

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SINCE 1919

Author

Dr. V. DEEPTHI

Assistant Professor

Department of History

Manonmaniam Sundaranar University

Tirunelveli – Tamil Nadu



**DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY
MANONMANIAM SUNDARANAR UNIVERSITY
DIRECTORATE OF DISTANCE AND CONTINUING EDUCATION
TIRUNELVELI – TAMIL NADU -627 012.**

December - 2025

S.N.	Units	Content	Page No.
1	I	Origin and Growth of International Relations– Theoretical Perspectives: Realism – Idealism – Liberalism – Neo-Realism – Neo-Liberalism – World Systems and Dependency – Feminist Approaches – Concepts: Balance of Power – Collective Security – Diplomacy – National Interest	1-48
2	II	First World War 1914- 1918 - Wilson’s Fourteen Points – Paris Peace Conference – League of Nations – Kellogg Briand Pact – Locarno Pact – Mussolini and Fascism – Hitler and Nazism – British Policy of Appeasement – Second World War – Causes, Course and Results	49-118
3	III	Cold war: Origins – Causes – Truman’s Doctrine – Marshall Plan – NATO – SEATO – CENTO –SALT I and II— Emergence of Third world	119-142
4	IV	UNO: Principal Organs – Specialised Agencies of UNO – Achievements & Failures – Decolonization and Emergence of the Third World – Non-Aligned Movement – Regional Organizations: European Union – ASEAN – SAARC	143-156
5	V	Post-Cold War Era: Disintegration of USSR – Glasnost – Perestroika – Reunification of Germany– Contemporary Issues: Globalization – GATT – WTO –Environment: Rio de Janeiro Summit – Green Peace Movement – Kyoto Protocol – Paris Agreement	157-197

Unit - I

Origin and Growth of International Relations– Theoretical Perspectives: Realism – Idealism – Liberalism – Neo-Realism – Neo-Liberalism – World Systems and Dependency – Feminist Approaches – Concepts: Balance of Power – Collective Security – Diplomacy – National Interest

Objectives

- To understand the origin and development of International Relations theories.
- To examine alternative approaches such as World Systems, Dependency,
- To analyze core concepts like Balance of Power, Collective Security, Diplomacy,
- To develop a basic framework for understanding state behavior and global interactions.

Origin and Growth of International Relations

In ancient times, **Aristotle said:** “Man by nature and necessity is a social animal.” A man who can live without other beings is either a God or a beast. In modern times we can safely say that no nation or country can live in isolation. The co-existence of nations is the order of the day. No doubt, every nation is independent and **sovereign**; nevertheless, it counts on other nations of the world in several respects. Cordial relations and understanding among nations have become an important phenomenon of modern life. International Relations have thus assumed great pragmatic and academic significance in present times.

Though International Relations as an academic discipline is of a recent origin, relations among nations were as old a phenomenon as history. There were inter-tribal inter city-state and inter Kingdom relations even in the ancient age. One can find incidental references to war and peace issues in the religious texts and epic literature of ancient times, mostly with the pacifist approach. Ancient civilizations like the Egyptians, the Sumerian, the Assyrian, the Indian, the Chinese, the Greeks,s and the Rom had evolved a distinct code of inter-state conduct and a pattern of international relations. Out of the Fifteen Books of **Kautilya’s Arthashastra**, one was devoted exclusively to diplomacy.

But in the ancient world, international relations were incidental sporadic, and limited in nature. Mostly they were not global but merely regional in character. They

were actually not international relations of the true sense of the term. They can, at best, be described as parochial and occasional interstate relations.

With the Renaissance and the reformation, international relations assumed a new character. After the Peace of West-Phalia in 1648, statehood became an ideal unit of humanity. With this, territorial **sovereign** and nation-state emerged as a basic political unit and an effective international relations actor. These sovereign states were very much aware of their independence, yet they were also conscious of the reality of interdependence in the modern world. Modern international relations began to grow in the paradoxical situation of independence and inter-dependence, separateness and closeness, individuality and mutuality, **nationalism and internationalism**. They continued to develop as a process of co-operation and conflict.

There was a manifold increase in the wants and needs of the various countries after the industrial Revolution. It was considered after the industrial Revolution; relations were a considerable improvement in transport and communications. Trade, transit, and transactions between the nations became the order of the day. Scientific and technological revolutions of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries further brought the nations nearer and closer. All these developments made international relations more regular, more comprehensive, more valuable day by day.

Their character became more and more global and broadened instead of regional and narrower. The industrial and scientific innovations had an impact on war technology and armaments. The trauma of the First World War, together with the demand for democratic control of **foreign policy**, stimulated the public urge to better understand foreign relations. The issues of war and peace came to the forefront. These developments attracted people's attention to the growing importance of international relations and provided the ground for creating international relations as an academic discipline.

Universities have long divided knowledge into different disciplines, a division meant to facilitate learning. A discipline comprises a distinctive focus, a set of institutions and traditions of thought. All three are crucial to the development and growth of a field or body of knowledge. 'Discipline' also has another, not altogether unrelated, meaning: to bring under control, train to obedience, maintain order. Disciplines thus maintain intellectual order by holding certain subjects in focus.

First, a discipline carves out a branch of learning focused on a relatively distinct subject matter, although these often can appear arbitrary. For example, where do we draw the boundaries between international politics, international ethics, international law and international economics? Nevertheless, if a discipline implies a subject matter relatively distinguishable from others, it must have questions and topics it calls its own. Some disagreement about the scope of a discipline is to be expected, but there will always be dominant tendencies – questions and topics that occupy the thought and research of most students and scholars. These will define the discipline at any given moment, but there will always be other questions and topics that are neglected or ignored by the mainstream.

Second, disciplines grow within institutions and grow their own institutions. Universities are the most obvious sites for the institutionalization of the research and teaching of particular subjects, but they are not alone, as we shall see. Departments, schools or centres have been established in universities around the world to study international relations. The first was established in 1919 at the University of Wales, in the seaside town of Aberystwyth, when Welsh industrialist and philanthropist David Davies established the Woodrow Wilson Chair of International Politics. The London School of Economics and the University of Oxford followed shortly afterwards, with the establishment of chairs in 1924 and 1930 respectively. The institutionalized study of IR in the United States began with the establishment of Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service in 1919, followed by the University of Southern California's School of International Relations in 1924. In Switzerland, the Graduate Institute of International Studies in Geneva was established in 1927, becoming the 1st university dedicated to the study of international relations.

In the United States, the study of international relations generally remained a sub-field of Political Science. Brian Schmidt (1998) has shown that much of the discipline's early formation in America grew out of late nineteenth century inquiries into colonial administration and national imperialism. In his path-breaking *White World Order, Black Power Politics*, Robert Vitalis (2015) shows how race and race subjection were major preoccupations of the early twentieth-century discipline of American IR. This entailed the exclusion of African American scholars like Ralph Bunche, head of what Vitalis (2015) calls the 'Howard School' of IR. Pioneering historical research has also been conducted

to reveal the extensive writing and activism of women in the emerging discipline of IR. Much of this work was marginalised, ignored or considered extraneous to the main concerns of the emergent discipline, resulting in a highly gendered construction of International Relations. Intellectual historians are now recovering formative works by Black and female intellectuals that were hitherto neglected. Disciplines, it should be noted, are not without their politics; nor are they without their exclusions and amnesia.

The institutionalisation of academic areas of study provides housing for teaching and research, both of which are crucial. Teaching passes on knowledge and modes of analysis from one generation to the next in the classroom. Research, of course, needs to be published, so findings and analyses can be widely disseminated and tested – not only from one generation to the next but with contemporary teachers and students as well. Research practices and publishing reproduce and renew a discipline's body of knowledge.

Third, a discipline draws upon traditions of thought that have developed and evolved around the subject matter. The study of international relations did not begin in 1919. When departments were being established, scholars and students were not inventing a discipline out of thin air; they had over two millennia of recorded words, thoughts and actions to draw upon. Thucydides (c. 460–406 BCE), Niccolò Machiavelli (1469–1527) and Hugo Grotius (1583–1645), for example, may not have taught in universities but they wrote about the actors and events that shaped the 'international relations' – as we now call it – of their day.

Care must be taken here because the actors and events they analysed are vastly different to those that now animate international relations. Moreover, none of these canonical thinkers limited themselves to the external relations of actors, whether city-states, empires or sovereign states. Indeed, it is closer to the truth to say that they discussed what we would call international relations either indirectly or only in occasional passages of their canonical texts. We need to be careful when discussing the past not to commit the historical sin of anachronism – discussing one historical epoch in terms of language, concepts and understandings borrowed from another. In other words, we risk anachronism when we speak of these great thinkers as contributors to IR or as adhering to one of our modern traditions of thought because, in fact, they did not neatly distinguish international relations from domestic politics, or international law or ethics, in the way

the discipline of IR has done since its inception. Their thinking was not underpinned by the 'Great Divide', the 'anarchy problematique' or the categories of realism and liberalism.

Growth of International Relations

The earliest text on International Relations for the first time, was written by the Greek historian Thucydides (430-406 B.C), The Peloponnesian War was introduced with the establishment of the Woodrow Wilson chair of International Relations in 1919 at the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth, United Kingdom. Alfred Zimmern was the first holder of this chair. C.K. Webster and E.H. Carr were among the early scholars of this discipline. This subject was offered in European and American Universities from the 1920s. Simultaneously at several other places, chairs of International Relations were established such as in Hebrew University, Jerusalem (1929), Oxford University (1930), the London Academically, the study of International Relations School of Economics (1936) and the University of Edinburgh (1948).

The First World War had a deep impact on the development of this new subject in social sciences. Before the First World War, according to Alfred Zimmern, "There was no teaching of the subject as such, and very little conscious study. Grant, Hughes, Greenwood, Kerr and Uguhart wrote the first textbook on International Relations entitled, An Introduction to the Study of International Relations, (1916, Britain). A few developments around the globe like establishment of a School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University in 1919, U.S.A; Independent School of International Relations at the University of Southern California in 1924; the Institute of Advanced International Studies in Paris (1923); the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace at Washington, D.C (1910); the Union of Democratic Control in England (1914); Foreign Policy Association and the Council on Foreign Relations in New York (1918); Royal Institute of International Affairs in London (1920) further helped in the development of IR. Several institutes in Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Pakistan were affiliated with the above institute. Further, with the establishment of some more institutes in International Affairs such as New Commonwealth Institute in London (1934), renamed as the London Institute of World Affairs; the Institute of International Affairs in Paris in 1935; Indian Council of World Affairs in India in 1943 also played a great role in the

development of IR. Thus, in the early 20th century, International Relations became a discrete academic field within Political Science. In practice, International Relations was carried out as a separate academic programme or as a subsection of Political Science. The courses taught therein were highly interdisciplinary in nature.

This subject was developing day by day. In the contemporary period, cordial relations and mutual understanding among states have greater significance for the progressive development of each nation. This resulted in providing independent status to 'International Relations.'

Development of International Relations

As a well defined academic discipline, International Relations emerged in the first half of the twentieth century. Kenneth Thompson illustrated a very comprehensive picture of different stages of International Relations which could be enumerated as follows:

The first stage can be termed as historical approach where more emphasis was laid on historical analysis rather than on the political study of international events. However, this historical approach could not develop a theoretical core for the discipline.

The second stage can be labeled as contemporaneous stage when more emphasis was laid on contemporary issues rather than on history. It emerged after the end of First World War. This approach totally neglected past, it was also partial.

The third stage began during the inter-war period when there occurred a paradigm shift from the historical and contemporaneous to a moralistic-legalistic approach. Scholars emphasised a war-free world order and suggested creation of organisations like League of Nations. However, this approach was too idealistic and ignored the hard realities of international life.

The fourth stage commenced after the end of the Second World War in 1945. Now there was a shift from merely praising or condemning different states' behaviour but to discover the causes behind such behaviour. The emphasis was now more on understanding. This shift in international relations in the fourth stage was the outcome of decolonization, emergence of new nation-states, rise of new universal values, demographic change etc. This shift gave birth to the Realist school which believed that

power was a means, as well as end in itself. International politics was nothing but a struggle for power. Morgenthau became its chief proponent.

The fifth stage started from the mid-sixties to the seventies when international organisation, trans-national institutions and multinational corporations were added to the study of International Relations, which resulted in the coming of Neo-liberal school of thought. Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye emerged as its chief proponents who stressed upon interdependence, security communities, transnational economic cooperation and creation of an international regime.

Kenneth Thompson opined that the dependency theorists reacted to many of the same international economic changes as neoliberals, but in a negative sense that was dependence not positive-interdependence. These changes resulted in increased intervention by the US in the affairs of Third World countries to fulfil her own economic interests. This further widened the gap between the world's rich and poor countries leading to North South conflict and thus generating new debate on the global political agenda. Thus for the first time, in this stage, the South demanded the establishment of a New International Economic Order (NIEO) which became a subject of analysis in international relations. Another development of this stage was the revival of peace studies. The issues of global stability, world order and control of global violence now got predominance in the international relations.

The sixth stage may be counted from the late seventies to the first half of eighties. In this period, the efficacy of detente was questioned and 'New cold war' emerged which changed the whole scenario. On the one hand, the Soviet Union intervened in Afghanistan, on the other, US President Reagan threatened the world by talking of star war programme. The whole world got worried about its effect on the environment and ecology. Hence, ecological and environmental issues now became the dominant subjects of international relations. In the same period, Kenneth Waltz formulated the neorealist theory and transformed the abstract principles of classical realism with a more concrete theory of realism making it more acceptable and much closer to a scientific study of international relations. The neorealist theory argued for managing and manipulating the new cold war in the 1980s. With the emergence of the steady process of multi-polarization, the scholars of the United States especially showed interest in third world

countries. Area studies were undertaken by different universities in the US and Britain. In many cases, for field data researchers were sent to the third world countries. But the Western theories of international relations were challenged by the scholars of the third world countries. They questioned the relevance and suitability of these theories to the underdeveloped countries which constitute the two-thirds majority of the UN membership.

The seventh stage began in 1985 with Mikhail Gorbachev's new political thinking, which recognised "balance of interests" in place of the balance of power, co-operation instead of confrontation, disarmament in place of armament, internationalisation instead of nationalisation and détente in place of cold war." With the advent of this 'new political thinking', international relations entered into a new era putting emphasis on peaceful coexistence and equal security for all. At first, the US is suspicious about these new moves, but later on, it responded positively to this 'new political thinking'. During this period, since the realist and liberalist debate disappeared, the postmodernists came to fill the vacuum. Post-modernists or reflectivists argued that norms and regimes could not be studied in a positivist framework based on objectivity, but has to be analysed as an inter-subjective phenomenon. This new trend in the 1980s was known as post-positivism. It contained four major currents: critical theory; post-modern Marxism; post-modernism and post-modern feminism.

The eighth stage began with the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Republics of the USSR and Yugoslavia became independent states. The supremacy of the US paved the way for the unipolar world as it remained the only superpower. The third world countries and the countries of the erstwhile disintegrated communist bloc started seeking economic aid from the Western countries and especially from the US. The US started pressurising these countries to accept its terms and conditions for economic aid. Thus, through the description of the above eight-stages, Thompson had aptly analysed how international relations developed from normative theory to causal theory, from idealism to realism, from realism to behaviouralism and scientism, neoliberalism to radicalism (globalism), neorealism to post-positivism and so on.

In the post-cold war period, there were several issues which gained significance in the study of international relations. Some of these were: importance of non-state actors,

energy crisis, terrorism, globalisation, the fear of third world war, technological development, increasing role of trans-national organisations, non-traditional security threats, the North South debate, environmental degradation, rise of world oligarchy and world mass, nuclearization, expansion of weapons of mass destruction, etc. However, in spite of the fact that the study of international relations remained no more statecentric and added many new areas in its scope, it had not yet given due consideration to the issue of gender. Women had throughout been ignored in the realm of international politics, their voices had not been heard, their representation in various decision-making and policymaking bodies had been minimal, yet these issues had been totally overlooked in the study of international relations.

Theoretical Perspectives

A theory attempts to explain something systematically or a set of guiding principles to study a phenomenon or some events. Theory gives meaning and clarity to our knowledge of facts by drawing generalizations and values to concepts, hypotheses, models and variables in social science research. In international Relations, theories allow us to understand the world through different lenses. For studying International Relations systematically, the scholars have adopted different theories in different periods of time. After 1940s there was a change in the International scenario which forced the political thinkers to formulate new theories for studying new emerging situations. This has resulted in the development of several other theories for studying International Relations. In this unit an attempt has been made to discuss different approaches to the study of International Relations.

Realist Theory:

Realism in International Relations emerges out of the individual belief that others are always trying to destroy him and therefore, he must be ready to destroy others whenever needed in order to protect himself. The basic assumption underlying the realist theory is the perpetual existence of conflicts among nations in one form or the other. This approach held the belief that a contest of power is going on in the world and this can neither be controlled nor regulated by international law or world government. Political philosophies of Thomas Hobbes and Niccolo Machiavelli provided the ground for the emergence of realist approach. Advocates of the new, ascendant paradigm known as

realism, as a general philosophy, emerged to frame an intellectual movement whose message reads like the antithesis of idealism. In the International Relations, among the principal advocates of realism are E.H. Carr, George F. Kennan, Hans J. Morgenthau, Reinhold Niebuhr and Kenneth W. Thompson. Realism regards politics as the struggle for power and seeks to explain it with the help of such factors as power, security and national interest. Conflicts of interests among the states are assumed to be inevitable. According to realism, the main challenge before the state is to survive in a hostile environment. To this end, no means is more important than the acquisition of power, and no principle is more important than selfhelp. In this conception, state sovereignty gives the heads of state the freedom and responsibility to do whatever is necessary to advance the state's interest and survival.

As it has been mentioned earlier, realism opposes the principles of idealism. For realism, respect for moral principles is a wasteful and dangerous interference in the national pursuit of national power. A state's philosophical or ethical preferences are neither good nor bad -what matters is whether they serve its self-interest. Thus, the game of International Politics revolves around the pursuit of power: acquiring it, increasing it, projecting it and using it to bend others to one's will. At the extreme, realism appears to accept war as normal and rejects morality as it pertains to relations between individuals. The basic assumptions of Realism are as follows:

- People are by nature narrowly selfish and ethically flawed, and cannot free themselves from the sinful fact that they are born to watch out for themselves.
- Of all people's evil ways, none are more prevalent or dangerous than their instinctive lust for power and their desire to dominate others.
- The possibility of eradicating the instinct for power is a utopian aspiration.
- International Politics is—as Thomas Hobbes puts it a struggle for power, “a war of all against all”.
- The primary obligation of every state is to promote its national interest, and to acquire power for this purpose.
- The nature of the international system dictates that states acquire sufficient military capabilities to deter attack by potential enemies.

- Economics is less relevant to national security than its military might; economics is important primarily as a means of acquiring national power and prestige.
- Allies might increase a state's ability to defend itself, but their loyalty and reliability should not be assumed.
- States should never entrust the task of self-protection to international security organizations or international law and should resist efforts to regulate international conduct.

Morgenthau is the most popular of all the realist thinkers. He has offered a realistic theory of International Relations. According to him, 'International Politics, like all politics, is a struggle for power. Whatever, the ultimate aims of International Politics, power is always the immediate aim.' Morgenthau in his realist theory laid down six principles which are as follows:

- Politics is governed by objective laws which are based on human nature and psychology. We can understand the political phenomena by developing a political theory based on human psychology and reason.
- Morgenthau lays great emphasis on the concept of national interest which he defines in terms of power. He states that politics cannot be understood in moral and religious terms but only on rational basis.
- According to him, interest is not fixed and is moulded by the environments. d) He believes that the universal moral principles cannot be applied to state's actions and these must be modified according to the circumstances of time and place.
- Morgenthau does not find any identity between moral aspirations of a nation and the moral law which governs the universe and asserts that all political actors pursue their national interests.

He is of the view that political sphere is as autonomous as the spheres of economist, or the lawyer or the moralist. The Realist approach is also subjected to criticism because of the boldness with which its proponents stated assumptions about political behaviour. Moreover, the concept of 'national interest' has been the object of considerable criticism as there is no operational meaning to the concept. Thus this approach suffers from ambiguity

The Realist thinkers are also criticized for their efforts to draw from the past a series of political concepts for the analysis of the contemporary international system. Pursuit of limited national objectives, the separation of foreign policy from domestic politics, the conduct of secret diplomacy, the use of balance of power as a technique for the management of power, and the pleas for nations to place reduced emphasis on ideology as a conditioner of international conduct, have little relevance to the international system today. By urging that nations return to the practices of an earlier period, some realist writers over estimate the extent to which such change in the present international system is possible.

In emphasizing power as the principal motivation for political behaviour, the Realists have made themselves the objects of criticism. According to the critics, no universally acceptable definition of power has been offered by the Realists. Prominent realist thinker, Morgenthau considers power as a psychological relationship. But psychological relationships themselves are very vague. In addition, the Realists have been criticized for allegedly having placed too much emphasis on power, to the relative exclusion of other important variables. Despite the shortcomings of realist approach, it is still relevant in analyzing international problems, especially in times of global tension. This happened, for example, in the early 1980s when the cold war competition between the United States and Soviet Union entered an embittered new phase and their arms race accelerated.

Idealism

In general parlance on international matters, idealism is a term applied to any idea, goal, or practice considered to be impractical. Thus eradicating nuclear weapons is considered idealistic, as is substituting open for secret diplomacy, entrusting international security to the UN, creating an African Union on the model of the EU, or the global eradication of poverty and injustice. The bases of such judgments are rarely made explicit, but they usually rest on a pessimistic reading of human nature along with an historical judgment on the difficulty of peaceably achieving radical change in world affairs.

In the professional study of international relations (IR), the term is generally employed in two ways: one broad, one narrow. The broad understanding sees idealism as

a perennial doctrine or disposition towards world affairs which can be witnessed in all historical periods where independent political communities exist in a condition of anarchy i.e. in the absence of central government. Idealism is an optimistic doctrine which seeks to transcend the international anarchy, and create a more cosmopolitan and harmonious world order. The narrow understanding sees idealism as intimately tied to the inter-war period (1919-1939). It is a doctrine that dominated the first phase of IR theorising, emphasising the growing interdependence and unity of mankind, and bound-up with the experiment in internationalism that was the League of Nations. It received a visceral attack in E. H. Carr's *The Twenty Years' Crisis* (1939).

There is no agreed definition of idealism. Indeed the term is often employed in a rhetorical way, particularly by realist thinkers, in order to discredit radical or reformist ideas they dislike. As a consequence various approaches and bodies of thought—cosmopolitanism, internationalism, liberalism—have frequently been lumped together and labelled idealism, despite considerable differences between and diversity within them.

According to most accounts, idealists emphasise the power of reason to overcome prejudice and counteract the machinations of sinister forces. They believe that the spread of education and democracy—including increasing democratic control of foreign policy—will empower world public opinion, and make it a powerful force that no government can resist. They view war as a disease of the international body politic, contrary to the interests of all bar a few special interests and unrepresentative governments. Arms manufacturers and merchants have frequently been targets of their wrath. Left-internationalists have also attacked large business corporations for their aggressive pursuit of profit and disregard of general human welfare. Idealists emphasise the importance of universal bodies such as the League and the UN in galvanising and organising world public opinion. Through such means, they contend, it will be possible to eliminate crude power from international relations, substituting research, reason and discussion in place of national armies and navies. Importantly, idealists tend to stress the existence of a natural harmony of interests between all peoples underlying the superficially conflicting interests of their states and/or governments. While accepting that the different peoples exhibit different codes of behaviour, cultural norms, values, habits

and tastes, they contend that human beings are fundamentally uniform. Regardless of ethnic, social, cultural and religious background, all human beings desire the same things in terms of security, welfare, recognition and respect. All are bound by a common morality with its bedrock in basic human rights and the Kantian principle that human beings should be respected as ends in themselves and never treated as mere means. Many idealists share the belief of Mazzini that there is no essential incompatibility between nationalism and internationalism. There is a natural division of labour between nations. Each nation has its special task to perform, its special contribution to make to the well-being of humanity. If all nations were to act in this spirit, international harmony would prevail. This doctrine provided the philosophical basis for President Woodrow Wilson's campaign to put national self-determination at the heart of the 1919 peace settlement.

In the inter-war period these beliefs gave rise to numerous policy prescriptions, nearly all of which sought to regulate the power of the independent nation state by investing increasing power and political authority in international organisations. The international anarchy of competing nationstates was seen as the underlying cause of the catastrophe of World War One, and thus the principle of sovereignty and the institution of the balance of power needed to be regulated and, in the view of some of the more radical idealists, abolished if the same was not to happen again. Collective security, compulsory adjudication of disputes, national disarmament, open diplomacy and international colonial accountability were the most cherished policy prescriptions of inter-war idealists. Some went further, calling for the creation of an international police force and complete international oversight of armaments production.

One of the main criticisms Carr levelled at the idealists (or 'utopians' as he preferred to call them) was that they underestimated the role of power in international politics and overestimated the role, actual and potential, of law, morality and public opinion. He was particularly scathing of the idea that reason and discussion could take the place of armies and navies. Change did not come about, he claimed, through reason—or at least not reason as conceived by the utopians. Power was a decisive factor in every political situation, and one could no more abolish power than abolish politics. Power, whether used, threatened, or held silently in reserve, was an essential factor in

international change, and change would only be brought about by whom or in the interests of whom power could be wielded.

Realists today often criticise the intellectual descendents of inter-war idealists—those e.g. advocating global governance, cosmopolitan democracy, and much greater power for the UN—on much the same grounds. They ignore the power and self-interestedness of the independent nation state, the reign of instrumental (cf. ‘abstract’) reason in international politics, and the emotional appeal of national sovereignty.

Liberalism

Liberal theorists have strong faith in human reason. This characteristic can be traced back to the ideas of John Locke (1632-1704) who argued that reason is necessary for arriving at truth and right action. Reason is necessary for understanding and shaping nature and society. According to the liberal theorists, human beings are capable of shaping their destiny, including international relations and moulding the negative ramifications of the absence of a world government.

Secondly, liberal theorists believe in the possibility of historical progress. Human reason and processes of social learning make progress possible. In the liberal conception therefore, mankind is not doomed to live in a state of perpetual conflict, but can choose political strategies to avoid it. In other words, liberal theorists argue that it is possible and desirable to reform international relations.

Thirdly, liberal theorists focus on state-society linkages and claim the existence of a close connection between domestic institutions and politics on the one hand and the international politics on the other. Since the publication of *Perpetual Peace* (1795) by German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) many liberal theorists became convinced that there is a causal link between the form of domestic regime and the possibility of war. Kant had specifically claimed that ‘republican’ (that is, democratic) states are more peaceful at least vis a vis one another. The contemporary idea of theory of democratic peace can be traced to this idea of Kant

Liberal theorists are pluralists as well. They believe that state is only one actor both in within a society and on the international stage. They challenge the realist assumption that states are the only actors in international politics. Liberals argue that there are many actors in world politics which play a vital role in influencing international

outcomes. The liberal tradition highlights the importance of nonstate actors such as MNCs and NGOs.

Fifth, some liberal theorists, following David Ricardo ((1772-1823) and Richard Cobden (1804-65), champion free trade as increasing interdependence among states reduces the likelihood of war. They reject mercantilism which regarded economic growth and war as compatible goals. Liberals argue that free trade is preferable to mercantilism as trade produces wealth without war. As we shall see later, these ideas have formed the basis of an entire current of thinking: interdependence liberalism.

Liberal theorists also place great emphasis on institutions. They believe that Institutions are necessary to protect and nurture the core values like order, liberty, justice and tolerance in politics. They therefore championed the creation of the League of Nations after the World War I. They were convinced that the League as an international organisation could prevent war better than the alternatives, including the traditional balance of power politics.

Classical Liberalism

Classic liberalism is the name given to liberal thought in the pre-Second World War years. As we saw, liberalism bestowed importance on the idea of human reason. It believes that all individuals are rational creatures. Hence, they are in a better position to decide what is for their own good. It is precisely because human beings are driven by the logic of reason that they have a tendency to cooperate with one another, especially in areas where they have common interest. Such cooperation can occur both domestically and internationally (Jackson and Sorensen 2008: 98). Liberalism focuses on the idea of individual liberty. The basics of classical liberalism can be found in the ideas of Adam Smith, John Locke and Jeremy Bentham.

John Locke (1688) is known as the father of classical liberalism. He argued that government should rule by the consent of the governed. Locke argued the case of limited government. The main responsibility of the government is to protect the rights and liberties of its citizens.

Adam Smith (1776) believed in the idea of ‘economic man’. Smith believed that if every individual tries to maximize their self-interest, it will lead to overall economic prosperity in the society. Smith coined the term *laissez faire* economy. According to this

idea, the market the state shall not interfere in the activities of the market. Smith visualized that a free market can bring about overall national prosperity.

Bentham introduced the concept of the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number'. Thus, individuals should focus on those activities which maximizes pleasure and minimizes pain. Bentham also proposed that there should be an international court. The spirit of Bentham's idea can be observed in the structures and functions of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) (Sutch and Elias 2010).

In the early 20th century, liberal thinkers dominated both scholarship on international relations and policy making. In fact, the establishment of the academic discipline to address international relations was essentially a liberal project. The academic discipline emerged specifically in order to improve our understanding of international relations and in turn to improve or reform the relations.

Liberal thinking at that time traced the causes of the World War I to fatal misperceptions among political elite, secret diplomacy and lack of democracy, war prone military establishments, lack of international institutions etc. Liberals played an important role in designing a political programme to address these issues in the immediate years after the World War I. In doing so, they made a significant mark on the dominant foreign policies of the day. Much of their agenda is reflected in the Fourteen Points programme speech delivered by the US President Woodrow Wilson in January 1918.

The main features of the Fourteen Point programme are as follows:

'Open covenants of peace openly aimed at' – This means that that the process of international diplomacy should be transparent in character. It means that states shall no longer be able to enter into secret alliances with one another. Following this logic, liberalism gives importance to the formation of international institutions so that it can enshrine laws, and rules for the states to follow.

'Removal of economic barriers' – This flows from the liberal belief that as economic cooperation among states increases, they will not go to war

'National Self-determination' – Every state should try to achieve democracy

'Associations of Nations' – States should form associations among themselves which would guarantee their territorial integrity and political independence.

On the basis of these principles, the League of Nations was established in 1919 Liberalism & Neo-Liberalism at the Paris Peace Conference. The League was intended to restore peace and prevent war. Member countries of the League were to protect the territorial integrity of other fellow members on the basis of collective security. Collective security is based on the idea of 'one for all, and all for one', that is, each state in the collective accepts that the security of one is the concern of all, and agrees to join in a collective response to aggression. This is different from Collective Defence or an alliance of a number of states joining together in response to a specific threat or for a specific issue of cause.

The liberal programme succeeded in influencing policy making but failed in avoiding conflict and war. Instead of a bright post-war future, it led to, what is referred to as the 'Twenty Years' crisis (E.H. Carr, 1939) and eventually to the World War II. During these years, with the United States not joining the League and the emergence of Nazism and Fascism in Europe, liberal ideas and strategies could not flourish. The collective security system too collapsed. Towards the fag end of the World War II, the major powers decided to give the liberal agenda a big push by establishing more advanced forms of international institutions, the United Nations and later the European Community

Neo-Realism

Neo-realism attempted to transform classical realism with application of methods and language of modern social sciences. It was impact of behaviouralism that attempts were made to use concepts of science and reasoning in IR theory to replace the normative approach used by classic realists like Morgenthau. In 1950s and 1960s, scholars from diverse backgrounds came to study IR and new research methods like game theory and quantitative research began to creep in the study of international relations. Moreover, in the 1970s, the detente between the US and Soviet Union led to a decline in tensions between the two superpowers. At the same, new actors like the Non-alignment movement, international economic institutions and other non-governmental organisations emerged as prominent actors in international politics. As a result of these developments, pluralism and liberalism once again began to gain influence in the international studies. It is in this context that Kenneth Waltz wrote his book, Theory of International Politics

(1979). In this book which was greatly influenced by theories and models of microeconomics, Waltz addressed the defects of classical realism. Drawing a parallel between the market and international relations, Waltz argued that they both operate without any defined order. States are like firms in a domestic market and the primary aim of both (state and firm) is to survive through competition in a system where self-help is the rule.

Neo-realism explains why states despite variation in their internal factors behave in similar ways and why the notion of interdependence is not going to succeed in international politics. Similar behaviour of states is due to the structure of international relations which is anarchic in nature. Absence of any central authority in international politics leads to anarchy which is the ordering principle in IR. Anarchy and egoism impede cooperation between states. States are the primary units in the international system and each unit performs the same function of survival. Hence, there is no functional differentiation between the units. In an anarchic system, each unit (state) performs the same function of survival. In such a scenario, their relative capability (power) becomes important to perform the same function. A more powerful state has more chances to survive. According to Waltz, there are two main factors which impede cooperation in anarchic international system – insecurity and relative gains. Every state remains concerned about the intentions of the other state leading to insecurity. For instance, since arms control agreements cannot be independently verified, states would engage in costly arms race. A state would also consider whether its own gains under interdependence outweigh those of the others. This would limit the possibility of cooperation. Analysing the nature of America-Soviet Union relations, neo-realists would argue that the US opposed the Russian Revolution and remained hostile to USSR for two decades after it. However, Nazi Germany under Hitler emerged as a common enemy and despite their internal (ideological) differences and history of enmity; both the US and the USSR cooperated against the common enemy. After the Second World War, both the superpowers again became adversaries leading to the Cold War. The rivalry between the two countries was induced by the structure of international politics and not their domestic factors (although they may have intensified it). In a bipolar system, both powers see each

other as a threat and would balance against each other. Hence, the Cold War was a natural result of bipolarity.

Differences between Classical Realism and Neo-Realism

The differences between Classical Realism and Neo-Realism are explained below. The first difference pertains to the question – why states want power? According to the classic realists, the answer is human nature. They would argue that great powers are led by individuals who want to accumulate power and have their state dominate its rivals. Neo-realism traces it to the structure of international system. In an anarchical international system, states cannot trust each other's intentions and it makes sense for them to be powerful enough to protect themselves in case they are attacked. Neo-realism is also called structural realism as it gives central importance to the anarchical structure of international politics.

Second, for classic realists, power is an end in itself while for the neo-realists, power is a means to an end and the ultimate end for a state is survival.

Third, neo-realism followed a different methodology as it relied on methods drawn from microeconomics. It, therefore, claims to be more systematic and scientific than classic realism. Neo-realism was influenced by the behaviouralist revolution of the 1960s while classic realism is based on subjective interpretation of international politics.

Defensive Realism

There are differences within structural realists on how much power is enough for a state. There are two views on this question. The first one is given by the defensive realists and the main proponents include Kenneth Waltz, Jack Snyder and Stephen Van Evera. Defensive realists argue that since states want security, it is possible to have an international equilibrium that is stable through balancing. They reject the argument of offensive realists that states seek hegemony and say that it is strategically foolish to pursue hegemony. States want an appropriate amount of power, not hegemony due to a number of factors. First, if any state becomes too powerful, other states will balance against it. Second, conquest is feasible but it would not pay as its costs outweigh the benefits. Due to nationalism, it is difficult to subdue the conquered. These factors would limit the appetite for power of a state, otherwise, they risk threatening their own survival.

Offensive Realism

John Mearsheimer in his *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics* (2001), has portrayed offensive realism as the successor to Kenneth Waltz's neo-realism. He argues that states seek to maximize power instead of security. States constantly seek opportunities to maximise their power and hegemony is their ultimate goal. This makes it harder to achieve equilibrium in international politics through balancing. Offensive realists argue that often, balancing is inefficient which allows an aggressor to take advantage of its adversaries. Threatened states sometimes resort to buck passing instead of joining a coalition against an adversary. This means that they remain on the sidelines while depending on other states to check the potential adversary. Such behaviour encourages aggression. Offensive realists have also argued that more often than not, history shows that a side that initiates war wins. Hegemony may be difficult to achieve but the US had gained hegemony in the western hemisphere in 19th century.

Neo-Liberalism

We have seen in the last unit that there was a new positivist orientation and shift in the scope of the Realist approach that has come to be called Neo-realism or structural realism. A similar shift occurred in Liberalism, largely as a reaction to the rise of Neorealism. Two seminal works that marked a break from the existing liberal tradition in international relations are Robert Keohane's *After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy* (1984) and Robert Axelrod's *Evolution of Cooperation* (1981). While the former focused on complex interdependence, the latter applied game theory to explain how cooperation emerges and persists. These publications introduced a new conceptual framework in liberal studies which has come to be called as Neo-liberalism. The use of the 'neo-liberal' label is no doubt because the theories developed by Keohane and Axelrod shared a lot with neo-realism. They accepted the two basic assumptions of international anarchy and rational egoism of states to show that it was possible for rational egoists to cooperate even in anarchic systems. They also drew on material from the same kind of sources as the neorealists- in particular game theory, public choice and rational choice theory.

A Break with Traditional Liberalism

Neo-liberalism differed from classical liberalism in several important ways. To begin with Liberal thought had not addressed the question of anarchy in the international system. Neo-liberals accepted the neorealist proposition that the international system is anarchic, but rejected the realist assertion that this condition would lead to conflict. Instead, Neo-liberals emphasised the centrality of cooperation in international politics. An important question that they pose to the Realists is “If the anarchic international system necessarily creates a self-help environment-a war of all against all as Hobbes suggested -then why is war not more common?”

Neo-liberals also differ from classical liberals on the causes of conflict. As we saw, liberalism had emphasized on the centrality of human nature and argued that conflict and war was the result of bad actors or failure of cooperation. Neoliberalism, on the other hand, stress on the importance of international institutions in structuring international environment in ways that mitigates against anarchy. In other words, causes for conflict cannot be traced to human nature, but to the presence or absence of international institutions. Neo-liberals assert that international institutions perform the following tasks: Encourage communication and dialogue between states creating a forum to negotiate their differences.

Promote transparency in interaction between states and in the agreements that they negotiate.

Help to shape expectations and to develop collective international norms that offer stability and predictability in global politics 4) Establish a framework to promote reciprocity and bargaining between states facilitating the peaceful resolution of disputes. They permit the coordination of policy to address tensions in collective action problems and thus help to avoid the security and prisoners’ dilemmas.

It is because of the importance placed on global institutions that the Neo-liberal theory of international relations is also referred to as Neo-liberal Institutionalism.

Secondly, Neo-Liberalism differs with Liberalism on the question of important actors in global politics. Liberalism tends to emphasise the importance of individual agents as actors in global politics. Individual choice and psychology tend to play an important role in the Liberal explanations and analysis. In sharp contrast, Neo-liberals

accept the Realist assertion that the state is the most important actor though they add international institutions as essentially as collections of states as well. Other actors would include non state actors like MNCs and NGOs. They accept the Neorealist claim that the state is a rational actor and that it engages in cost benefit analysis in pursuit of defined goals. Liberals would not be necessarily comfortable with this claim.

Finally, Neo-liberalism differs with Liberalism in its analysis of conflicts. Liberalism is generally historical and philosophical in their orientation, explaining conflict in specific historical context. It draws extensively on fields like political theory and philosophy. Neo-liberal explanations of conflicts, on the other hand, tend to be more focused on ahistorical structural explanations. Neo-liberals draw extensively from game theory and behavioural economics rather than history and philosophy in their analysis. Neo-liberals often use concepts from game theory to show how the structure of the international system can force particular outcomes or can lead to situations where rational decision making which may appear to be rational but which lead to suboptimal outcomes.

The Neo-Neo Debate in IR

If we are to examine the emergence of liberalism and neoliberalism as an academic discipline, it is necessary to focus on the Great Debates of IR. The First Great Debate between realism and liberal internationalism showed how the failure of the League of Nations proved that the idea of harmony of interest was not correct. Historians such as E.H Carr termed liberal internationalism as ‘utopianism’ and ‘idealism’. The Second Great Debate between Behaviouralism and Post-behaviouralism focused on whether IR should be studied by taking help from methods of natural science or it should be done by taking a more value-based approach. The third Great Debate in international relations between Neo-realism and Neo-Liberalism (the neo-neo debate) gives a detailed understanding of neoliberalism in IR as an approach to study. Both neorealism and neoliberalism believe that states are rational actors. But there are certain differences between them. They are as follows:

- Neorealism and Neoliberalism accept that there is anarchy in the international system. Neorealism argues that due to anarchy, states will never cooperate with one another. They will always compete with each other. Neorealists feel that cooperation depends upon the will of the state.

The neoliberals on the other hand point out that states do cooperate with one another on those issue areas where they have similar interests.

- Neorealism focuses on survival. Hence, use of force cannot be avoided. On the other hand, the neoliberal school believes in the idea of complex interdependence.
- The neorealists have given importance to ‘high politics’ such as military and diplomacy. For the neo-liberals, trade and economic activities are more important.
- Neo-liberals are optimistic about cooperative behaviour and therefore argue in favour of absolute gains. When states are conducting economic interactions, it leads to a positive sum game. All parties involved in the process benefit.
- Neo-realism, on the other hand, holds that states compete with one another and therefore there can be only relative gains. Neo-realism throws light on capabilities of the states. They feel that states are always uncertain about the intentions of other states.
- Neo-liberalism gives more importance to the preferences and intentions of states. Neo-liberals argue that international regimes play an important role world politics. They can help states to cooperate among themselves. Neo-realism does not agree with this point (Baldwin 1993).
- From the above, it is evident that there is much in common between the neorealism and neo-liberalism. Scholars outside the United States as well as those who work outside these paradigms therefore call it a ‘neo-neo synthesis’. Moreover, they argue that the neo-neo debate has not advanced IR scholarship as a whole. Instead it has narrowed the field to a superficial enquiry based on questionable assumptions (such as anarchy) and methodologies that may or may not be suitable to the discipline.

The Darker side of Neo-Liberalism

A number of studies based on the neoliberal approach have emerged since the 1980s. However, almost all studies have focused on the experience of Western countries with international interdependence and regimes. As Robert Cox has observed,

“regime theory has much to say about economic cooperation among the Group of 7 (G- 7) and other groupings of advanced capitalist countries with regard to problems common to them. It has correspondingly less to say about attempts to change the

structure of world economy, e.g. in the Third World demand for a New International Economic Order (NIEO). Indeed, regimes are designed to stabilize the world economy and have the effect, as Keohane has underlined in his work, of inhibiting and deterring states from initiating radical departures from economic orthodoxy, e.g. through socialism.”

