the hope that he would call off the campaign. Over the next seven years a greater tonnage of bombs was dropped on North Vietnamese cities than fell on Germany during the Second World War. In addition, over half a million American troops arrived in the south.

10.14. Tet Offensive:

The bombing of the North by the United States led to the disruption of the North Vietnamese war efforts due to the damage of both communication and production. In the South the *Vietcong* were forced out of some of their newly won territory. As their casualties mounted so morale fell and desertions increased. In contrast, confidence had returned so firmly to the South that in 1967 elections for a popularly based government were held. They resulted in a bicameral national Parliament and a new president. Meanwhile the Viet Cong forces dwindled through losses and desertion, more North Vietnamese army units were dispatched to the South to stiffen them. An all-out attempt was made by the North to check the successes of the South. In January 1968 *Vietcong* and the North Vietnamese troops launched attacks on every city and town in the northern and coastal provinces in what became known as the Tet offensive in which the casualty among the communists as well as the South Vietnamese and the Americans was quite heavy. However, though the South Vietnamese and Americans defeated the North Vietnamese and almost completely eradicated the *Vietcong*, Tet was a political victory for the communists. Moreover, the Tet offensive had considerable long-term results in South Vietnam itself. The offensive, by diverting US and South Vietnamese troops from the rural areas to the towns, had given the

Vietcong control of large tracts of countryside and seriously undermined the Saigon government's rural pacification programme.

10.15. Anti-War Movement in the USA:

The US involvement in Vietnam was causing immense drain on the treasury of the USA. Besides, thousands of youth who were drafted to fight in Vietnam were losing their lives. Besides, the atrocities committed by the US military on the helpless Vietnamese were causing concern among the right thinking people all-round about the 'good name' of the nation. Gradually, a large number of people in the US developed an anti-war feeling, which ultimately led to an anti-war movement. The anti-war movement received a new impetus when the college and university students who were eligible for the draft began to encourage disaffection.

10.16. Peace Initiative by President Johnson:

President Johnson, exhausted by the war and foreign and domestic hostility, announced that he would neither seek nor accept the Democratic nomination for another term as President in the elections to be held in November 1968. He intended to devote the rest of his time in office to the search for peace. After the Tet offensive, pressure of public opinion had caused President Johnson to order a cessation of bombing north of the 20th Parallel in return for talks with North Vietnam at ambassadorial level. But the North demanded the cessation of all bombing, and the talks, which began in Paris in May 1968, remained deadlocked. The Communists continued to lose ground and influence in the South but agreement was still not reached in Paris. Just before the presidential election in November, Johnson once more took the initiative by announcing the total and unconditional end to the bombing of the North. This delighted the North, who then agreed to include the South Vietnamese government at the Paris talks. Nevertheless, no real progress was made, and the weekly sessions became more of a propaganda exercise than a serious peacemaking conference.

10.17. Nixon's Policy of Vietnamization:

Richard Nixon (1969-74) succeeded Lyndon Johnson as President in January 1969. But it was clear that the North believed that time was on its side and that domestic pressures would compel the new American President to withdraw his forces from the war. Nixon responded to this by declaring, in mid-1969, that it was indeed his intention to withdraw American forces from the area, and in fact he ordered the repatriation of 25,000 Americans by the end of August the same year. At the same time, however, he ordered that the most modern equipment available should be sent to the South Vietnamese so that the departing Americans could be replaced with similarly armed Vietnamese troops. Nixon's new idea was known as *Vietnamization*, by which the Americans would re-arm and train the South Vietnamese army to look after the defense

of South Vietnam. He believed that this would allow a gradual withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. On the other hand, Nixon began the heavy bombing of North Vietnam again, and also began to bomb the Ho Chi Minh Trail through Laos and Cambodia along which supplies and troops came from North Vietnam.

10.18. End of the Vietnam War:

All these American tactics and strategies had no success. At the end of 1972, the *Vietcong* controlled the entire western half of the country. By this time Nixon was under pressure both at home and from world opinion to withdraw from Vietnam. Several factors caused revulsion of feeling against the Vietnamese war. The terrible bombing of North Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia caused death of numerous innocent people. In desperation to win the war against the communists, the United States used of chemicals to destroy jungle foliage and inflammable napalm jelly, which burned people alive. Thousands of innocent civilians lost their lives and property in the inhuman use of chemical weapons by the United States. The most notorious incident took place in March 1968, when American soldiers rounded up the inhabitants of the hamlet of My Lai, including old people carrying young children. They were all shot and buried in mass graves; between 450 and 500 people were killed. Even Russia and China, who were helping the *Vietcong*, were looking for a way out. In January 1973, Dr Kissinger, the American Secretary of State, announced that political agreement with North Vietnam had been achieved. The agreement enabled the United States to withdraw her forces from South Vietnam.

10.19. Unification of Vietnam:

It was agreed that all American troops would be withdrawn from Vietnam, and both North and South would respect the frontier along the 17th parallel. However, the *Vietcong* continued their campaign and without the Americans, President Thieu's government in Saigon soon collapsed as his badly led armies crumbled. In April 1975 the North Vietnamese and the *Vietcong* occupied Saigon. Vietnam was at last united and free from foreign intervention - under a communist government. In the same year communist governments were also established in Laos and Cambodia. American policy of preventing the spread of communism in Southeast Asia had ended in complete failure.

10.20. Causes of the Failure of the United States in Vietnam:

10.20.a. Popularity of the NLF:

The main reasons for the failure of the United States in preventing the success of the communists in Vietnam was that the *Vietcong* and the NLF had widespread support among ordinary people, who had genuine grievances against an inefficient government which failed to introduce necessary reforms. When the NLF was formed in 1960 the communists were only one of several

opposition groups. By ignoring the genuine case of the NLF and choosing to prop up such an obviously deficient regime in their obsession with the fight against communism, the Americans actually encouraged the spread of communism in the south.

10.20.b. Guerilla Tactics of Vietcong:

The *Vietcong*, like the *Vietminh* before them, were experts at guerrilla warfare and were fighting on familiar territory. The Americans found them much more difficult to deal with than the conventional armies they faced in Korea. With no distinguishing uniform, guerrillas could easily merge into the local peasant population. It proved impossible to stop supplies and reinforcements moving down the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

10.20.c. Support from Communist Countries to Vietcong:

The *Vietcong* received important help from North Vietnam in the way of troops, and from China and Russia who supplied arms. After 1970 the Russian contribution was vitally important and included rifles, machine-guns, long-range artillery, anti-aircraft missiles and tanks.

10.20.d. Determination of the North Vietnam:

The North Vietnamese were dedicated to eventual victory and the unification of their country. They showed amazing resilience: in spite of appalling casualties and damage during the American bombings, they responded by evacuating city populations and rebuilding factories outside the cities.

10.21. Vietnam and Her Neighbours:

In 1976 the South was reunited with the North in a new Socialist Republic of Vietnam, and Saigon was renamed Ho Chi Minh City. The conclusion of the war, however, did not end the country's troubles. The exodus of refugees, especially ethnic Chinese, the so-called 'boat people' who were willing to escape via hazardous sea crossings or less dangerous overland routes to other states, accelerated as socialization policies progressed in the south. Almost 200,000 left in 1979. Border tension with the Communist government in Cambodia escalated rapidly after the fall of Saigon, and in early 1979 the Vietnamese invaded Cambodia in support of elements opposed to the *Khmer Rouge*, and installed a pro-Vietnamese government. The virtual occupation brought widespread international protests, and a few weeks later, its Communist neighbour and erstwhile benefactor, China, which had become jealous of Vietnamese encroachment on its regional interests, itself attacked Vietnam. Chinese forces caused severe damage in the border region, but sustained heavy casualties. In the mid-1980's about 140,000 Vietnamese troops were stationed in Cambodia and another 50,000 troops in Laos. Vietnam

substantially reduced its forces in Laos during 1988 and withdrew virtually all its troops from Cambodia by September 1989.

20.22. Reconstruction of Vietnam:

Within Vietnam, post-war economic and social problems were severe, and reconstruction proceeded slowly. Efforts to collectivize agriculture and nationalize business aroused hostility in the South. Disappointing harvests, the absorption of resources by the military, and US embargoes on global assistance and investment further retarded Vietnam's recovery. Following the death of the veteran party chief Le Duan in 1986, economic reformists backed by a younger generation of Communist Party cadres took power, proclaiming a new policy of *doi moi* (renovation) modelled on Russian *perestroika*. The process accelerated in 1988, when poor harvests, famine, and bureaucratic mismanagement led to a mass dismissal of conservative party cadres under unprecedented reformist pressure. However, reaction to the events of 1989 in Europe and China led to the reinforcement of Communist primacy. The end of aid from the former Soviet Union in 1991 with the collapse of Soviet Communism further accelerated economic reform in Vietnam.

Questions

1. Discuss the political development in Vietnam between 1962 and 1989.
2. Give an account of the involvement of the USA in Vietnam. What was its outcome?
3. Analyze the impact of the Cold War politics on Vietnam.
4. Examine the peace initiatives undertaken by the US administration in Vietnam. What factors led to the failure of the US policy in Vietnam?
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Domino Theory
 - (b) 'Safe Village Policy'
 - (c) Tet Offensive
 - (d) Causes of the failure of the USA in Vietnam.



FERMENT IN WEST ASIA: ARAB-ISRAELI CONFLICT

Objectives:

1. To study the background of the Arab-Israeli conflict.
2. To understand the complexities of the West Asian politics in relation to the Arab-Israeli conflict.
3. To review the various attempts to bring about peace between the Arabs and Israelis.

Introduction:

West Asia consists of Egypt, the Sudan, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iran, Turkey, the Yemen republics, the United Arab Emirates and Oman. The population of most of these states, except Turkey and Iran is made up of Arabs; Iran, though not an Arab state, contains many Arabs living in the area around the northern end of the Persian Gulf. The West Asia also contains the small Jewish state of Israel, which was set up by the United Nations in 1948 in Palestine. The creation of Israel in Palestine, an area belonging to the Palestinian Arabs, outraged Arab opinion throughout the world. The Arabs especially blamed Britain who, they felt, had been more sympathetic to the Jews than to the Arabs. Besides, they blamed the United States, which had supported the idea of a Jewish state very strongly. The Arab states refused to recognize Israel as a legal state and they vowed to destroy it. Although there were four short wars between Israel and the various Arab states (1948-9, 1956, 1967 and 1973), Arab attacks failed, and Israel survived.

The Arab desire to destroy Israel tended for much of the time to overshadow all other concerns. However, two other themes, which ran through the West Asian affairs, got mixed up with the anti-Israel struggle: (1) The desire of some Arabs to achieve political and economic unity among the Arab states and (2) The desire of many Arabs to put an end to foreign intervention in their countries.

11.1. Background of the Arab-Israeli Conflict

West Asia had been the dangerous hotbed of crises and conflicts ever since the end of the Second World War. The four wars between Israel and Arab countries, the direct armed

intervention and the continuous interference of the United States and its NATO allies, the drawn-out Iran-Iraq war, the aggravation of relations between individual Arab countries, civil wars and sectarian violence all contributed in making the region one of the world's bloodiest and most tense areas.

11.1.1. Creation of the State of Israel:

The sources of the Arab-Israeli conflict can be traced to a complex of interrelated causes. The most important of these causes was the creation of the state of Israel in 1948. The origin of the Arab-Israeli problem goes back to almost 2000 years. In 71 AD, the Romans had driven out the Jews from Palestine, which was then their homeland. In fact, small communities of Jews stayed behind in Palestine, and over the following 1700 years there was a gradual trickle of Jews returning from exile. Until the end of the nineteenth century the number of Jews inhabiting Palestine did not make the Arabs threatened, who considered Palestine as their homeland, feel threatened.

11.1.2. Jewish Immigration to Palestine:

1897 some Jews living in Europe founded the World Zionist Organization at Basel in Switzerland. Zionists were people who believed that Jews ought to be able to go back to Palestine and have what they called 'a national homeland'; in other words, a Jewish state. Jews had been facing persecution in Russia, France and Germany, and a Jewish state would provide a safe refuge for Jews from all over the world. The problem was that Palestine was inhabited by Arabs, who were alarmed at the prospect of losing their land to the Jews.

11.1.3. Balfour Declaration:

It was the British who facilitated the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine. The British Foreign Minister, Arthur Balfour announced in 1917 that Britain supported the idea of a Jewish national home in Palestine. After 1919, when Palestine became a British mandate, large numbers of Jews began to arrive in Palestine. The Arabs protested bitterly to the British plan of creating a national home for the Jews in Palestine. They demanded an independent Palestine for the Arabs, and an end to the immigration of Jews into Palestine. Thus, the clash between Zionism's aims and the national interests of the Arab people of Palestine was the original cause of the Arab-Israeli conflict, which remains to this day at its core.

The British did not visualize that their generous offer to create conditions for the Jewish State in Palestine would embroil West Asia in one of the longest conflicts of modern times. The British government stated in 1922 that there was no intention that the Jews should occupy the whole of Palestine and that there

would be no interference with the rights of the Palestinian Arabs. The British hoped to persuade Jews and Arabs to live together peacefully in the same state. However, the British failed to understand the deep religious gulf between the two.

11.1.4. Proposal for the Division of Palestine:

The immigration of Jews into Palestine greatly increased following the Nazi persecution of Jews in Germany after 1933. By 1940 about half the population of Palestine was Jewish. As the protest from the Arabs to the Jewish immigration into Palestine increased, the Peel Commission appointed by the British government proposed the division of Palestine into two separate states, one Arab and one Jewish. However, the Arabs, who did not want the presence of Jews in Palestine, rejected the idea. The British tried again in 1939, offering an independent Arab state within ten years, and Jewish immigration limited to 10,000 a year. The Jews rejected this proposal.

The Second World War made the situation much worse. There were hundreds of thousands of Jewish refugees from Hitler's Europe desperately looking for somewhere to go. In 1945 the United States pressurized Britain to allow 100,000 Jews into Palestine. David Ben Gurion, one of the Jewish leaders, supported this demand. However, the British refused to yield to the US pressure, as they did not want to offend the Arabs.

11.1.5. Jewish Attacks against Arabs and the British:

The Jews, who had suffered at the hands of the Nazis, were determined to fight for their 'national home'. They began a terrorist campaign against both Arabs and British. One of the most spectacular incidents was the blowing up of the King David Hotel in Jerusalem, which the British were using as their headquarters. In this terrorist act ninety-one people were killed and many more injured. The British responded by arresting Jewish leaders and by turning back ships such as the Exodus, crammed with Jews intending to enter Palestine.

11.1.6. Declaration of Independent Jewish State:

The British, weakened by the strain of the Second World War, felt unable to bring about a settlement to the Arab-Jewish conflict in Palestine. Ernest Bevin, the Labour Foreign Secretary, asked the United Nations to deal with the problem, and in November 1947 the UN voted to divide Palestine, setting aside roughly half of it to form an independent Jewish state. Early in 1948 the British decided to withdraw from Palestine and let the UN carry out its own plan. Although fighting was already going on between Jews and Arabs, the British withdrew all their troops from Palestine. In May 1948 Ben Gurion declared the independence of the new state of Israel. As soon as the creation of the independence state of

Israel was proclaimed the neighbouring Arab state- Egypt, Syria, Jordan, Iraq and Lebanon immediately attacked it.

11.2. Course of the Arab-Israeli Conflict:

11.2.1. The Arab-Israeli War (1948):

When the formidable coalition of the Arab states declared war on the newly born state of Israel, most people expected the Arabs to win easily. However, in spite of overwhelming odds, the Israelis defeated them and even captured more of Palestinian land than the UN partition had given them. They ended up with about three-quarters of Palestine plus the Egyptian port of Eilat on the Red Sea. The Israelis won partly because they fought desperately, and partly because the Arab states were divided among themselves and poorly equipped. King Abdullah of Jordan was more interested in seizing the area of Palestine west of the River Jordan known as the West Bank, so that he could make it part of his own state, than in giving it to the Palestinian Arabs. The most tragic outcome of the war was that the Palestinian Arabs became the innocent victims who found themselves without a state or a homeland. Some were in the new Jewish state of Israel, others who lived in the area seized by King Abdullah, found themselves living in Jordan. Nearly a million Arabs fled into Egypt, Lebanon, Jordan and Syria where they had to live in refugee camps in miserable conditions. Jerusalem was divided between Israel and Jordan. The United States, Britain and France guaranteed Israel's frontiers, but the Arab states did not regard the ceasefire as permanent. They refused to recognize the legality of Israel, and they regarded this war as only the first round in the struggle to destroy Israel and liberate Palestine.

11.2.2. The Suez War (1956):

As the Cold War was in progress both the West and the Communist bloc tried to woo Nasser, the President of Egypt into their respective side. However, Nasser, who wanted to have best of both worlds decided to keep equidistance from both and tried to extract maximum benefit for his country. However, in September 1955, when Egypt announced an arms deal with Czechoslovakia, the West became apprehensive of the possibility of Egypt aligning with the Communist bloc. Meanwhile in December 1955, it was announced that the World Bank would provide a loan of \$20 million towards the building of the Aswan High Dam, to add to an American loan of \$56 million and a British contribution of \$14 million. The Western loan was conditional, as the West demanded that Nasser should break his ties with the communists, a condition that he was not prepared to meet. This led to the withdrawal of the promised aid by the United States. The American example was followed by Britain. Crisis point was reached when Nasser immediately retaliated by nationalizing the Suez Canal, intending to use the income from it to finance the dam. Shareholders in the

canal, the majority of whom were British and French, were promised compensation by Nasser.

Thus, in one stroke, Nasser was furthering Egyptian socialism, Arab nationalism and the independence of his foreign policy. At the same time, his action was seen by Britain as an illegal and irresponsible threat to a vital international waterway and a move of great strategic danger. Nasser, emboldened by his success and by tacit Russian support, increased his attacks on Israel and in October formed a joint military command with Syria and Jordan. He also blocked the Straits of Tiran, thus completing an Egyptian stranglehold on the northern end of the Red Sea. At this point the French, further angered by Egyptian support for rebels in Algeria, proposed a plan, whereby Israel should counterattack in the Sinai peninsula, thus giving the British and French a reason to reoccupy the Canal zone on the pretext of protecting international waters. The British and the French believed that such an action would restore the Anglo-French control over the Suez Canal, and the defeat of Egypt would result in the overthrow of Nasser from power.

The war began with the planned Israeli invasion of Egypt on 29 October 1956. This was a brilliant success, and within a week the Israelis had captured the entire Sinai Peninsula. Meanwhile the British and French bombed Egyptian airfields and landed troops at Port Said at the northern end of the canal. The attacks caused an outcry from the rest of the world, and the Americans, who were afraid of upsetting all the Arabs and forcing them into closer ties with the Soviet Union, refused to support Britain, although they had earlier hinted that support would be forthcoming. At the United Nations, Americans and Russians for once agreed: they demanded an immediate ceasefire, and prepared to send a UN force. With the pressure of world opinion against them, Britain, France and Israel agreed to withdraw, while UN troops moved in to police the frontier between Egypt and Israel.

The Suez War was a complete humiliation for Britain and France, who achieved none of their aims, and it was a triumph for Nasser. However, the war was not without success for Israel. Although she had been compelled to hand back all territory captured from Egypt, she had inflicted heavy losses on the Egyptians in men and equipment, which would take years to make good. For the time being the fedayeen raids ceased and Israel had a breathing space to consolidate her victories.

11.2.3. Foundation of the PLO:

The bitterness between Israel and her neighbours continued. In 1964 the Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) was founded. Another secret organization al Fatah (the Conquest) was also set

up and guerilla groups made increasing numbers of attacks on Jewish settlements. In Syria political upheavals brought the Ba'ath party to power in 1966. It supported al Fatah, the Palestinian Liberation Movement, a more effective guerrilla force than the fedayeen. In late 1966 the Syrian border became the scene of bombardments and reprisal raids, and Nasser pledged his support to Syria in the event of an Israeli invasion. In May 1967, Cairo Radio announced, "All Egypt is now prepared to plunge into total war which will put an end to Israel." This stirred the Arab nationalism into a state of high excitement. Nasser called for the withdrawal of the UN Emergency Force, received promises of support from Saudi Arabia, Algeria and Iraq, and made a treaty with King Hussein of Jordan. He also closed the Straits of Tiran. The Arab world followed Nasser's lead, expecting to arrive at the end of Arab-Israeli conflict by means of the eradication of the Jewish homeland. Following these developments, Arab troops massed on the frontiers of Israel.

11.2.4. The Six-Day War of 1967:

The Arab states had not signed a peace treaty at the end of the 1948-49 war and were still refusing to give Israel official recognition. In 1967 they joined together again in a determined attempt to destroy Israel. The lead was taken by Iraq, Syria and Egypt.

Levi Eshkol, the Prime Minister of Israel appointed General Moshe Dayan, hero of the 1956 Sinai campaign, as Minister of Defense. Preferring attack to defense, Moshe Dayan ordered a surprise attack on the Egyptian Air Force while it was on the ground, followed by an immediate assault on all fronts. Deprived of air cover, the Arab forces were rolled back on all fronts. In six days, the Israelis occupied the Gaza Strip and the whole of Sinai Peninsula up to the east bank of the Suez Canal, the rest of Jerusalem and the West Bank from Jordan, and the Golan Heights from Syria. By the time that the UN Security Council could arrange a cease-fire, the Arabs had suffered a major psychological and military defeat, and the Israelis were in a position from which they would not retreat without a guarantee of permanent recognition and security.

For the Israelis the Six Day War was a great success. This time they had ignored a UN order to return the captured territory from the neighbouring Arab states. This acted as a series of buffer zones between Israel and the Arab states, and meant that it would be much easier to defend Israel. However, it did bring a new problem of dealing about a million extra Arabs who now found themselves under Israeli rule. Many of them were living in the refugee camps set up in 1948 on the West Bank and in the Gaza Strip.

It was a humiliation for the Arab states, and especially for Nasser, who now realized that the Arabs needed outside help if they were ever to free Palestine. The Russians had been a disappointment to Nasser and had sent no help. To try to improve their relations with Egypt and Syria, the Russians began to supply them with modern weapons. Sooner or later the Arabs would try again to destroy Israel and liberate Palestine.

11.2.5. The War of Attrition (1970):

There followed a war of attrition, of air raids, outrages and terrorism in which the superpowers restocked the armouries of the two sides with highly sophisticated weapons. Pressure was brought to bear on the Arab states by the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) under its leader Yasir Arafat, for some further action. When very little happened, a more extreme group within the PLO, called the Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine, embarked on a series of terrorist attacks to draw world attention to the grave injustice being done to the Arabs of Palestine. They hi-jacked airliners and flew three of them to Amman, the capital of Jordan, where they were blown up (1970). This was embarrassing for King Hussein of Jordan, who now favoured a negotiated peace, and in September 1970 he expelled all PLO members based in Jordan. In 1972 innocent passengers were gunned down at Tel Aviv airport. Terrorist attacks reached a horrifying climax when some members of the Israeli team were murdered at the 1972 Munich Olympics by the Palestinian terrorists.

11.2.6. The Yom Kippur War of 1973:

Anwar Sadat, the President of Egypt since Nasser's death in 1970, was becoming increasingly convinced of the need for a negotiated peace settlement with Israel, before PLO terrorism turned world opinion against them. He was prepared to work either with the United States or the Soviet Union, but he hoped to win American support for the Arabs, so that the Americans would persuade the Israelis to agree to a peace settlement. However, the Americans refused to get involved.

Having failed to get the American support to his peace initiative, Sadat, together with Syria, decided to attack Israel again, hoping that this would force the Americans to act as mediators. The Egyptians were feeling more confident because they now had modern Russian weapons and Russian experts had trained their army.

In 1973, Egypt and Syria launched a new attack on Israel on 6 October, Yom Kippur, the holiest day in the Jewish calendar, hoping to catch the Israelis off guard. After some early Arab successes, the Israelis, using mainly American weapons, were able to turn the tables. They not only succeeded in holding on to all the

territory they had captured in 1967, but even carried on counter-attacks across the Suez Canal into Egypt, and across the Golan Heights towards Damascus. Syria lost further 300 square miles of territory. In one sense Sadat's plan had been successful - both the USA and the USSR decided it was time to intervene to try to bring about a peace settlement. Acting with UN co-operation, they organized a ceasefire, which both sides accepted.

An important development during the war was that the Arab oil-producing states tried to bring pressure to bear on the United States and on Western European states which were friendly to Israel, by reducing oil supplies. This caused serious oil shortages, especially in Europe. At the same time oil producers, well aware that oil supplies were not unlimited, looked on their action as a way of preserving resources. With this in mind, the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) began to raise oil prices substantially. This contributed to inflation and caused an energy crisis in the world's industrial nations.

11.3. Egyptian-Israeli Peace:

The Arab-Israeli conflicts and periodical wars had solved nothing. They had added to the number of refugees, and found no new home for the Palestinians. They had cost the luckless Hussein of Jordan much of his kingdom, and after his expulsion of the guerillas in 1970, they had aggravated civil war in Lebanon where the Palestinians settled as a last refuge. President Sadat had become convinced that Israel could not be destroyed by force, and that it was foolish to keep on wasting Egypt's resources in fruitless wars.

In 1974, Anwar Sadat ordered the clearing of the Suez Canal from sunken ships and the rebuilding of the ruined cities on the Canal edge. These actions and a request for a Geneva Peace Conference were an indication of a new peace initiative, which the United States was quick to recognize and promote. Secretary of State, Henry Kissinger 'shuttled around the capitals of West Asia, and by the end of 1975 the Suez Canal, which had been closed since the 1967 War, was open, and Israeli, Egyptian and Syrian troops had all withdrawn from the confrontation positions that they had occupied since 1973. While Lebanon became the new center for Palestinian raids against Israel and fell into civil war, Egypt established a new relationship with the United States, and buried its former friendship with the Soviet Union. President Nixon visited West Asia, and in return Sadat visited Washington. In November 1977, Sadat paid a visit to Israel and addressed the Knesset, the Israeli parliament. The Israeli Prime Minister paid a return visit to Egypt the following month.

Throughout 1978, the impetus for peace was maintained despite occasional flashes of the old hostility from both sides. In September 1978, President Carter of the United States invited Sadat and Begin to Camp David, near Washington. After two weeks of tough bargaining, a draft peace treaty was produced. It contained the first recognition by an Arab state of Israel's right to exist. In spite of the opposition from the Arab League, the peace treaty was signed between Egypt and Israel in Washington in March 1979 with Carter acting as intermediary. By this peace treaty: the state of war which had existed between Egypt and Israel since 1948 was now ended; Israel promised to withdraw its troops from Sinai; Egypt promised not to attack Israel again and guaranteed to supply her with oil from the recently opened wells in southern Sinai; Israeli ships could use the Suez Canal.

The treaty was condemned by the PLO and most other Arab states and there was clearly a long way to go before similar treaties could be signed by Israel with Syria and Jordan. World opinion began to move against Israel and to accept that the PLO had a good case. When the United States tried to bring the PLO and Israel together in an international conference, the Israelis did not co-operate. In November 1980 Begin announced that: Israel would never return the Golan Heights to Syria, not even in exchange for a peace treaty; and they would never allow the West Bank to become part of an independent Palestinian state; that would be a mortal threat to Israel's existence.

11.4. Establishment of Jewish Settlements in West Bank:

At the same time resentment among West Bank Arabs mounted at the Israeli policy of establishing Jewish settlements on land owned by Arabs. Many observers feared fresh violence unless Begin's government adopted a more moderate approach. The peace also seemed threatened for a time when some extremist Muslim soldiers assassinated President Sadat while he was watching a military parade in October 1981. They believed that he had betrayed the Arab and Muslim cause by entering into a deal with the Israelis. However, Sadat's successor, Hosni Mubarak, bravely announced that he would continue the Camp David agreement.

11.5. Withdrawal of Israel from Sinai:

For most of the 1980's the Arab-Israeli feud was overshadowed by the Iran-Iraq War, which occupied much of the Arab world's attention. In 1981 Israel shocked the world by sending bombers to destroy a nuclear reactor under construction at Osirak near Baghdad in Iraq, claiming that it was intended to produce the material for nuclear weapons to be used eventually against Israel. The annexation of the occupied Golan Heights the following December similarly strained Israel's relations with friendly

countries. Despite these developments and the complications caused by the assassination of Anwar al-Sadat in October 1981, the final Israeli withdrawal from the Sinai was completed on schedule in April 1982.

11.6. Lebanon-the Hot-bed of PLO-Israeli Conflict:

Having achieved peace with Egypt, Prime Minister Begin and Defense Minister Ariel Sharon, a hero of the 1973 war, planned an invasion of Lebanon to secure the elimination of the PLO and the selection of a new president of Lebanon who would sign a peace treaty with Israel along the lines of the Egyptian-Israeli treaty of 1979. On in June 1982, Israel invaded Lebanon and subsequently defeated the PLO, the Syrian armed forces, and assorted leftist Lebanese groups. Israeli forces and their Phalangist Lebanese allies encircled West Beirut, and the trapped PLO and Syrians were forced to leave the city. The assassination of the pro-Israeli Lebanese president-elect, Bashir Gemayel, provoked Israeli troops to move into West Beirut, where they failed to halt a massacre by Lebanese Christian Phalangists of more than 1,000 Palestinian civilians in two refugee camps.

11.7. Hijacking of Achille Lauro:

In the mid-1980's the PLO and Jordan advanced a plan for a peace process whose cornerstones were direct talks between Israel and a joint Palestinian-Jordanian negotiating team and a UN-sponsored international conference. Negotiations in which Washington served as the intermediary between Israel and Jordan continued for about a year, but they finally collapsed, mainly because of Israel's refusal to negotiate directly with persons linked to the PLO and Yasir Arafat's refusal to accept unconditionally UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338 and to recognize Israel's right to exist. Raids and counter raids continued between the Israelis and the Palestinians; perhaps the most spectacular of these were the Israeli attack on PLO headquarters in Tunis in October, 1985, and the hijacking of the cruise ship Achille Lauro by terrorists of the Palestine National Front.

11.8. The Intifada:

A large-scale uprising by the Palestinians in the occupied territories began in December 1987. This 'shaking' (intifada in Arabic) came after 20 years of Israeli occupation but was sparked by an increase in unemployment among Palestinian Arabs. The intifada took a number of different forms: boycott of Israeli goods, attacks against Israeli civilians and settlers, demonstrations to show public support for Palestinian nationhood, and stone throwing by youths against Israeli soldiers. Israel's reaction was one of armed suppression of the revolt, including the use of rigorous tactics by the Israeli military, whose severity was condemned not only by the Palestinians but also by many Israelis.

While deadlocked on peace proposals and many other issues, the Labour and Likud parties agreed that the intifada must be suppressed before changes could take place in the status of the occupied territories. King Hussein of Jordan did not wait to see the outcome of the intifada. He announced on in July 1988, that Jordan was renouncing its official claims to the West Bank and East Jerusalem. In November the PLO National Council voted to declare the establishment of 'a Palestinian state with Jerusalem as its capital' despite actual Israeli control over the territory claimed by the new state. After 1989 Israel was able to suppress but not eliminate many of the expressions of the intifada, which increasingly involved Palestinian violence against other, politically rival Palestinians.

11.9. Iraqi Missile Attacks on Israel During the Gulf War:

When Iraq invaded Kuwait in August 1990, the balance of power within West Asia, already substantially affected by the decline of the Soviet Union, was totally upset. The United States feared that the precarious coalition of countries that it directed under the auspices of the United Nations might collapse if Israel took an active role in the dispute over Kuwait. While President Saddam Hussein of Iraq attempted to link a withdrawal of his forces from Kuwait to an Israeli withdrawal from the occupied territories, Israel supported the United States but remained uninvolved in the diplomatic maneuvering that ultimately resulted in the Persian Gulf War in early 1991. Even in the face of Iraqi missile attacks on Israel, there was no counterattack by the Israelis, whose restraint was in marked contrast to Palestinian expressions of support for Iraq.

In late 1991 a new round of peace talks was set in motion. After an initial general meeting that included the United States and the Soviet Union, Israel and various Arab nations met for bilateral talks, but negotiations seemed to be ending in deadlock.

11.10. Peace Initiative Between Israel and the PLO:

The election of a less aggressive Labour government in Israel in June 1992 raised hopes for better relations with the Palestinians. Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres both believed in negotiation, and were prepared to make concessions in order to achieve a lasting peace. Yasir Arafat, the PLO leader, responded and talks opened between Israel and the PLO. But there was so much mutual suspicion and distrust after all the years of hostility that progress was difficult. However, both sides persevered and by early 1996, remarkable changes had taken place.

11.11. Formal Recognition of the PLO by Israel:

Events in the Middle East took a surprising turn in 1993. After secret negotiations, Prime Minister Rabin and PLO Chairman Yasir Arafat flew to Washington, DC, and agreed to the signing of a historic peace agreement. This was the first major breakthrough. By this peace accord Israel formally recognized the PLO; the PLO recognized Israel's right to exist and promised to give up terrorism; Israel agreed to allow Palestinian self-rule, first in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank town of Jericho, and later in other areas of the West Bank not settled by Jews.

Extremist groups on both sides opposed the agreement. The Popular Front for the Liberation of Palestine still wanted a completely independent Palestinian state. Israeli settlers on the West Bank were against all concessions to the PLO. However, the moderate leaders on both sides showed great courage and determination, and two years later they took an even more momentous step forward.

11.12. Peace Between Jordan and Israel:

In July 1994 Prime Minister Rabin and King Hussein of Jordan signed a peace agreement ending 46 years of conflict and strained relations. The agreement, which was signed at the White House in the presence of US President Bill Clinton, laid the groundwork for a full peace treaty. A full peace treaty between Israel and Jordan was signed in October 1994.

11.13. The Taba Agreement:

In September 1995, Rabin and Arafat signed the Taba Agreement on the lawns of the White House in Washington. This agreement promised self-rule for the Palestinians. As part of this peace package, Israel agreed to withdraw its troops from most of the West Bank in stages over several years, handing over both civil and security powers to the PLO. This would end Israeli control of the areas, which they had held since 1967. The areas would be ruled by a parliament or Palestinian Council of 88 members to be elected early in 1996 by all West Bankers and Arab residents of Jerusalem aged over 18. All Palestinian prisoners held by Israel (about 6000) would be released, in three phases.

11.14. Assassination of Yitzhak Rabin:

Most of the world's leaders welcomed this brave attempt to bring peace to the troubled region. But once again extremists on both sides claimed that their leaders were guilty of 'shameful surrender'. Yigal Amir, a Jewish student hostile to the peace process, and particularly to the handover of land to the Palestinians assassinated Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin shortly after addressing a peace rally on 4 November 1995 as he left a peace rally in Tel

Aviv. Deputy Prime Minister and Foreign Minister Shimon Peres succeeded Rabin.

11.15. Yasir Arafat As the Palestinian President:

Although Israelis were profoundly shocked that a Jew had perpetrated such an act, Rabin's assassination highlighted the growing divisions among Israelis over the peace process. Many Israelis, particularly those on the religious right, opposed any hand-over of land or the ending of the construction of settlements in the occupied areas. More general concerns were caused by a series of suicide bombings by Palestinian extremists, which had killed 20 Israelis in the previous 20 months. In January 1996 King Hussein of Jordan paid an official public visit to Israel for the first time, 1200 Palestinian prisoners were released and talks opened between Israel and Syria. The promised elections to the Palestinian Council were held in 1996. Although the extremists urged people to boycott them, there was an encouragingly large turnout of over 80 per cent. As expected, Yasir Arafat became the new Palestinian President and his supporters were in a large majority in the newly elected parliament. This was expected to hold office until 1999, when, it was hoped, a permanent peace agreement would have been reached.

11.16. Obstacles to Peace Process:

However, the situation changed rapidly during the spring of 1996: four suicide bombings carried out by the militant Palestinian group, Hamas, claimed 63 lives; the militant Shiite Islamic group, Hizbollah, shelled villages in northern Israel from southern Lebanon. All this enabled the hard-line Likud leader, Binyamin Netanyahu, who denounced Labour policy as 'too soft' towards the Palestinians, to win a narrow victory in the election of May 1996. This dismayed much of the outside world and threw the whole peace process into doubt.

11.17. The Wye Accord:

By February 1998 the United States was growing impatient with Israel's hardening policy. After heavy American lobbying, Israel signed a new peace accord with the Palestinians, the so-called Wye Accord, in October 1998. Under its terms, Israel began further troop withdrawals from the West Bank, and the first Palestinian airport was opened in the Gaza Strip in November. However, Netanyahu then suspended its terms, claiming Palestinian non-compliance.

11.18. Israelis Vote for Peace Process:

In December 1998 he asked the Knesset for endorsement of his handling of the peace process, but lost the vote, and called a general election. After a highly divisive campaign, Netanyahu was defeated in the May 1999 general elections by Ehud Barak and the

Labour Party, amid voter swings against religious policies and in favour of a revitalized peace process. Netanyahu resigned as Likud's leader and was succeeded, in September, by former defense minister and cabinet member Ariel Sharon.

11.19. The Sharm el-Sheikh Agreement:

Already a successful politician and renowned for his courage and bravery, Barak seemed the right man to boost the Arab-Israeli peace process. He immediately confirmed his commitment to implement the Wye Accord in a revised version. After several weeks of negotiations, the Israeli government and the Palestinian authorities signed a revised version of the Wye Accord, the so-called Sharm el-Sheikh Agreement, in Egypt, in September 1999. The document was intended to project the way toward the final peace agreement, to be concluded by September 2000, and was accepted by the Israeli Cabinet.

11.20. Failure of Peace Negotiations Between Syria and Israel:

Peace negotiations with Syria recommenced in December 1999, in the United States. The focal points of the talks were the issue of the Golan Heights and Syrian recognition of Israel. Despite high-level American mediation, involving the personal participation of President Clinton, no agreement was reached, and in March 2000 the talks were suspended.

11.21. Violence in West Bank and Gaza Strip:

Intensive negotiations, the so-called 'final status' or 'permanent status talks were begun between Israel and the Palestinians in the West Bank town of Ramallah in November, but were soon suspended. Days after the talks broke down again in May 2000, Barak announced his cabinet's approval to hand over three villages on the outskirts of East Jerusalem. The transfer was immediately postponed when the bloodiest violence for four years erupted in the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip.

11.22. Withdrawal of Israel from Southern Lebanon:

Ehud Barak announced in April that Israeli troops would be pulled out of southern Lebanon by July 2000. But as Hizbollah guerrillas made a rapid advance in the Israeli-occupied southern part of the country, the Israelis decided to pull out from the territory well ahead of this scheduled deadline. The withdrawal from the 'security zone', completed in May 2000, effectively finished the 22-year occupation.

11.23. The 'Make or Break' Summit:

The announcement of a 'make or break' summit meeting to be held in Camp David came in July from President Clinton. After a meeting of the PLO central council ahead of the peace summit, the PLO executive was empowered to declare a Palestinian state on 13

September 2000, the date also chosen by Barak as the deadline for reaching an agreement with the Palestinians.

11.24. Failure of the Camp David Summit:

The negotiating teams of Barak and Arafat met at Camp David on 11 July 2000. Their progress was unclear, on account of a news blackout imposed by US officials, but sources from both sides revealed that the major stumbling block in the negotiations was the future state of Jerusalem: for Israelis their undivided capital, while for Arafat the future Palestinian state had its capital within East Jerusalem. Negotiations continued until July 25, when the summit collapsed: Arafat and Barak left the United States the following day with no agreement in place. With the September-13 deadline looming, a further round of diplomatic efforts to restart negotiations was scheduled for September 11. These, too, broke down, and the peace process remained at an apparent impasse. In the full knowledge that the declaration of a Palestinian state would be recognized as unilateral and leave Palestinians diplomatically isolated, the Palestinian leadership agreed to delay their declaration of statehood.

11.25. The Second Intifada:

A controversial visit by Ariel Sharon in September 2000 to the Al-Aqsa mosque compound, sacred to both Muslims and Jews, in East Jerusalem, sparked off a second intifada among Palestinians. Months of violence, the worst for decades, resulted in the death of a number of Palestinians as well as some Israeli soldiers. This, together with the failure of peace talks to produce an agreement, caused a decline in support for Barak among both Israeli Jews and Arabs. Following his failure to achieve durable peace between Israelis and Palestinians, Barak announced his resignation from the post on in December 2000.

Even today, the peace process between the Israelis and Palestinians has remained a distant dream. The rigid stand taken by the extremists on both sides, the terrorist activities of the Palestinian militant group Hamas, especially the suicide bombing in Israel killing innocent people and the ruthless reprisal attacks being carried on by the Israeli armed forces, especially targeting the Hamas leadership has increased the determination on both sides not to yield to each other. Palestine has become a killing field in which not only the Israelis and the Palestinians kill each other, but also the peace process.

Questions

1. Trace the circumstances that led to the Arab-Israeli conflict.
2. Give an account of the Arab-Israeli wars from 1948 to 1973. What were their impact on both the Arabs and Israelis?
3. Examine the peace process between Egypt and Israel.
4. Discuss the various attempts made towards peace between the Israelis and Palestinians. What was their outcome?
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Creation of the State of Israel
 - (b) The Suez War (1956)
 - (c) The Six Day War (1967)
 - (d) The Yom Kippur War (1973)
 - (e) The Intifada



FERMENT IN WEST ASIA - REVOLUTION IN IRAN

Objectives:

1. To study the background of the Revolution in Iran.
2. To understand the post-revolutionary politics and society in Iran.

Introduction:

The revolution in Iran that swept away the Pahlavi monarchy in January 1979 was unique in the history of political revolutions. The revolution was engineered and led by the religious leader of the Shiite Muslims, Ayatollah Khomeini from his exile in Paris. The revolution brought the Muslim clergy in the forefront of the Iranian politics. The Ayatollah, who controlled both politics and religion decided to organize the Iranian society strictly according to the Shiite Islamic principles. Thus, the regime of the Ayatollah became much more autocratic and repressive than that of the Shah.

12.1. Background of the Revolution in Iran:

12.1.1. Accession of Muhammad Reza Shah:

The Second World War brought almost as much turmoil and anguish to Iran as if it had been one of the belligerents. Accused of Nazi sympathies, the ruler of Iran, Reza Shah Pahlavi was forced to abdicate in 1941 and was succeeded by his son Muhammad Reza Pahlavi. Because of its strategic importance, the British, Russians, and Americans occupied Iran's territory under pledges to respect its sovereignty and independence and to render economic assistance during and after the war. In spite of these pledges, unrest and inflation plagued the country. An internal political conflict led to the temporary expulsion of the Shah.

12.1.2. Downfall of Musaddiq:

Prime Minister Muhammad Musaddiq, a nationalist leader, precipitated an international crisis in 1951 when he secured authorization from parliament to nationalize the petroleum industry. Western opposition to any assertion of economic independence was complicated by Anglo-American rivalry. Averse to prolonged negotiations, the United States government cut off aid to Tehran and persuaded the British in effecting a boycott, which denied Iran access to oil tankers and oil markets. The consequent shutdown of

the huge Anglo-Iranian refinery at Abadan brought the Iranian government to the point of bankruptcy. In August 1953 a CIA-directed coup overthrew the government, replacing Musaddiq with a former Nazi collaborator and restoring the Shah to his throne. Under a new agreement, forty per cent of Iran's petroleum industry was allotted to five American companies.

12.1.3. Autocratic Rule of the Shah:

The fall of Musaddiq was a victory for the Shah. Musaddiq's left-wing supporters were persecuted and the Shah gradually asserted the paramountcy of the throne, first through military rule, which lasted until 1957, and then through a series of prime ministers who were either submissive or dismissed. The death of the Shah's only brother in 1954 jeopardized the Pahlavi dynasty. This prompted the heirless Shah to divorce his second wife and marry a third, who bore him a son a year later. Thus, being strengthened, the Shah began to implement a policy of land distribution and reform which proved so unpopular with the landowning classes and the *Majlis*, in which they were well represented, that the Shah dispensed with parliament for the two years from 1961 to 1963. In 1963 he felt strong enough to hold a plebiscite, which confirmed his personal ascendancy and the decline of the power of the provincial notables. The personal rule and policies of the Shah led to a lot of discontent among the urban politicians, the tribal chiefs and the educated young. However, oil revenues increased and Iran's gross national product began to register annual increases to the extent of seven per cent.

12.1.4. Iran in the Cold War Politics:

In 1952 Iran became the first recipient of American Point Four aid, which had been announced by President Truman in his inaugural address in 1949. In 1955 the Shah decided to join the CENTO, as the Baghdad Pact had become, and in 1959 he paid a state visit to London and received President Eisenhower in Teheran. After a short period of fridity, Russo-Iranian relations improved and in 1963 President Brezhnev was officially received in the Iranian capital. The improvement of relations with the Soviet Union was important due to the fact that Iran had a long undefended frontier with the Soviet Union. Besides, the Shah looked to northern trade routes for the export of the produce of its northern provinces. The Shah resisted the attempts of the United States to install nuclear missiles in Iran. Thus, without abandoning CENTO or joining the non-aligned group, he moved towards a more independent position in world politics. By 1969-70 he was able to play a decisive role in shaping the political future of the Persian Gulf after the departure of the British.

12.1.5. Economic Progress:

The Shah was keen to play the role of a crowned entrepreneur, to use mineral wealth and a growing economy to turn Iran into a considerable military and industrial power. He wanted to bring about the growth of Iran at all costs and the key was oil, although oil was not the country's only resource. It was rich in natural gas, other minerals and agriculture. When the Arab-Israel War of 1973 (Yom Kippur War) gave the oil producers the excuse to push up prices the Shah insisted on maximum increase. This was against the wishes of more cautious Arabs who hesitated to damage Western countries, which were their best customers. In two years the Iranian government's revenue per barrel was multiplied by ten and its total annual oil revenues rose from \$2.3 billion to \$18.2 billion. In the year after the oil price rise of 1973 GNP rose by 42.5 per cent. Revenues from oil made possible highway construction, power-generating dams, and the beginning of a system of public education.

