

Revised & Updated

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

**Part I & II
For
CSS Examination**

Compiled by: Aamir Mahar



This page intentionally left blank.

This eBook is licensed for your personal use only. Please do not pirate copies of this eBook. Thank you for respecting the hard work of this author.

This e-book is compiled from numerous articles & research papers.

Some of references are mentioned in the end of chapters.

I hope you make the best use of this hard work.

Best wishes. Kindly pray for this soul.



Amir Khan Mahar

www.facebook.com/Central.Superior.Services123

Chapter. 1

Strategy to Study International Relations

Chapter. 2

Past Papers Analysis (Revised Syllabus)

Chapter. 3

International Relations Notes Part-I

Chapter. 4

International Relations Notes Part-II

Strategy to Study International Relations

Assalam-E-Alaikum everyone!

I had received a lot of requests for a strategy to study International Relations Part I & II. I know, I am quite late but it was like a heavy burden on me, and with this e-book I feel quite relieved. Anyway, I have simply categorized the syllabus of both papers into different sections in a particular pattern, which may or may not be followed. The procedure including the books has been explained along with the analysis of **2016 Paper Pattern**. I hope I have done justice with it, for further queries kindly comment below.

Happy Reading!

Sections of IR (Paper I & II)

1) History Section (AB)

- i. International Relation between two Wars: Russian Revolution, Fascism, League of Nations, Second World War
- ii. Cold War: Decolonization in Asia and Africa, Rise of United States and Soviet Union, Era of Tight Bipolarity, Détente and Loose Bipolarity, Revival of Cold War
- iii. Post Cold War: End of History, Clash of Civilizations, Terrorism, Globalization, Unipolarity (New World Order) and Revival of Multi-Polarity

2) Theories and Approaches Section (JB)

- i. The Classical Approaches-Realism and Idealism
- ii. Neo-realism, Neo-liberalism.
- iii. The Scientific Revolution-Behavioral Approach, System Approach
- iv. Post-modernism, Critical Theory, Feminism, Constructivism

3) Concepts Section

- i. The Definition and Scope of International Relations
- ii. The Nation-State System
- iii. Evolution of International Society
- iv. Conceptualization of security in the Twenty-First century
- v. Power. Elements of National Power
- vi. Balance of Power
- vii. Foreign Policy: Determinants, Decision Making and Analysis
- viii. Sovereignty
- ix. National Interest

- x. War: Causation of War, Total War, Limited War, Asymmetric Warfare, Civil War, Guerilla Warfare
- xi. Strategic Culture: Determinants of Pakistani Strategic Culture.
- xii. Theories in IPE: Mercantilism, Economic Liberalism, and Neo- Marxism*
- xiii. Theories of Imperialism, Dependence and Interdependence discourse*
- xiv. Nationalism
- xv. Internationalism*
- xvi. Globalization
- xvii. Diplomacy
- xviii. International Law
- xix. Arms Control /Disarmament and Nuclear Non proliferation Regime
- xx. Weapons of Mass Destruction: Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, Nuclear Weapon States- Programs and Postures: Indian-Pakistan Nuclear Doctrines, Nuclear Non –Proliferation Regime: International Atomic Energy Agency, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty; Nuclear Supplier Group; Partial Test Ban Treaty; Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; Fissile Material Cut-off Treaty; Challenges of Non-Proliferation, Cooperation for Nuclear Energy; The Missile Defence Systems and their impact on global strategic environment; Militarization and Weaponization of Space.

4) Foreign Policy of Selected Countries

- i. USA, Russia, China, UK, India, Pakistan and EU

5) Current Affairs Section: Regional Relations

- i. India and Pakistan: Overview of agreements and accords, Indus Water Treaty; Composite Dialogue; Sir Creek & Siachen border, Visa and People to people contact; Trade; and Role of civil society Peace-making and Peace-Building in South Asia: Analytical overview of peace processes between/among the states of South Asia especially between India and Pakistan.
- ii. Pakistan and Afghanistan: Cold war theatre; Soviet Invasion and Mujahedeen; Geneva Accord; Post Cold War situation- Rise of Taliban, AL-Qeada & 9/11; Operation Enduring Freedom; The Bonn Process- Withdrawal

6) Current Affairs Section: International Political Institutions and Regional Organizations

- i. United Nations
- ii. International Monetary Fund (IMF)
- iii. World Bank
- iv. International Court of Justice
- v. EU, ASEAN, NAFTA, SAARC, SCO, OIC, ECO, WTO.
- vi. Reforms in the United Nations, World Bank and the IMF

7) Current Affairs Section: Contemporary Global Issues

- i. Euro-Atlantic Vs. Asia Pacific: Great Power Policies
- ii. Kashmir Issue
- iii. Palestine Issue

Short Notes Only

If you have a look at the above categorization, you'd realize that it is the complete syllabus of IR. A mere change of perception can simplify apparent complex ideas. Before starting the preparation of this subject, keep the IR Past Paper Analysis handy. The above data is your map and the past paper analysis is your key.

Technically, you only need to cover the First 4 Sections. The other sections are merely overlapping with Current Affairs (CA) as well as Pakistan Affairs. The manner of covering the topics is also mentioned. Firstly, complete the history portion from Anthony Best's book, reason being, you need to have your world history straight before you study the concepts. The bigger picture i.e. the World History must be clear before studying the components. Secondly, go to Globalization of World Politics by John Baylis (JB) for theories. Then, use these books to cover your concepts portion, you'll be able to find all of the concepts from these books; Prakash Chander (PC), Joshua Goldstein (JG), Globalization of World Politics (JB), Understanding IR by Chris Brown (CB). For foreign policy's portion, some countries' foreign policy (outdated) is mentioned in Parkash Chander, however, you'll have to research online. (Foreign Policies of Major Countries: History (Peu Gosh), Contemporary (www.foreignaffairs.com.)

Furthermore, you don't have to read all the books completely, except for the History portion. Read relevant topics to clear your concepts. It's more like being a gold miner and extracting only what you need. Anyway, you only need to purchase parkash chander, which is a standard book for IR. All other books are available online on Bookfi.net.

2016 Paper Pattern

1) Paper 1 Pattern

- i. 5 Questions were from the Concepts Section (you need to prepare all of the concepts in depth)
- ii. 1 Question From Current Affairs Section specifically International Organization i.e. UN
- iii. 1 Question from Theories Section (even if you had prepared a 10 mark note of the less important theories you would have been able to answer this question)

2) Paper 2 Pattern

- i. 2 Questions from History Section (a tricky one, but not really if you studied it well)
- ii. 1 Question from Foreign Policy Section
- iii. 4 Questions from CA; South Asia Relations(Pak-Afghan), Domestic (Nuclear Programme) (Pak-Saudi alliance's implications on the country), Global Issue (Greece Economic Crisis)

Now, considering the Pattern you'd realize that smart study would be sufficient. Only 4 Sections and CA. Voila, you're good to go!

ORGANIZATION OF TOPICS

Past Papers Analysis According to Revised Syllabus

IR PAPER-I

1. Define International Relations. Discuss its scope and importance of the study of International Relations. (2000)
2. Do you agree that in contemporary International Relations, International Economic and Trade linkages are being used as pressure tactics in inter-State Relations. (2000)
3. International Relations is a Separate discipline! Discuss. (2001)
4. The age of isolation is over. The modern states act and behave as member of the international community. Qualify the statement with reference to the following: (2004)
 - (a) Definition and scope of International Relations.
 - (b) Nature and utility of the subject.
5. The relations between the sovereign states of the world are becoming one of the most important aspects of contemporary life. Evaluate with reference to the importance of international relations. (2005)
6. Explain, with examples, the main principles of the NEO-REALIST SCHOOL OF THOUGHT in International Relations. How does Neo-Realism differ from Classical Realism? (2006)
7. Explain, with examples, the main principles of the NEO-LIBERAL SCHOOL OF THOUGHT in International Relations. How does Neo-Liberalism differ from Classical Liberalism/Idealism? (2006)
8. Comparatively analyze the basic philosophy of International Relations, "Peace and Security" has been challenged by the emerging "Economic Regionalism and Military Technologies". (2007)
9. Discuss the importance of International Relations as a field of study. (2009)
10. "Can you imagine a world with out inter-state relations"? Explain the importance of International Relations in the Nuclear age. (2010)
11. Identify the main arguments of the Realism and Liberalism in International Relations. Which approach appeals to you as a better explaining International Relations and why? Discuss the empirical evidence.(2011)
12. Define International Relations. Identify and explain its continuously changing and expanding nature and subject matter? (2011)
13. Discuss the development of the study of " International Relations" and define its core influential factors and define its role in the post cold war era? (2012)

14. Discuss evolution and development of the discipline of International Relations; define the dominant factors responsible for and explain their role in the post-cold war era. (2014)

FOREIGN POLICY

1. In the modern era the foreign policy is directly affected by the economic conditions of a country. Discuss. (2001)
2. Explain the future of Disarmament with reference to the foreign policy Of major Powers. (2001)
3. Define " Economics as an instrument in foreign policy" and explain its fundamental characteristic which can help to achieve state's objectives. (2012)

PAKISTAN'S FOREIGN POLICY

1. How does domestic politics influence foreign policy decision making? Explain with reference to Pakistan's policy towards India. (2006)
2. "In her foreign policy and trade, Pakistan has never benefitted fully from the ideal Geostrategic location". Discuss. (2015)

IMPERIALISM

1. Define Imperialism and discuss the Economic Theories of Imperialism. (2000)
2. Define Economic Imperialism. How far it is correct to say that the G-7 countries have embarked upon Economic Imperialism in the Third World through WTO and Multi-National Corporations? (2003)
3. Do you agree that 19th century European International Society was merely a means of legitimizing Imperialism? (Re-Exam 2013)

INTERNATIONAL LAW

1. International Law is a significant instrument in regulating conduct of states and International Organizations. Discuss (2001)
2. Short Notes: International Law and International Morality (2001)
3. Short Notes: International Law (2002)
4. International system creates interactions among states through diplomacy, international law, and economic relations. Comments. (2005)
5. "Development of International Law and Organization are the efforts of all states to make International System less anarchic". Elucidate the statement. (2008)
6. Define and explain the international Law. Does International Law have any real role in international Relations? (2011)

GLOBALIZATION

1. Is globalization under threat because of world economic crises? (2013)
2. Define the term globalization. Do you believe its prospects are threatened because of the current economic crises in general and third world economies in particular. (2014)

BALANCE OF POWER

1. In the context of its nature, purpose and devices, how does balance of power influence regional systems? (2005)
2. How does domestic politics influence foreign policy decision making? Explain with reference to Pakistan's policy towards India. (2006)
3. Describe interactions among Nations through diplomacy for establishing balance of power to preserve their National Interest. (2007)
4. Critically discuss the concept of Balance of power in the light of Hans Morgenthau's thought. (2013)
5. Explain the concept of Balance of Power in international relations and evaluate its relevance after the demise of Soviet Russia. (2014)

DIPLOMACY

1. International system creates interactions among states through diplomacy, international law, and economic relations. Comment. (2005)
2. Describe interactions among Nations through diplomacy for establishing balance of power to preserve their National Interest. (2007)
3. Discuss "Diplomacy" and define its kinds. Explain diplomatic means which can help to resolve disputes and conflicts in the world. (2012)
4. Do you believe that Diplomacy is the ultimate way to resolve international disputes? What diplomatic means are significant to realize that goal in general and Pakistan-India in particular? (2014)

INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

1. The economic power determines the superiority and political domination of a country in International System? Discuss. (2004)
2. International system creates interactions among states through diplomacy, international law, and economic relations. Comments. (2005)
3. The emergence of sovereign state as a primary actor was just the beginning of the evolution of modern International System. Assess the pace of change in International Relations from 1815 to 1914. (2008)
4. "Development of International Law and Organization are the efforts of all states to make International System less anarchic". Elucidate the statement. (2008)

5. How effective the UN in dealing with global problems. What will the International System look like in the year 2050? (2008)

INTERNATIONAL ECONOMICS

1. Do you agree that in contemporary International Relations, International Economic and Trade linkages are being used as pressure tactics in inter-State Relations. (2000)
2. What are the major demands of the SOUTH against the NORTH for a New International Economic Order. (2002)
3. Economics realities compelled the members of the developing world to demand for the establishment of New International Economic Order. Give your comment. (2009)
4. "After the downfall of Colonialism. The western Powers have embarked upon a new policy of "Economic Imperialism" through IMF, World Bank, Multi-nationals and WTO". Do you agree? Substantiate (2010)

UNITED NATIONS

1. How effective are international organizations in dealing with the global problems. Discuss with particular reference to the UN from 1945 to present. (2005)
2. The two great wars had dismantled colonialism and created Third World and Non-Alignment Movement. How did the UN justify its role in the World Affairs. (2007)
3. How effective the UN in dealing with global problems. What will the International System look like in the year 2050? (2008)
4. Discuss the significance and increasing role of International Society in the classically sovereign domains of state with reference to United Nations. Also debate whether the UN in its present structure of status can play the increased role expected of it? (2011)

NATION-STATE

1. President Bush's invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, without sound genuine reasons has made the future of the Modern Nation State doubtful. Do you agree? Give reasons for your answer. (2003)
2. How can a Nation state best protect her interest and identity in a transitional World Order? (2008)
3. Describe and discuss the concept of Nation-State and evaluate its future in the light of certain recent developments. (2009)
4. Describe the basic features of modern nation state. What are the dangers to its future? (2010)

INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY

1. Discuss the significance and increasing role of International Society in the classically sovereign domains of state with reference to United Nations. Also debate whether the UN in its present structure of status can play the increased role expected of it? (2011)

NATIONALISM

1. Nationalism has been major cause of conflicts. Justify with special reference to the following: (2004)
 - (a) Western concept of Nationalism
 - (b) Islamic concept
2. Discuss "Nationalism" and define its silent features in the post cold war situation and explain its grave consequences with reference to eastern Europe, African continent and South Asian tragic incidents. Also debate whether the UN and superpowers played any role in preventing bloodbath in the regions. (2012)
3. Is nationalism ultimately about preserving cultural identity against global pressure towards homogenization? Discuss.(Re-Exam 2013)

MISCELLANEOUS

1. "It is the national power both Tangible and Intangible that determines the actual as well as potential power of state". In the light of this statement discuss in detail the nature the attributes of national power. (2002)
2. "Globalization" and "Regionalism ". do you think these terms are antagonistic or complimentary? Give examples in your arguments. (2002)
3. How would a realist analyze the current problems in International Politics; (2005)
4. Write a critical analysis of the theory of 'Clash of Civilizations'. What are the prospects of a dialogue among Civilizations? (2006)
5. What are the principal challenges and potential opportunities for economic liberalization and democratization in the Muslim world? (2006)
6. "Europeans transformed Westphalian System of States into empires during 16th, 17th and 18th centuries to increase their Wealth and Power." Elucidate the statement. (2007)
7. The post Cold War, World Order promised Peace, Security, Democracy, Nuclear Non-proliferation and Human Rights protection. Assess its repercussions at present confronted by the world community in the context of Terrorism, Nuclear Proliferation, Globalization and erosion of Human Dignity. (2007)

8. War and Peace are conflicting values of International Politics. A state cannot encourage one without sacrificing other. Describe three means of peace and security in nuclear age. (2008)
9. Explain the socio-economic and Political Compulsions which led to the formation of Regional Blocs. (2010)
10. Discuss and explain the causes of World War II. Could a different policy by Britain, France and USA have avoided its occurrence? (2011)
11. Discuss and analyze the role of Soviet Union during the Cold War. Was it a stabilizing or destabilizing factor in International Relations? Elaborate your answer with reference to theory and facts.(2011)
12. Evaluate the general view the peace of Westphalia as the founding moment for modern state system. Do you think this system is challenged in the contemporary world? (2013)
13. In what ways was the Versailles treaty a contributory factor to european political instability in the period 1919-39? (2013)
14. How far was Germany responsible for the outbreak of war in 1914(Re-Exam 2013)
15. Short Notes: De-colonization (2000)
16. Short Notes: Crisis Management (2000)
17. Short Notes: Euro Communism (2000), (2003)
18. Short Notes: Limited War (2001)
19. Short Notes: congress of Vienna. (2002)
20. Short Notes: Peaceful co-existence (2003)
21. Short Notes: Perestroika. (2003)
22. Short Notes: Hostile Embargo (2004)
23. Short Notes: Entente (2004)
24. Short Notes: Co-existence (2004)
25. Short Notes: Human rights violations; (2005)
26. Short Notes: Politics of environmental protection. (2005)
27. Short Notes: Terminology of AF-PAK (2015)
28. Short Notes: E.C.O. (2015)
29. Short Notes: O.I.C (2015)

IR PAPER-II

AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

1. Critically evaluate American Foreign Policy towards Afghanistan. (2001)
2. In your opinion what are the distinguishing features in a profile of American foreign policy since 1990? (2002)
3. Critically evaluate American foreign policy towards Pakistan. (2009)
4. Carry out a comparative analysis of US foreign policy towards South Asia during and after the Cold war. (2013)

CHINESE FOREIGN POLICY

1. Analyze and elaborate the changes in Chinese foreign policy since the death of Mao dse dung. (2002)

PAKISTAN

1. Short Notes: Pak-China relations in the 1990s. (2000)
2. Evaluate the Sino-Pak nexus in the light of changing geo-politico-economic scenario of the region. (2004)
3. Critically evaluate American foreign policy towards Pakistan. (2009)
4. "The Kashmir problem has been mishandled from the beginning and every successive Government in Pakistan has contributed to that". Critically explain the statement. (2010)
5. Explain why, despite being target of terrorism, Pakistan's international allies often publicly express dissatisfaction with Pakistan's counter terrorism policy and actions ? Is this a failure of Pakistani diplomacy or weakness in its policy? Identify the fault and suggest corrective measures, if required. (2011)
6. Critically discuss "Pakistan's participation in SEATO and CENTO " and explain political, strategic, and economic causes and define its potential disadvantages for the country's foreign policy and diplomacy. (2012)
7. Discuss the economic and strategic importance of Gawadar port for Pakistan and for the region. (2015)

PAKISTAN-INDIA

1. Define the present "Russian Doctrine" and discuss its impact on Pakistan and India. (2000)
2. Explain the impact of India-Pakistan nuclearisation on strategic stability in South Asia. (2006)
3. How does domestic politics influence foreign policy decision making? Explain with reference to Pakistan's policy towards India. (2006)

4. Since South Asia has been dominated by the antagonism between India and Pakistan, what impact do nuclear weapons have on the balance of power in the region. (2008)

Pakistan-CHINA

1. Short Notes: Pak-China relations in the 1990s. (2000)
2. Analyze and elaborate the changes in Chinese foreign policy since the death of Mao zedong. (2002)
3. Evaluate the Sino-Pak nexus in the light of changing geo-politico-economic scenario of the region. (2004)
4. Will China become an Economic Super Power in 21st century? What should US-Policy be towards the modernization of China? (2005)
5. Discuss the strategic importance of "Indian ocean" in the post cold war scenario and analyze the role of the United States and China in the region. Also identify vital political, economic, and strategic interests of both great powers in the contemporary geopolitical situation. (2012)
6. Pakistan-China relations are historic and times tested, have devolved a momentum of their own and are continuing. Explain. (2015)

AFGHANISTAN

1. President Bush's invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, without sound genuine reasons has made the future of the Modern Nation State doubtful. Do you agree? Give reasons for your answer. (2003)
2. How do you perceive US military engagement in Afghanistan and Iraq and its implications in near future? (2007)
3. Critically Define " American interests in Afghanistan" and explain its political strategic failure in the region and its unnecessary pressure on Pakistan to "do more" which can destabilize the regional scenario rather than stabilizing the situation. Also discuss the serious impact of the American war on terror on the Pakistan's state, Society and system. (2012)
4. Visualise the post-Taliban scenario in Afghanistan and discuss its implications for Pakistan. (2015)

UNITED STATES

1. President Bush's invasion of Afghanistan and Iraq, without sound genuine reasons has made the future of the Modern Nation State doubtful. Do you agree? Give reasons for your answer. (2003)
2. The introduction of the concepts of Unilateralism and pre-emptive Strike by President Bush has eroded the basis of International law and Diplomacy, in inter state relations. Discuss. (2003)

3. How do you perceive US military engagement in Afghanistan and Iraq and its implications in near future? (2007)
4. Discuss the role of Nuclear Diplomacy in South Asia with particular reference to, "US Indian Nuclear deal has activated Indo-Russian Nuclear Cooperation". (2007)
5. "The Al- Qaeeda phobia has made USA a neurotic Super Power. She is disregarding the norms of International Law and Diplomacy". Make your comments by a brief survey of US Global Policy. (2010)
6. Discuss the strategic importance of "Indian ocean" in the post cold war scenario and analyze the role of the United States and China in the region. Also identify vital political, economic, and strategic interests of both great powers in the contemporary geopolitical situation. (2012)
7. Critically Define " American interests in Afghanistan" and explain its political strategic failure in the region and its unnecessary pressure on Pakistan to "do more" which can destabilize the regional scenario rather than stabilizing the situation. Also discuss the serious impact of the American war on terror on the Pakistan's state, Society and system. (2012)

MIDDLE EAST

1. Short Notes: Palestine Problem (2001)
2. State the conditions for the 'Road Map' of the Palestinian state. What are the hurdles in its implementation? (2003)
3. Middle East peace process is in doldrums. Discuss. (2004)
 - (a) Impediments to Middle East peace process
 - (b) Future prospects and peace efforts.
4. Analyse the causes and events of the Arab Israeli war of 1967? What were its implications? (Re-Exam 2013)

AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS

1. Describe the efforts of African National Congress against Apartheid regime of South Africa.

WORLD WAR II

1. Elucidate the impact of world war II on the decolonialization process in Asia. (2013)

COLD WAR

1. Critically discuss the origin and developments of the cold war and its consequences on world politics. (2009)

2. Discuss and analyze the role of Soviet Union during the Cold War. Was it a stabilizing or destabilizing factor in International Relations? Elaborate your answer with reference to theory and facts.(2011)
3. Discuss the development of the study of " International Relations" and define its core influential factors and define its role in the post cold war era? (2012)
4. Discuss the strategic importance of "Indian ocean" in the post cold war scenario and analyze the role of the United States and China in the region. Also identify vital political,economic,and strategic interests of both great powers in the contemporary geopolitical situation. (2012)
5. Do you agree that the post-Cold War international scenario has generated more constraints than opportunities for Pakistan's foreign policy? If so, what those? Suggest measures enabling Pakistan to face the 'new challenges'.(2014)

DÉTENTE

1. Short Notes: Detente (2002)
2. Define Detente. Is a Detente possible between India and Pakistan? Give your arguments. (2003)

DETERRENCE

1. Short Notes: Deterrence (2003)
2. What is nuclear deterrence? Is it an appropriate Policy? What are alternatives to nuclear deterrence? (2005)

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

1. Define the Politics of Nuclear Proliferation. How far the super powers have been responsible for the proliferation of Nuclear weapons. (2000)
2. What is Nuclear Proliferation? How far the United States of America is justified in pursuing the. policy of Non-proliferation towards North Korea and Iran? (2003)
3. What is nuclear proliferation? How far the United states of America is justified in making a nuclear deal with India? (2009)
4. What nuclear proliferation concerns have stemmed from the dissolution of the Soviet Union? Has the western world been able to address these concerns? (Re-Exam 2013)
5. Do you support the argument that Iran-US nuclear deal will bring a new wave of instability in the region and can also cause serious implications for global non-proliferation regime? (2014)

TERRORISM

1. Short Notes: Terrorism; (2005)

2. Short Notes: Control of Mass destruction weapons; (2005)
3. What are the main problems in defining 'terrorism'? Also narrate the implications of the "War on Terrorism" for International Law. (2006)
4. Terrorism has compelled every one to think, "No one can be trusted and every one is to be feared." Discuss an appropriate response to Domestic and International terrorism. (2008)
5. Explain why, despite being target of terrorism, Pakistan's international allies often publicly express dissatisfaction with Pakistan's counter terrorism policy and actions ? Is this a failure of Pakistani diplomacy or weakness in its policy? Identify the fault and suggest corrective measures, if required. (2011)
6. "A single catastrophic event "Nine Eleven", has turned the world topsy-turvy". (2015)
7. The phenomenon of terrorism has occupied centre stage in today's world. Highlight the difference between terrorism and freedom struggle. Discuss the issue of terrorism in backdrop of what is happening in Palestine, Afghanistan and Kashmir. (2015)

BALANCE OF TERROR

1. "Balance of terror and not of Power is helpful in maintaining Peace in the nuclear Power age Comment. (2001)
2. Short Notes: Balance to Terror (2004)
3. Define balance of terror. How far it has succeeded in preventing a major war in the world? (2010)

NATO

1. "Notwithstanding its recent expansion NATO should be disbanded because the purpose for which it was established exists no more". Do you agree with this statement? give reasons. (2002)
2. What factors were responsible for the creation of the WARSAW and NATO pacts? Can NATO's continuing existence be justified? (2009)
3. Elucidate the significance of NATO during the Cold War and discuss whether it is still useful for European security in the contemporary era? (Re-Exam 2013)

ORGANIZATIONS

1. Define Non-Aligned Movement? Make an appraisal of its role and discuss the future of NAM. (2000)
2. Short Notes: SEATO (2001)
3. Short Notes: NAM (2002)
4. Short Notes: WTO (2002)

5. OIC has failed to foster Pan Islamic unity and solidarity to meet the challenges faced by the Ummah in a spirit of cooperation and collective action. Indeed it is an important forum that needs complete overhauling/restructuring. Comment and suggest measures to make it effective. (2004)
6. "After the downfall of Colonialism. The western Powers have embarked upon a new policy of "Economic Imperialism" through IMF, World Bank, Multinationals and WTO". Do you agree? Substantiate. (2010)
7. Critically discuss "Pakistan's participation in SEATO and CENTO " and explain political, strategic, and economic causes and define its potential disadvantages for the country's foreign policy and diplomacy. (2012)
8. Critically evaluate the joining of Western Alliances (SEATO & CENTO) by Pakistan and explain its political, economic and strategic consequences for the state's policy. (2014)

International Relations Part-I

Contents

- 1) The Definition and Scope of International Relations.
- 2) The Nation-State System
- 3) Evolution of International Society
- 4) Theories and Approaches; The Classical Approaches-Realism
- 5) Theories and Approaches; The Classical Approaches-Idealism
- 6) Theories and Approaches; The Scientific Revolution-Behavioral Approach, System Approach
- 7) Theories and Approaches; Neo-realism, Neo-liberalism.
- 8) Theories and Approaches; Post-modernism, Critical Theory, Feminism, Constructivism
- 9) International Political Security (IPS): Conceptualization of security in the Twenty-First century
- 10) IPS: Power. Elements of National Power
- 11) IPS: Balance of Power
- 12) IPS: Foreign Policy: Determinants, Decision Making and Analysis
- 13) IPS: Sovereignty
- 14) IPS: National Interest
- 15) Strategic Approach to International Relation: War: Causation of War, Total War, Limited War, Asymmetric Warfare, Civil War, Guerilla Warfare
- 16) Strategic Culture: Determinants of Pakistani Strategic Culture.
- 17) International Political Economy; Theories in IPE: Mercantilism, Economic Liberalism, and Neo- Marxism
- 18) IPE: Theories of Imperialism, Dependence and Interdependence discourse
- 19) International political community: Nationalism
- 20) International political community: Globalization
- 21) Approaches to Peace: Diplomacy
- 22) Approaches to Peace: International Law
- 23) Approaches to Peace: Arms Control /Disarmament and Nuclear Non proliferation Regime
- 24) International Political Institution: United Nations (along with Reforms)
- 25) International Political Institution: International Monetary Fund (IMF) (along with Reforms)
- 26) International Political Institution: World Bank (along with Reforms)
- 27) International Political Institution: International Court of Justice

Topic 1

The Definition and Scope of International Relations

1) Introduction

- i. The study of international relations is not a science with which we solve the problems of international life. At its best it is an objective and systematic approach to those problems” **Palmer and Perkins**
- ii. The term international was used by **Jeromy Bentham** in the later 18th century with regards to laws of nations
- iii. A restricted scope of IR: the official relations conducted by the authorized leaders of the state”
- iv. From a broader perspective, IR may refer to all forms of interactions between members of separate societies, whether govt sponsored or not. **Hoffman** “IR is concerned with the factors and activities which affect the external policies and the powers of the basic units into which the world is divided”
- v. The study of IR includes analysis of foreign policies or political processes between nations, and also focuses on international trade and civil society interaction

2) Ingredients of IR

- i. The nature and principal forces of international organizations
- ii. The political, social, economic organization of political life, psychological, social, pol science, economics aspects are considered in order to understand what is happening
- iii. Elements of national power-political dynamics, every nation is interested in other country's political conditions
- iv. Instruments available for promotion of national interest-how national power is attained and what is its effect on the international level
- v. Limitations and control of national power (china vs US in Taiwan case due to capitalist vs communism theories (phermosa island)
- vi. Foreign policies of major powers and of smaller (strategic) powers-HDI
- vii. Historical ingredients as a background for other factors

3) International Politics and International Relations

- i. IR is wider in scope than IP
- ii. IP focuses on various styles of politics(capitalism vs. communism); politics of violence, persuasion (japan followed the plan of economic power and left military power), hierarchical policies and pluralistic politics

- iii. IR embraces the totality of relations among people and groups of people in global society

4) Relevance of International Institutions in IR

- i. Contemporary international institutions in which groups of states or other actors can participate include INGOs or the UN system (UNDP UNICEF)
- ii. EU, NATO, SAARC or ASEAN are examples of regional grouping with multiple functions

5) Scope of International Relations

- i. Historically, only concerned with the study of diplomatic history.
- ii. Later on it was studied under the purview of International Law.
- iii. Field of study widened after the creation of League of Nation as study of international organizations also included.
- iv. Post World War II Scenario further widened the scope due to emergence of two super powers, new states coming into society of nations, danger of thermo-nuclear war, rising expectations of underdeveloped states.
- v. Emphasis on scientific study; study of military policies.
- vi. Efforts to utilize the social science techniques (psychological aspects)
- vii. Modern scholars not willing to treat IR as an independent discipline as it lacks unity of subject matter, unanimity regarding scope and degree of objectivity.
- viii. IR has a descriptive-historical approach which leads to immense data but a theoretical framework is required for ordering and interpreting the facts, which new theories are beginning to provide. Organski "...within next few decades the basic foundations of a new discipline will be laid"

6) Significance of Study

- i. It enables us to understand the basic motives underlying the policies of various states.
- ii. Having an insight to the problems facing the world
- iii. Helping to understand that narrow nationalism is bane to humanity, poses serious threats
- iv. Various states view problems subjectively and give preference to national interest
- v. Traditional concept of national sovereignty has become out-dated and requires modification
- vi. Avoid policy of confrontation and instead focus on peaceful co-existence, policy of co-operation, and universal brotherhood.

7) Solution through the Core Principles of IR

The problem of shared interests versus conflicting interests among members of a group, we will refer to the general case as the collective goods problem.

- i. Dominance: The principle of dominance solves the collective goods problem by establishing a power hierarchy in which those at the top control those below.
- ii. Reciprocity The principle of reciprocity solves the collective goods problem by rewarding behavior that contributes to the group and punishing behavior that pursues self-interest at the expense of the group.
- i. Identity: members of an identity community care about the interests of others in that community enough to sacrifice their own interests to benefit others.

8) Conclusion

Topic 2

The Nation-State System

1) Introduction

- i. A nation denotes a common ethnic and cultural identity shared by a single people, while a state is a political unit with a governance system controlling a territory and its inhabitants.
- ii. The nation promotes emotional relationship amongst its members, while states provide political and legal foundation for the identity of its citizens.
- iii. The term nation-state has been used by social scientists to denote the gradual fusion of cultural and political boundaries after a long control of political authority by a central government.
- iv. Palmer “the nation-state system is the pattern of political life in which people are separately organized into sovereign states that interact with one another in varying degrees and in varying ways”

2) Historical Background

- i. The treaty of Westphalia in 1648 created the modern nation-state. (European states, different cultures, languages started fusing e.g. Switzerland consists of half German and half French but their identity is Swiss, plus after partition Indian Muslims are separate than Pakistani Muslims) It has to organize the different national identities into one, many grievances with state at times. Minority issue in Pakistan.
- ii. The treaty established the principle of internal sovereignty (preeminence of rulers from other claimants to power[state needs to have one ruler only and is supreme]) and external sovereignty (independence from outside powers)
- iii. England, Spain and France obtained independence from dominance by the Holy Roman Empire.
- iv. Scholars like Machiavelli (the Prince), Bodin and Grotius defended the authority of the state and provided justification for the secular state independent from the authority of the pope.

3) Approaches To International Relations Specifying Nation-State Concept

- i. There are three approaches to studying the socio-cultural, political and economic forces at work within different nation-states.
 - i. Objective (attributive Approach): identifies nationalism and the nation-state in terms of observable and quantifiable attributes, including linguistic, racial and religious factors.

- ii. Subjective (Emotional) Approach: views nationalism and the nation-state as a set of emotional, ideological and patriotic feelings binding people regardless of their ethnic backgrounds. (US) afro-Americans though have serious problems.
- iii. Eclectic (synthetic) Approach: A more subjective than objective approach, seeking to supplement notions of nationalism and patriotism with interethnic interaction and education processes to explain creation of a common identity.
- ii. Further Evolution of the Nation-State
 - i. State systems underwent further evolution on account of rise of representative governments, the industrial revolution, the population explosion, independence of developing countries, economic growth and growth of multi-lateral organizations.

4) Basic Features of Nation-State

- i. Concept of Sovereignty
 - i. The concept of sovereignty is permanently associated with a nation-state.
 - ii. It evolved in the 16th century in France during the conflict between the state and the church.
 - iii. Many theorists have defined sovereignty. Hobbes focused on its absolutist aspect, while Austin focused on legalistic or juristic notions of sovereignty.
 - iv. The modern doctrine of popular sovereignty has transferred the source of absolute power from the monarch to the people.
 - v. The notion of sovereignty is important but it can become rigid unless applied to the evolving pattern of inter-state relations.
- ii. Nationalism in IR
 - i. Nationalism implies elevation of nation above all other values.
 - ii. States usually control the mass media to propagate their foreign policy objectives and centralize their education systems to popularize nationalistic values.
 - iii. Power is gauged by both tangible and non-tangible aspects.
 - iv. The economic output, size, population and military strength of a state are tangible and quantifiable aspects.
 - v. Power also rests on intangible factors like quality of leadership, ideology, morale and manipulative or diplomatic strength.
 - vi. Power purchases security and enables survival of the state. Thus it is an end unto itself. This long run objective to achieve power also requires exertion of power. It is also a means to an end. (to get power u need power.
- iii. Ingredients of National power

- i. Force-the explicit threat or use of military, economic, nuclear and other instruments of coercion by one state against another. Woodrow Wilson 'talk softly but carry a stick'
- ii. Influence-using instruments of persuasion by one state to alter or maintain the behavior of another state.
- iii. Authority-voluntary compliance with directives and orders of a state by other states out of respect, solidarity, or in recognition of expertise.

5) Elements of Modern Nation-State

- i. Sovereignty; right of self-government and promotion of national interests through independent foreign policy
- ii. Territorial Integrity
- iii. Legal Equality of the States; UN Charter; in reality this principle has become a farce; a state which had general interest and could protect those interests in all spheres was considered a great power.

6) Setback to Nation-State System

- i. Growing interdependence of the states due to globalization. (national Sovereignty)
- ii. Reconciliation of each other's national interests
- iii. Creation of regional blocs lead to dilution of nation-state concept
- iv. Rise of nuclear weapons; blow to concept of equality of states
- v. Growing role of public opinion alters foreign policy objectives
- vi. Growing dependence of developing nations on developed states.
- vii. Role played by Multi National Corporations.

7) Conclusion

Topic 3

Evolution of International Society

1. Introduction

- i. The basic structures and principles of international relations are deeply rooted in historical developments.
- ii. 'International society' is any association of distinct political communities which accept some common values, rules, and institutions.
- iii. It is the central concept of the 'English School' of International Relations.
- iv. Although originally coined to refer to relations among European states, the term may be applied to many different sets of political arrangements among distinct political communities.

2. Historical Background

- i. Elements of international society may be found from the time of the first organized human communities.
- ii. Early forms of diplomacy and treaties existed in the ancient Middle East.
- iii. Relations among the city-states of ancient Greece were characterized by more developed societal characteristics, such as arbitration.
- iv. Ancient China, India, and Rome all had their own distinctive international societies.
- v. Medieval Europe's international society was a complex mixture of supranational, transnational, national, and subnational structures
- vi. The Catholic Church played a key role in elaborating the normative basis of medieval international society.
- vii. Islam developed its own distinctive understanding of international society.

3. Evolution of International Society

- i. The main ingredients of contemporary international society are the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention and the institutions of diplomacy, the balance of power, and international law.

- ii. These took centuries to develop, although the Peace of Westphalia (1648) was a key event in their establishment throughout Europe.
- iii. The Napoleonic Wars were followed by a shift to a more managed, hierarchical, international society within Europe and an imperial structure in Europe's relations with much of the rest of the world.
- iv. World Wars I and II dominated the 20th century, yet they seem to offer contradictory lessons about the utility of hardline or conciliatory foreign policies.
- v. The League of Nations was an attempt to place international society on a more secure organizational foundation.
- vi. For nearly 50 years after World War II, world politics revolved around the East-West rivalry of the Cold War. This bipolar standoff created stability and avoided great power wars, including nuclear war, but turned states in the global South into proxy battlegrounds.
- vii. The United Nations was intended to be a much improved League of Nations but the cold war prevented it from functioning as such.
- viii. The post-Cold War era holds hope of growing peace and great-power cooperation despite the appearance of new ethnic and regional conflicts
- ix. Decolonization led to the worldwide spread of the European model of international society.
- x. The collapse of the Soviet Union completed this process.
- xi. Globalization poses serious problems for a sovereignty-based international society.
- xii. These include the challenges emanating from new forms of community, failing states in Africa, American hyperpower, growing resistance to Western ideas, and global poverty and environmental issues.

4. Conclusion

Topic 4

Theories and Approaches; The Classical Approaches-Realism

1) Introduction

- i. Realism emphasizes and assumes that all nation-states are motivated by national interests, or, at best, national interests disguised as moral concerns
- ii. national interest must be defined in terms of power
- iii. National power has an absolute meaning since it can be defines in terms of military, economic, political, diplomatic, or even cultural resources.
- iv. The unifying theme around which all realist thinking converges is that states find themselves in the shadow of anarchy such that their security cannot be taken for granted.
- v. At the end of the millennium, Realism continues to attract academicians and inform policy-makers, although in the period since the end of the cold we have seen heightened criticism of realist assumptions.

2) Assumptions

- i. Analytic unit: state is the principal actor.
- ii. View of actor: state is unitary actor.
- iii. Behavioral dynamic: in its foreign policy, the state is a rational actor seeking to maximize its own interest or objectives.
- iv. Issues: national security issues are most important.

3) Precursors

- i. Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes
- ii. Grotius: maintenance of order between states through norms of international law
- iii. Clausewitz: a state's military objectives are important, but subordinate to larger political objectives.
- iv. E.H. Carr: The Twenty Years' Crisis: 1919-1939
- v. Hans j Morgenthau: Politics among nations

4) Six Principles of realism as explained by Hans J. Morgenthau

- i. Politics is governed by objective laws which are based on human nature and psychology.

- ii. Concept of national interest in terms of power, understood only on rational basis.
- iii. Interest is not fixed and is molded by environments.
- iv. Universal moral principles cannot be applied to state's actions and these must be modified according to the circumstances of time and place.
- v. Morgenthau does not find any identity between moral aspirations of a nation and the moral law which govern the universe and asserts that political actors pursue their national interests.
- vi. Political sphere is as autonomous as the spheres of the economist, or the lawyer or the moralist.

5) Power

- i. Definition: several elements
 - i. Absolute power and relative power
 - ii. Static power and dynamic power
 - iii. Resources and outcomes
- ii. Measurement
 - i. Characteristics (capabilities) of the state (e.g., Morgenthau's)
 - ii. Material factors, psychological factors
 - iii. Is it really possible to presume a unitary state?
 - iv. Universal measurements of power; power related to time, place, and issue

6) System

- i. The concept of balance: Statism is the centerpiece of Realism. This involves two claims. First, for the theorist, the state is the pre-eminent actor and all other actors in world politics are of lesser significance. Second, state 'sovereignty' signifies the existence of an independent political community, one which has juridical authority over its territory. Key criticism: Statism is flawed both on empirical (challenges to state power from 'above' and 'below') and normative grounds (the inability of sovereign states to respond to collective global problems such as famine, environmental degradation, and human rights abuses).
- ii. System as distribution of characteristics vs. system as interaction: Realism tries to describe politics rationally, not on the basis of

morality, but there is no universally acceptable definition of power.

- iii. Survival: The primary objective of all states is survival; this is the supreme national interest to which all political leaders must adhere. Key criticism: Are there no limits to what actions a state can take in the name of necessity?
 - iv. Is the international system a large collection of bi-state relations (dyadic structure) or a condition of the whole?
 - v. Anarchy and the structure of international relations: The realist conception of the international system is an anarchical environment (no fixed rules). All states have to rely upon their own resources to secure their interests, enforce whatever agreements they may have entered into with other states, or maintain a desirable domestic and international order.
 - vi. The principle of self-help: No other state or institution can be relied upon to guarantee your survival. Key criticism: Self-help is not an inevitable consequence of the absence of a world government; self-help is a logic that states have selected. Moreover, there are historical and contemporary examples where states have preferred collective security systems, or forms of regional security communities, in preference to self-help.
 - vii. Rousseau's stag hunt fable: Realists also think that there is a constant struggle of power as power is the ultimate aim for all states, which is not necessarily the case
- 7) Vulnerability: imbalance between strong and weak actors
- i. Military (science and technology, weapons, organization, scale, leadership)
 - ii. Examples: the Russian border; the U.S.A. in Latin America
 - iii. Economic factors (food, oil, advanced technology): examples of the Great Depression and the Middle East
 - iv. The hegemonic state: a source of peace and stability, or an object of fear and envy?
- 8) Different Types Of Realism
- i. Structural realism divides into two camps: those who argue that states are security maximizers (defensive realism) and those who argue that states are power maximizers (offensive realism).

- ii. Neoclassical realists bring individual and unit variation back into the theory.

9) Criticism

- i. Ambiguous and inconsistent with reality
- ii. Wrongly assumes that all men and states seek their national interests in terms of power
- iii. Wrongly assumes that power is the most important goal that nations pursue
- iv. Theory defective in so far it treats the world as static unit in which power is permanent guiding factor.
- v. Wrong to assume that national interest carries its own morality
- vi. Hardly any relationship or activity which does not involve power.
- vii. Political sphere not autonomous

10) Conclusion

- i. Still it holds advantages; it is persuasive, supported by historical evidences.
- ii. Compelled scholars to re-evaluate their own assumptions
- iii. More reliance on realist perspectives

Topic 5

Theories and Approaches; The Classical Approaches- Idealism/Liberalism

1) Introduction

- i. Liberalism (also known in American circles as idealism) is generally considered the second great body of theory in contemporary international politics
- ii. The liberal tradition in political thought goes back at least as far as the thinking of John Locke in the late seventeenth century. From then on, liberal ideas have profoundly shaped how we think about the relationship between government and citizens.

2) Underlying Concepts

- i. Liberalism is a theory of both government within states and good governance between states and peoples worldwide. Unlike Realism, which regards the 'international' as an anarchic realm, Liberals seek to project values of order, liberty, justice, and toleration into international relations.
- ii. The high-water mark of liberal thinking in international relations was reached in the inter-war period in the work of Idealists who believed that warfare was an unnecessary and outmoded way of settling disputes between states.
- iii. Domestic and international institutions are required to protect and nurture these values. But note that these values and institutions allow for significant variations which accounts for the fact that there are heated debates within Liberalism.
- iv. Liberals disagree on fundamental issues such as the causes of war and what kind of institutions are required to deliver liberal values in a decentralized, multicultural international system.
- v. An important cleavage within Liberalism, which has become more pronounced in our globalized world, is between those operating with a positive conception of Liberalism, who advocate interventionist foreign policies and stronger international institutions, and those who incline towards a negative conception, which places a priority on toleration and non-intervention.

3) Evolution of Liberalism

- i. Early liberal thought on international relations took the view that the natural order had been corrupted by undemocratic state leaders and outdated policies such as the balance of power. Prescriptively, Enlightenment liberals believed that a latent cosmopolitan morality could be achieved through the exercise of reason and through the creation of constitutional states. In addition, the unfettered movement of people and goods could further facilitate more peaceful international relations.
- ii. Although there are important continuities between Enlightenment liberal thought and twentieth-century ideas, such as the belief in the power of world public opinion to tame the interests of states, liberal Idealism was more programmatic. For idealists, the freedom of states is part of the problem of international relations and not part of the solution. Two requirements follow from their diagnosis. The first is the need for explicitly normative thinking: how to promote peace and build a better world. Second, states must be part of an international organization, and be bound by its rules and norms.
- iii. Central to Idealism was the formation of an international organization to facilitate peaceful change, disarmament, arbitration, and (where necessary) enforcement. The League of Nations was founded in 1920 but its collective security system failed to prevent the descent into world war in the 1930s.
- iv. The victor states in the wartime alliance against Nazi Germany pushed for a new international institution to be created: the United Nations Charter was signed in June 1945 by 50 states in San Francisco. It represented a departure from the League in two important respects. Membership was near universal and the great powers were able to prevent any enforcement action from taking place which might be contrary to their interests.
- v. In the post-1945 period, liberals turned to international institutions to carry out a number of functions the state could not perform. This was the catalyst for integration theory in Europe and Pluralism in the United States. By the early 1970s Pluralism had mounted a significant challenge to Realism. It focused on new actors (transnational corporations, non-governmental

- organizations) and new patterns of interaction (interdependence, integration).
- vi. Neo-liberalism represents a more sophisticated theoretical challenge to contemporary Realism. Neo-liberals explain the durability of institutions despite significant changes in context. In their view, institutions exert a causal force on international relations, shaping state preferences and locking them into cooperative arrangements.
 - vii. Democratic peace Liberalism and neo-liberalism are the dominant strands in liberal thinking today
- 4) Basic Principles
- i. Internal order: a state's foreign policy is not determined entirely by the international system around it, but rather by its own internal order - democratic, communist, dictatorial, etc.
 - ii. Democratic governments and capitalistic economies: least aggressive states hence democratization of currently authoritarian states
 - iii. Role of Non-state actors
 - iv. Prime objective is world peace
 - v. The growth of international organizations and international laws
 - vi. Promotion of universal human rights and conflict prevention in the United Nations
 - vii. Market liberalization through the World Trade Organization.
 - viii. Domestic and international reforms must be linked
 - ix. Absolute gains Vs relative gains: in other words, they are concerned with achieving a measurable increase in their own power and prosperity on their own terms, rather than more narrowly with increasing their power and prosperity relative to other states.
 - x. Neo-conservatism under the late Clinton and Bush administrations owes much to liberal idealism.
- 5) Strengths and Weaknesses
- i. first major body of international political theory to focus explicitly on the problem of war and peace
 - ii. allows for the analysis of non-state actors

- iii. democratic peace theory is one of the strongest claims to truth
- iv. theoretical incoherence and a Western-centric perspective
- v. naive to think that world peace is achievable, and wrong to include corporations and international organizations as important actors
- vi. liberalism ignores the frequently violent foreign policies of imperial democracies
- vii. limitations of concepts like "human rights," which are merely Western rather than truly universal.

6) Important Scholars

- i. Immanuel Kant (Perpetual Peace)
- ii. John Locke (Two Treatises of Civil Government)
- iii. Hugo Grotius (On the Law of War and Peace)
- iv. Emerich de Vattel (The Law of Nations).

7) Conclusion

Topic 6

Theories and Approaches; The Scientific Revolution-Behavioral Approach, System Approach

1) Traditional Approach

- a. In view of the complex variables influencing behavior of states, the traditionalists focus on the observed behavior of governments.
- b. They explain observable government behavior on the basis of concepts like balance of power, national interest, diplomacy etc. (related to realist)
- c. Traditional realists try to understand and resolve the clashing interests that inevitably lead to war (primary occupation is to have such interests that do not clash with others)
- d. They regard it as a sub-discipline of history and political science
- e. There are historical, philosophical and legal variants to the traditional approach

2) Scientific Approach

- a. Scientific scholars challenged the traditionalist, arguing that IR is too broad and complex a field to be a sub-discipline of political science.
- b. They began constructing conceptual frameworks and partial models of international systems, and tried to collect and analyze data to refute or validate a formulated hypothesis. (Empirical evidence)
- c. Such theorists focus on statistical correlations between variables like incidence of war and alliance policies for e.g. world wars 1 and 2 (the effect of alliances on wars)
- d. This approach has brought a methodological rigor to IR but it relies more on process analysis than experimentation in order to prove its hypothesis. (a weakness, cannot be taken to labs)
- e. Even obtaining data is difficult in IR and the units of analysis vary (terrorism for e.g. is a relative term, another weakness, no one will give the info regarding nuclear assets for instance, no universal understanding on one issue, everyone has their own definitions of terrorism for example) accuracy k lihaz say faiday hain but constraints b hain

3) Behavioral Approach

- a. In the 1960s and 70s, scholars began arguing that politics cannot be studied factually without reference to values
- b. Behavioral approach is informed by socio-anthropological and psychological perspectives. It focuses on understanding the

- reasons behind the action/behavior of states and other international actors. Values are connected with politics
- c. This approach has contributed to understanding how people and organizations of different cultures interact, the effects of propaganda and stereotypical views on conflict situations and IR. (propaganda is a tool to convince others e.g. Nazi propaganda that convinced people to kill Jews)
 - d. It is difficult to determine the behavior of states, which is the aggregate behavior of a large number of individuals and of superimposing authorities.

4) Post-Behavioral Approach

- a. In the 1980s, an attempt was made to combine normative and empirical approaches to study IR. (two approaches and combines them)
- b. This approach can be used to test the validity of idealist's hypothesis for example to see if democratic or authoritarian states are more likely to be engaged in internal conflicts.

5) Systems Approach

- a. This approach places more emphasis on the complex interaction between and within state, while retaining a post-behavioral scientific orientation.
- b. It does so by focusing on international systems which are interdependent and interrelated.
- c. These systems range from small systems to intermediate and large systems. Such as the UN system, individual nations, ethnic groups, individual voters, political parties, MNCs etc can all be categorized into corresponding systems to understand the complex nature of IR.

6) Conclusion

Topic 7

Theories and Approaches; Neo-realism, Neo-liberalism

1) Introduction

- i. The neo-neo debate has been the dominant focus in international relations theory scholarship in the USA for the last 10–15 years.
- ii. More than just theories, neo-realism and neo-liberalism represent paradigms or conceptual frameworks that shape individuals' images of the world and influence research priorities and policy debates and choices.
- iii. There are several versions of neo-realism or neo-liberalism. Rational choice approaches and game theory have been integrated into neo-realist and neo-liberal theory to explain policy choices and the behaviour of states in conflict and cooperative situations.
- iv. Neo-realist and neo-liberal theories are status quo-oriented problem-solving theories. They share many assumptions about actors, values, issues, and power arrangements in the international system. Neo-realists and neo-liberals study different worlds. Neorealists study security issues and are concerned with issues of power and survival. Neo-liberals study political economy and focus on cooperation and institutions.

2) Neo-Realism

- i. Kenneth Waltz's structural realism has had a major impact on scholars in International Relations. Waltz claims that the structure of the international system is the key factor in shaping the behaviour of states. Waltz's neo-realism also expands our view of power and capabilities. However, he agrees with traditional Realists when he states that major powers still determine the nature of the international system.
- ii. Structural realists minimize the importance of national attributes as determinants of a state's foreign policy behaviour. To these neorealists, all states are functionally similar units, experiencing the same constraints presented by anarchy.
- iii. Structural realists accept many assumptions of traditional Realism. They believe that force remains an important and

effective tool of statecraft and balance of power is still the central mechanism for order in the system.

- iv. Joseph Grieco represents a group of neo-realists or modern realists who are critical of neo-liberal Institutionalists who claim states are mainly interested in absolute gains. Grieco claims that all states are interested in both absolute and relative gains. How gains are distributed is an important issue. Thus, there are two barriers to international cooperation: fear of those who might not follow the rules and the relative gains of others.
- v. Scholars in security studies present two versions of neo-realism or modern realism. Offensive neo-realists emphasize the importance of relative power. Like traditional Realists, they believe that conflict is inevitable in the international system and leaders must always be wary of expansionary powers. Defensive realists are often confused with neo-liberal Institutionalists. They recognize the costs of war and assume that it usually results from irrational forces in a society. However, they admit that expansionary states willing to use military force make it impossible to live in a world without weapons. Cooperation is possible, but it is more likely to succeed in relations with friendly states.

3) Neo-liberalism

- i. Neo-liberalism in the academic world refers most often to neoliberal Institutionalism. In the policy world, neo-liberalism is identified with the promotion of capitalism and Western democratic values and institutions.
- ii. Contemporary neo-liberalism has been shaped by the assumptions of commercial, republican, sociological, and institutional Liberalism.
- iii. Commercial and republican Liberalism provide the foundation for current neo-liberal thinking in Western governments. These countries promote free trade and democracy in their foreign policy programmes.
- iv. Neo-liberal Institutionalism, the other side of the neo-neo debate, is rooted in the functional integration theoretical work of the 1950s and 1960s and the complex interdependence and transnational studies literature of the 1970s and 1980s.

- v. Neo-liberal Institutionalists see institutions as the mediator and the means to achieve cooperation in the international system. Regimes and institutions help govern a competitive and anarchic international system and they encourage, and at times require, multilateralism and cooperation as a means of securing national interests.
 - vi. Neo-liberal Institutionalists recognize that cooperation may be harder to achieve in areas where leaders perceive they have no mutual interests.
 - vii. Neo-liberals believe that states cooperate to achieve absolute gains and the greatest obstacle to cooperation is 'cheating' or non-compliance by other states.
- 4) Comparative Analysis of Neo-Liberalism and Neo-Realism
- i. The neo-neo debate is not a debate between two polar opposite worldviews. They share an epistemology, focus on similar questions, and agree on a number of assumptions about international politics. This is an intra-paradigm debate.
 - ii. Neo-liberal Institutionalists and neo-realists study different worlds of international politics. Neo-realists focus on security and military issues. Neo-liberal Institutionalists focus on political economy, environmental issues, and, lately, human rights issues.
 - iii. Neo-realists explain that all states must be concerned with the absolute and relative gains that result from international agreements and cooperative efforts. Neo-liberal Institutionalists are less concerned about relative gains and consider that all will benefit from absolute gains.
 - iv. Neo-realists are more cautious about cooperation and remind us that the world is still a competitive place where self-interest rules.
 - v. Neo-liberal Institutionalists believe that states and other actors can be persuaded to cooperate if they are convinced that all states will comply with rules and cooperation will result in absolute gains.
 - vi. This debate does not discuss many important issues that challenge some of the core assumptions of each theory. For example, neorealism cannot explain foreign policy behaviour that challenges the norm of national interest over human interests.

5) Globalization and Neo-Liberalism and Neo-Realism

- i. Globalization has contributed to a shift in political activity away from the state. Transnational social movements have forced states to address critical international issues and in several situations that have supported the establishment of institutions that promote further cooperation, and fundamentally challenge the power of states.
- ii. Neo-realists think that states are still the principal actors in international politics. Globalization challenges some areas of state authority and control, but politics is still international.
- iii. Neo-realists are concerned about new security challenges resulting from uneven globalization, namely, inequality and conflict.
- iv. Globalization provides opportunities and resources for transnational social movements that challenge the authority of states in various policy areas. Neo-realists are not supportive of any movement that seeks to open critical security issues to public debate.
- v. Free market neo-liberals believe globalization is a positive force. Eventually, all states will benefit from the economic growth promoted by the forces of globalization. They believe that states should not fight globalization or attempt to control it with unwanted political interventions.
- vi. Some neo-liberals believe that states should intervene to promote capitalism with a human face or a market that is more sensitive to the needs and interests of all the people. New institutions can be created and older ones reformed to prevent the uneven flow of capital, promote environmental sustainability, and protect the rights of citizens.

6) Conclusion

Topic 8

Theories and Approaches; Post-modernism, Critical Theory, Feminism, Constructivism

Alternative Approaches to International Theory

- 1) Theories can be distinguished according to whether they are explanatory or constitutive and whether they are foundational or anti-foundational. As a rough guide, explanatory theories tend to be foundational and constitutive theories tend to be anti-foundational.
- 2) The three main theories comprising the inter-paradigm debate were based on a set of positivist assumptions.
- 3) Since the late 1980s there has been a rejection of positivism.
- 4) The current theoretical situation is one in which there are three main positions: first, rationalist theories that are essentially the latest versions of the Realist and Liberal theories; second, alternative theories that are post-positivist; and third, Social Constructivist theories that try to bridge the gap.
- 5) Alternative approaches at once differ considerably from one another, and at the same time overlap in some important ways. One thing that they do share is a rejection of the core assumptions of rationalist theories.
- 6) Historical sociology has a long history. Its central focus is with how societies develop the forms that they do. It is basically a study of the interactions between states, classes, capitalism, and war.
- 7) Charles Tilly looks at how the three main kinds of state forms that existed at the end of the Middle Ages eventually converged on one form, namely the national state. He argues that the decisive reason was the ability of the national state to fight wars.
- 8) Michael Mann has developed a powerful model of the sources of state power, known as the IEMP model.
- 9) The concerns of historical sociology are compatible with a number of the other approaches surveyed in this chapter including feminism and post-modernism.
- 10) Liberal feminism looks at the roles women play in world politics and asks why they are marginalized.

- 11) Marxist/socialist feminists focus on the international capitalist system and patriarchy.
- 12) Standpoint feminists want to correct the male dominance of our knowledge of the world.
- 13) Post-modernist feminists are concerned with gender as opposed to the position of women as such. They look into the ways in which masculinity and femininity get constructed.
- 14) Post-colonial feminists work at the intersection of gender, race, and class on a global scale. Lyotard defines post-modernism as incredulity towards metanarratives, meaning that it denies the possibility of foundations for establishing the truth of statements existing outside of discourse.
- 15) Foucault focuses on the power–knowledge relationship and sees the two as mutually constituted. It implies that there can be no truth outside of regimes of truth. How can history have a truth if truth has a history?
- 16) Derrida argues that the world is like a text in that has to be interpreted. He looks at how texts are constructed, and proposes two main tools to enable us to see how arbitrary the seemingly 'natural' oppositions of language actually are. These are deconstruction and double reading.
- 17) Given the state-centrism and positivism of IR, post-colonial approaches have been largely ignored until recently as old disciplinary boundaries are breaking down.
- 18) Post-colonialism essentially focuses on the persistence of colonial forms of power in contemporary world politics, especially how the social construction of racial, gendered, and class differences uphold relations of power and subordination.
- 19) Racism, in particular, continues to operate in both obvious and sometimes subtle ways in contemporary world politics but this is not captured in traditional approaches to international theory.
- 20) Post-colonial research seeks to offer positive resources for resistance to imperial and other forms of power and not just critique.

Social Constructivism

- 1) Constructivists are concerned with human consciousness, treat ideas as structural factors, consider the dynamic relationship between ideas and material forces as a consequence of how actors interpret their material reality, and are interested in how agents produce structures and how structures produce agents.
- 2) Knowledge shapes how actors interpret and construct their social reality.
- 3) The normative structure shapes the identity and interests of actors such as states.
- 4) Social facts such as sovereignty and human rights exist because of human agreement, while brute facts such as mountains are independent of such agreements.
- 5) Social rules are regulative, regulating already existing activities, and constitutive, making possible and defining those very activities.
- 6) Social construction denaturalizes what is taken for granted, asks questions about the origins of what is now accepted as a fact of life and considers the alternative pathways that might have produced and can produce alternative worlds.
- 7) Power can be understood not only as the ability of one actor to get another actor to do what she would not do otherwise but also as the production of identities and interests that limit the ability of actors to control their fate.
- 8) Although the meanings that actors bring to their activities are shaped by the underlying culture, meanings are not always fixed and the fixing of meaning is a central feature of politics.
- 9) Although Constructivism and rational choice are generally viewed as competing approaches, at times they can be combined to deepen our understanding of global politics.
- 10) The recognition that the world is socially constructed means that Constructivists can investigate global change and transformation.
- 11) A key issue in any study of global change is diffusion, captured by the concern with institutional isomorphism and the life-cycle of norms.
- 12) Although diffusion sometimes occurs because of the view that the model is superior, frequently actors adopt a model either because of external pressures or its symbolic legitimacy.

- 13) Institutional isomorphism and the internationalization of norms raise issues of growing homogeneity in world politics, a deepening international community, and socialization processes.

Gender in world politics: Feminism

- 1) Feminism is a movement dedicated to achieving political, social, and economic equality for women.
- 2) The goal of feminist theory is to explain why women are subordinated. Feminists believe that we cannot separate knowledge from political practice and that feminist knowledge should help improve women's lives.
- 3) There are a variety of feminist theories, such as liberal, Marxist, socialist, post-modern, and post-colonial. Each gives us different explanations for women's subordination.
- 4) Feminists define gender as distinct from sex. Gender is a set of socially constructed characteristics that define what we mean by masculinity and femininity. It is possible for women to display masculine characteristics and vice versa.
- 5) Gender is a system of social hierarchy in which masculine characteristics are more valued than feminine ones.
- 6) Gender is a structure that signifies unequal power relationships between women and men.
- 7) IR feminists use gender-sensitive lenses to help them answer questions about why women often play subordinate roles in global politics. IR feminists build on other IR theories, such as liberalism, critical theory, Constructivism, post-modernism, and post-colonialism. They go beyond them by introducing gender as a category of analysis.
- 8) Liberal feminists believe women's equality can be achieved by removing legal obstacles that deny women the same opportunities as men.
- 9) Post-liberal feminists disagree with liberal feminists. They claim that we must look more deeply at unequal gendered structures in order to understand women's subordination.
- 10) Feminist critical theory examines how both ideas and material structures shape people's lives. IR feminist critical theorists show how changes in the meaning of gender have changed the practices of international organizations over time.

- 11) Feminist constructivists show us the various ways in which ideas about gender shape and are shaped by global politics. Elisabeth Prügl shows us how these ideas shaped the framing of international legal conventions.
- 12) Post-modern feminists are concerned with the link between knowledge and power. They suggest that men have generally been seen as knowers and as subjects of knowledge. This influences how we see global politics.
- 13) Post-colonial feminists criticize Western feminists for basing feminist knowledge on Western women's lives and for portraying Third World women as lacking in agency. They suggest that women's subordination must be differentially understood in terms of race, class, and geographical location, and that all women should be seen as agents rather than victims.
- 14) Traditional stories about war portray men as protectors and women and children as being protected. In today's wars, women and children are being killed and injured in large numbers. This challenges the myth of protection.
- 15) War is associated with masculinity. Our image of a soldier is a heroic male. This image is being challenged by an increasing number of women in militaries around the world. There is a debate among policy-makers and in militaries, and even among some feminists, as to whether women should fight in military combat.
- 16) Militarized masculinity is popular when states are preoccupied with national security threats. This has larger consequences. Conciliatory options in policy-making tend to get discounted. It makes it difficult for women's voices to be seen as legitimate, particularly in matters of security policy.
- 17) Feminists define security broadly to include the diminution of all forms of violence, physical, economic, and ecological. The national security of states, defined in masculine terms that emphasize military strength, can cause a trade-off with the physical and economic security of individuals.
- 18) In every society, women are disadvantaged relative to men in terms of material well-being. We need to put on our gender lenses to

explain why. This gender-sensitive perspective helps us see how women's relative disadvantage is due to the gendered division of labour.

- 19) The gendered division of labour dates back to seventeenth century Europe and the subsequent separation of paid work in the public sphere from unpaid work in the private sphere. The role distinction between workers in the public and private spheres has an effect on the kind of work that women do in the public sphere.
- 20) Women are disproportionately clustered in low-paying jobs in garment industries and services. Home-based workers are predominantly women also. Women do more subsistence agriculture than men and men more often work with advanced agricultural technologies.
- 21) In addition to paid work, women perform most of the reproductive and caring labour in the private sphere. This is known as the double burden. The double burden constrains women's choices in the public sphere. When it is not paid, household labour is invisible in economic analyses.
- 22) We must not overgeneralize about the negative effects of the gendered division of labour. When women have more opportunities for waged work, this is empowering. However, women often perform the same tasks for lower wages than men.

Topic 9

International Political Security (IPS): Conceptualization of security in the Twenty-First century

1) Introduction

- a. Security is a 'contested concept'.
- b. The meaning of security has been broadened to include political, economic, societal, environmental, and military aspects.
- c. Differing arguments exist about the tension between national and international security.
- d. Different views have also emerged about the significance of 9/11 for the future of international security.
- e. Debates about security have traditionally focused on the role of the state in international relations.

2) Theorists View of Conceptualization of Security

a. Realists and Neo-realists

- i. Realists and neo-realists emphasize the perennial problem of insecurity.
- ii. The 'security dilemma' is seen by some writers as the essential source of conflict between states.
- iii. Trust is often difficult between states, according to realists and neo-realists, because of the problem of cheating.
- iv. Realists and neo-realists also point out the problem of 'relative gains' whereby states compare their gains with those of other states when making their decisions about security.
- v. Neo-realists reject the significance of international institutions in helping many to achieve peace and security.

b. Liberal Institutionalism

- i. Contemporary politicians and academics, who write under the label of Liberal Institutionalism see institutions as an important mechanism for achieving international security.
- ii. Liberal Institutionalists accept many of the assumptions of Realism about the continuing importance of military power in international relations, but argue that institutions can provide a framework for cooperation which can help to overcome the dangers of security competition between states.

c. Globalization

- i. can be seen in the fields of economic development, communications, and culture. Global social movements are also a response to new risks associated with the environment, poverty, and weapons of mass destruction.
- ii. The 'fracture of statehood' is giving rise to new kinds of conflict within states rather than between states which the state system cannot deal with. This has helped encourage an emerging politics of global responsibility.
- iii. There are disputes about whether globalization will contribute to the weakening of the state or simply to its transformation, and over whether a global society can be created which will usher in a new period of peace and security.