The principal cooperative institution of the Global South during the Cold War, the Nonaligned Movement (NAM) has received scant attention from the Neoliberal theorists. Secondly, these theories would ‘assume, rather than establish, regimes as benevolent, voluntary, cooperative and legitimate’ (Kieley, 1990, 90), a highly questionable assumption when one considers the exclusionary nature of some of the regimes and multilateral institution, at least from the point of Global South. Consider the case of those Latin American countries which have experienced economic inequality as a result of privatization and Structural Adjustment Policy (SAP). Bolivia, Venezuela and other Latin American nations have expressed their voices in protest of the neoliberal economic policies (Lamy 2008: 136). Moreover, it needs to be remembered that due to the increased mobility of capital, the government of states have faced difficulties in taxing the profits incurring from privatization-led development projects (Rodrik 1997). Had the government been able to earn revenues from these projects, it could have been channelized towards the development of social sectors such as health, education and social security measures. Hence, it can be argued that as a theory, neoliberalism is a construct of the developed world. As Robert Cox famously argued, ‘Theory is always for someone and for some purposes’.

Diplomatic History Stage (1648-1919)

Until the First World War (1914-18), the study of IR was dominated by historians rather than political scientists. At this stage, the study of IR mainly centred around the state system. Individual scholars also identified and organised themselves in sovereign states and through them strove to fulfil their interests. That is why no organised and systematic study of international relations was made in universities anywhere in the world. Only in a few courses dealing with history, law and theology etc, initial efforts were made to study a wide variety of current international problems. But all this was done in a very unsystematic and superficial manner. No real attempt was made to study

and analyse IR in an organised and systematic manner to give it the shape and stature of a distinctive subject. The only exception is the pioneering effort of Paul S. Reinsch, who in 1900 delivered lectures on world politics at the University of Wisconsin.

Despite the existence of the state system, however, not all states accepted every other state. The norms of universality and sovereign equality were still nebulous and often questioned by powerful states. Truth is, some of the states had only partial attributes; they were small principalities and fiefdoms owing their allegiance to some big empire or a strong man. Some states were significant because of their neighbourhood; while others were due to their economic or military might. Some others due to their cultured or ethnic peculiarities. Thus, inter-state relations existed due to sovereign states and it constituted the agenda of international relations. However, relations between two or more states acquired complexities and divergent implications due to a variety of factors like economy, geography, military, historical, social, cultural, religious, ideological, strategic, and leadership. As a result, there emerged a situation of conflict or cooperation among them and the same became the area of study of international relations. Since both these aspects continued to remain part of the behaviour of states, international relations also was constrained to study both dimensions of conflict and cooperation. Thus, in the real sense of the term, despite the emergence of nation-states, international relations did not develop much till the First World War.

Since the study of International Relations was dominated by diplomatic historians the basic trends of this era were as follows

- Most of the study was descriptive and no effort was made to develop the causal relationship.
- Instead of analysing the events based on various factors and forces, most studies of the period were chronological descriptions of the events, recorded partially.
- Most studies were rooted to know the historical past and no effort was made to analyse the contemporary events. Therefore, the study of contemporary events and developments did not receive the importance it deserved.
- Since most of the studies were not done systematically, they lacked scientific rigour towards theory building.

- Since most studies were descriptive and chronicled the events without any effort to find a causal relationship, the discipline of International Relations lacked empirical and scientific grounding.
- Thus, in the years before World War I, studies in International Relations were predominantly in the form of historical and diplomatic writings. This disrupted the growth of the analytical, theoretical, and contemporary study of the IR. Therefore, this era was devoid of the development of theories of the discipline. Besides, systematic and comprehensive growth of the subject was also missing during this period.

World Systems

The section points out the key concepts used by Wallerstein in world-systems theory. It begins by conceptualising the notion of world-system, which is central to the world-systems theory. In doing so, it reflects on the concept of capitalist world economy. Further, it elaborates on three economic zones- core, periphery and semi-periphery that constitute the capitalist world economy. The international division of labour and relationships between various parts of the world economy provide a departure from the idea of nation-states.

The notion of system is central to the world-systems theory, which it takes as the basic unit of analysis. Wallerstein has given multiple definitions and explanations to the concept. He broadly defines it as a socio-economic unit with a single division of labour that binds its members in a relationship of mutual interdependence.

Wallerstein elaborates on world system in contradiction from mini-systems. Minisystems he states, are based on a single division of labour and have a unified culture. Simple agricultural or hunter-gatherer societies are examples of minisystem. These have no economic interaction with the outsiders. In contrast, as pointed out earlier world-systems are characterised by single division of labour that binds divergent cultures together. They involve economic networks and relationships that cut across political boundary and society. The world system analysis reflects on mini-systems as characteristics of past, a bygone era and focus on world-systems as operative units of social reality whose rules have constraining effect on individuals and society.

Further, Wallerstein focuses on two types of world systems—— world-empire and world economy. A world empire is a large bureaucratic structure with one political centre based on domination by conquest for e.g. the Roman Empire in ancient times and British Empire in the modern history. In contrast, the world economy is characterised by multiple political structures and cultures. It does not have a common political structure. Wallerstein's centre of attention is world economy. According to him the modern period is characterised by a unified capitalist economy rather than political interests. The economic interests and networks are pivotal in the organisation of the world capitalist economy and not political structures. The section 6.4 elaborates further that the world economy began to take shape from the 16th century along with the development of market capitalism. The North Western Europe became the centre for the origin for the world economy with the growing agricultural specialisation and diversification and was supplemented by the development of manufacturing industries like textiles and metals. The growth of manufacturing sector led to emergence of demand for specialised kind of labour, raw material and new markets among the merchants and newly emerging capitalists. Expansion of trading networks and later colonisation provided a basis to fulfil these demands. The rationale for expansion was economic rather than political.

Core, Periphery and Semi-Periphery

According to the world-systems analysis the origin and expansion of capitalism and simultaneously, the international division of labour divided the world economy into four economic zones namely, core, periphery, semi-periphery and external areas. This stratification of the world economy reflects on the Marxian and Weberian analysis of class. For Marx class is based on ownership and nonownership of means of production and forces of production. Weber understood class in relation to both ownership and occupational skill in the production process. The three economic zones of the world economy, the core, semi-periphery and periphery hold distinct economic and class positions in the world economy, by virtue of which they accrue advantages and benefits or suffer from disadvantages and exploitation. Below are discussed the characteristic features of the three economic zones of the world economy:

Core Countries

The core is constituted by economically and militarily the most powerful and dominant countries of the world. The core countries are highly industrialised, owners of the means of production and perform extremely skilled production tasks. In fact, their high level of industrialisation and technical advancement attracts the skilled labour from the other economic zones. The core countries are the producers of manufactured goods rather than raw-material. They are the vanguard of all technological innovations and industrial development. These are the countries that focus on the capital intensive production and have benefitted maximum from the capitalist economy. They have a locally strong dominant bourgeoisie class that enable them to obtain control over international commerce and extract capital surpluses from this trade for their own benefit. The core countries exercise significant influence over non-core countries. They draw significant advantages by dominating and exploiting the periphery countries. They are markets for raw material and cheap labour from the periphery countries. They extract profits from the periphery countries by selling their manufactured goods and commodities at a high cost. Further, they draw enormous profits by making capital investments in the periphery countries, which makes the latter dependent and vulnerable. The history of world capitalist system makes evident that there has been a competition among groups of core countries to establish their domination over periphery countries for the want of access to resources and quest for economic dominance. There have been occasions where one core country has been able to establish its supremacy over others. The dominance of Holland and then Great Britain in the history of the origins of the world capitalist economy as a part of mercantile capitalism well establishes the point. The following section on the history of the origins of the world capitalist system will further enable us to reflect on the point. Wallerstein added that a core nation can establish its dominance over others by being dominant in the sphere of production, trade and financial/banking activity. The dominance in these three spheres contribute to a core country attaining military dominance. However, superior military and armed strength in the history of world capitalist system have not been the basis of economic dominance of a core country, rather military expansion has led to loss of economic dominance.

Periphery Countries

The periphery countries are the economically and militarily marginalised and exploited countries of the world. They are least industrialized, tend to have very little of the world's means of production and have a pool of unskilled labour. Periphery countries are predominantly agricultural economies/ producers of cash crops with a huge base of peasant population. They lack strong central governments and are primary exporters of raw material to the core nations. They engage in labour-intensive production and have to rely on coercive labour practices often set externally by the governments of the core countries. They are vulnerable to investments from multi-national and transnational corporations from core countries which expropriate much of the surplus generated through unequal trade. The periphery countries manifest high degree of social inequality. They have a small bourgeoisie class, which fulfils its vested interests by forging connections with the multinational and transnational corporations.

The history of world of capitalist system is replete with examples whereby, core countries have established/sought to establish their monopoly over a periphery country to maximize their profits and benefits from it. In this context, Wallerstein's concepts of trade concentration and investment concentration, whereby periphery country trade with and receive investments from a few core countries (or only one) becomes relevant. A high trade and investment concentration adds to the vulnerable status of the peripheral country. The periphery country would be hard hit, economically, in case the core country decides to end trade and investment transactions with it. The case of Latin America a peripheral country with concentration of trade with and investment from the U.S.A well explains this point.

Semi-periphery Countries

Semi-peripheral are countries that are intermediate and in between the core and periphery. These are countries that have to prevent themselves from falling into periphery status and simultaneously attempt to graduate to the category of core status. In other words, semi-peripheries can come into existence from declining core and developing periphery countries. These are industrializing and developing countries, which are becoming more diversified economies. When compared to periphery countries, semi-peripheral countries have relatively developed and diversified economies. However, they

are not dominant in international trade as the core countries. They have export and import tie-ups with the peripheral and core countries respectively. The existence of semi-peripheries is extremely crucial according to Wallerstein for the stability of world system. The semi-peripheries act as buffers between cores and peripheries, the two opposing economic zones. They deflect and ease the political pressures, tensions and opposition of groups in peripheral areas that may threaten the dominance of core-states and dismantle them.

History of Dependency

Theory ECLAC (the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean) conducted research in the 1950s that laid the groundwork for the theory of reliance. Raul Prebisch was one of the most representative writers. The main ideas of the Prebisch model are that in order to foster development within a nation, it is imperative to: regulate the monetary exchange rate and prioritize fiscal over monetary policy; encourage a more effective role for the government in terms of national development; establish an investment platform where national capitals are given priority; and permit the inflow of outside money in accordance with the development priorities already set forth in national plans in order to support the industrialization process in Latin America; encourage a more effective internal demand in terms of domestic markets; increase internal demand by raising worker wages and salaries, which will positively affect aggregate demand in internal markets; develop a more effective government social service coverage, particularly for impoverished sectors, in order to create conditions that will make those sectors more competitive; and create national policies based on the import substitution paradigm, safeguarding domestic output through the imposition of tariffs and quotas on foreign markets.

Dependency theory had its roots in the proposal made by Prebisch and ECLAC at the start of the 1950s. Nonetheless, a number of writers, including Falleto and Dos Santos, contend that the dependency model was only established as a result of the failure of the ECLAC's development initiatives. The latter part of the 1950s and the middle of the 1960s saw the publication of this more complex theoretical model. Andre Gunder Frank, Raul Prebisch, Theotonio Dos Santos, Enrique Cardozo, Edelberto Torres-Rivas, and Samir Amin are some of the prominent writers of dependence theory.

Tenets of Dependency Theory

The theory of dependency blends aspects of Keynes' economic theory—the liberal economic theories that arose in the United States and Europe in reaction to the Great Depression of the 1920s—with neo-marxist perspectives. Four key ideas from Keynes' economic theory are embodied in the theory of dependency: To: a) Create a significant internal effective demand in terms of domestic markets; b) Acknowledge the importance of the industrial sector in achieving higher levels of national development, particularly given that it can add more value to products than the agricultural sector can.; c) To raise worker incomes in order to boost aggregate demand in domestic markets; d) To encourage a more capable role for the government in order to uphold domestic development conditions and raise living standards. The following are the main theories put out by the dependency theory regarding Third World country development:

1. The growth of countries in the Third World requires deference to the core, while the development of the core nations is self-sufficient. Examples of this kind of circumstance are found throughout Latin America, particularly in highly industrialized nations like Sao Paulo, Brazil.
2. The weakest connections to the core coincide with the greatest economic progress for the periphery countries. The industrialization process that began in South America in the 1930s, while the Western powers were fighting in World War II and the core nations were concentrating on finding solutions to the issues left over from the Great Depression, is an example of this situation.
3. The periphery countries are fully reincorporated into the system by the time the core emerges from its crisis and resumes trade and investment relations, which stunts the expansion of industrialization in these areas. Third World countries suffer in terms of balance of payments, inflation, and political stability when core countries recover from war or other crises that divert their focus from the periphery.
4. The areas that have the strongest historical ties to the center are those that are extremely poor and continue to function under a feudal system.

Criticisms of Dependency Theory

The main criticism of the dependency theory has centered on the fact that this institution's conclusions are not fully supported by actual data. Moreover, this theoretical stance employs extremely abstract analytical levels. Another criticism leveled at the dependency movement is that connections with multinational firms are viewed as exclusively bad for nations, despite the fact that these connections can be leveraged to transfer technology.

Feminist Approaches

We noted the nineteenth century academic context within which the comparative method arose. More recent anthropologists would point to the fact that colonialism and the access to the study of 'other' cultures was a political context that cannot be wished away. This political context was, in a manner, camouflaged, owing to the unquestioned dominance of western power and western scholarship. The natives have just begun talking back. The political context also went unnoticed because the method explicitly advocated value neutrality and indeed took pains to delineate guidelines to avoid obvious pitfalls of bias. In sharp contrast the feminist approach has an overt political context. And also overtly states its value preferences. A commitment to gender equity is embedded within the approach.

While the first phase of the women's movement dates back to the suffragette movement of the west (see Box10.3) and the national movement in the colonised countries like ours, it is only with the second phase of the women's movement in the 1970s that a systematic interrogation of the social sciences from a feminist approach took place. Unlike the lineage of the comparative method, as shown by Chaudhuri (2004), the feminist method has an inextricable link with the feminist movement. The issue here is not whether each practitioner of feminist scholarship is an activist or not. The issue is that the basis of feminist knowledge emerged from a radical movement that questioned the given social order as both natural and divinely destined. We discussed the farreaching impact of changing or not changing surnames above (see Box 10.3 about lesser known facts about feminist movement).

Furthermore by the 1980s, it was becoming clear that the feminist scientific revolution, like those that Kuhn (1970) had studied, would not take place without

resistance (see also Unit 6). As Kuhn (1970) has noted, scientific disciplines are aptly named; they discipline thought by making some ideas seem natural and others almost unthinkable. The practice of science involves commitments to such disciplines. The commitments of the scholarly community to certain ideas and ways of thinking seem to stand in the way of new theories, however useful they might prove to be in the long run, as we will shortly discuss in the next section on features of the feminist approach to sociology. While calling for a critical appraisal of research in women's studies Krishnaraj (2005: 3008-3017) said, "Feminist research is expected to use theory not so much to test hypotheses but develop a better understanding through grounded concepts. "

Let us now turn to the stages in the growth of a feminist approach and then to key features of the feminist method. But before proceeding to this ,mportant section of the unit, as you need to complete the Reflection and Action 10.2 exercise for fully understanding the thinking involved in pursuing the feminist method.

Features of the Feminist Method

Much as in the case of the comparative method (while there are certainly some common features within the vast body of studies that warrant them being called comparative or feminist), it is important to assert that important differences also characterise what can be broadly termed the feminist method. For purposes of elucidation, I will first begin with the stages in the development of a feminist approach to sociology and then see what could be seen methodologically as some common features.

A) Stages in the development of a feminist approach to sociology A useful way to mark the growth of a feminist approach to sociology is to identify three stages in the study of gender related issues since 1970.

- Initially, the emphasis was on sex differences and the extent to which such differences might be based in biological properties of individuals.
- In the second stage, the focus shifted to individual-level sex roles and socialization, exposing gender as the product of specific social arrangements, although still conceptualizing it as an individual trait.
- The hallmark of the third stage is the recognition of the centrality of gender as an organising principle in all social systems, including work, politics, everyday interaction, families, economic development, law, education, and a host of other

social domains. As our understanding of gender has become more social, so has our awareness that gender is experienced and organised in race and class-specific ways.

Some Key Features It has already been emphasised that important differences exist between different feminist approaches. Along with noting down the direct and indirect links with different political and theoretical approaches, we are here making a case for delineating what a feminist method in sociology entails. To start with, we can clearly distinguish between the traditional sociological approach to gender and the feminist approach. Most introductory sociology textbooks still treat gender as an individual attribute and gender inequality as an outcome of childhood socialisation (Marb Mies (1931.)) In contrast, current feminist thinking stresses the far greater input of the division of labour, power, social control, violence, and ideology as structural and interactional bases of inequality, not only between women and men, but among women and men of diverse social classes and racial ethnic groups. Gorelick (1991: 461) referred to Maria Mies, who had in the nineteen seventies provided methodological guidelines for feminist research. She stressed the need for replacing the practice of value-free research with a conscious bias towards women's struggles for social change. Secondly, she made a case for conscientisation of the researcher as well as the researched. Let us now outline the following key features that mark the feminist method.

Feminist sociology argues that research designs were based on men's experiences.

Feminist social scientists demanded a fundamental transformation in how questions are asked and what criteria are employed to define an answer as acceptable (see Box 10.4 and Unit 4). Illustrative of this is the long practice of assuming that the head of the household is the eldest male member. It has been increasingly shown that the number of female-headed households in the rural areas of India is very high. But the very concept of a head of household was based on the urban middle class men's experience that women are 'housewives'. Another very common example is the manner that the category 'work' assumed that it meant 'regular work outside the home for which wages were given. However it has been increasingly realised that women for the most part work in the informal sector, in what are termed as household production units. Instances in the city of Delhi would be bangle and toy making, zardozi, assembling of electronic parts that are

subcontracted to poor women in the slums, domestic workers etc. Indeed concerted efforts were made in the 1991 census to educate both census personnel and ordinary citizens that breaking stones or carrying bricks is also work. Apart from this informal work, which is growing with globalisation, the idea that housework is also 'work' is still considered alien (see Box 10.4 about ignoring women).

Feminist sociology is against a separation and reification of -- a division 1 between' the public and private

In sociology, when gender was seen primarily as an organising principle of the family, thgothor areas of social life were falsely conceptualised as "ungendered". The division between an ungendered "public" sphere and a gendered "private" sphere is both ideological and misleading (see Box 10.5). Illustrative of this would be the fact that male professionals would be preferred in the corporate sector and the argument given would be that men are more committed to work while women would be distracted; they get married and pregnant. The significant point is that men too get married and become fathers but the dominant assumption is that Feminist Approach the private sphere comprises the cleaning, cooking, shopping, child care, attending parent-teachers meet, looking after the sick, would be the women's work. The public sphere of work for women cannot therefore be reorganised until the private sphere is. In developing countries and increasingly in the developed ones too there are part-time or full-time female domestic workers. Sri Lankan, Philippino and Bangladeshi women among others are migrating across national borders to run middle class homes. This leads us to the third point (elaborated below) about the intersection of gender with other categories like class or ethnicity.

Feminist Discourse in India

The feminist discourse in India has organised itself around its critique of marriage and family. In this context, you may say that the feminists in India have articulated the debate in the last three decades of the twentieth century by theorising not only around deconstruction of oppression of women but also its negotiation and transformation in real life situations. Focussing on the economic class aspects of women's oppression, socialist feminism has engaged in discussing the relationship between sexual, economic class and racial oppression. Scholars, like Hensman provided a socialist feminist critique of marriage, family and community as they feel that 'the original left critique is inadequate'.

Similarly, John (2005: 712) has studied family and marriage in a historical perspective and shown how the social reform movement "during the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries engaged with the domestic domain via a critique of 'tradition', as embodied by specific subjects such as widows, child brides and others". Not just confined to the upper and middle class social reality, the feminists in India have drawn our attention to emerging critiques by Dalit and lower caste women. Formation of an all India group by the name of National Federation of Dalit Women symbolised another arena of debate around caste-based inequalities and Indian feminists faced the challenges that this critique brought out into the open about the invisibility of Dalit women's perception of exclusion from the mainstream the feminist movement.

Concepts: Balance of Power

A State of stability amongst two or more contending powers is referred as the balance of power. In international relations, maintaining of equilibrium amongst the states or alliances to prevent or check on attaining absolute power by other state or a group of states is termed as the balance of power. The primary objective behind the balance of power remains to limit a state or a group of states from imposing their authorised or illicit will upon other countries in the region as well as global state system. In this manner, an international or regional order is maintained whereby different geostrategic moves from any state are significantly checked and balanced by others. No doubt, realists, and neo-realists have primarily used the concept of BOP in international relations. However, its history is as old as human civilisation. Since, the ideology of realism and neo-realism is mainly guided by the principle of selfpreservation, and hence, the BOP provides a milieu for the survival to the weaker states in the system

The notion of balance of power in international relations is defined in different ways. Some of the well-known definitions of the concept are stated here, One of the renowned political realist, Hans. J. Morgenthau has defined the concept as "whenever the term is used without qualification, it refers to an actual state of affairs in which power is distributed among several nations with approximate equality".

One of the supreme American historians, Sidney B. Fay has defined the concept as "balance of power is such a 'just equilibrium' in power among the members of the

family of nations as will prevent any one of them from becoming sufficiently strong to enforce its will upon others”.

As per Palmer and Perkins, “The balance of power assumes that through shifting alliances and countervailing pressures no one power or combination of powers will be allowed to grow so strong as to threaten the security of the rest”.

Therefore, from the descriptions mentioned above, it can be rightly concluded, that the concept of balance of power has been defined in different ways. The balance of power, in fact, confirms to protect state’s interests by maintaining the symmetry of power through various means. In this regard, War, threat, annexation, alliances, and counter-alliances, buffer states, intervention, international pressure, armaments, sophisticated technology and occasionally persuasion are categorised as various strategies employed while maintaining the Balance of power.

Undoubtedly, the balance of power has given a round of applause for maintaining the peace and security through restricting aggressiveness of the aggressor. Throughout the history, BOP has remained a success in ensuring the global peace and security. The structure of the BOP has often protected the diverse interests of smaller and weaker nations against the dominant states. Though, war is categorised as a significant tool in maintaining the balance of power. However, continually various clashes and conflicts among global states are settling down through the peace negotiations as well. It is a widely accepted that the states often try to gain maximum power through military aggression, seizure of territory and alliance formations. In this way, the states endeavour to safeguard their interests without caring for the interests of smaller or weaker states. There are many opinions, which can be put forward against the balance of power viz. nations find it hard to break alliances, single power dominance can also ensure global peace, difficulty in maintaining mutual consensus amongst two or more strong states, etc. Therefore, it can be rightly said that the Balance of power is creating several challenges. Nevertheless, BOP is still considered as a better tool to maintain peace and security at both regional as well as global levels. In fact, since time immemorial, BOP has had been there in the international system in one form or other to maintain the required status quo as and when required.

Methods of Maintaining Balance Of Power

The following are the ways or methods of maintaining the balance of power.

Alliances and counter alliances: Alliances are a necessary function of the balance of power operating with a multistage system. The rival groups in the balance of power system have three choices in order to maintain and improve their relative power positions.

They can increase their own power, ii) they can add to their power the power of the other nations iii) they can withhold the power of other nations from the opponents. If they make the first choice, they embark upon an armament race. If they make second and third choices, they purpose a policy of alliance.

Alliances generally lead to counter alliances. When an alliance is specifically or indirectly directed against some states, it is quite natural that they will not remain as silent spectators. For example the triple alliance of 1882 between Germany, Austro Hungary and Italy led to a rival alliance, triple entente 1907 between Britain, France and Russia. Alliances may be both offensive and defensive. While an offensive alliance seeks to upset the balance in favour of its members a defensive alliance aims at restoring peace. Armament and disarmament:

Power is a relative term which is determined in the context of a particular nation or a group of nations. In the event of an impending danger from the enemy, every nation tries to maximise its power. The direct way of maintaining the balance is to increase one's own power in relation to power of one's opponents. When there is a great disparity between power position of two nations, it is not possible for the weaker one to increase its own power to the level of its rival. This method of maintaining the balance can be resorted to only when there is a rough parity in the power position the rivals

Like armament, disarmament can resolve a balance of power one can succeed in keeping its rival disarmed one preserves the balance in one's favour. But in practice disarmament as such has rarely been resorted to except in case of defeated powers on the conclusion of general war. For example the effort on the part of the allied powers after the first world war was to keep Germany permanently weak.

Causes of the failure of collective security:

The success and failure of institutions not only depend upon their quality but also upon the conditions with which they are confronted in realizing their tasks. Collective security largely depends upon three factors viz, the attitudes of the aligned members to the fulfilment of their obligations their mutual confidence and the balance of power among them. Collective security requires that "the power of those who threaten or break the peace be relatively slight compared with that of others who are willing to mobilize power against them. Otherwise, action will be war, waged in the name of collective security". The confidence among the aligned members is equally an important factor. They must repose confidence in each other. "Otherwise, those with little faith will resort to the traditional power game". Balance of power is the third condition favorable to collective security. The larger the number in the institution pledge to collective security, the better. But unfortunately, the absence of these ideal conditions was ultimately responsible for the failure of collective security.

The League Covenant embodied the provisions for international security. The arrangement for collective security against future aggressive warfare was made in the League Covenant. At the Paris Peace Conference, France proposed a plan for setting up an inter-national police force to maintain world-peace and security. But this plan failed to secure the support of the Allies. The U. S. President, Wilson, was opposed to employ the U. S. army under the League of Nations. Rather he advised the chief powers of the world to rely on each other for peace and security. At the failure of the French scheme, the supporters of the international security system faced a great difficulty. Due to lack of mutual faith and confidence among the nations, the urgency for collective security was felt most. But ultimately all efforts for collective security failed. The chief reasons for such failure were:

No country of Europe was in favor of keeping her troops at the disposal of the League of Nations.

Every state was opposed to the idea of unnecessary involvement in a war for the benefit of all by employing its own army at the disposal in other words, no state was in favor of entanglement in international warfare for the interest of others unless its own

interest for mutual assistance and co-operation against aggression as was directly involved.

Despite the provisions for mutual assistance and co-operation against aggression included in the Treaty of Versailles and the League Covenant, the Locarno Pact, the Kellogg-Briand Pact etc. were also concluded. These Pacts created difficulties in the way of -ensuring collective security Because, when the Locarno pact was signed, the signatories were under the impression that unless they were pledged to each other by an engagement of a voluntary character, they had no obligations to preserve the Treaty of Versailles or the similar international engagements. As a consequence, the security provisions of the League Covenant lost significance and became weak.

The French efforts for regional security gave birth to more than one set of rival pacts and alliances in Europe which hampered the cause of collective security. In the words of Langsam "Thus in 1927...Europe was again divided into armed camps; the outlook was hardly one to inspire confidence in the hearts of any European people". By concluding pacts with the Little Entente, France not only was pledged to preserve the Treaty of Versailles but she also undertook the responsibility of pre-serving the Versailles system-which, in fact, was never possible for her.

The aggressive activities of Nazi Germany and the appeasement policy of the Western powers towards Germany destroyed all chances of ensuring collective security.

Nature of Diplomacy

Diplomacy is "the art of managing the intercourse and adjusting the relations between states by negotiation" It is usually studied as the handmaid of international law, but it is in greater conformity to the facts of history to state that international law is the resultant of the working of diplomacy. Were international law to be entirely swept away, diplomacy would still survive, for states must needs have relations with one another. The attitude adopted by one state to another or to others during negotiations is determined primarily by self-interest. It is the duty of the diplomatist always to keep the security and dignity of his state in the forefront of negotiations and to enable it to attain legitimate ambitions by every justifiable means. If a state has a settled national policy in foreign affairs his activities must look to the maintenance of that national policy. During practically the entire nineteenth century, the British government had as the cornerstone of

its foreign policy the maintenance of the integrity of the Ottoman Empire. A British diplomat who, however much he might disapprove the actions of the Ottoman government, failed to uphold that policy would have soon been rejected by government, Parliament and people. Similarly, no place can be found in the American diplomatic service for an official who neglects to maintain the integrity of the Monroe Doctrine. The diplomatist labors under the consciousness that every foreign diplomat with whom he negotiates, labors with an aim in view similar to his own. The diplomatist works, moreover, in a field where the unforeseen may modify conditions at any moment, but he is nevertheless held responsible for results. He is not a free agent. If he is a representative of his country abroad, his actions and decisions may be influenced and even determined by telegraphic orders from home, however much against his will. If he is in the Foreign Office at home, he works in the knowledge that he must carry the legislature or its Committee on Foreign Affairs with him when he is part of a parliamentary regime, or carry the Senate with him if he is part of the American system. This may compel him to follow a policy and agree to decisions for which he personally has no liking.

"Open diplomacy" is one of the reforms most loudly demanded today. The complaint is made that diplomatists bring negotiations to a conclusion without keeping the public informed or without consulting the representatives of the people who, they say, have little to do with the conduct of foreign policy except to ratify whatever decisions are placed before them. Such criticism neglects to take into consideration the fact that in foreign affairs one country is dealing with matters that do not concern it alone. It frequently deals with secrets which it must share with other countries. A premature disclosure might result in the breaking off of negotiations altogether by another power, for that other power may follow methods wholly at variance with freedom of discussion and unrestrained publicity. Diplomatic negotiations, moreover, are frequently of a delicate nature, involving national predilections which cannot be overlooked. To attempt to discuss everything in public would often offend national pride, arouse international antagonisms and render impossible the give-and-take so necessary to the successful conclusions of negotiations, for both sides have rights to guard and national points of view to realize. A wise diplomat may render during negotiations the greatest service to the public interest by ignoring popular clamor for full information even when voiced in

the legislature. Lord Lyons did much to solve a serious situation when he deliberately and courageously refrained from giving any opinion of his own in the Trent affair.

Then, too, it must not be forgotten that in many cases diplomatic negotiations have to do with subjects a knowledge of whose technical details requires special information or which would have little interest for the general public, or in which many sources of valuable information would dry up entirely were publicity given to them. It is certainly true that a ministry which neglects to obtain the support of public opinion whenever possible loses an immense force in securing the adoption of its foreign policy. The real statesman is he who will constantly seek to instruct public opinion in his international policy so as to carry it with him in time of crisis. Recent events have shown how readily public opinion will respond to the activities of the propagandist in such times. Statesmen and diplomatists are at least partially informed on international affairs. There would be little profit in turning from them to an ill-informed public opinion for leadership. Moreover, it is a question whether popular assemblies are more likely to keep the peace than statesmen and diplomatists, especially when laboring under the stress of nationalist excitement. It did not prove so in the United States at the time of the Spanish War. It is a question, therefore, whether even on the grounds of theory, "open diplomacy" in the extreme sense would affect the conduct of international affairs for the better. Finally, as will be considered at greater length later in this chapter, most governmental systems of today afford the representatives of the people fair opportunity if they wish to use it, to see to it that the international relations of the country are carried on not only to advance the national interests but in accordance with good faith and honorable conduct.

History of Diplomacy

Diplomacy was originally the servant of war when war was the normal state of international intercourse. It was an agency to secure without fighting the ends for which war was waged. Today the positions are reversed, and war, when it takes place, is the outcome of diplomacy. The present status of diplomacy is the result of an evolution in which is discernible a movement away from a condition in which falsehood, chicane, and excessive formalism prevailed in international relations, to one characterized by honorable conduct among the negotiators, and by business methods in procedure. Diplomacy is one of the products of the Renaissance. Intercourse between nations

existed, of course, from time immemorial; but diplomacy, as defined in this paper, viz.: "The art of managing the intercourse and adjusting the relations between states by negotiations" dates from the rise of permanent embassies. Feudalism had little place for diplomacy, but the Italy of the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries anticipated, in miniature, Europe of the nineteenth century. Intense rivalry existed between the little states into which northern and central Italy were divided, and for self-preservation alliances and ententes were necessary to maintain the balance of power. This object could not be accomplished by temporary embassies, such as those of the Middle Ages, which were sent to accomplish some specific purpose and were disbanded immediately afterward. Permanent representatives were necessary who were to be "the eyes and ears" of their states at the foreign courts. Of all these early Italian states Venice had most at stake and it was natural that she should first establish permanent embassies and develop a professional diplomatic class. Her example was followed in course of time not only by all the Italian states but by the national states that slowly developed in Western Europe such as Spain, France and England, and by the Empire. The permanent embassy had become the normal agency of international intercourse by the middle of the sixteenth century. But it was looked upon as a necessary evil, the home government trusting its representative abroad none too much and the government to which he was sent viewing him with extreme suspicion. At first, Venetian ambassadors were sent for short terms of three or four months, and the term was only gradually lengthened to three years, at which it remained until the Republic was abolished by Napoleon. Moreover, from the very founding of the permanent embassy Venice laid down rules to be followed by its ambassadors abroad and required them to make comprehensive reports to the Senate of their observations and activities. The suspicion with which foreign ambassadors were viewed at first is well illustrated by the practice of the three great monarchs of the Renaissance, Charles V, Francis I and Henry VIII of interpreting the phrase "ambassador near the court" to keep ambassadors as far as possible away from the court. Nor did these monarchs scruple to open and examine the correspondence of foreign ambassadors. The diplomatist, it must be admitted, had early earned a bad reputation, but it is questionable how justifiably. The prudent suggestions made by Machiavelli in *The Prince* for the guidance of statesmen accurately reflected the spirit of the times though they frequently

were much overstepped in actual practice by ambassadors. Sir Henry Wotton's definition of an ambassador, "an honest man sent to lie abroad for the good of his country" is fairly descriptive of the attitude of his day, that of James I. The Father of International Law, Grotius, whose great work *De Jure Belli ac Pacis* was published in 1625, viewed the permanent ambassador with scant sympathy and maintained that he had no right of existence. The growth in the importance of the office, however, is well illustrated by the statement of Vattel whose *La Droit des Gens* was published in 1758, that, though there is no obligation on the part of a sovereign to accept a permanent ambassador it is necessary a matter of convenience, comity and custom.

teenth century was the period par excellence when dynastic interests controlled international relations. The ambassador, as the personal representative of the sovereign, occupied a place in the affairs of the day second only in importance to that of the sovereign himself. The ceremoniousness emphasized in official life by Louis XIV, and copied from Versailles throughout Europe, demanded certain qualities in an ambassador such as smooth and attractive manners, shrewdness and the art of using personal influence in managing men. As these could be acquired best at court, the practice arose of young men of rank becoming attached to embassies for the express purpose of learning the art of diplomacy. Diplomacy became an aristocratic profession. At the same time, it became a hierarchical profession. Down almost to the sixteenth century no distinction of rank existed among the diplomatic representatives at a court though various titles were used in referring to them. But the desire of the rulers of big states to be differentiated from those of little states caused a distinction between Ambassador and Resident to develop during that century. The process of differentiation determined not by questions of function but of dignity continued down to the Congress of Vienna of 1815, when regulations were adopted which were confirmed at the Congress of Aix-la-Chapelle of 1818 dividing diplomatic agents into four classes:

- Ambassadors, legates, nuncios.
- Envoys extraordinary and minister's plenipotentiary.
- Ministers Resident accredited to the sovereign-
- Charges d'affaires accredited to the foreign office

As these offices rank have only ceremonial value, and do not affect either the functions or powers of diplomatic representatives, the United States ignored them and accredited all its principal diplomatic agents as minister's plenipotentiary, that is ministers of full power and authority. In 1893, however, Congress enacted legislation whose practical effect was to authorize the President to conform to the practice which prevailed among other nations. During the nineteenth century the heart burnings formerly caused by the question of precedence among diplomatic agents were extinguished by the simple rule of seniority of appointment and in the case of signatures to treaties by an appeal to the alphabet.

The Agents of Diplomacy

The conduct of the international relations of a country is essentially an executive function. Historically, the monarch was the state and when his powers were gradually distributed among the organs of government the duty of speaking and acting for the state naturally remained with the executive. Few will deny that legislatures are unsuited to originate and determine the foreign policy of a country and conduct delicate negotiations, which are of necessity often complicated and where the issues involved may be momentous. In no constitutional country; however, is the executive power irresponsible in international relations. It is everywhere subject to the intervention of the legislative power, though the method of intervention differs. This control, however, extends to particular questions of foreign affairs rather than to foreign policy generally. In the United States each administration pursues policies without any legislative control whatever unless the policies require the passage of treaties or laws. For example, the Taft administration encouraged the financial consortium in China. The Wilson administration discouraged it. And in the countries organized upon the parliamentary system, while the legislative control is more direct, it rarely attempts to interfere with policy. Under modern conditions the chief agencies acting for the executive in the conduct of international relations are:

- The Department of State or Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
- Regular diplomatic agents of various grades ranging from ambassadors to charges d'affaires.

- Occasional or special agents appointed to realize some particular object. For the purposes of this paper they need but a very brief discussion.

(A) The Department of State or Ministry of Foreign Affairs. The public law of every state, whether written or customary, provides for a Ministry of Foreign Affairs or a Department of State composed of a trained body of permanent officials headed by a member of the cabinet whose duty it is to handle the international relations of the country. As early as the sixteenth century most of the European monarchies had established a special branch of the government for the conduct of foreign affairs, and the office has steadily grown in influence and dignity. Though the powers of the Minister for Foreign Affairs vary according to the political organization of different -states, he is nearly everywhere the regular intermediary between his country and foreign countries from whom all directions and communications to foreign states emanate and by whom all directions and -communications from foreign states are received. In Great Britain, for example, neither the sovereign nor parliament can give orders directly to diplomatic agents

(B) Regular Diplomatic Agents Abroad. Since the status of ambassadors and subordinate diplomatic agents has already been discussed, only their relations with the chief of the foreign office -need to be considered here. Before the invention of the telegraph, the position of ambassador was undoubtedly one of greater responsibility than today. A great deal was left to his discretion and good judgment because by the time instructions were received from home conditions might so have changed as to render them out of date. Frequently he had to act upon his own initiative when a difficult question arose. Today he can receive telegraphic directions from home. The result has been to enable the Minister of Foreign Affairs to have a more immediate control of negotiations than formerly. Probably the conduct of Foreign Affairs has thereby become more steady -and reliable. And yet it is a question whether the opinion of the man at the distant post, familiar not only with the facts but with the psychology surrounding the problem, is not as important today as ever. Official correspondence which must be published has become formal. For example, it is now the general practice for diplomatic agents abroad to repeat conversations with foreign ministers of state without comment. But there is much unofficial correspondence of an intimate nature between the agent

abroad and the minister at home, a correspondence moreover which usually remains private. The importance, therefore, to the student of diplomacy of a study of the memoirs of statesmen and diplomatists is obvious. Telegraphic communication has obviated the necessity of the long and detailed instructions that were formerly given to diplomatic agents abroad. One of the unfortunate incidental results for the student was the discontinuance of such collections as that mine of information the French *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France depuis les Traités de Westphalie jusqu'à la Révolution Française*.

(C) Occasional or Special Diplomatic Agents. During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, monarchs frequently sent secret agents abroad, sometimes to realize a particular object, sometimes to report on conditions without the knowledge of the regular representative. That the latter practice had not completely disappeared even in our own day was made evident in the Lichnowsky revelations. Experience justifies the belief that the practice can hardly fail to affect the diplomacy of the country unfavorably, making it uncertain and personal. When a special agent is appointed today for a particular object, he is usually an expert such as may be needed to negotiate a treaty of commerce or regulate a boundary dispute or other matter outside the scope of the regular diplomatic representative. When a special embassy has a merely ceremonial character, it may result in the increase of international good-will. When it is of a political nature, the speculation and even suspicion that are roused may render such a result dubious. A special agent of a political nature is likely also to arouse resentment among the members of the permanent embassy.

Self-Assessment Questions

1. Explain the origin and growth of International Relations as a discipline.
2. Discuss the main principles of the Realist theory.
3. Examine the role of Idealism in International Relations.
4. Analyze the Liberal approach to International Relations.
5. Distinguish between Realism and Neo-Realism.
6. Explain the key ideas of Neo-Liberalism.
7. Discuss World Systems and Dependency theories.
8. Examine Feminist approaches to International Relations.
9. Explain the concept of Balance of Power and Collective Security.
10. Discuss Diplomacy and National Interest in International Relations.

Unit - II

First World War 1914- 1918 - Wilson's Fourteen Points – Paris Peace Conference – League of Nations – Kellogg Briand Pact – Locarno Pact – Mussolini and Fascism – Hitler and Nazism – British Policy of Appeasement – Second World War – Causes, Course and Results

Self-Assessment Questions

- To understand the causes and results of the First
- To examine post-war peace efforts and institutions.
- To analyze inter-war agreements and the policy of appeasement.
- To study the rise of Fascism and Nazism

Importance of the World War I

The war of 1914-18 is an epoch-making event in world history. The result or the historical importance of the First World War was extensive and profound. Vastness of the battle areas, countless number of states joining the hostilities; political, social and economic results and gradual spread of internationalism-from all these considerations the First World War can be described as a great revolution. "The Great War was more than an international conflict, it was a revolution",

(1) Fall of great empires and rise of many independent states: Four great imperialist states-Germany, Austria, Russia and Turkey fell as a result of the First World War. On the ruins of these imperial structures many small independent states emerged, Before 1914 Europe was composed of some empires and some big nations. The small nations practically had no importance. After the world war Poland, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia gained importance in world politics. Before the war, six countries controlled the inter-national relations of Europe. But the temporary eclipse of Germany, Austria, Russia and Turkey and the emergence of a number of states of the second rank created a new international situation and inter-national problem became more complicated.

(2) Spread of Nationalism: The most important result of Spread of Nationalism in Europe the First World War was the spread of nationalism. From this point of view there was a great difference between the Vienna Congress and the Paris Conference. While the Vienna Congress attempted to uproot nationalism, the Paris Conference accepted it as an

international rule. Those states which stood in the way of people's interest or were composed of diverse races disappeared and the European states were reorganized on the basis of the principle of one language and one nation. Out of the ruins of the Czarist Russia four new states like Finland, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania emerged which were organized on the principle of nationalism. A new Poland was carved out of the territories of the neighboring states. On the ruins of the former Austro-Hungarian empire some independent states like Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia were created. Transylvania was taken away from Austria and was included into Rumania. The aspirations of the French and Danish nationalists were fulfilled as France got Alsace-Lorraine and Denmark got the Danish territory of Schleswig. Thus, it can be said that nationalism was acknowledged as an international rule. But at the same time, it should be borne in mind that later on Fascism or terrorism and Nazism emerged in Italy and Germany respectively from extreme form of nationalism. The nationalist movement in Ireland triumphed. At the beginning of the twentieth century the nationalist movement in Ireland Popularly known as the Sinn Fein gradually became very strong. In 1919 the revolutionaries elected D. Valera as President after establishing a separate parliament in Dublin for Ireland. In 1921 South Ireland achieved independence. Nationalism spread not only throughout Europe. Nationalist spirit awoke China and effected an epoch-making change in the administration of Turkey. Ultimately Great Britain had to yield before the nationalist movement in Egypt. The principle of nationalism and self-determination stimulated unrest in India, East Africa and elsewhere too.