12.1.6. Miserable Condition of the Poor:

However, the Shah's much advertised reform programme did little to alleviate the poverty of the majority of his subjects. In 1979 three out of five rural families owned no land, and millions of uprooted agricultural workers had drifted to the cities in search of work. One-tenth of the population controlled half of the wealth in Iran. Social services were inadequate and inferior. Sixty per cent of the adult population was illiterate. Wasteful expenditure and corruption flourished and inflation rose to new heights. Those hurt by inflation and least able to make a profession of corruption had to be compensated and wages were nearly doubled. This resulted in the usual cyclic nightmare: demand for goods, inadequate supply, rising prices and further wage demands. The Shah, who had dealt sternly with the landed aristocracy in the early 1960's, showed signs of his displeasure with the new, ostentatious and corrupt rich. He came up with schemes for handing over half the ownership and profits of industry to the workers. Yet wages remained unsatisfactory and Teheran became a shantytown of five million for whom housing was shamefully inadequate.

12.1.7. Absolute Monarchy:

The Shah promoted absolute monarchy in Iran. Five palaces maintained for the royal family exemplified the luxurious living of the Shah and his family. A multi-million dollar extravaganza at Persepolis glorified the monarchy in 1971 to celebrate the 2,500th anniversary of Persian monarchy. While rooting the monarchy in the past, the Shah hoped to modernize the nation.

12.1.8. Huge Spending on Military:

The Shah built up modern and sophisticated military machinery in Iran. Additional income from oil led to increased

spending especially on defense. By 1975 Iran was spending on defense a larger proportion of GNP than any country in the world except Israel. The results of this spending were reflected in the deficit in the balance of payments of nearly one billion dollars in 1975. Seemingly equating modernization with militarization, between 1959 and 1978 the Shah spent thirty six billion dollars on arms, about half of them purchased from the United States. In order to pay for the sophisticated planes, missiles, and supporting equipment, he raised the price of oil in 1974. Expansion of land, air and naval forces made Iran the strongest military power in the Persian Gulf area.

12.1.9. Repressive Measures:

Disregarding the 1906 constitution that guaranteed basic rights to the citizens, the Shah suppressed all political parties except one of his own invention and forbade any opposition to his rule. Being Commander-in-chief of the armed forces, he bolstered his position by keeping an imperial guard and, especially, through the notorious SAVAK (trained by Americans and Israelis), a secret police force employing terror and various forms of torture.

The weakness of the regime of the Shah was the uncertainty that surrounded an autocracy with an infant heir. The Shah began to face opposition from the conservative *mullahs*, the anger of radical students and other protesters, which even one of the world's most ferocious secret police apparatuses could not silence. He was obsessively concerned with left-wing conspiracies. However, he could not visualize the threat from clerical radicalism that was growing in Iran. Moreover, the Shah became dangerously ignorant of the state of affair of his own country. He was unaware of the savagery of his secret police, SAVAK, and blatant economic and social inequality that existed in his country.

12.1.10. Spread of Discontent and the Revolution:

Disaffection spread throughout the Iranian population in the late 1970's when an economic slump halted industrial projects and rising unemployment was accompanied by a fifty per cent rate of inflation. January 1978 inaugurated a year of riots and bloody clashes. Crowds of millions demonstrated in the streets. More than eight thousand people were killed as the police cracked down on protesters. In September 1978, the Shah imposed martial law and appointed a military governor, confident that, with the army behind him, he could overcome the storm of protest. But strike in the oilfields and violent eruptions led by university students paralyzed the government and brought the economy to a standstill. When it became evident that the army was not without sympathy for the revolutionaries, the Shah was forced to vacate his throne. When in January 1979 the Shah asked Dr Shahpur Bakhtiar to assume the premiership, Bakhtiar consented only upon condition that the Shah

leave the country. On 16 January 1979, the Shah left Iran by plane 'on a vacation', and a Revolutionary Council was installed in his place.

Between his return in 1953 and his second flight in 1979 the Shah worked a revolution in Iran. Using the country's wealth the Shah created prosperity and strength. However, the pace of the modernization, which was equated with westernization, along with the inhuman repressive measures united conservatives, radicals and liberals against him and thus, generated a counter-revolution.

12.2. Iran After the Revolution of 1979:

12.2.1. Leadership of Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini:

The chief revolutionary figure in Iran was a seventy-eight-year old Islamic theologian, the Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini. He was a life-long enemy of the Pahlavi dynasty and its material values. He became a leader of those who opposed secular government and the modernization of Iran in the American mould. After harshly suppressed riots in the early 1960's Khomeini had fled in 1964 to Turkey and thence to Iraq and finally to France, from where he continued to foster opposition to the Shah. He entertained a personal bitterness against the Shah as he had refused permission to the Ayatollah to return to Iran for the funeral of one of his sons. After a month following the flight of the Shah, Bakhtiar also fled from Iran. Following these events, Khomeini, now an ageing and obdurate moralist and nationalist returned to Iran to tumultuous welcome. On his re-entry into Iran, Khomeini inaugurated an autocratic rule, which lasted unchallenged until his death ten years later.

12.2.2. The 'Islamic World Order':

Khomeini proclaimed an Islamic republic and instituted a regime even more intolerant than the Shah's, although possibly less murderous. With the assistance of Revolutionary Council, Khomeini issued decrees for the nation. Before long, every secular or moderate leader was eliminated, and Khomeini drafted a new constitution designed to remake society in rigid conformity with Islamic law and Shiite tradition. The constitution provided for a popularly elected president but made all officials subject to supervision and removal by the religious authorities. Although SAVAK was abolished, a special police force was created to eliminate any opposition and enforce behavioural codes. Women lost what few rights they had ever possessed. Reduced in the eyes of the law to chattels of their husbands, they were forbidden to appear in public unless concealed by the veil and tent like *chador*. Khomeini suppressed dissidents as ruthlessly as had the Shah. It appeared that a secular tyranny had been replaced by an equally cruel one grounded in religious fanaticism. The Ayatollah viewed

himself not simply as Iran's leader but as the precursor of an 'Islamic world order'. He rejected both the concept of the nation state and the present international system, which he viewed with stark simplicity as a dualistic struggle between good and evil forces. To him the United States represented 'Great Satan', the Soviet Union 'Lesser Satan', which together oppressed the world's peoples and must be opposed with physical and moral force. He saw it as his mission to prepare the way for the world's salvation by calling on people everywhere to establish true Islamic governments.

12.2.3. Suppression of Liberalism:

Khomeini appointed as Prime Minister Mehdi Bazargan, a liberal Muslim intellectual with a scientific education who had been imprisoned by the Shah, but there was in fact no central government. Bazargan was harassed from left and right, by Kurdish and Arab minorities. The Ayatollah, who retired to the holy city of Qum dominated the political scene by conflicting pronouncements. He also allowed a kind of religious hooliganism to prevail. Local Islamic committees spent their time rounding up and executing those who were considered to be opposed to the Islamic revolution. The Shah's authority and partisans had evaporated with his flight, which turned him into a figure of suspicion. The memory of the Shah's restoration to his throne in 1953 by the Americans began to haunt the Islamic revolutionaries when the Shah went to the United States from Egypt via Mexico in search of the best medical treatment for the cancer, which would soon kill him. Many in Iran feared that his arrival in New York forebode another American attempt to put him back on his throne.

12.2.4. The Hostage Crisis:

In November 1979, a group of Islamic militants seized the United States embassy in Teheran and took fifty-two hostages. This coup was partly directed against Bazargan, but more overtly against the United States. This incident alarmed Russians who feared retaliatory American action in Iran at a time when their own hold over their puppets in neighbouring Afghanistan was becoming insecure. It was also useful to Khomeini in rallying the splintered fragments of Iranian society behind himself. Throughout the hostage crisis Ayatollah supported the hostage-takers, who were keen to lay hands on the Shah and humiliate the United States. Bazargan, and after him, Abolhasan Bani-Sadr, who was appointed president in 1980, were in favour of settling the hostage crisis amicably and restoring normal relations with the United States in order to unfreeze Iranian assets in American banks and get spare parts for weapons. Bani-Sadr was forced into exile by a fresh wave of terror in 1981. After 444 days, the release of the American hostages was obtained only after long, repeatedly stalemated, and humiliating negotiations.

12.2.4. Death of Khomeini:

Khomeini died in 1989. He had established a theocratic state in Iran, which became the symbol of active opposition to the seamier side of Western civilization. Meanwhile, he had also imposed on his country a tyranny as repulsive as that of the Shah. Khomeini's death fell between the end of Iran's war with Iraq and the international assault on Iraq in 1991. From the latter Iran emerged the greatest winner since the war eliminated Iraq for the time being from the politics of the Gulf, forced Saudi Arabia into a controversial role and inordinate expenditure and so helped Khomeini's successors to repair the damage suffered by Iran in the earlier war.

12.2.5. Ali Akbar Rafsanjani:

The new president, Ali Akbar Rafsanjani, consolidated his relations with the military and won a comfortable victory in elections for the *Majlis* in 1992. He pacified Western governments by helping in the release of hostages in Lebanon and tried to attract Western bankers and industrialists. After Ayatollah Khomeini's death his successor as leader, Ayatollah Ali Khamenei, lacked Khomeini's personal magic, his religious credentials and his reputation for learning. He was neither referred to as the *Imam* nor accorded the supreme rank *marja* until after his promotion to Ayatollah. He was the keeper of the true Islamic flame in succession to Khomeini, the senior figure in a land where the spiritual crown vied with the constitutional head of the state. Unlike the president, he occupied an office with no fixed term. Ayatollah Khamenei owed his position to Khomeini's dying preference over his rival, Ayatollah Hussein Ali Montazeri, and maintained his influence with the discreet support of Rafsanjani. The outside world interpreted this diarchy as a sharp ideological antithesis between extremists and moderates, dogmatists and pragmatists, but the reality was less clear-cut and less confrontational. Power in Iran, like power in most states, was shared. Khamenei and Rafsanjani both belonged to the same broad constituency but whereas the leader was head of the clerical establishment, the president was charged by virtue of his office with the tasks of improving the economy and Iran's capacity to play the role of a major regional power.

12.2.6. Decline of Economy:

The Iranian economy continued to decline. Foreign debts began to accumulate, the currency began to lose value faster than almost anywhere in the world, industrial sector began to suffer due to closure of a number of factories, foreign investment was negligible, and inflation caused widespread despair. The Iranian government tried to counter these economic woes by rigid anti-Western propaganda and blatant support for extremist regimes

such as in Sudan or subversive groups such as in Egypt. Education, whatever its quality, and literacy were greatly extended; so were the public services, expectations of life and basic incomes. But free speech and a free press were bounded by a prudent self-censorship, penal sanctions were brutal and indiscriminate, the young were kept in what their elders considered to be their right place, women were discriminated against.

12.2.7. Anti-US Stand:

In external affairs Iran was extremely critical and abusive of the United States. It made no secret of its support for the *Hizbollah* in Lebanon but denied wider charges of subversion and terrorism, for which the Americans could not produce evidence. Clinton branded Iran a threat to the Middle East and the world and imposed sanctions on companies, which traded with or in Iran. Iran aimed to assert its regional power by rebuilding its armaments after the war with Iraq and pressing its interests in Central Asia as well as in traditional areas in the Arabian Peninsula and the Gulf. It barely concealed its intention to develop a nuclear armoury, thus challenging Israel's monopoly in the Middle East.

12.2.8. Muhammad Khatami:

When Rafsanjani's term ended in 1997 Muhammad Khatami succeeded him as the president of Iran. He surprisingly defeated Khamenei's favoured candidate by a large margin. Khatami was known to be a moderate and was evidently disposed to relax internal tensions rather than impose on all the rigorous conservatism of a dogmatic and intolerant minority. He had strong support from the rising generations and the unemployed, who numbered a quarter or more of the workforce. However, his clerical opponents were entrenched in the *Majlis* and the judiciary, the National Security Council and the Council of Guardians. Khatami improved relations with the Arab world and Europeans and even made approving remarks about some aspects of American culture, but he remained constrained by the religious right and by the slump in the price of oil, which provided ninety per cent of Iran's export earnings.

Questions

1. Narrate the circumstances that led to the Revolution of 1979 in Iran.
2. How far Muhammad Reza Shah was responsible to the revolution in Iran.
3. Give an account of the role played by Ayatollah Khomeini in the Revolution of 1979 in Iran.

4. Trace the political developments in Iran after the Revolution of 1979.
5. What was the impact of the Iranian revolution on her society and economy?
6. Write short notes on:
 - (a) Revolution of 1979
 - (b) Muhammad Reza Shah
 - (c) Ayatollah Khomeini
 - (d) Post-revolutionary Iran



FERMENT IN WEST ASIA - IRAN-IRAQ CONFLICT

Objectives:

1. To understand the circumstances that led the Iran-Iraq War (1980-1989)
2. To critically examine the role of the United States in the Iran-Iraq conflict.
3. To study the consequences of the Iran-Iraq conflict on both these countries in particular and on West Asia in general.

Introduction:

The war between Iran and Iraq, which lasted for eight years, was the longest and bloodiest conflict in the history of the developing world. The Iran-Iraq conflict became a major center of tension in the Persian Gulf area. When it broke out in September 1980 no one expected that it would become such a prolonged clash. The conflict between the two countries, which had so much in common, surprised many. Both Iran and Iraq had been developing and non-aligned countries in which Islam had been the state religion. Not so long ago agreements were reached between the two countries on some quite acute territorial issues. Wars were previously waged between Arabs and Persians only in the seventh century when Islam and the Arab caliphate were being established. There had been no military clashes between Iraq and Iran since then.

13.1. Circumstances that led to the Iran-Iraq Conflict:

Like any other conflict, the Iran-Iraq war had its causes and prerequisites, and there were powerful forces, which sought to protract it. A complex of local factors intertwined very closely and strangely with the action of regional and international forces. But the world at large thought that Iran-Iraq conflict was illogical and senseless. The conflict looked particularly anachronistic in modern time when the emphasis had been on the necessity of rejecting war and the use of force as a means of settling disputes.

13.1.1. Rise of Saddam Hussein in Iraq:

The causes of the Iran-Iraq war can be traced to the change of governments in Iraq and Iran and the long-standing dispute between the two countries on various issues. In Iraq the Aref

regime had been overthrown in 1968 by a coup, which put General Ahmad Hassan Al-Bakr in the presidency. This was a victory for the Iraqi branch of the Ba'ath Party and more particularly for Saddam Hussein Takriti, the strong man of the new regime. The Ba'ath Party carried out a secular, socialist revolution before the outbreak of the war with Iran. While imposing a military dictatorship, the revolutionary leaders strengthened Iraq's economy and initiated a land-redistribution programme for the benefit of the cultivators. Huge oil reserves, largest among the Arab states except for Saudi Arabia and carefully managed, gave Iraq an advantageous position in foreign trade and its people a relatively high standard of living. Meanwhile, Iraq's military establishment was steadily expanding in order to replace Iran as the strongest power in the Persian Gulf. Saddam Hussein, who in 1979 replaced the ailing President Bakr as head of the Revolutionary Command and president, asserted that Iraq's political struggle was a revolution against imperialism, and he called upon other Arabs to join him in creating a new power on the world scene.

13.1.2. Apprehension of the Spread of Militant Islam:

First of all Saddam Hussein was afraid of militant Islam spreading across the border into Iraq from Iran. Iran had become an Islamic republic in 1979 under the leadership of the Ayatollah Khomeini and his fundamentalist Shiite Muslim supporters. Most foreign observers believe that the conflict between Iran and Iraq was above all a clash of diametrically opposed ideologies. The nationalist policy of the Ba'ath supporters in Iraq, who were Sunnis, as opposed to the majority of the population, was mainly of a secular nature and is attempted above all at attaining Arab unity. The pan-Islamic doctrine of the Iranian Shiite clergy, who came to power in 1979, which adamantly stresses the need for Islamic unity, rejects nationalism and called for the export of the 'Islamic revolution'. From Iraq's point of view, the Islamic Revolution of Ayatollah Khomeini was simply a new manifestation of Iranian expansionism, while Iran saw 'Ba'ath socialism' as a barrier to Islamic universalism, a 'curse' cast upon the Arabs for their 'deviation from the true path'. This idea was invariably emphasized in Khomeini's speeches. Khomeini believed that the country should be run according to the Islamic religion, with a strict moral code enforced by severe punishments. According to Khomeini, 'in Islam the legislative power to establish laws belongs to God Almighty'. The population of Iraq was mainly Sunni Muslim, but there was a large Shia minority. Saddam Hussein profoundly disliked Ayatollah Khomeini, whom he regarded as religious lunatic. Saddam Hussein, whose government was non-religious, was afraid that the Shias might rise up against him. He was uneasy with Khomeini's Shia intrigues among the Iraqi Shias, who staged serious riots at the end of 1979. Following the Shia insurgency, Saddam Hussein

had some of their leaders executed early in 1980. The Iranians retaliated by launching raids across the frontier.

13.1.3. Iran's Support to the Kurdish Minority:

Saddam Hussein was also concerned about the presence of the Kurdish minority in the oil-bearing Kirkuk region. He was apprehensive that Iran might use them against Saddam Hussein's regime. Saddam had settled the Kurdish question in 1975. After admitting Kurds to the Iraqi cabinet in 1973 and granting autonomy to the Kirkuk region in 1974, Iraq extracted from the Shah of Iran a promise to stop Iranian aid to Kurdish dissidents. However, Saddam was not sure that Khomeini would honour the Shah's promise.

13.1.4. Dispute over the Shatt-al-Arab Waterway:

Undoubtedly, the rivalry between the two states for the leading positions in the Gulf area played an important role in the Iran-Iraq conflict. There was decades-long border dispute between the two countries. The chief area of dispute was the 195-kilometre long Shatt al-Arab estuary formed by the confluence of the Tigris and the Euphrates and serving as an outlet to the Persian Gulf for both countries. At the beginning of the twentieth century the Ottoman Empire had secured control over almost the whole of the Shatt and this position was inherited between the two world wars by Iraq. It was, however, challenged by the resurgent power of Iran under the Pahlavi dynasty, which claimed that the frontier ran down mid-channel. In 1937 a new treaty considerably improved the Iranian position, notably by making the Shatt freely usable by naval and merchant vessels of both countries. After the Second World War, and particularly after the 1958 revolution in Iraq, Iran began to put pressure on Iraq. In 1969 Iran denounced the 1937 treaty. Iraq retaliated by declaring the whole of the Shatt to be Iraqi territorial water but Iran's support for Kurdish revolts against the Iraqi regime forced Iraq in 1975 to accept a mid-channel frontier. In 1978 the fall of the Shah again transformed the situation. Iran lapsed into something like chaos and lost the American support. Iraq on the other hand, had been gathering strength since the coup in 1968. In 1980 Saddam Hussein abrogated the 1975 agreement and invaded Iran.

13.2. Course of the Iran-Iraq War:

13.2.1. Saddam's Expectation of Quick Victory:

Saddam Hussein expected a quick military victory over Iran. He was of the opinion that the Iranian forces would be weak and demoralized soon after the fundamentalist takeover. It soon became clear that he had miscalculated badly.

13.2.2. Iran's Strong Stand Against Iraq:

The Iranians quickly organized themselves to deal with the invasion, which began with the Iraqi seizure of the disputed waterway. The Iranians replied with mass infantry attacks against heavily fortified Iraqi positions. On paper Iraq seemed much the stronger, being well supplied with Soviet tanks, helicopter gun ships and missiles, and some British and American weapons as well. However, the Iranian revolutionary guards, inspired by their religion, and ready to become martyrs, fought with fanatical determination. Eventually, the Iranian army also began to get modern equipment such as anti-aircraft and anti-tank missiles from China and North Korea, and secretly from the United States. As the war dragged on, Iraq concentrated on strangling Iranian oil exports, which paid for their arms supplies. Iran meanwhile captured Iraqi territory, and early in 1987 their troops were only ten miles from Basra, Iraq's second most important city, which had to be evacuated. By this time the territorial dispute had been lost in the deeper racial and religious conflict. Khomeini had sworn never to stop fighting until his Shia Muslim fundamentalists had destroyed the 'godless' Saddam regime.

13.2.3. Reaction of Arab States to Iran-Iraq Conflict:

The Iran-Iraq conflict threatened the stability of the entire Arab world. The more conservative Arab States such as Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Kuwait, gave cautious support to Iraq. However, Syria, Libya, Algeria, South Yemen and the PLO were critical of Iraq for starting the war at a time when, they believed, all Arab states should have been concentrating on the destruction of Israel. The Tunisian newspaper, Al-Mustakbal wrote: "It is quite obvious that only imperialism and Zionism are interested in the continuation of the bloody and destructive war between Iraq and Iran and that they strive to protract it in every way. The war distracts Arabs from their main task-the struggle against Israeli aggression, and is a means of the senseless destruction of their manpower and material resources. As Iraq and Iran exhaust each other in a military confrontation Israel gets rid of two serious opponents at once." The Saudis and the other Gulf States, suspicious of Khomeini's extreme brand of Islam, wanted to see Iran's ability to dominate the Persian Gulf controlled.

13.2.4. Failure of the Islamic Conference to end the Conflict:

The success of Iran's Shia fundamentalist troops, especially the threat to Basra, alarmed the non-religious Arab governments. Many Arabs were afraid of what might happen if Iraq was defeated. Even President Assad of Syria, at first a strong supporter of Iran, was worried in case Iraq split up and became another Lebanon. This could destabilize Syria itself. Representatives of forty-four nations attended an Islamic conference held in Kuwait in January

1987, but Iran's leaders refused to attend, and no agreement could be reached on how to bring the war to an end.

The war entered a new and even more terrible phase towards the end of 1987 when both sides began to bombard each other's capital cities, Tehran, the capital of Iran and Baghdad, the capital of Iraq, causing thousands of death.

13.3. Attempts to End the Conflict:

13.3.1. Peace Initiatives:

Since the start of the conflict between Iraq and Iran different states and international organizations made numerous mediatory attempts to stop the war. Such peace initiatives were taken at various times by Olof Palme, the Prime Minister of Sweden, acting as a special representative of the UN Secretary General. The Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Non-Aligned Movement, Algeria, Japan, India, the Gulf Cooperation Council, etc. also tried their best to terminate the conflict between the two countries. Their proposal essentially was to enact an immediate ceasefire, to withdraw the troops of Iran and Iraq to the internationally recognized borders as prescribed by the 1975 Algiers Agreement, to station international forces on both sides of the border to supervise the ceasefire, to raise funds for financing the rehabilitation of the war ravaged areas of both countries, to set up a commission to determine the aggressor, and to begin indirect Iranian-Iraqi negotiations. As the conflict grew in scope these proposals were supplemented by appeals to limit the areas of hostilities and to stop the mutual bombardment of civilian targets and the attacks on shipping in the Persian Gulf. But the proposals were not accepted.

13.3.2. Failure of the UN Initiative:

The mediatory efforts of UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar, who visited Teheran and Baghdad in April 1985 to discuss his proposals to lower the scale of the conflict and ultimately end it, were also unsuccessful.

The question of the Iran-Iraq War has several times been considered by the United Nations. The Security Council passed resolutions urging both countries to refrain from any further use of force and to settle the dispute between them by peaceful means in keeping with the principles of justice and international law.

13.3.3. Rigid Stand of Iran:

Iraq had demonstrated a generally positive attitude to the idea of intermediary missions and the termination of the conflict. Baghdad had repeatedly expressed its readiness to agree to a political settlement and its consent to return to the borders defined

by the 1975 Algiers Agreement. Iran, however, took a rigid position in regard to all proposals to end the war and demanded as its main condition the removal of the Ba'ath regime headed by Saddam Hussein. Iran declared that it was being forced to accept a peace, which was 'worse than war' and was staking itself on a final victory no matter at what cost.

13.4. Role of the United States in the Iran-Iraq Conflict:

13.4.1. US Interest in the Persian Gulf Region:

Despite the irreconcilability between Iran and Iraq, it was quite evident that the conflict would not have assumed such a scope nor lasted so long if the United States had not indirectly supported the war as it wanted to see the end of both the regimes in both the countries. The United States was keen to secure the dominant position in the Persian Gulf zone where nearly 60 per cent of the world's oil reserves were concentrated. The United States also viewed the keeping of the Arab states from forming a united anti-imperialist front as a primary task.

13.4.2. Calculated Approach of the US to Iran-Iraq Conflict:

Having imposed a virtual blockade on Iran, the US government made advances to Iraq, proposing more than once to Baghdad that they restore full diplomatic relations. The Iraqi army was constantly praised as being the strongest in the Gulf region. For instance, The New York Times wrote that after the collapse of the Iranian military machine specialists believed that Iraq had become the possessor of the strongest military force in the sub-region. In June 1980 the United States indicated that the United States would not oppose Iraqi claims to the Shatt al-Arab.

In short, the Americans directly helped to fan the flames of the dispute between Iraq and Iran by providing misinformation and sowing mistrust, suspicion and hostility. The United States calculated that Iraq's victory would lead to Iran's destabilization, the defeat of the Islamic regime and the establishment of a pro-Western government. In the event of Iraq's defeat, which was also considered, the United States could act as a protector and demand certain compensation for its assistance.

According to many sources, the US administration decided to provoke an armed conflict between the two countries immediately after the abortive operation to rescue the American hostages in Iran, attempted in the spring of 1980. It was expected that by an armed conflict between Iraq and Iran the latter's armed forces would be weakened and at the same time distract Iraq's attention from the confrontation with Israel and furnish the prerequisites for direct American military interference in the internal affairs of the two countries and the Persian Gulf zone as a whole.

13.4.3. The Irangate:

The United States had often publicly stated its neutrality in the Iran-Iraq war. But its actual policy was aimed at the aggravation of the conflict, was in striking contrast to those pronouncements. The Irangate, the scandal of worldwide dimensions concerning the secret operations carried out from 1983 to 1985 to supply American and Israeli arms to Iran in an attempt to secure the release of American captives in Lebanon could be seen as an attempt of the United States to prolong the Iran-Iraq conflict. The Western press had provided sufficient proof that the US arms supplied to Iran played a substantial role in increasing the scope and ferocity of the hostilities on the Iran-Iraq front. The funds obtained from the sale of arms to Iran were secretly used to support the contras in their war against the Sandinista revolution in Nicaragua. A prolonged deadlocked situation between Iran and Iraq was in the interest of the United States. It cared little for the deaths of tens of thousands of people, the destruction of towns, villages and factories or the fact that the material damage amounted to hundreds of billions of dollars.

At first it was the aim of the United States to 'punish' Iran through Iraq. But when Iran took the military initiative, the United States became worried that this might undermine its position in the sub-region. Many US newspapers and magazines wrote of the necessity of 'erecting a barrier to block the export of the Shiite revolution'. There was a barrage of statements to the effect that the Reagan administration would not stand passively by and watch the Khomeini regime attempt to destabilize the Gulf States.

13.5. End of the Iran-Iraq Conflict

13.5.1. Arrangement of the Cease-fire by the UNO:

The involvement of the United States in the Gulf made it impossible for Iran to win a war, which Iraq had already failed to win in spite of considerable foreign aid in arms, intelligence and finance. Ending the war became a matter of time and diplomacy. Although neither side had achieved its aims, the cost of the war, both economically and in human lives, was very heavy. Thus, both sides began to look for a way to end the fighting. However, for a time both the countries carried out propaganda. Saddam talked about 'total victory' and the Iranians demanded 'total surrender'. The UN became involved in the Iran-Iraq conflict and did some straight talking to both sides. The Security Council succeeded in arranging a cease-fire in August 1988. This was monitored by the UN troops, and against all expectations, the truce lasted. Peace negotiations opened in October 1988 and terms were finally agreed in 1990 by both Iran and Iraq.

13.5.2. Consequences of the Iran-Iraq Conflict:

The Iran-Iraq conflict had inflicted incalculable losses on the two peoples. According to the Western press, the combined total number of those killed alone approaches one million. Le Parisien Libere reported in January 1987 that the war had taken 600,000 Iranian and 400,000 Iraqi lives and that more than three million people had been wounded.

During the war chemical weapons were used for the first time in many years. This was condemned by the UN Security Council as a blatant violation of the 1925 Geneva Protocol prohibiting the use of chemical weapons in war.

The material losses suffered by both Iran and Iraq were also colossal-hundreds of villages, dozens of towns and many factories and plants were destroyed. Millions of villagers and townspeople were forced to leave their homes and move into the hinterland of their countries. The output of oil of these major oil-exporting countries had been drastically reduced.

According to the Iranian government's estimates, its country's economic losses during the first five years of the war with Iraq amount to more than 300,000 million dollars. The war played havoc with Iran's economic life: industrial production was greatly shrunk, many enterprises were closed and unemployment is rampant. The Iraqi economy also went going through hard times. The situation was further aggravated by the fact that both sides did not limit themselves to combat actions at the front, but struck blows ever more frequently at densely populated towns and economic targets. Both the countries tried to inflict maximum economic damage on each other. Foreign sources report that nearly 200 ships had been attacked.

Questions

1. Trace the circumstances that led to the Iran-Iraq War in 1980.
2. Analyze the factors that contributed to the Iran-Iraq conflict.
3. Examine critically the role of the United States in the Iran-Iraq conflict.
4. Discuss the causes and consequences of the Iran-Iraq conflict.



COLLAPSE OF COMMUNISM AND IT'S AFTERMATH IN THE SOVIET UNION (1989-2000)

Objectives:

1. To understand the circumstances that led to the collapse of Communism in the Soviet Union.
2. To study the role of Gorbachev in the collapse of Communism.
3. To analyze the consequences of the collapse of Communism in the Soviet Union.

Introduction:

The collapse of communism and disintegration of the Soviet Union during the last quarter of the twentieth century is one of the great events that had wider ramifications. The great communist experiment that was set in motion following the Revolution of 1917 in Russia could not sustain with the passage of time. The internal weakness of the system and external pressure from the capitalist democratic West gradually led to the shaking of communism in the Soviet Union. The autocratic rule of Stalin leading to the elimination of thousands of people in Russia, gradual economic stagnation due to the extreme centralization of the means of production, denial of political rights to the people, overspending on military and space race to compete with the United States due to Cold War, revolts in the Central and Eastern European states against Soviet hegemony and many other factors ultimately led to the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union.

14.1. Circumstances that led to the Collapse of Communism in the Soviet Union

14.1.1. Political Background:

After Khrushchev's dismissal in 1964, three men, Kosygin, Brezhnev and Podgorny, seemed to be sharing power. At first Kosygin was the leading figure and the chief spokesman on foreign affairs, while Brezhnev and Podgorny looked after home affairs. In early 1970's Brezhnev eclipsed Kosygin after a disagreement over economic policies. Kosygin pressed for more economic decentralization. However, this proposal was unpopular with the other leaders, who claimed that it encouraged too much

independence of thought in the satellite states, especially Czechoslovakia. Brezhnev established firm personal control by 1977, and remained leader until his death in November 1982. Broadly speaking, his policies were similar to those of the Khrushchev period.

14.1.2. Stagnation of the Economy:

The economic policies during the Brezhnev years maintained wage differentials and profit incentives, and some growth took place, but the rate of growth was slow. The system remained strongly centralized, and Brezhnev was reluctant to take any major initiative. By 1982 therefore, much of the Russian industry was old fashioned and was in need of new production and processing technology. There was concern about the failure of coal and oil industries to increase output, and the building industry was notorious for slowness and poor quality. Low agricultural yield was still a major problem. Not once in the period 1980-84 did grain production come anywhere near the targets set. The 1981 harvest was disastrous and 1982 was only slightly better. The successive poor harvests threw Russia into an uncomfortable dependency on American wheat. It was calculated that in the United States in 1980 one agricultural worker produced enough to feed seventy-five people, while his counterpart in Russia could manage only enough to feed ten.

14.1.3. Brezhnev Doctrine:

The Eastern Bloc states were expected to obey Moscow's wishes to maintain their existing structure. When liberal trends developed in Czechoslovakia, especially abolition of press censorship, Russian and other Warsaw Pact troops invaded the country. The reforming government of Dubcek was replaced by a strongly centralized, pro-Moscow regime. Soon afterwards Brezhnev declared the so-called *Brezhnev Doctrine*. According to the *Brezhnev Doctrine* intervention in the internal affairs of any communist country was justified if socialism in that country was considered to be threatened. This caused some friction with Romania, which had always tried to maintain some independence, refusing to send troops into Czechoslovakia and keeping on good terms with China. The Russian invasion of Afghanistan (1979) was the most blatant application of the doctrine, while more subtle pressures were brought to bear on Poland (1981) to control the independent trade union movement, *Solidarity*.

14.1.4. Poor Human Rights Record:

Brezhnev's record on human rights was not impressive. Though he claimed to be in favour of the Helsinki Agreement signed in 1975, which included an undertaking, by the signatories to protect human rights, and appeared to make important concessions about human rights in the Soviet Union, in fact little

progress was made. Groups were set up to check whether the terms of the agreement were being kept, but the authorities put them under intense pressure. Their members were arrested, imprisoned, exiled or deported, and finally the groups were dissolved altogether in 1982.

The Russians worked towards detente, but after 1979 relations with the West deteriorated sharply as a result of the invasion of Afghanistan. Brezhnev continued to advocate disarmament but presided over a rapid increase in Soviet armed forces, particularly the navy and the new SS-20 missiles. He increased Soviet aid to Cuba and offered aid to Angola, Mozambique and Ethiopia.

14.1.5. Andropov and Chernenko:

After Brezhnev's death Russia was ruled for a short period by two elderly and ailing politicians - Andropov (November 1982-February 1984) and then Chernenko (February 1984-March 1985). Andropov, who was the head of the KGB until May 1982, immediately launched a vigorous campaign to modernize and streamline the soviet system. He began an anti-corruption drive and introduced a programme of economic reform, hoping to increase production by encouraging decentralization. Some of the older party officials were replaced with younger, more progressive men. Unfortunately he was suffering from ill health and died after little more than a year in office.

The 72-year-old Chernenko was a more conventional type of Soviet politician. There was no relaxation in the treatment of human rights activists. Dr Andrei Sakharov, the famous nuclear physicist, was still kept in exile in Siberia, where he had been since 1980, in spite of appeals by Western leaders for his release. Members of an unofficial trade union, supporters of a group 'for the establishment of trust between the Soviet Union and the United States', and members of unofficial religious groups were all arrested.

14.2. Mikhail Gorbachev and the Collapse of Communism

14.2.1. Towards Reformation:

Mikhail Gorbachev, who came to power in March 1985, was, at fifty-four, the most gifted and dynamic leader Russia had seen for many years. He was determined to transform and revitalize the country after the stagnant years following Khrushchev's fall. He intended to achieve this by modernizing and streamlining the communist party with new policies of *glasnost* (openness) and *perestroika* (restructuring - which meant economic and social reform). The new thinking soon made an impact on foreign affairs, with initiatives on detente, relations with China, a withdrawal from Afghanistan, and ultimately the ending of the Cold War in late 1990.

14.2.2. Desire to Replace Stalinist System with Socialist System:

Gorbachev outlined what was wrong at home in a speech to the Party Conference in 1988. He said that the system was too centralized, leaving no room for local individual initiative. It was based almost completely on state ownership and control, and weighted strongly towards defense and heavy industry, leaving consumer goods for ordinary people in short supply. Gorbachev did not want to end communism. His aim was to replace the existing system, which was still basically Stalinist, with a socialist system, which was humane and democratic. He did not have the same success at home as abroad. His policies failed to provide results quickly enough, and led to the collapse of communism, the breakup of the Soviet Union, and the end of his own political career.

14.2.3. Glasnost:

Glasnost means intellectual openness. Gorbachev adopted this policy to relax the restrictive policies that prevented freedom of speech and dissemination of ideas. It allowed public debate on political issues and therefore encouraged criticism of Soviet policies and society. The aim of the policy was to create an internal debate amongst Soviet citizens, to encourage a positive attitude and enthusiasm for the reform of the Soviet Union. The media was allowed greater freedom to express opinions that would have been condemned previously. Failures of Soviet government were allowed to be revealed, such as the 1986 nuclear accident at Chernobyl. This was soon seen in areas such as human rights and cultural affairs. Several well-known dissidents were released, and the Sakharovs were allowed to return to Moscow from internal exile in Gorky in December 1986. Gorbachev also allowed the release of a number of political prisoners, and the emigration of some dissidents. Leaders like Bukharin who had been disgraced and executed during Stalin's purges of the 1930s were declared innocent of all crimes. Pravda was allowed to print an article criticizing Brezhnev for overreacting against dissidents, and a new law was introduced to prevent dissidents from being sent to mental institutions (January 1988). Important political events like the Nineteenth Party Conference in 1988 and the first session of the new Congress of People's Deputies (May 1989) were televised.

In cultural matters and the media generally, there were some startling developments. In May 1986 both the Union of Soviet Filmmakers and the Union of Writers were allowed to sack their reactionary heads and elect more independent-minded leaders. Long-banned anti-Stalin films and novels were shown and published, and preparations were made to publish works by the great poet Osip Mandelstam, who died in a labour camp in 1938.

There was a new freedom in news reporting. In April 1986, for example, when a nuclear reactor at Chernobyl in the Ukraine exploded, killing hundreds of people and releasing a massive radioactive cloud, which drifted across most of Europe, the disaster was discussed with unprecedented frankness. The aims of this new approach were to use the media to publicize the inefficiency and corruption, which the government was so anxious to stamp out; educate public opinion; and mobilize support for the new policies. Glasnost was encouraged provided nobody criticized the party itself. However, the policy developed a momentum of its own as people became more confident in speaking out while the failings of Soviet society became apparent and the economic reform programme failed.

14.2.4. Perestroika:

In the Russian language *Perestroika* means 'restructuring'. It was the term used by Gorbachev for economic reform in the Soviet Union in later 1980's. The policy had been in the planning stages prior to his election, but it was at the Plenary Meeting of the Communist party Central Committee in April 1985 that it was decided that the programme was crucial to rescuing the state from economic collapse and was to be implemented forthwith.

Perestroika was intended to be a systematized programme and concrete strategy for the country's further development. The programme reached into all areas of the Soviet system: science and technology, structural reorganization of the economy, and changes in investment policy. The aim was to change the very centralized management system into a more decentralized one, which would be based on a degree of local autonomy and self-management. Small-scale private enterprise such as family restaurants, family businesses making clothes or handicrafts or providing services such as car or TV repairs, painting and decorating and private tuition, was to be allowed, and so were workers' co-operatives up to a maximum of fifty workers. One motive behind this reform was to provide competition for the slow and inefficient services provided by the state, in the hope of stimulating a rapid improvement. Another was the need to provide alternative employment as patterns of employment changed over the following decade: as more automation and computerization are introduced into factories and offices, the need for manual and clerical workers declines. Other aims within the programme were to reduce alcoholism and absenteeism amongst the workforce; to allow economic units to make business decisions without consulting the political authorities; and to encourage private enterprise and the introduction of joint ventures with a limited number of foreign companies. The most important part of the reforms was the Law on State Enterprises enacted in June 1987. This removed the central

planners' total control over raw materials, production quotas and trade, and made factories work to orders from customers.

14.2.5. Political changes:

Political changes in the Soviet system began in January 1987 when Gorbachev announced moves towards democracy within the party. Instead of members of local soviets being appointed by the local communist party, they were to be elected by the people, and there was to be a choice of candidates. There were to be secret elections for top party positions, and elections in factories to choose managers.

During 1988 dramatic changes in central government were achieved. The old parliament, the *Supreme Soviet* of about 1450 deputies only met for about two weeks each year. Its function was to elect two smaller bodies - the *Presidium* comprising of 33 members and the *Council of Ministers* comprising of 71 members. It was these two committees, which took all-important decisions and saw that policies were carried out. Now the *Supreme Soviet* was to be replaced by a *Congress of People's Deputies* comprising of 2250 members whose main function was to elect a new and much smaller Supreme Soviet consisting of 450 representatives, which would be a proper working parliament, sitting for about eight months a year. The chairman of the Supreme Soviet would be head of state.

Following the elections under the reformed system the first *Congress of People's Deputies* met in May 1989. During the second session in December 1989 it was decided that reserved seats for the communist party should be abolished. Gorbachev was elected President of the Soviet Union in March 1990, with two councils to advise and help him. One contained his own personal advisers, the other contained representatives from the fifteen republics. These new bodies completely sidelined the old system, and it meant that the communist party was on the verge of losing its privileged position.

14.3 Opposition to Gorbachev's Policies

14.3.1. Opposition from the Radicals and Conservatives:

As the reforms got under way, Gorbachev ran into problems. Some party members, such as Boris Yeltsin, the Moscow party leader, were more radical than Gorbachev, and felt that the reforms were not drastic enough. They wanted a change to a Western-style market economy as quickly as possible, though they knew this would cause great short-term hardship for the Russian people. On the other hand, the traditional conservative communists like Yegor Ligachev, felt that the changes were too drastic and that the party was in danger of losing control. This caused a dangerous split in

the party and made it difficult for Gorbachev to satisfy either of the groups.

14.3.2. Protest Demonstrations in Moscow:

The conservatives were in a large majority, and when the *Congress of People's Deputies* elected the new Supreme Soviet in May 1989, it was packed with conservatives. Yeltsin and many other radicals were not elected. This led to massive protest demonstrations in Moscow, where Yeltsin was a popular figure since he had cleaned up the corrupt Moscow communist party organization. Demonstrations would not have been allowed before Gorbachev's time, but *glasnost*-encouraging people to voice their criticisms, was now in full bloom, and was beginning to turn against the communist party.

14.3.3. Economic Crisis:

The economic reforms as visualized through the policy of *Perestroika* did not produce quick results. The rate of economic growth in 1988 and 1989 stayed exactly the same as it had been in previous years. In 1990 national income actually fell and continued to fall by about fifteen per cent in 1991. Some economists think that the Soviet Union was going through an economic crisis as serious as the one in the United States in the early 1930's.

14.3.4. Short Supply of Consumer Goods:

A major cause of the crisis was the disastrous results of the Law on State Enterprises. The problem was that wages were now dependent on output, but since output was measured by its value in roubles, factories were tempted not to increase overall output, but to concentrate on more expensive goods and reduce output of cheaper goods. This led to higher wages, forcing the government to print more money to pay the wages. This resulted in the inflation government's budget deficit. Basic goods such as soap, washing-powder, razor blades, cups and saucers, TV sets and food were in very short supply, and the queues in the towns got longer. Disillusion with Gorbachev and his reforms rapidly set in, and, having had their expectations raised by his promises, people became outraged at the shortages.

14.3.5. Strike of the Coal-miners:

In July 1989 some coalminers in Siberia found there was no soap to wash themselves with at the end of their shift. After staging a sit-in, they decided to go on strike. They were quickly joined by other miners in Siberia, in Kazakhstan and in the Donbass (Ukraine), the biggest coalmining area in the Soviet Union, until half a million miners were on strike. It was the first major strike since 1917. The miners were well disciplined and organized, holding mass meetings outside party headquarters in the main towns. They put forward detailed demands, which made up forty-two in all.

These included better living and working conditions, better supplies of food, a share in the profits, and more local control over the mines. Later, influenced by what was happening in Poland, where a non-communist prime minister had just been elected, they called for independent trade unions like Poland's *Solidarity*, and in some areas they demanded an end to the privileged position of the communist party. The government soon gave way and granted many of the demands, promising a complete reorganization of the industry and full local control.

By the end of July the strike was over, but the general economic situation did not improve. Early in 1990 it was calculated that about a quarter of the population was living below the poverty line; worst affected were those with large families, the unemployed and pensioners. Gorbachev was fast losing control of the reform movement, which he had started, and the success of the miners was bound to encourage the radicals to press for even more far-reaching changes.

14.3.6. Pressure from Nationalities:

Nationalist pressures also contributed towards Gorbachev's failure and led to the breakup of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union was a federal state consisting of fifteen separate republics each with its own parliament. The Russian republic was just one of the fifteen, with its parliament in Moscow. The republics had been kept under strict control since Stalin's time, but *glasnost* and *perestroika* encouraged them to hope for more powers for their parliaments and more independence from Moscow. Gorbachev himself seemed sympathetic, provided that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) remained in overall control. However, things went out of control.

14.3.7. Gradual Break-up of the Soviet Union:

Trouble began in Nagorno-Karabakh, a small Christian autonomous republic within the Soviet republic of Azerbaijan, which was Muslim. The parliament of Nagorno-Karabakh requested to become part of neighbouring Christian Armenia in February 1988, but Gorbachev refused to concede the demand. He was apprehensive that if he agreed, this would upset the conservatives who opposed internal frontier changes, and turn them against his entire reform programme. Fighting broke out between Azerbaijan and Armenia, and Moscow had clearly lost control.

Worse was to follow in the three Baltic Soviet republics of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, which had been taken over against their will by the Russians in 1940. Independence movements denounced by Gorbachev as 'national excesses' had been growing in strength. In March 1990, encouraged by what was happening in the satellite states of Eastern Europe, Lithuania took the lead by

declaring itself independent. The other two soon followed, though they voted to proceed more gradually. Moscow refused to recognize their independence.

14.3.8. Rise of Boris Yeltsin:

Boris Yeltsin, who had been excluded from the new Supreme Soviet by the conservatives, made a dramatic comeback when he was elected president of the parliament of the Russian republic (Russian Federation) in May 1990.

Wide differences in their perception and goals made Gorbachev and Yeltsin bitter rivals. They disagreed on many fundamental issues. Yeltsin believed that the union should be voluntary. Each republic should be independent but also have joint responsibilities to the Soviet Union as well. If any republic wanted to opt out, as Lithuania did, it should be allowed to do so. However, Gorbachev thought that a purely voluntary union would lead to disintegration.

