



Centre for Distance and Online Education
Punjabi University, Patiala
(All Copyrights are Reserved)

M.A. PART-I (SEMESTER I)

POLITICAL SCIENCE
PAPER-IV
INTERNATIONAL POLITICS

Unit II

LESSON NO.:

- 2.1 : Cold War Era
- 2.2 : Post-Cold War Era
- 2.3 : Non-Aligned Movement : Basis, Role and Relevance
- 2.4 : Disarmament and Arms control : As A Theory of Peace
- 2.5 : New International Economic Order

COLD WAR ERA

- 2.1.1. Objectives
- 2.1.2. Introduction
- 2.1.3. Superpowers
- 2.1.4. Superpowers and Major Powers
- 2.1.5. Meaning of Cold War
- 2.1.6. Self-check Exercise
- 2.1.7. Origin and Bases of Cold War1
- 2.1.8. Phases of Cold War
- 2.1.9. Impact of Cold War on World Politics
- 2.1.10. Summary
- 2.1.11. Key Words
- 2.1.12. Short Answer type Questions.
- 2.1.13. Long Answer type Questions.
- 2.1.14. Suggested Readings

2.1.1 Introduction

Emergence of Super Powers: In the history of International Politics there has been changing power position of states/ actors time to time. Modern nation state system took birth due to rising nationalism in Europe. When we study the history of international politics it revolves around the Europe and its imperial instincts for the past five-six centuries. In this very period sometimes major powers are reduced to secondary status, and secondary powers emerged as major powers. Spain, Portugal, England, France, Germany, Russia, Japan, Austria – Hungary Empire remained major powers time to time in the past 5 centuries almost. 20th century is the witness of two World Wars which changed drastically the power equations in international politics. In the beginning of 20th century Prussia, Japan and Russia were considered great powers. After the First World War Britain, France, Austria–Hungary came to be reckoned as great powers. Along with them, United State emerged very slowly as string power in international politics. Besides, between the World Wars the Soviet Union (USSR) consolidated the Bolshevik revolution. With the result there was tremendous industrial progress in Soviet Union. **The Second World War (1939-1945)** significantly alters the international scene. Important scene was that USA (United States of America) and USSR (Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) emerged two powerful states. For the first time in the history of international relations – a non-European country - The USA became a decisive factor in

international politics. The axis powers (Germany, Italy) of Western Europe were shattered after their defeat. The condition was not much better of allied (The Successors – Britain, France). They all lost largely in terms of men and material. These phenomena created the power vacuum in international order. The weakening of European States instantly covered up by USA and USSR. Though these two states incurred heavy losses but they were able to retain their military, economic and industrial supremacy. Even during the Second World War the leadership of Roosevelt (US President) and Stalin (USSR President) played a vital role to lead and direct the war politics. Tensions between the Soviet Union and the United States had been always present since the **Communist Revolution** in 1917 in USSR. Communist Russia throughout evoked hostility or a non-friendly response in the Capitalist World. The presence of free economic enterprise in capitalist countries was in direct contrast to the state ownership of means of production in Soviet Union. But these differences submerged during the Second World War against common threat of Nazism. These differences surfaced again after the end of war.

USA was the only major combatant not to have experienced fighting on its own soil during World Wars. Europe, Japan and even Soviet Union were divested and impoverished. Despite the enormous costs of fighting the war, and the distortions imposed on it by a high level of military production, the US economy was in good shape. The Soviet Union, in contrast, was badly damaged and struggling to be a superpower. USA had the atomic bomb by 1945 whereas the Soviet Union did not. But this did not stop the Soviet Union retaining large armed forces and keeping a firm military control over Eastern Europe.

2.1.2 Objectives of this lesson

1. To understand the meaning of cold war
2. To study the origin and bases of cold war
3. To know about the different phases of cold war
4. To study the impact of cold war on World Politics

2.1.3 Superpowers: How can we define the term ‘superpower’? It is not very easy and simple as it might seem. The term superpower was first coined by Willian Fox in 1944. Recalling that at the time, Germany, Italy and Japan (the axis powers) were all but defeated. Most of Europe was in tatters and China was in the midst of a Civil War. Fox defined a superpower as a state that possessed great power plus great mobility of power. He argued that only the great United States, the Soviet Union and Britain deserved to be called superpowers because these three states would be responsible for shaping the post 1945 world. But it would be a mistake to think that these were three states of equal power. After 1949 nuclear explosion by USSR; then, USA and USSR two states emerged as superpowers. Even Britain was

almost bankrupt by the end of Second World War and being dictated by USA.

Term superpower implies that there is hierarchy of power among states. It is a state that plays a crucial leadership role in the international system and is able to gain the allegiance of other states. Within its sphere of influence, a superpower can impose its political will on smaller states with relative impunity. Not only does a superpower have the capacity to project effective military power far from its territory but it also has enormous military resources at its disposal. Besides, that a superpower has special duties with respect to the maintenance of international order and holds a privileged status in international forums and organizations. Fox defined again that a superpower as a “great power whose armed force is so mobile that it can deploy in any strategic theatre, as opposed to a great power, whose interests and influences are confined to single regional theatre. The possession of two military characteristics by the superpower: one “the full range of strategic nuclear armory and two the capacity to deploy its forces, whether armed conventionally or with nuclear weapons, in any strategic theatre of the world.” Therefore, the superpower has the capacity to intervene, interfere and move in any part of the world without affecting its own power, prestige and popularity in any substantial way.

According to Oxford Dictionary of Politics, ‘In its generic use, the term (superpower) refers to those few states with powers (defined by combining a series of variables together – e.g. economic wealth, population, size, and above all, military strength, especially in the possession of sophisticated nuclear armaments) far transcending that of the rest of the states in the international arena. More specifically, the term refers to the two states, the United States and the Soviet Union, in the time of Cold War. Both emerged superpowers first in Europe than in the rest of the world. Both competed against each other for influence in the global politics of the Cold War’.

2.1.4 Super Powers and major Powers: A nation could be described as major power as different from a superpower, when she is able to assert or dictate her position beyond her region. A country could be described as a major power when she possesses all the concomitants of power along with nuclear capability and also a capacity to maintain balance of power within a given region. However nuclear capability does not make a nation a major power. It is the capacity to maintain or upset the balance of power in a region which is more important. For example before the First World War Britain, Germany, Russia, France etc. had been major powers during late 19th and early 20th century. These states maintained European balance of power system time to time. Fox argued that there was a qualitative difference between the superpowers of the post 1945 era and the European

great powers of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Even though they were significant international actors, they never had the global reach and influence as of USA and Soviet Union after the Second World War. The superpowers phenomena during the Cold War period engulfed the whole world relations in its lap. WE and USSR both were increasing their spheres of influences not only in Europe but also in other areas of the world. Superpowers seem to be very powerful in respect of dictating its term to their bloc partners.

According to Wenger and Zimmermann, 'following the end of World War II hopes abounded that the future world order would be informed by the vision of 'One world' and that law and order would replace the anarchy of international relations. Instead, the antagonism between East and West, between communism and liberal democracy, between a socio-economic command economy and capitalism – in short, between two fundamentally divergent social and value systems (ideologies) largely determined international politics. The postwar world was organized into two distinct blocs, with the United States and the Soviet Union at the two centers. The process leading up to the bipolar international system of the Cold War'.

II

THE COLD WAR

2.1.5 Meaning of Cold War: The Cold War of the two post superpowers was not an episode like other wars of modern times. The term 'cold war' was invented to describe a state of affairs. The principal ingredient in this state of affairs was the mutual hostility and fears of the protagonists. These emotions were rooted in their several historical and political differences and were powerfully stimulated by myths which at times turn hostility into hatred. The Cold War dominated world affairs for a generation and more (Peter Calvocoressi: 2000). The term '**Cold War**' was coined by Walter Lippman to describe the tension and conflict in the bilateral relationship of the US and USSR after World War II. As a concept in international relations, it denotes a state of constant conflict and strife, maintained and perpetuated without a direct armed conflict between the antagonists. Every expression of hostility and tension is used without a direct use of arms. Cold War, "a state of intensive competition, political, economic and ideological, which yet falls below the threshold of armed conflict between states" (Melkote and Rao: 1992).

The most popular view about Cold War was 'an intense struggle for power between the superpowers'. The word 'War' implies tension, armed conflict, and a zero-sum relationship between the superpowers. The word 'Cold' refers to the presence of factors that allegedly restrained the confrontation and prevented a 'hot' war. Conventional meaning is based on a

definition of the Cold War that assumes a high level of East-West tension with the threat of escalation to nuclear conflict. According to the orthodox argument, the Cold War was a struggle between conflicting universal values. In the West, the concepts of a market economy and a multi-party democracy were cherished. In the East, single party statism and a command administrative economy were highly valued. The obvious conflict of ideas and obstinate nature of those who defended them were the driving forces behind the conflict.

The policies of containment followed by the United States were defensive reactions to an inherently aggressive and expansionist enemy. It was a period of American dominance whose legitimacy was based on a mythical Soviet 'threat'. In contrast to the view that Cold War was inherently antagonistic, regardless of who was the main instigator? In fact Cold War was very useful to both sides. For the United States, it solved the problem of what to do about Germany and Japan, both of whom were key states in bringing about the Second World War. For the Soviet Union and United States, the Cold War permitted a de facto solution of the German problem by freezing the social/ political contours of Europe, both East and West (Griffiths and Callaghan: 2004).

Therefore the name 'Cold War' normally given to the period of intense conflict between the United States and Soviet Union after World War II. After the war Soviet Union effectively occupying the countries of Eastern Europe and the United States as liberator of the countries of Western Europe. In Germany these two superpowers along with France and Britain, established zones of occupation and a framework for four power control. During Yalta and Potsdam (both 1945) conferences about post war settlement, serious differences emerged. Shortly we can say that Cold War was phenomena of opposite interests and ideologies between US and USSR. They were competing and conflicting with each other without direct 'hot war'. But mutual hostilities, arms race, nuclear arms race, zones of influences were prevalent during this period.

2.1.6. Self-check Exercise:

Self-check Exercise:	
1.	Who coined the term Cold War?
2.	Define Cold War?
3.	What was the period of Cold War.?

2.1.7. Origin and Bases of Cold War: With the bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki (Japan) in August 1945 by USA, it was the declaration of end of Second World War. Because Japan and no other axis power was capable to compete USA nuclear bomb. Along with it, there was the end of common enemy of allies' powers. Then the western alliance turned towards post war international order and security system. As the war drew to a conclusion the fundamental disagreements among allies (USA, France, Britain and USSR) resurfaced. The increasing conflict between the new superpowers posed insurmountable problems in constructing a viable post war security system. A number of contentious issues soon surfaced. These contentious issues were: The Atom Bomb – The sudden invention of atomic bomb by USA created Soviet Union suspicious of USA hegemony. USA earlier never shared its secret of nuclear bomb. Even USA believed that USSR would never be capable to produce the bomb in the coming 10 years. This will help US to check Soviet aggression. But USSR created nuclear bomb in four years after. Secondly Churchill's (British P.M.) Fulton speech of 5th March, 1946 made differences more deep, "If the Western democracies stand together in strict adherence to the principles of UN Charter, their influence for furthering those principles will be immense and no one is likely to molest them. If, however, they become divided or fail in their duty and if these all important years are allowed to slip away, then indeed catastrophe may overwhelm us all." This speech specially targeted USSR and it was sign of coming closeness of Western democracies of Britain, France and US etc... Soviet Union regarded it as a unilateral attack by 'Capitalism' and 'Imperialism' over socialist countries. Conflict was not only limited up to Central Europe, it was reached beyond Europe – on the issues Iran, Turkey, Greece and Truman Doctrine. Truman Doctrine constituted a call to resist outside forces and was clearly directed against international communism or Soviet Union. Truman's address to Congress in March 1947 had a significant impact on the future of superpowers relations. He said, "I believe that we must assist free peoples to work out their own destinies in their own way. President Truman's proposal for an interventionist foreign policy can be understood as prelude to the Cold War. The Truman Doctrine and the associated policy of containment expressed the self-image of the United States as inherently defensive, and were underpinned by the Marshall Plan for European economic recovery, proclaimed in June 1947, which was essential to the economic rebuilding of Western Europe. In Eastern Europe, democratic or other anti-communist forces were systematically undermined or eliminated and being replaced by Marxist-Leninist regimes loyal to Moscow were installed. Moscow understood that, the Western world was inspired by capitalist values which demanded the destruction of USSR and the

extirpation of communism by any means available, but above all by force or the threat of irresistible force. The major factors which led to a Cold War atmosphere between the two superpowers became identifiable during post-war conferences. The famous Iron Curtain speech made by Churchill led to permanent wedge between the superpowers.

Important bases of Cold War were as follows:

- **Ideological differences:** Communist ideology led by USSR was against capitalism. Communist ideology advocates state control on means of production and socialist governments. Which America (capitalist) considers largely totalitarian and anti-democratic. Communist ideology was intent upon converting the entire world. Therefore, it posted a real threat to freedom and liberty throughout the world. On the other side communist Soviet Union blaming capitalism is responsible for the exploitation of resources in all over the world.
- **Historical background:** Soviet distrust of American intentions was based on historical record of hostility. As America's intervention in Russia in 1918-19. Former's refusal to establish diplomatic relations till 1933. US nourished hostility towards Soviet Union due to growing Soviet belligerence. Russia's unwillingness to permit democratic elections in countries liberated from Nazis. And Soviet Union's disagreements in post-war resettlements.
- **German issue:** The Cold War mainly originated from the German issue, and remained confined mostly to Europe for a long time. The Western powers were against the division of Germany and wanted to keep joint control of France, England, US and USSR. But USSR interested to keep the Germany fully its sphere of influence. Later on this conflict resulted in division of Germany.
- **Mutual misunderstanding and antagonism:** According to some scholars that the mistrust and consequent fears were the basis of Cold War. Mutual fear and suspicion produced hostile interaction between the two parties. The diplomacy of co-existence failed. Both the capitalists and the communists developed mutual suspicion. Soviet expansion in East Europe paid greater role for erosion of diplomacy of co-existence.

III

2.1.8. THE COLD WAR: PHASES OF COLD WAR

From the onset of Cold War till the demise of USSR in 1990, there have different phases of Cold War. During this long period of 45 years

sometimes there was arms race, period of deterrence and increased hostilities, conflict and competition. Other the time there was some understanding developed between two superpowers, specifically regarding nuclear arms, or the era of detente, reduced hostilities or controlled competition and conflict. On the bases of this we can divide the Cold War period into three important phases:

1. 1945 to 1962 – First Cold War
2. 1962 to 1978 – Détente Era
3. 1978 to 1986 – Known as Second or New Cold War

1. Phase I - 1945 to 1962

During this period the polarization of two blocs occurred. US, a capitalist bloc, led the Western or democratic states – as Britain, France, Greece, Italy, West Germany, Japan, Australia. She also increased its influence in South East Asia, Central Asia, Australia and New Zealand. There was formation of alliances on US side known as NATO, SEATO, CENTO, ANZUS etc. On the other hand Soviet Union established its supremacy and zone of influence in Eastern Europe which include the countries: Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania, Czechoslovakia, East Germany etc... During this first phase of Cold War major important international controversial issues was The German Division, Korean War (1950), the Suez Crisis (1956), Vietnam War, Cuban Missile Crisis (1962), The Berlin War Crisis (1961), Hungarian Civil War (1956). Germany was divided into two parts. Federal Republic of Germany (West Germany) brought under control of USA, France and England. German Democratic Republic (East Germany) fell under the influence of USSR or Communist Bloc. The popular East-West divide was division of Europe and particularly division of mighty Germany, which remained an aggressor power throughout the half of 20th century. German division fulfills the purpose of weakening its power for a long time. The Korean War (1950) ushered in an era of the third party projections of bipolar rivalry. The emergence of People's Republic of China (communist China – 1949) as the second biggest communist state perfected the capitalist vs. communist dimension of the Cold War crisis. Korean War brought conflict between communist Korea (under the influence of China and USSR) and non-communist South Korea. US extended help to South Korea as a part of its containment policy. Then war seemed between communism and US. With the direct help of China the UN troops (led by US) were pushed back by North Koreans across the 38th parallel. This 38th parallel divided the Korea into North Korea and South Korea. Cuban missile crisis (1962) considered the greatest of all Cold War crises. These crises are concerned with Cuba, an American continent Island country, where the Castro regime was growing dependence upon the Soviet Union for economic

aid, assistance and the placement of Soviet missiles and troops on Cuban territory. Castro was extremely against US hegemony over all American continent and strengthening Cuba for its independence in international relations. President Kennedy of US imposed a naval blockade on Cuba until the missiles were removed. Consequently, The Kennedy-Khurchev (USSR) communication during the Cuban crisis not only prevented a hot-war but it led to an era of détente. A number of doctrine and most of the defense and power alliance come into existence during this period. These alliances on both sides sharpened the crisis and vertically divided world and particularly Europe into two power blocks.

Truman Doctrine: To combat the communist danger, first important step taken by US President Truman in 1947. Truman doctrine advocated US intervention in any part of world to contain communism or declared to help to “free people to maintain their free institutions and their national integrity against aggressive movements.” Truman doctrine endorsed by US Congress for defense of Greece and Turkey where communist threat was eminent due to Civil War.

Marshall Plan: US Secretary of State George Marshall formed a plan known as Marshall Plan. That the United States should do whatever it is able to assist in the return of normal economic health in the world, without which there can be no political stability and no assured peace. USSR considered Marshall Plan as to control USSR’s increasing popularity and influence. USSR rejected the plan and decided that communist countries will not take any advantage of the capitalist design of interference. Therefore this plan contributed to strengthen the economies of Western Europe and to make their dependence on US.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) – 1949:

The formation of NATO, its structure and sophistication, reflected the Western alliance’s new purpose and the seriousness of the West’s perception of East’s aggressive tendencies and growing military power. This treaty was signed by 12 nations at Washington for the purpose of safeguarding the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their people founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty and rule of law. The 12 original members were - US, United Kingdom, France, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, Italy, Iceland, Luxemburg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Greece and Turkey joined in 1952 and West Germany in 1955.

Although, NATO’s formation was under the rules and regulations of UN Charter. But practically it was not according in the spirit of these rules. There was tremendous criticism of NATO all over the world particularly from communist world which called it formation of military alliance and will disturb the pace of world and to increase international tension. The

formation of NATO undoubtedly, had given rise to the opponent alliance called Warsaw Pact. Besides, the dominant position in NATO was being enjoyed by US and UK which undermined the sovereignty of other partners. Despite numerous shortcomings NATO had promoted political, social and military co-operation among member states and encouraged them to settle their mutual disputes and differences amicably.

Central Treaty Organization (CENTO):

US increased its influence to West Asia. In 1954 an alliance between a NATO member Turkey and Pakistan occurred in 1955. Turkey and Iraq joined an alliance known as Baghdad Pact. Later on Baghdad Pact was joined by Britain, Pakistan and Iran, renamed as CENTO. However USA never joined this pact but it was under auspicious of USA. In March 1979, Iraq, Pakistan and Turkey left CENTO. By September 1979 CENTO was officially ceased to an existence. The purpose of Baghdad pact was to counter communist danger in the region. US were providing economic and military aid to member countries.

South - East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO):

Also known as Manila Pact - USA, UK, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand and Philippines signed a pact at Manila in 1954. US bloc's concern here was Korean issue and if South Korea falls into communist zone then there will be no stop for communist bloc to reach one by one to South East Asian states. Pakistan withdrew its membership in 1972. France was also taking keen interest in SEATO by 1974, Australia and New Zealand decided not to participate in SEATO sessions. Finally SEATO was dissolved in 1977. **ANZUS:** US pact with Australia and New Zealand with the purpose to secure pacific from communism.

Communist Bloc Alliances

Cominform: Communist Information Bureau created in response to Marshall Plan. Communist parties of Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, Rumania, Hungary, Poland, USSR and Czechoslovakia participated. The proposal of Cominform was to coordinate the policies of communist parties and mutual economic assistance to communist countries.

Sino-Soviet Treaty: Soviet Union made a treaty with China in 1950 - a treaty of friendship, alliance and mutual assistance for thirty years duration. They promised to render military assistance in case of any threat by Japan and any other power.

Warsaw Pact: Communist bloc's Warsaw Pact was a response to NATO. In May 1955, Albania, Bulgaria, Hungary, East Germany, Poland, Romania, USSR and Czechoslovakia concluded a pact at Warsaw (Poland). Along with treaty of friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance the proposal was also made to set up joint command of armed forces of the

signatory states with its headquarters in Moscow, to be headed by Soviet Marshal I.S. Koniev. Deputy Commander in Chief also appointed from other partners. The contracting parties agreed to settle international disputes by peaceful means in accordance with the UN Charter and to develop economic and cultural ties.

All these doctrines, treaties and pacts certainly enhanced the tension between two blocs, divided the international relations into bi-polar order. Through these pacts Soviet Union and WE both were trying to bring more and more areas under their influence. All important alliances were occurred during this phase of Cold War.

2. The Detente Era (1962-78):

According to Oxford Dictionary of Politics detente means literally 'loosening'. Detente was used to refer the periods of reduced tension in relations between the United States and Soviet Union during the Cold War. It was closely associated with the process of arms control, and the main period of détente ran from the Nuclear Partial Test Ban Treaty (1963) to the late 1970s. In brief we can say that détente means reduced hostilities, controlled conflict, competition and arms race. Era of more stability than arms race and deterrence.

According to Len Scot, "How far the arms race was the result of mutual misperceptions, how far the unavoidable outcome of irreconcilable political differences, are central questions. Some influential Americans believed that the Soviets were bent on world domination, which the communist rhetoric of world revolution certainly encouraged. What is clear is that nuclear weapons provided context and pretext for their more dangerous confrontations, most notably when the Soviets deployed nuclear weapons in Cuba in 1962. It is also clear that when political confrontation gave way to Soviet – American detente, agreements on nuclear weapons became the most tangible achievement of detente.

1970s witnessed a shifting balance of power. There was Sino-US understanding by 1971. As then President Nixon referred early 1970s as an 'age of Negotiation'.

US – Soviet relations steadily improved with the US withdrawal from Vietnam. The ideological rift between USSR – China was a thaw to ideological alliances. Rising China's armed forces and nuclear arsenals added a new dimension to international relations. Besides, Willy Brandt, West German Chancellor (1969) enthusiastically pursued 'Ostpolitik' – aimed at reaching a series of constructive agreements between East and West. Poland tried to make comfortable relations with West Germany. The leading incidents towards East-West détente were:

- Nuclear Test Ban Treaty – 1962

- NPT – 1968
- Biological Weapons Conventions – 1972
- Conference on Security and Cooperation (CSCE) in US, Canada and Europe in which 33 European countries participated from both East and West Europe– 1975

3. New Cold War – 1979 to 1986

The new turn to Cold War occurred when in 1979 USSR forces' direct intervention in Afghanistan in 1979. This was end of the detente era and started next face of Cold War. The Belgrade Conference on New Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) failed in 1977-78 due to US allegations that the Soviet Union was not honouring the pledges of human rights made in 1975. It was President Carter's aggressive policy but Brezhnev (USSR) accused US (Jimmy Carter) of West's interference in East's internal affairs. Carter also demands concessions on immigration from Moscow.

USSR's direct intervention with Soviet forces led to end of detente era. USSR was justifying its action that West was attempting to destabilize Afghanistan, a country bordered the USSR, a threat to USSR. Under President Reagan NATO took a decision to deploy American made cruise missiles towards the close of 1979, and the advanced medium range Pershing II missile in West Europe. America intervened in El Salvador, Soviets in Nicaragua, Vietnam, Angola and Mozambique. Reagan Star War and Bomber B-20 programmed aggravated the tension.

In 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev became President of USSR. He understood the actual hollowness of Soviet of communist economies. He made several efforts to reduce the tension between US and USSR. Loosened some pressure on East European countries. With the result there was German unification in 1990 and disintegration of USSR by 1991. Ultimately it was end of Cold War and bi-polarity at international scene.

IV

2.1.9. IMPACT OF COLD WAR ON WORLD POLITICS

1. Bi-Polar World Order: Cold War power politics divided the world in two camps opposite to each other. All the world politics was guided by bi-polar world order. International organizations like UNO became also catapult of bi-polar world politics. UN Security Council members a number of times misused its veto power in favour of their bloc members or camp followers. Foreign policy of not only bloc members but of non members had been dictated by bi-polar world structure. International order as bi-polar order maintained the balance of power. Obviously this bi-polar balance of power saved the world from any large scale world war.

2. Impact on European Colonialism: US, who was against European colonialism in earlier period. Later on, to maintain the status-quo US started

favouring European colonialism. It has given the advantage to USSR to become the 'Messiah' of Third World. USSR raised voice against colonialism at every platform. The Marxian leaders of these countries were leaning more heavily with communist camp.

3. Emergence of Non-Aligned Movement (NAM): Cold War had given impetus to formation of NAM – an organization of new independent countries of Asia and Africa, or Latin America to keep their independence of the international relations. These countries wanted to take more advantages from both blocs while prevailing their autonomy. NAM was movement which loosened the bi-polar international order up to great extent. This organization along with UN played an active role to diffuse the tension between two blocs when ripened highly.

4. Arms Race: Cold War's most dangerous impact was that most of the states indulged in arms race, developing more and more arms of mass-destruction, especially by US and USSR. For example the periods from 1945 to 1985 US developed from 2 to 11,200 bomb and warheads. USSR made from 0 to 9900 nuclear arms in the same period. China, France, England became nuclear powers.

5. Proxy Wars in Third World Countries: The highly advanced high-technology arms race encouraging two super-powers engaging in proxy wars areas other than Europe. The Korea, Vietnam, Suez Crisis, Cuba, Cambodia, Afghanistan etc. became victims of proxy wars by superpowers. Cold War also destabilized the social, political, and economic development of TWCs.

6. Impact on Economy: Cold War affected the whole world economy. It increased the difficulties of superpowers by high defense spending which resulted numerous economic problems. Developing countries were also following arms race and increased their defense budgets to maintain their security within the region. Bordering states were being aided by superpowers. India, Pakistan, Iran, Iraq, North Korea and South Korea are some examples.

2.1.10. Summary

In short, Cold War was one of most important happenings at international level, which engulfed the whole world into its influence. Almost half a century world relations have been dictated by bi-polar world order. Two superpowers dominated and maintained their hegemony at international level.

2.1.10. Key words

Super power

Hegemony

Third World Countries

NATO

SEATO

Nationalism

Nazism

Axis power

International Order

Capitalism

Imperialism

ANZUS

Detente

2.1.11. Short Answer Type Questions

1. What do you mean by Superpowers & Major Powers?
2. Explain the meaning of Cold War.
3. Write the meaning of 'detente'.