(3) **Spread of Democracy:** As a result of the world war, democratic ideals also spread simultaneously with the expansion of nationalism. Republics were established in almost all the new states, monarchies in Germany, Austria, Russia and Turkey were abolished and democratic administrative system was introduced. After being defeated by Turkey in 1922 the Greek monarchy was abolished and a republican form of government was established. But democracy had its greatest success in Turkey. After abolishing the Sultanate there, the people established republican form of government under the leadership of Kemal Pasha. In almost all the newly reconstituted states of Europe women's rights to vote got recognition.

(4) **New form of Balance of Power:** As an effect of the worldwar, ar, the balance of power took a new shape in the world and according the relative importance of the states also changed. According to Gottschals and Lach "A striking result of the war was the shift of the center of gravity, political, military and economic from Europe to America. Before the war six great powers had maneuvered for advantage in Europe when the war was over, Austria Hungary had ceased to exist, Russia was in the turmoil of civil war, intervention and revolution; Germany was in a state of chaos; only Great Britain, France and Italy were left as Europe's great powers, all three in a state of exhaustion. The might of the two non-European powers, the United States had provided the Allies with ammunition...long before it. The Allies became heavily indebted to the United States largely because of loans made by the United States into a creditor country..." but after 1914 she emerged as the world's greatest creditor. "Her new importance was the cause of much ill will and jealousy". Till 1914 the U.S.A. could not assert her importance in the world politics, But after 1919 the U.S.A. stood as a rival of Great Britain in the struggle for world leadership. East Asia. The Bolshevik Revolution in Russia came as a great Taking the advantage of the war, Japan established her supremacy in challenge to the political and economic ideals of Western Europe. Russian communism appeared as an international force.

(5) **Rise of Dictatorship:** In some states the course of democratic movement took a turn to the establishment of dictatorship. problems and in many cases democratic methods failed to solve them. In the post-war period many states of Europe faced innumerable Hence the people delivered all power to a particular man and by doing so they helped in the establishment of dictatorship. Experiments of dictatorship went on in Germany, Italy, Russia and Spain. Later, dictatorship took its extreme form in Bolshevism, Nazism and Fascism.

(6) **Revolution in Social Life:** As a result of the First World War, a great change came in the European social life. The laborclass became politically conscious as they played an important Labor Welfare role in the war with the increase of power and influence of the labor class in political sphere various progressive social reforms were undertaken. In almost all the European countries state-interference was acknowledged in the case of investment of capital and employment of labor. The principle of social

reforms was accepted in many states and welfare schemes were introduced. In all states trade union and labor organizations slowly began to function. Under the League of Nations' supervision an International Labor Organization was set up. Welfare of Peasantry classthe peasantry gained more from the war than the labor class did. As the standard of living rose, the price index also rose high and consequently the profit of peasantry class multiplied.A revolution came in the East European peasant-life. In Russia the landed property of the landlords was distributed among the peasants. Also, in the Baltic countries the same was done. The principle of peasants' ownership of land and of the protection of their interests was accepted all over Europe.As the males were employed in the battlefield during the war, the social importance of women gained appreciation and hence in social life a new era had ushered in.

(7) **Growth of Internationalism:** As a result of the war,the spirit of internationalism increased. An international organization namely the League of Nations was founded on the basis of President Wilson's "Fourteen Points". Although its influence in the world politics cannot be distinctly gauged, effects of internationalism in social and economic spheres cannot be underestimated. The Communist organization namely the Third International provides an illustration.

(8) **Economic Crisis:** The worldwide economic depression of1929 was the outcome of the economic destruction involved in the First World War. The chief characteristics of this economic depression were unemployment, poverty, depression of money and fall of trade and commerce. This economic distress produced conflicts and sometimes direct hostilities among the nations during the 1930's.

(9) **Scientific and Commercial Developments:** The first worldwar served as a great stimulus to scientific and commercial developments. Also, it served as a stimulus to the development of efficient machines of destruction. Great progress was made in the field of medicine, in the art of ship-building and in aviation. New industries were set up producing the products which formerly had been available through import.

Paris peace conference:

The First World War came to an end in 1918. From an analytical study of its terrible impact and totality, the unscrupulous use of mechanical arms and ammunition and the loss of life and property, the war of 1914-1918 should be regarded as the real-

world war which never occurred before in the history of human civilization. The loss of life involved in this war had been twice the total number of deaths involved in the previous wars occurred in the period between 1790 and 1913. The war of 1914-1918 had involved a mobilization of 65 million men of whom 13 million had died in actual war or of injuries and 7 million were crippled and disabled. The destructions on both sides were so extensive that the distinction between the combatants and non-combatants completely vanished. Two-thirds of the world population were affected by this war. It has not yet been possible to ascertain definitely the exact loss of property. The heavy cost of the war led to economic crisis in the warring countries. All social classes in most of the countries faced inevitable destruction. The death rate of the civilian was much greater than that of the military personnel and that was due to famine, epidemics, raids and indiscriminate attacks of both the belligerents. in a word, in its scope and intensity, in the scale of destruction and in the involvement of every nation interest, the first world war was certainly unprecedented

Declaration of Kaisers deposition and of democratic government in Germany

On 30th September 1918, after the fall of Austria and Bulgaria, the German General Ludendorff advised the Kaiser to conclude peace with the Allies. Woodrow Wilson as terms of armistice, demanded that (1) Germany a democratic government in place of the despotic one. On 20th October, the German Government agreed to thesedemands. The declaration regarding the Kaiser's deposition and the establishment of democratic government came on November 9. On November 11, the armistice was signed between Marshal Foch, the General of the Allied Powers and the German representatives, Germany surrendered almost unconditionally.

- According to the terms of the Armistice, Germany
- withdrew her army from the territories of the Allies,
- declared the Rhineland as de-militarized zone, surrendered her war-materials, submarines, battleships in large numbers to the Allies, repudiated the Treaty of Brest-Litovsk previously concluded with Russia (1918) and also repudiated the Treaty of Bucharest concluded with Rumania previously

Leaders of the Peace Conference:

At the beginning of 1919 Representatives of most of the nations of the world assembled in Paris to finalize the Peace Treaty. The right of representation to that conference was not given to Germany, Austria, Hungary, Turkey and Bulgaria. Among the diplomats assembled at the Paris Peace Conference, most prominent were President Woodrow Wilson of America, the British Prime Minister Lloyd George, the French foreign-minister George Clemenceau and the Italian Prime Minister Vittorio Orlando. This group of the diplomats popularly known as 'Big Four' took all important decisions. In the Paris Peace Conference, President Wilson assumed the role similar to that played by Czar Alexander I in the Vienna Congress in 1815. An ex-professor of Political Philosophy at Princeton, a brilliant orator, an idealist and a man with rigid convictions, Wilson had a curious capacity to close his eyes to unpleasant realities. Wilson came to attend the Peace Conference in December 1918. More than the European diplomats, the European people expected his arrival in Europe most eagerly. They hoped that Wilson, rising above the world-wide bitter reaction against Germany, would play a very significant role in the Peace Congress. Hence everywhere en route from America to Europe, people accorded him a hearty welcome. It is said that on his arrival in France, the French people shed tears of joy. The Italians also accorded him a grand welcome. As Langsam writes "Not since the days of ancient empire had Rome witnessed such a triumphal procession as that accorded the President of the United States". The Germans looked upon Wilson as their Protector'. But Wilson failed to enjoy unanimous support of the Americans. He failed to gauge the American feeling and to feel the pulse of the American Senate on the issue of the peace settlement. In 1916, during the first world war, as a candidate of the Democratic Party, Wilson was elected to the U.S. Presidency. But in the post-war election of 1918 the Democratic party suffered defeat in the U.S. Congress and the Republican party gained majority in the congress as well as in the Senate.

Great Britain was represented by her Prime-minister Lloyd George, a well-informed, realistic, alert and clever diplomat. He came to attend the Peace Conference with the full support of the British people. In the conference he was the only statesman of immense personality. His characteristic virtues, political foresight and clear understanding of the European problems made him the key figure in the conference.

George Clemenceau represented France. Popularly he was known as 'Tiger'. Clemenceau was an experienced diplomat, cynical and had a strong determination. During the American civil war, he was engaged as a news-reporter in America. Hence, he acquired a valuable experience in the arts of war and politics. He played a very significant role in the Paris Conference and exerted his influence upon his counterparts more than once due to his depth of knowledge in world politics. His chief aim in the conference was to extend the glory of France, to ensure its national security and to keep Germany paralyzed for all time to come.

Italy was represented by Vittorio Orlando, "a learned, eloquent and artful diplomat." He was an ex-professor of law, a scholar, a fine orator and a clever diplomat. But as he was not well conversant with English, he failed to create any impression in the conference.

Besides the above mentioned 'Big-Four', there were other diplomatic representatives who played no insignificant part in the Paris Peace Conference. The French President Poincaré and the French Commander Marshall Foch exerted their enormous influence upon the conference although they were not representatives to the conference. The only aim of these two French diplomats was to keep Germany weak and crippled in every possible way. Greece was represented by Venizelos. Poland was represented by Roman Dmowski. But Dmowski was no match for the other diplomats attending the conference. Japan was represented by Kimmochi Saionji and Nobuyuki Makino. They played a significant part in the conference. Their opinions and aims regarding the Far East were very clear and fixed.

The Organization of the Conference:

Long before the Armistice, the chief warring states had been collecting important materials and statistics necessary for discussion in the future peace conference. In fact, almost all the representatives came to attend the Paris Peace Conference well equipped with records and memoranda. The Paris Peace Conference was formally opened on 18 January 1919. Representatives of most of the nations of the world attended the conference. With them also came a large number of secretaries' advisors and news reporters to attend the conference. Because of the difficulties of discussing the various problems at open sessions, Supreme Council of two representatives from each of the big

five states namely America, Britain, France, Italy and Japan, was formed. The Supreme Council was empowered to place before the conference all the important deliberations together with their recommendations. As the Far Eastern buses were put in the hands of the Japanese representatives, they remained almost unconcerned about the European issues. As Italy withdrew from the conference for some time after opposing the discussions over the Adriatic problems, the decisions on important issues practically passed into the hands of Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Wilson. The comparatively smaller powers were given the right to place their respective demands before the Supreme Council.

Initial Problems of the Conference:

The Conference could start its work quite some time after it assembled. The problems before the conference were extensive as well as complicated.

Firstly-in the case of the Vienna Congress, the number of Representatives attending the Congress were comparatively few and their only problem was to reconstruct Europe by force. Whereas 70 plenipotentiaries "mostly in felt hats armed with nothing more romantic than fountain pens" and 1037 delegates of various descriptions attended the Paris Peace Conference. Besides, the number of news reporters of different countries represented at the conference was also not negligible. Moreover, the opinions and counter-opinions of the experts were too numerous and too wide for assimilation. Hence the difficulties in the way of taking decisions of the conference were numerous.

Secondly-despite so many discourses and discussions about the future reconstruction of the world the leaders could not find out any formula or a definite plan to make a peaceful co-ordination of the varied conflicting interests. As a result, solution of the post-war problems on a well-defined principle had become almost impossible.

Thirdly-the leaders of the Vienna Congress attempted to reconstruct Europe on the principle of reparation. But the leaders of the Paris Conference resorted to logic and arguments to realize their own hopes and aspirations. Wilson had declared in bold language that on the plea of balance of power no country nor its people would be placed under any other country's occupation. "To save democracy in the world" was Wilson's ideal. But there were many obstacles in the way of harmonizing the interests of different states and nations with this ideal.

Fourthly the selection of Paris as the seat of conference was ill. timed. Because the aggressive mentality of the war-affected Parisian towards Germany and the open protests of the Parisians and their newspapers against the Germans created a tense atmosphere which was not favorable for peaceful discussions in the Conference. In 1814 Lord Castlereagh had commented that as a place Paris was not suitable for any important and serious discussions. Harold Nicholson said, "We felt like surgeons operating in the ball-room with the aunties of the patients gathered all around." A neutral city like Geneva or Lausanne ought to have been selected as a proper seat for the conference. It was due to the pressure of France that Paris was selected instead.

Fifthly-the four leaders Wilson, Lloyd George, Clemenceau and Orlando who were entrusted with the responsibility of taking decisions had no ideological unity among themselves. The only aim of Clemenceau was to conclude such a treaty as to guarantee the security of France even at the cost of Germany's national and economic solidarity. In his words "Lloyd George believes himself to be Napoleon but Wilson believes himself to be Christ". In criticizing Wilson, he once said "He speaks like Jesus Christ but he acts like Lloyd George". About Lloyd George he commented that Lloyd George was more eager to establish international peace on the basis of truth and justice only if the interests of Great Britain were protected. Lloyd George earned the respect of his countrymen as a social reformer and as a Minister of War but he could not get rid of his aggressive mentality in the Paris Conference. Woodrow Wilson was the idol of peace. He was in favor of establishing a long and lasting peace based upon justice and neutrality instead of taking revenge upon the enemy. In regard to the reconstruction and redistribution of the European states, he was in favor of attaching importance to the opinion of the people concerned. But sitting at a place far away from America he could not gauge the feeling of the Americans and of the U.S. Senate on the issue of international peace settlement. Orlando was more eager to protect the territorial interests of Italy than to ensure world peace. Like French attitude towards Germany, Italian attitude towards Yugoslavia created troubles many times in the conference.

Hence there arose in the conference a struggle between two conflicting ideologies. On one side, there were humanitarian, honest and just principles sponsored by Wilson for

the establishment of a permanent international peace and on the other, there was victor's firm determination to take revenge upon the vanquished.

Sixthly-Wilson sponsored a long list of "Fourteen Points" as the basis of international peace and Germany accepted it partially. On the other hand, many secret treaties were concluded among the European states during the war. But these, as opposed to the Fourteen Points in many respects, created difficulties in the conference. In 1919, while speaking before some American Senators in support of the Treaty of Versailles, Wilson said that he was not aware of these secret treaties until he joined the conference. But his claim does not appear to be true. For in 1917 Balfour, the British Foreign Minister discussed the Treaty of London with Colonel House and Wilson. In the House of Commons, Balfour had commented, "I have no secrets from President Wilson. Every thought I have in the way of diplomacy connected with the war is absolutely open to President Wilson".

Besides, after the Russian Revolution of 1917 the Bolshevik government had published all the secret treaties that Russia concluded with the continental powers. Long before the armistice, the news-papers of London and America had made them public. Hence the interested states reacted violently when Wilson denied the existence of the secret treaties in the conference. In fact, there grew up a struggle between Wilsonian idealism and materialism and in the end, materialism achieved victory in most of the cases. "Wilson's idealism came into sharp conflict with materialism at the conference and in most cases, materialism triumphed".

Wilson's Fourteen Points:

On 8th January 1918 Wilson analyzed his famous "Fourteen Points" as the basis of world peace in the U.S. Congress. His Fourteen Points were as follows:

No secret treaty of any nature should be concluded after the war always frankly", Except the territorial waters, the high seas terms of world peace openly accepted and "diplomacy shall proceed should remain open to ships of all nations in times of war and peace.

Facilities for international trade and commerce should be peacefully-fully provided after demolishing all sorts of economic hindrances and all countries should be careful to preserve that,

Colonial rights of a country should be reconsidered openly and disinterestedly. At the time of any such reconsideration, the interests of the people concerned should be taken into account,

The lost territories of Russia should be restored to her,

Foreign army should be withdrawn from Belgium and her independence should be maintained,

Foreign army from all places of France, should be withdrawn and the two provinces of Alsace and Lorraine should be restored to France,

The territorial frontiers of Italy should be determined on the basis of nationalism, The people of Austria-Hungary should be given opportunity of autonomous development, Foreign troops should be withdrawn from Rumania, Serbia and Montenegro; a policy for the establishment of friendship among the Balkan states should be adopted and their political and economic independence should be guaranteed,

The sovereign rights of the Turkish Sultan should be maintained in the Turkish speaking region, but the non-Muslims in the Turkish empire should be given the right of autonomy; the straits of Dardanelles should be permanently opened to ships and commerce of all nations under international guarantee,

An independent Polish state with the Polish speaking people should be reorganized and her economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by an international covenant,

All nations should reduce military arms except those essential for the preservation of internal security and (or) an international organization shall be established affording mutual guarantees of political sovereignty and territorial integrity of all powers strong or weak

The Kellogg-Briand Pact 1928

Next to the Locarno Pact another important international treaty was the Kellogg-Briand Pact of the Pact of Paris. It is said that The Pact of Paris was born of American initiative and French courtesy. For some time a movement had been going on in America for outlawing all aggressive wars. The leaders of this movement felt that international peace could never be permanent unless the traditional way of settling all international disputes by war was dropped. This opinion gradually earned popularity

even outside America. In 1927 the General Assembly of the League of Nations unanimously adopted a resolution declaring "that wars of aggression are and shall always be prohibited". A similar resolution was adopted in the Pan-American Conference held in February 1927. In the meantime, the French Minister Briand proposed to renounce the policy of war between America and France. The U.S. Secretary of State Kellogg, following the principle of Briand, proposed an inter-national pact for outlawry of war. France had difficulties in accepting the proposal of Kellogg. Because as a member of the League of Nations and according to the League Covenant she was under obligation to go to war or to support a war under certain conditions. In March 1928 Briand at last proposed that the proposed Pact should be concluded by the big powers and that the signatories should have the right to enter into war only in self-defense. In April 1928 Kellogg sent the draft of the proposed Pact to England, Germany, Italy and Japan. After securing approval of these states, Kellogg circulated the final draft of the proposed Pact to fourteen states (England, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, India, Free Irish State, Italy, Japan, Poland, New Zealand and South Africa). After the consent of all the states was secured, the representatives of fifteen states including Russia met at Paris and signed the Kellogg-Briand Pact on August 29, 1928. Through the good offices of France, Russia also accorded her consent to this Pact. By 1930 sixty two States had subscribed to the Pact.

The preamble of the Pact contained the following declaration; "Deeply sensible of their solemn duty to promote the welfare of mankind, persuaded that the time has come when a frank renunciation of war as an instrument of national policy should be made to the end that the peaceful and friendly relations now existing between their people should be perpetuated and all changes in their relations with one another should be sought only by pacific means-thus uniting civilized nations of the world in a common renunciation of war as an instrument of their national policy..." According to the Pact the signatory states (1) agreed not to resort to war as national policy and also agreed to renounce war in the interest of national progress, (2) agreed to settle all sorts of mutual differences by peaceful means and (3) consented to keep this Pact open for adhesion by all the other powers of the world.

The Kellogg-Briand Pact of the 'Pact of Paris received almost universal approbation and a large number of states of the world took the pledge of refraining from war. From this point of view, it was an important step towards the accomplishment of inter-national peace. For the first time since the world war, the U. S. A. entered into a treaty relationship with Soviet Russia. Thus the U. S. A. and Soviet Russia came closer to each other in international politics. Anxiety of the people of the world for world peace and security was fully manifested in this pact. So, its importance from this point of view was enormous. Following this Pact, many non-aggression treaties and treaties of mutual assistance between two or more states were concluded in later years. Hence in spite of its defects its importance cannot be overlooked.

The universal reception of the Pact could not conceal some of its glaring defects. Firstly, the Pact did not provide any machinery either for its enforcement or for its interpretation. It failed to provide any machinery of sanction. It failed to institute any authority to determine the measures to be taken against the aggressor. Neither the Pact set up any machinery for mutual consultations on matters of common concern including causes of war or threats of war.

Secondly, the Pact failed to outline the specific measures to be taken against the aggressor. Nor did it specify the means of pacific settlement of disputes which the signatories would be obliged to employ upon the out-break of an aggression or a conflict. Thirdly, the Pact did not clearly define the term 'aggression' Aggression might take the form of a declared war or an undeclared war. The signatories to the Pact, without flouting violently the terms of the Pact, might take recourse to undeclared wars. In fact, within a few years of the signing of the Pact, Italy and Japan, though signatories launched undeclared wars on weaker powers without any opposition from other signatories to the Pact.

Fourthly, the Pact, no doubt, condemned and renounced war. But the principle of war was not declared illegal. Further, it failed to indicate the conditions under which the signatories to the Pact would resort to war on the ground of self-defense.

Fifthly, it cannot be said that the Kellogg-Briand Pact fully accepted the principle of renunciation of war. Because it allowed wars of several types, for instance, it permitted war in self-defense, military operations against the aggressor or breaker of

peace under the terms of the League Covenant. Thus, the possibility of war was not fully removed by the Kellogg-Briand Pact. Recognition of war instead of renouncing war. Sixthly, the Kellogg-Briand Pact considerably undermined the importance of the League of Nations. In the opinion of Carr, instead of strengthening the League of Nations, the Kellogg-Briand Pact constituted a great challenge to it. "The Pact was an expression of pious hopes, the Covenant was a political treaty". The Pact of Paris only condemned wars but it had no appropriate provisions for punishing the aggressor. The Pact did not provide sanctions expressed or implied whereas the League Covenant provided the means for resisting all kinds of war. The importance of the League Covenant was undermined and aggression. As an instance, it can be cited that during the Russo-Chinese hostilities Chinese Eastern Railway, when forty signatories to the Pact of Paris over the reminded Russia of her obligations under the Pact, Russia pointed out that "the Pact of Paris does not give any single state or group of states the function of protector of this Pact". Flagrant violation of the Pact of Paris was also noticed in the case of Japan's Manchuria invasion in 1931. Justifying this aggression, Japanese foreign minister declared, "Manchuria and Mongolia are, of course, within the sphere where our right of self-defense can be exercised in case the peace of Manchuria was disturbed, Japan should be justified in taking necessary measures as a means of self-defense. In such case, Japan should not be bound by the anti-war pact". Although America held Japan guilty of the violation of the Pact of Paris, she refrained from taking any measure against Japan. Britain also remained silent. Thus, the Pact of Paris was not only ineffective, but also a serious challenge to the League Covenant. The Kellogg-Briand Pact had laid down certain principles, it provided no machinery to implement them. It was in fact, "a high sounding nothing". Doubtless, it has been called an "instrument of international confusion". In a word, the Pact of Paris was only an aspiration rather than an achievement.

Importance of the Kellogg-Briand Pact:

Despite these limitations, the importance of the Pact of Paris cannot be wholly denied. Although Imperfect in many ways, the Pact of Paris was a great landmark in the sphere of international relations.

Firstly, as Hardy has pointed out, "As an historical event, this almost universal repudiation of war as an instrument of policy seems to have a unique importance. As a gesture indicative of a new ethical attitude to war, it is undeniably impressive".

Secondly, the Pact gave rise to a series of treaties, and understandings like arbitration treaties, conciliation treaties, non-aggression and mutual assistance treaties. These treaties and understandings, doubtless, constituted a major effort to achieve collective security outside the League of Nations.

Thirdly, the Pact broke America's isolation from world politics and signified her desire to build up a world system under American leadership as distinct from the League of Nations which had fallen under Franco-British leadership

Fourthly, the Pact made Soviet-U. S. Collaboration with the members of the League of Nations is possible to work for collective security and world peace. The Pact brought these two powers into the vortex of world politics.

The Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Nuremberg Trial:

The Kellogg-Briand Pact or the Pact of Paris was a landmark in the sphere of international law. The very spirit of the Pact implied that there existed a universally accepted unwritten law which made war an offense and a crime. This universally accepted unwritten law assumed the status of a system of law. As a matter of fact, by condemning war and in providing that all international disputes should be resolved by peaceful means, the Pact rendered war an illegal act. Although the Pact permitted war in self-defense, it outlawed aggressive wars. Again, although the Pact did not set up any international body to mend the wrongs done by any signatory or non-signatory power in violation of the Pact, no signatory could disregard its Obligations arising out of her adhesion to the Pact. And herein lies the force of an international law.

The International Military Tribunal that was formed at Nuremberg at the end of the Second world war, gave the Pact of Paris for the first time the force and sanctity of an international law by declaring wars of aggression not only illegal but also a crime against humanity. The Tribunal further construed the Pact of Paris "as affording the judicial basis for the punishment of individuals who initiated and waged wars of aggression in violation of its terms" Until the outbreak of the first world war there did not exist any universally accepted law or convention in the sphere of International Law-making war

illegal or an act of crime. But through the Pact of Paris such a universally accepted law and convention developed which declared wars of aggression illegal and a crime. The International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg proceeded to prosecute those who had been responsible for initiating and waging the wars of aggression on the judicial basis of the Pact of Paris. The fact that the Pact of Paris was not merely "a pious hope" but a clear statement of positive law making the initiating and waging of aggressive war a crime, can be substantiated from the observation of Parker, the American jurist at the Nuremberg Tribunal. In the words of Parker "The Kellogg-Briand Pact was thus not the expression of a mere pious hope but a definite statement of positive law. Thereafter, those guilty of making such wars were violating a definite provision of international law relating to warfare and it has long been settled that a violation of the laws of warfare is a crime for which punishment may be imposed upon the guilty". Thus, the Kellogg Pact was a significant development in the sphere of International Law relating to the laws of war and peace.

The Locarno Agreements, 1925:

Though the Geneva Protocol failed. In order to secure the co-operation of France was abandoned, it remained evident that some form of guarantee against the main dangers threatening European Peace was indispensable and her East European allies in the scheme of disarmament, the accomplishment of European security became inevitable. Security on the regional basis was attempted again when the endeavor for collective security in the whole of Europe failed. It has already been said that the main defect of the regional security was the possibility of the rise of regional pacts and counter alliances. But according to some, regional security was possible if the states of a particular region could be bound by mutual defensive alliances and treaties of mutual settlements of disputes. In 1922 Germany proposed such a regional alliance with France in regard to the Rhine. But France had been cold to the proposals. Meanwhile in 1924-25 a sense of urgency was felt to strike a balance between Germany and France in order to detach Germany from the influence of Soviet Russia. Here it is to be mentioned that in 1922 Germany and Russia concluded a non-aggression treaty called the Treaty of Rapallo as a defensive measure against the Western powers. At the end of 1922, Germany, in order to allay the French fears roused by this treaty, had invited France to conclude a

mutual defensive alliance for a generation. But as France had definite designs in the Rhineland at that time, she rejected the proposal. The British Minister Chamberlain felt the necessity of settling disputes and concluding regional defensive alliances among the states through the League of Nations. In fact, Chamberlain, accepting the German proposal, sent it to France for consideration. While England and France had been negotiating on the proposal, the German Foreign Minister, Stresemann announced that Germany was ready to surrender her demand upon Alsace-Lorraine and he even proposed for the conclusion of more than one regional defensive alliances. In the negotiations that followed, the French Foreign Minister Briand failed to obtain guarantees of collective security in the East as well as in the West, because England was not at all interested in the security of the eastern frontier of Germany. Having no other alternative, France agreed to the security of her western frontier. But at the same time France demanded that Germany should enter the League of Nations unconditionally. Germany could not agree as that would have embittered her relations with Russia. At last it was decided that the member-states would support the activities of the League adjusting their own military interests and geographical conditions. For the first time since the war all powers met on equal footing. At the end of the initial discussion, the representatives of Belgium, England, France, Czechoslovakia, Germany, Italy and Poland drafted a series of agreements at Locarno. These are known as the Locarno Agreements. On December 1, 1925 the agreements received formal signatures in London. Among the Locarno Agreements the following were especially important:

(a) Franco-German and German-Belgian Treaty of Mutual Arbitration: According to this treaty, (1) the Franco-German and Belgian-German frontier was guaranteed and permanent demilitarization of the Rhineland was re-affirmed, (2) Belgium, Germany and France pledged to each other not to resort to war except in the event of the breach of the provisions relating to the Rhineland and the infringement of mutual frontiers; (3) in case of infringement of Germany's western frontier, the signatories were to take care to resist that collectively, (4) where the violation was doubtful, the League Council was to decide it.

(b) Arbitration Treaties between Germany and Poland and Germany and Czechoslovakia: It was mainly concluded relating to the eastern frontier of Germany.

Upon England's refusal to guarantee the Eastern frontier of Germany, the latter was compelled to conclude two separate treaties with Poland and Czechoslovakia. According to them, the signatories remained obliged to accept arbitration for the settlement of disputes arising among them.

(c) Arbitration Conventions between Germany and Belgium and Germany and France: According to these treaties it was decided that the signatories would settle their mutual differences by peaceful means.

(d) Treaties of Guarantee between France and Poland, and France and Czechoslovakia: According to these treaties it was decided that the signatories would render help to each other if any country endangered the interests of any one of them by flouting the Locarno Agreements.

When the Locarno Agreements were formally concluded, the signatory states promised to put into practice the principle of disarmament through the League of Nations. Germany entered the League of Nations as a permanent member in 1926 and a preparatory commission was formed to make necessary arrangements for the proposed world Disarmament Conference.

Criticism of the Locarno Agreements:

After the Paris Conference, the Locarno Treaties were regarded as the most significant event in the diplomatic history of the world. The main objective of the Dawes Plan was achieved by admitting Germany to the League of Nations as a permanent member. Although Germany was not given an equal status with the other member states in the League yet for the first time it was through these treaties that a balance was struck between the German demand for a revision of the Treaty of Versailles and the French demand for security, and at the same time the political status quo of Europe was maintained. That was why Chamberlain remarked "The Locarno drew the real dividing line between the years of war and the years of peace". According to France, the Locarno Treaties helped re-establish the Anglo-French friendship. Whereas according to England, she got the right of sitting in judgment between Germany and France and "deciding which it was in her interest to back at any given moment". Practically speaking, the motive behind the conclusion of these Locarno Treaties was to establish close relations between Berlin, London, and in fact, British foreign policy as followed since the war took

a turn. It was due to England's stubborn attitude that all previous attempts of achieving international security fell through, for example, the treaty of 1919, the Treaty of Mutual Assistance of 1923 and the Geneva Protocol of 1924. England opposed each of these proposals because French motive was to cripple Germany for all time to come. The anti-German attitude of France was changed by the Locarno Treaties, although the equal status of Germany with other member-states in the League of Nations got no recognition. Thus, the anti-German attitude of the victors as revealed in the Paris Peace Conference, the anti-German attitude of France as found expressed in her occupation of the Ruhr, and the disagreements and hatred among the powers so far ventilated in the subsequent conferences-all such bitterness came to an end and everywhere people adopted an attitude of compromise and reconciliation. The Locarno Treaties strengthened the forces of peace and improved the international relations to a considerable extent. According to Hardy, "At the time of its adoption, at any rate, the Locarno Pact was a most effective and formidable looking scarecrow... to accept the bindings of the terms of the Versailles Treaty. But by Germany had refused voluntarily putting signature to the Locarno Treaties she took upon herself the obligations of the Versailles Treaty. To Germany Locarno Pact was more acceptable than the Versailles Treaty. Locarno Agreements were not free from defects

Firstly, in spite of the abandonment of the German and French demands over Alsace-Lorraine and the Rhineland respectively, the problem of Germany's eastern frontier was not satisfactorily solved and there was hardly any certainty of its peaceful settlement.

Secondly, England's refusal to defend the eastern frontier of Germany definitely implied that she was security on an international basis. As an effect the ideal of collective security as adopted in the League Covenant proved to be a failure.

Thirdly, although the Locarno Agreements were unanimously accepted, the old and new international disputes continued to exist below the surface. Although Germany was under obligation to make peaceful settlement of all disputes with Poland and Czechoslovakia, she did not regard their frontiers as inviolable. So France was not relieved of her anxieties about security that was provided by the Geneva Protocol. Whereas this had been the goal of the French policy.

Fourthly, the possibility of Franco-German alliance and co-operation weakened the basis of the Franco-Polish Alliance.

Fifthly, Russia considered the Locarno Agreement as a conspiracy of the Western powers against itself.

Sixthly, the Locarno Pact hurled a terrible blow at the Treaty of Versailles and the League Covenant. In spite of the League Covenant's provision for collective measures against the aggressor, similar provision of mutual assistance was adopted in the Locarno Pact. So, the Locarno Pact had created the impression that in spite of the Covenant's provision no country was bound to render military aid against the aggressor until the conclusion of mutual assistance treaties among the states. In the Versailles there was also a provision for the preservation of the frontiers of all states. Due to the repetition of the same provision, the signatories to the Locarno Treaty picked up the impression that unless confirmed by other engagements of voluntary character, the Versailles Treaty would not be a binding force upon them. Carr observes, "In the long run, the Locarno Treaty was destructive both of the Versailles Treaty and of the Covenant."

In short, the Locarno Pact was a gain to Germany alone. Firstly, the French system of alliance became weakened. Secondly, France had to surrender the Rhineland. Thirdly, Germany got an opportunity to re-arm herself. Fourthly, Germany was re-admitted to the European family on terms of equality. As a result, Germany was reinstated to her national prestige that was lost

The League of Nations

The League of Nations formally came into existence on 10 January 1920, the same day that the Versailles Treaty came into operation. With headquarters in Geneva in Switzerland one of its main aims was to settle international disputes before they got out of hand, and thus prevent war from ever breaking out again. After some initial teething troubles, the League seemed to be functioning successfully during the 1920s; it resolved a number of minor international disputes, as well as achieving valuable economic and social work; for instance, it helped thousands of refugees and former prisoners of war to find their way home again. In 1930 supporters of the League felt optimistic about its future; the South African statesman Jan Smuts was moved to remark that 'we are

witnessing one of the great miracles of history'. However, during the 1930s the authority of the League was challenged several times, first by the Japanese invasion of Manchuria (1931) and later by the Italian attack on Abyssinia (1935). Both aggressors ignored the League's orders to withdraw, and for a variety of reasons it proved impossible to force them to comply. After 1935, respect for the League declined as its weaknesses became more apparent. During Germany's disputes with Czechoslovakia and Poland, which led on to the Second World War, the League was not even consulted, and it was unable to exert the slightest influence to prevent the outbreak of war. After December 1939 it did not meet again, and it was dissolved in 1946 - a complete failure, at least as far as preventing war was concerned.

What were the origins of the league?

The League is often spoken of as being the brainchild of the American President Woodrow Wilson. Although Wilson was certainly a great supporter of the idea of an international organization for peace, the League was the result of a coming together of similar suggestions made during the First World War, by a number of world statesmen. Lord Robert Cecil of Britain, Jan Smuts of South Africa and Leon Bourgeois of France put forward detailed schemes showing how such an organization might be set up. Lloyd George referred to it as one of Britain's war aims, and Wilson included it as the last of his 14 Points (see Section 2.7(a)). Wilson's great contribution was to insist that the League Covenant (the list of rules by which the League was to operate), which had been drawn up by an international committee including Cecil, Smuts, Bourgeois and Paul Hymans (of Belgium) as well as Wilson himself, should be included in each of the separate peace treaties. This ensured that the League actually came into existence instead of merely remaining a topic for discussion.

The League had two main aims:

To maintain peace through collective security: if one state attacked another, the member states of the League would act together, collectively, to restrain the aggressor, either by economic or by military sanctions.

To encourage international co-operation, in order to solve economic and social problems

How Was the League Organized?

There were 42 member states at the beginning and 55 by 1926 when Germany was admitted. It had five main organs.

The General Assembly

This met annually and contained representatives of all the member states, each of which had one vote. Its function was to decide general policy, it could, for example, propose a revision of peace treaties, and it handled the finances of the League. Any decisions taken had to be unanimous. One of the advantages of the League Assembly was that it gave small and medium-sized states a chance to raise issues that concerned them and have their say on world developments.

The Council

This was a much smaller body, which met more often, at least three times a year, and contained four permanent members - Britain, France, Italy and Japan. The USA was to have been a permanent member but decided not to join the League. There were four other members, elected by the Assembly for periods of three years. The number of non-permanent members had increased to nine by 1926. It was the Council's task to deal with specific political disputes as they arose; again, decisions had to be unanimous.

The Permanent Court of International Justice

This was based at the Hague in Holland and consisted of 15 judges of different nationalities; it dealt with legal disputes between states, as opposed to political ones. It started to function in 1922 and by 1939 it had dealt successfully with 66 cases, winning respect for the idea that there was a place for a generally accepted code of legal practice in international politics.

The Secretariat

This looked after all the paperwork, preparing agendas, and writing resolutions and reports so that the decisions of the League could be carried out. This acted as a sort of international civil service whose members came from over 30 different countries. Like the Court of Justice, the Secretariat won respect for the high quality of its organization and administration.

Commissions and committees

A number of these were formed to deal with specific problems, some of which had arisen from the First World War. The main commissions were those which handled the mandates, military affairs, minority groups and disarmament. There were committees for international labour, health, economic and financial organization, child welfare, drug problems and women's rights.

The main function of the League was meant to be peacekeeping. It was intended that any member which resorted to war, thus breaking the Covenant, would operate in the following way! All disputes threatening war would be brought before the Council, which would recommend what effective military, naval or air force the members should contribute to the armed forces.

Successes of the League

It would be unfair to dismiss the League as a total failure.

Many of the committees and commissions achieved valuable results and much was done to foster international co-operation. One of the most successful was the International Labor Organization (ILO) under its French socialist director, Albert Thomas. Its purpose was to improve conditions of labor all over the world by persuading governments to fix a maximum working day and week; specify adequate minimum wages; introduce sickness and unemployment benefits; introduce old-age pensions. It collected and published a vast amount of information, and many governments were prevailed upon to take action.

The Refugee Organization, led by Fridtjof Nansen, a Norwegian explorer, solved the problem of thousands of former prisoners of war marooned in Russia at the end of the war; about half a million were returned home. After 1933, valuable help was given to thousands of people fleeing from the Nazi persecution in Germany.

The Health Organization did good work in investigating the causes of epidemics, and it was especially successful in combating a typhus epidemic in Russia, which at one time seemed likely to spread across Europe.

The Mandates Commission supervised the government of the territories taken from Germany and Turkey, while yet another commission was responsible for

administering the Saar. It did this very efficiently, and concluded by organizing the 1935 plebiscite in which a large majority voted for the Saar to be returned to Germany.

Not all were successful, however, the Disarmament Commission made no progress in the near-impossible task of persuading member states to reduce armaments, even though they had all promised to do so when they agreed to the Covenant.

Political disputes resolved

Several political disputes were referred to the League in the early 1920s. In all but a few cases, the League's decisions were accepted.

In the quarrel between Finland and Sweden over the Åland Islands, the verdict went in favor of Finland (1920).

Over the rival claims of Germany and Poland to the important industrial area of Upper Silesia, the League decided that it should be partitioned (divided) between the two (1921).

When the Greeks invaded Bulgaria, after some shooting incidents on the frontier, the League swiftly intervened: Greek troops were withdrawn and damages were paid to Bulgaria.

When Turkey claimed the province of Mosul, part of the British mandated territory of Iraq, the League decided in favor of Iraq.

Further afield, in South America, squabbles were settled between Peru and Colombia and between Bolivia and Paraguay.

It is significant, however, that none of these disputes seriously threatened world peace, and none of the decisions went against a major state that might have challenged the League's verdict. In fact, during this same period, the League found itself twice overruled by the Conference of Ambassadors, based in Paris, which had been set up to deal with problems arising out of the Versailles Treaties. There were first the rival claims of Poland and Lithuania to Vilna (1920), followed by the Corfu Incident (1923); this was a quarrel between Mussolini's Italy and Greece. The League made no response to these acts of defiance, and this was not a promising sign.

Why did the league fail to preserve peace?

At the time of the Corfu Incident in 1923 (see (d) below), many people wondered what would happen if a powerful state were to challenge the League on a matter of major

importance, for example, by invading an innocent country. How effective would the League be then? The former British prime minister, Lord Balfour, remarked: "The danger I see in the future is that some powerful nation will pursue a realpolitik as in the past. I do not believe we have yet found, or can find, a perfect guarantee against such a calamity.' Unfortunately, several such challenges occurred during the 1930s, and on every occasion the League was found wanting.

It was too closely linked with the Versailles Treaties

This initial disadvantage made the League seem like an organization created especially for the benefit of the victorious powers. In addition, it had to defend a peace settlement which was far from perfect. It was inevitable that some of its provisions would cause trouble - for example, the disappointing territorial gains of the Italians and the inclusion of Germans in Czechoslovakia and Poland

It was rejected by the USA

The League was dealt a serious blow in March 1920 when the US Senate rejected both the Versailles settlement and the League. The reasons behind their decision were varied. The absence of the USA meant that the League was deprived of a powerful member whose presence would have been of great psychological and financial benefit.

Other important powers were not involved

Germany was not allowed to join until 1926 and the USSR only became derived (when Germany left). So, for the first few years of its existence the League was deprived of three of the world's most important powers

The Conference of Ambassadors in Paris was an embarrassment

This gathering of leading ambassadors was only intended to function until the League machinery was up and running, but it lingered on, and on several occasions it took precedence over the League. In 1920 the League supported Lithuania in her claim to Vilna, which had just been seized from her by the Poles; but when the Conference of Ambassadors insisted on awarding Vilna to Poland, the League allowed it to go ahead.

A later example was the Corfu Incident (1923): this arose from a boundary dispute between Greece and Albania, in which three Italian officials working on the boundary commission were killed. Mussolini blamed the Greeks, demanded huge compensation and bombarded and occupied the Greek island of Corfu. Greece appealed to the League,

but Mussolini refused to recognize its competence to deal with the problem. He threatened to withdraw Italy from the League, whereupon the ambassadors ordered Greece to pay the full amount demanded. At this early stage, however, supporters of the League dismissed these incidents as teething troubles.

There were serious weaknesses in the Covenant

These made it difficult to ensure that decisive action was taken against any aggressor. It was difficult to get unanimous decisions; the League had no military force of its own, and although Article 16 expected member states to supply troops if necessary, Resolution was passed in 1923 that each member would decide for himself whether or not to fight in a crisis. This clearly made nonsense of the idea of collective security. Several attempts were made to strengthen the Covenant, but these failed because a unanimous vote was needed to change it, and this was never achieved. The most notable attempt was made in 1924 by the British Labour prime minister, Ramsay MacDonald, a great supporter of the League. He and help any of the Conservative government which followed MacDonald informed the League that they commit Britain and the defense of all the 1919 frontiers. A resolution proposed by one British government was and the League was left, as its critics thus rejected by the next British government, and remarked, still lacking teeth.