By this time Yeltsin was completely disillusioned with the communist party and the way the traditionalists had treated him. He thought the party no longer deserved its privileged position in the state. Gorbachev was still a convinced communist and thought the only way forward was through a humane and democratic communist party.

On the economic front Yeltsin was keen on a rapid changeover to a market economy, though he knew that this would be painful for the Russian people. Gorbachev was much more cautious, realizing that Yeltsin's plans would cause massive unemployment and even higher prices. Gorbachev was fully aware of how unpopular he was already. He was afraid that if things got even worse, he might well be overthrown.

14.3.9. The coup of August 1991:

As the crisis deepened, Gorbachev and Yeltsin tried to work together, and Gorbachev found himself being pushed towards free multi-party elections. This brought bitter attacks from Ligachev and the conservatives, and Yeltsin resigned from the communist party in July 1990. Gorbachev was now losing control. Many of the republics were demanding independence, and when Soviet troops were used against nationalists in Lithuania and Latvia, the people organized massive demonstrations. In April 1991 Georgia declared independence. It seemed that the Soviet Union was falling apart. However, the following month Gorbachev held a conference with the leaders of the fifteen republics and persuaded them to form a new voluntary union in which they would be largely independent of Moscow. The agreement was to be formally signed on 20 August 1991.

At this point a group of hard-line communists, including Gorbachev's vice-president, Gennady Yanayev, decided they had had enough, and launched a *coup* to remove Gorbachev and reverse his reforms. On 18 August 1991, Gorbachev, who was on holiday in the Crimea, was arrested and told to hand over power to Yanayev. When he refused, he was kept under house arrest while the *coup* went ahead in Moscow. The public was told that Gorbachev was ill and that an eight-member committee was now in charge. They declared a state of emergency, banned demonstrations, and brought in tanks and troops to surround public buildings in Moscow, including the White House, the parliament of the Russian Federation, which they intended to seize. Gorbachev's new union treaty, which was due to be signed the following day, was cancelled.

However, the coup was poorly organized and the leaders failed to have Yeltsin arrested. He rushed to the White House, and, standing on a tank outside, he condemned the *coup* and called on the people of Moscow to rally round in support. The troops were confused, not knowing which side to support, but none of them would make a move against the popular Yeltsin. It soon became clear that some sections of the army were sympathetic to the reformers. By the evening of 20 August 1991 thousands of people were on the streets, barricades were built against the tanks, and the army hesitated to cause heavy casualties by attacking the White House. On 21 August the *coup* leaders admitted defeat and were eventually arrested. Yeltsin had triumphed and Gorbachev was able to return to Moscow. But things could never be the same again, and the failed coup had important consequences.

14.3.10. Resignation of Gorbachev:

The communist party was disgraced and discredited by the actions of the hardliners. Gorbachev soon resigned as party general secretary and the party was banned in the Russian Federation. Yeltsin was seen as the hero and Gorbachev was increasingly sidelined. Yeltsin ruled the Russian Federation as a separate republic, introducing a drastic programme to move to a free-market economy. When the Ukraine, the second largest soviet republic, voted to become independent in December 1991, it was clear that the old Soviet Union was finished. Yeltsin was already negotiating for a new union of the republics. This was joined first by the Russian Federation, the Ukraine, and Belarus, and eight other republics joined later. The new union was known as the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS). Although the member states were fully independent, they agreed to work together on economic matters and defense. These developments meant that Gorbachev's role as president of the Soviet Union had ceased to exist, and he resigned on Christmas Day 1991.

There can be no question that Gorbachev, in spite of his failures, was one of the outstanding leaders of the twentieth century. His achievement, especially in foreign affairs, was enormous. His policies of *glasnost* and *perestroika* restored freedom to the people of the Soviet Union. His policies of reducing military expenditure, detente, and withdrawal from Afghanistan and Eastern Europe made a vital contribution to the ending of the Cold War. It has been suggested that Gorbachev was the real successor of Lenin, and that he was trying to get communism back on the track intended for it by Lenin before it was hi-jacked by Stalin, who twisted and perverted it.

Much has already been written about the question whether Gorbachev would have succeeded and preserved a modernized, humane communism, if he had tackled the problems differently. Comparisons also have been made with communist China. Why did communism survive there but not in the Soviet Union? One explanation goes as follows: Both the Soviet Union and China needed reform in two areas, the communist party and government and the economy. Gorbachev believed these could only be achieved one at a time, and chose to introduce the political reforms first, without any really fundamental economic innovations. The Chinese did it the other way round, introducing economic reform first and leaving the power of the communist party unchanged. This meant that although the people suffered economic hardship, the government retained tight control over them, and in the last resort was prepared to use force against them, unlike Gorbachev.

It is important to note that 1991 did not witness the complete collapse of communism, in Russia or Eastern Europe. Reformed communist parties re-emerged, some times under different names, in a multi-party setting, in Lithuania, Bulgaria, Poland and Russia. What really ended in 1991 was not communism but Stalinism.

14.4. Aftermath of the Collapse of Communism in the Soviet Union

14.4.1. Yeltsin as the President of the Russian Federation:

Yeltsin's power base was not the Soviet Union but Russia. He had acted with courage during the anti-Gorbachev coup, risking his life in confronting the plotters and increasing his popularity in Russia, which had been growing since 1990. In that year the Congress of People's Deputies elected under Gorbachev's reforms of 1988 was replaced by a Russian parliament, which chose Yeltsin as its president. A few weeks before the coup of 1991 he was elected president of the Russian Republic by direct popular vote. This victory turned out to be the high point of his career. However, he failed thereafter to display any mastery over either of the two major problems: economic policy and nationalities.

14.4.2. Economic Collapse:

Yeltsin was given special powers to formulate and implement economic reforms. These reforms propounded by Yegor Gaidar, Anatoly Chubais and other adventurous advisers, comprised severe cuts in government spending, the privatization of state enterprises of all kinds, the dismantling of much of the central bureaucracy. But this programme proved not only painful but also far more protracted than anticipated. Inflation soared into four figures, production collapsed and the reformers appeared to be benefiting nobody except the handful of enterprising adventurers. Yeltsin was criticized by his former allies as trying to do in five years what should be spread to twenty. Through 1992 and 1993 the economy continued to decline as output fell even more steeply than under Gorbachev. Living standards declined and many people were worse off than before *glasnost* and *perestroika*. Economic failings resulted in crime, extortion and corruption. Wages in public services, including the armed forces, were frequently unpaid.

14.4.3. Formation of the Civic Union:

Yeltsin's critics formed the Civic Union, which became a principal group in the Congress and joined forces with the ex-communists, who were more hostile to Yeltsin than they had been to Gorbachev. Yeltsin was forced to withdraw his nomination of Gaidar as prime minister and appointed instead Victor Chernomyrdin, who was expected to be an amenable mediator between Yeltsin and the Congress chairman Ruslan Khasbulatov, another former ally of Yeltsin turned adversary.

14.4.4. Ethnic and Religious Conflict:

Meanwhile, ethnic and religious conflict plagued the republics. In the first years following the dissolution of the Soviet Union, warfare flared up in Georgia, Armenia and Azerbaijan. The most serious conflict arose in the predominately Muslim area of Chechnya, bordering Georgia in the Caucasus, which had declared its independence in late 1991. Three years later the Russian government, weary of this continuing challenge to its authority, launched a concerted effort to suppress resistance. The attempt failed, exposing Russia's military weakness to the world, in a conflict that saw the commission of atrocities on both sides. Although TV viewers worldwide saw pictures of the Chechen capital, Grozny, reduced to rubble, the Russian army seemed unable to defeat the rebels. A truce signed in July 1995 was short-lived. As the elections for the Duma, the lower house of the Russian Federation parliament, approached in December 1995, Yeltsin's popularity was waning and support for the reformed communist party under their leader, Gennady Zyuganov, was reviving. The communists scored something of a triumph in the elections, winning 23 per cent of the votes and becoming the largest party in the Duma.

14.4.5. Re-election of Yeltsin as the President:

During the first half of 1996 the economy began to show signs of recovery. The budget deficit and inflation were both coming down steadily, and production was increasing. Elections for a new president were due in June, and Western governments, worried about the prospect of a Zyuganov victory, were clearly hoping that Yeltsin would be re-elected. The International Monetary Fund was persuaded to give Russia a \$10.2 billion loan. The leaders of the former Soviet republics, members of the Commonwealth of Independent States, also backed Yeltsin, because they were afraid that a communist president might try to end their independence. Yeltsin's chances received a boost when he succeeded in negotiating a ceasefire in Chechnya in May 1995. Yeltsin eventually won a comfortable victory, taking almost 35 per cent of the votes against 32 per cent for Zyuganov.

Yeltsin saw his victory in the 1996 presidential elections as a clear mandate for the continuation of the reform programme. He reorganized his Cabinet, bringing in new reformers as well as retaining loyalists such as Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and Chief of Staff Anatoly Chubais in key positions. Lebed, however, who had gained widespread popularity as a 'man of the people' rather than a party politician, continued to criticize government actions, especially aspects of the reform programme. In October he was sacked as national security advisor, and went on in December to launch a new political party, the Russian Popular Republican Party

Meanwhile, Yeltsin suffering from heart ailment underwent a quintuple heart bypass operation in November 1996. His return to full-time duties was delayed by a bout of pneumonia, which heightened doubts concerning his future. A bid in early February 1997 by the Communist bloc in the State Duma to oust him from office on health grounds failed through lack of support and procedural errors. Yeltsin finally returned to full-time duties at the end of February.

However, failing health, economic crisis and the opposition from the traditional communists raised serious questions about the future of the country. On 31 December 1999, Yeltsin suddenly resigned his office and was replaced by Vladimir Putin, an ex-member of the KGB. Putin vowed to bring the breakaway state of Chechnya back under Russian authority, while adopting a more assertive role in international affairs.

Questions

1. Describe briefly the circumstances that led to the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union.
2. Examine critically the role of Mikhail Gorbachev in the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union.
3. Give an account of the failure of Mikhail Gorbachev in bringing about political and economic reforms in the Soviet Union.
4. Discuss the political developments in Russia following the collapse of communism.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Glasnost
 - (b) Perestroika
 - (c) Mikhail Gorbachev
 - (d) Boris Yeltsin



COLLAPSE OF COMMUNISM AND IT'S AFTERMATH IN CENTRAL AND EASTER EUROPE (1989-2000).

Objectives:

1. To analyze the factors that led to the collapse o Communism in Central and Eastern Europe.
2. To study the impact of the policies of Gorbachev on Central and Eastern Europe.
3. To understand the political developments in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe following the collapse of Communism.

Introduction: Stalin's post-war order had imposed communist regimes throughout Central and Eastern Europe. The process of Sovietization seemed so complete that few people believed that the new order could be undone. But discontent with their Soviet style regimes always simmered beneath the surface of these satellite states, and after Mikhail Gorbachev made it clear that his government would not intervene militarily, their communist regimes fell quickly in revolutions of 1989. In the short period from August 1988 to December 1991 communism in Eastern Europe was swept away. Poland was the first to reject communism, closely followed by Hungary and East Germany and the rest. The chief reasons, which ultimately led to the collapse of communism in Central and Eastern Europe, were the economic failure and the policies of Gorbachev.

15.1. Factors that led to the Collapse of Communism in Central and Eastern Europe

15.1.1. Economic Failure:

Communism miserably failed to improve the economic condition in Eastern Europe. It could not produce the standard of living, which should have been possible, as vast resources available in Eastern European countries. The economic systems were inefficient, over-centralized and subject to too many restrictions. All the states, for example, were expected to do most of their trading within the communist bloc. By the mid-1980's there were problems everywhere. According to Misha Glenny, a BBC correspondent in Eastern Europe, the communist party leaderships refused to admit that the working class lived in more miserable

conditions, breathing in more polluted air and drinking more toxic water, than western working classes. The communist record on health, education, housing, and a range of other social services had been very poor. Increasing contact with the West in the 1980's showed people how backward the East was in comparison with the West, and suggested that their living standards were falling even further. It also showed that it must be their own leaders and the communist system, which were the cause of all their problems.

15.1.2. Policies of Gorbachev:

Gorbachev, who became leader of the Soviet Union in March 1985, started the process, which led to the collapse of communism not only in the Soviet Union but also in Central and Eastern Europe. He recognized the failings of the system and he admitted that it was 'an absurd situation' that the Soviet Union, the world's biggest producer of steel, fuel and energy, should be suffering shortages because of waste and inefficiency. He hoped to save communism by revitalizing and modernizing it. He introduced new policies of glasnost (openness) and perestroika (economic and social reform). Criticism of the system was encouraged in the drive for improvement, provided nobody criticized the communist party. He also helped to engineer the overthrow of the old-fashioned, hard-line communist leaders in Czechoslovakia, and he was probably involved in plotting the overthrow of the East German, Romanian and Bulgarian leaders. His hope was that more progressive leaders would increase the chances of saving communism in Russia's satellite states.

Unfortunately for Gorbachev, once the process of reform began, it proved impossible to control it. The most dangerous time for any repressive regime is when it begins to try to reform itself by making concessions. The radicals went on demanding additional reforms. In the Soviet Union, criticism inevitably turned against the communist party itself and demanded more radical reforms. Public opinion even turned against Gorbachev because many people felt he was not moving fast enough.

15.1.3. Demand for Reforms:

Taking example of the reforms that were sweeping across the Soviet Union, the people of the Central and Eastern Europe demanded similar reforms in their own countries. The communist leaderships found it difficult to adapt to the new situation of having a leader in Moscow who was more progressive than they were. The critics of the communist system became more daring as they realized that Gorbachev would not send soviet troops in to suppress their movement for reform as had been done earlier in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. With no help to be expected from Moscow, when it came to the crisis, none of the communist governments was prepared to use sufficient force

against the demonstrators, except in Romania. When they came, the rebellions were too widespread, and it would have needed a huge commitment of tanks and troops to hold down the whole of Central and Eastern Europe simultaneously. Having only just succeeded in withdrawing from Afghanistan, Gorbachev had no desire for an even greater involvement. In the end it was a triumph of 'people power': demonstrators deliberately defied the threat of violence in such huge numbers that troops would have had to shoot a large proportion of the population in the big cities to keep control.

15.2. Collapse of Communism in Individual Countries

15.2.1. Poland

15.2.1.a. Lech Walesa and the Solidarity Movement:

The challenge to the communist regime came first from Poland. Under Wladyslaw Gomulka, Poland had achieved certain stability in the 1960's. However, economic problems led to his ouster in 1971. His successor, Edward Gierek attempted to solve Poland's economic problems by borrowing heavily from the West. In 1980, Gierek announced huge increases in food prices in an effort to pay off part of the Western debt. Living standards deteriorated, and hundreds of thousands of Polish workers responded to a large food price rise by going on strike in the summer of 1980. In August the country was paralyzed when workers in Gdansk and other Baltic ports conducted sit-in strikes in their shipyards for three weeks and started making political demands. At the end of the month, the Communist authorities were forced into making unprecedented concessions. These included the right to strike, wage increases, the release of political prisoners, and the curtailment of censorship. The recognition of the right to organize independent trade unions led to the formation in mid-September of the Solidarity federation. Solidarity represented ten million of Poland's thirty-five million people. Almost instantly, Solidarity became a tremendous force for change and a threat to the government's monopoly of power. Under the leadership of an electrician, Lech Walesa, and with the full support of the Polish Catholic Church, workers and many intellectuals, Solidarity quickly became a political force sufficiently powerful to win a series of concessions. The sick and discredited Gierek stepped down as Communist Party leader in favour of Stanislaw Kania.

15.2.1.b. Tussle Between Solidarity and the Communist Party:

The standoff between Solidarity and the Communist Party took place in a period of increased economic decline and social discontent, causing a growing number of dangerous confrontations. Partly because of Soviet pressure, the government was unable or unwilling to carry out the necessary reforms. In February 1981, General Wojciech Jaruzelski was made Premier, and in October was made Party Chief. To control the situation, he used the radical

demands of the Solidarity movement as a pretext for imposing martial law in mid-December. He banned Solidarity, arrested thousands of activists and imprisoned nearly all its leaders, including Walesa.

15.2.1.c. Crackdown on Solidarity:

This Moscow-supported crackdown effectively quelled the Solidarity movement for the time being. All industrial and political opposition was banned and suppressed. Communist Party reformers were also disciplined. The authorities retained many of the expanded emergency powers even after the lifting of martial law in 1983. Solidarity lost its mass base but survived as an underground opposition movement with sufficient popular support to force gradual concessions from the regime. It was backed by the ever more powerful Roman Catholic Church, which had been strengthened by papal visits in 1983 and 1987. The Jaruzelski regime gradually loosened its grip on power and attempted to introduce economic reforms. These failed to gain sufficient social support and were never completed. The political and economic stalemate in 1980's Poland was broken by the glasnost and perestroika of Mikhail Gorbachev. The changed atmosphere in the Soviet Union made reforms possible in Poland.

15.2.1.d. Recognition of Solidarity as Political Party:

In 1988 when Jaruzelski tried to economize by cutting government subsidies, protest strikes broke out because the changes led to an increase in food prices. This time Jaruzelski decided not to risk using force. He was aware that there would be no backing from Moscow, and realized that he needed opposition support to deal with the economic crisis. Talks opened in February 1989 between the communist government, and Solidarity and other opposition groups. By April 1989 drastic changes were introduced in the Polish constitution. Accordingly, Solidarity was recognized as a political party; there were to be two houses of parliament, a lower house (Sejm) and a senate; in the lower house, 65 per cent of the seats had to be reserved to the communists; the senate was to be freely elected; the two houses voting together would elect a President, who would then choose a Prime Minister.

15.2.1.e. Poland After the Collapse of Communism:

In the elections of June 1989 Solidarity won 92 out of the 100 seats in the senate and 160 out of the 161 seats which they could fight in the lower house (Sejm). A compromise deal was worked out when it came to forming a government. Jaruzelski was elected as the President. He chose a Tadeusz Mazowiecki, a leading member of Solidarity, as prime minister. He became the first non-Communist prime minister since the Second World War. Mazowiecki chose a mixed government of communists and Solidarity supporters. The communist monopoly of power in Poland

had come to an end after forty-five years. The new government began to end Communist controls. Also in 1989, the Polish government began a programme to sell government-owned industries to private owners. This programme progressed through the 1990's.

In 1990, Poland's Communist Party was dissolved. In June 1990, Solidarity split into two opposing groups. One group supported Mazowiecki; the other supported Walesa. In the presidential elections held in November 1990, Walesa won the election and became Poland's new president. After the election, Walesa resigned as head of Solidarity.

The new government had to bear the burden of huge debts incurred in the 1970's and 1980's to the Paris Club of Western lenders and private bankers. The United States followed by Britain and France, wrote off two-thirds of its debts as a contribution to, and reward for, democracy. The European Council concluded a helpful association agreement, and the IMF provided funds in return for drastic reductions in government expenditure. In 1990's economy grew at about six per cent a year, unemployment fell, foreign investment was encouraging, hyperinflation was reduced. However, these improvements came too late and too little to save Walesa. He and the parliament were at odds over remedies and over distribution of power. Walesa, having played the central role in getting rid of communist rule in Poland, found it difficult to adapt to parliamentary democracy. Political parties proliferated manifesting pluralism in Polish polity. In the parliamentary elections that were held in October 1991 the Democratic Union, formed out of Mazowiecki's branch of Solidarity, won most seats in the lower house and the Senate, and the ex-communist Democratic Left Alliance (SLD) was in second position. Walesa failed to get himself made prime minister as well as president.

Presidential elections in 1995 were narrowed down to a contest between Walesa and the SLD's Alexander Kwasniewski, young, intelligent but a former communist who had held office in Poland's last communist government. During the campaign Walesa recovered much of his lost popularity. However, in spite of aggressive support from the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which focused on past ideological battles than current economic problems, he was narrowly defeated by his former prime ministerial nominee, Aleksander Kwasniewski, who was better organized and more forward-looking.

It was announced in June that the Gdansk shipyard, cradle of the pro-democracy movement Solidarity, would not be saved from bankruptcy, which prompted angry reaction from shipyard workers. In early March 1997 the announcement of the closure of

the Gdansk shipyard resulted in demonstrations in Warsaw and Gdansk, which prompted the government to propose a rescue plan. Pope John Paul II made an 11-day visit to Poland in late May, during which he spoke on NATO and EU membership, and the controversial law on abortion.

In December 1997, a protocol was signed scheduling Poland's accession to NATO. A concordat with the Vatican was approved by the parliament in January 1998 and included provision for the legalization of Church marriages. In September 1998, the Polish parliament enacted a Legislation, which abolished the death penalty, and introduced life imprisonment.

The biggest expansion in the 50-year history of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) took place in March 1999, when Poland with two other former Warsaw pact countries, the Czech Republic and Hungary, joined the Western defense alliance. In November 1999 a United Nations report praised Poland's economic growth since the fall of communism, but warned that a lack of investment in the countryside could lead to social instability. The report by the International Labour Organization maintained that most of the growth had been concentrated in urban areas leaving the countryside with high unemployment and predicted that further investment would be hampered if the government enacted its controversial plans to reform the tax system. Despite such promising economic indicators, the latter half of the year had seen much industrial unrest over the government's implementation of health, education, and pension reform, and widespread protests by farmers against government's agriculture policy of grain procurement and low prices.

The growing unrest among farmers and other workers in the agricultural sector was reflected, in January 2000, in the formation of a radical National Peasant bloc, an alliance of three political groupings strongly opposed to EU-influenced reforms and policies. Agricultural protests, as well as strikes in health care and education sectors, continued throughout 2000.

15.2.2.Hungary

15.2.2.a. Economic Reforms:

Once the Poles had thrown off communism without interference from the Soviet Union, it was only a matter of time before the rest of Eastern Europe tried to follow the example of Poland. The process of liberation from communist rule had begun before 1989. Remaining in power for more than thirty years, the government of Janos Kadar tried to keep up with the changing mood by enacting the most far-reaching economic reforms in Eastern Europe. In the early 1980's, he legalized small private

enterprises, such as shops, restaurants, and artisan shops. His economic reforms were called 'Communism with a capitalist facelift'. Hungary moved slowly away from its strict adherence to Soviet dominance and even established fairly friendly relations with the West. Multi-candidate elections with at least two candidates per seat were held for the first time in June 1985.

An economic downturn in the mid-1980's led to the imposition of an austerity programme, a mass demonstration for freedom of speech, and civil reforms. By 1987 there was conflict in the communist party between those who wanted more reforms and those who wanted a return to strict central control. In May 1988 Kadar was ousted from power and the progressives took control of the government.

15.2.2.b. End of Communism in Hungary:

The new general secretary, Károly Grósz, had been prime minister since June 1987. In that post he had initiated a tough economic programme that included levying new taxes, cutting subsidies, and encouraging the small private sector. As further signs of liberalization, the government relaxed censorship laws, allowed the formation of independent political groups, and legalized the right to strike and to demonstrate. In 1989 the leadership provided a hero's burial for Imre Nagy, eased restrictions on emigration, revised the constitution to provide for a democratic multi-party system, and changed the country's name from the People's Republic of Hungary to the Republic of Hungary. In March and April 1990 a coalition of center-right parties won a parliamentary majority in the nation's first free legislative elections in forty-five years. After a referendum providing for direct presidential elections failed because of a low turnout, the National Assembly chose a writer, Árpád Göncz, as head of state.

15.2.2.c. Post-Communist Hungary:

In 1990 Hungary became the first Central European nation in the Eastern bloc to join the Council of Europe, and in 1991 and 1992 the government signed declarations of cooperation with Poland, the Czech and Slovak republics, Russia, and Ukraine. A Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation with Slovakia was ratified in June. In parliamentary elections in May, the Hungarian Socialist Party regained a majority of 72 per cent of parliamentary seats. The new government introduced stringent budget cuts in an attempt to reduce its foreign debt. A further austerity package was introduced in March 1995, and a law aimed at revitalizing the stalled privatization programme was introduced in May. A bill was passed in November to abolish exchange control regulations, which had been in place for over 60 years, and thus make the forint fully convertible. In the largest privatization programme seen thus far in a former Communist state, foreign consortia took majority holdings

in the telecommunications and gas distribution companies, and minority holdings in the electricity, and the oil- and gas-producing industries.

In July 1996 Hungary became the first country in Eastern Europe to acknowledge its role in the Holocaust, when the establishment of a fund to administer confiscated property and compensate survivors was announced. When the proposal of Hungary joining the NATO was placed before the national referendum, more than 85 per cent of the people voted in favour of the proposition. In March 1999, Hungary joined the NATO in the biggest expansion of the organization's 50-year history. Hungary's participation in NATO was almost immediate: within a month of joining NATO its airspace was being used by alliance planes taking part in air strikes against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. In March 1998 Hungary was one of the ten applicant nations to the EU to benefit from the £1.8 billion-per-annum pool of grants made available to help them prepare for entry early next century.

15.2.3. East Germany

In East Germany, Erich Honecker, who had been communist leader since 1971, refused all reform and intended to stand firm, along with Czechoslovakia, Romania and the rest, to continue the communist regime. However, certain events shook the power of Honecker.

15.2.3.a. Gorbachev's Visit to West Germany:

In a desperate attempt to get financial help for the Soviet Union, Gorbachev paid a visit to West Germany in June 1989 and met Chancellor Kohl in Bonn. He promised to help bring an end to the divided Europe, in return for German economic aid. In effect he was secretly promising freedom for East Germany.

15.2.3.b. Flight of the East Germans to the West:

During August and September 1989 thousands of East Germans began to escape to the west via Poland, Czechoslovakia and Hungary, when Hungary opened its frontier with Austria. East Germans on holiday in Hungary found that they had an open road through Austria to West Germany, where they had automatic rights of access and citizenship. As many as 5,000 East Germans a day escaped from East Germany. This exodus went on increasing.

15.2.3.c. Anti-Government Movement:

There were huge anti-government movements in various parts of East Germany. The Protestant Church in East Germany became the focus of an opposition party called New Forum, which

campaigned to bring an end to the repressive and atheistic communist regime. In October 1989 there was a wave of demonstrations all over East Germany demanding freedom and an end to communism.

At the beginning of the year Honecker's inclination had been to hold on to power, if necessary by force. He wanted to order the army to open fire on the demonstrators, but other leading communists were not prepared to cause widespread bloodshed. As the political crisis mounted in 1989, Honecker was forced out of the presidency in October 1989 and Egon Krenz became President and leader of the Socialist Unity Party. The Berlin Wall, which separated the city into communist controlled East Berlin and non-communist West Berlin was demolished on 9 November 1989. The dismantling of the Berlin Wall by its people precipitated the reunification of Germany. Kohl and Gorbachev controlled the consequences.

15.2.3.d. Attempts towards the Unification of Germany:

When the great powers began to drop hints that they would not stand in the way of a reunited Germany, the West German political parties moved into the East. Chancellor Kohl staged an election tour, and the East German version of his party (CDU) won an overwhelming victory in March 1990 to the Peoples Chamber. This transitional body was given the responsibility for working out the constitutional arrangements under which the GDR (East Germany) would merge with the FRG (West Germany). The Soviet Union and the United States agreed that reunification of Germany could take place. Gorbachev promised that all Russian troops would be withdrawn from East Germany by 1994. France and Britain, who were not quite happy about German reunification could not oppose the same and felt bound to go along with the flow. Germany was formally reunited at midnight on 3 October 1990.

15.2.3.e. The Unified Germany:

While reunification brought together long-separated families and friends, it also brought numerous economic and social problems to Germany, including housing shortages, strikes and demonstrations, unemployment, and increases in crime and right-wing violence against foreigners. Budget deficits caused by unification and worsened by a recession led to increased taxes, reduced government subsidies and increased privatization, and cuts in social services. While increasing the market for consumer products, reunification significantly affected the strength and competitiveness of the German economy. There was huge gap between the two Germanys in standards of living, industrial performance, and infrastructure. Many East Germans felt patronized and overwhelmed by the west, and complained of second-class treatment. Many West Germans believed they were sacrificing their standard of living to support East Germans.

One of the greatest problems that Germany faced after reunification was that of xenophobia and attacks on foreigners. Since the end of the Second World War, West Germany tried to meet the problem of shortage of labour by permitting immigrants known as 'guest workers'. These 'guest workers', many from Turkey, worked full-time and brought or raised families in West Germany. However, they were not allowed to become citizens. By the 1990s, Germany had nearly 2 million guest workers. To this number was added asylum seekers from a number of countries, especially from the former Yugoslavia. The right-wing Germans who felt that the foreigners took their jobs away began to organize attacks on them. In 1992, about 2,300 attacks on foreigners were reported; in 1993, the figure was about 1,300. In that year eight died from right-wing extremist violence. Attacks on Jews declined, but attacks on homeless and disabled people more than doubled, from 145 to 324. Mass demonstrations protested against the violence, and the government increased its activities against neo-Nazi groups. In May 1993, the German parliament approved limitations on asylum for foreigners in Germany.

In September 1993, Germany renewed its bid for a permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations (UN). In the same year German voters ratified the country's membership of the European Union (EU). The Federal Constitutional Court ruled in July that German armed forces could serve with the UN or other international missions outside the NATO area, subject to parliamentary approval. This ruling of the Federal Constitutional Court freed Germany to send its forces outside Western Europe for the first time since 1945. As part of Germany's new policy of undertaking external peacekeeping commitments, the Bundestag voted in December to send a 4,000-strong peacekeeping force to Bosnia and Herzegovina. In August 1994 the last Russian troops left Berlin, followed in September by the last British, French, and American troops.

In the October 1994 general elections, Helmut Kohl's ruling coalition was returned to office for a fourth time with a reduced majority. Despite recovery from recession, continuing economic problems were highlighted in January 1996 when unemployment reached a post-war high of 10.8 per cent. The government responded with new industrial initiatives, talks with trade unions, and some trimming of the social security system.

In the September 1998 general elections, Helmut Kohl lost power to Gerhard Schröder and the SPD, marking the end of sixteen years of conservative government under Kohl. In October Schröder agreed a coalition with the Green Party and introduced a legislative programme including reform of German citizenship laws and measures against unemployment. In March 1999 Oskar

Lafontaine, finance minister in the new government and SPD leader, stepped down suddenly over policy disagreements with Schröder. This was seen as strengthening the Chancellor and moving his government away from Lafontaine's traditional left-wing loyalties. In March, Germany joined the rest of NATO in military action against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia over the Yugoslav government's actions in Kosovo.

15.2.4. Czechoslovakia

15.2.4.a. Charter 77:

Communist regimes in Poland and Hungary had attempted to make some political and economic reforms in the 1970's and 1980's. However, this was not the case in Czechoslovakia. After Soviet troops crushed the reform movement in 1968, hard-line Czech communists under Gustav Husak purged the party and followed a policy of massive repression to maintain their power. Only writers and other intellectuals provided any real opposition to the government. In January 1977, these dissident intellectuals formed Charter 77 as a vehicle for protest against violations of human rights. By the 1980's, Charter 77 members were also presenting their views on the country's economic and political problems. In spite of the government's harsh response to their movement.

Czechoslovakia had one of the most successful economies of Eastern Europe. She traded extensively with the west and her industry and commerce remained buoyant throughout the 1970's. But during the early 1980's the economy ran into trouble, mainly because there had been very little attempt to modernize industry. Husak, who had been in power since 1968, resigned as the general secretary of the communist party in 1987, but continued as the president. Milos Jakes, who did not have reputation as a reformer, succeeded him in the party post.

15.2.4.b. The Velvet Revolution:

Regardless of the atmosphere of repression, dissident movements continued to grow in the late 1980's. Government attempts to suppress mass demonstrations in Prague and other Czechoslovakian cities in 1988 and 1989 only led to more and larger demonstrations. In what became known as the Velvet Revolution in November 1989 there was a huge demonstration in Prague at which many people were injured by police brutality. Charter 77, now led by the famous playwright, Vaclav Havel, organized further opposition, and after Alexander Dubcek had spoken at a public rally for the first time since 1968, a national strike was declared. As the pace of political change quickened in the Soviet Union and elsewhere in Eastern Europe, Jakeš was unable to hold back the tide of reform.

15.2.4.c. End of Communism:

As the situation was out of control, the Czechoslovakia Federal Assembly voted to delete the constitutional articles giving the communists the leading role in politics. In December 1989, as demonstrations continued, the communist government, lacking any real support, collapsed. In November 1989 Jakes and other communist party leaders stepped down, and the government began negotiating with an opposition group, Civic Forum, led by Václav Havel. President Husak resigned at the end of December 1989 and a new government took office with a Slovak, Marian Calfa, as prime minister. Dubcek was elected chairman of the Federal Assembly, which then chose Havel as president of Czechoslovakia. In the nation's first free elections since 1946, voters in June 1990 gave Civic Forum and its allies large majorities in both houses of parliament. Havel was then re-elected to a two-year term, and he asked Calfa, a former communist, to head a coalition government.

In January 1990, Havel declared amnesty for nearly 30,000 political prisoners. He also set out on a goodwill tour to various Western countries in which he proved to be an eloquent spokesperson for Czech democracy and a new order in Europe.

The shift to non-communist rule, however, was complicated by old problems, especially ethnic issues. Czechs and Slovaks disagreed over the making of the new state but were able to agree on a peaceful division of the country. On 1 January 1993, Czechoslovakia was split into the Czech Republic and Slovakia.

15.2.5. Romania**15.2.5.a. Repressive Regime of Ceausescu:**

In Romania the communist regime of Nicolae Ceausescu, who was the leader since 1965, was one of the most brutal and repressive anywhere in the world. Ceausescu had used the Romanian Communist Party as a base for establishing a family tyranny of intense malignity, supported by a private army, a ruthless secret police, the Securitate, and driving megalomania. Like Stalin, whom he admired, Ceausescu was obsessed with getting things done at great human cost. He aimed to modernize and aggrandize Romania by the force. It was not based on communist doctrine, but on his own authority and personality. Both at home and abroad he won for a time a measure of approval through anti-Russian policies and gestures, including his refusal to co-operate in the Warsaw Pact or allow foreign troops on Romanian soil. He was rewarded with lavish praise from, among others, George Bush, the US President and with a British knighthood.

15.2.5.b. Revolution against Ceausescu:

During the rapid collapse of communism in Eastern Europe in 1989, Ceausescu brutally suppressed anti-government demonstration. Serious riots were first recorded from Brasov in 1987. The revolution against Ceausescu's regime began in Timisoara, a town in Transylvania at the end of 1989, with a demonstration in to protest the persecution of a fearlessly outspoken Protestant cleric, Laszlo Tokes. This spark lit a fire, which Ceausescu, returning from a visit to Tehran, was unable to quench. The demonstration was brutally put down by the Securitate and many people were killed on 17 December 1989. This caused outrage throughout the country, and when, four days later Ceausescu and his wife, Elena appeared on the balcony of Communist Party Headquarters in Bucharest to address a massed rally, they were greeted with boos and shout of 'murderers of Timisoara'. TV coverage was abruptly halted and Ceausescu abandoned his speech. It seemed as though the entire population of Bucharest now streamed out on to the streets. At first the army fired on the crowds and many were killed and wounded. The following day the crowds came out again. However, the army refused to continue the killing, and the Ceausescus had lost control. They were arrested, tried by a military tribunal and shot dead on 25 December 1989.

15.2.5.d. The National Salvation Front:

The hated Ceausescus had gone, but many elements of communism remained in Romania. The country had never had democratic government and opposition had been so ruthlessly crushed that there was no equivalent of the Polish Solidarity and Czech Charter 77. An interim ruling body, the Council of National Salvation, led by Ion Iliescu, revoked a number of Ceausescu's repressive policies and imprisoned some of the leaders of his regime. In May 1990 the National Salvation Front, consisting mostly of former communists, won multi-party elections for parliament and the presidency, and Iliescu became Romania's president. In June thousands of miners were brought to Bucharest to suppress anti-government demonstrations with a brutality that shocked the world. An economic austerity programme was introduced in October and a new constitution took effect at the end of 1991.

15.2.5.e. Demonstrations in Bucharest:

President Iliescu won re-election in October 1992, and in November a new government was formed by independents and members of the Democratic National Salvation Front (DNSF), one of two parties formed by the split of the NSF. In February 1993 thousands of people demonstrated in Bucharest against inflation, unemployment, and low wages. Labour unrest continued throughout the spring after the government-removed subsidies for goods and services, and public sector and steel workers demanded

higher wages. In February 1994 as many as two million workers staged a general strike protesting at the lack of economic reform. A motion of impeachment of President Iliescu was rejected in July 1994.

15.2.5.f. Ethnic Cleansing of the Gypsies:

Romania experienced significant ethnic turmoil in the early 1990's. Violent attacks in 1991 on the indigenous Gypsy population resulted in an exodus of the latter to Germany, Austria, and the Czech Republic. Most were returned by the host countries to Romania, but the problem of illegal Romanian immigrants, many of them young and unskilled, continues to cause friction and hostility with Romania's neighbours. Relations with Hungary continue to be strained because of clashes in Transylvania between ethnic Hungarians and Romanian nationalists. Under pressure from Western aid-giving organizations, Romania began to grant some educational, political, and linguistic rights to the ethnic Germans and Hungarians within its borders.

In foreign affairs, Romania signed a treaty of cooperation with Germany in 1992; strengthened relations with France, Israel, Greece, Turkey, Moldova, and the Vatican; signed a cooperative defense agreement with Bulgaria; and signed an association agreement with the European Community. In June 1993 Romania received a formal invitation for EU membership and began candidacy negotiations.

15.2.5.g. Membership of the NATO:

Romania emerged as a strong candidate for inclusion in expansion of the NATO after Russia gave its official approval to expansion in May 1997. In April 1999 the Romanian parliament overwhelmingly voted to give NATO unlimited use of the country's airspace to pursue its campaign against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the Kosovo crisis. President Constantinescu made an appeal to the deputies that they must grant the request if Romania were to join NATO and the EU in the near future.

15.2.5.h. Deterioration of Economy:

The summer of 1999 saw continuing industrial unrest and strikes against government austerity measures and the worsening economic situation. By December 1999 the economic crisis had put a million people out of work and caused widespread poverty. There was growing support for the former communists. On the final day of the EU summit in Helsinki, Finland, in December, Romania was among seven countries invited to become a candidate for membership, although the EU made it clear that Romania had to increase its rate of reform. However, continuing low incomes and high inflation led to series of strikes in the new year, most notably by railway workers in December 1999 and January 2000.

15.2.6. Bulgaria

15.2.6.a. Transformation of the Bulgarian Communist Party:

In Bulgaria the communist leader Todor Zhivkov had risen through the ranks from first secretary in 1954, to prime minister in 1962, and president in 1971. He had stubbornly refused all reforms, even when pressurized by Gorbachev. Zhivkov tried to strengthen his position by dismissing his deputy in 1983, and embarked on an ill-calculated campaign against Bulgaria's Turkish and Pomak minorities, who numbered about one million. The final blow to the Zhivkov regime was delivered by a conference of environmentalists in Sofia, which was turned into demands for glasnost. These were met by police brutality.

The progressive communists decided to get rid of Zhivkov. The Politburo voted to remove him in December 1989. Under his successor, Peter Mladenov, the Bulgarian Communist Party changed its name to Bulgarian Socialist Party. It renounced its political monopoly and began negotiations with other parties, the Agrarian People's Party and the Union of Democratic Forces, the latter as an assemblage of anti-communist groups, to form a transitional government. In the elections held in June 1990 the Bulgarian Socialist Party, won a comfortable victory over the main opposition party, the Union of Democratic Forces, probably because their propaganda machine told people that the introduction of capitalism would bring economic disaster.

15.2.6.b. Restructuring of the Economy:

Bulgaria began to restructure its economy and enacted a plan to return land seized by the Communist Party to the original owners. The parliament also passed laws allowing foreign investment. However, with the collapse of COMECON, the trade association of the former Soviet Union, Bulgaria lost many of its traditional markets and its economy suffered. Since then, Bulgaria has lagged behind the rest of Eastern Europe in economic reform because of a series of weak governments. The old Communist elite often ran private businesses. In 1995 unemployment stood at 20 per cent, and inflation topped 120 per cent. A general election held in December 1994 gave the Bulgarian Socialist Party (BSP) an outright parliamentary majority, under the leadership of 35-year-old Zhan Videnov.

15.2.6.c. NATO Membership:

In November 1999 Bulgaria announced the closure of four Soviet-built nuclear reactors in return for talks on European Union (EU) membership. In the same month, US president Bill Clinton, on a trip to Sofia to mark the tenth anniversary of the end of

Communism, encouraged Bulgaria's bid for NATO membership in return for the country's support for NATO's 1999 air attacks against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the Kosovo crisis.

On the final day of the EU summit in Helsinki, Finland, in December, Bulgaria was among seven countries invited to become a candidate for membership. The President of the European Commission, Romano Prodi, told Bulgaria that the EU would support the country's bid to join the organization by offering increased financial aid to the value of nearly US\$2 billion over six years.

15.2.6. Albania

Albania had been communist since 1945 when the communist resistance movement seized power and set up a republic. Thus, as with Yugoslavia, the Russians were not responsible for the introduction of communism in Albania. Since 1946 until his death in 1985 the leader had been Enver Hoxha, who was a great admirer of Stalin and copied his system faithfully. Following Hoxha's death in April 1985, Alia assumed leadership of the Communist Party.

Albania responded to the wave of democratization that swept across Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980's by cautiously easing restrictions on religion and foreign travel, legalizing opposition political parties, and broadening contacts with the West. Diplomatic relations with the United States were resumed in March 1991 after a 51-year break. After winning Albania's first free multi-party parliamentary elections, the Communists enacted a new interim charter creating the post of President of the Republic, to which the People's Assembly then elected Alia. The Communist Party, which in June changed its name to the Albanian Socialist Party, clung to power throughout 1991 but was defeated in parliamentary elections in March 1992. In April Alia resigned, and parliament elected Sali Berisha as Albania's first non-Communist president since the Second World War. In May 1992 Albania signed a ten-year cooperation agreement with the European Community. In June agreed to establish a Black Sea economic zone with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Greece, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine. The Albanian Communist Party was outlawed. Albania continued to be affected by instability in the former Yugoslavia, in 1993, when ethnic Albanians experienced difficulties in Kosovo, Macedonia, and Greece. Albania joined NATO's Partnership for Peace programme in April 1994.

15.2.7. Yugoslavia

15.2.7.a. Yugoslavia- a Mixture of Many Nationalities:

Yugoslavia was formed after the First World War, and consisted of pre-First World War state of Serbia, in addition to the territory gained by Serbia from Turkey in 1913, containing many Muslims, and territory taken from the defeated Habsburg Empire. It included people of many different nationalities, and the state was organized on federal lines. It consisted of six republics – Serbia, Croatia, Montenegro, Slovenia, Bosnia-Herzegovina and Macedonia. There were also autonomous provinces, Vojvodina and Kosovo, which were associated with Serbia.

15.2.7.b. Tito's Attempt to Keep Yugoslavia Integrated:

Under communism and the leadership of Tito, the nationalist feelings of different peoples were kept strictly under control, and people were encouraged to think of themselves primarily as Yugoslavs rather than as Serbs or Croats. Tito, half Croat and half Slovene, was determined to preserve the Yugoslav state which had emerged from the destruction of the Habsburg and Ottoman empires in the First World War. The different nationalities lived peacefully together, and had apparently succeeded in putting behind them memories of the atrocities committed during the Second World War. Tito had served as a cohesive force for the Yugoslav federation. In the 1970's, Tito had become concerned that decentralization had gone too far in creating too much power at the local level and encouraging regionalism. As a result, he purged thousands of local Communist leaders who seemed more involved with local affairs than national concerns.

Tito, who died in 1980, had left careful plans for the country to be ruled by a collective presidency after his death. This would consist of one representative from each of the six republics and one from each of the two autonomous provinces. A different president of this council would be elected each year.

15.2.7.c. Ethnic Conflict:

Although the collective leadership seemed to work well at first, in the mid-1980's things began to go out of control. The economy was in trouble with rising inflation and mounting unemployment. At the end of the 1980's, Yugoslavia was caught up in the reform movements sweeping through East Europe. The weakness of the economy and of government leadership stimulated the growth of ethnic conflict, as separatist movements in the individual republics and provinces threatened the viability of the nation. In the 1980's, tensions ran high in the southern Serbian province of Kosovo, which had become autonomous in 1968 after rioting to protest Serbian control. Seeking more independence and calling for a separate republic, the majority population of ethnic

Albanians clashed with Serbians and Montenegrins throughout the decade; efforts by the Serbian government to impose its authority over Kosovo contributed to strain relations between Yugoslavia and Albania. Towards the end of the 1980's, Serbia reasserted its control over Kosovo and the autonomous province of Vojvodina, ending their autonomy.

15.2.7.d. Demand for the Creation of Pluralistic Political System:

In January 1990, the League of Communists of Yugoslavia (LCY) called for an end to authoritarian socialism and proposed the creation of a pluralistic political system with freedom of speech and other civil liberties, free elections, independent judiciary, and a mixed economy with equal status for private property. But division between Slovenes, who wanted a loose federation, and Serbians, who wanted to retain the centralized system, caused the collapse of party congress, and hence the Communist Party. New parties quickly emerged. In multiparty elections held in the republics of Slovenia and Croatia in April and May of 1990, the first multiparty elections in Yugoslavia in fifty-one years, the Communists fared poorly.

15.2.7.e. Separatist Movements:

The Yugoslav political scene was complicated by the development of separatist movements that brought the disintegration of Yugoslavia in the 1990's. When new non-communist parties won elections in the republics of Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, and Macedonia in 1990, they began to lobby for a new federal structure of Yugoslavia that would fulfill their separatist desires. Slobodan Milosevic, who had become the leader of the Serbian Communist Party in 1987 and had managed to stay in power by emphasizing his Serbian nationalism, rejected these efforts. He maintained that these republics could only be independent if new border arrangements were made to accommodate the Serb minorities in those republics who did not want to live outside the boundaries of a greater Serbian state. Serbs constituted 11.6 percent of Croatia's population and 32 percent of Bosnia-Herzegovina's population in 1981.