2.1.12. Long Answer type Questions

1. What is Cold War? Explain the origin and bases of Cold War.
2. Discuss about different phases of Cold War. Explain also the impact of Cold War on World Politics.

2.1.13. Suggested Readings:

1. Andreas Wenger and Doron Zimmernann
International Relations. 2004
2. Urmila Sharma and S.K. Sharma,
International Relations: Theory and History. 2000
3. Rama S. Melkote and A. Narsimha Rao,
International Relations. 1992
4. John Baylis and Steve Smith
The Globalization of World Politics. 1992.
5. Peter Calvocoressi, World Politics 1945-2000. 2004.
6. Martin Griffiths and Terry O'Callaghan,
Key Concepts in International Relations. 2004 .

POST COLD WAR ERA

- 2.2.1 Introduction
- 2.2.2 Objectives of this lesson
- 2.2.4 Self-check Exercise
- 2.2.5 Disintegration of Soviet Union
- 2.2.6 Collapse of Communist Bloc
- 2.2.7 Consequences of collapse of Soviet Union
- 2.2.8 Future Possibilities
- 2.2.9 Summary
- 2.2.10 Key Words
- 2.2.11. Short answer type questions
- 2.2.12 Long answer type questions
- 2.2.13 Suggested Readings

2.2.1 Introduction

Disintegration of Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) and the Communist Bloc was one of the most important events in International Politics in the 20th century. Soviet Union which remained a superpower almost for four and half decades, who had posed deterrence to USA and its capitalist bloc, failed to be equal of opponent by 1990. Both USSR and USA respectively lead their respective power blocs for half a century. Not only that, even world politics was largely controlled by this bi-polar world order. Students of international relations spend a lot of time trying to understand things that actually did happen. Sometimes, however, it is just as interesting and equally important to ask about and understand those things that did not happen. The peace of Cold War provides a good example of just such a non event. For more than forty years, two of the greatest military powers of the world have ever known divided by an intense ideological rivalry, struggled against each other across the globe. But despite the intensity of the conflict, they never actually went to war with each other. In many ways this is a very curious outcome: It is unusual in international history for two great powers to compete against one another on such a scale and never fight. If any 'nonevent' cries out for an explanation, it is the curious peace that was the Cold War.

2.2.2 Objectives of this lesson

1. To understand about Post-Cold War Era.
2. To know the circumstances which led to collapse of Soviet Bloc.
3. To learn about the consequences of collapse of Soviet Bloc.

2.2.3 The meaning of Post Cold War Era

The events of 1989-91, from the collapse of the Iron Curtain (No connectivity between East and West Europe) to the dismantling of the Soviet Union in December 1991, represent a turning point in distinct respects. First, they marked the end of the broadly bi-polar structure, based on US-Soviet rivalry, which the international system has assumed since the late 1940s. A second set of important changes took place at the level of the Nation-State. Former communist states experienced serious problems of transition ranging from economic collapse, which affected them all (most of the communist regions) to the disintegration of the state itself. Even those states which maintained communist systems, such as China, North Korea and Cuba, faced enormous challenges, since they had to accommodate themselves to position of increased marginality. Yet those states not in the throes of post-communist transition were also forced to redefine their national interests and roles in the light of the radical change in the international balance of power. This applied as much too large states such as the United States, whose policies had been promised on the Soviet threat, as the small states in the Third World which had been to greater or lesser degree 'client' states of the super powers.

It is instructive to remember how grim International Politics looked by the middle of the 1980s and how much change occurred (mostly for the better) in the ensuing decade. By the end of 1988, the United States and the Soviet Union agree for the first time to dismantle a whole category of nuclear weapons. The eight year war between Iran and Iraq finally ended in 1988. The Soviets pulled their troops out of Afghanistan. There is a little doubt that most dramatic political events in the late 1980s and the first half of 1990s took place in the communist world. A decade of reforms in China culminated in massive pre-democracy demonstrations in Beijing in 1989. In Eastern Europe and especially in the Soviet Union, dramatic strides towards economic deterioration. Mikhail Gorbachev came to power in 1985 and put into effect his policies of **'perestroika' and 'glasnost'**.

The demise and eventual dissolution of the Soviet Union was unquestionably a major event that transformed critical aspects of international relations, especially in Europe. We are now over a decade and half into the post-cold war world. The mere fact that almost everyone still describes the period since 1989 as the 'Post - Cold War Era' is in itself telling. This is an era that remained defined by what it is not rather than what it is. Although all agree that we are no longer in the Cold War, there is no consensus about what sort of world has replaced it.

2.2.4. Self-check Exercise

Self-check Exercise	
1.	What is the 'end of history' thesis?
2.	What do you mean by post-Cold War Era?
3.	What does Perestroika and Glasnost mean?

II

2.2.5 Disintegration of Soviet Union

Debate about the end of Cold War is mired in as much ideological controversy as is debate about its origins. One vision credits Ronald Reagan with having brought the Cold War to an end by instigating a renewed US military buildup in the early 1980s, particularly in the form of Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) (the star war initiative) of 1983, thereby sparking off the 'Second Cold War'. The result of this was that the USSR was drawn into an arms race that its already fragile economy could not sustain. In a broader form, this explanation has been elaborated by Fukuyama (1992) amongst others, into the triumphalism 'end of history' thesis. This thesis suggests that the West 'won' the Cold War ultimately because only US-style liberal democracy offered a viable economic and political system. Other versions, however, place heavier stress on the structural weakness of the Soviet economy and the catastrophic mishandling of the reform process by Mikhail Gorbachev.

Among the most striking features of communism's collapse was its suddenness, a surprise as much to most western experts on the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe as to political leaders and the public. It is true that revolutionary change by its nature contains a large element of the incalculable. Institutional inertia, social customs and psychological habit ensure that systems can maintain their outer shapes long after they have begun in decay internally. Perhaps the most useful general observation on the causes of revolution remains that of French political philosopher Alexis de Tocqueville: that 'the most dangerous moment for a bad government is generally that in which it sets about reform'. This model, generalized as it is, is useful starting point for an understanding of Mikhail Gorbachev's revolutionary period in power. Gorbachev's 'new thinking' laid the groundwork for even more radical reforms by undercutting the moral and intellectual basis of the Stalinist state. Soviet-Style Communism had displayed all the characteristics of totalitarian rule, including central control over the armed forces, the mass media, and the economy; a dominant monopoly party; an official ideology; and a systematic program of terror

against suspected political opponents and the mass murder of innocents deemed unworthy by the regime. The most important fact to keep in mind about the Soviet political and economic system before Gorbachev came to power in 1985 was that all power was centralized in the communist party, which governed the nation. Although separate government structures and institutions existed, they were mere reflections of the fundamental control the party exercised over Soviet political life. Furthermore, not only was the communist party the primary repository of political power, it was also the main source of social rank, power and privilege within the Soviet Union. The party was hierarchically organized, with sharp gradations in power and authority according to rank. All personnel matters, not only within the party but also in all other key Soviet institutions were tightly controlled by the party hierarchy. It was not Gorbachev's intention to dismantle the Soviet Union. His widely read political credo, 'Perestroika' (1987), was firmly anti-Stalinist but not anti-socialist. Gorbachev advocated through 'Perestroika' means 'restructuring: the political and economic restructuring. It referred the market oriented economic reforms, ending of the leading role of the communist party. To emprise law, allowing state enterprises to sell part of their product in the open market and also allowing foreign companies to one Soviet enterprise. He also introduced 'glasnost' which means greater openness and democratization: to promote principle of freedom to criticize; loosening of control on media and publications; and freedom of worship or religious freedom etc... Policy changes under the influence of Gorbachev's these concepts lifted the pressure on people of different nationalities resulted in secession. The collapse of the Soviet Union was economic in nature. At the heart of the problem was the Soviet Union's command economy. Put simple, Soviet economic policy since its inception had been to increase inputs (e.g., labor, capital, raw material, and energy) to bolster production. Upton the 1960s this formula resulted in an impressive growth rate, because Soviet planners before then were still in route to mobilizing the full potential of all available wasteful. By contrast, capitalist economies carefully consider the extent and type of inputs used and compensated by maximizing productivity, that is, efficient production of goods. In the 1970s, as economic power rose to prominence, the Soviet input potential was employed to the limit; productivity stagnated. Industrial plants overdue for overhauls simple continued to produce goods of questionable quality, lacking stimuli that exist in open-market economies. Consequently it began to fall behind the standards set by international economy.

During the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan (by 1979 to 1988) as a consequence, the 120,000 Soviet soldiers stationed in Afghanistan incurred heavy losses by the standards of the day. Some 15,000 men perished in

fighting the mujahedeen between 1979 and Soviet withdrawal a decade later; 37,000 wounded during the war. The politbureau justified intervention in Afghanistan by referring to the Soviet Union's internationalist duty to support a fellow communist government. With the rise of Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985, a significant change in the conduct of Soviet War took place. He realized that the war was imposing an unbearable financial and human toll on the strained Soviet economy. His conclusion was simple: all Soviet troops had to be withdrawn, and the last chapter as soon as possible. Moreover, Gorbachev was under pressure to satisfy the west in its bid to improve Soviet relations with the United States, so peace in Afghanistan became imperative. Gorbachev finally agreed to withdraw all Soviet troops without any kind of settlement with mujahedeen. Conversely, he did seek a settlement with the United States. An agreement with Reagan-stipulating that both superpowers cease all direct or indirect support for their clients. Consequently, Afghanistan was plunged into a protracted civil war.

2.2.6 Collapse of Communist Bloc

The story in the rest of the communist world was virtually the mirror image of that in China. In Eastern Europe, and especially the Soviet Union, dramatic strides towards political liberalization and democracy coincided with equally dramatic economic deterioration. Gorbachev instituted an equally profound revolution in foreign policy, especially in Soviet relations with its erstwhile satellites in Eastern Europe. "In 1989" according to one historian, "While the nations of Western Europe celebrated the bicentenary of the French Revolution, the nations of Eastern Europe re-enacted it." In that year, a long process of liberalization in political culminated in open parliamentary elections, and other states were soon to follow Poland's lead. As the Los Angeles Time (December 17, 1989) observed in the wake of 1989 revolution in Eastern Europe, "It took 10 years in Poland, 10 months in Hungary, 10 weeks in East Germany, and 10 days in Czechoslovakia." By the end of the year the regime of Nicolae Ceausescu in Romania had also been overthrown. By 1991, even the long-isolated regime in Albania was liberalizing in various ways. In October 1990, East and West Germany were united in one Federal Republic of Germany, and in 1991, the Warsaw pact was officially disbanded. The Cold War was over.

Moscow had good reason to fear that the 'nationality question' might sooner or later be the Soviet Union's undoing. Ironically, it was Gorbachev's reforms that created the climate in which the non-Russian nationalities could dare to strife for self-determination and independence. Glasnost, in particular, encouraged a climate of local criticism of the central government and the communist party. The immense psychological impact of this

decision (to allow satellite states – Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Bulgaria, Romania to leave the Soviet fold) was increased by the geographical proximity of many of the republics to these East European nations. Independence became a political idea that was catching. With the demise of Soviet Union, independence for all the republics became a reality. Consequently, the independence movement surged in the Baltic States first, where Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia (which had been independent for a time before they were seized by Stalin under his infamous 1939 pact with Hitler) pushed the peace of reform further and faster than Gorbachev intended. In 1990, Lithuania led the way. On March 11, 1990, it formally declared its independence from Moscow followed by others. President Gorbachev attempted to stabilize the situation with a new Union Treaty that redefined the relationship between the central government and the republics. This treaty was heavily tilted in favor of the republics, so much so that some experts saw it as fundamentally transformation the very nature of Soviet state. For instance, the treaty permitted the republics to conduct their own diplomatic and commercial relations with other countries, reserved to them the right to secession, and permitted them to suspend national law. It was probably not coincidental that the attempt to remove Gorbachev from power took place on the eve of this treaty's signing. After the coup's failure, the treaty became moot as the floodgates were opened, and a majority of republics announced their intention to become independent. In December 1991, the Soviet Union ceased to exist.

The collapse of communism in Eastern Europe marked most graphically by the destruction of the Berlin Wall in November 1989 was intimately related to events in the Soviet Union but also had roots of its own. The nations of Eastern Europe (East Germany, Poland, Bulgaria, Romania, Albania, Hungary etc.) had experienced only forty years of communist rule as opposed to the seventy years of the Soviet Union and in all cases except Yugoslavia had communism imposed on them rather than choosing it themselves. The suddenness of communist collapse in Eastern Europe, and the realistic ease with which citizens shed the habits of forty years, suggests that those habits were to a considerable extent a matter of form. One important force which had held them in place since the late 1940s was the threat of Soviet intervention to reimpose orthodoxy should Eastern Europeans stray from the path set down for them. Gorbachev's top-down approach to reforming Soviet rule did have an impact on the member states of the Warsaw Pact. The introduction of perestroika and glasnost resulted in rapid delegitimization of communism in Eastern Europe. Gorbachev's reform policy was interpreted as an abnegation of traditional Soviet imperial claims. Between 1989 and 1991, there followed a chain reaction that resulted in the

disengagement of communist Eastern Europe from Soviet domination. Poland was the first Soviet satellite to break away. Discontent with the communist leadership and the declining standard of living in Poland gave rise to *solidarnosc* (solidarity) during the 1980s, a movement that had its roots in the heavy industry unions. In April 1989, *solidarnosc* was legalized and free elections were negotiated with the government for June 1989. Following the elections in August 1989, Tadeusz Mazowiecki was confirmed as the first non-communist Prime Minister of Poland. During the same month, the regime of Janos Kadar was overthrown in Hungary; in October the single-party system was abolished and political opposition was legalized. By the end of 1989, East European states had successfully overthrown communist rule. Shortly, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Romania and Albania forced communist governments out of power.

A new era of cooperation among European states had its emergence. West Germany and East Germany got united. Berlin Wall, the symbol and physical manifestation of Cold War in Europe got demolished. However, the wall was a propaganda disaster for East Germany and the Communist bloc. It became key symbol of what Western powers regarded as communist tyranny, particularly after the high profile shootings of would be defectors. Political liberalization in the late 1980s, associated with the decline of Soviet Bloc, led East Germany to relax border restrictions, culminating in mass demonstrations and the fall of the East German government. The wall was destroyed by a euphoric public in the several weeks of November 1989, and its fall was the first step toward German unification, which was formally concluded on October 3, 1990.

All this happened in East Europe largely due to 'Brezhnev doctrine' of 'limited sovereignty'. It was introduced to curb the East European uprising from 1956 in Hungary to 1968 in Czechoslovakia. Later on by 1985 Mikhail Gorbachev abandoned the Brezhnev doctrine. His reluctance to enforce the Brezhnev doctrine was that he had made much in his speeches and writings of this vision of a common European home which would bring to an end the division of Europe. He envisaged a reformed and reinvigorated communist system pursuing moderate policies of genuinely peaceful coexistence with the west. Gorbachev's 'new thinking' in foreign policy generally ruled out the kind of aggressive and interventionist policies which were being pursued in later Brezhnev years. It was in these circumstances that governmental authority decayed in Poland and Hungary during the early months of 1989 and finally collapsed in all of Eastern Europe by the end of the year.

III

2.2.7 Consequences of Collapse of Soviet Bloc

The demise of Soviet Union or Communist block was the beginning of new era of independence not only for 15 republics that comprised old USSR, but also of eastern communist countries. Soviet Republics became highly contentious about new negotiations proposed by Moscow. The Baltic States (Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia) and Georgia refused to consider entering a new association with Russia on any terms. The other eleven republics eventually agreed to join the loose-knit federation, the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), but reserved the right to opt out at any time. Ukraine second only to Russia in territory, population and wealth has been particularly suspicious of Moscow's motives and truculent in its insistence on unimpeded freedom of action.

The demise of Soviet Bloc taken by left as the reaction, understandably more varied and complex, has been again along predictable lines. The collapse of a system which nurtured and sustained the hopes of generation after generation of socialists throughout the world is a dreadful event from the point of view of socialites everywhere – this is how Ralfh Miliband put it at the very outset. It has been seen as a tragedy and a defeat not only for the 'faithfuls' among them but for the critics too, who had criticized in the hope of a change for the better and had never even remotely visualized this change for worst. It is a defeat not because the regimes in Eastern Europe and Soviet Union were models of the society the socialists want, but because they and the political movements influenced by them were the focus of worldwide challenge to capitalist power, capitalist morality and culture. Socialists who had no illusions about the Soviet Union nevertheless viewed it as a strategically significant entity. As G.A. Cohen has underlined it: The Soviet Union needed to be there as a defective model so that, with one eye on it, we could construct a better one. It created a non-capitalist space it which to think about socialism.¹⁵ The collapse of Soviet Bloc was unquestionably extremely important event of 20th century international politics. Its impact was irreparable and immeasurable all over the world. We will discuss here its major consequences on various nations and international politics.

1. End of Cold War: The Four decades old Cold War between two power blocs, which created the bi-polar nuclear world divided, which dominated the world politics, was ended with the demise of Soviet Bloc and disintegration of USSR. There was East-West dichotomy, as Europe has been divided into two parts. East Europe – the communist Europe and it its alliance has been with USSR. The Western Europe – the capitalist Europe and its alliance was with USA. Both the power blocs conflicting on several

international issues, particularly at UN and UN Security Council. Security Council usually had been handwork of this bi-polarism during Cold War period. Every international issue, problem, conflict had been engulfed and coloring by Cold War politics. With elimination of one Bloc (Communism) Cold War was over automatically.

2. Impact on Intellectual Community or Marxism: The retreat from socialism has inevitably meant a retreat from Marxism. In fact, in its entire history, no specific development has more single handily opened the floodgates of attack on Marxism, its analytic categories and political project than the collapse of the degenerate and deformed regimes in the Soviet Union and East Europe. This world historic event, whose substantive origins lay in a series of developments in the post-Lenin Soviet Union, coupled with the stagnation, retreat or even defeats of the revolutionary movements in recent years, has negatively conditioned, in its process and combination, so much of what is happening around and within Marxist theory today. 'Actually existing socialism' was born of revolutions primarily led by Marxists, had proclaimed Marxism as its official ideology and in its own way represented the first major seemingly successful revolutionary wave against capitalism. It should not be difficult to understand, therefore, that its collapse is seen as defeat of Marxism itself by its opponents. In their anti-communist perspective which refuses to make any distinction at all between theory and practice. Although the collapse of the Cold War provided further space for developments in thinking to flourish, reflective critical thought on the discipline, its purpose, methods and agenda. From at least 1980s new ideas had been introduced into IR (Study of International Relations) debates that departed from both realist and mainstream liberal ways of thinking as well as from orthodox Marxist analysis. By 1990s IR textbook included largely about feminism, postmodernism, environmentalism or the role of culture in world politics. During the period from 1989 onwards some grand ideas about world politics emerged to fill at least part of vacuum left by the collapse the old world order. These ranged from Francis Fukuyama's announcement of the 'end of history' to Samuel Huntington's forebodings concerning a 'clash of civilizations'. The latter especially, has implications for post Cold War developments such as the incidence of deadly conflict that appears to revolve around issues of 'identity' politics, including culture, ethnicity or religion. In certain parts of the world, especially the Asia-Pacific region, the concept of culture has also featured in casual theories relating to economic growth. Ideas about culture now play a significant role in some branches of security studies as well as normative theory.

3. East Europe: The Demise of communism in Eastern Europe was welcomed with great enthusiasm in the West. In Poland, Czechoslovakia and

Hungary, the new popularly elected governments moved quickly to solidify democratic reforms and dismantle the failed machinery of central planning.

a. *The Collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe:* It ranks as one of the most momentous political events of the post – World War II period, not least because it signaled the end of Cold War. This fact was underscored by Gorbachev's agreement not only to allow German reunification but also to withdraw the Soviet Union's nearly 400,000 troops from Eastern Germany and to allow the reunited Germany to remain in NATO. No less significant was Moscow's acquiescence in the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, which was formally accomplished in the spring of 1991.¹⁸ German Unification (1990) was neither welcomed by the other European powers (France, England) who worried about its impact on the peace, nor much looked by many in West Germany who feared that economic cost of unity were bound to outweigh the alleged political benefits. But the short term pain endured by United Germany should not however obscure our understanding of the historical significance of unification. Germany in the end was one of the more obvious international 'winners' of the 1990s.

b. *German Unification:* The division of Germany and of Berlin was resented deeply by the German people. The demand for political and economic liberalization in East Europe received a great impetus from the changes in Soviet Union after Gorbachev came to power. In November 1989 East Germans were granted freedom to leave and cross over the West at any point along the country's borders, including the crossing points through the Berlin Wall. The Kremlin greeted the opening of the wall as 'wise' and 'positive'. Erich Honeker, the East German party chief, resigned and Egon Krenz Oho took over the pursuit of Perestroika in East Germany. The breaking of the Berlin Wall was welcomed by the people all over a historic event. Once the wall was broken East and West Germany struck down the barriers between them and set on the path of unification. Free elections were held in East Germany on March 18, 1990, followed by economic union on July 1. In September 1990, the four World War II allies signed an agreement to end their remaining occupation rights. On October 3, 1990, unified Germany's flag (Black, Red and Gold) was hoisted in front of the Reichstag in Berlin. The German merged with eleven states of Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). One thing that seems to emerge from the changes in both East and West Europe is that the US and the USSR will no longer direct European affairs, much less exercise hegemony.

c. *The Breakup of Czechoslovakia:* After the fall of communism in Czechoslovakia, the Slovakian problem emerged. The Slovak question, which threatened the cohesion of the state. The Slovaks' penchant for independence was advanced in 1992. Slovaks were alienated by the Czechs'

preponderance within the federation. The Czechs also reneged on promise to Slovaks a measure of autonomy. Another reoccurring problem that fueled resentment was questions over use of the Slovak language, which hitherto had not been recognized as the official first language in Slovakia. Thus following the decline of communism, the Slovak Prime Minister Vladimir Meciar seized the first possible opportunity to break away from the federation. At least, the separation occurred toward the end of 1992. The absence of violence during the difficult transition from the multinational federation to nation-state attests to the unusually high sagacity and foresight among the leaders of two people.

d. Yugoslavia: By 1990, democracy and free elections had replaced communism. Accompanying the rise of democracy came unleashing of divisive ethnic fervor and the creation of numerous native parties among Yugoslavia's many peoples. Economic collapse accompanied the uprising of nationalistic feelings as production, trade and tourism all declined dramatically while bankruptcies and unemployment rose. By June 1991, Croatia and Slovakia, the two wealthiest, northern Yugoslav republics, declared independence. What followed was a bloody Civil War which claimed an estimated 10,000 casualties. The efforts of these republics proved largely successful and by January 1992 both were widely recognized as independent nation-states. In addition, the Yugoslav republics themselves had their own internal ethnic divisions and soon declared independence.²¹ In Bosnia-Herzegovina a referendum was held in 1992. Bosnian Muslims and Croats voted in favour of leaving Yugoslavia and forming a new state. Thereafter the most tragic of post – Cold War European conflicts unfolded with great speed and intensity exacting an appalling price in terms of lives lost, people displaced and property destroyed. Finally, on 22 December 1995, a US brokered peace deal was signed by warring parties at Dayton. But the status of Kosovo which remained under Serbian rule was finally resolved in 1999 after an extensive air war conducted by NATO against Serbia, following which Kosovo was made into formal protectorate under the protection of West.

e. The Expansion of NATO: Again US played the central role in solving the Balkans (Kosovo) problem of Europe. Then one of the most obvious is the extent to which Europe after the Cold War remained every bit as dependent on the USA for its security as it had been before. Then among the most critical actions in Europe after 1989 were the American decision to expand NATO and to offer full membership to several former members of the Warsaw Pact including Poland, Czech Republic and Hungary – who joined in 1994. And Baltic Republics Bulgaria and Romania joined ten years later. USA under Clinton administration was convinced that there is no European

answer to European problem with some resentment American pressure is remained in Europe.

4. The South or the Third World: The affect of dismantling communism obviously was serious on the Third World countries. Firstly, although the East Europe disturbed the communist regimes in South. Somehow Cuba and North Korea have become successful for persisting their communist political system till now with greater efforts. Tienamen Square Event (1989) in China was chain effect of withdrawal of communism in Eastern Europe. Gorbachev visited China in the same year and minimized the serious misunderstandings in between two. Secondly, the socialist model of economy came under pressure in Third World after demise of communism. There was imposition of market oriented policies in these courtiers e.g. Brazil, India, Mexico etc. Thirdly, the concept of non-alignment and even third world were being challenged as its existence. It has been considered that both these concepts related to bi-polar world structure. Where there was role to play for the South as the Third Force. Now it is the changed situation. Fourthly, disintegration of USSR or whole Soviet bloc seriously affects the third world economies and trade, because East Bloc was trading with the third world countries. The demise of it obviously caused serious problem for them. Fifthly, the ethnic or violent movements emerged in several third world countries which have been victim of US-USSR power politics e.g. Iraq, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Libya etc.

5. US Hegemony and Gulf War: With the Soviet withdrawal from a position of America's adversary, the nature of international relations is perceived as US domination over the rest of the world. A unipolar world is perceived in which the US will have the control of the working of UN as well as the power to shape or mould the international affairs at global level. This perception could be justified by first Gulf War and Kosovo crisis where US played a central role to establish its hegemony.

IV

2.2.8 SUMMARY

Globalization is another significant trend in the post – Cold War period with which states are struggling. Although the economies of the world have been very interdependent since the European powers began colonizing the globe and interdependence increased dramatically by the early 1970s. Free trade often clashes with other issues such as security, human rights, labor standards and environmental regulations.

According to Ian Clark, 'There are still significant elements of continuity, especially in terms of the American influence in the world and the perpetuation of the institutions created under American tutelage during the Cold War'. The ending of Cold War has not brought with it any

fundamental alteration in the scope of American power and commitments throughout the world. US forces remain in Japan, Korea, and Europe, though in somewhat smaller numbers, just as they were at the height of the Cold War. The passing of the Soviet military alliance in Europe, the Warsaw Pact, has not been accompanied by the end of the American alliance, NATO. The Gulf War, considered at the time of possible harbinger of a new world order, demonstrated the continuing centrality of the United States. A handful of other nations contributed military forces, money and military bases, but the outcome was determined by the military power of United States. The 2003 war which toppled Saddam Hussein (and now executed) was, with the significant exception of Great Britain, almost entirely an American undertaking. Even with the reductions in US military spending that accompanied of capability and willingness to challenge the military power of the United States. Whether one wishes to refer to this as American 'hegemony', 'dominance', or 'unipolarity', the basic point remains the same. Ian Clark highlights again this point in remarking on the essential continuing in the role of American power.... There are institutions that were created during the Cold War, and which were almost defining attributes of it, that still endure into the post – Cold War era.