Reasons for this apparently strange British attitude include the fact that British public opinion was strongly pacifist, and there was a feeling that Britain was now so militarily weak that armed interventions of any sort should be avoided. Many other League members felt the same as Britain; and so, perversely, they were all basing their security on a system whose success relied on their support and commitment, but which they were not prepared to uphold. The attitude seemed to be: leave it to the others.

It was very much a French/British affair

The continued absence of the USA and the USSR, plus the hostility of Italy, made the League very much a French/British affair. But as their rejection of the Geneva Protocol showed, the British Conservatives were never very enthusiastic about the League. They preferred to sign the Locarno Treaties (1925), outside the League, instead of conducting negotiations within it (see None of these weaknesses necessarily doomed the League to failure, however, provided all the members were prepared to refrain from

aggression and accept League decisions; between 1925 and 1930 events ran fairly smoothly.

The world economic crisis began in 1929

The situation really began to drift out of control with the onset of the economic crisis, or the Great Depression, as it was sometimes known. It brought unemployment and falling living standards to most countries, and caused extreme right-wing governments to come to power in Japan and Germany; together with Mussolini, they refused to keep to the rules and took a series of actions which revealed the League's weaknesses (points (h), (i) and (j)).

The Japanese invasion of Manchuria (1931)

In 1931 Japanese troops invaded the Chinese territory of Manchuria. China appealed to the League, which condemned Japan and ordered her troops to be withdrawn. When Japan refused, the League appointed a commission under Lord Lytton, which decided (1932) that there were faults on both sides and suggested that Manchuria should be governed by the League. However, Japan rejected this and withdrew from the League (March 1933). The question of economic sanctions, let alone military ones, was never even raised, because Britain and France had serious economic problems. They were reluctant to apply a trade boycott of Japan in case it led to war, which they were ill-equipped to win, especially without American help. Japan had successfully defied the League, whose prestige was damaged, although not yet fatally.

The failure of the World Disarmament Conference (1932-3)

This met under the aegis of the League, and the failure was a grave disappointment. The Germans asked for equality of armaments with France, but when the French demanded that this should be postponed for at least eight years, Hitler was able to use the French attitude as an excuse to withdraw Germany from the conference and later from the League.

The Italian invasion of Abyssinia (October 1935)

This was the most serious blow to the League's prestige and credibility (see Section 5.2(b)). The League condemned Italy and introduced economic sanctions; however, these were not applied to exports of oil, coal and steel to Italy. So half-hearted were the sanctions that Italy was able to complete the conquest of Abyssinia.

without too much inconvenience (May 1936). A few weeks later sanctions were abandoned, and Mussolini had successfully defrauded the League. Again, Britain and France must share the blame for the League's failure. Their motive was the desire not to antagonize Mussolini too much, so as to keep him as an ally against the real danger - Germany. But the results were disastrous:

1. 1 Mussolini was annoyed by the sanctions anyway, and began to draw closer to Hitler
2. 2 Small states lost all faith in the League
3. 3 Hitler was encouraged to break the Versailles Treaty by introducing conscription (March 1935) and sending German troops into the demilitarized zone of the Rhineland (March 1936). Neither matter was raised at the League Council, mainly because France and Britain were afraid that Hitler would reject any decision that went against Germany, and they were reluctant to be forced into military action against the Germans.

After 1935, therefore, the League was never taken seriously again. The real explanation for the failure of the League was simple: when aggressive states such as Japan, Italy and Germany challenged it, the League members, especially France and Britain, were not prepared to support it, either by decisive economic measures or by military action. The League was only as strong as the determination of its leading members to stand up to aggression, unfortunately, determination of that sort was sadly lacking during the 1930s.

However, some historians believe that the League should not be dismissed as a complete failure and a total irrelevance in world history. Ruth Henig, for example, feels that it is high time that these verdicts are challenged and that the League is seen for what it was, a bold step towards international cooperation which failed in some of its aims but succeeded comprehensively in others'. And challenge them she did, by publishing a book, *The League of Nations* (2010), to mark the ninetieth anniversary of its beginning. She argues that its creation 'marked an important step on the road to our contemporary global system of international organization, coordinated through the United Nations, which was built on the foundations of the League's experience'. Expectations of what the League might achieve were far too high and completely unrealistic. How could it

possibly have been expected to deal with aggressors when it had no army of its own and no mechanism to compel member states to provide their troops? In fact, its great contribution was that it provided the first experimental phase, the blueprint for a second, more effective and the United Nations (UN). The longer-lasting form of international co-operation Assembly, the Council and the Secretariat were adopted as a basis by the UN. The UN International Court of Justice reproduced almost identically the League's Permanent Court. The International Labor Organization is still operating today.

Mussolini and Fascism

The unification of Italy was only completed in 1870, and the new state suffered from economic and political weaknesses. The First World War was a great strain on her economy and there was bitter disappointment at her treatment by the Versailles settlement-Between 1919 and 1922 there were five different governments, all of which were incapable of taking the decisive action that the situation demanded. In 1919, Benito Mussolini founded the Italian fascist party, which won 35 seats in the 1921 elections. At the same time there seemed to be a real danger of a left-wing revolution: in an atmosphere of strikes and riots, the fascists staged a 'march on Rome', which culminated in King Victor Emmanuel inviting Mussolini to form a government (October 1922); He remained in power until July 1943. Gradually Mussolini took on the powers of a dictator and attempted to control the entire way of life of the Italian people. At first it seemed as though his authoritarian regime might bring lasting benefits to Italy, and he won popularity with his successful foreign policy. Later he made the fatal mistake of entering the Second World War on the side of Germany (June 1940), even though he knew Italy could not afford involvement in another war. After the Italians suffered defeats by the British, who captured Italy's African possessions and occupied Sicily, they turned against Mussolini. He was deposed and arrested (July 1943), but was rescued by the Germans (September) and set up as a puppet ruler in northern Italy, backed by German troops. In April 1945, as British and American troops advanced northwards through Italy towards Milan, Mussolini tried to escape to Switzerland but was captured and shot dead by his Italian enemies (known as 'partisans'). His body was taken to Milan and strung up by the feet in a public square - an ignominious end for the man who had ruled Italy for 20 years. Why was Mussolini able to come to power?

Disillusionment and frustration

In the summer of 1919, there was a general atmosphere of disillusionment and frustration in Italy, caused by a combination of factors:

1 Disappointment at Italy's gains from the Versailles settlement

When Italy entered the war, the Allies had promised her Trentino, the south Tyrol, Istria, Trieste, part of Dalmatia, Adalia, some Aegean islands and a protectorate over Albania. Although she was given the first four areas, the rest were awarded to other states, mainly Yugoslavia; Albania was to be independent. The Italians felt cheated in view of their valiant efforts during the war and the loss of close to 700 000 men. Particularly irritating was their failure to get Fiume (given to Yugoslavia), although in fact this was not one of the areas which had been promised to them. Gabriele d'Annunzio, a famous romantic poet, marched with a few hundred supporters and occupied Fiume before the Yugoslavs had time to take it. Some army units deserted and supported d'Annunzio, providing him with However, in June 1920, after d'Annunzio had held out in Fiume for 15 months, the new prime minister, Giovanni Giolitti, decided that the government's authority must be restored. He ordered the army to remove d'Annunzio from Fiume a risky move, since he was viewed as a national hero. The army obeyed orders and d'Annunzio surrendered without a fight, but it left the government highly unpopular.

2 The economic effects of the war

The effects of the war on the economy and the standard of living were disastrous. The government had borrowed heavily especially from the USA and these debts now had to be repaid. As the lira declined in value (from 5 to the dollar in 1914 to 28 to the dollar in 1921) the cost of living increased accordingly by at least five times. There was massive unemployment as heavy industry cut back its wartime production levels, and 2.5 million ex-servicemen had difficulty finding jobs.

3 Growing contempt for the parliamentary system

Votes for all men and proportional representation were introduced for the 1919 elections. Although this gave a fairer representation than under the previous system, it meant that there was a large number of parties in parliament. After the election of May 1921, for example, there were at least nine parties represented, including liberals,

nationalists, socialists, communists, the Catholic popular party and fascists. This made it difficult for any one party to gain an overall majority, and coalition governments were inevitable. No consistent policy was possible as five different cabinets with shaky majorities came and went. There was growing impatience with a system that seemed designed to prevent decisive government

There was a wave of strikes in 1919 and 1920

The industrialization of Italy in the years after unification led to the development of a strong socialist party and trade unions. Their way of protesting at the mess the country was in was to organize a wave of strikes in 1919 and 1920. These were accompanied by rioting, looting of shops and occupation of factories by workers. In Turin, factory councils reminiscent of the Russian soviets were appearing. In the south, socialist leagues of farm workers seized land from wealthy landowners and set up co-operatives. The government's prestige sank even lower because of its failure to protect property; many property-owners were convinced that a left-wing revolution was at hand, especially when the Italian Communist Party was formed in January 1921. But in fact, the chances of revolution were receding by then: the strikes and factory occupations were fizzling out, because although workers tried to maintain production, claiming control of the factories, it proved impossible in fact the formation of the Communist Party made a revolution less likely because it split the forces of the left; nevertheless, the fear of a revolution remained strong

Mussolini attracted widespread support

Mussolini and the fascist party were attractive to many sections of society because as he himself said, he aimed to rescue Italy from feeble government and give the country a political system that would provide stable and strong government. Mussolini (born 1883), the son of a blacksmith in the Romagna, had a varied early career, working for a time as a stonemason's mate and then as a primary-school teacher. Politically he began as a socialist and made a name for himself as a journalist, becoming editor of the socialist newspaper *Avanti*. He fell out with the socialists because they were against Italian intervention in the war, and started his own paper, *Il Popolo d'Italia*. In 1919 he founded the fascist party with a socialist and republican program, and he showed sympathy with the factory occupations of 1919-20. The local party branches were known as *fasci di*

combattimento (fighting groups) - the word fasces meant the bundle of rods with protruding axes which used to symbolize the authority and power of the ancient Roman consuls at this stage the fascists were anti-monarchy, anti-Church and anti-big business.

The new party won no seats in the 1919 elections; this, plus the failure of the factory occupations, caused Mussolini to change course. He came out as the defender of private enterprise and property, thus attracting much needed financial support from wealthy business interests. Beginning in late 1920, black-shirted squads of fascists regularly attacked and burned down local socialist headquarters and newspaper offices and beat up socialist councilors. By the end of 1921, even though his political program was vague in the extreme, he had gained the support of property-owners in general, because they saw him as a guarantee of law and order and as a protector of their property (especially after the formation of the Communist Party in January 1921). Having won over big business, Mussolini began to make conciliatory speeches about the Roman Catholic Church; Pope Pius XI swung the Church into line behind Mussolini, seeing him as a good anti-communist weapon. When Mussolini announced that he had dropped the republican part of his program (September 1922), even the king began to look more favorably on the fascists. In the space of three years Mussolini had swung from the extreme left to the extreme right. Some of the working class supported the fascists, although probably a majority, especially among industrial workers, supported parties of the left.

(d) Lack of effective opposition

The anti-fascist groups failed to co-operate with each other and made no determination and Giovanni Giolitti (prime minister from June 1920 to July 1921) held the elections of May 1921 in the hope that the fascists, still unrepresented in parliament, would win some that they would become more responsible once they were in parliament. However, they support his government. He was willing to overlook their violence, feeling won only 35 seats whereas the socialists took 123. Clearly there should have been no question of a fascist takeover, although the number of fascist squads throughout the country was the government to curb fascist violence: a coalition of Giolitti's nationalist bloc and the increasing rapidly. The socialists must take much of the blame for refusing to work with socialists who could have made a reasonably stable government, thus

excluding the fascists. and despair. The socialists tried to use the situation to their own advantage by calling a general strike in the summer of 1922.

(e) The attempted general strike, summer 1922

This played into the hands of the fascists, who were able to use it to their advantage: they announced that if the government failed to quell the strike, they would crush it themselves. When the strike failed through lack of support, Mussolini was able to pose as the savior of the nation from communism, and by October 1922 the fascists felt confident Mussolini was able to pose as enough to stage their 'march on Rome'. As about 50 000 black shirts converged on the capital, while others occupied important towns in the north, the prime minister, Luigi Facta, was prepared to resist. But King Victor Emmanuel III refused to declare a state of emergency and instead, invited Mussolini, who had remained nervously in Milan, to come to Rome and form a new government, which he obligingly did, arriving by train. Afterwards the fascists fostered the myth that they had seized power in a heroic struggle, but it had been achieved legally by the mere threat of force, while the army and the police stood aside.

The role of the king was important he made the crucial decision not to use the army to stop the black shirts, although many historians believe that the regular army would have had little difficulty in dispersing the disorderly and poorly armed squads, many of which arrived by train. The march was an enormous bluff which came off. The reasons why the king decided against armed resistance remain something of a mystery, since he was apparently reluctant to discuss them. Suggestions include lack of confidence in facts; doubts about whether the army, with its fascist sympathies, could be relied on to obey orders fears of a long civil war if the army failed to crush the fascists quickly.

There is no doubt that the king had a certain amount of sympathy with the fascist aim of providing strong government, and he was also afraid that some of the generals might force him to abdicate in favor of his cousin, the duke of Aosta, who openly supported the fascists. Whatever the king's motives, the outcome was clear: Mussolini became the first ever fascist premier in history.

Mussolini tries to introduce the Fascist state

There was no sudden change in the system of government and state institutions at first Mussolini was merely the prime minister of a coalition cabinet in which only four out of twelve ministers were fascists and he had to move cautiously. However, the king had given him special powers to last until the end of 1923, to deal with the crisis. His black twelve ministers were fascists, and he had to move cautiously. However, the king had The Acerbo Law (November 1923) changed the rules of general elections. From now on the party which got most votes in a general election would automatically be given two thirds of the seats in parliament. The private army was legalized, becoming the National State Voluntary Militia the fascists and their supporters came out with 404 seats while the opposition parties could manage thirds of the seats in parliament. As a result of the next election the only 107. The right-wing success can be explained partly by the general desire for a strong government which would put the country back on its feet again, after the weak minority governments of the preceding years. But there is no doubt that there was a good deal of violence and fraud during the election which prevented many people from voting freely

Beginning in the summer of 1924, using a mixture of violence and intimidation, and helped by divisions among the opponents Mussolini gradually developed Italian government and society along fascist lines. At the same time, he consolidated his own hold over the country, which was largely complete, at least politically, by 1930. However, he still seems to have had no 'revolutionary ideas about how to change Italy for the better: in fact, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that his main interest was simply to increase his own freedom. personal power by whatever methods were appropriate at the time

(a) Only the fascist party was allowed

Persistent opponents of the regime were either exiled or murdered, the most notorious case being the murder of Giacomo Matteotti, the socialist leader in the Italian parliament, who was stabbed to death. Soon after the 1924 election Matteotti made a speech in parliament complaining about the fraud and violence, and demanding that the election be declared invalid. Mussolini was furious, and there can be little doubt that he was responsible for having Matteotti killed. Later, another opposition leader, the liberal-conservative Giovanni Amendola, was beaten to death by fascist thugs. The fascists'

popularity levels slumped dramatically in the aftermath of these outrages; the party seemed likely to split, as many moderates felt that their tactics had gone too far. Even Mussolini thought his regime was likely to be overthrown. However, nobody seemed to have the nerve to take the lead and try to unite the opposition against the fascists. Mussolini survived, partly because he was still seen as a guarantee against a communist and socialist takeover. After 1926, when Mussolini felt more secure, violence was much reduced and the Italian system was never as brutal as the Nazi regime in Germany.

Further changes in the constitution meant that:

The prime minister (Mussolini) was responsible only to the king, not to parliament (1925);

The prime minister could rule by decree, which meant that new laws did not need to be discussed by parliament (1926);

The electorate was reduced from about 10 million to 3 million (the wealthiest)

Although parliament still met, all important decisions were taken by the Fascist Grand Council, which always did as Mussolini told it. In effect Mussolini, who now adopted the title IL Duce, was a dictator.

Employment policies

The Corporate State' was one of the key elements of the Fascist system. The government claimed that it was designed to promote co-operation between employers and workers and to end class warfare. Fascist-controlled unions had the sole right to negotiate for the workers, and both unions and employers' associations were organized into corporations, and were expected to work together to settle disputes over pay and working conditions. Strikes and lockouts were not allowed. By 1934 there were 22 corporations each dealing with a separate industry; each one included a government official among its members, and there was a minister of corporations in charge of the whole system. Mussolini himself acted as the first minister of corporations from 1926 until 1929. In this way Mussolini hoped to control workers and direct production and the economy. To compensate for their loss of freedom, workers were assured of such benefits as free Sundays, annual holidays with pay, social security, sports and theater facilities and cheap tours and holidays.

(e) An understanding was reached with the pope

The Papacy had been hostile to the Italian government since 1870 when all the territory belonging to the Papacy (Papal States) had been incorporated in the new kingdom of Italy. Although he had been sympathetic towards Mussolini in 1922, Pope Pius XI disapproved of the increasing totalitarianism of fascist government (the fascist youth organizations, for example, clashed with the Catholic scouts). Mussolini, who was probably an atheist himself, was nevertheless well aware of the power of the Roman Catholic Church, and he put himself out to win over Pius, who, as the Duce well knew, was obsessed with the fear of communism. The result was the Lateran Treaty of 1929, by which Italy recognized the Vatican City as a sovereign state, paid the pope a large sum of money as compensation for all his losses, accepted the Catholic faith as the official state religion, made religious instruction compulsory in all schools and left the Church free to continue its spiritual mission without interference from the government. In return the Papacy recognized the kingdom of Italy and promised not to interfere in politics. Some historians see the ending of the long hon Church and State as Mussolini most lasting and worthwhile achievement

Propaganda and censorship

Great importance was attached to propaganda in the attempt to brainwash the Italian people into accepting fascist values and culture. The government tried, with some success, to keep a close control over the press, radio, theater and the cinema. Strict press censor Min was enforced: anti-fascist newspapers and magazines were banned or their editors' mastermind the campaign to spread the fascist message, suggesting perhaps that for the were replaced by fascist supporters. A Ministry of Popular Culture was set up in 1937. In the last 15 years the campaign had been less successful than had been hoped. The main points and the celebration of military greatness. People were bombarded with slogans such as for emphasis were the cult of Mussolini, the hero and the man of action, always in uniform; ancient Rome were constantly with the implication that fascism would bring more military glory. (g) Racial policy for much of his time in power Mussolini showed little interest in any so-called problems to do with race. He had certainly not shown any signs of anti-Jewishness. At one time he had even encouraged Zionism because he thought it might be useful for embarrassing the British. Many leading

members of the fascist party were Jews, and he had insisted several times that there was no such thing as a Jewish problem in Italy. He was very critical of the Nazis anti-Semitism. On the other hand, he had also claimed that certain races were superior to others. He suggested that the Italians belonged to an Aryan race that was superior to such nationalities as Spaniards and Greeks, as well as to the Africans in the Italian territories of Abyssinia and Libya. He seemed to be more worried about what he called the 'Levantine', by which he meant the slaves brought in during the time of the Roman Empire. He was afraid that as their descendants intermarried with the pure Aryans over many generations, a wrong impression of the Italian national character would be given to the rest of the world. As late as September 1937 he said that the Jews in Italy were no problem; after all, there were at most only about 70 000 of them. In the summer of 1939, however, Mussolini announced the introduction of anti-Jewish laws on the same lines as the Nazi laws. In view of his earlier pronouncements most people were shocked by this sudden change. The reasons for the change were simple. Following the hostile reception from France and Britain of the Italian invasion of Abyssinia in 1935 and their imposition of economic sanctions on Italy, Mussolini found himself being pushed towards an alliance with Hitler. In 1936 he reached an understanding with Hitler, known as the Rome-Berlin Axis, and in 1937 he joined the Anti-Comintern Pact with Germany and Japan which was directed against Communism. After a four-day visit to Germany in 1937 Mussolini realized the political expediency of aligning Italy with Germany as closely as possible. As he moved towards the full alliance with Germany the Pact of Steel signed in May 1939, Mussolini moved quickly to emulate Hitler, in what was simply a cynical, tactical move. There was another motive for the policy change, or so Mussolini claimed: the possession of territory in Africa (Abyssinia and Libya) meant that it was important for Italians to emphasize their dominance over Africans and Arabs, and make sure that they showed the respect due to people of a superior race. In July 1938 the Charter of Race was published which claimed that Arabs, Africans and Jews were all inferior. races. He started by urging people not to employ Jews and to sack those already in jobs. Then the press was told to report that Jews had managed to get themselves into importance and influential positions can and must be ousted before they send Italy into decline. This policy was not popular with the general public, but when the pope

protested strongly, the press was ordered to print articles justifying the persecution of Jews and to ignore the pope. As known journalist and virulent anti-Semite, to supervise the racial policy They agreed that all Jews must be expelled from Europe. Although they knew that the Nazis were system-Italian Jews to be deported to Germany. Again, this policy was extremely unpopular and some officials either sabotaged orders or simply refused to carry them out

How totalitarian was Mussolini's system?

It seems clear that in spite of his efforts Mussolini did not succeed in creating a completely totalitarian system in the Fascist sense of there being 'no individuals or groups not controlled by the state'; nor was it as all-pervasive as the Nazi state in Germany. He never completely eliminated the influence of the king or the pope. In spite of the cult of Mussolini as *il Duce*, the king remained head of state, and was able to dismiss Mussolini in 1943. The Roman Catholic Church remained an extremely powerful institution and it provided the Italian people with an alternative focus of loyalty there was no way that Mussolini could sideline it, and there were several clashes between the two even after the signing of the Lateran Treaty. The pope became highly critical of Mussolini when he began to persecute Jews in the later 1930s. The historian and philosopher Benedetto Croce and other university professors were constant critics of fascism and yet they survived, apparently because Mussolini was afraid of hostile foreign reaction if he had them arrested. They would certainly not have been tolerated in Nazi Germany. A more accurate description of Mussolini's system would be authoritarian rather than totalitarian. Even fascist sympathizers admitted that the corporate system was not a success either in controlling production or in eliminating class warfare. According to historian Elizabeth Wiskemann, 'on the whole the big industrialists only made gestures of submission and in fact bought their freedom from the fascist state by generous subscriptions to Fascist party funds'. Most of the important decisions on the economy were taken by the government in consultation with business leaders, and the workers themselves had very little say. It was the workers who had to make all the concessions - agree not to strike and give up their own trade unions - while the big employers enjoyed considerable freedom of action. In fact, the corporate state was little more than a propaganda exercise and a way of controlling the workers. As far as the mass of the population was concerned, it seems

that they were prepared to tolerate fascism while it appeared to bring benefits, but soon grew tired of it when its inadequacies were revealed by its failures during the Second World War.

Hitler and Nazism

As Germany moved towards defeat in 1918, public opinion turned against the government. of Baden as Chancellor. He was known to be in favor of a more democratic form of government in which parliament had more power. But it was too late: in November the revolution broke out, the Kaiser escaped to Holland and abdicated, and Prince Max resigned. Friedrich Ebert, leader of the left-wing Social Democrat Party (SPD), became head of the government. In January 1919 a general election was held, the first completely democratic party and Ebert became the first president of the republic. They had some Marxist ideas one ever to take place in Germany. The Social Democrats emerged as the largest single believed that the way to achieve socialism the new government was by no means popular with all Germans: even before the elections the communists had attempted to seize power in the Spartacist Rising (January 1919). In 1920, right-wing enemies of the republic occupied Berlin (the Kapp Putsch). The government managed to survive these threats and several later ones, including Hitler's Munich Beer-Hall Putsch (1923).

By the end of 1919 a new constitution had been agreed by the National Assembly (parliament), which was meeting in Weimar because Berlin was still torn by political unrest. This Weimar constitution (sometimes called the most perfect democratic constitution of modern times, at least on paper) gave its name to the Weimar Republic, and lasted until 1933, when it was destroyed by Hitler. It passed through three phases

1. 1919 to the end of 1923 A period of instability and crisis during which the republic was struggling to survive.
2. From the end of 1923 to the end of 1929 A period of stability in which Gustav Stresemann was the leading politician. Thanks to the Dawes Plan of 1924, by which the USA provided huge loans, Germany seemed to be recovering from her defeat and was enjoying an industrial boom.
3. October 1929 to January 1933 Instability again; The world economic crisis, beginning with the Wall Street Crash in October 1929, soon had disastrous effects

on Germany, producing six and a half million unemployed. The government was unable to cope with the situation and by the end of 1932 the Weimar Republic seemed on the verge of collapse.

Meanwhile Adolf Hitler and his National Socialist German Workers' Party (Nazis -NSDAP) had been carrying out a great propaganda campaign blaming the government for all the ills of Germany, and setting out Nazi solutions to the problems. In January 1933, President Hindenburg appointed Hitler as Chancellor, and soon afterwards Hitler saw to it that democracy ceased to exist; the Weimar Republic was at an end, and from then until the death of Hitler 30 April 1945) freed the German people from the Nazi tyranny.

Why did the Weimar republic fail?

It began with serious disadvantages that.

It had accepted the humiliating and unpopular Versailles Treaty associated with defeat and dishonor. German nationalists could never forgive it for with its arms limitations, reparations and war-guilt clause, and was therefore always

There was a traditional lack of respect for democratic government and a great In 1919 the view was widespread that the army had not been defeated: it had been admiration for the army and the 'officer class' as the rightful leaders of Germany. betrayed 'stabbed in the back by the democrats, who had needlessly agreed to the Versailles Treaty, What most Germans did not realize was that it was General Ludendorff who had asked for an armistice while the Kaiser was still in power. However, the 'stab in the back' legend was eagerly fostered by all enemies of the republic.

The parliamentary system introduced in the new Weimar constitution was weak. nesses, the most serious of which was that it was based on a system of proportional representation, so that all political groups would be fairly represented. Unfortunately, there were so many different groups that no party could ever win an overall majority. For example, in 1928 the Reichstag (lower house of parliament) contained at least eight groups, of which the largest were the Social Democrats with 153 seats, the German National Party (DNVP) with 73, and the Catholic Center Party (Zentrum) with 62. The German Communist Party (KPD) had 54 seats, while the German People's party (DVP - Stresemann's liberal party) had 45. The smallest groups were the Bavarian People's Party

with 16, and the National Socialists, who only had 12 seats. A succession of coalition governments was inevitable, with the Social Democrats having to rely on co-operation from left-wing liberals and the Catholic Center. No party was able to carry out its program

The political parties had very little experience of how to operate a democratic parliamentary system, because before 1919 the Reichstag had not controlled politics; the Chancellor had the final authority and was the one who really ruled the country. Under the Weimar constitution it was the other way around the Chancellor was responsible to the Reichstag, which had the final say. However, the Reichstag usually failed to give a clear lead because the parties had not learned the art of compromise. The communists and nationalists did not believe in democracy anyway, and refused to support the Social Democrats. The communist refusal to work with the SPD meant that no strong government of the left was possible. Disagreements became so bitter that some of the parties organized their own private armies, for self-defense to begin with, but this increased the threat of civil war. The combination of these weaknesses led to more outbreaks of violence and attempts to overthrow the republic

(b) Outbreaks of violence

The Spartacist Rising

January 1919 the communists tried to seize power in what became known as the partisan Rising (Spartacus was a Roman who led a revolt of slaves in 71 BC). Inspired by the recent success of the Russian Revolution and led by Liebknecht and Rosa Luxemburg, they occupied almost every major city in Germany. In Berlin, President Ebert found himself besieged in the Chancellery. The government managed to defeat the communist only because it accepted the help of the Freikorps These were independent volunteer regiments raised by anti-communist ex-armyofficers. It was a sign of the government's weakness that it had to depend on private forces, which it did not itself officers. Control The two communist leaders did not receive a fair trial they were simply clubbed to death by Freikorpi members.

2 The Kapp Patch (March 1920)

This was an attempt by right-wing groups to seize power. It was sparked off when the government tried to disband the Freikorps private armies. They refused to

disband and declared Dr. Wolfgang Kapp as Chancellor. Berlin was occupied by a Freikorps regiment putsch (coup, or rising) because the generals were in sympathy with the political right. In and the cabinet fled to Dresden. The German army (Reichswehr) took no action against the end the workers of Berlin came to the aid of the Social Democrat government by call-regained control. However, it was so weak that nobody was punished except Kapp, who called a general strike, which paralyzed the capital. Kapp resigned and the government was imprisoned, and it took two months to get the Freikorps disbanded. Even then the ex-members remained hostile to the republic and many later joined Hitler's private armies.

3 A series of political assassinations took place

These were mainly carried out by ex-Freikorps members. Victims included Walter Rathenau (the Jewish Foreign Minister) and Gustav Herzberger (leader of the armistice delegation). When the government sought strong measures against such acts of terrorism, there was great opposition from the right-wing parties, who sympathized with the criminals. Whereas the communist leaders had been brutally murdered, the courts let right-wing offenders off lightly and the government was unable to intervene. In fact, throughout Germany, the legal and teaching professions, the civil service and the Reichswehr tended to be anti-Weimar, which was a crippling handicap for the republic

4 Hitler's Beer-Hall Putsch

Another threat to the government occurred in November 1923 in Bavaria, at a time when there was much public annoyance at the French occupation of the Ruhr and the disastrous fall in the value of the mark. Hitler, helped by General Ludendorff, aimed to take control of the Bavarian state government in Munich, and then lead a national revolution to overthrow the government in Berlin. However, the police easily broke up Hitler's march, and the 'Beer-Hall Putsch' (so-called because the march set out from the Munich beer hall in which Hitler had announced his 'national revolution' the previous evening) soon fizzled out. Hitler was sentenced to five years' imprisonment but served only nine months (because the Bavarian authorities had some sympathy with his aims).

5 Private armies expand

The violence died down during the years 1924 to 1929 as the republic became more stable, but when unemployment grew in the early 1930s, the private armies

expanded and regular street fights occurred, usually between Nazis and communists. All parties had their meetings broken up by rival armies and the police seemed powerless to prevent it from happening.

All this showed that the government was incapable of keeping law and order, and respect for it dwindled. An increasing number of people began to favor a return to strong, authoritarian government, which would maintain strict public order.

Hitler Consolidates His Power

Hitler was an Austrian, the son of a customs official in Braunau-am-Ion on the German der He had hoped to become an artist but failed to gain admittance to the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts, and afterwards spent six down-and-out years living in Vienna Drexler's tiny German Workers' Party (1919), which he soon took over and transformed into the National Socialist German Workers' Party (NSDAP). Now, in January 1933, he was not yet satisfied with the amount of power he possessed: Nazis held only three out of wax Chancellor of a coalition government of National Socialists and nationalists, but he eleven cabinet posts. He therefore insisted on a general election in the hope of winning an overall majority for the Nazis,

The election of 5 March 1933

The election campaign was an extremely violent one. Since they were now in government. the Nazis were able to use all the apparatus of the state, including the press and radio, to try and whip up a majority. They had a great advantage in that Hermann Goering, one of the leading Nazis, had been appointed minister of the interior for Prussia, the largest and most important German state. This meant that he controlled the police. He replaced senior police officers with reliable Nazis, and 50 000 auxiliary policemen were called up, most of them from the SA and the (Schutzstaffel - Hitler's second private army, formed originally to be his personal bodyguard). They had orders to avoid hostility towards the SA and SS but to show no mercy to communists and other 'enemies of the state'. They were given permission to use firearms if necessary. Meetings of Nazis and nationalists were allowed to go ahead without interference, but communist and socialist political meetings were wrecked and speakers were beaten up, while the police looked the other way. The nationalists went along with all this because they were determined to use the Nazis to destroy communism once and for all.

(b) The Reichstag fires

The climax of the election campaign came on the night of 27 February when the Reichstag was badly damaged by a fire, apparently started by a young Dutch anarchist called Marinus van der Lubbe, who was arrested, tried and executed for his pains. It has been suggested that the SA knew about van der Lubbe's plans, but allowed him to go ahead and even started fires of their own elsewhere in the building with the intention of blaming it on the communists. There is no conclusive evidence of this, but what is certain is that the fire played right into Hitler's hands: he was able to use the fire to stir up fear of communism and as a pretext for the banning of the party. Some four thousand communists were arrested and imprisoned. However, in spite of all their efforts, the Nazis still failed to win an overall majority in the 5 March election. With almost 90 percent of the electorate voting the Nazis won 288 out of the 647 seats, 36 short of the magic figure-324-ed worth remembering that even at the height of their electoral triumph the Nazis were supported by only 44 percent of the voting electorate.

How was Hitler able to stay in power?

The Enabling Law, 23 March 1933

Hitler was not satisfied with the election result. He was determined that he must be dependent on nobody except his Nazi party. While President Hindenburg was still in shock after the Reichstag fire, Hitler apparently persuaded him that emergency legislation was vital to pass through the Reichstag on 23 March 1933, and it was this that provided the legal basis of preventing a communist uprising. Known as the Enabling Law, this legislation was forced by Hitler's power. It stated that the government could introduce laws without the approval of the Reichstag for the next four years, could ignore the constitution and could sign agreements with foreign countries. All laws would be drafted by the Chancellor and come into operation the day they were published. This meant that Hitler was to be the complete dictator for the next four years, but since his will was now law, he would be able to extend the Weimar constitution that had been abandoned. Such a major constitutional change needed four-year period indefinitely. He no longer needed the support of Papen and Hugenberg: approval by a two-thirds majority, yet the Nazis didn't even have a simple majority

How did the Nazis get the Enabling Bill through the Reichstag?

The method was typical of the Nazis. Since the election, the whole country had experienced a wave of unprecedented Nazi violence directed at political opponents and at Jews. Jewish synagogues were attacked and trashed by Hitler's brownshirts (SA), and there were countless beatings and murders. Hundreds more were arrested and sent to newly set-up concentration camps on 23 March, the day of the Enabling Law vote. The Kroll Opera House (where the Reichstag had been meeting since the fire) was surrounded by Hitler's private armies. MPs had to push their way through solid ranks of SS troops to get into the building. The 81 communist MPs had either been arrested or were in hiding. Some of the socialists were simply not allowed to pass. Inside the building, rows of brown-shirted SA troops lined the walls, and the SS could be heard chanting outside: 'We want the Bill, or fire and murder. It took courage to vote against the Enabling Bill in such surroundings. When the Catholic Center Party decided to vote in favor of the Bill, the result was a foregone conclusion. Only the Social Democrats spoke against it, and it passed by 441 votes to 94 (all Social Democrats). The Nazi aim of killing off parliamentary democracy had been achieved, and by means that could in no way be called 'legal'. The Papen/Schleicher/Hindenburg plan to control Hitler had failed completely, and Ludendorff's prophecy was beginning to become reality.

(b) Gleichschaltung

Having effectively muzzled the Reichstag, Hitler immediately set about sidelining the Chancellery and the ministries. This was achieved by a policy known as Gleichschaltung (forcible co-ordination), which turned Germany into a totalitarian or fascist state. The government tried to control as many aspects of life as possible, using a huge police force. Dangerous to oppose or criticize the government in any way. The main features of the Nazi and the notorious State Secret Police, the Gestapo (Geheime Staatspolizei). It became totalitarian state were:

- 1 All political parties except the National Socialists were banned, so that Germany became a one-party state like Italy and the USSR. The Catholic Center Party actually dissolved itself a week before the official ban was introduced!

- 2 The separate state parliaments (Länder) still existed but lost all power. Most of their functions were taken over by a Nazi Special Commissioner, appointed in each state

by the Berlin government, who had complete power over all officials and affairs within his state. There were no more state, provincial or municipal elections.

3 The civil service was purged: all Jews and other suspected 'enemies of the state' were removed, so that it became fully reliable

.4 Trade unions, a likely source of resistance, were abolished, their funds confiscated and their leaders arrested. They were replaced by the German Labor Front, to which all workers had to belong. The government dealt with all grievances, and strikes were not allowed

5 The education system was closely controlled so that children could be indoctrinated with Nazi opinions. School textbooks were often rewritten to fit in with Nazi theory, the most obvious examples being in history and biology. History was distorted to fit in with Hitler's view that great things could only be achieved by force. Human biology was dominated by the Nazi race theory. Teachers, lecturers and professors were closely watched to make sure they did not express opinions which do they and may lived in fear in care they were reported to the Gestapo by children of convinced Nazis

6 The system was supplemented by the Hitler Youth

Which all boys had to join at 14. joined the League of German Maiden The regime was deliberately trying to destroy traditional bonds such as loyalty to the family children were taught that their first duty was to obey Hitler who took on the title Flührer (leader of guide) The favorite slogan was the Führer is always right, Children were right that their first duty was to obey Hitler, who took on the title Führer Vendet even encouraged to betray their parents to the Gestapo, and many did so. These youth organizations worked on the assumption that the Nazi regime would remain in power for many generations; There was much talk of the thousand-year Reich to provide a firm foundation for the regime. The vital element was they must become steeped in militaristic values. In a speech in Nuremberg in September 1935, Hitler told the crowd: 'What we look for from our German youth is different from what people wanted in a past. In our eyes the German Youth the future must be slim and slender, swift as the greyhound, tough as leather, and hard as Krupp steel. We must educate a new type of man so that our people are not ruined by the symptoms of degeneracy of our day.

7 There was a special policy concerning the family.

The Nazis were worried that the birth rate was declining, and therefore 'racially pure and healthy families were encouraged to have more children. Family planning centers were closed down and well were awarded medals Cross of Honor of the German Mother, a mother of eight children gained a gold medal, six children a silver medal, and four children a bronze medal. On the other hand, people who were considered 'undesirable' were discouraged from having children. These included Jews, gypsies, and people deemed to be physically and mentally unfit. In 1935, marriages between Aryans and Jews were forbidden; over 300 000 people who were designated as 'unfit' were forcibly sterilized to prevent them from having children.

8 All communications and the media were controlled by the minister of propaganda Dr Joseph Goebbels. Leni Riefenstahl, a brilliant young film director, was invited personally by Hitler to work for the Nazis; she made an impressive film of the 1934 Nuremberg party rally. Using 30 cameras and a crew of 120, she produced a documentary the like of which had never been seen before. When it was released in March 1935 under the title *Triumph of the Will*, it was widely acclaimed; it even won a gold medal at the Venice Film Festival in 1935. But it was more than an ordinary documentary. In the words of Richard J. Evans, the 'will' in question was 'not only that of the German people, but also and above all, the will of Hitler, whom her cameras almost invariably portrayed standing alone.... In the final stages of the film the screen was filled with columns of marching stormtroopers, and black-shirted, steel-helmeted SS men, leaving audiences no room for doubt. It was a propaganda film designed to convince Germany and the world of the power, strength and determination of the German people under Hitler's leadership.' No further films were made about Hitler himself - *Triumph of the Will* had said it all. However, the state gradually increased its control over the cinema so that only feature films approved by the regime could be shown

Radio, newspapers, magazines, books, theatre, music and art were all supervised. The government made cheap radios available so that by 1939 over 70 percent of German households owned a 'wireless' set. But as John Traynor puts it: 'While people may have appreciated the material benefit this represented, we cannot know for certain what they came to think of the relentless message that poured constantly from their radio set.' A

national book-burning day was held on 10 May 1933 when thousands of books by Jewish, socialist and other suspect writers were publicly burned on huge bonfires in Germany's university cities. By the end of 1934 about 4000 books were on the forbidden list because they were un-German'. It was impossible to perform the plays of Bertolt Brecht (a communist) or the music of Felix Mendelssohn and Gustav Mahler (they were Jewish). American jazz was popular with young people, but Hitler hated it and tried to exclude it from Germany. But it was so widespread in nightclubs and dance halls that it proved impossible to eliminate it completely.

Hitler had a special interest in art, having once tried to make a career as an artist. He was soon announcing that it was time for a new type of art - German art. The idea that art was international must be rejected out of hand because it was decadent and Jewish. A wide variety of artists were condemned and their works removed from galleries. They included Jewish, abstract, left-wing, modernist and all foreign artists, whatever their style. Hitler even condemned the French impressionists simply because they were not German. On 20 March 1939 about 5000 condemned paintings and drawings were burned on a massive bonfire outside the central fire station in Berlin. Artists, writers and scholars were continuously harassed until it became pointless to produce any artwork that did not win the approval of the regime, and it was impossible to express any opinion which did not fit in with the Nazi system. By these methods public opinion could be molded and mass support assured, or so the Nazis hoped.

9 The economic life of the country was closely organized Although the Nazis (unlike the communists) had no special ideas about the economy, they did have some basic aims: to eliminate unemployment and to make Germany self-sufficient by boosting exports and reducing imports, a policy known as 'autarky'. The idea was to put the economy onto a war footing, so that all the materials necessary for waging war could be produced, as far as possible, in Germany itself. This would ensure that Germany would never again be hamstrung by a trade blockade like the one imposed by the Allies during the First World War. The centerpiece of the policy was the Four-Year Plan introduced in 1936 under the direction of Hermann Goering, the head of the Luftwaffe (the German air force). Policies included

1. telling industrialists what to produce, depending on what the country needed at that moment; and closing factories down if their products were not required
2. moving workers around the country to places where jobs existed and labor was needed
3. encouraging farmers to increase agricultural yields;
4. controlling food prices and rents;
5. manipulating foreign exchange rates to avoid inflation
6. introducing vast schemes of public works slum clearance, land drainage and autobahn (motorway) building;
7. forcing foreign countries to buy German goods, either by refusing to pay cash for goods bought from those countries, so that they had to accept German goods instead (often armaments), or by refusing permission to foreigners with bank accounts in Germany to withdraw their cash, so that they had to spend it in Germany on German goods;
8. manufacturing synthetic rubber and wool and experimenting to produce petrol from coal in order to reduce dependence on foreign countries;
9. increasing expenditure on armaments; in 1938-9 the military budget accounted for 52 percent of government spending. This was an incredible amount for 'peacetime'. As Richard Overy puts it: 'this stemmed from Hitler desire to turn Germany into a economic and military superpower before the rest of the world caught up
10. Religion was brought under state control since the churches were a possible source of opposition. At first Hitler moved cautiously with both Roman Catholics and Protestants

What is meant by the term 'appeasement'?

Appeasement was the policy followed by the British, and later by the French, of avoiding war with aggressive powers such as Japan, Italy and Germany, by giving way to their demands, provided they were not too unreasonable.

There were two distinct phases of appeasement

1. From the mid-1920s until 1937, there was a vague feeling that war must be avoided at all costs, and Britain and sometimes France drifted along, accepting the

various acts of aggression and breaches of Versailles (Manchuria, Abyssinia, German rearmament, the Rhineland reoccupation).