15.2.7.f. Break-up of Yugoslavia:

After negotiations among the six republics failed, Slovenia and Croatia declared their independence in June 1991. Milosevic's government sent the Yugoslavian army, which it controlled, into Slovenia, but without much success. In September 1991, it began a full assault against Croatia. Increasingly, the Yugoslavian army was the Serbian army, and Serbian irregular forces played an important role in military operations. Before a cease-fire was arranged, the Serbian forces had captured one-third of Croatia's territory in brutal and destructive fighting.

15.2.7.g. Ethnic Cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina:

The recognition of Slovenia, Croatia, and Bosnia-Herzegovina by many European states and the United States early in 1992 did not stop the Serbs from turning their guns on Bosnia-Herzegovina. By mid-1993, Serbian forces had acquired seventy per cent of Bosnian territory. The Serbian policy of 'ethnic cleansing', killing or forcibly removing Bosnian Muslims from their lands, revived memories of Nazi atrocities in the Second World War. Nevertheless, despite worldwide outrage, European governments failed to take a decisive and forceful stand against these Serbian activities, and by the spring of 1993, the Muslim population of Bosnia-Herzegovina was in desperate situation. As the fighting spread, European nations and the United States began to intervene to stop the bloodshed, and in the fall of 1995, a fragile cease-fire agreement was reached at a conference held in Dayton, Ohio. An international peacekeeping force was stationed in the area to maintain tranquility and monitor the accords. Implementation has been difficult, however, as ethnic antagonisms continued to flare, notably in Kosovo, a part of Serbia inhabited primarily by Albanians.

15.2.7.h. Massacre of Kosovo Albanians:

The reported massacres of Kosovo Albanians in January 1999 intensified international pressure for peace talks between the Yugoslav government and the separatists. The failure of negotiations held in Rambouillet, France, during February 1999 caused the Western powers to carry out their threat of air strikes against Yugoslavia. This led to a NATO-led operation that lasted for seventy-two days. Milošević responded by intensifying the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo, causing a huge refugee crisis as 800,000 Kosovo Albanians fled their homes. As a result, the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia in The Hague indicted in May accusing Milošević of war crimes and crimes against humanity.

The sustained build-up of troops on the Yugoslav border throughout the duration of the air campaign ultimately prompted Milošević to sign up to a peace plan in June brokered by Viktor Chernomyrdin. Terms of the agreement included the withdrawal of all Yugoslav military forces from Kosovo and the deployment of a 50,000-strong UN-led peacekeeping force to ensure the safe return of the Albanian refugees. Opposition protests against Milošević began to increase within Serbia. However, their failure to dislodge Milošević resulted in increasing splits between opposition parties. In February 2000 it was announced that NATO troops would remain in Bosnia and Kosovo as long as Milošević held on to power and UN economic sanctions were extended to increase the pressure on the regime.

In July 2000, Milošević, with a year of his term to run, changed the method of election for president from a vote in parliament to a nationwide ballot, and called an election for September. He was of the opinion that the much-divided opposition would not be able to mount an effective challenge. However, eighteen of the different opposition parties forged an alliance, the Democratic Opposition of Serbia, to nominate Vojislav Koštunica, a law professor and firm nationalist, as their candidate. Following the election Koštunica claimed victory, despite the official results claiming that he had failed to get the fifty per cent of the vote necessary to avoid a second ballot. Milošević refused to relinquish power, leading to a series of protests that culminated on 5 October 2000 with an uprising in Belgrade that finally forced him to admit defeat.

Questions

1. Give an account of the collapse of Communism in Poland and East Germany.
2. Trace the circumstances that led to the collapse of Communism in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.
3. Examine the political developments that led to the end of the Communist regimes in Rumania and Bulgaria.
4. Account for the disintegration of Yugoslavia.



USA AS A UNI-POLAR POWER (1989-2000)

Objectives:

1. To understand the post-Cold War developments in the world with special Reference to the emergence of the USA as a Uni-polar power.

Introduction:

The emergence of the United States as a uni-polar power can be traced to the end of the Cold War. The dissolution of the Soviet satellite system in Eastern Europe, combined with the disintegration of the Soviet Union itself, brought a dramatic end to the Cold War at the end of the 1980's. In fact, however, the thaw in relations between the two power blocs had begun with Gorbachev's accession to power in 1985. Gorbachev was willing to rethink many of the fundamental assumptions underlying Soviet foreign policy, and his 'new thinking' as it was called, opened the door to a series of stunning changes. For one, Gorbachev initiated a plan for arms limitation that led in 1987 to an agreement with the United States to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear weapons (the INF Treaty). Both sides had incentives to dampen the expensive arms race. Gorbachev hoped to make extensive economic and internal reforms, while the United States had serious deficit problems. During the Reagan years, the United States had moved from being a creditor nation to being the world's biggest debtor nation. By 1990, both countries were becoming aware that their large military budgets were making it difficult for them to solve their serious social problems.

16.1. End of the Cold War:

During 1989 and 1990, much of the reason for Cold War had disappeared as the mostly peaceful revolutionary upheaval swept through Eastern Europe. Gorbachev's policy of allowing greater autonomy for the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe meant that the Soviet Union would no longer militarily support Communist governments faced with internal revolt. The unwillingness of the Soviet regime to use force to maintain the status quo, as it had in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968, opened the door to the overthrow of the Communist regimes. The reunification of

Germany in October 1990 also destroyed one of the most prominent symbols of the Cold War era. The disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991 brought an end to the global rivalry between two competing superpowers.

16.2. The New World Order:

With the end of the Cold War, world leaders began to turn their attention to the construction of what the President of the United States, George Bush called the New World Order. The revolution in the Soviet Union effected by Gorbachev changed this situation by smothering the Cold War, inducing the superpowers to co-operate in international affairs instead of opposing one another as a matter of principle. Both Moscow and Washington hoped to initiate a new era of peace and mutual cooperation. During the first administration of President Bill Clinton, the United States sought to engage Russia as well as its own NATO allies in an effort to resolve the numerous conflicts that began to arise in various parts of the world in the early 1990's.

16.3. War Against Iraq:

The first test came with Iraq's invasion and annexation of Kuwait in 1990. This was a blatant act of aggression. It raised the question like on earlier occasions, including Argentina's occupation of the Falkland Islands and Iraq's attack on Iran ten years earlier. The question was whether counter-action would be taken through or outside the UN. President Bush decided to do both. He dispatched large armed forces to Saudi Arabia and he resorted to the UN to impose economic sanctions against Iraq. Both these undertakings were international. A number of states participated in both, but only the latter was action by the UN. The former was action initiated and led by the United States independently.

In a series of resolutions adopted during August 1990, the Security Council, unanimously, demanded Iraq's immediate withdrawal from Kuwait. It also imposed a commercial, financial and military embargo; declared unanimously, that the annexation of Kuwait was null and void, and authorized the use of force to make the embargo effective. These first resolutions established sanctions against Iraq and the use of force to monitor them, but not the use of force for any other purpose.

The governments of the United States and Britain maintained that, they were entitled under Article 51 of the UN Charter to use military force against Iraq. The United States established in Saudi Arabia a powerful force, which, while enforcing the economic sanctions, was capable of attacking Iraq, overthrowing the Iraqi regime and liberating Kuwait. This show of American strength and power was a unilateral act, which was given international support by securing the participation of a number of

countries in and beyond the Middle East. It was also an expression of lack of confidence in the efficacy of the mechanisms and procedures of the UN.

Saddam Hussein proclaimed repeatedly that he would not budge from Kuwait, although he expressed willingness to participate in a conference on Middle Eastern affairs with an agenda from which Kuwait would not be excluded. The United States and some of its associates refused to consider any matter before a total and unconditional Iraqi withdrawal. It was appropriate that the United States should play the leading part in the UN's undertakings. Bush conducted simultaneously an American operation, which overshadowed the UN undertaking. In the American operation he relied on force and the threat of force to the exclusion of diplomacy. The US President took the position in which he demanded unconditional observance of UN resolutions. The Kuwait crisis, the first serious crisis after the end of the Cold War projected the United States as a uni-polar power. Increasingly, the United States bypassed the UN in the use of military force.

In January 1991, the United States opened hostilities against Iraq without informing the secretary-general of the UN. As the war continued Iraq suffered heavy losses, and Baghdad was subjected to destruction greater than anything, which it had suffered for 700 years. Iraq countered with largely ineffective missiles aimed at Saudi Arabian and Israeli cities and devastating Kuwait City. Facing defeat Saddam Hussein attempted negotiations. However, Bush insisted on unconditional compliance with all pertinent UN resolutions, by inviting Iraqis to revolt against their government and by adding conditions of his own in order to maintain pressure for unconditional surrender. Attempts by the Soviet Union to broker an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait on acceptable conditions were rejected by the United States. The US led war against Iraq, known as 'Desert Storm' succeeded in liberating Kuwait from Iraq and its ruling dynast was restored. Saddam Hussein was humiliated.

Though Iraq was attacked and defeated because it had invaded Kuwait and had an intention of invading Saudi Arabia, the chief reason for the action of the United States in the Middle East was oil resources. The United States was unable to secure it by occupying or dominating the relevant areas in the manner of the Ottoman Empire or Anglo-French mandates system. The Kuwait war was fought to assert the rule of law forbidding one state to appropriate the territory or resources of another. The alternative to this outmoded imperialism was to secure national interests through international peace and stability and the operation of the market forces. When that order broke down, as it did upon Iraq's annexation of Kuwait, force had to be used. By its war against Iraq

the United States showed that it could and would fight for its interests. The display of American will and the display of immense technical competence was a major event in international affairs.

16.4. United States in the Lead:

In December 1992, President Bush, who was still in office, dispatched over 20,000 US military personnel to Somalia under UN auspices to maintain peace and aid in the distribution of famine relief. President-elect Clinton supported this move. However, when US soldiers came under attack from the various factions in the civil war, the US involvement became unpopular among Americans. The troops were withdrawn by March 1994, and the UN took control of the peacekeeping operation.

Both in the Middle East and the former Yugoslavia, the United States was instrumental in helping negotiate peace agreements. At the White House in September 1993, Clinton hosted the signing of a historic peace agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), with Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and PLO Chairman Yasir Arafat in attendance. He also oversaw the signing of an agreement between Israel and Jordan at the White House in July 1994. In addition, in November 1995 the United States led peace talks between the Bosnian Muslims, Serbs, and Croats in Dayton, Ohio, in hopes of resolving the Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian War. The talks led to a peace agreement signed by all parties. As part of the agreement, Clinton pledged to send American soldiers to Bosnia and Herzegovina to help the NATO in providing humanitarian aid and policing a zone between the factions.

In Asia, the United States renewed favoured trading status for the People's Republic of China in 1994, despite controversy over that country's human rights record. The same year, Clinton announced the end of a 19-year trade embargo against Vietnam; and in July 1995, more than 20 years after the end of the Vietnam War, the United States extended full diplomatic recognition to Vietnam.

In the Americas, the United States took initiative to provide assistance to both Haiti and Mexico. In September 1994 the United States was prepared to launch a military invasion of Haiti to restore to power Haiti's elected president, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, who had been ousted in a military coup in 1991. Military confrontation was averted at the last minute, largely due to the diplomatic efforts of former president Jimmy Carter, who negotiated Aristide's peaceful return. The United States also came to the support of Mexico when its currency (the peso) began to drop in value in early 1995, providing a \$20 billion loan package to help restore the Mexican economy.

In August 1998, terrorists bombed US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania and over 250 people were killed. The United States retaliated with simultaneous missile attacks on a terrorist base in Afghanistan and a chemical-weapons factory in Sudan, both of which were suspected of being involved in the bombings. Following notification in December 1998, that the Iraqis had ceased to cooperate with the UN Special Commission arms inspection team, forces from the United States and Britain began a three-day campaign of air strikes on Iraq.

In July 1999, Clinton imposed sanctions against the Taliban in Afghanistan. Clinton said the sanctions were intended to encourage the Taliban to end its relationship with Osama Bin Laden, a wealthy Saudi Arabian who allegedly commands a terrorist organization blamed for the 1998 bombings against the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.

The above instances manifest the predominant position assumed by the United States in world affairs following the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the end of the Cold War. As the Soviet Union broke up into independent republics, Russia took the backstage in world affairs when the United States got itself involved in various hotspots. The United States as a uni-polar power began to act as a 'policeman' of the world. Advanced economy, a sound democratic tradition, and military might have given the United States an edge to play a predominant role in world politics. Since recent years the adversary of the United States has not been any other nation, communist or otherwise, but the threat of Islamic terrorism manifested by the Al-qaida led by Osma bin Laden. The American might has been challenged by the terrorist activities, which in turn has led to American action in Afghanistan and Iraq in recent times.

Questions

1. How far the end of the Cold War enabled the USA to play a leading role in the world politics?
2. Trace the circumstances that led to the emergence of the USA as a uni-polar power in the world.
3. Examine the role of the USA in the Gulf War and the War Against Terrorism.



ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION IN ASIA (1962-2000) ECONOMIC MIRACLE IN JAPAN

Objectives:

1. To study the consequences of the Second World War on Japanese economy.
2. To understand Japan's economic recovery and her emergence as a world economic power.

Introduction:

The economic difficulties confronting Japan immediately after her surrender in the Second World War were enormous. Before the close of hostilities almost one-third of the homes in Japan's urban areas were destroyed by air attacks, and the direct economic loss caused by the war was staggering. Japan was shorn of its empire, industrial production had fallen 80 percent below the 1937 level, foreign trade stood at zero, and the country depended upon imports even for foodstuffs. Until 1952 she was occupied by allied troops, mostly Americans, under the command of General MacArthur. For the first three years the Americans aimed to make sure that Japan could never again start a war. She was forbidden to have armed forces and was given a democratic constitution under which ministers had to be members of the Diet (parliament). The Americans did not at this stage seem concerned to restore the Japanese economy. During 1948 the American attitude gradually changed. As the Cold War developed in Europe and the Kuomintang crumbled in China, they felt the need for a strong ally in Southeast Asia and began to encourage Japanese economic recovery. From 1950 industry recovered rapidly and by 1953 production had reached the 1937 levels. American occupying forces were withdrawn in April 1952 as per the provisions of the Treaty of San Francisco (1951), though some American troops remained for defense purpose.

17.1. Economic Progress in Japan:

Viewed against the above background, Japan's economic recovery and advance have been spectacular. By 1953 the index of production was 50 per cent above the level of the mid-1930's, and it continued upward, with textiles, metal goods, and machinery leading the way. During the 1950's economic productivity doubled. In the next decade it overtook that of England, France, and West

Germany to become the third largest in the world. By the mid-1990's Japan's gross national product was more than half that of the United States, and ranked as the second largest economy in the world. A remarkable aspect of this economic expansion was that Japan both competed successfully in long-established industries and also pioneered in new fields. It became the world's largest shipbuilder, exported steel, light and heavy machinery, and gained a commanding position in such areas as chemicals, synthetics, optics, electronics, and computer technology.

17.2. Adoption of Modern technology:

The Japanese were quick to adopt modern technology. The Japanese outpaced most Western nations in the development of mass transit facilities, especially railways, famous in recent years for their 'bullet trains'. By the 1980's they were exporting prefabricated houses, producing artificial seafood and computer-controlled sailing ships, and carrying on advanced research in biotechnology, robotics, and artificial intelligence. Contributing significantly to the country's strong economic position are its financial resources. The surplus capital accruing from industrial expansion and technological innovation has made Japan the world's largest creditor nation, with large investments in developed and developing countries.

17.3. Factors Responsible for Japan's Economic Recovery

17.3.1. Retention of Technical Proficiency:

Several factors explain Japan's miraculous rise from a condition of utter ruin and desolation to one of great prosperity. First, in spite of devastating losses in the Second World War, the Japanese retained their technical proficiency, labour force, and traditions of hard work. A determination to recover lost ground and to overtake and surpass the West became a national obsession, eliciting self-sacrifice and mitigating disputes between management and underpaid labour. Employees of large corporations served them with a loyalty like that of the old feudal samurai to his lord. Postwar Japan achieved an extremely high ratio of savings to earnings, in some years amounting to thirty per cent.

17.3.2. American Financial Aid:

A second factor helping to stimulate recovery was American financial aid, not only during the Occupation but also by the purchase of goods and services by the Americans during the Korean War (1950-53). The stimulating impact of the war boom was reflected dramatically in the Tokyo stock market.

17.3.3. Initiative of the Government:

A third factor was the initiative of the government in stimulating and guiding the growth of an essentially private-enterprise

economy. The government encouraged capital investment by incentive tax and loan policies, operated an Economic Planning Agency to compile data and predict market trends, and through a Ministry of International Trade and Industry took the lead in directing industrial development.

17.3.4. Elimination of the Japanese Military Establishment:

Japanese economic policy successfully combines governmental guidance with private ownership and initiative. Paradoxically the defeat and elimination of Japan's military establishment, which had systematically drained the country's resources was helpful in Japan's economic recovery and growth. During a crucial period Japan enjoyed the distinction of being the only great industrial nation operating on a peace economy instead of a war economy.

17.4. Emergence of Japan as an 'Economic Superpower':

From 1956 onwards Japan enjoyed economic success. She had performed an 'economic miracle' and was hailed in the 1960's as an 'economic superpower'. This newfound prosperity brought with it unmistakable marks of international recognition. Japan was admitted to the United Nations in 1956 and to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) in 1963. The Olympic Games were held in Tokyo in 1964 and the great world fair (EXPO) was held in Osaka in 1970, the first to be held in Asia. The Japanese novelist, Kawabata, was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature in 1968. Sato, the statesman who served as the prime minister from 1964 to 1972, was awarded the Nobel Prize for peace in 1973 for various reasons including his three nuclear principles- 'never to produce arms of this nature, never to own them and never to introduce them into Japan'.

17.5. A Five-Year Commercial Agreement With China:

The 1960's were the years when Japan impressed herself on the rest of the world by annual growth rates of ten per cent or more. The alternation of boom and slump, which had characterized the 1950's, seemed to have gone for good. The Japanese industry took a new shape with emphasis on heavy goods and chemicals in place of textiles. Japan's investment and performance in the most advanced technology captivated the world. In 1962 Japan concluded with China a five-year commercial agreement on a barter basis. The vastness of China and its population mesmerized some Japanese industrialists but the government remained inhibited by the hostility of the United States towards China. Japanese trade with Communist China was comparatively smaller than with that of Taiwan. In fact, the 1962 agreement with China was no more than a gesture towards a vague future. More concretely Japan embarked on a policy of economic co-operation in Southeast Asia and the Pacific rim-lands.

17.6. Japanese Investment in Neighbouring Countries:

In 1967 the Prime Minister, Eisaku Sato, undertook a tour of Southeast Asian countries such as South Korea, Australia and New Zealand. He was the first Japanese prime minister to visit the last two countries. Japan's course was not easy. Besides being a former imperialist aggressor, Japan was a rapidly developing country in a largely underdeveloped region. Sato lavished loans for development. Japan was at pains to supply its poorer neighbours with high-grade capital and consumer goods rather than drain them of their natural resources in the classical colonial mode. In Australia, Japan became the leading investor of funds exceeding the sum of British, American and German funds. Australia was importing more goods from Japan in mid-1960's than from Britain and selling more of its mineral and agricultural products to Japan than to any other country. In a smaller way New Zealand was turning in the same direction. Even Canada, another Pacific state, although more firmly fixed in the North American economy, considerably increased its trade with Japan and its loans to and investment in the Southeast Asian sector of what was becoming a vast Asian-Pacific economic zone dominated by Japan. The spectacular Expo 70 in Tokyo crowned the achievements of Japan in 1960's.

17.7. Japan's Improvement of Diplomatic Relations with China:

In 1971 Nixon shocked Japan when, without warning to Tokyo, he announced that he had accepted an invitation to visit China. The policies of the Japanese government had been moulded and directed by the United States. In Asia they were based on hostility towards China. The United States had pressurized Japan to have close ties with the Nationalist regime in Taiwan and had stressed the necessity of joint action in dealing with Mainland China. The sudden change in the attitude of the United States towards China without the knowledge of Japan astonished the latter. There was a demand for the normalization of Sino-Japanese relations, which had only remained unresolved in the past because of American pressure. However, the Chinese declined to negotiate with Prime Minister Sato, and it was left to his successor, Tanaka, to begin negotiations.

In July 1972 the Chinese leaders announced that they were prepared to welcome him to their country. After a feverish period of talks between the political factions in Japan, and also the governments of Taiwan and the United States, Tanaka visited China and offered an apology to the Chinese people for Japan's past misconduct. With Premier Chou En-lai, he issued a joint communiqué. The Chou-Tanaka joint statement issued in Beijing was a masterpiece of diplomatic finesse and graceful ambiguity which laid a basis for 'peace and friendship' without a formal peace treaty and with important issues left unresolved. Japan recognized

that Taiwan 'ought to' belong to China. These meetings were followed by increased trade and by the conclusion of four working arrangements relating to trade, fisheries, airlines and shipping.

In seeking new economic opportunities the Japanese have also been mindful of political and strategic factors. They realized that any major conflict in East Asia would gravely harm their economic interest. The nation that for centuries remained in almost complete isolation is today one of the least isolated, dependent for its survival upon reciprocal relations with many other countries.

17.8. Oil-Shock and Recovery:

However, shortly after Expo 70 Japan suffered two serious setbacks. Its industrial recovery and commercial expansion had depended on a strong dollar, which made Japanese exports to its largest market exceptionally profitable and cheap oil. In 1971 the US President, Richard Nixon devalued the dollar and in 1973 war in the Middle East created an economic crisis in Japan. Japan relied entirely on imported oil, eighty-five per cent of which was imported from the Middle East. The war so reduced the supply of oil that Japanese stocks fell to a few days' consumption and when the oil flow resumed due to intense diplomacy the price had quadrupled. Ruthless economies cut consumption by half. The recession following the oil crisis slowed the economic growth rate, brought the threat of unemployment, and caused the Japanese to re-examine national priorities and to question whether the 'miracle of Japan' was reality or illusion. A factor hampering economic recovery was, ironically, the strength of the yen in comparison with the dollar and other depreciating Western currencies. The yen's high valuation made goods produced in Japan expensive, although products were exported at lower than the domestic prices, and the Japanese found such Asian competitors as South Korea, Taiwan, and Hong Kong were underselling them. Many small firms were forced out of business. In 1977 more than 18,000 bankruptcies were reported in Japan. To alleviate the situation the government sought to expand the market for exports and investments in less developed areas. In February 1978 Japan signed a \$20-billion eight-year trade agreement with China, followed six months later by a formal peace treaty with the People's Republic.

17.9. Second Oil-Shock:

A second oil shock came with the fall of the Shah of Iran in 1979. But during the interval between 1973 and 1979, Japan had regained its economic health by abandoning old and inefficient industries by experimenting in automation and robots, by massive investment of government money at cheap rates, and by extensive retraining of the workforce with government funds. In the next decade the same combination of industrialists, experts and government succeeded in capturing the world's leading place in

electronics. In the same period the United States was using its knowledge and its funds in putting a man on the Moon and building armaments.

17.10. Difficulties in Investment:

Japan's prosperity made her a voracious consumer of the world's products. According to an estimate by 1981 Japan needed one-tenth of the world's total exports and in oil more than one-tenth of world's total production. But Japan had no sure way of securing her needs. Britain in the nineteenth century and then the United States had had a similar problem and had solved it by a variety of means, which go under the name of imperialism. Japan had plenty of money to invest but there were difficulties in investing it as most of the known investment opportunities had been pre-empted by the United States or Western Europeans. Nevertheless, Japan invested considerable sums abroad, particularly in Malaysia, Indonesia, Thailand and the Philippines. In order to reduce her dependence on Middle Eastern oil, Japan engaged in exploration or investment in Indonesia, New Guinea, Australia and Nigeria.

17.11. Balance of Trade Between Japan and the United States:

Significant changes in the semi-partnership between the United States and Japan resulted from the latter's growing economic strength, which stimulated dissatisfaction with a condition of dependence. The balance of trade between the two countries shifted in Japan's favor, by 1976 yielding an annual surplus of \$5 billion and, by 1989, of \$49 billion. By the mid-1990's the trade surplus had surpassed \$100 billion. Moreover, as the Japanese gained pre-eminence in specialized and sophisticated technologies, the United States in its trade with them played a 'colonial' role, providing grains, lumber, cotton, and other raw materials in exchange for steel, machinery, cameras, watches, electronic components for radio and television, and innumerable other manufactures ranging from pianos to barber chairs. By the mid-1990's, however, American products such as apples and even automobiles began to increase their sales in Japan. In the computer industry, American software was in high demand in Japan.

17.12. Strength of the Japanese Economy:

There has been lively, sometimes heated, debate in both countries over trade policies and their effect. Restrictions on imports, bureaucratic regulations, and subsidies to domestic producers that make the Japanese market hard to penetrate were countered in the United States by quotas on Japanese products and by demands for protective legislation. While agreeing to remove some restrictions the Japanese argued persuasively that their success in marketing reflected the high quality of their manufactures and a scrupulous attention to customer demand. The

Japanese invest far more industrial research and development than Americans, keeping them in the forefront of technological advance, though the productivity of American workers continued to be higher than that of Japanese workers.

17.13. Towards an Open Market Economy:

Acknowledging the need to reduce its large trade surplus, Japan in recent years has moved cautiously toward an open-market economy, transferring the railway and telegraph systems to private ownership and attempting to stimulate domestic consumption by expanding imports, which have risen more than 50 per cent since 1984. Americans, accustomed to a long period of ascendancy in world affairs, are understandably perturbed at seeing a nation they flattened in defeat fifty years ago now threatening to eclipse their own economy. A Tokyo professor of international affairs predicted that a 'Confucian cultural zone' including China, Korea, Taiwan, and Singapore as well as Japan-by combining Confucian ethics with free-market principles would dominate the twenty-first century.

17.14. Japanese Investment in the United States:

Notwithstanding rivalry and disagreements Japan and the United States are destined to remain trading partners, to their mutual advantage. The huge American public debt is currently underwritten by Japan. In 1986 in addition to investments in American real estate, hotels, and commercial enterprises, the Japanese devoted more than a third of their \$90 billion trade surplus to purchasing U.S. bonds and Treasury notes. The successful conclusion of the Uruguay round of the GATT (General Agreement on Tariff and Trade) talks, ratified in 1994 by both Japan and the United States, gave promise that international trade would continue to grow.

17.15. Japanese Luxury Cars:

In 1995, the Clinton Administration threatened to increase tariffs on imported Japanese luxury cars from the existing 2.9 per cent to fully 100 per cent. The proposed tariff hike was an attempt to pressurize the Japanese into opening their markets for US autos and auto parts. US officials contended that the Japanese discriminated against American-made products, which the United States felt were just as good as those manufactured in Japan. If the United States government shut down Japan's luxury-car business in the United States, the Japanese might change their objectionable practices.

Thirteen luxury models produced by Toyota, Nissan, Honda, Mazda, and Mitsubishi were targeted for increased duties. These models were critical to Japanese automakers. More than 200,000 units had been sold in the United States the previous year, and

they provided higher profit margins than less-expensive models. It was believed that the higher tariff would dramatically increase the price of Japanese luxury cars compared with their US and European competitors. Such price increases would likely drive most of the US consumers out of Japanese showrooms, Japanese automakers might avoid raising prices. In the end, the United States did not impose the 100-per cent tariff on Japanese luxury automobiles. Instead, Japan and the United States negotiated an automobile pact that obligated Japan to open its automotive market to the United States.

17.16. Problems Faced by Japan:

Outside the realm of trade, Japan faced major problems as the twentieth century drew to a close. The Japanese government, like most of its contemporaries, had not sufficiently addressed many problems inherent in highly industrialized societies. While wealth in terms of the GNP had steadily increased, disparities in income had grown wider. A shocking example of government partiality to a special interest group was that of the rice farmers. Rice in Japan has been six times more expensive than that of California's best quality, but high tariffs and subsidies to the Japanese producers, though reduced in 1994, kept the price artificially high in Japan, constituting a tax on all consumers. Also, reserving acreage for inefficient rice cultivation had greatly inflated real estate values, making home ownership impossible for most workers. While watching their manufactures flooded markets the world over, undercutting the price of items produced locally, the Japanese found they could hardly afford to live in their own country, where the overall cost of living rose more than 600 per cent between 1960 and 1980 and the average family had to spend 30 per cent of its income on food. They saw the profits accruing from a favourable foreign trade balance used to subsidize exports while little was done to protect the environment or improve services in overcrowded cities, 40 per cent of whose buildings were not connected to public sewer systems.

When the Japanese government in response to US demands reduced the subsidies to rice farmers it angered a major voting bloc. Incidents of official corruption and a revelation that large corporations were underpaying their taxes provoked widespread resentment. This was reflected in the LDP's loss to a coalition of opposition parties in July 1993, the first time the LDP had been voted out of power in 38 years. That election proved to be a watershed in modern Japanese politics, plunging the whole political order into its worst crisis in four decades. In 1993 and 1994 the government changed hands four times. New parties appeared and disappeared in a matter of months. Amid all the tumult, the Diet passed a programme of electoral reforms that promised to open up Japanese politics to more genuine competition, reduce the power of

special interest groups in electing incumbents, and remove the advantages previously given to rural voters.

Further blows to Japanese self-confidence came in early 1995, when a devastating earthquake hit the city of Kobe, killing over 5,000 people and destroying more than 100,000 buildings. The slow response of the government to the crisis drew bitter criticism from many Japanese citizens. Less than three months later, a religious cult in Japan released poison gas on a busy Tokyo subway, killing ten people and injuring hundreds more. These two disasters cast a shadow over the Japanese economy, which had been gradually recovering from a slump in the early 1990's, and reinforced the sense of vulnerability that underlies much of modern Japanese life.

In spite of the internal problems, which are usually faced by any industrial society, Japan's economic miracle has forged her as a great power. However, she has few of the characteristics, which would normally be expected of a great power. She has a limited defense capability; she has renounced the use of nuclear weapons; she is virtually dependent on foreign sources of energy; and she is largely dependent on foreign raw materials. Her standing in the world comes from her industrial success, her industrial efficiency, trading expertise and skill in overcoming problems. During the five decades Japan has risen from the ashes of 1945 to a place, not perhaps in the front rank of powers, but comfortably within the second.

Questions

1. Trace the circumstances that led to the emergence of Japan as an economic power between 1962 and 2000.
2. Examine the strength and weakness of the Japanese economy from 1962 to 2000.
3. Write a detailed note on the Economic Miracle in Japan.



ECONOMIC TRANSFORMATION IN ASIA (1962-2000)

(A) ASEAN

(B) OPEN MARKET ECONOMY IN CHINA

Objectives:

1. To study the circumstances that led to the establishment of the ASEAN and Understand its aims and objectives and organization.
2. To trace the background to the emergence of the open market economy in China.

18. A. ASSOCIATION OF SOUTH EAST ASIAN NATIONS (ASEAN)

Introduction:

Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) is a regional alliance of ten independent countries of South East Asia. On 8 August 1967, the foreign ministers of five neighbouring countries in Southeast Asia-Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand, in a meeting held at Bangkok issued a declaration since then known as 'ASEAN Declaration', thereby establishing 'an association for regional co-operation among the countries of Southeast Asia'. Later, Brunei became a member after attaining independence in 1984. Vietnam, the Association's first Communist partner, joined ASEAN in 1995. Laos and Myanmar were admitted in 1997, and Cambodia in 1999. The permanent secretariat of ASEAN is situated Jakarta, Indonesia.

18. A. 1. Aims and Objectives of ASEAN:

The chief aims and objectives of ASEAN outlined in the Bangkok Declaration (1967), were: (1) to accelerate the economic growth, social progress and cultural development in the region through joint endeavours in the spirit of equality and partnership in order to strengthen the foundation for a prosperous and peaceful community of Southeast Asian nations; (2) to promote regional peace and stability through abiding respect for justice and the rule of law in the relationship among the countries of the region and adherence to the principles of the United Nations Charter; (3) to promote active collaboration and mutual assistance on matters of common interest in the economic, social, cultural, technical, scientific and administrative fields; (4) to collaborate more

effectively for the greater utilization of their agriculture and industries, the expansion of their trade, including the study of the problems of international commodity trade, the improvement of their transportation and communication facilities; and the raising of the standard of living of their peoples; and (5) to maintain close and beneficial co-operation with existing international and regional organizations with similar aims and purposes, and explore all avenues for even closer co-operation among themselves.

ASEAN is a mutual aid association, economic and social, but not without some silent hopes that it might curb Indonesia's potential capacity to dominate the region. The reason behind this apprehension was that Indonesia contained almost half of ASEAN's population. ASEAN established a joint forum with Japan in 1977, and a co-operation agreement with the European Community was signed in 1980.

18. A. 2. ASEAN Secretariat:

ASEAN's activities and policies are coordinated by the Secretariat, established at the 1976 summit in Bali, Indonesia, and by its secretary-general. ASEAN maintains national secretariats in member countries, and has also established committees in capital cities of eleven countries with which it co-operates. These are: Berlin, Brussels, Canberra, London, Moscow, New Delhi, Ottawa, Paris, Riyadh, Seoul, Tokyo, Washington, and Wellington. There is also an ASEAN committee in Geneva. Heads of governments of member countries meet annually; there are also annual ministerial meetings (AMM) and meetings of economic ministers of member countries (AEM).

18.A.3. Pre-ASEAN Regional Cooperation:

ASEAN was not the region's first post Second World War attempt in regional co-operation. In 1961 Thailand, Malaya and the Philippines formed the Association of Southeast Asia, which, however, disintegrated as a result of the rival claims of the last two to Sabah. In 1963 these two and Indonesia projected a different tripartite association, which never came into existence. The failure to set up the tripartite association was chiefly due to two major obstacles. The first was the tensions arising out of the creation of Malaysia and the second was the pro-communist attitudes of Sukarno in Indonesia. The removal of Sukarno by the Indonesian army was a necessary precondition for the creation of a broad Southeast Asian association. Besides, it was felt that Indonesia should show its willingness to collaborate. Sukarno's successors were willing to join such an association. Confrontation between Indonesia and Malaysia came to an end. Besides, the quarrel between Malaya and the Philippines also subsided following Sabah voted in 1967 to join Malaysia. President Marcos of the Philippines visited Kuala Lumpur a year after his inauguration. Relations were

again soured that same year after a mysterious massacre of Muslim soldiers on Corregidor, possibly by their own officers, and by a brief revival of the Philippines' claim to Sabah. However, the claim was put on hold by Marcos who, although unwilling to take the unpopular step of finally giving it up, considered that the new regional solidarity was more important. President Aquino later made a formal renunciation of Sabah.

18.A.4. Desire to Keep Southeast Asia as a Zone of Peace:

The British departure from Southeast Asia and the Americans' war in Vietnam put the solidarity of the Southeast Asian countries to test. Following the announcement of imminent British withdrawal from Malaysia and Singapore in 1968 prompted these two states to conclude a new agreement with Australia, New Zealand and Britain (to which Brunei later adhered), which replaced the existing Anglo-Malayan defense agreement. In the same year they joined their partners in ASEAN in proposing that Southeast Asia should be declared a zone of peace, freedom and neutrality. If these two steps were barely consistent with each other, the inconsistency was the price paid for transition from a colonial world to regional co-operation for the better securing of national independence. The American war in Vietnam was an obstacle to that independence until its conclusion in 1973. For the ASEAN states the most disturbing sequel to the United States' failure in Vietnam was Nixon's rapprochement with China. By this Sino-US rapprochement China saw an opportunity to exercise a dominant role in Southeast Asia that was abandoned by the United States. The problem came to be further complicated in deciding whether the prime enemy in the region was communist China or communist Vietnam. The threat from Vietnam was made the more acute by Vietnam's invasion of Kampuchea.

18.A.5. Division Among the ASEAN Members:

Members of ASEAN were divided on many issues. At the UN in 1970 Malaysia and Singapore had voted in favour of granting to communist China a seat in the Security Council. The Philippines had voted against this proposal, and Indonesia and Thailand had abstained. Most members of ASEAN hoped to add Vietnam to their association in spite of its communist regime, but by invading Kampuchea Vietnam offended against one of ASEAN's basic principles-respect for national sovereignty and independence. Vietnam's treaty with the Soviet Union was another impediment as another ASEAN principle emphasized that the ASEAN countries should keep away from the major powers, that is, the United States and the Soviet Union. The dilemma was most acute for Thailand. Thailand wished to act in concert with its ASEAN partners but it was more directly threatened than they were by Vietnamese expansion into Kampuchea and was well aware that ASEAN had no military might to oppose to Vietnamese aggression, whereas

China had. In fighting terms the anti-Vietnamese forces were the Khmer Rouge and China. For other ASEAN members on the other hand, especially, Indonesia, China was the main threat to the region in the long term and China's incursion into northern Vietnam in 1979 was a sinister omen. Under these circumstances ASEAN's survival was a tribute to its leaders, but these strains were not relieved until the Vietnamese withdrawal from Cambodia and the Russian withdrawal from Vietnam.

During the late 1980's and early 1990's, ASEAN played an important role in mediating the civil war in Cambodia. In January 1992, ASEAN members agreed to establish a free-trade area and to cut tariffs on non-agricultural goods over a 15-year period beginning in 1993. The ASEAN meeting in July 1994 signalled recognition of the need for closer internal ties, wider membership, and a greater role in regional security in the post-Cold War era. The following year brought the Treaty on the South East Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone. In July 1997 ASEAN formally admitted Laos and Myanmar as members. Cambodia's application for membership was accepted in April 1999; the application had been previously suspended due to concern over the legitimacy of its new government under Hun Sen. The combined gross national product of ASEAN countries in 1999 amounted to \$US685 billion, and a total trade figure reached \$US720 billion.

18.B. OPEN MARKET ECONOMY IN CHINA

Introduction:

In the early 1970's, the People's Republic of China was an insignificant participant in the world market for goods. The value of its exports and imports was less than \$15 billion, and it was only the 30th largest exporting country. China was also a negligible participant in world financial markets. However, by the turn of the millennium, China had totally transformed its role in the world economy. In 2000, China's exports and imports exceeded \$200 billion, and China was the world's 10th largest exporter, lagging behind only the major industrial countries. It is important to understand the circumstances that brought about this transformation.

18.B.1. Circumstances that led to Open Market Economy in China:

The history of modern China began in 1949, when a revolutionary communist movement captured control of the nation. Soon after the communist takeover China instituted a Soviet model of central planning with emphasis on rapid economic growth, particularly industrial growth. The state took over urban manufacturing industry, collectivized agriculture, eliminated household farming, and established compulsory production quotas.

18.B.1.1. Departure from the Soviet Model:

In the late 1950's, China departed from the Soviet model and shifted from large-scale, capital-intensive industry to small-scale, labour-intensive industry scattered across the countryside. Little attention was paid to linking individual reward to individual effort. Instead, a commitment to the success of the collective plans was relied on as the motivation for workers. This system proved to be an economic failure. Although manufacturing output rose following the reforms, product quality was low and production costs were high. Because China's agricultural output was insufficient to feed its people, China became a large importer of grains, vegetable oils, and cotton. As a result of this domestic economic deterioration, plant managers, scientists, engineers, and scholars, who favored material incentives and reform, were denounced and sent to work in the fields.

18.B.1.2. Deng Xiaoping's Initiative:

After 1976, Deng Xiaoping and other communist party leaders were hoping that rapid economic growth would satisfy the Chinese people and prevent them from demanding political reforms. The post-Mao leadership clearly placed economic performance over ideological purity. To stimulate the stagnant industrial sector, which had been under state control since the end of the New Democracy era, they reduced bureaucratic controls over state industries and allowed local managers to have more say over prices, salaries, and quality control. Productivity was encouraged by permitting bonuses for extra effort, a policy that had been discouraged during the Cultural Revolution. The communist regime also tolerated the emergence of a small private sector. Unemployed youth were encouraged to set up restaurants, bicycle or radio repair shops, and handicraft shops on their own initiative.

18.B.1.3. Example of the Neighbours:

By the 1970's, China could see its once-poor neighbours such as Japan, Singapore, Taiwan, and South Korea-enjoying extraordinary growth of prosperity. This led to China's 'marketizing' its economy through small, step-by-step changes to minimize economic disruption and political opposition. In agriculture and industry, reforms were made to increase the role of the producing unit, to increase individual incentives, and to reduce the role of state planners. Most goods were sold for market-determined, not state-controlled-prices. Greater competition was allowed both between new firms and between new firms and state firms. By the year 2000, non-state firms manufactured about 75 per cent of China's industrial output. Moreover, China opened its economy to foreign investment and joint ventures. The Chinese government's monopoly over foreign trade was also disbanded. In its place, economic zones were established in which firms could keep foreign exchange earnings and hire and fire workers.

18.B.2. Need for Further Reforms:

At the turn of the millennium, China had made all of the easy economic adjustments in its transition toward capitalism. The farmers were allowed to sell their own produce and the doors of China were opened to foreign investors and salespeople. However, there were still other areas where reforms were necessary: (1) there was a need of massive restructuring of state-owned industries, which were losing money; (2) a number of bankrupt state banks had to be cleaned up; (3) a social security system had to be created in a society that once guaranteed a job for life; and (4) there was a need for the establishment of a monetary system with a central bank free of Communist Party or government control.

If China were to shut down money-losing enterprises, millions of workers would be laid off with no benefits. Their addition to the already existing over 100 million workers already adrift in China could create serious socio-economic problems.

18.B.3. Lack of Political Freedom:

Although China has dismantled much of its centrally planned economy and has permitted free enterprise to replace it, political freedoms have not increased. The Chinese government's use of military force to end a pro-democracy demonstration in Beijing's Tiananmen Square in 1989, which led to loss of life manifested the Communist Party's determination to maintain its political power. China's evolution toward capitalism has thus consisted of expanded use of market forces under a communist political system. Today, China describes itself as a socialist market economy.

18.B.4. Differences Between China and Other East Asian Economies:

Important differences exist between China and the other East Asian economies. Public ownership and the share of public investment are much higher in China than in other East Asian economies. A significant share of China's state-owned enterprises has required government subsidies to remain in existence. Also, China has been more dependent on foreign capital to generate exports of manufactured products than other East Asian economies. Foreign-owned firms, or foreign-owned firms having joint ventures with Chinese firms, produce most of China's manufactured exports. A large portion of Chinese industry is thus not participating in China's export expansion. Finally, China is characterized by substantial income inequalities, especially between urban and rural living standards, which could undermine support for continued capitalistic reforms.

Concerning international trade, China has followed a pattern consistent with the principle of comparative advantage. On the export side, China has supplied a growing share of the world's

demand for relatively inexpensive sporting goods, toys, footwear, garments, and textiles. These goods embody labour-intensive production methods and reflect China's abundance of labour. On the import side, China is a growing market for machinery, transportation equipment, and other capital goods that require higher levels of technologies than China can produce domestically. Most of China's economic expansion since 1978 has been driven by rapid growth in exports and investment spending.

18.B.5. Labour-intensive Economy:

China is the most poorly endowed with land except for Singapore. Therefore, China's specialization in labour-intensive manufacturing relative to agriculture is expected to be the greatest. This will result in China's importing food and moving into manufacturing exports to feed and generate employment for an expanding population. Its high savings rate allows the buildup of capital necessary to make the transition. At the same time, China will likely lose market shares in primary products.

What manufactured goods China exports will also depend on the quality of the labour force. With more people educated up to the secondary-school level than to the tertiary level, and with low capital per worker, China is more likely to emphasize low-skilled manufactures and light industry. With its weaker higher-education base, China is unlikely to emerge as a major source of knowledge-based and complementary skilled-labour products.

18.B.6. China's Failure to Protect US Intellectual Property:

Enforcement of laws to protect intellectual property rights of foreigners has been a problem in China. Among the largest and most obvious offenders in China have been factories producing CDs, audiocassettes, videos, and video games.

Although China passed laws in 1991 that were supposed to protect intellectual property rights, enforcement of the laws has been selective. National copyright offices, located in China's provinces, have often lacked authority to take effective action against bootleggers. Also, the courts have been reluctant to issue substantial judgments in civil cases against Chinese defendants or criminal convictions for major copyright infringers. Furthermore, factories that make pirated goods have often been owned, or run by, powerful members of the provincial governments who hold themselves above the law. These factors have led to U.S. threats of trade sanctions unless China enforces its laws to protect intellectual property rights.

Responding to U.S. pressure, the Chinese government has agreed to improve its protection of intellectual property rights by establishing anti-piracy task forces and stepping up raids on retail

establishments; inspecting factories alleged by the United States to be producing pirated goods and imposing penalties against factories caught pirating intellectual property; and opening its market for audiovisual and published products, and making the censorship process more transparent. In spite of these pledges, there have been numerous U.S. complaints over the ineffective enforcement of the intellectual property rights by the Chinese government.

18.B.7. Permanent Normal Trade Relations with U.S.:

In 1979, the United States and China signed a bilateral trade agreement providing mutual normal trade relations. As a non-market-economy country, China's normal trade relation status was reviewed each year. Renewal of this status was routine throughout the 1980's, given China's willingness to allow as many as 10 million of its people to immigrate to the United States.

18.B.8. Concern About China's Unethical Practices:

However, since the suppression of the Tiananmen Square demonstrations in 1989, renewal of China's normal trade relation status has been controversial as the United States was very much concerned about the unethical practices adopted by China. Widespread concern has existed about China's treatment of dissidents and political prisoners. China has also been accused of using prison labour to produce and export products including diesel engines, tea, socks, machine presses etc. Importing such products is illegal under U.S. trade law. Other concerns have involved China's proliferation of weapons, its failure to enforce intellectual property rights, and the restrictions that it applies to imports from the United States and other countries.