3) Six Major Catalysts Of Change

- a. New ideas about international relations
- b. Emergence of new threats and perceptions of threats
- c. Shift in the distribution of power and new international leadership
- d. New Warfare (including technological changes that bring it about)
- e. Domestic political change (including regime security and not necessarily democratization)
- f. Advocacy by international institutions

4) Changing Security Discourses

- a. National Security was the security concept which is the protection of a state's sovereignty and territorial integrity from external military attack in the 1940s, reason being Technological change/New warfare. Main National, Institutional and epistemic advocates in Asia were US, SEATO, and Five Power Defence Arrangements.
- b. In the 1960s Comprehensive Security started due to Domestic politics and regime legitimation. Non-traditional security (NTS) is protection of a state's institutions and governing capacity from non-military threats. Comprehensive security (East Asia): NS + NTS. Japan, Malaysia, Indonesia, ASEAN, ASEAN-ISIS were main advocates.

- c. Common/Cooperative Security in 1970s/1980s due to Ideational prior, institutions; Common Security is security with (as opposed to security against) a potential or actual adversary realized through transparency, mutual confidence and conflict resolution measures and mechanisms. Cooperative Security: Asia-Pacific rendering (localization) of common security (minus human rights)
- d. Human Security in 1990s-2000s whose main catalysts were Ideational prior, institutions, domestic political change
- e. Non-Traditional Security in 1990s-2000s due to New Threats and main advocates were China, ASEAN Plus Three, and NEAT.

5) China's new security doctrine

- a. Integrated security, calling for a comprehensive partnership, with intertwined traditional and non-traditional security threats.
- b. Common security. No country can address transnational security threats alone.
- c. Inclusive security, the third element, emphasizes the need for mutual trust, and rejects exclusive military alliances (reference to US alliances with Japan, South Korea and other Asia Pacific countries) which are targeted against other countries
- d. Cooperative security, implies that security is to be achieved through cooperation, which would involve mutually beneficial partnerships and leads to a "win-win" situation for all involved.
- e. Evolving security, it states that the understanding of security by China and other nations is not static, or dependent on short-term calculations or single incident, but a long-term process subject to changes that will overcome historical animosities.

6) Concept Of Security For Asia And The World In The 21st Century

- a. Looking at developments associated with new warfare and the growing academic and policy prominence of non-traditional security concepts, Asia seems still wedded to the idea of national security, the policy rhetoric of and speech acts by leaders and Track-II conferences notwithstanding
- b. National security remains especially dominant in Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia,

- c. While non-traditional security (although it does not necessarily conflict with national security) appears increasingly important in Southeast Asia.
- d. The rise of China, India and Japan is unlikely to change this equation, although China, driven by domestic concerns, is striving to achieve a balanced mix between national and nontraditional security.
- e. It seems to be dealing with its North East Asian neighbours in mainly national security terms, while adopting a primarily non-traditional security approach towards Southeast Asians.
- f. Human security, the most direct opposite of national security, remains a distant prospect in Asia.
- g. War as a national security referent is not dead, but its effects would reverberate ever more than before across national and sub-regional, even regional boundaries.
- h. In Asia today, the prevailing security paradigm consists of no single concept, but an interplay of national, non-traditional and human security ideas and approaches.
- i. Perhaps the new security concept for Asia and the world in the 21st century is better described as transnational security, incorporating national security events and instruments that have wide regional and international implications non-traditional security issues that challenge state institutions and governance capacity, and human security concerns that are fundamentally geared towards security, well-being and dignity for the people

7) Conclusion

- a. Recent redefinitions of security have come about as the result of factors other than the shifts in the distribution of power.
- b. the emergence of concepts such as common security, comprehensive security, and human security were slow-moving, voluntary and evolutionary constructions featuring ideas and debates that fundamentally reflected dissatisfaction with the orthodox notions of security
- c. The 9/11 attacks spawned the “new” doctrine of homeland security, which to many was nothing other than the return of the

national security state (Homeland security: internal security
measures against terrorism)

Topic 10

IPS: Power. Elements of National Power

1) Introduction

- I. The concept of power politics is far more useful in describing a dynamic world in which power is a means by which the demands for change and resistance to change are advanced. J.W. Burton
- II. Political power; a psychological relation between those who exercise it and those over whom it is exercised. It gives the former control over certain actions of the latter through the influence which the former exerts on the latter's mind.
- III. Whatever the ultimate aim of international politics, power is always the immediate aim.
- IV. Power involves control of the mind: "The political objective of war itself is not per se the conquest of territory and the annihilation of enemy armies, but a change in the mind of the enemy which will make him yield to the will of the victor" (p. 36)

2) Meaning of Power

- I. According to Hans J. Morgenthau power is a man's control over the minds and actions of other men. There are Four key distinctions;
 - i. Power v. influence: e.g., an advisor can have influence but not power to impose his will.
 - ii. Power v. force: the threat of force is inherent in politics but its use "signifies the abdication of political power in favor of military... power" (p. 33).
 - iii. Usable v. unusable power: the nuclear threat against a nuclear-armed enemy is cancelled out by the fear of reprisal, so it's unusable.
 - iv. Legitimate v. illegitimate power--whether based on laws and morals. Legitimate power is "likely... more effective"
- II. Power is a multi-faceted and complex notion, and it makes sense to think of the term under three headings, always bearing in mind that the three are inter related
 - i. Power is an attribute: something that people or groups or states possess or have access to

- ii. Power is a relationship: ability that people or groups or states have to exercise influence on others
 - iii. Property of a structure: power can only be exercised by an actor or agent
- 3) Domestic and International Power: Lack of generally agreed upon rules globally lead states having to protect their rights and rectifying injuries through use of force.
- 4) Foundations of National Power
- I. Geography; large size of a country leads to more power; territory swallows the conqueror (Japan unable to disintegrate China in its attack in 1937); helps in developing effective defense, topography Himalayas china india. Advancement in science and technology.
 - II. Natural Resources
 - III. Technology; industrial, communications and military
 - IV. Population
 - V. National Character and Morale; National morale is the degree of determination with which a nation supports the home and foreign policies of its government in times of peace or war.
 - VI. Economic Development
 - VII. Political Structure: Balance between resources and policy formulation leading to its execution by the government, while ensuring people's participation, through political institutions.
 - VIII. Ideological Element; Ideology definition
 - IX. Leadership; "without leadership people cannot even constitute a state; without it there can be no well-developed or integrated technology..." Palmer and Perkins
 - X. Military Preparedness
 - XI. Diplomacy: diplomacy is the brain of national power, as national morale is its soul. Morgenthau says "it is the quality of a nation's diplomacy which gives 'direction and weight' to other elements of national power.
- 5) Evaluation of National Power
- I. According to Hans the nations commit three types of errors in evaluating their own power and the power of other nations, viz., the relativity of power, the permanency of a certain factor and the fallacy of the single factor.

6) Limitations on National Power

I. The balance of power

- i. Pattern of Direct opposition: one state offers direct opposition to the other state with a view to preserve status quo.
- ii. Pattern of Competition: two nations compete with one another to establish control over the third nation.

II. International Morality: All states are expected to observe universally accepted moral code of conduct.

III. World Public Opinion

IV. International Law; formation of arrangements called collective security by a group of nations to oppose collectively.

V. Disarmament

VI. International Organization

7) Conclusion

Topic 11

IPS: Balance of Power

1) Definitions of Balance of Power

- a. The equilibrium of power among members of the family of nations as will prevent anyone of them from becoming sufficiently strong to enforce its will upon the others. (Prof. Sydney Bay) Formed opinion
- b. The distribution of existing power between states is based on an assessment of each state's relative power capabilities.

2) BoP from historical perspective

- a. From 1648(peace of Westphalia) to 1789 (French Revolution) was a golden age of classical balance of power, when the princes of Europe began accepting BoP as the supreme principle of foreign policy.
- b. The Concert of Europe (from 1815 to 1870) is also a good example of major European states striving to balance power. The increasing power of Germany began seeing bipolar sets of alliances leading to World Wars, and followed by the Cold War.

3) Techniques used to achieve BoP

- a. Alliances (NATO-U.S.) and Counter-Alliances (WARSAW Pact(in Poland)-Soviet Union) [In cold war]
- b. Armament (arms race in the subcontinent spurred by need to maintain BoP) and Disarmament (Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty)
- c. Intervention (Soviets and U.S. incursion in Afghanistan in the 1980's) and Non-Intervention (France and Britain's' non-interference in Spain's civil war of 1936)

4) Different Kinds of BOP

- a. **Simple or Complex:** Simple BoP requires parity between powers but in more complex situations competing powers can achieve balance from additional sources e.g. alliance.
- b. **General or Particular:** General BoP lacks preponderant power whereas Particular BoP can imply regional preponderance.

c. Subjective or Objective: BoP based on appearances is subjective and fragile whereas that based on actual capabilities is objective and more stable.

d. Fortuitous or Contrived: Fortuitous Bop is not based on particular policies (on luck or chance) whereas Contrived BoP is based on conscious policies of either or both sides.

5) Theories concerning Balance of Power(How Power is balanced)

a. Threat rather than power is balanced, so distance, interdependence, and ideology matter.

b. External balancing through alliances but risks dependency and requires trust (NATO, WARSAW Pact for example)

c. Internal Balancing by building own capacities (US-Soviet arms race)

6) Degree of Polarization

a. Tightness of poles-all states in one camp or other

b. Discreteness of poles-degree of interaction between states on each side(No contact indicates trouble)

c. Level of animosity

7) BOP and War

a. Truly unipolar system would make major war less frequent, since one state can prevent others from arming for war. (we can handle the nuclear power/capacity, you can't! they feel threatened. jahan power concentrate hoti jati hai wo yehi chahti hai k dosron ko power na milay kiun k us ki apni power threaten hoti hai) U.S. has become a hyper state cuz it could not retain its power)

b. War is most likely during transitions in balance. Rising power gains strength, challenges previously superior state and, given newness of capacities, war occurs because each side thinks it can win. (transition or flux creates uncertainty)(to acquire more power states constantly engage in war)

8) Morton Kaplan's Rules of BOP

a. All states act to increase capabilities but prefer to negotiate rather than fight.

b. All states fight rather than pass up an opportunity to increase their capabilities.

- c. All states stop fighting rather than eliminate an essential state.(destroy a state completely)
- d. All states act to oppose any coalition or single state which tends to assume a position of dominance within the system.
- e. All states act to constrain states who subscribe to supranational (having power or influence that transcends national boundaries) organizing principles.(who try to impose it on others)
- f. All states permit defeated or constrained states to re-enter the system as potential partners.

9) BoP in the Modern World

- a. Creation of superpowers made it impossible to negotiate individual BoP. (nuisance value of individual states had increased as both the superpowers wanted them to be on their side)
 - b. Increasing disparity between states has made maintaining BoP very difficult.
 - c. Ideological positioning makes switching sides very difficult in the multi-polar world. Everyone has their own ideology and they consider it superior among others.
-

Topic 12

Foreign Policy, Determinants, Decision Making and Analysis

1) Introduction

- i. *No foreign policy — no matter how ingenious — has any chance of success if it is born in the minds of a few and carried in the hearts of none. Henry A. Kissinger*
- ii. It is the The policy of a sovereign state in its interaction with other sovereign states
- iii. “The foreign policy of a country is in a sense a projection of its internal policies, social, political and economic.” (F. M. Muhammad Ayub Khan).

2) Stages of Foreign Policy

- i. Making Foreign policy makers follow the same five steps with which public policy gets made: Agenda setting: A problem or issue rises to prominence on the agenda.
- ii. Formulation: Possible policies are created and debated.
- iii. Adoption: The government adopts one policy.
- iv. Implementation: The appropriate government agency enacts the policy.
- v. Evaluation: Officials and agencies judge whether the policy has been successful.

3) Tools of Foreign

- i. Policy Diplomacy is the tool of foreign policy, and war, alliances, and international trade may all be manifestations of it.

4) Kinds of Diplomacy

- i. “Diplomacy is a game of chess in which the nations are checkmated.” (Karl Kraus)
- ii. **Track 1 Diplomacy:** Official discussions typically involving high-level political and military leaders and focusing on ceasefires, peace talks, and treaties and other agreements.
- iii. **Track 2 Diplomacy:** Unofficial dialogue and problem-solving activities aimed at building relationships and encouraging new thinking that can inform the official process. academic, religious, and NGO leaders and other civil society actors.

- iv. **Track 3 Diplomacy:** People-to-people diplomacy undertaken by individuals and private groups to encourage interaction and understanding between hostile communities and involving awareness raising and empowerment within these communities. meetings and conferences, generating media exposure, and political and legal advocacy for marginalized people and communities. SAFMA
- v. **Backchannel or Backdoor Diplomacy:** Secret lines of communication held open between two adversaries. It is often communicated through an informal intermediary or through a third party.
- vi. **Multitrack diplomacy;** A term for operating on several tracks simultaneously, including official and unofficial conflict resolution efforts

5) Approaches to Foreign Policy

- i. There are few kinds of approaches of foreign policy, which help in understanding the foreign policy but they are used in different period of history.
- ii. **Historical or Traditional Approaches;** these approaches have been adopted for the study of diplomatic events of a particular period with accuracy, precision, so as to learn lesson for future on the basis of past experience.
- iii. **Legalistic Approach** This approach lays emphasis on the study of foreign policy in legalistic terms. Efforts are made to study the external relations of the states in the light of international law, treaties, constitutional provisions etc.
- iv. **Descriptive Approach** The scholars adopting this approach pick up some specific problems or conceptual framework, using their own judgement on the weighing of various factors.
- v. **Analytical Approach** This approach differs from all other approaches of study not only with regards to the method but also in of international politics.
- vi. **Comparative Approach** The comparative approach for the study of foreign policies is of relatively recent origin and draws inspiration from the study of comparative government.

- i. **Ideological Approach** This approach tries to analyze foreign policy as an expression of the prevailing political, social or religious beliefs. Thus, the policies are classified as democratic or authoritarian; liberal and socialistic, peace-loving or aggressive. However, the study of foreign policy purely on ideological basis is not possible because when there is clash between ideology and rational interests, the former is abandoned.
- 6) Making foreign policy; Models of decision making
 - i. The foreign policy process is a process of decision making
 - ii. States take action because people in governments, decision makers, choose those actions
 - iii. Decision making is a strong process in which adjustments are made as a result of feedback from the outside world
 - iv. A common starting point for studying the decision-making process is the rational model. In this decision makers set goals, evaluate their relative importance, calculate the costs and benefits of each possible course of action, then choose the one with the highest benefits and lowest costs.
 - v. Alternative to this is organizational process model. In this, foreign policy decision makers generally skip the labor-intensive process of identifying goals and alternative actions, relying instead for most decisions on standardized responses or standard operating procedures.
 - vi. One more alternative is government bargaining (or Bureaucratic politics) model, in which foreign policy decisions result from the bargaining process among various government agencies with somewhat divergent interests in the outcome.
- 7) Determinants of Foreign Policy
 - i. Size
 - i. Size of State's territory as well as its population
 - ii. Leaders and people of countries with small territory and population do not expect their country to carry great weight in international affairs and vice versa
 - ii. Geography
 - i. Geography including its fertility, climate, location in relation to their land masses , and water ways influence this

- ii. A major factor in determining self-sufficiency of a country
- iii. Culture and History
 - i. Generally people possessing a unified common culture and historical experience can pursue an effective foreign policy because of the support of all sections of society who share the same values and memories.
- iv. Economic Developments
 - i. Generally, the industrially advanced countries feel more deeply involved in relation with other countries because they have to import different kinds of raw materials and commodities from other countries.
- v. Technology
 - i. It influences Foreign policy indirectly
 - ii. Countries which possess advance technology are able to provide technical know-how to less developed and developing nations and thus exert necessary influence on their foreign policies
- vi. National Capacity
 - i. It depends on its military preparedness, its technological advancements and economic development
- vii. Social Structure
 - i. A society which is sharply divided on the basis of wealth, religion, regional imbalances can't pursue effective Foreign policy on account of division and lack of co-operation among various groups.
- viii. Public mood
 - i. It usually follows rather than guides the top leading to progress
 - ii. It can exercise a lot of influence on the determination of a foreign policy if the basic realignment in the prevailing great power structure takes place and the state becomes more involve/isolated from world's affairs.
- ix. Political organization
 - i. Generally under authoritarian system, quick foreign policy decisions are possible because the decision making power rests with an individual assisted by his clique.

- ii. Under this system undesirable opposition can be suppressed through censorship and promulgation of regulations.
- x. Role of Process
 - i. It does so by supplying factual information on the basis of which the people take decision by publishing specialized articles on current international developments which enable the people to understand the significance of developments in their country in relation to the past developments and by analyzing the policy of the government in regard to foreign affairs.
- xi. Political Accountability
 - i. Generally in an open political system, the demands of citizen and group get articulated and transmitted to foreign policy formulation
- xii. Leadership
 - i. Qualities of leadership have a deep impact on the country's foreign policy but their role is greatly constrained by the government and social structure

Conclusion

Topic 13

Sovereignty

1) Introduction

- I. The term “Sovereignty” has been derived from the Latin word “Superanus” which means supreme or paramount
- II. Although the term “Sovereignty” is modern yet the idea of “Sovereignty” goes back to Aristotle who spoke of the “supreme power of the state”.
- III. Sovereignty is the central organizing principle of the system of states
- IV. A more sophisticated view of sovereignty now envisions states and nonstate actors as engaged in a continual process of renegotiating the nature of sovereignty
- V. Sovereignty is granted in a socio-legal context

2) Concept of Sovereignty

- I. “Sovereignty is the sovereign political power vested in him whose acts are not subject to any other and whose will cannot be overridden”. -Grotius
- II. In political theory, sovereignty is a substantive term designating supreme authority over some polity.
- III. Confusion regarding the concept due to these factors
 - i. Sovereignty is in fact a relatively recent innovation connected to the emergence of the nation-state as the primary unit of political organization.
 - ii. A number of contemporary issues have placed increasing limits on the exercise of sovereign authority.
- IV. It means the possession of absolute authority within a bounded territorial space.
 - i. Internal dimension: a sovereign government is a fixed authority with a settled population that possesses a monopoly on the use of force
 - ii. External dimension: sovereignty is the entry ticket into the society of states. Recognition on the part of other states, participating in diplomacy and international organizations on an equal footing

- 3) Prerequisites for a political community to be sovereign
 - I. Territory
 - II. Population
 - III. Effective Rule Over That Territory And Population
 - IV. Recognition Of Other Nation-States
- 4) Characteristics or Attributes of Sovereignty (Acc to Dr, Garner)
 - I. Permanence;
 - II. Exclusiveness; There cannot exist another sovereign state within the existing sovereign state.
 - III. All-Comprehensiveness; the sovereign power is universally applicable
 - IV. Inalienability; "Sovereignty can no more be alienated than a tree can alienate its right to sprout or a man can transfer his life or personality to another without self-destruction".
 - V. Unity.
 - VI. Imprescriptibility; if the sovereign does not exercise his sovereignty for a certain period of time, it does not lead to the destruction of sovereignty
 - VII. Indivisibility.
 - VIII. Absoluteness or illimitability.
 - IX. Originality; the sovereign wields power by virtue of his own right and not by virtue of anybody's mercy.
- 5) Concept of Sovereignty under Nation-State
 - I. It evolved in the 16th century in France during the conflict between the state and the church.
 - II. Many theorists have defined sovereignty. Hobbes focused on its absolutist aspect, while Austin focused on legalistic or juristic notions of sovereignty.
 - III. The modern doctrine of popular sovereignty has transferred the source of absolute power from the monarch to the people.
 - IV. The notion of sovereignty is important but it can become rigid unless applied to the evolving pattern of inter-state relations.
 - V. Most notably, it appears in Article 2, Principle #7 of the United Nations Charter: "Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall

require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII."

6) Historical Development

- I. The development of a system of sovereign states culminated in Europe at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. This agreement allowed the ruler to determine the religion within his borders.
- II. As Europe colonized much of the rest of the world from the fifteenth through the nineteenth centuries, the state system spread around the globe. sovereign authority was clearly not extended to non-Europeans, the process of drawing boundaries to clearly demarcate borders would be critical for defining sovereign states during decolonization.
- III. The second movement appears to be the gradual circumscription of the sovereign state, which began after World War II. Much of international law was designed to reinforce sovereignty.
- IV. The post-war period also saw the growth of intergovernmental organizations to help govern interstate relations in areas ranging from trade and monetary policy to security.
- V. Granting former colonies independence and recognizing them as sovereign states, they joined intergovernmental organizations and were ostensibly the equals of European states.
- VI. Now, sovereignty also entitles developing states to development assistance.
- VII. As a result, in many instances, these post-colonial states have lacked the internal dimension of sovereignty.

7) Contemporary Challenges

- I. The Rise Of Human Rights; The emergence of human rights as a subject of concern in international law effects sovereignty because these agreed upon principles place clear limits on the authority of governments to act within their borders.
- II. Economic Globalization; The growth of multinational corporations and the free flow of capital have placed constraints on states' ability to direct economic development and fashion social and economic policy.

- III. The Growth Of Supranational Institutions being partially driven by economic integration and the cause of human rights; supranational organizations have emerged as a significant source of authority that, at least to some degree, place limits on state sovereignty.
- IV. Transnational Terrorism: recent US action in Middle East suggests that sovereignty will be further constrained in the fight against transnational terrorism.

8) Conclusion

Topic 14

National Interest

1. Introduction

2. Origins Of National Interest

- a. The word 'interest' is derived from Latin and means 'it concerns, or it makes a difference to'
- b. In 1930 Charles Bears wrote the first book on national interest.
- c. In IR, national interest describes the underlying rationale for the behavior of states in a threatening global environment, which preserves and protects one's values against another.
- d. Statesmen who are responsible for and to their separate publics, and who operate in an uncertain milieu, often have little choice but to put the interest of their own entity above those of others.
- e. National interest is understood to mean a state of affairs valued solely for its benefit to the nation.
- f. National interest often becomes synonymous with national egoism, with its disposition of transferring self love onto the national group. (army esp in wars)
- g. One cannot speak about national interest without reference to values, even if they are a culmination of those held by some or all members of a given society.

3. What does national interest include?

- a. Scholars define national interest in various ways. Some put self-preservation (territorial integrity, political independence and fundamental government institutions) at the head of the list.
- b. Other categories of national interest focus on self-sufficiency, prestige and aggrandizement.(a sense missions, expand centers' of influence)
- c. Charles Bear focused on the notion of territory and commerce as being the defining features of national interest.
- d. Morgenthau says that a country's national interests should be proportionate to its capacities. (e.g. Britain and France after WWII had superpower ambitions, not commiserate to their capacities) the sun never sets on the british raj.

4. Criteria for defining National Interest

- a. **Ideological Criteria:** If one country's ideology is liberal-democratic, it will make policies supporting democratic governments and movements and oppose totalitarian ones.
- b. **Moral and legal Criteria:** The imperative to act honestly and make decisions in accordance with international laws.
- c. **Pragmatic Criteria:** Unemotional, calculated decisions to deal with ground realities.
- d. **Bureaucratic Criteria:** Each organization tends to exaggerate its specific funding request, and to argue in the name of national interest rather than its own interest.
- e. **Partisan Criteria:** To equate the success of one's own political party with an entire nation's success.
- f. **Racial Criteria:** National Interest defined in terms of an ethnic or racial minority or majority.
- g. **Class-status Criteria:** A particular class will defend its interests while defining national interest.
- h. **Foreign dependency Criteria:** Protector states define policy obligations of their dependencies.

5. Variations in National Interest

- a. **Primary Interests:** Preservation of physical, political and cultural identity of the nation-state.
- b. **Secondary Interests:** Protection of citizens abroad and ensuring diplomatic immunity of foreign missions.
- c. **Permanent Interests:** Long-term interests of strategic, ideological or economic nature which do not change easily, for example with changes in domestic policies.
- d. **Variable Interests:** Short term interests vary with cross-currents of personalities, public opinion, partisan politics, sectional interests etc
- e. **Complementary Interests:** Though not identical, these interests can serve as basis for agreement on specific issues e.e us pak security cooperation
- f. **Conflicting interests:** Interests which bring countries at odds with each other, Yet these interests can also undergo change due to varying internal circumstances and a changing external scenario.

- g. **General Interests:** Involve a large number of nations, such as economic interests or diplomatic norms
- h. **Specific interests :** Location and issue specific interests emerging from more general interests(e.g. bilateral terms of trade)
- i. **Identical Interests:** Interests held in common by different states(e.g. climate protection concerns)

6. The means to promote National Interest

- a. **Coercive means: Indirect** so they don't infringe directly on other sovereign nations (e.g. embargos, boycotts, severing diplomatic relations) or **Direct** (e.g. seizure of property of offending state, suspension of treaties), and if the other state responds with escalating moves, It leads to an outbreak of war
- b. **Alliances:** based on complementary or identical interests and strengthened by ideology, alliances can promote national interest.
- c. **Diplomatic Negotiations:** Common interests are most effectively perpetuated by means of diplomacy. Also useful in negotiating conflicting national interests without resorting to coercive means.
- d. **Economic Aid:** can only be used by affluent and developed states
- e. **Propaganda:** 'It is a systematic attempt to affect the minds, emotions and actions of a given group for a specific public purpose'
- f. **Collective Security:** The system of collective security, which operates on the principle that international peace and security is the common objective to be secured by all the states through collective action against any violation of internal peace and security, also restricts the national power.

7. National Interest and Foreign Policy

- a. Defense of the state is naturally the primary concern of foreign policy.
- b. Promotion of economic interest, including securing favorable conditions of trade, is a vital objective of foreign policy-makers.
- c. Maintenance of international peace, respect for international law, pacific settlement of international disputes and strengthening of the system of international organization.
- d. There are some world leaders who believe that their foreign policy must be committed to a certain ideology, such as propagation of

Fascism or communism or the containment of communism. But, realist statesmen emphasize only the national interest. Consequently, the role of ideology has lately declined.

8. National vs. Global Interests

- a. Given the complexities of International politics, Morgenthau for example opposes state action based on universal principles. Instead he advocates a pragmatic approach of acting based on national interests.
 - b. Yet, issues of global concern like growing inequalities and environmental problems require world leaders to think beyond the narrow ambit of national interests.
-

Topic 15

Strategic Approach to International Relation: War

1) Introduction

2) The Changing Character Of War

- i. War has been a central feature of human history. Since the end of the cold war both the frequency and lethality of war has shown a sharp decline.
- ii. War between the great powers in particular has become much more unlikely than in previous eras. Changes in the international system may be changing the character of war.
- iii. War in the contemporary era is not always easy to define. War is a brutal form of politics.
- iv. Contemporary warfare is being influenced by globalization.
- v. War requires highly organized societies. War can be a powerful catalyst for change.
- vi. The nature of war remains constant, but its form reflects the particular era and environment in which it occurs. Dramatic technological advances mean that a revolution in military affairs may be underway. Few states currently possess such technology.
- vii. The 'information age' is increasingly reflected in 'information warfare'. Opponents with little or no access to RMA technology are likely to use 'asymmetric warfare' to fight the war on their own terms.
- viii. Most recent conflicts have been characterized by the kind of ferocity that was typical of 'modern' war, but overall casualty levels have been much lower. The post-modern age has seen warfare take numerous, varied forms.

3) Types of War

i. Introduction

- i. Although all wars are violent, not all wars are the same. In fact, there are many different types of wars, which can be classified according to which people actually fight, the intensity of the conflict, and the extent of combatants' use of violence, among other factors.

ii. Total war

- i. A total war is a war in which combatants use every resource available to destroy the social fabric of the enemy.
- ii. Total wars are highly destructive and are characterized by mass civilian casualties because winning a total war often requires combatants to break the people's will to continue fighting.
- iii. World Wars I and II were total wars, marked by the complete destruction of the civilian economy and society in many countries, including France, Germany, the Soviet Union, Italy, Great Britain, and Japan.

iii. Limited war

- i. A limited war is a war fought primarily between professional armies to achieve specific political objectives without causing widespread destruction.
- ii. Although the total of civilian casualties may be high, combatants do not seek to completely destroy the enemy's social and economic frameworks.
- iii. The Persian Gulf War of 1990–1991 was a limited war in which the United States and its allies forcibly removed Iraqi troops from Kuwait.

iv. Guerrilla war

- i. A guerrilla war is a war in which one or both combatants use small, lightly armed militia units rather than professional, organized armies.
- ii. Guerrilla fighters usually seek to topple their government, often enjoying the support of the people.
- iii. These wars are often very long but also tend to be successful for the insurgents as evidenced by Mao Zedong's victory over Chiang Kai-shek in China in the 1940s, the Vietcong's victory over the United States in the Vietnam War, and the Mujahideen's victory over the Soviet Union in Afghanistan in the 1980s.

v. Civil war

- i. A civil war is a war fought within a single country between or among different groups of citizens who want to control the

government and do not recognize another group's right to rule.

- ii. Civil wars are almost always total wars because each side feels compelled to destroy the enemy's political support base.
- iii. Regional rifts, such as the American Civil War between the North and the South, characterize some civil wars, whereas other civil wars have been fought among ethnic rivals, religious rivals, and rival clans. Revolutions can spark civil wars as well.

vi. Proxy war

- i. A proxy war is a war fought by third parties rather than by the enemy states themselves. Many of the militarized conflicts during the Cold War, such as the Korean War and the Vietnam
- ii. War, can be interpreted as proxy wars between the United States and the Soviet Union, neither of which wanted to fight each other directly.

vii. Categorizing Wars

- i. A war can often be a limited war, a guerrilla war, and a civil war all at the same time.
- ii. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 is a great example. The United States sent trainers, money, and weapons to Afghan rebels to fight against the invaders, making it a low-intensity, limited conflict from the U.S. point of view. The Afghan resistance mostly relied on guerrilla tactics. And the war split Afghanistan, so it was also a civil war.

viii. Intervention

- i. Intervention is a fairly common way for a third-party state to get involved in a civil war or a war between two or more other states.
- ii. A state intervenes when it sends troops, arms, money, or goods to help another state that is already at war.
- iii. During the Cold War, the term intervention was used to describe one of the superpowers becoming involved in a smaller country's war (often a developing country).

- iv. But states sometimes intervene in order to bring peace. This type of intervention occurs when a country (or countries) sends military forces into another state to act as peacekeepers or to block other forces from attacking. Sometimes these interventions are organized or conducted by the United Nations or another international governmental organization.
- v. Example: The United States, along with other NATO nations, sent troops into the former Yugoslavia on a number of occasions to protect people from war. A successful example of this peaceful intervention occurred during the 1999 U.S. bombing campaign in Kosovo, which helped stop a slaughter of Kosovars by attacking Serbs.
- ix. 'Virtual war', with few casualties, is an attractive option, but is extremely difficult and probably impossible to achieve in practice.
- x. 'New wars', following state collapse, are often conflicts over identity as much as territory. The new wars in fact follow a pattern of warfare that has been typical since the late 1950s. Such conflicts typically occur in countries where development is lacking and there is significant economic insecurity
- xi. Asymmetric War
 - i. Asymmetric warfare can describe a conflict in which the resources of two belligerents differ in essence and in the struggle, interact and attempt to exploit each other's characteristic weaknesses.
 - ii. Such struggles often involve strategies and tactics of unconventional warfare, the weaker combatants attempting to use strategy to offset deficiencies in quantity or quality. Such strategies may not necessarily be militarized.
 - iii. The 9/11 terrorist attacks and the war in Afghanistan are among the best-known recent examples of asymmetric warfare: conflicts between nations or groups that have disparate military capabilities and strategies.

4) Causation of War

- i. opposing interests and capabilities (specific sociocultural differences and similarities between the parties),

- ii. contact and salience (awareness),
- iii. significant change in the balance of powers,
- iv. individual perceptions and expectations,
- v. a disrupted structure of expectations,
- vi. a will-to-conflict.
- vii. It is aggravated by; sociocultural dissimilarity, cognitive imbalance, status difference, coercive state power.
- viii. It is inhibited by; sociocultural similarity, decentralized or weak, coercive state power.
- ix. It is triggered by: perception of opportunity, threat, or injustice, surprise.

5) Conclusion

Topic 16

Strategic Culture, Determinants of Pakistani Strategic Culture.

1) Introduction

- a. 'Strategic culture can be defined as a set of beliefs, attitudes and norms towards the use of military force', often moulded according to historical experience
- b. It serves as a screen through which the policymakers observe the dynamics of the external security environment, interpret the available information and decide about the policy options in a given situation.
- c. Determine the role and efficacy of military force in interstate political affairs
- d. Strategic culture is a useful concept for explaining the profile and behavior of the security policymakers of a state.
- e. It conditions their worldview, interpretation of political and military developments, perception of the adversary, and selection of policy options.

2) Influencing factors for Pakistan's Security Managers

- a. historical experiences, especially in the early years of independence
- b. their perception of the regional security environment and
- c. Pakistan's security handicaps, and their threat perceptions.

3) Features of Pakistan's Strategic Culture

- a. An acute insecurity developed in the early years of independence due to troubled relations with India and problems with Afghanistan.
- b. A strong distrust of India and a history of acrimonious Indo-Pakistani relations reinforced by the historical narratives of the pre-independence period and the troubled bilateral interaction in the post-independence period.
- c. Aversion to an India-dominated regional power arrangement for South Asia.
- d. An active search for security to maintain its independence in deciding about foreign policy options and domestic policies.

- e. A close nexus between Islam and strategic thinking, leading to connections between Islamic militancy and foreign policy.

4) Determinants of Pakistan's Strategic Culture

- a. an advocacy of a pluralist power arrangement for South Asia
- b. greater attention to external security
- c. acquisition of military capacity to raise the cost of war for the adversary
- d. liberal allocation of resources to defense
- e. weapons procurement from abroad
- f. the use of diplomacy and alliance-building with other states, especially with the United States, for strengthening its position in the region
- g. the acquisition of an overt nuclear status in response to India's nuclear explosions
- h. the use of Islamic militancy to pursue foreign policy goals.

5) Role of Other Factors in the formulation of Strategic Culture

- a. Realism, Professionalism and organizational imperatives
- b. As a professional and disciplined institution, the Pakistani military cannot be oblivious to realities on the ground.
- c. Realism and organizational imperatives have influenced their outlook and decisions on many occasions.
- d. At times, the dictates of different approaches conflict with each other and the policymakers may be unwilling or unable to make a clear-cut choice. This is the case with the approach of Pakistan's security managers towards the militant Islamic groups in the post-9/11 period.

6) Significance of Strategic Culture

- a. The strategic culture approach helps us understand the historical and psychological dynamics of decisionmaking.
- b. It highlights the impact of ideological and other societal variables on policymaking
- c. It offers a better understanding of the socio-cultural and political context within which the policymakers function.
- d. Any study of a state's strategic profile and the possible reaction to security pressures requires, inter alia, a good appreciation of the strategic culture of the country concerned.

- e. This facilitates communication between the security policymakers and the outside actors, i.e., individuals, states, and organizations, on security-related issues and helps to identify ways and means to change their policy outputs.
- f. This is quite important for promoting arms control in conventional and nonconventional fields.

7) Conclusion

Topic 17

International Political Economy; Theories in IPE: Mercantilism, Economic Liberalism, and Neo- Marxism

- 1) Introduction
- 2) Evolution of International Political Economy
 - i. Immediately after the Second World War international institutions were created to facilitate cooperation in the world-economy.
 - ii. The onset of the cold war postponed the operation of these institutions, as the United States stepped in directly to manage the reconstruction of Europe and the international monetary system based on the dollar.
 - iii. The Bretton Woods system of managed exchange rates and capital flows operated until its breakdown in 1971 when the USA announced it would no longer convert the dollar to gold.
 - iv. The 1970s were marked by a lack of international economic cooperation among the industrialized countries, which floated their exchange rates and indulged in new forms of trade protectionism.
 - v. Developing countries' dissatisfaction with the international system came to a head in the 1970s when they pushed unsuccessfully for a new international economic order.
 - vi. Trade negotiations were broadened to include many new areas but this led to later resistance from emerging economies.
 - vii. In 2007 a power shift became more obvious in the global economy, with emerging economies such as China and India playing a more prominent role in negotiations in trade, finance, and development assistance.
- 3) Different Theorists and International Political Economy
 - i. Rational choice explains outcomes in IPE as the result of actors' choices, which are assumed always to be rationally power or utility maximizing within given particular incentives and institutional constraints.

- ii. Institutionalists apply rational choice to states in their interactions with other states in order to explain international cooperation in economic affairs.
 - iii. Constructivist approaches pay more attention to how governments, states, and other actors construct their preferences, highlighting the role of identities, beliefs, traditions, and values in this process.
 - iv. Neo-Gramscians highlight that actors define and pursue their interests within a structure of ideas, culture, and knowledge which itself is shaped by hegemonic powers. Institutionalists argue that international institutions will play an important and positive role in ensuring that globalization results in widely spread benefits in the world-economy.
 - v. Realists and neo-realists reject the institutionalist argument on the grounds that it does not account for the unwillingness of states ever to sacrifice power relative to other states.
 - vi. Constructivists pay more attention to how governments, states, and other actors construct their preferences, highlighting the role that state identities, dominant beliefs, and ongoing debates and contestation plays in this process.
- 4) International Political Economy in an Age Of Globalization
- i. Globalization poses some new constraints for all states, including the most powerful. In particular, the emergence of global capital markets means that all governments have to be cautious in their choice of exchange rate and interest rate policies.
 - ii. On other issues of economic policy, wealthier and more powerful countries are less constrained by globalization than is portrayed by the globalists. This is because the firms and investors whom governments are keen to attract are not solely concerned with levels of taxation and wages. They are equally concerned with factors such as the skills of the workforce, the provision of infrastructure, and proximity to markets.
 - iii. At the international level the more powerful states in the system get to set (and enforce) many of the rules of the new global economy.
- 5) Theories; Mercantilism

i. Introduction

- i. The main goal was to increase a nation's wealth by imposing government regulation concerning all of the nation's commercial interests. It was believed that national strength could be maximized by limiting imports via tariffs and maximizing exports.
- ii. Beginning around 1650, the British government pursued a policy of mercantilism in international trade.
- iii. Mercantilism stipulates that in order to build economic strength, a nation must export more than it imports.
- iv. To achieve this favorable balance of trade, the English passed regulatory laws exclusively benefiting the British economy.
- v. These laws created a trade system whereby Americans provided raw goods to Britain, and Britain used the raw goods to produce manufactured goods that were sold in European markets and back to the colonies.
- vi. As suppliers of raw goods only, the colonies could not compete with Britain in manufacturing. English ships and merchants were always favored, excluding other countries from sharing in the British Empire's wealth.

ii. Triangular Trade

- i. British mercantilism manifested itself in the form of the triangular trade. Trade routes linked the American Colonies, West Indies, Africa, and England. Each port provided shippers with a payoff and a new cargo. New England rum was shipped to Africa and traded for slaves, which were brought to the West Indies and traded for sugar and molasses, which went back to New England. Other raw goods were shipped from the colonies to England, where they were swapped for a cargo of manufactured goods.
- ii. Mercantilism and the triangular trade proved quite profitable for New England tradesmen and ship builders. But in the Southern Colonies, where the Navigation Acts vastly lowered tobacco prices, economies suffered. The triangular trade also spurred a rise in the slave population

and increased the merchant population, forming a class of wealthy elites that dominated trade and politics throughout the colonies.

iii. Tenets of Mercantilism

1. That every little bit of a country's soil be utilized for agriculture, mining or manufacturing.
2. That all raw materials found in a country be used in domestic manufacture, since finished goods have a higher value than raw materials.
3. That a large, working population be encouraged.
4. That all export of gold and silver be prohibited and all domestic money be kept in circulation.
5. That all imports of foreign goods be discouraged as much as possible.
6. That where certain imports are indispensable they be obtained at first hand, in exchange for other domestic goods instead of gold and silver.
7. That as much as possible, imports be confined to raw materials that can be finished [in the home country].
8. That opportunities be constantly sought for selling a country's surplus manufactures to foreigners, so far as necessary, for gold and silver.
9. That no importation be allowed if such goods are sufficiently and suitably supplied at home.

6) Economic Liberalism

- i. Economic liberalism is the ideological belief in organizing the economy on individualist and voluntarist lines, meaning that the greatest possible number of economic decisions are made by individuals and not by collective institutions or organizations.
- ii. It includes a spectrum of different economic policies, such as freedom of movement, but it is always based on strong support for a market economy and private property in the means of production.
- iii. Although economic liberalism can also be supportive of government regulation to a certain degree, it tends to oppose

government intervention in the free market when it inhibits free trade and open competition.

- iv. However, economic liberalism may accept government intervention in order to remove private monopoly, as this is considered to limit the decision power of some individuals.
- v. While economic liberalism favours markets unfettered by the government, it maintains that the state has a legitimate role in providing public goods.
- vi. Economic liberalism is most often associated with support for free markets and private ownership of capital assets, and is usually contrasted with similar ideologies such as social liberalism and social democracy, which generally favor alternative forms of capitalism such as welfare capitalism, state capitalism, or mixed economies.
- vii. Economic liberalism also contrasts with protectionism because of its support for free trade and open markets.
- viii. Historically, economic liberalism arose in response to mercantilism and feudalism. Today, economic liberalism is also generally considered to be opposed to non-capitalist economic orders, such as socialism and planned economies

7) Neo-Marxism

- i. Neo-Marxism is a pretty loose term, and tends to encompass most of the trends of Marxist philosophy arising from the New Left.
- ii. There is certainly no unified ideology of Neo-Marxism in the way that there is in orthodox Marxism, and many of the former's currents are in fact not in agreement with one another.
- iii. Broadly, Neo-Marxism seeks to answer questions traditional or orthodox Marxism cannot, especially in light of technological advances and economic and political developments that Marx and Engels did not address or foresee.
- iv. The most influential and important current in Neo-Marxist thought is the Frankfurt School, which founded the Institute for Social Research in 1923.
- v. The Frankfurt School is critical of both capitalism and Soviet state communism, and sought to rectify the inadequacies of traditional Marxist theory. To do so, they draw from other schools of thought,

- such as antipositivist sociology, Weberian sociology, psychoanalysis, and existentialism.
- vi. Beyond the ISR, the original Frankfurt School thinkers were only loosely affiliated as a group, but they shared a common philosophical approach, and a belief that a different path of socio-economic development from Soviet communism was needed.
 - vii. The current of Neo-Marxist thought that is probably the most important and influential historically and today is Dependency Theory, which originated with the work of Hans Singer and Raúl Prebisch.
 - viii. In Dependency Theory, economic processes are largely defined as external and based on a core-periphery model of a world economy, rather than the internal approach of orthodox Marxism that sees economic exploitation occurring on a nation-state scale.
 - ix. Much of the work in the Dependency Theory school was done on Latin America and the decolonizing world by scholars such as Andre Gunder Frank and Samir Amin.
 - x. Today, Dependency Theory has evolved into World Systems Theory, whose originator and leading scholar is Immanuel Wallerstein.
 - xi. World Systems Theory expands on many of the basic ideas of Dependency Theory, but is an even more macro approach to economic and social change, arguing that nation-states should not be the basic unit of socio-economic analysis at all, but rather that international economic systems themselves are the key.

8) Conclusion

Topic 18

IPE: Theories of Imperialism, Dependence and Interdependence discourse

1) Introduction

- i. a policy of extending a country's power and influence through colonization, use of military force, or other means.
- ii. Imperialism is a type of advocacy of empire. Its name originated from the Latin word "imperium", which means to rule over large territories.
- iii. Imperialism is "a policy of extending a country's power and influence through colonization, use of military force, or other means". Imperialism has greatly shaped the contemporary world.
- iv. The term imperialism has been applied to Western (and Japanese) political and economic dominance especially in Asia and Africa in the 19th and 20th centuries. Its precise meaning continues to be debated by scholars. Some writers, such as Edward Said, use the term more broadly to describe any system of domination and subordination organised with an imperial center and a periphery
- v. Imperialism is defined as "an unequal human and territorial relationship, usually in the form of an empire, based on ideas of superiority and practices of dominance, and involving the extension of authority and control of one state or people over another."

2) Dependency Theory

i. Introduction

- i. Dependency theory is the notion that resources flow from a "periphery" of poor and underdeveloped states to a "core" of wealthy states, enriching the latter at the expense of the former. It is a central contention of dependency theory that poor states are impoverished and rich ones enriched by the way poor states are integrated into the "world system".
- ii. The theory arose as a reaction to modernization theory, an earlier theory of development which held that all societies progress through similar stages of development, that today's underdeveloped areas are thus in a similar situation to that

of today's developed areas at some time in the past, and that therefore the task in helping the underdeveloped areas out of poverty is to accelerate them along this supposed common path of development, by various means such as investment, technology transfers, and closer integration into the world market.

- iii. Dependency theory rejected this view, arguing that underdeveloped countries are not merely primitive versions of developed countries, but have unique features and structures of their own; and, importantly, are in the situation of being the weaker members in a world market economy.
- iv. Dependency theory no longer has many proponents as an overall theory, but some writers have argued for its continuing relevance as a conceptual orientation to the global division of wealth.

ii. Premises of Dependency Theory

- i. Poor nations provide natural resources, cheap labour, a destination for obsolete technology, and markets for developed nations, without which the latter could not have the standard of living they enjoy.
- ii. Wealthy nations actively perpetuate a state of dependence by various means. This influence may be multifaceted, involving economics, media control, politics, banking and finance, education, culture, and sport.

iii. Criticism

- i. Corruption: State-owned companies have higher rates of corruption than privately owned companies.
- ii. Lack of competition: By subsidizing in-country industries and preventing outside imports, these companies may have less incentive to improve their products, to try to become more efficient in their processes, to please customers, or to research new innovations.
- iii. Sustainability: Industries reliant on government support may not be sustainable for very long particularly in poorer

countries and countries which largely depend on foreign aid from more developed countries.

- iv. Domestic opportunity costs: Subsidies on domestic industries come out of state coffers and therefore represent money not spent in other ways, like development of domestic infrastructure, seed capital or need-based social welfare programs. At the same time, the higher prices caused by tariffs and restrictions on imports require the people either to forgo these goods altogether or buy them at higher prices, forgoing other goods.

3) Political Theories

- i. Examples: Morgenthau, Cohen
- ii. Imperialism is simply a manifestation of the balance of power and is the process by which nations try to achieve a favorable change in the status quo. The purpose of imperialism is to decrease the strategic and political vulnerability of a nation. Fashoda

4) Conservative Theories

- i. Examples: Disraeli, Rhodes, Kipling
- ii. Imperialism is necessary to preserve the existing social order in the more developed countries. It is necessary to secure trade, markets, to maintain employment and capital exports, and to channel the energies and social conflicts of the metropolitan populations into foreign countries. There is a very strong ideological and racial assumption of Western superiority within this body of thought. The Philippines and The Belgian Congo

5) Liberal Theories

- i. Examples: Hobson, Angell
- ii. Imperialism is a policy choice, not an inevitable consequence of capitalism. Increasing concentration of wealth within the richer countries leads to underconsumption for the mass of people. Overseas expansion is a way to reduce costs (and thereby increase or maintain profit levels) and to secure new consumption. Overseas expansion is not inevitable, however. A state can solve the problem of underconsumption by increasing the income levels of the majority of the population either through legislation concerning wage levels (minimum wage laws, legalization of

unions, child labor laws) or through income transfers (unemployment compensation, welfare).

6) Marxist Theories

- i. Example: Lenin
- ii. Imperialism also arises because increased concentration of wealth leads to underconsumption. However, since the state represents the capitalist interest it is not possible to reduce underconsumption effectively through liberal strategies. Both strategies involve taking away money from the bourgeoisie and Marx and Lenin did not view this strategy as possible. Ultimately, according to Lenin, the world would be completely divided up and the rich countries would then fight over the redivision of the world. This analysis served as his explanation for World War I.

7) Social-Psychological Theories

- i. Example: Schumpeter
- ii. Imperialism is objectless expansion, a pattern simply learned from the behavior of other nations and institutionalized into the domestic political processes of a state by a "warrior" class. This warrior class is created because of the need for defense, but, over time, the class will manufacture reasons to perpetuate its existence, usually through manipulation of crises.
- iii. These theories have been updated and modified by theorists who see an alliance between the warrior class and corporate interests.

8) Conclusion

Topic 19

International political community: Nationalism

1) Introduction

- i. "This term is used in two related senses. In the first usage, nationalism seeks to identify a behavioral entity - the nation - and thereafter to pursue certain political and cultural goals on behalf of it. In the second usage, nationalism is a sentiment of loyalty toward the nation which is shared by people."
- ii. Nationalism claims that the nation exists and should form the basis of the political order.
- iii. Nationalism can be considered as ideology, as sentiments, and as politics.
- iv. There are different typologies of nationalism, such as ethnic/civic, elite/mass, state-strengthening/state-subverting.
- v. The most important debates on nationalism concern whether it is cause or consequence of nation, the relative importance of culture, economics and politics, and the different roles played by internal and external factors.

2) Different Aspects of Nationalism

- i. It is impossible to define a 'nation-state' in objective terms without accepting the assumptions of nationalism. Therefore, nation-state will be defined largely in terms of its self-description and that of the international community.
- ii. There is no simple sequence leading either from nationalism to nation-state formation to changes in the global political order or the other way round.
- iii. There is no single, dominant form of nationalism. Instead it can take ethnic, civic, and other forms, be elite or popular, strengthen or subvert existing states.
- iv. The best place to start is with the central political actors. These are the most important state or states in each historical phase.

3) Evolution of Nationalism

- i. The political ideology of states matters most because they have the most power and others tend to respond to their power and ideologies. At the start of our history global conflict is shifting

- power to extensive middle classes in Britain and France, and the national idea justifies demands for reforms which challenge 'top-down' ideals of power based on religion, monarchy, and privilege.
- ii. Once the process is in motion it develops its own momentum. British victory over France popularizes its liberal, constitutionalist nationalism which is taken up in imitative form by elites elsewhere. These elites are able, especially when linked to modernizing states like Prussia, Japan, and the North in the American Civil War, to form powerful nation-states.
 - iii. Those nation-states generate new forms of nationalism. Subordinate nationalities react against new state nationalism. These states take up illiberal, imperialist nationalism to challenge British hegemony. Such imperialist nationalism provokes colonial societies to develop counter-nationalism.
 - iv. State-subverting nationalism usually cannot on its own defeat imperial powers. Also important is that those powers are weakened in global conflict with each other. Therefore the ability of state-subverting nationalism to form nation-states is based on a combination of its own social base and political organization, the power and policy of the state it confronts, and a favourable international situation.
 - v. The sacrosanct principle of state sovereignty was weakened with the end of the cold war, new nation-state formation, and new economic and cultural forms of globalization.
 - vi. This provoked a first wave of state-subverting ethno-nationalisms which could lead to violence and ethnic cleansing.
 - vii. However, international recognition for new states as civic, territorial entities, along with new forms of intervention and pressure, put pressure on nationalism to move away from this ethnic and statesubverting character.
- #### 4) Conclusion
- i. There is a state-strengthening nationalism which focuses on the threats globalization pose to the nation-state. This nationalism can paradoxically get stronger the more the nation-state is weakened.

- ii. However, perhaps more important is the shift of nationalism away from a state focus towards concerns with devolution, cultural recognition, and transnational linkages. Nationalism, once again, is showing how adaptive it is to changes in the nature of global politics.

Topic 20: International political community: Globalization

1) Introduction

- i. Globalization is evident in the growing extensity, intensity, velocity, and deepening impact of worldwide interconnectedness.
- ii. Globalization denotes a shift in the scale of social organization, the emergence of the world as a shared social space, the relative deterritorialization of social, economic, and political activity, and the relative denationalization of power.
- iii. Globalization can be conceptualized as a fundamental shift or transformation in the spatial scale of human social organization that links distant communities and expands the reach of power relations across regions and continents.
- iv. Globalization is to be distinguished from internationalization and regionalization.
- v. The contemporary phase of globalization has proved more robust in the aftermath of 9/11 than the sceptics recognize. Contemporary globalization is a multidimensional, uneven, and asymmetrical process.
- vi. Globalization is transforming but not burying the Westphalian ideal of sovereign statehood. It is producing the disaggregated state.

2) What is globalization?

- i. Material aspects: Communication and transportation, Manufacturing and finance, Movement of people and goods, Standardization, Institutional links, Ecological commons
- ii. Immaterial aspects: Closeness of identification and values, Cultural (including linguistic) similarities, Symbols of politics and organization, Shared ideas and ideologies

3) Types of Globalization (based on Robert Kudrle)

- i. Communication globalization: Economic effect, Cultural effect, Comparison effect
 - ii. Market globalization: Trade, Capital mobility, Labor mobility, Options for states
 - iii. Direct globalization: The environmental “commons”, Other public goods: “existence value”, Labor rights and human rights, Enforcement patterns and issues
- 4) International Relations and Globalization
- i. From sovereignty to transsovereignty: Terrorism, Criminal gangs, Infectious disease, New actors, new norms, new regimes, new networks
 - ii. International organizations at the end of the twentieth century: States and beyond, International civil service, Interactions with nongovernmental organizations, Reform of the United Nations, New round of negotiations in WTO, Governance by international conferences
 - iii. Civil society: Multinational corporations, NGOs, Participation and democratization
- 5) Evaluating globalization: light and shadow
- i. Rescue from poverty vs. increasing gap between rich and poor
 - ii. Advanced medical treatment vs. epidemics on a global scale
 - iii. Policies to protect the environment vs. global environmental pollution and warming
 - iv. The good and bad sides of the information society
- 6) Globalization and Global Politics
- i. Globalization requires a conceptual shift in our thinking about world politics from a primarily geopolitical perspective to the perspective of geocentric or global politics—the politics of worldwide social relations.
 - ii. Global politics is more accurately described as distorted global politics because it is afflicted by significant power asymmetries.
 - iii. Globalization creates a double democratic deficit in that it places limits on democracy within states and new mechanisms of global governance which lack democratic credentials.
 - iv. Global politics has engendered its own global political theory which draws upon cosmopolitan thinking.

- v. Cosmopolitanism offers an account of the desirability and feasibility of the democratization of global politics.
- vi. Distorted global politics can be interpreted as expressing a contest between the forces of statism and cosmopolitanism in the conduct and management of world affairs.

7) Globalization and The Transformation Of Political Community

- i. The members of a political community are usually committed to self-government. Because of expectations of war, states have tried to persuade their citizens to place obligations to the 'national community' ahead of duties to other associations. Most forms of political community in human history have not represented the nation or the people.
- ii. The idea that the state should represent the nation is a European development which has dominated politics for just over two hundred years.
- iii. War and capitalism are two reasons why the nation-state became the dominant form of political community.
- iv. The extraordinary power of modern states—the growth of their 'intensive' and 'extensive' power—made global empires possible.
- v. States have been the principal architects of global interconnectedness over the last five centuries. The global spread of the state and nationalism are key examples of global interconnectedness.
- vi. Citizenship rights developed by way of reaction to the growing power of modern states.
- vii. The demand to be recognized as a free and equal citizen began with struggles for legal and political rights to which welfare rights were added in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.
- viii. The stability of modern forms of political community has owed a great deal to the fact that citizens won these rights. Indeed, some modernization theorists in the 1960s believed that liberal democracies had largely solved the social conflicts of earlier centuries. Modernization theory also assumed that non-Western societies would emulate Western paths of development. This thesis resurfaced in the West at the end of the bipolar era. It was

linked with the belief that liberal democracies belong to a unique sphere of peace.

8) Globalization and Different Theorists

- i. Totalitarian states attempted to make the political community absolute. Liberal-democratic states recognize that their citizens value their membership of many communities alongside the nation-state.
- ii. Some liberals have argued that globalization promises a new era of peace between the great powers. This is a condition in which more cosmopolitan political communities may develop.
- iii. Many realists have argued that the war on terror and the renewed risk of nuclear proliferation indicate that globalization will not alter the basic features of world politics.
- iv. Huntington's notion of the Clash of Civilizations challenged the idea that globalization will lead to a world moral and political consensus.
- v. Cosmopolitan approaches which envisage an international system in which all individuals are respected as equal have flourished in the contemporary phase of globalization.
- vi. Communitarians argue that most people value their membership of a particular political community; they are unlikely to shift their loyalty from the nation-state to the human race.
- vii. Post-structuralists argue that all forms of political community contain the danger of domination or exclusion.

9) Globalization and Nationalism

- i. Globalization and fragmentation are two phenomena that challenge traditional conceptions of community and citizenship.
- ii. Ethnic fragmentation is one reason for the failed state in Europe as well as in the Third World, but demands for the recognition of cultural differences exist in all political communities.
- iii. Globalization theorists have defended cosmopolitan democracy on the grounds that national democracies are unable to influence the global forces which affect them.
- iv. The apex of nationalism in relations between the great powers occurred in the first half of the twentieth century.

- v. Nationalism remains a powerful force in the modern world but globalization and fragmentation have led to discussions about the possibility of new forms of political community.

10) Conclusion

Topic 21

Approaches to Peace: Diplomacy

1) Introduction

- i. Every foreign policy has two sides—one is the making (formulation) of the policy, and the other its implementation. If national interest is associated with the formulation part, diplomacy is linked with the implementation part of a foreign policy.

2) Definition and Use of diplomacy

- i. Diplomacy is the management of IR through negotiations or the method by which these relations are adjusted or managed.
- ii. Diplomacy tries to achieve the maximum objectives (national interests) with a minimum of costs in a system of politics where war remains a possibility.

3) Diplomacy from a historical perspective

- i. Rudimentary forms of diplomacy can be traced into ancient history but organized diplomacy became evident in the city-states of Greece (around 5 BC).
- ii. Envoys became negotiators rather than being just messengers.
- iii. During the middle ages (6th to 18th century) the scope of diplomacy did not grow much and diplomats were mostly confined to maintaining archives rather than negotiating them.
- iv. In the late middle ages, in Genova, the Duke of Milan (Italy) established the first foreign mission. But this was still diplomacy of the court rather than that of the people.
- v. After the American and French revolutions, diplomacy became more democratic and less aristocratic.
- vi. The Congress of Vienna (1815) laid down procedures for diplomatic immunities (safety) and defined diplomatic hierarchies.

4) How Diplomacy Functions

- i. Diplomacy functions through a network of foreign officers, embassies, consulates, and special missions operating around the globe.

- ii. Diplomacy is bilateral in character but as a result of growing international and regional organizations, it is becoming increasingly multi lateral in character.

5) What's the difference between Diplomacy and Foreign Policy (FP)?

- i. Diplomacy is one of the instruments for the application of foreign policy. In that sense, diplomacy as a concept is narrower in scope than foreign policy.
- ii. Diplomacy is the method and process by which foreign policy is pursued but it is not a policy onto itself. (diplomat is a cricketer, cricket or FP remains the same)
- iii. Outcome of diplomatic negotiations can affect foreign policy options.

6) Traditional vs. Modern Diplomacy

- i. Traditional diplomacy assumed that major European powers had special responsibility for maintaining world peace and the colonies had no more significant diplomatic role than that of satellites.
- ii. Traditional diplomacy was professional but secretive and relied on a limited cadre rather than extended diplomatic channels.
- iii. Modern diplomacy is more open and democratic; it requires reciprocal bargains and compromises so it is not possible for diplomats to spell out a given stance in advance.
- iv. Multilateralism is increasingly evident in the practice of modern diplomacy, with behind the scenes preparations by diplomatic officials.

7) Instruments of Diplomacy

- i. Most nation-states maintain Ministries of Foreign Affairs
- ii. Foreign office officials include career diplomats and political diplomats appointed by home governments.
- iii. Ambassadors head foreign missions and serve as the personal representative of the home state in host country (they can be career diplomats or political appointees)
- iv. Councilors of embassies rank second to the ambassador and they are career diplomats.
- v. Secretaries, with first, second and third rankings are mid-career officials implementing foreign policies of their home countries.

- vi. Attaches are junior career or non-career personnel focusing on specific areas (commercial, agricultural, naval, press attaches are common)

8) Diplomatic Procedures and Practices

- i. **Agreation:** Credentials of diplomatic envoys are approved by host countries where they are to be appointed. Presentation of credentials and assuming charge in host country involves interaction with the host governments.
- ii. **Diplomatic missions and personnel** enjoy certain immunities and privileges like the rights of extraterritoriality and inviolability. (safety, the rules on diplomats are the same as that of their country)
- iii. **Home states** can dismiss diplomats or they can be declared persona-non-grata by host countries.

9) Functions of Diplomacy

- i. **Representation:** Their main duties are to implement the foreign policies of their governments and to protect the national interests of their countries in the alien land. For exercising their duties successfully, they have to cultivate social contacts on foreign land.
- ii. **Negotiation:** Negotiating includes transmission of messages between foreign ministries of host and home states and the pursuit of agreements by compromise and direct contact.
- iii. **Reporting:** Reporting socio-cultural, economic and political conditions of host country for formulating diplomatic strategies and foreign policies (Economic, military attaches and political officers are sent to get feedback to frame foreign policy);
- iv. **Protection of the interests of the nation and its citizens in foreign lands;** As per provisions of different bilateral and international treaties and agreements, a diplomat shall protect the interests of his nation and its citizens in a foreign land.

10) Tasks of Diplomacy

- i. to determine the major objectives of the state, and the power actually available to fulfill these objectives;
- ii. diplomacy must assess the objectives of other states and the power actually available to fulfill these objectives;

- iii. diplomacy must assess to what extent these objectives are compatible with each other;
- iv. diplomacy must employ the means suited to the pursuit of its objectives.
- v. According to Morgenthau, 'Failure in any one of these tasks may jeopardize the success of foreign policy and with it the peace of the world.'

11) **Open and Secret Diplomacy**

- i. Diplomacy, since its inception to the later part of the nineteenth century, was a clandestine affair. So, for a very large period diplomatic activities were conducted secretly. The Berlin Congress Treaty of 1878 was kept a secret.
- ii. From the first half of the twentieth century, the demand for open diplomacy gained ground. People started to denounce secret diplomacy mainly for two reasons: the spread of democratic ideas and the hatred that a nation incurred due to secret diplomacy.
- iii. Woodrow Wilson, the former US President, was an ardent supporter of open diplomacy
- iv. Features of open diplomacy; rejection of the conclusion of secret treaties; Conducting of diplomatic negotiations in full public glare.

12) **Economic Diplomacy**

- i. Economic diplomacy means enhancing cooperation with other states through increasing trade and commercial relations.
- ii. Economic diplomacy avoids political differences, and places greater emphasis on strengthening friendship through economic cooperation.
- iii. In a changed international order after the Cold War, economic diplomacy gradually gained momentum in different parts of the world.
- iv. The Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan or the Warsaw Pact were forms of economic diplomacy in some way or the other.
- v. The onset of globalization gave a fillip to economic diplomacy. By the 1980s, third world countries had started liberalizing their economies. This liberalization programme had presented an unprecedented opportunity to the developed world to engage in economic diplomacy with the third world countries

13) Future of Diplomacy

- i.** In an age of spectacular development of information technology, the role and importance of professional diplomats are coming under scrutiny.
- ii.** With the spread of democratic ideals and growing demands for open diplomacy, the traditional form of diplomacy is also facing a crisis. Democratic institutions like the Parliament, media and peoples 'organizations are trying to influence the process of diplomacy.
- iii.** The world of diplomacy is, therefore, no longer the exclusive domain of the professional diplomats only; science and technology and democratic ideals have made deep inroads into this exclusive world.
- iv.** The groundwork and issues for talks between heads of different states have to be prepared by the diplomats, because the politicians are not always very well acquainted with every detail of foreign policies.

14) Diplomatic prerequisites

- i.** Diplomacy must be divested of the crusading spirit; those who try to achieve higher (or singular) cause become impractical and impede negotiations.(to understand the weaknesses and strengths of the other side, where they are coming from, not to lose your cool and asses the other side).
 - ii.** Foreign policy objectives must be defined in terms of national interest and supported by adequate power, to enable diplomats to negotiate effectively.
 - iii.** Diplomats must be able to realize the objectives and interests of other nations as well.
 - iv.** Nations must be willing to show flexibility on issues not vital to them or else diplomacy will be in vain.
-

Topic 22

Approaches to Peace, International Law

1) Introduction

- i. States have strong incentives to free themselves from the insecurities of international anarchy. States face common coordination and collaboration problems, yet cooperation remains difficult under anarchy.
- ii. To facilitate cooperation, states create international institutions, of which three levels exist in modern international society: constitutional institutions, fundamental institutions, and issue specific institutions or 'regimes'. We are concerned with fundamental institutions, of which international law is one of the most important.
- iii. The quest for global governance is pushing international law into new areas, raising questions about whether international law is transforming into a form of supranational law.
- iv. Individuals, and to some extent collectivities, are gradually acquiring rights and responsibilities under international law, establishing their status as both subjects and agents under international law.
- v. Non-governmental actors are becoming increasingly important in the development and codification of international legal norms.

2) What is International Law?

- i. International laws are rules which relate to the functioning of individuals, institutions and states in the international arena.
- ii. International law has various ingredients including general principles of law and justice, which are equally suited to regulating the conduct of individuals, organizations within a state and states themselves.

3) Evolution of International Law

- i. Formulation of international law can be traced back to the third and fourth millenniums B.C.
- ii. Early rulers had made international rules to safeguard emissaries, initiation and cessation of hostilities and arrangement of truces, and maritime laws.