2. When Neville Chamberlain became British prime minister in May 1937, he gave appeasement a new drive; he believed in taking the initiative - he would find out what Hitler wanted and show him that reasonable claims could be met by negotiation rather than by force.

The beginnings of appeasement can be seen in British policy during the 1920s with the Dawes and Young Plans, which tried to conciliate the Germans, and also with the Locarno Treaties and their vital omission - Britain did not agree to guarantee Germany's eastern frontiers which even Stresemann, the 'good German', said must be revised. When Austen Chamberlain, the British Foreign Minister (and Neville's half-brother), remarked at the time of Locarno that no British government would ever risk the bones of a single British grenadier in defense of the Polish Corridor, it seemed to the Germans that Britain had turned her back on eastern Europe. Appeasement reached its climax at Munich, where Britain and France were so determined to avoid war with Germany that they made Hitler a present of the Sudetenland, and so set in motion the destruction of Czechoslovakia. Even with such big concessions as this, appeasement failed.) How could appeasement be justified?

At the time appeasement was being followed, there seemed to be many very good things in its favour, and the appeasers (who included MacDonald, Baldwin, Simon and Hoare as well as Neville Chamberlain) were convinced that their policy was right:

1. It was thought essential to avoid war, which was likely to be even more devastating than ever before, as the horrors of the Spanish Civil War demonstrated. The great fear was the bombing of defenseless cities. Memories of the horrors of the First World War still haunted many people. Britain, still in the throes of the economic crisis, could not afford vast rearmament and the crippling expenses of a major war. British governments seemed to be supported by a strongly pacifist public opinion. In February 1933, in a much-publicized debate, the Oxford Union voted that it would not fight for King and Country. Baldwin and his National Government won a huge election victory in November 1935

shortly after he had declared: 'I give you my word of honor that there will be no great armaments.'

2. Many felt that Germany and Italy had genuine grievances. Italy had been cheated at Versailles and Germany had been treated too harshly. Therefore, the British should show them sympathy as far as the Germans were concerned, they should try and revise the most hated clauses of Versailles. This would remove the need for German aggression and lead to Anglo-German friendship.
3. Since the League of Nations seemed to be helpless, Chamberlain believed that the only way to settle disputes was by personal contact between leaders. In this way, he thought, he would be able to control and civilize Hitler, and Mussolini into the bargain, and bring them to respect international law.
4. Economic co-operation between Britain and Germany would be good for both. If Britain helped the German economy to recover, Germany's internal violence would die down.
5. Fear of communist Russia was great, especially among British Conservatives. Many of them believed that the communist threat was greater than the danger from Hitler. Some British politicians were willing to ignore the unpleasant features of Nazism in the hope that Hitler's Germany would be a buffer against communist expansion westwards. In fact, many admired Hitler's drives and his achievements.
6. Underlying all these feelings was the belief that Britain ought not to take any military action in case it led to a full-scale war, for which Britain was totally unprepared. British military chiefs told Chamberlain that Britain was not strong enough to fight a war against more than one country at the same time. Even the navy, which was the strongest in the world apart from the American navy, would have found it difficult to defend Britain's far-flung Empire and at the same time protect merchant shipping in the event of war against Germany, Japan and Italy simultaneously. The air force was woefully short of long-range bombers and fighters. The USA was still in favor of isolation and France was weak and divided. Chamberlain sped up British rearmament so that 'nobody should treat her with anything but respect'. The longer appeasement lasted, the stronger

Britain would become, and the more this would deter aggression, or so Chamberlain hoped.

(c) What part did appeasement play in international affairs, 1933-97

Appeasement had a profound effect on the way international relations develop. Although it might have worked with some German governments, with Hitler it was doomed to failure. Many historians believe that it convinced Hitler of the complacency and weakness of Britain and France to such an extent that he was willing to risk attacking Poland, thereby starting the Second World War.

It is important to emphasize that appeasement was mainly a British policy, with which the French did not always agree. Poincaré stood up to the Germans and although Briand was in favour of conciliation. Even he drew the line at the proposed Austro-German customs union in 1931. Louis Barthou, foreign minister for a few months in 1934, believed in firmness towards Hitler and aimed to build up a strong anti-German front into the League of Nations, which took place in September 1934. He told the British that group which would include Italy and the USSR. This is why he pressed for Russia's entry. France refused to legalize German rearmament, contrary to the Versailles Treaties. Unfortunately Barthou was assassinated in October 1934, along with King Alexander of Yugoslavia, who was on a state visit to France. They were both shot by Croat terrorists shortly after the king had arrived in Marseilles. Barthou's successor, Pierre Laval, signed an alliance with Russia in May 1935, though it was a weak affair - there was no provision in it for military co-operation, since Laval distrusted the communists. He pinned his main hopes on friendship with Mussolini, but these were dashed by the failure of the Hoare-Laval Pact. After this the French were so deeply split between left and right that no decisive foreign policy seemed possible; the French fell in behind the British.

Examples of appeasement at work

1. No action was taken to check the obvious German rearmament. Lord Lothian, a Liberal, had a revealing comment to make about this, after visiting Hitler in January 1935: 'I am convinced that Hitler does not want war ... what the Germans are after is a strong army which will enable them to deal with Russia.'
2. The Anglo-German Naval Agreement condoning German naval rearmament was signed without any consultation with France and Italy. This broke the Stresa

Front, gravely shook French confidence in Britain, and encouraged Laval to look for understandings with Mussolini and Hitler.

3. There was only half-hearted British action against the Italian invasion of Abyssinia.
4. The French, although disturbed at the German reoccupation of the Rhineland (March 1936), did not mobilize their troops. They were deeply divided, and ultra-cautious, and they received no backing from the British, who were impressed by Hitler's offer of a 25-year peace. In fact, Lord Londonderry (a Conservative, and Secretary of State for Air from 1931 to 1935), was reported to have sent Hitler a telegram congratulating him on his success. Lord Lothian remarked that German troops had merely entered their own 'back garden'.
5. Neither Britain nor France intervened in the Spanish Civil War, although Germany and Italy sent decisive help to Franco. Britain tried to entice Mussolini to remove his troops by officially recognizing Italian possession of Abyssinia (April 1938); However, Mussolini failed to keep his side of the bargain.
6. Although both Britain and France protested strongly at the Anschluss between Germany and Austria (March 1938), many in Britain saw it as the natural union of one German group with another. But Britain's lack of action encouraged Hitler to make demands on Czechoslovakia, which produced Chamberlain's supreme act of appeasement and Hitler's greatest triumph to date Munich.

The Second World War

Causes of the Second World War:

The invasion of Poland by Germany was not the chief cause of the Second World War as the Sarajevo Murder was not the chief cause of the First World War. The causes of the Second World War were many and varied.

Extreme nationalism of Germany was one of the main causes of the Second World War. The humiliating terms of the Treaty of Versailles severely wounded the national sentiment and political prestige of Germany. The terms for all time to come. Humiliation of defeat had Extreme nationalism of Germany, Italy were such as to make Germany weak and crippled and Japan It demonstrates roused unprecedented self-consciousness and nationalism in the German heart. The economic depression of 1924-25

destroyed the confidence of the Germans in the German government and it led to the resurgence of extreme nationalism and militarism under the leadership of the Nazi Party. The Nazi revolution infused in them a new hope and aspiration. Hitler said in the *Mein Kampf*, "State frontiers are made by men and changed by men at the greatest strength of the conquerors and weakness of the sufferers. And it is in this strength alone that right resides." The 'herd instinct' of people thus gives rise to an excessive patriotism and disregard for the interests of other nations. War was glorified as part of national ideology in the *Mein Kampf*. Hitler's attempts to absorb the German speaking people of Austria, Czecho Slovakia and Poland into Germany on the basis of nationalism deepened crisis in European politics. Military preparation of Germany and her occupation of the Rhineland, Czechoslovakia and Austria in rapid succession by force prepared the ground for the Second World War and the Great War broke out with the German invasion upon Poland. Like that of Germany, extreme nationalism and chauvinism of Italy and Japan paved the way for the Second World War. In the language of Mussolini "War alone brings up to their highest tension all human energy and puts the stamp of nobility upon peoples who have the courage to meet it". In fact, during the period following 1919 extreme nationalism of Germany, Italy and Japan created a crisis in the field of international affairs and undermined the forces of internationalism.

Another cause of the Second World War was the imperialist policy of Germany, Russia, Italy and Japan. But the First World War left Germany weakened in all respects. Imperialist policy of Japan and Italy colonies were seized and handed over to Britain, Germany, Russia, France and Japan. In fact, by 1920, the whole of the colonial world was parceled out among Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal and the United States. Consequently, movements for a proper distribution of colonies and raw materials of the world had begun in Germany, Italy and Japan immediately after the First World War. The Germans had never renounced their demand for the recovery of the German colonial empire lost by the Treaty of Versailles. imperialistic. The Germans were firmly determined to create a 'Middle Europe'. Moreover, Germany under the leadership of Hitler had become extremely under the leadership of Germany, to recover the lost colonies and to occupy Ukraine in Russia by making an advance in Eastern Europe. On the other hand, the Soviet leaders had been planning to annex the Baltic states and South-

Finland as well as to enter the Mediterranean through the Balkans. Italy was thoroughly dissatisfied with what she got at the Paris Peace Conference. So, Italy planned to occupy East-Adriatic Coast, French-Tunisia and French port of Djibouti. The chief aim of Italian imperialism was to replace the supremacy of Holland in the Mediterranean region by that of her own. In the Far East, Japan also had been endeavoring to establish her hegemony in Asia by driving out the western powers from there and the South-Western Pacific. Italian invasion of Ethiopia and Japanese expedition of Manchuria bear the stamp of their expansionist mentality. Of the world was the Second World War. So, the ultimate outcome of the extreme expansionism of certain powers

Various minority races were created by the Treaty of Versailles as well as by other subsequent treaties. President Wilson had desired to base the Peace Treaty on the principle of self-determination. But due to economic, military, the makers of the Peace Treaty to apply the principle of self-determination strictly everywhere. In many places' minority races opposed to each other were left under one rule. As a result, fierce discontent developed among the minority races in many states. Hitler took this opportunity, entered into bargain with the western powers and on the pretext of "misrule upon the minorities", occupied Austria and Sudetenland almost by force and attacked Poland

Conflict of ideologies between dictatorship on the one hand and democracies on the other led to inevitable clash. Germany, Italy and Japan proposed one kind of ideology, while Great Britain, France and the United States proposed the other. In between these two kinds of ideologies stood the proletariat dictatorship of the Soviet Union. Mussolini described the conflict between dictatorship and democracy thus "the struggle between the two worlds can permit no compromise "Either we or they." Basically, the difference between these two ideologies lay in the difference of the attitude of the State to the individuals. In the case of democracy, the individual plays a great role in state activities, while in a totalitarian state, the individual is not counted at all. He is to be merged in the state and sacrificed for the sake of the state. In between the two World Wars, the "Haves" and they had no expansionist aims. They demanded more space under the sun. The same was the case with Germany and Italy conflict between the different

kinds of ideologies ultimately made the global war inevitable as there was no point of compromise.

The failure of the disarmament efforts was another cause of the war. The League failed to achieve disarmament. The Peace Settlement of 1919-20 disarmed Germany totally and the Allied Powers pledged themselves "to apply the same measure to themselves and to open negotiations immediately with a view to adopt eventually a scheme of general reduction of armaments". It was laid down in Article 8 of the League Covenant that the members re-cognized that the maintenance of peace required the reduction of the national armaments to the lowest point consistent with national security. But this principle was flouted by the Allied Powers themselves which in consequence provoked defeated nations to armament. Hence a mad race for armament began. Germany called upon the Allied Powers to disarm themselves in the same way as they had made others to disarm. But the attitude of France was "Security first; disarmament afterwards" The refusal of the Allied Powers to disarm themselves gave Hitler the opportunity to arouse the national sentiment of his countrymen by asserting that "rearmament was the only way to power and fulfillment of national aspirations." It was the German rearmament under the Nazis that ultimately led to the War of 1939.

Economic factors also lay at the root of the second world war. It was a struggle for raw-materials, markets for exports and colonies for growing population. Germany, Italy and Japan took the lead in voicing their economic grievances. Germany was thoroughly frustrated at the re-distribution of territories after the war. She was deprived of all that she had and Italy also felt that she was not rewarded justly by the victors. Like Germany and Italy, Japan was also poor in natural resources and at the same time she was facing the problem of ever-increasing population. In fact, Germany, Italy and Japan were unsatiated countries. Common economic factor brought Germany, Italy and Japan together and they embarked upon a course of aggression which ultimately led to a global war in 1939.

As before the First World War more than one rival system of alliances divided the whole world into two main armed camps, the same was true on the eve of the Second World War. By 1937 two systems of alliances grew up in the international Berlin-Tokyo Axis of the 'unsatiated states like Germany, Italy and Japan while on the other was a

system of alliances popularly known as the Allies. No sooner had Britain and France taken the side of Poland than the Second World War broke out.

After 1930 a series of international crisis had been incessantly disturbing the world peace. Although after 1920 most of the countries of the world had taken the pledge of solving internal disputes by peaceful means, yet in practice none did care to respect that. The League of Nations had completely proved its inability to carry out its noble mission of maintaining international peace. Being convinced of the impotence of the League of Nations, the Fascist countries had grown more aggressive and paved the way for the World War.

(a) Japan, defying the pledge of international security occupied Manchuria in 1931 and attacked China in 1937. But the League of Nations failed to restrain Japan in any way. When the League censured Japan for her invasion of China, Japan quit the League.

(b) In 1935 and 1936 Italy occupied Ethiopia and Albania respectively. Although the League had imposed economic sanctions upon Italy, its other members were not at all eager to make the sanctions effective. Having realized the weakness of the League of Nations Italy also quit it.

(c) In 1936 Germany, defying the Treaty of Versailles and the Locarno Pacts, began military preparations in the Rhineland and by 1938 she occupied Austria and Czechoslovakia by force. The League of Nations remained a silent spectator even then.

(d) In 1939 Russia attacked Finland and the League of Nations again stood helpless. As a result of the League's failure in maintaining international peace, the countries of Europe lost faith in the efficacy of the League and formed alliances for the preservation of the balance of power.

Weakness of the League of Nations was one of the main causes of the Second World War. As the United States did not join the League of Nations and as Soviet Russia and the adversaries of the Allies of the First World War were not admitted into the League, it was weak from the very beginning of its establishment. A vast majority of the peoples of the world had become anxious to renounce war policy in the field of national relations. The Kellogg-Briand Pact concluded in 1928 outlawed war as an instrument of policy. Yet within a few years after this pact war conditions came to prevail on the

surface. The greatest defect of the League of Nations was the lack of its military and economic power. It was not well equipped to impose any sanction upon the aggressor. As a result, the Fascist countries by indulging themselves into more and more aggressive activities had made another world war inevitable.

Course of the Second World War

From the point of view of military importance, the course of the Second World War may be divided into several phases.

First Phase (September 3, 1939- June 22, 1941): During this phase Germany occupied Poland, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Belgium, Luxemburg, France and Greece one after another. In this period Mussolini being inspired by Hitler's success after success abandoned his neutral policy and in collaboration with Hitler attacked France. In this period differences between Germany and Soviet Russia began to widen more and more.

Second Phase (June 22-December 8, 1941) During this phase expeditions of the Axis powers and Japan continued in Africa and the Far East respectively and the American naval base of Pearl Harbor in the Pacific was attacked by Japan.

Third Phase (December 8, 1941-November 8, 1942): By this time Japan, Germany and her allied powers had completed their conquests of the Netherlands, the East-Indies, and North-Caucasus.

Fourth Phase (November 8, 1942-May 8, 1945): During this period the United States attacked French, North Africa and Germany after repeated reverses surrendered to the Allies unconditionally.

Last Phase (May 8-October 10, 1945): During this period atomic bombs for the first time were dropped on Nagasaki and Hiroshima, the two cities of Japan and Japan unconditionally surrendered to America.

From the military point of view the Second World War was characterized by the continuous success of the Axis Powers in the beginning; later the successful counter-attacks of the Allies and finally the discomfiture of the Axis powers and their collapse. From the diplomatic point of view, the Second World War was characterized by mutual suspicion and lack of faith among the Allies; mutual suspicion between Britain and the

United States on the one hand and suspicion of Soviet Russia about the West on the other.

War in Poland and the Baltic Region:

Without any formal declaration of war when Germany attacked Poland in September 1, 1939, the Second World War broke out. "The whole world was amazed at the speedy march of Germany. The German armies fell upon Poland like a swarm of locusts and Attack upon Poland by Germany and Russia, and the partition of Poland the German air force destroyed the whole country. Meanwhile, with the attack of the Red armies upon Poland the defense of the latter completely broke down. Though Russia advanced the plea of protecting the minority, the white Russians of Poland, yet her chief motive was to occupy some parts of Poland. The defeat and destruction of Poland was completed by the attack of two powerful neighboring enemies, Russia was opposed to the existence of an independent Poland. Hence Poland was partitioned between Germany and Russia.

Having established her mastery in Poland, Russia next proceeded to secure Latvia, and Lithuania concluded mutual assistance pacts with Russia and surrendered their naval bases to Russia. sides of the Frontier between Finland and Russia, and to conclude a nonaggression pact with Russia.

Next Russia asked Finland to deliver to Russia some territories on both side of the Frontier between Finland and Russia. Finland accepted all the demands except one relating to the strategic base. Being dissatisfied with it Russia attacked Finland on November 30, 1939 and Finland fell. In June 1940 Russia occupied and annexed Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

Russia had to incur much loss as a result of war in the Baltic in terms of lives and moral support of the world public opinion. But the most important reaction of Russian success was the deterioration in the Russo-German relations. Hitler had already been annoyed with Russia for her occupation of the three Baltic states. Still Hitler continued to maintain better relations with Russia for the time being in the expectation of military and economic advantages from Russia. On the other hand, it was also essential for Russia to maintain friendship with Germany at that time.

War in Western Europe:

When Germany was continuing operations inactivity of Britain and France, at the beginning of the war in Poland, Britain and France remained almost inactive in western Europe. Britain stopped sending troops to France. Hence, Germany got an opportunity of mobilizing her army in western Europe.

Having completed the conquest of Poland, Hitler placed before Britain and France his so-called 'Peace-Plan'. His terms were that

- (1) the western states were to recognize the extinction of Poland,
- (2) Germany and Russia, were to be permitted a 'free hand' in eastern and central Europe,
- (3) Germany was to be given back her former colonies. Upon the rejection of the Peace Plan by Britain and France Germany announced her determination to continue the war.

With the invasions of Germany upon Norway and Denmark in April 1940 the 'uneasy peace' of western Europe came to an end. Hitler attacked both Norway and Denmark on the pretext of protecting them from the evil design of the Allies when his conspiracy with Quisling was complete. Denmark could not offer any effective resistance. Due to the support and help of the 'Fifth Columnists' like Quisling and others, Norway fell within a month. Denmark was reduced to a protectorate of Germany and the rule of the local

Result

Nazi supported by Germany was installed in Norway. The easy fall of Denmark and Norway created a strong reaction in Britain against the Chamberlain Ministry. As a result Chamberlain's government fell and Churchill, the leader of the Conservative Party formed the ministry. The first address of Churchill in the Parliament is worth quoting "I have nothing to offer, but blood, toil, tears and sweat".

In May 1940, Germany's invasion of Luxemburg, Belgium and the Netherlands began. Earlier Germany by concluding treaties with Holland (1926), Luxemburg (1929), and Belgium (1935) had pledged to protect their territorial integrity and neutrality. Hitler began his expedition on the plea that the Allies had been trying to violate their neutrality. Britain and France sent armies to resist Germany's invasion. But the well-trained and

well-equipped German armies broke through all the resistance and continued their onward march. Holland surrendered. The German armies swooped down upon the Allied forces and the Allied forces left Denmark.

Next began the German invasion of France. In the Battle of Somme an all-out resistance of France failed. Taking the advantage of the helpless condition of France, Italy declared war on her. On June 10, 1940 the fascist army crossed the Alpine frontier. Four days later the Nazi troops entered Paris unopposed, the resistance of France completely collapsed and the French Prime Minister, Reynaud resigned. In his place Henry Philippe Petain was appointed Prime Minister. On June 21, France signed the armistice with Germany. The French government signed the treaty of armistice with Germany in the same railway compartment where Germany had appealed for armistice to the Allies in 1918. Germany thus avenged the humiliation of 1918. By the terms of armistice

- (1) France left most of her territories under the military control of Germany;
- (2) the French armies were dissolved;
 - (1) the war equipment's of France were totally handed over to Germany; and
 - (2) the French prisoners of war were detained until the terms of peace were signed.

Two days later, France concluded a separate treaty of armistice.

Causes of the defeat of France

Isolation of France in Europe after the expiration of the Franco-Soviet Agreement. (2) Weakness of the French army, (3) erroneous policy of the French military leaders, (4) moral degradation of the French army. (5) extreme deterioration of the political system of France, and (6) better war strategy and war equipment's of the German army

In fact, the most important reason of the defeat of the French was their unpreparedness. They were caught napping by the cautious strategy and superior military equipment of Germany. They put much reliance on the Maginot Line which they thought was impregnable. But that line of defense easily broke down under the pressure of German armored divisions and a powerful air force. Subversive activity of the Nazi fifth columnists was another factor that brought about the easy fall of France. Nazi secret agents had already infiltrated into French soil and when the German forces approached

France, these agents aided the German parachutists and gave signals to German planes. Moreover the Allies underestimated the war potentials of the Germans and they were unaware of the size and quality of the German army.

As a result of defeat France was divided into two parts, occupied and un-occupied zones. In the un-occupied zone, a new French government was installed. It was known as Vichy Government. Petain was given dictatorial powers by the Senate. The Petain government went on co-operating with Germany and Italy. But the patriotic French set up the Free French government in London under the leadership of Charles de Gaulle.

Results of the fall of France:

As a result of the fall of France firstly, the British Commonwealth states had to shoulder the responsibility of continuing the war against Germany and Italy; secondly, the aggressive policy of Japan became more violent. According to the Tripartite pact concluded between Germany, Italy and Japan,

- (1) Japan on the one hand and Germany and Italy on the other were recognized as the leaders of 'East Asia' and Europe respectively;
- (2) The signatories agreed to help each other.

Thirdly, the United States became firmly determined of ensuring security of the democratic countries of the world on account of the fall of France, Italy's participation in the war against the Allies and complete isolation of Britain in Europe. On August 4, 1939, the United States by amending the terms of the Neutrality started supplying war-equipment's to France and Britain. As a result, the Allied defense against the Axis Powers became strong.

Fourthly, after the fall of France Hitler got the opportunity of invading Britain.

Fifthly, difference between Hitler and Mussolini on one hand and Hitler and Franco on the other grew and began to develop further after the fall of France. General Franco of Spain preferred to remain neutral.

In the words of Carl. H. Pegg "with fall of France, the Nazis held the Atlantic coastline from Norway to Spain and had at their command the resources of western and central Europe. The Italians held many key points in Africa and had a sizable fleet in the Mediterranean. Across the narrow waters of the English Channel, Britain stood alone and weakly armed.....Many of her men in the newly created Home Guard were without

weapons of any sort. few western military experts gave the British much of the chance of withstanding the fury and might of the Axis Powers.

"War in Britain

By the middle of 1940 almost the whole of western Europe from the Arctic Sea to the Pyrenees fell at the feet of Nazi Germany. - After the fall of France, Britain had to continue the war against Germany single-handed in western Europe. In September, 1940 the historic Battle of Britain was fought. Britain won the final victory and the German air power almost collapsed. As a result, Britain became assured of her security from future German aggression.

War in the Balkan Region:

Due to the continuous success of Germany the Balkan states changed their policy towards the Axis powers. Hungary and Rumania were reduced to German protectorates. The Nazi army secured the right of entry into Bulgaria in 1941. Yugoslavia came to terms with the Axis. But the Yugoslavs reacted violently against the pact with the Axis and an anti-Axis government was formed. On the other hand, Greece also became determined to defend itself against Germany. Hence the Nazi army began military operations against Yugoslavia and Greece suddenly. Being supported by Britain, Greece opposed the enemy with immense valor, but ultimately the Nazis occupied both Yugoslavia and Greece. The Axis also occupied Crete and the British navy had to make a hasty retreat.

As the course of the war continued in favor of the Axis, Turkey changed her policy. In the beginning of the war Turkey was bound with Britain and France by military pacts. But after the fall of France and with the establishment of German hegemony in the Balkan region, Turkey concluded a non-aggression treaty with Germany in June 1941.

War in Eastern Europe:

The most remarkable event of the Second World war was the surprise attack of Germany upon Russia. In 1939 the Non-Aggression Pact between Germany and Russia was signed. Hitler's motives were to avoid war on two fronts of Germany, to deprive in western Europe. But completely defying this pact Germany Poland of Russian help and to continue war uninterrupted anti-German propaganda of Russia in the German frontiers, occupy Ukraine, Russia's granary and the petroleum of Baku.

Although clash of interests between Germany and Russia arose over the Balkan and Baltic affairs, Russia did not fail to maintain friendly relations with Germany. Russia confirmed the occupation of Belgium, Norway, and Yugoslavia by Germany and recognized the pro-German government of Iraq. But in spite of that Hitler began preparations for his historic expedition of Russia. He concluded a non-aggression pact with Turkey, secured co-operation of Rumania and Finland and ordered the German armies to invade Russia. The Russo-German war began on June 22, 1941 as soon as 150 divisions of the German armies marched across the frontiers of Russia.

Italy, Rumania, Slovakia, Hungary and Finland joined Germany. At this System of alliance turn in the course of the war, the British Prime Minister, Churchill once concluded a treaty with Russia. According to Germany jointly and not to make peace without consulting each other. In that year (1941) Britain and Russia announced their friendship with Turkey and both the states jointly occupied Persia. Soviet Union gave recognition to the exiled Polish government in London and annulled the Russo-German Pact of 1939. In the Far East Russia signed the Neutrality Pact alliance with Russia and offered the latter substantial aid under the Lend-Lease Act.

In the first five months of Germany's Russian expedition the mighty German armies created a remarkable sensation in the world by continuous success. The Nazi armies besieged Leningrad and threatened Moscow. In spite of heavy loss, the Russian Red Army continued to resist the enemy with immense vigour. Adopting 'scorched-earth' policy, the Russian army began to retreat after destroying all that might be useful to the enemy.

The situation took a turn after November, 1941. The German army was occupied by Germany and forced to retreat as soon as the Red Army launched a counter offensive. Yet the mighty German army occupied different parts of Russia. By December, 1942 the German army occupied the whole territories of the western frontier of Russia, Crimea and Ukraine in the south and Caucasus in the east. In the historic Battle of Stalingrad Russia won victory. On February 2, 1943 the German general Von Paulus surrendered and the German forces began to retreat. By April 1944 the Russian forces advanced as far as the prewar Polish Red Army of Russia. frontier. The whole world was amazed at the success of the Red army of Russia

War in Africa and the Near East

When Germany was busy in establishing her supremacy in Western Europe, Italy had been continuing the Mediterranean and African expeditions. In 1940 after attacking Lybia, the Fascist army invaded Egypt. Two months later the British army recovered the whole of Egyptian coast by operation with the German troops the Italian army occupied the British army in co-operation with the American forces began fresh offensive against the Axis. Eritrea, Italian Somaliland, and Abyssinia were occupied by the British forces. Italy lost her East-African Empire by the end of 1941. After resisting the attack of the Axis in the Suez area, the British forces advanced towards the Near East. They occupied Iraq and Syria and assured independence.

The U.S.A. and the Second World War:

With the outbreak of the war in Europe the United States had assumed neutrality. Although the Americans were not in favor of participating in the European war, they were sympathetic towards the democratic states of the world. So, immediately after the outbreak of the war, the U.S. Congress lifted the ban upon the export of armaments from America and followed the policy of "Cash and Carry".

Gradually, it became impossible for the United States to continue her neutrality when the European war assumed a gigantic turn. The Americans gradually became more eager to assist Britain in all possible Change of policy ways. Consequently, in March 1941 the U.S. Congress empowered the U.S. government to help the warring states with armaments against the Axis by enacting the Lend-Lease Act. This legislation turned America into the 'Arsenal of Democracy'. Within a few days the U.S. forces captured Greenland, Iceland and Dutch-Guiana. As the U.S. merchantmen were indiscriminately attacked by the German submarines, the U.S. naval forces were ordered to 'shoot on sight' the ships and submarines of the Axis- Practically from November 1941 the United States with her huge armaments proceeded to help the Allies In August 1941 Roosevelt and Churchill met at the historic North-Atlantic Conference. In this Conference both the leaders announced the Eight-point Program of War aims for the Second World War. They announced the following principles as national policies of their respective countries on which they based their hope for a better future of the world

1. Britain and the U.S.A. would not occupy foreign territories;

2. no territorial changes would be made without taking the consent of the peoples concerned;
3. the right of all peoples to choose the form of government would be respected;
4. for economic development, equal trading rights of all countries, victors or vanquished would be recognized;
5. economic advancement and social security of all nationalities would be assured;
6. universal peace would be restored in the world after the "end of Nazi barbarism";
7. equal rights of all nations over the seas would be recognized; and
8. the principle of demilitarization would be applied upon the aggressor states.

War in the Far East:

Meanwhile relations between Japan and America began to deteriorate very fast. Upon the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact between Germany, Italy and Japan in 1940, the United States became hostile towards Japan. Commenting on the Tripartite Pact Roosevelt said that "the U.S.A. has never before faced such a dangerous situation". On becoming the Prime Minister of Japan Tojo proposed a treaty with the United States. In reply to it the U.S. The government proposed that

- (1) Non-aggression Pact was to be concluded with the states whose interests were involved in the Far East, and
- (2) The Japanese armies were to be withdrawn from China and Indo-China. As Japan rejected this proposal, war between the two became almost inevitable. While the European states were heavily entangled in Europe, Japan had been advancing rapidly in the Far East. Japanese advance in the East Indies threatened the U.S. interests there. At such a juncture the U.S. The government invited Japan to a conference at Washington, in order to come to terms with the latter. While the talks between the representatives of Japan and the U.S.A. had been progressing in Washington, all on a sudden Japanese air force attacked the American naval base of Pearl Harbor in Hawaii Islands. Following this Japan declared war on Britain and America. The U.S. The government also declared war on Japan. Thus, the European war which originated from the attack of Germany upon Poland, in 1939 was henceforth transformed into a global war with the entry of the U.S.A. into it in 1941. In February 1942 Japan occupied Java, Burma, New Guinea and the

Andamans. Japan threatened the security of Australia by establishing air bases in China, Thailand and the French Indo-China. Everywhere the Allies suffered reverses.

War in the Mediterranean:

In order to disrupt the British communication in the Mediterranean, a party of the German troops began to proceed through Crete. Under the commandship of the German General Rommel a joint Italo-German army launched heavy attacks upon the British forces in North Africa. Rommel won astonishing victory over the Allied powers and forced the British army to retreat towards Alexandria. In June 1942 a fierce battle was fought between Montgomery and Rommel at El-Almein. The German offensive suffered disaster. The battles of Stalingrad and El-Almein were two epoch-making events of the Second World War.

At this stage the United States entered the theater of the Mediterranean war. The U.S. Commander Eisenhower was appointed the Commander-in-Chief of the Allied forces in Western Europe. The Allied troops landed along the coast of Morocco and Algeria. The Vichy government of France did not offer any resistance to the Allies. Being enraged at such behavior of the Vichy government, Hitler annexed the unoccupied zone of France.

Meanwhile, the Allied forces proceeded as far as the frontier of Tunisia after occupying French North Africa. In May 1943, about 75 thousand German soldiers in Tunisia surrendered to the Allies. This proved to be another turning point in the history of the Second World War.

War in Italy:

After the reverses of the Axis powers in the battles of Stalingrad and Tunisia, Mussolini for the security of Italy advised Hitler to conclude a treaty with Russia. But Hitler refused. At this time the internal situation in Italy was fast Attack upon Italy deteriorating and public opinion against the Fascist government had been mounting. Meanwhile on July 10, 1943, The "Anglo-U.S. forces attacked and occupied Sicily. The most important outcome of this battle was the fall of Mussolini. On July 25, 1943 Victor Emmanuel III, the king of Italy, dismissed Mussolini and commissioned Badoglio to form a non-Fascist government. On September 9, Italy surrendered to the Allies

unconditionally. Fall of Mussolini completely unnerved Hitler. On September 11, he announced his determination to rescue Mussolini and to reinstate the Fascist government in Italy.

In September 1943, the U.S. army under the generalship of Clark marched into the Western part of Italy. On the other hand, an English force attacked Italy from the Adriatic coast. A fierce battle was fought at Salerno, Naples and Monte-cassino. On June 4 Rome passed into the hands of the Allies. North-Italy remained under German occupation.

War in France:

After the fall of Italy, the Allies next made preparations to attack Germany. It was more convenient to attack Germany through France. For self-defense Germany raised strong fortifications along the entire coast line. The U. S. Commander Patton succeeded in a break-through in France and proceeded towards Paris. The German army began to retreat towards the German frontier. On August 25, 1944 the Allied troops entered Paris.

War in Germany:

After the recovery of France, the Allies attacked Germany from three sides, the Russian army from the east and the Allied forces from the side of Italy and France. Fall of Germany became imminent and her allies began to desert her. Rumania, Finland and Bulgaria concluded peace with Russia. The German defense broke down, and by April 1945 Russia freed Belgium and Holland and marched into Germany. The German army forced the U.S. forces to retreat for the time being. By April 1945 the Russian forces and the Allied forces completely besieged Germany and Germany became divided into zones. On May 2, the Russian army entered the city of Berlin. Everywhere the German army suffered severe reverses. The Nazi leaders began to commit suicide one after another. On May 1, 1945 the news of Hitler's death was announced. Goebbels and Himmler committed suicide. Goering, Ribben-trop, Von Papen and Streicher were taken into custody. In Milan Mussolini was attacked and killed by an anti-Fascist mob, Germany surrendered to the Allies unconditionally.

On May 7, 1945 the German representatives signed the treaty of unconditional surrender. On May 8 the news of the Allied Victory in Europe was announced. Only Japan on the Axis side went on continuing

War in the Pacific

In June 1942 Japan reached the highest peak of her power. After that America proceeded to restore her power and interests in the Pacific. The course of war in the Pacific took a turn when America won the naval battle of Midway on June 6, 1942. The U.S. Admiral Fletcher inflicted a severe defeat upon the Japanese army. As a result of the defeat, the Islands of Hawaii became secured. The U.S. Army occupied the Guadalcanal in the Solomon Islands after six months' fighting. As a result, Australia's security also became assured.

In October, 1942 the U.S. Commander General MacArthur launched a fierce attack on the Japanese army in the Philippine Islands and recovered the whole of the Philippines. Next began heavy air-raids upon the cities of Japan. On August 6, and 9, 1945 atomic bombs were dropped upon the two cities of Hiroshima and Nagasaki of Japan. That was the first occasion when atomic bomb was used in war. On August 8, Russia declared war on Japan. Japan unconditionally surrendered to the U.S. Army. Administration of Japan was left in the hands of MacArthur. With the surrender of Japan, the Second World War came to an end.

Causes of the fall of Germany:

The causes of the fall of Germany Anti-Hitler attitude of the German commanders and the German people were:

Firstly, conspiracy of the German commanders and utter discontent in the German army were the chief causes of the fall of Germany. A violent reaction had been mounting against the dictatorship of Hitler and many a time attempts were made to assassinate Hitler. Once an attempt was made to overthrow the Third Reich. A general like Rommel had to commit suicide. Goering and Himmler also did not escape the oppression of Hitler. Hence these seriously hampered the war operations of Germany against the Allies.

Secondly, Germany was not adequately equipped, to continue a war against the big powers of the world for a long time. The cause of Germany's success in the

beginning of the war was militarily un-preparedness of the U.S.A. and the Soviet Union. But later it became well-nigh impossible for Germany to compete with the United States and the Soviet Union in the race of armaments.

Thirdly, the tactical blunders and wrong war-strategy of Germany were also responsible for her defeat. For these blunders Hitler himself was mostly responsible. His suspicion and distrust of the German commanders and army officers destroyed their initiative. Hitler committed a great blunder in December 1941 when he took over the command of the German army in his own hands. The course of the Second World War would have been different had Hitler, instead of attacking Russia employed all his resources against Britain. Besides, Hitler had no clear understanding of naval power and that was another chief cause of the fall of Germany.

Fourthly, The Axis lacked a firm ideological bond among themselves. As long as Germany was on the triumphal march the other Axis powers went on co-operating with the former. But with the reverses of Germany her allies began to desert her in quick succession. The Vichy government of France betrayed Germany in its worst days. Finland signed an armistice with Russia and England and similar treaties were concluded by Rumania, Bulgaria and Hungary with the Allies. Moreover, Hitler's best ally, Fascist Italy had become a liability and a cause of anxiety for Germany. The murder of Mussolini in 1945 shattered Hitler's hopes and broke his morale. Genera Franco, the other ally of Germany, never supported Germany wholeheartedly and also never co-operated with Germany fully. Hence, the ideological difference and the lack of co-operation among the Axis contributed to the German defeat.

Self-Assessment Questions

1. Explain the causes of the First World War (1914–1918).
2. Discuss the course and results of the First World War.
3. Examine Wilson's Fourteen Points.
4. Describe the Paris Peace Conference and its outcomes.
5. Analyze the aims and failures of the League of Nations.
6. Explain the significance of the Kellogg–Briand Pact and Locarno Pact.
7. Discuss Mussolini and the growth of Fascism in Italy.
8. Examine Hitler and the rise of Nazism in Germany.
9. Analyze the British policy of appeasement.
10. Discuss the causes, course, and results of the Second World War.

Unit- III

Cold war: Origins – Causes – Truman's Doctrine – Marshall Plan – NATO – SEATO – CENTO –SALT I and II— Emergence of Third world

Objectives:

- To understand the origins and causes of the Cold War.
- To examine key Cold War policies and Marshall Plan.
- To analyze military agreements like NATO, SEATO, CENTO,

Cold War

Origin of Cold War

The co-operation and understanding that existed between Soviet Russia and the Western states during the Second World War began to evaporate gradually after the war and mutual distrust and suspicion began to appear. Moreover, ideological differences and the differences in social and economic policies between Soviet Russia and the Western powers widened the gulf between the two power blocs. Spread of communism in Eastern Europe and the formation of a 'bloc' by Soviet Russia gave rise to strong discontent in the U.S.A. and the Western countries. In reply the U.S.A. announced the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan. The efforts of the Western states to oppose the spread of communism in the world led to the origin of the so-called Western Bloc. Thus, the two rival systems of alliances have given birth to a war-tension. And this tension has been termed 'cold war' or 'a war of nerves' in the modern world. The struggle of these two rival blocs is not merely restricted in the ideological sphere. It is being clearly displayed in the political, economic and military spheres as well. Truly speaking, the cold war has been going on between the two rival blocs since the termination of the Second World War and another world war will be staged at the very moment when Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. would enter into open clash. In the words of Friedmann, "A world divided into two camps is still a world living under the shadow of war."

The cold war practically started after the Bolshevik Revolution of Russia in 1917. The struggle and dispute of the Western powers with Russia took its origin from the refusal of the Western powers to recognize the Bolshevik government and their subsequent attack upon Russia. In the opinion of J. B. Priestly, the terror which was

infused in the minds of the British conservatives by the greatness of the Russian Revolution has not yet totally disappeared. Before the Second World War Soviet Russia failed on many occasions to bring the Western powers to a collective security system and to a disarmament program through and outside the League framework. Time and again Russia protested against the appeasement policy of the U.S.A., Britain and France towards Germany. On many occasions the Western powers roused the suspicion of Russia by holding negotiations "with Germany behind the back of Russia." The co-operation and friendship between Soviet Russia and the western states during the war was only made possible due to the efforts of President Roosevelt. But as soon as President Truman came to power the policy of co-operation with Russia was abandoned and the second phase of the cold war began.

Some thinkers and scholars have described the international conflicts of our times as a struggle for world-leadership between Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. Again, according to others it is a struggle between two rival social systems. On account of this mutual rivalry between the Soviet and American blocs in international politics, the English historian Toynbee has described modern world-politics as Bipolar politics i.e., Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. have come out with the mission of establishing their absolute hegemony by dividing the whole world into two hemispheres. According to Toynbee the countries of these two hemispheres have been reduced to the position of either associates or satellites of these two giant powers. In the words of Toynbee, "All the other states in the world to-day are in some measures dependent-most of them on the United States and a few of them on Russia, but none completely independent of one or the other of these two powers"! But the bi-polar interpretation of the present international politics is, however, an over-simplification of the real situation. Moreover, it will not be reasonable to say that Soviet Russia and the United States have established their absolute hegemony in world-politics. Because the countries defeated in the Second World War may regain their lost power and in fact some of them have recovered their lost position. The rise of a new power may change the present balance of power system of the world. Some states, such as India and above all China, are moving towards a similar status.

Today nuclear power is no longer the monopoly of Soviet Russia of the U.S.A. alone. Britain is also gradually advancing in the field of nuclear power. Under the regime of the Fifth Republic France is also steadily progressing in that direction. Militarily rearmed Germany is also power to be reckoned with. In Asian politics Japan has been emerging again. The rise of Red China may also affect the balance of power in the world. Both China and Soviet Russia are equally eager to assume the leadership of the communist world and their mutual relations have degenerated considerably particularly after the Chinese aggression in India in 1962. At any moment these two contenders for world communist leadership may come to an open clash. In that case a triangular contest for world leadership may come to the surface between China, Russia and the U.S.A. The conflict between Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia proves the limitation of bipolarism even in the communist camp. In the ideological war against the Western states, Russia demands the national independence of smaller states, whereas the imperialist policy of Russia does not recognize the real independence of the states under Russian influence. Yugoslavia is a small state and she does not match Russia in any way. But the conflict between the two great world powers has enabled Yugoslavia to follow her own policy and to maintain her independence with complete disregard to Soviet Russia.

Not only Britain, France, India and other smaller states are exerting their influence over bipolar politics, and do not like to be mere pawns in the game between the super-powers. The United Nations is also putting check upon aspirations of these two giant powers although they disagree on every vital issue. If Soviet Russia, the U.S.A., Britain and France fail to preserve unity among themselves, the United Nations will also fail in its task of maintaining international peace. Evatt, the ex-foreign minister of Australia has described the United Nations in the age of the cold war as an "Organized restraint on power". Friedmann has observed, "It is the opportunity of influencing organized world opinion which, more than anything else, keeps the United States and Soviet Union in the United Nations Organization, although they disagree on practically every vital issue."