These concerns have resulted in proposals that the United States use its economic pressure to promote improvements in China's policies in areas such as human rights, trade, and weapons nonproliferation. Proponents of these proposals maintain that the United States should not extend normal trade relation status to China unless China improves its behavior in these areas.

As one of China's largest export markets, the United States purchases almost one-third of its exports. Revoking U.S. normal trade relation status for China would make duties on Chinese products extremely high. For example, tariffs on toys would increase from 6.8 to 70 per cent, those on cotton T-shirts would increase from 21 to 90 percent, and those on silk apparel would increase from 6.9 per cent to 65 per cent. Such tariff increases would diminish China's ability to provide certain products to the U.S. market at competitive prices. It is believed that these steps would give the Chinese incentive to become a responsible member of the world community.

18.A.9. Differences in the U.S. Regarding Trade Sanctions Against China:

Not everyone agrees that trade sanctions are effective devices to force progress on human rights and democracy in China. U.S. business leaders fear potential economic losses were China to retaliate against a U.S. withdrawal of normal trade relations by raising its own tariffs or taking other measures to limit U.S. access to the Chinese market. Such retaliation would especially hurt U.S. producers of aircraft, power stations, machine tools, and communications systems. Revoking China's normal trade relation status would also hurt U.S. retailers relying on Chinese goods such as sporting goods, textiles, etc. for their livelihood, and employees of these enterprises would stand to lose their jobs. Finally, it is questionable whether trade sanctions would be effective in forcing a large, diversified nation such as China to modify its political behavior.

Supporters of granting normal trade relations status to China also contend that it promotes improving human rights. This is because increased foreign trade contributes to China's integration into the world community; as the Chinese economy grows and becomes increasingly decentralized, a new business society develops that is independent of the state. Moreover, with greater wealth and access to foreign goods and modern telecommunications, Chinese citizens are increasingly exposed to a broader set of ideas, undermining the government's monopoly on information. The result is a diffusion of economic power and information, creating the pre-conditions for a civil society, and with it more pluralistic forms of governance and a greater respect for human life.

A key question was whether to grant China normal trade relations on a permanent basis or subject the status to annual reviews. Proponents of permanent normal trade relations maintained that lasting status would provide China the stability needed to integrate into the world community. However, opponents argued that annual reviews of normal trade relations were necessary to pressure China on human rights, the environment, and labor conditions.

18.B.10. Bilateral Trade Agreement:

In 1999, the United States and China reached a bilateral trade agreement that resulted in China's agreeing to cut tariffs and remove non-tariff barriers on trade in agriculture, industrial products and services; eliminate various restrictions on foreign investment in China; and accept U.S. use of safeguard measures to temporarily guard against possible import surges that might harm certain U.S. industries, such as textiles. This agreement led to the U.S. government's considering whether to permanently normalize trade

relations with China. After intense debate, the U.S. government granted permanent normal trade relation status to China in 2000.

18.B.11. China and the World Trade Organization:

An important goal of the economic reforms that were initiated by the Chinese government in the late 1970's was to open the economy to international trade and investment flows. To further the policy of opening, the Chinese government applied to become a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO). China has made its accession to the WTO a major priority for a number of reasons: (1) it would represent international recognition of China's growing economic power; (2) it would enable China to play a major role in the development of new international rules on trade in the WTO; (3) it would give China access to the dispute-resolution process in the WTO, reducing the threat of unilaterally imposed restrictions on Chinese exports; and (4) it would make it easier for reformers in China to push for liberalization policies if they could argue that such steps are necessary to fulfill China's international obligations.

Most analysts felt that it was important to include China, which is a major trading nation in the multilateral trading system. Allowing China to become a member of the WTO, they maintained, would further open China's economy to imports and ensure that Chinese exporters operate by the rules of the multilateral system. However, some analysts maintained that China's trade regime, which is heavily regulated by the central government, is incompatible with the multilateral system. The principles that underlie the WTO-nondiscrimination, national treatment, and adherence to negotiated tariff rates at fixed maximum levels-imply trade based on market forces rather than central planning in which government directly regulates what is produced, exported, and imported. Therefore, in the past, the centrally planned economic systems of China and other non-market-economy nations have been considered incompatible with the WTO. In other words in order to become a member of the WTO, China must change many laws, institutions, and policies to bring them into conformity with international trade rules. However, there was also an apprehension that placing too many conditions on China's accession could lead to the exclusion of China, and thus a significant part of world trade, from the discipline of multilateral rules.

For 30 years, the United States has worked to bring China more fully into the community of nations and to promote both economic development and a more liberal society. The policy has been working. Anyone who saw China in the early 1980's and compared it with the turn of the millennium must be amazed. Drab Mao suits and bicycles have transformed into bright fashions and traffic jams; the freedom and the range of individual choices available to the average citizen have increased dramatically.

China's transition, however, is far from complete. Despite recent reforms intended to encourage the remaining state-owned firms to operate on a commercial basis, many of them are either making no profits or losing money. The central government has been reluctant to allow bankruptcies because of fear that unemployment may lead to unrest. Consequently, the state-owned firms are supported with subsidies from the state budget. Moreover, while the reforms have allowed a greater role for market prices, the government continues to play a role in fixing some prices. Furthermore, China lacks the kind of legal system necessary to support a market economy, a shortcoming that has created uncertainty in the enforcement of contracts and an environment conducive to corruption and criminal influence in business.

Another important issue concerning China's application for WTO membership is the pace at which China will conform to WTO laws. The measures required to gain membership will adversely affect domestic Chinese firms that currently rely on trade protection and government subsidies to survive. As a result, China wants WTO status as a developing economy and some flexibility in the time it will take to conform to WTO standards. The United States, however, does not view China as a typical developing nation, given its status as one of the world's major exporters, and thus presses for a relatively short time period for substantial trade liberalization.

The conclusion of the U.S.-China bilateral trade agreement of 1999 and the U.S. government's decision in 2000 to permanently normalize trade relations with China gave new momentum towards China's accession to the WTO. It was partly due to the fact that the United States plays an important role in the WTO, and because Chinese officials in the past used to complain that the U.S. position on China's accession to WTO was the main obstacle to China's admission. China's accession into the WTO was also supported by a bilateral trade agreement reached with China and the European Union in 2000. Final approval of China's accession would require China to complete talks with the WTO over the nature of its trade regime, before a final vote could be taken in the WTO on China's accession.

Accession to the WTO requires numerous policy changes in China, including significant reductions in China's tariff and non-tariff barriers that put restrictions on U.S. exports to China, the opening up of China's service sector, further protection of intellectual property rights, and the elimination of many barriers to trade in agricultural products. It is believed that China's accession to WTO would benefit many sectors of the U.S. economy, as China would remove certain trade barriers on such articles as agricultural produce, beverages, chemicals, plastics, electronic equipment, etc. However, on the other hand, trade liberalization would promote

Chinese economy because of further investment in China, thereby expanding production. Also China would benefit from increased imports of capital goods, which would improve productivity. Therefore, some U.S. industries would lose ground to imports of Chinese goods such as, footwear, wearing apparel, wood products, and other light manufacturers. In general, analysts concluded that an agreement with China would provide positive but minor benefits for the U.S. economy.

China's reentry onto the world stage brought problems as well as achievements. As China's manufacturing sector became increasingly integrated into the global economy, the outside world put greater pressure on Chinese business and government officials to conform more closely to international standards of behaviour. Violations of human rights, particularly after the Tiananmen massacre in 1989, frequently threatened to disrupt economic and diplomatic relations between the United States and China. The brutal treatment of dissidents and Tibetan nationalists repeatedly alienated international opinion. Foreigners claimed, with irrefutable evidence that many Chinese companies exported products made by prison labour. Protection of intellectual property rights emerged as a major source of friction between China and foreign governments who alleged that only a small fraction of the computer software, music recordings, and videotapes sold in China were authorized. The huge trade deficit between the United States and China produced frequent charges that China excluded American products from the Chinese market. One former American ambassador accused China of "trying to export like a capitalist and import like a communist."

Questions

1. Trace the factors that led to the foundation of the ASEAN. What were its aims and objectives?
2. Write a detailed note the ASEAN.
3. Trace the circumstances that led China to adopt open market economy.
4. Examine the trade relations between China and the United States.
5. Discuss the role of China in the World Trade Organization.
6. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) ASEAN
 - (b) China and the World Trade Organization



DEVELOPMENT IN AFRICA: OAU (ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY)

Objectives:

1. To trace the development in Africa with special reference to the Organization of African Unity (OAU).
2. To study the aims and objectives and organization of the OAU.

Introduction:

Organization of African Unity (OAU) is an inter-African organization founded in May 1963 to promote unity and solidarity among African states; to coordinate political, economic, cultural, medical, scientific, and defense policies; to defend the independence and territorial integrity of member states; and to eliminate colonialism from Africa. All independent states are eligible to become OAU members. There are now 53 members. The two recent ones are Eritrea, which joined after gaining its independence in 1991, and South Africa, which became an OAU member in 1994. Morocco suspended its membership in 1985 in protest at the admittance of the Sahrawi Arab Republic (Western Sahara) in 1982. The OAU's headquarters are in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

19.1. Pan-Africanism:

The background to the Organization of African Unity can be traced to the development of Pan-African ideas and movements, which were developed during the early years of the twentieth century. The Pan-African ideas were promoted by a few American Negroes like Dr. W.E.B du Bois (1868-1963) and others. Du Bois, who won fame as a historian and sociologist, became the leading black opponent of racial discrimination during the first half of the 1900's. He later organized Pan-African conferences in Europe and the United States. Initially, the Pan-African movement aimed to arouse the Negroes to a sense of a 'lost homeland', a belief in the existence of a distinct 'African personality', common destiny and the ideal of 'Africa for the Africans'.

Pan-Africanism is the belief that all people of African descent have common interests and should work together to conquer

prejudice. Pan-Africanism began as an assertion of the distinctiveness and value of an explicitly African or black culture. As such primarily it was Caribbean and West African movement, but it became also part of the wider movement for colonial emancipation in which nationalists from all parts of Africa could identify with and seek strength from one another. There were also leaders such as Nkrumah, who saw that political freedom was not the whole of freedom. Even after independence economic dependence would persist, and that Africa might stand on its own feet economically only by developing its continental resources in common. In order to achieve these objectives Pan-Africanism logically pointed to a political union or at least a federation and it was therefore in conflict with the creation of new sovereign states committed to the preservation of their integrity as well as their independence. Between 1900 and 1945 six Pan-African conferences were held. The first of them and the four, which followed in the 1920's, were predominantly Caribbean and North American. However, the last was dominated by African leaders from Africa itself. All the Pan-African conferences were meetings of personalities.

19.2. Conferences of Independent African States (IAS):

With the beginning of independence came meetings of African parties and African governments. The former created an All African People's Organization. At conferences in Accra in 1958, Tunis in 1960 and Cairo in 1961, it discussed schemes for African unity or an African commonwealth on the basis that the co-operation between governments was not enough. However, the third meeting was the last. As the number of independent states increased, the states' system took hold. Nkrumah continued his attempt for a union government until his fall in 1966. However, this scheme, although a standard item at conferences of the Organization of African Unity for some years, did not attract sufficient support. This was chiefly due to the fact that such an idea was regarded as unpractical and because it became increasingly identified with a left-wing radical minority.

In 1958, a year after Ghana had secured its independence, a conference of Independent African States (IAS) was held at its capital Accra. It was attended by eight independent African states, Ethiopia, Egypt, Ghana, Liberia, Libya, Morocco, the Sudan and Tunisia. They were chiefly concerned with anti-colonialism, the racial and nationalist struggles in South Africa and Algeria, and the problem of achieving some sort of African unity while at the same time respecting the independence and integrity of African states. It was in this conference that for the first time African governments, acting in unison, called upon the administering imperial powers to grant independence to their colonial possessions in Africa. The conference also drew up a common programme to be followed by

African states for economic, technical, and scientific co-operation, and a common foreign policy, which was to be as had been laid down in the Bandung Conference of 1955, that is, non-alignment.

The second conference of Independent African States met at Addis Ababa, capital of Ethiopia, in June 1960. Fifteen states were represented in this conference. The Addis Ababa conference, like the previous one at Accra in 1958, adopted resolutions denouncing colonialism and neo-colonialism, and asking colonial powers to fix dates 'in conformity with the will of the people' for the granting of independence to their African possessions. The unity of the African states was put to test by the unhappy development of civil war in Congo and border disputes involving Ethiopia and Somalia, Ghana and Togo, Guinea and Cameroon. Another unhappy development was the growing difference of opinion among African leaders over the ways in which African unity was to be achieved.

19.3. Contest Between Ghana and Nigeria:

The contest between Ghana and Nigeria posed a greater danger for the prospects of African unity. Nkrumah of Ghana urged the case for immediate steps to unity, whereas Nigeria and Uganda argued in favour of a slow approach to some kind of looser federation. This dispute became serious due to some bitterness as the Nigerians resented Nkrumah's assumption of leadership and distrusted his aims. On the other hand Nkrumah feared that Nigeria intended to throw the influence of its vast size on to the side of conservatism versus socialism and of Nigerian nationalism versus pan-Africanism. In the case of Congo, the independent African states tried, both at the UN and in a conference at Leopoldville in August 1960, to present a united front and play a constructive pacificatory role. However, they were not successful.

19.4. Inter-State Organizations:

Following the differences among the independent African state on various issues, certain states belonging to particular regions formed separate groups comprising limited number of states. Later these various groups reassembled in one organization, which came to be known as the Organization of African Unity (OAU). The largest of these groups was the Brazzaville groups, consisting of all the former French colonies except Guinea, with the addition of Mauritania, whose claim to be independent and not a part of Morocco was accepted by the group. The Brazzaville group began as an ad hoc meeting at Abidjan in October 1960. The chief topic for discussion was Algeria, but a Brazzaville in December and at a further meeting during 1961 at Dakar, Yaounde and Tananarive it developed into a permanent association. It discussed ways of perpetuating the co-operation and

common services which had existed in the colonial period. It set up an organization for economic co-operation. It also considered joint institutions and defense arrangements. This group was neither pan-African nor regional, but an expression of common needs and a common outlook.

19.5. The Casablanca Group:

At a conference at Casablanca in 1961, a second group of African states came into existence. It comprised of six independent African states along with Algerian revolutionaries and Ceylon. The six African states were Morocco, Egypt and Libya, which soon after transferred to the Brazzaville group, and Ghana, Guinea and Mali. The Casablanca Group, consisting of the more 'radical' states, under the leadership of Kwame Nkrumah of Ghana, argued for pan-African political unity. The Casablanca group opposed the independence of Mauritania and was pro-Lumumbist in the Congo. This group also established permanent political, economic and cultural committees, a supreme command, and a headquarters at Bamako in Mali.

19.6. The Monrovia Group:

In May 1961, twenty African states met in a conference at Monrovia. This conference included the entire Brazzaville group, Libya and majority of former British colonies. Thus, the Brazzaville group got itself submerged into the Monrovia group. The group was dominated by Nigeria, thus, acquiring a specifically anti-Ghanaian and anti-Nkrumah character. The Monrovia Group, including the more 'conservative' states, outlined a programme of gradual economic unity. The movement for African unity seemed to have been blocked by current problems such as in the Congo and Mauritania and by personalities. However, the idea of African unity remained alive. Even if Nkrumah's vision of a union extending into every part of the continent was not acceptable or impracticable, there was room for lesser unions. The Ghana-Guinea union, with or without Mali, though proved of little practical consequence, was a political demonstration. In the northwest Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria had promoted federation at a meeting in Tangier in 1958. In east and central Africa there was talk of federation between Kenya, Uganda, Tanganyika, Zanzibar, Malawi, Zambia and Rhodesia, with a possible extension in future to Rwanda, Burundi, Mozambique and even South Africa. A Pan-African Freedom Movement of East and Central Africa came into existence in 1958, but was dissolved later in 1963. These above associations were meant for self-help in the struggle for liberation.

There were a number of other regional inter-state organizations among the previous French colonies. These included

the Entente Council comprising of Ivory Coast, Niger, Upper Volta, Togo, Dahomey; the Senegal River Association comprising of Senegal, Mali, Guinea, Mauritania; a West African and a Central African Customs Union; the African and Malagasy Economic Union founded in 1965 by thirteen former French and Belgian colonies and converted into the African and Malagasy Common Organization.

19.7. Establishment of OAU:

These above regional inter-state organizations paved the way for the desirability of a wider body encompassing the whole of the African continent. Although the Congo crisis became a divisive factor in the unity among the independent African states, it also demonstrated the need for and advantages of forging unity among them. At a conference at Lagos in 1962 a draft charter was drawn up for an organization of African states. At a further conference at Addis Ababa in 1963 the Organization of African Unity (OAU) was established with an initial membership of thirty-two. The OAU was not a collective security organization. It was an organization for the promotion of African unity and collaboration and for the eradication of colonialism.

19.8. Aims and Objectives of OAU:

The aims and objectives of the OAU are clearly defined in the Charter of the OAU. These include: promotion of unity and solidarity; achievement of a better life for the people of Africa; defense of their sovereignty, territorial integrity, and independence; eradication of all forms of colonialism from Africa; and promotion of international co-operation. The Charter affirmed such principles as 'the sovereign equality of member states'; 'non-interference in the internal affairs of states'; 'respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of each state and for its inalienable right to independent existence'; 'peaceful settlement of disputes by negotiations, mediation, conciliation or arbitration'; 'unreserved condemnation of political assassination...and of subversive activities'; 'absolute dedication to the total emancipation of the African countries which were still dependent'; and 'the policy of non-alignment with regard to the bloc'.

The OAU Charter, as signed at Addis Ababa, reflected a compromise between the prevailing views among the Casablanca and Monrovia groups, envisaging a unity 'that transcends ethnic and national differences'. After the formation of the OAU, the two groups were disbanded.

The conference also passed a number of resolutions touching some concrete issues. In anticipation of a situation in

Rhodesia, which had, since been created there by the declaration of independence by the white minority government, it asked Britain not to transfer power to it. The resolution also pledged moral and practical support to any 'legitimate' measures adopted by nationalist leaders in that country to recover power. Diplomatic relations between African states and Portugal and South Africa were to be suspended and the two states to be boycotted through the termination of trade and closure of ports and airfields to them. Support to the United Nations was re-affirmed and a call was given for the removal of military bases from Africa and for the recognition of Africa as a denuclearized zone. It was also decided by the conference that a fund should be created to support the anti-apartheid movement in South Africa. Racial discrimination of any sort was condemned and the members expressed their concern regarding the racial situation in the United States and appreciated the efforts made by the U.S. government in solving these questions.

19.9. Organization of OAU:

The OAU's policy-making body is the annual Assembly of Heads of State and Government. The Assembly coordinates policy and approves decisions made at the periodic meetings of the Council of Ministers, which consists of the foreign ministers of member countries. Efforts to resolve disputes are handled by the Commission of Mediation, Conciliation, and Arbitration. In 1991 it was decided to set up a conflict management division to monitor potential disputes and to try and prevent them erupting into violence; a peace fund was created to finance the division's operations. The OAU has a number of specialized commissions dealing with areas such as economics, transport and communications, and education, as well as a few specialized agencies—including the Pan-African News Agency, the Pan-African Postal Union, and the Scientific, Technical, and Research Commission. The organization, while maintaining its political nature, has become increasingly involved with promoting economic integration and cooperation. These efforts led to the decision to establish an African economic community whose treaty was signed by African leaders in 1991. After receiving the required two-thirds ratification, the treaty entered into force in April 1994. In early 2001 African leaders agreed in principle to proposals to set up an African union similar to that of the European Union.

The permanent administrative body of the organization is the General Secretariat. It is headed by a secretary-general, elected for a four-year term and aided by five assistant secretaries in charge of the various departments. The secretariat carries out the resolutions and decisions of the assembly, keeps archives, and conducts the organization's public relations. The headquarters of the Secretariat of the OAU is at Addis Ababa.

The creation of the OAU represented not only a negation of federal ideas but also an emphasis on specifically African issues. The Charter of the OAU and its founding conferences stressed the sanctity of existing frontiers and the role of the new organization in the peaceful settlement of disputes between African states.

Questions

1. Narrate the background to the establishment of the Organization of African Unity (OAU).
2. Examine the aims and objectives of the OAU. What were its achievements?



SOUTH AFRICA – END OF APARTHEID

Objectives:

1. To study the background of the racial discrimination in South Africa.
2. To understand the adverse effects of Apartheid and the attempts made to put an end to this evil practice.

Introduction:

South Africa has had a complicated history. The Dutch were the first white settlers in Southern Africa, establishing a colony on the Cape of Good Hope in 1652, which was a vital staging post on the route from Holland to the Dutch East Indies. It remained a Dutch colony until 1795, and during that time, the Dutch, who were known as Afrikaners or Boers, meaning 'farmers', took land away from the native Africans and forced them to work as labourers, treating them as little better than slaves. They also brought more labourers from Asia, Mozambique and Madagascar.

The British links with India similarly encouraged British colonization in the nineteenth century, but differences in religion, economic attitudes and colonial policies divided the British from the Dutch. In 1795 the British captured the Cape during the French Revolutionary Wars, and the 1814 peace settlement decided that it should remain under British control. Many British settlers went out to Cape Colony.

20.1. The Union of South Africa:

The Dutch settlers became restless under British rule, especially when the British government made all slaves free throughout the British Empire (1838). The Boer farmers felt that this threatened their livelihood, and many of them decided to leave Cape Colony. They trekked northeast and established their own independent republics of the Transvaal and Orange Free State (1835--40). Some also moved into the area east of Cape Colony known as Natal. The discovery of diamonds near Kimberley and gold near Johannesburg intensified the rivalry between the Boers and the British. The first Boer War (1880-81) resolved nothing, but the second Boer War (1899-1902) ended in British victory and the annexation of the two Boer colonies the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. In 1910 they joined up with Cape Colony and Natal to form the Union of South Africa. A provision was made for a central government and parliament, in which Boers and British mingled in a

ratio of about two to one. Thus, the Boers had a greater influence and provided all the prime ministers and most of the policies. The whites made up less than twenty per cent of the population. Black Africans comprised about seventy per cent of the population, and the remainders were Asians, especially Indians and Chinese and other 'coloured' people, a phrase denoting racially mixed backgrounds.

The first Prime minister, Botha (1910-19) and Smuts (1919-24) were moderate men. From 1924 to 1939, Hertzog was in power with the Nationalist Party. He shared many of Smut's policies. A splinter group of the Nationalist Party, the Afrikaner (Boer) Nationalists under Dr Malan, broke away. They won power in 1948.

20.2. Disabilities of the African Black People:

Although the black Africans made up the vast majority of the population, they suffered even worse discrimination than black people in the United States. Some of the gross disabilities from which the black people suffered were: (1) The white minority dominated politics and the economic life of the new state, and, with only a few exceptions, blacks were not allowed to vote. (2) Black people had to do most of the manual work in factories and on farms and were expected to live in areas reserved for them away from white residential areas. These reserved areas made up only about seven per cent of the total area of South Africa and were not large enough to enable the Africans to produce sufficient food for themselves and to pay all their taxes. Black Africans were forbidden to buy land outside the reserves. (3) The government controlled the movement of blacks by a system of pass laws. For example, a black person could not live in a town unless he had a pass showing he was working in a white-owned business. An African could not leave the farm where he worked without a pass from his employer. (4) Living and working conditions for blacks were primitive; for example, in the gold mining industry, Africans had to live in single-sex compounds with sometimes as many as ninety men sharing a dormitory. (5) By a law of 1911 black workers were forbidden to strike and were barred from holding skilled jobs.

20.3. Introduction of Apartheid:

Discrimination against non-whites was inherent in South African society from the earliest days. A clause in the Act of Union of 1910 provided that the native policies of the provinces would be retained and could be changed only by a two-thirds majority vote of parliament. In Cape Colony alone the Coloured community and a few black Africans had the right to vote. Even after Mahatma Gandhi's 21-year struggle before First World War to assure civil rights for Indian residents, they still had second-class status after the war.

South African blacks had an even lower status in the white-dominated state. Urban blacks lived in segregated areas and could not hold office or vote. They had no viable labour unions, and technical and administrative positions were closed to them. Even so, the National Party accused Prime Minister Smuts of allowing whites to be swallowed in a black sea. In the 1948 elections, led by Daniel F. Malan, the National Party won a narrow victory and began to implement its harsh concept of apartheid, which was designed to separate the races economically, politically, geographically, and socially. Apartheid is the Afrikaans word for 'apartness'. In 1948, it became the official word to describe the racial policies of the South African government, which were based on the separate development of the black and white races, and, on the domination of the black majority by the white minority.

The British settlers of the nineteenth century believed in a measure of white supremacy. However, the Boer prejudice against the coloured people was stronger, more rigid and more obstinate. They claimed that whites were a master race, and that non-whites were inferior beings. The preaching of the Dutch Reformed Church backed up this Boer attitude, the official state church of South Africa and quoted passages from the Bible, which, they claimed, proved their theory. This was very much out of line with the rest of the Christian churches, which believe in racial equality. The Boers also stood by vague biological beliefs that blacks were naturally inferior and that people of mixed race were possibly worse. When India and Pakistan were given independence in 1947, white South Africans became alarmed at the growing racial equality within the Commonwealth, and they were determined to preserve their supremacy. Malan campaigned in 1948 against the 'Black Menace', and his words touched the deep fears of those whites who felt that the black majority might challenge them for economic and political power.

The government's position was strengthened when the National Party merged with the smaller Afrikaner Party in 1954. Malan, with growing support in parliament, introduced several laws designed to relegate all non-whites to permanent inferior status. A severe anti-Communist law was passed in 1950; marriage between whites and blacks was made a crime; and education for blacks was defined differently than for whites.

20.4. Group Areas Act:

Most drastic was the Group Areas Act of 1950, which, augmented by later legislation, provided that specific areas be reserved for each of South Africa's four racial groups as defined by apartheid, that is, the Europeans (whites), Bantu (blacks), Coloureds (mixed race), and Asians. These laws and the homelands concept, which robbed most blacks of their South

African citizenship and which denied them the right to live in cities without special permission, were the foundations of apartheid. All blacks were assigned to specific tribal areas and had to carry passes when they entered restricted (white) areas. The goal was to create so-called 'homelands' for all blacks. In response to these harsh policies, the ANC decided to pursue a more militant stance through mass civil disobedience. Nelson Mandela emerged as a central leader at this time.

In 1951 the Separate Representation of Voters Act was passed by a simple majority. It provided for the removal from the white register of the names of Coloured voters in the Cape of Good Hope Province, reversing a policy that had been in effect since 1852. The bill was declared unconstitutional by the nation's Supreme Court in March 1952 because it had been passed by less than the two-thirds majority required to amend voting laws. Legislation to give parliament power to overrule the Supreme Court was passed in May, but it was also declared unconstitutional. Successive prime ministers reinforced the apartheid policy: Malan (1948-54); Strijdom (1954-58); Verwoerd (1958-66); and Vorster (1966-78).

20.5. Internal Resistance:

The earliest resistance to racist policies in South Africa was led by Mahatma Gandhi, with a programme of non-violent protests against laws discriminating against Indians, in the years 1913-15. From then until 1948, no champion of black rights appeared on the scene of South Africa. However, as apartheid tightened, some whites began to oppose it through the Liberal and Progressive Parties. The blacks began to use the boycott of buses as an economic weapons, and silent vigils by black-sashed women as a dignified and subtle psychological pressure. The Communist Party attracted support among whites and blacks. However, it was banned by the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950, which gave massive powers to the Minister of Justice. Similarly other acts such as the Public Safety Act of 1953, the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1953, the Riotous Assemblies Act of 1956, the Unlawful Organizations Act of 1960 and the Terrorism Act of 1967 increased the power of the Bureau of State Security (BOSS) and made resistance to the apartheid policies of the government more dangerous.

In view of the various acts and measures opposition to the system of apartheid in side South Africa was difficult. Anyone who objected, including whites, or broke the apartheid laws, was accused of being a communist and was severely punished under the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950. Africans were forbidden to strike, and their political party, the African National

Congress (ANC), was helpless. In spite of this, protests did take place.

20.6. The African National Congress (ANC):

The ANC was founded in 1912 as a non-violent civil rights organization that worked to promote the interests of black Africans. With a mostly middle-class constituency, the ANC stressed constitutional means of change through the use of delegations, petitions, and peaceful protest. In 1940 Alfred B. Xuma became ANC president and began recruiting younger, more outspoken members. Among the new recruits were Nelson Mandela, Oliver Tambo, and Walter Sisulu, who helped in establishing the ANC Youth League in 1944 and soon became the organization's leading members.

ANC membership greatly increased in the 1950's after South Africa's white-minority government began to implement the apartheid policy of rigid racial segregation in 1948. The ANC actively opposed apartheid, and engaged in increasing political conflict with the government. In 1955 the ANC issued its Freedom Charter, which stated, "South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and no government can claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people." It went on to demand: -equality before the law; freedom of assembly, movement, speech, religion and the press; the right to vote; the right to work, with equal pay for equal work; 40-hour working week, minimum wage and unemployment benefits; free medical care; free, compulsory and equal education.

Church leaders and missionaries, both black and white, spoke out against apartheid. They included people like Trevor Huddleston, a British missionary who had been working in South Africa since 1943. Later the ANC organized other protests, including the 1957 bus boycott: instead of paying a fare increase on the bus route from their township to Johannesburg ten miles away, thousands of Africans walked to work and back for three months until fares were reduced.

20.7. Sharpeville Massacre:

Protests against the racial policy of the South African government reached a climax in 1960 when a huge demonstration took place against the pass laws at Sharpeville, an African township near Johannesburg. Police fired on the crowd, killing sixty-seven Africans and wounding many more. Hundreds of people were beaten by police and thousands more were arrested and imprisoned as the protests continued. The government imposed ban on the ANC. This was an important turning-point in the campaign: until then most of the protests had been non-violent; but this brutal treatment by the authorities convinced many black

leaders that violence could only be met with violence. There was a spate of bomb attacks, but the police soon clamped down, arresting most of the black leaders, like Nelson Mandela, who was sentenced to life imprisonment. Chief Albert Luthuli organized a three-day strike for which he was deprived of his chieftaincy. He published his moving autobiography *Let My People Go*, for which he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. He was killed in 1967 under mysterious circumstances. The authorities claimed that he had deliberately stepped in front of a train.

20.8. Demonstrations at Soweto:

Discontent and protest increased again in the 1970's because wages of Africans failed to keep pace with inflation. In 1976, when the Transvaal authorities announced that Afrikaans, the language spoken by whites of Dutch descent, was to be used in black African schools, massive demonstrations took place at Soweto, a black township near Johannesburg. Although there were many children and young people in the crowd, police opened fire, killing at least 200 black Africans. This time the protests did not die down; they spread over the whole country. Again the government responded with brutality. Over the next six months a further 500 Africans were killed. Among the victims was Steve Biko, a young African leader and founder of the Black Consciousness movement who had been urging people to be proud of their blackness. He was a supporter of reconciliation rather than confrontation. He died of head wounds received while in police custody in 1977. Twenty thousand blacks attended his funeral, as well as many representatives of European countries.

20.9. Protest from Outside South Africa:

Though the policy of racial discrimination and apartheid was the internal matter of the South African government there was opposition from different parts of the world. The outside world became increasingly critical of South African policies as they contrasted more and more with the trend towards majority rule and racial equality in the rest of the world. The Commonwealth of Nations was bitterly critical of the policy of apartheid. Early in 1960 the British Conservative Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, had the courage to speak out against apartheid in Cape Town. He spoke about the growing strength of African nationalism: "the wind of change is blowing through the continent... our national policies must take account of it". His warnings were ignored, and shortly afterwards, the world was horrified by the Sharpeville massacre. At the 1961 Commonwealth Conference, criticism of South Africa was intense, and many thought she would be expelled from the Commonwealth of Nations. In the end Verwoerd withdrew South Africa's application for continued membership. In 1960 South Africa had decided to become a republic instead of a dominion, thereby severing the connection with the British crown; because of this she

had to apply for readmission to the Commonwealth, and she ceased to be a member of the Commonwealth.

20.10. Condemnation by the UN and the OAU:

The United Nations condemned the racial discrimination of apartheid in 1961, 1962 and 1963, at a time when many new African nations were joining the organization and rejoicing in their freedom from white domination. The Organization of African Unity also repeatedly condemned apartheid in South Africa in all its conferences. The UN voted to impose an economic boycott on South Africa (1962), but this proved useless because not all member states supported it. This was chiefly due to the fact that most of the countries of the Western world relied on gold and diamond reserves of South Africa. Britain, the United States, France, West Germany and Italy condemned apartheid in public, but continued to trade with South Africa. Among other things, they sold South Africa massive arms supplies, apparently hoping she would prove to be a bastion against the spread of communism in Africa. Wilson's Labour Government refused to sell arms to South Africa, a ban that the Conservative government reversed in 1970 because of its worries about the strategic importance of the Southern Ocean in the struggle against communism. South Africa was banned from the Olympic movement. When New Zealand maintained its rugby-playing links with South Africa, most black African nations boycotted the 1976 Olympic Games to indicate their disgust. Consequently Verwoerd (until his assassination in 1966) and his successor Vorster (1966-78) were able to ignore the protests from the outside world until well into the 1970's.

The United Nations and the OAU were particularly critical of the continued South African occupation of South West Africa (Namibia). In June 1971 the International Court of Justice ruled that South Africa's presence in Namibia was illegal. The situation became critical when guerrillas from the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) began crossing the border from Angola to attack South African targets in Namibia. The South African government responded by building up defenses, attacking Angola, and aiding the rebels who were fighting the Cuban-supported Angolan government. The war continued into the 1980's. Ultimately, international political and economic pressure forced South Africa to take a more conciliatory attitude. The initiative taken by the United States led to peace talks in December 1988, which resulted in independence for Namibia.

20.11. The end of apartheid:

The system of apartheid continued without any concessions being made to black people, until 1980. Vorster's successor as Prime Minister, P.W. Botha, who was elected in 1979 gave an immediate impression of being more liberal than his predecessors.

He realized that all was not well with the apartheid system. He decided that he must reform apartheid, dropping some of the most unpopular aspects in an attempt to preserve white control. Both external and internal factors prompted Botha to take the radical steps, which ultimately led to the dismantling of the apartheid regime in South Africa.

Externally, criticism of the apartheid regime of South Africa from the Commonwealth, the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity gradually gathered momentum. External pressures became much greater in 1975 when the white-ruled Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique achieved independence after a long struggle. The African takeover of Zimbabwe (former Rhodesia) in 1980 removed the last of the white-ruled states, which had been sympathetic to the South African government and apartheid. South Africa came to be surrounded by hostile black states, and many Africans in these new states had sworn never to rest until their fellow-Africans in South Africa had been liberated.

The economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations against South Africa, though not implemented rigidly, gradually began to affect South African economy. Recession in the late 1970's brought about hardships and the condition of many white people became worse. Whites began to emigrate in large numbers, but the black population was increasing. In 1980 whites were only sixteen per cent of the population, whereas between the two world wars they had formed twenty-one per cent. Under these circumstances, the continuation of the policy of apartheid was considered to be not in the long-term interest of South Africa.

In a speech in September 1979, which astonished many of his Nationalist supporters, the newly elected Prime Minister Botha said: "A revolution in South Africa is no longer just a remote possibility. Either we adapt or we perish. White domination and legally enforced apartheid are a recipe for permanent conflict." Botha went on to suggest that the black homelands must be made viable and that unnecessary discrimination must be abolished. Gradually he introduced some important changes, which he hoped would be enough to silence the critics both inside and outside South Africa. These changes were: blacks were allowed to join trades unions and to go on strike (1979); blacks were allowed to elect their own local township councils (1981). However, they were not yet granted right to vote in national elections; a new constitution was introduced setting up two new houses of parliament, one for coloureds and one for Asians (but not for Africans). The new system was so designed that the whites kept overall control. It came into force in 1984; sexual relations and marriage were allowed between people of different races (1985); the hated pass laws for non-whites were abolished (1986).

20.12. Renewal of Violence:

Botha was not prepared to go beyond these concessions to the blacks and coloured people of South Africa. He even refused to consider the ANC's main demands of the right to vote and to play a full part in ruling the country. Rather than being won over by these concessions, black Africans were angered that the new constitution made no provision for them, and were determined to carry on their struggle till they achieved full political rights.

Violence escalated, with both sides guilty of excesses. The ANC used the 'necklace', a tyre placed round the victim's neck and set on fire, to murder black councillors and black police, who were regarded as collaborators with apartheid. On the twenty-fifth anniversary of Sharpeville, police opened fire on a procession of black mourners going to a funeral in Port Elizabeth, killing over forty people in March 1985. In July a state of emergency was declared in the worst affected areas, and it was extended to the whole country in June 1986. This gave the police the power to arrest people without warrants and freedom from all criminal proceedings; thousands of people were arrested, and newspapers, radio and TV were banned from reporting demonstrations and strikes.

20.13. International Pressure:

The renewed violence and state repression roused the international community to take action against the South African government. In August 1986 the Commonwealth of Nations, except Britain, agreed on a strong package of economic and cultural sanctions against South Africa. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher would commit Britain only to a voluntary ban on investment in South Africa. Her argument was that severe economic sanctions would worsen the plight of black Africans, who would be thrown out of their jobs. This caused the rest of the Commonwealth to feel bitter against Britain; Rajiv Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister, accused Mrs. Thatcher of 'compromising on basic principles and values for economic ends'. In September 1986 the United States joined the international community when Congress, in spite of President Reagan's veto, voted to stop American loans to South Africa, to cut air links and to ban imports of iron, steel, coal, textiles and uranium from South Africa.

Within South Africa too things had been changing. The black population was no longer just a mass of uneducated and unskilled labourers. There was a steadily growing number of well-educated, professional, middleclass black people, some of them holding important positions, like Desmond Tutu, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 and became Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town in 1986. The Dutch Reformed Church, which had once supported apartheid, now condemned it as not in accordance with Christianity. A majority of white South Africans began to recognize

that it was difficult to defend the total exclusion of blacks from the country's political life. Thus, although they were nervous about what might happen, they were resigned to the idea of black majority rule at some time in the future. White moderates were therefore prepared to make the best of the situation and get the best deal possible.

20.14. Towards Black Majority Rule:

F.W. de Klerk, who was elected as the new President in 1989 had a reputation for caution, but privately he had decided that apartheid would have to go completely, and he accepted that black majority rule must come eventually. The problem was how to achieve it without further violence and possible civil war. With great courage and determination, and in the face of bitter opposition from right-wing Afrikaner groups, de Klerk gradually moved the country towards black majority rule.

In order to create an atmosphere of congeniality for a possible black majority rule, the government of President F. W. de Klerk released Mandela in February 1990 after twenty-seven years in jail. The government also lifted the ban on the ANC and other previously banned political parties. Mandela assumed the leadership of the ANC, and led negotiations with the government in the difficult years between 1990 and 1994 when, on many occasions, it looked as though talks would collapse and violence would take over instead. In 1991 the government repealed the last of the laws that formed the legal basis for apartheid. Namibia, the neighbouring territory ruled by South Africa since 1919, was given independence under a black government in 1990.

Following these confidence building measures talks began in 1991 between the government and the ANC to work out a new constitution, which would allow blacks full political rights. Meanwhile the ANC was doing its best to present itself as a moderate party, which had no plans for wholesale nationalization, and to reassure whites that they would be safe and happy under black rule. Nelson Mandela condemned violence and called for reconciliation between blacks and whites. The negotiations dragged on due to many complicated issues. The transition from white minority rule to black majority rule was not an easy task. De Klerk had to face right-wing opposition from his own National Party and from various extreme white racist groups who claimed that he had betrayed them. The ANC was involved in a power struggle with another black party, the Natal-based Zulu Nation Freedom party led by Chief Buthelezi. Mandela and de Klerk shared the 1993 Nobel Peace Prize for their efforts to establish democracy and racial harmony in South Africa.

19.15. Transition to black Majority Rule:

In the spring of 1993 the talks were successful and agreement was reached about how to carry through the transition to black majority rule. A general election was held and the ANC won almost two-thirds of the votes. As had been agreed, a coalition government of the ANC, National Party and Inkatha took office with Nelson Mandela as the first black president of South Africa and F.W. de Klerk as the deputy president in May 1994. Although there had been violence and bloodshed, it was a remarkable achievement, for which both de Klerk and Mandela deserve the credit that South Africa was able to move from apartheid to black majority rule without civil war.

The new government moved quickly to address the key concerns of the black majority such as health, housing, education, and jobs. Details of a Reconstruction and Development Programme were announced in May 1994, but implementation of this programme was expected to be long and slow. The other priority of President Mandela was national reconciliation. In all his speeches he stressed the need to maintain national unity. However, black frustration at the slow pace of change led to an increase in the number of strikes.

The first draft of a new national constitution, to be implemented from 1999, was published in November, while Archbishop Desmond Tutu was appointed to head a Truth and Reconciliation Commission to investigate human rights abuses by both sides during the apartheid years. Following a Supreme Court ruling in February 1996, black pupils were registered at the overwhelmingly white Primary School in Northern Province with heavy police protection, after the school had tried to deny them admission. Most local white families promptly boycotted the school. F. W. de Klerk took his National Party out of Mandela's government in May 1996, citing differences with Mandela and the need for the National Party to rebuild its electoral appeal.

In February 1998 a successor to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was announced. The Institute for Change, Memory, and Reconciliation will research the final report of the commission and help in the implementation of its recommendations. In October Desmond Tutu handed the final report of the Truth Commission to President Mandela. The ANC had attempted to block its publication, objecting to references to human rights abuses by its own members.

In the June 1998 general elections, the ANC strengthened its position in the assembly. The party received sixty-six per cent of the vote, but was one seat short of holding the two-thirds majority required to rewrite the constitution. The ANC formed a coalition with

the Indian-led Minority Front, which held one seat, and so assumed the majority. Nelson Mandela expressed his desire to retire from active politics and was succeeded by Thabo Mbeki as president.

Questions

1. Trace the origin of the policy of apartheid in South Africa. What was its impact on the South African people?
2. What factors led to the end of apartheid in South Africa?
3. Give an account of the movement within South Africa for the end of the apartheid.
4. Evaluate the role of international pressure in the termination of the policy of apartheid in South Africa.
5. Trace the transition from the white minority to black majority rule in South Africa.
6. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Apartheid
 - (b) African National Congress (ANC)
 - (c) Nelson Mandela



DEVELOPMENTS IN LATIN AMERICA ORGANIZATION OF AMERICAN STATES (OAS)

Objectives:

1. To understand the background of the political development in Latin America.
2. To study the circumstances that led to the organization of the American States.

Introduction:

Latin America, in the broadest sense is the entire American landmass south of the United States. In a more restricted sense Latin America comprises those countries of the Americas that developed from the colonies of Spain, Portugal, and France. Because these European powers used languages derived from Latin, the term Latin America was devised to designate the parts of the New World that they colonized

21.1. Colonization:

Beginning with the voyages of Christopher Columbus in 1492-1504, Europeans sailing for the crowns of Spain and Portugal reached, conquered, and colonized vast areas of the New World. From their initial bases in the West Indies, the Spaniards expanded into Central America, Mexico, and Peru, subjugating the indigenous peoples they found there. The small group of Spanish adventurers known as conquistadors (conquerors) had defeated the great Indian civilizations and given Spain a firm hold on most of Latin America. The conquistadors led relatively small but well-equipped forces. They easily defeated large armies of Indians, who had never seen guns or horses. By the end of the sixteenth century, they had occupied large areas of South and Central America and North America as far as the present southern border of the United States. The Portuguese settled on the coast of Brazil. During the 1600's, the Dutch, English, and French established small colonies in Latin America, chiefly in the West Indies.

The conquerors brought with them Roman concepts of law, administration, and justice, as they developed a highly bureaucratic colonial system and imposed Spanish or Portuguese language, culture, and institutions on the natives. The great unifying

organization became the Roman Catholic Church. The clergy converted the Native Americans to Hispanic Christian culture, became the principal educator in the colonies, and built hospitals and other charitable institutions. The church also was a major economic producer. Excepting only the royal governments, it was the largest landholder in the colonies. Clergymen held high government positions and served as bankers as well as spiritual leaders to the society.

During the early 1500's, Spain established the *encomienda* system in Latin America. Under this system, colonists were granted large tracts of land plus the Indians who lived on the land. The colonists collected tribute in the form of slave labour from the Indians, making them farm the land or work in the mines. In return, the colonists were supposed to protect the Indians and convert them to Christianity. However, many colonists treated the Indians cruelly. Several outstanding Roman Catholic missionaries pleaded for more humane treatment of the Indians. But millions of Indians died from overwork and harsh treatment. As the Indian population in Latin America declined, Europeans began to import black Africans as slaves.

Europe profited tremendously from Latin America's mineral wealth and agricultural products. Ships filled with silver and gold regularly departed from Latin-American ports for Europe. Agricultural exports included coffee, cotton, sugar cane, and tobacco. Over the years, Spain's economy became increasingly dependent on Latin America.