The triumph of capitalism therefore did not lead to an improvement in the lives of billions of people, a point made not just by radicals critical of status quo, but also by those who insist that after the failure of planning (of communism – socialist system), capitalism stands alone as the only feasible way rationally of organizing a modern economy. A well known Peruvian economist Hernando De Soto, admired by many rightists viewed (2001 the hour of Capitalism's Triumph) 'its hour of crisis'. After ten years of reform, restructuring, and dancing to the 'economic tune' of the experts at the IMF, the masses are still waiting. Communism has been seen off, he accepts, and possibly for good. But its demise has not for the most part seen a viable capitalism kick-started in those parts of the world where it was not already well established. The 'new world order' thus looks like the old one with North America, Europe and parts of Asia still in economic command. Everything has changed, or soon it seems, but the fundamentals remain the same. Finally, September 11, 2001 marked the end of the post – Cold War era. The key factors shaping world politics since 9/11 has been Islamic terrorism and the United States – led war on terror, US foreign policy has come under sustained attack after it decided to go to war against Iraq. The world is now a less stable place that it was before 9/11.

2.2.10. Keywords

Self-determination

Disintegration

Strategic defense initiative
Commonwealth
The Baltic States
Gulf war

2.2.11. Short Answer type questions

1. What do you mean by Post-Cold War era?
2. Write a paragraph on collapse of Communist Bloc.

2.2.12. Long Answer type question

1. Discuss the circumstances which led to demise of Communist Bloc.
2. What are the consequences of collapse of Communist Bloc?

2.2.13. Suggested Readings

1. Keith L. Shimko, International Relations, 2005.
2. Richard Crockatt, The End of Cold War, in John Baylis et al 2005.
3. James Lee Ray and Juliet Kaarbo, World Politics. (2005).
4. Andreas Wenger and Doron Zimmernann, International Relations from the Cold War to the Globalized World. 2004
5. Randhir Singh, Crisis of Socialism. 2006

NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT: BASIS, ROLE AND RELEVANCE

- 2.2.1. Introduction
- 2.2.2. Objectives of this lesson
- 2.2.3. Meaning of Non-Alignment:
- 2.2.4. Self-check Exercise
- 2.2.5. History or Genesis of Non-Alignment
- 2.2.6. Objectives of Non-Alignment
- 2.2.7. Features or Nature of Non-Alignment
- 2.2.8. Contemporary Challenges or Problems of Non-Aligned Movement
- 2.2.9. Relevance of Non-Aligned Movement in the Contemporary Period
- 2.2.10. Summary
- 2.2.11. Key Words
- 2.2.12. Short Answer Type Questions
- 2.2.13. Long Answer Type Questions
- 2.2.14. Suggested Readings

2.2.1. Introduction

The Second World War was the major landmark in the history of International Relations, which replaced the old system of European domination. Germany was in ruins, England and France were weakened as major forces in world politics. The two countries U.S.A. and Soviet Union emerged as super powers. Both were the leaders of two different political systems. U.S.A. assumed the role of the big brother and the Soviet Union called itself the leader of workers of world. Both of them tried to impose their respective systems on the newly independent countries.

On the other hand, the most important factor was the process of decolonization in Asia, Africa and Latin American regions. This led to the origin of new independent states. These states adopted non-alignment as the basis of their foreign policy which was later developed as a movement for maintaining their hard won independence.

The period of early fifties witnessed intensification of the Cold War tendencies into the actual outbreak of a hot war in Korea in June 1950 which further intensified the cold war in all fronts. The western programmed to hinder communism by organizing military pacts went ahead rapidly. The formation of the Brussels Treaty of 1948 and the North Atlantic Treaty of 1949 was the beginning of this policy. The ANZUS Pact was signed at San Francisco in September 1951. The South-East Asian Treaty, was signed at Manila in 1954. Similarly, in 1955, the Soviet Union and seven other Communist countries of Eastern Europe signed the Warsaw Pact which is the Communist counterpart of NATO with a unified army command. In this way both American and Russian policies become extremely rigid during this

period.

It was in this background of a rapidly deteriorating international situation of acute Cold War tensions threatening to break out into another world war was that a number of new nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America brought about such a drastic change that the nature of international relations underwent a significant change in terms of its content and style.

The predominant forces underlying the change in these countries during these years were the upsurge of nationalism. The colonial and under-developed countries like India, Indonesia, Vietnam and Thailand witnessed the emergence of strong anti-colonial movements for national independence. Soon after, West Asia also underwent a revolutionary upheaval, the discontent expressing itself against the Palestine policies and the economic and political domination of the countries of the region by the Western Powers.

Consequently, the newly independent countries rejected the cold war and military alliances to protect their newly acquired independence and sovereignty and to preserve much-needed peace in a war-torn world. The anti-colonial tradition of the nationalist movements was, therefore, against alignment with Western Powers. And the Socialist or the Communist elements present in the nationalist ranks were comparatively too weak and small to effect any change in the general social character of these nationalist movements. In this way, these newly liberated territories faced triangular policy difficulties the first was-How to give substance to and defend their political independence against super powers pressures? Secondly, How to reduce politico-military tension? These were the real policy difficulties before the newly liberated territories.

2.2.2. Objectives of the study

- At the end of the lesson, students will be able to answer the questions related to non-aligned movement.
- Students will also be able to analyze the objectives and features of NAM.
- They will also be able to understand the weaknesses of the non-aligned movement.
- In the end, they would also be able to suggest the measures to make it strong

2.2.3. Meaning of Non-Alignment:

Non-aligned Movement can be termed a situational movement; it developed out of the anti-imperialist movement and later served as an instrument to safeguard the interests of small powers in the bipolar world and continues to serve that purpose even in the changed world scenario.

The birth of the concept of non-alignment may be traced to the broadcast made by India's first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru 7th September 1946. Giving an outline of India's foreign policy, Nehru said, "We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past two world wars and which may a pain lead to disasters or an even vaster scale. We seek no

domination over others".

Historically the non-aligned movement arose from the struggle of nations for freedom and independence against colonialism, imperialism and fascism. It was this nationalist background and the urge for independence that compelled almost every newly emerging country in Asia, Africa and Latin America to choose the path of non-alignment. The doctrine of non-alignment was the response of a major nation just about to be decolonized to the preservers of the Cold War. To begin with, as a reaction to the Cold War, which was characterized by aggressive bloc-building by the two super powers, the smaller nations and new states of Asia and Africa felt the need to protect them.

Non-alignment, as Nehru conceived it, is the best defined as not entering into military alliances with any country and in particular with any country of either the western or the Communist bloc. He said, "Our foreign policy is one of keeping aloof from the big blocks of nations, rival blocs and being friendly to all countries". We will follow our own course of action as we judge right".

George Schwarzenegger deals with six concepts of which are often regarded as synonymous with the concept of non-alignment. They are as under:

(1) Isolationism: Isolationism stands for policies of aloofness varying from the splendid isolation of the great powers to postures of inoffensiveness in International affairs.

(2) Non-Commitment: It refers to policies of detachment from other powers in a triangular relationship.

(3) Neutrality: It describes the political and legal status of a country not at war with either of the two belligerents. Neutrality requires complete abstention from any act particularly in favour of one or the other belligerent.

(4) Neutralization: It is different from neutrality, because a neutral state remains free to give up its status of neutrality and assume that of a belligerent. But a neutralized state is permanently neutral and cannot give up its neutralized status. Eg. Switzerland and Austria.

(5) Unilateralism : Unilateralism is identified with policies of calculated risks such as the destruction of stockpiles of nuclear weapons irrespective of whether other nations do the same or not.

(6) Non-involvement: It emphasizes the struggle between contending ideologies. It signifies the attitude of tolerant detachment from the tensions between the world powers.

Schwarzenegger believes that non-alignment strikes a note of distinction between its meaning and the meaning of these six related concepts. Non-alignment, according to him, is a policy of keeping out of alliances in general and military pacts in particular. The foreign policy followed by independent nations without joining the military alliances of the western states arranged by the USA or the military alliances of Communist-states under the USSR, is known as the policy of Non-alignment.

Therefore, non-alignment means efforts to retain independence of thought, judgment and action under conditions of Cold War which generated military alliance and agreements of all sorts. Its purpose is to

enlarge the areas of peace and cooperation. So essence of non-alignment lies in the freedom and independence of a country to judge each issue as it arises on its own merits, as it effects the national interests of the country concerned and the interest of peace in the world but non on the basis of a pre-determined attitude because of alignment with one great power or another. The policy of not aligning with any bloc, but at the same time being friendly to everyone, so that it might be possible to exercise in international relations a moderating influence, came to known as non-alignment.

Thus, the policy of non-alignment is based on the principles of detachment from military blocs and faith in the solution of international disputes through mutual cooperation.

2.2.4. Self check exercise

Self check exercise	
1.	What was the process of decolonisation?
2.	What do you know about ANZUS?
3.	How will you define the term “nonalignment”?

2.2.5. History or Genesis of Non-Alignment:

To understand the true meaning of Non-Aligned Movement an analysis of the concept and its genesis is necessary. As far as the genesis of non-alignment is concerned, it is difficult to pin-point the time because it is a concept which evolved over a long period of time. It came into existence through various meetings and conferences of newly independent states, in which the domestic and international milieu played an important role in crystallizing the concept.

2.2.5.1. First Non-Official Asian Relations Conference:

The growth of Asian sentiment and cooperation was facilitated by the achievement of independence by India, Ceylon, Burma, Pakistan and the Philippines between 1946 and 1949. The emergence of collective voice against colonialism gathered as a movement. The most concrete evidence of this tendency was the First Asian Relations Conference, which was held in New Delhi from March 23 to April 2, 1947. It was a major landmark towards the origin of the concept of non-alignment. Delegates from twenty-eight Asian countries and other political entities, including all the Arab League members participated in the conference. The Palestine, Central Asian Republics of the Soviet Union was also invited to this conference. Indonesia was the hero of the conference because her freedom struggle was touching the heights of success.

A remarkable trend in the conference was that the problems of Asia were linked with Africa, manifesting seeds of Afro-Asian movement. Nehru observed, "We of Asia have a special responsibility to the people of Africa, we must help them to their rightful place in the human family". At the end of the conference the participant countries also emphasized the support of the Asian nations for their liberation movements involving: elimination of racial and social discrimination, transition from a colonial economy to a national

economy, agrarian reforms and industrial development etc. First time in history the continent of Asia, a resurgent Asia, had come together. The world was a new force to reckon with the awakened spirit of Asia.

2.2.5.2. Official Asian Conference:

Another conference was convened at New Delhi on India's initiative from 20-23 January 1949, on the issue of Independence of Indonesia. It was the first inter-governmental meeting held in Asia after the Second World War in which eighteen countries participated. All the participants, who were mostly from south and South-East Asia including Australia, New Zealand and Ethiopia, called for the withdrawal of Dutch troops from the areas under the control of the Indonesian Republic and for a transfer of sovereignty. It was decided in the conference that participating governments should explore ways and means of establishing suitable machinery, having regard to the areas concerned, for promoting consultation and cooperation within the framework of the United Nations. It was emphasized that they were not seeking to align the East against the West but to cooperate more closely in the future. Therefore, we can say that this conference was the most striking evidence of cooperation on a question of colonialism and put pressure upon the United Nations to act on in favour of Indonesia and to condemn the "most naked aggression" committed by Dutches.

2.2.5.3. Colombo Conference:

The Colombo Conference of Heads of governments of Burma, Ceylon (now Silence), India, Indonesia and Pakistan, held on April 5, 1954, were another step in the emergence of non-aligned movement. The five Prime Ministers of these countries dealt primarily the question of settlement of Indo-China.

2.2.5.4. Bogor Conference:

The five Prime Ministers, who had participated in the Colombo Conference, again met in Bogor (Indonesia) in December 1954, to chalk out future plan of action. It was decided to organize the first Afro-Asian Conference at Bandung (Indonesia). Its agenda and a list of its participants were decided. The proposed themes for debate were : development of cooperation between the nations of Asia and Africa, examination of socio-economic problems, questions relating to the particular interest of the participant countries, particularly regarding the sovereignty, colonialism and racialism) and finally, the role of the Afro-Asian countries connected with the strengthening of peace and international cooperation. The People's Republic of China was invited at the instance of India. Nehru took the lead in formulating the tasks for the next gathering under the joint sponsorship of the five Colombo Powers.

2.2.5.5. Treaty of Panch Sheela:

On the other hand, in 1954, Chinese Premier Chou-En-Lai and Prime Minister Nehru was the first statesman to formulate the five principles (Panch Sheela) of peaceful co-existence. They signed the Sino-Indian Treaty on Tibet and in its preamble five principles were mentioned which has become the basis of the policy of Non-alignment. They are as follows: (1) Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty; (2) Mutual non-aggression; (3) Mutual non-interference in each other's internal

affairs; (4) Equality and mutual benefit; and (5) Peaceful co-existence. In this treaty Chinese was compressed to be the path of good behaviour and later on these principles become the pillars of the policy of non-alignment.

2.2.5.6. Bandung Conference:

The Bandung Conference was the most important step in the emergence of Non-aligned Movement. It was held in Bandung (Indonesia) from April 18 to 24, 1955. Twenty nine countries, six from Africa and twenty three from Asia, participated in the conference. The countries represented were rich in history and cultural traditions but they were relatively weak in a power-political sense. Their strength bond was that for more than a century they had all experienced foreign domination or had lived in the shadow of the western powers.

The main decisions of the conference as contained in the communiqué may be summarised as follows: The most important decision of the conference was the "Declaration of World Peace and Cooperation". This declaration was the elaboration of Five Principles of Panchsheel and of the principles and purposes of the charter of the United Nations. The promotion of economic development in the Asian-African region is important and to this end, participating countries agreed to cooperate on the basis of mutual interest and respect for national sovereignty and the need for cooperation with countries outside the region was also recognized. They agreed to promote technical assistance to one another to the maximum extent possible to promote intra-regional trade fairs and the establishment of a special United Nations Fund for economic development and stabilization of commodity trade and prices through bilateral and multilateral arrangements. Establishment of national and regional banks and insurance companies, development of atomic energy for peaceful purposes and exchange of information and ideas on matters of mutual interest were also discussed. The conference called for suspension of production and use of weapons of mass destruction and also called for suspension of experiments with such weapons.

Therefore, the Bandung declaration did not merely set down the norms of international behaviour, but, also crystallized the ethos and values of Asia and Africa. In this way, Bandung foreshadowed the non-alignment in its agenda devoted to the problems of colonialism, economic development and maintenance of international peace. It powerfully influenced the subsequent course of international relations and became the code of the nations that emerged from colonial domination after 1955.

2.2.5.7. Brioni Meeting:

A very important addition to the non-alignment after Bandung was the Yugoslavia, the first European country. The conditioning factors in Yugoslavia persuading her to follow the non-alignment policy were to a large extent different from those of the Asian countries. All this happened because of her rift with Soviet Union. Marshal Joseph Broz Tito sought support from India and Egypt and joined the movement. In December 1954, he also visited India. In 1955, Nehru visited Yugoslavia and Egypt and reiterated that involvement in military pacts or alignment with great powers does not serve the cause of peace.

Finally the three leaders - **Nehru, Nasser and Tito** held a joint conference in July 1956 at Brioni Island in Yugoslavia. This meeting demonstrated the vigour and geographical spread of the principle. This conference linked states in three continents and more clearly than other international gatherings of the mid-fifties marked those years as the high point of Indian non-alignment diplomacy. In this meeting the basic principles for world peace and cooperation were proposed by the three founders of non-alignment.

Non-aligning in global policies was a pervasive feature of the fifties, luring adherents but not forming them into a coherent alliance or bloc. The growing threat of nuclear war, the attack in Suez, American intervention in the middle-east and later in Cuba, the Berlin crisis and the hostility of China towards India and Yugoslavia brought reaffirmations of the validity of Non-alignment and the common interest of the three states in staving off menacing moves by the great powers. President Tito made another mid winter visit to India in January 1959, when both Yugoslavia and India were experiencing a hostile shift in Chinese policy towards them. In this way, the two leaders maintained close contacts with each other till the Non-alignment was formally announced.

2.2.5.8. The Cairo Preparatory Meeting of Foreign Ministers:

On the initiative of Tito, Nasser and Sukarno, a preparatory meeting for a non-aligned conference was held on 5th June, 1961 in Cairo. The main issue during this conference was the criterion for the membership and its application to individual countries. This was the first time that the non-aligned peoples tried to define non-alignment which was shaped and finalized at the Belgrade summit.

In June 1961, Foreign Ministers from Non-aligned countries met in a preparatory meeting in Cairo (Egypt) and for the first time laid down five broad principles which would qualify a country to be considered non-aligned. These were:

1. A country should follow an independent policy based on the co-existence of states with different political and social systems and non-alignment or a trend in favour of such a policy;
2. It should consistently have supported movements for national independence;
3. It should not be a member of multilateral military alliances concluded in the context of great power conflicts;
4. In case of bilateral military agreement with a great power, or membership of a regional defense pact, the agreement or pact should not be one deliberately concluded in the context of great power conflicts.
5. In case of lease of military bases to a foreign power, the concession should not have been made in the context of great power conflicts.

2.2.6. Objectives of Non-Alignment:

The policy of non-alignment advocates that such rules be adopted in the international order and such an atmosphere be created in international relations that will make possible the solution of concrete problems in the

general interest of peace, security and cooperation.

The major tenants of non-alignment are as follows:

1. Non-alignment does not favour isolationism, but allows a nation to act decisively in international affairs on the basis of national interest alone.
2. It enables a nation to establish and maintain its own institutions and to support a way of life in accordance with the wishes and culture of its peoples without external pressure.
3. It is against slavery, colonialism and neo-colonialism and apartheid.
4. It seeks to promote interdependence between industrial and developing countries.
5. It insists on an international system in which all nations are actively involved in the decision making process in all matters.

Regarding the demands of the movement for the change in international economic relations the following are the main objectives of the non-aligned, which have been stressed in the subsequent meetings.

1. A meaningful share and control of world production, investment, trade and technology.
2. Direct participation in the policy making process that effects the wealth of the world.
3. A reorganization of correct international financial structures to allow transfer of resources and technology to places where they are most needed.
4. Full participation in the exploitation of the oceans and space.
5. They are seeking economic assistance because all the nations of non-alignment were underdeveloped and they could develop their economy only through economic and technical assistance from the industrially developed countries.

2.2.7. FEATURES OR NATURE OF NON-ALIGNMENT

Having grown into an active force in world politics these developing countries helped broaden the front of the struggle against imperialism, neo-colonialism and racism. Their role in the U.N. is exceptionally great. Today they are a major component of the structure of international relations. Its main features can be briefly explained as under:

2.2.7.1. Non-Alignment is not a Policy of Isolation:

Sometimes non-alignment is either confused with isolationism or denounced as a policy of in action. Non-alignment rejects concept of isolation, i.e., the practice of keeping away from international relations. It accepts the right and the obligation to participate fully in international politics. As speaking before the American Congress in 1949, Nehru explained this vital aspect of Non-alignment: "when freedom would be threatened and justice would be in peril, when the security of state would be jeopardized, we cannot remain indifferent and we will not remain indifferent, our policy is not one of indifference. Our policy is that there should be active efforts for world peace and it should be given a firm foundation".

2.2.7.2. Non-Alignment is not Neutrality:

Non-alignment does not mean neutrality. Neutrality has little meaning

as a policy except in times of war. In a sense it is true that if we take into account the Cold War between the two blocs, India might be said to be neutral in so far it has decided that it would not join either bloc. The term "neutrality" may, however connote that the country which adopts such a policy has no positive opinions on the issue which divide the blocs. This certainly was not true so far as India was concerned and the term "neutrality" is, therefore, inapplicable to India's policy as well as to other non-aligned countries too. Neutrality is a legal concept embodied in international law, a concept related to the state of war.

2.2.7.3. Keeping Away from Cold War:

The prevailing Cold War between the two power blocs was another factor which influenced the emergence of non-alignment. Both the U.S.A. and the USSR increasingly critical towards each other and got engaged in race for armaments. The new emerged states considered cold war as a harmful exercise against international peace and security. Non-alignment has been opposed to cold war as an abnormal and dangerous policy and it seeks to keep away from the tensions. It totally rejected the cold war and upholds peaceful co-existence.

2.2.7.4. Opposition to Military Alliances:

Non-alignment regards military alliances as instruments of war, imperialism and neo-colonialism, and hence has been totally opposed to them. All the military and political alliances have been regarded by the non-alignment as the agencies for conducting the cold war power-politics and for perpetuating the control over other third world countries. Therefore, non-alignment stood away from these alliances or pacts i.e. NATO and wassaw pact etc.

2.2.7.5. Peaceful Co-existence and Non-interference:

In 1954 India gave the doctrine of Panchsheel which has proved a land mark in the history of non-alignment. They were first launched in a treaty for Tibet, between India and China. Peaceful co-existence and non-interference are two main principles of the concept of Panchsheel. Non-alignment also stood for these two. Non-alignment accepts that nations with different political systems can peacefully co-exist and co-operate and work for mutual benefits, world peace and prosperity peaceful co-existence and beneficial bilateralism are two vitally important off-shoots of non-alignment. Non-alignment has always stood for peaceful co-existence, non-interference, mutual friendship and co-operation with all other nations. Therefore, the five principles or panchsheel offered as a solution to the world's problems. The panchsheel principles were incorporated in the ten principles enunciated at Bandung Conference.

2.2.7.6. Non-Alignment and World Peace:

The newly independent states wanted peace in the world so that they could concentrate on their development. Consequently, they decided to keep off from the military alliances and the two power blocs as they were based upon the concept of inevitability of war, particularly war between the opposing blocs. Therefore, non-alignment rejects the war, military alliances and power politics. It supports peace through peaceful means and pacific settlement of all disputes. Non-aligned countries believe the Disarmament

and Arms control are important devices to maintain international peace and security.

2.2.7.7. Independence of Judgment on International Issues or Independent Foreign Policy:

Another essential of non-alignment is "acting according to our best judgment", an independent approach to foreign policy, not being tied down to any particular line of action because of membership of a Cold War bloc. Non-alignment involves the principle of keeping the independence of foreign policy-making and its implementation. In fact, the origin of Non-alignment was to a large extent, also due to the desire of new states to keep their foreign policies independent from the possible pressures from the Super Powers and the developed nations.

2.2.7.8. Opposition to Imperialism and Neo-colonialism:

After having suffered long under the yoke of colonial powers the new states developed a strong opposition to the practices of imperialism and colonialism. Therefore, newly emerged states of Asia and Africa were keen and determined to preserve their independence. As such these states did not want to, directly or indirectly, help or tolerate any condition of outside control over their policies and decisions. The anti-colonial and anti-imperial feeling of these countries largely contributed to the growth of policy of Non-alignment. Hence they decided to oppose strongly the imperialism, colonialism and in contemporary times, neo-colonialism.

2.2.7.9. Against Racial Discrimination:

The non-aligned nations have been opposed to the policy of racial discrimination by the imperialist powers and also condemned the than racist regimes eg. South Africa. Because, for a long time colonial powers had fed the Afro-Asian nations with the idea that they were racially as well as culturally backward and inferior.

2.2.7.10. Non-Alignment as a Means, Foreign Policy and End:

It would be wrong to regard Non-alignment as only a means and not as a policy. Because every means constitutes a part of foreign policy as it seeks to contribute to the fulfillment of national interest which is the purpose of foreign policy also. Nevertheless, no particular means occupied equal significance in the foreign policy of all countries and this is true in the case of Non-alignment as well. It can be identified with foreign policy of these countries. Non-alignment cannot be seen in separation from foreign policy also because one of its two main attributes is independence of foreign policy. As such, Non-alignment is a quality of foreign policy which it could not be if it were only a means. Thus, it would be wrong to regard Non-alignment as only a means and not as a policy. In fact, it is not only a means and a policy but has become an objective also. A policy becomes so important with the passage of time that its preservation itself becomes an end.

2.2.7.11. Non-Alignment is a Movement:

Emerging as a principle of the foreign policies of newly emerged sovereign independent states like India, Non-alignment has come to develop into an active and most popular movement of our times. It is presently being followed by nearly two-thirds of the United Nations members. Non-alignment

stands for full participation in international relations and does not admit either isolationism or involvement based upon prior commitments. The following chronology of Non-aligned summits shows that it is the popular movement of our times.

CHRONOLOGY OF SUMMIT CONFERENCES OF NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

Summit	Venue	Date and Year	Membership
1.	Belgrade (Yugoslavia)	September 1-6, 1961	25 Countries
1.	Cairo (Egypt)	October 5-10, 1964	47 Countries
2.	Lusaka (Zambia)	September 5-10, 1970	54 Countries
3.	Algiers (Algeria)	September 5-9, 1973	75 Countries
4.	Colombo (Sri Lanka)	August 16-19, 1976	88 Countries
5.	Havana (Cuba)	September 3-9, 1979	94 Countries
6.	New Delhi (India)	March 7-12, 1983	100 Countries
7.	Harare (Zimbabwe)	September 1-6, 1986	101 Countries
8.	Belgrade (Yugoslavia)	September 4-7, 1989	102 Countries
9.	Jakarta (Indonesia)	September 1-7, 1992	108 Countries
10.	Cartagena (Colombia)	October 18-20, 1995	112 Countries
11.	Durban (South Africa)	September 2-3, 1998	113 Countries
12.	Kuala Lumpur (Malaysia)	February 20-25, 2003	116 Countries
13.	Havana (Cuba)	September 15-16, 2006	118 Countries
14.	Sharm-el-Sheikh (Egypt)	July 15-16, 2009	118 Countries
15.	Tehran (Iran)	August 26-31, 2012	120 Countries

2.2.7.12. Establishment of New International Economic Order:

The demand for the establishment of a new international economic order (NIEO) was raised in early 1970's. Due to the efforts of the non-aligned countries, the UN General Assembly in its sixth special session, passed the declaration and programme of action on the establishment of a "New International Economic Order" in 1974. It was a call for restructuring of international economic relations based on equality and justice. The adoption of this declaration by the UN was the result of consistent and persistent efforts of the non-aligned countries. Non-aligned conferences in Belgrade (1961), Cairo (1964), Lusaka (1970) and Algeria (1973) played an important role in strengthening international public opinion in favour of NIEO. Thus, the demand for the establishment of NIEO has been remained a crucial issue for the Non-aligned countries. The movement remained deeply concerned over the continued marginalisation of the developing countries from the benefits of International Financial Institutions, and persistent income and economic gaps between the developed and developing countries.