Apart from the Eastern and Western blocs, the neutral countries of Asia and Africa have also formed another bloc which has been described as Third Bloc. This Third Bloc has been exerting a vital influence on the policy of the two giant powers. The

United States of America and the Soviet Union may look at the present-day world politics in terms of bipolarism "but their view must be balanced against the increasing unrest and lack of sympathy with the picture of world affairs in the rest of the world."

As Friedmann writes' It is only with these important reservations that' bipolar interpretation of the world conflict can be accepted."

Progress of the Cold War between the Two Blocs:

After the Second World War the wartime co-operation and friendship between Soviet Russia and the western Allies ended and, in its place, mutual suspicion, distrust and discontent began to develop which has ultimately led to the formation of the Soviet bloc or East European bloc and the Western bloc. Conflict and artificial war-tension between these two blocs have continued to grow on different international issues.

The Soviet Union and the West:

The Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 for the time being introduced the conflict of social philosophies as an important factor in the sphere of international relations. The zeal with which the Bolshevik leaders and propagandists proclaimed the inevitability of world communism, naturally alienated Russia's former allies who saw in the Bolshevik Revolution a great menace to their existing political and social systems and hence between 1917 and 1920 they gave an all-out support to the counter-revolution in the mainland of Russia. The Allied intervention in the Russian Civil War characterized the first phase of the relations between communist Russia and the western democracies. With the passage of time the Soviet states. Britain gave recognition to the Soviet government of Russia and the latter was admitted to the family of nations in 1934. The triumph of Stalin over Trotsky in 1925 normalized Soviet Russia's relations with the Western countries. Between 1925 and 1933 a series of commercial agreements were concluded between the Soviet Union and the non-communist countries and quite a large number of foreign engineers and technicians were employed in the Soviet establishments. The emergence of Nazi Germany with Hitler's violent anticommunist propaganda gave a formidable threat to the Soviet Union and thus led Russia to set up a system of collective security with the Western democracies against German aggression. The Soviet Union got her entry into the League of Nations in 1934. But unfortunately, her efforts in the direction of establishing a collective security system with the Western democracies failed

miserably when the League under the influence of Chamberlain and Laval could not rise to the occasion in resisting Mussolini's Abyssinian adventure, and in preventing the signing of the Munich Settlement, Soviet Russia abandoned her policy of collaboration with the Western democracies and entered into commercial and non-aggression pacts with Nazi Germany in 1938.

But the German invasion of Russia in 1941 again brought about a change in Soviet Russia's relations with the West. "The Allied Powers, on the initiative of Winston Churchill, immediately accepted Soviet Russia as an ally" and since then until 1945 Soviet Russia's collaboration with the West continued uninterrupted. All these years since 1941 the relations between the Soviet Union and the Allies were never intimate and time and again Russia seriously resented her gigantic sacrifices in comparison to those of the Allies. Although the Soviet and the Western leaders met from time to time in conferences, there was a lack of true coordination and understanding on certain vital issues particularly with regard to the invasion and control of Germany. Observing on the relations between the Soviet Union and the Allies, Friedmann writes, "up to the end of the last war, the relations between Soviet Russia and the West were characterized by distrust and expediency rather than the assumption of inevitable and irreconcilable conflict.

(2) First Five Treaties:

With the conclusion of the War, sharp differences between the Soviet Union and the West cropped up. In April, 1946 the Council of Foreign Ministers initiated the discussion on the first five treaties in Paris. The Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain, Russia and France sharply differed on the question of the Italo-Yugoslav border. Earlier in September, 1945, these four ministers failed to arrive at an agreed solution of this issue in London. The Soviet Minister, Molotov argued that from the point of view of population and economy, the Julian March was closely connected with Yugoslavia and that Trieste, if delivered to Italy, would serve as a military base for aggression upon the Balkan states. The other three ministers insisted on the partition of Trieste between Italy and Yugoslavia as a means of settlement of the dispute. At last, they agreed to the creation of Free Territory of Trieste to be governed by the Security Council.

(3) Italian Reparation:

The question of realizing reparation from Italy posed another problem to the big powers. Molotov demanded two thirds of the reparation from Italy for Yugoslavia, Greece and Albania and the rest for Russia. At last it was decided that the amount of reparation to be paid to the Soviet Union would be fixed by a Four Power Commission.

(4) Paris Peace Conference:

A controversy arose over the procedure of Paris Peace Conference convened in 1946 and ultimately it was resolved that the Peace conference would submit the drafts of the peace treaties containing the demands of both sides for ratification, Molotov accused Britain and the U.S.A. of having gained much during the War. On the other hand, Britain and the U.S.A. accused Soviet Russia of having unlawfully occupied many territories during the War.

(5) German Problem:

In central Europe the settlement of the German problem proved acute. In July 1946. Molotov strongly denounced the agrarian policy of the Western powers in Germany. Molotov strongly denounced the partition of Germany. Byrnes, the U.S. representative in reply condemned the aggressive attitude of Molotov towards the West and announced that the U.S.A. would consider each occupation zone as an economic unit. A sharp difference between them arose on the issue of economic unity and reparation of Germany. Russia proposed an establishment of Four Power Control over the Ruhr, nationalization of all trust properties of Germany, introduction of the German central administration for industry and foreign trade and a huge payment to Russia as reparation. Britain and the U.S.A. charged Russia that her real motive was to establish her own domination in Germany. At length the four powers only agreed to consider Prussia as a separate state from Germany.

The Four Power Control over Germany ended in 1949 upon the establishment of the Federal Republic in West Germany and the Democratic Republic in East Germany. Western Germany entered into an alliance with the Western powers. Soviet Russia announced that the unification of Germany could only be possible if western Germany agreed to follow a neutral policy and detached itself from diplomatic relations with the

Western countries. Thus, Germany has still remained a burning question between the two power-blocs.

(6) Berlin Question:

The City of Berlin has been an issue of serious differences between Soviet Russia and the Western states. When in June 1948 Russia besieged West Berlin, the Western powers protested vehemently and both sides were at the verge of open clash. In September, 1948, the U.S.A., Britain and France represented to the Security Council that the restrictions imposed by Russia upon the communications between West Germany and Berlin had created a serious problem. They also pointed out that this action of Russia was opposed to Article 2 of the U.N. Charter and it might even endanger world peace. However, under an agreement reached in May 1949 the overland traffic into west Berlin was resumed.

(7) Austria:

At the Moscow Conference of 1943, the Foreign Ministers of the Allies had decided to consider Austria as an independent state after the war. From 1945 to 1955 Austria remained under the Four power military occupation and during this period it was not possible for the Allies to conclude a peace treaty with Austria due to the unwillingness of Russia to quit Austria. Another sharp conflict between the two sides arose over the question of Austria's future. In December, 1952 the General Assembly of the U.N. directed Russia, the U.S.A., Britain and France to conclude a treaty with Austria by renouncing their right of occupation and to declare Austria as an independent state. The other three Allied powers recognized the neutrality of Austria and no sooner the foreign troops were withdrawn from Austria than the Peace Treaty was signed in May, 1955.

"The Austrian Peace Treaty", writes Friedmann, major international treaty on which the four erstwhile allies have been able to agree after years of an unbroken record of dissension and tension, sometimes threatening to lead to the brink of war". The reasons for the agreement are not, however, due to real goodwill and co-operation between Soviet Russia and the three 'big'. The real purpose of the creation of the Austrian Republic by an international agreement was to serve Austria as the model of

agreement that was to be concluded with regard to Germany and other states in Europe. According to the terms of the peace,

1. Austria is to be recognized as an independent, sovereign and democratic state,
2. the Allies are to respect the independence, territorial integrity and neutrality of Austria and
3. Austria undertakes not to seek directly or indirectly any political and economic union with Germany.

Truman Doctrine March 12, 1947

Ideological aspect of the conflict:

The leaders of both the Eastern and Western blocs generally describe their mutual struggle and conflict in ideo-logical terms. Democracy and dictatorship, capitalist imperialism and people's democracy are opposed to each other.

Most of the American leaders look upon the political and social systems of the Soviet Union as 'objectionable' and 'dangerous' because in the Soviet systems there is no place for parliamentary democracy and individual liberty. On the contrary the communists regard the American democracy as 'shameful', 'an instrument of the wealthy', and an 'aggression upon people's democracy'. According to the communists, Nationalist China, Greece and Spain which are being aided by America can be ranked with the Fascist states. The communists do not even consider some of the republics of Central and South America allies with U.S.A. and Britain as genuine democratic states. The possibility of a world state and a world federation solely depends upon the conformity of political and social systems of all nations. In the words of Friedmann, "close international integration, in the form of a world state, a world-federation or an international code of human rights would demand a greater conformity of political and social values. But in the world of today this is a distant aspiration."

The apprehension that has been created in the U.S.A. and other democratic states is not the particular political system of Soviet Russia. It has actually arisen from a different fact. For examples firstly, apparently Soviet Russia preaches for world communism as well as for a change of the social system of all states of the world. But practically speaking an appraisal of the progress of communist movements of the past thirty years' world reveals that the Soviet government has all these years given much

attention to achieve success in the sphere of Russia's own foreign policy through these communist movements.

Secondly, at present Soviet Russia is not only the central figure of the worldwide international communist movement, but also after World War II, she has established herself as one of the greatest powers of Europe and Asia. On the other side, as the United States has taken responsibilities in Germany and Japan, she has been directly involved in the European and Asiatic politics. Thus the U.S.A. not only views the direct or indirect expansion of Soviet Russia as the success of communism; she also fears Russia's every advance as dangerous for her own security and national integrity.

Hence the ideals of worldwide communist movement well-published by Russia is not the real cause of the apprehension of the U.S.A. and other democratic states. Russia's expansionism has become the actual cause of such apprehension.

On the other hand, Soviet Russia is also looking upon the course of international politics from a different angle. Even after the Second World War the Soviet leaders have not forgotten the non-cooperative attitude of the western powers towards Soviet Russia. Even today Soviet Russia has not forgotten the immense loss that she incurred in the Second World War. Apart from this the rise of the nationalists and reactionary industrialists in West Germany and Japan has made Soviet Russia all the more suspicious about the western powers. Russia is always under an apprehension that the western powers may use all these reactionary forces against

In all the western plans of world economic revival Russia traces aggressive designs of the Western powers. Thus, the political and social differences rather than mere ideological conflict have led to the origin of the cold war between the Western and Eastern blocs.

Indirect Conflicts between the Eastern and Western Blocs:

Ever since the end of the Second World War indirect if not direct conflicts have been continuing between Soviet Russia and the Western bloc in different parts of the world. At times indirect conflicts assumed the form of open clash.

As soon as World War II ended attitude of mutual suspicion, unreliance and resentment between Soviet Russia and the western countries appeared on the surface. According to many the cold war has started with Soviet Russia's effort to extend her

sphere of influence by following a policy of spreading communism in Eastern Europe and that of imperialism in other parts of the world.

Even before the Second World War Russia was aware of her weak defense. During the Second World War Russia had attempted to strengthen her defense in Eastern Europe by extending her influence and authority in the Baltic and Balkan regions. After the war Russia installed communist governments dependent on itself in the Baltic countries (Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia), in the Balkan region and Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, East Germany etc. Russia succeeded in extending her political, military and economic influence over the Eastern European countries. Through the Cominform branches and the local communist organizations Russia has been able to establish her political supremacy in these countries. On the economic side a series of trade and commercial pacts have been concluded between Soviet Russia and these countries. Thus, immediately after the Second World War the Soviet bloc has emerged as a great force in Eastern Europe.

At first the western powers did not resist Soviet Russia's neo-imperialism and expansion of her influence over her neighboring countries. The reason was that the western powers believed in the continuation of the war-time co-operation with Soviet Russia even after the war. The western powers even believed that Russia would respect her pledges given at Yalta and Potsdam. But when Russia formed the Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe by establishing undisputed communist dictatorship alarm and resentment among the western powers ran high and gradually, they became determined to oppose further expansion of Russia's influence.

Conflict between Soviet Russia and the western powers was unleashed for the first time over the affairs of Greece, Turkey and Iran. As soon as the German forces left Greece in 1944, the British forces stepped in. Russia had acknowledged the British position in Greece according to the treaty concluded between itself and Britain. On the strength of that treaty the British forces had entered Greece. Meanwhile, in Greece an open clash between the leftists and the royalists began. British support to the royalists at once led to internecine war in Greece. Upon the attack of the British forces many communists of Greece took shelter in the mountains. By a plebiscite held in 1945 monarchy was restored in Greece. But by continuous offensives the communists

harassed the Greek government. They began to receive help from the communists of Bulgaria, Albania and Yugoslavia in many ways. Under such circumstances as it became impossible for Britain to suppress the terrorists, she appealed to the U.S.A. for help. Being alarmed at the prospect of the progress of communist influence in Greece and Turkey, the U.S. President, Truman, in order to help those two countries, appealed the U.S. Congress in March 1947 passed a sanction of \$400 million. He declared, "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation-of Truman was subsequently known as the 'Truman Doctrine' or policy of 'containment'. The Truman Doctrine put an end to the policy of isolation in European politics which the United States had been pursuing since the conclusion of the Second World War and henceforth she stepped forward to assume leadership in world politics. Besides, the Truman Doctrine may be described as the first direct response to the challenge of Soviet Russia. In this declaration it was stated that international peace would be endangered over the free peoples of the American continent as well. The chief aim of the Truman Doctrine was to preserve the balance of power with Soviet Russia by forming a bloc loyal to the USA through economic and military assistance. In fact, Truman Doctrine was announced with a view to checking the expansion of Russia's influence over the Middle East and the Balkan area. The U.S. Congress permitted Truman to help Greece and Turkey and sanctioned the necessary fund. This was the beginning of a great shift in American foreign policy marking the end of her isolationism. At the concluding state of the second World War Turkey, wartime an ally of Germany, joined the Allies against Germany. But Turkey's diplomatic move during the war antagonized Russia. On the other hand, Turkey had also been harboring enough suspicion. However, after the war Russia demanded an amendment of the non-aggression pact concluded with Turkey. On this score ill-feeling on both sides ran high and Turkey became alarmed of Russia's aggression upon herself. However, when at length President Truman announced assistance to Greece and Turkey, Russia retired temporarily and the political situation in the Middle East improved a little.

After the World War II when Russia turned her attention towards the oil resources of Iran, indirect conflict with the Western bloc began. Five provinces of North Persia viz. Azerbaijan, Mazandaran, Gorgan, Jilan and Khorasan had been under Russian

occupation and the rest under British suzerainty. During the World War II communist-influenced Tudeh Party of Azerbaijan proceeded to establish self-government there. After the end of the war movement in this direction began in Azerbaijan at the instigation of Soviet Russia. In the beginning the western states remained indifferent. In December 1945 the Tudeh Party proclaimed an independent republic in Azerbaijan. The communists of other provinces of North Persia started similar movements and the Kurd Republic was set up. At such a turn of events, Persia lodged a protest with the Security Council against Russia. On the failure of the Security Council to take a firm decision in this matter, Persia was compelled to sign a treaty with Russia on April 4, 1946 whereby Russia's interests over the oil resources of North Persia for 25 years were recognized. But relations between the two grew strained once again upon the refusal of the new Parliament (the Majlis) of Persia to ratify the treaty. The Persian Majlis abrogated the treaty of 1946 and concluded an alliance with the United States whereby the latter assured military as well as non-military help to Persia. The motive behind this arrangement was to oppose the spread of Russia's influence over the oil regions of the Middle East. As a result, a struggle between the Soviet and the western blocs began in the Middle East

Marshall Plan.

The United States did not cease its attempts in arresting the progress of Russia's influence even after the announcement of the Truman Doctrine. In 1947, the United States sponsored the European Recovery Program. It is known as the Marshall Plan as it was prepared by Marshall, the U.S. Secretary. Marshall Plan After the Second World War and at the end of 1947 the whole of Europe fell into the grip of an economic depression. The United States proceeded to the rescue of Europe under the apprehension that the economic crisis in Britain, France, Belgium, Italy and West Germany would help the spread of communist influence in the "free world". The Marshall Plan stands as a most significant event in post-war international relations. Analyzing the plan Marshall had said that as long as poverty, economic depression and scarcity of food would remain in western Europe, "there will steadily develop social unease and political confusion on every side Our national security will be seriously threatened. But if we furnish effective aid to support the now visibly reviving hope of Europe, the prospect would

quickly change." In short, the chief aim of the Marshall Plan was to improve the political and social life of Europe by fighting out poverty and economic crisis. According to this Plan the initiative for economic recovery should come from the Europeans themselves and the U.S.A. would only give economic aid to those countries engaged in the task of economic reconstruction.

Soviet Russia and both the communist and non-communist countries of Eastern Europe were invited to accept the Marshall Plan. The Soviet Union rejected the offer. The arguments put forward by Soviet Russia were, firstly, the Soviet Union as well as Eastern Europe could not accept such a plan which aimed at giving economic help to Europe as a whole instead of giving such help individually to the countries accepting the plan. Secondly, this plan was completely opposed to the basic principles of the United Nations Charter. Thirdly, in the opinion of the Soviet Union the United States under the cover of this plan aimed at creating an economic empire taking advantage of Europe's economic plight. Czechoslovakia at first accepted the plan but later she rejected it under Soviet pressure. "This shattered the idea of a joint European economic plan" (Friedmann). Not only that, Russia's negative attitude towards the plan led to the continuation of the struggle and dispute between Eastern and Western Europe, which in turn made all attempts in the direction of achieving economic co-operation between Eastern and Western Europe abortive. Only seventeen countries, Austria, Belgium, Luxemburg, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, Britain, West Germany and Trieste accepted the Marshall Plan. This plan was in operation till June 1952. In spite of non-co-operation of the Eastern European countries, the Marshall Plan achieved some success. In the words of Friedmann, "When the Marshall Plan Program came to an end in June 1952, it had achieved triumphantly what it had set out to do." By 1951 the volume of industrial products except coal in the aided countries exceeded the pre-war level. Except France and Italy, the economic plans in other aided countries achieved tremendous success. In the case of hydroelectric power almost a revolutionary improvement was achieved. Even West Germany, a war-solvency. Apart from unexpected improvement in agriculture and industry, the political, social and economic stability returned to the disturbed and war-

ravaged western Europe as a whole and western Europe treaded a long way to progress and development.

It has already been pointed out that the Marshall Plan stiffened the Cold War between Eastern and Western Europe instead of bringing about a rapprochement between the two. Moreover, Soviet Russia had already branded the Truman Doctrine as imperialistic. In order to check the Netherlands, Luxemburg etc., signed the Treaty of Brussels in March, 1948 whereby the signatories expressed their complete reliance upon the U.N. Charter and pledged their mutual military, economic and political co-operation. The Treaty of Brussels played a vital role in strengthening the unity and security of the western countries.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization:(NATO)

The North Atlantic Treaty Organization may be called a defensive organization against the Soviet bloc. After the signing of the Treaty of Brussels and particularly when the conflict between eastern and western Europe over the German problem assumed a serious proportion, the United States endeavored to establish a mutual military assistance organization with the western countries. On April 4, 1949 the U.S.A., Britain, France, Italy, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, Luxemburg, Norway, Portugal, Iceland and the Netherlands signed the North Atlantic Treaty containing 14 provisions. Greece, Turkey and West Germany later joined this organization. At the top of this organization there is one permanent staff under a Secretary General and one permanent high-level Executive Committee. This organization mainly rests on army, navy and air forces supplied by its member states. The main executive body of NATO is the North Atlantic Council. At present it is composed of four main commands viz., the European Command, The Atlantic Ocean Command, The Channel Command and the Canada U.S. Regional Planning Group. Four-fifths of its expenditure has so far been borne by the U.S.A. There are currently 14 divisions in western Europe under the control of NATO.

According to its terms, the signatories have expressed their full confidence in the U.N. Charter, have agreed to make peaceful settlement of all disputes among themselves for international peace, security and justice, have pledged to encourage economic collaboration among themselves, have agreed to resort to arms singly or jointly against foreign aggression and also have agreed to put up joint resistance to foreign aggression

until the Security Council would take necessary measures against the aggressor. In accordance with Article 51 of the U.N. Charter the signatory states have agreed to submit reports to the Security Council on all matters. Besides, they have also extended their pledge to help the Security Council in its efforts to maintain international peace and security

Objectives of NATO

The Chief purposes of NATO is to strengthen the military power of the western countries under U.S. control against the Soviet or the Eastern European bloc and to encourage economic collaboration among the participating countries. It can be easily assumed that NATO has been formed primarily to oppose the spread of Russian influence in western Europe.

NATO is not strictly restricted to the North Atlantic region alone. For it includes countries which have no geographical regionalism such as Italy, Greece and Turkey who have confined their efforts to arrest Russian expansion in the Mediterranean. Greece and Turkey are regarded as vital bastions against Russian advance into the Mediterranean. Again, any Russian attack upon Yugoslavia would certainly lead to intervention by the NATO powers, although Yugoslavia is not a member. Hence, it indicates the chief defect of the regional military alliance in the worldwide power conflict. For Europe the Mediterranean region and the central and Near Eastern countries occupy a very important position in any future major struggle. The Suez Canal still remains a vital link between Europe and Asia as the important oil resources are concentrated in this region. Yet none of the countries of this region (Arabia or Israel) has been admitted into it. But, over question of supremacy in the Mediterranean a struggle between the two blocs may be inevitable in the future! The inclusion of Portugal, the country of dictatorship, into this organization means the abandonment of idealism for mere military reasons. Whereas, in spite of having military importance Spain has not been admitted into it. Thus, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has not been established on the basis of any settled principles. The observations of Friedmann, that, "The idea of North Atlantic Community is based on solid foundations of geography as well as common interests and traditions" do not bear truth.

Another charge against NATO is this that although it was established with the original purpose of maintaining international peace and security it is no constituted as an anti-Soviet military organization and hence it has given rise to tensions between the Eastern and the Western blocs instead of ensuring world peace. This Treaty Organization can be called a rival organization of the U.N. Because, the importance of the U.N. has been considerably lessened due to encroaching upon the U.N.'s responsibility of enduring world peace and security. Apart from this, the international relations of NATO are being controlled by the Anglo-American governments. As a result, the sovereignty of the smaller powers in the field of foreign policy has been restricted to some extent.

In spite of its defects, the achievements of NATO cannot be overlooked. Commenting on the prospect of this organization Friedmann writes, "Of all the regional international organizations formed in recent years as a reaction to the failure of the United Nations, the NATO community has the greatest prospect and permanency." Although the dominating role of the U.S.A. in this organization has been criticized by the European fellow members, yet at the same time, it should be admitted that the U.S.A. has been shouldering the bulk of its responsibility.

NATO has been able to equip the Western bloc with proper armaments against the Soviet bloc. Besides, NATO has helped much in strengthening political, social and military collaboration and unity among its member states in spite of their mutual disputes and rivalries. Due to the augmentation of the military strength of this organization it has become impossible for Soviet Russia to extend her influence in Europe any longer. Presently, the NATO Council paid much attention towards economic and political co-operation among the member states instead of increasing its military potentiality. It cannot be denied that a certain degree of coordination of the productive resources of NATO countries have been achieved.

The Ministerial Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization held in April, 1969, was very significant. The organization seems to be at a turning point. NATO was given birth at a time when the West European states and the U.S.A. were very much perturbed at the rapid progress of the Soviet Union's influence in Europe after the Second World War. Doubtless, the Organization has greatly contributed to containing Russia. Similarly, the factors giving birth to the Warsaw Pact under Soviet

leadership have undergone big changes. Today, the European and international situations demonstrate great changes against those of the era when NATO and the Warsaw Pact came into existence. Italy, Turkey, Denmark and Norway indicate signs of reactions to those changes, reactions not without any influence on NATO. They reflect reduced Apprehension about the spread of Soviet influence and domination. France has detached itself from NATO, however, without ceasing to be a party to the Organization. As to the Warsaw Pact, it is also at present contemplating adjustments due to the present intensification of Sino-Soviet tension.

Outstanding changes responsible for modification of NATO and the Warsaw Pact and the mutual relationship of the two organizations are: economic recovery and stability of most of the European states, notably West Germany; the abandonment of the Soviet claims to the Turkish provinces of Ardahan and Kars; the relative consolidation of East Germany, thereby improving the prospects of better relations between the two Germanies; the success of West Germany in improving her relations with some of the communist countries, particularly with Rumania and Yugoslavia; and the tensions between China and the Soviet Union.

The desire of the East European countries as expressed at the Budapest Conference held in April, 1969, for a European Security Scheme covering both the parts of Europe, reacted not negatively on NATO. Fourteen foreign ministers of NATO who met at Brussels in December 1969 agreed to renew their offer of negotiations with communist states on balanced force cuts in Europe. Only France remained aloof.

The Warsaw Pact, 1955:

Soviet Russia was alarmed at the aggressive attitude of the western states when the North Atlantic Treaty Organization came into being. Yet Soviet Russia could not establish a rival organization of NATO for a few years more. But Russia strongly protested against the inclusion of West Germany into NATO. Russia gradually began to take care of her self-defense as the western states paid no heed to her protest and ultimately, she formed a rival regional organization with the Eastern European countries. Russia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania and East Germany concluded the Warsaw Pact on May 4, 1955. The Pact provides for a joint command of the armed forces of the signatories. Moscow is the headquarters of this unified

command. Thus war-tension in the sphere of international relations has started afresh.

Terms of the Warsaw Pact

According to the terms of the Warsaw Pact the signatories have given an undertaking to settle their mutual disputes by peaceful means; to resist the attacks of the imperialist and capitalist states jointly; to establish peace and security by jointly resisting any foreign attack upon any member state. Moreover, the signatories have accepted Soviet command upon their unified armed force. Apart from mutual security, the signatories have also agreed to participate in mutual economic and cultural collaboration. This Pact is left open to all countries.

On the pretext of the Warsaw Pact, Soviet Russia suppressed the nationalist's risings against the communist government in Hungary in 1956, According to many Russia thereby violated the Warsaw pact by intervening in the domestic affairs of a signatory state. But in favor of Russia it was argued that it was at the request of the Kadar government of Hungary that Russia had sent her troops there, extremely conciliatory approach to West Germany. For the first time in a Warsaw Pact document, positive features of development within West Germany were set down.

South East Asia Treaty Organization or SEATO

Like NATO the South East Asia Treaty Organization was also born out of communist fear. With the establishment of the Chinese communist regime, the fear of communist advances spread over South East Asia. In order to check the spread of communist influence in South East Asia and the neighboring Pacific regions the United States and the Western powers proceeded to establish a regional collective defense system. Promptness of Chiang Kai-shek and Quirino Being driven out by the communists, Chiang Kai-shek, the nationalist leader of China, and his nationalist government took shelter in the island of Formosa. Chiang Kai-shek naturally felt the necessity of building up a defense system against the probable attacks of the Chinese communists. Hence Chiang Kai-shek and Quirino, the President of the Philippines, tried to convene a conference of representatives of some Asian countries. But as no country other than South Korea showed much eagerness in this matter, Quirino announced that in the proposed conference the matters relating only to economic and cultural collaboration would be discussed instead of anything relating to political or military problems. On

such assurance, representatives of India, Ceylon, Australia assembled at the Banguio Conference. But Chiang Kai-shek and President Syngman Rhee of South Korea refused to attend the conference as there was no agenda to discuss the measures against the communists. In Southeast Asia. As a result, no resolution could be taken in the conference. Finding lack of enthusiasm among the Asian countries, the United States voluntarily engaged itself in this matter. At the beginning a treaty of military assistance was concluded between America and Pakistan in 1954. Meanwhile, the Indo-Pakistan disputes over Kashmir and other issues gave the U.S.A. a grand opportunity of forming an anticommunist bloc in South-East Asia. At this time the possibility of the destruction of the French influence in Viet Nam of French Indo-China also appeared to be certain. Being encouraged at these developments the United States proposed a defense organization for the South East Asia. But this proposal did not find favor with India, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia. However, on the acceptance of the proposal by other Asian countries, the statesmen of the U.S.A., Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines met at Manila, the capital of the Philippines and signed the South East Asia Treaty or the Manila Treaty of 1954. There are eleven provisions in this treaty. The chief purpose of this pact is to provide collective defense against the spread of communism in South East Asia and the adjacent Pacific region. Under the terms of this treaty, the signatories have undertaken to settle their dispute by peaceful means; to consider the enemy attack upon any one of them as an attack upon them all, to help the aggrieved state in all possible ways and to cooperate with each other in the field of economy and culture. It is unnecessary to state that the SEATO was formed against communist China and Russia. Unlike NATO, SEATO has no permanent army of its own.

Firstly, this treaty cannot influence the balance of power in international politics. For, many of its signatories are already connected with one or the other regional treaty organization. Secondly, this treaty cannot be called a real regional treaty. For, of the signatory states the big and powerful countries are non-Asian and only a few of South East Asian countries are its members. Moreover, the bigger opposed to this organization. Thirdly, originally this pact was signed with the purpose of protecting South East Asia from the communist menace. But at the insistence of Pakistan, the term

'aggression' has not been applied in the case of the communists alone. Hence, there is a difference of opinion between the U.S.A. and the other signatories on the definition of the term 'aggression' as incorporated in the treaty. Fourthly, like NATO this treaty organization has no permanent army of its own. Its military power is dependent upon the U.S.A. As a result, the U.S.A. has got an opportunity of influencing the foreign policy of the South East Asian countries. On the strength of this treaty the U.S.A. had sent troops and armaments to Thailand in 1962 when the Pathet Lao and the nationalists came to a clash in Laos. Commenting on the SEATO, Sir Francis Low observes "SEATO can never be the complete. It would be answer to the communist menace in South East Asia. a welcome assistance but it could hardly be defensive." The downfall of SEATO came with the Laotian crisis in 1960-61. Ever since the organization has been quietly falling to pieces, Britain and France were against treaty action. They argued that it would prove ineffective and might easily lead to the wrong war in the wrong place. "There were weaknesses enough in the anti-communist politics that SEATO pursued in South-east Asian countries including Laos.

The SEATO Ministerial Council meeting in Bangkok in May 1969 did little to remove the anxieties of South East Asian countries about the prospect of an American withdrawal from Viet Nam. Thailand had recently been most vocal about its military value. "The military capability of SEATO is a fiction", observed the Thai foreign minister on the eve of the annual meeting. As a matter of fact, Thailand was threatened with the spread of Hanoi's influence in neighboring Laos and Cambodia and this has already happened.

SEATO never achieved its early aim of collective security for South East Asia. In fact, the defense commitments by the U.S., Britain, France, Australia and New Zealand had been by independent agreement. France and Pakistan had in practice withdrawn even from the functions of the Military Planning Office. Only Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines of the Asian countries could be persuaded to join the West in a regional collective defense treaty. India has maintained her neutrality. India is mostly concerned to find a way of containing China Asia's only nuclear power. Yet from the beginning SEATO's effectiveness was undermined by the fact that in the eyes of many Asians it was less a defense treaty than a "modern version of protectorate".

The South East Asia Treaty Organization was pronounced dead in September 1975, 21 years after its formation. The decision to phase out SEATO was first mooted by the Thai Prime Minister Kukrit Pramoj and endorsed by President Marcos of the Philippines. Bangkok and Manila, the two active Asian members, liked the world to forget that SEATO had ever existed. It had long been a source of embarrassment particularly to Bangkok where SEATO headquarters were located. It had been in many respects an encumbrance to the countries for whose protection it was devised by the late Foster Dulles of America. American accord with China, the Communist victory in the Indo-Chinese region and the resultant changes in Asian political attitudes generated their own compulsions leading to the rejection of SEATO and all that it implied. From Peking's point of view, it is a rejection of the American hegemony in Asia, marking the beginning of a new order of international relations in South-east Asia and the Pacific region.

The ANZUS Pact, 1951:

When the communist success in China and the Korean war created an atmosphere of uneasiness in the Pacific region the United States immediately signed a treaty with Australia and New Zealand in 1951. The ANZUS Pact has been so called after the names of Australia, New Zealand and the U.S.A. According to its terms, in the event of an aggression upon any one of these states in the Pacific, each of the three would proceed to meet the common danger. The signatories agreed to form a council of their foreign ministers to consider the plans concerning the implementation of the pact. This pact is to remain in force for an indefinite period and any member may terminate his membership after serving one year's notice. This Pacific security system is another endeavor of the Western powers to face communist activities. Of course, this pact has not been supported by the neutral countries of Asia. Since 1952 this pact has been in force.

The Baghdad Pact or CENTO, 1955

The other center of the struggle between the Eastern and Western blocs is the Middle East. Some of the countries of this region are associates of the Soviet and American blocs and the rest are neutral. Till the beginning of the World War II the Middle East had been the spring-board of Western diplomacy and even to-day these countries have not been able to emancipate themselves from the domination of the former

imperialist powers. At present the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia have been endeavoring to extend their respective influences in this area. The strategic and economic importance of the Middle East is not insignificant to the Western nations. Being the treasure house of oil-resources a fierce competition and brisk activities between Russia and the western countries have begun over this region. During the Second World War the Arab countries, in order to protect their newly achieved independence, had established a League in 1945, known as the Arab League. The Middle Eastern countries never desire that they should jeopardize their independence and economic interests by being drawn into the struggle between the Eastern and the Western blocs. Their aim has always been to eliminate all kinds of Western influence while maintaining their independence and neutrality at the same time. The support of the western countries to the Jews, establishment of an independent Jewish state after the Second World War and the American support to the Jewish state etc. gave rise to complications in the Middle East, agitated the Arabs and thereby pushed many of the Arab countries towards Soviet Russia. "Oil, Palestine and the Soviet menace provided the three avenues of approach." Under such circumstances, for the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East the rival blocs like the Arab League the Baghdad Pact etc. came into being.

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

The Anglo-American bloc expected that other Arab countries would subscribe to this pact soon. But instead Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia have taken a neutral stand. As a reaction to this pact, the British nations with Egypt have deteriorated the aggression of the Anglo-French-Jewish coalition upon Egypt have failed and in consequence the Anglo-French influence in the Middle East has suffered greatly. In the words of Acheson, this pact "has given rise to differences and weakness instead of strength and

unity." Moreover, it has become impossible to put the Baghdad pact into operation against Soviet Russia as well as to hold in check the communist activities in the Middle East. Soviet Russia has not failed to avail the opportunity of the reactions of the Arab League as well as of Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia against the Baghdad pact. In short, the opposition of the Arab countries to the Baghdad pact has helped Russia to consolidate its position in the Middle East on a firm basis.

The continuous spread of Russian influence in the Middle East had worried the United States. The entry of the United States into the Middle Eastern politics had given rise to a terrible rivalry between the two rival blocs in this area. By giving economic aid at first and then military aid to the countries of this region the United States has succeeded in establishing itself there as a strong rival of Russia. The United States has stopped giving economic aid to Egypt, Syria and Jordan since then. In 1958 the Baghdad pact (now renamed CENTO) lost its cohesion. In that year a military coup occurred in Iraq and a new government under the leadership of Karim Kasem was installed. Kasem abandoned the Baghdad pact.

The Baghdad Pact can be said to have failed in its objective. Firstly, in the Middle East this pact did not succeed in forming any kind of military bloc; secondly, it failed to check the infiltration of Russia as well as of the communists into the Middle East; and thirdly most of the Arab states assumed an anti-western attitude.

America: Rio and Bogota Pacts:

Like the other continents, in the American continent also two treaty organizations have come into force, one is the Rio and the other the Bogota Pacts. Indeed, of all the regional military treaties that have been concluded under the influence of the U.S.A., the Rio and Bogota Pacts deserve special mention.

The relations of the Latin or South America with U.S.A. date from earlier centuries. Ever since the American civil war, the U.S.A. had been demanding her natural leadership upon the South American countries. Till the outbreak of the Second World War the United States was assured of the security of this continent due to its long distance from other parts of the world. But with the invention of atomic weapons during the Second World War, the United States became worried about the security of South

America. Besides, she also apprehended the spread of communist influences in this hemisphere. In this context the Russian influence over Cuba can be cited.

During the Second World War the South American states proceeded to build up a regional security system. In March 1945 a law containing certain provisions was signed by all the Latin American countries except Argentina. The chief provision of this law was that in the event of an aggression upon any one of these states, each of the signatories would act to meet the common danger.

In 1947 the representatives of the South American states met at a conference at Rio-de-Janeiro and signed the Rio Pact. Under its terms the South American states have agreed on mutual aid if attacked by any foreign or any American power. The pact includes Canada and Greenland by implication besides all South American states.

Next, in 1948 the representatives of different states of America met at a conference at Bogota in order to ensure regional security of the American states and the Bogota Pact was signed. According to this pact The Bogota Pact a joint North and South American organization under the name of the 'Organization of American States' or OAS was formed. This organization had been entrusted with the task of settling mutual disputes of the American states by peaceful means and promoting cultural collaboration among the states.

Self-Assessment Questions:

1. Explain the origins of the Cold War.
2. Discuss the major causes of the Cold War.
3. Examine the significance of the Truman Doctrine.
4. Analyze the objectives of the Marshall Plan.
5. Explain the role of NATO in the Cold War.
6. Discuss the formation and importance of SEATO and CENTO.
7. Examine the importance of military alliances during the Cold War.
8. Explain SALT I and SALT II agreements.
9. Discuss the emergence of the Third World.
10. Analyze the impact of the Cold War on Third World countries.

Unit - IV

UNO: Principal Organs – Specialised Agencies of UNO – Achievements & Failures – Decolonization and Emergence of the Third World – Non-Aligned Movement – Regional Organizations: European Union – ASEAN – SAARC

Objectives:

- To understand the structure and functions of the United Nations
- To examine the role of specialized agencies of the UNO
- To study decolonization, the emergence of the Third World,
- To analyze the role of regional organizations ASEAN, and SAARC.

The United Nations

Origin of the U.N.O. By 1938 the League of Nations almost passed into oblivion. Due to the aggressive activities of Japan, Italy and Germany and the indifferent attitude of the other big powers the League of Nations almost became a defunct body. With a view to maintaining balance of power, the big powers again reverted to the pre-war policy of alliances and regional pacts. The Second world war broke out in 1939. For the second time the intensity of the war, the use of new types of destructive weapons, the vast scale of Casualties and destruction of property had made the people all over the world anxious for peace and security and they felt the necessity of establishing a well-organized and more powerful world organization. Some people had thought of the revival of the League of Nations. But most of the statesmen of the world resolved to form such organization which would be able to infuse new hopes and confidence in the teeming millions for ever lasting peace and security. The United Nations was born out of such anxiety and determination.

Attempts of establishing an international organization in the name of United Nations had already begun a few years before the end of the Second World War. In June 1941 the representatives of Britain, Canada, New Zealand, Australia and South Africa proposed for the first time in the London declaration the establishment of an international organization in lieu of regional pacts as the means of enduring permanent peace and security. In August 1941 the U.S. President Roosevelt and the British Prime Minister Churchill issued a declaration known as the Atlantic Charter. The objectives of this Charter were to maintain international peace and security; to encourage international co-

operation in the sphere of social, economic and cultural development of the world; to develop friendly relations among nations on the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples and to recognize the fundamental rights and status of all people. In order to achieve these purposes, it was declared in the Charter that

1. all the signatories to the Charter will recognize sovereignty and equality of all states big and small,
2. will peacefully settle all sorts of disputes instead of war or threats of war,
3. will help the U.N.O. against a state violating treaties or engagements,
4. in the case of determining the frontiers of a foreign country the signatories will not dishonor the opinion of the people of that state,
5. the people of each state will enjoy the right of drafting their constitution according to their own desire,
6. in the sphere of trade and commerce and economy equal rights of all countries will be recognized,
7. all will try to create a favorable condition for all nations so that after the fall of Nazi Germany they can devote themselves to the task of internal reconstruction in freedom from fear and want and
8. all nations will equally try to preserve peace and security in the world by reducing armaments and ammunition.

International organization based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving nations for the preservation of international peace and security. The Moscow communiqué declared for the first time that "They recognize the necessity of establishing at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security". Truly speaking, this article laid down the foundation of the United Nations Organization.

Yalta Conference

Next in 1945 the U.S. The President, the British Prime Minister Churchill and the Soviet Prime Minister Stalin met at the Yalta conference and resolved to convene a session of the United Nations. The nature of its organization was also settled at this

conference. The first session of the U.N. was convened at San Francisco in April-June of 1945. The delegates of 51 nations signed the U.N. Charter. The Charter came into force on October 24, 1945. Membership The first 51 nations who have signed the Charter are called the 'charter members'. The admission of a state to the United Nations is affected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. The conditions for membership are that a state must be peaceful, and must agree to obey and follow the terms and obligations contained in the U.N. Charter. It should be noted that the five chief members of the Security Council (U.S.A, Britain, France, Soviet Union and Kuomin-tang China) have the right of veto. It is not possible to admit a new member without the unanimous support of these five permanent members. The chief reason of depriving Communist China of its membership is the opposition of the U.S.A. In October 1962 Communist China made an aggression upon India by violating international law. Hence, she can never be called a peace-loving state according to one of the chief conditions of the U.N. Charter. However, after the Chinese nuclear blast (Oct. 1964), it would not be possible for long to keep communist China away from the U.N.

The United Nations is composed of six chief organs. There are

1. the General Assembly,
2. the Security Council,
3. the Secretariat
4. the Trusteeship Council,
5. the Economic and Social Council, and
6. the International Court of Justice.

The General Assembly is composed of all the members of the U.N. each represented by five delegates. Apart from this each member may have advisers and experts as may be required. The Assembly meets in regular annual sessions and for each session one President and seven Vice Presidents are elected. Special sessions may be convened at the request of the majority of the members or of the Security Council. Each member of the General Assembly has one vote. The Assembly may discuss any matter falling within the scope of the U.N. Charter. Any member of the Assembly or of the Security Council or a non-member may initiate a discussion regarding international peace

and security in the Assembly. The Assembly has no legislative power and the execution of its recommendations is not binding. Yet it is a forum of world opinion. The General Assembly may attract the attention of the Security Council towards a situation disturbing international peace and security. The non-permanent members of the Security Council and all members of the Trusteeship Council and those of the Economic and Social Council are all elected by the General Assembly.