21.2. Discontent Against the Colonial Rule:

Colonial rule of Latin America lasted about 300 years. During that time, discontent among the colonists gradually grew. Many Latin Americans wanted greater control over their economic and political affairs. But the European powers ignored the demands for more self-government until the movement for independence began to gather momentum. The desire for independence among Latin Americans arose for several reasons. The Creoles (people of Spanish ancestry born in Latin America) resented the fact that officials from Spain held all the top posts in colonial government. These officials looked down on the Creoles because they had not been born in Europe. Dissatisfaction was even greater among Latin Americans of mixed European and Indian ancestry. Many of these mestizos had gained wealth and property and wanted to take an active role in colonial government. However, mestizos had little social or political standing among the Europeans who controlled Latin America. The continual flow of the region's resources to Europe also angered many Latin Americans. Spain and Portugal permitted the colonies to trade only with their mother countries. The colonies could not even trade among

themselves. In addition, Spain and Portugal hampered Latin America's economic growth by discouraging the development of manufacturing. The colonial rulers wanted Latin Americans to buy European-made products rather than manufacture products for themselves. The political and economic injustices suffered by the colonists led to a growing desire for independence in Latin America. Although Spain and Portugal introduced a number of reforms in the colonies before 1800, many Latin Americans still wanted freedom.

21.3. Emergence of Independent States:

The wars of independence in Latin America were finally triggered by events in North America and Europe. The success of the American Revolution (1775-1783) and the ideals of freedom and equality promised by the French Revolution (1789-1799) inspired the unhappy colonists. At the same time, Spain and Portugal were losing their importance as world powers. In 1807, the forces of Napoleon Bonaparte of France invaded and conquered Portugal. The next year, Napoleon drove Ferdinand VII from the Spanish throne and replaced him with his own brother, Joseph Bonaparte. Spain's control over its colonies was thereby weakened, and many Latin Americans took the opportunity to fight for independence.

Mexico began its revolt against Spain in 1810 and eventually won its independence in 1821. Central America also gained its freedom from Spain in 1821. Central America had little economic importance, and so Spain largely ignored the area. As a result, Central Americans won their independence without bloodshed. In 1822, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua became part of Mexico. In 1823, however, they broke away from Mexico and formed a political union called the United Provinces of Central America. Bitter regional rivalries caused this union to begin to collapse in 1838, and each of the states had become an independent republic by 1841. The territory of Panama was a Colombian province from 1821 until 1903, when it rebelled against Colombia with help from the United States and became an independent country. Belize, called British Honduras until 1973, was a British colony from 1862 to 1981, when it gained independence.

The two greatest heroes in the fight for independence in Spanish South America were the Venezuelan general Simon Bolivar and the Argentine general Jose de San Martin. Bolivar helped in winning freedom for Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, and Venezuela. San Martin fought for the independence of Argentina, Chile, and Peru. In the south, landowners in Chile declared their country's freedom in 1810 and succeeded in winning lasting independence for Chile in 1818 by armies led by San Martin and the Chilean hero Bernardo O'Higgins. Earlier, in 1816, San

Martin had freed Argentina from Spanish rule. His armies later fought for Peru's independence.

Brazil won its freedom from Portugal without firing a shot. When Napoleon invaded Portugal in 1807, the Portuguese ruler, Prince John, fled to Brazil. John returned to Portugal 14 years later, after Napoleon's defeat. He left his son Pedro to govern Brazil. But the Brazilians no longer wanted to be ruled by Europeans. They demanded freedom from Portugal. In 1822, Pedro declared Brazil an independent empire and took the throne as Emperor Pedro I.

In the Caribbean Haiti won its freedom from the French in 1804 and became the first independent nation in Latin America. The Dominican Republic declared its independence in 1844. A revolt broke out against Spanish rule in Cuba in 1895. The United States sided with the Cuban rebels, which led to the Spanish-American War (1898) between Spain and the United States. The United States won the war, and Cuba became a republic in 1902. Under the terms of the peace treaty, Spain also gave up its colony of Puerto Rico to the United States. Most small West Indian islands remained under British, Dutch, or French control until the mid-1900's. Since then, most of these islands have become independent. Many of the others have gained more control over their affairs.

21.4. Latin America in Post-Independence Era:

During colonial times, Latin Americans were governed by the laws of distant monarchs and had almost no voice in their own affairs. When they rebelled and established their own independent countries, they had little experience in government. For that reason, some leaders thought it unwise to establish republics in Latin America. But eager patriots, inspired by the French Revolution and the American Revolution, demanded republican government. After achieving independence, Latin Americans soon found that it was easier to set up a republican government than to make it work. The inexperience of the new leaders led to violent struggles throughout Latin America. Ambitious dictators seized power in a number of countries. Armies that had fought for independence often helped to keep dictators in power. In other countries, wealthy landowners controlled the government.

Immediately upon gaining independence, many Latin-American republics abolished slavery. By the late 1800's, all the slaves in the region had been freed. However, independence brought little improvement in the lives of most Latin Americans. Wealthy Creoles and mestizos took over the established economic, political, and social institutions. Poor mestizos, Indians, and blacks

had little, if any, power. For many of these people, life became even harder than it had been under colonial rule.

Since independence, relations between a number of Latin-American countries have been severely damaged by disagreements over national boundaries. War broke out in 1825 between Argentina and Brazil over disputed territory bordering both countries. A treaty signed three years later established the area as the independent nation of Uruguay. In the War of the Triple Alliance (1865-1870), Argentina, Brazil, and Uruguay defeated Paraguay. The war firmly established the common borders of those countries. In the War of the Pacific (1879-1883), Chile fought Bolivia and Peru over a nitrate-rich area along the Pacific Ocean. Chile won the war and took possession of the territory, leaving Bolivia without a seacoast. Bolivia has remained landlocked ever since.

From 1932 to 1935, Bolivia and Paraguay fought for control of the Gran Chaco, a lowland region bordering both countries. Most of the area was eventually awarded to Paraguay. Fighting broke out several times during the early 1900's between Peru and Ecuador over a wild, uncharted area of the Amazon River Basin between Ecuador and Brazil. Peru annexed the area in the 1940's, but Ecuador still claims it. In other continuing disputes, Guatemala claims land controlled by Belize, and Venezuela claims about two-thirds of Guyana.

Trade relations and economic developments. Since colonial times, the economies of most Latin-American countries have depended heavily on the export of a few agricultural and mineral products. The exports of some nations consist chiefly of one product—for example, bananas in Honduras; coffee in Colombia; copper in Chile; petroleum in Ecuador, Mexico, and Venezuela; sugar in Cuba and the Dominican Republic; and tin in Bolivia. A drop in the market price for these exports causes severe economic hardships. Since the mid-1900's, many countries have spent large sums of money to develop other industries and so lessen their dependence on agricultural and mineral exports. Many of these countries have received loans from regional and international economic organizations for this purpose. They have also been given economic aid from other nations.

In the past, most Latin-American nations imported many manufactured goods from Europe and the United States. Latin-American countries traded relatively little with one another because they produced similar products. With the growth of manufacturing, however, several economic unions have been formed to encourage regional trade. They include the Latin American Integration Association, the Central American Common Market, the Caribbean

Community and Common Market, and the Andean Pact. These organizations work to lower trade barriers among the member countries and to promote economic growth in the region.

Before the 1960's, most major industries in Latin America were owned by United States and European companies. Many Latin Americans believed that these foreign businesses were only interested in making huge profits and cared little for the welfare of the region's people. Since the late 1960's, some countries have passed laws prohibiting foreign ownership of certain key industries. The governments of such nations as Bolivia, Guyana, Peru, and Venezuela took control of industries previously owned by U.S. and European companies. However, most countries also encourage foreign investment in industries that require modernization.

In 1975, most of the region's independent nations joined the Latin American Economic System. The major goals of this organization include the promotion of regional economic interests and the establishment of locally owned companies to offset the influence of European, Japanese, and U.S. businesses.

21.5. Pan-American Movement:

The background to the establishment of the Organization of American States (OAS) can be traced to the Pan-American movement and Pan-American conferences. Pan-American conferences were aimed to bring together representatives from countries of North, Central, and South America. These meetings also have been called Inter-American conferences. Through them, the nations of the Americas have worked to create friendly relations with one another.

The Pan-American movement began soon after the Latin American republics achieved independence between 1816 and 1824. Simon Bolivar, the South American statesman, took the first steps toward setting up an arrangement among American republics. Through his efforts, the independent American countries held their first conference in 1826 in Panama City, Panama. Except for issuing the Monroe Doctrine 1823, the United States did not take an active part in the movement during its early stages, and its almost exclusively Latin American nature limited its effectiveness. Latin America and the United States have often had a difficult relationship. The United States supported the Latin-American colonies in their wars of independence. In 1823, U.S. President James Monroe issued the Monroe Doctrine, which warned European powers not to meddle in the affairs of the Western Hemisphere. But the doctrine caused much resentment among Latin Americans. Many of them felt that the United States was assuming its superiority over Latin America by making itself the region's protector.

After the American Civil War (1861-1865) the United States took a more active interest in Latin American trade and inaugurated a series of Pan-American economic conferences. The first, held in Washington, D.C., from October 1889 to April 1890. It was attended by Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, the United States, Uruguay, and Venezuela. It laid the foundations of the modern system of Pan-American co-operation and formed what came to be known as the Pan-American Union. In 1890, the United States and 18 Latin-American nations formed the International Union of American Republics. The central office of this organization, called the Commercial Bureau of the American Republics, was renamed the Pan American Union in 1910. The purpose of the Pan American Union was to establish closer economic, cultural, and political cooperation among member nations. After the establishment of the Organization of American States (OAS) in 1948 the Pan American Union became its permanent governing body. Three additional conferences, at which the Dominican Republic was also represented, were held in the period before the First World War. These meetings approved resolutions on legal, commercial, and financial matters.

The four conferences between the First World War and the Second World War were concerned with war, defense, and mutual cooperation. The one in Santiago, Chile (1923), approved a pact to prevent wars among American nations. Latin-American distrust of the United States decreased somewhat after the seventh Pan-American conference at Montevideo in 1933. This conference agreed that no country had the right to intervene in the affairs of another. In 1936, at the Inter-American Conference for the Maintenance of Peace, held in Buenos Aires, the American republics agreed to cooperate in solving their disagreements. The eighth Pan-American Conference met in Lima in 1938. This conference declared that any threat to "the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic" was the concern of all. In a 1947 conference at Rio de Janeiro, representatives drew up the Inter-American Treaty of Reciprocal Assistance, or Rio Treaty, which declared that an armed attack on one member is an attack against all. All the nations pledged themselves to the Good Neighbour Policy outlined by U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The policy provided that no nation would interfere in the affairs of any other nation. During the Second World War (1939-1945), all the Latin-American nations supported the Allies, though only Brazil and Mexico provided troops. The conference in Lima, Peru (1938), issued the Declaration of Lima, asserting the solidarity of the American states and their intention to defend themselves against foreign intervention.

The ninth Pan-American Conference, held in Bogotá, Colombia, in 1948, was the first after the Second World War. It was notable for creating the Organization of the American States (OAS), of which the old Pan-American Union then became the general secretariat. The tenth conference, in Caracas, Venezuela (1954), adopted resolutions on subversive propaganda and activities, the abolition of racial segregation, and the termination of colonial rule in the hemisphere. It was the last of the formal Pan-American conferences. Hemispherical meetings since have taken the form of consultative forums of the nations' foreign ministers, as provided for in the OAS charter, and of special conferences, also under the OAS aegis, to discuss specific topics of concern or to approve amendments of the organization's charter.

21.6. Organization of American States:

Organization of American States (OAS) is a regional alliance comprising the autonomous nations of the Americas. The OAS was founded on 30 April 1948, by 21 nations at the Ninth Inter-American Conference, held at Bogotá, Colombia, and came into effect on 13 December 1951. The organization is an outgrowth of the International Union of American Republics, founded in 1890 at the First International Conference of American States held in Washington, D.C., and the Commercial Bureau of American Republics, later renamed the Pan American Union, also founded in 1890.

21.6.1. Aims and Objectives of the OAS:

The chief aims and objectives of the OAS, as described in its charter, are: (1) to strengthen the peace and security of the continent; (2) to promote and consolidate representative democracy, with due respect for the policy of non-intervention; (3) to prevent possible causes of difficulties and to ensure the pacific settlement of disputes that may arise among the member states; (4) to provide for common action on the part of those states in the event of aggression; (5) to seek the solution of political, juridical, and economic problems that may arise among them; (6) to promote, by cooperative action, their economic, social, and cultural development; and (7) to achieve an effective limitation of conventional weapons that will make it possible to devote the largest amount of resources to the economic and social development of the member states.

The charter of the OAS has been amended on four different occasions: by the Protocol of Buenos Aires, signed in 1967, which came in force since 1970; the Protocol of Cartagena de Indias, approved in 1985, and came in force since 1989; and the Protocols of Washington (1992) and Managua (1993), which was to become effective after ratification by two-thirds of the member states. In

1998 the OAS drafted a protocol calling for progressive elimination of the death penalty by its members.

The amendments to the Charter of the OAS were designed to further economic development and integration among the nations of the hemisphere; to promote and defend representative democracy; to help overcome poverty; and to render more effective the provision of technical cooperation. The Protocol of Washington stated as one of the main purposes of the OAS “to eradicate extreme poverty, which constitutes an obstacle to the full democratic development of the peoples of the hemisphere”.

21.6.2. Organs of the OAS:

The OAS functions through eight major organs: (1) the general assembly; (2) the Meeting of Consultation of Ministers of Foreign Affairs; (3) the Councils (Permanent Council; Inter-American Economic and Social Council; and Inter-American Council for Education, Science and Culture); (4) the Inter-American Juridical Committee; (5) the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights; (6) the general secretariat; (7) the Specialized Conferences; and (8) the Specialized Organizations. Upon ratification of the Protocol of Managua, a new Inter-American Council for Integral Development was to replace the current Inter-American Economic and Social Council and the Inter-American Council for Education, Science and Culture.

The secretary general directs the general secretariat and is its legal representative. The secretary general is elected by the General Assembly for a five-year term and cannot be elected for more than two terms. The seat of the general secretariat is in Washington, D.C. The secretariat also has offices in the member states.

21.6.3. Members of the OAS:

The founding members of the OAS are Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, United States of America, Uruguay, and Venezuela. The other members which joined the OAS later were: Antigua and Barbuda (1981), Commonwealth of the Bahamas (1982), Barbados (1967), Belize (1991), Canada (1989), Dominica (1979), Grenada (1975), Guyana (1991), Jamaica (1969), St Lucia (1979), St Vincent and the Grenadines (1981), Federation of St Kitts and Nevis (1984), Suriname (1977), and Trinidad and Tobago (1967).

A mutual defense treaty signed in September 1947 in Rio de Janeiro (the Rio Treaty) laid the foundation for security relations among OAS member states, although several conflicts have

occurred between member countries over security issues. In 1962 Cuba was suspended from the organization when it refused to remove Soviet missiles from its territory; although Cuba nominally remains a member of OAS, it may not vote or participate in its activities. During 1980 and 1981, several members advocated imposing sanctions against Nicaragua for alleged interference in other OAS countries, although no formal action was taken. In 1989 the OAS condemned the United States invasion of Panama and called for the withdrawal of United States forces. In September 1991 the OAS imposed a trade embargo on Haiti after the deposition of Haitian president Jean-Bertrand Aristide. Similar sanctions were also implemented in Peru (1992), Guatemala (1993), and Paraguay (1996). Other significant landmarks in 1996 included the founding of the Inter-American Council for Integral Development, a body designed to harmonize the economic development in the region and to combat poverty, and the signing of an anti-corruption treaty. The latter was followed in 1997 by the signing of the American treaty to combat illegal arms trafficking and production.

Questions

1. Discuss the political and economic development in Latin America.
2. Trace the circumstances that led to the establishment of the Organization of American States. What were its aims and objectives?
3. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Pan-American Movement
 - (b) Organization of the American States (OAS)



THE UNO AND ITS FUNCTIONING

Objectives:

1. To understand the origin, aims and objectives and organization of the UNO.
2. To study the functioning of the UNO in the fields of international disputes and in promoting social, economic and cultural life of the people throughout the world.

Introduction:

The United Nations Organization was the outcome of the alliances of nations throughout the world against the Fascist dictatorial powers during the Second World War. The weakness and final collapse of the League of Nations in the face of the aggression of the Axis Powers and the outbreak of the Second World War led the world statesmen and diplomats to think in terms of establishing another world organization, much more powerful and enduring than the League of Nations. The seeds of such an organization were laid by Franklin D. Roosevelt, the President of the United States and Sir Winston Churchill, the British Prime Minister on 14th August 1941, when they signed the Atlantic Charter, which included a set of principles for world peace and cooperation among nations. The Atlantic Charter also contained the sublime principles such as self-determination of nations, peace and security. The representatives of twenty-six 'united nations' who signed a joint declaration on 1st January 1942 accepted the principles and objectives of the Atlantic Charter.

22.1. Origin of the UNO:

The proposals for the establishment of an international organization were discussed in subsequent meetings and conferences by the 'Big Three', Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at Dumbarton Oaks, Washington (1944) and Yalta (1945). Eventually, delegates from fifty-one nations met at San Francisco (U.S.A.) in the United Nations Conference between April and June 1945, to frame the basic Charter of the United Nations. By 24th October 1945, majority of the member nations had ratified the Charter of the United Nations. Thus, the United Nations Organization officially

came into existence on 24th October 1945. This day is now the official birthday of the U.N.O. and celebrated each year as the United Nations Day throughout the world.

22.2. Aims and Objectives of the U.N.O.:

The aims and objectives of the United Nations Organizations have been clearly mentioned in its preamble and also in the first article of the UN Charter. The chief aims and objectives of the UNO are the following:

- (1) Maintenance of international peace and security.
- (2) Development of friendly relations among nations on the basis of equal rights and self-determination of the peoples.
- (3) Promotion of international co-operation in solving social, cultural, and humanitarian problems.
- (4) Promotion and encouragement of respect for human rights without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion.

To maintain peace and security in the world the U.N.O. adopts various measures such as (a) appointing body of persons to help in bringing about an agreement between the opposing nations in their disputes; (b) sending investigation teams to troubled areas to gain first hand information; (c) securing agreements to reduce armaments and work for disarmament, and (d) preventing genocide by appealing to member nations to observe principles laid down in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

22.3. Organization of the U.N.O.

There are six main organs of the UNO. They are: (1) The General Assembly, (2) The Security Council, (3) The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), (4) The Trusteeship Council, (5) The International Court of Justice, and (6) The Secretariat.

22.3.1. The General Assembly:

The General Assembly is a kind of legislative body of the UNO. It comprises of the representatives of all member nations. Each member-state can send a maximum of five representatives but has only one vote. It meets once in a year, usually in the month of September. However, it holds special sessions whenever necessary. A two-thirds of majority is needed to pass resolution on important questions such as recommendations on peace and security, admission of new members, electing members to the councils and budget considerations. Simple majority decides other questions. The General Assembly elects its own president and vice-president.

The General Assembly has the following important functions: (1) It discusses international problems fully and freely. (2) It receives and makes recommendations to member-nations, to the Economic and Social Council, to the Security Council and to the

Trusteeship Council. (3) It elects members of the organs of the UNO, such as the Security Council, ECOSOC and International Court of Justice. (4) With the prior recommendation of the Security Council, the General Assembly can suspend or expel any member-nation for violating the U.N. Charter. (5) It admits nations as the members of the U.N. (6) It approves the budget of the U.N. (7) The General Assembly elects the Secretary General of the U.N. on the recommendation of the Security Council. (8) It also elects the non-permanent members of the Security Council, members of Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council and judges of the International Court of Justice.

22.3.2. The Security Council:

The Security Council is the executive body of the U.N.O. It occupies an important position in the world organization. Originally, the Security Council comprised of 11 members, 5 of whom were designated as the Permanent Members. They were the U.S.A., the Soviet Union, England, France, and Nationalist China. The remaining six were the non-Permanent Members, and were to be elected by the General Assembly for a term of two years. At present the Security Council consists of 15 members. Five of them are Permanent Members. They are the U.S.A., England, France, Russia and Communist China. The remaining 10 are the non-Permanent Members, elected by the General Assembly for a period of two years. The presidency of the Security Council is alternated on a monthly basis by its member-states in alphabetical order.

The Security Council meets more frequently than the General Assembly. Decisions on important issues require 9 affirmative votes including all the 5 Permanent Members. Any negative vote (veto) by any one of the Permanent Members could defeat a decision of the Security Council. However, abstention from voting by a Permanent Member is not considered a veto.

The functions of the Security Council are:

- (1) It deals with "any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression". It may appeal to the nations involved in the dispute to settle it through negotiation or mediation or through judicial settlement. If fighting breaks out, the Security Council has the power to take collective action in recommending diplomatic and/or economic sanctions.
- (2) It submits annual or special reports to the General Assembly.
- (3) It recommends to the General Assembly the admission of new member nations and also suspension or expulsion of member nations for violating the U.N. Charter.
- (4) The members of the Security Council participate in the election of judges of the International Court of Justice.

- (5) It recommends to the General Assembly the name of a person for the post of the Secretary General.

22.3.3. The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC):

The economic and social functions of the United Nations were placed under the charge of the Economic and Social Council. Originally it consisted of 18 members. At present it is made up of representatives from 54 member-states elected by the General Assembly. Eighteen members are elected each year for a term of three years. Any country, not a member of ECOSOC, involved in a problem under discussion is invited to participate without the right to vote. At least two regular sessions of the ECOSOC are held each year. Special meetings are called if needed.

The aim of the ECOSOC has been to solve the international economic, social, educational, health and cultural problems. It was established for the purpose of promoting, encouraging and respecting human rights and freedom. Through its efforts, the U.N. has been trying to eliminate the underlying causes of war. It has been assisting the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Trusteeship Council in matters relating to its area of operation. Since 1947, several regional economic commissions have been set up which come under the jurisdiction of the ECOSOC. These include Economic Commission for Europe (ECE) with headquarters at Geneva; Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (ECAFE) with headquarters at Bangkok; Economic Commission for Africa (ECA) with headquarters at Addis Ababa; Economic Commission for Western Asia (ECWA) with headquarters at Baghdad; Economic and Social Commission for Latin America (ECLA). Additional functional commissions deal with such matters as statistics, population, human rights, economics and employment, status of women, transportation and communication and control of narcotic drug traffic. The ECOSOC also supervises the activities of various specialized agencies.

22.3.4. The Trusteeship Council:

The Trusteeship System was the outgrowth of the Mandate System of the League of Nations. Following the Second World War, the defeated powers were deprived of their colonies in Asia and Africa. The former colonies of Italy and Japan, together with the remaining mandates, were placed under the United Nations' supervision as trust territories. The main objective of the Council was the advancement of political, economic, social and educational life of the peoples with a view to develop self-government in trust territories, and eventually their independence.

The membership of the Trusteeship Council is made up of three different groups: (a) Countries which administered the trust territories; (b) Permanent Members of the Security Council which did not administer the trust territories; (c) other members elected by the General Assembly for a period of three years.

The chief functions of the Trusteeship Council are:

- (1) It considers reports submitted by the administering nations.
- (2) It accepts and examines petitions from the peoples of the trust territories.
- (3) It sends, with the consent of the administering nation, an investigating committee, to inquire into the complaints of the peoples of the trust territories.
- (4) It submits to the General Assembly an annual progress report based on the replies received from the trustee nations to its questionnaires.
- (5) It exercises supervision over the administration of trust territories.

22.3.5. The International Court of Justice:

The International Court of Justice has its headquarters at The Hague, Holland. It is an important organ of the U.N.O. It replaced the Permanent Court of International Justice of the League of Nations. The International Court of Justice consists of fifteen judges, elected by the General Assembly and the Security Council, for a term of nine years. The International Court of Justice examines all international cases referred to it and settles legal disputes between member states. The Court's jurisdiction extends to all states that agree to accept its verdicts. It also gives advisory opinion to UN organs on legal questions. Decisions in the Court are taken by majority votes.

22.3.6. The Secretariat:

The Secretariat operates from the U.N. headquarters at New York (U.S.A.). It is the administrative organ of the UNO. The Secretary General heads it. He is elected for a five-year term by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council. The Secretary General is assisted by 12 Under Secretaries General and over 12 assistant Secretaries General. The personnel of the U.N. Secretariat is recruited from different member-nations. The Secretary General and his staff are completely independent of the authority of any individual country in the discharge of their duties.

The chief functions of the Secretariat include drafting, translation, minuting and other tasks; provision of information to the delegates and implementation of U.N. decisions. According to Article 99 of the U.N. Charter, the Secretary General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter, which in his opinion may threaten international peace and security.

The Secretary General holds an important position in the U.N.O. Through his annual report and personal equation with world leaders, the Secretary General can create a climate favourable for

international peace. The leadership of the Secretary General is important in promoting the aims and objectives of the U.N.O.

The first Secretary General of the U.N.O. was Trygve Lie of Norway (1946-1953). The succeeding Secretaries General of the U.N.O. were: Dag Hammarskjöld of Sweden (1953-1961), U Thant of Burma (1961-1971), Kurt Waldheim of Austria (1972-1981), Javier Perez de Cuellar of Peru (1982-1991), Boutros Boutros Ghali of Egypt (1992-1996). The present Secretary General of the U.N.O. is Kofi Annan of Ghana from 1997.

22.4. Specialized Agencies of the U.N.O.

The specialized agencies are self-governing international organizations related to the United Nations. They deal with such worldwide problems as agriculture, communication, living and working conditions and health. Some of these have been associated with the ECOSOC for co-coordinating their activities with the United Nations. The Specialized Agencies are independent organizations with their own secretariats, deliberative bodies and executive councils. Some of them pre-date the United Nations and came into existence by inter-governmental agreement. The following are the Specialized Agencies of the U.N.O.

- (1) **Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO):** The FAO helps in improving the production of farms, forests and fishing waters. Headquarters: Rome.
- (2) **International Labour Organization (ILO):** The ILO helps in improving working conditions throughout the world. Headquarters: Geneva.
- (3) **United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO):** The UNESCO encourages educational, scientific, and cultural progress to increase understanding among nations. Headquarters: Paris.
- (4) **World Health Organization (WHO):** It aims at promoting health of all people and works for eliminating diseases and encourages medical research. Headquarters: Geneva.
- (5) **International Bank for Reconstruction and development (IBRD):** This is also known as the World Bank. It lends money to help countries with such projects as dams, power plants and railroads. Headquarters: Washington D.C.
- (6) **International Monetary Fund (IMF):** It helps to adjust differences between the money systems used by various nations, making it easier for nations to trade with one another. Headquarters: Washington D.C.
- (7) **United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF):** It is concerned with the promotion of all round welfare of children all over the world. Headquarter: New York.

- (8) **United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP):** It provides machinery for international cooperation in matters relating to the human environment. Headquarters: Nairobi.
- (9) **United Nations Fund For Population Activities (UNFPA):** It aims at promoting population programmes and in extending systematic and sustained population assistance to developing countries and helps them in dealing with their population problems. Headquarters: New York.
- (10) **United Nations Industrial Development Organization (UNIDO):** It is an international agency established by the General Assembly of the United Nations to help developing nations build strong economies by creating a solid industrial base. Headquarters: New York City and Geneva.
- (11) **International Maritime Organization (IMO):** The IMO promotes international cooperation on technical matters affecting shipping; recommends and encourages adoption of the highest standards of maritime safety and efficient navigation; and fosters international action to prevent pollution of the sea. Headquarters: London.
- (12) **International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA):** It aims to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy and to ensure that assistance provided by it or at its request or under its supervision or control is not used in such a way as to further any military purpose. Headquarters: Vienna.
- (13) **World Meteorological Organization (WMO):** The WMO helps to coordinate, standardize, and improve world meteorological information. Headquarters: Geneva.
- (14) **International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO):** It works for better safety in air service and for standard international flying regulations. Headquarters: Montreal, Canada.
- (15) **International Telecommunication Union (ITU):** It helps nations to cooperate to solve problems dealing with radio, telephone, telegraph and satellite communications. Headquarters: Geneva.
- (16) **Universal Postal Union (UPU):** It aims at forming a single postal territory of countries for exchange of correspondence, organizing and improving postal services and promoting international collaboration. Headquarters: Berne.
- (17) **United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR):** It aims at providing international protection for refugees and seeks permanent solution to their problems. Headquarters: Geneva.
- (18) **World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO):** It works for international cooperation to protect artistic and literary

works, inventions and trademarks against copying. Headquarters: Geneva.

(19) International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD): It is a one billion dollar fund which is used for raising food production in developing countries, employing poor and landless farmers and reducing malnutrition in the Third World countries. Headquarters: Rome.

(20) International Finance Corporation (IFC): It works with the World Bank. It encourages smaller, private development. It mostly lends money for large governmental projects. Headquarters: Washington D.C.

22.5. Functions of the United Nations

22.5.1. Settlement of disputes

The primary function of the United Nations is to maintain international peace and security. Chapter 6 of the UN Charter provides for the pacific settlement of disputes, through such means as negotiation, mediation, arbitration, and/or judicial decisions. When pacific settlement fails, the principle of collective security is applied by which the security of each member is assured by all, and aggression against one would be met by the resistance of all. This implies coercive measures, including economic and military sanctions, against an aggressor. In practice, however, collective security has been extremely difficult to achieve. During the Cold War, collective security was replaced by peacekeeping and preventive diplomacy. In the post-Cold War period, appeals to the United Nations for peacemaking purposes increased dramatically.

Owing to the Security Council's inability to agree on the instigator of aggression during the Cold War, actions to maintain international peace and security often took the form of peacekeeping missions. These missions began under the initiative of Secretary-General Dag Hammarskjöld (1953-61). In peacekeeping missions, UN troops are placed in situations of conflict to defuse tensions and are deployed only in situations in which all parties to the conflict in question have agreed on their deployment. The UN troops are to remain neutral and use force only for self-defense purposes. UN peacekeeping troops, called 'blue helmets', have served throughout the world, most extensively in the Middle East.

In addition to traditional peacekeeping and preventive diplomacy tasks, the functions of UN forces in the post-Cold War era have been expanded considerably. From 1990 they supervised elections in many parts of the world, including Nicaragua, Eritrea, and Cambodia; encouraged peace negotiations in El Salvador, Angola, and Western Sahara; and distributed food in Somalia. UN troop presence during the violent and protracted disintegration of

Yugoslavia renewed discussion about the role of UN troops in refugee resettlement. Despite the inability of the United Nations to enact fully the collective security measures envisioned in the Charter, the importance of UN peacekeeping forces was recognized in 1988, when they were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize.

Some of the important disputes that were settled by the United Nations in varying degree of success were the following:

22.5.1.a. West New Guinea, 1946:

In 1946 the UN helped to arrange independence of the Dutch East Indies (Indonesia) from Holland. However, no agreement was reached about the future of West New Guinea (West Irian), which was claimed by both countries. In 1961 fighting broke out between Indonesia and Holland. Following an appeal to both sides by the Secretary-General, U Thant negotiations were reopened. It was agreed in 1962 that the territory should become part of Indonesia. The transfer was organized and policed by a UN force. In this case the UN played a vital role in getting negotiations off the ground, though it did not itself make the decision about West Irian's future.

22.5.1.b. Palestine, 1947:

In 1947 Britain brought the problem of Palestine, especially the dispute between Jews and Arabs to the United Nations. After an investigation, the UN decided to divide Palestine, setting up the Jewish state of Israel. This was one of the UN's most controversial decisions, and the majority of Arabs did not accept it. The UN was unable to prevent a series of wars between Israel and various Arab states (1948-9, 1967 and 1973) though it did useful work arranging cease-fires and providing supervisory forces, while the UN Relief and Works Agency cared for the Arab refugees.

22.5.1.c. The Korean War (1950-3):

On 25 June 1950 the United Nations Commission in Korea informed the Security Council that South Korea had been invaded by North Korea. The Security Council met immediately and, in the absence of the Soviet Union, passed a resolution calling for an end of fighting and asking all members of the UN to help in this. Two days later the United States informed that she had sent troops to help South Korea, and the UN recommended other members to do the same. Eventually sixteen countries contributed forces, and forty-five countries gave some sort of aid. The American General Macarthur commanded the United Nations forces in the Korean War. This was the only occasion on which the UN was able to take decisive action in a crisis directly involving the interests of one of the superpowers. However, this was possible only because of the temporary absence of the Russian delegates, who would have vetoed the resolution if they had not been boycotting Security

Council meetings since January of that year in protest at the failure to allow communist China to join the UN. Although the Russian delegates returned smartly, it was too late for them to prevent action going ahead. The UN troops led by MacArthur were able to repel the invasion and preserve the frontier between the two Koreas along the 38th parallel.

Though this was claimed by the west as a great UN success, it was in fact very much an American operation. The vast majority of troops and the commander-in-chief, General MacArthur, were American, and the US government had already decided to intervene with force the day before the Security Council decision was taken. Only the absence of the Russians enabled the United States to turn it into a UN operation.

In July 1953 the signing of an armistice ended fighting in Korea. The Korean War had important results for the future of the UN: one was the passing of the 'Uniting for Peace' resolution which would permit a Security Council veto to be by-passed by a General Assembly vote. This increased the importance of the General Assembly and the authority of the UN as a whole. It also increased the support for the American case against allowing Communist China to join the UN. The Soviet Union launched a bitter attack on Secretary-General Trygvie-Lie accusing him of being the tool of the United States and Britain. In February 1951, the Soviet Union vetoed the renomination of Trygvie-Lie for the post of Secretary-General. His position soon became impossible and he eventually agreed to retire early, to be replaced by Dag Hammarskjold, the Director-General of the Swedish Foreign Ministry in April 1953.

22.5.1.d. The Suez Crisis (1956):

When President Nasser of Egypt suddenly nationalized the Suez Canal in July 1956. Britain and France, who held many shares of the Suez Canal Company protested strongly and sent troops 'to protect their interests'. Up to October 1956 the UN had played little or no part in the Suez Canal problem. On 13 October the Security Council's six unexceptionable principles for the settlement of the problem were vetoed by the Soviet Union. At the same time on 29 October the Israelis invaded Egypt from the east; the real aim of all three states was to bring down President Nasser. Britain and France vetoed a Security Council resolution condemning force. Following this the issue was transferred to the General Assembly under 'Uniting for Peace' resolution of 1950. The General Assembly, by a majority of 64 votes to 5, condemned the invasions and called for a withdrawal of troops. In view of the weight of opinion against them, the aggressors agreed to withdraw, provided the UN ensured a reasonable settlement over the canal and a United Nations force kept the peace between the Arabs and Israelis. Hammarskjold then drew up a plan for a United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF). Eventually 5000 troops from ten

different countries moved in, while the British, French and Israelis gradually withdrew. The UNEF remained as a buffer between the Israelis and the Egyptians until 1967. The prestige of the UN and of Dag Hammarskjold, who handled the Suez Crisis with considerable skill, was greatly enhanced, though American and Russian pressure was also important in bringing about a cease-fire. However, the UN was not so successful in the 1967 Arab-Israeli conflict.

22.5.1.e. The Hungarian Rising (1956):

The Hungarian revolution against the Soviet control occurred simultaneously with the Suez Crisis. In October 1956, the West brought the question of the Soviet threat to Hungarian independence before the Security Council, and early in November Nagy appealed for help from the United Nations. However, the Soviet Union vetoed the Security Council resolution demanding the immediate withdrawal of Soviet forces from Hungary. The same resolution was passed by the General Assembly. However, nothing was done except that the Soviet Union was condemned for 'violation of the Charter'. The failure of the United Nations to influence Soviet actions towards Hungary showed that if a Great Power was determined to defy the United Nations and had the power to do it, the UN was helpless. The contrast with Suez was striking: there, Britain and France were willing to bow to international pressure; the Soviet Union simply ignored the UN and nothing could be done.

The period from 1957 to 1960 was relatively quiet for the United Nations. Hammarskjold was elected to a second term of office as Secretary-General. In 1960 seventeen new countries, mainly African, joined the United Nations.

22.5.1.f. Civil War in the Belgian Congo (1960-4):

At the end of June 1960 Belgium granted independence to the Congo. A few days later the Congolese army mutinied and Belgian troops returned. In July 1960 Hammarskjold took the initiative and requested a meeting of the Security Council, which passed a resolution recommending the creation of a United Nations force. This force was intended to help in restoring order so that Belgian and any other foreign troops could leave. The Belgian troops withdrew from Congo as soon as 3,000 UN troops arrived in Congo. In August, Lumumba, the Congolese Prime minister, asked the UN forces to attack the breakaway state of Katanga. Though Hammarskjold refused to recognize the right of Katanga to breakaway, he was not in favour of using the UN forces to attack the province. Lumumba then looked for help from other sources, including the Soviet Union.

At this point the United Nations action in the Congo lost the support of the Soviet Union, whose representatives began a personal attack on the Secretary-General. Khrushchev even

demanded the resignation of Hammarskjold, which the latter refused. Hammarskjold believed that the Congo was a potential battleground between the East and the West as well as between different groups of Africans, and in February 1961 he was given greater authority by the United Nations to prevent an outbreak of civil war in the country. In July 1961 the UN helped in arranging a meeting between the various political leaders of the Congo, and in September 1961 United Nations forces entered Katanga. While on his way to a meeting with Tshombe, the president of Katanga, his plan crashed and Hammarskjold was killed. U Thant of Burma succeeded him as Secretary-General in November 1961. By the end of 1962 United Nations operations against Katanga were finally successful, and two years later the UN military forces finally left the Congo.

22.5.1.g. Cyprus:

Cyprus has kept the UN busy since 1964. A British colony since 1878, the island was granted independence in 1960. In 1963 civil war broke out between the Greeks, who made up about 80 per cent of the population, and the Turks. A UN peacekeeping force arrived in March 1964; an uneasy peace was restored, but it needed 3,000 UN troops permanently stationed in Cyprus to prevent the conflict between the Greeks and Turks. That was not the end of the trouble. In 1974 the Greek Cypriots tried to unite the island with Greece. This prompted the Turkish Cypriots, helped by invading Turkish army troops, to seize the north of the island for their own territory. They went on to expel all Greeks living in that area. Again UN forces achieved a cease-fire and are still policing the frontier between Greeks and Turks. However, the UN has so far failed to find a solution to the problem of two hostile communities on one island.

22.5.1.h. Kashmir:

In Kashmir the UN found itself in a similar situation to the one in Cyprus. After 1947, this large province, lying between India and Pakistan was claimed by both states. Already in 1948 the UN had negotiated a cease-fire after fighting broke out between India and Pakistan. At this point the Indians were occupying the southern part of Kashmir, the Pakistanis the northern part, and for the next sixteen years the UN policed the ceasefire line between the two zones. When Pakistani troops invaded the Indian zone in 1965, a short war developed, but once again the UN successfully intervened and hostilities ceased. The original dispute still remained though, and in the 1990's there seemed little prospect of the UN or any other agency finding a permanent solution.

22.5.1.i. The Czechoslovak Crisis (1968):

This was almost a repeat performance of the Hungarian rising twelve years earlier. When the Czechs expressed what the Soviet Union considered to be too much independence, the Soviet

and other Warsaw Pact troops were sent Czechoslovakia to enforce compliance to the Soviet Union. The Security Council tried to pass a motion condemning this action, but the Soviet Union vetoed it, claiming that the Czech government had asked for their intervention. Although the Czechs denied this, there was nothing the UN could do in view of the Soviet Union's refusal to co-operate.

22.5.1.j. Lebanon:

The United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) had been operating with about 7,000 troops in the South Lebanon since 1978 in a frontier dispute between Lebanese Christians, aided by the Israelis, and Palestinians. UNIFIL has had some success in maintaining relative peace in the area, but it had been a constant struggle against frontier violations, assassinations, terrorism and the seizing of hostages.

22.5.1.k. Iran-Iraq War:

The UN was successful in bringing an end to the long drawn-out war between Iran and Iraq (1980-88). After years of attempting to mediate, the UN at last negotiated a cease-fire between the two belligerents. The fact that both sides were close to exhaustion made the task of the United Nations easier.

22.5.1.l. Iraq's Invasion of Kuwait:

UN action during the Gulf War of 1991 was impressive. When Saddam Hussein of Iraq sent his troops to invade and capture the tiny, but extremely rich neighbouring state of Kuwait in August 1990, the UN Security Council warned him to withdraw or face the consequences. When he refused, a large UN force was sent to Saudi-Arabia. In a short and decisive campaign, Iraqi troops were driven out, suffering heavy losses, and Kuwait was liberated. However, critics of the UN complained that Kuwait had received help only because the West needed her oil supplies; other small nations, which had no value to the West, had received no help when larger neighbours invaded them. For example East Timor, taken over by Indonesia in 1975.

22.5.1.m. Cambodia:

Problems in Cambodia (Kampuchea) dragged on for nearly twenty years, but eventually the UN was able to arrange a solution. In 1975 the Khmer Rouge, a communist guerrilla force led by Pol Pot, seized power from the right-wing government of Prince Sihanouk. Over the next three years Pol Pot's brutal regime slaughtered about a third of the population until in 1978 a Vietnamese army invaded the country. They drove out the Khmer Rouge and set up a new government. At first the UN, prompted by the United States, condemned this action, although many people thought Vietnam had done the people of Cambodia a great service by getting rid of the cruel Pol Pot regime. But it was all part of the Cold War, which meant that any action by Vietnam, an ally of the

Soviet Union, would be condemned by the United States. The end of the Cold War enabled the UN to organize and supervise a solution. Vietnamese forces were withdrawn in September 1989, and after a long period of negotiations and persuasion, elections were held in June 1993, won by Prince Sihanouk's party. The result was widely accepted, and the country gradually began to settle down.

22.5.1.n. Mozambique:

Mozambique, which gained independence from Portugal in 1975, was torn by civil war for many years. By 1990 the country was in ruins and both sides were exhausted. Although both sides had signed a cease-fire agreement in Rome in October 1992 at a conference organized by the Roman Catholic Church and the Italian government, it was ineffective. There were many violations of the cease-fire and there was no way that elections could be held in such an atmosphere. The UN now became fully involved operating a programme of demobilizing and disarming the various armies, distributing humanitarian relief, and preparing for elections, which took place successfully in October 1994.

It is important to note that the United Nations was not always successful in a number of international crises. The United Nations was not involved to any great extent in crises over Berlin, Cuba, the Sino-Indian frontier or Vietnam. In 1964-65, the United Nations was almost bankrupt as the Congo operation had been very expensive. The Soviet Union, the communist states, Belgium, France, and South Africa refused to pay their contribution arguing that the United Nations force was not properly authorized.

In October 1995 the United Nations celebrated its fiftieth anniversary. But it is still nowhere near achieving its basic aims. The world is still full of economic and social problems and acts of aggression, wars and terrorism continue. However, the United Nations in spite of its inherent weaknesses had been playing an important role in attempting to maintain peace and security and promoting co-operation among the nations of the world in promoting economic, social, educational and cultural progress throughout the world.

22.5.2. Arms Control and Disarmament:

The founders of the United Nations hoped that the maintenance of international peace and security would lead to the control and eventual reduction of weapons. Therefore, Article 11 of the Charter empowers the General Assembly to consider principles for arms control and disarmament and to make recommendations to member states and the Security Council. Article 26 gives the Security Council the responsibility to formulate plans "for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments." The goal of arms control and reduction has not proved to be successful.

Nevertheless, the United Nations has facilitated the negotiation of several multilateral arms control treaties.

Because of the enormous destructive power realized with the development and use of the atomic bomb during Second World War, the General Assembly in 1946 created the Atomic Energy Commission to assist in the urgent consideration of the control of atomic energy and in the reduction of atomic weapons. The conflicting positions of the two superpowers prevented agreement on international control of atomic weapons and energy.

In 1947 the Security Council organized the Commission for Conventional Armaments to deal with armaments other than weapons of mass destruction, but progress in this field also was blocked by disagreement between the Soviet Union and the Western powers. As a result, in 1952 the General Assembly voted to replace both of these commissions with a new Disarmament Commission. This commission, which consisted of the members of the Security Council and Canada, was directed to prepare proposals that would regulate, limit, and balance reduction of all armed forces and armaments, eliminate all weapons of mass destruction, and ensure international control of and use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only. In spite of vigorous efforts to achieve constructive results through the commission and through the General Assembly, little progress was made. In 1957, however, the International Atomic Energy Agency was established to promote the peaceful uses of atomic energy.

The General Assembly in 1961 adopted a resolution declaring the use of nuclear or thermonuclear weapons to be contrary to international law, to the UN Charter, and to the laws of humanity. The Nuclear Weapons Test-Ban Treaty was signed in August 1963, by the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom, and the United States. This agreement--to which more than 100 states later adhered--prohibited nuclear tests or explosions in the atmosphere, in outer space, and underwater. In 1966 the General Assembly unanimously approved a treaty prohibiting the placement of weapons of mass destruction in Earth orbit, on the Moon, or on other celestial bodies and recognizing the use of outer space exclusively for peaceful purposes. In June 1968 the assembly approved the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, which banned the spread of nuclear weapons from nuclear to non-nuclear powers.

The United Nations has been active in trying to eliminate other weapons of mass destruction of a variety of types and in a variety of contexts. In 1970 the General Assembly approved a treaty banning the placement of weapons of mass destruction on the seabed. In 1971 the assembly approved a convention prohibiting the manufacture, stockpiling, and use of biological weapons, although many states have never acceded to it. In 1993

the Chemical Weapons Convention, prohibiting the development, production, stockpiling, and use of chemical weapons and providing for their destruction was proposed by the United Nations.

22.5.3. Economic Welfare and Cooperation:

The General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Secretariat, and many of the subsidiary organs and specialized agencies are responsible for promoting economic welfare and cooperation in such areas as postwar reconstruction, technical assistance, and trade and development. To assist in dealing with regional problems, the Economic and Social Council in 1947 established the Economic Commission for Europe and the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East. Similar commissions were established for Latin America in 1948 and for Africa in 1958.

In 1960 the International Development Association (IDA) was established to make loans to less-developed countries on terms that were more flexible than bank loans. The General Assembly in 1957 unanimously adopted a resolution to set up a fund to provide systematic assistance in fields essential to technical, economic, and social development of less-developed countries. The special fund went into effect in 1959. The Expanded Programme of Technical Assistance and the Special Fund were merged in 1965 to become the UN Development Programme (UNDP).