2.2.7.13. Seeking Economic Assistance:

All the Nations of Non-aligned Movement were under-developed and they could develop their economy only through economic and technical assistance from the industrially developed countries. On the other hand, it

was also essential to keep off from the international tension. As they needed capital and financial assistance from the powers of both the blocs to achieve their objectives of development. However, the economic basis of non-alignment is that no foreign aid should be accepted if it is accompanied by "political strings".

2.2.8. Contemporary Challenges or Problems of Non-Aligned Movement:

Changes in the international politics after the end of the Cold War have affected the established institutions and foreign policy orientations all over the world. They have also changed strategies and national interests of states. These factors have also questioned the continuity and validity of the arrangements and processes of the bipolar world. Consequently, Non-aligned Movement is also facing some crucial problems and challenges regarding its structural and functional aspects in the changed situation.

2.2.8.1. The Crisis of Identity with G-77:

One of the important challenges before Non-Aligned Movement is the identity crisis. The policy of Non-alignment, since its inception, has been equated with neutrality and the terms, "third force" or "third bloc" were used in the initial stages of the movement, by the super powers. In fact, Non-Aligned Movement did not represent a "third force" or seek to create a "third camp" or "bloc of nations" against the existing blocs during the Cold War period. In fact, the aim of Non-alignment is to build to build up a "third area" which did not want war, which worked for peace in a positive way and which believed in cooperation.

With the formation of the G-77 due to the membership and programmes, the continuation of Non-Aligned Movement was questioned. The problem became more crucial after the end of the Cold War, when some non-aligned countries proposed to merge NAM with G-77. The membership of both, NAM and the third world movement is overlapping to a great extent. This, at times, leads to confusion regarding the member states of the Movement but the economic concerns under NAM cannot be discarded as today politics to a great extent linked with the economic issues.

The socialist bloc states, that earlier formed the Soviet Union, have become more crucial to identify differences between the third world and non-alignment. In fact, the third world consists of the countries that got independence after a long colonial exploitation and are having backward or developing economic status. These countries and their economic problems still exist. G-77 is a group of developing countries of the third world, representing the third world economic agenda or problem at international level. Basically, it is a forum for the systematic representation of their problems. Therefore, to overcome the doubts being raised about NAM's identity, there is no need to redefine it the changed context. In fact, Non-alignment as a policy of joint action, according to one's best judgment, is still relevant.

2.2.8.2. Problem of Criteria for Membership:

Loose and flexible criteria for membership also played important role in increasing the identity crisis. On the one hand NAM's membership has steadily increased and on the other, increasing membership has resulted in decreasing credibility due to lack of precise criteria for the admission of new

members. In June 1961, diplomats from Non-aligned countries met in a preparatory conference in Cairo and laid down five broad principles or criteria which would qualify a country as Non-aligned (see in the previous pages). These criteria were neither precise nor unambiguous even at that the time when they were formulated. It was apparently based on a compromise of the conflicting view expressed by the countries represented at the preparatory meeting.

There are no set rules and regulations regarding the re-entry of the members. Besides this, some member countries compromised their independence of policy and action in world affairs in various ways, such as Egypt and Pakistan became part of American strategic consensus yet they continued to be members of the movement.

There are no corresponding criteria for admission of states as guests and observers at the Non-aligned summits. This unwritten principle, governing the admission of observers to summits, has not been strictly followed. The big powers also misuse the facility of guest status. It has been found that they have attempted to sow seeds of division among the members. There is a need to check this emerging negative trend in the summit conferences.

Therefore, the loose and flexible criteria and unchecked membership may lead to the problem of non-cooperation, non seriousness and lack of unity of purpose. It is leading to problems of factionalism or regionalism. It may destroy the identity and credibility of the Movement instead of preserving it. In this post cold war era Non-aligned countries should modify their criteria for membership to avoid these problems.

2.2.8.3. Lack of Unity and Solidarity among the Members:

Lack of Unity and Solidarity is the most alarming challenge before the Non-aligned Movement. Unity, Solidarity and spirit of cooperation were the corner-stones in establishing the Non-aligned Movement and the driving force behind its struggle in the early stage of its emergence. But now, it is evident that this spirit is missing and relations among its members are strained at times due to bilateral, regional and domestic problems. It may be more aggravated owing to the large membership of the Movement and proliferation in its activities. The emergence of vigorous regional cooperative arrangements has shifted the focus of attention of most members of the Non-aligned Movement away from their common or regional concerns and interests. Power ambitions of these countries are resulting in violation of the principles of Non-aligned Movement and creating disunity among the member states.

2.2.8.4. Bilateral Disputes between the Members:

Another most important hurdle is the bilateral disputes between the Non-aligned countries. The barriers of self-interests, self aggrandisement and narrow nationalism come in the way of meaningful relationship among the members. Some countries use the Non-aligned meetings as the forum for hitting out at member countries, with which they have strained relations, it, often, happens between India and Pakistan. They are also facing serious bilateral disputes regarding territorial boundary, water resource and other areas and other areas of concern.

2.2.8.5. Problem of Divergent Approaches:

Unity and solidarity among the Non-aligned countries are not possible in totality the members of NAM belong to different ideologies. Political, economic and social systems. Its membership includes democracies and dictatorships, liberals and socialists, conservatives and Marxist Leninists, feudalists and progressives. They differ in size, population, culture and levels of economic development. Moreover, at the domestic level, the internal problems of political instability, lack of political participation of the masses, poverty, hunger, starvation, illiteracy and political authoritarianism have aggravated the problem of divergent approaches to the issues facing the Non-aligned Movement.

2.2.8.6. Problem of Institutionalisation of the Non-Aligned Movement:

Another structural challenge before the Non-Aligned Movement is to institutionalize it by setting up a permanent secretariat. It does not have any constitution or charter for its functioning, nor does it have any set of strict rules and regulations regarding the conferences and meetings. Its working is based on traditions and practices. First time, the proposal for setting up a "Coordinating Bureau", to coordinate the chairman, was implemented at the Colombo Summit in August 1976.

But the idea of secretariat was opposed by some member countries. They feared that the establishment of a secretariat would be an attempt to kill its spontaneity and dynamism. They further warned that the institutionalisation of the Movement would be an encouragement to the formation of a separate bloc, which by no means, was an objective of the Non-aligned Movement. Moreover, with a permanent structure Non-aligned Movement would be a victim of the majority tyranny. However, some countries supported the idea of secretariat. They suggested that a secretariat will give prompt attention to serious and urgent problems and conflicts that come up from time to time. In fact, a secretariat can help the movement to play an effective role in international affairs.

2.2.8.7. Lack of Charismatic Leadership:

Lack of charismatic leadership is another challenge before the Non-Aligned Movement. The stature of the leadership as in the earlier days has declined. It was the charismatic leadership of Nehru, Nasser and Tito which influenced both, the newly independent states and the than Super Powers. Their broad vision provided the solid base to the Movement in the shape of agenda and criteria. After a long period, Non-Aligned Movement is working on the old basis and agenda prescribed by the founding fathers. The new generation of leadership lacks political will and commitment to the Movement. Their leaders either try to give pro-American or other Western power tilts to the Movement in their own narrow national interests.

2.2.8.8. Attitudinal Change among the Founder Members:

With the passage of time, the founder member states of the Movement have lost that status. Yugoslavia has disintegrated and lost its capability to lead the Movement. It is no longer a member of the movement as it was suspended in 1992. Another founder member Egypt has lost its old vision; it has compromised with the U.S. on the interests of the Arab World during the Camp David talks and, thus, lost its credibility. Rather, it is now

questioning the relevance of the Non-Aligned Movement in the contemporary world order and has proposed its merger with the Third World Movement. Cuba was known as a strong leader but could not understand the true spirit of the Movement due to its own biases. It considers Russia to be the natural ally of the Movement. During the cold war Fedel Castro tried to give the Non-aligned Movement an anti-American and pro-Soviet Union focus.

India is the only existing founder member who has the capability of leading the Non-aligned Movement. It has consistently argued strongly for its continuation. But, after the Durban Summit in 1998, South Africa tried to keep the Movement away from India under the pressure of the Western powers. So, it is an attitudinal change amongst the members in the post cold war era.

2.2.8.9. Problem of the Bulky Agenda:

Non-Aligned Movement is also facing the some serious functional challenges. The movement had started with some basic objectives to maintain the sovereignty of the member countries and to work collectively for the developmental activities. Accordingly, the agenda grew with the developing needs of the member countries and the changes in the world politics. Thus, issues relating to peace, disarmament, opposition to colonialism and imperialism, establishment of new international economic order (NIEO) were pursued. The demand for democratisation of international relations, restructuring of United Nations, protection of human rights, environment, establishment of the new international information order (NIIO) and combating terrorism were added to the agenda with the passage of time.

All these issues have made the agenda bulky. Some of the issues have become outdated and others require new strategies. In other words, with the end of the Cold War, the agenda must be modified in accordance with the change in the world politics and needs of the member countries. There is a lack of clarity over the issues on which the Movement should focus. This further leads to the problems of loose decisions, non-seriousness and confusion among the member states.

2.2.8.10. Lack of Commitment:

In the contemporary times another problem is that despite the consensus in decisions, there is a lack of commitment. The problems of ambiguous agenda, increased membership and a lack of commitment, further lead to weak follow-up actions. During the conferences and meetings Non-aligned countries declare and announce their commitment towards the movement. But when it is over, they behave according to their interests and do not follow what they supported and committed in the conferences. In fact, there is big gap between what the Non-aligned countries preach at their summits and what they actually practice. Therefore, ineffectiveness of the Movement in taking up issues affecting its member states is a major weakness. Non-Aligned Movement has failed to discipline its own members when they violate the principles and objectives of Non-alignment. This situation weakens the role and utility in practice and creates the question of validity and relevance. So, it is imperative for Non-Aligned Movement to build up a strategy for the implementation of the decisions to remain

relevant in the world affairs.

2.2.8.11. Problem of External Interference:

In the changed scenario, Non-Aligned Movement is facing another challenge of external interference with the disintegration of the Soviet Union, external interference, covert or overt, has increased and the balancing force has disappeared. It happened in the case of Nicaragua, when the Summit Conference was held in Jakarta in September 1992, it was decided unanimously by the members that 11th summit will be held in Nicaragua. Although nothing was said in public, the US administration decisively twisted the arm of Nicaragua President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro for not agreeing to take over the NAM mantle. Within a few months of the Jakarta summit. Ms. Chamorro expressed her inability to hold the 11th summit. In 2001, the former US ambassador to the United Nations, Richard Holbrooke, in a farewell speech advised the representatives of several African nations to break away from the Non-aligned Movement. He stated that, "I respectfully ask the African countries to reconsider their association with the Non-aligned Movement. It is not Africa's friend at this point. Your goals and the NAM's are not synonymous".

In this situation, the capability of the Non-aligned countries, to resist external interference is being questioned? They are facing the problems of mounting debts, and desperately need western economic assistance, western technology, foreign direct investment and loans from the banks under western influence. In fact, individually, it is not possible for them to resist this kind of interference. It is only the unity and solidarity among Non-aligned states which can protect them from any external arm twisting.

2.2.8.12. Economic Issues (Impact of Globalization on Third World Countries or Non-Aligned Countries):

In the post Cold War era, globalization has raised various questions about the problems of developing countries and economic relations between the North and the South. The process of globalization was considered by the Non-aligned countries in the 1990s as a process of opportunity and challenge.

In the Durban Summit in 1998 and in the Kuala Lumpur Summit in 2003, it was made clear that the process of globalization is benefiting the interests of the developed countries. It could become a threat to newly acquired freedom, unless interests of the South were protected and promoted by ensuring that liberalization would not be promoted for providing a cover for the protectionist policies of the rich and powerful, securing their vital interests.

In fact, globalization is a big challenge for the developing countries, the majority of whom are Non-aligned countries. These countries, due to the internal and external compulsions, or requirements are participants in the process of globalization despite the fact they are aware that they are losers. But they are trying to strengthen themselves through conferences and gatherings under the Non-aligned Movement and are trying to influence the rich countries for reforms in the system.

The process of globalization, which is based on the openness and restructuring of the markets, has led to the restructuring of international

economy in favour of rich countries by the use of rules and regulations of international financial institutions. Globalization poses a number of problems before the Non-aligned countries, but it is not possible to keep completely out of it. Thus, in this context the Non-aligned countries must take united action to ensure that their demands are met and economic stability and security maintained.

2.2.8.13. Economic Backwardness and Related Problems:

The Non-aligned countries are facing the problem of development. The gap between the developed industrial countries and the Non-aligned nations is widening and cannot be narrowed due to unequal development and technological backwardness. Majority of the Non-aligned countries continues to live in poverty. It is a serious problem which has affected the political, social, cultural and other aspects of the developing countries. The Non-aligned countries are facing the problem of illiteracy, health, education and cultural backwardness. The economic backwardness is responsible for the problem of communalism, violence, regionalism, instability and insecurity of life. Mismanagement and unequal distribution of resources at the domestic level is responsible for this sorry state of affairs.

2.2.8.14. The State Withdrawal from its Basic Responsibilities:

Moreover, the process of globalization, liberalization, privatization and the demise of the Soviet Union bloc have further aggravated the problems of poverty, illiteracy, hunger and starvation. Due to the process of globalization, the public sector, in these countries, is shrinking, and the state withdrawing itself from its basic responsibilities. Which has adversely affected the public utility services and welfare activities of the state? On the other hand, the increasing role of MNC's has affected the indigenous, production and markets of the developing countries.

2.2.8.15. Non-Alignment is not able to provide security to the member countries:

During the Cold War Non-aligned countries have been failed to protect or to provide security to the member countries against conflict, war, aggression, intervention and hegemony of great powers. It was very much clear by the Iraq war that Super Power's hegemonistic intervention is very much there even in the post Cold War era. The unchallenged leadership of U.S.A. and with its extended power through NATO attacked Iraq in the name of its liberation. Although it was criticised by the Non-aligned countries.

2.2.9. RELEVANCE OF NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT IN THE CONTEMPORARY PERIOD

2.2.9.1. Even after the end of Cold War and decline in ideological groupings, justification for continuation of Non-aligned Movement, stands:

The end of the Cold War, disintegration of the Soviet Union and changes which brought the process of integration and disintegration of state system, also saw a shift from politico-military to economic issues and decline in the ideological groupings. These changes along with the change in the global power structure, questioned the very relevance of Non-Aligned Movement. It was argued that Non-alignment stands for Non-alignment to

power bloc or bloc alliances of the bipolar world. In this light, with the end of the bloc system the justification for and continuation of Non-Aligned Movement is questioned. In fact, it has to be understood that Non-alignment is not a passive policy. It is a policy which stands for independence of judgment and action at the international level, according to which there is no commitment to any power or bloc and each issue is judged on its merit. It is a fact that the roots of Non-Aligned Movement lie in the political, socio-economic and historical milieu of the post World War II era. But, the basic motivating force behind the Movement was the fear of the newly independent states of becoming pawns of the super powers in the bipolar world. They tried to develop, through the dictum of 'strength in unity of the weak', under the Non-Aligned Movement. It is situational and dynamic Movement of the small powers for the preservation of their independence. Thus, its purpose will be relevant as long as there is an unequal world order and attempts of domination over the third world countries.

2.2.9.2. Demand for Restructuring and Democratization of United Nations and other International Bodies:

There is a need for these countries to remain united and pursue their interests through a common platform, as they are the exploited lot of the world. Thus, they need to continue their opposition to the neo-imperialist forces by striving for self-determination by resisting the hegemonistic forces through strength of numbers and by working towards democratization of international bodies so that the small and weak states can be heard. In spite of resistance from the powerful nations, an important move in this direction has been made with the demand for restructuring and democratization of the United Nations which suffers from the hegemonism of the permanent members of the Security Council. Thus, judicious reforms in the UN structure and functioning are being actively advocated by the Non-Aligned Movement countries. They are demanding expansion of the Security Council and extension of permanent membership and representation to countries from the developing world. This is to preserve the hard won independence and sovereignty of the member nations in the globalised world, in which boundaries have become vague with the growth of transnational bodies and forces.

2.2.9.3. The Non-aligned Movement has been emphasising the establishment of the new World Order based on equality, peace, security and socio-economic justice:

These countries too have been sucked into the process of liberalization and privatization, however, no drastic change has taken place in their economic conditions. The transnational forces are again being used by the big powers as instruments of exploitation to further neo-imperialism. Cold War is over, but the rich and poor divide in the world continues. Poverty, hunger, unemployment, underdevelopment and economic backwardness continue to be the fate of the developing countries. The situation has become more critical with the emergence of protectionism in trade and investment and hegemonism of the sole Super Power.

Thus, the Non-aligned countries have rightly continued to pursue the demand for a more equitable and just economic order in the form of NIEO.

They are demanding the restructuring and modification in the international economic order to protect themselves from the neo-colonial forces and exploitative trends of globalization. For the establishment of NIEO the Non-aligned countries demanded North-South dialogue on all economic aspects and dimensions. With the disintegration of the Soviet Union, leaving US (capitalist economy) dominating the international markets, it is becoming increasingly important for the developing countries to check the trends of domination and exploitation in the economic sphere and constant vigil is required.

2.2.9.4. Trade and Trade related problems facing the Non-aligned countries:

International trade related institutions are playing an important role in shaping the international economic order. Rules for the conduct of trade, and trade related activities, have been framed through WTO. In this forum the countries from the non-aligned world made efforts to exert themselves and influence the decision making process, yet the trade norms are tilted towards the rich countries. In the present economic order TNCs (Transnational Corporations) have emerged as major players and are controlling trade in the world. They are the legitimized instruments of the rich countries to exploit the economic resources of the Non-aligned countries. They not only exploit the economy but they negatively affect the political and socio-cultural systems of the host countries.

Due to the economic management systems of international funding agencies loaded in favour of the rich, the Non-aligned countries are facing serious financial problems. These institutions and other international financial systems are undemocratic and non-transparent and are dominated by the rich countries. Non-aligned countries, through the forum of Non-Aligned Movement, are demanding reforms in these systems so as to protect their interests, but it has been observed that they have not gained much ground. Consequently, they have to continue struggle.

2.2.9.5. Disarmament, particularly Nuclear Disarmament, Continues to be a top item on the Future Agenda of Non-Aligned Movement:

The race for making and developing conventional and sophisticated or nuclear weapons not only affects world peace and security but also impinges upon the socio-economic system. It has led to the race of arms and transfer of resources from developmental activities to stockpiling of deadly weapons. The only way to check this race is through disarmament. The Non-Aligned Movement being a holistic movement has not ignored the strategic and humanitarian dimensions. Strategically, the existence, production and deployment of nuclear, chemical and biological weapons are posing major threat to the security of the Non-aligned countries. General and complete disarmament is still an objective of Non-Aligned Movement. With the end of Cold War, it was assumed that the arms race would reduce but the rejection of CTBT by the American Senate, US proposal of NMD (National Missile Defense) and the nuclear tests by India and Pakistan and further proliferation into North Korea etc., have established the fact that weapons of mass destruction still exist and are increasing in bulk and destructive capability. Thus, efforts towards disarmament need to be strengthened

under the umbrella of the Non-Aligned Movement.

2.2.9.6. Non-Aligned Countries can play a significant role for Combating Terrorism:

The lack of proper strategies to counter terrorism and clash of interests among Non-aligned countries has further aggravated the problem. In fact, strict rules and regulations must be framed for combating of terrorism collectively. But, the real application of measures depends on the relations between the big powers and the non-aligned countries and cooperation between the non-aligned countries themselves. Terrorism of various types, at national and international levels, has emerged as the new threat to the political, socio-economic structures and security of the developing countries. The process of globalization has further facilitated terrorism by providing unchecked flow of goods and services. The socio-economic backwardness and inequality provides breeding ground for terrorism in the world. The developed countries are capable of combating terrorism to some extent by their technological and other capabilities, but the non-aligned countries are the real victims.

2.2.9.7. Drug Trafficking:

Drug trafficking is also emerging as a serious problem at the international level. Again, due to lack of technology and resources, developing countries are finding it difficult to overcome this problem on their own. Thus, concerted efforts are being made at the international level to overcome these problems. Here Non-Aligned Movement has played a significant role in highlighting these issues, and the other countries have shown concern because they are also being adversely affected by these problems. The Non-aligned countries are emphasizing cooperation according to the UN charter.

2.2.9.8. Demand for New International Information Order:

Establishment of new international information and communication order is another objective of Non-Aligned Movement. The information structures and flow are being dominated by the rich countries. They use it for their own benefit. In the present world order, impartial, free, fair, effective and balanced flow of information is the basic requirement of a state for all activities but here too the balance is tilted towards the rich countries, because they have economic and technological edge.

2.2.9.9. Environmental issues and Non-Aligned Countries:

The problem of pollution and environmental degradation is of great concern for the world. Thus, it is imperative for the developing countries, along with the developed world, to devise strategies to protect the environment. In the controversy between the East and the West, the developing countries are the victims, because they lack the know-how and resources for developing it on their own. This, again, makes them dependent on the developed world. They are caught in the vicious circle of being exploited. Non-Aligned Movement has helped in increasing awareness about this issue, but again these countries need to adopt a concerted effort to safeguard the environment as this issue is of equal concern to all. Rather, strategies should be developed not only for safeguarding the environment but also to promote sustainable development, which can come if the world is

able to curb wasteful consumption.

2.2.9.10. Protection of Human Rights:

The Non-aligned countries failed to develop their own concept of human rights. They are following the declarations, laws and rules framed by the UN or other international institutions. The right to self determination, right to development, the rights of women and children and the opposition to racism and racial discrimination are issues of concern to the developing world, yet they have been hijacked by the developed world. Moreover, the disintegration of the Soviet Union has led to the unipolar dominance and growing interference in the third world or developing countries. The process of globalization has allowed direct economic interference of the rich countries through their MNCs in these countries and, on the other hand, the process of privatization has decreased the state's role in human welfare activities. All these changes in the post-Cold War era have negatively affected the condition of human rights in the developing countries. In this situation, Non-aligned countries need to restructure their society and democratize their state institutions. And at the international level, it requires unified actions of the Non-aligned countries for the protection of human rights.

2.2.9.11. The struggle for hegemony in the world did not disappear with the end of the Cold War:

The struggle for hegemony in the world did not disappear with the end of the Cold War, nor did the alliance politics. After the Cold War, a new alliance emerged, seeking to perpetuate its dominance and hegemony in the world affairs. Even though this new alliance is no longer as cohesive as it was during the 1990's, its members are continuing to pursue the objective of preserving the status quo in the world order. One of the major objectives of the NAM was to change this status quo. This objective still remains unfulfilled. Moreover, the essence of NAM was to judge issues on their merits and not in the light of the interest of a power or power bloc. Major Powers continue to impose their points of view on important issues, like trade liberalization, global financial architecture and climate change, on the rest of the world. Therefore, this essence of the Movement still remains valid.

2.2.9.12. NAM resisted all pressures to dismantle it:

In the post Cold War world, Non-Aligned Movement resisted all pressures to dismantle it. It had adapted itself to the changes in the bipolar world, even now; it continues to work as a pressure group to safeguard the interests of the member nations without committing itself to any power lobby. As far as the success of Non-Aligned Movement is concerned in the changed context, it cannot boast of having achieved its goals. But, it cannot even be said that there is no progress. The Movement has raised a number of issues and it has given a voice to the developing countries and is slowly building up world public opinion on issues of general concern. It has also tried to sensitise the world towards the problems facing the smaller countries.

It is true that one of the purposes of NAM was to oppose the division of the world into two power blocs, to prevent the proxy wars that the rival power blocs waged in the Third World and to ensure that rivalry between

them did not escalate into a global armed conflict. NAM, therefore, worked for bringing about a thaw in the Cold War and reconciliation between the rival power groups. It also took a number of initiatives for reducing and halting the nuclear arms race.

With the end of the Cold War, the possibility of a war brought about by the division of world into two blocs receded into the background and significant progress was made in the reduction of the nuclear arsenals of the two largest nuclear powers. Thus, some of the purposes behind NAM were largely served. In the sense, it stood vindicated.

What is to be done?

The Movement, like all other movements, is facing serious challenges from within and outside. Thus, the members of Non-Aligned Movement must be vary about these problems and should continue to make efforts to overcome them. First and foremost, it must establish its relevance. Since the end of the Cold War, it is being argued that Non-Aligned Movement is no longer relevant. In this situation it is necessary that the confusing interpretations and outlook of Non-Aligned Movement after the Cold War must be clarified. But that does not warrant major changes in the definition and relevance of Non-Aligned Movement. It is still a movement for the preservation of independence of the member nations. As the determinants of world politics have undergone some change, Non-Aligned Movement too needs to modify its policies and regulate them in the context of the new world order.

To maintain its relevance it further needs to bring about some reforms. It must establish rules for membership which cannot be misused. Flexibility in the criteria of membership was needed in the bi-polar world order as they were playing a role of balancer. But in the new world order, they have to put a strong and joint front. Thus, the criteria of membership should be fixed and specific conditions established for re-entry of members.

The movement must be institutionalized. There must be some structural organization for better co-ordination, co-operation and continuity regarding the activities among members.

Beside this, Non-Aligned Movement should develop some mechanism to resolve the bilateral and multilateral disputes among members. The divisions within the movement must be overcome by redressing the power struggles between members by co-coordinating policies and building up their common interests, which will consequently bring about atmosphere of cooperation and strengthen their bargaining power.

The leadership of NAM is weak and divided; there is an urgent need to strengthen it. The Movement should be led by powers which have made all round advancements and are really committed to the principles of the Movement.

Non-Aligned Movement agenda must be redefined and modified in the context of recent changes. The old and out dated issues must be deleted from the agenda, so that important and relevant issues may be pursued.

The Non-aligned countries must also think over the method of decision making in its gatherings. The consensus method was feasible at the initial stages, when the number of members was small. Its membership has

grown over the years, thus, the democratic principles of voting should be adopted to respect majority opinion, as in other international bodies.

Moreover, in the context of changes in the global scenario, Non-Aligned Movement must redefine and modify its role and adjust itself to new world order. In fact, the task before Non-Aligned Movement is difficult, yet its flexibility and adaptability to situations is its strength.

The continuation of the Movement was being questioned in the early 1990's. The very fact is that, it is continuing and regular meeting at the levels of foreign ministers and heads of state are being held and issues are being raised and strategies are planned, all this proves that the Movement is still working and relevant. To make it effective, it has to be still seen as a Movement of the smaller powers for the preservation of their independence.

In this hegemonistic world order, the non-aligned countries should stand united and should build up its individual identity, so that Movement's purpose is not diluted. The political interests cannot be delinked from economic, strategic and humanitarian concerns and these should be pursued by the Movement in accordance with the needs of the time. Its challenges and problems can be overcome effectively, by redefining the movement and its goals besides building up the strength of member nations which will enhance their negotiating and bargaining power in the world at large.

2.2.10. Summary:

The non-alignment has consistently grown in popularity. This is evident from the fact that in comparison to 1961 when 25 states participated in the Non-Aligned conference at Jakarta, the number of non-aligned countries has increased to 118 in 2009, in Sharm el- Sheikh and again their number has increased to 120 in 16th Tehran Summit in 2012. Despite minor differences among members of Non-Aligned Movement, it has played important role in favour of world peace, disarmament, development and decolonization. It is well known that the non-aligned countries have played an active role at the United Nations and have refused to deviate from their chosen path despite all pressures. The main contributions or achievements of the Non-Aligned Movement are as under:

1. Non-Alignment has made a principled and lasting contribution towards the maintenance of world peace and prevention of global and local conflicts. The enormous growth in the number of the non-aligned countries greatly contributed to the easing of cold war and encouraged the newly independent countries to keep away from power blocs. No wonder, this helped in resolving several problems posed by the power politics.

2. It greatly transformed the nature of the United Nations and acted as a check on the arbitrary powers of the permanent members of the Security Council because by virtue of their overwhelming strength in the General Assembly the non-aligned countries were able to impose some moral check on the big powers.

3. Though, initially the two super powers were sceptical about the non-aligned countries, but in course of time they thought it desirable to win their favour. This naturally enabled the non-aligned nations to play a more effective role in international politics. Non-alignment had increased the

chances of peace in the world. It did make valuable contribution to the relaxation in, and then end of, the cold war. By helping the process of decolonisation, the Non-Aligned Movement succeeded in changing the nature of international politics and composition of the United Nations.

4. The Non-alignment has prevented the threatened division of the world into two antagonistic power blocs and showed an alternative to the third world. It has promoted the ideology of co-existence or 'live and let live' by keeping themselves away from the two blocs into which the world had got divided in the post world war II period.

5. Non-alignment has discouraged the armament race and thereby contributed to the promotion of world peace. It is well known that the Moscow Test Ban Treaty of 1963 was made possible largely due to the efforts of the non-aligned states. The world has been made aware of the dangerous implications of armament race both conventional and nuclear.

6. Non-alignment countries have played a major role in the process of decolonisation and freedom of the slave countries. This was quite natural in view of the fact that most of the non-aligned countries were themselves colonies of the western powers and were subjected to economic, social and political exploitation. No wonder they took up the cause of their exploited brethren.

7. Non-aligned nations paid great attention to the problem of economic development and played a vital role in the formation of the UNCTAD. They were also instrumental in the formation of the Group of 77. It has undertaken collective responsibility in the economic and industrial development of the South.

8. Non-aligned Movement also tried to resolve differences and conflicts among various member states although its efforts did not meet with much success. However, it cannot be denied that the Non-aligned Movement played an important mediatory role in the Cuban crisis of 1962 and the Sino-Indian Conflict 1962. It helped in promotion of peace through mediation. In Korean and Vietnam issues India persuaded the USSR and China and arranged a compromise.

9. Non-alignbed countries have vehemently criticised policy of racial discrimination and pleaded for equality among people of all races. They have raised voice against racial discrimination in the UN and international forums. It was chiefly as a result of this consistent condemnation of racial discrimination by non-aligned countries that racialism gradually disappeared.

10. Finally Non-aligned Movement has contributed to the end of game of power politics by keeping aloof from power blocks. In fact Non-alignment represents a true blend of idealism and realism and had great relevance during the period of cold war. It worked for the scaling down of Cold War.

11. It stood against imperialism, neo-colonialism, racism and hegemonism as practiced by big states against the small ones.

12. It focused the need of new international order on both political and economic equality.

13. An important achievement of the Non-aligned Movement has been the lesson learnt by the developing countries not to rely too much on the

North, but the stand on their own strength which in turn has led to greater South-South cooperation. It has ended the monopoly of western agencies over the news dissemination services. The establishment of the Pool of News Agencies is an important achievement in the cultural field. This enables the deprived countries of the South to gather information and communicate with the rest of the world without the help of western communication system.

14. Non-alignment was effectively pursued by more than half of the world for over five decades. The Non-aligned countries generally concentrated their efforts on decolonization, economic development and keeping away from bloc politics. The priorities kept changing and varying. Decolonization became less relevant as vast majority of colonies gained their independence. This issue became irrelevant after Namibia became free and South-Africa got an all-race government. The Polestinian problem continued to dominate till today, though PLO-Israel detente had earlier begun earnestly.

15. An important role of the Non-aligned Movement was the strengthening of forces that favoured the easing of tension. Lundestad concludes thus: "The emergence of new nations probably contributed to strengthening the forces within the two blocs that favoured an easing of tension, as an uncompromising policy could repel the Non-aligned nations".

It has played a vital role in accelerating the process of decolonization by strengthening the freedom struggles in Afro-Asian Countries.

2.2.11. Keywords

Communism
Colonialism
Isolationism
Racial discrimination
Neutrality

2.2.12. Long answer type questions

1. Write an essay on the relevance of Non-Aligned Movement in the contemporary world?
2. Write a detailed note on the Contemporary challenges being faced by non-aligned movement?
3. Write a detailed note on the nature of Non-Aligned Movement.

2.2.13. Short answer type questions

1. What do you know about Panchsheel?
2. Write a short note on the objectives of nonalignment?
3. Write any two main achievements of NAM

2.2.14. Suggested Readings

1. K.P. Misra and K.R. Narayanan (ed.), *Non-Alignment in Contemporary International Relations*, 1981
2. Rikhi Jaipal, *Non-Alignment : Origins, Growth and Potential for World Peace*, 1983

DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL : AS A THEORY OF PEACE

- 2.4.1. Introduction
- 2.4.2. Objectives
- 2.4.3. Definition of Disarmament and Arms Control
- 2.4.4. Theories of Disarmament or Arguments in Favour of Disarmament
- 2.4.5. Self-check Exercise
- 2.4.6. History of Efforts of Disarmament and Arms Control
- 2.4.7. Causes of Failure of Disarmament in the Inter-War Period
- 2.4.8. Disarmament and Arm Control after World War-II
- 2.4.9. Summary
- 2.4.10. Key Words
- 2.4.11. Short Answer type Questions.
- 2.4.12. Long Answer type Questions.
- 2.4.13. Suggested Readings

2.4.1. Introduction:

Peace and Security are essential for development. War and the arms race are dangerous for peace, security and survival of human beings. It also diverts large amount of funds for raising army and collecting weapons, which could have been used to alleviate poverty and promote development. It was the failure of Disarmament and Arms Control efforts that led to the First and Second World Wars. The conditions of the Cold War further hindered the progress towards Disarmament and Arms Control, resulting in antagonistic groupings in the form of **Military Alliances** and **Counter-alliances**, and creation and proliferation of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction.

2.4.2. Objectives of the Study:

The greatest and immediate need of mankind is to strengthen international peace, security and development by eliminating or reducing the armaments and thereby war. So after reading this lesson you will have an understanding of the importance of Peace and the need of disarmament and arms control in contemporary world. . You will also come to know about the international efforts towards disarmament and arms control and hindrances in the way. In the end, you will be able to suggest the prospects regarding this to have a peaceful international system.

2.4.3. Meaning of Disarmament and Arms Control:

A world free from cold war and several local wars can think and work better for securing peace and security for all. For this purpose Disarmament and Arms Control are regarded as highly useful devices which on the one hand can eliminate or reduce the chances of war, and on the other hand, can secure peace and transform international relations into a movement for

all round development of all the members of the International Community. Somehow, the end of the Cold War has relatively reduced superpower tensions, creating hope for eventual steps towards Disarmament. However, nuclear weapons have proliferated in several nations, further endangering peace and complicating Disarmament and Arms Control efforts. Therefore, presently, of all the devices which are considered desirable or ideal for securing international peace and security, Disarmament and Arms Control are considered the most important and helpful instruments. The concepts of Disarmament and Arms Control are defined and an attempt is made to understand the real issues, constraints and their relationship in the complex world of global politics. First of all we shall examine the meaning and nature of the Disarmament and Arms Control and try to understand the difference between the two concepts.

Disarmament and Arms Control are the means for the elimination, reduction and control of armaments. The terms 'disarmament' and 'arms control' are often confused and taken as identical. In reality they differ from each other even though they deal with different aspects of the same problem. Disarmament aims at liquidation the existing arms, while arms control tries to regulate the future production of armaments to control both the arms race and the misuse of weapons. Disarmament may mean total elimination of all weapons or the regulation and control of only a few strategic weapons with a view to reduce armament levels or eliminate highly destructive weapons. Disarmament does not necessarily imply Control of Arms. On the other hand, Arms Control does not necessarily mean a reduction in armament levels. The concept of Disarmament also means a plan or a system for the abolition, limitation or reduction of armed forces, including their weapons, arms, equipments, budgets and other related items such as military bases. Arms Control means a cooperative or multilateral approach to armament policy, where armament policy includes amounts and kinds of weapons, forces, development and utilization in periods of relation or tension. **Headley Bull** defines arms control as "restraint internationally exercised upon armament policy whether in respect of the levels of armaments, their character or use". It aims at improving national security by the adjustment of armament capabilities.

It is only recently that a clear distinction has been made between Disarmament and Arms Control. Disarmament is treated as anything having to do with limitation, reduction and abolition of certain or all armaments through the voluntary agreement of two or more nations. In this way, Disarmament does not cover control of the weapons of future. It seeks reduction of obtaining arms to the extent of total elimination. So, we can say, 'disarmament' means reduction or elimination of existing arms, and 'arms control' means restraint on the production of the arms.

2.4.3. Definition of Disarmament and Arms Control:

Disarmament: **Headley Bull** defines Disarmament as "reduction or abolition of armaments". In the words of **Hans J. Morgenthau**, "Disarmament is the reduction or elimination of certain or all armaments for the purpose of ending the armament rce". But according to **Benjamin V. Cohen**, disarmament means, "a process of creating conditions which make it difficult or impossible for nations to break or endanger the peace and not

as a bargaining process to reduce the cost of preparing for war". **Vernon Van Dyke** argued that "any regulation or limitation having to do with armed power is treated as a measure of disarmament. Defining disarmament **Charles Schleicher** observes, "it means reducing or eliminating the material and human instrumentalities for the exercise of physical violence (war)...through the voluntary agreement of two or more states". According to **Coulombis and Wolfe**, "disarmament requires the global destruction of weapons and the disestablishment of all armed forces". After analyzing the above discussed definitions we can conclude that Disarmament stands for elimination or reduction of armaments as a means for preventing wars in international relations and to maintain international peace and security.

Arms Control: The concept of Arms Control covers the control of weapons for the future. Arms Control necessarily implies control of arms and arms race by nations. It means a cooperative or multilateral approach to armament policy that includes the amount and kind of weapons, forces, deployment and utilization in a period of tension or relaxation. The basic aim of arms control is to improve national security by the adjustment of armament capabilities. **Hans J. Morgenthau** writes that "the attempts at arms control seek to strengthen international peace by increasing military stability. According to **Vernon Van Dyke**, "arms control connotes measures of a positive sort, pursued deliberately and persistently with a view to preserving peace". As long as the political incentives to military competition persists, Disarmament is impossible and Arms Control at best precarious.

Arms reduction and arms limitation are the two types of Arms Control. Arms reduction is called "partial" disarmament. Arms Reduction refers to a mutually agreed upon set of arms level by the countries in agreement. Arms Reduction may be between two countries or on a regional or worldwide basis. Arms Limitation refers to a wide variety of international agreements to limit the impact of war and prevent its accidental outbreak. It also refers to agreements between two or more countries, restricting sale of arms and military technology to a third country. It is also called 'arms restraint'.

Thus, we can conclude that Arms Control includes international or mutual agreements to limit or regulate the use of arms and their future production and sale. It also tries to regulate armament capabilities of the agreeing partner countries to improve a sense of mutual security and military transparency.

Forms and Types of Disarmament:

There are several forms of Disarmament which are as follows:

- (i) **Human Disarmament** relates to limitation or reduction of armed forces.
- (ii) **Conventional Disarmament** refers to the elimination or reduction of conventional weapons.
- (iii) **Nuclear Disarmament** stands for the liquidation of nuclear weapons.
- (iv) **Quantitative Disarmament** means an overall reduction of armaments of most or all types.

- (v) **Qualitative Disarmament** refers to the abolition or reduction of only special types of armaments. It mean elimination of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).
- (vi) **General Disarmament** is a kind of disarmament in which all nations take part.
- (vii) **Local Disarmament** refers to disarmament by a limited number of countries of a region.
- (viii) **Comprehensive Disarmament** refers to reduction or destruction of weapons and war instruments of all types by all nations.
- (ix) **Total Disarmament** mean abolition of all human and material instrumentalities of warfare. It refers to a condition of world order in which no country will possess any armed forces or weapons of any kind. Total Disarmament is very difficult to achieve.

2.4.4. Theories of Disarmament or Arguments in Favour of Disarmament:

Disarmament and Arms Control are together regarded as the effective means through which international peace and security can be greatly strengthened. The objectives of Disarmament are mainly three fold: (I) to promote international peace and security and to reduce international tension; (ii) to promote economic prosperity; and (iii) to promote moral objectives. Various theories or arguments have been advocated to support Disarmament, which can be categorized as the Peace Theory, Economic Theory, Moral Theory and Pragmatic Theory.

2.4.4.1. Peace Theory of Disarmament: The protagonists of Peace Theory argue that armaments lead an arms race and militarization, which ultimately leads to war. Armaments develop jealousy and insecurity among rival or neighbouring countries. They try to develop similar or more offensive armaments that can threaten their rivals. This leads to an arms race. Therefore, the mutual suspicion, jealousy and feelings of insecurity create conditions for war. In words of **Benjamin V. Cohen**, “Armaments aggravate tension and fear Disarmament should facilitate and strengthen the process of peaceful settlement”.

The development of atom bombs and missiles by the USA resulted in the development of similar kinds of weapons by several other countries such as Russia, France, Britain, China, India, Pakistan and Israel. Such militarization boosts the country to indulge in aggressive policies, coercion and war. America’s military indulgence in the Gulf War, Afghanistan and so on, can be cited as examples. The militarization of Pakistan’s army led to several aggressions against India. The believers of Peace Theory argue that Disarmament leads to peace, as the elimination of weapons reduce capabilities of war and aggression as well as tensions in international relations. **John Burton** “considers peace as a precondition for Disarmament”. So, we can say that destruction of instruments of war secure peace. By ending the instrumentalities of war, Disarmament can end war. It also can reduce the existing tensions, strains and conflicts among the nations. Summing up the Peace Theory of Disarmament, **Coulombis and Wolfe** observes, “Arms and arms race can themselves be the causes of bloody and costly wars. The possession of arms definitely increases the probability that they will be used. Consequently, an arms race heightens the

psychological insecurity of nations rather than providing them with a sense of security against attack". In India **Rabindernath Tagore** and **Mahatma Gandhi** were the great exponents of the Peace view of Disarmament.

Evaluation of the Peace Theory of Disarmament: There are several theorists or critics who do not support the Peace Theory of Disarmament and they have given their own arguments against it. **Quincy Wright** observes that "disarmament would increase the frequency of war, as wars are more likely to happen when countries have less quantity of armaments". He further suggests that an effective way to avoid war is to prepare for war and to disarm is to invite aggression or war. Some theorist argues that political disputes lead to war and not the possession of weapons. **Morgenthau** argues that men do not fight because they have arms. They have arms because they deem it necessary to fight. Missiles and nuclear bombs might be abolished, but more and more would be produced as long as the scientific and technological knowledge and the factories and materials remain for producing instruments which can be used in war.

Stefan T. Possony argued that there would be "no peace without arms". War occurs when there is will for war by the leadership of the countries, and not by weapons themselves. In the absence of proper defense of a country, war would be frequent. The Anglo French naval race of the 19th century did not lead to war. The whole arms race between USA and Soviet Union during the Cold War did not result in direct war between the two countries. After acquiring nuclear weapon capabilities, India and Pakistan are trying to maintain restraint and not indulge in aggression, as war would lead to huge destruction and loss of lives in both countries. It would be a mutual suicide. So, history does not provide conclusive evidence that arms races always lead to war.

Both the supporters and critics have several valid arguments. It must be stated that Disarmament alone cannot lead to peace. The Peace Theory contains only a partial truth. Disarmament can be a means to peace but it cannot be the only means to peace. It is believed that Disarmament cannot by itself abolish war, but it can at least lesser the political tensions to a great extent. More particularly, it can reduce the unnecessary burden on nations in indulging in unregulated armament race.

2.4.4.2. Economic Theory of Disarmament: Exponents of Economic Theory argue that through Disarmament countries can save large amount of funds meant for the production of dangerous and nuclear weapons and building huge armed forces. This huge amount saved can be utilized for the development and welfare purposes of the nations, such as construction of roads, railways, schools, colleges, hospitals and for securing food. **Herbert Hoover**, the former President of United States, at the World Disarmament Conference in 1932 said that the expenditure on armaments was the major cause for the great depression. Another former American President, **Eisenhower**, argued that "every gun that was being made every warship launched, every rocket fired, in the final sense, signified a theft from those who were hungry and not fed, those who were cold and unclothed". He further argued that "this world in arms is not spending money alone; it is spending the sweat of its labourers, the genius of its scientists, and the hope of its children". Eisenhower came out with "Atoms for Peace Plan" for

peaceful use of atoms meant for making nuclear bombs. **Coulombis and Wolfe** argued that “A reduction in the nation’s armaments releases sizeable funds, which could be transferred to programmes designed to improve the general welfare of that nation's citizens. In the timeless dilemma of choosing between “guns and butter”, the advocates of arms reduction opt for the latter”. **Arnold Toynbee** argues that “social change can be vital through peaceful development after securing Disarmament”. **Seymour Malman** gave the idea a “Peace Race as substitute for arms race and the money and resources saved by reducing the arms race could be diverted for international cooperation and world industrialization”. It is really an irony that when millions of people in poor countries of the globe are perishing due to hunger and disease, and many countries are spending a huge proportion of income and resources on the production of armaments. It may be more profitable and useful if it spent for building hospitals and for increasing food production or factories. So, the advocates of the Economic Theory of Disarmament argue that the big and ever increasing defense budgets of various nations need elimination through Disarmament and thereby release funds for development of the society.

Evaluation of the Economic Theory of Disarmament: The critics of the Economic Theory of Disarmament give many arguments against it. (i) there is no guarantee that the funds saved by Disarmament will be surely spent on development by the concerned governments. (ii) The funds released due to Disarmament will be huge, which would create economic depression in the countries. (iii) **Hedley Bull** points out that Disarmament would prevent development of new science and technology. In the long run, this would be harmful for the defense and security of nations. (iv) Disarmament is not a guarantee that the rival or enemy nations will not develop sophisticated weapons clandestinely. In such a situation, a truly disarmed nation will be a great loser if there is a war or coercive politics in future. (v) Huge economic development without a strong defence force will be like a bank without adequate security guards. Such a situation will invite foreign invaders and plunderers. History reveals the fact that militarily weak nations have fallen prey to military strong nations. This was a great reason for the colonization of Asian and African countries in the past by Britain, France, Germany and other European countries.

However, these arguments of critics contain little truth as all these arguments represent the negative and narrow thinking. **Arnold Toynbee** is of the opinion that “human progress will not suffer when peaceful methods are adopted for social change”. By developing civil technology we can secure vital and important gains. It is a fact that by keeping the defense budget low due to Disarmament, a country can focus more on economic development. A balanced approach of defense and development is required by all nations. The real problem is of adjustment and converting an armament economy into a disarmament economy. By adopting advance economic planning we can ensure against the possible danger of economic depression, by developing peace research and peace technology we can keep up the development of scientific knowledge even after Disarmament. Disarmament may result in economic and employment loss in many countries. Because, production and sale of armaments provide a huge income to many developed

countries boosting industrialization. However, these huge financial and employment losses can be overcome by an economic planning.

2.4.4.3. Moral Theory of Disarmament: The third and philosophically most effective argument in favour of Disarmament is the moral argument. This theory holds the view that wars are immoral and evil, so the preparations for and instruments of war are also immoral and must be eliminated. Exponents of the Moral view, such as **Victor Gollanz**, argue that "armaments have tendencies to lead nations to war". In fact armament production is the beginning of the immoral process of war. If the war is an evil and immoral, so, the elimination of war demands the elimination of arms and armament races.

The phase of Enlightenment and the Political Theory of Liberalism demanded respect for human life, which got reflected in social and political reforms of the 19th and 20th centuries. This also demanded respect for life, peace and order in international relations. The idealist thinker **Immanuel Kant** had emphasized that "the elimination of standing armies was an essential requirement for peace between states. **Lewis Mumford** emphasized the ethical aspects of Disarmament. **C. Wright Mills** emphasized on the humanitarian aspect for unilateral Disarmament. Earlier, **Mahatma Gandhi** considered violence as morally wrong, whether it was on a personal, national or international level. Many religions also consider war to be immoral, as there is a huge loss of innocent lives. On the other hand, many religions have the concept of "Holy war" or 'Jihad' or just war meant for fighting against gross injustice or for protection of their own religion; otherwise, wars for greed of power, wealth or revenge are considered unethical.

Evaluation of Moral Theory of Disarmament: The critics of the Moral Theory of Disarmament argue that war in self defense is always moral hence the preparation for self-defense is not immoral but moral. Every country had the right to prepare for self-defense and engage in war for self-protection. Thus, war cannot be immoral all the time. The critics also hold the view that any unilateral Disarmament will be suicidal for a country, as the enemy nation can occupy a disarmed country. What is required is more reliability on a non-violent defense system than the military defense system. However, a non-violent defense system will take a very long time to develop. On the other hand, it is very difficult to ensure that the countries following non-violent defense will not be attacked.

2.4.4.4. Pragmatic or Practical Theory of Disarmament : Many theorists and people give a practical argument that nuclear weapons as well as other dangerous and sophisticated weapons developed till date have created a situation of "mutually assured destruction" (MAD) and dangers to the survival of life on earth. These weapons cannot be used, as the world will be destroyed.

Bertrand Russell argued that "Civilization must be freed from the pressure of nuclear arms race by means other than war. This could be achieved by removing secrecy and by conducting open successful negotiations for Disarmament".

C. Wright Mills emphasized unilateral Disarmament on humanitarian grounds. On the other hand, these weapons have been threatening the survival of human beings on earth even without war. Any accident, human

error or technical error can explode these weapons and ruin the earth. Thus, on practical grounds, nuclear armaments should be destroyed to save mankind.

After discussing the above four major arguments, we can say that all the above theories of disarmament individually hold a partial truth, but collectively they provide a strong argument in favour of Disarmament. All the statesmen, philosophers, jurists, scholars and scientists accept the need for securing elimination or at least a reduction of arms and a limitation of the growing armament race in International Relations. It is believed that Disarmament cannot by itself abolish war, but it can at least lessen the political tensions to a great extent. More particularly, it can reduce the unnecessary burden on nations in indulging in unregulated armament race. To conclude, we can say that armament race is a cause of war and the Disarmament and Arms Control constitute "an element of the solution of the war and a necessary condition of the evolution of peaceful international order".

2.4.5. Self Check Exercise

Self check exercise	
1.	Define disarmament?
2.	Write a short note on the types of disarmament.
3.	What do you know about the economic theory of disarmament?

2.4.6. History of Efforts of Disarmament and Arms Control

(A) The Efforts of Disarmament before the First World War:

1. Disarmament efforts are not necessarily a twentieth century phenomenon. The history of Disarmament can be traced back to the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. The Treaty stipulated that all existing fortifications be demolished and no new fortifications be erected.
2. The first systematic proposal for the reduction of armaments was mooted by Czar of Russia in 1816, when he proposed to the British Government, the reduction of all types of armed forces. However, these proposals were not seriously received and failed to produce any impact.
3. In the years 1863 and 1869 France also submitted certain proposals for the reduction of armaments to the Great Powers, but they also met the fate of the proposals submitted by the Russian Czar.
4. Other powers like Britain (1870) and Italy (1877) also initiated steps to put a stop to armament race but without any success.

(5) The First Hague Peace Conference: The Czar of Russia addressed a note to the various powers of Europe in 1899 to meet at Hague and workout

a scheme for reduction of arms. 28 states attended the First Hague Peace Conference. The Conference considered ways and means to reduce armaments. The Conference appointed a committee of military and naval experts to study the problem of arms control. The Expert Committee of the conference recommended that it is extremely desirable for the moral and material welfare of the people that military charges must be restricted. Two declarations were made at The Hague in 1899 by which (1) discharge of projective and explosives from the air was prohibited; (2) the use of asphyxiating gas and expanding bullets was forbidden.

(6) The Second Hague Peace Conference: The Second Hague Peace Conference was held in 1907 and attended by forty three nations. It initiated proposals for the reduction of arms and reduction of expenditure on military forces; but this conference also did not find favour with the powers. The participating states failed to achieve any concrete result.

After the failure of the Second Hague Conference, no concrete move was initiated towards Disarmament. The outbreak of First World War in 1914 came as a big blow to the Disarmament efforts. During the course of war the violation of the laws of war by the belligerents made the earlier Disarmament agreements and undertakings only a mockery.

(B) Disarmament and Arms Control after First World War under the League of Nations: It was after the end of the First World War that some efforts, both inside and outside the League of Nations, were made for securing Disarmament and Arms Control.

(1) Regulation of Armaments under the Peace Treaties of 1919:

A serious beginning in this direction was made by the Treaty of Versailles, when it disarmed the defeated powers of the World War I. The Allied Associated Powers while doing so, made it clear that this step was intended not as a step to weaken the defeated states, but as the first step towards the general reduction and limitation of armaments, which is one of the most fruitful preventions of war and which it will be one of the first duties of the League of Nations to promote".

The First World War brought to the fore the urgent need of achieving Disarmament. The Covenant of the League clearly stated that one of its first tasks was to secure an agreement on a general Disarmament as the means for securing international peace. Article 8, Para 1 of the Covenant stated that "the members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national safety, and the enforcement by common action of international obligations".

The covenant further provided under Article 8, Para 2 that "at least in every ten years the League's Council, after taking into account of the geographical situation and circumstances of each state, shall formulate plans for each reduction for the consideration and action of the several Governments".

Therefore, when the League of Nations came to existence in 1920 one of its first task was to secure an agreement on the General Disarmament. The Covenant of the League of Nations had facilitated the job of the League by incorporating a provision by which "willingness to accept arms regulations" was made a condition of League membership (Art.1 (2). The

members were also expected under the League Covenant to "accept such obligations as may be prescribed by the League in regard" to its military, naval and air forces and armaments". To fulfill the obligations under Covenant, the League Council set up the Permanent Advisory Committee to formulate a reduction programmed. This Committee was mainly composed of military representatives. But it failed to make headway in the direction of Disarmament.