- iii. To aid governance, the Romans devised principles of just gentrium or law of the people. By the time the Roman Empire fell, application of these laws was widely accepted.
- iv. European states also contributed to international laws at a later stage in history. By the 14th century, scholars were writing about international law. Hugo Grotius, for example, produced a momentous work on laws concerning war and peace, emphasizing the independent nature of law.
- v. During the eighteenth century, three prominent schools of thought concerning international law were evident; the positivists, the naturalists and the Grotians.
- vi. The naturalists believed in upholding morality through laws. The positivists focused on practicalities and the consensual nature of these laws. The Grotians combined both naturalists and positivist elements.
- vii. In the past century, the League and the UN system, and subsequently the International Court of Justice have made important contributions to international law. Other institutions like IMF or WTO influence laws concerning trade economic laws.

4) Different Types of International Law

- i. Private and Public Laws: private law concerns individuals, whereas public law concerns the behavior of organizations and even states.
- ii. Procedural and Substantive Laws: Procedural laws define types of permitted behavior whereas substantive laws concern territorial rights of states.
- iii. Laws of War and Peace: There are laws governing behavior of states in a state of war (concerning rights of prisoners of war) and those meant to prevent outbreak of violence and promote peace.
- iv. Particular and General Laws: General or universal laws are applicable to all sovereign states, whereas particular laws are defined by bilateral or regional agreements.

5) Another Perspective on International Laws

- i. **The laws of power, coordination and reciprocity;** Laws of power regulate master-slave relations. Those of coordination regulate relations amongst members of the same group. Laws of

reciprocity refer to the intermediary interaction which implies mutual benefit.

- ii. **Naturalists vs. Positivists;** Naturalism and positivism developed side by side. Naturalists argued that Divine authority was the source of all laws. Positivists argued that only those international laws had validity, which were adopted by consent of sovereign states.

6) Sources of International Law

- i. Article 38 of the ICJ recognizes natural laws, general laws, custom and legal commentaries as the basic sources of international law.
- ii. Based on principles of universal acceptability, some natural laws are applicable across the world.
- iii. Based on the implicit or explicit consent of states, customary laws are mainly based on customs or treaties.
- iv. General laws defined with reference to terms like justice or rights, enables jurists to fill in the gaps left by positivist laws.
- v. Legal commentaries help clarify, elaborate upon and apply the broad nature of laws to specific circumstances

7) Formulation & Implementation of International Laws

- i. There is no formal institution to make international laws, so they are made outside of formal institutions. Issue of Treaties.
- ii. If a sufficient number of states follow a customary practice, it becomes an international custom.
- iii. The International Court of Justice (ICJ), which is composed of UN member states recommended by the Security Council, has an advisory capacity to interpret treaties, but it lacks the authority of national courts.
- iv. International tribunals also lack the authority of national judicial institutions.

8) Modern International Law and its Evolution

- i. Modern international law is a historical artefact, a product of the revolutions in thought and practice that transformed the governance of European states after the French Revolution (1789).
- ii. Prior to the French Revolution, in the 'Age of Absolutism', law was understood principally as the command of a legitimate superior, and international law was seen as a command of God, derived

from natural law. In the modern period law has come to be seen as something contracted between legal subjects, or their representatives, and international law has been seen as the expression of the mutual will of nations.

- iii. Because of its historical roots, the modern institution of international law has a number of distinctive characteristics, informed largely by the values of political Liberalism.
- iv. The most distinctive characteristics of the modern institution of international law are its multilateral form of legislation, its consent-based form of legal obligation, its language and practice of justification, and its discourse of institutional autonomy.
- v. So long as international law was designed to facilitate international order, it was circumscribed in key ways: states were the principle subjects and agents of international law; international law was concerned with the regulation of inter-state relations; and the scope of international law was confined to questions of order.

9) International Law and Views of Different Theories

- i. Realists argue that international law is only important when it serves the interests of powerful states.
- ii. Neo-liberals explain how self-interested states come to construct dense networks of international legal regimes.
- iii. Constructivists treat international law as part of the normative structures that condition state and non-state agency in international relations. Like other social norms, they emphasize the way in which law constitutes actors' identities, interests, and strategies.
- iv. New Liberals emphasize the domestic origins of state preferences and, in turn, international law. Within international law, they stress the need to disaggregate the state to understand transnational legal integration and interaction, and they prioritize international humanitarian law.
- v. Critical legal studies concentrate on the way in which the inherent Liberalism of international law seriously curtails its radical potential.

10) International Humanitarian Law and War

- i. International law is increasingly affecting domestic legal regimes and practices, and the rules of the international legal system are no longer confined to issues of order. As international humanitarian law evolves, issues of global justice are permeating the international legal order.
- ii. Placing limits on the legitimate use of force is one of the key challenges of the international community, and the laws of war have evolved to meet this challenge.
- iii. The laws of war have traditionally been divided into those governing when the use of force is legitimate, *jus ad bellum*, and how war may be conducted, *jus in bello*.
- iv. Laws governing when war is legally permitted have changed dramatically over the history of the international system, the most notable difference being between the nineteenth-century view that to wage war was a sovereign right to the post-1945 view that war was only justified in self-defence or as part of a UN mandated international peace enforcement action.
- v. Laws governing how war may be conducted divide, broadly, into three categories: those governing weaponry, combatants, and non-combatants.

11) International versus National Laws

- i. National laws have much greater legitimacy than international laws.
- ii. While individuals rarely have recourse to self-help within nations, states rely on self-help as a matter of norm lest they are bound by a treaty of some sort.
- iii. With the passage of time, international laws are becoming more accepted and complex and sanctions and international censure ensure states to oblige to them.

12) Relevance of International Laws

- i. Despite its limitations, international law helps give shape to international order.
- ii. It influences and channels bilateral or even multilateral economic, social and political cooperation.
- iii. It provides the normative background based on which independent states can make their decisions.

Topic 23

Arms Control /Disarmament and Nuclear Non proliferation Regime

1) Introduction

- i. A stable and peaceful international order requires controls on nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) and other types of weapons and dangerous sensitive materials as well as regulation of the behavior of both state and non-state actors.
- ii. For almost a decade, however, there has been little progress in multilateral arms control in general and some processes have suffered severe setbacks.

2) Justifications for Armament

- i. Weapons are not causes but the consequences of conflictive relations.
- ii. A historical survey of the arms race indicates that during the past two centuries this form of international competition often ends peacefully in recognition of the military superiority of one side or the other.(Armament increases the chances of peace)
- iii. Countries that have no adequate defense tempt aggressors and therefore preparing for war is the best way to achieve peace. (Keep all aspects in mind to make an intelligent opinion). (Einstein and Openheimer's research lead to atom bomb)

3) Arguments for Disarmament

- i. Arms and arms races are costly and potentially very bloody. (Saint Augustine-book on the justification of war)
- ii. Arms reduction can curtail defense burden and allow economic investment for productive purposes.
- iii. Unchecked growth of armaments without economic means can lead to internal repression and external aggression.(backup your argument with solid pragmatic approach, nothing is wrong)

4) Arms Control

- i. Arms reduction implies partially disarmament based on mutually agreed set of arms levels between a given groups of nation states.
- ii. Arms limitation includes a wide variety of international accords to limit impact of potential wars or to prevent their accidental

outbreak(exchange of information or ban on particular types of weaponry)

5) History of Disarmament

- i. Disarmament attempts can be traced back to the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, which stipulated against the need for building fortifications.
- ii. In 1816, the Czar of Russia proposed to the British government the reduction of armaments, this call was not very well received.
- iii. In 1863 and in 1869, France made similar calls for disarmament in Europe, but it too was ignored.
- iv. In 1898, the Tsar of Russia called on European powers to gather at The Hague to discuss disarmament, a suggestion which was well received, leading to the First Hague Peace Conference attended by 28 states.
- v. In 1907, another conference was held at The Hague for the same purpose. Both Conferences called upon military and naval experts to propose reducing military expenditures through disarmaments, but the major powers were not ready for such moves in practice.
- vi. Disarmament after WW1
 - i. The devastation caused by WWI impelled statesmen of the world to give serious thought to disarmament. Woodrow Wilson in one of his famous fourteen points asserted armament should be reduced to 'the lowest point consistent with domestic safety'.
 - ii. The treaty of Versailles (1919) also recognized that 'the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armaments'.
 - iii. The League of Nations was given the duty to secure a general agreement on disarmament and its covenant stated that only those countries be allowed membership who accepted the proposed agreement. A permanent advisory commission was established in the League, but being compromised of military personnel, it failed to make much progress on disarmament.
 - iv. The Council of the League appointed another commission in 1920, the Temporary Mixed Commission, with a fixed four

year mandate and comprised primarily of civilians. This temporary commission was asked to identify limitation of land and naval forces for various countries according to their national security needs. This commission also proposed compulsory arbitration and international aid to victims of aggression. This commission's recommendations were not accepted by League of Nations members.

- v. In 1926, the League set up another preparatory commission for disarmament which prepared a draft treaty considered at the League conference in Geneva in 1932 by 61 states. Discussions on this draft continued for two years but then the Japanese attack on Manchuria and the German withdrawal from the treaty in 1933, dashed hopes for the global disarmament.
 - vii. Disarmament after WW2
 - i. The devastation unleashed by WW2 again led to calls for disarmament
 - ii. The UN Charter laid much emphasis on the need for disarmament.
 - iii. The UN established a military Staff Committee to assist the Security Council to regulate armaments and explore means for disarmament.
 - viii. Atoms for Peace Plan
 - i. In 1953, Eisenhower proposed establishing a pool of fissionable materials, donated by nuclear states to the Atomic Energy Commission, to be provided to other countries strictly for peaceful purposes.
 - ii. The Soviets opposed this plan arguing that an agreement on prohibiting nuclear weapons was necessary prior to disseminating nuclear technology.
- 6) UN disarmament Efforts
- i. UN Atomic Energy Commission included all 5 SC members and Canada.
 - ii. The UN Atomic commission was to explore mechanisms for peaceful transfer of nuclear technology, to identify safeguards for

- inspections of compliant states to prevent hazards or violations, and work toward eliminating nuclear weapons.
- iii. Both superpowers agreed to cooperate but their divergent stances (US argued that control must take precedence over disarmament and USSR wanted the reverse) failed to help achieve the Commission goals.
 - iv. The UN General Assembly also established a Commission on Conventional Armaments, which too fell victim to Cold War divergence. Ultimately, the USSR pulled out of both Commissions due to China's representation on them.
 - v. In April 2004 the United Nations (UN) Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1540 on the proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery.
 - vi. In December 2004 UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan released the report of the UN High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. The two areas of concern were:
 - i. how to ensure universal adherence to multilateral agreements intended to establish global norms and rules of behavior; and
 - ii. how to ensure that those states which do adhere to the agreements comply fully with the commitments that they have made.

7) Other Notable Efforts

- i. Many disarmament and arms control efforts were undertaken through bilateral means between US and USSR, the biggest proliferations of armaments in the post WW2 period (NTBT, NPT, SALT I AND II)
- ii. In 1985 six nation summits in New Delhi was indicative of the growing concern amongst developing countries about nuclear weapons.
- iii. In 2001 the administration of U.S. president George W. Bush announced that it would unilaterally withdraw from the ABM Treaty, laying the groundwork for the deployment of defenses against long-range ballistic missiles.
- iv. The Bush administration, however, also pursued an arms reduction agreement with the Russian Federation, and the two

- nations signed a treaty in 2002 to deactivate about 75 percent of their strategic nuclear arsenals.
- v. In December 2003 the EU also adopted a Strategy against the Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD Strategy) setting out measures to be used, ideally, to prevent proliferation from taking place.
 - vi. In 2004, following up a proposal made by its Director General in October 2003, the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) initiated a study of multilateral approaches to the nuclear fuel cycle.
- 8) Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT)
- i. The NPT review conference was held in Geneva in 1995 which recommended infinite extension of the NPT (Non-Proliferation Treaty).
 - ii. Israel, Pakistan and India were criticized for not acceding to the NPT nor to the subsequent CTBT, which even forbids tests required for developing nuclear weapons.
 - iii. Even France signed the CTBT after conducting its last nuclear test in the South Pacific.
 - iv. India and Pakistan remain reluctant and argue that the advanced nuclear states can keep their weaponry safe and updated by tests stimulated in lab settings.
 - v. In late 2003 the United States began funding a research program that could lead to a new type of nuclear weapon known as a mininuke.
 - vi. Some arms control advocates objected to the research, saying it would lead to a new type of nuclear weapon, which would violate the intent of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.
- 9) Conclusion

Topic 24

International Political Institution United Nations

(Along with Reforms)

1) Introduction

- i. The United Nations was established to preserve peace between states after the Second World War.
- ii. In a number of ways, the institutions of the United Nations reflected lessons learned from its predecessor, the League of Nations.
- iii. The institutions and mechanisms of the United Nations reflect both the demands of great power politics (i.e. Security Council veto) and universalism. They also reflect demands to address the needs and interests of people, as well as the needs and interest of states. The tensions between these various demands are a key feature of UN development.
- iv. The UN has its headquarters in New York.

2) Historical Background

- i. Two years after the outbreak of the Second World War the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill met with President Roosevelt of the United States.
- ii. Between them they issued a document called the Atlantic Charter, setting out their war aims. Apart from the defeat of Nazi Germany, they sought peace, freedom, collaboration, and security between states, overseen by a wider and permanent system of general security.
- iii. The Atlantic Charter contained the seeds of the United Nations, whose principles were adopted by 26 states in January 1942 when they signed a Declaration of the United Nations.
- iv. In 1944, representatives of the great powers (the Soviet Union, the United States, China, and Britain) met at Dumbarton Oaks in the United States to draw up firm proposals for the new international organization, the successor to the League of Nations. In 1945, 51 states met at the United Nations Conference in San Francisco to debate the terms of the UN Charter.

3) Objectives of UN

- i. to maintain international peace, to develop friendly relations among states, and to cooperate internationally in solving international economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems and in promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

4) Organs of UNO

- i. The General Assembly;
 - i. The only time that all member states meet together is in the General Assembly. Here representatives from each of the 187 states that make up the UN gather every year to discuss the world's problems in a global parliamentary setting. Much of the Assembly's work goes on in its six committees:
 - 1. First Committee – disarmament issues, outer space, political and security issues
 - 2. Second Committee – economic and financial issues
 - 3. Third Committee – social, humanitarian, and cultural matters
 - 4. Fourth Committee – colonial matters
 - 5. Fifth Committee – administrative and budgetary matters
 - 6. Sixth Committee – legal issues
 - ii. The Assembly has little influence in world politics. It can debate any issue it chooses, adopt Resolutions with a two-thirds majority, help elect members of other UN bodies, and vote on the UN budget. Ultimately, whatever power it has depends on its moral authority as a reflection of global opinion.
- ii. the Security Council;
 - i. Security Council remains ready to meet at any time whenever there is a threat to international peace and security.
 - ii. There are 15 members of the Security Council. Five are permanent (the P5), and ten non-permanent members are elected for a period of two years from regional groups within the UN: Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America, Western Europe, and Oceania.

- iii. The P5 are the United States, Russia, China, France, and Britain. Decisions of the Council have to be accepted by a majority of members, and must include the P5, each of which is able to veto a decision.

iii. the UN Secretariat;

iv. the Economic and Social Council;

v. the International Court of Justice;

vi. the Trusteeship Council.

vii. Apart from the other four organs, the UN includes a variety of bodies known as Specialized Agencies, which regulate specific activities and set world standards. They include the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, the World Health Organization (WHO), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the UN International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), the UN High Commission for Refugees (UNHCR), and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).

5) Evolution of UN System

- a. The cold war and the decolonization process had discouraged more active involvement by the United Nations within states, due to the constant use of the veto by the great powers.
- b. The UN did oversee the complex process of decolonization, which led to a rapid expansion in the number of member states in the 1950s and 1960s. It also developed the practice of peacekeeping, which was in part designed to prevent the superpowers from intervening in conflicts that might then escalate into a direct confrontation between them.
- c. After the cold war, it became more difficult for states and diplomats to accept that what happened within states was of no concern to outsiders.
- d. It became more common for governments to see active membership in the United Nations as serving their national interest as well as being morally right.
- e. By the mid-1990s the UN had become involved in maintaining international peace and security by resisting aggression between

- states, by attempting to resolve disputes within states (civil wars), and by focusing on conditions within states, including economic, social, and political conditions. Such as the successful mediation efforts from 1988 to 1990 related to long-festering regional conflicts: Iran– Iraq, Afghanistan, Cambodia, Namibia, and El Salvador.
- f. New justifications for intervention in states were being considered by the 1990s. Most operations of the United Nations were justified in the traditional way: as a response to a threat to international peace and security.
 - g. The number of institutions within the UN system that address economic and social issues has significantly increased. Several Programmes and Funds were created in response to Global Conferences.
 - h. Despite a shortage of funds and coordination problems, the UN has done important work in key economic and social areas.
 - i. In the mid- to late 1990s under the leadership of then Secretary-General Kofi Annan, the UN embarked on an overarching reform effort.

6) Reasons for decline

- i. Patterns of war have changed. The Charter of the UN is based on the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention in the internal affairs of states. The UN is unable to respond effectively to armed conflict that blurs the line between civil and interstate war.
- ii. Despite the end of the cold war, the UN is only as effective as its member states, particularly the P5, allow it to be.
- iii. The UN lacks its own military forces, and therefore relies on member states to make forces available to the Secretary-General on request.
- iv. It is slow to respond to crises, and cannot act in those areas that are regarded as legitimate spheres of influence by any of the P5, especially the United States, Russia, and China.
- v. The UN is wholly funded by its member states, particularly the P5. This enables them to use their financial power to promote their own national interests at the UN.

- vi. At the end of the twentieth century, there has been much discussion about how to reform the UN.

7) Reforms of UN

- i. Proposals have been put forward to make the organization more representative of the changing balance of power in world politics. For example, the P5 represent the victors of the Second World War rather than the most important states of the twenty-first century.
- ii. Some commentators argue that Japan, Germany, and India deserve greater recognition and status in the Security Council.
- iii. In addition, there has been much debate over whether and how to provide the UN with more financial and military power to respond to crises deemed to be within its remit.
- iv. Unless the United Nations is reformed, the gap between expectation and performance is unlikely to be closed.
- v. The Millennium Development Goals have focused attention on measurable socioeconomic targets and have further integrated the work of the UN at the country level, but progress towards reaching the goals has been uneven.
- vi. This would be unfortunate, since the United Nations remains the only international organization that approximates a form of global governance.
- vii. Reform of the economic and social arrangements of the UN aimed at improving coordination, eliminating duplication, and clarifying spheres of responsibility is pertinent. These efforts would strengthen the norms of the multilateral system.

8) Conclusion

Topic 25

International Political Institution: International Monetary Fund (Along with Reforms)

1) Introduction

- i. Formed in 1944 at the Bretton Woods Conference, it came into formal existence in 1945 with 29 member countries and the goal of reconstructing the international payment system.
- ii. Countries contribute funds to a pool through a quota system from which countries with payment imbalances can borrow. As of 2010, the fund had XDR476.8 billion, about US\$755.7 billion at then-current exchange rates.
- iii. Through this fund, and other activities such as statistics keeping and analysis, surveillance of its members' economies and the demand for self-correcting policies, the IMF works to improve the economies of its member countries.

2) Historical Background

- i. The Great Depression of the 1930s had an enormous impact on the advanced industrialized states. In the United States and Europe agricultural prices fell, unemployment skyrocketed, banks closed leaving people penniless, factories stood idle, and international trade collapsed.
- ii. Indeed, the onset of the Depression was one of the main reasons why so many ordinary Germans were willing to follow Hitler into war in 1939.
- iii. At the same time, the outbreak of war in Europe proved to be a key factor in the United States' economic recovery. Increases in the level of production needed to fight the war stimulated economic growth, put people back to work, and money into circulation.
- iv. One of the important questions confronting American policymakers, however, was how to maintain the new level of economic activity after the war.
- v. The purpose of the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 was primarily to ensure that these things did not happen. The goals

were to stabilize the value of money and to promote international trade.

3) Objectives of IMF

- i. promote international monetary cooperation;
- ii. facilitate the expansion and balanced growth of international trade;
- iii. promote and maintain high levels of employment;
- iv. promote exchange stability and avoid competitive exchange rate depreciation;
- v. eliminate foreign exchange restrictions;
- vi. offer resources to countries to correct maladjustments in their balance of payments without resorting to measures destructive of national or international prosperity;
- vii. shorten the duration and lessen the degree of disequilibrium in the international balance of payments of its members.

4) Organization

- i. The Board of Governors consists of one governor and one alternate governor for each member country. Each member country appoints its two governors. The Board normally meets once a year and is responsible for electing or appointing executive directors to the Executive Board.
- ii. 24 Executive Directors make up Executive Board. The Executive Directors represent all 188 member countries in a geographically based roster.
- iii. The IMF is led by a managing director, who is head of the staff and serves as Chairman of the Executive Board. 5 July 2011 to present; Christine Lagarde from France.
- iv. Voting power in the IMF is based on a quota system. Each member has a number of basic votes (each member's number of basic votes equals 5.502% of the total votes)

5) The Original Mandate of the IMF

- i. The original mandate of the IMF was achieved primarily by linking the world's currencies to the American dollar.
- ii. Members were required to fix the value of their currencies in relation to the dollar.

- iii. Changes beyond 1 per cent had to be discussed with the other members of the Fund and agreed to by them.
- iv. Investors, manufacturers, and states benefited enormously from what was called the par value system. Not only did it give them a clear idea of the actual value of different currencies, it also helped to bring a degree of predictability to the international economy.

6) Evolution of IMF

- i. The par value system lasted until the early 1970s, when the US decided it could no longer afford to allow countries to convert their US dollars into gold.
- ii. It is customary to talk about the collapse of the Bretton Woods system in the early 1970s. This is not quite correct. In fact, the IMF survived because the need for monetary stability became more crucial in the absence of fixed exchange rates.
- iii. None the less, the role of the IMF has changed since the 1970s. True, it continues to promote monetary stability and trade, but increasingly its role is to assist countries that are in the midst of financial crisis.

7) Functions of IMF

- i. it works to foster global growth and economic stability by providing policy, advice and financing to members, by working with developing nations to help them achieve macroeconomic stability, and by reducing poverty
- ii. The IMF provides alternate sources of financing.
- iii. Upon initial IMF formation, its two primary functions were: to oversee the fixed exchange rate arrangements between countries,[9] thus helping national governments manage their exchange rates and allowing these governments to prioritise economic growth, and to provide short-term capital to aid balance of payments
- iv. The IMF's role was fundamentally altered after the floating exchange rates post 1971. It shifted to examining the economic policies of countries with IMF loan agreements to determine if a shortage of capital was due to economic fluctuations or economic policy. Their role became a lot more active because the IMF now manages economic policy rather than just exchange rates.

- v. Surveillance of the global economy
- vi. Conditionality of loans; The IMF does require collateral from countries for loans but also requires the government seeking assistance to correct its macroeconomic imbalances in the form of policy reform.
- vii. Some of the conditions for structural adjustment can include: Cutting expenditures, also known as austerity, Devaluation of currencies, Trade liberalisation, or lifting import and export restrictions etc.

8) Role of IMP in Current Times

- i. It has become something of an economic crisis management institution.
- ii. It offers financial and technical assistance to countries experiencing monetary problems and remains a lender of last resort.
- iii. This gives the IMF enormous power to determine the economic fate of countries experiencing balance-of payment problems.
- iv. If, for example, a member country has continuing economic problems, the IMF will initiate Structural Adjustment Programmes (SAPs). These macroeconomic reforms can include debt reduction strategies, privatization policies, and cuts in public spending.
- v. Unfortunately, these strategies generally impact on the poor most severely. It is for this reason that SAPs are regarded as particularly iniquitous by some observers.

9) Criticism

- i. Today, the IMF has more critics than friends. Some economists suggest that the world economy would function better without it, and that many of its SAPs exacerbate crises rather than alleviate them.
- ii. Others suggest that while it is an imperfect institution, it is better at maintaining economic stability than many governments.
- iii. Whatever the truth, there is little evidence to suggest that the IMF is heading for the institutional scrap-heap.

- iv. There have been muted calls for a new Bretton Woods conference, but this message has not yet filtered up to policymakers and government officials.
- v. At the same time, it is hard to imagine how the global economy could function effectively without some institutional guidance.

10) Reforms

- i. The challenge is to ensure that a balance is struck between good economic management and human needs. In striking this balance, the IMF appears to have a long way to go.
- ii. The IMF is only one of many international organisations, and it is a generalist institution that deals only with macroeconomic issues; its core areas of concern in developing countries are very narrow. One proposed reform is a movement towards close partnership with other specialist agencies such as UNICEF, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP).
- iii. Increase and rebalancing of the quotas that determine each country's voting power and financial obligation, Greater voting power to developing countries so they have a greater say.

11) Conclusion

Topic 26

International Political Institution: World Bank

(Along with Reforms)

1. Introduction

- i. The World Bank is an international financial institution that provides loans to developing countries for capital programs.
- ii. It comprises two institutions: the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) and the International Development Association (IDA).
- iii. The World Bank is a component of the World Bank Group, and a member of the United Nations Development Group.
- iv. The World Bank's official goal is the reduction of poverty. Established in 1944, the World Bank Group is headquartered in Washington, D.C. they have more than 10,000 employees in more than 120 offices worldwide.
- v. According to its Articles of Agreement, all its decisions must be guided by a commitment to the promotion of foreign investment and international trade and to the facilitation of Capital investment.
- vi. Jim Yong Kim 2012–present current president, nationality from United States, Former Chair of the Department of Global Health and Social Medicine at Harvard, president of Dartmouth College.

2. Goals

- i. The World Bank Group has set two goals for the world to achieve by 2030:
 - i. End extreme poverty by decreasing the percentage of people living on less than \$1.25 a day to no more than 3%
 - ii. Promote shared prosperity by fostering the income growth of the bottom 40% for every country
- ii. Millennium Development Goals targets for 2015
 - i. Eradicate Extreme Poverty and Hunger
 - ii. Achieve Universal Primary Education
 - iii. Promote Gender Equality
 - iv. Reduce Child Mortality
 - v. Improve Maternal Health

- vi. Combat HIV/AIDS, Malaria, and Other Diseases
 - vii. Ensure Environmental Sustainability
 - viii. Develop a Global Partnership for Development
3. Financial Products and Services
- i. low-interest loans, zero to low-interest credits, and grants to developing countries
 - ii. support a wide array of investments in such areas as education, health, public administration, infrastructure, financial and private sector development, agriculture, and environmental and natural resource management.
 - iii. Some of the projects are cofinanced with governments, other multilateral institutions, commercial banks, export credit agencies, and private sector investors
 - iv. provide or facilitate financing through trust fund partnerships with bilateral and multilateral donors.
4. Innovative Knowledge Sharing
- i. support to developing countries through policy advice, research and analysis, and technical assistance.
 - ii. analytical work often underpins World Bank financing and helps inform developing countries' own investments.
 - iii. support capacity development in the countries, sponsor, host, or participate in many conferences and forums on issues of development, often in collaboration with partners.
 - iv. Key priorities include:
 - i. Results:
 - ii. Reform: working to improve every aspect of the work:
 - iii. Open Development: offer a growing range of free, easy-to-access tools, research and knowledge to help people address the world's development challenges. For example, the Open Data website offers free access to comprehensive, downloadable indicators about development in countries around the globe.
 - v. Membership
 - i. There are 184 member countries that are shareholders in the IBRD

- ii. To become a member, however, a country must first join the International Monetary Fund (IMF)
- iii. The size of the World Bank's shareholders, like that of the IMF's shareholders, depends on the size of a country's economy. Thus, the cost of a subscription to the World Bank is a factor of the quota paid to the IMF.
- iv. There is an obligatory subscription fee, which is equivalent to 88.29% of the quota that a country has to pay to the IMF
- v. a country is obligated to buy 195 World Bank shares (US\$120,635 per share, reflecting a capital increase made in 1988)
- vi. Of these 195 shares, 0.60% must be paid in cash in U.S. dollars while 5.40% can be paid in a country's local currency, in U.S. dollars, or in non-negotiable non-interest bearing notes.
- vii. The balance of the 195 shares is left as "callable capital," meaning the World Bank reserves the right to ask for the monetary value of these shares when and if necessary.
- viii. A country can subscribe a further 250 shares, which do not require payment at the time of membership but are left as "callable capital."
- ix. The president of the World Bank comes from the largest shareholder, which is the United States, and members are represented by a Board of Governors.
- x. Throughout the year, however, powers are delegated to a board of 24 executive directors (EDs).
- xi. The five largest shareholders - the U.S., U.K., France, Germany and Japan - each have an individual ED, and the additional 19 EDs represent the rest of the member states as groups of constituencies.

5. How World Bank Operates

- i. The IBRD was the original arm of the World Bank that was responsible for the reconstruction of post-war Europe.
- ii. Before gaining membership in the WBG's affiliates (the International Finance Corporation, the Multilateral Investment

- Guarantee Agency and the International Center For Settlement of Investment Disputes), a country must be a member of the IBRD.
- iii. International Development Association offers loans to the world's poorest countries. These loans come in the form of "credits," and are essentially interest-free. They offer a 10-year grace period and hold a maturity of 35 years to 40 years.
 - iv. The International Finance Corporation (IFC) works to promote private sector investments by both foreign and local investors.
 - v. The Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA) supports direct foreign investment into a country by offering security against the investment in the event of political turmoil.
 - vi. the International Center for Settlement of Investment Dispute facilitates and works towards a settlement in the event of a dispute between a foreign investor and a local country.
6. Adapting to the Times
- i. sometimes as a nation develops, it requires more aid to work its way through the development process.
 - ii. This has resulted in some countries accumulating so much debt and debt service that payments become impossible to meet.
 - iii. Many of the poorest countries can receive accelerated debt relief through the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries scheme, which reduces debt and debt service payments while encouraging social expenditure.
 - iv. The WBG has also been focusing on reducing the risk of projects by means of better appraisal and supervision mechanisms as well as a multidimensional approach to overall development.
 - v. The Bank encourages all of its clients, which number over 100, to implement policies that promote sustainable growth, health, education, social development programs focusing on governance and poverty reduction mechanisms, the environment, private business and macroeconomic reform.
7. Opposition to the Bank
- i. The globalization of market forces, vigorously promoted by the World Bank, creates greater inequality.
 - ii. The World Bank is wrong in arguing that economic growth will solve the problems we face.

- iii. The system allows the largest shareholders to dominate the vote, resulting in WBG policies being decided by the rich but implemented by the poor.
 - iv. The real function of institutions such as the World Bank is not to promote "development" but rather to integrate the ruling elites of third world countries into the global system of rewards and punishments.
 - v. opponents have observed that developing countries often have to put health, education and other social programs on hold in order to pay back their loans.
 - vi. Evidence from many countries shows that the policies promoted by the World Bank are disastrous.
 - vii. The World Bank's emphasis on expanding exports has been disastrous for the environment.
 - viii. The "free market" economic model being pushed on third world governments is not one the industrial countries used to develop themselves.
 - ix. Globalization-from-above is being rejected and millions of people all over the world are struggling to build globalization-from-below.
8. Reform: An Easy Way to Pressure the World Bank for Change
- i. The World Bank gets most of its capital by selling bonds to wealthy investors.
 - ii. If we could pressure large institutional funds (e.g., university endowments and state worker pension funds) to stop buying World Bank bonds as a way to protest the Bank's destructive policies, we could exert serious pressure on the Bank.
 - iii. Opposition groups have protested by boycotting World Bank bonds such as the huge impact the divestment campaign had on South Africa's white minority rulers during the closing days of apartheid
9. Conclusion

Topic 27

International Political Institution: International Court of Justice

1) Introduction

- i. The International Court of Justice plays an immense role in the growth and implementation of International law.
- ii. It is also known as the “World Court” and is a creation of a multi-lateral treaty.
- iii. The International Court of Justice (ICJ) is one of the six organs of United Nations. It is based in The Hague, Netherlands.
- iv. The ICJ is composed of 15 judges elected to nine year terms by the UN General Assembly and the UN Security Council. It is stated under Article 93 of the UN Charter, that all the state parties (192) to the UN charter are automatically parties to the Court's statute.

2) Main Functions

- i. Its main functions are to settle legal disputes submitted to it by member states and to give advisory opinions on legal questions submitted to it by duly authorized international organs, agencies and the UN General Assembly.
- ii. An advisory opinion is a function of the Court open only to specified United Nations bodies and agencies. In principle, the Court's advisory opinions are only consultative in character, though they are influential and widely respected.
- iii. So far, ICJ has given over 115 decisions and resolved issues between states along with some advisory opinions.

3) The jurisdiction of the ICJ

- i. According to article 93 of the UN Charter, all member of UN can automatically be the parties to the Court.
- ii. For non-member states, article 93 also provides the right to be the parties of the Court if they wish to and willing to be bound by the jurisdiction of the Court. For example: Switzerland used this method to become the party of the Court in 1948
- iii. Article 34, paragraph 1 of the Statute of ICJ states that only state may be parties in cases before the Court.
- iv. The Court has the jurisdiction over the states when the states accept the jurisdiction and willing to be bound by the jurisdiction.
- v. The jurisdiction of the Court is divided into two parts: The first jurisdiction is the power to decide on the legal dispute which

submitted by the states. This kind of power is called contentious jurisdiction i.e. the Court has the power to settle the dispute when parties agree to submit to the Court.

- vi. The second jurisdiction is advisory jurisdiction. The Court gives advisory opinion to the UN organ such as Security Council or General Assembly when they need the legal advice from the Court. For example, World Health Organization (WHO) request for an advisory opinion on the legality of the use of nuclear weapons by a state during armed conflict

4) The ICJ and the Security Council relationship

- i. After the Court issue the judgment for the disputed parties, there is one thing must be done. Implement of judgment is the important step in the Court's procedure.
- ii. ICJ doesn't have the power to enforce the parties of dispute to comply the judgment. This job is transfer to the Security Council if the parties fail to perform the obligation incumbent upon it under a judgment rendered by the Court
- iii. ICJ is not effective if there is not enforcement of Security Council.

5) ICJ on the Case of Nuclear Weapons

- i. On 8 July, 1996, The ICJ handed down its Advisory Opinion on the request made by the General Assembly of the United Nations concerning the "Legality of the Use by a State of Nuclear Weapons in Armed Conflict".
- ii. The initial request for an advisory opinion by the ICJ was put forward by the World Health Organization (WHO) on 3 September 1993, but the ICJ did not render an opinion on this request because the WHO was Ultra Vires (acting outside its legal capacity).
- iii. Later another request was presented by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1994 which was accepted by the Court in January 1995.
- iv. The General Assembly or the Security Council has the power to request advisory opinion from the ICJ under Article 96 of the UN Charter.
- v. The opinion provides one of the few authoritative judicial decisions concerning the legality under international law of the

use or the threatened use of nuclear weapons. Previously, there was no substantive theory or concrete debate over the issue of use, possession and legality of nuclear weapons. It was after the request made by the UNGA, the ICJ gave a detailed opinion regarding nuclear weapons. Apart from the 15 sitting judges, international lawyers from different states were called upon to put forward the arguments concerning nuclear weapons.

- vi. The first issue dealt with by the ICJ concerned “the right to life”. The use of nuclear weapons posed a threat to life as under article 6 of International Covenant on Civil, Political Rights (ICCPR).
- vii. The lawyers argued that this will further the growth of use of nuclear weapons by the states who are not member of NPT. Thus, the debate over this still continues and no conclusive decision is yet given on its usage.

6) Reforms of ICJ

- i. Ineffectiveness of the present ICJ
 - i. Only 63 states have recognized the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court (with or without reservation) through the optional clause system (out of 192; only 1/3rd)
 - ii. ICJ deal with less than 100 cases in more than 50 years
 - iii. Reform of Jurisdiction; This character of non-compulsory jurisdiction over the state is because of the principle of sovereignty
 - iv. Enforcement of judgment; The problem of enforcement arises when the Security Council can't issue the resolution. In order to issue the resolution, 9 votes of Security Council member are needed. For substantive matter such as enforcement of ICJ judgment, all permanent member need to vote without veto of anyone.
- ii. At the UN General Assembly session in 2000 the Member States adopted a Millennium Declaration, which sets out an ambitious plan of reform aiming to gear the Organisation for the challenges of the 21st century. The document envisages a reform and strengthening of the General Assembly, the Security Council, ECOSOC and the Secretariat.

iii. Reforms

- i. Increasing the Number of Judges: An expanded format of the Security Council with more permanent members would logically result in calls for the 'reservation' of seats on the ICJ bench for the members concerned.
- ii. Removal of re-election: The justices of the International Court are elected for a term of 9 years and according to Article 13 of the Statute may be re-elected. Every three years one-third of the justices are elected simultaneously by the General Assembly and the Security Council. However, re-election campaigns place judges wishing to obtain a second or a third nine-year tenure in a vulnerable position and raise challenges for the Court's independence
- iii. there is a need for debate on reforming its working methods, including by means of establishing individual chambers in order to preclude delays in the administration of justice.
- iv. The second category of reform proposals, which does not require amending or supplementing the Charter or Statute, includes procedural matters and working methods. It covers issues such as the need for a more balanced presence of women on the bench and the potential introduction of an age limit for nominees applying for election as justices at the ICJ.
- v. setting up an open-ended working group within the UN General Assembly to be tasked with discussing and drafting recommendations on Court reform;
- vi. initiating an informal group of Friends of the Court to be tasked with rallying sufficient support for proposals and recommendations that would enhance the efficiency of the Court and global rule of law.
- vii. launching, at a later stage, of intergovernmental negotiations on ICJ reform at UN level on the basis of the model underlying the current intergovernmental negotiations on the reform of the Security Council.

7) Conclusion

Further Readings

- Politics Among Nations by Hans Morgenthau
- International Relations by Parkash Chander
- International Relations by Joshua Goldstein
- Understanding International Relations by Chris Brown
- Globalization of World Politics by Baylis
- Virtual University Notes
- International Relations by Ikram Rabbani (Important)
- <http://www.amitavacharya.com/sites/default/files/Changing%20Concepts%20of%20Security%20in%20the%2021st%20Century.pdf>
- <http://diplomacy.bg/archives/1445?lang=en>
- <http://unsystemessays.blogspot.com/2008/01/reform-of-icj.html>

International Relations Part-II

Contents

1. International Relation between two Wars: Russian Revolution
2. International Relation between two Wars: Fascism
3. International Relation between two Wars: League of Nations
4. International Relation between two Wars: Second World War
5. Cold War: Decolonization in Asia and Africa
6. Cold War: Rise of United States and Soviet Union, Era of Tight Bipolarity, Détente and Loose Bipolarity, Revival of Cold War
7. Post Cold War: End of History, Unipolarity (New World Order), Revival of Multi-Polarity
8. Post Cold War: Terrorism
9. Post Cold War: End of History and Clash of Civilizations
10. Post Cold War: Globalization
11. Foreign Policy: Russia
12. Foreign Policy: China
13. Foreign Policy: UK
14. Foreign Policy: India
15. Foreign Policy: USA
16. Foreign Policy: Pakistan
17. South Asia: Peace-making and Peace-Building in South Asia: Analytical overview of peace processes between/among the states of South Asia especially between India and Pakistan.
18. South Asia: India and Pakistan
19. South Asia: Afghanistan
20. Weapons of Mass Destruction: Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons
21. Contemporary Issues: Palestine Issue

Topic 1

International Relation between two Wars: Russian Revolution

1. General Summary

- a. Debates about the origins of the First World War focus on whether responsibility should rest with the German government or whether war came because of more complex systemic factors.
- b. The Paris Peace settlement failed to address the central problems of European security, and in restructuring the European state system created new sources of grievance and instability.
- c. The rise of Hitler posed challenges that European political leaders lacked the ability and will to meet.
- d. The German attack on the Soviet Union extended the scope and barbarity of the war from short and limited campaigns to extended, large-scale, and barbaric confrontation, fought for total victory.
- e. The Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor brought America into the war in Europe and eventually led Germany into war on two fronts (again)
- f. Debate persists about whether the atomic bomb should have been used in 1945, and about the effect that this had on the cold war.
- g. The First World War produced the collapse of four European empires (the Russian, German, Austro-Hungarian, and the Ottoman Empire in Turkey).
- h. Different European powers had different attitudes to decolonization after 1945: some, such as the British, decided to leave, while others sought to preserve their empires, in part (the French) or whole (the Portuguese).
- i. European powers adopted different attitudes to different regions/countries. For example, British withdrawal from Asia came much more quickly after 1945 than from Africa.
- j. The process of decolonization was relatively peaceful in many cases; it led to revolutionary wars in others (Algeria, Malaya, and Angola),

- whose scale and ferocity reflected the attitudes of the colonial power and the nationalist movements.
- k. The struggle for independence/national liberation became embroiled in cold war conflicts when the superpowers and/or their allies became involved, for example Vietnam.
 - l. Whether decolonization was judged successful depends, in part, on whose perspective you adopt—that of the European power, the independence movement, or the people themselves.
 - m. There are disagreements about when and why the cold war began, and who was responsible. Distinct phases can be seen in East–West relations, during which tension and the risk of direct confrontation grew and receded.
 - n. Some civil and regional wars were intensified and prolonged by superpower involvement; others may have been prevented or shortened.
 - o. The end of the cold war has not resulted in the abolition of nuclear weapons.
 - p. Nuclear weapons were an important factor in the cold war. How far the arms race had a momentum of its own is a matter of debate.
 - q. Agreements on limiting and controlling the growth of nuclear arsenals played an important role in Soviet–American (and East–West) relations.
 - r. Various international crises occurred in which there was the risk of nuclear war. Judging how close we came to nuclear war at these times remains open to speculation.
- ## 2. Russian Revolution
- a. The Russian Revolution took place in 1917, during the final phase of World War I. It removed Russia from the war and brought about the transformation of the Russian Empire into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR), replacing Russia’s traditional monarchy with the world’s first Communist state. The revolution happened in stages through two separate coups, one in February and one in October. The new government, led by Vladimir Lenin, would solidify its power only after three years of civil war, which ended in 1920.
 - b. Although the events of the Russian Revolution happened abruptly, the causes may be traced back nearly a century. Prior to the

revolution, the Russian monarchy had become progressively weaker and increasingly aware of its own vulnerability (and therefore more reactionary). Nicholas II—the tsar who led Russia in the years leading up to the revolution—had personally witnessed revolutionary terrorists assassinate his grandfather and, subsequently, his own father respond to the assassination through brutal oppression of the Russian people. When Nicholas II himself became tsar in 1894, he used similarly severe measures to subdue resistance movements, which were becoming bolder and more widespread every year. As Nicholas’s newly imposed oppressions in turn incited still more unrest, he was forced to make concessions after each incident: it was in this manner that Russia’s first constitution was created, as was its first parliament. These concessions continued gradually until Nicholas II’s grip on power became very tenuous.

- c. As Nicholas II grew weaker, Vladimir Lenin rose to prominence as the most powerful figure in Russia. Although this famous leader of the October Revolution was not even in Russia for the February Revolution—he had lived in self-imposed exile in Europe since 1900 and returned to Russia only in April 1917—he nonetheless exerted tremendous influence. Whatever history’s judgment of him, few other Russian revolutionaries possessed Lenin’s decisiveness and strength of vision for Russia’s future. Born in 1870 in the provincial town of Simbirsk as Vladimir Ilich Ulyanov, the young Lenin was profoundly affected by his older brother Alexander’s 1887 execution for being involved in a plot to assassinate the tsar. As a young adult, Vladimir joined the resistance movement himself and took the pseudonym Lenin but swore that he would never engage in the sort of “adventurism” that had ended his brother’s life. Nevertheless, his actions would one day become very adventurous indeed.
- d. The revolution that Lenin led marked one of the most radical turning points in Russia’s 1,300-year history: it affected economics, social structure, culture, international relations, industrial development, and most any other benchmark by which one might measure a revolution. Although the new government would prove to

be at least as repressive as the one it replaced, the country's new rulers were drawn largely from the intellectual and working classes rather than from the aristocracy—which meant a considerable change in direction for Russia.

- e. The revolution opened the door for Russia to fully enter the industrial age. Prior to 1917, Russia was a mostly agrarian nation that had dabbled in industrial development only to a limited degree. By 1917, Russia's European neighbors had embraced industrialization for more than half a century, making technological advancements such as widespread electrification, which Russia had yet to achieve. After the revolution, new urban-industrial regions appeared quickly in Russia and became increasingly important to the country's development. The population was drawn to the cities in huge numbers. Education also took a major upswing, and illiteracy was almost entirely eradicated.
- f. The Russian Revolution also had considerable international consequences. Lenin's government immediately pulled Russia out of World War I, changing the balance of forces for the remaining participants. During the ensuing civil war in Russia, several nations, including the United States, sent troops to Russia in hopes of keeping the chaos from spreading beyond Russia's boundaries. Over the next several decades, the Soviet Union actively sponsored and assisted Communist movements and revolutions around the world in an effort to broaden its sphere of influence. The country also played a fundamental role in the defeat of Nazi Germany during World War II.
- g. Threatened by the possibility of revolutions in their own lands, the governments of many Western nations viewed Communism as a spreading threat and moved to isolate the Soviet Union as much as possible. Following World War II and the advent of the nuclear age, a confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States took center stage. As this Cold War got under way, the two countries emerged as superpowers with much of the rest of the world falling in behind one or the other. A protracted nuclear arms race between the United States and Soviet Union would last until the USSR finally collapsed in 1991.

Topic 2

Fascism

9) Introduction

- I. A number of political movements which arose in Europe after the World War I are generally given the name "Fascist".
- II. The common features of this movement were their hostility of democracy and socialism and the aim of establishing dictatorships.
- III. They succeeded in many countries of Europe, such as Hungary, Italy, Poland, Portugal, Germany and Spain. Their success in Italy and Germany had the most serious consequences.
- IV. The term Fascism is of Italian origin. It was first used from the movement which started in Italy under the leadership of Benito Mussolini. The movement had certain well-defined features.
- V. Dr. Lawrence Britt has examined the fascist regimes of Hitler (Germany), Mussolini (Italy), Franco (Spain), Suharto (Indonesia) and several Latin American regimes.

10) Characteristics of Fascism (Dr. Lawrence Britt)

- I. Powerful and Continuing Nationalism - Fascist regimes tend to make constant use of patriotic mottos, slogans, symbols, songs, and other paraphernalia. Flags are seen everywhere, as are flag symbols on clothing and in public displays.
- II. Disdain for the Recognition of Human Rights - Because of fear of enemies and the need for security, the people in fascist regimes are persuaded that human rights can be ignored in certain cases because of "need." The people tend to look the other way or even approve of torture, summary executions, assassinations, long incarcerations of prisoners, etc.
- III. Identification of Enemies/Scapegoats as a Unifying Cause - The people are rallied into a unifying patriotic frenzy over the need to eliminate a perceived common threat or foe: racial, ethnic or religious minorities; liberals; communists; socialists, terrorists, etc.

- IV. Supremacy of the Military - Even when there are widespread domestic problems, the military is given a disproportionate amount of government funding, and the domestic agenda is neglected. Soldiers and military service are glamorized.
- V. Rampant Sexism - The governments of fascist nations tend to be almost exclusively male-dominated. Under fascist regimes, traditional gender roles are made more rigid. Divorce, abortion and homosexuality are suppressed and the state is represented as the ultimate guardian of the family institution.
- VI. Controlled Mass Media - Sometimes media is directly controlled by the government, but in other cases, the media is indirectly controlled by government regulation, or sympathetic media spokespeople and executives. Censorship, especially in war time, is very common.
- VII. Obsession with National Security - Fear is used as a motivational tool by the government over the masses.
- VIII. Religion and Government are Intertwined - Governments in fascist nations tend to use the most common religion in the nation as a tool to manipulate public opinion. Religious rhetoric and terminology is common from government leaders, even when the major tenets of the religion are diametrically opposed to the government's policies or actions.
- IX. Corporate Power is Protected - The industrial and business aristocracy of a fascist nation often are the ones who put the government leaders into power, creating a mutually beneficial business/government relationship and power elite.
- X. Labor Power is Suppressed - Because the organizing power of labor is the only real threat to a fascist government, labor unions are either eliminated entirely, or are severely suppressed.
- XI. Disdain for Intellectuals and the Arts - Fascist nations tend to promote and tolerate open hostility to higher education, and academia. It is not uncommon for professors and other academics to be censored or even arrested. Free expression in the arts and letters is openly attacked.
- XII. Obsession with Crime and Punishment - Under fascist regimes, the police are given almost limitless power to enforce laws. The

people are often willing to overlook police abuses and even forego civil liberties in the name of patriotism. There is often a national police force with virtually unlimited power in fascist nations.

- XIII. Rampant Cronyism and Corruption - Fascist regimes almost always are governed by groups of friends and associates who appoint each other to government positions and use governmental power and authority to protect their friends from accountability. It is not uncommon in fascist regimes for national resources and even treasures to be appropriated or even outright stolen by government leaders.
- XIV. Fraudulent Elections - Sometimes elections in fascist nations are a complete sham. Other times elections are manipulated by smear campaigns against or even assassination of opposition candidates, use of legislation to control voting numbers or political district boundaries, and manipulation of the media. Fascist nations also typically use their judiciaries to manipulate or control elections.

Topic 3

League of Nations

8) Structure of League of Nations

- a. The League of Nations (LON) was the predecessor to the United Nations. It represented a major attempt by the great powers after the First World War (1914–18) to institutionalize a system of collective security, and its founding Covenant was formulated as part of the Treaty of Versailles (1919).
- b. First Meeting: The first meeting was held in Geneva in 1920, with 42 states represented. Over the next 26 years, a total of 63 states were represented at one time or another.
- c. Last Meeting: The last meeting was held in 1946, at the end of which the League was formally replaced by the United Nations which promptly moved its headquarters to New York, reflecting not only the status of the United States but also disillusionment with the performance of the League.
- d. Like the United Nations, the League consisted of an Assembly, a Council, and a Secretariat. The Assembly, consisting of every member state, convened annually in Geneva. The Council was composed of several permanent members (France, Britain, Italy, Japan, and later Germany and the Soviet Union) and some nonpermanent members elected by the Assembly.
- e. It met more often than the Assembly to consider political disputes and to focus on the reduction of armaments. Its decisions had to be unanimous. The Secretariat, the administrative branch of the League, consisted of a Secretary-General and a staff of 500 people.
- f. Several other organizations were associated with the League such as the World Court and the International Labour Organization. To some extent, the League was an extension of liberal, parliamentary practice to international relations. It was based on the idea that political compromise arrived at by open discussion was the best means to promote political stability, an idea deeply held by one of the main architects of the League, US President Woodrow Wilson.

- g. Like so many international organisations, the League was also designed in light of the alleged lessons of the First World War, of which three were particularly important.
 - i. First, in 1914 Germany had crossed the border into France and Belgium. It was believed that in future wars it would be easy to decide who was the aggressor, a decision that was meant to trigger a range of collective countermeasures, ranging from diplomatic boycotts to the imposition of sanctions and ultimately war.
 - ii. Second, the system for the prevention of conflicts rested on the assumption that war could be prevented by the application of reason based on legal principles. The idea that power could be subordinated to law was a common assumption among many idealists of the interwar period.
 - iii. Third, the speed of political developments in 1914 led to the implementation of several mechanisms of delay to slow down unilateral decision-making in a crisis. Only after a period of three months subsequent to bringing a dispute to the Council was resort to war legal. It was assumed that such time limits would be respected.
- h. The role of the League of Nations was:
 - i. It was based on the Fourteen Points of the US President Woodrow Wilson.
 - ii. It was created to ensure that there would be no repeat of the First World War.
 - iii. It was suppose to keep the peace by encouraging nations to negotiate (talk) over disputes rather than resorting to war.
 - iv. Members of the League agreed to 26 Articles in a Covenant (list of rules).
 - v. Article 10 promised collective security whereby members agreed that if one member were attacked all other members would come to their protection.
 - vi. Initially 42 members joined which later grew to 59 members by the 1930s.
 - vii. The defeated countries like Germany were not allowed to join.

- viii. The Soviet Union (Russia) was not allowed to join because it was Communist.
- ix. The USA despite the fact Wilson's had founded it refused to join the League.

9) Causes of Failure of League of Nations

- a. The failure of the League to deter or punish aggression by Italy, Japan, and ultimately Germany in the 1930s reflected some fundamental flaws in the design of the League.
- b. It should be noted that the League was never fully representative of the international community.
- c. The United States Senate did not ratify the treaties and did not become a member of the League.
- d. South Africa and Liberia were the only African states.
- e. The Soviet Union was not invited to Versailles, and did not join the League until 1934.
- f. Few South American states were represented, and only China, Japan, and Thailand represented Asia.
- g. Germany was missing from the start in light of its alleged responsibility for the First World War.
- h. Because the League was primarily a European body, the number of states that were able to carry out any police action against an aggressor was effectively limited to France and Britain. Without their consent, of course, no decision was likely to be carried out, and France in particular was determined to use the League to contain Germany in Europe.
- i. The ultimate failure of the League to maintain international peace and security was a product of its limited membership, its preservation of a territorial settlement that humiliated Germany, and its faith in the willingness of great powers to subordinate their short-term national interests to the preservation of international peace.
- j. Confronted with the rise of fascism in Italy, Germany, and Japan in the 1930s – a powerful bloc of states that glorified war and embarked on a sustained rearmament programme to achieve their aim to reconfigure the global balance of power in their favour – the League was impotent.

- k. Indeed, it was established during a period in which powerful states continued to rely on war as a means of resolving conflict, and when new forms of nationalism not only undermined some European empires (Austria, Hungary, Turkey) but also justified new patterns of imperial domination.
 - l. In light of the rapid shifts in power that were taking place in the first half of the twentieth century, combined with the diplomatic isolation of the United States and the Soviet Union, it is hardly surprising that the League participated in rather than prevented the decline of Europe.
 - m. During 1938, Britain and France tried a new policy - 'appeasement' (negotiating directly with Hitler); this failed in 1939 when Hitler invaded Czechoslovakia.
 - n. When war broke out in 1939, the League closed down; its headquarters in Geneva remained empty throughout the war.
 - o. In 1943 - at a Conference in Tehran - America, Britain and Russia agreed to set up a new international organisation (the 'United Nations') when the war finished.
 - p. On 12 April 1946, the League met in Geneva and formally abolished itself. The British delegate, Robert Cecil, said: 'The League is dead. Long live the United Nations'.
- 10) Powers of Council of League of Nations
- a. To settle disputes between countries the League could: Start an inquiry by the Council, Provide a hearing by an impartial neutral country, Ask for a ruling by the Permanent Court of International Justice.
 - b. The enforcement powers of the League of Nations included:
 - i. Moral Pressure (Turn world opinion against a guilty country).
 - ii. Economic Sanctions (Stop countries trading with a guilty country).
 - iii. Military Force (Go to war against a guilty country).
 - c. The Strengths of the League were:
 - i. It had the goodwill of governments and ordinary people towards it.
 - ii. Most of the major countries had joined the League.

- iii. Defeated countries were later allowed to join the League.
- iv. It provided a forum to end disputes peacefully.
- d. The Weaknesses of the League were:
 - i. The USA did not join it.
 - ii. The Soviet Union (Russia) did not join until 1934.
 - iii. It had very little power and no permanent army.
 - iv. It failed to encourage disarmament.
 - v. International suspicions and rivalries between countries continued.
 - vi. Countries left the League when they disagreed with its decisions.
 - vii. Economic sanctions especially without US support proved very ineffective.
 - viii. It had to uphold the Treaty of Versailles, which was increasingly viewed as unfair.
 - ix. It failed to stop Japan (Manchuria), Italy (Abyssinia) or Germany (Hitler's breaking of the Treaty of Versailles).

Topic 4

Second World War

ii. Introduction

- a. World War II (WWII or WW2), also known as the Second World War, was a global war that lasted from 1939 to 1945, though related conflicts began earlier. It involved the vast majority of the world's nations—including all of the great powers—eventually forming two opposing military alliances: the Allies and the Axis.
- b. It was the most widespread war in history, and directly involved more than 100 million people from over 30 countries. In a state of "total war", the major participants threw their entire economic, industrial, and scientific capabilities behind the war effort, erasing the distinction between civilian and military resources.
- c. Marked by mass deaths of civilians, including the Holocaust (in which approximately 11 million people were killed) and the strategic bombing of industrial and population centres (in which approximately one million were killed, and which included the atomic bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki), it resulted in an estimated 50 million to 85 million fatalities.

iii. Timeline

- a. 1939: Hitler invades Poland on 1 September. Britain and France declare war on Germany two days later.
- b. 1940: Rationing starts in the UK. German 'Blitzkrieg' overwhelms Belgium, Holland and France. Churchill becomes Prime Minister of Britain. British Expeditionary Force evacuated from Dunkirk. British victory in Battle of Britain forces Hitler to postpone invasion plans.
- c. 1941: Hitler begins Operation Barbarossa - the invasion of Russia. The Blitz continues against Britain's major cities. Allies take Tobruk in North Africa, and resist German attacks. Japan attacks Pearl Harbor, and the US enters the war.
- d. 1942: Germany suffers setbacks at Stalingrad and El Alamein. Singapore falls to the Japanese in February - around 25,000 prisoners taken. American naval victory at Battle of Midway, in

- June, marks turning point in Pacific War. Mass murder of Jewish people at Auschwitz begins.
- e. 1943: Surrender at Stalingrad marks Germany's first major defeat. Allied victory in North Africa enables invasion of Italy to be launched. Italy surrenders, but Germany takes over the battle. British and Indian forces fight Japanese in Burma.
 - f. 1944: Allies land at Anzio and bomb monastery at Monte Cassino. Soviet offensive gathers pace in Eastern Europe. D Day: The Allied invasion of France. Paris is liberated in August. Guam liberated by the US Okinawa, and Iwo Jima bombed.
 - g. 1945: Auschwitz liberated by Soviet troops. Russians reach Berlin: Hitler commits suicide and Germany surrenders on 7 May. Truman becomes President of the US on Roosevelt's death, and Attlee replaces Churchill. After atomic bombs are dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, Japan surrenders on 14 August.

iv. Major Causes of WWII

a. The Rearmament of Germany

- i. German rearmament began after Hitler left 1932-4 Geneva Disarmament Conference, stating that as the powers would not disarm to his level, he would rearm Germany to their level. By 1935 rearmament was well underway. This involved conscription and munitions factories.
- ii. Rearmament alarmed the French who, feeling insecure, reinforced the Maginot line (built between 1929 and 1934). This was a line of steel and concrete fortifications stretching from Belgium to Switzerland and was called 'a gate without a fence' because Germany would be able to avoid it and invade France via Belgium. France remained passive without Britain's support.
- iii. Britain was sympathetic towards Germany and even signed an Anglo German naval Treaty (June 1935) allowing Germany's navy to be 35% of the size of the Royal Navy. Hitler used his new found arms to support Franco in the Spanish Civil War (1936-9) Hitler sent the Condor Legion of the Luftwaffe to bomb Guernica on 26th April, 1937. Guernica was razed to the ground and Franco went on to

conquer the Basque areas of Spain. Hitler had used Spain as a practise ground.

b. The Remilitarization of the Rhineland (1936)

- i. Having broken the Treaty of Versailles once, Hitler risked doing it a second time by marching 30,000 troops into Cologne on 7th March 1936. France, with 250,000 troops mobilised, remained passive because Britain would not support her. Britain took the view that Germany was 'marching into her own back yard.'
- ii. To show that his remilitarization was popular, Hitler held a plebiscite, which showed that 98.8% were in favour. He went on to build his own defensive fortification, the Siegfried Line.

c. The Rome Berlin Axis (October 1936): Originally Mussolini did not want to be Hitler's ally and in 1935 talks were held with Britain and France at the Stresa Front, but these came to nothing when Anthony Eden of Britain threatened oil sanctions against Mussolini during the Abyssinian crisis. This caused the Rome-Berlin Axis in 1936. Mussolini and Hitler strengthened their alliance on two occasions. The Anti-Comintern Pact (November 1937) with Japan. The Pact of Steel (May 1939).

d. Britain's policy of Appeasement (May/June 1937 – March 1939)”: Neville Chamberlain became British Prime Minister on 28th May 1937, and followed the policy of appeasing Germany, believing that all Hitler wanted to do was unite German speaking people. In so doing, Hitler would break the Treaty of Versailles (28th June 1919) but Chamberlain did not believe Hitler would cause war. Churchill disagreed, citing *Mein Kampf* (1924) where Hitler had written that Germany must regain lands 'in the East ... by the power of the sword.' Chamberlain had misinterpreted Hitler's aims. (We have the benefit of hindsight.)

e. The Anschluss with Austria (13th March, 1938): Austrian Fascists wanted to unite with Germany but Schuschnigg, the Austrian Chancellor, wanted Austria to be independent. He was unable to gain support from abroad (France and the Little Entente) so agreed to meet Hitler in Berlin. He was persuaded to accept Hitler's henchman Seyss-Inquart as Minister of the Interior.

Rioting in Vienna increased under Seyss-Inquart's leadership and Schuschnigg resigned. Seyss-Inquart invited Hitler to assist him and on 13th March, 1938 troops from the Wermacht entered Austria. In a plebiscite on the Anschluss a vote of 99.75% in favour was recorded. This was 'rigged' by biased questioning. Hitler made it seem that he had been invited into Austria, in fact he had incited the union.

f. Hitler Gained the Sudetenland (29th September, 1938)

- i. The Sudetenland was lost by Austria in the Treaty of St. Germain (10th September 1919) and hereby Czechoslovakia gained 3 million German speaking people. After the Anschluss the Sudeten German leader, Konrad Henlein, demanded a union with Germany. Unable to receive help from France, the Czech Premier, Benes, mobilised alone. Fearing war, Chamberlain met Hitler on three occasions at Berchtesgaden, Godesburg and at Munich. Munich Agreement (29th September, 1938)
- ii. This was signed by Hitler, Mussolini, Chamberlain and Daladier. Benes was not present. It said: Hitler could take the Sudetenland the following day without a plebiscite, Hungary and Poland could take border districts from Czechoslovakia, Britain and Germany would never go to war.
- iii. Chamberlain's Reaction: On his return to England, Chamberlain announced that he had gained 'peace with honour, peace in our time'. The majority rejoiced, except Churchill.
- iv. Hitler's Reaction: In public Hitler seemed satisfied, but in private he exploded saying 'that fellow Chamberlain has spoiled my entry into Prague.'

g. The Fall of Czechoslovakia (March 1939)

- i. In March 1939, Hitler forced Lithuania to give him Memel where most people spoke German. So far Hitler had only taken German speaking territory, so Chamberlain could still appease Hitler. However, in March 1939, Hitler threatened to bomb Prague, so the Czechs surrendered. Chamberlain

realised appeasement had failed, so he began to rearm Britain and guarantee peace in Poland.

h. Nazi-Soviet Pact (29th August, 1939) – The Ribbentrop-Molotov Pact

i. By the summer of 1939, Hitler's plans to invade Poland were complete. He realised that to invade Poland might cause Britain to attack him from the West but he was more concerned to avoid a Russian attack from the east. Therefore to avoid a war on two fronts, he arranged the Nazi-Soviet Pact, which said that if either country went to war the other would remain neutral.

ii. Hitler gained the chance to invade Poland with a war on one front, if Britain supported Poland.

iii. Stalin of USSR gained time to rearm in case Hitler attacked him later, and the chance to gain the eastern half of Poland. This would provide the USSR with a bufferzone.

i. German Invasion of Poland (1st September, 1939) (Immediate Cause): German tanks invaded West Prussia and Posen on the 1st September 1939 using blitzkrieg tactics. (This is a lightning, sudden attack co-ordinating air, then land forces). Chamberlain sent an ultimatum (a warning with a threat) saying that if Hitler did not withdraw from Poland by 11am, 3rd September 1939, Britain would declare war. On 3rd September, Britain, followed by France, declared war on Germany.

j. Hitler's Aims: To unite German speaking people (using NSD which had been denied at the Treaty of Versailles. He wanted lebensraum (living space) in order to gain self-sufficiency (autarky) He wanted to dominate Europe and the World To achieve any of these aims would involve breaking the Treaty of Versailles (28/6/1919), and this could lead to war.

k. The aggression of Hitler's Allies

i. Italy – Mussolini wanted a Fascist-Roman empire in the Mediterranean and Africa (e.g. Abyssinian invasion in 1935.)

Japan – Japan wanted a Nipponese empire in the Pacific, extending into China and Australia (e.g. Manchurian invasion in 1931). Germany, Italy and Japan were hostile to

Communism (USSR), and this way a cause of war and vice versa.

- l.** Democratic powers were passive
 - i.** USA – Isolated
 - ii.** France – France was unlikely, and reluctant, to intervene against Germany, because she could not rely on Britain's and America's support.
 - iii.** Britain – Between 1934 and 1937, Britain was sympathetic to German recovery. Between May 1937 and March 1939, Britain appeased Germany.
 - iv.** These powers could have stopped Fascist aggression earlier than 1939.
- m.** The League of Nations failed to keep peace and control disarmament
- n.** The harshness of the Treaty of Versailles (28th June, 1919) on Germany: Land losses, Reparations, and War Guilt.
- v.** Conclusion

Topic 5

Cold War: Decolonization of Asia and Africa

10) Introduction

- i. The decolonization of Asia and Africa was the gradual growth of independence movements on the Asian and African continent, leading ultimately to the retreat of foreign powers and the creation of a number of nation-states in the region.
- ii. A number of events were catalysts for this shift, most importantly the Second World War.
- iii. Prior to World War II, some countries such as the Philippines during 1898 had proclaimed independence from Spain.
- iv. The first state to be de-colonised was the Philippines in 1898, and the last was Macau in 1999.

11) Historical Background

- i. In the mid to late 19th century, the European powers colonized much of Africa and Southeast Asia. During the decades of imperialism, the industrializing powers of Europe viewed the African and Asian continents as reservoirs of raw materials, labor, and territory for future settlement.
- ii. In most cases, however, significant development and European settlement in these colonies was sporadic. However, the colonies were exploited, sometimes brutally, for natural and labor resources, and sometimes even for military conscripts.
- iii. In addition, the introduction of colonial rule drew arbitrary natural boundaries where none had existed before, dividing ethnic and linguistic groups and natural features, and laying the foundation for the creation of numerous states lacking geographic, linguistic, ethnic, or political affinity.
- iv. During World War II Japan, itself a significant imperial power, drove the European powers out of Asia.
- v. After the Japanese surrender in 1945, local nationalist movements in the former Asian colonies campaigned for independence rather than a return to European colonial rule. In many cases, as in Indonesia and French Indochina, these nationalists had been guerrillas fighting the Japanese after

European surrenders, or were former members of colonial military establishments. These independence movements often appealed to the United States Government for support.