After the massive decolonization of the 1950's and early 1960's, the developing countries became much more numerous, organized, and powerful in the General Assembly, and they began to create organs to deal with the problems of development and diversification in Third World economies. Because the international trading system and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) dealt primarily with the promotion of trade between advanced industrialized nations, the General Assembly established the UN Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) in 1964 to address the issues of developing countries. Toward that end, UNCTAD and the Group of 77 less-developed countries that promoted its establishment tried to codify principles of international trade and arrange agreements to stabilize commodity prices. UNCTAD discussions resulted in agreements on providing for lower tariff rates for some exports of poorer countries. It has also discussed questions related to shipping, insurance, commodities, the transfer of technology, and the means for assisting the exports of developing countries. The ultimate impact of UNCTAD's discussions and agreements, however, has been reduced by internal cleavages and by disagreements with GATT and the advanced industrialized states.

22.5.4. Social Welfare and Co-operation:

Like the League of Nations before it, the United Nations is concerned with issues of human rights, including the rights of women and children, refugee resettlement, and narcotics control. Some of its greatest successes have been in the area of improving the health and welfare of the world's population.

The International Refugee Organization was successful in resettling, repatriating, transporting, and maintaining more than one million European refugees. It was abolished in 1952 and replaced by a new refugee structure, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The commission has undertaken major operations to help refugees in Western Europe, Africa, Asia, Central America, and the Balkans. A separate organization, the UN Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), is responsible for aiding refugees in the Middle East.

The Commission on Narcotic Drugs was authorized by the General Assembly in 1946 to assume the functions of the League of Nations Advisory Committee on Traffic in Opium and Other Dangerous Drugs. In addition to re-establishing the pre-Second World War system of narcotics control, which had been disrupted by the war, the United Nations addressed new problems resulting from the development of synthetic drugs.

The UN, through the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) and specialized agencies such as the World Health Organization (WHO), works toward improving health and welfare conditions around the world. UNICEF was established by the General Assembly in December 1946 to provide for the needs of children in areas devastated by the Second World War. UNICEF was made a permanent UN organization in 1953. Financed largely by the contributions of member states, it has helped feed children in more than 100 countries, provided clothing and other needs, and sought to eradicate such diseases as tuberculosis, whooping cough, and diphtheria. UNICEF promotes low-cost preventative health care measures for children. By 1991, UNICEF and WHO achieved a goal, set in 1985, of providing immunization for 80 percent of the world's children against six childhood diseases.

Because of a growing concern with environmental issues, the General Assembly organized the UN Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm in 1972, which led to the creation of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) that same year. UNEP has worked on such problems as cleaning up the Mediterranean; protecting water resources; combating deforestation, desertification, and drought; and phasing out the production of ozone-depleting chemicals. Although both developing and developed countries recognize the need to preserve natural resources, developing countries often charge that the environment has been despoiled primarily by the advanced industrialized states.

The UNEP succeeded in establishing, through the General Assembly, a World Commission on Environment and Development and in 1988 outlined an environmental programme to set priorities for the 1990-95 period. International conferences continued to focus attention on environmental issues, culminating in the UN Conference on Environment and Development, held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992. It was the largest intergovernmental conference in history. The conference, however, produced only a statement of principles and a plan for the simultaneous promotion of economic growth and preservation of natural resources.

22.5.5. Decolonization and the Trust Territories:

The United Nations has been concerned with people living in non-self-governing territories and tried to facilitate the transition to independence of former colonies. The anti-colonial movement in the United Nations reached a high point in 1960, when the General Assembly adopted a resolution sponsored by more than forty African and Asian states. This resolution, called the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, condemned 'the subjection of peoples to alien subjugation, domination and exploitation' and declared that 'immediate steps shall be taken . . . to transfer all powers' to the peoples in the colonies 'without any conditions or reservations, in accordance with their freely expressed will and desire . . . in order to enable them to enjoy complete independence and freedom.' After the decolonization period of the 1960's, new states exerted increasing power and influence, especially in the General Assembly.

The trusteeship system of the United Nations became redundant by the 1990's due to the independence of most former trusteeships. The trusteeship system was established on the principle that colonial territories taken away from defeated enemies should not be annexed by any victorious nation but should be administered by mandatory or trust power under international supervision in preparation for determining their own future status.

Eleven such territories taken from Germany, Italy, and Japan were brought under the trusteeship system after 1945. With the attainment of independence by Togo, the British Cameroons (part of which joined Nigeria, the remainder becoming part of Cameroon), the French Cameroons (now Cameroon), Somaliland (now Somalia), Tanganyika (now Tanzania), Western Samoa (now Samoa), Ruanda-Urundi (which became the separate countries of Rwanda and Burundi), New Guinea (now part of Papua New Guinea), and Nauru, by 1980 only the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands remained under trusteeship.

Questions

1. Examine the origin, aims and objectives and organization of the UNO.
2. Evaluate the role of the UNO in maintaining peace and settlement of disputes.
3. Describe the achievements of the UNO in any TWO of the following:
 - (a) Arms control and disarmament
 - (b) Economic welfare and cooperation
 - (c) Social welfare and cooperation
 - (d) Decolonization and Trust territories



HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT AND CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Objectives:

1. To study the concept and practice of Human Rights Movement.
2. To understand the progress of Civil Rights Movement with special reference to the USA.

23. 1. HUMAN RIGHTS MOVEMENT:

Introduction:

Human Rights are of Universal importance. They are common to all regardless of caste, colour, religion, race, etc. Countries, all over the world strive hard to safeguard human rights through their well established constitutions as per the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights; Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and Optional Protocols. Violations of Human Rights occur in the name of religion, race, creed, caste, colour, sex, region, etc.

It has been said that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. The concept of human rights has been evolved from the concept of natural rights. These natural rights are derived from Natural Law, which helped in the development of human rights.

23. 1.1. Historical Background:

Traces of human rights can be found in the writings of ancient Greek and Roman thinkers in the fifth century B.C. According to ancient Greek writers, the God establishes a law, which stands above the obligations and interdictions imposed by the rulers of the community. But it was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that this theory was popularized by the philosophers such as Hobbes, Locke, Spinoza and others. The American Declaration of Independence (1776) and the Declaration of the Rights of Man by the French National Assembly (1789), stressed the inherent rights of man. These indicate how it was for the first time an attempt was made to derive human rights from natural rights.

Human rights had already found expression in the Covenant of the League of Nations, which led to the creation of the International Labour Organization. At the 1945 San Francisco Conference, held to draft the Charter of the United Nations, a proposal to embody a 'Declaration on the Essential Rights of Man' was put forward but was not examined because it required more detailed consideration than was possible at the time. The Charter clearly speaks of 'promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.' The idea of promulgating an 'international bills of rights' was also considered by many as basically implicit in the Charter.

The League of Nations and the United Nations stressed the need for striving towards peace among the countries of the world and for the upliftment of human rights. The United Nations Charter pays special attention in safeguarding and developing human rights since 1945. There was lack of proper understanding about human rights prior to 1945. But, today the realization of human rights has become important at the national and international level. Democracy is a precondition for strengthening human rights. No society can be free, or no state can claim to be democratic unless every citizen enjoys human rights. In modern times all the democratic states give top most priority to safeguard human rights and establish peace in their states. Un Charter also emphasizes peace and human rights all over the world, which in turn helps to promote socio-economic development.

23.1.2. Universal Declaration of Human Rights:

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted as a resolution unanimously on 10 December 1948 by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The objective of the 30-article declaration is to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The declaration proclaims the personal, civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights of humans, which are limited only by recognition for the rights and freedoms of others and the requirements of morality, public order, and general welfare. Among the rights cited by the declaration are the rights to life, liberty, and security of person; to freedom from arbitrary arrest; to a fair trial; to be presumed innocent until proved guilty; to freedom from interference with the privacy of one's home and correspondence; to freedom of movement and residence; to asylum, nationality, and ownership of property; to freedom of thought, conscience, religion, opinion, and expression; to association, peaceful assembly, and participation in government; to social security, work, rest, and a standard of living adequate for health and well-being; to education; and to participation in the social life of one's community. The declaration was conceived as the first part of an international bill of rights. The UN Commission

on Human Rights directed its efforts to the incorporation of the main principles of the declaration into various international agreements.

The General Assembly in 1955 authorized two human rights covenants, one relating to civil and political rights, and the other to economic, social, and cultural rights. After a long struggle for ratification, both of these covenants became effective in January 1976.

Since 1948 it has been and rightly continues to be the most important and far-reaching of all United Nations declarations, and a fundamental source of inspiration for national and international efforts to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms. It has set the direction for all subsequent work in the field of human rights and has provided the basic philosophy for many legally binding international instruments designed to protect the rights and freedoms, which it proclaims. As its very name implies it is universal not only in title but also in content. It enunciates and directs that human rights and fundamental freedoms should be available to all human beings on the earth. These rights are beneficial to the peoples of the whole universe. Almost all its articles start with the word 'Every one' or 'No one' or 'Men and Women'. It shows that every human being is entitled to enjoy the human rights regardless of citizenship or domicile.

The United Nations have proclaimed that peoples all over the world have these rights not because they belong to certain countries or states, but because they are the members of human family. The Universal Declaration of Rights sets a new international standard. It is one of the greatest achievements of Mrs. Roosevelt, the chairperson of the Commission on Human Rights and the principal representative of the United States on the Third Committee. She stated that, "the Declaration was the first and foremost declaration of the basic principles to serve as a common standard for all nations." She also added that, "it is the International Magna Carta of all Mankind."

In the Proclamation of Teheran, adopted by the International Conference on Human Rights held in Iran in 1968, the Conference agreed that "the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states a common understanding of the peoples of the world concerning the inalienable and inviolable rights of all members of the human family and constitutes an obligation for the members of the international community." The Conference affirmed its faith in the principles set forth in the Declaration, and urged all peoples and governments "to dedicate themselves to [those] principles. . . and to redouble their efforts to provide for all human beings a life consonant with freedom and dignity and conducive to physical, mental, social and spiritual welfare."

23.1.3. International Covenants on Human Rights:

In 1952, it was decided that there should be two great Covenants one on Civil and Political Rights and the other on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Following this, a separate instrument called the Optional Protocol to the Civil and Political Rights Covenant was adopted in 1966 to regulate the implementation arrangements. As such the two Covenants were adopted unanimously on 16 December 1966 but they came into force only in 1976. The Covenants are to affirm legal obligations of States to respect human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights constitute a trinity, often regarded as the 'Magna Carta of Humanity'.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights came into force from March 1976 together with its Optional Protocol. The major rights and freedoms provided by this Covenant are rights to self-determination, right to life, abolition of slavery and suppression of slave trade, right to liberty, right of prisoners to be treated with humanity, right of not to be imprisoned arbitrarily, right of every one to leave any country, including his own and to return to his country, right to equality in the administration of justice, right to provide legal assistance, right to privacy, right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, right to freedom of opinion and expression, right to freedom of peaceful assembly, right to freedom of association, rights relating to marriage and family protection, right of the child, right to take part in the conduct of public affairs, and right to equality before law and equal protection of the law.

This Covenant has the provision to check violation of human rights and implement the same. In order to implement these rights the Covenant has established an international organ known as the 'Human Rights Committee'. The Committee consists of eighteen members who are experts in human rights. The International Court of Justice elects the members. Each member has a term of four years. The Human Rights Committee adopts four different methods in implementing human rights as provided in the Covenant. These are: meetings, reporting, inter-state communication system and conciliation.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol are separate instruments. But they are related to each other. Only those states, which are parties to the Covenant, can become parties to the Protocol. The first Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights enables the Human Rights Committee set up under the Covenant, to receive and consider communications from individuals claiming to be victims of violations of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant. Both the Covenant and the Protocol came into force

simultaneously in March 1976. The country that ratifies the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights undertakes to protect its people by law against cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. It recognizes the right of every human being to life, liberty, privacy and security of a person.

A country ratifying the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights acknowledges its responsibility to promote better living conditions of its people. It recognizes every one's right to work, to fair wages, to social security, to adequate standards of living and freedom from hunger and to health and education. It also undertakes to ensure the right of every one to form and join trade unions.

The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations plays an important role in protecting the human rights as provided in the UN Charter. The ECOSOC set up the International Commission on Human Rights in February 1946. The Human Rights Committee has the right to make recommendations to the ECOSOC. The Human Rights Committee has submitted certain conventions, which are considered to be very important. Some of these are: Declaration of the rights of the Child (1953); United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1963); Declaration on the Elimination of Religious Intolerance (1964); International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (1972); Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from being subjected to Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1989).

23.1.4. Limitations:

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that the exercise of a person's rights and freedoms may be subject to certain limitations, which must be determined by law, solely for the purpose of securing due recognition of the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society. Rights may not be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, or if they are aimed at destroying any of the rights set forth in the Declaration. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights states that the rights provided for therein may be limited by law, but only in so far as it is compatible with the nature of the rights and solely to promote the general welfare in a democratic society.

Unlike the Universal Declaration and the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights contains no general provision applicable to all the rights provided for in the Covenant authorizing restrictions on their exercise. However, several articles in the Covenant provide that the rights being dealt with shall not be

subject to any restrictions except those which are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect national security, public order, or the rights and freedoms of others.

Certain rights, therefore, may never be suspended or limited, even in emergency situations. These are the rights to life, to freedom from torture, to freedom from enslavement or servitude, to protection from imprisonment for debt, to freedom from retroactive penal laws, to recognition as a person before the law, and to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights allows a State to limit or suspend the enjoyment of certain rights in cases of officially proclaimed public emergencies, which threaten the life of the nation. Such limitations or suspensions are permitted only 'to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation' and may never involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin. The limitations or suspensions must also be reported to the United Nations.

23.1.5. Violation of Human Rights:

Almost in all the countries of the world, violation of human rights has become a normal commitment. Even the organized governments could not prevent the violation of human rights. Police and custodians of law cause atrocities against women, children, prisoners, poor and destitutes. The police use third degree methods to extract confessions from suspected criminals. Sometimes innocent people die due to such inhuman treatment by the police. Death in police custody has become a common feature in many countries of the world. Police encounters in which criminals are killed are also violation of human rights. Abuse of prisoners, ill treatment of women in the name of dowry leading to either murder or suicide, honour killing of women for violation of clan or caste rules, etc. constitute violation of human rights. Genocides carried out by the Khmer Rouge regime of Pol Pot in Cambodia from 1975 to 1979, mutual massacre of Tutsis and Hutus in Rwanda in 1994, mass killings in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo in former Yugoslavia since 1991, elimination of political dissidents in many countries of Latin America and Africa, and suppression of democratic movement in China (Tiananmen Square massacre, 1989), and Burma, have been serious violations of human rights. The apartheid followed by the minority white regime in South Africa was the worst human rights abuse known in history.

23.1.6. Human Rights and International Law:

Since the Second World War international law has become increasingly concerned with the protection of human rights. It has provided improved procedures for that purpose within the UN. This new emphasis has also been manifested in the adoption by the UN of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the conclusion of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of

Genocide in 1948, the signing of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in 1966, and the adoption in 1975 of the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture or Other Cruel, Inhumane, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. These measures have been supplemented by regional conventions, such as the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950) and the American Convention on Human Rights (1969). In 1945 an international convention for the prosecution of the major war criminals of the European Axis Powers provided for the punishment of crimes against humanity and established a special International Military Tribunal for that purpose.

The ethnically-motivated massacres and human rights atrocities during recent and continuing civil wars, such as those in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, have prompted the UN to establish international courts to deal with violations of human rights in times of war. For example the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) was set up in 1994 and, after the conclusion of two trials, now has twenty-four suspects in custody. The tribunal's conviction of Jean-Paul Akayesu, the former mayor of the central Rwandan community of Taba, on nine counts of genocide and crimes against humanity in September 1998 set an important precedent for other international courts. In a second ruling the ICTR became the first international court to define the crime of rape, calling it a "physical invasion of a sexual nature, committed on a person under circumstances which are coercive." This was necessary, the court said, because "to date, there is no commonly accepted definition of [rape] in international law." The court also ruled that rape and sexual violence may constitute genocide if committed with the intent to destroy a specific national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.

The international application of human rights violations developed further with the extradition of former Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet from Britain to Spain. After his arrest in October 1998, Pinochet was extradited to Spain to face trial for crimes against humanity, specifically the violation of the human rights of Spanish citizens in Chile. In April 1999 the British Home Secretary, Jack Straw, decided that the extradition could go ahead, despite claims from Pinochet's supporters, including those in Chile, that a head of state was immune from such charges. Extradition proceedings were opened in September, and a ruling the following month stated that Pinochet's extradition to Spain could go ahead. However, medical examinations undertaken as part of an appeal against this decision revealed that he was too ill to stand trial. Four European countries appealed against the Home Office's decision, but Pinochet was allowed to return to Chile in March 2000.

New threats constantly call for new international responses. As well as the establishment of temporary international courts to investigate specific cases of alleged genocide and government-sponsored violation of human rights, examples include the conventions against acts of terrorism and the distribution of drugs. Thus, despite the modern multiplication of global and regional multilateral treaties, customary international law still maintains a central role in the legal system of the international community. Two Libyans suspected of carrying out the Lockerbie bombing in 1988, in which 259 people died, were handed over to United Nations officials in April 1999. They entered pleas of not guilty at the pre-trial hearing; their trial started in the Netherlands in May 2000 with Scottish judges presiding.

23.1.7. Amnesty International:

Amnesty International is an independent, worldwide pressure group campaigning impartially for the release of all prisoners of conscience, that is, people imprisoned or maltreated because of their political or religious beliefs. The movement was founded in 1961 by the British lawyer Peter Benenson, and maintains its headquarters in London. Amnesty International is based on a network of voluntary local groups and individual members throughout the world, who adopt prisoners of conscience and pursue their cases with the governments concerned or through international bodies. Methods of investigation and campaigning include monitoring, fact-finding missions, media publicity, and individual correspondence.

The general purposes of the organization are to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; to work for the release of those detained, restricted, or otherwise subjected to physical coercion by reason of their beliefs, ethnic origin, gender, colour, or language, provided they have not used or advocated violence; to oppose detention without trial and to uphold the right to a fair trial; and to oppose the use of the death penalty or torture, whether or not the people concerned have advocated violence.

Amnesty International is financed by voluntary donations. Its membership stands at some 1.2 million people, with 4,300 volunteer groups and nationally organized sections in 55 countries, and supporters in more than 160 countries. In 1977 Amnesty International received the Nobel Prize for Peace for "its efforts on behalf of defending human dignity against violence and subjugation".

23.2. CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

23.2.1. Civil Rights:

Civil rights are the freedoms and rights that a person may have as a member of a community, state, or nation. Civil rights include freedom of speech, of the press, and of religion. Among

others are the right to own property, and to receive fair and equal treatment from government, other persons, and private groups.

In democratic countries, law and custom protect civil rights. The constitutions of many democracies have bills of rights that describe basic liberties and rights. Courts of law decide whether a person's civil rights have been violated. The courts also determine the limits of civil rights, so that people do not use their freedoms in order to violate the rights of others.

In many non-democratic countries, the government claims to respect and guarantee civil rights. But in most of these countries, such claims differ greatly from the actual conditions. In some Communist countries, for example, the people were denied such basic rights as freedom of speech and of the press. Yet their constitutions guaranteed these rights.

Some people draw sharp distinctions between civil liberties and civil rights. They regard civil liberties as guarantees to a person against government interference. They think of civil rights as guarantees of equal treatment for all people. For example, civil liberties would include freedom from government interference with a person's right to free speech. Civil rights would include the right of all people to receive equal protection of the law. Civil rights often refer to the condition and treatment of minority group.

23.2.2. Basic Civil Rights:

The basic civil rights recognized by most democratic countries are freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to peaceful assembly. These rights are guaranteed under the constitutions of many countries. Legislation may guarantee other rights concerned with the process of law. These include protection against arrest and detention without a proper reason, the right to jury trial, and protection against being tried twice for the same offence. In addition, people and property may not be wrongfully searched or seized and excessive or unusual punishments may not be inflicted.

Rights against discrimination protect minority groups and ensure equal rights and opportunities for all people regardless of race, sex, religion, age, or disability. Laws exist in many countries to give equal rights to all men and women regardless of their race or religion. But in some countries, discrimination on racial or religious grounds is part of government policy. Rights to form trades unions are intended to protect workers from exploitation by their employers. In many countries, workers are still fighting for the right to organize and to campaign for better pay, improved working conditions, and the right to strike.

23.2.3. Limits of Civil Rights:

All civil rights have limits, even in democratic countries. For example, a person may be denied freedom of speech in a

democracy if it can be shown that his or her speech might lead to the overthrow of the government. A person may not use civil rights to justify actions that might seriously harm the health, welfare, safety, or morals of others. A person may be denied a civil right if that right is used to violate other people's rights. Freedom of expression, for example, does not permit a person to tell lies that ruin another person's reputation. Property owners have the right to do what they choose with their property. However, this right may not allow a person legally to refuse to sell property to a person of a certain race or religion. This is because the property owner would be denying the other person equal freedom of choice.

The specific limits of civil rights vary with the times. In time of war, a government may restrict personal freedoms in the interest of the security of the country. Changing social and economic conditions also cause changes in the importance that people give certain rights.

23.2.4. Civil Rights Movement in the United States:

One of the bitterest civil rights movements was that of black Americans in the United States, who campaigned for equal rights from the 1800's. This campaign continued through the 1900's, and led to a major protest movement during the 1950's and 1960's, which resulted in important civil rights legislation to end discrimination against black Americans.

23.2.4.a. Constitutional Amendments in Favour of the Blacks:

Black Americans, who make up the largest minority group in the United States, have been denied their full civil rights more than any other minority group. However, the black Americans made significant gains in their struggle for equal rights during Reconstruction, the twelve-year period following the Civil War (1860-65). The Thirteenth Amendment, adopted in 1865, abolished slavery in the United States. In 1868, the Fourteenth Amendment made the former slaves citizens. It also provided that the states must grant all people within their jurisdiction 'equal protection of the law'. The Fifteenth Amendment, which became law in 1870, prohibited the states from denying people the right to vote because of their race. During Reconstruction, Congress passed several laws to protect blacks' civil rights.

23.2.4.b. 'Separate but Equal' Rule:

During the 1870's, white Americans increasingly disregarded the newly won rights of black Americans. The government itself contributed greatly to denying blacks the rights. In 1883, the Supreme Court ruled that Congressional acts to prevent racial discrimination by private individuals were unconstitutional. In 1896, in the case of Plessy v. Ferguson, the Supreme Court upheld Louisiana law requiring separate but equal accommodations for blacks and whites in railroad cars. For over fifty years, many

Southern states used the 'separate but equal' rule established in this case to segregate the races in public schools, and in transportation, recreation, and such public establishments as hotels and restaurants. Many states also used literacy, poll taxes, and other means to deprive blacks of their voting rights.

23.2.4.c. Changes in the American Race Relations:

The period after the Second World War was one of rapid change in American race relations. As more blacks left the rural south for urban areas, the relative economic status of blacks improved. The existence of a growing affluent and educated black population in urban areas made possible major political gains. Black urban voters provided decisive support for liberal Democratic candidates, who in turn backed civil rights reforms.

A pattern of black influence on national politics was clearly established in 1948, when Harry Truman was elected president, despite receiving only a minority of white votes. Truman had gained the support of blacks by issuing an executive order that eventually desegregated the armed forces and by supporting a civil rights policy for the Democratic Party. Although Truman's actions had little immediate impact on blacks, they indicated that the federal government was listening to black demands. Vigorous political dissent among blacks was discouraged during the so-called McCarthy era (1950-1955), as black leaders came under attack from the government, but anti-communism also provided an excuse for blacks to demand that the United States live up to its democratic claims.

23.2.4.d. Desegregation in Schools:

Although neither President Eisenhower nor Congress was willing to take action on behalf of black civil rights during the first half of the 1950's, new presidential appointments to the US Supreme Court prepared the way for a reversal of racial segregation in schools established in 1896. In 1954 the Supreme Court ruled, in *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, that segregation in public schools is unconstitutional. In time, this decision broke down the 'separate but equal' principle. Although southern white officials sought to obstruct implementation of the *Brown* decision, many African-Americans saw the ruling as a sign that the federal government might intervene on their behalf in other racial matters. Unwilling to wait for firm federal action, however, southern blacks began their own desegregation efforts. In 1957, black children defied white mobs in Little Rock, Arkansas, until Eisenhower sent troops to protect their right to attend an all-white high school. Ten years after the *Brown* decision, however, less than two per cent of southern black children attended integrated schools. During the early 1960's, it was necessary to maintain federal troops and police on the University of Mississippi campus to ensure the right of a black student to attend classes.

23.2.4.e. The Montgomery Bus Boycott:

The Brown decision also encouraged African-Americans to launch a sustained movement to desegregate all public facilities. It began in Montgomery, Alabama, in December 1955, when a black woman called Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a city bus to a white man and was arrested. Led by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., black residents reacted to the arrest by organizing a bus boycott that lasted more than a year, before a federal court declared Alabama's bus segregation laws unconstitutional. The Montgomery Bus Boycott dramatized the effectiveness of non-violent direct action and raised Martin Luther King into leadership of the non-violent movement. He adopted the Gandhian philosophy of Satyagraha. King's commitment to reform through non-violent means attracted a favourable response even in the press for his protests.

23.2.4.f. The Civil Rights Act of 1957:

In 1957, Congress passed the first federal civil rights law since Reconstruction. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 set up the Commission on Civil Rights to investigate charges of denial of civil rights. It also created the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice to enforce federal civil rights laws and regulations.

Although King remained the most renowned black leader, protest activities soon moved beyond the control of any single individual or group. King's supporters organized the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in 1957, but when black university students began a widespread campaign of sit-ins in lunch-bars in February 1960, most young activists rejected leadership by SCLC and older civil rights groups. They formed the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which was often more militant than other civil rights groups.

23.2.4.g. Struggle to Achieve Voting Rights:

The Freedom Rides of 1961 initiated by Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) were designed to end segregation in facilities dependent on interstate commerce, and demonstrated the ability of civil rights protesters to force federal intervention in the South. They brought many young activists into Mississippi, where white officials firmly resisted any concessions to the civil rights movement. Black civil rights leaders in Mississippi, who had long struggled for gains with the help of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP) encouraged young civil rights workers affiliated with SNCC to concentrate their efforts on achieving voting rights. By 1962 Robert Moses, a Harvard-educated schoolteacher, had brought together a staff of organizers who worked closely with local residents seeking to register as voters. White resistance, however, remained strong. In 1964, after the murder of three of the organizers, a major national effort led to the unsuccessful challenge by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic

to unseat the all-white Mississippi delegation at the national Democratic convention.

23.2.4.h. March to Washington, 1963:

Although the voting-rights movement in Mississippi made slow progress, civil rights protests in southern urban centres achieved important gains. Massive demonstrations were held in Albany, Georgia, during 1961 and 1962, and the following year more than a million demonstrators kept up the pressure in numerous other cities. This wave of protests reached a peak during the spring of 1963, when federal troops were sent into Birmingham, Alabama, to quell racial violence. President John Kennedy reacted to the widespread demonstrations by introducing civil rights legislation designed to end segregation in public facilities. On 28 August 1963, more than 250,000 protesters gathered in Washington, D.C., for a peaceful demonstration, calling for congressional action in civil rights and employment legislation. This was the climax of the non-violent movement and, perhaps of Martin Luther King's career. The huge gathering of black and white marchers promoted hope that Dr. King's dream that "this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed" might be realized. This hope dimmed when four children died in a church bombing in Birmingham and when an assassin's bullet killed President Kennedy.

23.2.4.i. The Civil Rights Act of 1964:

But there was still reason for hope. In 1964, the Noble Prize Committee chose Dr. King to receive the Nobel Peace Prize, and President Lyndon B. Johnson secured the enactment of a comprehensive Civil Rights Act of 1964. This was the strongest civil rights bill in the history of the United States. It ordered restaurants, hotels, and other businesses that serve the general public to serve all people without regard to race, colour, religion, or national origin. It also barred discrimination by employers and unions, and established the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to enforce fair employment practices. In addition, the act provided for a cutoff of federal funds from any programme or activity that allowed racial discrimination.

23.2.4.j. The Voting Rights Act of 1965:

The President and the Congress responded again when Dr. King led his forces into Selma, Alabama, where black citizens were being denied the right to vote. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 removed the remaining legal and technical obstacles to the exercise of the franchise by black citizens. It prohibited literacy tests in many Southern states. In 1966, the Supreme Court prohibited poll taxes in state and local elections. A 1970 law made literacy tests illegal in all the states. These acts had a dramatic impact on black voter registration. In Mississippi, the percentage of

blacks registered to vote increased from seven per cent in 1964 to fifty-nine per cent in 1968.

23.2.4.k. Changes in the Civil Rights Movement:

Major changes in the Civil Rights Movement occurred during the 1970's. Earlier civil rights efforts had involved lawsuits and other attempts to protect individual rights. In the 1970's the emphasis shifted from individual rights to group rights. The federal government began to enact laws designed to assure rights for groups that formerly had suffered discrimination. For example, the government began a programme of affirmative action. Affirmative action consists of efforts to counteract past discrimination by giving special help to disadvantaged groups. Typical measures included recruiting drives among women and minority groups and special training programme for minority workers.

23.2.4.l. Allegation of 'Reverse Discrimination':

Efforts to help groups that had suffered discrimination raised a number of new civil rights issues. Many people felt the government violated the principle of equality under the law by giving preference to certain groups at the expense of others. Some white men complained of reverse discrimination, saying they were treated unfairly because of their race and sex. Other individuals believed such efforts were necessary to help the disadvantaged overcome past discrimination and eventually compete on an equal basis with white males.

23.2.4.m. The Black Power:

The years of civil rights activism in the South led to an upsurge in racial pride and militancy among blacks throughout the nation. In 1966 SNCC announced that the goal of the black movement was no longer civil rights but 'black power', which could be achieved only when black people developed a more positive image of themselves. Such sentiments coincided with a trend towards black militancy in northern urban centres spearheaded by Black Muslims. The most renowned advocate of Black Nationalism and leader of the Black Muslims was Malcolm X. Although he had attracted only modest support by the time he was assassinated in 1965, his ideas became increasingly popular after his death. His calls for armed self-defence reflected widespread anger among urban blacks and resulted in outbreaks of extensive racial violence in Los Angeles, California, in August 1965. During the following three years, nearly every major urban centre in the United States experienced similar violent, black disturbances. The Kerner Commission, set up by President Johnson, reported in 1968 that the "nation is moving toward two societies, one white, one black—separate and unequal". New militant organizations, such as the Black Panther party, sought to provide leadership for discontented urban blacks. The outspoken radicalism of many black leaders resulted in considerable federal repression, and by the late 1960's

most of the black militant groups had been weakened by police raids as well as internal dissension. Before his assassination in April 1968, even Martin Luther King became a target for government surveillance and harassment, as he responded to the new mood of militancy with forceful attacks on US involvement in the Vietnam War (1959-1975) and with calls for economic reforms.

Blacks attending university launched a movement to introduce black studies into the curriculum, which would result in greater knowledge and understanding of the African-American experience. A new spirit of black racial assertion was particularly evident in sports. In the 1960's black athletes gave university and professional sports a distinctive, individualistic, and spontaneous style of play, despite frequent objections from white coaches and observers in the media. For example, the refusal of the heavyweight boxer Muhammad Ali to be enlisted into the army cost him his world championship but also made him a hero to many blacks.

Questions

1. Explain the concept of the Human Rights Movement and trace its origin and progress.
2. Write a detailed note on the Amnesty International.
3. Examine the various aspects of the Civil Rights Movement.
4. Trace the progress of Civil Rights Movement in the USA.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Constitutional Amendments in favour of the Blacks
 - (b) Desegregation in Schools
 - (c) The Black Power
 - (d) Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.



GLOBALIZATION AND ITS IMPACT

Objectives:

1. To understand the concept and factors that lead to globalization.
2. To study the impact of globalization.

Introduction:

Globalization is a concept that underlines the growth of connections between people on a worldwide scale. Globalization involves the reduction of barriers to trans-world contacts. Through it people from different parts of the world become more able, physically, legally, culturally, and psychologically, to engage with each other in 'one world'.

Globalization means different things to different people. It can be defined, simply, as the expansion of economic activities across political boundaries of nation-states. It refers to a process of increasing economic integration and growing economic interdependence between countries in the world economy. It is associated not only with an increasing cross-border movement of goods, services, capital, technology, information and people, but also with an organization of economic activities which cut across national boundaries. This process is driven by the lure of profit and the threat of competition in the market.

24.1. Globalization Through History:

Historians have dated the beginning of globalization at various points. Taking the longest view, it may be said that globalization began a million years ago with the first transcontinental migration of the human species out of Africa. Alternatively, we could date the start of globalization from the fifth and sixth centuries BC with the birth of two of the earliest 'world' religions, namely Zoroastrianism and Buddhism. A secular global imagination arose in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries with the geographical discoveries and explorations including the first circumnavigation of the Earth. Technologies for high-speed global connections initially appeared in the mid-nineteenth century with the advent of intercontinental telegraph lines. The second half of the nineteenth century also saw the arrival of long-distance telephony, global commodity markets, global brand names, a global monetary regime, and global associations in several social movements, including labour and feminist activism. The consolidation of intercontinental colonial

empires in the late nineteenth century facilitated the development of many of these trans-world connections.

Whenever one dates the beginning of globalization, it is clear that the process has unfolded on an unprecedented scale in contemporary history. Most manifestations of global connectivity have seen most of their growth during the past half-century. Consider the recent spread of jet travel, satellite communications, facsimiles, the Internet, television, global retailers, global credit cards, global ecological problems, and global regulations. To take but one indicator, the world count of radio receivers rose from fewer than 60 million in the mid-1930's to over 2,000 million in the mid-1990's. Today's society is more global than that at any earlier time.

24.2. Causes of Globalization:

Different social theories offer different interpretations of how and why trans-world connections have grown. For example, liberal economics stresses the role of unrestricted market forces in a context of technological change and deregulation. In contrast, Marxist political economy highlights the dynamics of the international capitalist system as the engine of globalization. For many sociologists, meanwhile, globalization is a product of modern rationalism. Others find their explanation of globalization in a combination of these causes.

24.2.1. Technological innovation:

Technological innovation has contributed to globalization by supplying infrastructure for trans-world connections. In particular, developments in means of transport, communications, and data processing have allowed global links to become denser, faster, more reliable, and much cheaper. Large-scale and rapid globalization has depended on a number of innovations relating to coaxial and later fibre-optic cables, jet engines, packaging and preservation techniques, semiconductor devices, computer software, and so on. In other words, global relations could not develop without physical tools to effect cross-planetary contacts.

24.2.2. Regulations:

Next to technology, regulation has also played an enabling role for globalization. Supraterritorial links would not be possible in the absence of various facilitating rules, procedures, norms, and institutions. For example, global communications rely heavily on technical standardization. Global finance depends in good measure on a working world monetary regime. Global production and trade are greatly promoted by liberalization, that is, the removal of tariffs, capital controls, and other state-imposed restrictions on the movement of resources between countries. Tax laws, labour legislation, and environmental codes can also encourage or discourage global investment. In short, globalization requires supporting regulatory frameworks.

24.2.3. Capitalism:

Capitalism has been a further force for globalization. Already in the 1850's, Karl Marx noted in his *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, 1859, that "capital by its nature drives beyond every spatial barrier" to "conquer the whole Earth for its market". More specifically, global markets offer prospects of increased profits through higher sales volumes. In addition, larger production runs to feed global markets promise enhanced profits due to economies of scale. Capitalists also pursue globalization since it allows production facilities to be located wherever costs are lowest and earnings greatest. Furthermore, global accounting practices enable prices and taxes to be calculated in ways that raise profits. Finally, global connections themselves such as telecommunications, electronic finance, etc., create major opportunities for profit making.

24.2.4. Rationalism:

Rationalism as the prevailing modern form of knowledge also has provided impetus to globalization. With its secular character, rationalist thought orients people towards the physical world of the planet rather than spiritual realms. As a secular universalism, rationalism provides a knowledge foundation for globalization.

Many theorists identify one of these forces as the primary engine of globalization and treat other elements as having secondary or no causal significance. Other analysts hold that globalization has a multi-causal dynamic involving the interrelation of several forces.

24.3. Forms of Globalization:

Global connections take many forms. For instance, jet airplanes transport passengers and cargo across any distance on the planet within a day. Telephone and computer networks effect near-instantaneous interpersonal communication between points all over the Earth. Electronic mass media broadcast messages to world audiences. Countless goods and services are supplied to consumers in global markets. Moreover, some articles are manufactured through trans-world processes, where different stages of production are located at widely dispersed locations on the Earth. The US dollar and the Euro are examples of currencies that have global circulation. In global finance, various types of savings and credits flow in the world as a single space. Many firms, voluntary associations such as Amnesty International, and regulatory agencies, such as the World Trade Organization, operate across the globe. Climate change, so-called 'global warming', and stratospheric ozone depletion are instances of human induced ecological developments that unfold on a planetary scale.

Globalization is the trend whereby these various kinds of global relations emerge, proliferate, and expand. As a result of globalization, social geography gains a planetary dimension. 'Place' comes to involve more than local, provincial, country, regional, and continental realms. With globalization the world as a whole also becomes a social space in its own right. Thus global connections involve a different kind of geography. Whereas other social contexts are territorially delimited, global relations transcend territorial distances and territorial borders to unfold on planet Earth as a single social space. In this sense globalization might be characterized as the rise of 'supraterritoriality'.

Of course globalization does not signal the end of other social spaces. The rise of supraterritoriality does not eliminate the significance of localities, countries, and regions. Nor does the spread of trans-world connections abolish territorial governments or dissolve territorial identities. The global coexists and interrelates with the local, the national, the regional, and other dimensions of geography.

24.4. Extent of Globalization:

It is important to note that Globalization has not encompassed all of humanity to the same extent. In terms of territorial location, for example, global networks have involved the populations of North America, Western Europe, and East Asia much more than other parts of the world. In terms of class, global finance has been a domain of the wealthy far more than the poor. In terms of gender, men have linked up to global computer networks much more than women. This unevenness of globalization has important implications for social power relations. People with connections to supraterritorial spaces have access to important resources and influence that are denied to those who are left outside. In this regard, some commentators have deplored 'global apartheid', as manifested in the so-called 'digital divide' and other inequalities. Others have objected to a 'cultural imperialism' of Hollywood and McDonald's in contemporary globalization. Since the mid-1990's such discontents have provoked a so-called 'anti-globalization movement' marked by regular mass protests against global companies, the International Monetary Fund, and other prominent agents of trans-world relations.

24.5. Approaches to Globalization:

There are basically two main attitudes towards the approaches to globalization-positive and normative. The positive group of thinkers visualizes globalization as purely as objective and descriptive phenomenon that is taking place under current trends. On the other hand, the normative group of thinkers explores the reality from the objective truth, norms, policies, prescriptions which are being taken as a form of advice to developing countries for liberalizing and integrating themselves with the rest of the world as

fast as possible as the definite way to achieve the pace of development. As seen above, a much more comprehensive approach to globalization should not be associated with purely economic view rather it must embrace into its folds a much more political and cultural dimension.

Apparently the approach to globalizations is mainly an economic phenomenon. However, the real perception of globalization is much more comprehensive. It is primarily a cultural and political phenomenon that is driven by technology and other scientific innovations. With the progress in transport, telecommunication, computers that makes possible to divide the stages of production of an article in different geographic locations.

The world economy has experienced a progressive international economic integration since 1950. However, there has been a marked acceleration in this process of globalization during the last quarter of the twentieth century. The fundamental attribute of globalization is the increasing degree of openness in most countries. There are three dimensions of this phenomenon: international trade, international investment and international finance. It is important to note that openness is not confined to trade flows, investment flows and financial flows. It also extends to flows of services, technology, information, ideas and persons across national boundaries. However, trade, investment and finance constitute the cutting edge of globalization.

The second half of the twentieth century has witnessed a phenomenal expansion in international trade flows. World exports increased from \$61 billion in 1950 to \$315 billion in 1970 and \$3447 billion in 1990. The international investment flows also took the same route. The stock of direct foreign investment in the world economy increased from \$68 billion in 1960 to \$502 billion in 1980 and \$1948 billion 1992. The past two decades have witnessed an explosive growth in international finance. The movement of finance across national boundaries is enormous. The internationalization of financial markets has four dimensions: foreign exchange, bank lending, financial assets and government bonds.

It has been now abundantly clear that the challenges and opportunities of globalization in almost all the countries of the world in the twenty-first century would more and more depend on the advancement of science and technology which have emerged as major determinants wealth and power of nations. The comparative advantage of a nation will be more and more influenced by its capacity to generate absorb, adapt and assimilate new technologies into production processes and organize production process efficiently. If liberalization and globalization are not to create islands of prosperity surrounded by vast sea of destitution, there has to be firm commitment to human resource development

and to continuous upgrading of human skills and capabilities in the fast changing world that we live in.

24.6. World Trade Organization (WTO):

In recent times, the issue of global governance has been an extensively explored subject of discussion particularly with the emergence of WTO since January 1995. It is an international body established to promote and enforce global free trade. The WTO was founded in 1993 by the Final Act that concluded the Uruguay Round (1986-1994) of multilateral negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) of 1947, which it supersedes, and exists to administer and police the 28 free-trade agreements in the Final Act, oversee world trade practices, and adjudicate trade disputes referred to it by member states. The headquarters of WTO is in Geneva. When it began operating on 1 January 1995 it had 76 member states, but by November 2000 its membership increased to 140. Unlike its predecessor (GATT), it is a formally constituted entity whose rules are legally binding on its member states, but it is independent of the United Nations. It provides a framework for the rule of law in international trade. Its regulations include trade in services, intellectual property rights, and investment. A disputes panel composed of WTO officials adjudicates trade disputes referred to the WTO; nations can appeal against rulings to a WTO appellate body, whose decision is final.

In February 1997 the WTO concluded a landmark agreement liberalizing telecommunications trade between its members. In March 1999 the United States imposed sanctions on selected European Union (EU) goods following a WTO ruling against EU tariffs on bananas; the dispute broadened later the same month when the WTO ruled against an EU ban on US beef reared with growth hormones. At the Seattle summit in November 1999 the WTO's failure to reach any kind of agreement on the opening up of previously protected areas of trade was seen as a major blow to the free-trade movement. In the same month China and the United States signed a historic agreement that paved the way for China to join the WTO. However, the deal still required formal approval from the United States, the EU, Canada, and other countries.

The WTO with its comprehensive mandate and extensive out reach has emerged as the most powerful supra-national body for global governance. The concept of nation-state is gradually losing its ground in view of the fact that many economic decisions, which are of great crucial relevance to the people of a nation, are taken either by the transnational co-operation or by economic power groups outside the nation-state. As a result nation-state is losing at least some part of their autonomy in designing their own policies and development strategies. This gradual erosion in the autonomy of the nation-state has synchronized with the emergence

of many powerful interest groups in the management of the world economy. They often pose a serious threat to the pursuit of national priorities and assertions of indigenous perceptions. The option open to the developing countries in the long-run perspective is to improve their own economic strengths by efforts for improvement in productivity, human resource development, higher saving, and overall discipline in economic management. They have to identify the right kind of policies and programmes which enable them to safeguard and promote their national interest even within the framework of the new rules and the game.

24.7. Impact of Globalization

24.7.1. Economic Impact:

Globalization has wider implications. In terms of economics, globalization substantially alters the organization of production, exchange, and consumption. Many firms 'go global' by setting up affiliates across the planet. Many enterprises also form trans-world alliances with other companies. Countless mergers and acquisitions occur as business adjusts to global markets. Questions of competition and monopoly can arise as a result. In addition, corporations relocate many production facilities as globalization reduces transport and communications costs. Globalization also expands the 'virtual economy' of information and finance, sometimes at the expense of the 'real economy' of extraction and manufacturing. All of this economic restructuring in the face of globalization raises vital issues of human security related to employment, labour conditions, poverty, and social cohesion.

24.7.2. Political Impact:

In relation to politics, globalization has significant implications for the conduct of governance. Territorially based laws and institutions through local, provincial, and national governments are not sufficient by themselves to regulate contacts and networks that operate in trans-world spaces. Globalization, therefore, stimulates greater multilateral collaboration between states as well as the growth of regional and trans-world governance arrangements like the European Union and the United Nations. In addition, private-sector bodies may step in to regulate areas of global relations for which official arrangements are lacking, as has occurred regarding certain aspects of the Internet and trans-world finance, for instance. The resultant situation of multi-layered and diffuse governance raises far-reaching questions about the nature of sovereignty and democracy in a globalizing world.

24.7.3. Cultural Impact:

With regard to culture, globalization disrupts traditional relationships between territory and collective identity. The growth of trans-world connections encourages the rise of non-territorial cultures according to age, class, gender, race, religion, and sexual

orientation. As a result, identity of such people who lead more globalized lives tend to become less fixed on territory, in the form of nation-states and ethnic bonds. Besides, globalization encourages more hybridity, where individuals develop and express a mix of identities. At the same time, other people, including those who have less opportunity to participate in global relations, react against globalization with defensive nationalism. In these various ways globalization calls the nature of community into question.

However, it is important to note that the extent of social transformation connected with globalization must not be exaggerated. Hence traditional sectors like agriculture and manufacturing still matter in a globalizing economy. The state still figures centrally in the governance of global flows. Territorial cultures survive alongside, and in complex interrelations. Thus with globalization, as with any other trend, history involves an interplay of change and continuity.

24.8. How to respond to Globalization?:

Globalization and its consequences have become a subject of heated political debate. The important question is how should we respond to the trend of globalization?