(2) Temporary Mixed Commission (1920-1924): In 1920, the Assembly of the League urged the Council to appoint a new Commission. In 1921, the Commission was appointed. It is a large body of military as well as civilian representatives. During its life of four years it made efforts to secure Disarmament through fixation of land forces of the various countries according to their national needs, and limited the naval armaments of the great naval powers. For the attainment of the same objective it proposed "international aid to the victims of aggression," and compulsory arbitration. So, the purpose of the Commission was to create an atmosphere of security in which Disarmament projects could be hopefully undertaken.

However, all these proposals were turned down by the states and it failed to accomplish anything. Thus, the first five years of League's existence were wasted in discussion and the next seven years in presenting an agreement which provided little satisfaction to the nations concerned.

(3) Preparatory Commission (1925): The next important step taken by the League in the direction of Disarmament was the establishment of the Preparatory Commission for the Disarmament Conference in 1925. The Preparatory Commission was entrusted with the responsibility of preparing a provisional draft treaty concerning Disarmament. After a hard work of six years the Commission completed the draft treaty.

(4) The World Disarmament Conference held at Geneva-1932: The Disarmament Conference was held at Geneva on February 3, 1932, under the President ship of Arthur Henderson, the British Foreign Secretary, to discuss the Provisional Draft Treaty prepared by the Preparatory Commission. The Conference was attended the 59 nations including five non-members of League of Nations. The participants in the Conference discussed the "Draft Convention on Reduction and Limitation of Armaments" for two years. The Conference failed to produce any major agreement. Agreements if any were on generalities such as denunciation of the use of chemical and biological weapons, the need to reduce military budgets and international supervision of arms business and publicity of arms budget. Though the League failed in Disarmament, it kept the issue alive. Japanese attack on Manchuria and reluctance of Germany under Hitler to follow the restrictions regarding Disarmament are the examples of the failure of the League. In 1933 Germany withdrew from the Disarmament Conference. With her withdrawal the great effort for International Disarmament practically came to an end.

In May 1934, the Disarmament Conference was again held. This time a deadlock took place between Russia and France on one hand and England, Italy and U.S.A. on the other. While Russia and France put emphasis on security; England, Italy and United States attached more importance to Disarmament. On June 11, 1934, the Conference was

adjourned sine die and never met again. Thus, all attempts for resolving Disarmament problem through the League of Nations utterly failed.

Efforts outside the League of Nations before the Second World War:

During the Inter-war Years, while the League was busy making efforts for Disarmament and Arms Control, some states were making efforts in this regard outside the League also. Some important efforts made in this regard were as follows:

(1) The Washington Conference 1921-22: The Washington Conference constituted a major attempt for Disarmament and Arms Control outside the League of Nations. In 1921-22 at the Washington Conference, the five major powers namely Britain, the USA, France, Japan and Italy agreed to fix their respective naval strength. This treaty is popularly known as the Five Powers Treaty. The Five Powers also made an effort to come to some understanding regarding cruisers, submarines, destroyers and aircrafts, but could not succeed. The failure to get ratification from the signatory states, particularly by France, made this treaty less useful in actual practice. Though, the Washington Conference failed to achieve much due to the opposition of the French, it paved the way for similar conferences in the future. Further, no plan of Naval Disarmament could achieve success in the field of World Disarmament without an overall plan for reducing the land and air armaments.

(2) The Geneva Naval Conference-1927: As the Washington Conference failed to accomplish any substantive results, President Coolidge of United States convened a Second Naval Conference at Geneva in 1927. It was attended by three states, namely U.S.A., Britain and Japan. France and Italy did not participate in it and did not approve the idea of this conference. Soon vital differences were developed between the participating countries over the issue of cruisers, destroyers and submarines. Consequently, the Conference dispersed without accomplishing anything.

(3) The London Naval Treaty-1930: In 1930, the representatives of the five Major Powers, (Britain, the USA, Japan, France and Italy) met at London again to affect Naval Disarmament. These Major Naval Powers agreed to limit tonnage in respect of cruisers, destroyers and submarines. France and Italy refused to sign the Treaty. The Treaty of London also failed to achieve substantial results regarding the naval Disarmament. The real purpose of the Treaty was completely shattered when the three signatory states viz., U.S.A., Britain and Japan, extorted the right to reservation for themselves. One of its clauses accepted the right of the signatory states to undertake rearmament in case of deterioration in international situation. This clause contained the germs of the failure of this conference and then treaty.

(4) The London Naval Conference 1935-36: Another effort aimed at limiting the naval armaments was made again at the London Naval Conference of 1935-36. The Conference met at a time when international conditions were quite unfavorable. Japan had committed aggression upon Manchuria, Germany had remilitarized the Rhineland in violation of the Treaty of Versailles. So, the fast deteriorating international environment resulting from rising militarism and the failure of disarmament efforts under League, made it difficult for this Conference to sign a naval Disarmament

and Arms Control Treaty. The Treaty provided neither for reduction nor for quantitative limitation of naval armaments. No limitation remained on the number of battleships, aircraft-carriers, cruisers, destroyers and submarines, which the signatories might build. The signatories (France, Italy, England, Japan and United States), however, agreed to exchange information regarding the future naval building programmes.

(5) The Anglo-German Naval Agreement-1935: In June 1935, Britain concluded an agreement with Germany by which she conceded a right to Germany to increase her battleships of various types. England concluded this treaty with Germany mainly to protect her interest against the possible German aggression. This agreement, however, paved the way for an increased armament race in international relations. As a result, during the subsequent years no important attempt for Disarmament was made.

(6) Atlantic Charter-1944: During the Second World War, in August, 1944, the great Atlantic Charter was signed by President Roosevelt of the USA and Prime Minister of the UK, Sir Winston Churchill. It gave a great momentum to the cause of Disarmament. The eight points of the Charter declared that all nations "for realistic as well as for spiritual reason, must cover to the abandonment of the use of force". The Charter also declared that for general security of all nations, Disarmament was essential.

Summary

Thus, by the beginning of 1937, all the efforts towards Disarmament, both inside and outside the League, got struck up with failures and after this no important attempt were made towards Disarmament. As **Schuman** has said: "all treaties imposing quantitative restrictions on the three Great Naval Powers were at end". In place of efforts towards Disarmament there emerged a new and more vigorous armament race in international relations. United States of America also proceeded to strengthen the fortification of its basis in Western Pacific. England announced plans for construction of new battleships. Germany armed herself for the day of glory and her neighbours armed desperately in self-defense. In the words of **Schuman**, "Each power sought safety in matching its potential enemies regiment for regiment, bombing-plane for bombing-plane, battleship for battleship. In this there could be no security but only the promise of disaster". In fact "the letters of failure written large over the portals of successive Disarmament Conferences during the two decades after Versailles, became letters of impending catastrophe for the Western World".

2.4.7. Causes of Failure of Disarmament in the Inter-War Period:

The efforts for Disarmament in the inter-war period both through the League of Nations and outside it, failed to achieve anything substantial. The reasons for the failure of Disarmament are:

- (1) In fact, almost all the states were interested in strengthening their respective position rather than reducing the weapons.
- (2) The failure of the League of Nations to deal effectively with states like Japan, Italy and Germany who resorted to arms in violation of their obligations under the Covenant, made the states lukewarm in their support to the proposals of Disarmament. They were convinced that they could not rely on the League for their

security and had to raise their forces to meet any unforeseen eventuality.

- (3) There were differences among the members of the Disarmament Conference on various issues.
- (4) The difficulty in arriving at an accepted distinction between the aggressive and defensive weapons.
- (5) The statesmen focused their attention solely on reduction of armaments and war equipment failed to focus attention on the economic, psychological and political conditions prevailing in various countries.
- (6) In the presence of mutual distrust and suspicion, fear and hatred all around Disarmament could not be possible.

2.4.8. DISARMAMENT AND ARMS CONTROL AFTER WORLD WAR-II

United Nations Charter and Disarmament and Arms Control:

2.4.8.1. The purpose of the establishment of the United Nations is the “maintenance of international peace and security”. The Charter refers to Disarmament as one of the basic means of achieving this aim. The enormous destruction caused by the Second World War once again brought into the focus the need for Disarmament. Therefore, there are numerous provisions relating to “regulation” of armaments in the United Nations Charter which are as follows:

- (i) The Preamble of the UN Charter refers that, “to save the succeeding generations from the scourge of war” and “to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours”, and to ensure that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest”.
- (ii) Article 2 (4) of the UN Charter stipulates a formal war prohibition- “All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any manner inconsistent with the purpose of the United Nations”.
- (iii) Article 11 (1) of the Charter while enumerating the functions of the General Assembly declares: “General Assembly has been entrusted to “consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments, and to make recommendations with regard to such principles to the Members or to the Security Council or to both”.
- (iv) Article 26 of the Charter defines the functions of the Security Council regarding the Disarmament and Arms Control: “In order to promote the establishment and maintenance of international peace and security with the least diversion for armaments of the world’s human and economic resources, the Security Council shall be responsible for formulating.....plans to be submitted to the Members of the United Nations for the establishment of a system for the regulation of armaments”.
- (v) Article 47 (1) of the Charter makes the provision for “a Military Staff Committee to advise and assist the Security Council on all questions relating to the Security Council’s military requirements

for the maintenance of international peace and security, the employment and command of forces placed at its disposal, the regulation of Armaments and possible Disarmament”.

Although the term Disarmament has not been defined properly under the UN Charter, the topic of Disarmament has been dealt by the United Nations continuously and so vigorously that perhaps no one would deny that the idea of Disarmament in no way contradicts with the Charter. Some weapons such as chemical and biological weapons have been banned out rightly by the United Nations. Whereas some others are on the international agenda for total global elimination of nuclear weapons and landmines.

2.4.8.2. Disarmament and Arms Control Efforts under the United Nations: The discovery of atom bombs soon after the signing of the UN Charter and just before the conclusion of the Second World War, gave added importance to the question of Disarmament. On 3 October, 1945, a declaration on general security was signed by the United States, Great Britain, Soviet Union and China. It was declared that the four powers were to bring about a practical agreement regarding the regulation of armaments in the post-war period. On November 15, 1945, the Great Britain, the United States and the Canada declared that they were prepared to share with other members of the United Nations, on the basis of reciprocity, detailed information regarding the practical industrial information on atomic energy. The Soviet Union gave her approval to this declaration. She also joined hands in a resolution asking the General Assembly of the United Nations to set up a UN Atomic Energy Commission.

(1) The United Nations Atomic Energy Commission-1946: The UN General Assembly constituted the Atomic Energy Commission on January 24, 1946, “to make proposals for the utilization of Atomic Energy for peaceful purpose. It was also required to suggest effective safeguards by way of inspection to protect the violations and invasions on the part an effective system of international control of atomic energy be established. So that the atomic energy must be utilized only for peaceful purposes. The ‘Atomic Energy Commission was made subordinate to the Security Council and hence was required to make all recommendations to it.

The Commission started its work in June, 1946. However, the growing Cold- War between the USA and the USSR made its functioning difficult. The USSR pleaded for the ban of the production and use of atomic weapons and it also proposed that within three months of acceptance of its proposals total stock of atomic weapons was to be destroyed, but no progress could be made due to the difference of opinion between the USA and the USSR. The USA was unwilling to give up the weapons in stock, whereas the USSR opposed the plans of international inspection on the ground that it violates the sovereignty of states.

(2) The Conventional Armaments Commission-1947: On December 14, 1946, the General Assembly recommended that the Security Council consider essential practical measures for an early general regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces. The Assembly also recommended that the Security Council accelerate measures to have armed forces placed at its disposal, as provided for in Article 43 of the Charter.

In pursuance of the above, the Security Council set up a Commission for Conventional Armament on February 13, 1947. On August 12, 1948, the Commission approved two resolutions. The first resolution suggested that weapons of mass destruction should be defined to include automatic explosive weapons, radioactive material weapons, lethal, chemical and biological weapons. The Second resolution envisaged that a system for the regulation and reduction of armaments and armed forces should embrace all states and that to put such a system into effect, there must be international confidence and security, but the regulation and reduction of armaments and the existence of confidence are reciprocal. The Commission also recommended that there must be a provision of adequate safeguards and effective enforcement action in case of violation.

However, when the resolution came up to for discussion before the General Assembly, the USSR firmly opposed the recommendations and insisted that atomic weapons should not be excluded from the purview. It also insisted on the establishment of a body for the supervision of reduction of armaments and prohibition of atomic weapons. This was not acceptable to Western Powers. The Commission could not go very far as the USSR withdrew from it in protest against the refusal of representation to China on it.

(3) United Nations Disarmament Commission-1952: In November 1951, President Truman of USA made a suggestion to the UN to merge the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and the Conventional Armaments Commission. On January 11, 1952, the UN General Assembly decided to establish a single Disarmament Commission. The Atomic Energy Commission and the Conventional Armaments Commission known as, United Nations Disarmament Commission. The Commission included all the members of the Security Council and Canada. This Commission operated and worked under the control and supervision of the UN Security Council. The Commission submitted a number of proposals like: (I) inventory and verification, (ii) reductions for all armed forces and all armaments, (iii) determination of armaments programmed through negotiations among states, (IV) agreement upon disarmament etc. The Commission also discussed various projects for armament limitations such as nuclear weapons, conventional weapons, budgetary expenditure for armament, inspections and controls etc. But all these efforts of the Commission also failed to produce any fruitful results.

(4) Atoms for Peace Plan-1953: In December 1954 President Eisenhower of USA proposed "Atoms for Peace Plan". The Plan aimed at peaceful uses of atomic energy for promoting the cause of international peace and security. It urged those powers which possessed atomic energy materials, to contribute the same to the Atomic Energy Commission under the UN. The Commission was expected to use these materials for promoting the cause of international peace and security. The proposal of President Eisenhower was rejected by Soviet Union and she insisted on a prior agreement regarding prohibition of atomic weapons.

(5) Disarmament Efforts During 1954-1957: During this period the United Nations, Disarmament Commission appointed a sub-committee of five powers, consisting, Canada, France, USSR, U.K. and USA, to examine

the problem of disarmament. In June, 1954, England and France submitted a plan of Disarmament to the General Assembly to disarm in three phases. In this plan military expenditure was to be reduced, man power to be frozen and nuclear weapons to be eliminated. But, the plan had to be shelved on account of the opposition by the USSR.

Further, the Disarmament problem was discussed in 1955 at a summit meeting held at Geneva by the leaders of the USA, the USSR, the UK and France. During the discussion USA mooted "Open Skies Plan" under which the USA and the USSR were to exchange military information which could be verified by mutual aerial reconnaissance. However, the USSR turned down the plan.

In March 1957, U.S.A. and other Western Nations put up another Comprehensive Plan for Disarmament before the UN General Assembly, which was rejected by Soviet Union. In the, twelfth session of the General Assembly, Soviet Union declared that she would not participate in further talks and negotiations of the Disarmament Commission and its sub-committee. Thus, Disarmament talks through the UN organ suffered a set-back.

2.4.8.3. Disarmament and Arms Control Efforts by United Nations General Assembly:

The General Assembly has been making efforts continuously in relation to disarmament. The most important contribution in this field is the convening of three Special Sessions on Disarmament which is as follows:

(1) First Special Session on Disarmament – 1978: The First special session on the General Assembly on Disarmament was held from May 23 to July 1, 1978. A "Final Document" consisting of an Introduction, a Declaration, a Programme of Action and recommendations concerning the international machinery for Disarmament negotiations was adopted. The Disarmament Commission composed of all the members of the United Nations was constituted and it was a successor to Commission of the same name established by the General Assembly in 1952. The Assembly defined the Commission as a deliberate body, subsidiary to the General Assembly. Its main function was: (i) to consider and make recommendations on various problems in the field of Disarmaments; (ii) to follow up on relevant decisions of the Special Session on Disarmament of 1978; (iii) the Commission was charged with consideration of the elements of a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament to be submitted as recommendations to the General Assembly and, through it to the Committee on Disarmament.

The Commission was to function under the rules of procedure relating to the Committees of the General Assembly-with such modifications as the Commission may deem necessary. It shall make every effort to ensure that, in so far as possible decisions on substantive issues are adopted by consensus. The Commission was to make report annually to the General Assembly. It considered the subjects relating to nuclear arms race and nuclear Disarmament and the reduction of military budget. These were the main subjects of discussion in its working groups. The Commission's discussion on these and other matters during its four years existence were summarized and submitted to the General Assembly at its Second Special Session on Disarmament in 1982.

(2) Second Special Session on Disarmament-1982: Delegates of 157 Governments gathered at the United Nations on June 7, 1982, for a five week Special Session of the General Assembly to promote the goal of Disarmament, conscious of a threat from conventional weapons as also advanced new armaments employed in current conflicts. The Secretary General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, while opening the Special Session, said that the time had come for mankind to put an end to the madness and immorality of the arms race. However, the Committee of Disarmament had not succeeded in preparing drafts for the general and complete Disarmament, because its members did not agree on draft Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament, by the time 1982 Special Session of the Assembly began. All sides felt that report submitted by the Committee was limited in its scope and felt for short of the goals set for the five-week session. In its conclusions, the Assembly report noted that a Programme of Action agreed by the first Special Session on Disarmament in 1979 had remained largely unimplemented. The document stated that a number of important negotiations either had not begun or had been suspended, and efforts in the Committee on Disarmament and other forums had produced little tangible result.

The Special Session of 1982, therefore, also failed to reach agreement, and turned the draft programme back to the Committee on Disarmament for further work. Failure of the Second Special Session of Disarmament, and a particular, the failure to adopt a Comprehensive Programme of Disarmament has disappointed most of the countries. However, the Special Session agreed only on a concluding Document, which unanimously reaffirmed the validity of 1978. Final Document as well as the solemn commitment to it of all State Members of the United Nations.

(3) Third Special Session on Disarmament-1988: The Third Special Session on Disarmament was held in June 1988, where all member states participated in the work of the Session. This Session was to elaborate on the 1978 Final Document, developing a concrete programme of action covering issues ranging from nuclear and conventional Disarmament to verification and confidence building measures. It also was to review and appraise the present international situation in light of “the vital objective of terminating the arms race” and the need to achieve progress in the Disarmament field. After two weeks of deliberation, three working groups were set up to draft the final document. These groups did not come up with consensus agreement on texts they had worked on. This led to the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to prepare a paper summarizing the work of the three working groups, to serve as a basis for final informal talks.

The document’s five sections were: Introduction Assessment, Directions for the future, Machinery and Conclusions. “Part-III Directions for the future” was the most controversial. The points preventing consensus on a concluding document were the prevention of an arms race in outer space, the relationship between Disarmament and Development, nuclear weapon-free zones, zones of peace, and the acquisition of a nuclear-weapon capability by South Africa and by Israel. Consequently, the UN General Assembly’s Third Special Sessions on Disarmament ended in dramatic last-minute failure on June 26, 1988, with the United States being accused of

“wrecking” by obstructing a declaration outlining a new programme for global Disarmament. It failed to achieve consensus on a final set of recommendations contained in the concluding document setting out new aims and priorities in the field of Disarmament.

The Secretary-General of the United Nations expressed regret that the Third Special Session had not been able to reach agreement on a concluding statement. However, despite the absence of consensus, the Session was widely viewed as a success in the sense that the long negotiations signified the interest of States in Disarmament issues. And, the General Assembly is determined to make progress in the field of Disarmament in spite of limited success achieved in the three Special Sessions on Disarmament. On December 4, 1990, it adopted the 7-paragraph Declaration of the 1990’s as the Third Disarmament Decade. General Assembly in 2007 decided to include the provisional agenda of its 63rd Session the item entitled “Convening of the Fourth Session of the General Assembly devoted to Disarmament”.

2.4.8.4. Multilateral Treaties on Disarmament and Arms Limitation:

A number of multilateral treaties have been concluded on specific issues of Disarmament particularly on the prevention of the spread of nuclear weapons, suspension of nuclear weapon tests, prevention on the arms race on the sea-bed and prohibition of chemical and bacteriological weapons. They are as follows:-

(1) Partial Test-Ban Treaty-1963: In 1958, the Soviet Union, the USA and the UK agreed to appoint a group of experts, called the General Expert Conference on nuclear tests. After a protracted negotiations for over a four years, the Treaty banning the Nuclear-Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under water commonly known as Partial Test-Ban Treaty was signed at Moscow on August 5, 1963. The Treaty prohibited all nuclear explosions military or peaceful, in the atmosphere, outer-space and under-water. The Treaty banned all nuclear weapon tests except those held underground. Article 1, Para 1 of the Treaty provided that “Each of the Parties to this Treaty undertakes to prohibit, to prevent and not to carry out any nuclear weapon test explosions or any other nuclear explosions, at any place under its jurisdiction or control”. It did not reduce nuclear stockpiles. It imposed limitations on the development of new weapons of mass destruction. France and China refused to be the members to this Treaty stating their own reasons. These two countries were willing to sign the Test Ban Treaty only if the USA and the USSR were willing to destroy their nuclear stockpiles. Thus, the Treaty failed to bring the mad race for armament to a halt. The treaty was opened for signature on August 8, 1963 and came into force on October 10, 1963. As on December 31, 2007 it had 125 States Parties.

(2) Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) 1968: NPT opened for signature on July 1, 1968 and came into force on March 5, 1970. By the end of 2007, the Treaty had 189 States Parties. North Korea which accepted to the NPT in 1985 announced its withdrawal in 2003. Four UN member states have never joined the Treaty which is India, Israel, Pakistan and South Sudan.

The main purposes of the conclusion of NPT are: (i) the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; (ii) guarantees to ensure that the peaceful nuclear activities of Non-Nuclear-Weapon States are not diverted to producing nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices; (iii) promotion of the peaceful uses of nuclear energy; (iv) promotion of nuclear Disarmament; (v) maintenance of the right of states to establish nuclear-weapon-free-zones.

NPT has been criticized as it is an unequal and discriminatory treaty in the sense that there is a considerable asymmetry of the treaty rights and obligations of the Nuclear-Powers and the Non-Nuclear-Weapon States. The Treaty recognize-China, France, Russia, England and the United States as Nuclear-Weapon States. They may retain nuclear weapons for an unlimited period of time whereas the Non Nuclear Weapon states, which constitute an overwhelming majority of states, are prohibited from engaging in any nuclear-weapon related activity.

The treaty provides that Nuclear Powers will not transfer their nuclear weapons or control over them to any Non-nuclear Power. They were also not to provide any assistance to no-nuclear countries to produce such weapons. However, these powers could give their nuclear know-how to the non-nuclear states for the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. There was no provision in the Treaty for the control and inspection of nuclear establishments. India has not become a party to the Treaty despite that it is strongly in favour of non-proliferation of nuclear weapons.

(3) Biological Weapons Convention, 1972: An effort to check the use of bacteriological and chemical weapons was made in 1972 by signing the “Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapon and on their Destruction”. The Convention though signed on 10 April, 1972 came into force on March 26, 1975. The convention has 183 parties by the end of 2007. The signatory states agreed not to develop, produce, stockpile or otherwise acquire or retain microbial or other biological agents or toxin, weapons of means of delivery designed to use such agents or toxins for hostile purposes or in armed conflict. They were also not to encourage or assist any state or organization of states to manufacture or otherwise acquire any of the above agents, etc. If a signatory to the convention found the other signatory state violating the provisions of the convention, it could lodge a complaint with the Security Council. Thereafter, other members were obliged to cooperate with the Security Council in carrying out investigation. The states also agreed to continue negotiations to reach an early agreement on effective measures for the prohibition of their development, production and stockpiling. As provided in the Convention, a review conference is held in every five years after the Convention entered into force. The first was held in 1980. The sixth review conference was held in the year 2006.

(4) Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other Hostile use of Environmental Modification Techniques-1977 : The signatory states of this Convention, which was signed at Geneva in May 1977, agreed not to engage in military or other hostile use of environmental modification techniques. They were not to assist, encourage or induce any state or organization of states or international organization to engage in

activities opposed to the provisions of this Convention. They further agreed to work for and co-operate with each other for the preservation, improvement and peaceful utilization of the environment. The Convention came into force on October 5, 1978. As on December 31, 2000 the Convention had 66 States Parties.

(5) Inhumane Weapons Convention-1981: On April 10, 1981, the “Convention on Prohibition or Restrictions on the use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be excessively injurious or to have indiscriminate effects” was opened for signature. The instrument was a significant step forward in efforts by the international community to prohibit or at least restricts the use of specially cruel and inhumane Conventional Weapons. The Convention also prohibits in all circumstances the making of civilian population, as such the object of attack by incendiary weapons. It prohibits the employment of laser weapons which may cause permanent blindness to the naked eyes etc. It was a practical expression to the renewed commitment by member states to the objective outlined by the United Nations General Assembly in the Final Document of its Special Session devoted to Disarmament 1978.

(6) Convention on Chemical Weapons-1993: The Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction was signed on January 15, 1993 at Paris by 125 members of the United Nations including USA, Russia, China, France, India, Pakistan and Iraq. The Convention entered into force on April 29, 1997. As, in June 1993, the Convention had 182 States Parties. India ratified the Convention on September 3, 2006. Provisions of this treaty are that any state party undertakes that it never, under any circumstances, shall develop, produce or acquire, stockpile or retain chemical weapons, or transfer them, directly or indirectly, to anyone. Each State Party also undertakes never to use chemical weapons; never to engage in any military preparations to use chemical weapons; and never to assist, encourage or induce in any way, anyone to any activity prohibited under the Convention. However, the Treaty has been criticized on the ground that it is not global and it is not verifiable and, therefore, it will not work.

(7) Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT)-1996: With the strong support from the United Nations, negotiations for the Comprehensive Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) began at the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva in January 1994. The Final Draft, agreed upon by 127 states, was presented to the UN General Assembly on 10 September, 1996. The Treaty was opened for signature on 24 September 1996 at the UN Headquarters. The Preamble to the CTBT stresses the need for “Continued systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally” with the ultimate goal of their elimination and of “general and complete Disarmament under strict and effective international control”. It recognizes that “the cessation of all nuclear weapon test explosions and all other nuclear explosions....constitutes an effective measure of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation in all its aspects”. It was mentioned that to enter into force, the CTBT must be ratified by all forty-four countries that, in 1996, possessed nuclear research or power reactors. The status in 2010 was that forty-one of these forty-four countries have signed the treaty but only thirty-

one have ratified it. Non-signatories include India, Pakistan and North-Korea.

India criticized the CTBT that it was only an instrument to cap the nuclear programmes of the developing countries, while it would have practically no control over the nuclear activities of developed nations with sophisticated technologies. India also reservations about linking universal Disarmament with proliferation issues. Therefore, a CTBT would indulge in further discrimination between the Nuclear- Weapon-States and Non-weapon states. Considering all these and many more factors. India refused to sign the Treaty.

(8) Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction-1997 : The Convention commonly known as Anti-Personnel (Land) mines or Ottawa Convention, adopted on September 18, 1997 at Oslo, came into force on March 1, 1999. By the end of 2007, the convention had 156 States Parties. The Convention under Article 2, defines Anti-Personnel Mine as a mine designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a person and that will incapacitate, injure or kill one or more persons. The Convention provides that each state party undertakes never, under any circumstances : (a) to use anti-personnel mines; (b) to develop, produce, otherwise acquire, stockpile, retain or transfer to anyone, directly or indirectly, anti-personnel mines; (c) to assist, encourage or induce, in any way, anyone to engage in any activity prohibited to a State Party under this convention. Each State Party undertakes to destroy or ensure the destruction of all anti-personnel mines in accordance with the provisions of this Convention.

2.4.8.5. Bilateral Treaties on Disarmament:

It is significant to note that a number of bilateral agreements relating to the prevention of nuclear war, arms regulations and Disarmament, have been concluded between the former Soviet Union and United States which includes the following:

(1) Memorandum of Understanding-1963: In 1963, a Memorandum of understanding (MOU) was signed which established for use in time of emergency, a direct communication between Moscow and Washington, known as the 'hot-line'.

(2) Agreement on the Prevention of Incidents on and over the High Seas - 1972: In order to reduce peace-time naval tensions between the Soviet Union and United States, an agreement was concluded which provided for measures to ensure the safety of navigation of ships of their armed forces on the High Seas and the flight of their military aircraft over the High Seas.

(3) Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile System (ABM Treaty)-1972 : ABM Treaty, negotiated in the first stage (1969-72) of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT-I) commits the Soviet Union and the United States not to develop, test or deploy ABM systems or components which are sea-based, air based, space-based or mobile land-based. They have agreed to limit ABM systems or their components to two sites in each country, with no more than 100 launchers per site. In 1974, the two parties signed a Protocol that limits each side to one ABM deployment area only.

The United States plan to deploy a national missile defensive system led to discussion in 1999 as to the validity of the ABM Treaty. It was feared that if the United States were to proceed with the plan, it would constitute a breach of the ABM Treaty and trigger a new arms race.

(4) Threshold Test-Ban Treaty-1974: The United States and the USSR signed the Threshold Test-Ban Treaty in July 1974, wherein the two countries undertook not to carry out, beginning March 31, 1976, and any underground nuclear-weapon test having a yield in excess of 15 kilotons and to conduct all permitted tests solely within specified testing areas. Each party would use the national technical means of verification at its disposal and was under obligation not to interfere with the means of verification of the other party. The parties also agreed to exchange information's necessary to improve the assessment of the yields of explorations. The Threshold Treaty does not, however, cover underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The Treaty entered into force on December 11, 1990, following further negotiations and agreement on a Protocol dealing with verification arrangements for the Treaty.

(5) Peaceful Nuclear Explosions Treaty-1976: The treaty was signed by the USSR and the United States on March 28, 1976, which regulates the underground Nuclear Explosions for Peaceful Purposes, which may be carried out by the Soviet Union and the United States outside their nuclear-weapon test sites, and which may, therefore, be presumed to be for peaceful purposes. This Treaty bans underground nuclear test for peaceful purposes with yield of more than 150 kilotons by either the USA or the USSR. The Treaty entered into force on December 11, 1990 after completing the verification Protocol.

(6) Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty-1979 (SALT-II): Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty of 1972 signed by the USA and USSR lapsed in October, 1977. Both the Powers continued to observe its provisions and continued efforts for a new agreement. After prolonged negotiations they signed at Vienna on June 1, 1979, the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty, 1979 to limit the Strategic Offensive Weapons for a period up to December 31, 1985. While concluding this treaty both the Powers reaffirmed their desire to take further measures for further limitations and reduction of strategic arms with a view to achieve general and complete Disarmament. The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan jeopardized the ratification of SALT-II. And therefore, the Treaty did not enter into force, but each Party unilaterally declared its intention to adhere to the provisions as long as the other does likewise. However, the USA continued to adhere to it till May, 1986.

(7) Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Short Range Missiles (Intermediate Nuclear Force (INF Treaty-1987): In December 1987, U.S. President Reagan and USSR President Gorbachev met at Washington and signed INF Treaty. This Treaty provided for the elimination of land-based missiles having a range of 500 kms to 5000 kms and the launchers on which these missiles were mounted, within three years. The Treaty also provided for the elimination of the short-range missiles within next 18 months. The two parties also agreed to inform each other of the type of missiles and place where they were being destroyed.

The Treaty became the first International Agreement for reducing the deployment of existing nuclear weapons and hence marked the first step towards the denuclearization of the world. Most of the countries of the world welcomed it, including NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, the Indian Parliament passed a resolution greeting the Treaty.

(8) Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START-I) (1991) : United States and the USSR in 1988 negotiated for the conclusion for START-I Treaty by which they would cut fifty percent in Air Launched Nuclear Armed Cruise Missiles, the worst dangerous nuclear arsenals of long range missiles. However, at that time the Treaty could not be concluded mainly because both the States differed on issue of Sea Launched Cruise Missile. Later, in July 1991, START was signed at Moscow. The START was the first to reduce, rather than limit, long-range nuclear weapons arsenals. The Treaty also provided for complex verification procedure, including on-site inspections, short notice inspections and suspect site inspections. The two sides will set up a Joint Commission on verification and inspection.

US President Bush and Russian President Gorbachev signed the Treaty on July 31, 1991 and entered into force on December 5, 1994. The Treaty was valid for 15 years, unless superseded earlier by a subsequent agreement. The START Treaty expired in December 2009. It was replaced by a new START treaty which was signed on April 8, 2010 in Prague. It entered into force on January 26, 2011 after ratification by the U.S. Senate and the Federal Assembly of Russia.

(9) Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START-II) 1993: To bring about further reduction in strategic nuclear weapons, the START-II was signed on January 3, 1993 in Kremlin between USA and Russia by American President Bush and the Russian President Boris Yeltsin. It has been ratified by United States in 1996 and by Russian Federation in 2000. This was the Fourth Major arms control agreement in the Post-Cold War era. START-II was a great improvement in terms of Disarmament over START-I. START-II sought to bring down the US nuclear stockpiles of 1960s level and Russian nuclear stockpiles to the mid-1970s levels. Some main provisions of the Treaty were: (1) it agreed for two-thirds reduction in Nuclear Strategic Missiles-ICBMs and SLBMs (Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles, and Submarine-based ballistic missiles) as well as heavy bombers by January 1, 2003. It meant that for the USA and the Russia, the total such strategic weapons would be just 3500 units each. (2) Elimination ICBMs with Independently Targeted Fractional Warheads. (3) Total number of nuclear warheads were limited on submarine missiles to 1,750 units, on heavy bombers to 1,250 units and on ICBMs to 1,200 units each side. Thus START-II was designed as a big effort in the direction of Disarmament. (4) Limits were put on nuclear warheads with which heavy bombers of the sides can be equipped. The Limit varies from 750 to 1250 units of nuclear warheads of any type. The only major problem was the delay in implementation as it failed to get operational before 2003.

(10) Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reduction (TSOR)-2002: In May 2002, the US and Russian Federation signed the Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reduction in Moscow. It is known as Moscow Treaty also. It was signed to slash their long-range nuclear warheads by two-thirds within 10

years. They will slash their arsenals to 1700 and 2000 from 6000, each side. However, till now, there is very slow progress with regard to the reduction of strategic weapons as desired in TSOR.

Thus, in the era of globalization, there is remarkable progress towards Disarmament of nuclear and non-nuclear weapons amongst the old rivals the US and Russia who have the maximum stockpile of such weapons. Their traditional hostility on ideological basis has ended, making the circumstances conducive for Disarmament of nuclear weapons. However, we also observe a new wave of nuclear proliferation by new powers such as India, Pakistan, North Korea, Israel, South Africa, Libya, Iran and so on, as they have developed or acquired nuclear weapons of mass destruction.

2.4.8.6. Disarmament in Specific Zones and Areas:

During the last six decades, a few treaties have been concluded which demilitarized the Specific Zones and Areas. Since demilitarization is limited only to the deployment, testing and using of nuclear weapons either in Specific Zones or Areas, these areas may be termed as Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zones. The idea of establishing Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zones began to attract the attention of the International Community in the 1950s as a means of limiting the areas where nuclear weapons could neither be deployed, tested nor used.

The first formal proposal to this effect was made by Poland, who's **Racki Plan** of 1957 called for the permanent absence of nuclear weapons from the territories of several States in Central Europe. Various proposals on the establishment of Nuclear-Weapon-Free-Zones have been made since that time. Following are the Treaties which make certain areas Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone which are as follows:

1. Antarctica Treaty-1959: Antarctica Treaty was convened on December 1, 1959 at Washington. The Treaty prohibited in Antarctica any measures of a military nature, such as the establishment of military bases and fortifications, the conducting of military maneuvers and the testing of any type of weapon (except for any peaceful purpose). Nuclear explosions and the disposal of radioactive waste material are also prohibited. The Treaty further provides that if, in the future, all consultative parties to the Antarctic Treaty become parties to international agreements on the use of nuclear energy including nuclear explosions and the disposal of radioactive waste, the rules established by those agreements will be followed in Antarctica. The Treaty entered into force on June 23, 1961.

2. Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America-1967: The Treaty was signed on February 4, 1967 at Tlatelolco (Mexico), by Mexico and El-Salavador and endorsed by the UN General Assembly in the same year. The Treaty prohibits (a) the testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition by any means by the parties themselves directly or indirectly and (b) the receipt, storage, installation, deployment and any form of possession of any nuclear weapons, directly or indirectly, by the parties themselves in Latin America. It also stipulates that safeguards be applied by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) to the nuclear activities of the parties. However, it does not prohibit nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. The Treaty was indeed significant in so far as it created the first Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in a densely populated area

and was the first area control agreement whose implementation was certified by the International Organization.

3. Outer-Space Treaty-1967 : Treaty on Principles Governing the Activities of States in the Exploration and use of Outer-Space including the Moon and other Celestial Bodies, was concluded between the USA, the USSR and UK on January 27, 1967. This Treaty prohibited nuclear weapons and their landing on the moon and other celestial bodies for military bases. The signatory countries agreed not to place in orbit around the earth any objects carrying personnel for scientific research of peaceful nature. As on December 31, 2000, the Treaty had 97 parties.

4. Sea-Bed Treaty-1971: The Treaty on the Prohibition of the Emplacement of Nuclear Weapons and other Weapons of Mass Destruction on Sea-Bed and the Ocean Floor and in the subsoil thereof. USA, UK and Soviet Union concluded this Treaty on February 11, 1971 and entered into force on May 18, 1972. As on December 31, 2000, the Treaty had 92 States Parties. Under Article-I, all the parties to the Treaty undertake not to implant or emplace on the sea-bed and the ocean floor any nuclear weapons or any other types of weapons of mass destruction as well as structure, launching, installations or any other facilities designed for storing, testing or using such weapons. The Treaty also provides that each state parties "shall have the right to verify, through observation, the activities of other States Parties provided that observation does not interfere with those activities" which infringes their rights recognized under International Law including the freedom on high seas.

5. South Pacific Nuclear Free-Zone Treaty-1985: The Treaty was opened for signatures on August 6, 1985. The Treaty entered into force on December 11, 1986. As on December 31, 2007 the Treaty had 17 States Parties. The Treaty established a large Nuclear-Free zone in the South Pacific, stretching from the West of Australia to the boundary of the Latin American Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the South Pacific, stretching from the equator to the boundary of the demilitarized zone of Antarctica to the South. The Treaty prohibits its parties from manufacturing, acquiring, possessing or controlling any nuclear device inside or outside the zone. It also forbids them to carry out nuclear testing and commits them to refrain from and prevent the dumping of radioactive waste.

6. Moon Agreement-1979: Agreement Governing the Activities of States on the Moon and the other Celestial Bodies was concludes on December 5, 1979. It was adopted through a resolution of the General Assembly of United Nations. The Agreement entered into force on July 11, 1984. By the end of December 2000, the Agreement had 98 States Parties.

The Agreement expressly lays down that "the moon is not subject to national appropriation by any claim of Sovereignty, by means of use or occupation, or by any other means". The moon and its natural resources are the common heritage of mankind. Moreover, "the provisions of the Agreement relating to the moon shall also apply to other Celestial Bodies within the solar system, other than the earth".

7. The African Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone Treaty-1995: The draft of the Treaty was finalized under the auspices of the United Nations on June 2, 1995. It was signed in Pelindaba (South-Africa) in 1996. It is also known

as the "Treaty of Pelindaba". It was approved by the Organization of African Unity (OAU) in its Ordinary Session held from June 26 to 28, 1995. The Treaty came into force on July 15, 2009, when it was ratified by 28 States.

The Treaty provides that "parties to the Treaty shall not conduct research on, develop, manufacture, stockpile or otherwise acquire, possess to have control over any nuclear explosive device by any means anywhere". The Treaty further provides that "each party undertakes not to seek or receive any assistance in the research on, development, manufacture, stockpiling or acquisition, or possession of any nuclear explosive device. The Treaty also lays down that each party undertakes to prohibit, in its territory, the stationing of any nuclear explosive device and they neither test any nuclear device nor assist nor encourage the testing thereof by any state in their territory".

8. Bangkok Treaty-1995: On December 15, 1995 a Treaty on the South-East Asia Nuclear Weapon-Free Zone was signed by the ASEAN member States. It came into force on March 27, 1997. As on December 31, 2007, the Treaty had 10 States Parties. Parties to the Treaty have committed themselves not to acquire, develop, test, use or allow the stationing of Nuclear Weapons within the zone and the dumping of radioactive waste.

9. The Treaty on a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in Central Asia (Semipalatinsk Treaty)-2006: The Treaty opened for signature at Semipalatinsk (Kazakhstan) on September 8, 2006. All the Central Asian States, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan signed the Treaty. The Treaty was entered into force on March 21, 2009. The Treaty was ratified by all the five States Parties.

10. UN General Assembly Resolutions on Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zones: In addition to the above regional Treaties, the UN General Assembly has adopted many resolutions on the establishment of a Nuclear-Weapon-Free Zone in the Region of Middle East, but such a Treaty has not been concluded as yet.

2.4.9. Summary

The Post-Cold War period and the era of globalization ended the hostility and distrust among the major powers and the ideological hostility has ended. There are still several hindrances in the way of Disarmament, Arms Control and a Nuclear Weapon-Free World. But, the winds of change since 1990, and successful signing of several treaties for Disarmament and Arms Control, have given great hope to the people of the world that one day good sense will prevail, and big powers and Nuclear-Weapon-Capable countries will destroy the existing nuclear weapons, other weapons of mass destruction and biological and chemical weapons. The arms that are instrumental for killing are used for business by many countries. In the world, 90 per cent of conventional arms exports are from the five permanent members of the Security Council, namely the USA, the UK, the France, the Russia and the China. Most of these arms are imported by the poor and underdeveloped countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. In the recent times, there is a strong world public opinion against nuclear weapons. This phase has also ironically witnessed the proliferation of nuclear weapons in some new powers such as India, Pakistan, North Korea, Israel, and South

Africa and may be Iran. These are negative developments in the way of Disarmament and Arms Control. Therefore, in such a scenario, it is high time to think of Disarmament and Arms Control in a real sense of and divert a large part of the world weapons budget for poverty alleviation and developmental programmes.

2.4.10. Keywords

Arms reduction
Arms limitation
Gulf war
Covenant
PTBT
Biological weapons
Conventional weapons
Nuclear weapon free Zones

2.4.11. Short Answer type Questions

1. What is the difference between disarmament and arms control?
2. Write a short note on NPT.
3. What do you know about START II?

2.4.12. Long answer type questions

1. Explain in detail, the main hindrances in the way to Disarmament and Arms Control?
2. Write a historical note on the efforts towards Disarmament since 1980.
3. Write a detailed note on the history of disarmament under the United Nations.

2.4.13. Suggested Reading

1. David A. Cooper. : Arms Control For The Third Nuclear Age, 2021
2. Mariana Budjeryn : Inheriting the bomb, 2022.
3. John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens The Globalization of World Politics, 2014.
4. Tapan Biswal : International Relations, 2009
5. Mahindra Kumar : Critical aspects of International Politics.

NEW INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER

- 2.5.1. Introduction
- 2.5.2. Objectives
- 2.5.3. What is New International Economic Order (NIEO?)
- 2.5.4. Self-check Exercise
- 2.5.5. United Nations and New International Economic Order
- 2.5.6. North-South Conflict over New International Economic Order (NIEO)
- 2.5.7. South-South Co-operation: Progress and Prospects
- 2.5.8. Summary
- 2.5.9. Key Words
- 2.5.10. Short Answer type Questions
- 2.5.11. Long Answer type Questions.
- 2.5.12. Suggested Readings.

2.5.1. Introduction

After the end of Imperialism and Colonialism, newly independent and developing countries have been making frantic efforts for economic independence and economic development. The Third World nations considered the existing economic structure as one that was against their interests and a reason of being their backward position. Thus, the end of colonialism from their viewpoint merely brought another era of more covert, clever and dangerous exploitation. The Third World regards the restructuring of the existing International Economic Order as the only way to get out of its present problems of poverty, scarcity, economic problems, imbalances and under-development. Therefore, for their economic independence and emancipation, in the decade of 70's countries of the Third World made persistent demand for the establishment of **New International Economic Order** (NIEO). The Third World comprises about three-fourth of the world's population, but it accounts for only about one-fifth of the world's combined gross national product. Furthermore, the gap between the world's rich and the poor have grown, and the inequalities are projected to expand further in future.

2.5.2. Objectives

- After reading this lesson, students will be able to answer the meaning of International Economic Order.
- They will also understand evolution of New International Economic Order.
- Students will also have the clarity about the politics of this order, North Vs South and the need for south- South Co-operation.

2.3.3 What is New International Economic Order (NIEO)

The emergence of a strong demand for a New International Economic Order has been largely due to the sharp and big changes in the international system of the post-war period. The process of decolonisation has coincided at a point in time, with the establishment of the Bretton Wood's under the overall leadership of the USA and UK. This new system did not address itself to the problems economic recovery of the newly independent states. Because, these countries neither system, which aimed at the European Recovery Programme to rebuild the war shattered economies had any place nor role in the Bretton Wood's system, nor could they expect any real help for their national development within its overall framework. On the country, the system tended to perpetuate the essentials of the colonial nexus in the relations between the former metropolis and newly indepent countries. It proved to be a new order only for the countries with developed market economy. In consequence, its transformation into economic order became the goal for the struggle of the developing countries against colonialism, neo-cological exploitation and the structures of economic dominance.

Therefore, the weakened position of Europe, the rise of two super powers, the emergence of cold war, the rise of strong anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist movements, the emergence of a rapid process of decolonisation etc, were responsible for changing fast, the political map of the world and the contents of relations among nations. The demand for the establishment of a New International Economic Order was raised in the 1970's. Due to the efforts of the Non-aligned countries, the UN General Assembly's special session passed the declaration and programme of action on the establishment of a "New International Economic Order" in 1974. After that, the Developing Countries demanded in concrete terms, through NIEO, A non-discriminatory and preferential treatment for their manufactured goods in the markets of industrial countries, more stable and higher prices for their commodities, renegotiation of their external public debt, codes of conduct for activities of the multinational corporations, more transfer of useful technology to the less developed countries and a greater voice in the management of the world's monetary system.

2. 5.4. Self Check Exercise

Self Check Exercise	
1.	What was Breton Woods system?
2.	What is new International Economic order?
3.	What are the main objectives of International Economic Order?

2. 5.5. United Nations and New International Economic Order

2. 5.5.1. Adoption of the International Development Strategy.

The United Nations' General Assembly had declared the period from 1 January 1971 to 31 December 1981 as the Second United Nations

Development Decade, and adopted an International Development Strategy for this decade. Later on, the General Assembly resolution regarding the establishment of NIEO, adopted by its Sixth Special Session, specifically recommended this International Development Strategy for the realization of the NIEO. The IDS aimed at a 6 percent average annual rate of growth in the GDP of the fewer developing countries during this decade with the possibility of attaining a higher rate in the second half of the decade.

2. 5.5.2. Sixth Special Session of the UN General Assembly—1974.

The UN General Assembly, at its Sixth Special Session in 1974, declared its determination to establish a New International Economic Order (NIEO) in the following words:

“We, the Members of the United Nations... solemnly proclaim our united determination to work urgently for the establishment of a New International Economic Order based on equity, sovereign equality, interdependence, common interest and cooperation among all states, irrespective of their economic and social systems, which shall correct inequalities and redress existing injustices, make it possible to eliminate the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries and ensure steadily accelerating economic and social development and peace and justice for present and future generations”. The Declaration adopted by the Sixth Special Session of the UN General Assembly included the following principles:

(a). The broadest co-operation of all the States members of the international community, based on equality, whereby the prevailing disparities in the world may be banished and prosperity secured for all;

(b). Full and effective participation on the basis of all countries in the solving of world economic problems in the common interest of all countries, bearing in mind the necessity to ensure the accelerated development of all the developing countries;

(c). Full permanent sovereignty of every state over its natural resources and all other resources and all economic activities including the right to nationalize or transfer its ownership to its nationals.

(d). Right of all states and peoples to restitution and full compensation for the exploration and depletion of and damages to the natural resources and all other resources under foreign occupation or alien or colonial domination or apartheid;

(e). Regulation and supervision of the activities of transnational corporations by taking measures in the interest of the national economies of the countries where such transnational corporations operate on the basis of the full sovereignty of those countries;

(f). Just and equitable relationship between the prices of raw materials, primary products and manufactured and semi-manufactured goods exported by developed countries;

(g). Extension of active assistance to developing countries by the whole international community, free of any political or military strings or conditions and the adequate flow of real resources to them;

(h). Securing favourable conditions for the transfer of financial resources to developing countries;

(l). Transfer of science and technology to developing countries and improvement of their indigenous technology;

(j). The need for all states to put an end to the waste of natural resources;

(k). Facilitating the role of producer's associations in the promotion of sustained growth of the world economy and accelerating the development of developing countries.

2. 5.5.3. Programme of Action for the Establishment of NIEO.

By another resolution the General Assembly adopted, at the same session, a Programme of Action for the establishment of the NIEO. The strategies to establish the new economic order were mentioned in detail in the Action Programme which included the following broad items:

1. Fundamental problems of raw materials and primary commodities as related to trade and development.
2. International monetary system and financing of the development of developing countries.
3. Industrialization.
4. Transfer of technology.
5. Regulation and control over the activities of transnational corporations.
6. Charter of economic rights and duties of states.
7. Promotion of cooperation among developing countries.
8. Assistance in the exercise of permanent sovereignty of states over natural resources.
9. Strengthening the role of the United Nations system in the field of international economic cooperation.
10. Special programme for the most seriously affected developing nations.

The Chapter of Economic Rights and Duties, as mentioned above, in item VI of the Programme of Action, was adopted by the UN General Assembly at its Twenty-ninth Session in 1975. This Chapter provided, inter alia, for : full sovereignty of states over their natural resources; control over multy-national corporations (MNCs); nationalization of foreign investment; sharing of common natural resources; right of primary commodity producers to organize their own associations; right to sub regional, regional and international cooperation; equitable terms of trade; duty of the Developed Countries to transfer technology to the Less Developed Countries; remunerative prices for the primary products of the Less Developed Countries; transfer of resources from the Developed Countries to the Less Developed Countries through disarmament; extension of generalized, non-reciprocal and non-discriminatory tariff preferences by the Developed Countries to the Less Developed Countries; expansion of trade by the less developed countries with the socialist countries; promotion of their mutual trade by the less developed countries; increased net flow of financial as well as real resources from the developed countries to the less developed countries; assistance from the Developed Countries for resource mobilization by the Less Developed Courtiers; treating the seabed, the ocean floor and the subsoil thereof as the common property of all states; full and effective participation of all states in the international decision-making

process for the solution of world economic, financial and monetary problems.

Article 8 of the Charter of Economic and Rights and Duties expressly stated that “States should cooperate in facilitating more rational and equitable international economic relations and in encouraging structural changes in the context of a balanced world economy in harmony with the needs and interests of all countries, especially developing countries , and should take appropriate measures to this end .”

Fundamental Principles of Economic Charter: The economic as well as political and other relations among states shall be governed by the principles of:

- (i). Sovereign territorial integrity and political independence of states;
- (ii). Sovereign equality of all states;
- (iii). Non-aggression;
- (iv). Non-intervention;
- (v). Mutual and equal benefit;
- (vi). Peaceful co-existence;
- (vii). Equal rights and self-determination of people;
- (viii) Peaceful settlement of disputes;
- (ix). Remedying of injustices which have brought about by force and which deprive a nation of natural means necessary for its normal development;
- (x). Fulfillment in good faith of international obligation;
- (xi). Respect of human rights and fundamental freedoms;
- (xii). Non-attempt to seek hegemony and spheres of influence;
- (xiii). Promotion of international social justice;
- (xiv). International cooperation for development; and
- (xv). Free access to and from sea by land-locked countries within the framework of above principles.

2.5.5.4. Seventh Special Session of the UN General Assembly—1975. UN General Assembly Seventh Special Session on Development and International Economic Co-operation on September 16, 1975 served as a turning point in the North-South relations because of the realism displayed by both the Third World and the West in their negotiations.

The Provisions of the 1975 Resolution. The basic provisions of the resolution read:

- (i) The expansion and diversification of trade improvement of productivity, and increasing the export earnings of the developing countries in order to eliminate the economic imbalance between developed and developing countries.
- (ii) Securing stable, remunerative and equitable prices for commodities of export interest to developing countries and promoting equilibrium between supply and demand.
- (iii) Developed countries should take effective steps within the framework of multilateral trade negotiations for the reduction or removal of tariff and non-tariff barriers affecting the exports of the developing countries.
- (iv) Developed countries confirm their continued commitment in respect of the targets relating to the transfer of resources , in

particular the official development assistance target of 0.7 percent of gross national product, as agreed in the International Development Strategy for the Second United Nations Development Decade (1971-1980). And, adopt as their common aim, an effective increase in official development assistance with a view to achieving these targets by the end of the decade.

- (v) The burden of the debt on developing countries is increasing to a point where the import capacity as well as reserves have come under serious strain. At its fourth session the UNCTAD should devise ways and means to mitigate this burden, taking into account the development needs of developing countries, with special attention to the plight of the most seriously affected countries.
- (vi) Developing countries should be granted increased access on favorable terms to the capital markets of the developed countries.
- (vii) The participation of developing countries in the decision-making process in the competent organs of international finance and development institutions should be adequately increased and made more effective.
- (viii) Developed and developing countries should co-operate in the establishment, strengthening and development of the scientific and technological infrastructure of developing countries. Developed countries should significantly expand their assistance to developing countries for direct support to their science and technology programmes.
- (ix) Developed countries should facilitate the process of industrialization in the developing world. In this context, UNIDO should serve as a forum for negotiation of agreements in the field of industry between developed and developing countries.
- (x) To sort out the world food problems, it is essential that developed countries should substantially increase the volume of assistance to developing countries for agriculture and food production, and that developed countries should effectively facilitate access to their markets for food and agricultural products to developing countries.

Non-alignment understood only as a rejection of military alliances and bloc politics by the newly independent countries is usually described as a product of the cold war. Response to the cold war constituted a very important dimension of non-alignment. But, there were other equally important dimensions of non-alignment. These were: anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism in all its manifestations; independence and equality; peace, cooperation, and prosperity. **Therefore, the principal motivation and goal of non-alignment was the creation of a new world order based on rational, democratic, equitable, and non-exploitative inter-state relations.**

The non-aligned countries rejected the cold war and military alliances to protect their newly acquired independence and sovereignty and to preserve much-needed in a war torn world. It is significant that the Non-aligned Movement acquired a definitive form and content only in 1961. The

Movement grew in size and strength as the tensions of the cold war tended to yield to a *detente* in East-West relations and the process of decolonization further consolidated itself.

Thus, Non-alignment has a much wider canvas and a broader thrust than it might have had if it had been no more than a response to the cold war. Defining its broad thrust, the Declaration of the first non-aligned summit held in Belgrade (Yugoslavia) in September 1961, said : the Movement has noted that “ **there are crises that lead towards a world conflict in the transition from an old order based on cooperation between nations founded on freedom , equality, and social justice for the promotion of prosperity.**”

Thus, the task of reordering international economic relations on the basis of the principles of democratic interaction and social justice became an inherent part of non-alignment . They were also an essential component of the process of true and complete decolonization ; for, in the absence of economic emancipation , political independence and sovereignty were bound to suffer erosion. The urge for economic emancipation and democratization of international economic relations also lies at the heart of the demand for the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO). The call for an NIEO was a call for a restructuring of international economic relations on the basis of “equality, interdependence , common interests and co-operation among all states irrespective of their economic and social system .”

The broad thrust of the struggle for an NIEO and the Non-aligned Movement is that there are generic linkages between them. The struggle for an NIEO is inherent in the wider struggle of Non-alignment for the elimination of colonialism-imperialism and neo-colonialism in all their manifestations. In theory and practice NAM and the struggle for an NIEO are complementary to each other. Although the non -aligned countries showed an awareness of the importance of economic issues during the 1950s, the generic linkages between the NAM and the struggle for an NIEO did not come into sharp focus. This was due largely to the fact that at this stage non-alignment remained preoccupied with the political aspects of decolonization and preservation of peace, independence and national sovereignty. World politics this time was dominated by the strategic security paradigm. Therefore, the economic issues remained by and large in the background of international politics during the 1950s.

In the 1960s the link between NAM and the struggle for NIEO became more apparent; for the non-aligned countries succeeded not only in identifying and articulating the important elements of the NIEO they were seeking to build but also in taking some steps with a view to their realization. The first non-aligned summit in Belgrade in September 1961 called for efforts to remove “economic imbalances inherited from colonialism and imperialism.” It felt that such efforts were “necessary to close , through accelerated economic, industrial, and agricultural development, the ever widening gap in the standards of living between the economically advanced countries and the many economically less developed countries.” Most importantly the Belgrade summit decided to convene an international conference “to discuss and agree upon the most effective measures” to

remove the hindrances in their way to economic and social development. Such a conference met in Cairo in July 1962. After this conference the Third World launched concerted efforts in the United Nations which led eventually to the establishment of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). Consequently, the UNCTAD held its first meeting in Geneva from 23 March to 16 June 1964.

The second non aligned summit held in Cairo (Egypt) in October 1964, imparted a fresh thrust to the conclusions reached by UNCTAD-I. The Declaration of the Cairo summit assigned a full section to the subject of economic development and co-operation. It explicitly urged "...all the countries to contribute to the rapid evolution of a *new and just economic order* under which all nations can live without fear or want or despair and rise to their full stature in international community of nations, because the structure of world economy and the existing international institutions of international trade and development have failed either to reduce the disparity...or to rectify serious and growing imbalances between developed and developing countries." Thus, the basic elements of the UN resolution of May 1, 1974 on an NIEO had already been identified and even articulated in Cairo.

The evolution of interaction during the 1960s and even later between the non-aligned conferences and the sessions of the UNCTAD made it clear that the NAM functioned as a motivating force and as a catalyst in gearing the Third World towards an NIEO.

The decade of the 1970s began against the background of the failure and disappointments of the 1960s. The mood of the non-aligned at this stage was characterized by a determination for assertive action and even by certain militancy for the establishment of an NIEO.

The third Non-aligned summit held in September 1970 in Lusaka (Zambia) was a land mark in this respect: it set the tone and drew a blueprint for assertive action by the Non-aligned countries for the establishment of NIEO. It brought the economic component of the Movement into full focus. It adopted a separate, full-length Declaration of Non-alignment and Economic Progress in which it laid down specific guidelines for policies and action programmes. The Lusaka Summit Conference reviewed the lack of progress in the implementation of the global economic policies and objectives of the non-aligned countries by the international community. It observed that the rapidly widening gulf between the developing and the developed states constituted a threat to international peace and security. The Summit also declared that "the poverty of developing nations and their economic dependence on those affluent circumstances constitute a structural weakness in present world economic order." It stressed the urgent need for preventing "technological colonialism." It urged the United Nations "to employ international machinery to bring about a rapid transformation of the world economic system, particularly in the field of trade, finance and technology, so that economic domination yields to economic cooperation and economic strength is used for the benefit of the world of community."

The Algiers (Algeria) Summit Conference of 1973 continued the demand for economic emancipation of the third world countries. It was

again the emerging economic dimension of the collective Non-aligned Movement which added a special significance to the Algiers conference. There was a general condemnation of “the neo-colonialist exploitation of developing countries.” The “creation of zones of peace and cooperation in the various regions of the world on the basis of the principles of the UN Charter” was recommended. The participant countries took note of the deteriorating condition of the developing countries vis-a-vis the developed ones “in the international context since the Lusaka conference, with special reference to the United Nations International Strategy, UNCTAD-III, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, preparations for multilateral trade negotiations, reform of the monetary system, and the important Conference of Foreign Ministers of non-aligned countries in Georgetown(Guyana),”

The Conference requested the United Nations to adopt a “charter of economic rights and duties of the states” at the 28th session of the General Assembly on the priority basis. It pleaded for greater cooperation between the developing and the developed states in the economic and the technological spheres, but declared the sovereign rights of the developing countries over all their natural resources.

The Fifth Conference of Heads of State or Government of Non-aligned countries were held in Colombo (Sri Lanka), August 16-19, 1976. The most significant feature of the Colombo Conference was the developing trend of the preoccupation of nonaligned states with international economic issues. The Economic Declaration stated that the widening gap between the developed and the developing countries was “**one of the most threatening sources of tensions and conflicts,**” and that “**the existing system cannot ensure the promotion of the development of the developing countries and hasten the eradication of poverty, hunger, sickness, illiteracy and also the social scourges engendered by centuries of domination and exploitation.**”

The Conference explained in details the economic inequalities and injustices perpetrated by the richer nations on the poorer ones. It further declared that “**nothing short of a complete restructuring of international economic relations through the establishment of the NIEO will place developing countries in a position to achieve an acceptable level of development.**” The NIEO must include (a) fundamental restructuring of international trade, with special reference to the terms of trade; (b) fundamental restructuring of world production on the basis of a new international division of labour; (c) radical overhauling of the existing international monetary arrangements; (d) adequate transfer of resources “on an assured, continuous and predictable basis”; (e) **urgent** and adequate solution to the problem of external debt, particularly of the “least developed and the most seriously affected nations”; (f) financial and technological assistance to the developing nations for the development of their agriculture; and (g) free access to sea for land-locked countries.” The Conference welcomed the “exemplary unity” of the Non-aligned states at the UNCTAD-IV and in the General Assembly of the United Nations with regard to the global economic issues.

The Conference also adopted a detailed and itemized Action Programmed for Economic Cooperation among the non-aligned states themselves as well as with other developing states.

The sixth NAM Summit Conference was held in Havana (Cuba) from September 3-7, 1979. The Havana Declaration stated: "...the establishment of the NIEO is one of the most important and the most urgent tasks facing the NAM and that democratization of international economic relations constitutes its political substance..." Therefore, the economic part of the Conference overshadowed its political part. In its Economic Declaration and the Economic Resolutions the Conference was seriously concerned with the problems of the iniquitous economic structure of the contemporary international system; with the inadequacy of the International Development Strategy of the UN and the feeble response of the Developed Countries to it; with the delay in the establishment of the NIEO and the obstructive tactics on the part of the Developed Countries and the Developing Countries. The Havana Conference dealt with each of these issues at greater length than any earlier conference. Like the Colombo Conference, the Havana Conference adopted a detailed Action Programmed for Economic Cooperation among the Non-aligned countries, and reiterated the need for collective self-reliance among the Developing Countries.

Thus, the economic crises of the 1970s compelled the non-aligned countries to take upon themselves the responsibility of solving the problems involved in the establishment of a NIEO. This was reflected in the resolutions on the economic situation passed at the Algeria, Colombo, and Havana summits. What was in forefront of demands, especially since the Colombo summit was the strong desire for the establishment of an n NIEO.

Except the above discussed NAM Summits some other meetings and conferences were held on the initiatives of non-aligned countries in the intervening decade. These were the Algiers Charter (1967), the Second UNCTAD Resolution and Declaration (New Delhi, 1968), the Group of 77 Ministerial Conference(1971), the Third UNCTAD Resolution at Santiago (Chile, 1972), the Declaration and Action Programme for Economic Co-operation of the Georgetown Non-aligned Foreign Ministers Conference (1972), Conference of the Foreign Ministers of Non-aligned nations (Lima,1975), were all documents adopted on the initiative and under the predominant influence of the non-aligned countries and documents giving definition in increasing number and with more and more clarity of the elements of the NIEO. Thus, the demand for the establishment of NIEO till now remains a crucial issue for the NAM countries.

But, after a long period in the 1990's drastic changes took place in the political and economic arena. The process of globalization, liberalization and privatization were introduced as new methods for regularization of the world economy and economic relations among various states at the international level. But the gap between the haves and have not nations in the economic sphere continues.

2.5.6 North-South Conflict over New International Economic Order (NIEO)

Here, **the North** refers to the developed countries like the USA, Canada, Japan, Australia , New Zealand and the countries of eastern

Europe and **the South** refers to the developing countries of the Third World which number about 160. Geographically the developed countries, with the exception of Australia and New Zealand are in the Northern hemisphere, while most of the developing countries are in the Southern hemisphere.

Characteristics of the North

(i). The states of North are rich, strong and developed nations. They are industrial and surplus economic states. Except a few countries, they have stable and democratic governments. (II). the states of North have developed in science and technology and they are pioneers in air, space, seas, deep seas and Antarctica etc. They are manufacturing very sophisticated weapons and armaments and are trading with them. (III). Multinational corporations which have caused the huge financial development are playing an important role in the states of North. These developed countries are culturally reflecting materialism. (IV). the number of States of North is less and they consist of one-fifth of the humanity. During the colonialism period, these developed states established colonies in the under developed countries. They dominate the UN and its main organs and specialised

Characteristics of the South

(i). The States of the South are poor, weak and developing nations. Most of the nations of South are agricultural countries. Majority of them have fallen in a debt trap and are over burdened with heavy debts. Many of the States of South are in a state of political crises and military coups and counter coups are common except in some countries like India. (II). These third world nations formed a policy of 'non-alignment' and most of them Afro-Asian countries got independence after World War II. Therefore, they are not developed in science and technology and they are dependent upon the North. These countries purchase required ammunition, weapons from the North. (III). Most of the states of South are following the policy of Public Sector under the influence of Socialism. The materialistic view is absent in the states of South. (IV). the number of states in the South is large and are inhabited by four-fifths of the world population. But they are still expelled by the North. The states of the South are seeking UN to bring international peace and equal distribution of economy through NIEO.

Main Elements of Conflict between the North and the South

Controversy and even deadlock over the issue of NIEO has been a hard reality of relations between the developed North and the under-developed South because both hold the divergent views over NIEO. The Third World regards that securing of a is the only alternative for halting the fast deterioration of their economies in the present state of international economic affairs. They strongly oppose the continuance of the economic squeeze that is currently being practiced by the developed countries over the developing countries. And they further advocate that in this age of global interdependence any further squeeze and deterioration of their resources, markets, and economies is bound to be very harmful, counter-productive and even destructive of the economies of even developed countries. The existing international economic system based on exchange depreciation, protectionism, preferential trade blocs and discriminatory restrictive devices have brought about virtual destruction of the economies of the South.

Industry of the South is not in a position to hold in competition with the well established industry of the North. The general feeling that the post Second World War international trading , monetary, financial, institutional, technological and other resource transfers systems and development patterns have been prejudicial to the interests of the South. Therefore, the Third World or the South strongly supports NIEO and advocates that the North should come forward to negotiate the issue. And an immediate and serious North-South dialogue is the need of the hour.

The developed countries or the North, on the other hand, are not willing to accept the abandonment of their existing strong and dominant position and their key role in international economic decision making. And they also do not want to part with their dominant position in the UN and other international economic institutions like World Bank, IMF etc. They are of the view that the existing economic institutions are capable of all actions in international relations. They, therefore, are neither serious nor keen to participate in a North- South dialogue over the issue. The North- South rivalry is a collective bargaining exercise between the developed and developing countries. The North wants the South to sell its primary products at low prices and the South demands the North to sell technology and manufactured goods at fair prices. Thus the North- South conflict is economical in nature. The conflicts between the North and the South can be classified as (I) territorial claims, (ii) natural resources, (iii) population migration; (IV) international trade; (v) balance of payments and (VI) protectionism.

Consequently, the difference in approach of the developed North on the one hand and the South on the other has made the issue of the NIEO a highly **controversial** issue. The developing countries are not willing to go in for it, whereas the under-developed countries are committed to secure it. The latter are strongly critical of such attempts of the former as are aimed at perpetuating and using the existing system for maintaining their control over international economy and trade.

North-South Dialogue over NIEO

The North and the South have economic, racial, politico-military and cultural confrontations and conflicts. The North is trying to continue its quasi imperialistic hegemony over the South through the preservation of its monopoly of nuclear weapons, science and technology; through its system of unequal military alliances ; through its oligopolistic control over the United Nations and its other international organizations.

To solve these conflicts and confrontations and to establish NIEO, the answer lies in collective decision-making and increased communication between the North and the South .These can be achieved through dialogue between these two. Such efforts were made through UN and outside conventions. For this purpose the UN created the UNCTAD (United Nations conference on Trade and Development) in 1964 to work for a better for the under-developed South in trade, tariffs, bilateral and multilateral assistance. From the very beginning UNCTAD's aim is of compromise and cooperation, not of confrontation and conflict, to promote economic development and trade through international cooperation within the universal United Nations framework.

Now, we will discuss the main elements of the North-South dialogue designed to establish the NIEO. These elements are neatly summed up in the demands of the developing and non-aligned countries from UNCTAD-I to UNCTAD-VI. In order to highlight the growing economic disparity and degradation, the south tried to broaden their struggle for equality in international economic order by forging a link between the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America UNCTAD held at Geneva in 1964. Accordingly they formed a sort of an international trade union which later on came to known as “the Group of 77” (now nearly 125 developing countries). The first UNCTAD (1964) spelt out the responsibilities of the international community in fields such as stabilization commodity prices, volume of trade, terms of aid and preferences. But, the none of the recommendations was translated into practice as the North is not interested. The group made similar demands at the sessions of UNCTAD held at New Delhi in 1968 and at Santiago (Chile) in 1972. The South demanded for greater participation in world trade rather than the financial aid and technical assistance. Their demand included a greater share of world’s wealth and a more equitable, just distribution of the resources of the world. The demand for the establishment of NIEO was officially voiced for the first time in the UNCTAD-III in 1972 by the South. This conference discussed the issues like the continuance of foreign aid, low-rated unconditional loans, some reliefs in debt burden and shipping freights problems.

The UNCTAD-IV was held at Nairobi (Kenya), in May 1976. The major results that emerged from the conference were : (i) creation of a Common Fund for buffer stock financing; (ii) Ensuring stable conditions for commodity trade and development of export products from the developing countries; (iii) the developing countries should receive high priority in assistance. The UNCTAD -V was held at Manila(Philippines), in June 1979 .The conference recommended the following measures; (I) Much larger flows of assistance for the least developed countries.(ii) Reaffirmation of the importance of structural adjustment of protectionism to enable the developing countries to attain an increased share in world production and trade.

The UNCTAD, ever since its inception in1964, thirteen conferences have been held so far (the recent one was held at Doha, Qatar, from 21-26 April, 2012). Despite the debates and recommendations over the years NIEO remained only on paper; resolutions were made but never implemented; its targets were not met even halfway. The North-South dialogue does not seem to move anywhere. It has been rendered toothless by the onslaught of globalization. The industrialized North firmly believes that development could best be achieved by full participation in the World Trade System and the creation of free market economies at home.

To solve the conflicts and confrontations between the North and the South following efforts have been made outside the United Nations.

2.5.6.1. At the level of Third World Countries.

For the first time, the developing countries held a meeting at New Delhi in February 1982 (see detail in next pages) at the initiative of India, with a view to forging self-reliance among the poor nations of the South. India placed a eight point programme to make international cooperation

more effective which, among other things called for a present disturbing trend in the flow of concessional assistance, the lifting of protectionist barriers in developed countries and urgent measures, including regional arrangements, to lighten the financial burden of increased oil prices.

2.5.6.2. At the level Developed Countries.

(I). Brandt Commission----On the advice of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the IMF and GATT, an Independent Commission on international development issues, with Willy Brandt as Chairman, has been appointed in 1977 to make recommendations. The Commission has suggested that the rich countries should set up a 'Super Fund' to assist the development of the Third World nations. It suggested establishing a new multi-billion dollar financial institution to be known as the 'World Development Fund' for the massive transfer of resources from the North to the South in addition to the existing IBRD and IMF. The Commission has prepared a radical new strategy for the development of the Third World over the next 10 to 15 years. But, in practice the developed nations did not put a step forward towards these recommendations.

(II). The Cancun Summit, 1981----On 23-24 October, 1981, heads of the 22 governments from both the North and the South was held at Cancun (Mexico) to discuss the progress of North-South negotiations in the United Nations and the other forums. The proposal for such a summit was put forward by Brandt Commission in 1980. This summit assumed significance in the context of the rigid attitude adopted by the US President Ronald Reagan towards the developing countries. He was not in favour of North-South dialogue and wanted his allies to do the same. Consequently, the North showed no willingness to increase their official assistance during the eighties to bring it close to the target of one per cent of the GNP which they had accepted two decades ago. They are not enthusiastic in helping the South to stabilise the prices of their raw materials and commodities which constitute the major source of their export earnings. The OPEC countries also refused to be bound by any discipline that would make their oil output and prices predictable for the non-oil producing countries. So, the Cancun Summit failed to produce any positive result.

After the failure of the efforts taken in the UN and outside it, no meaningful progress has been possible towards the securing of a North-South dialogue over NIEO. The differences between the North and South are as they were at the ending of Second World War. At present the chances for a meaningful North-South dialogue appeared to be very dim. Therefore, the developing countries are trying to concentrate on the objective of South-South cooperation for development.

2.5.7. South-South Co-operation : Progress and Prospects

After the failure of North-South dialogue over the NIEO as the North did not respond favourably to the demands of the South the latter decided for South-South cooperation. Therefore, since early 1980s, the developing countries have been trying to promote economic cooperation among them for development. Since the UN resolution for NIEO in 1974, the North-South dialogue could not yield any result due to the non-cooperative attitude of the

North. Therefore, the developing countries tried to concentrate on the objective of South- South Cooperation for development. The objectives of the South-South Cooperation are:

(I). To Accelerate the Pace of Development of the South

The following are some of the important ways by which this can be achieved: (I) The relatively developed or developing countries of the South (like India and Brazil etc.) can help others, particularly the least developed countries, through financial assistance. (ii) Transfer of technology between the countries of the South can help to reduce the technology gap to a certain extent. (iii) An increase in the trade between the developing countries may help to alleviate several problems. (iv) South-South cooperation can also help to ensure food security.

(II). To Increase Economic Efficiency.

South-South cooperation, in certain areas, can help to increase the economic efficiency of development activities through aggregation of resources and by increasing the efficiency of resources utilisation. The technology of the states of South may be more suited to the conditions of the less developed countries than the technology of the North.

(III). To Strengthen the Status of the South.

South-South Cooperation will help to reduce the dependence of the South on the North and this would natural enable the South to withstand the various sorts of pressures from the North. The solidarity of the South will increase the bargaining power of the South vis-a-vis the North. This should lead to better North-South relations.

Since the New Delhi meet of 1982 several attempts have been made towards the promotion of South-South Cooperation. Various efforts have been done to promote South-South cooperation. They are;

(1). South-South Meet at New Delhi (1982). With a view to secure increased economic and trade cooperation among the developing countries. As well as securing coordination in their policies over the issue of the approach to be pursued within the Group of 77, India took the initiative to hold a meeting of the developing countries in New Delhi. The meeting took place on February 22-24, 1982 and was attended by the representatives of 44 developing countries. Mrs. Indira Gandhi in her opening speech expressed concern over what she described as **“visible deterioration in the global economy since the Cancun Summit”** and she was especial critical of **“protectionism in industrialized countries “**which she said had **“victimised the developing world “**. So, **“the developing countries should close their ranks to withstand pressure from affluent nations.”**

The South-South cooperation conference in New Delhi agreed to concentrate upon the following points for further consideration: (I) the formulation of programmer’s agricultural self-reliance and food sufficiency; (ii) the creation of a World Bank “energy affiliate”; and (iii) the creating of a multi-lateral financing facility for joint ventures and technical cooperation among the third world countries. On the last subject, the expert group was to be convened under Indian chairmanship to report back to the Group of 77. Consequently, the conference concluded with unanimous acceptance of the importance of cooperation for collective self-reliance.

(2). New Delhi Ministerial Meeting of Developing Countries, 1985.

The day ministerial level meeting of the developing countries was on 25-26 July, 1985 to consider the Global System of Trade Preference as means for promoting South-South cooperation. Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi in his inaugural speech, called upon the developing countries to work for collective self-reliance through boosting their trade. More than seventy countries deliberated for on ways of making South-South cooperation meaningful and mature, agreed tariff reduction of up to ten percent in addition to a product by product approach. Talks were held but no agreement was made.

With little hope for an early North-South agreement over NIEO, the promotion of South-South cooperation constitutes the best way for the developing countries to develop. It constitutes good step towards de-facto NIEO. Non-aligned Movement, Group of 77 and the Third World countries in their all conferences had been trying hard to secure a North – South dialogue on NIEO, but their efforts have not yet been successful. As an alternative, aerogramme for South-South cooperation is gradually emerging. The Third World countries regard it as their best bet. NAM has taken a lead in this direction. The Harare summit (1986) decided to hold a full-fledged conference of the non-aligned Foreign Ministers on South-South cooperation.

NAM Foreign Ministers Conference on South-South Cooperation (1987) this conference, which was held in Pyongyang (North Korea), gave a call to give new impetus to cooperation among the non-aligned and other developing nations. The Pyongyang declaration listed a number of measures for developing and strengthening economic independence of these countries which would build collective self-reliance and increase their bargaining power in negotiations with the North. An action plan, incorporated in the declaration, gave a call for measures for economic cooperation at the national, regional and international levels to promote South-South Cooperation. It demanded a political North-South dialogue on the debt crisis faced by the developing countries. The Pyongyang Conference and the declaration adopted at this conference emphasised the need for NIEO and the inter-relationship between peace, development and disarmament.

2.5.8. Summary

Since the seventies the NAM, the Group of 77 at UNCTAD conferences, the Group of 15 and several other institutions, organisations and arrangements have been trying to secure NIEO, both through the promotion of South-South cooperation as well as North-South dialogue. However, unfortunately, the progress in this respect continues to be slow, rather very slow and uneven. The concepts of globalization and sustainable development have been gaining popularity over and above the Third World demand for NIEO. While the developing countries believe that without NIEO there can be little real progress and benefit of globalization, the developed countries continue to ignore NIEO and to project globalization as the panacea for all economic ills which continue to characterize the prevailing international order. Consequently, the gap between the rich and the poor countries to widen, instabilities spread more quickly from one country to other, particularly to the developing countries, which are now vulnerable and sensitive to external factors. Liberalization and globalization of financial

markets has also become a source of volatility and imbalances. The initiatives taken so far to enlarge South-South cooperation could not succeed despite establishing several sub regional organizations for economic cooperation in Latin America, Africa and Asia. Because , there were several unfavourable factors including inadequate and ineffective institutions , lack of resources , and insufficient political commitment on the part of governments, who were preoccupied with other developmental matters. Moreover, the foreign exchange and other crises forced the governments of most developing countries to concentrate a domestic economic management, short-term objectives, and their relations with the developed countries. Disagreements and rivalries, conflicts and even wars among developing countries further sapped the South's ability to recover its strength. As a result, the South became weakened on the global scene, because they could not withstand the strategies of developing countries.

2.5.9. Key words

Decolonization
Monetary System
Transnational Corporation
Nonaggression
Non-Intervention
Self-Determination

2.5.10. Long answer type question

1. Write a critical note on the New International Economic Order

2.5.11. Short answer Type Questions

1. What is International Development Strategy?
2. How will you define MNCs?
3. What is the main conflict between the North and the South?
4. What do you understand by South South Cooperation?

2.5.12. Suggested Readings

1. Jayantanuja Bandyopadhyaya, : *North Over South*.1982
2. Devan C. Vohra, : *Economic Relevance of Non-Alignment* 1983.
3. Paul Krugman, Marice Obstfeld : *International Economics: Theory and Practice*, 2017.
and Marc Melitz,

Unit I & Unit II: Converted in Self Learning Mode by Dr. Amandeep Kaur.

Last Update June 15, 2023.

Mandatory Student Feedback Form

<https://forms.gle/KS5CLhvpwrpgjwN98>

Note: Students, kindly click this google form link, and fill this feedback form once.