12) Process of decolonization

- a. There was no one process of decolonization. In some areas, it was peaceful, and orderly.
- b. In many others, independence was achieved only after a protracted revolution.
- c. A few newly independent countries acquired stable governments almost immediately; others were ruled by dictators or military juntas for decades, or endured long civil wars.
- d. Some European governments welcomed a new relationship with their former colonies; others contested decolonization militarily.
- e. The process of decolonization coincided with the new Cold War between the Soviet Union and the United States, and with the early development of the new United Nations.
- f. Decolonization was often affected by superpower competition, and had a definite impact on the evolution of that competition. It also significantly changed the pattern of international relations in a more general sense.
- g. The creation of so many new countries, some of which occupied strategic locations, others of which possessed significant natural resources, and most of which were desperately poor, altered the composition of the United Nations and political complexity of every region of the globe

13) European powers and decolonization

- i. In the mid to late 19th century, the European powers colonized much of Africa and Southeast Asia.
- ii. During the decades of imperialism, the industrializing powers of Europe viewed the African and Asian continents as reservoirs of raw materials, labor, and territory for future settlement. In most cases, however, significant development and European settlement in these colonies was sporadic.
- iii. However, the colonies were exploited, sometimes brutally, for natural and labor resources, and sometimes even for military conscripts. In addition, the introduction of colonial rule drew

- arbitrary natural boundaries where none had existed before, dividing ethnic and linguistic groups and natural features, and laying the foundation for the creation of numerous states lacking geographic, linguistic, ethnic, or political affinity.
- iv. During World War II Japan, itself a significant imperial power, drove the European powers out of Asia. After the Japanese surrender in 1945, local nationalist movements in the former Asian colonies campaigned for independence rather than a return to European colonial rule.
 - v. These independence movements often appealed to the United States Government for support. While the United States generally supported the concept of national self-determination, it also had strong ties to its European allies, who had imperial claims on their former colonies.
 - vi. The Cold War only served to complicate the U.S. position, as U.S. support for decolonization was offset by American concern over communist expansion and Soviet strategic ambitions in Europe.
 - vii. Several of the NATO allies asserted that their colonial possessions provided them with economic and military strength that would otherwise be lost to the alliance. Nearly all of the United States' European allies believed that after their recovery from World War II their colonies would finally provide the combination of raw materials and protected markets for finished goods that would cement the colonies to Europe.
 - viii. Whether or not this was the case, the alternative of allowing the colonies to slip away, perhaps into the United States' economic sphere or that of another power, was unappealing to every European government interested in postwar stability.
 - ix. Although the U.S. Government did not force the issue, it encouraged the European imperial powers to negotiate an early withdrawal from their overseas colonies.
- 14) Cold War and Decolonization
- i. As the Cold War competition with the Soviet Union came to dominate U.S. foreign policy concerns in the late 1940s and 1950s, the Truman and Eisenhower Administrations grew increasingly concerned that as the European powers lost their colonies or

- granted them independence, Soviet-supported communist parties might achieve power in the new states. This might serve to shift the international balance of power in favor of the Soviet Union and remove access to economic resources from U.S. allies.
- ii. Events such as the Indonesian struggle for independence from the Netherlands (1945–50), the Vietnamese war against France (1945–54), and the nationalist and professed socialist takeovers of Egypt (1952) and Iran (1951) served to reinforce such fears, even if new governments did not directly link themselves to the Soviet Union. Thus, the United States used aid packages, technical assistance and sometimes even military intervention to encourage newly independent nations in the Third World to adopt governments that aligned with the West.
 - iii. The Soviet Union deployed similar tactics in an effort to encourage new nations to join the communist bloc, and attempted to convince newly decolonized countries that communism was an intrinsically non-imperialist economic and political ideology.
 - iv. Many of the new nations resisted the pressure to be drawn into the Cold War, joined in the “nonaligned movement,” which formed after the Bandung conference of 1955, and focused on internal development.
- 15) UN and Decolonization
- i. The newly independent nations that emerged in the 1950s and the 1960s became an important factor in changing the balance of power within the United Nations.
 - ii. In 1946, there were 35 member states in the United Nations; as the newly independent nations of the “third world” joined the organization, by 1970 membership had swelled to 127.
 - iii. These new member states had a few characteristics in common; they were non-white, with developing economies, facing internal problems that were the result of their colonial past, which sometimes put them at odds with European countries and made them suspicious of European-style governmental structures, political ideas, and economic institutions.
 - iv. These countries also became vocal advocates of continuing decolonization, with the result that the UN Assembly was often

ahead of the Security Council on issues of self-governance and decolonization.

- v. The new nations pushed the UN toward accepting resolutions for independence for colonial states and creating a special committee on colonialism, demonstrating that even though some nations continued to struggle for independence, in the eyes of the international community, the colonial era was ending.

16) Conclusion

Topic 6

Cold War

8) Introduction

- i. The Cold War refers to the phenomenon that overshadowed world politics from the end of WWII until the fall of the former Soviet Union.
- ii. The Cold War was waged on political, economic, and propaganda fronts and had only limited recourse to weapons.
- iii. The term was first used by the English writer George Orwell in an article published in 1945 to refer to what he predicted would be a nuclear stalemate between “two or three monstrous super-states, each possessed of a weapon by which millions of people can be wiped out in a few seconds.” It was first used in the United States by the American financier and presidential adviser Bernard Baruch in a speech at the State House in Columbia, South Carolina, in 1947.
- iv. The term Cold War signifies the state of affairs in which bitter relations, hostility and confrontation between the two post-WWII superpowers (US and USSR).
- v. The Cold War did result in an arms race, diplomatic confrontation, proxy warfare, ideological competition which engulfed the entire world order. The Cold War resulted in formation of eastern and western power blocks and corresponding alliances and institutions under the Communist and Capitalist power blocks. The United States accused the Soviet Union of seeking to expand their version of communism throughout the world.
- vi. The Soviets, meanwhile, charged the United States with practicing imperialism and attempting to stop revolutionary activity in other countries. Cold War tensions increased the likelihood of a third world war, which could have led to devastating consequences due to the possibility of nuclear conflict. The Korean War, the Vietnam War and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan were some of the violent conflicts indirectly fueled by the Cold War. Another manifestation was in the propaganda wars between the United States and the USSR. Indeed, it was far from

- certain that a global nuclear war wouldn't result from smaller regional wars, which heightened the level of concern for each conflict. This tension shaped the lives of people around the world almost as much as the actual fighting did.
- vii. In the war between the U.S.S.R. and U.S.A. a major arena was the strategy of technology. This cold war also involved covert conflict, through acts of espionage. Beyond the actual fighting and killing that went on through intelligence services, the Cold War was heavily manifest in the concerns about nuclear weapons and the wars which could be fought with them, as well as in the propaganda wars between the United States and the USSR.
 - viii. One major hotspot of conflict was Germany, particularly the city of Berlin. Arguably, the most vivid symbol of the Cold War was the Berlin Wall. The Wall isolated West Berlin (the portion of the city controlled by West Germany and the Allies) from East Berlin and the territory of East Germany, which completely surrounded it and was supported by the Soviets. Formation of Power Blocks The eastern (communist) power block led by the Soviets and the western (capitalists) power block by the US also formed alliances.
 - ix. The communist nations were held together by the Warsaw Pact and the capitalist power block formed NATO.
 - x. Communist Ideology and Practice: The common ownership of means of production and distribution provided the political and economic basis for the spread of communism, based on Marx's philosophy of empowering the proletariat. Communism in practice resulted in dominance of a single political party and centralized decision making. The bureaucracy became the new bourgeoisie under communism in practice.
 - xi. Capitalist Ideology and Practice: Capitalism is based on the notion of individual liberty and the right to own private property. At the political level, capitalism emphasized the need for democratic government, multiparty politics, the independence of the judiciary, and freedom of press. In practice capitalism has caused problems for minorities, growing inequalities and arguments concerning the role of the state in managing the economy.

9) Types of War

- i. **Hot War:** this is actual warfare. All talks have failed and the armies are fighting.
- ii. **Warm War:** this is where talks are still going on and there would always be a chance of a peaceful outcome but armies, navies etc. are being fully mobilized and war plans are being put into operation ready for the command to fight.
- iii. **Cold War:** this term is used to describe the relationship between America and the Soviet Union 1945 to 1980. Neither side ever fought the other – the consequences would be too appalling – but they did ‘fight’ for their beliefs using **client states** who fought for their beliefs on their behalf e.g. South Vietnam was anticommunist and was supplied by America during the war while North Vietnam was pro-Communist and fought the south (and the Americans) using weapons from communist Russia or communist China. In Afghanistan, the Americans supplied the rebel Afghans after the Soviet Union invaded in 1979 while they never physically involved themselves thus avoiding a direct clash with the Soviet Union.

10) *Origins of the Cold War*

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

countries under American influence and the Soviets had installed openly communist regimes in eastern Europe.

11) **The struggle between superpowers**

- i. The Cold War reached its peak in 1948–53. In this period the Soviets unsuccessfully blockaded the Western-held sectors of West Berlin (1948–49); the United States and its European allies formed the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), a unified military command to resist the Soviet presence in Europe (1949); the Soviets exploded their first atomic warhead (1949), thus ending the American monopoly on the atomic bomb; the Chinese communists came to power in mainland China (1949); and the Soviet-supported communist government of North Korea invaded U.S.-supported South Korea in 1950, setting off an indecisive Korean War that lasted until 1953.
- ii. From 1953 to 1957 Cold War tensions relaxed somewhat, largely owing to the death of the longtime Soviet dictator Joseph Stalin in 1953; nevertheless, the standoff remained. A unified military organization among the Soviet-bloc countries, the Warsaw Pact, was formed in 1955; and West Germany was admitted into NATO that same year. Another intense stage of the Cold War was in 1958–62. The United States and the Soviet Union began developing intercontinental ballistic missiles, and in 1962 the Soviets began secretly installing missiles in Cuba that could be used to launch nuclear attacks on U.S. cities. This sparked the Cuban missile crisis (1962), a confrontation that brought the two superpowers to the brink of war before an agreement was reached to withdraw the missiles.
- iii. The Cuban missile crisis showed that neither the United States nor the Soviet Union were ready to use nuclear weapons for fear of the other's retaliation (and thus of mutual atomic annihilation). The two superpowers soon signed the Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty of 1963, which banned aboveground nuclear weapons testing. But the crisis also hardened the Soviets' determination never again to be humiliated by their military inferiority, and they began a buildup of both conventional and strategic forces that the United States was forced to match for the next 25 years.

iv. Throughout the Cold War the United States and the Soviet Union avoided direct military confrontation in Europe and engaged in actual combat operations only to keep allies from defecting to the other side or to overthrow them after they had done so. Thus, the Soviet Union sent troops to preserve communist rule in East Germany (1953), Hungary (1956), Czechoslovakia (1968), and Afghanistan (1979). For its part, the United States helped overthrow a left-wing government in Guatemala (1954), supported an unsuccessful invasion of Cuba (1961), invaded the Dominican Republic (1965) and Grenada (1983), and undertook a long (1964–75) and unsuccessful effort to prevent communist North Vietnam from bringing South Vietnam under its rule.

12) ***Toward a new world order***

- i. In the course of the 1960s and '70s, however, the bipolar struggle between the Soviet and American blocs gave way to a more-complicated pattern of international relationships in which the world was no longer split into two clearly opposed blocs. A major split had occurred between the Soviet Union and China in 1960 and widened over the years, shattering the unity of the communist bloc. In the meantime, western Europe and Japan achieved dynamic economic growth in the 1950s and '60s, reducing their relative inferiority to the United States. Less-powerful countries had more room to assert their independence and often showed themselves resistant to superpower coercion or cajoling.
- ii. The 1970s saw an easing of Cold War tensions as evinced in the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) that led to the SALT I and II agreements of 1972 and 1979, respectively, in which the two superpowers set limits on their antiballistic missiles and on their strategic missiles capable of carrying nuclear weapons. That was followed by a period of renewed Cold War tensions in the early 1980s as the two superpowers continued their massive arms buildup and competed for influence in the Third World. But the Cold War began to break down in the late 1980s during the administration of Soviet leader Mikhail S. Gorbachev. He dismantled the totalitarian aspects of the Soviet system and began efforts to democratize the Soviet political system. When

communist regimes in the Soviet-bloc countries of eastern Europe collapsed in 1989–90, Gorbachev acquiesced in their fall. The rise to power of democratic governments in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia was quickly followed by the unification of West and East Germany under NATO auspices, again with Soviet approval.

- iii. Gorbachev's internal reforms had meanwhile weakened his own Communist Party and allowed power to shift to Russia and the other constituent republics of the Soviet Union. In late 1991 the Soviet Union collapsed and 15 newly independent nations were born from its corpse, including a Russia with a democratically elected, anticommunist leader. The Cold War had come to an end.

13) **Cold War in Europe**

- i. The October Revolution of 1917 had sowed the seeds of Communism in Europe. The Soviet Union's ambitions were checked by the rise of fascism in Italy and Germany.
- ii. The Soviets agreed to join France, Britain and the US to check the power of the fascists during WWII. At the end of WWII however, tensions grew between the former Allies over dividing the spoils of war. The Soviets were reluctant to grant Poland independence and did not want to vacate their troops from eastern Germany. Communism spread to Poland and led to East Germany.
- iii. The Cold War intensified in the next few years and the Soviets managed to install Communist regimes in Bulgaria, Hungary and in Romania. Thereafter, Albania, Yugoslavia and Czechoslovakia also came under the influence of the Soviets and Finland's coalition government was also dominated by the Communists.
- iv. Europe was thus divided into two blocks: the Eastern block controlled by the Soviets and the Western block backed by the US. The post-WWII outbreak of conflict in Greece between the government and the Communist guerillas was a turning point in US foreign policy, when President Truman vowed to check the Soviet influence and to actively protect its foreign interests abroad.

- 14) **Truman Doctrine:** The Truman Doctrine was meant to fill the vacuum in power politics created by the weakening of Britain so as to

prevent the global domination of Communism. The Truman Doctrine offered direct assistance to Greece and to Turkey to check Communist influence and bypassed even the UN mechanism (a trend which was to reoccur in later years).

- 15) **Marshal Plan:** The Marshal Plan (named after the US Secretary of Defense) was an extension of the Truman Doctrine to protect (western) Europe from economic collapse and communist domination. Aid under the Marshal Plan was used to reconstruct war ravaged Europe and it became the basis for lending for development to newly independent countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

16) **Expansion of the Cold War Arena**

- i. Communism also spread to China with the initial backing of Soviets. The disposed Chiang Kai Sek government was exiled to Formosa, which is now Taiwan. The spread of Communism to China also lent support to North Korea, where the US backed the South Koreans. Soviet support to the North Vietnamese led to more serious US engagement in the conflict, due to the fear that Cambodia, Laos, Burma and Thailand could also become Communist. Despite sending up to 600,000 troops to Vietnam by 1965, the North Vietnamese won the battle with support of China and the Soviets.
- ii. In the M.E, the US provided active support to the Israelis but the Soviets were not able to influence the ME conflict to its advantage. In Latin America, the Soviet influence in Cuban and Nicaragua made the US very nervous and it supported brutal regimes like that of Pinochet in Chile to prevent its fall to communist influence.
- iii. The Congo, Ghana and Gold Coast got military and financial aid from the Soviets, which also led the US to take counter measures in Africa. In South Asia, besides Indian leaning towards the Soviet and the Pakistani inclination towards the US, the invasion of Afghanistan became a major Cold War arena for a proxy war between the Superpowers.

17) **Reconciliation (Détente)**

- i. Even at the height of the Cold War, there were efforts to prevent an outbreak of all out conflict as that could have brought an end to

- human civilization as a whole. Khrushchev and Eisenhower yet at Camp David and commenced the trend towards disarmament.
- ii. A Partial Test Ban Treaty (PTBT) was signed in 1962, a hotline was established between the heads of states in 1963 and the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was signed in 1968.
 - iii. From 1969 to 1978, a period of détente remained, where both sides accepted the status quo in view of the mutually assured destruction (MAD) capacity of the superpowers and as the realization concerning costs of nuclear arsenals was becoming apparent.
 - iv. Nixon visited USSR and signed a Limitation on Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Systems and Limitation of Strategic Offensive Arms, indicating adoption of a defensive rather than offensive posture by both superpowers.
 - v. Strategic Arms Limitation Talks continued from 1969 to 1979. The US proposed ban on using mobile land sites and the superpowers also reached an agreement on a Seabed Treaty, banning use of sea-beds as nuclear launch sites

18) **Resurgence of tensions**

- i. The invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 fanned the embers of the Cold War again. The USSR's interference in Angola was also another irritant and the new US administration was also less tolerant and it wanted to begin building bridges with China, which Soviets were now opposed to, these moves simultaneously ended the period of détente.
- ii. Jimmy Carter used the human rights agenda to criticize Soviet backed regimes, the US discovered a Soviet brigade in Cuba and withdrew from SALT II, it boycotted the Olympic games in Moscow in 1980 and imposed a grain embargo on the USSR.
- iii. The Soviets in turn banned the LA Olympics in 1984 and shot down a South Korean air liner and by 1983 they pulled out completely from bilateral arms talks with the US after the Cruise and Pershing 2 missiles were found deployed by three west European countries.
- iv. The overthrow of the Shah of Iran in 1979 also impelled the US to secure bases in Oman, Kenya and Somalia to obtain a strategic

stronghold and protects its interests around the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

- v. On the other hand, the Soviets, Cubans, Nicaraguans and even the Ethiopians were accused by the US of supplying arms to insurgents El Salvador in Central America.
- vi. While the Cold War ended practically with dismantling of the 35 km Berlin Wall in 1989, it wasn't until the London Summit a few years later that the Cold War was formally announced to be over London Summit. The London Summit emphasized the need for the US to reduce the number of nuclear weapons it had deployed in Europe. It obtained a pledge to withdraw the 1470 nuclear tipped artillery shells from West Germany and for the Soviets to withdraw troops from Central and Eastern Europe. It redefined NATO's new role from strength seeking alliance to a peace keeping mission.

19) **End of the Cold War**

- i. The process that brought the Cold War to an end began in the second half of the 1980s. It led to the Malta Summit between President Bush and Mikhail Gorbachev in 1989.
- ii. The Washington Summit in 1990 between the same leaders resulted in signing of number of nuclear, chemical and conventional arms reduction agreements. Enormous defense spending by America (the implications of which were first hinted at by President Eisenhower's speech on the Military-industrial complex) under President Ronald Reagan is often seen as a major factor in the end of the war. According to this theory, the robust Western economies could absorb the expenses of programs such as the Star Wars missile defense but the Eastern bloc countries crippled themselves trying to match them. However, Reagan's policy towards the Soviet Union defined Eastern bloc governments as "totalitarian", under a doctrine which denied that such regimes could ever undergo internal transformation towards democracy. Thus Reagan's foreign policy was never intended to bring about the changes which actually occurred in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union.

- iii. Corrupt governments and citizens' desire for greater personal freedom and greater individual wealth were also major factors in the collapse of the Soviet Union and its satellite countries.
- iv. Others argue that the Soviet Union's collapse was already inevitable. There is certainly evidence that the CIA played up Soviet military power through the 1980s.

20) **The World after the Cold War**

- i. The balance of power shifted drastically after the Cold War and its effects were felt the world over (Consider the case of Pakistan for e.g. which felt abandoned by the US after the fall of the Soviets).
- ii. The collapse of the Soviet Union led to the emergence of new states and the change of governments in several countries (Breakup of Yugoslavia for e.g.). Unresolved conflicts, in Korea, Vietnam and Germany, complicated by the interference of the superpowers came to a quick end.
- iii. A new world order emerged at the end of the Cold War, which was influenced by multilateralism and a unilateral superpower. The end of the Cold War called for a new focus in IR which could better analyze and anticipate the realities of a new world order. The end of communism also had economic implications which boosted the legitimacy of the market mechanism.

21) **The Capitalist Ideology:** Capitalism is based on the notion of individual liberty and the right to own private property. At the political level, capitalism emphasized the need for democratic government, multiparty politics, independence of the judiciary, and freedom of press. In practice capitalism has caused problems for minorities, growing inequalities and arguments concerning the role of the state in managing the economy.

22) **The Effects of the Cold War:**

- i. The United States believed that the Soviet Union's expansion threatened the developing nations of the world. So, in 1949 President Truman and Congress approved nearly \$400 million for technical development programs in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. The goal of this Point Four Program was to modernize and strengthen developing nations and discourage the growth of communism.

- ii. Gorbachev's policy of Glasnost eliminated the strict censorship practiced for hundreds of years. Glasnost stands for openness, and Soviet citizens were now allowed to speak openly about their country's problems. Perestroika, or "restructuring," was Gorbachev's attempt to end the inefficiency and corruption in government.
- iii. The United States and other Western nations decided to form alliances against possible Soviet attempts to extend their sphere of influence. In April 1949 the United States signed the North Atlantic Treaty. Members agreed that an attack on one of them would be considered an attack on all of them. The Soviets later formed an opposing alliance known as The Warsaw Pact. Because of the arms race many countries in the world now own nuclear weapons.

23) **Timeline of the Cold War:**

1940s

1945: February 4-11-- Yalta Conference Cold War Begins

1945: August 6 -- United States first used atomic bomb in war (A bomb was dropped on Hiroshima + Nagasaki)

1945: August 8 -- Russia enters war against Japan

1945: August 14 -- Japanese surrender End of World War II

1946: March -- Winston Churchill delivers "Iron Curtain" Speech

1947: March -- Truman declares active role in Greek Civil War

1947: June -- Marshall Plan is announced

1948: February -- Communist takeover in Czechoslovakia

1948: June 24 -- Berlin Blockade begins

1949: July -- NATO ratified

1949: May 12 -- Berlin Blockade ends

1949: September -- Mao Zedong, a Communist, takes control of China

1949: September -- Soviets explode first atomic bomb

1950s

1950: February -- Joe McCarthy begins Communist witch hunt

1950: June -- Korean War begins

1951: January 12 -- Federal Civil Defense Administration established
1953: June 19 -- Rosenberg executions
1953: July -- Korean War ends
1954: March -- KGB established
1954 -- CIA helps overthrow unfriendly regimes in Iran and Guatemala
1954: July -- Vietnam split at 17th parallel
1955: May -- Warsaw Pact formed
1956: October - November -- Rebellion put down in Communist Hungary. Egypt took control of Suez Canal; U.S. refused to help take it back.
1957: October 4 -- Sputnik launched into orbit
1958: November -- Khrushchev demands withdrawal of troops from Berlin
1959: January -- Cuba taken over by Fidel Castro
1959: September -- Khrushchev visits United States; denied access to Disneyland

1960s

1960: May -- Soviet Union reveals that U.S. spy plane was shot down over Soviet territory
1960: November -- John F. Kennedy elected President
1961: April -- Bay of Pigs invasion
1961: July -- Kennedy requests 25% spending increase for military
1961: August 13 -- Berlin border closed
1961: August 17 -- Construction of Berlin Wall begins
1962: -- U.S. involvement in Vietnam increased
1962: October -- Cuban Missile Crisis
1963: July -- Nuclear Test Ban Treaty ratified
1963: November -- President Kennedy assassinated in Dallas, Texas
1964: August -- Gulf of Tonkin incident
1965: April -- U.S. Marines sent to Dominican Republic to fight Communism
1965: July -- Announcement of dispatching of 150,000 U.S. troops to Vietnam
1968: January -- North Korea captured U.S.S. Pueblo

1968: August -- Soviet troops crush Czechoslovakian revolt

1969: July 20 -- Apollo 11 lands on the moon

1970s

1970: April -- President Nixon extends Vietnam War to Cambodia

1972: July -- SALT I signed

1973: January -- Cease fire in Vietnam between North Vietnam and United States

1973: September -- United States helps overthrow Chile government

1973: October -- Egypt and Syria attack Israel; Egypt requests Soviet aid

1974: August -- President Nixon resigns

1975: April 17 -- North Vietnam defeats South Vietnam

1979: July -- SALT II signed

1979: November -- Shah of Iran overthrown; Iranian Hostage Crisis

1980s

1983: -- President Reagan proposes Strategic Defense Initiative

1983: October -- U.S. troops overthrow regime in Grenada

1985: -- Iran-Contra Affair (arms sold to Iran, profits used to support contras in Nicaragua)

1985: -- Mikhail Gorbachev ascends to power in Soviet Union

1986: -- Gorbachev ends economic aid to Soviet satellites

1986: October -- Reagan and Gorbachev resolve to remove all intermediate nuclear missiles from Europe

1986: November -- Iran-Contra Affair revealed to public

1987: October -- Reagan and Gorbachev agree to remove all medium and short-range nuclear missiles by signing treaty

1989: January -- Soviet troops withdraw from Afghanistan

1989: June -- China puts down protests for democracy; Poland becomes independent

1989: September -- Hungary becomes independent

1989: November -- Berlin Wall fall

1989: December -- Communist governments fall in Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Rumania; Soviet empire ends

1990s

1990: March -- Lithuania becomes independent

1990: May 29 -- Boris Yeltsin elected to presidency of Russia

1990: October 3 -- Germany reunited

1991: April -- Warsaw Pact ends

1991: August -- End of Soviet Union, Cold War Ends

- 24) So why were these two super powers so distrustful of each other?
- i. America: free elections, democratic, Capitalist, 'Survival of the fittest', Richest world power, Personal Freedom, Freedom of the media
 - ii. Soviet union: No elections or fixed, Autocratic/ Dictatorship, Communist, Everybody helps everybody, Poor economic base, Society controlled by the NKVD (secret police), Total censorship

25) **Conclusion**

Topic 7

Post Cold War: Unipolarity (New World Order) and Revival of Multi-Polarity

- From The Cold War to the War On Terror
 - The cold war was a complex relationship that assumed competition but remained cold in large part because of the existence of nuclear weapons.
 - Most experts assumed the cold war would continue and were surprised when it came to a peaceful conclusion. There is no academic consensus as to why the cold war came to an end when it did or why it did.
 - The end of the cold war divided—and still divides—International Relations scholars into mainstream realists and ideas-oriented constructivists.
 - The term 'globalization' was rarely used before 1989 but became one of the most popular ways of defining international politics after the cold war. Though globalization is a much disputed term, analysts agree that it describes a one-world system where all actors have to play by the same economic rules. Globalization has become the master discourse of governments around the world. Globalization has produced many winners and a large number of losers, but there would appear to be no escaping its competitive logic. Most experts did not anticipate—and some did not look forward to—the new American hegemony following the end of the cold war. In spite of the spread of democracy and globalization, most US policy-makers still viewed the world as a threatening and dangerous place during the 1990s.
 - The United States after the cold war is best described as a 'superpower without a mission'. After the fiasco in Somalia the majority of Americans were reluctant to use US forces abroad. In spite of the break-up of former Yugoslavia, Europe benefited as much from the end of the cold war as the United States.
 - Europeans after the cold war were divided over a series of key issues, most notably the degree of European integration, economic strategy, and the foreign policy aspirations of the European

Union. The European Security Strategy of 2003 was one of the first serious efforts by the EU to think about its international role under conditions of globalization.

- Many issues face Europe, including Turkish membership of the EU, the position of Europe's Muslims, and China's economic challenge.
- The first Russian President, Boris Yeltsin, sought a new partnership with the West but was often accused by his domestic enemies of not defending the Russian national interest. Vladimir Putin, his successor, has pursued more authoritarian policies at home, brought Russia's economic assets back under state control, and pursued a more nationalist foreign policy abroad.
- A new cold war between the West and Russia is unlikely because of the important economic and political changes that have occurred in Russia since the collapse of the USSR in 1991.
- Compared to Europe after 1945, the international relations of East Asia during the cold war were highly volatile, marked by revolutions, wars, and insurgencies.
- The end of the cold war left many issues in its wake and led Aaron Friedberg (1993) to conclude that Asia was primed for further rivalry. Friedberg's thesis has been challenged as being too pessimistic: economic growth, regional integration, America's presence, and Japan's peaceful foreign policy continue to make the region less dangerous than he suggested.
- One of the big questions now facing the region and the United States is 'rising China'. Realists insist it will challenge the status quo. Others believe it can rise peacefully.
- One of the defining areas of instability during the cold war was the Third World. With the end of the cold war the term 'Third World' has been challenged by many analysts.
- China and India are prime examples of countries where globalization has produced high levels of development.
- Inequality creates security challenges in the form of migration, refugees, and in certain instances, political violence directed against the more powerful West.

- September 11 effectively brought the post-cold war era to an end and in the process transformed US foreign policy.
- The war to remove Saddam Hussein was sold as part of the war on terror; very few analysts, however, saw a connection between Iraq and 9/11. The reasons for going to war have been much disputed, though most people now believe it was a strategic error.
- The longer-term impact of the Bush doctrine could very easily weaken America's global position over the long term.

- **Introduction**

- **“The post-Cold War era saw optimism, and the balance of power shifted solely to the United States”**
- With the breakup of the Soviet Union into separate nations, and the re-emergence of the nation of Russia, the world of pro-U.S. and pro-Soviet alliances broke down. Different challenges presented themselves, such as climate change and the threat of nuclear terrorism. Regional powerbrokers in Iraq and Saddam Hussein challenged the peace with a surprise attack on the small nation of Kuwait in 1991.
- President George H.W. Bush organized a coalition of allied and Middle Eastern powers that successfully pushed back the invading forces, but stopped short of invading Iraq and capturing Hussein. As a result, the dictator was free to cause mischief for another twelve years.
- After the Gulf War, many scholars like Zbigniew Brzezinski claimed that the lack of a new strategic vision for U.S. foreign policy resulted in many missed opportunities for its foreign policy. The United States mostly scaled back its foreign policy budget as well as its cold war defense budget during the 1990s, which amounted to 6.5% of GDP while focusing on domestic economic prosperity under President Clinton, who succeeded in achieving a budget surplus for 1999 and 2000.

- **The aftermath of the Cold War**

- It continues to influence world affairs. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the post–Cold War world was widely considered as unipolar, with the United States the sole remaining superpower. The Cold War defined the political role of the United States in the

post–World War II world: by 1989 the U.S. held military alliances with 50 countries, and had 526,000 troops posted abroad in dozens of countries, with 326,000 in Europe (two-thirds of which in west Germany) and about 130,000 in Asia (mainly Japan and South Korea).

- The Cold War also marked the apex of peacetime military-industrial complexes, especially in the United States, and large-scale military funding of science. These complexes, though their origins may be found as early as the 19th century, have grown considerably during the Cold War. The military-industrial complexes have great impact on their countries and help shape their society, policy and foreign relations.

- **New World Order**

- A concept that defined the world power after the Cold-War was known as the new world order. The most widely discussed application of the phrase of recent times came at the end of the Cold War. Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and George H.W. Bush used the term to try to define the nature of the post Cold War era, and the spirit of a great power cooperation they hoped might materialize . Historians will look back and say this was no ordinary time but a defining moment: an unprecedented period of global change, and a time when one chapter ended and another began.

- **War on Terrorism**

- A concept that defined the world power after the Cold-War was known as the new world order. The most widely discussed application of the phrase of recent times came at the end of the Cold War. Presidents Mikhail Gorbachev and George H.W. Bush used the term to try to define the nature of the post Cold War era, and the spirit of a great power cooperation they hoped might materialize . Historians will look back and say this was no ordinary time but a defining moment: an unprecedented period of global change, and a time when one chapter ended and another began.
- Furthermore, when no weapons of mass destruction were found after a military conquest of Iraq, there was worldwide skepticism

that the war had been fought to prevent terrorism, and the continuing war in Iraq has had serious negative public relations consequences for the image of the United States.

- **Multipolar World**

- The big change during these years was a transition from a bipolar world to a multipolar world. While the United States remains a strong power economically and militarily, rising nations such as China, Pakistan, India, Brazil, and Russia as well as a united Europe have challenged its dominance. Foreign policy analysts such as Nina Harchigian suggest that the six emerging big powers share common concerns: free trade, economic growth, prevention of terrorism, and efforts to stymie nuclear proliferation.
- And if they can avoid war, the coming decades can be peaceful and productive provided there are no misunderstandings or dangerous rivalries.

- **General Overview**

- An era ended when the Soviet Union collapsed on Dec. 31, 1991. The confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union defined the Cold War period. The collapse of Europe framed that confrontation. After World War II, the Soviet and American armies occupied Europe. Both towered over the remnants of Europe's forces. The collapse of the European imperial system, the emergence of new states and a struggle between the Soviets and Americans for domination and influence also defined the confrontation. There were, of course, many other aspects and phases of the confrontation, but in the end, the Cold War was a struggle built on Europe's decline.
- Many shifts in the international system accompanied the end of the Cold War. In fact, 1991 was an extraordinary and defining year. The Japanese economic miracle ended. China after Tiananmen Square inherited Japan's place as a rapidly growing, export-based economy, one defined by the continued pre-eminence of the Chinese Communist Party. The Maastricht Treaty was formulated, creating the structure of the subsequent European Union. A vast coalition dominated by the United States reversed the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait.

- Three things defined the post-Cold War world. The first was U.S. power. The second was the rise of China as the center of global industrial growth based on low wages. The third was the re-emergence of Europe as a massive, integrated economic power. Meanwhile, Russia, the main remnant of the Soviet Union, reeled while Japan shifted to a dramatically different economic mode.
- The post-Cold War world had two phases. The first lasted from Dec. 31, 1991, until Sept. 11, 2001. The second lasted from 9/11 until now.
- The initial phase of the post-Cold War world was built on two assumptions. The first assumption was that the United States was the dominant political and military power but that such power was less significant than before, since economics was the new focus. The second phase still revolved around the three Great Powers — the United States, China and Europe — but involved a major shift in the worldview of the United States, which then assumed that pre-eminence included the power to reshape the Islamic world through military action while China and Europe single-mindedly focused on economic matters.
- **The Three Pillars of the International System**
 - In this new era, Europe is reeling economically and is divided politically. The idea of Europe codified in Maastricht no longer defines Europe. Like the Japanese economic miracle before it, the Chinese economic miracle is drawing to a close and Beijing is beginning to examine its military options. The United States is withdrawing from Afghanistan and reconsidering the relationship between global pre-eminence and global omnipotence. Nothing is as it was in 1991.
 - Europe primarily defined itself as an economic power, with sovereignty largely retained by its members but shaped by the rule of the European Union. Europe tried to have it all: economic integration and individual states. But now this untenable idea has reached its end and Europe is fragmenting. One region, including Germany, Austria, the Netherlands and Luxembourg, has low unemployment. The other region on the periphery has high or extraordinarily high unemployment.

- Germany wants to retain the European Union to protect German trade interests and because Berlin properly fears the political consequences of a fragmented Europe. But as the creditor of last resort, Germany also wants to control the economic behavior of the EU nation-states. Berlin does not want to let off the European states by simply bailing them out. If it bails them out, it must control their budgets. But the member states do not want to cede sovereignty to a German-dominated EU apparatus in exchange for a bailout.
- In the indebted peripheral region, Cyprus has been treated with particular economic savagery as part of the bailout process.
- China's economy couldn't possibly continue to expand at the same rate. Leaving aside all the specific arguments, extraordinarily rapid growth in an export-oriented economy requires economic health among its customers. It is nice to imagine expanded domestic demand, but in a country as impoverished as China, increasing demand requires revolutionizing life in the interior.
- It is interesting to recall the extravagant claims about the future of Japan in the 1980s. Awestruck by growth rates, Westerners did not see the hollowing out of the financial system as growth rates were sustained by cutting prices and profits. Japan's miracle seemed to be eternal. It wasn't, and neither is China's. And China has a problem that Japan didn't: a billion impoverished people. Japan exists, but behaves differently than it did before; the same is happening to China.
- Both Europe and China thought about the world in the post-Cold War period similarly. Each believed that geopolitical questions and even questions of domestic politics could be suppressed and sometimes even ignored. They believed this because they both thought they had entered a period of permanent prosperity. 1991-2008 was in fact a period of extraordinary prosperity, one that both Europe and China simply assumed would never end and one whose prosperity would moot geopolitics and politics.
- Periods of prosperity, of course, always alternate with periods of austerity, and now history has caught up with Europe and China. Europe, which had wanted union and sovereignty, is confronting

- the political realities of EU unwillingness to make the fundamental and difficult decisions on what union really meant. For its part, China wanted to have a free market and a communist regime in a region it would dominate economically. Its economic climax has left it with the question of whether the regime can survive in an uncontrolled economy, and what its regional power would look like if it weren't prosperous.
- And the United States has emerged from the post-Cold War period with one towering lesson: However attractive military intervention is, it always looks easier at the beginning than at the end. The greatest military power in the world has the ability to defeat armies. But it is far more difficult to reshape societies in America's image. A Great Power manages the routine matters of the world not through military intervention, but through manipulating the balance of power. The issue is not that America is in decline. Rather, it is that even with the power the United States had in 2001, it could not impose its political will — even though it had the power to disrupt and destroy regimes — unless it was prepared to commit all of its power and treasure to transforming a country like Afghanistan. And that is a high price to pay for Afghan democracy.
 - The United States has emerged into the new period with what is still the largest economy in the world with the fewest economic problems of the three pillars of the post-Cold War world. It has also emerged with the greatest military power. But it has emerged far more mature and cautious than it entered the period. There are new phases in history, but not new world orders. Economies rise and fall, there are limits to the greatest military power and a Great Power needs prudence in both lending and invading.
- **A New Era Begins**
 - Eras unfold in strange ways until you suddenly realize they are over. For example, the Cold War era meandered for decades, during which U.S.-Soviet detentes or the end of the Vietnam War could have seemed to signal the end of the era itself. Now, we are at a point where the post-Cold War model no longer explains the behavior of the world. We are thus entering a new era.

- First, the United States remains the world's dominant power in all dimensions. It will act with caution, however, recognizing the crucial difference between pre-eminence and omnipotence.
- Second, Europe is returning to its normal condition of multiple competing nation-states. While Germany will dream of a Europe in which it can write the budgets of lesser states, the EU nation-states will look at Cyprus and choose default before losing sovereignty.
- Third, Russia is re-emerging. As the European Peninsula fragments, the Russians will do what they always do: fish in muddy waters. Russia is giving preferential terms for natural gas imports to some countries, buying metallurgical facilities in Hungary and Poland, and buying rail terminals in Slovakia. Russia has always been economically dysfunctional yet wielded outsized influence — recall the Cold War. The deals they are making, of which this is a small sample, are not in their economic interests, but they increase Moscow's political influence substantially.
- Fourth, China is becoming self-absorbed in trying to manage its new economic realities. Aligning the Communist Party with lower growth rates is not easy. The Party's reason for being is prosperity. Without prosperity, it has little to offer beyond a much more authoritarian state.
- And fifth, a host of new countries will emerge to supplement China as the world's low-wage, high-growth epicenter. Latin America, Africa and less-developed parts of Southeast Asia are all emerging as contenders.
- **Relativity in the Balance of Power**
 - There is a paradox in all of this. While the United States has committed many errors, the fragmentation of Europe and the weakening of China mean the United States emerges more powerful, since power is relative. It was said that the post-Cold War world was America's time of dominance. I would argue that it was the preface of U.S. dominance. Its two great counterbalances are losing their ability to counter U.S. power because they mistakenly believed that real power was economic power. The

United States had combined power — economic, political and military — and that allowed it to maintain its overall power when economic power faltered.

- A fragmented Europe has no chance at balancing the United States. And while China is reaching for military power, it will take many years to produce the kind of power that is global, and it can do so only if its economy allows it to. The United States defeated the Soviet Union in the Cold War because of its balanced power. Europe and China defeated themselves because they placed all their chips on economics. And now we enter the new era.
- Conclusion

Topic 8

Post Cold War: Terrorism

9) Introduction

- i. The War on Terror is a term commonly applied to an international military campaign begun by the United States and United Kingdom with support from other countries after the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks . The campaign's official purpose was to eliminate al-Qaeda and other militant organizations. The two main military operations associated with the War on Terror were Operation Enduring Freedom in Afghanistan and Operation Iraqi Freedom in Iraq.
- ii. **The phrase "War on Terror"** was first used by U.S. President George W. Bush on 20 September 2001. The Bush administration and the Western media have since used the term to denote a global military, political, legal, and ideological struggle targeting organizations designated as terrorist and regimes accused of supporting them. It was typically used with a particular focus on Al-Qaeda and other militant Islamists. Although the term is not officially used by the administration of U.S. President Barack Obama, it is still commonly used by politicians, in the media, and officially by some aspects of government, such as the United States' Global War on Terrorism Service Medal.

10) Precursor to 9/11 Attacks

- i. The origins of al-Qaeda as a network inspiring terrorism around the world and training operatives can be traced to the Soviet war in Afghanistan (December 1979–February 1989). The United States supported the Islamist mujahadeen guerillas against the military forces of the Soviet Union and the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. In May 1996 the group World Islamic Front for Jihad Against Jews and Crusaders (WIFJAJC), sponsored by Osama bin Laden and later reformed as al-Qaeda, started forming a large base of operations in Afghanistan, where the Islamist extremist regime of the Taliban had seized power that same year. In February 1998, Osama bin Laden, as the head of al-Qaeda, signed a fatwā declaring war on the West and Israel, and later in

May of that same year al-Qaeda released a video declaring war on the U.S. and the West.

11) **U.S. Military Responses (Afghanistan)**

- i. On 20 September 2001, in the wake of the 11 September attacks, George W. Bush delivered an ultimatum to the Taliban government of Afghanistan to turn over Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda leaders operating in the country or face attack. The Taliban demanded evidence of bin Laden's link to the 11 September attacks and, if such evidence warranted a trial, they offered to handle such a trial in an Islamic Court. The US refused to provide any evidence.
- ii. Subsequently, in October 2001, US forces invaded Afghanistan to oust the Taliban regime. On 7 October 2001, the official invasion began with British and U.S. forces conducting airstrike campaigns over enemy targets. Kabul, the capital city of Afghanistan, fell by mid-November. The remaining al-Qaeda and Taliban remnants fell back to the rugged mountains of eastern Afghanistan, mainly Tora Bora. In December, Coalition forces (the U.S. and its allies) fought within that region. It is believed that Osama bin Laden escaped into Pakistan during the battle.

12) **U.S. Military Responses (Iraq)**

- i. Iraq had been listed as a State Sponsor of Terrorism by the U.S. since 1990, when Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. Iraq was also on the list from 1979 to 1982; it had been removed so that the U.S. could provide material support to Iraq in its war with Iran. Hussein's regime proved a continuing problem for the U.N. and Iraq's neighbors due to its use of chemical weapons against Iranians and Kurds.
- ii. In October 2002, a large bipartisan majority in the United States Congress authorized the president to use force if necessary to disarm Iraq in order to "prosecute the war on terrorism. " After failing to overcome opposition from France, Russia, and China against a UNSC resolution that would sanction the use of force against Iraq, and before the U.N. weapons inspectors had completed their inspections, the U.S. assembled a "Coalition of the

Willing" composed of nations who pledged support for its policy of regime change in Iraq.

- iii. The Iraq War began in March 2003 with an air campaign, which was immediately followed by a U.S.-led ground invasion . The Bush administration stated that the invasion was the "serious consequences" spoken of in the UNSC Resolution 1441. The Bush administration also stated that the Iraq War was part of the War on Terror, a claim that was later questioned.
- iv. Baghdad, Iraq's capital city, fell in April 2003 and Saddam Hussein's government quickly dissolved. On 1 May 2003, Bush announced that major combat operations in Iraq had ended. However, an insurgency arose against the U.S.-led coalition and the newly developing Iraqi military and post-Saddam government. The insurgency, which included al-Qaeda affiliated groups, led to far more coalition casualties than the invasion. Iraq's former president, Saddam Hussein, was captured by U.S. forces in December 2003. He was executed in 2006.

13) Conclusion

Topic 9

Post Cold War: End of History, Clash of Civilizations

- **End of History:**

- One was Francis Fukuyama's "end of history" thesis, first outlined in an article in the National Interest in 1989 then elaborated in a book published in 1992. It pronounced total victory for Western capitalism and liberal democracy over all other competing ideologies and even predicted a boring future of peace and tranquility.
- This article was written in 1989, in a period of unpredictable changes in the history. With the collapse of the Soviet Union, socialism, Which is the main threat and alternative to liberalism was defeated. In this newly occurring situation, he wrote his article, without examining this process in detail and with its multi-dimensional aspects.
- At the beginning of this article, he briefly summarizes his main argument as follows; victory of economic and political liberalism occurred at the end of the 20th century. The victory of the West and Western idea is evident firstly with the collapse of systematic alternatives to Western liberalism. He states that, in the past decade, there have been important changes in the intellectual climate of the world's two largest communist countries(Russia, China) and reform movements have begun in both. Also it can be seen in the spread of consumerist Western culture. As a result of these indications, he reaches to his main idea: "What we may be witnessing is not just the end of the Cold War or the passing of a particular period of post-war history; that is the end point of mankind's ideological evolution and the universalization of Western liberal democracy as the final form of human government." But as we see from the beginning, he states his arguments without a strong basis and with a lack of evidence.
- After expressing his main argument, he makes some references to Marx, Hegel and Kojève. He says that his main concept 'the end of history', is not an original concept. This concept was firstly used

- by Hegel. According to Hegel, history is a dialectical process, with a beginning, a middle and an end. On the other hand, Marx, believes that, the direction of historical development was a purposeful one and would come to an end with the achievement of a communist Utopia that would finally resolve all prior contradictions.
- He was affected especially by Hegel's historicism. According to this perspective, mankind has progressed through a series of primitive stages of consciousness, on his path to the present. Hegel believes that, at the end, rational form of society and state became victorious. According to Hegel, history came to an end in 1806 with Napoleon's defeat of the Prussian monarchy at the Battle of Jena which symbolised the victory of the ideals of the French Revolution. At that point, the vanguard of humanity actualized the principles of the French Revolution. But particular regimes in the real world might not implement these ideas fully. After stating these references, Fukuyama explains his own opinions. According to him, the state that emerges at the end of history is liberal, democratic, recognizes and protects man's universal right to freedom through a system of law. Fukuyama, also makes references to Kojève, who is a modern French interpreter of Hegel. For Kojève, this so-called 'universal homogenous state' is realized in the countries of post-war Western Europe
 - Fukuyama explains the evolution process of human history as follows; human history was based on the existence of contradictions; as it can be seen in the primitive man's search for mutual recognition, contradiction between master and slave. But in the universal homogeneous state, all prior contradictions are resolved and all human needs are satisfied. There is no conflict over large issues and no need for generals or statesmen, what remains is primarily economic activity. So he states that, main contradictions of human history will come to end with the end of history. Fukuyama, also tries to improve the inefficiency of materialist theories and support Hegel's idealist perspective. He gives examples about Far Eastern societies; he emphasizes their

cultural heritage, the etrnc of work, family and other moral qualities which are important in explaining their economic performance.

- **Clash of Civilizations:**

- The Samuel Huntington's "clash of civilizations" thesis was first presented in a Foreign Affairs article in 1993 and then in a book published in 1996.
- He was decidedly pessimistic, predicting that the end of the U.S.-Soviet rivalry would be followed by a new wave of conflict fueled by civilizational competition and animosity.
- Samuel Huntington's article "The clash of civilizations?" was published in the journal Foreign Affairs in 1993 and resulted in a heated academic and public debate. Three years later the book with the same title, now without the question mark, appeared. The appeal of Huntington's theory is his attempt to develop an all-encompassing construct that explains not only the conflicts of the present and future, but also the key features of the international political system. Since it also touches upon intrastate conflicts, its implications reach beyond international relations.
- There have been a number of 'world images' of international politics predicted for the twenty-first century. On the one hand, some of the more optimistic students of globalization and the alleged spread of democracy see the world's peoples coming closer together in economic, political, and cultural terms. On the other hand, more pessimistic analyses have focused on the gap between 'zones of peace and war' and clashes between emerging great powers in a multipolar era.
- Huntington's diagnosis belongs in the pessimistic camp, although it is distinctive in its focus on civilizations as the main unit of analysis. Huntington argues that the world is divided into a number of such civilizations. They are Western, Latin American, African, Islamic, Sinic, Hindu, Christian Orthodox, Buddhist, and Japanese. Within some of these civilizations, there is a core state, often possessing nuclear weapons. Sinic civilization has China as its core; Japan has its own civilization.

- Western civilization has linked cores in the United States, France, Germany, and the United Kingdom. Russia is the core state of Orthodox Christianity. In contrast, Islam lacks a core state, as does Latin America and Africa. In the future, we can expect conflicts to emerge along the major fault-lines between civilisations: Orthodox versus Western Christianity and Islam; Muslim versus Hindu; Sinic versus Hindu. Africa and Latin America will remain on the sidelines.
- **Huntington defines a civilization** as the broadest grouping of people beyond the level distinguishing humans from other species. A civilization is defined by common objective elements – language, history, religion, customs, and institutions – as well as by people's self-identification.
- Huntington is particularly concerned about the challenge that Islam poses to the West, both because its birthrate is higher than that of other civilisations and because of the resurgence of its popularity at the end of the twentieth century.
- Moreover, its rejection of Western values and American influence means that these two civilizations are bound to clash at some point. If China allies with Islamic states against the United States, the danger of war will be very high. Huntington offers some guidelines or rules of conduct to avoid such a fate. The core states should abstain from intervening in the internal affairs of other civilizations; they must mediate disputes that could turn into wars on fault-lines between civilizations; and all civilizations should work to identify shared values.
- As for the West, Huntington urges the United States to strengthen its alliances with others in the Western bloc, and avoid weakening its distinctive cultural values. Huntington is no supporter of multiculturalism and the politics of respect among different minorities.
- Criticism
 - **First**, it has been pointed out that to reduce the number of civilizations to eight or nine does not seem serious. The mention of a possible African civilization is dubious. Africa is

a rich mosaic of cultures; so is Europe. And Europe is not the same as North America. What Huntington lumps together as Western civilization has considerable internal fractures. Civilizations are not monolithic blocs. Some, for example Islam, are defined primarily by their religious inspiration; in others, such as the Confucian civilization, the relationship between the religion inspiring them and the political force they exert is less clear.

- In Western civilization, Catholic or Protestant versions of Christianity form part of the cultural landscape, although citizens of Western states are deeply divided with regard to religious beliefs. In each of Huntington's civilizations there are trends of thought that follow confessional lines, and others that follow secular lines – a subject of lively debate today in countries such as Turkey and Italy.
- Besides religion, cultural splits make it difficult to look at civilizations as politically compact blocs. Huntington talks of Latin American culture but ignores, for example, the division between the Spanish and Indian cultures.
- There are also considerable splits between social groups that benefit from the international economic system and those it discriminates against. On the African continent, oligarchies share Western values and cultural preferences while other groups make do with socially devalued lifestyles far removed from modernity. Who represents African civilization, the English- or French-speaking communities, or the masses that speak only local languages and lack access to Western technologies?
- **The second major criticism** levelled at Huntington's argument is that the relationship between states and civilizations remains unclear. If civilization is the true independent variable, why did it give way to power relationships between states during the cold war? Furthermore, Huntington's own analysis of alignments between, say, China and Islam explicitly crosses civilizational boundaries and reflects the interests of

powerful states. One might then argue that military power and the balance of power among states could overwhelm the influence of culture and religion.

- Finally, critics have argued that Huntington underestimates the enduring strength of Western civilization, global capitalism, and interdependence. Whilst his vision does alert us to the ways in which cultural values can exacerbate particular conflicts (e.g. between the former Soviet Union and Afghanistan, and during the wars in the Gulf in 1991 and in Yugoslavia over the past decade), it remains flawed in some important respects.

- **How the two big ideas of the post cold war era failed?**

- a. Two major prophecies about international order emerged as the Cold War ended. Both Fukuyama and Huntington might claim vindication in the recent turn of events. Many have interpreted the emergence of the Islamic State as evidence of the truth of Huntington's "clash of civilizations" thesis. On the other hand, in an article last year in the Wall Street Journal and in his book, "Political Order and Political Decay" Fukuyama who foresaw the end of great power rivalry but continued strife in the Third World, claims that his "end of history" thesis remains "essentially correct" even as he acknowledges that liberal democracies and civil liberties might suffer from "decay," as may be happening in the United States. In a 2002 op-ed for the International Herald Tribune, now the Global New York Times, I challenged the Fukuyama thesis by arguing that liberal democracy in the United States and the West could be in "retreat" due to the attack on civil liberties in the name of the war on terror.
- b. Despite my respect for the intellect of their protagonists, I argue that the two big ideas of the post-Cold War era have been proven to be not only mostly wrong, but also wrong-headed. Islam and the Islamic world have played a significant role in disproving and discrediting these ideas and not necessarily in the most predictable ways.
- c. The original end of history article pointed to the "unabashed victory of economic and political liberalism," and claimed that the

- “triumph of the West, of the Western idea is evident in the total exhaustion of viable systematic alternatives to Western liberalism.” This was an ironic claim, since the defeated alternatives to Western liberalism, namely fascism and communism, were still Western ideas. So the end of history was really the victory by one set of Western ideas over another.
- d. Fukuyama also predicted greater geopolitical stability in the world. For him, only “large states still caught in the grip of history” can produce and sustain big ideologies to challenge Western liberalism and thereby cause “large-scale conflict” in the international system. The only candidates for offering such a challenge after the end of the Cold War would be Russia and China, but both were embracing Western-style markets and even, to some degree, political openness, thus moving out of said grips of history.
 - e. Yet Russia and China might signal the “return of geopolitics” in the international system. What about the Islamic world? Fukuyama dismissed the potential of Islam to offer a political alternative to either liberalism or communism. Certainly Islam, without a large or great power in its ranks, could pose no traditional Realpolitik challenge to liberalism. Yet history does not begin or end with the big ideas of big powers. The Islamic world is a massive demographic entity.
 - f. There are 49 Muslim majority countries in the world, about one fourth of the total U.N. membership. The world’s Muslim population, at 1.6 billion, constitutes 23 percent of the total world population, with significant growth among its youth. Indeed, these demographic facts feature prominently in Huntington’s list of reasons for the clash of civilizations between Islam and the West. Adding China’s 1.35 billion to the equation means that about a third of the world’s population theoretically remain outside of the West’s triumphant ideology.
 - g. Even an ardent believer in democracy, such as this author, finds Fukuyama’s claims that there are no “real alternatives” (what constitutes real?) to Western style liberal democracy and

- that “we should have no doubt as to what kind of society lies at the end of History” too sweeping, arrogant and deterministic.
- h. Did the Arab Spring vindicate the Fukuyama thesis promoted by the neo-con ideologues of the George W. Bush administration, whose invasion of Iraq was legitimized as a means to promote democracy in the Arab world? No. The impetus for the Arab Spring came mainly from within Arab societies and had little to do with Western help. There is no direct link between the downfall of Saddam Hussein and the Arab Spring. By now, it is also clear that the Arab uprisings were more of a protest against corrupt and repressive regimes than a call for the establishment of Western style liberal democratic institutions. If they were, they have certainly failed in most places except Tunisia.
 - i. While it would be wrong to say that a single or consistent Islamic world view runs through Muslim states and societies, it is equally wrong to assume that they simply identify with or adopt Western liberalism. This should not be confused with an acceptance of the Huntingtonian clash of civilizations. The vast majority of Muslims and Muslim nations who do not accept Western liberalism similarly have no sympathy for al-Qaeda or the Islamic State or other form of Islamic extremism. In fact, several are themselves targets of the terrorist groups.
 - j. Huntington’s clash of civilizations has gained support in recent years as the new paradigm of global conflict replacing the Cold War and identifying the threat against which the US and the West could focus and mobilize its strategic response. It reinforced the fear of Islam and might have offered an implicit justification for the United States invasion of Iraq. However, like Fukuyama’s, Huntington’s thesis has flunked its test in the Islamic world and elsewhere. Much of the Islamic world rallied to the United States after 9/11. Islamic states were far more critical and uncooperative when the United States under the George W.
 - k. Bush presidency invaded Iraq in 2003, but this was because the invasion flouted international norms and disdained the UN Security Council. Now, some of the most prominent Islamic countries have joined hands with the United State to fight the

Islamic State and other terrorist groups in Syria, Iraq and Yemen. While some point to the conflicts in Middle East and Ukraine as proof of Huntington's pessimism—and bearing in mind that Fukuyama too believed that conflicts other than those among the great powers would persist—recent and long-term trends in violence may come as a surprise. The 2013 Human Security Report finds that between the early 1990s (when both ideas emerged) until now, **“overall conflict numbers have dropped by some 40 percent, while the deadliest conflicts, those that kill at least 1,000 people a year, have declined by more than half.”**

- l. The Armed Conflict Survey conducted by the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) paints a more negative picture, estimating a rise in the number of fatalities from major conflicts from 56,000 in 2008 to 180,000 in 2014. Interestingly enough, only two countries, Iraq and Syria, take up about half of deaths: approximately 88,000 of 180,000 in 2014. Even if one assumes that these two conflicts are civilizational in nature—rather than social, economic or political causes like repression—the evidence of a world on fire caused by a clash of civilizations is still limited at best. The IISS survey also confirmed that the overall conflict numbers in the world is still going down, from 63 in 2008 to 42 today.
- m. More damning for the Huntington thesis is the fact that the overwhelming majority of the targets and victims of violence perpetrated by Islamic extremist groups are Muslims. According to the University of Maryland's Global Terrorism Database, between 2004 and 2013, about half of all terrorist attacks and 60 percent of fatalities caused by terrorist attacks took place in just three countries: Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan, all with Muslim-majority populations and epicenters of the War on Terror.
- n. A 2011 report from the U.S. government's National Counter-Terrorism Center (NCTC) estimates that “in cases where the religious affiliation of terrorism casualties could be determined, Muslims suffered between 82 and 97 percent of terrorism related fatalities over the past five years.” Contrary to Huntington's

thesis, the violence that occurs in the Islamic world is mainly a clash within a civilization. The above also applies to Ukraine. Here is a striking example. Huntington had predicted in his 1996 book, "If civilization is what counts, violence between Ukrainians and Russians is unlikely." Obviously it does not.

- o. Some of the long-term causes of international stability, according to the Human Security Report, include the end of colonialism and the Cold War, international norms against the use of military force except in self-defense or authorized by the UN, peacekeeping, peacebuilding and "peacemaking" operations to prevent and stop wars, enhanced state capacity in securing resources to promote economic development and address grievances in the Third World, and growing economic interdependence among nations. One other factor identified by the Report is "inclusive democratization" in previously authoritarian countries that contributes to non-violent conflict resolution and hence internal stability within these states.
 - p. It is clear that many of these factors, which are unlikely to disappear, cut across civilizational fault lines. They are not uniquely the result of Western ideologies and leadership but are actively supported by both Western and non-Western states and societies. For example, China and other authoritarian nations of East Asia led the way in building state capacity and economic growth and fostering economic interdependence.
 - q. Countries such as India, Pakistan, Bangladesh and Indonesia are among the world's largest contributors to UN peacekeeping. Peace in today's world is possible because civilizations can and do learn from each other and cooperate. This is a lesson of history that will never end. The only history that is rapidly ending is that of the relatively short period of Western dominance in the long march of civilization.
- Conclusion

Topic 10

Post Cold War: Globalization

- 11) The principal characteristics of the contemporary order that give it its distinctive quality are difficult to discern.
- 12) As we live in its midst, it is hard to get any sense of historical perspective.
- 13) Our understanding of, say, the inter-war period (1919–39) is informed by how it ended, but we do not yet know how our present period will 'end'.
- 14) The international order now delivers a range of international 'goods', but also a wide range of 'bads'.
- 15) When we speak of order, we need to specify order for whom—states, peoples, groups, or individuals.
- 16) International order focuses on stable and peaceful relations between states, often related to the balance of power. It is primarily about military security.
- 17) World order is concerned with other values, such as justice, development, rights, and emancipation.
- 18) A pattern of order may advance some values at the expense of others. There is often a tension, for example, between state-centred concepts of order and those that promote individual values. For instance, policies based on the balance of power might lead to support for regimes with bad human rights' records.
- 19) A key question about globalization is whether it supercedes other ideas of international order, or whether it can be incorporated into more traditional ideas.
- 20) Order is shaped by the changed nature of states and of the tasks they perform.
- 21) There are complex questions about whether the end of the cold war has released a new agenda of nationalism and national identity, or whether these issues have been present all along.
- 22) Security is increasingly dealt with on a multilateral basis even when this does not conform to classical 'collective security' models.

- 23) The global economy is primarily shaped by relations between the three key groupings (North America, Western Europe, and East Asia) and is managed by a panoply of Western-dominated institutions.
- 24) There are dense patterns of international institutions in all functional areas.
- 25) There are strong trends towards regionalism, but they take different forms in various regions.
- 26) Human rights have a much higher profile than in earlier historical periods Are there two separate orders in the North and South, or a more complex diversity of orders?
- 27) Globalization is often portrayed as an effect of the end of the cold war because this led to its further geographical spread.
- 28) At the same time, globalization needs to be understood as one of the factors that contributed to the end of the cold war. It was the Soviet Union's marginalization from processes of globalization that revealed, and intensified, its weaknesses.
- 29) Accordingly, globalization should be regarded as an element of continuity between the cold war and post-cold war orders, and the latter should not be regarded as wholly distinct.
- 30) There is reason for scepticism that globalization is the exclusive hallmark of contemporary order.
- 31) One of the reasons is that, as a long-term historical trend, globalization is not specific to the late twentieth or the early twenty-first century.
- 32) Globalization is often associated with a 'borderless world' in which the old Westphalian order no longer applies.
- 33) Globalization embodies a range of often competing values.
- 34) Globalization is too much outside our control to form an order on its own. We are its objects rather than its subjects.
- 35) There is evidence of resistance to globalization. Some of this is generated by the feeling that traditional democracy does not offer effective representation in the global order.
- 36) National elections may not make politicians accountable if they cannot control wider global forces.

- 37) There is a heated debate about whether global civil society can help democratize international institutions, or whether they themselves are largely undemocratic.
- 38) Some governments in the South remain suspicious of social movements that may be better organized in developed countries.
- 39) Globalization is often thought of as an extreme form of interdependence. This sees it exclusively as an outside-in development.
- 40) The implication of such analyses is that states are now much weaker as actors. Consequently, they are in retreat or becoming obsolete. If this were the case, ideas of international order would be much less relevant to our concept of order.
- 41) But if globalization is considered as a transformation in the nature of states themselves, it suggests that states are still central to the discussion of order: they are different but not obsolete. This leads to the idea of a globalized state as a state form, and introduces an inside-out element. In this case, there is no contradiction between the norms and rules of a state system operating alongside globalized states.
- 42) This international order will nonetheless have different norms and rules in recognition of the new nature of states and their transformed functions. Rules of sovereignty and non-intervention are undergoing change as symptoms of this adaptation.

Topic 11

Foreign policy of Russia

6) The Post–Cold War Dilemma

- i. The Russian Federation, the largest country in the contemporary world, emerged after the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991.
- ii. It is one of the fifteen independent countries created from the former Soviet Union. Today's Russian Federation (henceforth, only Russia) is twice as big as the US and China, and six times bigger than India.
- iii. Russia has retained permanent seat in the UN Security Council, and inherited a large portion of nuclear arsenals from the Soviet Union. Russia is now an emergent economy, a multiparty democracy, and very rich in energy resources. So it is believed to have all the capabilities of emerging as an important power in world politics.
- iv. The present foreign policy of Russia is geared to take up the 'big power' role in international politics. After the end of the Cold War, with the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991, Russia entered the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) along with eleven other former Soviet republics. However, immediately after the Cold War, it was struggling to find its proper role in world politics. During this period (1991–99), it concentrated more on domestic political and economic reconstruction, and pursued a modest, not-too-ambitious foreign policy, unlike the former Soviet Union.

7) The Yeltsin Period

- i. An Incoherent Beginning Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin was the first post–Cold War President of Russia. The Yeltsin administration had to give more time to build the 'new look' Russian Federation, which was passing through a transitional phase after the disintegration of the Soviet Union. Yeltsin tried to give a new dimension to Russian foreign policy as he made major departures from the preceding Gorbachev era. In early 1992, Russian Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev announced that Russian foreign policy

- would differ from foreign policy under Gorbachev's 'New Thinking' because now democratic principles would drive it instead of the earlier 'socialist' principles. These new democratic principles would give Russia the opportunity to engage itself in the global peace process in a new international order after the Cold War.
- ii. Kozyrev also emphasized that the basis for the new foreign policy would be Russia's national interests rather than the so-called class interests of the workers of the world that theoretically dominated Soviet foreign policy for a long time. For two years (1992–93), Russian foreign policy was generally low key and conciliatory towards the West with endorsement of many Western positions in world politics. Pressing domestic problems faced by the Yeltsin government were determining factors behind this 'low key' foreign policy. But this departure from the traditional socialist policies, and conciliatory attitude of the Yeltsin government towards the West, raised severe public debates. Ultranationalists and communists criticized the new foreign policy as detrimental to Russian national interests. Some of them argued that Russia should not follow a low- key foreign policy with a 'soft' attitude towards the West. Foreign policy issues, along with other pressing domestic problems, were troubling the Yeltsin government immediately after the end of the Cold War. In response, the Yeltsin government came up with a comprehensive foreign policy document in 1993 to allay criticisms that the government's initial foreign policy measures were sketchy and lacked imagination. This document, approved by the Russian Parliament in April 1993 and named as the 'Foreign Policy Concept', was the first major official foreign policy document of the Russian Federation.
 - iii. The 1993 Foreign Policy Concept (FPC) declared Russia as a great power with several foreign policy priorities. These priorities were: (1) protecting the sovereignty and unity of the state, with special emphasis on border stability; (2) ensuring national security through diplomacy; (3) providing favourable external conditions for democratic reforms in Russia; (4) mobilizing international assistance for the establishment of a Russian market economy and

- assisting Russian exporters; (5) protecting the rights of Russians abroad; (6) furthering integration of the CIS and pursuing friendly relations with other neighbouring and nearby states, including those in Central Europe; (7) continuing to build friendly relations with all other countries; and (8) ensuring Russia an active role as a great power. The FPC also called for enhanced ties with Asia-Pacific countries to balance relations with the West. Through the FPC, the Yeltsin government placed greater emphasis on the protection of Russia's vital interests.
- iv. The FPC of 1993 was Yeltsin's answer to his critics and an attempt to place Russia as a great power in the new international order. It also refrained from pursuing open pro-Western policies. Yeltsin was President of Russia for two terms: the first from 1991 to 1996; and the second from 1996 to 1999. During his first term in office, Yeltsin was rather unsure about the role Russia would take in international politics. He began in 1991 with a conciliatory foreign policy that manifested a soft attitude towards the US and the West; but soon changed his position—as the FPC of 1993 makes evident—under increasing criticism from his rivals in Russian politics. From 1993–94, he started to espouse Russian nationalism and began to talk in terms of Russia as a great power. In his first State of the Federation Address to the Russian Parliament in February 1994, Yeltsin noted that as a great country, Russia was capable of preventing any global war, cold or hot, and Russia would also prevent the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. What is worth notable here is Yeltsin's emphasis on Russia as the single main actor to prevent future global wars.
- v. Through his reference to the possibility of global war, Yeltsin tried to appease the Russian military and other conservatives within Russia that the US and the West still remained a threat. He also opposed the expansion of the NATO to include Central European states leaving out Russia. He put emphasis on making the CIS an economic union with a common market and a common security system with guarantees on human rights. He warned that Russia would not tolerate any harm to its national interests. The

nationalist rhetoric of 1993–94 mellowed down in favour of conciliatory policies again in 1995–96. In his State of the Federation Address of February 1995, Yeltsin highlighted a cooperative and conciliatory foreign policy for Russia. He outlined Russia's cooperation with the Group of Seven (G-7) industrialized states, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the UN, and the NATO. He announced Russia's sincere intention to adhere to arms control agreements and hinted at possible reductions in Russian armed forces. Yeltsin, however, continued with Russia's objection to the enlargement of the NATO and called it a threat to European security. He also announced that in 1995–96 Russian foreign policy would be peaceful and committed to the principle of 'real partnership in all directions' with the US, Europe, China, India, Japan and Latin America. Russian foreign policy, Yeltsin declared in his address, would be guided by a 'balance of interests' with respect to the CIS and the Western world including the United States. During his second term in office, Yeltsin was troubled by recurring health problems, domestic political turmoil, more intense separatist movements in Chechnya, and a weak economy.

- vi. As a result, he had to continue with conciliatory policies towards the West with occasional outbursts of Russian nationalism. For instance, during the 1999 Kosovo war, he strongly opposed NATO military operations and warned of possible Russian intervention and a resumption of the Cold War, if NATO deployed ground troops to Kosovo. He also had differences of opinion with the American President Bill Clinton over Moscow's military intervention in Chechnya which, according to the American President, resulted in huge civilian casualties. Clinton requested him to stop military operations in Chechnya, which he refused. But at the same time Yeltsin relied heavily on the Americans and US-supported financial organizations for the reconstruction of the Russian economy. He sought help from the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the World Bank, and from the US Treasury Department for Russia's economic revival. During his presidency, Russia received more than US \$40 billion from international

financial organizations. His government was also accused of embezzling these funds, and other financial corruptions.

- vii. Yeltsin's foreign policy, like his domestic policies, was marked by inconsistency and incoherence. Russia was searching for its proper identity and place in world politics during the Yeltsin presidency. Although it inherited the legacy of the former Soviet Union, Russia was unsure of its status in the new international order. It wished to bask in the superpower glory, and wanted to play a bigpower role in international politics. However, the world at large, and Russia itself, was sceptic about its big-power status in international politics. With a struggling economy, a nascent and weak democracy, pressing domestic problems, and an ailing but obstinate President, Russia's transition from a socialist political system to a liberal democracy was arduous. It had to take conciliatory policies towards the West, yet wanted to pursue big-power ambitions. These incoherent policies did not help Russia to assume the leading role that it wished to follow in international politics during the Yeltsin period.

8) The Putin Presidency

- i. A Resurgent Russia Vladimir Vladimirovich Putin assumed Russian Presidency in 2000, and served two tenures; first during 2000–04, and second, during 2004–08, lasting till May 2008. Putin was a more assertive leader than Yeltsin. This observation could be substantiated by the progress of the Russian economy, considerable domestic political stability, and a more focused and assertive foreign policy. During Putin's eight years as the President, Russian economy grew at an average 7 per cent, making Russia the seventh largest economy in the world in terms of purchasing power. The country's GDP (Gross Domestic Product) increased six-fold between 2000 and 2008, and the poverty level (people living below the poverty line) decreased from 30 per cent in 2000 to 14 per cent in 2008. Putin enjoyed a very high approval rating from the Russians, an average of 65 per cent during his presidency, the highest enjoyed by any leader in the world (as per public opinion surveys), because he was credited with bringing political stability to the country and restoring rule of law. In

international affairs, Putin firmly placed Russia as a leading state and earned respect for it; a dream that his predecessor Yeltsin nurtured, but failed to achieve. This was possible through an assertive foreign policy backed by a resurgent economy. During his presidency, Russia emerged as an able competitor to the US and Europe. The theoretical foundation of Putin's foreign policy was laid in the 'Foreign Policy Concept of the Russian Federation'(FPCRf), approved and issued by the President on 28 June 2000. This sixteen-page document clearly stated the foreign policy objectives of the Putin government, and Russia's priorities in the new international order in the twenty-first century. Section 2 of the FPCRf, entitled 'The Modern World and the Foreign Policy of the Russian Federation', stated:

- ii. There is a growing trend towards the establishment of a unipolar structure of the world with the economic and power domination of the United States. In solving principal questions of international security, the stakes are being placed on western institutions and forums of limited composition, and on weakening the role of the U.N. Security Council. The strategy of unilateral actions can destabilize the international situation, provoke tensions and the arms race, aggravate interstate contradictions, national and religious strife. . . . Russia shall seek to achieve a multi-polar system of international relations that really reflects the diversity of the modern world with its great variety of interests. Clearly, the pronouncements are assertive. By naming the US as the power wishing to perpetuate its dominance in international affairs, Putin's FPCRf denounced such tendencies and said that Russia was in favour of a multipolar world. These pronouncements sounded like resumption of the Cold War by the Putin administration, although it was proved later on that Putin was not interested in another Cold War; rather he wanted Russia to be strong and resilient, both in economic and security terms.
- iii. Putin's foreign policy was forthright, yet moderate. Russia conveyed its opinions clearly without antagonizing other important powers. For instance, Putin condemned American attacks on Iraq in 2003 and called for removing economic

sanctions from Iraq. But his views did not affect US–Russia relations. The Russian President had very good personal equations with George W. Bush (Jr). In fact, Bush waived economic sanctions on Iraq after the war was over in 2003. Before the Iraq war, Putin allowed coalition military bases in Central Asia during the US-led military operations in Afghanistan in 2001, despite objections from the ultranationalists in Russia. This instance showed that Putin’s opposition to the US was issue-based, and not chronic. He signed the very important ‘Strategic Offensive Reduction Treaty’(SORT; also known as the ‘Moscow Treaty’) with Bush in Moscow on 26 May 2002. According to the treaty, both the US and Russia would reduce 1,700 to 2,200 operationally deployed nuclear warheads each. The SORT, a significant step towards nonproliferation, would expire on 31 December 2012. The moderate but assertive foreign policy pursued by the Putin government earned respect for Russia from the international community.

- iv. Putin objected to Kosovo’s plan for separation from Serbia, and warned the US and European powers not to encourage Kosovo’s cessation. At the same time, he was credited with improving Russia’s relations with the European Union (EU). He opposed NATO’s expansion programme, but also formed the NATO–Russia Council. These instances revealed stark pragmatism in Putin’s foreign policy. He understood correctly that Russia would require economic help from the US and other European powers. Therefore, he did not blindly oppose these nations to appease Russian nationalists. Yet he never missed any chance to condemn American ‘dominance’ in international politics, and projected the image of a constructive critique of the US in international relations. This moderate foreign policy yielded tremendous results for Russia. During his eight years as the President of Russia, Putin’s foreign policy achievements were significant. Russia regained its status as a leading global power during the presidency of Putin. Sustained economic growth, coupled with assertive domestic and foreign policies, led to Russia’s enhanced international prestige and acceptance. It had emerged as the

- world's biggest energy base, producing more oil than Saudi Arabia. Almost the whole of Europe is dependent on the export of natural gas from Russia.
- v. The growing arms and commodity items exports have made Russia the third largest reserve of foreign exchange in the world. Russia is now included in the group of the most rapidly developing emerging economies, the BRIC. Russia under Putin formed several multilateral forums like the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), NATO–Russia Council, Collective Security Treaty Organization (CSTO), Quartet on the Middle East (QME) and the EU–Russia Common Spaces, to increase its presence and importance in international politics. It also continued with its strong presence in other important international forums like the UNO, CIS, WTO, G-8, OSCE, and the APEC (Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation). Russia's active involvement in all these forums indicated Putin's desire to achieve a big-power role for his country. Vladimir Putin faced foreign policy challenges as well.
 - vi. Anti-Russian regimes in neighbouring states like Kyrgyzstan, Georgia and Ukraine emerged for some time to threaten Russia's security and its foreign policy initiatives in neighbouring countries. But Putin successfully met these challenges and made Russian position secure in Central Asia and East Europe. A failed 'tulip revolution' initiated by anti-Russian groups in Kyrgyzstan in 2005 turned into a nightmare for the local population. The failure, accompanied by killings and chaos in the capital and other cities, frightened the local elites and population; but at the same time it strengthened Russia's position in Central Asia. Earlier, the much publicized 'rose revolution' in Georgia in 2003, and the 'orange revolution' in Ukraine in 2004–05 (these were also known as 'colour revolutions') that destabilized Russia-friendly governments in these countries, lost their sheen and gradually the political elite close to Russia came to power in Georgia and Ukraine. These failed revolutions in effect ensured the success of Putin's foreign policy in neighbouring states. Putin warned the US and West European powers not to meddle in Georgia and Ukraine, and the situation never went out of Russia's control.

- vii. The Americans, with limited strategic interests in Georgia and Ukraine, also restrained themselves because they did not wish to antagonize Putin due to increased American political and business interests in Russia. Putin and his Russia commanded more respect from the international community compared to Yeltsin and his Russia of the 1990s. The foreign policy of Putin had its shortcomings as well. Russia, despite strong economic growth, failed to emerge as a major trade partner for many of its important neighbours like China, Japan, and Kazakhstan. With industrial nations like Germany, Italy, England, and Canada, Russian trade remained insignificant during the Putin period.
- viii. Further, Russia's trade volume with important regional organizations like the EU and the ASEAN did not assume significant proportions during the Putin presidency. Russia in 2009-10—when Putin was the Prime Minister and a main figure in the Medvedev government—seemed to have lost its earlier political influence in many neighbouring states, especially in Georgia and Ukraine, with the proliferation of anti-Russian forces in these states. However, negative points in Putin's foreign policy are outweighed by the positive points. Without reviving the Cold War and significantly antagonizing the West, Putin was very successful in establishing Russia as an important actor in international politics.

9) The Medvedev Presidency

- i. Dimtry Anatolyevich Medvedev took over as the Russian President on 7 May 2008, after Putin finished his two terms in presidency, the maximum allowed at a stretch by the Russian Constitution. He was appointed as the Prime Minister in the new government. Medvedev was widely known as the person groomed by Putin to take over the mantle after him. He continued with Putin's policies in domestic and foreign affairs, although he often showed sparkles of his individuality in dealing with internal and external issues. Unlike Putin, Medvedev was not known in Russian politics as a person comfortable with foreign policy; he was more a 'domestic' politician. He was largely dependent on

- Putin and the Russian foreign ministry for external affairs. But he gradually attained control in foreign policy matters as well.
- ii. Like his predecessors, Medvedev also issued a Foreign Policy Concept (FPC) on 31 July 2008, that outlined foreign policy priorities of his government. It contained six priority areas that Russia wished to follow in international relations. These were: (1) the emergence of a new world order where Russia would work for a multipolar world instead of a unipolar world; (2) the primacy of law in international relations; (3) strengthening international security; (4) international economic and environmental cooperation; (5) international humanitarian cooperation and protection of human rights; and (6) information support for foreign policy activities, by which Russia would demand correct and accurate information on foreign policy activities pursued by different states in the world. The FPC of 2008 contained nothing unique as compared to the FPCR issued by the Putin government in 2000. The former also opposed the expansion of the NATO and called for equitable relationship between Russia and the NATO in the Russia–NATO Council.
 - iii. It objected to the inclusion of Georgia and Ukraine in the NATO and the projected expansion till the borders of Russia. The FPC stated that ‘Russia calls for building a truly unified Europe without divisive lines through equal interaction between Russia, the European Union and the United States. This would strengthen the positions of the Euro-Atlantic States in global competition’. It also stressed on increasing cooperation with the CIS, the EU, Japan, China, the two Koreas, the ASEAN, and several West European, African and Latin American states. Medvedev met US President Barack Obama in April 2009 during the Group of 20 (G-20) Leaders’ Summit in London. The two presidents issued a joint statement after their bilateral meeting which was cordial and positive. Medvedev and Obama agreed to pursue verifiable reductions in their huge nuclear arsenals. By agreeing to verifiable reductions, Medvedev made a departure from the earlier Putin administration, which did not go for the verifiable reduction clause after the SORT, signed in 2002.

iv. Both Medvedev and Obama reiterated their commitment to a nuclear-weapon-free world, and vowed to work together to achieve the goal. They underscored the need for enhanced cooperation between their nations to meet the demands of the new international order. The statement noted: 'We, the leaders of Russia and the United States, are ready to move beyond Cold War mentalities and chart a fresh start in relations between our two countries. . . Now it is time to get down to business and translate our warm words into actual achievements. . . .' The tone of the statement was very positive and underlined the desire of the Medvedev government to improve relations with the US. Medvedev, like Putin, continued the policy of economic diplomacy for Russia. He also used the resurgent Russian economy and strong energy resources to establish Russia's position in international politics. Russia under Medvedev continued as the largest arms and energy exporter in the world. But Medvedev gradually came out of the shadow of Putin in foreign and domestic policy matters, and put the stamp of his own personality in these areas. For instance, Medvedev wanted the dismantling of a moribund OSCE in favour of more active security and cooperation mechanisms for Europe, and proposed a European Security Treaty. He established a Customs Union with Belarus, and proposed similar unions with other CIS-countries. Medvedev is no longer another Putin in a different garb; he is a different mind as well. Time is not yet ripe to scrutinize the success or failure of Medvedev's foreign policy, because he has been in office for nearly two years (as of March 2010). But Russia under Medvedev is doing well in economic development and international affairs, although the process of building a democratic Russia is far from over.

10) War with Georgia

- i. Putin ally Dmitry Medvedev wins presidential elections as Mr Putin cannot serve a third consecutive term. 2008 May - President Medvedev appoints Vladimir Putin prime minister.
- ii. Russia and Georgia went to war over South Ossetia
- iii. 2008 August - Tensions with Georgia escalate into war after Georgian troops attack separatist forces in South Ossetia. Russia

- drives Georgian forces from South Ossetia and Abkhazia, then recognizes both as independent states.
- iv. 2008 October - The Russian parliament approves a \$68bn package of measures to help banks hit by the global credit crunch.
 - v. 2008 November - Parliament votes overwhelmingly in favour of a bill that would extend the next president's term of office from four to six years.
 - vi. 2009 January - Russia stops gas supplies to Ukraine after the collapse of talks to resolve a row over unpaid bills. Supplies to southeastern Europe are disrupted for several weeks as a result of the dispute.
 - vii. 2009 April - Russia formally ends operations against rebels in Chechnya, although sporadic violence continues.
- 11) Thaw with US
- i. 2009 July - President Medvedev and Barack Obama, on his first official visit to Moscow, reach an outline agreement to reduce nuclear weapons stockpiles in move aimed at replacing 1991 Start 1 treaty.
 - ii. 2009 September - Russia welcomes the US decision to shelve missile defence bases in Poland and the Czech Republic.
 - iii. 2009 October - Opposition parties accuse the authorities of rigging local elections, as the governing United Russia party wins every poll by a wide margin.
 - iv. 2010 April - President Medvedev signs a new strategic arms agreement with US committing both sides to cut arsenals of deployed nuclear warheads by about 30 percent.
 - v. 2010 June - Presidents Medvedev and Obama mark warming in ties on the Russian leader's first visit to the White House. Obama says the US will back Russia's World Trade Organisation accession, and Russia will allow the US to resume poultry exports.
 - vi. 2010 July - A customs union between Russia, Belarus and Kazakhstan comes into force despite Belarusian complaints about Russia retaining duties on oil and gas exports to its neighbours.
 - vii. 2010 October - President Medvedev sacks the powerful mayor of Moscow, Yuri Luzhkov, after weeks of criticism from the Kremlin. Mr Luzhkov had been in office since 1992.

- viii. 2011 November - Georgia and Russia sign a Swiss-brokered trade deal which allows Russia to join the World Trade Organization (WTO), ending Georgia's blockade of Russian membership since the 2008 war.
 - ix. 2011 December - United Russia suffers drop in share of the vote at parliamentary elections, but keeps a simple majority in the State Duma. Tens of thousands turn out in opposition protests alleging fraud, in first major anti-government protests since the early 1990s.
- 12) Putin's second presidency
- i. 2012 March - Vladimir Putin wins presidential elections. Opponents take to the streets of several major cities to protest at the conduct of the election, and the police arrest hundreds.
 - ii. 2012 July - Law goes into force requiring non-governmental organisations receiving funds from abroad to be classed as "foreign agents", in what critics say is part of a wider crackdown on dissent.
 - iii. 2012 August - US, EU and human rights groups condemn jail sentences imposed on three members of punk band Pussy Riot over an anti-Putin protest in a Moscow cathedral. The women were sentenced to two years for hooliganism.
 - iv. Russia formally joins the World Trade Organization (WTO) after 18 years of negotiations.
 - v. 2012 December - Angered by a US bill blacklisting Russian officials in connection with the death in custody of lawyer Sergei Magnitsky, Moscow bans Americans from adopting Russian children and stops US-funded non-governmental organisations from working in Russia.
- 13) Crackdown continues
- i. 2013 July - Anti-corruption blogger and leading opposition activist Alexei Navalny is sentenced to five years in prison after being found guilty of embezzlement in a trial he rejects as politically motivated.
 - ii. 2013 September - Mr Navalny comes second in the Moscow mayoral election after being released pending appeal, coming close to forcing the Kremlin's candidate into a run-off.

- iii. 2013 October - Appeals court upholds Alexei Navalny's conviction but suspends his jail sentence, allowing him to go free while barring him from standing for elected office.
 - iv. 2013 December - The Kremlin announces that the state-owned news agency RIA Novosti and the Voice of Russia radio station are to be restructured and placed under the control of a pro-Kremlin figure known for his extreme anti-Western views.
- 14) Ukraine crisis
- i. 2014 February-May - After flight from Ukraine of pro-Moscow president Viktor Yanukovych, Russian forces take over Crimea, which then votes to join Russia in a referendum. This sparks biggest East-West showdown since Cold War, with the US and its European allies imposing sanctions and accusing Russia of stoking separatism in eastern Ukraine.
 - ii. 2014 May - Russia's Gazprom sign 30-year deal to supply the China National Petroleum Corp with gas, estimated to be worth over \$400bn.
 - iii. 2014 June - US President Barack Obama condemns Russian "aggression" in Ukraine while speaking in Warsaw to mark 25 years since the fall of communism in Poland.
 - iv. 2014 July - Following the downing of a Malaysian Airlines passenger plane over eastern Ukraine in a suspected missile strike, Russia comes in for international criticism amid claims - denied by Moscow - that it supplied rebels with heavy weaponry.
 - v. The EU and US announce new sanctions against Russia. The IMF says Russian growth is slowing down to zero.
 - vi. 2014 October - Russia agrees to resume gas supplies to Ukraine over the winter in a deal brokered by the EU.
 - vii. 2014 November - Separatists in eastern Ukraine elect new leaders in polls backed by Russia and denounced by Kiev and the West.
 - viii. Ukraine accuses Russia of sending a big column of tanks, artillery and troops into eastern Ukraine.
 - ix. 2014 December - The Russian rouble begins to drop rapidly against the US dollar, losing about half its value in the next two months.

- x. A Moscow court finds leading opposition figure Alexei Navalny guilty of fraud charges and imposes a suspended prison sentence.
- xi. 2015 January - A public inquiry opens in Britain into the 2006 murder in London of former Russian intelligence officer and Putin critic Alexander Litvinenko.
- xii. 2015 February - Opposition activist and former first deputy prime minister Boris Nemtsov, a leading figure in the democratic movement since the 1990s, is shot dead in Moscow within sight of the Kremlin.
- xiii. Police charge two Chechens with murder. They deny the charges, one after alleging he was coerced into confessing. There is widespread domestic and international scepticism about the official account.
- xiv. 2015 September - Russia carries out first air strikes in Syria, saying it targets the Islamic State group. But West and Syrian opposition say it overwhelmingly targets anti-Assad rebels instead.

15) Conclusion

Topic 12

Foreign Policy of China

8) Origin and Evolution

- a. Today's People's Republic of China (PRC) has a rich political history. One of the most ancient civilizations, China's political history is nearly seven thousand years old. During this long political history, China was under various rulers and political systems. It had dynastic rulers who ruled the land for long periods. Notable among them were the Shang, the Chou and the Manchu dynasties. The Manchu rulers governed China for a very long period, from 1661 to 1911. They were able to create a large territory that included Tibet, Mongolia and Sinkiang. But at a later stage, the Manchu rulers were unable to govern and protect this large empire. Inefficiency, corruption and extravagance of the later Manchu rulers led to the downfall of the Manchu dynasty. This unstable situation was exploited by different foreign powers to proclaim their dominance in different parts of China. The Russian, German, British and Japanese forces occupied these parts. But it should be remembered at this point that entire China never came under any particular foreign rule; parts of the land were occupied by different foreign rulers at different times. To protest against the presence of foreign rulers, and the corruption in Manchu rule, the Boxer Revolt was led by Sun Yat Sen during 1895–1900. Although this revolution was not totally successful, it nevertheless inspired people to unite against foreign rule and the Manchu dynasty.

After the end of Manchu rule, Sun Yat Sen became the leader of China in 1912. Since then, China experienced a republican system instead of the earlier monarchical system. Before the First World War, Sun Yat Sen relinquished power in favour of Yuan Shi Kai, although Sen and his Kuomintang Party were very influential in China during this period. During the First World War, Yuan Shi Kai declared himself as the Emperor of China reviving

possibilities of returning to a monarchical system again. However, after the death of Shi Kai in 1916, the Kuomintang appointed Li Yuan Hang as the President of China, and declared China as a Republic. The tremors of the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia in 1917 were also felt in China, and the Chinese Communist Party was set up in Shanghai, the largest Chinese city, in 1920. Several members of the Kuomintang joined the Communist Party under the influence of the Bolshevik revolution, and socialism. After the death of Sun Yat Sen in 1925, Chiang Kai Shek assumed leadership of the Kuomintang party and China. Kuomintang preferred to call itself a nationalist party with the aim to create a unified China, and Chiang Kai Shek became, as the undisputed leader of his party, the harbinger of this aim. But Chiang had problems to realize the dream of a unified China. Among these problems, Japanese aggression, internal political and administrative corruption, and the increasing popularity of the Communist Party under the leadership of Mao Zhe Dong were prominent. Since 1935, Mao was pressurizing the Kuomintang government for rapid land reforms programme in favour of the peasants. Mao and his Communist Party started to concentrate on rural areas working on the welfare of the rural people, mainly peasants. This focus on rural areas yielded tremendous results as the popularity of Mao and his party soared in a largely rural, agrobased China.

- b. Before the Second World War, the communists gave issue-based support to the Kuomintang to fight Japanese aggression; but their ideological differences continued. Gradually the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) emerged as an organized, popular, and respectable political outfit, and during the Second World War they became a formidable political force in China. There were several reasons behind the phenomenal growth of the CCP: (1) Mao's very able leadership; (2) call for land reforms and establishment of rights of the peasants; (3) support from the 'socialist' Soviet Union; and (4) a corrupt Kuomintang rule. Mao was trying to topple the Kuomintang regime, and training the communists to fight the Kuomintang. In 1946, a civil war started in China

between the communists and the Kuomintang. The US supported the Kuomintang regime through military and economic assistance. But the communists who were more organized and efficient (in guerilla warfare) won the civil war, and created the modern Peoples'Republic of China on 1 October 1949. Chiang Kai Shek fled to Formosa (now Taiwan). The modern Chinese state (PRC) was born in 1949 and Mao Zhe Dong became its supreme leader. From 1949 till his death in 1976, Mao Zhe Dong was the undisputed leader of the PRC, and the chief architect of China's foreign policy.

9) Foreign Policy of China

- a. Under Mao Zhe Dong (1949–76) Mao's revolutionary background and faith in socialism influenced his foreign policy agenda. America's assistance to the Kuomintang regime during the civil war in China, and later in Taiwan, led him to locate the US as an adversary. He believed that after the Second World War, when European imperialism had taken a backseat, the Americans had assumed the role of a neo-imperialist and a neocolonialist. Mao's PRC was very critical of the American role in Taiwan and in other parts of the world, where the US was allegedly trying to interfere in the domestic affairs of states through economic and security assistance. American interference in the Korean War in 1950 angered Mao, and China's relations with the US plunged to an abysmal low after the Korean War. At various times in his leadership, Mao openly labelled the US as an imperial and neocolonial power.
- b. Understandably, China's relations with the US were much strained from the beginning. Mao was also sceptical about other Western European powers like Britain, France, West Germany and Italy for their perceived anti-communist ideological positions. As a committed person to socialist ideologies, Mao was deeply resentful of the West Bloc, and almost turned China away from the Western world. China thus had very little relationship with the West European states, which were viewed as harbingers of capitalism and agents of the US by Mao and his PRC. So China's relations with the US and other Western powers were very cold

- and distant during the Mao era. Mao's PRC went on a bonhomie with the Soviet Union, the first socialist state in the world, a superpower and a supporter of the Chinese communists during China's civil war and thereafter. Ideological proximity and material support brought the Soviet Union closer to China. Moscow gave huge economic and technological assistance to China after 1949, when the state-building process was going on in full swing. China was creating its industrial and transport infrastructure with Soviet assistance during this time. But the Soviet–China proximity did not last long, as differences emerged from the mid-1950s, overtly on the issue of transfer of poor Soviet technology to China, but covertly over the broader issue of leadership of the Socialist bloc.
- c. The Sino-Soviet rift became very pronounced by the early 1960s as both China and the Soviet Union accused each other to be a 'social imperialist'. China strongly condemned the Soviet role in the Cuban Missile Crisis of 1962. The same year, the two countries levelled charges of illegal occupation of territories around their borders against each other. China also severely criticized the presence of Soviet troops in Czechoslovakia in 1968 to curb a popular movement against the communist government. From the mid-1960s, China tried to be close to the East Bloc countries, only to arouse further Soviet suspicion. The Soviet Union viewed this Chinese zeal as designs to curb the Soviet influence in the East Bloc countries. However, China was able to develop close relationship with Albania by the mid-1960s. An angry Soviet Union stopped economic and technological assistance to Albania as a retaliatory measure. The Sino-Soviet rift continued throughout the 1970s and the 1980s, as both the socialist countries tried to provide leadership to other socialist states during this period, and viewed the other with suspicion and mistrust. US President Richard Nixon's visit to China in 1972 further fuelled the suspicion. Soviet leaders alleged that China was trying to build an unholy nexus with the US to marginalize the Soviet Union in international politics. China's relations with

the socialist superpower were thus mostly adversarial in Mao's time.

- d. Mao's China provided support to the anti-colonial struggle in the developing states with the desire to become the leader in those states. For this purpose, China supported the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and participated in the Bandung Conference in 1955 that formally created the NAM. China also became friendly with India, and the two big countries of Asia went along well for some time. But from the late 1950s, border disputes and the issue of Tibet created serious differences between the two countries which ultimately led to the 1962 Indo-China war. During the initial years after the formation of the NAM in 1955, China was keen on becoming a leading nation in the NAM. But differences with India—and later with Indonesia—and the broader issue of leadership of the Socialist bloc refrained Mao from taking very active interest in the NAM. Instead, China concentrated on building good relations with some other Asian states like Burma (now Myanmar), Nepal, and Pakistan. Foreign policy analysts in India viewed this Chinese move with suspicion, a latent design to isolate India and strengthen anti-India sentiments in these countries. However, China's efforts to become a leader of the third world failed, as it could not take leadership in the NAM, and as it developed acrimonious relations with many thirdworld countries.

After 1965, China's relations with Indonesia and many other countries in Africa and Latin America deteriorated. Indonesian President Suharto alleged that China was instigating the communists in Indonesia with a view to create internal disturbances in the country. Suharto severed diplomatic relations with China. Three African states, Burundi, Ghana, and Central African Republic, cut off diplomatic relations with China in 1965–66. Kenya also condemned the aggressive 'socialist imperialism' of China during this time. Mao's China also failed to develop close connections with the developing countries of Latin America.

- e. It tried to woo Cuba to come out of Soviet influence by condemning Soviet role in the Cuban Missile Crisis; but Fidel Castro, the

supreme leader of Cuba, remained committed to the Soviet Union during and after the crisis. China's aim to lead the third world against the 'imperialistic' policies of the two superpowers was not realized, as Mao's China got estranged from several third world countries. Viewed from an objective standpoint, Mao's foreign policy was not very successful. He isolated both the superpowers and developed adversarial relations with them. With important states of the third world like India, Indonesia and Yugoslavia (all leaders of the NAM), Mao's China developed very antagonistic relations. China also remained isolated from the industrially developed Western European countries due to Mao's apathy for these 'capitalist', formerly colonial powers. Mao, who was supposed to develop cordial relations with the poor states for his support to the anticolonial freedom struggle in poor countries, also isolated poor countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. The Soviet influence over East Europe was a deterrent for Mao to make any significant impact in East Europe, although he tried and succeeded to establish close links with one or two smaller states in the region. But he failed to bring them out of the Soviet ring.

- f. The ideological underpinning of Mao's foreign policy, to avoid the 'colonial' and 'imperial' powers, did not help China economically or politically, as China got estranged from the industrially developed US and the West. The confusion in Mao's foreign policy was manifested further when China got entangled in bitter rivalries with a 'socialist' Soviet Union, and 'nonaligned' India and Indonesia, and other developing countries of the third world with whom Mao's ideology should have gone well. Instead, Mao's China was soon termed as politically ambitious, with an eye to leadership in the socialist bloc, and the third world. This China aroused suspicion in the world, and as a consequence, failed to win friends. During Mao's tenure, China remained largely estranged in international relations.

10) **China's Foreign Policy After Mao (1977–91)**

- a. China's foreign policy during the Cold War years could be classified mainly into two parts: first, the Mao era (1949–76); and

second, the Deng era (1978–97). This proposition clearly refers to the fact that after the death of Mao Zhe Dong, China's domestic and foreign policies were controlled by another supreme leader, Deng Xiao Ping. Although Deng officially assumed leadership in 1978, succeeding Hua Guo Feng, who took over leadership for a very short period (1976–78) after Mao's death, Deng's rise in Chinese politics could be noticed from 1977. From 1977 till his death in 1997, Deng Xiao Ping remained the most prominent figure in Chinese politics. Consequently, Chinese foreign policy was also controlled by Deng during this period. He made significant departures from Mao's policies, both in domestic and international spheres. Mao's foreign policy was loaded with ideological issues like distance from the 'capitalist' and 'imperialist' states, spreading the message of socialism, supporting 'revolutionary' communist and nationalist movements around the world. Deng's foreign and domestic policies were considered more pragmatic than ideological. Deng was the architect of economic reforms in China which opened hitherto closed Chinese doors to the industrially developed Western world. Chinese economic reforms helped Deng to pursue a more realistic and internationally acceptable foreign policy.

- b. Deng realized that it would not help China much to isolate both the US and the Soviet Union simultaneously. For China's economic development, the US, Western European states and an industrially developed Japan were crucial and more welcome than the socialist rival, the Soviet Union. China could no longer afford to ignore the Western states as 'capitalist' and 'imperialist' powers. In 1979, Deng's China established diplomatic relations with the US. Apart from economic interests, a common adversary (the Soviet Union) also brought China and the US closer. American President Richard Nixon tried to break the ice in Sino-American relations by visiting China in 1972.
- c. But differences between the two nations persisted over Taiwan—which China claimed as its territory but the US considered as a sovereign independent country—and Mao's label on the US as an 'imperialist' power. Therefore, Sino-American relations continued

- to be indifferent during the Mao period. It was Deng who broke real grounds to establish closer links with the US and other developed states of the West. Deng used economic diplomacy to attract these states towards China. In 1979, China opened up its economy, allowing private business to proliferate and foreign investment to come. Deng made a very new experiment for China. He retained Communist Party's control over Chinese politics and the state, but transformed Chinese economy into a liberal market economy.
- d. A new Chinese Constitution was introduced in 1982 to facilitate liberal economic developments in China. Deng's China created Special Economic Zones (SEZ), mainly in the coastal areas, to give special privileges to foreign investors. Now, the industrially advanced states, apathetic to China for long for its 'closed door' policies, felt encouraged and got attracted to China. The socialist market economy (SME) that Deng introduced in China was a new model in international politics and economy. It retained one-party control in Chinese politics and society, but allowed deregulation of the economy.
 - e. Although there were initial schisms about the SME, it gradually proved to be a huge success and made Deng, the conservative pragmatist, the undisputed leader of modern China. Deng's foreign policy, must, therefore, be analysed in the context of the SME and his conservative pragmatism. The success of the state-controlled liberal economy in China, manifested through its economic growth rate, made China a very attractive destination for foreign investments. American, Japanese and west European private business started to enter China in a big way from the early 1980s, paving ways for the relegation of political differences to the background. China's annual average economic growth rate for the decade 1960–70 was 5.2, and for 1970–80 it was 5.5. During the next decade (1980–90), when SME was operating, China's annual growth rate rose to a staggering 10.3, almost double the average growth rate of the earlier two decades (source: International Monetary Fund). Therefore, Deng's China was economically stronger than Mao's China, and it was easier for an

- economically open and strong China to conduct international relations with more determination, zeal and success
- f. As China shed its ideological bias to invite foreign investments from the 'capitalist' and 'imperialist' states of the West, these industrially developed nations also changed their views about a 'rigid' and 'closed' socialist state in Asia. Gradually China's relations with the Western world improved, as China began to play, from the early 1980s, a significant role in mainstream international economics and politics. Mao's China also wanted to play a major role in world politics, but could not fulfill its desires due to China's closed economy and adverse international relations; but Deng's China, economically open and strong, could play this desired role more easily, as China became more acceptable to the rest of the world. China's relations with the Soviet Union also improved after Mikhail Gorbachev came to power in the USSR in 1985. Border trade between the two socialist giants went up and got strengthened by the late 1980s. Gorbachev paid an official visit to China in May 1989. Before his visit, the Soviet Union announced the withdrawal of 5,00,000 Soviet troops from its borders with China. Chinese leaders welcomed this Soviet gesture. In 1990, Li Peng, Prime Minister of China, visited the Soviet Union.
- g. A ten-year vision on close cooperation in trade, economic and technological areas between the two countries was announced during Peng's visit. With 'glasnost' and 'perestroika' taking shape, the Soviet Union also opened up and shed its earlier hostility towards China. As a consequence, Sino-Soviet relations began to improve. Deng also reached out to third world countries, including India, to assess possibilities of improved trade and commerce. By the early 1990s, when Cold War was nearing its end, China secured its place in the international order as a rapidly growing economy, a strong military, and a more open state with a realistic view of the world. China's journey towards a major power status continued after the end of the Cold War.

11) **China's Foreign Policy**

- a. After the Cold War China maintained its spectacular economic growth after the Cold War and continued to use economic diplomacy as its major thrust in international relations. Although an ageing Deng Xiao Ping resigned from all official posts in 1991, he remained as the central figure in Chinese politics, and virtually controlled the party and the state in China till his death in 1997. The SME brought economic gains for China, which subsequently helped China in conducting international diplomacy more effectively. After the Cold War, the US remained the only superpower in an altered international order. Deng's pragmatic China wanted to be close to the world's only remaining superpower. The US also wanted to forge strong economic relations with China because of its emerging market. Mutual interests brought these two countries close after the Cold War.
- b. In 1994, the US granted the 'Most Favoured Nation (MFN) in Trade' status to China. Despite persistent criticism in the US Congress about human rights violations in China, the US did not hesitate to grant MFN status to China for trade and economic interests. By 1998–99, China became the fourth largest trading partner of the US with bilateral trade reaching US \$94.9 billion at the end of 1999. Sino-US two-way trade was only US \$2.4 billion in 1979. In 2001, China entered the World Trade Organization (WTO), backed heavily by the US. Since then, it has become a major player in the WTO, supporting interests of the developing states. Sino-US trade continued to escalate in the new century as well. Two-way trade reached a substantial US \$409.2 billion in 2008.
- c. The US emerged as the top trading partner of China in 2008 and 2009, with Japan emerging as the second largest trading partner in 2009. These data revealed how China had used its economic diplomacy after the Cold War to bring former adversaries close towards China. Despite occasional American concern for an authoritarian political system, and violation of democratic and human rights in China, the US–China economic relations remained very strong after the Cold War, and these would continue to remain strong in the future for mutual trade and

- business interests. Strengthened economic relations also helped Sino-American political relations to improve after the Cold War. Top-level mutual visits by the leaders of the two nations continued after the war. American President Barack Obama visited China in November 2009. The US–China joint statement issued during Obama’s visit acknowledged China’s leading role in world politics, and particularly in Asia.
- d. The statement, which raised eyebrows in India, clearly indicated that China occupied a dominant role in Asia. It appeared to highlight the new Democratic Administration’s preference for China. This preference may also strengthen US–China political relations in future. With Gorbachev becoming the President of the Soviet Union, Sino-Soviet relations began to improve. China’s relations with the new Russian Federation continued to grow after the Cold War. In 1991, the Sino-Russian Border Agreement was signed apportioning territory that became controversial during the Sino-Soviet border conflict during the Cold War period. In 1992, Russian President Boris Yeltsin visited China, and signed economic and defence agreements with China. After Gorbachev’s visit to China in 1989, leaders of the two states continued to pay mutual visits. These top-level visits helped to normalize relations between the two countries.
 - e. Russian President Vladimir Putin visited China in 2000, and signed three important economic and trade agreements with China. In 2001, Russia emerged as the top supplier of defence equipments to China. Also in 2001, the close relations between the two countries were formalized with the ‘Treaty of Good Neighborliness and Friendly Cooperation’, a twenty-year strategic, economic, and arguably, an implicit military, treaty. Before this treaty was signed, the two countries joined Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan and Uzbekistan to form the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), a multilateral forum for economic and strategic cooperation. The Russian government also agreed to transfer Tarabarov Island as well as one half of Bolshoy Ussuriysky Island to China in 2004, ending a long-standing border dispute between the two countries. The transfer had been

- ratified by both the Chinese and the Russian parliaments. The official transfer ceremony was held on 14 October 2008.
- f. This event was a big leap forward in bilateral relationship between China and Russia, and could act as a confidence-building measure in the future. Two-way trade between the two countries also registered significant growth in recent times. Sino-Russian trade volume was US \$33.4 billion in 2006. It reached a healthy US \$56.8 billion in 2008. During his visit to Russia in 2007, Chinese President Hu Jin Tao told Russian journalists that he was very optimistic about bilateral trade reaching US \$80 billion by 2010.¹² Russian President Dimitry Medvedev also expressed similar hopes during his state visit to China in 2008.¹³ Although the total volume of present China–Russia trade is not as large as the volume of Sino-American trade, it is encouraging to note that China–Russia two-way trade has gained momentum after the Cold War. It appears from the analyses made here that both countries are now eager to forge strong economic and political relations in a changed international order after the Cold War. China also improved its relations with Japan, a close neighbour and an economic giant, after the Cold War. Under the SME, China allowed Japanese companies to do business in the country. This Chinese gesture helped to ease tensions between the two Asian neighbours. In 1992, Japanese Emperor Akihito visited China. This was the first visit to China by any Japanese Emperor after the Second World War.
- g. Naturally, this visit aroused great interests in the two countries and helped to improve relations. In 1993, Japan's erstwhile Prime Minister Hosokawa expressed regrets on behalf of his people for Japan's aggression over China during the Second World War. His regrets softened Chinese sentiments towards Japan. The two states are now politically and economically very close. Top-level mutual visits by the leaders of the two states are taking place regularly. In 2006, Shinzo Abe, Prime Minister of Japan, visited China. During his talks with the Chinese leaders, Abe stressed on cooperation in bilateral trade and investment. Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao visited Japan in 2007 and held talks on various areas

of cooperation between the two states. Chinese Foreign Minister Yang Jiechi visited Japan in November 2009 and met Japanese leaders. Japan's Foreign Minister Okada welcomed Yang on his official visit to Japan, and stated that Japan and China had engaged in dialogues on a variety of issues between their counterparts and that he would like to further promote active cooperation not only in bilateral relationship but also in regional and global issues.

- h. As mentioned earlier, Japan had emerged as the second largest trade partner of China in 2008 with a total trade volume of US \$266.8 billion.¹⁴ Clearly, mutual economic interests had paid dividends in Sino-Japanese bilateral relations which improved significantly after the Cold War. China also endeavoured to improve its relations with the ASEAN, the regional organization with strong economic credentials. China is an important part of the ASEAN + 3 mechanism that also includes Japan and South Korea as non-members of the ASEAN. China and the ASEAN now hold regular summits, also known as the 10 + 1 mechanism. On 24 October 2009, the Twelfth China–ASEAN Summit (10 + 1) was held in Hua Hin, Thailand.
- i. Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao and the leaders of ASEAN-countries attended the summit. The two sides reviewed the joint efforts to tackle the international financial crisis and other challenges faced by the two sides over the past one year, expressed their will to forge cooperation and seek common development, and reached broad consensus on deepening comprehensive cooperation. The China–ASEAN Free Trade Area (FTA), to be completed by 2010, would become another important milestone in the history of relations between the two sides. The current relationship between China and the ASEAN is featured by stronger mutual trust, closer ties in different areas, and the will to work for peace and security in the Asia Pacific region.
- j. China has also enhanced its cooperation with the European Union. China's relations with EU were established in 1975, and are currently guided by the 1985 EU–China Trade and Cooperation Agreement. At present, apart from regular political,

trade and economic dialogue meetings between China and the EU, there are over twenty-four sectoral dialogues and agreements, ranging from environmental protection to industrial policy, to education and culture. The Twelfth EU–China Summit took place in Nanjing, China, on 30 November 2009. The joint statement issued after the summit acknowledged the role played by EU and China in fostering peace and harmony in the world, and called for increasing cooperation between the EU and China in the areas of trade, security, environment, education and culture.

- k. As a group, the EU emerged as the largest trade partner of China in 2008. China's relations with the developing nations of Asia, Africa and Latin America also improved after the Cold War in an atmosphere of free market economy and changed political calculations. China is helping many developing states to improve their industrial and social infrastructure through economic and technological assistance. On the whole, an economically resurgent China is now playing the role of an important actor in world politics after the Cold War.

12) Conclusion

Topic 13

FOREIGN POLICY OF UK

- 7) England enjoyed great-power status in international politics for a long time, from the early sixteenth century to the end of the Second World War. After the war, England's powers were diminished because its economy was hit hard due to the war; and its colonies all over the world became free of British control, depriving it of essential resources to sustain its economy. In comparison, the United States and the Soviet Union emerged as strong economic and military superpowers after the Second World War, relegating England to a lesser-power status in international politics. British economy and foreign policy became largely dependent on the US, its ally before and after the war. This dependence continued during the Cold War and also thereafter. All the important bases of British power for centuries actually started eroding before the Second World War, leaving Britain to remain satisfied with a medium-power status today. Britain rose to great-power status from the early sixteenth century due to its five strengths: geography, sea power, trade, imperial interests, and balance of power.
- 8) For a long time, British diplomacy depended heavily on these factors to establish Britain's supremacy in world politics. Of these five 'strengths', imperial interests and balance of power ended with the Second World War. The vast British empire, in the form of colonies in almost every part of the world, went out of British control after the war. For almost three and a half centuries Britain did not allow any other power to dominate in Europe, and maintained a balance of power in the continent through its command as holder of the balance. But the system of balance of power also came to an end after the Second World War with the rise of two superpowers possessing nuclear weapons.
- 9) The end of the balance of power system also marked the end of British political command in the world. With unprecedented development in the field of science and technology from the early twentieth century, several European states—such as Italy, Germany, France, Portugal and Spain—started competing with England as important sea powers and trading states. So Britain's dominance as a sea power and a trading state faced challenges before the Second World War.

- 10) The advantage of the British geography—its ‘insularity’ from the rest of the European continent— remains valid till today; although in an age of spectacular progress in military technology, such insularity is not enough to gurantee total security for Britain. British economy, traditionally dependent on sea power and trade, found many competitors after the Second World War—such as Japan, the US, Italy and the USSR—and lost grounds. All these factors led to Britain’s ‘fall from grace’ as a great power in world politics. During the Cold War, Britain wished to play the role of an important actor in international politics, and succeeded to some extent, with the help of the United States. With common bonds of heritage, language and culture, Britain and the US remained strong allies before and after the Second World War. Like the US, Britain’s post-war foreign policy was preoccupied with the task of thwarting the ‘advancement’ of communism and the Soviet Union in the world.
- 11) Britain was an active member of the West Bloc and the NATO, and formed an anti-Soviet group with the US and other West European countries during the Cold War. For this reason, Britain’s relations with the socialist countries of East Europe, Africa, Asia and Latin America were distant, and sometimes antagonistic. But it must be pointed out at this point that Britain did not always support the US blindly during the Cold War. It expressed its reservations about the American policy on China, and put forward the view, as early as in 1950, that trade with China must be augmented. With impressive and increasing volumes of Sino-American and Sino-British trade today, Britain’s views proved right in the long run. Britain also opposed American policies during the Suez Canal Crisis and the Vietnam War. Moreover, Britain tried to expand its sphere of influence in the world, independent of the US, through the Commonwealth. Britain was able to establish close political, economic, and cultural links with more than a hundred states in the world through the commonwealth system. Although the commonwealth is a much heterogeneous movement now, with lesser British control, it nevertheless helps British foreign policy to cultivate closer ties with many states, and has proved to be beneficial for British diplomacy for a long time.

- 12) As a permanent member of the Security Council, Britain played a very important role in international affairs during the Cold War. In 1979, during the premiership of Margaret Thatcher, Britain successfully resolved the Rhodesian crisis leading to the establishment of Zimbabwe. Thatcher, the last Prime Minister of Britain (1979–90) during the Cold War, also won the Falklands War against Argentina in 1982 to re-establish British control over the Falkland islands that Argentina had captured for a brief period. British victory in the Falklands War reminded the world that Britain was not a spent force and could preserve its national interests effectively. John Major of the Conservative Party was the first post–Cold War Prime Minister (1990–97) of England.
- 13) The Major government pursued a moderate foreign policy for Britain, perhaps appropriate with the changing international order. Major and his team did not seek a very proactive role for Britain in the new world order immediately after the Cold War. However, the first Gulf War in 1991 and the Maastricht Treaty for a revamped European Union were tough foreign policy challenges for the Major government. The Major administration attempted to ratify the treaty with stiff opposition from the Labour Party, and a section of his own Conservative Party.
- 14) A nationalistic Major ultimately showed his disinterest in the policy of a single European currency, opting to retain the ‘pound sterling’ for Britain. But the Maastricht Treaty and the issue of a united Europe raised political storms in Britain, bringing out the shaky position of the Major government on foreign policy matters. However, Major showed some determination during the first Gulf War by sending British troops to defend Kuwait, and by persuading the American President George Bush (Sr) to support ‘no-fly zones’ in Northern Iraq with a view to prevent Iraqi aircrafts from flying over the area to attack rival aircrafts. This policy proved very effective during the first Gulf War.
- 15) Major also initiated the Northern Ireland peace process by opening talks with the provisional Irish Republican Army (IRA) in 1993. He paved the way for the Belfast Agreement, also known as the ‘Good Friday Agreement’, between Britain and Northern Ireland which

sought to end London's direct control over Northern Ireland. The agreement was finally signed in 1998 after John Major left office. Anthony Charles Lynton Blair, popularly known as Tony Blair, of the Labour Party served as British Prime Minister from 1997 to 2007. Unlike John Major, Blair was more assertive in foreign policy matters. Under him, Britain preferred an 'interventionist' role in international politics. During his two terms in office (1997–2002 and 2002–07), Blair mainly pursued a three-pronged foreign policy: assertive interventionism; close ties with the US; and placing of Britain at the helm of European affairs. The Blair government's interventionist preferences could be ascertained from Britain's active involvement in NATO attacks on Kosovo and Serbia in 1999 in the wake of ethnic conflicts in these regions.

- 16) Blair persuaded the US government of Bill Clinton to attack Kosovo and Serbia with a view to contain Slobodan Milosevic and his Serbian forces. The Blair administration also made England an active player in the 'humanitarian intervention' in Afghanistan in 2001 and in Iraq in 2003. The British military joined hands, mainly with its American counterparts, to launch massive attacks on disruptive forces in Afghanistan and Iraq. In all these operations—Kosovo, Serbia, Afghanistan and Iraq—the Blair government cooperated closely with the US to achieve its foreign policy goals of making Britain a principal actor in international politics again. Blair was an ardent advocate of US–UK partnership to secure and promote Britain's national interests. Immediately after taking over as Prime Minister, Blair declared in a 'Foreign Policy Speech' in November 1997: 'our aim should be to deepen our relationship with the U.S. at all levels. We are the bridge between the US and Europe. Let us use it.'²⁰ After the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the US, the Blair government began to work in close partnership with the US in counter-terrorism activities. This cooperation became stronger after suicide bombers attacked civilians in London in 2005.
- 17) During his two terms in office, Blair used the policy of maintaining close rapport with the Americans, the sole superpower in the world, and engaging them in all major areas of bilateral diplomacy. The Blair government, with a view to securing a prominent role for Britain in European affairs, took active interest in matters related to

the European Union. Britain worked hard towards achieving a European Monetary Union, and the Blair government asked the British Treasury to assess the possibility of adopting the Euro. After careful assessment, the government decided to defer the adoption of euro for Britain when the single currency was introduced in many countries of Europe in 2002. But it hoped that the currency would be introduced in Britain in future. The Labour government also endorsed the Nice Treaty in 2002 which sought to strengthen the European Union by revamping its internal structure. Further, it signed the Brussels Reform Treaty in 2007 that wanted to extend the powers of the union. The Belfast Agreement was initiated by the former John Major government to bring peace to Northern Ireland.

- 18) After assuming office, the Blair government signed this treaty in 1998. This agreement formed a part of Blair's policy to brighten England's image in Europe. In deference to the Belfast agreement, the Tony Blair government helped to restore the 'Stormont', the Northern Ireland Parliament, in 2007. During his two tenures, Blair visited almost every part of Europe—including several areas in East and Central Europe—to restore Britain's close ties with these countries which were affected in many cases by Cold War politics. Blair's euro-centric policies helped in many ways to reestablish Britain at the helm of European politics after the Cold War. James Gordon Brown of the Labour Party assumed charge as the Prime Minister of England in June 2007, after Tony Blair resigned from office. Brown continued with the foreign policy priorities of the Blair government, seeking closer ties with the US and an active role in European and international politics. Although Brown was committed to the Iraq War, he ordered withdrawal of British combat troops from Iraq in 2008. Wanting to improve relations with China, he paid an official visit to the country in July 2008.
- 19) There he expressed hope that England-China economic relations would continue to be strong, and the volume of bilateral trade would touch US \$60 billion by the end of 2010. Although British sympathisers of the Tibetan unrest in 2008 wanted Brown to send a strong message to China, he could not satisfy them fully as he attended the closing ceremony of the summer Olympics of 2008 in Beijing on 24 August

2008. Brown was in favour of building closer ties with China, a booming economy and an important power in today's world politics. British relations with Russia suffered a setback when the Brown government expressed support to the people of Georgia during the South Ossetia War of 2008 between Russia and Georgia. The British Foreign Secretary, David Miliband, visited the Georgian capital Tbilisi to meet the Georgian President and said that the British government and people stood in solidarity with the Georgian people. The opposition party in Britain accused the Brown government in October 2009, during a Westminster Hall debate on a 'frozen relationship' with Russia that was reminiscent of the Cold War disengagement between the two countries. Although Brown met with his Russian counterpart Medvedev twice in 2009, the relationship appeared far from cordial. With Japan, the Brown government nurtured a traditionally close relationship, and further strengthened it. It signed the Lisbon Treaty in December 2007, which sought to reform the EU by amending the earlier Maastricht Treaty.

- 20) The Lisbon Treaty aroused severe political controversies in Britain, and the opposition Conservative Party was against signing it. However, the treaty was ratified by the British Parliament in July 2008, signalling an important foreign policy victory for the Brown government. However, in the May 2010 General Elections, the Labour Party did not fare well and Brown resigned. David William Donald Cameron, the leader of the Conservative Party, became the new Prime Minister of Britain on the basis of a new coalition between the Conservatives and the Liberal Democratic Party. The Cameron government became the first coalition government in the UK since the Second World War. The Cameron Ministry is new in Britain and it will take time to evaluate its performance. British foreign policy in the post-Cold War period suffered from a major dilemma, caused by its close links with the US. Criticism arose within and outside England that British foreign policy was nothing but another face of American foreign policy. To remove this 'American' tag, policy planners in Britain had been searching for a 'British' identity in their foreign policy since the end of the Second World War. But due to several reasons, their policy could not come out of the American sphere of influence.

- 21) Demands of 'realpolitik', alliance sentiments, advantages of partnership, and Britain's incapacity to carry on its international ambitions alone are some of the reasons for Britain's dependence on the US in foreign policy matters. The reliance of three successive Labour governments (Blair and Brown periods) on the US bears testimony to such observations. The Blair government faced intense domestic criticism for its role in Afghanistan and Iraq, for its failure to check human massacre in Rwanda, Bosnia and Serbia. The opposition Conservative Party and the media accused it of earning a bad name for Britain by aligning with the US in military operations across the world. This criticism forced the Brown government to withdraw combat troops from Iraq; but due to Britain's economic and strategic interests, it also remained heavily dependent on the US. British foreign policy thus often suffers from an identity crisis, and it would continue to haunt policy makers in Britain in future.

Topic 14

Foreign Policy: India

9. Origin and Philosophical Base

- a. The foreign policy of any nation is the reflection of its tradition, cultural heritage, and sociopolitical and economic conditions. Indian foreign policy is no exception. It draws inspiration from the age-old tradition of the land, its rich cultural heritage, as well as from the comparatively recent socio-political and economic experiences. India's foreign policy is imbued with ideas of peace, universal brotherhood, non-interference and non-violence. The philosophical basis of India's foreign policy is rooted in its rich cultural heritage that rests on Buddha's tolerance, Emperor Ashoka's non-violence, Sri Chaitanya's love for humanity and Kabir's religious harmony.
- b. There are three main determinants of foreign policy: people, history and geography: People- identity, values, aspirations and skills, History- circumstances, opportunities and constraints of the past, Geography- location, resources and neighbourhood
- c. India was an old civilization with great cultural resources which, however, was stratified socially, economically and politically. Three major developments changed the character of India:
- d. The direct involvement of the masses in the freedom movement in the first half of the 20th century with independence in 1947 and, in spite of the Partition, an identity as a secular nation.
- e. The ambition reflected in the Preamble of the 1950 Constitution to form an egalitarian, secular, socialistic-type just society focused on the social and economic development of the people and politically united into a democratic republican nation.
- f. The economic reforms of 1991, liberating the trading and entrepreneurial spirit of the people
- g. The near coincidence in time of Indian independence and Partition, the beginning of the Cold War in the aftermath of the World War II and the Communist victory in China created a difficult situation for India. It led to a foreign policy of non-alignment as a means of retaining strategic autonomy combined

with an effort to create solidarity of Asian/ developing countries as a political support base.

- h. In the wake of the Cold War, India's pro-Soviet-tilt and Pakistan's total support for the West as well as China's occupation of Tibet, helped to exacerbate the neighbourhood tensions. In spite of trying to settle peacefully through the UN the Kashmir issue created by Pakistan's aggression, the issue got converted there into an Indo-Pakistan dispute. Two wars, one in 1965 and the other in 1971, the latter changing the political geography of the sub-continent, and the respective peace agreements signed in Tashkent and Simla failed to resolve the problem. Subsequently, Pakistan started using terror as a state policy to try to force India to submit as part of its proxy war strategy.
- i. The foreign policy of a state mainly has two sides to it—the first is the 'policy side', the second the 'application side'. The policy side consists of the philosophical or theoretical base of foreign policy. Generally, this part remains unaltered. The philosophical or theoretical base of foreign policy is built upon the tradition, culture, social and political history, and political ideas of great personalities of the state. The application side, on the other hand, is developed on the basis of the changing contours of national and international politics. As such, it is more pragmatic and dynamic as it has to constantly adjust itself with the changing demands of the times and politics. The application side of a state's foreign policy may not always reflect the ideologies contained in the policy side. For instance, one aspect of the theoretical base of India's foreign policy is the policy of nonalignment. But in its application, India's nonaligned policies were not beyond doubt during the Cold War period. Further, one theoretical premise of the US foreign policy is noninterference in the internal matters of sovereign independent states. But in the application of US foreign policy, one might also question if the Americans were true to this idea of non-interference during and after the Cold War. Actually, the theoretical side of a foreign policy relates to the 'idealistic plane', whereas the application side relates to the 'realistic plane'.

Keeping these distinctions in mind, we proceed to discuss the basic principles of India's foreign policy.

10. **Introduction:** While local politics in India mandate an internal focus, recent Indian administrations have understood that achieving their domestic objectives will require the engagement of the international community. In recent years, India's military, diplomatic and economic energies have expanded far beyond Nehru's Non-Aligned position. But what does that mean for India, its region, and the United States?
11. **CURRENT SITUATION:** India's foreign policy is driven by five principal factors, through which are interwoven its relationships with two countries: the United States and China.
 - a. **Conventional Security:**
 - i. Pakistan is historically perceived to be India's main conventional threat, as evidenced by the military stand-off in late 2001 and early 2002.
 - ii. At the same time, India lost a war to China in 1962. China is also India's closest military equal, a fact made most clear when India pronounced that its 1998 nuclear tests were in response to the China risk.
 - iii. India's military is rooting out internal militancy prevalent (in the northeast, in the east (among the Naxelite groups), and in Jammu and Kashmir.) Notably, however, there are no known Indian al Qaida or Taliban members (excepting the 2006 Heathrow plot).
 - iv. India is also located in a volatile neighborhood, with ongoing wars, insurgencies and unrest taking place in Sri Lanka, Nepal, Pakistan, and Afghanistan, and a coup in Bangladesh.
 - b. **Economic Growth:**
 - i. For decades, India maintained what economists termed a "Hindu" rate of GDP growth between 1.5 and 3%. Following the 1991 economic reforms, growth tripled and has stabilized since 2006 at 8-9.5%. However, if India hopes to continue to lift up the 60% of its population in the rural sector and build

infrastructure, it must increase its foreign financing significantly.

- ii. Exchange with its neighbors has supported India's growth, from the "Look East" policy of the early 1990's to today's increasing engagement with ASEAN, BIMSTEC, and the new SAFTA agreement. At the same time as it pursues regional agreements, India also engages bilaterally (with free trade agreements with Singapore and a possible bilateral investment treaty with the U.S.) and globally, taking a leadership position in the WTO Doha negotiations.
- iii. India's growth has been bolstered by China, which has achieved annual growth of over 10% since 2000. However, the two countries will compete increasingly, as India engages in China's traditional stronghold of manufacturing, and China focuses on the services market.

c. Energy Security:

- i. India currently imports 70% of its oil and 50% of its gas; it is projected to import 80% of its energy needs by 2025.
- ii. While India holds that it should be allowed to expand energy consumption and emissions until its per capita levels correspond with those of Western countries, increasingly polls indicate that the Indian public is recognizing the importance of more attention to environmental concerns.
- iii. India is increasingly exploring nuclear power as an alternative energy source (presuming the U.S.-India July 2005 civil nuclear agreement is completed); it is also one of the leading R&D venues for solar and wind power. However, currently only 6% of potential non-conventional energy resources have been tapped.
- iv. In an effort to ensure access to energy resources, India will continue to focus on the Middle East, particularly Iran (including the Iran-Pakistan-India oil pipeline). At the same time, India is expanding its search for energy resources into Africa and Latin America (though India typically loses bids to China).

d. Nuclear Capability and Nonproliferation:

- i. India's nuclear policy is shaped by its unstable relations with Pakistan and China, as well as the recent escalation of nuclear proliferation in the wider region. Its goal is to build a "credible minimum deterrent" through land-, air-, and sea-based capabilities.
 - ii. Since 2002, the India-Pakistan Composite Dialogue has significantly lowered tensions and resulted in several agreements to mitigate the chance of a mistaken nuclear attack.
 - iii. If the U.S.-India civil nuclear agreement is completed (see India-Iran Relations briefing memo), India will be able to take a more active role in promoting nonproliferation directly, a goal that has long been touted as vital to India's national interest.
- e. Strategic Stature and Leadership:
- i. India has the second largest population in the world, and one of the youngest. Its economy, by purchasing power parity, is 4th in the world. India's soft power remains strong, and its military, economic and diplomatic reach is increasingly significant. India is a multi-ethnic and multi-religious democracy. While already a leader of the developing world, India now wants status in the developed world.
 - ii. Given South Asia's instability, there are ample opportunities for India to focus on helping to alleviate the conflicts in neighboring Nepal, Sri Lanka and Bangladesh. In so doing, India often confronts China's similar desire for regional leadership and seniority (such as China's desire to exclude India in 2005 from the newly formed East Asia Summit (EAS)).
 - iii. In addition to focusing on bilateral relationships, India engages in regional and ad hoc groups such as the 2004 Asian Tsunami Core Response Group, and enhancing its status in global groups (such as its bid to become a permanent member of the UN Security Council and interest in the G8).

12. POLICY IMPLICATIONS: These five broad drivers of India's foreign policy have major implications for its relations with the two principal regional (and global) powers: China and the United States.

a. China

- i. Given their mutual desire for stability leading to economic growth, China and India have worked hard in recent years to improve their relationship with senior diplomatic visits — Chinese President Hu Jintao visited in 2006 and Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh reciprocated in January 2008 — along with numerous ministerial level visits and, starting in December 2007, joint military exercises.
- ii. At the same time, the two nations are hedging their bets, with China developing a "string of pearls" policy to encircle India by building relationships with its neighbors, from its long-standing strong links to Pakistan, to improving engagement with Burma and Bangladesh. India is countering this by building its own avenues of leverage in the region.
- iii. Increasingly the environment is going to conspire to complicate this relationship, building on inherent areas of conflict in the economic, energy, nuclear, strategic and security realms. These pressures are likely to increase as both India and China pursue leadership roles in Asia.

b. United States

- i. Since 2000, India's relations with the United States have undergone a "transformation," reaching a level of primacy today. After advocating for non-alignment (while tilting towards the Soviet Union during the Cold War), India began to move towards a more self-determining policy in the 1990s. In 2000, then-President Clinton led a path-breaking visit to India that transformed Indian views of the U.S. and launched the new relationship. The foundations for this new interaction were put in place by U.S. Ambassador Robert Blackwill from 2001 to 2003.
- ii. America's principal challenges today lie in such areas as terrorism, extremism, proliferation of weapons of mass

destruction, economic growth, energy, environment, narcotics, Iraq, Iran, Afghanistan, North Korea and potentially China. These are very similar to the principal foreign policy challenges facing India today. And, in many cases they can only be addressed through long-term engagement and cooperation by the U.S., India, and many of their other allies.

- iii. However, this bilateral relationship is held back by a number of constraints, most notably bureaucratic inertia and lack of trust, and the political considerations that accompany democratic polities.

c. RECOMMENDATIONS

- i. As India advances its position in the world and lives up to the potential that its character and natural assets imply, it could become a powerful force for transformation in key areas such as energy, nonproliferation, environment, economic development and terrorism. However, if the United States does not engage seriously on an equal basis with India, the vacuum will be filled with other players, and America will have lost an opportunity to build a strong and vital alliance with a growing Asian power.
- ii. Given this, the United States should pursue the following principles with India:
 - 1. Build a truly strategic relationship with India that transcends the civil nuclear deal. This requires committing time, energy and resources to other significant elements of the relationship.
 - 2. Continue to treat India as a principal world player, including supporting India's bid for permanent membership in the United Nations Security Council and the G8.
 - 3. Support India's involvement in global energy groups, including the International Energy Agency (IEA) and serious bilateral engagement on post-Kyoto protocols. The United States will need to find ways through R&D and financial incentives to help India build "green."

4. Push India to start to carry the burdens of leadership in areas of its direct interest, such as nonproliferation and terrorism.

13. Conclusion

Topic 15
Foreign Policy of USA

10) Introduction

- a. The United States, the only remaining superpower after the Cold War, has a long political history. The territory, known as the US today, was discovered in the early sixteenth century by John Cabot, an Englishman by birth. Cabot reached the East coast of America and established a settlement in Maryland, Virginia. Before Cabot, another sailor, Christopher Columbus, reached the nearby islands of West Indies in 1492. So it was Cabot and not Columbus who discovered America. As Cabot was a British, he ultimately handed over the power to rule Virginia to the British monarch Henry VII, and a British colony, the first foreign colony in America, was set up in Virginia.
- b. Gradually other foreign powers reached different parts of America and set up their colonies. In the Southwest, near the present Florida, Spain established its rule. The French people occupied Novo-Scotia, the Dutch-captured areas around the Hudson Valley, while the Swedish set up their colony in Delaware. The first official colony in America was set up in 1607 at James Town.
- c. By 1732, the number of formal official colonies rose to thirteen, all ruled by European powers. In 1664, the British defeated the Dutch and captured the Dutch-ruled areas. Similarly, they also captured the Spanish colonies and established British rule over a vast area of America. Finally, the Englishmen defeated the French in the Anglo-French war of 1763, and established their sovereignty over the whole of America. Anger and frustration over British rule began to be noticed in all thirteen colonies, and protest movements started all over America. The dissident leaders in all colonies gradually established close links among themselves bypassing political differences. They also set up a combined armed force to fight the British rulers. On 4 July 1776, leaders of the thirteen colonies signed a declaration proclaiming independence from British rule.

d. This day (July 4) is now treated as Independence Day in the US. Although America got freedom from British rule in 1776, it took eleven more years to start the constitutional process in the territory. In 1787, the constitution was adopted and the United States of America, consisting of thirteen former colonies, was officially formed. The constitution became effective from 4 March 1789. The two Houses of the American Parliament (Congress), the House of Representatives and the Senate met separately for the first time in April 1789. On 30 April 1789, George Washington took charge as the first President of the US, and John Adams assumed office as the first Vice President of the country. Gradually, states were reorganized in the US and today, the US Federation consists of fifty states. An abundance of natural resources, spectacular development of agriculture and industry, science and technology, and above all, human endeavour, have made the US the only economic, political, military and technical superpower in the world. The political history of the US is, therefore, more than 230 years old (from 1776), and its constitutional history is more than 220 years old (from 1787). But in its long constitutional history, the US foreign policy mainly followed a policy of isolationism—willful abstinence from the main currents of international politics. From 1789 to 1940, the US never involved itself actively in international politics, although it maintained diplomatic ties with several countries.

11) Foreign Policy Goals

- a. To investigate the nature of current United States foreign policy, the logical source is the State Department, whose job it is to define and direct it. Foreign policy goals include the following:
- b. Preserving the national security of the United States
- c. Promoting world peace and a secure global environment
- d. Maintaining a balance of power among nations
- e. Working with allies to solve international problems
- f. Promoting democratic values and human rights
- g. Furthering cooperative foreign trade and global involvement in international trade organizations

- h. Examining these goals closely reveals that they are based on cooperation with other nations, although "preserving the national security of the United States" implies possible competition and conflict.

12) Major Points

- a. Foreign relations to be conducted so as to give the fullest diplomatic support to the United States armed forces.
- b. Effective steps to prevent Germany and Japan, after the United Nation's victory, from again waging an aggressive war.
- c. Establishment at the earliest possible moment of a United Nations security organization to maintain peace, by force if necessary, for generations to come.
- d. Agreement on measures to expand world trade so that the United States can maintain full employment and enter with other nations into an era of expanding production and rising standards of living.
- e. Encouragement of all conditions of international life favorable to the development by men and women everywhere of institutions of a free and democratic way of life in accordance with their own customs and desires.

- 13) Who is in charge of foreign policy: Presidents have more power and responsibility in foreign and defense policy than in domestic affairs. They are the commanders in chief of the armed forces; they decide how and when to wage war. As America's chief diplomat, the president has the power to make treaties to be approved by the Senate.

14) Foreign Policy and Isolationism

- a. The Republican party had an isolationist wing led by Senator Robert A. Taft. During World War II, the internationalist wing of the GOP gained strength, as former isolationist Arthur Vandenberg switched sides.
- b. The leaders of the anti-isolationist or "internationalist" wing were Dwight D. Eisenhower (president 1952-60), and Richard Nixon (president 1968-74).
- c. Conservative leader Barry Goldwater in 1964 rejected isolationism and called for an aggressive Rollback strategy to defeat Communism, a policy followed by Ronald Reagan (president 1980-88).

- d. Meanwhile isolationist sentiment grew in the Democratic party, largely in reaction to the failure of the Vietnam War. the chief spokesman was Senator George McGovern, whose 1972 presidential campaign had the isolationist slogan, "Come Home America".

15) Historical Background

- a. **1933-39: Isolation:** The rejection of the League of Nations treaty in 1919 marked the dominance of isolationism from world organizations in American foreign policy. Despite Roosevelt's Wilsonian background, he and Secretary of State Cordell Hull acted with great care not to provoke isolationist sentiment. Roosevelt's "bombshell" message to the world monetary conference in 1933 effectively ended any major efforts by the world powers to collaborate on ending the worldwide depression, and allowed Roosevelt a free hand in economic policy. The main foreign policy initiative of Roosevelt's first term was the Good Neighbor Policy, which was a re-evaluation of U.S. policy towards Latin America.
- b. **World War 2:** By 1940, it was in high gear, with bipartisan support, partly to expand and re-equip the Army and Navy and partly to become the "Arsenal of Democracy" supporting Britain, France, China and (after June 1941), the Soviet Union. As Roosevelt took a firmer stance against the Axis Powers, American isolationists—including Charles Lindbergh and America First—attacked the President as an irresponsible warmonger. Unfazed by these criticisms and confident in the wisdom of his foreign policy initiatives, FDR continued his twin policies of preparedness and aid to the Allied coalition.
- c. **Truman: 1945-53** Truman shifted from FDR's détente to containment as soon as Dean Acheson convinced him the Soviet Union was a long-term threat to American interests. They viewed communism as a secular, millennial religion that informed the Kremlin's worldview and actions and made it the chief threat to American security, liberty, and world peace. Truman in 1947 announced the Truman Doctrine of containing Communist expansion by furnishing military and economic American aid to Europe and Asia, and particularly to Greece and Turkey. He

- followed up with the Marshall Plan, which was enacted into law as the European Recovery Program (ERP) and pumped \$12.4 into the European economy, forcing the breakdown of old barriers and encouraging modernization along American lines.
- d. **Containment:** In 1947 Truman, a Democrat, convinced the Republican-controlled Congress to support the Truman Doctrine by sending massive aid to the small country of Greece, threatened by a Communist takeover. The rest of Europe was still in economic ruin, which Washington feared would help the spread of Communism, so the Marshall Plan was proposed to help restore the European economies. The strategy of friendship (or *détente*) with Communism had failed in 1948. Washington decided on a strategy of containment, as embodied in the NATO military alliance set up in 1949. The plan was to prevent further Communist expansion, hoping that the internal weaknesses of the Soviet system would soon lead to its collapse. The problem with containment was that it meant fighting wars against Communist expansion, especially in Korea in 1950-53, and in Vietnam 1963-73. Containment had the basic flaw that the enemy could choose the time and place of movement, while America and its allies had to defend everywhere at all times. In 1949 Mao ZeDong and his Communists won the civil war in China showing the failure of containment in Asia.
 - e. **Korean War: 1950-1953:** The Korean War began at the end of June 1950 when North Korea, a Communist country, invaded South Korea, which was not under explicit American protection. Without consulting Congress Truman ordered General Douglas MacArthur to use all American forces to resist the invasion. In late 1950 China intervened unexpectedly, drove the UN forces all the way back to South Korea.
- 16) **Cold War Policy:** In 1950 Truman approved NSC-68, a top-secret[13] policy paper that formed the grounds for escalating the Cold War, especially in terms of tripling spending on rearmament and building the hydrogen bomb. The integration of European defense was given new impetus by continued U.S. support of NATO, under the command of General Eisenhower. A vast foreign aid program

supplemented a network of military alliances stretching around the globe. The services contained about 3 million soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines at all times. The military stressed mechanization and electronics, with elaborate support mechanisms and a huge training program in technical skills; fewer than 20% of the servicemen were in combat roles. The necessary hardware was supplied by the “military-industrial complex” of big corporations and labor unions. A peaceful race to the moon, won by the Americans in 1969, was played out against rapid advances in size and accuracy of rockets by both sides.

- 17) **Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson: 1953-1968:** President John F. Kennedy called for youth, dynamism, vigor and an intellectual approach to aggressive new policies in foreign affairs. The downside was his inexperience in foreign affairs, standing in stark contrast to the vast experience of the president he replaced, Republican Dwight D. Eisenhower. Kennedy's rashness and inexperience caused a national humiliation in 1961 as he sent CIA-trained Cuban exiles into an ill-prepared attack on Castro's Cuba. At the Bay of Pigs, all Kennedy's invaders were killed or captured, and he was forced to ransom them for cash. Kennedy's supporters blamed the fiasco on Eisenhower. Kennedy and Khrushchev reached a compromise whereby the Soviets removed their missiles from Cuba publicly (giving Kennedy a public relations triumph), while Kennedy secretly removed American missiles from Turkey aimed at the Soviets, and also promised that America would never invade Cuba—a promise still in effect in 2009. Vietnam proved a trap for Kennedy as he sent in 16,000 military advisors to prop up an ineffective regime in South Vietnam.
- 18) **Nixon and Kissinger: 1969-77:** Kissinger's first priority in office was the achievement of détente with the Soviet Union and China, and playing them off against each other. Recognizing and accepting the Soviet Union as a superpower, Nixon and Kissinger sought both to maintain U.S. military strength and to inaugurate peaceful economic, cultural, and scientific exchanges to engage the Soviet Union in the international system. This policy flourished under Kissinger's direction and led in 1972 to the signing of the first Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT I). At the same time they successfully engineered a rapprochement with Communist China, leading to the astonishing news

in 1971 that Nixon would visit China, which he and Kissinger did in 1972.

- a. Vietnam: Nixon and Kissinger worked to achieve a disengagement of U.S. forces fighting in Vietnam.
 - b. Middle East: One challenge to détente came with the outbreak of the October 1973 Arab-Israeli War. Faced with a threat of Soviet intervention, Nixon put U.S. military forces on worldwide alert. He then employed shuttle diplomacy to secure cease-fires between Israel and the Arab states and to restore U.S. Egyptian diplomatic ties, broken since 1967.
 - c. Latin America: The Nixon administration sought to protect the economic and commercial interests of the United States during a period of heightened Latin American nationalism and expropriations, 1969-74. Though the administration initially adopted a flexible policy toward Latin American governments that nationalized American corporations' assets, the influence of Nixon's economic ideology, domestic political pressures, and the advice of his close adviser, Secretary of the Treasury John Connally, led to a more confrontational stance toward Latin American countries.
 - d. South Asia: During the South Asian crisis in 1971, the White House, stood firmly behind Pakistani president Yahya Khan and demonstrated a disdain for India and particularly its leader, Indira Gandhi because of India's tilt toward the Soviet Union. Many analysts believed that Pakistan's role as a conduit of rapprochement with China and Kissinger's focus on geopolitical concerns greatly influenced the American policy decision in 1971.
- 19) **Ford years:** Nixon resigned in 1974 under the threat of impeachment and was succeeded by Gerald R. Ford, who kept Nixon's policies. The US was not involved in 1975 when North Vietnam invaded and defeated South Vietnam, except to rescue Americans and some Vietnamese supporters.
- 20) **Jimmy Carter 1977-81:**
- a. In his inaugural speech Carter stated that "our commitment to human rights must be absolute." He singled out the Soviet Union

- as a violator of human rights and strongly condemned the country for arresting its citizens for political protests.
- b. Carter also tried to remove the U.S. image of interventionism by giving Panamanians control of the Panama Canal. He was strongly opposed by conservatives but won, and gave back the Canal. The result was disaster and the US invaded Panama in 1989 to overthrow a nasty dictator named Noriega.
 - c. Détente with China continued successfully.
 - d. Détente with the Soviet Union collapsed in 1979 when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, setting off a long war that the Soviets lost. President Carter responded by giving military aid to the rebels, imposing an embargo on the sale of grain to the Soviet Union and boycotting the 1980 Summer Olympic Games in Moscow. The policy of détente that was established by President Nixon had ended.
 - e. Carter's only triumph while in office was a historic peace treaty known as the Camp David Peace Accords, between Israel and Egypt, two nations that had been bitter enemies for decades. The treaty was formally signed in 1979, with most middle eastern countries opposed to it, but it remains in effect in 2009.
- 21) **Iran Hostage Crisis:** In 1979, a new radical Islamic regime led by Ayatollah Khomeini in Iran overthrew America's close ally Shah. Thousands of modernizers were arrested, expelled or executed. In November 1979 student revolutionaries stormed into the American embassy in Tehran and captured 52 United States diplomats as hostages. They refused to negotiate and the government refused to intervene. The US seized all Iranian assets and tried to bargain, a process that dragged on for 444 days. Carter tried to use the US military action to rescue the hostages, but it was a total failure. Fearful of what President Reagan might do, the Iranians released the hostages were released minutes before Reagan was inaugurated on January 20, 1981. The result was a major humiliation for the United States, and a consensus that the country was now an underdog and needed new leadership to claw its way back.
- 22) **Ronald Reagan 1981-93:** Reagan restructured American politics in a manner reminiscent of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal Coalition.

Reagan built entirely new electoral coalitions using fresh issues, such as opposition to taxes, opposition to economic regulation, and support for moral issues (like right-to-life) promoted by Catholics and especially evangelical Protestants. In foreign policy the Cold War resumed with renewed intensity. The defeatism of the late 1970s sparked a new determination among the Reaganites. In the 1970s the Soviets had rejected détente, expanded Cold War operations into Africa, Asia and Latin America, enlarged their long-range missile forces, and invaded neutral Afghanistan. The fall of the Berlin Wall in November, 1989, marked the end of the Cold War with a stunning American victory. Gorbachev's reforms, meanwhile, made the Soviet economy worse

23) **Relations with Britain:** Relations with Britain had been strained since the Suez crisis of 1956. Now both countries were led by like-minded leaders who collaborated closely, Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and Reagan. Their collaboration was based on a striking convergence of ideologically driven conservatives who shared similar domestic agendas and a common foreign policy. Both led domestic political revolutions--supply-side economics, increased defense spending, privatization, deregulation, and an overall conservative agenda. Reagan was the "Great Communicator", Thatcher the "Iron Lady". The two became personal friends. Reagan and Thatcher's mutual trust strengthened Reagan's hand against the Soviet Union.

24) **Post Cold War Policy**

- a. The immediate post–Cold War world order was mainly based on the following conditions:
 - i. the emergence of the US as the only superpower;
 - ii. end of bipolarity and bloc politics;
 - iii. end of American and Western fear about the spread of socialism;
 - iv. an apparent end to military rivalry with the decline of bipolarity and bloc politics. US foreign policy was new to such conditions and it had the responsibility to adjust itself and protect American interests in this new international order.
- b. Foreign policy planners in the US were ready to take up the challenges posed by the post–Cold War international order.

- c. In a new altered scenario, American foreign policy placed emphasis on the following issues:
 - i. **Nonproliferation Of The Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) In The World;** The Bush administration zealously pursued nonproliferation policies. The US Foreign Policy Department worked hard to contain the spread of the WMD. After Bush (Sr), Bill Clinton took office as the US President. Clinton served two terms in office, from 1993 to 2000. His administration was the first significant American foreign policy planner after the Cold War. During his presidency, nonproliferation of WMD became an important element of American foreign policy. The Clinton administration declared different countries of the world as nuclear 'rogues' and 'threshold' states. For instance, North Korea and Iraq were declared as nuclear rogue states. India, Pakistan, Israel, South Africa, Brazil and Argentina were termed as nuclear 'threshold' states. The US also identified South Asia as a 'nuclear hot spot', along with North Korea and Iraq, and engaged in diplomatic talks with India and Pakistan—North Korea and Iraq did not respond to such talks—to encourage nonproliferation in these countries.
 - ii. **Protection of Human Rights;** American diplomatic relations suffer with countries accused of human rights violations by the AHRR. Normally, the US tries to avoid relations of economic, political or security-related significance with countries alleged by the AHRR of violation of human rights. But there are exceptions in case of important powers.
 - iii. **Economic Diplomacy;** Economic diplomacy places importance on trade and business, keeping aside political considerations. After the Cold War, the US worked hard to pursue policies of economic diplomacy with different states. Enhancing trade and commercial relations with other countries, providing investment opportunities to American capital in different parts of the world, increasing American financial assistance for industrialization and developmental activities in other states, all these constitute integral elements of American economic diplomacy.

- iv. **Counter-Terrorism;** Bush's 'war on terrorism' contained four major policies: (1) no compromise with terrorism and terrorists, and no exchange or settlement with terrorists (like release of detained terrorists or economic exchanges); (2) judicial trial of terrorists for crime against humanity; (3) isolation of countries providing help to terrorists from the international community, and pressurizing these countries to abandon their harmful activities; and (4) provision of all kinds of assistance to states engaged in the fight against terrorism. The Bush (Jr) administration also declared an 'anti-terrorism assistance programme' that contained, among other things, military training, exchange of information and security assistance to countries involved in the war on terrorism. Further, a 'rewards for justice' programme announced by the Bush Administration sought to exchange information about international terrorists with friendly states, and give rewards of upto US \$25 million for information on international terrorists, and assistance to capture them. The Obama administration also stepped up American efforts on counter-terrorism. For instance, Obama's 'Af-Pak Policy', announced in March 2009, sought to eliminate terrorist groups like the Al Qaeda and the Taliban from Afghanistan and Pakistan and provide massive economic and security assistance to these countries to eliminate terrorist activities from their soil.
- v. **Security Assistance Programme:** Security Assistance Programme (SAP) became an integral part of US foreign policy after the Second World War. Almost 50 per cent of American assistance to different countries during the Cold War period came under this programme, which was considered crucial for American strategic interests to counter Soviet influence. However, after the end of the Cold War, the future of the programme was hotly debated in the US. In the absence of the Soviet Union, whether it would be wise for the US to spend huge amounts on the SAP became a controversial issue. But all American Presidents after the Cold War preferred to continue with the programme, and the US Congress approved the budget on the SAP from time to time. The continuance of the programme by all American

administrations during the post Cold War period proved the importance of the SAP as an element of American foreign policy in recent years. The SAP contains several programmes like Foreign Military Financing (FMF), Economic Support Fund (ESF), International Military Education and Training (IMET) and Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR). About 95 per cent of the SAP-money is spent on FMF and ESF. President George W. Bush (Sr), the first US President after the Cold War, lobbied hard to retain the SAP after the Cold War. Bush considered SAP as a very significant part of US defence strategy. He identified three areas in the American Defence Strategy which could be bolstered by the SAP. They were: (1) meeting crisis situations; (2) reorganization; and (3) presence of US military in other countries as per requirements. He believed that the SAP would be very useful to protect vital American interests, mainly in these areas. After Bush (Sr), all post–Cold War American Presidents lent their support for the SAP and continued to consider it as an integral part of American security policy. After the Cold War, the SAP was used to strengthen democratic processes in East Europe, help counter-terrorism and anti-narcotic activities around the world, strengthen the maintenance of international peace and security, and above all, protect American national interests. The US Congress also allocated enough money to keep the SAP going during the post–Cold War period.

25) 1989-present:

- a. **Clinton 1993-2001** The years since 1991 comprise a new era. Fears of cataclysmic wars faded, to be replaced by new threats, especially those arising in the Middle East. When Iraq under Saddam Hussein invaded its neighbor Kuwait in 1991, the United Nations demanded that Iraq withdraw. When it refused the United States led a broad coalition that pushed Iraq out, but which left Hussein in power under UN supervision. In 2001 Al Qaeda terrorists attacked the United States, leading America into a war on terrorism. America was the world's only superpower, with military strength much greater than everyone else combined, and economic muscle and high technology to back it up. The

overwhelming strength of the United States, and the absence of any countervailing force like Communism, meant that fears and hatreds came to focus on America, widely seen as a new empire. Americans meanwhile had to adjust to heightened levels of security at home, and were ill-disposed to listen to foreign critics. The ways to which society and culture of the American homefront would adjust to the new Age of Terror became a central issue of the new century.

- b. **Bush: 2001-2008:** President George W. Bush leveraged his public support to eliminate the long-term threat posed by Iraq, with an invasion in spring 2003. He moved in close cooperation with Britain and other allies, but without the endorsement of the United Nations. The warfare was short and decisive, but the occupation was met with violence and the goal of creating a democratic nation in Iraq proved much more difficult than expected. Public opinion worldwide turned hostile to America—the superpower-as-bully syndrome brought out the old clichés about the “Ugly American” that had been in circulation for decades, emboldening anti-American forces and causing Americans, in the 2004 presidential campaign, to take a hard look at the nation’s role in the world.

c. Obama 2009-present:

- i. Obama is a much different candidate today from the senator who distinguished himself by his opposition to the "dumb war" on his way to the presidency in 2008. Obama has turned out, in many ways, to have pursued a fairly conventional, at times, hawkish foreign policy. He has had some notable successes, such as the bin Laden raid and this year’s withdrawal from Iraq — albeit on a timetable negotiated by his predecessor — and the successful overthrow of Muammar al-Qaddafi. All the same, "apology tours" and "leading from behind" — referring to an unfortunate description of Obama’s diplomatic strategy by a White House staffer — have already become buzzwords for Republican candidates. He has also faced heavy criticism on

the left for a sometimes inconsistent approach to international law in counterterrorism operations.

- ii. Afghanistan/Pakistan: "We have put al Qaeda on a path to defeat," Obama announced last June, noting that the 33,000 "surge" troops he sent to Afghanistan in 2009 would be out of the country by the summer of 2012.
- iii. Military spending: Pentagon will lead a "fundamental review" of U.S. military capabilities in order to cut \$400 billion in defense spending over the next 10 years.
- iv. Immigration/borders: Obama insists that enacting comprehensive immigration reform, which would likely include a path to citizenship for at least some illegal immigrants already in the United States, is still a "top priority,"
- v. Israel/Palestine: Obama's engagement in the Israeli-Palestinian peace process has probably been the most frustrating foreign-policy initiative of his presidency and the one on which he is most often criticized by his Republican opponents. Obama continues to support negotiations on a two-state settlement of the conflict, but his best-remembered statement on the topic is controversial: his suggestion that Israel's pre-1967 war borders be taken as a starting point for negotiations, a position fiercely opposed by Israel. More recently, the administration has confirmed that it will veto Palestine's statehood bid in the U.N. Security Council.
- vi. China: Obama has repeatedly criticized China — most recently at the APEC summit in Honolulu — for currency policies that he says have a distorting effect on the global economy.
- vii. Foreign aid: In his 2010 address to the U.N. General Assembly, Obama announced an overhaul of U.S. foreign aid policies, which he vowed will place them at the center of U.S. foreign policy.
- viii. Iran/nukes: Early in his presidency, Obama made several overtures to Iran in an effort to improve relations.

- ix. Trade: In October, Obama signed long-delayed free trade agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea. On his trip to Asia this November, Obama is working to promote a new trans-Pacific free trade agreement.
- x. War on terror/detainees: Obama signed an executive order closing the Guantánamo Bay detention center as one of his first actions as president. The facility remains open, however, largely due to congressional opposition over where to house the remaining prisoners.
- xi. Environment: Despite his stated support for environmental legislation and green energy, there has been little progress on passing major climate-change bills under Obama's watch.
- xii. Russia/reset: One of the centerpieces of Obama's first-term foreign policy was the effort to "reset" relations with Russia. The president successfully negotiated the New START nuclear reduction treaty,
- xiii. Still, with 200,000 dead in Syria's civil war, eastern Ukraine engulfed in a Russian-backed insurgency, and the Islamic State governing large parts of Syria and Iraq, it can be hard to see what's "better" about this world. (Obama did, however, correctly note that "the trajectory of this planet overall is one toward less violence, more tolerance, less strife, less poverty.") On each of these crises, one can criticize Obama for how badly they have turned out, but that assumes that the United States had the ability to influence these crises for the better before they spiraled out of control.

26) Conclusion

Topic 16

Foreign Policy of Pakistan post 9/11

8) Introduction

- i. The foreign policy of Pakistan is primarily directed to the pursuit of national goals of seeking peace and stability through international cooperation.
- ii. To project the image of the country as a dynamic and moderate society
- iii. Seeks to promote the internationally recognized norms of interstate relations
- iv. Generally Pro-West, India-centric and Security-oriented

9) Guiding Principles of Pakistan's Foreign Policy

- i. According to Quaid e Azam: "Our foreign policy is one of the friendliness and goodwill towards all the nation of the world. We do not cherish aggressive designs against any country or nation. We believe in the principle of honesty and fair-play in national and international dealings, and are prepared to make our contribution to the promotion of peace and prosperity among the nations of the world. Pakistan will never be found lacking in extending its material and moral support to the oppressed and suppressed peoples of the world and in upholding the principles of the United Nations Charter."
- ii. The Constitution of Pakistan also lays down guidelines in Article 40: "The State shall endeavour to preserve and strengthen fraternal relations among Muslim countries based on Islamic unity, support the common interests of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, promote international peace and security, foster goodwill and friendly relations among all nations and encourage the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means."
- iii. Objectives
 - i. Promotion Pakistan as a dynamic, progressive, moderate, and democratic Islamic country
 - ii. Safeguarding national security and geo-strategic interests, including Kashmir

- iii. Consolidating our commercial and economic cooperation
 - iv. Safeguarding the interests of Pakistani Diaspora abroad.
 - v. Ensuring optimal utilization of national resources for regional and international cooperation
- 10) Determinants of Foreign Policy of Pakistan
- i. Ideological Obligation: Islamic ideology; Liaquat Ali Khan once said: **“Pakistan came into being as a result of the urge felt by the Muslims of this subcontinent to secure a territory, however limited, where the Islamic ideology and way of life could be practiced and demonstrated to the world.”**
 - ii. Historical Legacy: Pakistan inherited from the British files; fear of Russia. Pakistan’s foreign policy makers always sought western assistance.
 - iii. Geographical Location: “the foreign policy of Pakistan largely begins and ends at her borders, more particularly at the Indian border,” seems to be accurate.
 - iv. The Indian Threat; Security
 - v. Economic Compulsions
 - vi. National Interests
 - vii. Diplomacy and Decision making
 - viii. Public Opinion Formulation
- 11) Foreign Policy of Pakistan
- iv. Pattern of relationship established with the outside world for the promotion of national interest of a country.
 - v. Foreign policy of any country is a reflection of its domestic situation, particularly on matters related to politics and economy. Sometimes other factors such as religion, culture, ethnicity and leadership also influence the foreign policy making process.
 - vi. Foreign policy often considered as the first line of defense of any country. This is truer in case of Pakistan, as it was surrounded by different security situation.
 - vii. Foreign policy is based on sheer realism and is free of allusions, romanticism and emotions.
 - viii. Pakistan is, geo-politically, at the cross roads of central Asia, west and South Asia. Its proximity to the Persian gulf and the middle east is also a source of its strategic prominence.

- ix. Pakistan has been a focal point of international political events due to its strategic location and due to the interests of the global powers in the region.
 - x. Pak foreign policy based on the desire to safeguard the country's independence and terrestrial integrity.
 - xi. Before 1990's our elites were comfortable with the west, therefore pro-west policies dominated our foreign policy. In 1990's we shifted from bilateralism to multilateralism, after the end of cold war. Pak established better ties with Beijing and Moscow and sought option to play a viable role in the 3rd world and in the Muslim world.
 - xii. Events in international politics in the 1990's and early 21st century shaped the dynamics of our foreign policy.
 - xiii. Withdraw of Soviet and rule of Taliban in Afghanistan.
 - xiv. Outbreak of violence in Kashmir.
 - xv. Indo-Pak Nuclear tests in May 1998. Arms race in South Asia.
 - xvi. Emergence of Terrorism.
 - xvii. Event of 9/11; attacks on Twin Towers, heavily affected our foreign policy
- 12) Trends
- i. Era of Neutrality; 1947-53 – neutral foreign policy
 - ii. Era of Alliances; 1953-62 – alignment with the West (SEATO, CENTO, Mutual Cooperation Pact, US Foreign Assistance Act) Pakistan became US' "most-allied ally in Asia"
 - iii. 1963-71 – phase of transition
 - iv. Era of Bilateralism: 1971-79 – bilateralism and non-alignment (introduced by Zulfikar Ali Bhutto)
 - v. Era of Non-alignment: 1980-88 – tilted non-alignment (Pro-US but still normal with socialists except Soviet Union) 1989-2000 – search for allies (oscillating relationship with US; issues-based foreign policy)
 - vi. Era of 'War against Terror': 2000 – on wards frontline state in war on terror; allegations of double game
- 13) Foreign policy of Pakistan Post 9/11
- xviii. Introduction

- i. 9/11 attacks proved to turn the foreign policy of Pakistan upside down
- ii. It was a crucial time that demanded an intelligence filled response.
- iii. Musharaf was one of the foreign leaders to receive a call from Washington (You are either with us or against us)
- iv. Two ways were given,
 - 1. To exigently join US in principle and workout the modalities later on
 - 2. To refuse to submit in clear defiance and be ready for a war.
- xix. Consequences Of Choosing Not To Co-Operate:
 - i. U.S might have bracketed Pak with Taliban while declaring Pak a terrorist state.
 - ii. Our territory would have been subjected to furious onslaughts and airstrikes to neutralize resistance under the pretext of eliminating terrorist bases.
 - iii. India would have given a green signal to attack Kahuta as it had done previously.
 - iv. Kashmiri freedom struggle might have been labeled as a terrorist insurgency.
- xx. Pakistan's Choice
 - i. Taliban refused to hand Osama to America despite Pak's pleadings.
 - ii. Musharaf on 19th Sept,2001 while addressing to nation said, "Pakistan comes first, everything else is secondary."
 - iii. Pakistan joined U.S in strategic interest of,
 - 1. territorial security
 - 2. protection of its own nuclear and missile programs
 - 3. revival of economy
 - iv. Joining (WOT) was the most appropriate among the available options and was generally, if not entirely, in national interest.
 - v. This shift in foreign policy of Pakistan showed the strategic intelligence of government towards the oncoming hurricane.
- xxi. Demands By U.S After Alliance
 - i. To stop Al-Qaeda operations at its border.

- ii. To give blanket over flight and landing rights for military operations.
- iii. To provide intelligence information.
- iv. To provide territorial access to allied forces.
- v. To continue to publicly condemn the terrorist acts.
- vi. To sever ties with the Taliban, if they refuse to cope.
- vii. To cut off all shipments of fuel to Taliban and stop recruits from going to Afghan.

14) Challenges

- i. Improving Pak image in the international community.
- ii. Coping with the situation in Afghanistan.
- iii. Kashmir issue
- iv. Arms race in South Asia
- v. To take into account the domestic constraints

15) Options with Pakistan

- i. Pak must not meddle with Afghan affairs and it must support the reconstruction process of Afghanistan.
- ii. Good relations with India.
- iii. Pakistan needs to establish Good relations with China and other countries and should not only stick only to the U.S.
- iv. Strong foreign policy is possible only when Pak's economy is strong, and there is political stability and good governance in the country.
- v. Pakistan should not go the extreme extent of assisting U.S.
- vi. No infiltration into Kashmir from Pakistan side.. Instead Pak should opt diplomatic and political support of Kashmiris.

16) Effects of Changing Foreign Policy:

- i. Pakistan's decision to join world community in the war against terrorism brought it back into the international mainstream and won it the revived and stronger support from major countries of the world.

17) New Strategic Vision Of Foreign Policy Of Pakistan

- i. The security of its own country and not the security of others.
- ii. Peaceful co existence, i.e. further development of regional ties and the strengthening of their own positions.
- iii. The future strategy of Pakistan in its foreign policy must be a "shift from traditional diplomacy to economic diplomacy as well as cultural diplomacy"

- iv. An effective policy requires domestic stability and a national consensus on issues.
- v. Deft diplomacy , using innovative and novel means we must strive to promote our interests and at the same time keep a triangular balance among the world giants i.e The U.S, The China ,and the E.U.

18) Conclusion

Topic 17

South Asia: Pakistan and India

8) Introduction

9) Timeline

- i. 1947 — The British Empire in the subcontinent is divided into two countries: India and Pakistan. The unexpected Partition and lack of proper arrangements for one of the greatest migrations of modern history led to skirmishes and bloodshed on both sides of the divide.
- ii. 1947/48 — India and Pakistan go to war over Kashmir. The war ends with a UN-ordered ceasefire and resolution seeking a plebiscite for the people of Jammu and Kashmir to decide whether to become part of India or Pakistan.
- iii. 1965 — India and Pakistan fight their second war over Kashmir. Fighting ends after the United Nations calls for a ceasefire.
- iv. 1971 — A rebellion in East Pakistan and alleged interference from the Indian side lead the two countries to war for a third time. East Pakistan becomes independent Bangladesh.
- v. 1972 — Pakistani Prime Minister Zulfikar Ali Bhutto and Indian Prime Minister Indira Gandhi sign agreement in Indian town of Simla over principles meant to govern relations.
- vi. 1974 — India detonates its first nuclear device.
- vii. 1989 — Separatist revolt starts in Indian-administered Kashmir. India accuses Pakistan of arming and sending militants into the region, which Pakistan denies.
- viii. 1998 — India carries out nuclear tests. Pakistan responds with its own tests.
- ix. February 1999 — Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee holds summit with Pakistani counterpart Nawaz Sharif in Lahore.
- x. 1999 — India and Pakistan wage brief conflict in the mountains above Kargil on the Line of Control, the ceasefire line dividing Jammu and Kashmir.
- xi. July 2001 — Summit between Pakistani leader General Pervez Musharraf and Vajpayee in Agra in India ends in failure.

- xii. December 2001 — Militants attack Indian parliament. India blames Pakistan-based militants Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT) and Jaish-e-Mohammad of launching attack. Tensions rise as one million troops are mobilised on either side of the border; war only averted months later in June 2002.
- xiii. 2003 — Pakistan, India agree ceasefire on the Line of Control.
- xiv. 2004 — The two countries launch a formal peace process.
- xv. November 2008 — Ten gunmen launch three days of multiple attacks in Mumbai, killing 166. India again blames Pakistan-based militants and snaps talks with Pakistan.
- xvi. February 2009 — India cautiously welcomes Pakistan's probe into Mumbai attack. Pakistan admits the attack was launched and partly planned from inside Pakistani territory.
- xvii. June 2009 — Prime Minister Manmohan Singh and Pakistani President Asif Ali Zardari meet on the sidelines of an international gathering in Russia. Singh tells Zardari he wants him to ensure militants cannot operate from Pakistan.
- xviii. August 2009 — India gives Pakistan new "evidence" to investigate the Mumbai attacks and prosecute Hafiz Mohammad Saeed, suspected mastermind of the carnage.
- xix. March 2011 — Singh invites Pakistani Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani to watch a historic World Cup cricket match between the two sides and discuss reviving peace process. India beat Pakistan in the match.
- xx. May 2011 — Indian and Pakistani troops exchange cross-border fire after an Indian soldier is killed by Pakistani troops in Kashmir. After talks, India and Pakistan break no ice on how to demilitarise the no-man's land above the Siachen glacier.
- xxi. July 2011 — Foreign ministers of India and Pakistan hold talks in New Delhi, hailing a "new era" in ties.
- xxii. November 2011 — Pakistan decides to grant India Most Favoured Nation trade status. Singh and Gilani promise a new chapter in their history after discussions in the Maldives.

- xxiii. 2011 — Pakistan takes further steps toward normal trade and travel ties with India, agreeing to open most commerce by February 2012 and ease visa rules.
- xxiv. April 2012 — Zardari meets Singh in New Delhi in the highest-level meeting on each other's soil in seven years.
- xxv. November 2012 — India secretly hangs the lone survivor of the Pakistan-based militant squad responsible for the 2008 Mumbai attacks.
- xxvi. January 2013 — India accuses a group of Pakistani soldiers of “barbaric and inhuman” behaviour after two Indian soldiers are killed in a firefight in Kashmir and their bodies mutilated. Pakistan denies involvement. Peace talks stall and Indian Prime Minister Singh says there can be no “business as usual”.
- xxvii. February 2013 — India hangs a Kashmiri man for the 2001 attack on its parliament that New Delhi blamed on militants backed operating from inside Pakistan.
- xxviii. May 2013 — India reacts furiously to the death in a Pakistani jail of an Indian farmer convicted of spying who was badly beaten by fellow inmates.
- xxix. May 2013 — Nawaz Sharif returns to power in Pakistan and looks to ease mistrust with India.
- xxx. July 2013 — Indian officials say Islamabad is pushing for Sharif and Singh to meet in New York in September, on the sidelines of the UN General Assembly, to resume the peace process.
- xxxi. 2014 - On February 12, India and Pakistan agree to release trucks detained in their respective territories, ending a three week impasse triggered by seizure of a truck in India-administered Kashmir coming from across the de facto Line of Control for allegedly carrying brown sugar.
- xxxii. 2014 - On May 1, Pakistan's Army chief General Raheel Sharif calls Kashmir the "jugular vein" of Pakistan, and that the dispute should be resolved in accordance with the wishes and aspirations of Kashmiris and in line with UNSC resolutions for lasting peace in the region.

xxxiii. 2014 - On May 25, Pakistan releases 151 Indian fishermen from its jails in a goodwill gesture ahead of swearing-in ceremony of Narendra Modi as prime minister.

xxxiv. 2014 - On May 27, Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi holds talks with Pakistan's Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif in New Delhi. Both sides express willingness to begin new era of bilateral relations.

10) Irritants:

i. Kashmir:

i. Introduction

1. A long standing issue between India and Pakistan.. Dual policy of US regarding Kashmir.
2. Obama said in his presidential speech; "Kashmir is the crucial irritant between India and Pak".
3. He further said on the occasion of his China visit: "U.S. and China must play greater role of mediation in solving this issue".
4. Mike Mullen said; "The solution of Kashmir issue is indispensable for regional stability in South Asia".
5. But US policy took a u turn when Richard Hallbrooke, on the occasion of his visit to India said "America will not play a role of mediator between Pak and India over kashmir"
6. The longstanding Kashmir dispute is the core hurdle in the normalization of relations between the two countries. The BJP's election slogan regarding Kashmir has added fuel to the fire of concerns in Pakistan as the BJP kept on emphasizing the scrap of the special status of Jammu and Kashmir enshrined in Article 370 of the Indian Constitution. Then there are other issues including Siachen, Sir Creek, water and so on and they need to be immediately resolved, if both countries want to cultivate an environment of friendship.

ii. Pak Stances:

1. COAS General Keyani said: “India centric institution and that really not change in any significant way until the Kashmir issue is solved.
2. Pak Foreign office opines: “Kashmir is at the top of our agenda in bilateral talks.

iii. India Stances:

1. “Kashmir is on our agenda in bilateral talks but our priority is terrorism”. (Indian Foreign office)
2. Miss Niropama Roa, the foreign secretary said: “Terrorism is our top priority and U.S. understand our apprehensions”.
3. The basic problem between both countries, Pak wants to solve all the mutual problems in the parameters of composite Dialogue as it includes all the issue including terrorism also. India, on the other hand wants to satisfy her apprehensions against terrorism.

ii. Trust Deficit

- i. The second stumbling block is the existing mistrust between the two countries. It partly emanates from the first challenge i.e. Kashmir issue, in particular. Former premiers of both countries, Yousaf Raza Gillani and Dr Manmohan Singh, during their meeting on the sidelines of Saarc Summit in Bhutan, assigned their foreign ministers to take steps to eliminate the trust deficit. However, all such efforts were thwarted by the circumstances and bigoted attitudes. With lack of exchanges of sportspersons, academicians, students, parliamentarians, civil society activists, and the general public the trust deficit won't end anytime soon.
- ii. Secondly, the Track-II or Track-III diplomacy in the context of Pakistan and India has always been dependent upon Track-I or formal diplomacy. It means if the governments are comfortable with each other and are in a mood to negotiate, only then the visas for all other forms of non-formal diplomacy will be made available.

iii. Terrorism

- i. Terrorism is another formidable challenge for both India and Pakistan. Unfortunately, instead of extending cooperation to each other to eradicate this menace, the two countries have been pointing fingers at each other. India accuses Pakistan of being behind all acts of terrorism in India — Modi also reiterated this stance in his first meeting with Nawaz Sharif. On the other hand, Pakistanis blame India of patronizing terrorism in Pakistan, particularly Indian funding for insurgents in Balochistan and FATA has been a source of great concern in Pakistan. India has not been able to conclude the investigation of Samjhota Express tragedy so far.

iv. Modi's Security Team

- i. Narendra Modi's security and foreign policy team is also being seen as a challenge. Dr Manmohan Singh had Shiv Shankar Menon as his National Security Advisor. Mr Menon had served as India's High Commissioner to China and Pakistan. So, he was privy to the concerns of India's two most important neighbours. However, Modi chose a former head of Indian Intelligence Bureau, Mr Ajit Doval, as his new National Security Advisor, which also indicates some wrangling in future.
 - ii. India's obsession pointing fingers at Pakistan in any act of terrorism, and completely ignoring domestic extremists groups, could hamper the serious efforts aimed at normalization of relations. The Minister for External Affairs Ms Sushma Sauraj, a Hindu hard-liner, is known as a dove neither in domestic political arena nor on external affairs. Moreover, allocating a cabinet slot to former Army Chief General (Retd) V K Singh is also not a positive sign because throughout his career, Mr Singh had been engaged in war games against China and Pakistan.
- v. Trade: The Ultimate Strength Soon after taking over as Pakistan's Prime Minister, in 2013, Mian Nawaz Sharif announced that his top priority will be economic diplomacy and development. In India, Narendra Modi contested the election on

the slogan of development and good governance. Nawaz Sharif himself comes from Pakistan's powerful corporate sector whereas Modi was also fully backed by that of India. If trade and business gets a driving seat in policies of both the countries, huge gains in bilateral relations will definitely be reaped.

vi. Water Disputes

- i. All hand workers in Indian occupied Kashmir. According to Indus Water treaty Pak to get 55 thousands cusec water in peak season but Pak got 20 cusec last year.
- ii. India can utilize water but can't divert its flow.
- iii. Violation:
 1. Construction of Buglihar dam without satisfying Pak concern.
 2. Construction of Kashan ganga, Dulhasti, Dugar, Gondhala, Such Khas hydro power projects on Chenab, Jehlum rivers have greatly decreased the flow of water into Pak.
 3. Pak would face Rs. 1 billion loss per month.
 4. India has to inform Pak 6 month in advance regarding any plan of construction of new dams over the rivers that flow into Pak. This is a clear Violation of 1960 Indus water treaty by India.
 5. Where there is more water, India releases its floods into Pak.
 6. Buglihar and other water issues should be solved through negotiations as was done in case of "Salal" dam in 1978.
 7. Pak wants talks but India has always been stubborn. Only agrees to talk when there is international pressure.

vii. 26/11 Mumbai carnage

- i. Commerce secretaries meeting held in April 2011.
- ii. Defense secretaries in May 2011.
- iii. Foreign secretaries in June 2011.

- iv. Talks held on Sir Creek and working group is trying to abolish visa restrictions by both countries. No concrete results yet.
- v. Indian foreign secretary acknowledgment that Indian decision to suspend dialogue after 26/11. Mumbai carnage was probably not correct.
- vi. Dialogue should continue even long standing issues like Kashmir and Mumbai attacks are not resolved.
- vii. Pak facing variety of problems. If it collapses it would be for the whole South Asia, and India would suffer more than any one.
- viii. Both India and Pak should recognize and acknowledge each other's stakes in Afghanistan. Both should cooperate for a democratic Afghanistan.
- ix. Demolition of visa restrictions will help normalization of relations better than the settlement of this dispute or that.
- x. Success in dialogue could be achieved only if high up (PMS-the heads of both the states) are involved in discussion.
- xi. Terror revisits Mumbai 11th of July 2011: A series of bomb blasts occurred in Mumbai. For the first time in Indian history did not, India did not blame Pak for this attack. Khar offered "uninterrupted and unintermittible peace dialogue" to India.
- viii. India Presence in Afghanistan
 - i. Mac crystal (the previous chief of ISAF forces in Afghanistan) said: "India presence in Afghanistan has significantly increased in the last few years" ... And it is troubling Pak... in return the whole region is destabilized".
 - ii. Indian consulates in Afghanistan especially in the bordering areas of Afghanistan troubles Pakistan.
 - iii. The Construction of Naryn-Chaghbar road in Afghanistan by India, worth 1.3 billion dollars, to minimize the strategic importance of Pakistan. Through this road India wants to minimize the dependency of the world over Pakistan transit facility in order to reach out to the CARs resource. According to the Commerce and Trade President of Pak; "This road would affect the Pak transit over 40%"

- iv. Other Indian investments in Afghanistan, worth 1.5 billion dollars.
 - v. Training the Afghan forces.
 - vi. Presence of Indian forces in Afghanistan.
 - vii. The emergence of ISIS in Afghanistan: The emergence of ISIS in Afghanistan (to counter Taliban) also has connections with Indian security agencies, as do the majority of the groups, which announce their allegiance to it, enjoying good contacts with RAW and being exploited as proxies against Pakistan. Recently, the ISIS claimed incident in Jalalabad (suicide attack) also has traces of Indian linkage. In fact, India, through ISIS in Afghanistan, is trying to counter the Taliban. Interestingly, in response to Pakistan's accusations, Indian Defense Minister Manohar Parrikar, in a TV interview on May 23, said that India had to "neutralize" terrorists through terrorists only.
 - viii. The current TTP chief Mullah Fazlullah is being protected by Afghan intelligence agents in Afghanistan. Last year, US troops snatched former TTP chief Hakimullah Mehsud's deputy, Latifullah Mehsud, from Afghan intelligence agents. Apparently, Latifullah had been traveling back and forth to coordinate attacks in Pakistan with Afghan agents. On December 16, 2014, terrorists attacked the Army Public School in Peshawar, killing 145 people, including 132 schoolchildren.
 - ix. Afghan Government's Advisor, Ehsanullah Aryanazai, in his statement said, "India is using Afghan soil to destabilize Pakistan and Afghan security agencies are unable to stop Indian intervention due to the absence of a centralized government mechanism".
- ix. Indian Involvement in Pak
- i. Pak shared evidence with U.S. regarding Indian involvement.
 - ii. Leader of Baluch Liberation Army (LA) received with red carpet in India.

- iii. RAW had hired Afghanistan's defunct intelligence agency, KHAD's agents to establish a bridge between the Tahreek Taliban Pakistan (TTP) and itself. RAW, via TTP, has hired the services of criminal elements/groups to gather information and conduct surveillance of potential targets.
- iv. India's external intelligence agency, the Research and Analysis Wing (RAW), has long faced allegations of meddling in its neighbors' affairs. "India has always used Afghanistan as a second front against Pakistan. India has over the years been financing problems in Pakistan", said Chuck Hagel, the United States Defense Secretary (2013-2015), in a written speech at Oklahoma's Cameron University in 2011.
- v. Prime Minister Modi appointed Ajit Doval, a well-known hawk, as his National Security Advisor. In the 1990s, Mr. Doval served as an undercover RAW agent in Pakistan for seven years.
- vi. Besides, in Baluchistan, RAW, in collaboration with the Afghan intelligence agency, 'National Directorate of Security' (NDS), has been encouraging separatists. It provides funding and weapons to Baloch militant groups such as Baluchistan Liberation Army (BLA), Baloch Republican Army (BRA) and Baluchistan Liberation Front (BLF) for terrorist activities in the province. Intelligence reports suggest that Baloch militants are being harbored at various places and training camps located in Kabul, Nimroz and Kandahar in Afghanistan. RAW is involved in providing fake identity and travel documents to Baloch militants for moving out of Afghanistan to India, the UAE and Western countries.
- vii. "The conference took serious notice of RAW's involvement in whipping up terrorism in Pakistan." - (ISPR)
- viii.

11) Current Developments

- i. Adjustments of the approaches of the general line of foreign policy of Pakistan and India in 2014 – 2015 are connected with several reasons:

- i. Firstly, the accession to power of new leaders in Pakistan (Prime Minister Muhammad Nawaz Sharif – May 2013), and in India – Prime Minister Narendra Modi as a result of the parliamentary elections in May 2014, and subsequent changes in their foreign policy vectors;
 - ii. Secondly, the modification of the general geopolitical content in the region after the completion of the combat mission of the International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan (ISAF) and the withdrawal of the major part of the coalition forces in December 2014;
 - iii. Thirdly, the establishment of India had an impact on the development of foreign policy, particularly in the Pakistani direction.
- ii. Adjustment in Kashmir Issue: The Kashmir sovereignty issue was again included as a major point in the agenda of Pakistani-Indian relations. The former ruling in 2008-2013, the Pakistan Peoples Party (PPP) avoided to raise the issue as a priority in its dialogue with New Delhi in 2011-2013. On the contrary, the government urged to “freeze” this and settle some technical issues, visas (providing expedited visa regime for certain categories of citizens of the both countries), transportation (bus routes in Kashmir), etc.
- iii. Muhammad Nawaz Sharif and Narendra Modi met in May, 2014 for the first time when the head of the Federal Cabinet of Ministers of Pakistan was invited to the inauguration in New Delhi. But the first political battles were turned by them against each other at the end of September 2014 at the UN General Assembly. Pakistan severely criticized the position of India directed at blocking the execution of a referendum in Kashmir. The main accusation of the Indian party came down to the characterisation of Pakistan, as a “main source of terrorism”. A little later, in January 2015, this point was again voiced during the visit of President Barack Obama in New Delhi.
- iv. Several traditional and new “painful points” appeared in the relations between Islamabad and New Delhi in 2014 and the first half of 2015:

- i. armed conflicts along the Line of Control and Working boundary in Kashmir from September, 2014 to March, 2015;
 - ii. strong statements of Pakistan with the purpose of blocking plans of India for the construction of new settlements in the Indian part of Kashmir;
 - iii. Islamabad once again accused New Delhi of using Afghan territory for terrorist attacks in Pakistan, as well as the involvement of the Indian intelligence agency (RAW) to the activities of terrorist organizations in Pakistan;
 - iv. the strengthening of confrontation between India and Pakistan for influence in Afghanistan, or so-called “proxy war”.
- v. In March 2015, the main attention was paid to the discussion of bilateral issues: Jammu and Kashmir, Siachen, Sir Creek and water issues. They confirmed that for in order to find their solutions concerted efforts are required and the resumption of the dialogue process, maintaining the ceasefire (2003), the main mechanism for the stabilization of the situation on the Line of Control and the Working boundary between the two countries. The visit of the Secretary Ministry of Foreign Affairs of India in Pakistan was generally formal and was held on the eve of the SAARC summit, which will take place in Islamabad. Analysts pointed out that it had not brought much hope for a qualitative breakthrough, improvement of bilateral relations. At the same time, according to the Pakistani side, it opened the way for future negotiations. However, without a specific date of the event.
- vi. And in May 2015, the Prime Minister of India, Narendra Modi confirmed his intention to “break the ice” in relations with neighbouring countries through the “cricket diplomacy”: “... We have decided to start a series of games of cricket between the teams of the two countries, and it will be the first step towards normalization of relations.” The games are planned in the United Arab Emirates, away from the unpredictable behaviour of the majority of the fans. “Cricket diplomacy” is a return to the positions of the parties in 2011-2012, when former Pakistani Prime Minister Yousuf Raza Gilani arrived in India on an

unofficial visit, and together with the former Prime Minister of India M.Sindhom watched a cricket match. And so all the years of these relationships – one step forward, two steps back.

12) Recommendations

- i. To build on the momentum of, and demonstrate commitment to, the dialogue process
- ii. To the Government of Pakistan:
 - i. Implement its pledge to grant MFN status to India by the end of 2016.
 - ii. Punish those involved in the 2008 Mumbai attacks, communicating any challenges to trials of the accused or related legal processes, including military interference, to Indian counterparts.
 - iii. Act against banned groups that operate freely and against any groups and individuals calling for jihad against India, invoking laws against incitement to violence.
 - iv. Take action against all militant groups, including India and Afghanistan-oriented jihadi outfits.
- iii. To the Government of India:
 - i. Respond to the above steps by: acknowledging that non-tariff barriers (NTBs) are a legitimate Pakistani grievance and ensuring that Pakistani exporters have unimpeded access to the Indian market under the MFN regime; and
 - ii. repealing the Armed Forces Special Powers Act (AFSPA) and other draconian laws, replacing a military-led counter-insurgency approach in Jammu and Kashmir (J&K) with accountable policing and holding a meaningful dialogue with all Kashmiri groups.
- iv. To the Governments of Pakistan and India:
 - i. Grant each other overland transit rights.
 - ii. Relax visa regimes significantly.
 - iii. Focus on short, medium and long-term measures to optimize the use of water resources, going beyond project-related disputes that the IWT can already address.
 - iv. Prioritise cooperation on joint energy-related ventures, such as petroleum product pipelines from India to Pakistan, and

assess the feasibility of a bilateral, and at a later stage regional, energy grid.

- v. Ensure Kashmiri participation in the dialogue process.

13) Conclusion

Topic 18

Peace-making and Peace-Building in South Asia

9) Introduction

- i. **Peacemaking:** using diplomacy in order to affect the outcome of regional conflicts in a manner which promotes your country's international interests.
- ii. **Peacekeeping:** using military force in order to affect the outcome of regional conflicts in a manner which promotes your country's international interests.
- iii. **Peace-building:** establishing a web of NGO's and funds around "peacemaking" and "peacekeeping", creating a micro-economy of jobs and positions for well-spoken and generally white people.
- iv. International armed forces were first used in 1948 to observe cease-fires in Kashmir and Palestine. Although not specifically mentioned in the UN Charter, the use of such forces as a buffer between warring parties pending troop withdrawals and negotiations—a practice known as peacekeeping—was formalized in 1956 during the Suez Crisis between Egypt, Israel, France, and the United Kingdom. Peacekeeping missions have taken many forms, though they have in common the fact that they are designed to be peaceful, that they involve military troops from several countries, and that the troops serve under the authority of the UN Security Council. In 1988 the UN Peacekeeping Forces were awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace.

10) Historical Background

- i. For the last sixty years or so, India and Pakistan have been locked into several conflicts, which have engulfed most of the resources of the region and still have the capability to absorb the rest. Although several efforts, both at the governmental and nongovernmental levels, have been made to resolve those conflicts, the region has so far failed to observe a durable and long-lasting peace. Although the 'Cricket Diplomacy' between the two countries at the time of the Cricket World Cup, held in India in February-March 2011, has helped melt the ice, the normalization of relations between the two nuclear-armed neighboring countries

- of South Asia are still in the transitional phase and can only become normal if the long-standing element of mistrust, which developed after their inception in August 1947, is removed.
- ii. The current thaw in relations between India and Pakistan needs to be noticed for several reasons. First, a realization occurred on both sides of the border that a continued brinksmanship may escalate into a full-fledged war. India and Pakistan are the only nuclear neighbors, which are involved in active conflict with each other. The Kashmir issue has become a nuclear flashpoint between the two states. The world narrowly escaped the nuclear disaster when both the states had deployed over a million troops on borders during the crisis after the attack on the Indian Parliament in December 2001.
 - iii. Second, the keen interest of the US in the South Asian affairs has also put pressure on both India and Pakistan to work for peace-building in the region. It must be noted that for the success of the Global War on Terror (GWOT), peace between India and Pakistan is a prerequisite. After the 9/11 incident, Pakistan became the frontline ally of the US in the GWOT. Washington needed Islamabad's active support in counter-terrorism operations both in Afghanistan as well as in Pakistan. For this, normalization of India Pakistan relations was necessary so that Islamabad could effectively concentrate on its western borders.
 - iv. Third, a realization has also occurred in both India and Pakistan that for the economic growth and development, peace in the region is inevitable. The militant Jihadi groups, which were previously nurtured by the Pakistani state, have now become too powerful to control. The blowback of the policy of using the Salafi/Jihadi groups in Afghanistan and Kashmir could be seen in the form of sectarian violence in Pakistan. Therefore, crackdown against those militant groups was the need of the time. This policy also met the Indian demand to dismantle terrorist infrastructure in Pakistan before the beginning of a meaningful dialogue between the two countries.
 - v. A significant change, which has occurred after 9/11, is that the US has now become an important regional actor in South Asia

because of its physical presence in Afghanistan and Pakistan. Therefore, it is in no way that the US would remain uninvolved in case any crisis occurs between India and Pakistan. Moreover, the US would no more bear Pakistan's policy of supporting militant Jihadi groups in Kashmir in order to engage India in a low intensity conflict. It is argued that the US presence and role will determine the future course of India-Pakistan relations and so as the solution of disputes, including Kashmir, between them. Two important factors support this argument. First, the US, today, enjoys a greater degree of influence on both India and Pakistan simultaneously. Second, a realization on the part of the US, India and Pakistan has occurred that the common threat to the regional as well as global peace and security is the menace of terrorism.

11) **The Genesis of India-Pakistan Relations**

- i. The partition of India in 1947 and as a result the creation of Pakistan on the basis of religion sowed the seeds of hatred and mistrust in relations between the two countries from the very beginning. The Indian hawks did not accept the partition and "posited it as a great betrayal to Mother India." Even "some analysts attributed India's acceptance of Partition to its belief that Pakistan would not last² and that "Pakistan would collapse in a short time." **The Indian Prime Minister Jawahar Lal Nehru himself admitted that "the question of Indo-Pakistani relationship was difficult to deal with because it was a psychological thing, resulting from the way the sub-continent was divided between India and Pakistan."**
- ii. On the other hand, both the nationalists and conservative Islamists along with the military in Pakistan saw India as an enemy, which was against their existence. Therefore, this enemy image on both sides of the border set the future direction of the relations between the two countries.
- iii. The unjust and delayed distribution of assets and territory further marked the increasing mistrust between India and Pakistan.
- iv. The principle of 'communal majority' was applied to the partition of the Indian Sub-Continent. Under this principle, the contiguous

Muslim majority areas were included in Pakistan, whereas the contiguous Hindu majority areas became the part of India.

- v. The last moment change in the Partition Plan deprived Pakistan of the territory of Kashmir, a Muslim majority princely state ruled by a Hindu Maharaja Hari Singh. When faced with the tribal invasion, the Maharaja “invited the Indian army to repel the invaders – but India first demanded his accession, which he provided. Thus, Kashmir became the only Muslim majority state in India.” Since then Kashmir has been the bone of contention and the issue of continuous antagonism between the two countries, which have fought two major wars in 1948 and 1965, and a limited war in Kargil in 1999.

12) **India-Pakistan Peace Efforts and their Failures**

- i. Although several plans to resolve the Kashmir dispute have been discussed between the two countries under Track-I and Track-II diplomacy, both New Delhi and Islamabad are very firm on their principled stances: for India, Kashmir is its integral part, while Pakistan considers it as its lifeline.
- ii. Moreover, one may also see the difference on the methodology to resolve the dispute: whereas India emphasizes on the bilateral negotiations between the two countries and rejects any third party mediation, Pakistan insists on the resolution of the dispute according to the UN resolutions, which call for the holding of plebiscite in Kashmir under the right of self-determination rule. These different and opposite approaches on Kashmir have not only complicated the situation between India and Pakistan, but have also diminished the prospects of the resolution of the dispute.
- iii. Having failed to resolve the Kashmir dispute through bilateral and multilateral negotiations, Islamabad then resorted to a strategy of engaging New Delhi in a low-intensity war in Kashmir. For this purpose, Pakistan extended its full support to the militant Jihadi groups fighting against the Indian troops in Kashmir. Although Pakistan continuously denied its role in Kashmir, it was disclosed during the Kargil incident in July 1999, when it was revealed that Pakistan-based militant groups along with regular forces participated in the operation. **According to**

Strobe Talbott, “The United States condemned Pakistan’s infiltration of armed intruders and went public with information that most of the seven hundred men who had crossed the Line of Control were attached to the Pakistani Army’s 10th Corps.”

- iv. Pakistan’s engagement with the militant Jihadi groups and its involvement in the Kargil war further authenticated when the then Prime Minister of Pakistan, Nawaz Sharif, rushed to the US in July 1999 and sought American assistance to avert the crisis as well as to end Pakistan’s isolation. On American facilitation, the crisis was averted.
- v. After achieving nuclear capability in May 1998, Pakistan became confident that the low-intensity war strategy in Kashmir would bear fruits. It rather backfired. The Kargil war not only sabotaged the whole peace process, which was started after the visit of the Indian Prime Minister, Atal Bihari Vajpayee, to Pakistan and the signing of the Lahore Declaration in February 1999, but also put a dent on the Pakistan’s credibility. The Declaration was the most prolific document in which the two governments committed to ‘intensify efforts to resolve all issues, including the issue of Jammu and Kashmir’, to ‘take immediate steps for reducing the risks of accidental or unauthorized use of nuclear weapons, and the ‘condemnation of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations.’
- vi. The region missed another opportunity to improve India Pakistan relations when Pakistan’s then President General Pervez Musharraf visited Agra in July 2001. Although both Musharraf and Vajpayee agreed to the basic fundamentals of the draft agreement, it had fallen victim to the hard-line mindset of the Indian hawks, who did not want to see peace between the two neighboring countries. The man responsible for obstructing the agreement was then Deputy Prime Minister, L.K. Advani.
- vii. However, Pakistan’ policy of supporting the militant Jihadis in the Indian Held Kashmir continued even after the 9/11 incident. Islamabad believed that since Washington badly needed its assistance in Afghanistan against the Al-Qaeda and Taliban, it

would ignore its policy of engaging New Delhi in a low-intensity war in Kashmir. Nevertheless, the policy proved to be ineffective and counter-productive with serious repercussions for Pakistan.

13) India-Pakistan Relations in the aftermath of 9/11 incident:

The 9/11 incident changed the overall international and regional political scenario in terms of renewed alliances to wage war against international terrorism. With reference to India Pakistan relations, the immediate impact of the 9/11 incident could not be seen. The element of mistrust, which was created in Kargil, continued, though the success of the US-led GWOT was largely depended upon normalization of relations between India and Pakistan. Pakistan, which became the frontline ally of the US in the war against Taliban and Al-Qaeda in Afghanistan, continuously faced the Indian pressure to dismantle home-grown terrorist infrastructure. For this, New Delhi linked the cross border terrorism with international terrorism. Consequently, India and Pakistan continued to remain at loggerheads and could not formulate a common strategy to counter the most pressing menace of terrorism.

14) Attack on the Indian Parliament

- i. India-Pakistan relations got further deteriorated when an attack on the Indian parliament took place on December 13, 2001. India accused Pakistan of its support to the Lashkar-e-Taiba (LeT), which was involved in that incident. To escalate pressure on Pakistan, the Vajpayee government took strict measures:
 - i. It massed its troops on the borders threatening an invasion across the Line of Control (LoC) in Kashmir or across the international borders;
 - ii. It demanded to hand over 20 people who were allegedly involved in terrorist activities in India;
 - iii. It reduced the diplomatic representation in Pakistan; and
 - iv. It cut off rail, road and air links.
- ii. Moreover, India also demanded Pakistan to ban militant Jihadi organizations, which were involved in that attack. Realizing the tense situation on the borders, Musharraf in his address to the nation on January 12, 2002, vowed to take severe action against the Islamic extremist organizations. He not only condemned the terrorist act, but also vowed to take stern action against any

Pakistani group found involved in terrorism in the name of Kashmir. He announced a ban on Jaish-e-Mohammad (JeM), LeT, Sipah-e-Sahaba Pakistan (SSP), Tehrik-e-Ja'afria Pakistan (TJP), and Tehrik Nifaz-e-Shariat-e-Muhammadi (TNSM). Their offices were sealed in a nation-wide swoop. Also, their accounts were frozen and their activities in Afghanistan and Kashmir were halted.

15) **Indian Peace offer**

- i. Although Musharraf's statement was a radical departure from the past policy of supporting Islamic militants in Kashmir, the normalization process did not take place until Vajpayee, during his address in Srinagar in April 2003, offered negotiations with Pakistan on all issues, including the issue of Jammu and Kashmir. In a conciliatory tone, Vajpayee said, "As Prime Minister of the country I wanted to have friendly relations with our neighbors and I went to Lahore, but it was returned with Kargil. We still continued and invited General Pervez Musharraf to Agra but again failed...We are again extending a hand of friendship but hands should be extended from both the sides. Both sides should decide to live together. We have everything which makes us to have good relations...No guns but only brotherhood can resolve the problems. However, the Indian Prime Minister "did not specifically drop India's condition that Pakistan first to stop militants crossing into occupied Kashmir before talks could begin."
- ii. On the other hand, Pakistan welcomed the Indian offer. The then Prime Minister of Pakistan, Mir Zafarullah Khan Jamali said, "We welcome it, we appreciate it." He further stated, "Pakistan has always said talks are the only way to resolve issues, including the Kashmir dispute... On the main issue (of Kashmir) Pakistan's stand remains the same. But once talks start there could be flexibility from both sides"²¹ Furthermore, Pakistan also announced a ceasefire on the Line of Control (LoC) and lifted the ban on the air service. Although both sides had realized the need of the dialogue process, they could not move forward and stuck to their old stances on the issue of Kashmir.

16) **Composite Dialogue: The Road to Peace?**

- i. In continuation of conducive environment, which developed with Vajpayee's offer of peace, the Composite Dialogue process started between India and Pakistan in January 2004. The Composite Dialogue consisted of eight baskets, which included: Kashmir, Peace and Security, Siachen, Wullar barrage, Sir Creek, Terrorism and Drug Trafficking, Economic Cooperation, and Promotion of friendly Exchanges.
- ii. With the coming of Manmohan Singh in power in May 2004, the peace process continued with full realization that it would ultimately lead to sustained engagement and understanding between the two countries. Even Musharraf, despite domestic pressure from religious-political party, the Muttahida Majlis-iAml (United Action Front – MMA), emphasized upon the outof-box approach. In an interview to an American TV Channel on April 21, 2005, Musharraf floated an idea for the resolution of the Kashmir dispute. He said, "The parts of Kashmir held by Pakistan and India separately can be divided geographically into seven parts." He further said, "Either any specific portion of the Kashmir or its entire area could be declared non-military zone and later changing it statues afterwards." After the earthquake in Pakistan on October 8, 2005, Musharraf also proposed the opening of the LoC at five points. The five crossing points across the LoC that the two sides agreed to open were: Nauseri-Tithwal; Chakoti-Uri; Hajipur-Uri; Rawalakot-Poonch and TattapaniMendhar.
- iii. This was a tectonic shift in Pakistan's Kashmir policy. These proposals also enjoyed the consent of the All Parties Hurriyat Conference (APHC), a representative organization of the Kashmiris. However, no major breakthrough on the materialization of those proposals took place because of the severe opposition from the Indian Army.²⁸ Under the Composite Dialogue process, four rounds of talks were held between the two foreign secretaries by July 2008.²⁹ Some major agreements, related to the CBMs, signed by the two countries were: the establishment of hot lines between foreign secretaries; an advance notification of missile tests; memorandum on not conducting nuclear tests, except under extra-ordinary circumstances;

reducing risks from nuclear accidents; pre-notification of ballistic missile tests; beginning of Amritsar-Lahore, Lahore-Nankana Sahib and Muzaffarabad-Srinagar bus services; operationalization of Khokhrapar-Munabhao rail service; release of prisoners who had completed their sentences; opening of Sialkot-Jammu route and five other additional crossing points on the LoC; and agreement on trade between Pakistan- and Indian-held Kashmir.³⁰ Despite this, the peace process under the Composite Dialogue continued until it suffered a severe setback when Mumbai incident took place on November 26, 2008.

17) **The Mumbai Incident**

- i. The Mumbai incident completely changed the regional political scenario and brought the peace process between India and Pakistan to a standstill. The carnage, which continued for about three days, caused more than 150 deaths, both Indians and foreigners. Nine of ten militants had also been killed. Pakistan strongly condemned the incident and offered India its full support and cooperation with the investigation. But mutual mistrust overshadowed all the efforts. The Indian government attributed the attack to the LeT for perpetrating the terrorist activity. Initially Pakistan denied any connection of the LeT with the attack. However, later on, it acknowledged the only survived terrorist, Ajmal Kasab, was the citizen of Pakistan. This was acknowledged by then National Security Advisor of Pakistan, Major General (Retd.) Mahmud Ali Durrani. Speaking to an Indian TV channel, Durrani revealed that Ajmal Kasab was a Pakistani national. Perturbed on this revelation, Yousuf Raza Gilani, then Prime Minister of Pakistan, sacked Mr. Durrani.
- ii. The Mumbai incident has had serious consequences for IndiaPakistan relations, and of course, the regional peace. First, the mistrust between the two countries reached to its height when in an interview with the CNN in November 2009, Manmohan Singh raised doubts over Pakistani civilian leadership's control over the military, compatibility of Pakistan's and US' objectives in Afghanistan, safety of the nuclear weapons and Pakistan's

seriousness in bringing the perpetrators of the Mumbai incident to the justice.

- iii. Second, the major casualty of the Mumbai carnage was the derailment of the 'Composite Dialogue' process between India and Pakistan. The talks at the foreign secretary level were cancelled. Although Pakistan, immediately after the incident, offered its assistance in joint investigation, India rejected it. The situation between the two countries got further tensed when the Pakistan military was put on 'high alert', particularly after "President Zardari received a threatening phone call purportedly made by Indian External Affairs Minister Mukherjee."
- iv. Third, at the diplomatic front Pakistan faced a very awkward situation when the international community supported the Indian position.

18) **Resumption of Dialogue Process**

- i. A ray of hope of establishing peace between India and Pakistan could be seen when prime ministers of the two countries agreed to resume talks, during their meeting in Thimphu, Bhutan, at the sixteenth SAARC Summit conference in April 2010. They agreed to restore trust and confidence, which was shattered after the Mumbai incident. Although both the countries did not concede to the 'Composite Dialogue' process, they pledged to restore peace process. While addressing the press conference after the prime ministers' meeting, the Indian Foreign Secretary, Nirupama Rao, made it clear that the dialogue process would not be under the 'Composite Dialogue'. She said, **"We don't have to be stuck with nomenclatures. This does the relationship no good. Dialogue is the only way forward to open channels of communications and restore trust and confidence."** However, the positive sign of the Thimphu Summit was that it paved the way for the high-level dialogue process.
- ii. To advance the peace talks, foreign ministers of the two countries met in Islamabad in July 2010. However, the dialogue process could not move forward because of "India's new claim that Pakistan's spy agency orchestrated the 2008 terrorist attack on Mumbai." India's this claim came immediately after it was

- disclosed during the interrogation of David Coleman Headly, A Pakistani American, who was arrested in Chicago in 2009. This further underscored the element of mistrust and diminished the prospects of peace between the two nuclear-armed countries of South Asia.
- iii. The dormant peace process between the two countries once again got further impetus when Manmohan Singh in his address in March 2011 at a university in Jammu and Kashmir offered peace talks to Pakistan. He said, “We wish to resolve all outstanding issues between the two countries through friendly dialogue and constructive and purposeful negotiations. This includes the issue of Jammu and Kashmir.” As a result, talks at the secretary level started. The dialogue at the secretary level remained successful and resulted in the signing of various agreements. For instance, the interior secretaries met in March 2011 in New Delhi. They agreed to the “sharing of real time intelligence to prevent terrorist attacks.”
 - iv. Similarly, the Commerce Secretaries of both the countries in their meeting on April 28, 2011, agreed to form various groups of experts to examine the feasibility of trading electricity and petroleum products, promotion of travel facilities and reducing customs duties on products of export interest of both countries. Pakistan also agreed to grant India the Most Favored Nation (MFN) status.
 - v. Although the resumption of the dialogue between the two neighboring countries was a dire need particularly after the Mumbai incident, the element of mistrust has not yet reduced. India still doubts that Pakistan is not doing enough to dismantle the terrorist infrastructure, which causes cross-border terrorism. The militant Jihadi groups are still active in Kashmir. The Indian argument is that the peace process with Pakistan will not go forward until the latter ends its support for terrorist groups.
 - vi. In the presence of such a deep element of mistrust and the history of failed negotiations, it is argued that both India and Pakistan need to seek the help of the third party mediation in order to ensure a stable peace in the region. It is also argued that after the

9/11 incident the US has become an active extra regional actor in South Asia. The American involvement as a third party mediator between India and Pakistan may help both the neighboring countries resolve their longstanding disputes, mainly Kashmir. It must be noted that the American engagement in the region is not a new phenomenon. It has played an active role not only in averting various crises between India and Pakistan, but also bringing the two countries on the negotiation table.

- vii. The US Engagement in the South Asian affairs During the Cold War period, the American role in the South Asian region could only be seen with reference to its relations with Pakistan. The major interest of the US was to counter the expansion of Communism in South and South-East Asia. Because of its unique strategic location, Pakistan was offered the membership of South East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO) and Central Treaty Organization (Cento). Although one may see several ups and downs in the US' relations with Pakistan, India saw the former as an imperialist power and the latter being an agent of it. Therefore, the US, like Pakistan, could not lure India and its influence in the region during the Cold War period remained marginal.
- viii. The disintegration of the Soviet Union and India's policy of economic liberalization in 1992 led to the establishment of favorable relations between Washington and New Delhi. However, it did not pave the way for an active American engagement in the South Asian affairs till the Kargil crisis took place in May-July 1999. It was the first armed confrontation between India and Pakistan after their nuclear tests in May 1998. The US not only condemned Pakistan, but also urged it "to respect the LoC and withdraw its forces across the LoC, while at the same time, urging India to restrain itself from crossing the LoC to open another front in the conflict." The crisis was averted when Nawaz Sharif visited the US in July 1999 and sought American assistance. A meeting between Mr. Sharif and then American President, Bill Clinton, was held on July 4. Quoted by Rahul Chaudhury, "Amidst considerable American pressure, Sharif finally agreed to take concrete and immediate steps for the restoration of the LoC, which

was accepted by Vajpayee when it was conveyed to him prior to its publicization.” It is a well-known fact that it was an American facilitation which led to the formal end of the Kargil crisis.

- ix. The successful American facilitation during the Kargil crisis could not last long and the two nuclear states of South Asia once again faced a grim crisis when Pakistan-based Jihadi groups attacked the Indian Parliament on December 13, 2001.

19) **American Mediation and Prospects of Peace**

- i. The 9/11 incident and as a result the launching of American led military operations in Afghanistan and Pakistan has made the US a regional actor in the South Asian affairs. For the success of the GWOT, the US is very keen to see cordial, friendly and tension-free relations between the two neighboring states of South Asia. It is a fact that the rigid mistrust between India and Pakistan has impeded resolution of political disputes between the two countries. Since bilateral means to resolve disputes have proven ineffective, both India and Pakistan, by taking advantage of the US stakes in the region in the post-9/11 scenario, may seek its assistance to play the role of a third party mediator.
- ii. Although India opposes any third party mediation in the bilateral talks with Pakistan, it must understand that without involving the third party, Islamabad would not be satisfied with the outcome of the negotiations. Both India and Pakistan need to bear in mind that this is high time to seek American assistance to resolve their political disputes and move forward in the direction of durable peace in the region. The matter of the fact is that once Afghanistan is politically stabilized and Al-Qaeda infrastructure is uprooted, the Americans would leave the region without any responsibility of cleaning the mess as it did in late 1980s after the Geneva Accords and left the region at the mercy of India-Pakistan rivalry. Had the 9/11 incident not taken place, the US would not have taken keen interest in this region. In other words, the 9/11 incident and as a result the American compulsion to depend on India and Pakistan for the successful launching of military operations, is a blessing in disguise.

iii. On the part of the US, it is imperative to play the role of a third party mediator between India and Pakistan. The US must understand that the success of the GWOT largely depends on the joint cooperation of India and Pakistan. Moreover, taking advantage of its leading role in the GWOT, and Pakistan being its frontline ally, Washington needs to keep intense pressure on Islamabad to curtail its support for the militant Jihadi groups fighting in Kashmir who have their links with militant groups in Afghanistan. If Pakistan discontinues its support to the militant Jihadi groups, it will not only ease Indian concerns about Pakistan's non-seriousness in dismantling terrorist infrastructure, but also ensure the success of American strategy to defeat the AlQaeda and associated groups, fighting in Afghanistan. Similarly, the US, by taking advantage of its nuclear deal with India, can also pressure the latter to seriously work upon mending the fences with Pakistan. Moreover, the US must transform its role from an agent of conflict management to conflict resolution. In this regard, the support of the United States to the existing peace process between India and Pakistan is also necessary.

20) **Conclusion: Peace making**

- i. The world has entered the 21st century with lots of hope and expectation of progress and prosperity. Unfortunately, South Asia continues to remain the least developed region with the expected 'destiny' of rampant corruption, unemployment, poverty, illiteracy, economic fragility and political instability. The leadership of the respective countries has even failed to give its people any hope for a better future. The abysmal economic situation of the South Asian region can be seen from the fact that it **"generates less than 2 per cent of world income, but it has 22 per cent of world's population, whereas 44 per cent of the world's poor live in this region."**
- ii. With huge natural and human resources, the South Asian region has a potential to progress at a rapid speed. The only thing which is lacking is the political will among the respective countries to take bold decisions to resolve inter-state disputes, which have hindered the prospects for peace in the region. The most

- important challenge for both India and Pakistan is how to continue and sustain the dialogue process, which could lead to the establishment of perpetual peace between the two belligerents.
- iii. Although both India and Pakistan have several times initiated talks on various contentious issues, including Kashmir, they failed to materialize them because of the deep element of mistrust. As a result of their failed ventures, the extremist tendencies on both sides of the border have strengthened. These extremist tendencies have not only caused the rise of terrorism, but also marginalized the saner elements on both sides of the border. It is, therefore, a high time to invite a third party for mediation in order to evolve a workable strategy for the resolution of the most pressing conflict, i.e., Kashmir, which has the potential to cause another war between India and Pakistan. In this regard, the US may be a suitable option because of its interests in the South Asian region in the wake of the GWOT.
 - iv. However, before such mediation takes place, India, Pakistan and even the US, need to take few steps for the confidence-building measures. India needs to believe that a weak Pakistan is not in its interest. Being a big regional power, India has to play a leadership role and at the same time de-emphasizing upon being a hegemonic power of the region. If India wants long-lasting peace in the region, it has to alter its attitude towards its smaller neighbors, particularly Pakistan. This is a fact that a nuclear Pakistan cannot accept bullying from India, and New Delhi needs not to outstare Islamabad.
 - v. On the part of Pakistan, it has to shun the policy of engaging India in a low-intensity war in Kashmir by disassociating itself from the militant Jihadi groups. Failing to do so, may not only enrage India, but also disorient the US from engaging itself in the dialogue process. Being the sole super power and an active extra-regional actor after the 9/11 incident, the US enjoys a greater leverage in South Asia than any other country in the world. It is in a position to pressure both India and Pakistan to make the existing peace process between the two countries meaningful and result oriented. If this happens, the region will not only witness

the economic prosperity, but also the resolution of political disputes, including Kashmir.

21) Recommendations: CBMS and Peace in South Asia

- i. CBMs are such actions and agreements, which would be helpful in détente. 'Confidence Building Measure' means any action, understanding, or any treaty that generates trust between adversaries. It covers from any sign of peace initiative to a treaty. However, to be more specific it can be defined as a bilateral or multilateral measure that builds confidence or trust, arrests the undesirable drifts towards open hostilities, reduces tensions and encourages the adversaries to make contact for negotiations without taxing too much the operative policy pursuits.
- ii. It is a fact that both countries are armed with nuclear weapons and therefore, the threat of intentional, accidental or inadvertent use of nuclear weapons has increased. Conflict prevention and promoting CBMs is the need of the time. Successful CBMs need consistent negotiations, which may evolve a proper mechanism of defusing tension. Secondly, after defining, CBMs should be implemented in true faith. Thirdly, transparency is very necessary. It helps in reducing the misunderstandings of the adversary.
- iii. As for as India and Pakistan are concerned, both have failed to implement CBMs. Their relations are the product of cold peace and cold war and even hot war. Misperceptions, misunderstandings and incompatibilities have plagued their relations.

22) MILITARY CBMs

- i. Military CBMs can be defined as a "type of arms control employing purposely designed, distinctly cooperative measures intended to help clarify participating states' military intentions, reduce uncertainties about their potentially threatening military activities and constrain their opportunities for surprise attacks or the coercive use of force," i.e. as mechanisms aimed at constraining conflict.
- ii. India and Pakistan have signed a number of agreements to establish ground rules for military exercises with the objective of

avoiding the outbreak of an accidental conflict. An agreement was ratified in August 1992 on Advance Notice of Military Exercises, Man oeuvres and Troops Movements. The agreement does not permit military man oeuvres of the Pakistani and Indian land, naval, and air forces in close proximity to or in the direction of their international border. No military activity is permitted within 5 km of the international border. The agreement also provides for prior notification of major military exercises within a specified timeframe. But both countries have violated the spirit of this agreement. It was this non-compliance of the agreements that had resulted in Kargil crisis.

- iii. A similar agreement was signed in 1991, also ratified in 1992 for the Prevention of Airspace Violations by Military Aircraft, establishing a no-fly zone along their international border. According to the agreement, combat aircraft are prohibited within 10 kilometers of the international border and unarmed transport and logistics aircraft are permitted up to 1000 meters from each other's airspace. This agreement has not been honored, and it has failed to de-escalate tension, especially during the time of military crisis. Pakistan's downing of two Indian aircraft and India's downing of a Pakistani plane near the international border, during the Kargil crisis, are the most suitable quotable examples here.
- iv. Realizing the nuclear status of each other, both countries have entered into a nuclear specific CBM-Prohibition of Attack on Nuclear Installations and Facilities. According to this agreement, on 1st of January of every year, both countries were to inform each other about the volume and any change in nuclear installation. Here the accuracy of nuclear facilities lists is also not beyond doubt. Hence it has undermined the effectiveness of this CBM.
- v. The existing CBMs can be studied in the following ways:
 - i. A direct communication link (DCL) known as "Hotline" between DGMOs (Director Generals of Military Operations) was established in 1971. In 1990, due to the mounting

tension on borders, it was decided to use this line on weekly basis.

- ii. Establishment of hotline between Pakistan Air Force and Indian Air Force (1993).
- iii. Communication between the Naval vessels and aircraft of the two navies when in each other's vicinity (May 1993).
- iv. Establishment of a hotline between Prime Ministers in 1997 after Male summit.
- v. Track-2 diplomacy, people to people contact.
- vi. Participation of senior military and civilian officials in various seminars in each other's country.
- vii. Invitation of the Guest Speakers at each other's national defense colleges.
- vi. Despite of such a list of CBMs, both have failed to achieve peace in the region. They, probably, use them more as instruments to influence the West then to defuse tension in true sense. Lack of political will has also marred the mechanism of conflict resolution.
- vii. Military CBMs have become even more essential due to the absence of political reconciliation between the two geographically contiguous, nuclear-capable states.
- viii. The following suggested CBMs could improve the deteriorating atmosphere of peace in South Asia.
 - i. Posting UN observers along the Line of Control.
 - ii. Exchange of military instructors at various levels.
 - iii. No War Proposal in some acceptable form.
 - iv. Withdrawal of troops from border areas and creating a 20 miles (on both sides) a troops free Security Zone.

23) **ECONOMIC CBMs**

- i. As present century is the century of economics, it has provided us an opportunity to assess the ECBMs (economic confidence building measures) in South Asia. It is globalization of the world economy and closer co-operation of individual economies in the world that has engaged the global entities in economic diplomacy for peace building.
- ii. Economic CBMs involve mainly the elimination of tariffs, custom duties, taxes, and non-tariff barriers etc. As far as South Asia is

concerned, intra-SAARC trade has remained at 4.2%, which shows the lack of confidence of South Asians over each other. According to an estimate, India and Pakistan trade volume is \$120 million since 1994, whereas their combined total global trade is \$ 72 billion and has shown practically no substantial increase over the years.

- iii. There are so many agreements, which have been chalked out for co-operation in economic field, but it is an irony of fate that all such ventures are lying on the paper and no concrete steps have so far been taken. The most important of all these is the intra-regional trade co-operation under the 1995 South Asian Preferential Agreement-SAPTA — which has been a strategic instrument in bringing about economic development in the region.
- iv. In the first round of negotiations in 1995, 226 items were resulted to offer tariff concessions by the member states. In the next round, 2,000 products were covered by the regional agreement. If it is fruitless, it is because of the non-serious attitude of the regional members. In a world, where Regionalism is the slogan of development, South Asian's individual approach is understandable. Following measures should be adopted to boost ECBMs here:
 - i. Encouraging Chambers of Trade & Commerce contacts.
 - ii. Promoting SAPTA and SAFTA-South Asian Free Trade Area.
 - iii. Joint Ventures in different trading items - initially in both countries and then in the 3rd country.
 - iv. Joint Commission on Agriculture.
 - v. Promoting Trade in the region.
- v. One may not find more proper time to discuss and eagerly request for CBMs in South Asia than now, as unfortunately, relations between India and Pakistan have reached to their lowest ebb since 1971.
- vi. In May 1998, both countries went nuclear and celebrations on both sides were watched with fearful eyes. It was followed by Kargil conflict that had caused intense war jingoism and had shaped South Asia a potential nuclear flashpoint. Then came

- political change in Pakistan on Oct 12, 1999. For the first time in Pakistan, a military regime declared itself as Futurist (looking towards future with pacific intentions and forgetting the past hostilities) and Chief Executive as 'a man of peace'.
- vii. But Indian government's response was still endemic. The postponement of the SAARC summit, due to India's unwillingness to talk to the military rulers of Pakistan, was serious setback to the normalization. Hijacking of Indian plane was another event that deepened the thaw in the regional tension. 'During all this period, as relations between the two countries take a spiraling downward course, the press and particularly electronic media of India and Pakistan continue to pour venom against each other, further vitiating the atmosphere'.
- viii. It is a fact that both governments are entangled by their domestic political problems. Indigenous turmoil-government and traders row, pressure from political parties to hold elections, future political set up, and deteriorating law and order situation in Pakistan at one hand and on the other hand, growing freedom struggle in Kashmir, insurgency in Assam, attacks on Christians and holy churches by the fundamentalist Hindus and lawlessness in many parts of India, have become hard nuts to crack. But both governments are busy to deflect attention of their people from these real issues to the enemy across the border. Instead of acting insanely, one must follow long-term policies for eternal peace here.
- ix. One of the very important determinants for peace making in South Asia is political will. It is necessary now, because both countries as a matter of national policy are trying to harm each other to pursue their ends. 'Each country's press and electronic media should take the initiative as they can play a crucial role in lowering the war hysteria on both sides. Public statements coming out of the leaders of both countries are most harmful. They need to lower their rhetoric to create an environment of building at least a minimum level of confidence.

Even the conciliatory statements being made by both sides are meant more to impress the international community rather than

- motivated by a desire to reduce tensions and restore stability in the region. The unrelenting harassment of each other's diplomats has to come to stop as it further increases animosity and aggravates the crisis.
- x. Another very difficult problem, which both the countries are facing, is the extremist posture adopted by the religious fundamentalist organizations. Hindu, Muslim, and Christian minorities do exist on both sides of the border. Lack of tolerance amongst them has further contributed in plaguing the relations. It would be in the fitness of the things that a direct interaction between the fundamentalist organizations may be arranged, which will in turn help in easing tension.
 - xi. Probably the situation is not that worse as has been portrayed by the respective intelligence agencies. It is their over-efficiency and suspicions that have made each other's face grimmer. They have formed mirror images of one another. Gap of communication amongst the agencies has flared up mutual antagonism. Under such circumstances, it is the need of the moment to initiate a dialogue between the intelligence agencies of both countries so that misunderstandings may be addressed.

24) **Conclusion: CBMs**

- i. As a major achievement of international peace and conflict research, there is a broad consensus that peace is more than just the absence of war. Will to peace and the capability for peace is more important than deterrence. If South Asia is observed intently, the state of affairs since 1947 cannot be called Peace. Even when Pakistan and India did not clash militarily, their regional cold war was going on. So, discussing imperatives of peace in South Asia, the problem of the will to peace and the capability for peace is a major factor for answering the question whether peace is possible in this part of the world. CBMs are the need of the time. If we want peace in South Asia, a real peace, then at first we have to bring peace in our minds.
- ii. We have to convince our people that for our survival and of the world at large, there is no other choice but to live in peace with neighbors. We have to re-educate our media who is busy in

providing Hot News early in the morning through creating war, ideological, enemy, and threat hysteria. We cannot secure our people by securing the boundaries. People can be secured by providing them food, shelter, and clothing, and this is possible only when both countries will bring peace, harmony, and economic well being in the region. National security cannot be ensured by arms race, rather it would destroy the shabby fabric of our economies as well. In the year 2000, Economic Prosperity means National Security indeed.

- iii. CBMs do not mean peace, rather these are the ways to long lasting harmony. Why shouldn't we be the trendsetters? After every war, the belligerents have signed the peace treaty. Why shouldn't we sign peace treaty before the war? War is a reality but not a necessity. Peace loving nations must realize it.

Topic 19
South Asia: Afghanistan

Cold war theatre; Soviet Invasion and Mujahedeen; Geneva Accord; Post Cold War situation- Rise of Taliban, AL-Qeada & 9/11; Operation Enduring Freedom; The Bonn Process- Withdrawal

A chronology of key events:

1838-42 - British forces invade, install King Shah Shujah. He is assassinated in 1842. British and Indian troops are massacred during retreat from Kabul.

1878-80 - Second Anglo-Afghan War. A treaty gives Britain control of Afghan foreign affairs.

1919 - Emir Amanullah Khan declares independence from British influence.

1926-29 - Amanullah tries to introduce social reforms, which however stir civil unrest. He flees.

1933 - Zahir Shah becomes king and Afghanistan remains a monarchy for next four decades.

1953 - General Mohammed Daud becomes prime minister. Turns to Soviet Union for economic and military assistance. Introduces social reforms, such as abolition of purdah (practice of secluding women from public view).

1963 - Mohammed Daud forced to resign as prime minister.

1964 - Constitutional monarchy introduced - but leads to political polarisation and power struggles.

1973 - Mohammed Daud seizes power in a coup and declares a republic. Tries to play off USSR against Western powers.

1978 - General Daud is overthrown and killed in a pro-Soviet coup. The People's Democratic Party comes to power but is paralysed by violent infighting and faces opposition by US-backed mujahideen groups.

Soviet intervention

1979 December - Soviet Army invades and props up communist government.

1980 - Babrak Karmal installed as ruler, backed by Soviet troops. But opposition intensifies with various mujahideen groups fighting Soviet forces. US, Pakistan, China, Iran and Saudi Arabia supply money and arms to the mujahideen.

1985 - Mujahideen come together in Pakistan to form alliance against Soviet forces. Half of Afghan population now estimated to be displaced by war, with many fleeing to neighbouring Iran or Pakistan.

1986 - US begins supplying mujahideen with Stinger missiles, enabling them to shoot down Soviet helicopter gunships. Babrak Karmal replaced by Najibullah as head of Soviet-backed regime.

1988 - Afghanistan, USSR, the US and Pakistan sign peace accords and Soviet Union begins pulling out troops.

Red Army quits

1989 - Last Soviet troops leave, but civil war continues as mujahideen push to overthrow Najibullah.

1992 - Najibullah's government toppled, but a devastating civil war follows.

1996 - Taliban seize control of Kabul and introduce hard-line version of Islam, banning women from work, and introducing Islamic punishments, which include stoning to death and amputations.

1997 - Taliban recognised as legitimate rulers by Pakistan and Saudi Arabia. They now control about two-thirds of country.

1998 - US launches missile strikes at suspected bases of militant Osama bin Laden, accused of bombing US embassies in Africa.

1999 - UN imposes an air embargo and financial sanctions to force Afghanistan to hand over Osama bin Laden for trial.

2001 September - Ahmad Shah Masood, leader of the main opposition to the Taliban - the Northern Alliance - is assassinated.

US-led invasion

2001 October - US-led bombing of Afghanistan begins following the September 11 attacks on the United States. Anti-Taliban Northern Alliance forces enter Kabul shortly afterwards.

2001 December - Afghan groups agree deal in Bonn, Germany for interim government. Hamid Karzai is sworn in as head of an interim power-sharing government.

2002 January - Deployment of first contingent of foreign peacekeepers - the Nato-led International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) - marking the start of a protracted fight against the Taliban.

2002 April - Former king Zahir Shah returns, but makes no claim to the throne and dies in 2007.

2002 June - Loya Jirga, or grand council, elects Hamid Karzai as interim head of state. Karzai picks members of his administration which is to serve until 2004.

2003 August - Nato takes control of security in Kabul, its first-ever operational commitment outside Europe.

Elections

2004 January - Loya Jirga adopts new constitution which provides for strong presidency.

2004 October-November - Presidential elections. Hamid Karzai is declared winner.

2005 September - Afghans vote in first parliamentary elections in more than 30 years.

2005 December - Parliament opens with warlords and strongmen in most of the seats.

2005 vote: The first parliamentary poll in more than 30 years

2006 October - Nato assumes responsibility for security across the whole of Afghanistan, taking command in the east from a US-led coalition force.

2007 August - Opium production has soared to a record high, the UN reports.

2008 June - President Karzai warns that Afghanistan will send troops into Pakistan to fight militants if Islamabad fails to take action against them.

2008 July - Suicide bomb attack on Indian embassy in Kabul kills more than 50.

2008 September - US President George Bush sends an extra 4,500 US troops to Afghanistan, in a move he described as a "quiet surge".

2009 January - US Defence Secretary Robert Gates tells Congress that Afghanistan is new US administration's "greatest test".

2009 February - Nato countries pledge to increase military and other commitments in Afghanistan after US announces dispatch of 17,000 extra troops.

New US approach

2009 March - US President Barack Obama unveils new strategy for Afghanistan and Pakistan. An extra 4,000 US personnel will train and bolster the Afghan army and police and there will be support for civilian development.

2009 August - Presidential and provincial elections are marred by widespread Taliban attacks, patchy turnout and claims of serious fraud.

2009 October - Mr Karzai declared winner of August presidential election, after second-placed opponent Abdullah Abdullah pulls out before the second round.

2009 December - US President Obama decides to boost US troop numbers in Afghanistan by 30,000, bringing total to 100,000. He says US will begin withdrawing its forces by 2011.

An Al-Qaeda double agent kills seven CIA agents in a suicide attack on a US base in Khost.

2010 February - Nato-led forces launch major offensive, Operation Moshtarak, in bid to secure government control of southern Helmand province.

2010 July - Whistleblowing website Wikileaks publishes thousands of classified US military documents relating to Afghanistan.

General David Petraeus takes command of US, ISAF forces.

2010 August - Dutch troops quit.

Karzai says private security firms - accused of operating with impunity - must cease operations. He subsequently waters down the decree.

2010 September - Parliamentary polls marred by Taliban violence, widespread fraud and a long delay in announcing results.

2010 November - Nato - at summit in Lisbon - agrees plan to hand control of security to Afghan forces by end of 2014.

2011 January - President Karzai makes first official state visit to Russia by an Afghan leader since the end of the Soviet invasion in 1989.

2011 February - Number of civilians killed since the 2001 invasion hit record levels in 2010, Afghanistan Rights Monitor reports.

2011 April - Burning of Koran by a US pastor prompts country-wide protests in which foreign UN workers and several Afghans are killed.

Some 500 mostly Taliban prisoners break out of prison in Kandahar.

2011 July - President's half-brother and Kandahar governor Ahmad Wali Karzai is killed in Taliban campaign against prominent figures.

2011 September - Ex-president Burhanuddin Rabbani - a go-between in talks with the Taliban - is assassinated.

2011 October - As relations with Pakistan worsen after a series of attacks, Afghanistan and India sign a strategic partnership to expand co-operation in security and development.

Military pact

2011 November - President Karzai wins the endorsement of tribal elders to negotiate a 10-year military partnership with the US at a loya jirga traditional assembly. The proposed pact will see US troops remain after 2014, when foreign troops are due to leave the country.

2011 December - At least 58 people are killed in twin attacks at a Shia shrine in Kabul and a Shia mosque in Mazar-i-Sharif.

Pakistan and the Taleban boycott the scheduled Bonn Conference on Afghanistan. Pakistan refuses to attend after a Nato air strike killed Pakistani soldiers on the Afghan border.

2012 January - Taliban agree to open office in Dubai as a move towards peace talks with the US and the Afghan government.

2012 February - At least 30 people are killed in protests about the burning of copies of the Koran at the US Bagram airbase. US officials believed Taliban prisoners were using the books to pass messages, and that they were extremist texts not Korans. Two soldiers are also killed in reprisal attacks.

2012 March - US Army Sgt Robert Bales is accused of killing 16 civilians in an armed rampage in the Panjwai district of Kandahar.

2012 April - Taliban announce "spring offensive" with audacious attack on the diplomatic quarter of Kabul. The government blamed the Haqqani Network. Security forces kill 38 militants.

Nato withdrawal plan

2012 May - Nato summit endorses the plan to withdraw foreign combat troops by the end of 2014.

New French President Francois Hollande says France will withdraw its combat mission by the end of 2012 - a year earlier than planned.

Arsala Rahmani of the High Peace Council is shot dead in Kabul. A former Taliban minister, he was crucial in reaching out to rebel commanders. The Taliban deny responsibility.

2012 July - Tokyo donor conference pledges \$16bn in civilian aid to Afghanistan up to 2016, with US, Japan, Germany and UK supplying bulk of funds. Afghanistan agrees to new conditions to counter corruption.

2012 August - The US military discipline six soldiers for accidentally burning copies of the Koran and other religious texts in Afghanistan. They will not face criminal prosecution. Three US Marines are also disciplined for a video in which the bodies of dead Taliban fighters were urinated on.

2012 September - US hands over Bagram high-security jail to the Afghan government, although it retains control over some foreign prisoners until March 2013.

The US also suspends training new police recruits in order to carry out checks on possible ties to Taliban following series of attacks on foreign troops by apparent police and Afghan soldiers.

2013 February - President Karzai and Pakistan's Asif Ali Zardari agree to work for an Afghan peace deal within six months after talks hosted by Britain's Prime Minister David Cameron. They back the opening of an Afghan office in Doha and urge the Taliban to do the same for talks to take place.

2013 March - Two former Kabul Bank chiefs, Sher Khan Farnood and Khalilullah Ferozi, are jailed for the multi-million dollar fraud that almost led to its collapse and that of the entire Afghan banking system in 2010.

2013 June - Afghan army takes command of all military and security operations from Nato forces.

President Karzai suspends security talks with the US after Washington announces it plans to hold direct talks with the Taliban. Afghanistan insists on conducting the talks with the Taliban in Qatar itself.

2014 January - Taliban suicide squad hits a restaurant in Kabul's diplomatic quarter, the worst attack on foreign civilians since 2001. The 13 foreign victims include IMF country head.

2014 April - The presidential election produces an inconclusive result and goes on to a second round between Abdullah Abdullah and Ashraf Ghani.

2014 June - Second round of presidential election is held, with more than 50 reported killed in various incidents during the vote.

2014 July - Election officials begin recount of all votes cast in June's presidential run-off, as part of a US-mediated deal to end dispute between candidates over widespread claims of fraud.

Election deal

2014 September - The two rivals for the Afghan presidency, Ashraf Ghani and Abdullah Abdullah, sign a power-sharing agreement, following a two-month audit of disputed election results. Ashraf Ghani is sworn in as president.

2014 October - The US and Britain end their combat operations in Afghanistan.

Opium poppy cultivation in Afghanistan reaches an all-time high, according to a US report

2014 December - NATO formally ends its 13-year combat mission in Afghanistan, handing over to Afghan forces. Despite the official end to Isaf's combat role, violence persists across much of the country, with 2014 said to be the bloodiest year in Afghanistan since 2001.

2015 January - NATO-led follow-on mission "Resolute Support" gets underway, with some 12,000 personnel to provide further training and support for Afghan security forces.

2015 March - US President Barak Obama announces that his country will delay its troop withdrawal from Afghanistan, following a request from President Ashraf Ghani.

The lynching of a woman wrongly accused of burning a Koran in Kabul provokes widespread revulsion and criticism of hard-line clerics. Police face accusations of doing too little to save her. The incident leads to widespread protests against the treatment of women. Four men are later convicted of murder.

2015 May - Taliban representatives and Afghan officials hold informal peace talks in Qatar. Both sides agree to continue the talks at a later date, though the Taliban insist they will not stop fighting until all foreign troops leave the country.

2015 September - Taliban briefly capture major northern city of Kunduz in their most significant advance since being forced from power in 2001.

2015 October - Powerful earthquake kills more than 80 people in northeast of country.

Topic 20

Weapons of Mass Destruction

Introduction

- i. Nuclear weapon production requires a broad-based technological infrastructure and individuals with key skills.
- ii. Nuclear reactors and nuclear weapons differ in their management of the chain reaction, and in the nature of the energy produced.
- iii. In 1948, the United Nations introduced the category known as WMD.
- iv. A new category has appeared known as CBRN.
- v. Nuclear weapons produce energy in three forms—blast, heat and nuclear radiation—and the phenomenon known as EMP.
- vi. Nuclear weapons were used at the end of the Second World War and have not been used in conflict since.
- vii. The testing of thermonuclear weapons indicated the greater explosive capacity of this type of weapon, although the trend has been towards weapon designs with lower yields.
- viii. The nature of nuclear weapons and the dissemination of the capabilities to manufacture them around the world since 1945 makes nuclear proliferation a good illustration of the globalization of world politics.
- ix. The end of the cold war and the dissolution of the former Soviet Union generated new problems.
- x. Greater attention has been paid to theoretical aspects. A debate has emerged over the merits of the further proliferation/spread of nuclear weapons. Because of new proliferation challenges generated by what some analysts call the 'second nuclear age', a debate has begun over whether the nuclear non-proliferation regime should be supplemented or supplanted by a new more flexible approach to the problems of global nuclear governance.
- xi. A major element of the nuclear proliferation process is the acquisition of the technologies to produce fissile materials to construct either a fission (nuclear) or fusion (thermonuclear) weapon.

- xii. The effects of nuclear weapons are considerable and are manifest in the form of blast, heat, and nuclear radiation.
- xiii. Since 1945, the spread of nuclear technology for civil and military purposes has meant that states beyond the five which possess nuclear weapons now have the capacity to produce nuclear devices at relatively short notice, if they have not already done so.
- xiv. Over the same period the structure of the civil nuclear trading market has also changed, leading to proliferation concerns because there are more nuclear suppliers around.
- xv. There has also been a diffusion of ballistic missile and spacelaunch technology since 1945.
- xvi. A debate over the merits of deploying defensive systems to counter ballistic missiles has emerged and the ABM Treaty agreed in 1972 between the United States and the former Soviet Union is no longer in force.
- xvii. The characterization of motivations for acquiring nuclear weapons has become more complex.
- xviii. There are difficulties in determining whether nuclear proliferation has occurred.
- xix. A number of states have the potential to manufacture nuclear weapons if they wanted, and a few embarked on military nuclear programmes before abandoning them.
- xx. The role of non-state actors has added a further dimension to the nuclear proliferation issue.
- xxi. There is an ongoing task of ensuring the safety and security of nuclear materials around the world.
- xxii. The complexity surrounding compliance with international obligations has been a feature of debate since the early 1990s.
- xxiii. Nuclear control and anti-proliferation measures have been evolving since 1945.
- xxiv. The IAEA has established a global safeguards system.
- xxv. Attempts to implement a CTBT and negotiate a FMCT have stalled following a period of renewed impetus after 1995.
- xxvi. A number of NWFZs have been negotiated.
- xxvii. The NPT now has 188 parties, although India, Israel, and Pakistan remain non-signatories.

xxviii. In 1987 the MTCR began operating and The Hague Code of Conduct was introduced in 2002.

xxix. NPT Review Conferences have been held every five years since 1970. Since 1995, the NPT has encountered several challenges related to new incidences of nuclear testing, attempts to achieve universality, disposal of fissile material, compliance, and verification.

xxx. It has been suggested that a 'second nuclear age' has emerged. New measures have been implemented in response to the continuing globalization of the nuclear proliferation issue.

- 5) **Extent of the Issue:** The world at present faces a huge challenge of nuclear proliferation. Nuclear proliferation is the act of spreading nuclear weapons or fissile material to non-recognized nuclear countries or independent organizations. The US, which is the sole superpower of the world, has actively engaged in ending nuclear proliferation. Although the Western World has engaged in double standards as it kept a blind eye and provided clandestine support to Israel's nuclear program, overall it has done a good job in curbing the proliferation of nuclear material.
- 6) **Nuclear Non proliferation Treaty:** The world has joined hands and 189 countries signed the Nuclear Non proliferation Treaty. This treaty effectively recognized the 5 major powers UK, US, France, Russia and China as nuclear weapons state. India, Pakistan and Israel have not signed this treaty, as they believe it is discriminatory, as it does not legally allow other states to possess nuclear weapons. But these three nations have agreed to abide by principles, which discourage proliferation of nuclear weapons.
- 7) **International Atomic Energy Agency:** International Atomic Energy Agency, which was formed in 1957, helps nations nuclear energy for peaceful purposes. It also helps in establishing protocols and safeguards, which ensure that nuclear weapons or components don't fall into the wrong hands. Terrorist organizations such as Al Qaeda or other independent organizations have actively tried to acquire nuclear weapons but have failed because of strict safeguards applied by all nuclear powered nations. Thus, the world faces a danger of nuclear material falling into the wrong hands but the safeguards taken by

nuclear powered nations and IAEA has ensured that chances of nuclear components falling into the wrong hands are minimal.

8) Steps to be taken by international community to eliminate nuclear proliferation:

- i. Punitive international sanctions against hostile nations looking to acquire nuclear weapons capability
- ii. An agreement regarding safeguards and protocols signed by both NPT and Non NPT Members
- iii. Pro active steps should be taken by the international community which includes diplomatic, economic and military sanctions if it emerges that a state or a non state entity is looking to acquire nuclear capability
- iv. Security assurances should be provided to states that are looking to acquire nuclear weapons for their safety
- v. Redouble efforts to resolve conflicts and confrontations
- vi. Reasserting the image of a nuclear free world and taking tangible steps to make this goal real

9) ARMS CONTROL AND ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

- i. A stable and peaceful international order requires controls on nuclear, biological and chemical (NBC) and other types of weapons and dangerous sensitive materials as well as regulation of the behavior of both state and non-state actors.
- ii. In April 2004 the United Nations (UN) Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1540 on the proliferation of NBC weapons and their means of delivery. Unlike most Security Council resolutions—which respond to developments in a particular location—Resolution 1540 has a preventive character. It was adopted primarily in response to the growing concern that non-state actors would succeed in acquiring NBC weapons. The evidence of an extensive grey market in nuclear and nuclear-related goods and technologies revealed in information released by the Government of Libya and in investigations carried out by the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) was a catalyst for the decision.

- iii. In December 2004 UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan released the report of the UN High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. The report, approximately one-third of which was devoted to arms control issues, pointed to the urgent need to establish effective controls over nuclear weapons and nuclear materials that can be used to make them. The High-level Panel expressed concern over the lack of progress in two areas of persistent difficulty for multilateral arms control as well as the pressing need for effective measures to reduce the threat of nuclear terrorism. The two areas of concern were:
 - i. how to ensure universal adherence to multilateral agreements intended to establish global norms and rules of behavior;
 - ii. how to ensure that those states which do adhere to the agreements comply fully with the commitments that they have made. Section II surveys some of the key developments in arms control and nonproliferation in 2004, which are analyzed in detail in other chapters in this Yearbook.
- iv. Section III addresses the issue of the role of global arms control processes—in particular, the role of the United Nations.
- v. In September 2004 the IAEA, Russia and the USA organized an international conference in Vienna with four objectives. The objectives were: to build consensus among the widest possible group of states that vulnerable, high-risk nuclear and radiological materials ‘pose a threat to our collective security and that all states share the common objective to help reduce this threat’; to stimulate national programs to identify, secure, recover and facilitate the disposal of such materials; to create international support for practical measures to mitigate the common threat; and to secure the widest possible active participation in implementing these practical measures.
- vi. The concern that the informal character of the document, in effect a political declaration, would undermine its implementation was offset by the commitment to review implementation regularly and at a high level. In order to satisfy the commitment to conduct regular, high-level scrutiny of implementation, the General Affairs

and External Relations Council (GAERC), which is composed of the foreign ministers of the EU member states, will be informed about the actions taken to implement the strategy on a six-monthly basis and is expected to debate the progress of implementation.

vii. During 2004 information about implementation was presented to the EU Political and Security Committee (PSC) and to the Permanent Representatives Committee (COREPER) prior to each of the discussions in the GAERC. The measures taken by the EU to implement its WMD Strategy can be grouped under four headings.

- i. The first measure is to ensure that the EU itself is a **‘model citizen’** that does not undermine non-proliferation objectives. A number of companies located in EU member states were active participants in the ‘Khan network’ and provided items that contributed to nuclear weapon programmes. From February to July 2004 the national export control systems of member states were scrutinized by teams of officials drawn from other EU states. On the basis of this ‘peer review’ the EU has recommended concrete actions to improve the efficiency of national systems.
- ii. The second measure was to **strengthen global arms control processes** in order to stimulate what has been termed ‘effective multilateralism’. The EU has continued to provide financial support to conferences and meetings intended to promote the universal ratification of, and adherence to, the NPT, the IAEA safeguards agreements, the 1972 Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC) and the Chemical Weapons Convention as well as to bring into force the 1996 Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT). The country holding the EU presidency continued to make statements on behalf of the EU at the relevant international meetings and in international organizations. The EU pledged €1.8 million to finance a number of measures to promote universal participation in the CWC and

to assist states parties to the CWC with effective implementation.

- iii. The third measure consists of **financial support for practical measures** to secure weapons and materials of concern. This financial assistance has included contributions by member states as well as contributions from the EU common budget (which can include both Joint Actions under the Council and projects and programmes administered directly by the European Commission).
- iv. The fourth measure consists of the **so-called ‘mainstreaming’ of nonproliferation policies** into the wider relations between the EU and its partners, including states and international organizations. Annalisa Giannella, Personal Representative on Weapons of Mass Destruction in the cabinet of the EU High Representative for the CFSP, Javier Solana, has argued that as a result of actions taken in 2004 this process of mainstreaming has given the EU ‘real leverage’ in negotiations with partners. According to Giannella, ‘nonproliferation has now been placed on a similar level to human rights and the fight against terrorism. If you don’t meet certain standards it affects your relations with the EU’.

10) Global zero world without nuclear weapons

- i. **“This is the moment to begin the work of seeking the peace of world without nuclear weapons” (Barak Obama)**
- ii. Man has achieved tremendous progress in developing scientific technology for the welfare and well-being of humanity, but simultaneously, he has also developed weapons for his own destruction. To acquire power—the most flagrant of all passions—he created weapons including explosive, chemical, biological and nuclear. Among them, the nuclear weapons are the most destructive causing mass destruction. Though, these have been used once in history during the World War-II, these have created a perpetual fear of annihilation among all humans. Now, with the evolving of a multi-cultural globalised world, there is an increase in momentum to develop a consensus for achieving Global Zero-

- elimination of all nuclear weapons. To succeed in this initiative, the need is to sit together, contemplate, devise a strategy and agree to divert this capability from weapons to welfare of humanity. The most resounding argument, generating urge to achieve this surpassable task lies in the brief history of apocalyptic perils of nuclear weapons.
- iii. **The perils of atomic weapons were manifest as the two cities of Japan were wreaked when the bombs were dropped on them. In Hiroshima, some 75,000 people were immediately killed by blast, fire and radiation. Another 70,000 died by the end of 1945.**
 - iv. The Americans and Japanese learned different lessons from these bombings. “The Americans lesson was; the nuclear weapons win wars, and therefore have value. The Japanese learned that human being and nuclear weapons cannot co-exist.” (David Krieger, President Nuclear Age Peace Foundation). However, the danger posed by nuclear weapons today is far greater than the destruction they caused in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.
 - v. Today, the number of nuclear weapons around the world is about 30,000 bombs with far greater weight and destruction power. Even a fraction of these weapons could put an end to human as well as other species on our planet. It is clear that if we don’t achieve ‘Global Zero’, our planet is always at risk, of being converted into a ‘Ground Zero’. This could happen not only due to a deliberate act but also accidental incident. Therefore, there is a strong reason that ‘these weapons must be abolished before they abolish us’.

The need to eliminate nuclear weapons is not only because these can be used for destruction in war but also because they pose equal danger in times of peace. There have been “Close Calls” to annihilation in various occasions. [In 1995] President Boris Yeltsin was informed that a nuclear missile was speeding towards the heart of Russia. Russian nuclear forces, already on hair-trigger alert, were put in even higher alert. Russian policy called for a “launch on warning”. The fate of the planet hung in the

balance. Yeltsin wisely waited. And within those moments, the alarm declared false. “An unimaginable nuclear disaster had barely been avoided”, declared America’s Defense Monitor, Center for Defence Information, December 26, 1999.

vi. wisdom calls for elimination of all nuclear weapons in order to make the future of humanity—our generation and our future generations – safe and secure.

vii. One of the major world powers, the USSR too, collapsed under the heavy burden of extraordinary defence spending on economy. The developing countries like India, Pakistan, and North Korea also joined the race. They did succeed in acquiring nuclear weapons but their poor population is suffering from abject poverty. A country like Pakistan, which is merely surviving at the edge of economic insolvency, could gain much economic growth, had the resources been utilised for the welfare of people. Iranians are bearing the sanctions imposed by western powers through the UN for pursuing nuclear technology, which according to them, is aimed at acquiring weapons.

viii. Besides, the argument to possess nuclear weapons to maintain deterrence capability has also lost its ground. More the states acquire ‘nukes’, more the risk of their use builds-up. Moreover, the presence of nukes always poses risk of slipping into the hands of terrorists.

ix. Negotiations between Washington and Moscow should start to cut back nuclear stockpiles to minimum. According to moderate estimates, the US and Russia have about 26000 of total 27000 weapons in the world.

x. In order to seize this positive trend, to achieve the commitment of the entire international community, and to re-energise effort for complete nuclear disarmament, a new initiative “Global Zero” was launched on December 9, 2008, in Paris. The initiative was endorsed by 100 international political, military, business and civic leaders across the world. The signatories included former US President Jimmy Carter, former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, former British Foreign Secretary Margaret Becket, Queen Noor of Jordan, Ehasnul Haq, former Joint Chief of the Staff committee

(JCSC) of Pakistan, former Indian National Security advisor Brajes Mishra.

xi. Global Zero envisages eliminating nuclear weapons through phased and verified reduction over a period of years. Key steps include:

- i.** Massive reduction in Russian-US arsenal.
- ii.** Complete elimination to zero by all states.
- iii.** Establishing verification system to keep check.
- iv.** International management of the fuel cycle.

xii. The phased and verifiable elimination of nuclear weapons is possible. Here are some of the steps needed to achieve this goal:

- i.** Firstly; the ratification of Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT). The NPT, which was sponsored by the US, UK and the USSR, was aimed “to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons and weapon technology, to promote cooperation in the peaceful use of nuclear energy and to further the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament”. The treaty was signed by 187 states and was ratified in 1975. However, the US, its sponsors, did not ratify it. Other four countries which have not signed it are: India, Pakistan, Israel and Cuba. Similarly, CTBT, introduced in 1995, has not been ratified by many states, including the US. It is strongly felt that if the US ratifies these treaties, others would follow the course. “Early the US ratification would do much to encourage the few remaining states to follow suit,” wrote David Miliband, UK’s former Foreign Secretary, in The Washington Post on December 8, 2008.
- ii.** Secondly; negotiations between Washington and Moscow should start to cut back nuclear stockpiles to minimum. According to moderate estimates, the US and Russia have about 26000 of total 27000 weapons in the world. As both these states possess largest stockpiles—96 per cent of all the nuclear weapons in the world—they should reduce their arsenal in the first step. “Process needs to start with American and Russian leaderships”, argues Richard

Burt. This is an absolutely insensible approach to accumulate that much big arsenal that fraction of which can destroy the whole world. "When a country can be destroyed by a dozen weapons, its own possession of thousands of weapons gains no security", says Admiral Noel Gayler. The huge possession of nukes itself puts larger responsibility on the US and Russia to initiate the process of disarmaments up to minimum level. The successful conclusion of 'START NEW' between both powers strengthens the possibility of reaching an agreement on nuclear disarmament.

- iii. Thirdly; following the reductions by the US and Russia, the rest of the countries can be brought on board for complete abolition of nukes. It would not be a difficult task. Once the powerful countries lead the course, rest will follow them. Perhaps others seem poised to welcome such move. The willingness of China, the UK and France has already been mentioned. The two South Asian countries India and Pakistan are also ready to shun the nukes. Last June, Indian Prime Minister Manmohan Singh, backed the same goal, saying that: "The only effective form of nuclear disarmament and elimination of nuclear weapons is global disarmament." President Zardari has also talked of "nuclear weapon-free South Asia". North Korea is already on-board in six-party talks and has also committed to abolish nuclear weapons for economic incentives. The only country which has stayed silent is Israel which is undeclared nuclear state. But given the leverage, Washington enjoys over it, Israel will have to be part of the process. Once this process sets in momentum, the weapons could be delivered to a single and common remote place in oceans for dismantling under the supervision of skilled scientists. The nuclear material could be returned to the donors for use in the energy sector or disposal.
- iv. Lastly, having achieved the complete and verified elimination of nuclear weapons from the world, all the countries will have to conclude a joint treaty at the UN

platform banning any development of nuclear weapons and technology. As Queen Noor of Jordan told BBC, “We have to work on de-legitimising the status of nuclear weapons.” This is vital for making the elimination of nukes irreversible. This would require establishing many mechanisms to constitute an eventual regime for overseeing the global ban.

xiii. The Global Zero initiative envisages ‘international management of the fuel cycle to prevent future development of nuclear weapons.’ “An agreement on a new International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) led system that would help states wishing to develop a civil nuclear energy industry to do so without increasing the risk of nuclear weapon proliferation” says David Miliband. Creation of such international fuel bank would also end the conflicts in the world like Iran Nuclear Issue. This proposal was also forwarded by IAEA’s former head Muhammad Elbradi as early as in 2003, that: “all production and processing of nuclear material be under international control”. This novel idea has attracted the EU and an American billionaire ‘Warren Buffett’ for financing the project.

xiv. Global Zero offers two-pronged benefits: achieving safety by eliminating nuclear weapons and to achieve prosperity by using nuclear energy. The leaders of world have the greatest moral responsibility to seize the opportunity for the welfare of the living and the future generations of mankind. As Benazir Bhutto said, “We owe it to our children to build a world free of the threat of nuclear annihilation.”

11) NUCLEAR PROGRAM OF PAKISTAN

i. Pakistan’s nuclear program has been under the scope of the international community for a very long time. International overblown concerns that Pakistani nuclear weapons or components might fall into the wrong hands. It is true that Pakistan acquired a lot of its nuclear capabilities through a clandestine program by importing crucial technologies from the Western World, but it is equally true that the all the other nuclear powers have acquired their capabilities through their own clandestine programs.

- ii. Pakistan has effectively dismantled the Abdul Qadeer Khan Network and has enhanced security mechanisms inside their nuclear facility. Islamabad has taken a number of steps to improve its nuclear security and to prevent further proliferation of nuclear-related technologies and materials. A number of important initiatives, such as strengthened export control laws, improved personnel security, and international nuclear security cooperation programs have improved Pakistan's security situation in recent years. Thus, it is safe to conclude that international concerns regarding Pakistan's nuclear program are overblown and Pakistan's nuclear program is very safe.
- iii. In the mid-1970s Pakistan embarked upon the uranium enrichment route to acquire a nuclear weapons capability. Pakistan conducted nuclear tests in May 1998, shortly after India's nuclear tests, declaring itself a nuclear weapon state. Pakistan currently possesses a growing nuclear arsenal.
- iv. Capabilities: Hans Kristensen and Robert Norris characterize Pakistan as having, "the world's fastest-growing nuclear stockpile." According to the SIPRI 2014 Yearbook, Pakistan possesses between 100 and 120 nuclear weapons. However, the International Panel on Fissile Materials concluded in 2013 that Pakistan possesses fissile material sufficient for over 200 weapons. Islamabad has stockpiled approximately 3.0 ± 1.2 tons of highly enriched uranium (HEU), and produces enough HEU for perhaps 10 to 15 warheads per year. Pakistan currently has a stockpile of 150 ± 50 kg of weapons-grade plutonium, with the ability to produce approximately 12 to 24 kg per year. Plutonium stocks are expected to continue to increase as Pakistan brings more production reactors online at its Khushab facility. The Khan Research Laboratories greatly increased its HEU production capacity by employing more efficient P-3 and P-4 gas centrifuges.
- v. History
 - i. Establishing a Nuclear Program: 1956 to 1974: Pakistan asserts the origin of its nuclear weapons program lies in its adversarial relationship with India; the two countries have engaged in several conflicts, centered mainly on the state of Jammu and

Kashmir. Initial steps toward the development of Pakistan's nuclear program date to the late 1950s, including with the establishment of the Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission (PAEC) in 1956. President Z.A. Bhutto forcefully advocated the nuclear option and famously said in 1965 that "if India builds the bomb, we will eat grass or leaves, even go hungry, but we will get one of our own." After the December 1971 defeat in the conflict with India, Bhutto issued a directive instructing the country's nuclear establishment to build a nuclear device within three years. India's detonation of a nuclear device in May 1974 further pushed Islamabad to accelerate its nuclear weapons program, although the PAEC had already constituted a group in March of that year to manufacture a nuclear weapon.

- ii. A.Q. Khan's Contribution: 1975 to 1998: The Pakistan Atomic Energy Commission, headed by Munir Ahmad Khan, focused on the plutonium route to nuclear weapons development using material from the safeguarded Karachi Nuclear Power Plant (KANUPP), but its progress was inefficient due to the constraints imposed by the nuclear export controls applied in the wake of India's nuclear test. Around 1975 A.Q. Khan, a metallurgist working at a subsidiary of the URENCO enrichment corporation in the Netherlands, returned to Pakistan to help his country develop a uranium enrichment program. Having brought centrifuge designs and business contacts back with him to Pakistan, Khan used various tactics, such as buying individual components rather than complete units, to evade export controls and acquire the necessary equipment. By the early 1980s, Pakistan had a clandestine uranium enrichment facility, and A.Q. Khan would later assert that the country had acquired the capability to assemble a first-generation nuclear device as early as 1984. Pakistan also received assistance from states, especially China. Beginning in the late 1970s Beijing provided Islamabad with various levels of nuclear and missile-related assistance, including centrifuge equipment, warhead designs, HEU, components of various missile systems, and technical expertise. Eventually, from the 1980s onwards, the

Khan network diversified its activities and illicitly transferred nuclear technology and expertise to Iran, North Korea, and Libya. The Khan network was officially dismantled in 2004, although questions still remain concerning the extent of the Pakistani political and military establishment's involvement in the network's activities.

vi. Pakistan as a Declared Nuclear Power: 1998 to the Present

- i. On 11 and 13 May 1998, India conducted a total of five nuclear explosions, which Pakistan felt pressured to respond to in kind. Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif decided to test, and Pakistan detonated five explosions on 28 May and a sixth on 30 May 1998. In a post-test announcement Sharif stressed that the test was a necessary response to India, and that Pakistan's nuclear weapons were only "in the interest of national self-defense... to deter aggression, whether nuclear or conventional."
- ii. With these tests Pakistan abandoned its nuclear ambiguity, stating that it would maintain a "credible minimum deterrent" against India. In 1998, Pakistan commissioned its first plutonium production reactor at Khushab, which is capable of yielding approximately 11 kg of weapons-grade plutonium annually. Based on analysis of the cooling system of the heavy water reactors at Khushab, Tamara Patton, of the Vienna Center for Disarmament and Non-Proliferation, estimates the thermal capacity and thus the plutonium production capacity of Khushab-2 and Khushab-3 to be ~15 kg and ~19 kg per annum respectively.
- iii. Construction of a fourth plutonium production reactor at Khushab is ongoing and is estimated to be more than 50% complete based on satellite imagery analysis. Patton estimates that "if Khushab-4 has at least an equivalent thermal capacity as Khushab-3, the entire complex could be capable of producing 64 kg of plutonium per year or enough fissile material for anywhere from 8–21 new warheads per year depending on their design." Associated facilities and their associated security perimeters are also being expanded,

including the plutonium separation facilities at New Labs, Pakistan Institute of Science and Technology, to reprocess spent fuel from the new reactors at Khushab.

- iv. Islamabad has yet to formally declare a nuclear doctrine, so it remains unclear under what conditions Pakistan might use nuclear weapons.] In 2002 then- President Pervez Musharraf stated that, "nuclear weapons are aimed solely at India," and would only be used if "the very existence of Pakistan as a state" was at stake. General Khalid Kidwai further elaborated that this could include Indian conquest of Pakistan's territory or military, "economic strangling," or "domestic destabilization."
- v. Because of India's conventional military superiority, Pakistan maintains the ability to quickly escalate to the use of nuclear weapons in case of a conventional Indian military attack.
- vii. Disarmament and Nonproliferation Policies
 - i. Pakistan is not a signatory to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), and is the sole country blocking the negotiations of the Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT). Pakistanis argue that in the face of India's increasing conventional capability, it is unreasonable to expect Pakistan to cap its fissile materials production. Furthermore, they argue that the FMCT legitimizes India's fissile material stocks. At the Conference on Disarmament (CD) in January 2011, Pakistan reiterated its opposition to the commencement of negotiations towards an FMCT.
 - ii. While declaring its opposition to the FMCT in its current format at the CD in January 2010, Islamabad called for the CD's agenda to be enlarged to consider aspects of regional conventional arms control and a regime on missile-related issues, while also maintaining its opposition to a treaty that did not cover fissile stocks retroactively.
 - iii. In general, Pakistan's position on nuclear disarmament is that it will only give up nuclear weapons if India gives up its own nuclear arsenal, and in 2011 the National Command

Authority "reiterated Pakistan's desire to constructively contribute to the realization of a world free of nuclear weapons."

- iv. However, given Islamabad's objective of balancing India's conventional military and nuclear superiority, Pakistan is unlikely to consent to a denuclearization agreement. Islamabad has also consistently refused to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), and from 2009 to 2010 official Pakistani statements indicated that even if India signed the treaty, Islamabad would not necessarily follow suit.
- v. Pakistan is a member of some multilateral programs, including the Global Initiative to Combat Nuclear Terrorism. Islamabad has also put into place more stringent export control mechanisms, including the 2004 Export Control Act and the establishment of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs' Strategic Export Control Division (SECDIV) to regulate exports of nuclear, biological, and missile-related products.
- vi. The Export Control (Licensing and Enforcement) Rules were published in 2009, and in July 2011 Islamabad issued an updated control list including nuclear and missile-related dual-use goods to bring its restrictions in line with those of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR), and the Australia Group (AG). Pakistan acceded to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (CPPNM) in 2000. Additionally, Pakistan has been involved in the U.S. government's Secure Freight Initiative through the stationing of systems at Port Qasim to scan containers for nuclear and radiological materials.
- viii. Nuclear Weapons Security
 - i. The security of Pakistan's nuclear weapons has been of significant concern to the international community in recent years, with increased terrorist and insurgent violence and expanded geographical areas of the country under Taliban control. Senior Al Qaeda leaders have also expressed an

- interest in co-opting Pakistan's nuclear weapons. Such developments increase the likelihood of scenarios in which Pakistan's nuclear security is put at risk. Since 2007, Taliban-linked groups have successfully attacked tightly guarded government and military targets in the country. Militants carried out small-scale attacks outside the Minhas (Kamra) Air Force Base in 2007, 2008, and 2009, and gained access to the site during a two-hour gunfight in August 2012.
- ii. Pakistani officials have repeatedly denied claims that the base, which houses the Pakistan Aeronautical Complex, is also used to store nuclear weapons, and a retired army official asserted that Pakistan's nuclear weapons are stored separately from known military bases. However, several Pakistani nuclear facilities, including the Khushab facility and the Gadwal uranium enrichment plant, are in proximity to areas under attack from the Taliban. Additionally, there have been some attempts to kidnap officials and technicians working at nuclear sites in western Pakistan, although it is not clear who was responsible or what their intentions were.
 - iii. Nevertheless, Islamabad has consistently asserted that it has control over its nuclear weapons, and that it is impossible for groups such as the Taliban or proliferation networks to gain access to the country's nuclear facilities or weapons. After 11 September 2001 and the exposure of the A.Q. Khan network, Pakistan has taken measures to strengthen the security of its nuclear weapons and installations and to improve its nuclear command and control system.
 - iv. The National Command Authority (NCA), composed of key civilian and military leaders, is the main supervisory and policy-making body controlling Pakistan's nuclear weapons, and maintains ultimate authority on their use. In November 2009, Pakistani ex-President Asif Ali Zardari announced that he was transferring his role as head of the National Command Authority to the ex -Prime Minister, Yusuf Gilani. The Strategic Plans Division (SPD) is the secretariat of the

NCA, and is responsible for operationalizing nuclear doctrine and strategy, managing nuclear safety and security, and implementing the command and control system.

v. Pakistan has also strengthened its personnel reliability program (PRP) to prevent radicalized individuals from infiltrating the nuclear program, although various experts believe that potential gaps still exist. Pakistani analysts and officials state that they have developed their own version of "permissive action links" or PALs to safeguard their warheads, and have not relied on U.S. assistance for this technology. Satellite imagery also shows increased security features around Khushab-4. In recent years, the United States has provided various levels of assistance to Pakistan to strengthen the security of its nuclear program.

vi. According to reports in April 2009, with the expansion of Taliban control in western Pakistan, Islamabad shared some highly classified information about its nuclear program with Western countries in order to reassure them of the country's nuclear security. At the Nuclear Security Summit in The Hague in 2014, Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif announced that Pakistan is considering ratification of the 2005 Amendment to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material (CPPNM).

ix. Civilian Nuclear Cooperation

i. Pakistan has been critical of the U.S.-India nuclear cooperation agreement, but at the same time has periodically sought a similar arrangement for itself, a demand Washington has so far turned down. In 2008 Islamabad pushed for a criteria-based exemption to the rules of the Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), which unlike the country-based exception benefiting only India could have made Pakistan eligible for nuclear cooperation with NSG members. Despite its reservations about the India special exception, Islamabad joined other members of the Board of Governors in approving India's safeguards agreement with

the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in August 2008.

- ii. At the Nuclear Security Summit in Washington in April 2010, Islamabad again sought "non-discriminatory access" to civilian nuclear technology, while also offering nuclear fuel cycle services covered by IAEA safeguards to the international community. At the Nuclear Security Summit in The Hague in 2014, Pakistan called for its inclusion in international export control regimes.

x. Recent Development and Current Status

- i. In response to the U.S.-India deal, Pakistan has sought to increase its civilian nuclear cooperation with China. Under a previous cooperation framework China had supplied Pakistan with two pressurized water reactors, CHASNUPP-1 and CHASNUPP-2, which entered into commercial operation in 2000 and 2011 respectively. In April 2010, reports confirmed long-standing rumors that the China National Nuclear Corporation (CNNC) had agreed to supply two additional 650-MW power reactors to Pakistan, CHASNUPP-3 and CHASNUPP-4.
- ii. These reactors are currently under construction at the Chashma Nuclear Complex and will also be placed under IAEA safeguards. CHASNUPP-3 and CHASNUPP-4 are expected to be completed by 2016 and 2017, respectively. China, a member of the Nuclear Suppliers Group since 2004, did not pursue an exemption to NSG guidelines for Pakistan, instead arguing that Chashma 3 and 4 are "grandfathered in" under the pre-2004 Sino-Pakistan nuclear framework. While the United States has consistently rejected this argument, the deal has been accepted as a "fait accompli" in international fora such as the NSG and the IAEA. In November 2013, Pakistan announced the construction of two additional Chinese-supplied 1,100 MW reactors, KANUPP-2 and KANUPP-3, under a \$9 billion agreement.
- iii. As of early 2014, the Pakistani government has begun a bid for three additional nuclear power plants, reportedly to be

built in the Muzaffargarh district, Punjab province. At a cost of approximately USD 13 billion, this bid could enable Pakistan to meet its 2030 goal of generating 8,800 MW of nuclear energy to solve its chronic power shortages.

12) Nuclear Disarmament Resource collection

i. **Introduction**

- i. Seventy years after their development and their first use in war, nuclear continue to be the basis for a number of states' national security policies. The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) prohibits its state parties from developing nuclear weapons. The treaty, however, exempts five *de jure* nuclear weapon states (NWS) (France, the People's, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States) from this ban. These five states had tested nuclear weapons before the treaty was negotiated in 1968. This "exemption" is, however, countered with a legal obligation in Article VI of the treaty for the five nuclear weapon states to eventually disarm. Three other nuclear armed states—India, Israel, and Pakistan—have not joined the NPT, but are commonly considered as *de facto* nuclear weapon states. Korea withdrew from the NPT in 2003, and tested nuclear devices in 2006, 2009 and 2013.
- ii. More than two decades after the end of the Cold War, approximately 15,700 nuclear warheads remain in the arsenals of eight states (China, France, Israel, India, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States) of which approximately 4,100 are actively deployed. A large amount of fissile material, including directly weapons-useable highly enriched uranium and separated plutonium, still exists in the world today.
- iii. In addition to the nuclear warheads on the territories of the NPT-recognized nuclear weapon states, and non-NPT members (Israel, India, Pakistan, and North Korea), five European NATO countries (Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey) may have approximately 180

U.S. tactical nuclear weapons deployed on their territories in accordance with NATO nuclear deterrence policies.

- iv. Some states believe that the U.S. deployments of nuclear weapons in Europe are contrary to Article I of the NPT, which requires that NWS not "transfer to any recipient whatsoever nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or control over such weapons or explosive devices directly." Previously, the United States deployed nuclear weapons in South Korea and Greece, but it withdrew these weapons in 1991 and 2001, after 33 and 40 years respectively. Credible open source evidence suggests that an estimated 130 U.S. nuclear weapons at the Ramstein Air Base in Germany appear to have been removed in 2005, which reportedly reduced the number of U.S. nuclear weapons in Germany to only 20.
- v. Most recently, several sources suggest that 110 U.S. non-strategic nuclear weapons were removed from the RAF Lake Hatham air base in the United Kingdom, marking the complete withdrawal of U.S. nuclear weapons from the UK.
- vi. However, given the Russian intervention in Ukraine and Russia's apparent violations of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty, withdrawing the remaining U.S. tactical nuclear weapons in Europe has become far less likely to occur in the near-term.
- vii. In sharp contrast to the large number of nuclear weapons in the arsenals or on the territories of a handful of countries, the majority of countries in the world—the non-nuclear-weapon states (NNWS)—are committed to remaining free of nuclear weapons. South Africa, long suspected of having developed a clandestine nuclear weapons program, announced in July 1993 that it had developed a small arsenal before destroying it in 1991 in order to join the NPT as an NNWS. Belarus, Kazakhstan, and Ukraine returned large arsenals of nuclear warheads and associated delivery systems inherited from the former Soviet Union to Russia in the mid-1990s, subsequently joining the NPT as NNWS.

viii. Other countries, including Brazil and Argentina, considered acquiring nuclear weapons, but abandoned their programs before accepting binding restraints on nuclear weapons development. Brazil and Argentina decided to join the NPT in 1994 and 1995, respectively, as NNWS. In further support of their legal obligations under the NPT, a large number of NNWS are parties to nuclear weapon-free zones (NWFZs), and have thereby accepted additional legal obligations not to develop, manufacture, stockpile, acquire, possess, or control any nuclear explosive devices on their territories. Today, more than 110 countries belong to NWFZ treaties. Nuclear weapon-free zones are in force in South America and the Caribbean, Southeast Asia, the South Pacific, Africa, and Central Asia.

ii. Nuclear Disarmament and the Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT)

- i. The NPT prohibits nuclear weapon states from transferring nuclear weapons to, or assisting NNWS in the development of nuclear weapons. At the same time, NNWS are legally required not to receive, manufacture, or acquire nuclear weapons, and to place all their peaceful use nuclear materials and facilities under IAEA safeguards.
- ii. The NPT not only prohibits the manufacture, acquisition, and transfer of nuclear weapons, but Article VI of the treaty also requires all of its state parties to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament, and on a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control." As such, this obligation is one of the three main "pillars" of the treaty, the other two being nuclear nonproliferation and the right to use nuclear technology for peaceful purposes.
- iii. At the 1995 NPT Review and Extension Conference, state parties agreed to indefinitely extend the treaty based on a package of decisions that included Principles and Objectives

for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament, which called for a Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), negotiations on a verifiable treaty banning the production of fissile material for nuclear weapons, and for "systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally."

- iv. Further building on this action plan, the 2000 NPT Review Conference, in its consensus final document, laid out 13 practical steps towards nuclear disarmament, including an "unequivocal undertaking by the nuclear weapons states to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals." This "unequivocal undertaking" was significant in that it re-committed NWS to their Article VI obligations, and for the first time in the NPT's history the NWS agreed to "the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals."
- v. The successes of the 1995 and 2000 NPT Review Conferences were not repeated in 2005. State parties could not agree upon an agenda until the second week, and failed to adopt further substantive recommendations to build upon those adopted in 1995 and 2000. Failure at the 2005 NPT Review Conference epitomized what proved to be, at best, an idle decade for progress in nuclear nonproliferation and disarmament. However, the election of Barack Obama as President of the United States heralded a new era for U.S. engagement in multilateral disarmament diplomacy.
- vi. In the lead-up to the 2010 NPT Review Conference, the United States signed the New START Treaty with Russia, diminished the role of its nuclear arsenal in its new Nuclear Posture Review, and held the first in a scheduled series of Nuclear Security Summits. The second summit was convened in Seoul in 2012, and the third summit was held in the Netherlands in 2014. The next summit is scheduled to be held in the United States in 2016. Although these initiatives will not result in near-term nuclear disarmament, they demonstrated a commitment by the United States to make progress toward the ultimate goal of a "world free of nuclear

weapons" as stated in President Obama's April 2009 Prague Speech.

- vii. Widely considered a success, the 2010 NPT Review Conference's final outcome document included a 64-item action plan covering the NPT's three pillars and a commitment to implement the 1995 Resolution on the Middle East. While the review conference indicated clear divergences continue to exist between the priorities of the NWS and the NNWS, state parties were able to compromise and generate the political will necessary to produce a successful outcome.
- viii. Many NNWS, and mainly the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) countries, strongly supported the idea of negotiating a nuclear weapons convention that would delegitimize nuclear weapons and eliminate them within a clear timeframe. Although these ideas were opposed by the NWS, the final document noted the Secretary General's five-point proposal for nuclear disarmament, including consideration of negotiations on a nuclear weapons convention. The forward-looking action plan sets clear benchmarks for the implementation of Article VI by the NWS.
- ix. Reflecting the lack of progress in nuclear disarmament leading up to the 2015 NPT Review Conference, the RevCon was unsuccessful in producing a final outcome document. The most contentious issues were nuclear disarmament and discussions of a Middle East WMD-Free Zone. The Review Conference highlighted deep divisions between the NWS and NNWS. The discussion on the humanitarian approach to nuclear disarmament drew a wide range of support, but was also a source of tension and disagreement. While disarmament issues prompted the most contentious debates among states parties, in the end, the disagreement over convening a conference on a Middle East WMD-Free Zone prevented the Review Conference from adopting a final document.

iii. Has Any Progress Been Made Towards Disarmament?

- i. The United States has reduced its stockpile by 84% from a Cold War peak of 31,255 warheads in 1967, to the current stockpile of approximately 5,000 operational and reserved warheads. While France has reduced its arsenal unilaterally, and the United Kingdom announced ambitious reductions to its arsenal in 2010, both states plan to maintain a credible nuclear deterrent for the foreseeable future. In contrast to the unilateral reduction measures taken by the NWS, India and Pakistan are believed to be rapidly expanding their nuclear arsenals.

- ii. ***Bilateral Efforts***

1. There is an extensive precedent for bilateral U.S.-USSR/Russia arms control. Since 1969, the United States and Russia have been limiting/reducing their strategic nuclear arsenals through bilateral treaties. These arrangements began modestly with SALT I, which only limited the number of ICBMs and SLBMs, leaving both nations to increase numbers of both bombers and warheads. SALT I also produced the ABM treaty in 1972, which banned nationwide strategic missile defenses (the U.S. withdrew from the ABM treaty in 2002).
2. Following the Cold War, START I (enacted in 1994), placed limitations on the numbers of deployed launchers, and for the first time warheads. While both START II and III failed to materialize, the United States and Russia negotiated the Strategic in 2002. SORT provided for a significant reduction of deployed strategic nuclear warheads in each arsenal to 1,700 - 2,200. However, SORT was often criticized for having a weak verification regime that relied on the START I regime. Fears that this treaty and the START agreement would expire without anything to fill the void were allayed with the signing of the New START Treaty in April 2010, and its subsequent entry into force in February 2011. New START limits the United States and Russia to no more than 1,550 deployed nuclear warheads and 700 launchers by 2018.

3. On 19 June 2013, four years after the groundbreaking Prague speech, President Barack Obama again presented his administration's plan for a world free of nuclear weapons in Berlin, calling for further negotiated nuclear reductions to move beyond Cold War nuclear postures. He stated that his administration will pursue "up to a one-third reduction" in deployed strategic warheads permitted under the New START treaty, reducing those stockpiles to about 1,000 warheads.
4. In addition, President Obama called for a reduction in U.S. and Russian tactical nuclear weapons in Europe (yet to be addressed in any arms control treaty). Furthermore, President Obama stated that the United States will host a nuclear security summit in 2016 to continue to advance efforts to secure nuclear materials around the world. Russia has expressed unwillingness to pursue bilateral nuclear cuts with the United States until other nuclear powers join negotiations.

iii. **Multilateral Efforts**

1. Attempts at negotiating legally binding multilateral nuclear disarmament treaties have proven challenging. The United Nations established the Conference on Disarmament (CD) as the sole multilateral disarmament-negotiating forum in 1979. The 65-member, consensus-ruled body has only negotiated one treaty related to nuclear disarmament over the past 30 years, the Comprehensive in 1996. Widely considered to be a milestone towards nuclear disarmament, the CTBT would prohibit all nuclear testing.
2. Nineteen years after it opened for signature the CTBT has yet to enter into force. Entry into force of the CTBT requires ratification by all states with nuclear power reactors and/or research reactors (in 1996), known as Annex II states. As of November 2014, eight of these countries, including the United States and China, have yet to ratify.
3. Since the conclusion of CTBT negotiations in 1996, the CD has been locked in a perpetual stalemate. Negotiations on

a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT) have not commenced even 18 years after agreement on the Shannon Mandate (a mandate adopted by the CD in 1995 that proposed the negotiation of a treaty banning the production of fissile material [30]). Many consider an FMCT ripe for negotiation and the next logical step toward nuclear disarmament. In 2009, CD member states agreed upon a program of work, CD/1864, but were unable to implement it due to procedural blockages.

4. Over the past three years Pakistan has emerged as the single detractor, objecting on the basis of national security and substance. Pakistan fears its national security will be at risk if its rival and neighbor, India, is left with a larger existing fissile material stockpile, and therefore has the capability to continue to produce nuclear weapons after the implementation of the treaty. Pakistan argues that an FMCT would not address existing stockpiles of fissile materials, and would therefore further nonproliferation but not disarmament.
5. Pakistan's conceptual argument taps into the longstanding confrontation between the nuclear weapon "haves and have nots." Paradoxically, as Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) members, Pakistan and India vocally support nuclear disarmament while simultaneously increasing their nuclear arsenals and delivery systems. Many NAM members and other NNWS believe that the NWS are not fully meeting their Article VI obligation to pursue in good faith negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament.
6. Apart from the bilateral negotiations by Russia and the United States on New START in 2009, there have been no negotiations or efforts on disarmament measures since the conclusion of the CTBT negotiations. Moreover, unilateral and U.S.-Russia reductions have been perceived by many NNWS as nothing more than efforts to streamline existing nuclear arsenals, rather than steps towards complete nuclear disarmament. Perhaps most notably, all nuclear

weapon states (both de jure and de facto) are pursuing some degree of modernization of their nuclear arsenals to increase the weapons' lifetimes, and sometimes to enhance other characteristics (including safety, security, and/or militarily significant characteristics).

7. To circumvent a stalemate in the CD, UN General Assembly Resolution A/RES/67/56 established an open-ended working group (OEWG) in December 2012. This UNGA Resolution authorized the OEWG "to develop proposals to take forward multilateral nuclear disarmament negotiations for the achievement and maintenance of a world without nuclear weapons." The United States, United Kingdom, France, and Russia voted against A/RES/67/56 while China India, Pakistan and Israel abstained.
 8. In their joint explanation of vote, the United States, United Kingdom, and France stated that organizing another process to discuss nuclear disarmament undermined established fora, such as the UNDC and the CD. Furthermore, these states expressed concerns that this new forum did not fit clearly into the NPT framework and focused solely on nuclear disarmament, while the 2010 NPT action plan covered all three pillars of the NPT equally.
- iv. **Other Significant Efforts to Promote Nuclear Disarmament**
1. Certain national governments and members of civil society have cooperated on initiatives to promote progress towards a world free of nuclear weapons. A progressive approach to promote nuclear disarmament was taken by the New Agenda Coalition (NAC). In June 1998, foreign ministers from Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, Slovenia (which later withdrew from the NAC), South Africa, and Sweden (which withdrew in May 2013), issued a statement calling for a new nuclear disarmament agenda, "**Toward a Nuclear-Weapons-Free World: Time for a New Agenda.**" The aim of these like-minded countries is to increase political momentum towards a world free of

nuclear weapons. The NAC have proposed that the five NWS and the three non-NPT nuclear weapon possessors take a number of concrete steps. The NAC played an instrumental role in convincing the NWS to agree to the thirteen practical steps towards nuclear disarmament in the final document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Since its establishment in 1998, the NAC has consistently submitted to the United Nations General Assembly resolutions calling for a world free of nuclear weapons.

2. Around the same time, the Middle Powers Initiative was established in support of non-nuclear weapon states' efforts to reduce and eliminate worldwide nuclear weapons arsenals. The Middle Powers Initiative, in cooperation with middle power governments, works as a catalyst in promoting practical steps toward the elimination of nuclear weapons, and to encourage and educate nuclear weapon states to be more attentive to their disarmament obligations. Following the failure of the 2005 NPT Review Conference, the Middle Powers Initiative launched the "Article VI Forum" in October 2005 to examine the legal, technical, and political requirements to fulfill nonproliferation and disarmament commitments for a nuclear weapon-free world.
3. Several independent international commissions have played an important role by providing expert recommendations in the form of nuclear disarmament action plans. These commissions include the 1996 Canberra Commission on the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons sponsored by the Australian Government, the 1998 Tokyo Forum for Nuclear Nonproliferation and Disarmament sponsored by the Japanese government, and the Weapons of Mass Destruction (WMD) Commission.
4. The Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission was established in 2003 amidst stagnation on nuclear disarmament and serious challenges facing the nuclear

nonproliferation regime. Its report concluded that stagnation in global arms control and disarmament forums could be attributed to the fact "that the nuclear weapon states no longer seem to take their commitment to nuclear disarmament seriously-even though this was an essential part of the NPT bargain, both at the treaty's birth in 1968 and when it was extended indefinitely in 1995." Based on this observation, the Blix Report offered several recommendations for furthering nuclear disarmament through multilateral cooperative actions.

5. Significant among these recommendations was the call on all NPT nuclear weapon states to take steps toward nuclear disarmament as required by the NPT, and the commitments made in connection with the treaty's indefinite extension. Other important recommendations included the early entry-into-force of the CTBT; the immediate commencement of negotiations on a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty without preconditions; the revision by all nuclear possessor states of their nuclear defense doctrines and their use policies; an agreement between Russia and the United States to de-alert their nuclear weapons; and the withdrawal of all non-strategic nuclear weapons to central storage on national territories pending eventual elimination. The commission also encouraged all states possessing nuclear weapons to "start preparing for the outlawing of nuclear weapons through joint practical and incremental measures that include definitions, benchmarks and transparency requirements for nuclear disarmament."
6. An initiative undertaken by four former high- ranking U.S. officials — George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger, and Sam Nunn — created significant momentum for a world free of nuclear weapons. The four statesmen originally published their proposals in a January 4, 2007 *Wall Street Journal* op-ed, "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons," followed a year later by another op-ed, "Toward

a Nuclear Weapon Free World." This initiative came at a critical juncture, with the international community facing new and ongoing nuclear threats, when no new significant arms control reductions between the United States and Russia were being pursued. In addressing the "tremendous dangers" presented by nuclear weapons, the four statesmen argued that "U.S. leadership will be required to take the world to the next stage - to a solid consensus for reversing reliance on nuclear weapons globally as a vital contribution to preventing their proliferation into potentially dangerous hands, and ultimately ending them as a threat to the world." They called on the leaders of the countries in possession of nuclear weapons "to turn the goal of a world without nuclear weapons into a joint enterprise." Such a joint enterprise, they considered, "would lend additional weight to efforts already underway to avoid the emergence of a nuclear-armed North Korea and Iran."

7. In 2008, Japan and Australia established the International Commission on Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament (ICNND), an independent commission co-chaired by Yoriko Kawaguchi, former Foreign Minister of Japan, and Gareth Evans, former Foreign Minister of Australia, to reinvigorate international nonproliferation and disarmament efforts, and to help shape a consensus at the then-upcoming 2010 NPT Review Conference. The ICNND's final report, containing 76 recommendations, was issued in December 2009, advocating a phased approach toward a nuclear weapons free world.
8. Japan and Australia joined together again in September 2010 to create the Nonproliferation and Disarmament Initiative (NPDI). The group originally consisted of ten countries (Australia, Canada, Chile, Germany, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Poland, Turkey and the United Arab Emirates) that aim to facilitate the implementation of the measures from the consensus document of the 2010 NPT Review Conference. Two more countries, Nigeria and

the Philippines, joined the NPDI at its seventh ministerial-level meeting, held on the sidelines of the United Nations General Assembly on September 24, 2013. At its eighth ministerial-level meeting in Hiroshima in April 2014, the NPDI adopted the Hiroshima Declaration that contains concrete proposals for both disarmament and nonproliferation.

9. The NPDI strives to support efforts to negotiate the FMCT, increase nuclear safety and safeguards, encourage the entry into force of the CTBT, and increase transparency in disarmament reporting. At the same time, the NPDI insists that it is more effective to take realistic and practical measures in a progressive manner while engaging nuclear weapons states in order to achieve the goal of a world without nuclear weapons, calling this approach, "building blocks approach." However, consisting mainly of the U.S. allies that are protected by the U.S. extended nuclear deterrence, their disarmament approach toward a world free of nuclear weapons are often considered more moderate than the ones of the NAC or NAM that call for delegitimizing nuclear weapons.

iv. The Humanitarian Initiative for Nuclear Disarmament

- i. The humanitarian impact of nuclear weapons has increasingly drawn attention as a fundamental global concern posed by nuclear weapons. Since the 2010 NPT Review Conference final document expressed deep concern about the catastrophic humanitarian consequences of any use of nuclear weapons, civil society, international organizations, and several state parties (championed by Norway, Switzerland, Austria, Mexico, and New Zealand) have repeatedly highlighted this issue.
- ii. At the 2015 NPT Review Conference, the humanitarian initiative was the center of disarmament discussions. Over the past five years, this issue has gained significant momentum. The Austria-led Joint Statement on the Humanitarian Consequences of Nuclear Weapons delivered

by H.E Sebastian Kurz was sponsored by 159 countries. This is the largest number since a statement was first delivered at the 2012 NPT. The statement emphasized that nuclear weapons should never be used again "under any circumstances."

13) NUCLEAR WEAPONS MODERNIZATION A THREAT TO NPT

- i. Nearly half a century after the five declared nuclear-weapon states in 1968 pledged under the nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty (NPT) to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament," all of the world's nuclear-weapon states are busy modernizing their arsenals and continue to reaffirm the importance of such weapons.
- ii. None of them appears willing to eliminate its nuclear weapons in the foreseeable future. Granted, the nuclear arms race that was a main feature of the Cold War is over, and France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States have reduced their arsenals significantly. Nevertheless, huge arsenals remain, especially in Russia and the United States. China, India, North Korea, Pakistan, and possibly Israel are increasing their stockpiles, although at levels far below those of Russia and the United States. All nuclear-armed states speak of nuclear weapons as an enduring and indefinite aspect of national and international security.
- iii. As a result, the world's nine nuclear-armed states still possess more than 10,000 nuclear warheads combined, of which more than 90 percent are in Russian and U.S. stockpiles. In addition to these stockpiled warheads, those two countries possess thousands of additional nuclear warheads. These warheads, retired but still relatively intact, are in storage awaiting dismantlement. Counting both categories of nuclear warheads, the world's total combined inventory includes an estimated 17,000 nuclear warheads.
- iv. Moreover, many non-nuclear-weapon states that publicly call for nuclear disarmament continue to call on nuclear-armed allies to protect them with nuclear weapons. In fact, five non-nuclear-

weapon states in NATO have volunteered to serve as surrogate nuclear-weapon states by equipping their military forces with the necessary tools to deliver U.S. nuclear weapons in times of war—an arrangement tolerated during the Cold War but entirely inappropriate in the post-Cold War era in which NATO and the United States are advocating strict adherence to nonproliferation norms as a foundation for international security.

- v. Thus, although the numerical nuclear arms race between East and West is over, a dynamic technological nuclear arms race is in full swing and may increase over the next decade. Importantly, this is not just a characteristic of the proliferating world but of all nuclear-armed states. New or improved nuclear weapons programs under way in those countries include at least 27 for ballistic missiles, nine for cruise missiles, eight for naval vessels, five for bombers, eight for warheads, and eight for weapons factories .

14) **United States**

- i. The United States has embarked on an overhaul of its entire nuclear weapons enterprise, including development of new weapons delivery systems and life extension programs (LEPs) for and modernization of all its enduring nuclear warhead types and nuclear weapons production facilities. Moreover, rather than constraining the role of nuclear weapons, the Obama administration's 2013 nuclear weapons employment strategy reaffirmed the existing posture of a nuclear triad of forces on high alert. There are currently approximately 4,650 warheads in the U.S. stockpile, down from 5,113 in 2009, and another 2,700 retired warheads awaiting dismantlement.
- ii. Unlike other nuclear-armed states, the United States has modernized its nuclear arsenal over the past two decades mainly by upgrading existing weapons rather than fielding new types. The intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) force is the final phase of a decade-long, \$8 billion modernization intended to extend its service life until 2030. Similarly, beginning in 2017, the Navy will begin to deploy a modified version of the Trident II D-5 submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM) on ballistic missile

- submarines (SSBNs) to extend its service life through 2040. The Air Force has begun LEPs for the air-launched cruise missile and the B-2 and B-52 bombers.
- iii. Beyond these upgrades of existing weapons, work is under way to design new weapons to replace the current ones. The Navy is designing a new class of 12 SSBNs, the Air Force is examining whether to build a mobile ICBM or extend the service life of the existing Minuteman III, and the Air Force has begun development of a new, stealthy long-range bomber and a new nuclear-capable tactical fighter-bomber. Production of a new guided “standoff” nuclear bomb, which would be able to glide toward a target over a distance, is under way, and the Air Force is developing a new long-range nuclear cruise missile to replace the current one.
 - iv. As is often the case with modernizations, many of these programs will introduce improved or new military capabilities to the weapons systems. For example, the LEP for the B61 gravity bomb will add a guided tail kit to one of the existing B61 types to increase its accuracy. The new type, known as the B61-12, will be able to strike targets more accurately with a smaller explosive yield and reduce the radioactive fallout from a nuclear attack. Other modifications under consideration, such as interoperable warheads that could be used on land- and sea-based ballistic missiles, could significantly alter the structure of the nuclear warheads and potentially introduce uncertainties about reliability and performance into the stockpile. These uncertainties could increase the risk that the United States would need to conduct a nuclear test explosion in the future.
 - v. All told, over the next decade, according to the U.S. Congressional Budget Office, the United States plans to spend \$355 billion on the maintenance and modernization of its nuclear enterprise, an increase of \$142 billion from the \$213 billion the Obama administration projected in 2011.
 - vi. According to available information, it appears that the nuclear enterprise will cost at least \$1 trillion over the next 30 years.
 - vii. These sums are enormous by any standard, and some programs may be curtailed by fiscal realities. Nevertheless, they

indicate a commitment to a scale of nuclear modernization that appears to be at odds with the Obama administration's arms reduction and disarmament agenda. This modernization plan is broader and more expensive than the Bush administration's plan and appears to prioritize nuclear capabilities over conventional ones. The Obama administration entered office with a strong arms control and disarmament agenda, but despite efforts by some officials and agencies to reduce the number and role of nuclear weapons, the administration may ironically end up being remembered more for its commitment to prolonging and modernizing the traditional nuclear arsenal.

15) **NATO**

- i. The new B61-12 is scheduled for deployment in Europe around 2020. At first, the guided bomb, which has a modest standoff capability, will be back fitted onto existing F-15E, F-16, and Tornado NATO aircraft. From around 2024, nuclear-capable F-35A stealthy fighter-bombers are to be deployed in Europe and gradually take over the nuclear strike role from the F-16 and Tornado aircraft.
- ii. Slightly more than 180 B61 bombs are currently deployed in underground vaults inside 87 protective aircraft shelters at six bases in five NATO countries (Belgium, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, and Turkey). About half of the bombs are earmarked for delivery by the national aircraft of these non-nuclear-weapon states, although they all are parties to the NPT and obliged "not to receive the transfer from any transferor whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over such weapons or explosive devices directly, or indirectly." In peacetime, the weapons at the national bases are under the control of a U.S. Air Force munitions support squadron, but in a war, the United States would hand over control of the weapons to the national pilots who would deliver the weapons and effectively violate the NPT at that moment.
- iii. The combination of a guided standoff nuclear bomb and a fifth-generation stealthy fighter-bomber will significantly enhance the military capability of NATO's nuclear posture in Europe. The

upgrade contradicts the Obama administration's pledge that LEPs "will not...provide for new military capabilities" and NATO's conclusion that its nuclear force posture "currently meets the criteria for an effective deterrence and defence posture." Neither the administration nor NATO has officially addressed this contradiction, but officials privately insist, incorrectly, that the B61-12 will not add military capabilities to NATO's posture in Europe. Some NATO countries scheduled to receive the B61-12 have recently begun to ask questions about the B61-12 program via diplomatic channels.

- iv. The modernization also undercuts the U.S. goal to seek "bold reductions" in Russian and U.S. nonstrategic nuclear weapons in Europe and NATO's stated resolve "to create the conditions for a world without nuclear weapons." Moreover, the modernization sends a clear signal to Russia that it is acceptable to enhance nonstrategic nuclear forces in Europe, effectively removing NATO's ability to appeal to Russian restraint.
- v. The extension and modernization of the U.S. nuclear deployment in Europe competes with increasingly scarce resources needed for more-important conventional forces and operations. Conventional forces would be much more credible than tactical nuclear weapons in providing security assurance to eastern NATO allies.

16) **France**

- i. France is in the final phase of a comprehensive modernization of its nuclear forces intended to extend the arsenal into the 2050s. Most significant is the deployment during 2010-2018 of the new M-51 SLBM on the Triumphant-class submarines. The new missile has greater range, payload capacity, and accuracy than its predecessor, the M-45. Starting in 2015, the current TN75 warhead will be replaced with the new TNO (Tête Nucléaire Océanique) warhead. France currently has a stockpile of roughly 300 warheads.
- ii. The modernization of the sea-based leg of the arsenal follows the completion in 2011 of the replacement of the ASMP (Air-Sol Moyenne Portée) air-launched cruise missile, which had a range of 300 kilometers, with the new ASMPA (Air-Sol Moyenne Portée

Amélioré), which has a range of 500 kilometers. The missile has been integrated with two fighter-bomber squadrons—Mirage 2000N K3 aircraft at Istres on the Mediterranean coast and Rafale F3 aircraft at Saint-Dizier northeast of Paris. Eventually, the Istres wing will also be upgraded to Rafale aircraft. The ASMPA carries the new TNA (Tête Nucléaire Aéroportée) warhead.

- iii. A navy version of the Rafale aircraft is deployed on the Charles de Gaulle aircraft carrier based at Toulon. The wing was upgraded to carry the ASMPA missile in 2010, but the weapons are stored on land under normal circumstance and not deployed on the carrier in peacetime.

17) **The United Kingdom**

- i. Of all the nuclear-weapon states, the UK is the country that has progressed furthest toward potential nuclear abolition. Its current stockpile of approximately 225 weapons is scheduled to decline to about 180 by the mid-2020s. After the UK's elimination of its air- and sea-based tactical nuclear weapons in the 1990s, there has been a lively debate about whether the country any longer needs nuclear weapons. For now, however, the government appears determined to replace the current class of four Vanguard-class nuclear-armed submarines with a new class of three to four submarines in the mid-2020s.
- ii. The UK leases its Trident II D5 SLBMs from the United States. These missiles are currently being equipped with the W76-1/Mk4A, a version of the existing warhead that has increased targeting capabilities. The W76-1 is believed to have been modified by UK warhead designers for use on UK missiles.

18) **Russia**

- i. Russia is in the middle of a significant nuclear modernization that marks its attempt to transition from Soviet-era nuclear force structure to something more modern, leaner, and cheaper to maintain. Despite continued financial constraints, the regime of Vladimir Putin has prioritized maintenance and modernization of nuclear forces as symbols of national prestige and, to some extent, compensation for inferior conventional forces. The Russian

- stockpile is estimated at roughly 4,300 warheads, of which approximately 2,000 are for nonstrategic weapons, with another 3,500 retired warheads awaiting dismantlement.
- ii. Within the next decade or more, retirement of all Soviet-era ICBMs and SLBMs will be completed, and these systems will be replaced with various versions of the SS-27 ICBM and the RS-26 (possibly another SS-27 modification) on land and the SS-N-32 Bulava SLBM on a fleet of eight new Borei-class SSBNs. Work is also said to be under way on a new “heavy” ICBM known as the Sarmat to replace the SS-18. Putin promised shortly before the election in 2012 that Russia intends to produce more than 400 land- and sea-based ballistic missiles through the mid-2020s. It remains to be seen how much of that production the Russian military-industrial complex can accomplish.
 - iii. Despite the modernization, the Russian ICBM force already has declined to approximately 300 missiles and is expected to drop further to roughly 250 missiles over the next decade. In order to keep some level of parity with the larger U.S. arsenal, Russia is deploying more warheads on each of its missiles.
 - iv. With regard to the Russian bomber force, the Tu-160 Blackjack, Tu-95MS Bear, and Tu-22M Backfire bombers are all undergoing various upgrades to extend their service lives and improve their military capabilities. In addition, work is currently under way on the design of a subsonic replacement bomber to enter service early in the next decade. A new nuclear cruise missile, known as the KH-102 air-launched cruise missile, has been under development for a long time and may become operational soon.
 - v. As for tactical forces, the new SS-26 Iskander-M short-range ballistic missile is replacing the nuclear-capable SS-21s in 10 brigades, mostly in western and southern military districts. The Su-34 Fullback fighter-bomber is gradually replacing the old Su-24M Fencer in the tactical nuclear strike role, and the Severodvinsk-class, or Yasen-class, SSGN (nuclear-powered, guided-missile attack submarine) is about to enter service with the new long-range Kalibr cruise missile that might have nuclear capability.

- vi. The Russian government has repeatedly stated that modernizing strategic nuclear forces is its priority, but this effort competes with the modernization of conventional forces, which are much more relevant for the type of security challenges facing Russia today.
- vii. Information on Russian nuclear spending is scarce and contradictory. In 2011, Russian news media and analysts reported that Russia planned to spend \$70 billion on new strategic weapons through 2018. That sounds like a considerable amount, but only adds up to \$10 billion per year. That is close to what the U.S. National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA) spends per year on weapons activities.
- viii. Likewise, Russian media in 2012 reported that Russia planned to spend 101 billion rubles on nuclear weapons from 2013 through 2015. That also sounds like a very significant sum, but corresponds to only \$2.9 billion over three years. This does not appear to be the entire nuclear budget; it apparently covers only the “nuclear weapons complex.” If that corresponds to the U.S. nuclear complex—that is, NNSA facilities—then it would imply that Russia spends less than half of what the United States spends on nuclear weapons infrastructure. The buying power in Russia is probably greater, but so is corruption and inefficiency.
- ix. Russia’s overall defense budget has increased. Over the next 10 years, the plan is to spend 19 trillion rubles (\$542 billion) on defense. That is less than the annual U.S. defense budget. Of that amount, strategic nuclear forces are thought to account for about 10 percent, or \$54 billion in total over 10 years. It is unclear what categories are included, but it appears to be roughly 20 percent of the \$30 billion the United States is estimated to spend on its nuclear triad per year.
- x. The Russian economy seems ill equipped to support such investments in nuclear forces that will only constrain resources available for conventional forces. Since 2008, Russia has scaled back and reorganized its military to save money and shed excess or outdated capacity. Ground forces, armor, and infantry

battalions alone have been reduced by about 60 percent since 2008.

- xi. The Putin government's 10-year defense procurement plan adopted in 2010 is intended to replace Soviet-era equipment and bolster deterrence, but U.S. intelligence characterizes the Russian economy as "sluggish" and Putin's defense plan as being hampered by funding, bureaucratic, and cultural hurdles. The difficulty of reinvigorating a military industrial infrastructure that deteriorated for more than a decade after the Soviet collapse is seen by the U.S. intelligence community as complicating Russian efforts. The 2014 budget is "harsh," with a projected deficit of 391 billion rubles (\$12 billion), rising to 817 billion rubles (\$25 billion) in 2015. Additional financial constraints created by the international reaction to the Russian invasion of Crimea would exacerbate this outlook. The Russian nuclear modernization plan therefore seems headed for serious economic and organizational challenges.

19) **China**

- i. Chinese nuclear forces are in the latter phase of a two-decade-long upgrade that includes deployment of new land-, sea-, and air-based nuclear delivery vehicles. This effort is occurring in parallel with a broader modernization of China's general military forces. Unlike the other nuclear members of the NPT, China is increasing the size of its nuclear arsenal, which is currently estimated to be around 250 warheads.
- ii. Although China does not seem to plan a significant increase in the size of its nuclear forces, it is changing the composition of that force and putting more emphasis on mobile systems. The ICBM force is expanding with deployment of the solid-fueled, road-mobile DF-31 and DF-31A in limited numbers to complement the old silo-based, liquid-fueled DF-5A. The DF-31 and DF-31A do not appear to have been very successful; deployment of the DF-31 has stalled, and China may produce a new ICBM to replace the DF-31A.
- iii. Another new development is the Jin-class SSBN with the JL-2 SLBM, a significant improvement over the old Xia/JL-1 weapons

system, which never became fully operational. It is difficult to understand the role of the small fleet of Jin/JL-2 SSBNs under construction given the reluctance of the Chinese leadership to allow deployment of nuclear warheads on missiles under normal circumstances. Given the geographical constraints and the superiority of U.S. attack submarines, it will be a challenge for China to operate SSBNs effectively. Yet, the navy appears to have received permission to build the fleet at least to some extent because of national prestige.

- iv. There are also unconfirmed rumors that China is adding a nuclear capability to ground- and air-launched cruise missiles. If so, it would represent an important addition to the Chinese nuclear posture, particularly in light of Beijing's stated adherence to a doctrine of minimum deterrence.

20) **Pakistan**

- i. For a country with limited resources, Pakistan is spending a considerable amount on modernizing its nuclear forces. New systems under development include the Shaheen II medium-range ballistic missile, Ra'ad air-launched cruise missile, Babur ground-launched cruise missile, and Nasr short-range rocket. Infrastructure upgrades include construction of the third and fourth plutonium-production reactors and upgrades of uranium-enrichment and spent fuel reprocessing facilities. Pakistan's current arsenal is estimated at around 120 weapons.
- ii. At the same time, the Shaheen II missile has been under development for a long time, but might only now become operational, an indication of possible technical difficulties developing the road-mobile, solid-fueled, medium-range ballistic missile. Likewise, although India has embarked on an SSBN program, there is so far no indication that Pakistan is following the example. This is somewhat surprising given the normal tit-for-tat patterns in Pakistani-Indian nuclear competition. Whether this reflects financial constraints is unclear, and it remains to be seen if the Babur cruise missile eventually will be deployed also in a sea-based version.

- iii. Development of the nuclear-capable Nasr short-range missile launcher, whose range is estimated to be 60 kilometers, signals a significant and worrisome tactical addition to Pakistan's nuclear strategy because the weapon is intended for use before a strategic nuclear exchange.

21) **India**

- i. India's nuclear modernization is entering a new and complex phase. After the initial introduction of the Prithvi and Agni missiles, India is developing several long-range Agni systems on new launchers. The first SSBN has been launched and is expected to begin sea trials later this year as the first of a class of perhaps three to five boats with a new SLBM. Construction of a new plutonium-production reactor is expected to start soon along with fast breeder reactors, which can produce more plutonium than they consume, as well as upgrades to reprocessing facilities. India's current stockpile is estimated at around 110 warheads.
- ii. Unlike Pakistan's nuclear posture, which is directed against only India, India's nuclear posture is directed against Pakistan and China. As a result, most of India's current missile development efforts are geared toward developing long-range missiles that can reach all of China. There is a prominent internal debate about the need to deploy canistered launchers—a system in which the missile is carried inside a climate-controlled canister—and equip ballistic missiles with the capability to carry multiple warheads. It remains to be seen what, if any of this, the government will approve.

22) **Israel**

- i. Israel has a relatively small and steady nuclear arsenal. The nuclear stockpile is thought to include around 80 nuclear warheads for delivery by aircraft and ballistic missiles. Nonetheless, there are rumors about modernization.
- ii. One rumor concerns an upgrade of the land-based ballistic missile force from the current Jericho II to a longer-range Jericho III missile based on the Shavit space launch vehicle.

- iii. The air-based leg of Israel's nuclear force could potentially also face modernization as the Israeli air force acquires the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter from the United States.
- iv. There are persistent rumors that Israel may have converted a cruise missile to nuclear weapons capability for its new Dolphin-class attack submarines. The rumors have focused on the Popeye Turbo or Harpoon missiles, but the status of the weapon remains unclear. If this conversion is taking place, the submarines would provide Israel with a new limited-range offensive capability and more-secure retaliatory capability.

23) **Conclusions**

- i. Despite significant reductions in the overall number of nuclear weapons compared with the Cold War era, all of the world's nine nuclear-armed states are busy modernizing their remaining nuclear forces for the long haul. None of the nuclear-armed states appears to be planning to eliminate its nuclear weapons anytime soon. Instead, all speak of the continued importance of nuclear weapons.
- ii. The pace of nuclear reductions appears to be slowing as Russia and the United States shift their focus to sustaining their arsenals for the indefinite future. Three of the nuclear-armed states are increasing their arsenals, and nuclear competition among the nuclear-armed states appears to be alive and well.
- iii. Despite the financial constraints facing several of the nuclear-armed states, these states appear committed to spending hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade on modernizing their nuclear forces.
- iv. Perpetual nuclear modernization appears to undercut the promises made by the five NPT nuclear-weapon states. Under the terms of that treaty, they are required to "pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament." Nearly 50 years after this promise was first made, the non-nuclear-weapon states, who in return for that commitment renounced nuclear weapons for themselves, can rightly question

whether continued nuclear modernization in perpetuity is consistent with the NPT.

- v. Without some form of limitations on the pace and scope of nuclear modernization, the goals of deep cuts in and eventual elimination of nuclear weapons remain elusive and appear increasingly unlikely as continued reaffirmation of the value of nuclear weapons, sustained by a global nuclear competition, threatens to extend the nuclear era indefinitely.

Topic 21

Contemporary Issues: Palestine Issue

Key Points of Palestinian problem

- ii. Zionism is a race-based program of ethnic cleansing, designed from the very beginning to dispossess the indigenous natives from their homeland.
- iii. If we assume that Israel is a democracy, that does not necessarily make it a "better" country or one which can freely trample the human rights of others.
- iv. Israel is not US's "ally." Is it a dependent client state.
- v. Israel's oppression of the Palestinians is the major source of conflict in the world today. It is the major cause of terrorism and hatred of the US.
- vi. Israel is a democracy in exactly the same way South Africa was a democracy up until 1994. It is an apartheid democracy with a system weighted toward the privileges of a particular race. It is NOT a true democracy.
- vii. Zionism is colonialism.
- viii. The Arabs of Palestine did not leave "voluntarily" in 1948. They were forced out by extensive, methodical terrorism by Jewish guerrilla groups and by fleeing combat operations.
- ix. Refusal to allow persons displaced by war to return to their homes is a direct violation of the most basic of human rights treaties and a violation of several major agreements in international law.
- x. The fact that the Jews "conquered" the West Bank does not allow them to keep it. Hussein "conquered" Kuwait, did we let him keep it? Milosovitch "conquered" Kosovo; was that OK?
- xi. The solution to peace in the region is for Israel to withdraw its army of occupation, both military and civilian back to pre-1967 borders.
- xii. Where the border is drawn is irrelevant to Israel's "security." No matter where you draw the border there will be Jews on one side and Arabs on the other.
- xiii. The fact that a minority of Palestinians still wish the destruction of Israel is not an excuse to keep the entire population imprisoned in a ghetto.

- xiv. Once Palestinians have true freedom and the chance to build a future, they themselves will be motivated to mollify and silence the radical fringe minority.
- xv. Almost no terrorism is initiated by the one million Arabs who live inside Israel. Why? Because they have freedom and hope for the future.
- xvi. Terrorism by Lehi, the Irgun and the Haganah played a significant role in the establishment of Israel. Ben-Gurion himself frequently referred to himself and his group as "terrorists."
- xvii. Ariel Sharon himself is guilty of some of the most heinous, cruel and heartless acts of terrorism as leader of Group 101.
- xviii. A significant portion of the Jewish population of Israel (60% by some polls) want the Arabs of the West Bank to be rounded up into concentration camps and then expelled into diaspora. This is unabashed racism and ethnic cleansing.
- xix. Opposing Israel's admittedly "controversial" policies does NOT make you an anti-Semite.
- xx. The Palestinians are fighting for freedom, liberty and justice; things that we Americans can identify with.

Israeli- Palestinian conflict issues and history in brief.

8) Divisive History

History's legacy created divisive issues between Palestinians and Israelis. Judea, home of the Jews in ancient times, was conquered by the Romans and renamed Palestine. Palestine was later conquered and inhabited by Arabs for over a thousand years. The Zionist movement arose to restore the Jews to Israel, largely ignoring the existing Arab population. Following the Balfour Declaration in 1917, Palestine was granted to Britain as a League of Nations mandate to build a national home for the Jewish people. The Arabs resented the Jews coming in to take their land. Led by Grand Mufti Hajj Amin El Hussein, they rioted repeatedly and later revolted, creating a history of enmity between Jews and Arabs in Palestine. Britain stopped Jewish immigration to Palestine. Following the Holocaust, in which 6 million Jews were killed by the Nazis, pressure on Britain increased to allow Jewish immigration to Palestine. In 1947, the UN partitioned the land into Arab and Jewish states. The Arabs did not accept the partition and war broke out.

The Jews won a decisive victory, expanded their state and created several hundred thousand Palestinian refugees. The Arab states refused to recognize Israel or make peace with it. Wars broke out in 1956, 1967, 1973 and 1982, and there were many terror raids and Israeli reprisals. Each side believes different versions of the same history. Each side views the conflict as wholly the fault of the other and expects an apology.

9) Occupation, Land & Settlements

Israel has occupied the West bank and Gaza Strip (about 2,200 square miles) since the 1967 6-day war, and has built settlements with a population of about 220,000, mostly in the West Bank. Palestinians demand withdrawal from all of the land conquered in the 1967 and evacuation of the settlements. Israel continued to expand settlements throughout the peace process that began in 1993 and continues to do so today. In the final status negotiations at Camp David and Taba, Israel offered to turn over 97% of the land in the West Bank and all of Gaza, as well as Arab sections of Jerusalem. This offer was turned down by the Palestinians.

10) Palestinian State

Originally formed to regain all of Palestine for the Palestinian Arabs, the Palestine Liberation Organization signaled that it would accept a two state solution in 1988. The Oslo accords were supposed to have led to a peaceful resolution of the conflict, but continued Israeli settlement and Palestinian violence and incitement degenerated into open conflict in September 2000.

Mainstream Palestinians demand a state in the West Bank and Gaza. Right wing Israelis are opposed to creating a state, because, they claim, it would be a base for terror groups. In final status negotiations, the Israeli government agreed to a demilitarized Palestinian state with limited control over its borders and resources - a "state minus." The Palestinians have won a commitment for a state from the UN, and from US President Bush. The Road Map peace plan is intended to result in a Palestinian state. The Oslo Accords and the Road Map are opposed by Palestinian extremist groups like Hamas and by Zionist extremists.

11) Refugees

About 726,000 Palestinians were expelled or fled their homes in 1948 in the war that followed the creation of Israel, and additional Palestinians fled in 1967. There are now about 4 million Palestinian refugees. Many of them live in crowded refugee camps in poor conditions in the West Bank and Gaza, in Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Iraq. Palestinians demand that these refugees should have the right to return to their homes in Israel under UN General Assembly Resolution 194. Israelis note that an almost equal number of Jews fled Arab lands to Israel in 1948. Israelis oppose return of the refugees because that would create an Arab Palestinian majority and would put an end to Israel as a Jewish state. Most Palestinian groups, including the Fateh, agree, and openly proclaim that resolution of the refugee issue by granting right of return would mean the end of Israel.

12) Palestinian Terror

Almost all Palestinian groups were founded with the declared aim of destroying Israel by violence, and had a history of terrorist activities. Only the PLO (Palestine Liberation Organization) has renounced this aim officially. In 1993, the PLO signed the Oslo Declaration of Principles, renouncing violence and agreeing to honor UN SC Resolution 242, which implicitly recognizes the right of Israel to exist. In return, Israel allowed the PLO to enter the West Bank and Gaza strip, and Palestinians gained autonomous control of most of the population of these areas. Extremist Palestinian groups that objected to the agreements began a campaign of ambushes and suicide bombings against Israel. The Palestine National Authority claimed they could not control the dissident groups. Final status negotiations faltered in September 2000. Ariel Sharon visited the Temple mount (Haram as Sharif), which includes the Al-Aqsa mosque on September 28, though he did not enter either of the mosques.. This ignited violent riots, that were met with lethal force by the IDF. The violence became generalized "resistance," called "the Intifadeh," and involving large sectors of the population as well as the Palestine National Authority itself, and the Palestinian police force set up by the Oslo agreements. Polls indicate that about half the Palestinians believe that the aim of the Intifadeh is to destroy Israel. Since September 28, 2000, Palestinians have killed over a thousand Israelis in terror and suicide attacks. Israelis have killed over 3,500 Palestinians in "defense" operations and reprisals, including many civilians.

The Intifadeh destroyed the belief of many Israelis in the possibility of peace, and destroyed the credibility of Yasser Arafat and the PLO as peace partners. Israeli retaliation and repression further embittered the Palestinians.

13) Israeli Repression

Israel responded to Palestinian violence at the beginning of the Oslo process by limiting the flow of Palestinian workers to Israel to prevent infiltration of terrorists, and by strict checks at border checkpoints. The border closing drastically reduced the Palestinian standard of living. Palestinians who did come to work were often subjected to humiliating searches and very long waits at checkpoints. Following terror attacks at the checkpoints, nervous IDF (Israel Defense Forces - the Israeli Army) soldiers sometimes were too quick to open fire on suspicious vehicles, killing innocent civilians. Checkpoints around Jerusalem made it difficult for Palestinians to get to work in Jerusalem and to travel between Palestinian towns.

After September 2000, Israeli reprisals for Palestinian terror raids became increasingly severe, including assassinations of wanted terrorists that Palestinians refused to arrest. Following a series of deadly suicide bombings in March of 2002, Israel launched operation Defensive Wall in the West Bank and has since reoccupied most of the territories ceded to to the Palestinians in the West Bank. The IDF set up additional checkpoints and has kept towns under virtual siege with extended periods of curfew, disrupting work, education and daily life. Ditches surround towns, preventing people from leaving. The IDF has killed over 3,500 Palestinians, demolished houses and uprooted olive groves. After a recent IDF study showed that the demolitions do not deter suicide bombings, demolitions of the houses of suicide bombers were discontinued, but houses are still demolished for other reasons.

In addition to measures taken to ensure security, Israeli extremist settlers have harassed Palestinians, destroyed property, uprooted olive trees and killed several Palestinians in doubtful circumstances. The perpetrators are rarely identified and almost never prosecuted.

14) Israeli Security

The area of Israel within its pre-1967 armistice borders is slightly less than 8,000 square miles. The distance from Tel Aviv to the green line border of

Israel (West Bank) is about 11 miles.(see map of distances), Tel Aviv, Jerusalem and other Israeli cities are within artillery range of any Palestinian state. Israel therefore insists on guarantees that a Palestinian state would be demilitarized. The West Bank has enormous strategic importance to any country wishing to invade Israel. Israel therefore insists on guarantees that the Palestinian state would not allow a foreign army to enter its borders, and has insisted on bases within the West Bank.

15) Water

The land has always had a scarcity of water. The Israel National Water Carrier has made possible a high population density and standard of living. The carrier pumps water from the Sea of Galilee and carries it to areas in the center and south of Israel as well as for Palestinian areas. In one day it delivers the volume of water used in all of 1948, but it is not enough. The aquifers that supply Israel's central area lie in the West Bank. The Jordan river flows through territory that would be part of Palestine. Both sides need water for survival and development and want to ensure an adequate water supply from the limited resources available. Israel has reserved for its own use a large percentage of the water in West Bank aquifers.

16) Jerusalem

Jerusalem was to have been internationalized under the UN Partition plan. Both sides have claims on the eastern part of Jerusalem. Jerusalem was the ancient capital of Judea and site of the Jewish holy temple, of which only the Western Wall remains (right). It is also the site of the Al-Aqsa mosque (left) - regarded by many as the third holiest site in Islam. Jewish and Arab neighborhoods are closely interwoven and would be difficult to separate. More about Jerusalem.

17) Current Issues in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

- I. Death of Yasser Arafat - Following the death of Yasser Arafat a new era began in Palestinian history and in Israeli-Palestinian relations. Mahmoud Abbas (Abu Mazen) was elected President ("Rais") of the Palestinian National Authority with a comfortable majority in free and democratic elections. Abbas vowed to put an end to terror and to negotiate peace based on Israeli withdrawal from all the lands of the

West Bank and Gaza, a Palestinian capital in Jerusalem, and "return of the Palestinian refugees."

- II. Hamas election victory - In elections held in January 2006, the Hamas movement won a majority of seats in the Palestinian Legislative Council and formed a government. This was eventually expanded into a unity government that included the Fatah, until June of 2007. The Hamas refuse to recognize the right of Israel to exist or to make peace with Israel.
- III. Recognizing Israel - A majority of Palestinians want the radical Hamas movement which won an upset victory over the Fateh in PLC elections in January, 2006 to recognize Israel and negotiate peace. Hamas officials say they "recognize that Israel exists" but also state that they will never recognize the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish state, and will never make peace with Israel. European and American leaders pledged not to negotiate with Hamas and not to provide aid to the Palestinians until Hamas agreed to disarm and recognize Israel. Hamas spokesmen sent mixed signals, but vowed never to recognize Israel and never to give up their claim to all of Palestine, though a majority of Palestinians apparently want them to follow the path of peace.
- IV. Palestinian Unity and Quartet boycott - The Quartet countries have officially boycotted the Hamas led government until they agree to recognize Israel and end violence. The boycott has been circumvented to allow provision of funds for salaries directly to Palestinian employees. In March of 2007, Hamas and Fateh concluded a unity agreement in Mecca, allowing for formation of a unity government with a vague platform. Palestinians called on Western governments to recognize the new government and end the boycott. Quartet members will talk to non-Hamas members of the new government. Israel insisted it would maintain relations only with Mr. Abbas, who is President and not part of the government.
- V. Collapse of the Palestinian authority - In June of 2007, following growing anarchy in Gaza, Hamas militants attacked Fatah/Palestinian authority positions in Gaza, including military posts, government buildings, and hospitals, and drove the Fatah out of the Gaza strip. Palestinian PM Mahmoud Abbas dissolved the unity government and announced he would form a different government based in the West

Bank. In the West Bank, Fatah militants arrested Hamas officials and Hamas fighters. At present (June 16) there are two separate governments in the Web Bank and Gaza. This makes the future of any peace process very uncertain.

- VI. Truce and violence - Mahmoud Abbas tried to convince Palestinian militant groups to declare a truce and refrain from attacking Israel, while Israel declared that it would refrain from assassinations and hunting down wanted terrorists except in emergencies. The truce was kept imperfectly (June 2007) and flickered on and off. Israel continued to arrest wanted Palestinians and people on their way to terror attacks in the West Bank, while Palestinians continued to fire Qassam rockets (see below) from Gaza. Israeli reprisals in Gaza killed civilians as well as armed terrorists.
- VII. Security - Abbas has declared again and again that he will not use force against armed groups. At the same time, he has insisted that "the law will be enforced" and that the PNA would not permit chaos and independent actions by armed groups. The year 2005 however, was plagued by attacks of Fatah and Hamas factions against Palestinian institutions, as well as a suicide attack apparently instigated by the Syrian branch of Islamic Jihad.
- VIII. Provisional State versus Final Status - The quartet roadmap calls for considering a Palestinian state within provisional borders as an option, which is favored by Israelis and the United States, while Abbas is insisting on final status status negotiations and claims he does not want a state with provisional borders.
- IX. Qassam Rockets - Beginning in 2001, Palestinian groups in the Gaza strip have been firing Qassam rockets, initially at Israeli settlements in the Gaza strip and later at civilian targets inside Israel. The firing escalated after the Hamas took power. The rockets have claimed about a dozen lives and done extensive property damage. The town of Sderot has been subject to a daily barrage of Qassam rockets in 2007.
- X. Kidnapped Soldier - In June of 2006, groups affiliated with the Hamas, including those who later kidnapped BBC reporter Alan Johnston, crossed the border into Israel and kidnapped Corporal Gilad Shalit. He is being held for ransom against freeing of an unspecified large number of Palestinian prisoners. Israel insists that serious negotiations about

final status issues cannot be restarted until Shalit is returned. Palestinian negotiators were apparently offered release of over 1,000 prisoners in return for Shalit, but turned the offer down.

- XI. Israeli Security Handover - Israel is supposed to hand over security responsibilities in West Bank cities, gradually lifting the siege and returning conditions to what they were before the start of the violence in 2000.
- XII. The "security barrier" (Apartheid Wall) - A "security barrier" being built inside the West Bank cuts off Palestinians from their lands and from other towns, and destroys olive groves and other property according to Palestinians. The route of the fence has been changed several times under international pressure. Today (October 2005) it includes about 7% of West Bank territory on the Israeli side of the barrier. An International Court of Justice (ICJ) advisory ruling declares the barrier to be in violation of international law. Since the barrier was built, Israeli casualties decreased dramatically, and the IDF claims that it is vital to preventing terror attacks. An Israeli Supreme Court ruling declared that the fence is not illegal in principle, but that the route must be changed to optimize the balance between security and humanitarian concerns. More about the Security Barrier ("Apartheid Wall")
- XIII. Prisoners - Israel holds thousands of Palestinian prisoners, of whom about 500 were released in February of 2005, and an additional group of over 450 are to be released soon. Palestinians want release of all prisoners, especially women and minors. Israel is unwilling to release prisoners who have served less than two-thirds of their sentence and those who were directly involved in attacks ("blood on their hands").
- XIV. Disengagement - The Israeli Government decided to unilaterally withdraw from the Gaza Strip and from 4 settlements in the West Bank, evacuating about 8,000 settlers. After the death of Yasser Arafat, it partially coordinated the move with the Palestinians. Disengagement was completed without major incidents by September of 2005, but was followed by considerable chaos within Gaza. (Click for Israel Disengagement Map) (Click for more about disengagement).
- XV. Safe Passage and open borders - Palestinians living in Gaza have very restricted access to the outside world. A safe passage for Gazans to the West Bank was supposed to have been implemented under the Oslo

accords but never came into being. Israel favors a rail link, while Palestinians want a motor road. Most border crossings between Gaza and Israel have been closed since disengagement. The Rafah border crossing with Egypt was supposed to be closed at one point, but Palestinians overwhelmed the guards and Hamas exploded a portion of the barrier, allowing Palestinians to cross freely for a brief time before the crossing was closed again. Israel wanted the crossing to remain closed for several months, and wanted to open a crossing at Kerem Shalom in Israeli territory, which unlike Rafah, would be partly under Israeli control. In the fall of 2005, however, the Rafah Crossing was opened under European Union, Egyptian and Palestinian supervision, with Israeli remote monitoring via TV cameras. Israel promised to implement safe passage but did not do so. Even so, the crossing is open only intermittently. In the West Bank, numerous checkpoints restrict the movement of Palestinians.

- XVI. Israeli Outposts - Under the roadmap, Israel had undertaken to evacuate illegal "outposts" set up by settlers with government knowledge, but without formal approval, after March 2001. There are estimated to be about 28 such outposts by the government. Peace Now estimates there are 53 such outposts. In all, there are over 100 outposts, including those erected before the cutoff date. The Sasson report released March 9, 2005 catalogued extensive misuse of government funds for building settlements, though most of the information had been known beforehand. Israeli PM Ariel Sharon promised once again to evacuate the outposts. No substantial progress was made, however, as late as June 2007.
- XVII. In July 2014 Israel again has taken military action against the former occupied territory of Gaza in retaliation for ongoing terrorist attacks. The development has made peace efforts in the region as illusive as ever.

18) Peace Proposals

Official peace plans include the quartet roadmap, and the Arab League initiative for Arab-Israeli peace. Various informal initiatives for solving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict have been proposed. The most popular is the Geneva Accord, under which Israel would return approximately the territories outside the current route of the security fence, and cede parts of Jerusalem to the Palestinians, and Palestinian refugees would return to the

Palestinian state, but not to Israel. The Ayalon Nusseibeh Agreement incorporates similar principles but is much less detailed. No informal accord has been approved by Israeli or Palestinian governments.

Key UN resolutions on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict

In 1974, the General Assembly adopted a resolution recognizing the right of Palestine Arabs, including those in Israel, to nationhood. A second resolution gave observer status to the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), a group approved by Arab countries to represent the Palestinians. This international designation of the PLO as an official representative for Palestinian interests was an important step in the peace process. The United Nations Security Council has consistently opposed Israel's practice of establishing settlements in occupied territories and its policy to settle East Jerusalem and to designate Jerusalem as its capital.

Both the United Nations general assembly and its 15-member security council, the body with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security, have passed resolutions relating to the division of the former British mandate of Palestine and the subsequent Arab-Israeli conflict since the 1947. The security council has alone passed over 200.

Unlike that body, the general assembly does not have the power to make its resolutions legally binding under the UN charter. However, it is an important indicator of international opinion and today called on Israel to dismantle its West Bank "security fence". Its other notable resolutions include the following:

- 7) 181: The 1947 resolution that endorsed the partition plan for Palestine.
- 8) 3379: Passed in 1975, resolution 3379 stated that Zionism to be a form of racism and racial discrimination. This has remained a controversial topic, and its resurgence at the UN 2001 anti-racism summit in South Africa saw both Israel and the US walk out.
- 9) The security council's resolutions deal with the day-to-day and year-to-year episodes in the conflict. Though not explicitly legally-binding as those issued under chapter seven of the charter (which include the 1950 and 1991 resolutions ahead of the Korean and Gulf wars), they have consistently called for actions to bring peace forward. They include:

- i. 242: The most important of the security council's resolutions. Issued after the 1967 war, when Israel captured the Sinai peninsula from Egypt, the Golan Heights from Syria and the West Bank from Jordan, it calls for the withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from the recently occupied territories and a "just settlement of the refugee problem". Its language is ambiguous. It does not set out what a "just" solution for the Palestinian refugees would entail and there are disputes over its translation, but resolution 242 remains the basis for most peace plans. It also speaks of the necessity for "sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognised boundaries."
- ii. 338: Issued after the 1973 Yom Kippur war, it reaffirmed 242 and called for its immediate implementation.
- iii. 425: Adopted in March 1978, it called on Israel to cease military action "against Lebanese territorial integrity and withdraw forthwith its forces". Israel withdrew from Lebanon in 2000 though it retains the disputed Shebaa Farms area.
- iv. 681: Passed on December 20, 1990, weeks before the 1991 Gulf war, it calls for an international conference on the Middle East as a means of keeping together the international coalition backing the use of force to expel Saddam Hussein's Iraq from Kuwait.
- v. 1322: Issued in October 2000, at the beginning of the current intifada, it expressed concern over tragic events that had taken place since September 28 of that year, when Ariel Sharon provoked Palestinian ire with a visit to the site of the al-Aqsa mosque in Jerusalem. It noted the "numerous deaths and injuries, mostly among Palestinians" that followed and reaffirmed that a "just and lasting solution to the Arab and Israeli conflict" must be based on its resolutions 242 and 338.

Role of US and British

The United States has exercised considerable diplomatic efforts over the past three decades in promoting a peaceful solution to the Israeli/Arab conflict. The U.S. is generally regarded with distrust by the Arab world because of its close ties to Israel but it is in a position to be persuasive with Israel when

there have been difficulties in the negotiations. Present U.S. policy is consistent with the principles set forth in the 1978 Camp David Accords in that the status of the Gaza Strip and the West Bank is to remain unresolved until there is a final agreement between interested parties. The U.S. also recognizes that Jerusalem has a special status and the resolution of issues pertaining to Gaza and the West Bank might be different than those pertaining to Jerusalem.

US Endorsement of Israel

The majority of countries in the Middle East have been U.S. allies throughout the Cold War to the present, including Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Qatar, Bahrain, the UAE, Oman, pre-Khomeini Iran, Pakistan, Yemen, Turkey, Morocco, Tunisia, Sudan, Somalia, Lebanon, Jordan and Egypt. Not only is the US heavily dependent upon the region's oil, but it has also used the territory of these countries as strategic American bases. Most Islamic nations have shared in the US goal of opposing communism, and the 1991 Gulf War demonstrated the willingness of the Middle Eastern nations to work with the United States, proving that the U.S. can operate in the Middle East without Israeli land, equipment, or personnel.

Israel, on the other hand, said Lt. Col. Abo-Sak, "has no strategic, social or political depth in the region and has no coalition partners in the Middle East." Indeed, it has been in a state of war with each of its surrounding neighbors since its creation. In addition, during the US-led coalition against Iraq in 1990, Israel effectively blackmailed the United States for being kept out of the conflict, coming away with almost \$2 billion in military equipment and economic support.

"While the United States has been enjoying the benefits of its Arab and Islamic Middle Eastern friendships," said the Colonel, "Israel has been enjoying the benefits of strong U.S. support" – and at the Palestinians' expense.

America's unquestioned support of Israel has led some Arabs to call it "Americael." The US involvement and endorsement of Israel is complicating

the future for the US presence in the region and is not serving the interests of the American people, said Lt. Col. Abo-Sak.

Britain's Role:

- 15) The Middle East Peace Process: Resolving the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is one of our top foreign policy priorities. This conflict matters to British national security, and to the security of the entire region, and we will take every opportunity to help promote a peaceful 2-state solution.
- 16) Gaza crisis: On 15 July, Foreign Secretary Philip Hammond welcomed the Egyptian ceasefire initiative and urged parties in Gaza and Israel to take this opportunity to end hostilities.
- 17) The search for Middle East Peace continues to be an urgent priority in 2014. This conflict matters to British national security, and to the security of the entire region, and we will take every opportunity to help promote a peaceful two-state solution.
- 18) We want to see a stable, prosperous Middle East with a sovereign and viable Palestinian State living in peace alongside a secure Israel at the heart of it.
- 19) Our goal is a negotiated two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, resulting in a secure and universally recognised Israel living alongside a sovereign and viable Palestinian state, based on the borders of 1967, with Jerusalem the future capital of both states, and a just, fair and agreed solution for refugees.
- 20) The UK will continue to do all it can to support and advance efforts for peace, including by working with the EU to support the parties in taking the difficult decisions necessary to resume serious dialogue. We do not underestimate the challenges but firmly believe that if both parties show bold leadership, peace is possible.
- 21) Settlements: We are concerned by developments that threaten the viability of the two-state solution. Changing circumstances, in particular the construction of settlements on occupied land in the West Bank and East Jerusalem, mean that the two-state solution is slipping away. Our position on Israeli settlements in the Occupied Palestinian Territories is clear: they are illegal under international law, an obstacle to peace and make a two-state solution harder to achieve. We

consistently urge the Israeli authorities, including at the highest levels, to cease all settlement building, revoke previous announcements and to remove illegal outposts, as required under international law.

- 22) Supporting development in the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPTs): The Department for International Development (DFID) is helping to build Palestinian institutions and promote economic growth, so that any future state will be prosperous and an effective partner for peace.
- 23) International law obligations: We believe that Israel has legal obligations as an occupying power with respect to the Occupied Palestinian Territories under applicable international law and international humanitarian law, including the Fourth Geneva Convention.
- 24) We have a regular dialogue with the Government of Israel about the implementation of those obligations and raise our serious concerns regarding such issues as treatment of Palestinian prisoners, including children, demolitions of Palestinian property, restrictions on movement and access.
- 25) In Jerusalem we are funding the Jerusalem Community Advocacy Network (JCAN), which assists and empowers Palestinian residents of East Jerusalem to attain their legal, economic and social rights.

References

- 1) Globalization of World Politics
- 2) BBC News
- 3) Other Online Sources

**Aur Allah jise Chahta hai Izzat deta hai
aur jise Chahta hai Zillat deta hai.
(Surah Imran)**

Compiled by:

Amir Khan Mahar

www.facebook.com/Central.Superior.Services123