24.8.1. Neo-Liberal Approach:

Those people who are concerned with the problem of globalization advice what is generally called a 'neo-liberal' approach to globalization. Neo-liberalism takes inspiration from the tradition of laissez-faire economics and holds that globalization will yield maximum gains when its course is left to unrestricted market forces. Neo-liberals therefore prescribe that globalization should be met with full-scale liberalization, deregulation, and privatization. According to the neo-liberal creed, official measures should be used only to enable, but not to constrain, global market forces. The unrestricted global economy will then in time generate prosperity, democracy, community, and peace for all.

24.8.2. Reformism:

Another general policy framework for globalization can be termed as reformism, or global social democracy. Reformists agree with neo-liberals that market capitalism can be a major force for social good. However, they argue that these benefits can only be secured with proactive public policies that steer, and where necessary restrict, global flows. For example, many reformists advocate official measures to protect labour, the poor, and the environment from the potential harmful effects of unrestricted globalization. Some reformists also promote the principle of global redistributive taxes, for example, on foreign-exchange transactions or the profits of global companies. Reformist programmes generally visualize a considerable expansion of suprastate governance through regional and trans-world institutions, and many reformists

are concerned to enhance the democratic credentials of these regimes.

24.8.3. Progressive Radicalism:

A third broad political response to globalization might be described as progressive radicalism. These critics reject the structural foundations of contemporary globalization and seek to reconstruct the process on a different basis. For example, global socialists regard capitalism as an evil that no amount of reform can correct. Thus, they seek to rebuild globalization with a different, post-capitalist mode of production. From another radical perspective, global postmodernists treat rationalism as incorrigibly flawed and promote an alternative globalization based on different kinds of knowledge and identity politics.

24.8.4. Traditionalism:

A fourth approach to globalization can be termed as traditionalism. This viewpoint regards trans-world connections as being inherently violent as globalization tend to undermine cultural heritage, democracy, ecological health, economic well-being, and social cohesion. In the eyes of traditionalists, globalization has nothing to offer anything new and must therefore be reversed. Traditionalist calls for 'de-globalization' have come in a number of forms, including ultra-nationalism, religious revivalism, and certain strains of environmentalism.

Broadly speaking, neo-liberalism was the prevailing and largely unchallenged policy framework for globalization in the 1980's and early 1990's. Since the mid-1990's both traditionalist and reformist reactions against neo-liberal globalization have gathered force, though laissez-faire tendencies remain very strong at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Meanwhile, progressive radical approaches to globalization have not yet become popular among the masses, although they may prove important in times to come.

24.9. Future of Globalization:

The future prospects of globalization are unclear. In one scenario the twenty-first century will experience a continuation, if not a further acceleration, of recent high rates of globalization. In an alternative account, globalization will slow down and stop once it reaches a certain plateau. In another forecast, for example, if globalization is a cyclical trend or succumbs to traditionalist opposition, the future will bring a process of de-globalization that reduces trans-world connections.

At present the forces behind globalization seem to be very strong. Current trends in technological innovations and regulatory developments are highly conducive for a further expansion of trans-world connectivity. Likewise, both capitalism as a mode of production that promotes globalization and rationalism as a mode

of knowledge that stimulates globalization are quite strong in contemporary world. Under these circumstances a halt to globalization, let alone a reversal, seem to be a remote possibility in modern times.

Questions

1. Explain the concept, causes and different forms of globalization.
2. Write a detailed note on globalization.
3. Describe the consequences of globalization. What are different kinds of responses to globalization?
4. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Forms of globalization
 - (b) World Trade Organization (WTO)
 - (c) Impact of globalization
 - (d) Response to globalization



A. POPULATION EXPLOSION

B. PROBLEM OF POVERTY

Objectives:

1. To study the population explosion and its impact on the world.
2. To analyze the causes and impact of poverty on the world.

25.1. Population Explosion

Introduction:

'Population Explosion' is a term used in the twentieth century for the rapid growth of population. Population explosion has been one of the chief reasons for the many problems that the contemporary world is facing. Poverty, unemployment, crime, environmental degradation, etc. are intimately related to the population explosion.

25.1.1. Range of Population Explosion:

Between 1850 and 1900 the world's population was increasing, on average, by 0.6 per cent every year. During the next fifty years the rate of increase averaged 0.9 per cent a year. It was after 1960 that the full force of the 'population explosion' was felt, with the total world population increasing at the rate of 1.9 per cent a year, on average. In 1990 the population was increasing by roughly one million every week, and the total had reached 5300 million. In 1994 there was an increase of 95 million, the biggest ever increase in a single year. The world population in 1995 was estimated at 5.7 billion, and had exceeded 6 billion by mid-1999, twice the figure for 1960. India's billionth citizen was born in August 1999. Population estimates vary according to sources, and the margin of error is increased in developing countries. Population predictions are similarly problematic. In general, recent predictions of population growth, it will remain at over 80 million per year for the next decade. However, there were important regional variations within the general population increase. Broadly speaking, the industrialized nations of Europe and North America had their most rapid increase before the First World War; after that their rate of increase slowed considerably. In the less developed, or Third World nations of Africa, Asia and Latin America, the rate of population increase accelerated after the Second World War, and it was in these areas that population growth caused the most serious problems. The growth rate began to slow down in some Latin

American countries after 1950, but in Asia and Africa the rate continued to increase.

25.1.2. Reasons for the Population Increase:

The population increase in Europe and North America in the later part of the nineteenth and the early twentieth centuries had several causes: (1) Increasing industrialization, economic growth and prosperity meant that the necessary resources were there to sustain a larger population, and the two seemed to go hand-in-hand. (2) There was a great improvement in public health, due to advances in medical science and sanitation. The work of Louis Pasteur and Joseph Lister in the 1860's on germs and antiseptic techniques helped to reduce the death rate. At the same time, the big industrial cities introduced piped water supplies and drainage schemes which all helped in reducing diseases. (3) There was a decline in infant mortality (the number of babies who died before the age of one). Again this was mainly due to medical improvements, which helped to reduce deaths from diseases such as scarlet fever, diphtheria and whooping cough, which were so dangerous to young babies. (4) Immigration helped to increase the population of the United States and, to a lesser extent, some other countries on the continent of America, such as Canada, Argentina and Brazil. In the hundred years after 1820, around 35 million people entered the United States; in the last few years before 1914 they were arriving at a rate of a million a year.

After 1900 the growth rate in Europe began to slow down, mainly because more people were using modern contraceptive techniques. Later, the economic depression of the 1930's discouraged people from having as many children.

The rapid population growth after 1945 in Third World countries had three main causes: (1) Modern medical and hygiene techniques began to make an impact for the first time. The child mortality rate fell and people lived longer, as killer diseases like smallpox, malaria and typhoid were gradually brought under control. (2) At the same time the vast majority of the population made no attempt to limit their families by using contraceptives. This was partly through ignorance and the fact that contraceptives were too expensive for ordinary people to buy. The Roman Catholic Church said that contraception was forbidden for its members, on the grounds that it prevented the natural creation of new lives and was therefore sinful. Since the Roman Catholic Church was strong in Central and South America, its teaching had greater effects. The population growth rate for many countries in these areas was over three per cent per annum. The average for the whole of Latin America was 2.4 per cent in 1960, whereas the average for Europe was only 0.75 per cent. Any increase of over two per cent happened in Brazil and Mexico in the 30 years up to 1960. (3) Many Third World countries had a long tradition of people having as many children as

possible to combat high infant mortality. They wanted to make sure that their family continued. Muslims, for example, attach great value to having many sons. The same attitudes persisted in spite of the reduction in infant mortality.

25.1.3. Consequences of the population explosion:

In the industrializing nations of Europe and North America, the population growth of the nineteenth century helped to stimulate further economic development. There was a plentiful workforce and more people to buy goods, and this encouraged more investment and enterprise. Nor were there any great problems about feeding and educating these growing numbers, because prosperity meant that the necessary resources were available to meet the needs of the increasing population.

Later on, there were unexpected effects on the age structure of the population in the developed nations. This was especially true in Europe where, because of the very low birth rates and longer life expectancy, a growing proportion of the population was over 65. By the 1970's, in countries such as Sweden, France and Britain, about fifteen per cent of the population were over 65. In the early 1990's, with this proportion still increasing, questions were being asked about whether state welfare systems would be able to afford to pay pensions to all old people if this trend continued into the twenty-first century.

In the Third World, the rapid population growth caused serious problems. Some countries like India, Pakistan and Bangladesh became overcrowded and there was not enough land to settle the population and for agricultural purposes. This forced people to move into towns and cities, but these were already overcrowded and there were not enough houses or jobs for all the new arrivals. Many people were forced to live on the streets. Some cities, especially those in Latin America, were surrounded by shantytowns and slums, which had no proper water supply, sanitation or lighting.

With the ever-increasing population it became increasingly difficult to feed the population. All areas of the world succeeded in increasing their food production during the late 1960's and 1970's, chiefly due to what became known as the 'green revolution'. Scientists developed new strains of heavy cropping rice and wheat on short, fast-growing stems, helped by fertilizers and irrigation schemes. For a time, food supplies seemed to be well ahead of population growth. Even a densely populated country like India was able to export food, and China became self-sufficient. In the United States crop yields increased threefold between 1945 and 1995, and the Americans were able to export surplus crops to over a hundred countries. However, in the mid-1980's, with the world's population growing faster than ever, the 'green revolution' was running into problems and scientists became concerned about the future.

In the case of food production a point had been reached beyond which crop yields could not be increased any further, and there was a limit to water supply, topsoil and phosphates for fertilizers. A survey carried out by scientists at Stanford University (California) in 1996 found that the amount of farmland available was dwindling because of industrialization, the spread of cities and soil erosion. They calculated that the number of mouths to feed in the United States would double by 2050. There seemed no way in which food production could be doubled from less land. Matters were made worse in parts of Africa (Ethiopia, Angola, Mozambique and Somalia) during the 1980's and 1990's by drought and civil wars, which played a part in causing severe food shortages and tens of thousands of deaths from starvation.

25.1.4. Shortages of Resources in the Third World:

Third World governments were forced to spend their valuable cash to feed, house, and educate their growing populations. As a result the resources, which they would have spent on industrializing and modernizing their countries are being spent in providing the basic necessities to their ever-increasing population. This in turn has resulted in the delay and tardiness of their economic development. The general shortage of resources meant that the poorest countries also lacked sufficient cash to spend on health care. Following a meningitis epidemic in the African state of Niger, Save the Children reported in April 1996, that one-sixth of the world's population, over 800 million people, had no access to health care. Health systems in many poorer countries were collapsing, and the situation was becoming worse because richer countries were reducing aid. The Report estimated that it cost at least \$12 a person a year to provide basic health care. But sixteen African countries (including Niger, Uganda, Zaire, Tanzania, Mozambique and Liberia) along with Bangladesh, India, Pakistan, Nepal and Vietnam were spending much less than that. In comparison, Britain was spending the equivalent of \$1039 (£723). I

25.1.5. Measures to Control Population Explosion:

For many years people had been giving serious thought to the question of controlling the population before the world became too overcrowded and impossible to live in. Soon after the First World War scientists in a number of countries first began to be concerned at the population growth and felt that it was a problem that should be studied at international level. The first World Population Congress was held in Geneva in 1925, and the following year an International Union for the Scientific Study of Population was set up in Paris. Besides scientists, the organization also included statisticians and social scientists who were concerned about the economic and social effects if the world's population continued to grow. They did valuable work in collecting statistics and encouraging governments to improve their data systems, so

that accurate information about population trends could be collected.

25.1.6. The United Nations Population Commission:

When the United Nations Organization was set up in 1945, a Population Commission was included among its many agencies. When the Third World population began to 'explode' during the 1950's, it was the UN, which took the lead in encouraging governments to introduce birth control programmes. India and Pakistan set up family planning clinics to advise people about the various methods of birth control available, and to provide them with cheap contraceptives. Huge publicity campaigns were launched with government posters recommending a maximum of three children per family. Many African governments recommended a maximum of three children, while the Chinese government went further and fixed the legal maximum at two children per family. But progress was very slow: ancient practices and attitudes were difficult to change, especially in countries like India and Pakistan. In the Roman Catholic countries of South America, the church continued to forbid artificial birth control.

In spite of the problems that hampered the control of population in many of the Third World countries, it may be said that in parts of Asia the population growth rate was beginning to fall slightly during the 1980's. However, in many African and Latin American countries it was still rising. The most rapid growth rate in 1986 was in Africa, where some countries had population growth rates of over three per cent per year. There was serious problem of overcrowding in some areas where there were on average over a hundred people to every square kilometre. This was not so serious in the developed nations of Europe, which had the prosperity and resources to support their populations. But in the poorer nations of Asia, it meant grinding poverty. Bangladesh was probably the world's most crowded country, with an average of 700 people to every square kilometre.

25.1.7. World Population Conferences:

Internationally, the World Population Conference in Bucharest, in 1974, marked the beginning of a global effort to deal with the issue. It saw the publication of a World Population Plan of Action, which was updated and revised at Mexico City in 1984. This meeting was also important for its acceptance that development and population were indivisible, and that action was needed on both issues.

This view was taken to its logical conclusion at the 1994 Cairo Conference when it was agreed that at the core of any population programme are the individual's well being, reproductive health, and the freedom to make an informed choice. The conference was heavily influenced by non-governmental

organizations representing women's views and marked a real turning point in the approach to the issue.

The 20-year action plan agreed at the meeting aims to increase annual spending on women's reproductive health including improved family planning services and action to combat sexually transmitted diseases, to 17 billion dollars by the end of the century. Two thirds of this sum is expected to come from developing countries and the other third from international donors. The plan outlines specific goals for reducing maternal, child, and infant mortality and extending primary education to all children by 2015, with special efforts to push ahead with secondary education, especially for girls. It includes recommendations to deal with women's issues such as sex discrimination, age of marriage, earning power, female circumcision, and responsibilities of fathers. It defines what effective family planning really means, and tackles the difficult issues of unsafe abortion and the needs of teenagers for help and advice.

In December 1995, the Population Institute predicted that, with effective birth control, the global population could stabilize by 2015 at about 8000 million. However, without effective promotion of family planning, the total could well have reached 14,000 million by 2050. With the population of Europe and North America growing so slowly, it meant that an ever-increasing proportion of the world's population would be poor.

On the other hand, some historians feel that the fears about the population explosion have been exaggerated. Paul Johnson, for example, believes that there is no need to panic. Once Asia, Latin America and Africa become more successfully industrialized, living standards will rise, and this economic betterment, along with more effective use of contraception, will slow down the birth rate. According to Johnson, the example of China is most encouraging. In 1980's the population in China appeared virtually to have stabilized.

25.2. Problem of Poverty

Introduction:

Poverty is an economic condition in which people lack sufficient income to obtain certain minimal levels of health services, food, housing, clothing, and education generally recognized as necessary to ensure an adequate standard of living. What is considered adequate, however, depends on the average standard of living in a particular society.

25.2.1. Causes of Poverty:

Individuals who have a lower-than-average ability to earn income, for whatever reason, are likely to be poor. Historically, this group has included the elderly, people with disabilities, single mothers, and members of some minorities. In the West today, a

significantly large group in the poverty-stricken population consists of single mothers and their children. These families account for about one-third of all poor people. Not only do women who work outside the home generally earn less than men, but a single mother often has a difficult time caring for children, running a household, and earning an adequate income. Other groups disproportionately represented below the poverty threshold are people with disabilities and their dependants, very large families, and families in which the principal wage earner is either unemployed or works for low wages.

Lack of educational opportunity is another cause of poverty. In the developed world, a larger percentage of blacks than whites are poor today. This is chiefly due to the fact that they do not have access to better education, which reduces employment opportunities.

Much of the world's poverty is due to a low level of economic development. China and India are examples of heavily populated, developing nations where, despite substantial recent industrialization, poverty is rampant. Even in economically developed countries, widespread unemployment can create poverty. The Great Depression impoverished millions of Americans and Europeans in the 1930's. Less severe economic crises known as recessions, cause smaller increases in the poverty rate.

A report by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), known as GEO-2000, identified excessive consumption of energy, raw materials, and other resources in Western and some East Asian nations as one of the main causes of the continued poverty of the majority of world population. Extreme poverty in many parts of the world forces residents of those areas to exploit natural resources in an unsustainable manner. Both factors have considerable economic and environmental implications.

25.2.2. Consequences of Poverty:

Poverty is closely associated with crime. Most of the poor are not criminals, and many criminals are not poor, but people from environments dominated by poverty are more likely to commit crimes and to be punished. Other social problems, such as mental illness and alcoholism, are common among the poor, in part because they are causes as well as effects of poverty, and often because there is little medical provision for dealing effectively with them. Finally, poverty tends to breed poverty. In certain cases, the handicap of poverty is passed from one generation to another, possibly as a result of the family being caught in a poverty trap. It is a situation in which a relatively small increase in income will take the family over the threshold for entitlement to benefits, thereby creating a net loss. One possible consequence of this is that members of the household may be discouraged from seeking employment, losing the opportunities for social advancement that such employment might afford them.

25.2.3. Population and Poverty:

The interactions between population and poverty are complex and often controversial, because the two problems often influence each other. One reason for this is that they are often two-way. For example, rapid growth of population may well make it more difficult for governments to provide education, health, housing, and employment opportunities for all who need them. However, at the same time, a failure by governments to invest in the social sector and to create a positive climate for fair and equitable economic development can perpetuate the conditions under which couples continue to have large families. The situation is made critical by the fact that 95 per cent of the annual increase in world population of over 90 million takes place in developing countries, the very places that are least able to provide for them.

Numerous studies have shown that where women have access to education, and especially secondary education, they are more likely to marry later and have fewer children. The same is true in relation to health care. Where women have access to good health services, including those related to reproduction and birth control, they are less likely to have unwanted pregnancies and more likely to have healthy children—thus reducing the incentive to have more babies in case some of them die. The same may be said for other aspects of human development. Where couples do not have to rely on their children for security in old age, and where women have job opportunities and status other than through childbearing, they are more likely to opt for a smaller family.

Population and development are thus two sides of the same coin. Slowing population growth in countries where it is growing unsustainably is an important policy aim, but its achievement requires both direct action to provide women and men with the means to plan their families and indirect action to create the right conditions under which they are empowered to do so. That was very much the theme of the United Nations Conference on Population and Development, held in Cairo in September 1994. This developed an ambitious 20-year plan that put the emphasis on women and the integration of its recommendations into other aspects of development.

Poverty has been viewed as a measure of social class and sex inequality in industrial societies, with women and lower-class households experiencing the greater level of poverty. Similarly, poverty has been regarded as an indicator of inequitable economic dealings between the developed and the developing nations, with the poverty of the developing world being linked to the accumulation of wealth in the developed world. It is also known as 'North-South divide'. The poorest nations in the world are in South Asia (Bangladesh, India and Pakistan); sub-Saharan and North

Africa; the Middle East; Latin America and the Caribbean; and East Asia (China).

The United Nations Millennium Summit in September 2000 looked at issues of poverty distribution worldwide and set targets for 2015 that included reducing by half the number of people living on less than one US dollar a day, providing safe drinking water for fifty per cent of people deprived of such access, primary education for all children, and reversing the spread of diseases such as malaria and AIDS. For 2020 a significant improvement in the circumstances of slum inhabitants and a greater access to modern technologies for poorer nations was also envisaged.

Questions

1. Discuss the causes and consequences of the global population explosion.
2. Give an account of the various attempts made to control the world population explosion.
3. Review the causes and consequences of the problem of poverty in contemporary world.
4. Write short notes on the following:
 - (a) Causes of world population explosion
 - (b) World population conferences
 - (c) Population and poverty



A. DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT

B. WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Objectives:

1. To study the problems of development and its impact on environment.
2. To understand the various attempts made by different individual women and organizations towards Women's Liberation Movement.

26.A. DEVELOPMENT AND ENVIRONMENT

Introduction:

There is a widespread belief in the world today that twentieth century society, based on increasing use of and reliance on technology, will soon begin to collapse under its own weight as the earth's resources, on which the human beings depend to maintain the immensely complex infrastructure of today, become exhausted by human beings' insatiable greed. The industrialized nations that are more and more obsessed with the creation of wealth and profit pay little attention to the side effects that such developmental strategies have been producing.

26.A.1.Origin of Civilization:

The human beings, who appeared late in the Earth's history, were ultimately able to modify the Earth's environment by their activities. Because of their unique mental and physical capabilities, human beings were able to escape the environmental constraints that limited other species and to change the environment to meet their needs. Although early human beings lived in some harmony with the environment, as did other animals, their retreat from the wilderness began with the first, prehistoric agricultural revolution. The ability to control and use fire allowed them to modify or eliminate natural vegetation, and the domestication and herding of grazing animals eventually resulted in overgrazing and soil erosion. The domestication of plants also led to the destruction of natural vegetation to make room for crops, and the demand for wood for fuel depleted forests. Wild animals were slaughtered for food and destroyed as pests and predators.

26.A.2. Development of Technology:

While human populations remained small and human technology modest, their impact on the environment was localized. As populations increased and technology improved and expanded, however, more significant and widespread problems arose. Rapid technological advances after the Middle Ages culminated in the Industrial Revolution, which involved the discovery, use, and exploitation of fossil fuels, as well as the extensive exploitation of the Earth's mineral resources. With the Industrial Revolution, humans began to change the face of the Earth, the nature of its atmosphere, and the quality of its water. Today, unprecedented demands on the environment from a rapidly expanding human population and from advancing technology are causing a continuing and accelerating decline in the quality of the environment and its ability to sustain life.

26.A.3. Problems of the Contemporary World:

The contemporary world is faced with two main type of problems: (1) Industrialization and development has been exhausting the world's resources of raw materials and fuel such as oil, coal and gas, and (2) Industrialization has been causing massive pollution of the environment, and if this continues, it would likely to severely damage the ecosystem. This is the system by which living creatures, trees and plants function within the environment and are all interconnected.

26.A.3.a. Exhaustion of the World's Resources:

Fossil fuels such as coal, oil and natural gas, are the remains of plants and living creatures, which died hundreds of millions of years ago. These resources cannot be replaced. They are known as non-renewable resources. The continuous exploitation of these energy resources may ultimately lead to their exhaustion. There is probably plenty of coal left, but nobody is quite sure just how much natural gas and oil are left. Oil production increased enormously during the twentieth century. Some experts believe that all the oil reserves will be used up early in the twenty-first century. This was one of the reasons why Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) tried to conserve oil during the 1970's. The British responded by successfully drilling for oil in the North Sea, which made them less dependent on oil imports. Another response was to develop alternative sources of power, especially nuclear power.

Other raw materials to be seriously depleted were tin, lead, copper, zinc and mercury. Experts are of the opinion that these might get exhausted early in the twenty-first century. It is the Third World, which is being stripped of the resources it needs to help it escape from poverty.

A lot of timber is being used all over the world for various purposes. About half the world's tropical rain forest had been lost by 1987, and it was calculated that about 80,000 square kilometres, an area roughly the size of Austria, was being lost every year. A side effect of this was the loss of many animal and insect species, which had lived in the forests.

Most of the edible fish have been extensively fished and are being in danger of falling below the level where it will be worth fishing. Many species of fish face extinction.

The supply of phosphates, which are used for fertilizers, was being rapidly used up. The more fertilizers farmers used to increase agricultural yields in an attempt to keep pace with the rising population, the more phosphate rock was quarried. Supplies of phosphates are expected to be exhausted by the middle of the twenty-first century.

There is a danger that supplies of fresh water might soon run out. Most of the fresh water on the planet is tied up in the polar icecaps and glaciers, or deep in the ground. All living organisms, human beings, animals, trees and plants, rely on water to survive. With the world's population growing by 90 million a year, scientists at Stanford University (California) found that in 1995 human beings and their farm animals, crops and forestry plantations were already using up one-fourth of all the water taken up by plants. This leaves less moisture to evaporate and therefore a likelihood of less rainfall. "The wars of the next century will be over water" is the depressing prediction of Ismail Serageldin, Vice-President of the World Bank. Whether or not this turns out to be the case, there is undeniably a problem with water. It is not the total quantity of water which is the issue but where it is located. Nature has distributed water very unequally across the world, making for severe shortages in parts along with excesses in others. Moreover, the demand for water is increasing. Population is increasing, which naturally increases demand both directly and indirectly by its use in industry and agriculture.

The amount of land available for agriculture was dwindling. This was partly because of spreading industrialization and the growth of cities, but also because of wasteful use of farmland. Badly designed irrigation schemes increased salt levels in the soil. Sometimes irrigation took too much water from lakes and rivers, and whole areas were turned into deserts. Soil erosion is accelerating on every continent but Antarctica and is degrading one fifth to one third of the cropland of the world, posing a significant threat to the food supply. For example, erosion is undermining the productivity of approximately 35 per cent of all cropland in the United States. In the developing world, increasing needs for food and firewood have resulted in the deforestation and cultivation of steep slopes, causing severe erosion. Adding to the

problem is the loss of prime cropland to industry, dams, urban sprawl, and highways. The amount of topsoil lost each year is at least 25 million tonnes, which is enough, in principle, to grow 9 million tonnes of wheat. About half of all erosion is in the United States, the former Soviet Union, India, and China. Soil erosion and the loss of cropland and forests also reduce the moisture-holding capacity of soils and add sediments to streams, lakes, and reservoirs.

26.A.3.b. Environmental Pollution:

Discharges from heavy industry cause pollution of the atmosphere, rivers, lakes and the sea. In 1975 all five Great Lakes of North America were described as 'dead', meaning that they were so heavily polluted that no fish could live in them. About ten per cent of the lakes in Sweden were in the same condition. Acid rain (rain polluted with sulphuric acid) caused extensive damage to trees in central Europe, especially in Germany and Czechoslovakia. Britain was blamed for producing the majority of the pollution causing the acid rain. Acid rain corrodes metals, weathers stone buildings and monuments, injures and kills vegetation, and acidifies lakes, streams, and soils, especially in the poorly protected regions of northeastern North America and northern Europe. In these regions, lake acidification has killed some fish populations. It is also now a problem in the southeastern and western United States. Acid rain can also slow forest growth.

26.A.4. Greenhouse Effect and Global Warming:

From about 1970 scientists were worried about what they called the 'greenhouse effect' and 'global warming'. It is alleged that the world is getting warmer due to the activities of human beings, and in particular the process of industrialization, coupled with the quickly expanding population. The primary causes of this are the so-called greenhouse gases. The temperature of the earth is partly governed by the balance of the radiation which comes in and that which escapes. These are determined by the constitution and quantity of the gases in the atmosphere. If they increase, the earth gets warmer; if they decrease it gets colder. The present forms of life on the earth depend on there being a greenhouse effect to keep it at the appropriate temperature. However, difficulties arise if the gases vary. Thus, the greenhouse effect in itself is crucial to human life. It is the variations in it, which cause the problems. The evidence seems to suggest that the world is getting warmer. The greenhouse gases are increasing largely due to various forms of economic activity.

The most significant of the greenhouse gases is carbon dioxide, which accounts for a little more than half of the contribution to global warming. It comes chiefly from fossil fuel burning and deforestation. CFCs are used in aerosol sprays, refrigerators and fire extinguishers. About fifteen per cent of global warming comes

from methane, the source of which is rice paddies and various forms of fermentation. Nitrous oxide accounts for about six per cent and comes from biomass burning, fertilizer use and fossil fuel consumption.

Once the greenhouse warming is underway it sets up various feedback processes, that is, processes which either speed up the process of global warming, which are known as positive feedback processes, or those which counteract the trend, which are known as negative feedback processes. Global warming increases the amount of water vapour from the seas. Water vapour itself is a powerful greenhouse factor so the warming process is amplified.

The consequences of global warming are various. First, the sea level will rise, which will put various coastal states in serious positions. The countries with low-lying coasts will have a lot of problems. Unfortunately, it is accidentally the case that many of the most vulnerable countries are also very poor. These countries include Egypt, Mozambique and Pakistan. Bangladesh, already one of the poorest countries outside Africa, will be particularly badly affected. In Europe, Netherlands and the east coast of Britain are vulnerable to the sea and will become much more so if the sea level increases significantly.

Another major consequence of global warming is the displacement of various sorts of economic activity. Thus, temperate areas suitable for wheat will become hotter and less suitable, while other areas, which are now too cold, will become more suitable. The central Wheatlands of the United States will move northwards to Canada. Similarly Siberia may become grain basket. This suggests that the process of global warming will simply shift economic activity. Some areas and countries will gain from this while others may lose.

26.A.5. Depletion of the Ozone Layer:

Another major problem faced by the contemporary world is that of the depletion of the ozone layer. Around the earth, at a height between 10 and 35 kilometres, is a layer of ozone, which keeps harmful radiation from the Sun down to levels, which the present living inhabitants of the world, human and non-human, can tolerate. Studies showed the ozone layer was being damaged by the increasing use of industrial chemicals called chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs, compounds of fluorine) that are used in refrigeration, air-conditioning, cleaning solvents, packing materials, and aerosol sprays. Chlorine, a chemical by-product of CFCs, attacks ozone. In 1979 scientists discovered that there was a large hole in the ozone layer over the Antarctic. By 1989 the hole was much larger and another hole had been discovered over the Arctic. This meant that people were more likely to develop skin cancers because of the unfiltered radiation from the sun. Some progress

was made towards dealing with this problem, and many countries banned the use of CFCs.

26.A.6. Problem of Disposal of Sewage:

Getting rid of sewage from the world's great cities has been a problem. Some countries simply dumped sewage untreated or only partially treated straight into the sea. The sea around New York is badly polluted, and the Mediterranean is heavily polluted, mainly by human sewage. Farmers in the richer countries contributed to pollution by using artificial fertilizers and pesticides, which drained, off the land into streams and rivers.

26.A.7. Nuclear Radiation:

Although most countries have banned atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons, eliminating a large source of radioactive fallout, nuclear radiation still remains an environmental problem. It is now known that this can cause cancer, particularly leukemia. Power plants always release some amount of radioactive waste into the air and water. There was a constant risk of major accidents like the explosion at Three Mile Island in the United States in 1979, which contaminated a vast area around the power station. When leaks and accidents occurred, the authorities always assured the public that nobody had suffered harmful effects; however, nobody really knew how many people would die later from cancer caused by radiation. The worst ever nuclear accident happened in 1986 at Chernobyl in the Ukraine, then part of the Soviet Union. A nuclear reactor exploded, killing possibly hundreds of people and releasing a huge radioactive cloud, which drifted across most of Europe. Ten years later it was reported that hundreds of cases of thyroid cancer were appearing in areas near Chernobyl. Even in Britain, a thousand miles away, hundreds of square miles of sheep pasture in Wales, Cumbria and Scotland were still contaminated and subject to restrictions. A greater problem facing the nuclear industry is the storage of nuclear wastes, which remain toxic thousands of years, depending on the type. Safe storage for geological periods of time is problematic. Meanwhile nuclear wastes accumulate, threatening the environment. Concern about the safety of nuclear power has led many countries to look towards alternative sources of power, which were safer, particularly solar, wind and tide power.

26.A.8. Chemical Pesticides and Toxins:

Extensive use of synthetic pesticides derived from chlorinated hydrocarbons in pest control has had disastrous environmental side effects. These chemical pesticides are highly persistent and resist biological degradation. They are relatively insoluble in water and cling to plant tissues and accumulate in soils, the bottom mud of streams and ponds, and the atmosphere. Although these synthetic chemicals are not found in nature, they nevertheless enter the food chain. The pesticides are either taken in by plant eaters or absorbed directly through the skin by such

aquatic organisms as fish and various invertebrates. The pesticide is further concentrated as it passes from herbivores to carnivores. It becomes highly concentrated in the tissues of animals at the end of the food chain, such as the predatory birds and animals. As a result, some large predatory and fish-eating birds have been brought close to extinction. Because of the dangers of pesticides to wildlife and to humans, and because insects have acquired resistance to them, the use of halogenated hydrocarbons such as DDT is declining rapidly in the Western world, although large quantities are still used in developing countries.

Toxic substances are chemicals and mixtures of chemicals the manufacturing, processing, distribution, use, and disposal of which present an unreasonable risk to human health and the environment. Most of these toxic substances are synthetic chemicals that enter the environment and persist there for long periods of time. Major concentrations of toxic substances occur in chemical dumpsites. If they seep into soil and water, the chemicals can contaminate water supplies, air, crops, and domestic animals, and have been associated with human birth defects, miscarriages, and organic diseases. Despite known dangers, the problem still persists. In a recent 15-year period, more than 70,000 new synthetic chemicals were manufactured, and new ones are being created at the rate of 500 to 1,000 each year.

26.A.9. Deforestation:

The deforestation technique of slash and burn, utilized extensively to clear large areas of forest for agricultural and other purposes, causes an enormous amount of environmental damage. The large amounts of carbon dioxide given off into the atmosphere during burning add to the greenhouse effect. The removal of all trees and groundcover destroys animal habitats and greatly accelerates erosion, adding to the sediment loads of rivers and making seasonal flooding much more severe.

Increasing numbers of human beings are encroaching on remaining wild lands, even in those areas once considered relatively safe from exploitation, degradation, and pollution. Insatiable demands for energy are forcing the development of Arctic regions for oil and gas and threatening the delicate ecological balance of tundra ecosystems and their wildlife. Tropical forests, especially in southeastern Asia and the Amazon River Basin, are being destroyed at an alarming rate for timber, conversion to crop and grazing lands, pine plantations, and settlements. It was estimated at one point in the 1980's that such forest lands were being cleared or converted at the rate of 20 hectares (nearly 50 acres) a minute; another estimate put the rate at more than 200,000 sq km (78,000 sq mi) a year. In 1993 satellite data provided a rate of about 15,000 sq km (5,800 sq mi) a year in the Amazon Basin area alone. This tropical deforestation has already

resulted in the extinction of as many as 750,000 species, and is likely to eliminate millions if allowed to continue unchecked. This would mean the loss of a multiplicity of products: food, fibres, medical drugs, dyes, gums, and resins. In addition, the expansion of croplands and grazing areas for domestic livestock in Africa, and illegal trade in endangered species and wildlife products, could mean the end of Africa's large mammals. In North America, wild areas are being threatened by agricultural expansion and widespread pollution.

26.A.10. United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP):

The UNEP is a specialized agency established in 1972 by the United Nations General Assembly. Its aim is to promote international cooperation in environmental matters. Its tasks include constant surveillance of the environment in a programme known as Earthwatch, analysis of trends, the collection and dissemination of information, the adoption of environmentally sound policies, and ensuring the compatibility of projects with the priorities of developing countries. UNEP has initiated projects concerned with the following problems: the ozone layer, climate, the transport and disposal of waste, the marine environment, water systems, soil degradation, deforestation, biodiversity, urban environment, sustainable development, energy conservation, human settlements and population issues, health, toxic chemicals, environmental law, and education. The activities of the UNEP are financed from the UN's general budget, by members' contributions, and by trust funds. The money is allocated proportionally: Twenty per cent to Africa, Asia, Latin America, western Asia, Europe, and the Mediterranean and eighty per cent to global projects. UNEP, however, is not a funding agency. Its resources are used to start up programmes, which then draw funds from other sources, such as governments and environmental agencies. It works in close cooperation with other UN agencies, especially the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the World Health Organization (WHO). It also has links with over 6,000 non-governmental bodies concerned with the environment. Its Governing Council, with representatives from 58 member states, meets every two years. The Administrative Committee on Coordination liaises between UNEP and other UN agencies and related programmes. The organization's headquarters are in Nairobi, Kenya. In September 1999 UNEP claimed that the world would face a massive environmental crisis in the twenty-first century unless immediate action was taken. According to its report, *Global Environment Outlook 2000 (GEO-2000)*, which UNEP claims is the most 'authoritative assessment' of environmental issues ever produced, the chief culprits behind the world's current environmental situation were the 'continued poverty of the majority'

of the world's people and 'excessive consumption' by Western and some East Asian nations.

26.A.11. The Earth Summit:

In June 1992 the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, commonly known as the Earth Summit was convened for twelve days on the outskirts of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It was attended by delegates from 178 countries including many prime ministers and presidents, making it the largest conference ever held.

The Earth Summit developed and legitimized a broad agenda for environmental, economic, and political change. The purposes of the conference were to identify long-term environmental reforms and to initiate processes for their implementation and supervision. Conventions were held to discuss and adopt documents on the environment. The major topics covered by these conventions included climate change, biodiversity, forest protection, Agenda 21, which is a 900-page blueprint for environmental development, and the Rio Declaration, which is a six-page statement that called for integrating the environment with economic development. The Climate Convention and the Biodiversity Convention were legal agreements. The Earth Summit was an historic event of great significance. Not only did it make the environment a priority on the world's agenda

The environmental outlook for the future is mixed. In spite of economic and political changes, interest in and concern about the environment remains high. Air quality has improved in some areas in the developed world but has deteriorated in many developing countries, and problems of acid deposition, chlorofluorocarbons and ozone depletion, and heavy air pollution in Eastern Europe still seek solutions and concerted action. Until acid deposition is diminished, loss of aquatic life in northern lakes and streams will continue, and forest growth will be affected. Water pollution will remain a growing problem as increasing human populations put additional stress on the environment.

26.B. WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT

Introduction:

Women's movement campaigned to obtain political, social, and economic equality between women and men. Among the equal rights campaigned for are control of personal property, equality of opportunity in education and employment, equal suffrage, that is, the right to vote, and equality of sexual freedom. The women's rights movement, also known as feminism and women's liberation, first arose in Europe in the late eighteenth century. Although by 1970 most women throughout the world had gained many rights according to law, in fact complete political, economic, and social equality with men remains to be achieved.

26.B.1. Beginning of Change:

After wars and revolutions in Russia (1917) and China (1949), new Communist governments discouraged the patriarchal family system and supported sexual equality, including birth control. In the Soviet Union, however, the majority of working women held low-paid jobs and was minimally represented in party and government councils. Birth-control techniques were primitive, day-care centres were few, and mothers working outside the home were largely responsible for keeping house and tending children too. China more fully preserved its revolutionary ideals, but some job discrimination against women nevertheless existed. Socialist governments in Sweden in the 1930's established wide-ranging programmes of equal rights for women, which included extensive child-care arrangements.

26.B.2. The Right to Vote:

The participation of women in the First World War and the Second World War helped them achieve one of the major aims of the nineteenth century feminist movement, the right to vote. Already after the First World War, many governments acknowledged the contributions of women to the war effort by granting them the right to vote. Sweden, Britain, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Austria, and Czechoslovakia did so in 1918, followed by the United States in 1920. Women in France and Italy did not obtain the right to vote until 1945. After the Second World War, European women tended to fall back into the traditional roles expected of them, and little was heard of feminist concerns. But by the late 1960's, women began to assert their rights again and speak as feminists. Along with the student upheavals of the late 1960's came renewed interest in feminism, or the women's liberation movement, as it was now called. Increasingly women protested that the acquisition of political and legal equality had not brought true equality with men.

In a British Women's Liberation Workshop in 1969 the women expressed their anguish in the following words: "We are economically oppressed: in jobs we do full work for half pay; in the home we do unpaid work full-time. We are commercially exploited by advertisement, television, and the press; legally we often have only the status of children. We are brought up to feel inadequate, educated to narrower horizons than men. This is our specific oppression as women. It is as women that we are, therefore, organizing."

26.B.3. Simone de Beauvoir:

Of great importance to the emergence of the postwar women's liberation movement was the work of Simone de Beauvoir (1908-1986). Born into a Catholic middleclass family and educated at the Sorbonne in Paris, she supported herself as a teacher and later as a novelist and writer. She maintained a lifelong relationship, but not marriage, with the philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre. Her

involvement in the existentialist movement, the leading intellectual movement of its time, led her to become active in political causes. De Beauvoir believed that she lived a 'liberated' life for a twentieth-century European woman, but for all her freedom, she still came to perceive that as a woman she faced limits that men did not. In 1949, she published her highly influential work *The Second Sex*, in which she argued that as a result of male dominated societies, women had been defined by their differences from men and consequently received second-class status.

26.B.4. Betty Friedan:

Another important influence in the growth of a women's movement in the 1960's came from Betty Friedan. Friedan, who was a journalist and the mother of three children, grew increasingly uneasy with her attempt to fulfill the traditional role of the 'ideal housewife and mother'. In 1963, she published the famous book entitled *The Feminine Mystique*, in which she analyzed the problems of middle-class American women in the 1950's and argued that women were being denied equality with men. She wrote: "The problem that has no name-which is simply the fact that American women are kept from growing to their full human capacities-is taking a far greater toll on the physical and mental health of our country than any known disease." *The Feminine Mystique* became a bestseller and elevated Friedan into a newfound celebrity.

26.B.5. Transformation of Women's Lives:

It is estimated that women need to average 2.1 children in order to ensure a natural replacement of a country's population. In many European countries, the population stopped growing in the 1960's, and the trend has continued since then. By the 1990's, birthrates were down drastically; among the nations of the European Union, the average number of children per woman of childbearing age was 1.4. Italy's rate-1.2, was the lowest in the world in 1997.

26.B.6. Women in Profession:

At the same time, the number of women in the workforce has continued to rise. In Britain, for example, the number of women in the labour force went from 32 per cent to 44 percent between 1970 and 1990. Moreover, women have entered new employment areas. Greater access to universities and professional schools enabled women to take jobs in law, medicine, government, business, and education. In the Soviet Union, for example, about 70 percent of doctors and teachers were women. Nevertheless, economic inequality still often prevailed. Women received lower wages than men for comparable work and received fewer opportunities for advancement to management positions.

26.B.7. 'Consciousness-raising' Groups:

Feminists in the women's liberation movement came to believe that women themselves must transform the fundamental conditions of their lives. They did so in a variety of ways after 1970. First, they formed numerous 'consciousness-raising' groups to further awareness of women's issues. Women met together to share their personal experiences and become aware of the many ways that male dominance affected their lives. This 'consciousness raising' helped many women to become activists.

26.B.8. Legislation Favouring Women:

Women sought and gained a measure of control over their own bodies by seeking to overturn legal restrictions on both contraception and abortion. In the 1960's and 1970's, hundreds of thousands of European women worked to repeal the laws that outlawed contraception and abortion and began to meet with success. A French law in 1968 permitted the sale of contraceptive devices, and in the 1970's French feminists worked to legalize abortion. In 1979, a new French law legalized abortion. Even in Catholic countries, where the church remained strongly opposed to abortion, legislation allowing contraception and abortion was passed in the 1970's and 1980's.

26.B.9. Women Activists:

As more women became activists, they also became involved in new issues. In the 1980's and 1990's, women faculty in universities concentrated on developing new cultural attitudes through the new academic field of women's studies. Courses in women's studies, which stressed the role and contributions of women in history, came to be introduced in both American and European colleges and universities.

Other women began to try to affect the political environment by allying with the anti-nuclear movement. In 1981, a group of women protested American nuclear missiles in Britain by chaining themselves to the fence of an American military base. Thousands more joined in creating a peace camp around the military compound. Enthusiasm ran high; one participant said: "I'll never forget that feeling; it'll live with me forever . . . As we walked round, and we clasped hands. . . it was for women; it was for peace; it was for the world."

Some women joined the ecological movement. As one German writer who was concerned with environmental issues said, it is women "who must give birth to children, willingly or unwillingly, in this polluted world of ours." Especially prominent was the number of women members in the Green Party in Germany, which supported environmental issues and elected forty-two delegates to the West German parliament in 1987.

Women in the West have also reached out to work with women from the rest of the world in international conferences to change the conditions of their lives. Between 1975 and 1995, the United Nations held conferences in Mexico City, Copenhagen, Nairobi, and Beijing. These meetings made clear the differences between women from Western and non-Western countries. Whereas women from Western countries spoke about political, economic, cultural, and sexual rights, women from developing countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia focused their attention on bringing an end to the violence, hunger, and disease that haunt their lives. Despite these differences, these meetings made it clear how women in both developed and developing nations were organizing to make people aware of women's issues.

26.B.10. Gains of the Women's Liberation Movement:

The women's rights movement has made many gains in its history. In more than ninety per cent of nations, women can vote and hold public office. Aided by the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women (1946), women in many countries have gained legal rights and fuller access to education and the professions. However, the advent of industrialization in non-Western nations destroyed some traditional economic arrangements that favoured women and made underpaid factory labour the only work available to them, while the recent resurgence of religious fundamentalism, for example, in the Islamic world, has sometimes brought about the re-emergence of oppressive practices towards women. Women's rights movements in the developing world have aimed to improve the social status of women by campaigning against divisive legal and social codes such as purdah (seclusion of women) in Arab and Islamic societies, and the dowry system in India, and by opposing female genital mutilation (circumcision). In Africa, women produce more than two-thirds of the continent's food, and steps are being taken to help women gain greater control over agricultural technology. In 1975 the United Nations launched a Decade for Women programme, and major conferences were held in 1975, 1980, and 1985, and again in 1995. The 1995 conference, held in Beijing, China, centred on human-rights issues relating specifically to women.

In the 1990's, the women's movement has been examining the possibility that Western society is demonstrating a so-called post-feminist backlash against legal and social gains made by women. Books such as *The Beauty Myth* (1990) by Naomi Wolf and *Backlash* (1992) by Susan Faludi have concentrated on how gains previously made as a result of the women's liberation movement are now being eroded. The recent opposition, especially in the United States, to abortion, is sighted as one of the examples of this argument.

Questions

1. Analyze the causes of the exhaustion of the resources in the contemporary world.
2. Discuss the various factors that have led to the degradation of the environment in the contemporary world.
3. Trace the various stages in the women's liberation movement since 1945.
4. Examine the women's liberation movement in the contemporary world.
5. Write short notes on the following:
 - a) Greenhouse effect and global warming
 - b) Deforestation
 - c) Nuclear radiation
 - d) Earth Summit (1992)
 - e) Simone de Beauvoir
 - f) Betty Friedan