The Security Council is the executive body of the U.N. It is composed of 11 members-five permanent and six non-permanent. The U.S.A., Britain, France, Soviet Russia and Kuo-min-tang China are permanent members. The six non-permanent members of the Security Council are elected by the General Assembly for a term of two years. The permanent members have the right of veto. By an application of this right a permanent member may reject any decision of the Security Council. Any state which is not a member of the Security Council may join in its deliberations if it is a party to dispute without voting. The presidency of the Security Council is held in turn by the members of the Security Council. Each president holds office for one month. Committee. If a member is attacked by an enemy state, then the aggrieved state may form a regional military pact for its own security until a decision is taken by the Security Council. Apart from this the Security Council may recommend to the General Assembly for the expulsion of any member of the U.N. from it or for the admission of a new one. The U.N.O. has a secretariat. It is instituted on the model of the League Secretariat. The U.N. Charter has attached special significance to the Secretariat. For, upon its efficiency depends the better functioning of the whole organization. It is composed of a Secretary General, a number of assistant secretaries and a large number of international officials. The Secretary General is appointed by the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. He acts as the Secretary General in all meetings of the General Assembly, of the Security Council, of the Trusteeship Council and of the Economic Council. He is authorized to bring to the attention of the Security Council any event or situation which in his opinion may threaten international peace and security. With a view to maintain the international character of the organization, the Secretary General and the staff in the performance of their duties cannot seek advice or order from any authority outside the U.N.O. The Secretary and all the Assistant

Secretary Generals enjoy diplomatic immunities of all kinds. The officials of the Secretariat cannot be prosecuted in any court for any acts performed by them in their official capacity. agency. The chief functions of the council are

1. to collect data in respect to economic, social, educational, health and such other related matters and to submit reports thereon to the General Assembly,
2. to make recommendation with a view to promote respect for and observance of fundamental human rights, fundamental freedom and improvement of the standard of living etc. for all and
3. to convene international conference from time to time on matters falling within its jurisdiction.

Many organizations have been set up under the Economic and Social Council. These are the World Bank, the Food and Agricultural Council, International Fund, International Labor Organization, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization etc. The International Court of Justice has been constituted, on the model of the earlier world court. Practically all members of the U.N. are its members. Any non-member of U.N. may join it on conditions set up by the General Assembly upon the Security Council's recommendations. Each member of the U.N. undertakes to comply with the decision of the court in any case to which of a party to a dispute, then the aggrieved party may appeal to the Security it is a party. If its judgment does not go to the satisfaction council. The court has jurisdiction over all international legal disputes and the legal cases of the member states. The International Court is composed of 15 judges. Not more than two of the judges shall be of the same nationality. The judges are elected for nine years by the General Assembly and the Security Council. Those candidates who obtain an absolute majority of votes in the General Assembly and in the Security Council shall be considered as elected.

Relation between the Security Council and the General Assembly:

The Security Council and the General Assembly may be called the government body and the deliberative body of the U.N. respectively. The chief responsibility of the Security Council is to preserve world peace and security. While on the other hand the chief function of the General Assembly is to discuss all matters falling within the scope of the U.N. Charter. The Security Council has the sole authority to take the decision

with regard to any such dispute or situation which in its opinion may threaten international peace and security.

Of course, according to Article 15 of the Charter the Security Council has to place before the General Assembly an annual report of the measures taken by itself in the matters of international peace and security. But the General Assembly cannot revise or dismiss the decision of the Council. In some matters the Council and the Assembly act jointly, for example, admission or expulsion of U.N. members, the appointment of Secretary General and the judges of the International court. The Security Council is the permanent executive body while the General Assembly meets only in regular annual session or in special sessions convened by the Secretary General. Of course, special sessions of the General Assembly can be convened at the request of majority members of the U.N. or at the Security Council's request. The General Assembly is actually a representative body while the Security Council being composed of only 11 members can be described as a diplomatic body as it consists of diplomats and officials.

Since 1950, the relationship between the General Assembly and the Security Council has been drastically altered as the 'Uniting for peace' resolution has enabled the General Assembly to assume wide powers in case the Security Council fails to exercise its primary responsibility of maintaining international peace and security. "An informed world opinion is the factor most likely to affect the course of events and the General Assembly, better than any other organ, would reflect world opinion on what is right".

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

During the first decade of its creation, the U.N. did not achieve much by intervening in the international disputes. Yet it cannot be denied that the U.N. has earned credit in the midst of adverse situation immediately after the Second World War. It was proved in the case of the League of Nations that no international organizations could achieve success unless the members particularly the major members of an

international organization display an attitude of patience and co-operation. This norm is no exception with the U.N. also.

All important activities of the U.N. are being operated by the Security Council either independently or in collaboration with the General Assembly. The chief obstacle in the better functioning of the Security Council is its members' right of veto. At the beginning Soviet Russia created obstacles in the way of smooth functioning of the Security Council by exercising the right of veto indiscriminately. By 1954 Soviet Russia had exercised this right in 57 cases. Whereas during that period France had exercised this right only on two occasions.

Let us review the activities of the U.N.O. since its inception.

In January 1946 Iran had accused Soviet Russia before the U.N. In accordance with a previous engagement, the Soviet army was stationed in Iran during World War II. But as Soviet Russia did not withdraw her army even after the conclusion of the war and as the former interfered in the domestic affairs of Iran, the latter, lodged a protest. Russia denied the charges. In such circumstances the Security Council postponed the discussion over this issue. Meanwhile the dispute came to an end upon the withdrawal of the Soviet army from Iran.

In January 1946 Soviet Russia complained against Greece that the Greco-Soviet dispute stationing of the British army in Greece and British interference in the internal affairs of Greece had endangered peace and security in that region. Greece denied the accusations of Soviet Russia and launched counter charges against Russia that the communist states had been aiding the Greek guerrillas against the Greek Government. Russia, Greece, Britain and Yugoslavia expressed their views in the Security Council. The Security Council closed the discussion arguing that the British army had been called into Greece by its own government.

Allegation of disturbing peace and security in that region. The Ukrainian Ukraine against Britain In January 1946, Ukraine complained to the Security Council that the use of the British and Japanese troops against the Indonesian nationalists had been representative proposed to appoint a commission to inquire into the fact. But the proposal was rejected. On the other hand, the representatives of the Netherlands strongly

protested against the U.N. intervention in Indonesia. Consequently the Security Council dissolved the discussions.

Anglo-French troops were stationed in Syria and Lebanon during the Allegation of Syria and Lebanon Second World War though their independence was recognised. But as the Anglo-French armies continued to stay there even after the war both Syria and Lebanon complained to the U.N. in 1946. But the matter at last ended as Britain and France removed their troops on the advice of the Security Council.

Poland's allegation against Spain

In April 1946 Poland alleged in the U.N. that the continuation of the Franco regime in Spain was a threat to peace and proposed that all members of the U.N. should sever diplomatic relations with Madrid. A sub-committee was appointed to investigate the situation in Spain. The committee refused to admit that the Franco government was endangering peace although it was fascist in nature. Upon the renewed allegation of Poland, the Security Council took the issue to the General Assembly. At the end of 1946 the General Assembly adopted a resolution excluding the Franco government from all international organizations and called upon the UN. members to sever diplomatic relations with Spain. But as in the meantime democratic constitution was introduced.

In Spain under Franco, the General Assembly revoked its resolution. In June 1946 India complained against South Africa that the South African Allegation government was discriminating against and mistreating the Indian minorities there. But the General Assembly refused to intervene in the domestic affairs of a state.

Renewed allegation against Greece

In August 1946, Greece had once more come on the Council's agenda. Ukraine again alleged that Greece's policy was threatening peace in the Balkan region. In reply, Greece brought a countercharge that Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria had been provoking the communist guerrillas against the Greek government. A special investigation commission was appointed by the Security Council to inquire into the charges of both sides. In June 1947 discussion was held in the Council over the commission's report. Majority members of the Council opined that Yugo-slavia, Albania and Bulgaria were actually helping the pro-communist revolutionaries of Greece. But the Soviet and the Polish members of the commission held the Greek government responsible

for the situation. As the Council failed to arrive at any decision, the Greek issue was taken up by the General Assembly. The Assembly directed Yugoslavia, Albania and Bulgaria to settle their disputes through the establishment of normal diplomatic relations and to refrain from giving any help to the communist revolutionaries of Greece. Yugoslavia thereupon ceased to give aid to the guerrillas in Greece. Meanwhile as the communist movement in Greece became weak, the matter lost its importance.

Indonesia

During the Second World War, Indonesia was occupied by Japan. Indonesia was a Dutch colony. When the Japanese army left Indonesia after the end of the war, the Indonesian nationalists proclaimed the Republic of Indonesia and declared its independence. But with the refusal of Holland to acknowledge the independence of Indonesia, armed clash between the two countries ensued. In 1947 Australia and India appealed to the Security Council to hold discussion over the dispute.

The Council appointed a Good Offices committee, which brought about a cease-fire in August 1947 and an armistice between Holland and Indonesia was signed in January 1948. But within a short time Holland renewed her aggression upon the Republic of Indonesia by violating the terms of the armistice. In such circumstances the Council called upon the Dutch government to cease military operations in Indonesia, to release all political prisoners of Indonesia and to transfer power to the Indonesian Republic by July 1950. The Dutch government consequently recognized the Republic of Indonesia as an independent and sovereign state in accordance with the resolution.

The Hague.

In 1950 Indonesia was admitted as a member of the U.N. Sometime before the world war II, Korea was occupied by Japan. At the resolved that in due course Korea was to become an independent state. Soviet Russia had also approved this resolution. After the end of the World War, both the American and the Russian troops entered Korea and took over the territory. Korea was divided into two parts between the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. (for example South Korea and North Korea along the line of 38th parallel of latitude). However efforts to re-unite these two parts continued. But as Russia became a stumbling block, the United States brought the Korean issue before the U.N. General Assembly in September 1947. The General Assembly proposed to form a government for

the whole of Korea through election. Russia opposed the proposal and closed the door of North Korea to the U.N. Commission. However, under the supervision of the U.N. Commission a general election was held in South Korea and a republic was established there in 1947. Seoul became the capital of the new republic and Syngman Rhee became its first President. In that year Korea became a member of the U.N.

Meanwhile under Soviet Russia's initiative Democratic People's Republic was established in North Korea. The situation in Korea grew tense as the relations between the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. deteriorated in 1949 and 1950. And when at last in June 1950 North Korea attacked South Korea the situation became all the more complicated.

At the request of the United States, the Security Council resumed its discussion over the Korean situation. Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia did not participate. The rest of the members of the Security Council accused North Korea and called upon her to refrain from hostilities and at the same time called upon all the members of the U.N. to help in the execution of the Council's directives. In the meantime upon the intrusion of North Korean troops into South Korea, the United States sent an army to the aid of the Seoul government. Besides the U.S.A., 15 members of the U.N. sent military assistance to South Korea. But the situation took a turn when Communist China attacked South Korea on the side of North Korea. The U.N. declared China an aggressor. At the instance of Soviet Russia a conference for armistice was held in Sesong and a truce agreement was signed at Panmunjon in 1953. But the problem of the repatriation of the prisoners of war cropped up. India and other neutral states volunteered to take the responsibility of the prisoners of war. The U.N. has not yet been able to unify the divided Korea even after series of interventions. Like the other native states of India under British rule, Kashmir was also under the direct rule of the British Crown. When in 1947 Kashmir issue the British sovereignty in India came to an end, the sovereignty of the British Crown over the princely states came to an end as well. By the Independence Act of 1947 these states were given the option to join either the Indian Union or Pakistan.

The state of Jammu and Kashmir is bounded by North East Tibet, China Turkestan, in the north, the Soviet Republic of Turkestan, Afghanistan and West Pakistan in the north west and by India in the south. In October 1947 the Maharaja of Kashmir

officially acceded to the Indian Union and thereby Kashmir became an integral part of India.

Immediately after the partition of India, Pakistan's machination for occupying Kashmir began. Supported and incited by the government of Pakistan, the tribals launched raids upon Kashmir and Jammu. To avoid war with Pakistan, the Government of India requested the United Nations in December 1947 to refrain Pakistan from aiding and abetting the raiders. The U.N. sent a commission to study the situation. In 1948 the commission proposed a truce between India and Pakistan and subsequently a truce was signed between the two countries.

More than 22 years have rolled on yet the U.N. has not been able to settle the problem of Kashmir. Commission after commission under Macnatten, Dixon, Jarring etc. came to Kashmir to end the Kashmir tangle but failed. At last the U.N. declared Pakistan an aggressor. In 1962 Ireland brought an anti-Indian proposal regarding Kashmir to the Security Council. But Soviet Russia dismissed that by using veto. That proposal put the aggressor and the aggressed on the same footing.

Although the U.N. has tried and failed in its attempts to solve the Kashmir problem, it cannot be denied at the same time that its handling of the problem has never been based on any sound principle.

In 1956 there was a large-scale uprising in Hungary against the former pro-Russian government. The Hungarian Prime Minister Nagy sought help from Russia to suppress it. As a result the nationalist movement.

The Hungarian crisis assumed a violent turn and gained momentum against the Nagy government. At such a juncture, the Nagy government refused to receive help from Russia and appealed to the U.N. for the neutrality of Hungary. Meanwhile the Nagy government fell and pro-Soviet Kadar came to power. At the invitation of Kadar, thousands of well armed Soviet troops marched into Hungary and mercilessly suppressed the people's uprising in a brief span of time. At this turn of events, a resolution sponsored by Cuba for the settlement of the Hungarian crisis was endorsed by the U.N. General Assembly to the effect that Russia was to withdraw her army from Hungary and a U.N. investigation commission was to be appointed. But the Kadar government refused to assent to the resolution. Kadar even refused to allow the U.N. Secretary General

Hammaraskjold to enter there. The U.N. commission submitted a report on Hungary. Soviet Russia strongly protested against the U.N. interference in the internal affairs of Hungary. As a result the U.N. could not make much progress on the issue. In Rhodesian affairs, the U.N. promptly intervened on the petition of Rhodesia.

Britain. With a view to bring down the rebel regime of Ian Smith, Britain appealed to the Security Council. The Security Council gave Britain (April 1966) a mandate to stop tankers by force, if necessary from offloading their oil cargo at the port of Beira in Portuguese Mozambique and then pipelined into Rhodesia. The Security Council resolution represented only the second time in 21 years of the U.N. history that the mandatory provisions of chapter VII of the Charter had been invoked. It was also for the first time that Britain had asked for a judgment that the rebellious regime in Salisbury constitutes a threat to peace.

Under the terms of the treaty signed between the Republic of Egypt and Britain, the latter agreed to withdraw its army from the Suez canal within the stipulated Suez crisis period. But when in 1955 the Egyptian President Nasser announced the nationalization of the Canal and froze the Canal Company's funds in Egypt, Britain and France jointly accused Egypt in the Security Council for the violation of the treaty. After a debate in the Security Council, six principles forming a basis for future negotiation on the Suez Canal were adopted, for example, (1) there shall be free transit of all nations through the Suez Canal (2) no foreign power shall enjoy any kind of control of the Canal, (3) Sovereignty of Egypt shall be respected, (4) the users of the canal shall enter into agreements with Egypt regarding the tolls and other charges, (5) a portion of the dues shall be allotted for the development of the Canal, and (6) the disputes between the Egyptian government and the Suez Canal Company shall be settled by arbitration. Thus a settlement of the dispute seemed possible when both sides endorsed those principles.

But very soon difference of opinion regarding the application of those points cropped up between the government of Egypt and the Suez Canal Company. The crisis deepened when Israel at the instigation of France attacked Egypt in 1956. The U.N. asked Israel to withdraw her army from Egypt. On October 31, 1956 the U.S.A. moved a proposal in the Security Council urging that the use of force should not be allowed in Egypt. Britain and France rejected the proposal by resorting to veto. Immediately after

that Britain and France launched a joint attack on Egypt. On November 7, 1956 the General Assembly adopted a resolution directing the withdrawal of the Anglo-French-Israeli forces from Egypt. With a view to restore peace in Egypt, a committee of seven U.N. member-states including India were appointed. A U.N. force composed of the troops of these seven states was dispatched to Egypt. It was due to the efforts of the U.N. that the war in Egypt came to an end and Britain, France and Israel were compelled to withdraw their forces. Thus a great catastrophe was averted.

Egypt conditionally accepted the stationing of a U.N. force in Egypt that it would not infringe Egypt's sovereignty over the Canal. In June 1958, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development announced that an agreement had been reached on the draft of a final agreement between the Suez Canal Company and the Egyptian government for the settlement of the compensation to Suez stock holders. Subsequently, the final agreement was signed in Geneva in July 1958. The International Bank undertook the responsibility of collecting compensation from the United Arab Republic.

Palestine

By large majorities, the General Assembly adopted four resolutions on 10 December 1982 calling for the continuation of the U.N. machinery to promote the establishment of a Palestinian state on territory under Israeli occupation. The Assembly adopted a resolution asking the Palestinian Rights Committee to "keep the situation relating to the question of Palestine under review" and making suggestions to the Assembly and Security Council as appropriate. The U.S.A. and Israel voted against the resolution. A third resolution endorsed plans for the international conference on the questions of Palestine to take place in the Palais de Chaillot in Paris next August (1983). The fourth and last resolution stated that lasting peace in West Asia could not be established without unconditional Israeli withdrawal from the occupied Arab territories nor without Palestinian self-determination. Costa Rica, Canada, Israel and the U. S. A. voted against it.

U. N. O. as an organ for international peace: The importance of the U. N. O. as an organ for preserving international peace cannot be under-estimated. Right from 1947, the United Nations has been playing the role of a peace-preserving organ in the international sphere. The cases of Palestine, Syria, Korea, Indo-China, Kashmir, Suez Canal,

Morocco, Tunisia, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Berlin and Indonesia may be cited. In each case the U.N. has succeeded in enforcing negotiated settlement. In the case of Korea, the collective security measures were enforced. Like the League of Nations, the U.N. has not been able so far to build up an international army. But it has succeeded in creating the U.N. Emergency Force in 1956. This force has rendered great service as a peace-organ in the Middle East in 1956, in the Congo in 1960 and in Cyprus since 1964. This Emergency Force is composed of contingents from the small and neutral states. To the credit of the U.N. it should be admitted that it has wielded these diverse contingents into a united body inspired with the high ideal of humanism. In Cyprus this force is doing meritorious work

Self-Assessment Questions:

1. Explain the aims and principles of the United Nations Organization.
2. Discuss the principal organs of the UNO.
3. Examine the role of specialized agencies of the UNO.
4. Analyze the achievements of the United Nations.
5. Discuss the failures of the United Nations.
6. Explain the process of decolonization after the Second World War.
7. Discuss the emergence of the Third World.
8. Examine the objectives and significance of the Non-Aligned Movement.
9. Analyze the structure and functions of the European Union.
10. Discuss the role of ASEAN and SAARC in regional cooperation.

Unit - V

Post-Cold War Era: Disintegration of USSR – Glasnost – Perestroika – Reunification of Germany– Contemporary Issues: Globalization – GATT – WTO –Environment: Rio de Janeiro Summit – Green Peace Movement – Kyoto Protocol – Paris Agreement

Objectives:

- To understand the disintegration of the USSR
- To examine reforms like Glasnost and Perestroika
- To analyze globalization trade institutions such as GATT and WTO.
- To study global environmental initiatives like the Rio Summit, Kyoto Protocol

Background

During most of the latter half of the 20th century, the two most powerful states in the world were the Soviet Union (USSR) and the United States (US). These two federations were called the world's superpowers. Faced with the threat of growing German and Italian fascism, Japanese Shōwastatism, and a world war, the western Allies and the Soviet Union made an alliance of necessity during World War II.[4] The pragmatic nature of this alliance and the underlying ideological differences between the powers led to mutual suspicions between the allies after the Axis powers were defeated. This struggle, known as the Cold War, lasted from about 1947 to 1991, beginning with the second Red Scare and ending with the Dissolution of the Soviet Union. Prominent Historian of the Cold War, John Lewis Gaddis, wrote at the dawn of the post-Cold War era that the characteristics of the new era are not yet certain but it is certain that it will be very different from the Cold War era and it means that a turning point of world-historical significance took place. The new world of the post-Cold War era is likely to have few, if any, of these characteristics: that is an indication of how much things have already changed since the Cold War ended. We are at one of those rare points of 'punctuation' in history at which old patterns of stability have broken up and new ones have not yet emerged to take their place. Historians will certainly regard the years 1989–1991 as a turning point comparable in importance to the years 1789–1794, or 1917–1918, or 1945–1947; precisely what has 'turned,' however, is much less certain. We know that a

series of geopolitical earthquakes have taken place, but it is not yet clear how these upheavals have rearranged the landscape that lies before us.

Linguistic debate

The term "post-Cold War" was criticized for its ambiguity: "Even though it has been ten years since the Berlin Wall came down," wrote Paul Wolfowitz in 2000, "we still have no better name for the period in which we live than the post-Cold War era." The name means that this new era "does not yet have a name." It was suggested that Pax Americana or "clash of civilizations" would more reflect the reality of the era but the former term would be "offending for many." The same dilemma expressed Condoleezza Rice: "That we do not know how to think about what follows the US-Soviet confrontation is clear from the continued references to the "post-Cold War period."" "We knew better where we had been than where we were going." The collapse of the Soviet Union caused profound changes in nearly every society in the world. Much of the policy and infrastructure of the West and the Eastern Bloc had revolved around the capitalist and communist ideologies respectively and the possibility of a nuclear warfare.

Government, economic and military institutions:

The fall of Communism formed an existential threat for many institutions. The US military was forced to cut much of its expenditure, though the level rose again to comparable heights after the September 11 attacks and the initiation of the War on Terror in 2001. The end of the Cold War also coincided with the end of apartheid in South Africa. Declining Cold War tensions in the later years of the 1980s meant that the apartheid regime was no longer supported by the West as a bulwark against Communism and they were condemned with an embargo. In 1990, Nelson Mandela was freed from prison and the regime made steps to end apartheid, which were on an official basis completed by 1994 with the new election. Socialist and Communist parties around the world saw drops in membership after the Berlin Wall fell and the public felt that free market ideology had won. Libertarian, neoliberal, nationalist and Islamist parties on the other hand benefited from the fall of the Soviet Union. As capitalism had "won", as people saw it, socialism and communism in general declined in popularity. Social Democratic Scandinavian countries privatized many of their commons in the 1990s and a political debate on modern institutions re-opened. Scandinavian nations are now

more seen as social democrat (see Nordic model). The United States, having become the only global superpower, was also able to use this ideological victory to reinforce its leadership position in the new world order. It was claimed that, “the United States and its allies are on the right side of history”. The US also became the most dominant influence over the newly connecting global economy. However, this unipolar international system was in tension with the emerging potential for a multipolar world as India, China, and Japan developed to a point where they might challenge US hegemony. This created new potential for worldwide conflict, ending the balance, from mutually assured destruction in the case of nuclear war, which had held the world in a state of “long peace” throughout the Cold War.

The People's Republic of China, already having moved towards capitalism starting in the late 1970s and facing public anger after the Tiananmen Square protests of 1989 in Beijing, moved even more quickly towards free market economics in the 1990s. McDonald's and Pizza Hut both entered the country in the second half of 1990, the first American chains in China aside from Kentucky Fried Chicken which had entered 3 years earlier in 1987. Stock markets were established in Shenzhen and Shanghai late in 1990 as well. The restrictions on car ownership were loosened in the early 1990s, causing the bicycle to decline as a form of transport by 2000. The move to capitalism has increased the economic prosperity of China, but many people still live in poor conditions, working for companies for very small pay and in dangerous and poor conditions. After the end of the Cold War, Communism would also end in Mongolia, Congo, Albania, Yugoslavia, Afghanistan, and Angola. Today there are only five remaining Communist countries in the world: China, Cuba, Laos, North Korea and Vietnam. Many other third world countries who had seen involvement from the United States and/or the Soviet Union were also able to resolve political conflicts with the removal of the ideological interests of these superpowers. As a result of the apparent victory of democracy and capitalism in the Cold War, many more countries adapted these systems, which also allowed them access to the benefits of global trade, as economic power became more prominent than military power in the international arena. However, as the United States maintained global power, its role in many Regime Changes during the Cold War went mostly officially

unacknowledged, even when some, such as El Salvador and Argentina, resulted in extensive human rights violations.

Technology:

The end of the Cold War allowed many technologies that were formerly off limits to the public to be declassified. The most important of these was the Internet, which was created as ARPANET by the Pentagon as a system to keep in touch following an impending nuclear war. The last restrictions on commercial enterprise online were lifted in 1995. In the approximately two decades since, the Internet's population and usefulness grew immensely. Only about 20 million people (less than 0.5 percent of the world's population at the time) were online in 1995, mostly in the US and several other Western countries. By the mid-2010s, more than one third of the world's population was online.

The Digital Revolution is the shift from mechanical and analogue electronic technology to digital electronics which began anywhere from the late 1950s to the late 1970s with the adoption and proliferation of digital computers and digital record keeping that continues to the present day. Implicitly, the term also refers to the sweeping changes brought about by digital computing and communication technology during (and after) the latter half of the 20th century. Analogous to the Agricultural Revolution and Industrial Revolution, the Digital Revolution marked the beginning of the Information Age. Central to this revolution is the mass production and widespread use of digital logic, MOSFETs (MOS transistors), and integrated circuit (IC) chips, and their derived technologies, including computers, microprocessors, digital cellular phones, and the Internet. These technological innovations have transformed traditional production and business techniques.

Postmodernism

Postmodernism is a broad movement that developed in the mid- to late 20th century across philosophy, the arts, architecture, and criticism, marking a departure from modernism. The term has been more generally applied to describe what postmodernists believe to be the historical era following modernity and the tendencies of this era. While encompassing a wide variety of approaches and disciplines, postmodernism is generally defined by an attitude of skepticism, irony, or rejection of the grand narratives and ideologies of modernism, often calling into question various assumptions of

Enlightenment rationality. Consequently, common targets of postmodern critique include universalist notions of objective reality, morality, truth, human nature, reason, science, language, and social progress. Postmodern thinkers frequently call attention to the contingent or socially-conditioned nature of knowledge claims and value systems, situating them as products of particular political, historical, or cultural discourses and hierarchies. Accordingly, postmodern thought is broadly characterized by tendencies to selfreferentiality, epistemological and moral relativism, pluralism, and irreverence. Postmodern critical approaches gained purchase in the 1980s and 1990s, and have been adopted in a variety of academic and theoretical disciplines, including cultural studies, philosophy of science, economics, linguistics, architecture, feminist theory, and literary criticism, as well as art movements in fields such as literature, contemporary art, and music. Postmodernism is often associated with schools of thought such as deconstruction, post-structuralism, and institutional critique, as well as philosophers such as Jean-François Lyotard, Jacques Derrida, and Fredric Jameson. Criticisms of postmodernism are intellectually diverse, and include assertions that postmodernism promotes obscurantism, is meaningless, and that it adds nothing to analytical or empirical knowledge.

Cold peace

A cold peace is a state of relative peace between two countries which is marked by the enforcement of a peace treaty ending the state of war while the government or populace of at least one of the parties to the treaty continues to domestically treat the treaty with vocal disgust. It is contrasted against a cold war, in which at least two states which are not openly pursuing a state of war against each other, openly or covertly support conflicts between each other's client states or allies. Cold peace, while marked by similar levels of mistrust and antagonistic domestic policy between the two governments and populations, do not result in proxy wars, formal incursions, or similar conflicts.

Interwar period

In the context of the history of the 20th century, the interwar period was the period between the end of the First World War in November 1918 and the beginning of the Second World War in September 1939. This period is also colloquially referred to as Between the Wars. Despite the relatively short period of time, this period represented an

era of significant changes worldwide. Petroleum-based energy production and associated mechanisation expanded dramatically leading to the Roaring Twenties, a period of economic prosperity and growth for the middle class in North America, Europe and many other parts of the world. Automobiles, electric lighting, radio broadcasts and more became commonplace among populations in the developed world. The indulgences of this era subsequently were followed by the Great Depression, an unprecedented worldwide economic downturn which severely damaged many of the world's largest economies. Politically, this era coincided with the rise of communism, starting in Russia with the October Revolution and Russian Civil War, at the end of World War I, and ended with the rise of fascism, particularly in Germany and in Italy. China was in the midst of a half-century of instability and civil war between the Kuomintang and the Communist Party of China. The empires of Britain, France and others faced challenges as imperialism was increasingly viewed negatively in Europe, and independence movements emerged in many colonies; the southern part of Ireland became independent after much fighting. The Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian and German empires were dismantled, while the Ottoman and German colonies were redistributed among the Allies, chiefly Britain and France. The western parts of the Russian Empire, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania and Poland became independent nations in their own right, while Bessarabia (modern-day Moldova) chose to reunify with Romania. The Russian communists managed to regain control of the other East Slavic states, Central Asia, and the Caucasus, forming the Soviet Union. Ireland was partitioned between the independent Irish Free State and the British-controlled Northern Ireland. In the Middle East, Egypt and Iraq gained independence. During the Great Depression, Latin American countries nationalised many foreign companies (mostly American) in a bid to strengthen their own economies. The territorial ambitions of the Soviets, Japanese, Italians and Germans led to the expansion of their domains. The interwar period ended in September 1939, with the German and Soviet invasion of Poland and the beginning of World War II.

Disintegration of USSR

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) was created after the socialist revolution in Russia in 1917, which ended the Russian empire. The USSR was a loose confederation of 15 republics and Russia was the leader. It was a strong segment with

great control over politics of entire world from 1922 to 1991 when it was disintegrated into smaller units, mainly due to Mikhael Gorbvachev's economic and political reforms-Perestroika and Glasnost respectively. This led to the end of the cold war between the two superpowers USA and USSR. It was marked by events like the fall of the Berlin Wall and power shift from Soviet center to the republics. The breakdown of USSR made USA the sole global power, ending the bipolarity in the world order.

Problems faced by USSR

There were many problems with the USSR. Some of them are as follows:

- At that time, there was a bureaucratic and authoritarian system.
- Democracy was just another word.
- There was no freedom of speech.
- There was one party system which was unaccountable to people.
- Because of the dominance of Russia, there was neglect to the interests of other republics.
- There was a very high expenditure on defense and the system was low on infrastructure and technology.

Major Events that led to disintegration of the USSR

The following were the main reasons for the disintegration of USSR:

Socialist bloc crisis: The people from many east European countries started protesting against their own governments and USSR without the right intervention from USSR at the right time. Communist governments in the Second World War collapsed one after the other without the right intervention from USSR at the right time.

Fall of Berlin Wall: After the Second World War Germany was divided among the socialist USSR and the capitalist western regimes. Fall of Berlin led to a series of events including the disintegration of the USSR.

Political and Economic reforms in USSR: Gorbachev realized the economic and political problems of USSR, and started a series of reforms, with the intention to revive the economy and settle economic problems. This was more closely associated with the market economy and was a deviation from the communist policies. Many communist leaders in USSR opposed to reforms initiated by Gorbachev. They encouraged a coup in the year 1991.

Opposition against the coup: Boris Yeltsin, who won the popular election in the Russian Republic, also protested against the coup and central control of USSR. The freedom for republics became the slogan. Boris Yeltsin and the pluralist movement advocated democratization and rapid economic reforms. The hard-line Communist elite wanted to thwart Gorbachev's reform agenda.

The power shift from Soviet center to republics: Republics like Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus emerged as a powerful country. They declared that the Soviet Union as being disbanded.

Factors that led to the disintegration of USSR

The factors that led to the disintegration of USSR are as follows:

1. Economic Weakness

The weakness in the economy at that time was the major cause of dissatisfaction among the people in USSR. There was a huge shortage of consumer items. The reasons for economics weakness were as follows:

- A Huge amount was spent on the military.
- In the Easter Europe, there was a large maintenance of satellite states
- Maintenance of the Central Asian Republics within the USSR states.

2. Political Un-accountability

There was a single party rule for around 70 years that turned authoritarian. There were widespread corruption and lack of transparency in the system. Gorbachev made a decision to allow elections with a multi-party system and create a presidency for the Soviet Union. This began a slow process of democratization that eventually destabilized Communist control and contributed to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

3. Gorbachev's reforms

Once freedom was achieved by under Michael Gorbachev's reforms, they demanded more for it. The demand grew into a big force which turned very difficult to control. The people wanted to catch up on the western side very quickly.

4. Rise of nationalism

There was a rise of nationalism among countries like Russia, Baltic republics, Ukraine, Georgia etc. This is the most important and immediate cause of the disintegration of the USSR. The national feeling was strong among the most prosperous

areas in USSR and not in Central Asian republics. Ordinary people among prosperous republics never liked to pay the big price to uplift the backward Central Asian republics.

Consequences:

The major consequences of the disintegration of the USSR upon countries like India were:

End of ideological battle: The disintegration of USSR showed the lacunae of socialistic model of economic governance to the developing world. It was seen as a victory of capitalism over socialism, often termed as 'end of ideology' thesis.

Rise of free-market economic model: Dominance of western institutions like IMF and World Bank in the global economic governance pushed developing countries to adopt neo-liberal economic policies. India adopted free-market economic model in the form of LPG reforms post 1991.

Decline in financial aid to other countries: Though a member of NAM, India had mutual strategic cooperation with USSR as per its 1971 Indo-Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation. The financial aid from the Soviet Union to India was significantly reduced due to the disintegration of the USSR. This was also one of the reasons for balance of payments crisis of India in 1991.

Reorganization of Eastern Europe: Changes in politics of Europe led to dilution of division between Western and Eastern Europe. Demolition of the Berlin wall, the unification of Germany, the end of the Warsaw Pact and rise of democratic regimes changed the politics of Europe. The membership of European Union enlarged, leading to emergence of new economic bloc -EU.

Rise of Central Asia: Central Asia became a new centre of global interest particularly from Chinese expansionist ambitions in the region.

Glasnost and perestroika

Glasnost and perestroika were the names of significant reforms introduced by Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev in the 1980s. These reforms followed a dismal decade in the Soviet Union, due to economic stagnation, falling production, significant shortages and a marked decline in living standards. Gorbachev was elected General Secretary of the Communist Party chiefly to push through economic reforms that would end stagnation. Younger and less conservative than his predecessors Brezhnev, Andropov and

Chernenko, Gorbachev had a strong record of improving economic outcomes at local and regional levels. He was also a skilful negotiator who many hoped could push reform through the Soviet political establishment. Gorbachev's maiden speech paid tribute to his predecessors and maintained his commitment to communism – but also hinted at a reformist agenda. The Soviet Union needed “a decisive turn in transferring the national economy to the tracks of intensive development”, Gorbachev told listeners. He also stressed the need for better living conditions for Soviet workers, calling for a “qualitative improvement of the material conditions of his life and work, of his spiritual makeup”.

Gorbachev began planning a course for reform and discussing them in high-level party meetings. Shortly after taking office he emphasised the need for uskoreniye (‘accelerated development’) to modernise the economy and improve efficiency and productivity. In a forceful speech in May 1985, Gorbachev called for a minimum annual growth of four percent – but emphasised that this would require changes, some of which would be unpopular. “Those who do not intend to adjust and who are an obstacle to solving these new tasks”, he added “must simply get out of the way”. Understanding that meaningful economic change was impossible under the current regime, Gorbachev sought to modify the Soviet state and its stranglehold over the economy. At the 27th Congress of the Communist Party in February-March 1986, the new Soviet leader floated the need for perestroika or ‘restructuring’. Then a general idea rather than a fully worked-out plan, perestroika called for significant decentralisation of Soviet economic policy and production. Economic recovery was not possible, Gorbachev argued, with the current level of centralised planning and bureaucratic control.

Gorbachev's 1987 book, outlining the aims and methods of perestroika

The first two years of Gorbachev's rule were spent building support for perestroika and removing political obstacles to reform. This was a difficult task, given that the Soviet bureaucracy and Communist Party were populated with conservatives and communist hardliners. This faction was resistant to any policy that looked like a retreating step towards capitalism. In early 1987 Gorbachev gave a fuller account of his ideas in a book titled *Perestroika: New Thinking for Our Country and the World*. He affirmed his commitment to communism but emphasised the need for greater trust in the people. The Soviet Union, Gorbachev wrote, needed “wholesome, full-blooded

functioning by all public organisations, all production teams and creative unions, new forms of activity by citizens and the revival of those which have been forgotten. In short, we need broad democratisation of all aspects of society. That democratisation is also the main guarantee that the current processes are irreversible... We want to invigorate the human factor.”

As mentioned above, perestroika sought to revive economic production by weakening Moscow’s centralised stranglehold. By 1987 Gorbachev had enough support to push through a law allowing factories and manufacturers to determine their own output, effectively ending production quotas. These industries were now able to adopt some practices used by private businesses: setting production levels, sourcing materials, paying expenses and wages, even selling surplus goods. The main difference was that Soviet firms were controlled by workers’ collectives rather than private owners. These changes did little to improve the ailing Soviet economy so Gorbachev became even more ambitious. Identifying a need for capital investment, Gorbachev permitted foreign companies to invest in the Soviet economy (June 1987), so long as this investment took the form of joint ventures and majority ownership remained in Soviet hands. More reforms in May 1988 legalised the private ownership of most businesses, as well as removing barriers to foreign trade.

These economic reforms were accompanied by some political liberalisation and demokratizatsiia (‘democratisation’). Frustrated by opposition from within the Communist Party, Gorbachev floated constitutional changes to weaken the party’s grip on government and policy. His most significant change was the creation of a new national parliament. The Congress of People’s Deputies, as the new body was called, was floated in July 1988. Nominations for candidates became open and competitive, allowing Soviet citizens to select their own representatives rather than having them appointed by the party. This marked the end of the one-party state, as other non-communist parties were allowed to stand candidates. In elections for the Congress of People’s Deputies in early 1989, around 300 reformist candidates were elected and many ‘old communists’ were removed from the government. One of those to depart was Andrei Gromyko, who had served as the Soviet Union’s foreign minister for a staggering 38 years. Gorbachev himself was elected Chairman of the Supreme Soviet, extending his constitutional power.

While these changes left the Soviet Union far from democratic, they encouraged greater levels of political participation and freedom.

The second aspect of Gorbachev's reforms was dubbed glasnost (Russian for 'openness'). Glasnost lifted restrictions on information and debate that had been a feature of Soviet life since the days of Joseph Stalin. Under glasnost, media censorship was relaxed, though not completely abolished. Literature previously banned in the USSR was now permitted. The horrors of the Stalinist regime, once suppressed and whispered about in private, were exposed and openly discussed. The policy failures of previous leaders were also subjected to scrutiny and criticism. Privately, Gorbachev hoped that lifting censorship would expose the errors of previous governments, creating support for more extensive economic reforms. Many Soviet people believed they were living in a successful communist state; under glasnost, they began to understand how dismal their lives were in comparison to those in the West. Glasnost reforms also encouraged greater political involvement and accessibility. In 1989 viewers tuned in to live broadcasts from the Congress of People's Deputies, meeting for the first time with democratically-elected members. They were astonished to see deputies criticising leaders past and present, the government, bureaucracy, the Soviet military hierarchy, even the much-feared KGB.

Perestroika and glasnost marked a genuine attempt to revive the Soviet Union by creating a mixed economy and a freer society. Today, these changes are widely considered to have failed. There were a number of reasons for this. Many experts believe Gorbachev's economic reforms did not follow a complete plan but were attempted gradually and experimentally. Some believe these reforms did not go far enough: they left too much economic control in the hands of the Soviet bureaucracy, such as the power to fix prices, regulate foreign exchange and manage raw materials and resources. The reforms were also hindered by widespread internal opposition. Elements in the Soviet bureaucracy, which was responsible for implementing the reforms, were stridently opposed to them. The Soviet economic system was fundamentally flawed and needed to be replaced, not reformed; Gorbachev's piecemeal changes were not enough to revive the economy – and indeed only created confusion and disruption. These critical economic problems, coupled with the changing political landscape in 1989-91, contributed to the dissolution of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War.

Reunification of Germany

Germany's sudden reunification in 1990 was a large shock to which the German government responded with unprecedented scale. The Communist East was transformed into a decentralised and democratic market economy within less than a year. Trillions were spent with the aim of narrowing gaps between East and West Germany. In terms of scale and speed of response, modern Europe has seen nothing quite like it.

The dimension and disruption of reunification was certainly unique, but aspects of the German experience have implications for the UK, which is also challenged by deep social and economic spatial divides. Reunification policies in Germany, for instance, successfully harmonised infrastructure and took major strides in equalising living standards. This was only possible because the fiscal response was far-reaching, permanent, and based on an all-party 'whatever-it-takes' consensus.

But some areas were overlooked by policy makers. Unaddressed wage differentials have led to a major brain drain, with a net 1.7 million people moving from East to West Germany between 1989 and 2019, and a related pay gap between East and West for all skills levels. And reunification policies addressing the private and public sector were not always consistent. When it came to business support this focused on manufacturing while innovation and more knowledge-based service-focussed businesses were not significant policy priorities. This approach inadvertently led to a de-facto spatial strategy that prioritised industrialised smaller towns over larger cities, the consequences of which are still borne out in productivity figures today as Germany becomes a more service-orientated economy. At the same time, policy on public services and infrastructure, such as on schools and local administration, led to more centralisation in cities.

Meanwhile an absence of democracy-building and civil-society strengthening policies, and the wholesale import of Western institutions and elites without sufficient participation of East German stakeholders, has contributed to the high levels of political disfranchisement in today's East Germany.

So what can policy makers in the UK learn from the German experience? First, that to make progress on large structural regional inequalities requires significant long-term commitment and funds – Germany has spent the equivalent of a furlough scheme

every year on its reunification agenda over the last three decades. Second, the prioritisation of legacy jobs via subsidies and other interventions at the expense of initiatives to grow emerging parts of the economy that were set to become engines of growth, namely large service-orientated cities, was an error. UK policy makers shouldn't make the same mistake. Places like Leeds and Manchester are underperforming but the right policy and investment mix could leverage the benefits of agglomeration and the UK's services specialism to drive more regionally balanced economic growth.

Relatedly, reunification demonstrates how investment in public infrastructure, though crucial, is not enough on its own to drive prosperity gains. Infrastructure in East Germany may be on a par with that in the West, but productivity and pay are still one-fifth lower

Contemporary Issues: Globalization

Meaning and Definition of Globalisation

Globalisation is a process which leads to an integration of the cultural, economical, social, political and religious system throughout the world. It provides an opportunity for the whole world becomes a single market (process called as economic globalisation) and the raw materials, services and capitals are traded between countries and also provides a flow of researches and information between countries at worldwide level. In fact, it is the globalisation that encourages the requisition of diverse workforce.

According to WHO, globalisation can be defined as “the increased interconnectedness and interdependence of people and countries, is generally understood to include two inter-related elements: the opening of international borders to increasingly fast flows of goods, services, finance, people and ideas; and the changes in institutions and policies at national and international levels that facilitate or promote such flows. Globalisation has the potential for both positive and negative effects on development and health”

Relevance and Impact of Globalisation

Globalisation is very relevant for sustainability or organisations in international markets. Few of the significance and impact of globalisation can be mentioned as follows:

- It encourages exchange of technology, training and skill development, organizational development as well as nation development.

- Though, managing a diverse workforce and imparting them the updated technical knowhow is a big challenge for the organisations (as discussed in the previous chapter also).
- It is a process which promotes adoption of new technologies, adapting the other existing technologies, cultural differences, foreign policies and managing change.
- It provides an opportunity for organization to recruit, retain as well as train its workforce to adjust to different cultures of various countries.
- It provides an opportunity to employees to work at overseas level and gain experience.
- It encourages individuals to overcome cultural differences and cultural identities
- It helps the HR managers and related employees to gain an expertise on legal policies, tax laws as well as labor laws of other countries (since they need to deal with employee grievances).
- It also promotes development of linguistic skills for in house and foreign staff for the smooth flow of communication.
- It is a process which helps in development of trades and financial exchanges.
- It helps the world to unite as a global entity.

Types of Globalisation

Globalisation is taking place in several ways. It is not only the exchange of human resources, goods or trade but also the exchange of ideas and information is also being actively taking place through the process of globalisation. In this section, you will be introduced about the different type or ways of globalisation :

Economic globalisation: The international trade of commodities and services, the spread of technologies and the flow of capital across borders has led to interdependence among the different economies of the world and this interdependence across countries is termed as economic globalisation . It has lead to expansion and integration of international markets.

Cultural globalisation: The cultural globalisation refers to a process through which the different countries try to adopt the values, beliefs, principles, costumes and tradition of each other. This unification of culture helps the nations to understand the

thoughts and feelings of people belonging to other cultures also and thereby they turn out to be sensitive about others' values too.

Financial globalisation: The unification of international trade market has given out ways for financial and monetary exchanges. This is known as global financial system or financial globalisation which has an influence on all related countries. A depreciation or appreciation of financial value of a nation influences the financial system of other nations too.

Technological globalisation: The technology has also integrated the world as a single unit. Social media for example, has interconnected individuals through a common platform of digital world. Internet has made communication through various modes easier and approachable.

Political globalisation: Several international bodies or committees are trying out ways to maintain relations and security across borders. International organisations such as United Nations, World Health Organisations as well as NGO's at global level have been actively contributing towards maintaining peace, progress, employment, security, justice and so on within international boundaries. These contributions have led to political unity among nations, and are known as political globalisation .

Sociological globalisation: Due to the globalisation process, people belonging to different societies are also connected together. This process of sociological globalisation has made people remain connected, share information instantly and interdependent. This has also led to integration of various societies.

Geographic globalisation: The process of exchange of goods and services has given an opportunity to the people to travel across various countries for gaining experience, education, travel purpose and finding out better opportunities. This has ultimately led to the fluidity of geographical boundaries.

Ecological globalisation: There are several organisations who are working out ways to save our ecology and environment at global level. The changes in weather, atmosphere and disasters influence people in similar manner across the different countries. Such precautions and steps of prevention to handle our environment globally have unified the ecology of the world at an international level.

A Brief History of GATT Negotiations

The current WTO agreements are the legacy of commitments that countries have voluntarily negotiated with each other, on a repeat basis, in the decades since 1947. To understand the causes of the present patterns of import protection across WTO member countries as well as across products and industries within those countries, it is important to turn to the past

The 1930s and 1940s era of the Great Depression and World War II provide important reminders of globalization's last dark episode of protectionism. The U.S. imposition of the Smoot-Hawley tariffs and the international retaliatory response in the 1930s led to the virtual halting of international commerce. Table 1-1 illustrates the pattern of the new trade barriers that were implemented by the United States and a number of other European countries during the Great Depression. What is clear is that the level of tariffs during the Depression was much higher than what most developed economies impose today

At the conclusion of World War II, twenty-three countries, led primarily by the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom, negotiated the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.¹ The goal was to create an agreement that would ensure postwar stability and avoid a repeat of the mistakes of the recent past, including the Smoot-Hawley tariffs and retaliatory responses, which had been a contributor to the devastating economic climate that culminated in the death and destruction of the Second World War. The 1947 GATT created a new basic template of rules and exceptions to regulate international trade between members (referred to as contracting parties) and locked in initial tariff reductions that these countries committed to establish. Even as early as 1952, the tariff cuts had reduced average tariffs substantially, as shown in table 1-1, for a number of these countries.

Average Tariff Levels for the United States and Major European Countries

Country	1913	1925	1931	1952	2007
Belgium	6	7	17	n.a.	5.2
France	14	9	38	19	5.2
Germany	12	15	40	16	5.2
Italy	17	16	48	24	5.2
United Kingdom.	n.a	4	17	17	5.2
United States	32	26	35	9	3.5

Over the next forty-seven years, more countries signed on to the GATT, and further trade liberalization negotiations ensued. As table 1-2 documents, between 1947 and 1994, the GATT contracting parties began and concluded eight separate negotiating rounds of voluntary trade liberalization. The last of these completed rounds was the Uruguay Round, which ended the GATT era in 1994 by ushering in the World Trade Organization. By 1994, the GATT membership had simultaneously expanded from an initial 23 contracting parties to 128 participating countries. With a number of new members acceding to the WTO since its 1995 inception, more than 150 countries have signed the agreement.

The Negotiating Rounds and Negotiating Approaches

The first five rounds of GATT negotiations covering the initial 1947–61 period were typically dominated by major exporting countries, or those with a “principal supplying interest” in a particular product, getting together and negotiating reciprocal market access improvements.³ The initial negotiators under the

Barton and others (2006) provide an economic, legal, and political assessment of the trade regime from the GATT through to the WTO.

For a discussion, see Dam (1970, chapter 5). Hoekman and Kostecki (2009, chapter 4) discuss not only the negotiating history but also the economic outcomes of different negotiating approaches of principal suppliers versus tariff formulas and exceptions. Ludema and Mayda (2009) provide an economic theory that rationalizes participation by the largest exporters in negotiations, and thus supports the principal supplier rule as a feature of the negotiations. Their theory justifies the principal supplier rule as a means to overcome the otherwise nontrivial concern of externalities that can lead to the failure of multilateral negotiations attributed to the free rider problem.

GATT, especially those with a principal supplying interest, were developed economies. They focused their negotiation efforts on reducing import barriers in other countries that were of primary interest to their own exporters, and they used the political trade-off of expanded market access abroad for exporting industries against increased market access granted at home to foreign industries and thus the losses to industries competing against these imports

Since the trade barriers targeted for elimination were typically those in the import markets of other developed countries, the primary result was that developed countries were asked to reduce their tariffs. Put differently, since most developing countries were neither principal suppliers nor major importing markets, little was asked of them in terms of their own trade liberalization, and little of what was of direct export interest to developing countries was liberalized by others. Such an outcome is consistent with the pattern of import tariff protection that persists today, which is explored in more depth in the next chapter, a remnant of the form of the negotiations begun in the 1940s.

Starting with the Kennedy Round of negotiations in 1964 through the Tokyo Round in the 1970s, countries participating in the trade negotiations used formulaic approaches to reduce further the remaining trade barriers across the board. Certain tariff-cutting formulas can be preferable to reciprocal negotiations between principal suppliers, in that they can serve to reduce average tariff levels as well as their dispersion. The dispersion of tariffs within a country, and even for products within an industry, is related to the difference between the average tariff and the country's highest tariffs, or the phenomenon of "tariff peaks,"

Although formulas can be preferable to simple negotiations between principal suppliers if the formulas are applied rigorously, inevitably the formulaic approaches applied during the Kennedy and Tokyo Rounds did not turn out to be sufficiently "pure" in practice to fully achieve this effect. In the rounds in which formulas were applied, negotiating countries sought and were granted exemptions for "sensitive products" that they could remove from the list of goods whose import tariffs would be subject to the formula. In this manner countries typically avoided having to reduce the highest tariffs in products that the formulaic approach was trying to attack in the first place. The result is a persistent pattern of protection across countries and industries that likely looks quite similar to the reciprocity-based, bid-offer approach between principal suppliers of different products.

Important Commercial Sector Exemptions to the GATT

In addition to the general problem of certain products effectively being excluded from multilateral trade liberalization rounds because of the principal supplying interest and formula-exemption approaches to the GATT negotiations, the contracting parties

deepened the severity of the problem in certain sectors by essentially taking two industries off the negotiating table—agriculture and apparel and textiles.

First, most agricultural trade was exempted from GATT disciplines beginning in the 1950s. The United States initiated the trend by requesting a GATT waiver to that effect; the emerging European Economic Community subsequently supported this decision as it undertook substantial government intervention in agricultural markets through its Common Agricultural Policy (CAP). This lack of discipline concerning trade in agricultural products would ultimately result in a complicated web of domestic policies throughout the sector—excesses in import restrictions as well as substantial domestic support (subsidies) programs, which can have the effect of choking off imports and making suppliers artificially competitive in third country (export) markets.

Second, beginning with Japan's accession to the GATT in 1955, special trading rules also were introduced to deal with potentially disruptive imports in clothing and textile products. What began as the Short-Term Arrangement covering cotton textiles (1961) turned into the Long-Term Arrangement (1962–73) and subsequently the Multifibre Arrangement (MFA) (1974–94). These agreements managed global textiles and apparel trade through a complex system of quantitative restrictions and voluntary export restraints. The products covered by these agreements thus fell outside of the GATT system of rules, disciplines, and ultimately enforcement.

As discussed in chapter 2, the creation of the WTO in 1995 has provided a framework to resolve these problems. Nevertheless, these particular two sectors are of fundamental interest to exporters in many developing countries. Thus the effects of the negotiating legacy of such sectors do contribute to complaints being made by developing countries about the WTO today, especially because countries continue to impose high import tariffs on these products.

The Fundamental Principles of the GATT and the WTO

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade established the forum for negotiations on cutting tariffs that subsequently would take place over the following decades through multilateral trade rounds. In addition, the initial negotiations resulted in an agreement that established a set of basic rules and disciplines that participating countries were to follow, as well as a forum for dispute resolution if countries deviated

from them. Perhaps the most important and enduring of these basic rules embodied in the GATT 1947 are the fundamental principle of reciprocity and two nondiscrimination principles—most-favored-nation treatment and national treatment.

Reciprocity

The GATT fundamental principle of reciprocity enters into the agreement in a number of different ways, both formally and informally. First, as discussed above in the section about the process of GATT rounds of multilateral trade negotiations, these negotiations were typically undertaken on a reciprocal basis—frequently between countries with a principal supplying export interest in the other’s import market. While this particular approach to negotiations was successful, it was more of a rule of thumb in the negotiations phase. There is nothing in the GATT texts that requires countries to reciprocally negotiate market access liberalization.

Second, once a contracting party had committed to opening up access to its market, reciprocity did become a formal rule for renegotiations if that country subsequently wanted to back off from its commitment. There are two broad ways that countries have backed off prior commitments, and the GATT/WTO response to both has typically been based on reciprocity.

The first instance is when a country seeks to follow GATT/WTO legal procedures when raising its import tariffs to levels higher than the “bound” commitments (or limits) it had promised to offer to the rest of the membership during an earlier negotiating round. Adversely affected trading partners are then permitted to negotiate a reciprocal market access change in another area of interest. Although it is possible that this might occur through additional trade liberalization in another sector of interest to the affected exporter, typically it is implemented through a new “market closing,” which, while retaliatory, is limited by this reciprocity principle so as to rebalance the deal.

The second instance is when a country backs off commitments to opening market access in a way that is not “GATT/WTO legal,” whereby adversely affected trading partners use the dispute settlement process to obtain a legal ruling that allows them to rebalance market access obligations. Case law that has emerged under the formal trade dispute settlement procedures adjudicated at the WTO has also resulted in use of the reciprocity rule for instances in which compensation needs to be allocated to adversely

affected exporters after legal breaches of the GATT/WTO bargain.⁷ This second point indicates that reciprocity is thus an extremely important principle when it comes to the issue of disputes.

Most-Favored-Nation Treatment

The second fundamental principle of the GATT is the most-favored-nation (MFN) treatment, that is, nondiscrimination by importers across different foreign export sources. MFN in the GATT is a rule for both negotiations and renegotiations. In a negotiating round, when one GATT contracting party offers to lower its tariff to increase the market access available to foreign exporters in another GATT country, that same lower tariff and terms of market access must be then granted to all other GATT countries on a nondiscriminatory, MFN basis. This is clearly one of the most important reasons for desired membership in the agreement. Even if a country did not seek to utilize the GATT for its own tariff liberalization negotiations or as an external commitment device to facilitate internal reform (for reasons described in the next section), joining the GATT was useful because it provided some guarantee that the country's exporters would receive the "best" treatment made available to any other country in the agreement. This helps to explain why developing countries would want to join the GATT/WTO and establishes that there was some theoretical benefit to them of doing.

Nevertheless, while MFN is an important principle in all aspects of the GATT and the WTO—during formal trade liberalization negotiations as well as renegotiations, for example, that might occur during the settlement of a dispute—this treatment becomes increasingly diluted in the presence of GATT/ WTO-permitted exceptions to MFN. In particular, the GATT/WTO does permit members to sign preferential trade agreements (PTAs) between one another and thus offer lower-than-MFN tariff rates to preferred partners provided that this covers "substantially all trade." Furthermore, and as chapter 2 describes in more detail, the GATT/WTO also encourages members to offer lower-than-MFN tariff rates to developing country exporters through the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP).

National Treatment

The second fundamental principle of nondiscrimination embodied in the GATT/WTO is the rule of national treatment. The basic idea is simple—once a foreign-

produced good has paid the price of entry into an import market (an import tariff), it has to be treated just like a nationally produced good. The good cannot then be subject to additional taxes or regulatory barriers that would otherwise differentiate it from a domestically produced good, once the import tariff has been paid. The national treatment rule is there to prevent policymakers from eliminating the market access promised by tariff cuts through subsequent recourse to other domestic policies, such as taxes or subsidies.

Evidence that the coverage of the national treatment principle is broad and powerful is that it is the core issue in a large number of the formal WTO disputes, many of which are examined in later chapters. In fact, in almost any dispute in which a WTO member is alleged to have differentiated unfairly between domestic and foreign-produced goods—whether it be because of a discriminatory tax code, an explicit or implicit subsidy, or a regulatory barrier motivated by concerns over environmental or consumer safety—the heart of the issue is the applicability of and the potential limits to the national treatment principle.

The Theories and Empirical Evidence that the GATT and the WTO Are Relevant

For years, even serious scholars had difficulty reconciling the apparent successes of the GATT/WTO—and what appeared to be relatively mercantilist approaches taken by negotiators under its auspices—with basic economic theory. Nevertheless, the last decade in particular has seen much research progress made in understanding the relevance of the GATT/WTO as an important and necessary component of international economic relations.

In this section I make a brief detour to highlight some of the insights provided by this increasingly sophisticated political and economic scholarship on the GATT and the WTO. In particular, I describe a substantial literature in economic theory that ascribes two potential complementary benefits to a trade agreement such as the GATT or the WTO. I refer to these as the market access theory and the commitment theory.

The market access theory is based on the well-established fact that large importing countries, whose tariff policies can affect world market prices because of the country's size, require an external motivation to agree to reduce and bind their import tariffs. The GATT and the WTO, and the principle of reciprocity in particular, provide

this inducement by allowing any one country's change in trade policy—either a lowering of trade barriers under a negotiating round or a raising of trade barriers subsequently bound by the agreement—to be accompanied by an equivalent, reciprocal change in market access by trading partners. The theory suggests that without the reciprocal inducement during negotiations of increased access to foreign markets, a large importing country would not unilaterally offer its own market access to foreign exporters through tariff liberalization. Furthermore, without the threat that this foreign market access will be taken away if one country deviates from the agreement by imposing new trade barriers, market access openings could not be sustained through renegotiations either.

Supporting the dominant market access theory of why the world trading system needs an institution like the GATT/WTO is increasing empirical evidence. A first study by Broda, Limão, and Weinstein uses new empirical techniques and data to provide two pieces of evidence broadly consistent with the theory.¹¹ They estimated disaggregated foreign export supply elasticities, which are one component in answering the important economic question of whether the importing country is “large” in its ability to affect world prices. They found that countries that are not WTO members systematically set higher tariffs on goods that are supplied inelastically. Thus WTO nonmembers—countries that have not agreed to limit their policies toward imports—tend to impose higher import tariffs on goods for which they are large and need a trade agreement inducement to get these tariffs lowered. Second, for the United States, the authors found that trade barriers are significantly higher on products not covered by the WTO agreement for which the United States has more market power

A second recent study by Bagwell and Staiger focuses on a set of countries newly acceding to the WTO between 1995 and 2005. They examined whether the motive of gaining access to markets affects these countries' tariff cut commitments and found evidence consistent with the importance of this effect. Specifically, the farther the tariff to which a country negotiates is below its original (pre-WTO) tariff level, the larger is its original, pre-WTO import volume. This result is also consistent with negotiating behavior predicted by the market access theory.

These studies seek to explain why the world needs the GATT/WTO, because the fundamental problems that these agreements are designed to tackle would not be

addressed if market forces were left unfettered and government policies were not coordinated internationally. These pieces of evidence indicate that the GATT/WTO has had important real effects on countries' trade policies and the resulting trade flows. The evidence is consistent with what economists predict for government behavior, especially for large, developed countries. The GATT/WTO system has created incentives for such countries to restrict their import tariff barriers compared to the tariffs they would levy in the absence of a GATT/WTO-like agreement. Simply compare current policies with what these large developed economies were doing in the 1930s (see again table 1-1): unilaterally imposing mutually destructive import barriers toward one another because they could not coordinate reciprocal market access opening. This underscores one fundamental benefit that the GATT/WTO provides to the world trading system.

According to the second major theory of trade agreements, the commitment theory, even for countries that are not large (in the sense of market access described above), the GATT/WTO may help struggling governments take on efficiency-enhancing, national welfare-improving economic reforms, including trade liberalization. This potential role for the GATT/WTO comes into play when a government faces entrenched political interest groups demanding special policies that make it difficult for the government to act unilaterally. In this case, the GATT/WTO might also help the government convince its domestic sectors that it is serious about reform and a long-term policy of more liberal trade.

Although there has been little empirical research formally testing the practical relevance of the commitment theory, one particular element should be noted with regard to the issue of GATT/WTO enforcement. As highlighted repeatedly throughout this book, the GATT/WTO institution does virtually no enforcement on its own. Rather, the GATT/WTO is a set of self-enforcing agreements: member countries enforce trading partners' commitments embodied in the agreements by challenging each other's missteps through formal dispute settlement. Thus, as described in substantial detail in later chapters, for a country to take advantage of the potential commitment-device role that the GATT/WTO might offer to government policymakers, some other trading partner must be willing to enforce the commitments that a country takes on. If there is no external enforcement—and this is especially relevant to the case of the poorest WTO member

countries whose commitments are almost never enforced through dispute settlement—the WTO essentially provides the country seeking the external commitment with nothing .

Environment: Rio de Janeiro Summit

The United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), also known as the "Earth Summit", was held in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, from 3-14 June 1992. This global conference held on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the first Human Environment Conference in Stockholm, Sweden, in 1972, brought together political leaders, diplomats, scientists, representatives of the media and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) from 179 countries for a massive effort to focus on the impact of human socio-economic activities on the environment. A 'Global Forum' of NGOs was also held in Rio de Janeiro at the same time, bringing together an unprecedented number of NGO representatives, who presented their vision of the world's future in relation to the environment and socio-economic development.

The Rio de Janeiro conference highlighted how different social, economic and environmental factors are interdependent and evolve together, and how success in one sector requires action in other sectors to be sustained over time. The primary objective of the Rio Earth Summit was to produce a broad agenda and a new blueprint for international action on environmental and development issues that would help guide international cooperation and development policy in the twenty-first century.

The 'Earth Summit' concluded that the concept of sustainable development was an attainable goal for all the people of the world, regardless of whether they were at the local, national, regional or international levels. It also recognized that integrating and balancing economic, social and environmental concerns in meeting our needs is vital for sustaining human life on the planet and that such an integrated approach is possible. The conference also recognized that integrating and balancing economic, social and environmental dimensions required new perceptions of the way we produce and consume, the way we live and work, and the way we make decisions. This concept was revolutionary for its time, and it sparked a lively debate within governments and between governments and their citizens on how to ensure sustainability for development.

One of the major results of the UNCED Conference was Agenda 21, a program of action calling for new strategies to invest in the future to achieve overall sustainable

development in the 21st century. Its recommendations ranged from new methods of education to new ways of preserving natural resources and new ways of participating in a sustainable economy.

The Earth Summit had many great achievements: the Rio Declaration and its 27 universal principles, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the Convention on Biological Diversity; and the Declaration on the principles of forest management. It also led to the creation of the Commission on Sustainable Development, the holding of the first world conference on the sustainable development of small island developing states in 1994, and negotiations for the establishment of the agreement on straddling stocks and highly migratory fish stocks. Through treaties and other documents signed at the conference, most of the world's nations nominally committed themselves to the pursuit of economic development in ways that would protect the Earth's environment and non-renewable resources.

The Convention on Biological Diversity is a binding treaty requiring nations to take inventories of their plants and wild animals and protect their endangered species. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), or Global Warming Convention, is a binding treaty that requires nations to reduce their emission of carbon dioxide, methane, and other “greenhouse” gases thought to be responsible for global warming; the treaty stopped short of setting binding targets for emission reductions, however. Such targets were eventually established in an amendment to the UNFCCC, the Kyoto Protocol (1997), which was superseded by the Paris Agreement on climate change (2015).

The Declaration on Environment and Development, or Rio Declaration, laid down 27 broad, non-binding principles for environmentally sound development. Agenda 21 outlined global strategies for cleaning up the environment and encouraging environmentally sound development.

Principles of Rio Conference

The Rio Conference has set forth the following principles with the “goal of establishing a new and equitable global partnership through the creation of new levels of cooperation among States, key sectors of societies and people, and working towards

international agreements which respect the interests of all and protect the integrity of the global environmental and developmental system”

“Human beings are at the centre of concerns for sustainable development. They are entitled to a healthy and productive life in harmony with nature.

States have, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, the sovereign right to exploit their resources according to their own environmental and developmental policies, and the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction.

The right to development must be fulfilled to equitably meet the developmental and environmental needs of present and future generations.

To achieve sustainable development, environmental protection shall constitute an integral part of the development process and cannot be considered in isolation from it.

All States and all people shall cooperate in the essential task of eradicating poverty as an indispensable requirement for sustainable development, to decrease the disparities in standards of living and better meet the needs of the majority of the people of the world.

The special situation and needs of developing countries, particularly the least developed and those most environmentally vulnerable, shall be given special priority. International actions in the field of environment and development should also address the interests and needs of all countries.

States shall cooperate in a spirit of global partnership to conserve, protect and restore the health and integrity of the Earth's ecosystem. Given the different contributions to global environmental degradation, States have common but differentiated responsibilities. The developed countries acknowledge the responsibility that they bear in the international pursuit of sustainable development in view of the pressures their societies place on the global environment and of the technologies and financial resources they command.

To achieve sustainable development and a higher quality of life for all people, States should reduce and eliminate unsustainable patterns of production and consumption and promote appropriate demographic policies.

States should cooperate to strengthen endogenous capacity-building for sustainable development by improving scientific understanding through exchanges of scientific and technological knowledge, and by enhancing the development, adaptation, diffusion and transfer of technologies, including new and innovative technologies.

Environmental issues are best handled with the participation of all concerned citizens, at the relevant level. At the national level, each individual shall have appropriate access to information concerning the environment that is held by public authorities, including information on hazardous materials and activities in their communities, and the opportunity to participate in decision-making processes. States shall facilitate and encourage public awareness and participation by making information widely available. Effective access to judicial and administrative proceedings, including redress and remedy, shall be provided.

States shall enact effective environmental legislation. Environmental standards, management objectives and priorities should reflect the environmental and developmental context to which they apply. Standards applied by some countries may be inappropriate and of unwarranted economic and social cost to other countries, in particular developing countries.

States should cooperate to promote a supportive and open international economic system that would lead to economic growth and sustainable development in all countries, to better address the problems of environmental degradation. Trade policy measures for environmental purposes should not constitute a means of arbitrary or unjustifiable discrimination or a disguised restriction on international trade. Unilateral actions to deal with environmental challenges outside the jurisdiction of the importing country should be avoided. Environmental measures addressing transboundary or global environmental problems should, as far as possible, be based on an international consensus.

- States shall develop national laws regarding liability and compensation for the victims of pollution and other environmental damage. States shall also cooperate in an expeditious and more determined manner to develop further international law regarding liability and compensation for adverse effects of environmental damage caused by activities within their jurisdiction or control of areas beyond their jurisdiction.

- States should effectively cooperate to discourage or prevent the relocation and transfer to other States of any activities and substances that cause severe environmental degradation or are found to be harmful to human health.
- To protect the environment, the precautionary approach shall be widely applied by States according to their capabilities. Where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective measures to prevent environmental degradation.
- National authorities should endeavour to promote the internalization of environmental costs and the use of economic instruments, taking into account the approach that the polluter should, in principle, bear the cost of pollution, with due regard to the public interest and without distorting international trade and investment.
- Environmental impact assessment, as a national instrument, shall be undertaken for proposed activities that are likely to have a significant adverse impact on the environment and are subject to a decision of a competent national authority.
- States shall immediately notify other States of any natural disasters or other emergencies that are likely to produce sudden harmful effects on the environment of those States. Every effort shall be made by the international community to help the States so afflicted.
- States shall provide prior and timely notification and relevant information to potentially affected States on activities that may have a significant adverse transboundary environmental effect and shall consult with those States at an early stage and in good faith.
- Women have a vital role in environmental management and development. Their full participation is therefore essential to achieving sustainable development.
- The creativity, ideals and courage of the youth of the world should be mobilized to forge a global partnership to achieve sustainable development and ensure a better future for all.
- Indigenous people and their communities and other local communities have a vital role in environmental management and development because of their knowledge and traditional practices. States should recognize and duly support

their identity, culture and interests and enable their effective participation in the achievement of sustainable development.

- The environment and natural resources of people under oppression, domination and occupation shall be protected.
- Warfare is inherently destructive of sustainable development. States shall therefore respect international law to provide protection for the environment in times of armed conflict and cooperate in its further development, as necessary
- Peace, development and environmental protection are interdependent and indivisible.
- States shall resolve all their environmental disputes peacefully and by appropriate means in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.
- States and people shall cooperate in good faith and a spirit of partnership in the fulfilment of the principles embodied in this Declaration and the further development of international law in the field of sustainable development”.

Indeed, there should be a holistic approach to the problems of environment, ecology, poverty and population, and of socially indefensible excess of consumption. The bio-future in the wider sense is in peril if we don't heed these urgent needs.

Green Peace Movement

Green Peace Movements: Objectives Members of Green peace use direct and as mentioned earlier, nonviolent methods of protest. Green peace has been campaigning against environmental degradation since 1971, where the US Government was conducting underground nuclear tests. This tradition of 'bearing witness' in a non-violent manner continues till today. The green peace activists' act of protest is unique. They go to the place where an activity that the group considers harmful is occurring. Without using force, they try to stop the activity. For example, to protest against whaling, Green peace members in boats position themselves between whales and whaling ships.

Green peace is a campaigning organisation and organises public campaigns for the following causes:

Protection of oceans and ancient forests

- Phasing out of fossil fuels and the promotion of renewable energy to stop climate change
- Elimination of toxic chemicals

- Prevention of genetically modified organisms being released into nature
- End to the nuclear threat and nuclear contamination
- Safe and sustainable trade

Examine the significance of the objectives of greenpeace movement in the context of present day development practices. Green peace does not solicit or accepts funding from governments; for not compromising its independence, aims, objectives or integrity. It relies on the voluntary donations of individual supporters, and on grant support from foundations.

Among other things Green peace has played a pivotal role in:

- Ban on toxic waste exports to less developed countries
- Moratorium on commercial whaling
- United Nations convention providing for better management of world fisheries
- Southern Ocean Whale Sanctuary
- A 50-year moratorium on mineral exploitation in Antarctica

Ban on the dumping at sea of radioactive and industrial waste and disused oil installations

- End to high-sea, large-scale driftnet fishing
- Ban on all nuclear weapons testing which was their first ever campaign.

Green peace Movements: Global Avenues of Action

The priority issue for green peace is climatic changes. They believe the disruption in the ecosystem will likely harm everything from minke whales to coral reefs to polar bears. The world forest cover will deplete, and hundreds of thousands of species will become extinct due to drastic weather change. Climate change will also bring devastation to people and communities, especially some of the world's poorest. They do this by sensitising the people about the need to maintain climatic stability and influencing the policy decisions of national governments that may leave an impact on the climate. Let us now look into some of the green peace actions against some national initiatives which otherwise could have caused adverse environmental changes.

Some of the main avenues of action of green peace movements as mentioned earlier, are in the areas of climate change are saving sea and sea wealth, protection of ancient forests, protesting against genetic engineering, elimination of toxic chemicals,

ending nuclear tests, encouraging sustainable trade, and abolishing nuclear weapon. In this section let us see some of the initiatives of the green peace in each of these avenues.

Stop human caused climate change: Green peace activists are very prompt in protesting the energy and power plants that may cause environmental deterioration and climatic changes. They claim burning of coal is one of the main causes for global warming. And this is precisely what many of the giant power plants around the globe do. They accuse that international lending agencies such as Asian Development Bank, World Bank, Japanese International Bank for International Cooperation, Export Agencies etc. all of whose proclaimed agenda is development of underdeveloped, in fact are depriving the people of the both developing and developed nation a healthy living environment by way of financing huge power projects that cause adverse environmental impact.

According to green peace movement out of the ADB's entire Energy Portfolio Financing from 1966-2004, only 1.82% went towards funding renewable energy and energy efficiency. The overwhelming majority of financing has been geared towards fossil fuel power projects such as the Masinloc coal plant in the Philippines and Southeast Asia's largest coal plant in Mae Moh, Thailand and currently funds are being earmarked for newer plants like Map Ta Phut in Thailand. Since Mae Moh began operations in 1955, 30000 people have been displaced, almost 200 killed and thousands suffer from respiratory problems caused by inhalation and exposure to sulfur dioxide from the mine and the power station.

Clean alternatives to fossil fuel power in Asia are widely available. In the Philippines enough wind power potential exists to produce 7 times over the country's current energy demand. In the Chinese province of Guangdong there exists sufficient wind power potential to meet the equivalent of the current energy supply in Hong Kong.

International financing institutions like the ADB, along with the WB, need to stop fuelling the problem of climate change and start financing cleaner, safer solutions. Greenpeace calls on them to commit to a 20% renewable energy target for power project lending annually. They need to come clean on dirty energy. Green peace activists demonstrate peaceful protest against these projects. They protested the expansion of the Masinloc coal power plant in Mainila. Greenpeace activists were at the plant to draw attention to Australian and Japanese backing of the expansion of climate changing coal

dependency in Asia. Australia and Japan are underwriting climate change at a time when the Philippines and Asia are facing the likelihood of devastating social and economic instability from climate change precisely when the country and the rest of Asia are least able to deal with its impacts.

Another instance is that of a case in Brazil. The devastating drought currently affecting the Amazon rainforest is part of a vicious cycle created by the combined affects of global warming and deforestation and could cause the collapse of the rainforest, according to scientists. Brazil is one of the most vulnerable countries to climate changes in the world because of its invaluable biodiversity. Seventeen per cent of the Amazon has been completely wiped out over the past 30 years, according to Brazilian National Institute for Space Research (INPE) and even more has been damaged by destructive and illegal logging and other human activities. Life on Earth depends on ancient forests for its survival. They are the richest most diverse habitats, and help stabilize climate and regulate the weather. Amazonian deforestation and fires account for more than 75% of Brazil's greenhouse gas emissions and place it amongst the top four contributors to global climate change. Greenpeace called on governments to take urgent action to stop deforestation and commit to the massive carbon dioxide reductions needed to protect the Earth's biodiversity and millions of people who are at risk from the impacts of climate change and ancient forest destruction.

In China the severity of climate change is already bringing two of the world's mightiest rivers at the brink of collapse. Scientists from the Chinese Academy of Sciences say that environmental damage linked to climate change is pushing the Yellow River source into an ecological breakdown, threatening the lifeblood of 120 million people who rely on it for domestic as well as agricultural and industrial uses. In the Amazon river region, one of the worst droughts ever recorded is damaging the world's largest rainforest, with wildfires breaking out, fresh drinking water becoming scarce and polluted and the death of millions of fish as the streams dry up.

Kyoto Protocol

The Kyoto Protocol was adopted on December 11, 1997, at the third session of the Conference of Parties (COP3) to the UNFCCC in Kyoto, Japan. However, it came

into force only after a lengthy ratification process, officially taking effect on February 16, 2005. At present, 192 Parties are signatories to the protocol.

The primary aim of the Kyoto Protocol is to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and curb the concentration of greenhouse gases (GHGs) in the atmosphere. Its core principle rests on the idea that industrialized nations, being the largest historical contributors to emissions, bear greater responsibility for cutting down their GHG output.

Kyoto Protocol 1997

The Kyoto Protocol is a global agreement that gives effect to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The UNFCCC itself, adopted at the 1992 Earth Summit and enforced from March 21, 1994, was the first multilateral environmental treaty aimed at addressing climate change. Its primary objective was to stabilize atmospheric greenhouse gas (GHG) concentrations at a level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system.

The Kyoto Protocol builds on the UNFCCC's annex-based framework, adhering to its rules and provisions. It recognizes that industrialized nations are historically responsible for the bulk of existing GHG emissions, and therefore places binding commitments on them in line with the principle of common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities (CBDR-RC).

Through these commitments, the Kyoto Protocol became the key instrument for operationalizing the UNFCCC's vision of reducing global warming by lowering greenhouse gas emissions. Today, 192 parties are part of the Protocol, reflecting near-universal participation.

Kyoto Protocol History

The Kyoto Protocol was adopted at the third Conference of Parties (COP3) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), held in Kyoto, Japan, in 1997. It was formally approved on December 11, 1997, but only came into force on February 16, 2005, after Russia ratified the agreement, ensuring it met the required threshold of global emissions for activation. The protocol takes its name from the city of Kyoto, where the negotiations were held, and has since become synonymous with international efforts to combat climate change

Kyoto Protocol Principles

The Kyoto Protocol is built on the principle of Common But Differentiated Responsibilities (CBDR). This principle recognizes that while climate change is a global challenge, countries share different levels of responsibility based on their historical and present contributions to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. Industrialized nations, having contributed the most to the current high concentration of GHGs, are expected to take the lead in reducing emissions.

Under CBDR, responsibilities are categorized as:

Historical Polluters – Countries that have been emitting GHGs for a long time, primarily the developed, industrialized nations. They bear the greatest responsibility for addressing the problem.

Recent Polluters – Countries whose emissions have risen more significantly in recent decades, often the developing economies. While they are expected to contribute to mitigation efforts, their obligations are lighter compared to the historical polluters.

Kyoto Protocol Principles

Historical Polluter – Developed Countries.	Recent Polluters – Developing Countries
Since the Industrial Revolution, developed nations such as the US, UK, France, Japan, and Russia have been the largest contributors to global emissions..	Developing countries like China, India, and Brazil have seen rapid growth in emissions, particularly since the 1950s.
Under CBDR, industrialized countries are required to make greater contributions to GHG reduction strategies.	These nations are encouraged to adopt measures to reduce emissions, but their commitments are voluntary rather than legally binding
They must accept specific, legally binding caps on emissions.	They take action according to national capacity and developmental priorities
They are also expected to provide financial and technological support to developing and least-developed nations for emission reduction projects	Their role is to gradually shift toward cleaner growth pathways while addressing poverty and development needs

Kyoto Protocol Targets and Responsibility

The Kyoto Protocol was designed to help nations confront the harmful effects of climate change by encouraging strategies that strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerabilities. A central feature of the agreement is its legally binding commitment requiring the European Union and 37 industrialized countries to cut down their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The protocol is rooted in the principle that nations historically responsible for high levels of emissions must take the lead in solving the problem. For this reason, it does not impose mandatory reduction targets on developing countries. At the same time, it acknowledges that rapidly growing economies, particularly China and India, will play an increasingly important role in shaping future global emissions trends.

Kyoto Protocol Member Countries

The Kyoto Protocol, approved by 184 countries, gained wide international support and created strong global momentum in the fight against climate change. Its broad acceptance highlighted a shared recognition that addressing rising greenhouse gas emissions required coordinated action across nations.

Kyoto Protocol Doha Amendment

The Doha Amendment to the Kyoto Protocol established a second commitment period from 2013 to 2020. It was adopted on December 8 in Doha, Qatar, and entered into force on December 31, 2020, after 147 Parties submitted their instruments of acceptance, exceeding the required threshold of 144.

During the first commitment period, 37 developed countries and economies in transition participated, with the European Community pledging an average reduction of 5% in GHG emissions compared to 1990 levels. For the second commitment period, Parties agreed to cut emissions by at least 18% below 1990 levels, reinforcing global efforts to combat climate change.

Kyoto Protocol and Paris Agreement

Both the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement aim to curb greenhouse gas emissions, but they differ in approach, obligations, and scope. While the Kyoto Protocol legally binds developed countries to reduce emissions based on scientific consensus, the Paris Agreement adopts a more flexible, inclusive framework under the UNFCCC,

encouraging all nations to set voluntary targets and take climate action. The table below highlights the key differences between these two landmark agreements.

Aspect	Kyoto Protocol	Paris Agreement
Year Established	1997	2016
Targeted Nations	Primarily industrialized nations; developing nations were exempt	Both developed and developing nations are required to reduce emissions
Primary Objective	Reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 5.2% below 1990 levels	Prevent the average global temperature from rising more than 2°C above pre-industrial levels
Focus	Six major greenhouse gases: CO ₂ , methane, nitrous oxide, HFCs, PFCs, SF ₆	All anthropogenic greenhouse gases
Duration/Timeline	First phase lasted until 2012	Goals to be achieved between 2025 - 2030

Paris Agreement

The authoritative information on the status of approval, acceptance, accession and ratification of the Agreement is provided by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, on the respective internet page of the United Nations Treaty Depository under: The Paris Agreement is a **legally binding international treaty on climate change**. It was adopted by 195 Parties at the UN Climate Change Conference (COP21) in Paris, France, on 12 December 2015. It entered into force on 4 November 2016. Currently, as of 27 January 2026, there are 194 Parties to the Paris Agreement.

Its overarching goal is to hold “the increase in the global average temperature to well below 2°C above pre-industrial levels” and pursue efforts “to limit the temperature increase to 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels.” However, in recent years, world leaders have stressed the need to limit global warming to 1.5°C by the end of this century.

That's because the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change indicates that crossing the 1.5°C threshold risks unleashing far more severe climate change impacts, including more frequent and severe droughts, heatwaves and rainfall.

To limit global warming to 1.5°C, greenhouse gas emissions must peak before 2025 at the latest and decline 43% by 2030. The Paris Agreement is **a landmark** in the multilateral climate change process because, for the first time, a binding agreement brings all nations together to combat climate change and adapt to its effects. Implementation of the Paris Agreement requires **economic and social transformation**, based on the best available science. The Paris Agreement works on a **five-year cycle** of increasingly ambitious climate action -- or, ratcheting up -- carried out by countries. Since 2020, countries have been submitting their national climate action plans, known as **nationally determined contributions (NDCs)**. Each successive NDC is meant to reflect an increasingly higher degree of ambition compared to the previous version.

Recognizing that accelerated action is required to limit global warming to 1.5°C, the COP27 cover decision requests Parties to revisit and strengthen the 2030 targets in their NDCs to align with the Paris Agreement temperature goal by the end of 2023, taking into account different national circumstances.

Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs)

In their NDCs, countries communicate actions they will take to **reduce their greenhouse gas emissions** in order to reach the goals of the Paris Agreement. Countries also communicate in their NDCs actions they will take to **build resilience to adapt** to the impacts of climate change.

Long-Term Strategies

To better frame the efforts towards the long-term goal, the Paris Agreement invites countries to formulate and submit **long-term low greenhouse gas emission development strategies (LT-LEDS)**. LT-LEDS provide the **long-term horizon to the NDCs**. Unlike NDCs, they are not mandatory. Nevertheless, they place the NDCs into the context of countries' long-term planning and development priorities, providing a vision and direction for future development.

The Paris Agreement reaffirms that developed countries should take the lead in **providing financial assistance** to countries that are less endowed and more vulnerable, while for the first time also encouraging voluntary contributions by other Parties. Climate finance is needed **for mitigation**, because large-scale investments are required to significantly reduce emissions. Climate finance is equally important **for adaptation**, as significant financial resources are needed to adapt to the adverse effects and reduce the impacts of a changing climate.

Technology

The Paris Agreement speaks of the vision of **fully realizing technology development and transfer** for both improving resilience to climate change and reducing GHG emissions. It establishes **a technology framework** to provide overarching guidance to the well-functioning Technology Mechanism. The mechanism is accelerating technology development and transfer through its policy and implementation arms.

Capacity-Building

Not all developing countries have sufficient capacities to deal with many of the challenges brought by climate change. As a result, the Paris Agreement places **great emphasis on climate-related capacity-building** for developing countries and requests all developed countries to enhance support for capacity-building actions in developing countries. With the Paris Agreement, countries established an **enhanced transparency framework (ETF)**. Under ETF, starting in 2024, countries will report transparently on actions taken and progress in climate change mitigation, adaptation measures and support provided or received. It also provides for international procedures for the review of the submitted reports.

The information gathered through the ETF will feed into the **Global stocktake** which will assess the collective progress towards the long-term climate goals. This will lead to recommendations for countries to set more ambitious plans in the next round.

Self-Assessment Questions:

1. Explain the disintegration of the USSR.
2. Discuss the significance of Glasnost and Perestroika.
3. Examine the reunification of Germany.
4. Analyze the main features of the post–Cold War world order.
5. Explain the concept of globalization.
6. Discuss the role of GATT in international trade.
7. Examine the objectives and functions of the WTO.
8. Discuss the importance of the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit.
9. Examine the role of the Greenpeace Movement in environmental protection.
10. Analyze the significance of the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement.