

## **COLD WAR (1945-1985) MEANING, CAUSES, SECURITY PACTS AND CONFLICTS OF COLD WAR**

### **Unit Structure :**

- 1.0 Objectives
- 1.1 Introduction
- 1.2 Meaning and Origin of the Cold War:
- 1.3 Causes of the Cold War:
- 1.4 Security Pacts
- 1.5 Conflicts of Cold War
- 1.6 Summary
- 1.7 Questions
- 1.8 References

---

### **1.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

- 1) To understand the meaning and origin of the Cold War.
- 2) To analyse the causes of Cold War
- 3) To examine various Security Pacts signed between the nations of Cold War

---

### **1.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

The Cold War was the post-Second World War phenomenon that led to the formation of two major power blocs – the Capitalist bloc and the Communist bloc. With the end of the Second World War in 1945, the Fascist and Nazi dictatorship in Europe, and Japanese military dictatorship in Asia came to an end. The Western democracies led by the U.S.A. and the Communist regime of the U.S.S.R. joined to defeat the Axis Powers - Germany, Italy and Japan. With the defeat of the fascist forces, both the super powers tried to dominate the world and tried to spread their own brand of ideology. This led to an age of suspicion, rivalry and conflict between these two superpowers. The strained relations that developed between these two superpowers following the Second World War came to be known as the 'Cold War'. Thus, the Cold War was post-1945 struggle between two blocs of nations led by

the United States and the Soviet Union. The Cold War was waged on political, economic, and propaganda fronts and had only limited recourse to weapons. Intense economic and diplomatic struggles erupted between the two rival power blocs, including the extension of the contest across the world through proxy conflicts in the Third World. Different interests led to mutual suspicion and hostility in an escalating rivalry rooted in ideology. Paradoxically, the Cold War secured military peace in Europe for almost 50 years.

---

## **1.2 MEANING AND ORIGIN OF THE COLD WAR**

---

The American financier and presidential adviser, Bernard Baruch has been considered as the originator of the term 'Cold War'. During a congressional debate on 16 April 1947, Bernard Baruch first used the term. He remarked: "Let us not be deceived today that we are in the midst of a Cold War." Walter Lippmann who through his book entitled 'Cold War' popularized it picked up the term. Following this, the term Cold War has been used to describe the relations between the Western democratic capitalist bloc led by the United States and the Eastern Communist bloc led by the Soviet Union since the end of the Second World War.

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

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

conceivable field of international life, especially in national defense, economic growth, diplomacy and ideology.”

---

## 1.3 CAUSES OF THE COLD WAR

---

### 1.3.1. Conflicting Ideology:

Though the Cold War manifested itself after the Second World War, the differences between the Soviet Union and the Western powers could be traced to the establishment of the Communist rule in Russia following the Bolshevik Revolution in 1917. The basic cause of conflict lay in differences of principle between the communist states and the liberal capitalist-democratic states. The communist system has been based on organizing the state and society in line with the ideas of Karl Marx. Marxism embodied the principle that the wealth of a country should be collectively owned and shared by everybody. The economy should be centrally planned and the interests and well-being of the working classes safeguarded by the state. The capitalist system on the other hand, operates on the basis of private ownership and the driving forces behind capitalism have been private enterprise and laissez faire with a view of making profits.

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

### 1.3.2. Dominance of Soviet Russia Over Eastern Europe:

When the defeat of Nazi Germany was imminent Stalin decided to take advantage of the situation to extend Soviet influence over large part of Europe. With the collapse of the military machine Stalin tried to acquire vast regions of Germany, Finland, Poland and Romania. The Soviet occupation of Eastern and Central Europe by Soviet forces was viewed with great apprehension by the Western powers. Stalin failed to

honour the pledges included in the Yalta and Balkan Agreements. At Yalta (1945) the Western powers had acknowledged Russia's military authority over Eastern and Central Europe. However, it was agreed that in all the liberated countries of Europe democratic institutions would be created after holding free elections. In spite of these pledges, the Soviet Union established a communist regime in Poland. Similarly, Soviet supported regimes were established in other Central and Eastern European countries. These included Finland, Bulgaria, Romania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and East Germany. Communist guerillas were dispatched by the Soviet Union to Greece for the same purpose. Under these circumstances the Western powers took upon themselves the task of checking further expansion of Soviet influence in Europe.

### **1.3.3. The Truman Doctrine:**

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

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

The Truman Doctrine was formulated as a message to the Congress, delivered by President Truman on 12 March 1947. The Truman Doctrine was based on the following basic postulates: "At the present moment nearly every nation must choose between alternative ways of life. The choice is too often not a free one. One way of life is based on the will of the majority and it is distinguished by free institutions, representative government, free elections, guarantees of individual liberty, freedom of

speech and election and freedom from political oppression. The second way of life is based upon the will of a minority forcibly imposed on the majority. It relies upon terror and oppression, a controlled press and radio, fixed elections and the suppression of personal freedoms. I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures”.

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

#### **1.3.4. The Berlin Blockade:**

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

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

The Russian response was immediate. All road, rail and canal links between West Berlin and West Germany were closed. The Soviet aim was to force the West to withdraw from West Berlin by reducing it to starvation point. The Western powers, convinced that a retreat would

encourage a Soviet attack on West Germany, were determined to hold on. They decided to airlift supplies to the residents of West Berlin. Over the next ten months two million tones of supplies were airlifted to the blockaded city in a remarkable operation, which kept the 2.5 million West Berliners fed and warm right through the winter. In May 1949 the Russians admitted failure by lifting the Berlin blockade.

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

---

## 1.4 SECURITY PACTS

---

### 1.4.1 North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) :

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

Under these circumstances led by Britain and its foreign secretary, Ernest Bevin, Western European countries, especially France, Holland, Belgium and Luxembourg formed the Western Union Defensive Alliance by the Brussels Defense Treaty of 1948 promising military collaboration in case of war. They were joined by the United States, Canada, Portugal, Denmark, Iceland, Italy and Norway. This willingness to stand together and the Soviet- instigated Blockade

of Berlin, which began in March 1948, encouraged negotiations that culminated in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in April 1949. Greece and Turkey accepted the Treaty in 1952, and the new Federal Republic of Germany became the member of the NATO in May 1955.

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

#### **1.4.2 Baghdad Pact or Central Treaty Organization (CENTO):**

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

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

The Baghdad Pact was viewed with suspicion by the Arab countries. As Nasser of Egypt refused to join the Baghdad Pact and attempt was made to his ouster. Thus, the Pact was seen as a threat to the Arab national movement. The Soviet Union denounced it and India also disapproved the U.S. aid to Pakistan. In 1958 following the fall of monarchy in Iraq and the establishment of a republican government under General

Qasim led to the withdrawal of Iraq from the Baghdad Pact. Under these circumstances, the United States could no longer remain aloof from the security arrangement of the Middle East. The Baghdad Pact was replaced by the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) and its headquarters were shifted from Baghdad to Turkey.

#### **1.4.3 The Anzus Pact:**

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

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

#### **1.4.4 South East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO):**

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

#### **1.4.5 Warsaw Pact:**

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

---

## 1.5 CONFLICTS OF COLD WAR

---

### 1.5.1 The Korean Conflicts (1950-53):

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Koreans and Chinese vainly tried to score further success on the battlefield. The negotiations dragged on for months, until after the U.S.

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

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

### **1.5.2. German Conflicts and The U-2 Incident:**

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

In 1959 Khrushchev visited the USA, partly to address the UN General Assembly, partly to meet Eisenhower at Camp David. In spite of US revulsion at the suppression of the Hungarian revolution in 1956

and Dulles's hesitations, it was agreed that a summit meeting should be held in 1960. Apart from disarmament, the summit would, it was hoped, lead to a settlement of the German question. The summit was arranged for May 1960 in Paris.

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

### **The Berlin Wall:**

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

### **1.5.3. The Cuban Conflict :**

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

Convinced that Cuba was now a communist state in all but name, the new US President John F. Kennedy, approved a plan by a group of Batista supporters to invade Cuba from American bases in Guatemala (Central America). The American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), a kind of secret service, was deeply involved in this operation. The small invading force of about 1400 men landed at the Bay of Pigs in April 1961.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## 1.6 SUMMARY

---

After the Second World war over in the year 1945, the nations of the world including those who were affected and even some who were unaffected thought to come for the International organization and on 14<sup>th</sup>

October, 1945, United Nations Organization-UNO was established. The principal aim of the UNO was to maintain any international conflict by the way of meetings and fruitful discussions instead of coming to waging of war. But the countries like USA and USSR have been the super powers of all the nations of the world and they invested their economic and scientific resources in the Science and its application by they were able to boast of the discoveries and inventions. They did not remain content amongst their own nation with this progress and prosperity but they started the shadowy wars which is popularly known as -Cold War. So, they started teasing each other and promoting their own ideologies like USA as a Capitalism and USSR as Communism. Many countries which were dependent on these countries for their needs fell prey to these tactics and started joining their groups or Blocs of USA and USSR. This situation created the Silent Conflicts among the world and created many international crises in the world politics.

---

## 1.7 QUESTIONS

---

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

---

## 1.8 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985

2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History: 1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London, 1977.



## **ECONOMIC REVIVAL OF WESTERN EUROPE**

### **Unit Structure:**

- 2.0 Objectives
- 2.1 Introduction:
- 2.2 Problems of European Recovery
- 2.3 The Marshall Plan
- 2.4 The Growth of European Unity
- 2.5 The European Community and European Union
- 2.6 The Machinery of the European Community
- 2.7 Summary
- 2.8 Questions
- 2.9 References

---

### **2.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

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

---

### **2.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

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

---

## 2.2 PROBLEMS OF EUROPEAN RECOVERY

---

When the Second World War ended the countries of Western Europe were in a state of physical and economic collapse. To this was added the fear of Russian dominance by frontal attack or subversion. Large parts of the European continent had been devastated by war. The imperial powers had largely exhausted their overseas reserves in the struggle against the Fascist powers. They lacked capital for rebuilding industry and converting to peacetime production. Shortages were acute, particularly of food, fuel and raw materials. The situation in Britain was serious. The special American loan of \$ 3,750 million in 1946 provided valuable short-term relief, but did little to stabilize the long-term situation. During the war plans had been made for the relief of immediate needs of Europe. The UN Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (UNRRA) was created in 1943 and functioned until 1947. A European Central Inland Transport Organization, a European Coal Organization and an Emergency Committee for Europe were established and merged in 1947 in the UN's Economic Commission for Europe (ECE). These organizations assumed that Europe's post-war economic problems could be solved on a continental basis. However, the Cold War destroyed this assumption. Although the CEC continued to exist and issued valuable Economic Surveys from 1948 onwards, Europe became divided for economic as well as political purposes.

---

## 2.3 THE MARSHALL PLAN

---

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

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

George Marshall's speech at Harvard University on 5 June 1947 forcefully expressed American interest in the rehabilitation of Europe, and is generally regarded as the official launching of the Marshall Plan.

From the beginning it was assumed that positive initiatives must come from Europe, and that participation in the plan would be opened to all countries in Europe, including the Soviet Union, although there was little expectation that the Russians would join. The Plan envisaged economic aid up to 1951 on the basis that the European governments would accept responsibility for administering the programme and would themselves contribute to European recovery by some degree of united effort. The Marshall plan was a bridge back to normality, to be financed with \$ 17 billion of American money to regenerate industry, modernize agriculture and ensure financial stability. It required the creation of a European organization. The Russian refusal of the offer turned the organization into a Western European one. The leading Western European nations established a Committee for European Economic Co-operation (CEEC), and on 22 September 1947 CEEC presented to the United States government a report advocating a four-year programme for economic recovery embracing sixteen countries of Europe including West Germany. Four objectives were outlined: an increase in industrial and agricultural productivity at least up to pre-war levels, the establishment of financial stability, economic co-operation between the participating countries, and a solution of the problem of dollar deficits through expansion of exports. Members pledged co-operation, reduction of tariffs, and ultimate convertibility of currencies.

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

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

The effects of the Marshall Plan were quickly felt in all recipient countries and in all branches of industry and agriculture. It contributed to land reclamation projects in Italy, shipbuilding in Britain, and agricultural

improvements in Germany. During the first two years of Marshall Aid industrial production in Western Europe as a whole rose by more than twenty-five per cent. The output of steel went up by seventy per cent, of cement by eighty per cent, while the output of oil-based products as trebled. By the end of 1951 European output was thirty-five per cent above the 1939 level, exports were up by ninety-five per cent and Europe could pay its way in the economic world.

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

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

---

## **2.4 THE GROWTH OF EUROPEAN UNITY**

---

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

1. The best way for Europe to recover from the ravages of war was for all the states to work together and help each other by pooling their resources.

2. The individual states were too small and their economies too weak for them to be economically and militarily viable separately in a world dominated by superpowers, the USA and the Soviet Union.
3. The more the countries of Western Europe worked together, the less chance there would be of war breaking out between them again. It was the best way for a speedy reconciliation between France and Germany.
4. Joint action would enable Western Europe more effectively to resist the spread of communism from the Soviet Union.
5. The Germans were especially keen on the idea because they thought it would help them to gain acceptance as responsible nation more quickly than after the First World War.
6. The creation of a third force in the world would counter-balance the strength of the United States and the Soviet Union

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

#### **2.4.1 The Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC):**

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

#### **2.4.2 The Council of Europe:**

The Council of Europe, which was set up in 1949 was the first attempt at some kind of political unity. Its founder members were Britain, Belgium, Netherlands, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Ireland, Italy, Norway and Sweden. By 1971 all the states of Western Europe, except Spain and Portugal had joined. Turkey, Malta and Cyprus joined later making eighteen members in all. The Council of Europe consisted of the Foreign Ministers of the member states, and an Assembly of representatives

chosen by the parliaments of the states. It had no powers, however, since several states, including Britain, refused to join any organization, which threatened their own sovereignty. It could debate pressing issues and make recommendations. It did useful work such as sponsoring human rights agreements.

---

## 2.5 THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY AND EUROPEAN UNION

---

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

### 2.5.1. Evolution of the European Community :

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

## **2.6 THE MACHINERY OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITY**

---

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

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

The European Parliament, which met at Strasbourg, consisted of 198 representatives chosen by the parliaments of the member states. They could discuss issues and make recommendations, but had no control over the Commission or the Council. In 1979 a new system of choosing the

representatives was introduced. Instead of being nominated by parliaments, they were to be directly elected by the people of the Community.

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

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

### **2.6.1. Refusal of Britain to Join the EEC:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **2.6.2. Britain Joins the EEC:**

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

1. By 1961 it was obvious that the EEC was an outstanding success even without Britain. Since 1953 French production had risen by seventy-five per cent while German production had increased by almost ninety per cent.
2. Over the same period British production had risen only about thirty per cent. The British economy seemed to be stagnating in comparison with those of the six, and in 1960 there was a balance of payment deficit of nearly 270 million pounds. This means that imports had cost Britain 270 million more than was earned from British exports. When this happens, a country has to spend some of its gold and foreign currency reserves to make up the difference.
3. Although the EFTA had succeeded in increasing trade among its members, it was nothing like as successful as the EEC.
4. The Commonwealth, in spite of its huge population, had nothing like the same purchasing power as the EEC. Macmillan now thought that there need not be a clash of interest between Britain's membership of the EEC and trade with the Commonwealth. There were signs that the EEC was prepared to make special arrangements to allow Commonwealth countries and some other former European colonies to become associate members. Britain's EFTA partners might be able to join as well.
5. Another argument in favour of Britain joining the EEC was that once Britain was in, competition from other EEC members would stimulate British industry to greater effort and efficiency. Macmillan also made the point that Britain could not afford to be left out if the EEC developed into a political union. He seems to have some idea that Britain could take over the leadership and build the Community up into a strong defensive unit against the Soviet Union, and in partnership with the USA.

### 2.6.3. French Opposition to Britain's Joining EEC:

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

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

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

Community. The economic integration of the members of the EC led to co-operative efforts in international and political affairs as well.

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

---

## 2.7 SUMMARY

---

The recovery of Western Europe following the end of the Second World War was quite impressive. Economic recovery, which required the restoration of severely damaged but essentially sound and skilled economies, was made possible through American financial aid. A major consequence of economic dislocation was political instability. The circle was completed when political weakness contributed to economic tension. Insecure governments were unable to take the stern measures, which were necessary to bring about economic restoration and reconstruction.

During the life of the Marshall Plan between 1948 and 1952 Congress appropriated a total of \$13,150 million for the European recovery programme. The committee of sixteen nations became the permanent OEEC. Its first function, successfully achieved over the next four years was to distribute the American aid among its members. It also encouraged trade among its members by reducing restrictions. Finally, on 1 January 1973, Britain along with Ireland and Denmark was able to enter the EEC and the six became the nine. Britain's entry into the EEC was made possible by two chief factors: President de Gaulle had resigned in 1969 and his successor Georges Pompidou was friendlier towards Britain.

Thus, the Economic Revival of the Western Europe came to be established.

---

## 2.8 QUESTIONS

---

1. Evaluate the role of the Marshall Plan in the reconstruction of Western Europe.
2. Trace briefly the growth of the European Economic Community (EEC).
3. Critically examine the role of Britain and France in the European Economic Community (EEC).
4. Write short notes on:

- (a) The Marshall Plan
- (b) The Organization for European Economic Co-operation (OEEC)
- (c) The European Economic Community (EEC)
- (d) Role of Britain in the EEC

---

## 2.9 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History: 1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London, 1977.



## SOVIET UNION'S RELATIONS WITH EASTERN EUROPE

### Unit Structure :

- 3.0 Objectives
- 3.1 Introduction
- 3.2 Suspicion of the Soviet Union against the West
- 3.3 Division of Europe
- 3.4 Establishment of 'People's Republics'
- 3.5 The US Attempt to Counter the Soviet Move in Europe
- 3.6 Communist Unity in Eastern Europe
- 3.7 The Warsaw Pact
- 3.8 Differences Between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union
- 3.9 Suppression of Anti-Stalinist Leaders
- 3.10 Khrushchev's dictum of 'Different Roads to Socialism'
- 3.11 Demand of 'Bread and Freedom' in Poland
- 3.12 Revolution in Hungary (1956)
- 3.13 Impact of the Crises in Poland and Hungary
- 3.14 Questions
- 3.15 Summary
- 3.16 References

---

### 3.0 OBJECTIVES

---

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

---

## 3.1 INTRODUCTION

---

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

---

## 3.2 SUSPICION OF THE SOVIET UNION AGAINST THE WEST

---

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

### 3.2.1 Fear of German Invasion:

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

### **3.2.2. Non-Aggression Pact with Hitler:**

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

### **3.2.3 German Attack on the Soviet Union:**

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

---

## **3.3 DIVISION OF EUROPE**

---

It has been argued that the division of Europe and the resulting in Soviet control over Eastern Europe were the consequence not of historical accident but of agreement, notably agreement at Yalta by Roosevelt and Churchill to give Stalin a position of power, which otherwise he could not have achieved. However, this argument cannot be sustained. Roosevelt and Churchill conceded at Yalta nothing that it was in their power to withhold. The Russian armies were already in occupation of positions in Europe from which they could not be expelled. Thus, Stalin's post-war dominance in Eastern Europe derived from his victories and not from any bargain with his Allies. The most that Roosevelt and Churchill could do was to try to get Stalin to accept certain rules governing the exercise of the power that was his. This they succeeded in doing by persuading him to endorse a Declaration on Liberated Countries, which promised free election and other democratic practices and liberties. When, later, Stalin ignored the engagements contained in this declaration, Western governments could do no more than protest. They were in no position to take action against the Soviet Union.

---

## **3.4 ESTABLISHMENT OF 'PEOPLE'S REPUBLICS'**

---

Because of the need to recoup their enormous industrial losses and their fears of further invasions, the Soviets were determined to maintain political, economic and military control of those countries in Eastern Europe that they had liberated for the Nazi Control. They employed diplomatic pressure, political infiltration and military terrorism to establish 'people's republics' in Eastern Europe sympathetic to the Soviet regime. In country after country the process repeated itself: at first all-

party coalition governments from which only fascists were excluded; then further coalitions in which communists predominated; and finally, one party states. By 1948, governments that owed allegiance to Moscow were established in Poland, Hungary, Rumania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Albania. The nations of Eastern Europe did not all succumb without a struggle. Greece, which the Soviets wished to include within their sphere of influence, was torn by a civil war until 1949, when with Western aid its monarchy was restored. A direct challenge to the Yalta guarantee of free, democratic election occurred in Czechoslovakia, where in 1948, the Soviets crushed the coalition government of liberal leaders Eduardo Benes and Jan Masaryk.

---

### **3.5 THE US ATTEMPT TO COUNTER THE SOVIET MOVE IN EUROPE**

---

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

---

### **3.6 COMMUNIST UNITY IN EASTERN EUROPE**

---

The communist countries of Eastern Europe were joined in a kind of unity under the leadership of the Soviet Union. The main difference between the unity in Eastern Europe and that in the West was that the countries of Eastern Europe were forced into it by the Soviet Union where as the members of the European Community joined voluntarily. By the end of 1948 there were nine states in the communist bloc: the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia.

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

#### **3.6.1. The Molotov Plan:**

This was the first Soviet sponsored step towards an economically united Eastern bloc. The idea of the Soviet Foreign minister, Molotov, it was a response to the American offer of Marshall Aid. Since the Soviets

refused to allow any of their satellites to accept American aid, Molotov felt they had to be offered an alternative. The plan was basically a set of trade agreements between the Soviet Union and its satellites negotiated during the summer of 1947. It was designed to boost the trade of Eastern Europe.

### **3.6.2 The Communist Information Bureau (Cominform):**

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

### **3.6.3. The Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON):**

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

---

## **3.7 THE WARSAW PACT**

---

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

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

---

### 3.8 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN YUGOSLAVIA AND THE SOVIET UNION

---

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

The Yugoslavs began to reverse the process of centralization: industries were denationalized, and instead of being state-owned, they became public property, managed by workers' representatives through councils and assemblies. The same applied in agriculture: the communes were the most important unit in the state. These were groups of families each containing between 5000 and 100,000 people. The elected Commune Assembly organized matters concerning the economy, education, health, culture and welfare. The system was a remarkable example of ordinary people playing a part in making the decisions, which closely affected their own lives, both at work and in the community. It achieved much because workers had a personal stake in the success of their firm and their commune. Many Marxists thought this was the way a genuine communist state should be run, rather than the over-centralization of the Soviet Union.

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

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

---

### **3.9 SUPPRESSION OF ANTI-STALINIST LEADERS**

---

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

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

---

### **3.10 KHRUSHCHEV'S DICTUM OF 'DIFFERENT ROADS TO SOCIALISM'**

---

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

---

### **3.11 DEMAND OF 'BREAD AND FREEDOM' IN POLAND**

---

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

been acceptable to Stalin. For example they introduced the collectivization of agriculture only very slowly, and probably only about ten per cent of farmland was ever collectivized. Poland also traded with countries outside the communist bloc. Gomulka remained in power until he resigned in 1970.

---

### **3.12 REVOLUTION IN HUNGARY (1956)**

---

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

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

---

### 3.13 IMPACT OF THE CRISES IN POLAND AND HUNGARY

---

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

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

---

### 3.14 QUESTIONS

---

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

---

### 3.15 SUMMARY

---

The Soviet policy of establishing control over Eastern Europe was both a cause and an effect of the Cold War. Stalin wanted a 'ring fence' territory in Eastern Europe under Russian control. The Allies in view of the fact that Germany had attacked Russia twice in 1914 and 1941 accepted his claim to such as buffer zone. While making this concession, the Western Allies put their faith in the Declaration on Liberated Europe and in their hope that Stalin would honour this and other similar agreements.

The Soviet Union believed that these treaties were aimed at winning Germany away from the Treaty of Rapallo, which she had signed, with Russia in 1922, and bringing her into alliance with Britain, France and the other Western powers.

It has been argued that the division of Europe and the resulting in Soviet control over Eastern Europe were the consequence not of historical accident but of agreement, notably agreement at Yalta by Roosevelt and Churchill to give Stalin a position of power, which otherwise he could not have achieved. By the end of 1948 there were nine states in the communist bloc: the Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, Rumania and Yugoslavia. The situation in Hungary ended very differently from the one in Poland. After Stalin's death in 1953, a more moderate communist leader, Imry Nagy, replaced the pro-Stalin leader, Rakosi. However, Rakosi continued to interfere in the government affairs and overthrew Nagy in 1955. The dramatic events in Poland and Hungary graphically demonstrated the vulnerability of the Soviet Satellite system in Eastern Europe, and many observers throughout the world anticipated that the United States would intervene on behalf of the freedom fighters in Hungary.

Thus, the Soviet Union of Socialist Republic maintained its relations with Eastern Europe.

---

### 3.16 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.

9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge,1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay,1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History:1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London,1977.



munotes.in

## **DISINTEGRATION OF U.S.S.R.**

### **Unit Structure :**

- 4.0 Objectives
- 4.1 Introduction
- 4.2 Circumstances That Led To The Collapse Of Communism In The Soviet Union
- 4.3 Mikhail Gorbachev And The Collapse Of Communism
- 4.4 Opposition To Gorbachev's Policies
- 4.5 Aftermath Of The Collapse Of Communism In The Soviet Union
- 4.6 Questions
- 4.7 References

---

### **4.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

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

---

### **4.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

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

---

## 4.2 CIRCUMSTANCES THAT LED TO THE COLLAPSE OF COMMUNISM IN THE SOVIET UNION

---

### 4.2.1. Political Background:

After Khrushchev's dismissal in 1964, three men, Kosygin, Brezhnev and Podgorny, seemed to be sharing power. At first Kosygin was the leading figure and the chief spokesman on foreign affairs, while Brezhnev and Podgorny looked after home affairs. In early 1970's Brezhnev eclipsed Kosygin after a disagreement over economic policies. Kosygin pressed for more economic decentralization. However, this proposal was unpopular with the other leaders, who claimed that it encouraged too much independence of thought in the satellite states, especially Czechoslovakia. Brezhnev established firm personal control by 1977, and remained leader until his death in November 1982. Broadly speaking, his policies were similar to those of the Khrushchev period.

### 4.2.2. Stagnation of the Economy:

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

### 4.2.3. Brezhnev Doctrine:

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

pressures were brought to bear on Poland (1981) to control the independent trade union movement, Solidarity.

#### **4.2.4. Poor Human Rights Record:**

Brezhnev's record on human rights was not impressive. Though he claimed to be in favour of the Helsinki Agreement signed in 1975, which included an undertaking, by the signatories to protect human rights, and appeared to make important concessions about human rights in the Soviet Union, in fact little progress was made. Groups were set up to check whether the terms of the agreement were being kept, but the authorities put them under intense pressure. Their members were arrested, imprisoned, exiled or deported, and finally the groups were dissolved altogether in 1982.

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

#### **4.2.5. Andropov and Chernenko:**

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

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

---

### **4.3 MIKHAIL GORBACHEV AND THE COLLAPSE OF COMMUNISM**

---

#### **4.3.1. Towards Reformation:**

Mikhail Gorbachev, who came to power in March 1985, was, at fifty-four, the most gifted and dynamic leader Russia had seen for many years. He was determined to transform and revitalize the country

after the stagnant years following Khrushchev's fall. He intended to achieve this by modernizing and streamlining the communist party with new policies of glasnost (openness) and perestroika (restructuring - which meant economic and social reform). The new thinking soon made an impact on foreign affairs, with initiatives on detente, relations with China, a withdrawal from Afghanistan, and ultimately the ending of the Cold War in late 1990.

#### **4.3.2. Desire to Replace Stalinist System with Socialist System:**

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

#### **4.3.3. Glasnost:**

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

In cultural matters and the media generally, there were some startling developments. In May 1986 both the Union of Soviet Film-makers and the Union of Writers were allowed to sack their reactionary heads and

elect more independent-minded leaders. Long-banned anti-Stalin films and novels were shown and published, and preparations were made to publish works by the great poet Osip Mandelstam, who died in a labour camp in 1938.

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

#### **4.3.4. Perestroika:**

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

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

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

#### **4.3.5. Political changes:**

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

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

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

---

## **4.4 OPPOSITION TO GORBACHEV'S POLICIES**

---

### **4.4.1. Opposition from the Radicals and Conservatives:**

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

#### **4.4.2. Protest Demonstrations in Moscow:**

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

#### **4.4.3. Economic Crisis:**

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

#### **4.4.4. Short Supply of Consumer Goods:**

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

#### **4.4.5. Strike of the Coal-miners:**

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

These included better living and working conditions, better supplies of food, a share in the profits, and more local control over the mines. Later, influenced by what was happening in Poland, where a non-

communist prime minister had just been elected, they called for independent trade unions like Poland's Solidarity, and in some areas they demanded an end to the privileged position of the communist party. The government soon gave way and granted many of the demands, promising a complete reorganization of the industry and full local control.

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

#### **4.4.6. Pressure from Nationalities:**

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

#### **4.4.7. Gradual Break-up of the Soviet Union:**

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

Worse was to follow in the three Baltic Soviet republics of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, which had been taken over against their will by the Russians in 1940. Independence movements denounced by Gorbachev as 'national excesses' had been growing in strength. In March 1990, encouraged by what was happening in the satellite states of Eastern Europe, Lithuania took the lead by declaring itself independent. The other two soon followed, though they voted to proceed more gradually. Moscow refused to recognize their independence.

#### **4.4.8. Rise of Boris Yeltsin:**

Boris Yeltsin, who had been excluded from the new Supreme Soviet by the conservatives, made a dramatic comeback when he was

elected president of the parliament of the Russian republic (Russian Federation) in May 1990.

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

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

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

#### **4.4.9. The coup of August 1991:**

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

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

union treaty, which was due to be signed the following day, was cancelled.

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

#### **4.4.10. Resignation of Gorbachev:**

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

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

Much has already been written about the question whether Gorbachev would have succeeded and preserved a modernized, humane communism, if he had tackled the problems differently. Comparisons also have been made with communist China. Why did communism

survive there but not in the Soviet Union? One explanation goes as follows: Both the Soviet Union and China needed reform in two areas, the communist party and government and the economy. Gorbachev believed these could only be achieved one at a time, and chose to introduce the political reforms first, without any really fundamental economic innovations. The Chinese did it the other way round, introducing economic reform first and leaving the power of the communist party unchanged. This meant that although the people suffered economic hardship, the government retained tight control over them, and in the last resort was prepared to use force against them, unlike Gorbachev.

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

---

## **4.5 AFTERMATH OF THE COLLAPSE OF COMMUNISM IN THE SOVIET UNION**

---

### **4.5.1. Yeltsin as the President of the Russian Federation:**

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

### **4.5.2. Economic Collapse:**

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

#### **4.5.3. Formation of the Civic Union:**

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

#### **4.5.4. Ethnic and Religious Conflict:**

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

#### **4.5.5. Re-election of Yeltsin as the President:**

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

Yeltsin saw his victory in the 1996 presidential elections as a clear mandate for the continuation of the reform programme. He reorganized his Cabinet, bringing in new reformers as well as retaining loyalists such as Prime Minister Viktor Chernomyrdin and Chief of Staff Anatoly Chubais in key positions. Lebed, however, who had gained

widespread popularity as a ‘man of the people’ rather than a party politician, continued to criticize government actions, especially aspects of the reform programme. In October he was sacked as national security advisor, and went on in December to launch a new political party, the Russian Popular Republican Party. Meanwhile, Yeltsin suffering from heart ailment underwent a quintuple heart bypass operation in November 1996. His return to full-time duties was delayed by a bout of pneumonia, which heightened doubts concerning his future. A bid in early February 1997 by the Communist bloc in the State Duma to oust him from office on health grounds failed through lack of support and procedural errors. Yeltsin finally returned to full-time duties at the end of February.

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

---

#### 4.6 QUESTIONS

---

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

---

## 4.7 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History: 1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London, 1977.



## **RE-DRAWING OF POLITICAL BORDERS OF GERMANY, YUGOSLAVIA AND CZECHOSLAVIA**

### **Unit Structure :**

- 5.0 Objectives
- 5.1 Introduction
- 5.2 Causes of the Collapse of Communism in Central and Eastern Europe
- 5.3 Collapse of Communism in Individual Countries
- 5.4 Hungary and Causes of Communism
- 5.5 East Germany and Communism
- 5.6 Czechoslovakia and Communism
- 5.7 Romania and Communism
- 5.8 Bulgaria and Communism
- 5.9 Yugoslavia and Communism
- 5.10 Summary
- 5.11 Questions
- 5.12 References

---

### **5.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

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

---

## 5.1 INTRODUCTION

---

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

---

## 5.2 CAUSES OF THE COLLAPSE OF COMMUNISM IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

---

### 5.2.1. Economic Failure:

Communism miserably failed to improve the economic condition in Eastern Europe. It could not produce the standard of living, which should have been possible, as vast resources available in Eastern European countries. The economic systems were inefficient, over-centralized and subject to too many restrictions. All the states, for example, were expected to do most of their trading within the communist bloc. By the mid-1980's there were problems everywhere. According to Misha Glenny, a BBC correspondent in Eastern Europe, the communist party leaderships refused to admit that the working class lived in more miserable conditions, breathing in more polluted air and drinking more toxic water, than western working classes. The communist record on health, education, housing, and a range of other social services had been very poor. Increasing contact with the West in the 1980's showed people how backward the East was in comparison with the West, and suggested that their living standards were falling even further. It also showed that it must be their own leaders and the communist system, which were the cause of all their problems.

### 5.2.2. Policies of Gorbachev:

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

plotting the overthrow of the East German, Romanian and Bulgarian leaders. His hope was that more progressive leaders would increase the chances of saving communism in Russia's satellite states.

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

### **5.2.3. Demand for Reforms:**

Taking example of the reforms that were sweeping across the Soviet Union, the people of the Central and Eastern Europe demanded similar reforms in their own countries. The communist leaderships found it difficult to adapt to the new situation of having a leader in Moscow who was more progressive than they were. The critics of the communist system became more daring as they realized that Gorbachev would not send soviet troops in to suppress their movement for reform as had been done earlier in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968. With no help to be expected from Moscow, when it came to the crisis, none of the communist governments was prepared to use sufficient force against the demonstrators, except in Romania. When they came, the rebellions were too widespread, and it would have needed a huge commitment of tanks and troops to hold down the whole of Central and Eastern Europe simultaneously. Having only just succeeded in withdrawing from Afghanistan, Gorbachev had no desire for an even greater involvement. In the end it was a triumph of 'people power': demonstrators deliberately defied the threat of violence in such huge numbers that troops would have had to shoot a large proportion of the population in the big cities to keep control.

---

## **5.3 COLLAPSE OF COMMUNISM IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES**

---

### **5.3.1. Poland**

#### **a. Lech Walesa and the Solidarity Movement:**

The challenge to the communist regime came first from Poland. Under Wladyslaw Gomulka, Poland had achieved certain stability in the 1960's. However, economic problems led to his ouster in 1971. His successor, Edward Gierk attempted to solve Poland's economic problems by borrowing heavily from the West. In 1980, Gierk announced huge increases in food prices in an effort to pay off part of the Western debt. Living standards deteriorated, and hundreds of thousands of Polish workers responded to a large food price rise by going on strike in the summer of 1980. In August the country was paralyzed when workers in Gdansk and other Baltic ports conducted sit-in strikes in their shipyards

for three weeks and started making political demands. At the end of the month, the Communist authorities were forced into making unprecedented concessions. These included the right to strike, wage increases, the release of political prisoners, and the curtailment of censorship. The recognition of the right to organize independent trade unions led to the formation in mid-September of the Solidarity federation. Solidarity represented ten million of Poland's thirty-five million people. Almost instantly, Solidarity became a tremendous force for change and a threat to the government's monopoly of power. Under the leadership of an electrician, Lech Walesa, and with the full support of the Polish Catholic Church, workers and many intellectuals, Solidarity quickly became a political force sufficiently powerful to win a series of concessions. The sick and discredited Gierek stepped down as Communist Party leader in favour of Stanislaw Kania.

#### **b. Tussle Between Solidarity and the Communist Party:**

The standoff between Solidarity and the Communist Party took place in a period of increased economic decline and social discontent, causing a growing number of dangerous confrontations. Partly because of Soviet pressure, the government was unable or unwilling to carry out the necessary reforms. In February 1981, General Wojciech Jaruzelski was made Premier, and in October was made Party Chief. To control the situation, he used the radical demands of the Solidarity movement as a pretext for imposing martial law in mid-December. He banned Solidarity, arrested thousands of activists and imprisoned nearly all its leaders, including Walesa.

#### **c. Crackdown on Solidarity:**

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

#### **d. Recognition of Solidarity as Political Party:**

In 1988 when Jaruzelski tried to economize by cutting government subsidies, protest strikes broke out because the changes led to an increase in food prices. This time Jaruzelski decided not to risk using force. He was aware that there would be no backing from Moscow, and realized that he needed opposition support to deal with the economic crisis. Talks opened in February 1989 between the communist government, and Solidarity and

other opposition groups. By April 1989 drastic changes were introduced in the Polish constitution. Accordingly, Solidarity was recognized as a political party; there were to be two houses of parliament, a lower house (Sejm) and a senate; in the lower house, 65 per cent of the seats had to be reserved to the communists; the senate was to be freely elected; the two houses voting together would elect a President, who would then choose a Prime Minister.

#### **e. Poland After the Collapse of Communism:**

In the elections of June 1989 Solidarity won 92 out of the 100 seats in the senate and 160 out of the 161 seats which they could fight in the lower house (Sejm). A compromise deal was worked out when it came to forming a government. Jaruzelski was elected as the President. He chose a Tadeusz Mazowiecki, a leading member of Solidarity, as prime minister. He became the first non-Communist prime minister since the Second World War. Mazowiecki chose a mixed government of communists and Solidarity supporters. The communist monopoly of power in Poland had come to an end after forty-five years. The new government began to end Communist controls. Also in 1989, the Polish government began a programme to sell government-owned industries to private owners. This programme progressed through the 1990's.

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

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

Presidential elections in 1995 were narrowed down to a contest between Walesa and the SLD's Alexander Kwasniewski, young, intelligent but a former communist who had held office in Poland's last communist

government. During the campaign Walesa recovered much of his lost popularity. However, in spite of aggressive support from the Roman Catholic hierarchy, which focused on past ideological battles than current economic problems, he was narrowly defeated by his former prime ministerial nominee, Aleksander Kwasniewski, who was better organized and more forward-looking.

It was announced in June that the Gdansk shipyard, cradle of the pro-democracy movement Solidarity, would not be saved from bankruptcy, which prompted angry reaction from shipyard workers. In early March 1997 the announcement of the closure of the Gdansk shipyard resulted in demonstrations in Warsaw and Gdansk, which prompted the government to propose a rescue plan. Pope John Paul II made an 11-day visit to Poland in late May, during which he spoke on NATO and EU membership, and the controversial law on abortion.

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

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

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

---

## 5.4 HUNGARY AND CAUSES OF COMMUNISM

---

### 5.4.1 Economic Reforms:

Once the Poles had thrown off communism without interference from the Soviet Union, it was only a matter of time before the rest of Eastern Europe tried to follow the example of Poland. The process of liberation from communist rule had begun before 1989. Remaining in power for more than thirty years, the government of Janos Kadar tried to keep up with the changing mood by enacting the most far-reaching economic reforms in Eastern Europe. In the early 1980's, he legalized small private enterprises, such as shops, restaurants, and artisan shops. His economic reforms were called 'Communism with a capitalist facelift'. Hungary moved slowly away from its strict adherence to Soviet dominance and even established fairly friendly relations with the West. Multi-candidate elections with at least two candidates per seat were held for the first time in June 1985.

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

### 5.4.2 End of Communism in Hungary:

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

### 5.4.3 Post-Communist Hungary:

In 1990 Hungary became the first Central European nation in the Eastern bloc to join the Council of Europe, and in 1991 and 1992 the government signed declarations of cooperation with Poland, the Czech and Slovak republics, Russia, and Ukraine. A Treaty of Friendship and Co-operation with Slovakia was ratified in June. In parliamentary elections in May, the Hungarian Socialist Party regained a majority of 72 per cent of parliamentary seats. The new government introduced stringent budget cuts in an attempt to reduce its foreign debt. A further austerity package was

introduced in March 1995, and a law aimed at revitalizing the stalled privatization programme was introduced in May. A bill was passed in November to abolish exchange control regulations, which had been in place for over 60 years, and thus make the forint fully convertible. In the largest privatization programme seen thus far in a former Communist state, foreign consortia took majority holdings in the telecommunications and gas distribution companies, and minority holdings in the electricity, and the oil- and gas-producing industries.

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

---

## **5.5 EAST GERMANY AND COMMUNISM**

---

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

### **5.5.1 Gorbachev's Visit to West Germany:**

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

### **5.5.2 Flight of the East Germans to the West:**

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

### **5.5.3 Anti-Government Movement:**

There were huge anti-government movements in various parts of East Germany. The Protestant Church in East Germany became the focus of an opposition party called New Forum, which campaigned to bring an end to the repressive and atheistic communist regime. In October 1989 there was a wave of demonstrations all over East Germany demanding freedom and an end to communism.

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

### **5.5.4 Attempts towards the Unification of Germany:**

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

### **5.5.5 The Unified Germany:**

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

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

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

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

In the September 1998 general elections, Helmut Kohl lost power to Gerhard Schröder and the SPD, marking the end of sixteen years of conservative government under Kohl. In October Schröder agreed a coalition with the Green Party and introduced a legislative programme including reform of German citizenship laws and measures against unemployment. In March 1999 Oskar Lafontaine, finance minister in the new government and SPD leader, stepped down suddenly over policy disagreements with Schröder. This was seen as strengthening the Chancellor and moving his government away from Lafontaine's traditional left-wing loyalties. In March, Germany joined the rest of NATO in military action against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia over the Yugoslav government's actions in Kosovo.

---

## 5.6 CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND COMMUNISM

---

### 5.6.1 Charter 77:

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

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

### 5.6.2 The Velvet Revolution:

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

### 5.6.3 End of Communism:

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

Forum and its allies large majorities in both houses of parliament. Havel was then re-elected to a two-year term, and he asked Calfa, a former communist, to head a coalition government.

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

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

---

## **5.7 ROMANIA AND COMMUNISM**

---

### **5.7.1 Repressive Regime of Ceausescu:**

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

### **5.7.2 Revolution against Ceausescu:**

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

again. However, the army refused to continue the killing, and the Ceausescus had lost control. They were arrested, tried by a military tribunal and shot dead on 25 December 1989.

### **5.7.3 The National Salvation Front:**

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

### **5.7.4 Demonstrations in Bucharest:**

President Iliescu won re-election in October 1992, and in November a new government was formed by independents and members of the Democratic National Salvation Front (DNSF), one of two parties formed by the split of the NSF. In February 1993 thousands of people demonstrated in Bucharest against inflation, unemployment, and low wages. Labour unrest continued throughout the spring after the government-removed subsidies for goods and services, and public sector and steel workers demanded higher wages. In February 1994 as many as two million workers staged a general strike protesting at the lack of economic reform. A motion of impeachment of President Iliescu was rejected in July 1994.

### **5.7.5 Ethnic Cleansing of the Gypsies:**

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

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

membership and began candidacy negotiations.

### **5.7.6 Membership of the NATO:**

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

### **5.7.7 Deterioration of Economy:**

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

---

## **5.8 BULGARIA AND COMMUNISM**

---

### **5.8.1 Transformation of the Bulgarian Communist Party:**

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

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

### **5.8.2 Restructuring of the Economy:**

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

### **5.8.3 NATO Membership:**

In November 1999 Bulgaria announced the closure of four Soviet-built nuclear reactors in return for talks on European Union (EU) membership. In the same month, US president Bill Clinton, on a trip to Sofia to mark the tenth anniversary of the end of Communism, encouraged Bulgaria's bid for NATO membership in return for the country's support for NATO's 1999 air attacks against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia during the Kosovo crisis.

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

### **5.8.4 Albania**

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

Albania responded to the wave of democratization that swept across Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980's by cautiously easing restrictions on religion and foreign travel, legalizing opposition political parties, and broadening contacts with the West. Diplomatic relations with the United States were resumed in March 1991 after a 51-year break. After winning Albania's first free multi-party parliamentary elections, the Communists enacted a new interim charter creating the post of President of the Republic, to which the People's Assembly then elected Alia. The Communist Party, which in June changed its name to the Albanian Socialist Party, clung to power throughout 1991 but was defeated in

parliamentary elections in March 1992. In April Alia resigned, and parliament elected Sali Berisha as Albania's first non-Communist president since the Second World War. In May 1992 Albania signed a ten-year cooperation agreement with the European Community. In June agreed to establish a Black Sea economic zone with Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Greece, Moldova, Romania, Russia, Turkey, and Ukraine. The Albanian Communist Party was outlawed. Albania continued to be affected by instability in the former Yugoslavia, in 1993, when ethnic Albanians experienced difficulties in Kosovo, Macedonia, and Greece. Albania joined NATO's Partnership for Peace programme in April 1994.

---

## **5.9 YUGOSLAVIA AND COMMUNISM**

---

### **5.9.1 Yugoslavia- a Mixture of Many Nationalities:**

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

### **5.9.2 Tito's Attempt to Keep Yugoslavia Integrated:**

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

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

### **5.9.3 Ethnic Conflict:**

Although the collective leadership seemed to work well at first, in the mid-1980's things began to go out of control. The economy was in trouble with rising inflation and mounting unemployment. At the end of the 1980's, Yugoslavia was caught up in the reform movements sweeping through East Europe. The weakness of the economy and of government leadership stimulated the growth of ethnic conflict, as separatist movements in the individual republics and provinces threatened the viability of the nation. In the 1980's, tensions ran high in the southern Serbian province of Kosovo, which had become autonomous in 1968 after rioting to protest Serbian control. Seeking more independence and calling for a separate republic, the majority population of ethnic Albanians clashed with Serbians and Montenegrins throughout the decade; efforts by the Serbian government to impose its authority over Kosovo contributed to strain relations between Yugoslavia and Albania. Towards the end of the 1980's, Serbia reasserted its control over Kosovo and the autonomous province of Vojvodina, ending their autonomy.

### **5.9.4 Demand for the Creation of Pluralistic Political System:**

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

### **5.9.5 Separatist Movements:**

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

### **5.9.6 Break-up of Yugoslavia:**

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

### **5.9.8 Ethnic Cleansing in Bosnia-Herzegovina:**

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

### **5.9.9 Massacre of Kosovo Albanians:**

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

The sustained build-up of troops on the Yugoslav border throughout the duration of the air campaign ultimately prompted Milošević to sign up to a peace plan in June brokered by Viktor Chernomyrdin. Terms of the agreement included the withdrawal of all Yugoslav military forces from Kosovo and the deployment of a 50,000-strong UN-led peacekeeping force to ensure the safe return of the Albanian refugees. Opposition protests against Milosevic began to increase within Serbia. However, their

failure to dislodge Milošević resulted in increasing splits between opposition parties. In February 2000 it was announced that NATO troops would remain in Bosnia and Kosovo as long as Milošević held on to power and UN economic sanctions were extended to increase the pressure on the regime.

In July 2000, Milošević, with a year of his term to run, changed the method of election for president from a vote in parliament to a nationwide ballot, and called an election for September. He was of the opinion that the much-divided opposition would not be able to mount an effective challenge. However, eighteen of the different opposition parties forged an alliance, the Democratic Opposition of Serbia, to nominate Vojislav Koštunica, a law professor and firm nationalist, as their candidate. Following the election Koštunica claimed victory, despite the official results claiming that he had failed to get the fifty per cent of the vote necessary to avoid a second ballot. Milošević refused to relinquish power, leading to a series of protests that culminated on 5 October 2000 with an uprising in Belgrade that finally forced him to admit defeat.

---

## 5.10 SUMMARY

---

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

Communism miserably failed to improve the economic condition in Eastern Europe. It could not produce the standard of living, which should have been possible, as vast resources available in Eastern European countries. The economic systems were inefficient, over-centralized and subject to too many restrictions. All the states, for example, were expected to do most of their trading within the communist bloc. The growing unrest among farmers and other workers in the agricultural sector was reflected, in January 2000, in the formation of a radical National Peasant bloc, an alliance of three political groupings strongly opposed to EU-influenced reforms and policies. Agricultural protests, as well as strikes in health care and education sectors, continued throughout 2000.

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

. In February 2000 it was announced that NATO troops would remain in Bosnia and Kosovo as long as Milošević held on to power and UN economic sanctions were extended to increase the pressure on the regime.

Thus, the collapse of Communism led by Soviet Russia was mostly came to exist.

---

### 5.11 QUESTIONS

---

1. Give an account of the collapse of Communism in Poland and East Germany.
2. Trace the circumstances that led to the collapse of Communism in Hungary and Czechoslovakia.
3. Examine the political developments that led to the end of the Communist regimes in Rumania and Bulgaria.
4. Account for the disintegration of Yugoslavia.

---

### 5.12 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History: 1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London, 1977.



## U.S.A. AS A DOMINANT WORLD POWER

### Unit Structure:

- 6.0 Objectives
- 6.1 Introduction
- 6.2. End of the Cold War
- 6.3. The New World Order
- 6.4. War Against Iraq
- 6.5. United States in the Lead
- 6.6 Summary
- 6.7 Questions
- 6.8 References

---

### 6.0 OBJECTIVES

---

- 1) To understand the post-Cold War developments in the world with special Reference to the emergence of the U.S.A. as a dominant world power.

---

### 6.1 INTRODUCTION

---

The emergence of the United States as a uni-polar power can be traced to the end of the Cold War. The dissolution of the Soviet satellite system in Eastern Europe, combined with the disintegration of the Soviet Union itself, brought a dramatic end to the Cold War at the end of the 1980's. In fact, however, the thaw in relations between the two power blocs had begun with Gorbachev's accession to power in 1985. Gorbachev was willing to rethink many of the fundamental assumptions underlying Soviet foreign policy, and his 'new thinking' as it was called, opened the door to a series of stunning changes. For one, Gorbachev initiated a plan for arms limitation that led in 1987 to an agreement with the United States to eliminate intermediate-range nuclear weapons (the INF Treaty). Both sides had incentives to dampen the expensive arms race. Gorbachev hoped to make extensive economic and internal reforms, while the United States had serious deficit problems. During the Reagan years, the United States had moved from being a creditor nation to being the world's biggest debtor nation. By 1990, both countries were becoming aware that their large military budgets were making it difficult for them to solve their serious social problems.

---

## 6.2 END OF THE COLD WAR

---

During 1989 and 1990, much of the reason for Cold War had disappeared as the mostly peaceful revolutionary upheaval swept through Eastern Europe. Gorbachev's policy of allowing greater autonomy for the Communist regimes of Eastern Europe meant that the Soviet Union would no longer militarily support Communist governments faced with internal revolt. The unwillingness of the Soviet regime to use force to maintain the status quo, as it had in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968, opened the door to the overthrow of the Communist regimes. The reunification of Germany in October 1990 also destroyed one of the most prominent symbols of the Cold War era. The disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991 brought an end to the global rivalry between two competing superpowers.

---

## 6.3 THE NEW WORLD ORDER

---

With the end of the Cold War, world leaders began to turn their attention to the construction of what the President of the United States, George Bush called the New World Order. The revolution in the Soviet Union effected by Gorbachev changed this situation by smothering the Cold War, inducing the superpowers to co-operate in international affairs instead of opposing one another as a matter of principle. Both Moscow and Washington hoped to initiate a new era of peace and mutual cooperation. During the first administration of President Bill Clinton, the United States sought to engage Russia as well as its own NATO allies in an effort to resolve the numerous conflicts that began to arise in various parts of the world in the early 1990's.

---

## 6.4 WAR AGAINST IRAQ

---

The first test came with Iraq's invasion and annexation of Kuwait in 1990. This was a blatant act of aggression. It raised the question like on earlier occasions, including Argentina's occupation of the Falkland Islands and Iraq's attack on Iran ten years earlier. The question was whether counter-action would be taken through or outside the UN. President Bush decided to do both. He dispatched large armed forces to Saudi Arabia and he resorted to the UN to impose economic sanctions against Iraq. Both these undertakings were international. A number of states participated in both, but only the latter was action by the UN. The former was action initiated and led by the United States independently.

In a series of resolutions adopted during August 1990, the Security Council, unanimously, demanded Iraq's immediate withdrawal from Kuwait. It also imposed a commercial, financial and military embargo; declared unanimously, that the annexation of Kuwait was null and void, and authorized the use of force to make the embargo effective. These first resolutions established sanctions against Iraq and the use of force to monitor them, but not the use of force for any other purpose.

The governments of the United States and Britain maintained that, they were entitled under Article 51 of the UN Charter to use military force against Iraq. The United States established in Saudi Arabia a powerful force, which, while enforcing the economic sanctions, was capable of attacking Iraq, overthrowing the Iraqi regime and liberating Kuwait. This show of American strength and power was a unilateral act, which was given international support by securing the participation of a number of countries in and beyond the Middle East. It was also an expression of lack of confidence in the efficacy of the mechanisms and procedures of the UN.

Saddam Hussein proclaimed repeatedly that he would not budge from Kuwait, although he expressed willingness to participate in a conference on Middle Eastern affairs with an agenda from which Kuwait would not be excluded. The United States and some of its associates refused to consider any matter before a total and unconditional Iraqi withdrawal. It was appropriate that the United States should play the leading part in the UN's undertakings. Bush conducted simultaneously an American operation, which overshadowed the UN undertaking. In the American operation he relied on force and the threat of force to the exclusion of diplomacy. The US President took the position in which he demanded unconditional observance of UN resolutions. The Kuwait crisis, the first serious crisis after the end of the Cold War projected the United States as a uni-polar power. Increasingly, the United States bypassed the UN in the use of military force.

In January 1991, the United States opened hostilities against Iraq without informing the secretary-general of the UN. As the war continued Iraq suffered heavy losses, and Baghdad was subjected to destruction greater than anything, which it had suffered for 700 years. Iraq countered with largely ineffective missiles aimed at Saudi Arabian and Israeli cities and devastating Kuwait City. Facing defeat Saddam Hussein attempted negotiations. However, Bush insisted on unconditional compliance with all pertinent UN resolutions, by inviting Iraqis to revolt against their government and by adding conditions of his own in order to maintain pressure for unconditional surrender. Attempts by the Soviet Union to broker an Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait on acceptable conditions were rejected by the United States. The US led war against Iraq, known as 'Desert Storm' succeeded in liberating Kuwait from Iraq and its ruling dynast was restored. Saddam Hussein was humiliated.

Though Iraq was attacked and defeated because it had invaded Kuwait and had an intention of invading Saudi Arabia, the chief reason for the action of the United States in the Middle East was oil resources. The United States was unable to secure it by occupying or dominating the relevant areas in the manner of the Ottoman Empire or Anglo-French mandates system. The Kuwait war was fought to assert the rule of law forbidding one state to appropriate the territory or resources of another. The alternative to this outmoded imperialism was to secure national interests through international peace and stability and the operation of the market forces. When that order broke down, as it did upon Iraq's annexation of

Kuwait, force had to be used. By its war against Iraq the United States showed that it could and would fight for its interests. The display of American will and the display of immense technical competence was a major event in international affairs.

---

## 6.5 UNITED STATES IN THE LEAD

---

In December 1992, President Bush, who was still in office, dispatched over 20,000 US military personnel to Somalia under UN auspices to maintain peace and aid in the distribution of famine relief. President-elect Clinton supported this move. However, when US soldiers came under attack from the various factions in the civil war, the US involvement became unpopular among Americans. The troops were withdrawn by March 1994, and the UN took control of the peacekeeping operation.

Both in the Middle East and the former Yugoslavia, the United States was instrumental in helping negotiate peace agreements. At the White House in September 1993, Clinton hosted the signing of a historic peace agreement between Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), with Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin and PLO Chairman Yasir Arafat in attendance. He also oversaw the signing of an agreement between Israel and Jordan at the White House in July 1994. In addition, in November 1995 the United States led peace talks between the Bosnian Muslims, Serbs, and Croats in Dayton, Ohio, in hopes of resolving the Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian War. The talks led to a peace agreement signed by all parties. As part of the agreement, Clinton pledged to send American soldiers to Bosnia and Herzegovina to help the NATO in providing humanitarian aid and policing a zone between the factions.

In Asia, the United States renewed favoured trading status for the People's Republic of China in 1994, despite controversy over that country's human rights record. The same year, Clinton announced the end of a 19-year trade embargo against Vietnam; and in July 1995, more than 20 years after the end of the Vietnam War, the United States extended full diplomatic recognition to Vietnam.

In the Americas, the United States took initiative to provide assistance to both Haiti and Mexico. In September 1994 the United States was prepared to launch a military invasion of Haiti to restore to power Haiti's elected president, Jean-Bertrand Aristide, who had been ousted in a military coup in 1991. Military confrontation was averted at the last minute, largely due to the diplomatic efforts of former president Jimmy Carter, who negotiated Aristide's peaceful return. The United States also came to the support of Mexico when its currency (the peso) began to drop in value in early 1995, providing a \$20 billion loan package to help restore the Mexican economy.

In August 1998, terrorists bombed US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania and over 250 people were killed. The United States retaliated with simultaneous missile attacks on a terrorist base in Afghanistan and a chemical-weapons factory in Sudan, both of which were suspected of

being involved in the bombings. Following notification in December 1998, that the Iraqis had ceased to cooperate with the UN Special Commission arms inspection team, forces from the United States and Britain began a three-day campaign of air strikes on Iraq.

In July 1999, Clinton imposed sanctions against the Taliban in Afghanistan. Clinton said the sanctions were intended to encourage the Taliban to end its relationship with Osama Bin Laden, a wealthy Saudi Arabian who allegedly commands a terrorist organization blamed for the 1998 bombings against the US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania.

The above instances manifest the predominant position assumed by the United States in world affairs following the collapse of communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe and the end of the Cold War. As the Soviet Union broke up into independent republics, Russia took the backstage in world affairs when the United States got itself involved in various hotspots. The United States as a uni-polar power began to act as a 'policeman' of the world. Advanced economy, a sound democratic tradition, and military might have given the United States an edge to play a predominant role in world politics. Since recent years the adversary of the United States has not been any other nation, communist or otherwise, but the threat of Islamic terrorism manifested by the Al-qaida led by Osama bin Laden. The American might has been challenged by the terrorist activities, which in turn has led to American action in Afghanistan and Iraq in recent times.

---

## 6.6 SUMMARY

---

The emergence of the United States as a uni-polar power can be traced to the end of the Cold War. The dissolution of the Soviet satellite system in Eastern Europe, combined with the disintegration of the Soviet Union itself, brought a dramatic end to the Cold War at the end of the 1980's. The reunification of Germany in October 1990 also destroyed one of the most prominent symbols of the Cold War era. The disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991 brought an end to the global rivalry between two competing superpowers.

In December 1992, President Bush, who was still in office, dispatched over 20,000 US military personnel to Somalia under UN auspices to maintain peace and aid in the distribution of famine relief. President-elect Clinton supported this move. However, when US soldiers came under attack from the various factions in the civil war, the US involvement became unpopular among Americans. The troops were withdrawn by March 1994, and the UN took control of the peacekeeping operation.

In this way, USA became the dominant world power.

---

## 6.7 QUESTIONS

---

1. How far the end of the Cold War enabled the USA to play a leading role in the world politics?
2. Trace the circumstances that led to the emergence of the USA as a uni-polar power in the world.
3. Examine the role of the USA in the Gulf War and the War Against Terrorism.

---

## 6.8 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History: 1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London, 1977.



## **CAMPAIGNS WITHIN AND OUTSIDE SOUTH AFRICA AGAINST APARTHEID**

### **Unit Structure :**

- 7.0 Objectives
- 7.1 Introduction
- 7.2 The Union of South Africa
- 7.3 Disabilities of the African Black People
- 7.4 Introduction of Apartheid
- 7.5 Group Areas Act
- 7.6 Internal Resistance
- 7.7 The African National Congress (ANC)
- 7.8 Sharpeville Massacre
- 7.9 Demonstrations at Soweto
- 7.10 Protest from Outside South Africa
- 7.11 Condemnation by the UN and the OAU
- 7.12 The end of apartheid
- 7.13 Renewal of Violence
- 7.14 International Pressure
- 7.15 Towards Black Majority Rule
- 7.16 Transition to black Majority Rule
- 7.17 Summary
- 7.18 Questions
- 7.19 References

---

### **7.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

1. To study the background of the racial discrimination in South Africa.
2. To understand the adverse effects of Apartheid and the attempts made to put an end to this evil practice.

---

## 7.1 INTRODUCTION

---

South Africa has had a complicated history. The Dutch were the first white settlers in Southern Africa, establishing a colony on the Cape of Good Hope in 1652, which was a vital staging post on the route from Holland to the Dutch East Indies. It remained a Dutch colony until 1795, and during that time, the Dutch, who were known as Afrikaners or Boers, meaning 'farmers', took land away from the native Africans and forced them to work as labourers, treating them as little better than slaves. They also brought more labourers from Asia, Mozambique and Madagascar.

The British links with India similarly encouraged British colonization in the nineteenth century, but differences in religion, economic attitudes and colonial policies divided the British from the Dutch. In 1795 the British captured the Cape during the French Revolutionary Wars, and the 1814 peace settlement decided that it should remain under British control. Many British settlers went out to Cape Colony.

---

## 7.2 THE UNION OF SOUTH AFRICA

---

The Dutch settlers became restless under British rule, especially when the British government made all slaves free throughout the British Empire (1838). The Boer farmers felt that this threatened their livelihood, and many of them decided to leave Cape Colony. They trekked northeast and established their own independent republics of the Transvaal and Orange Free State (1835--40). Some also moved into the area east of Cape Colony known as Natal. The discovery of diamonds near Kimberley and gold near Johannesburg intensified the rivalry between the Boers and the British. The first Boer War (1880-81) resolved nothing, but the second Boer War (1899-1902) ended in British victory and the annexation of the two Boer colonies the Transvaal and the Orange Free State. In 1910 they joined up with Cape Colony and Natal to form the Union of South Africa. A provision was made for a central government and parliament, in which Boers and British mingled in a ratio of about two to one. Thus, the Boers had a greater influence and provided all the prime ministers and most of the policies. The whites made up less than twenty per cent of the population. Black Africans comprised about seventy per cent of the population, and the remainders were Asians, especially Indians and Chinese and other 'coloured' people, a phrase denoting racially mixed backgrounds.

The first Prime minister, Botha (1910-19) and Smuts (1919-24) were moderate men. From 1924 to 1939, Hertzog was in power with the Nationalist Party. He shared many of Smut's policies. A splinter group of the Nationalist Party, the Afrikaner (Boer) Nationalists under Dr Malan, broke away. They won power in 1948.

---

### **7.3 DISABILITIES OF THE AFRICAN BLACK PEOPLE**

---

Although the black Africans made up the vast majority of the population, they suffered even worse discrimination than black people in the United States. Some of the gross disabilities from which the black people suffered were: (1) The white minority dominated politics and the economic life of the new state, and, with only a few exceptions, blacks were not allowed to vote. (2) Black people had to do most of the manual work in factories and on farms and were expected to live in areas reserved for them away from white residential areas. These reserved areas made up only about seven per cent of the total area of South Africa and were not large enough to enable the Africans to produce sufficient food for themselves and to pay all their taxes. Black Africans were forbidden to buy land outside the reserves. (3) The government controlled the movement of blacks by a system of pass laws. For example, a black person could not live in a town unless he had a pass showing he was working in a white-owned business. An African could not leave the farm where he worked without a pass from his employer. (4) Living and working conditions for blacks were primitive; for example, in the gold mining industry, Africans had to live in single-sex compounds with sometimes as many as ninety men sharing a dormitory. (5) By a law of 1911 black workers were forbidden to strike and were barred from holding skilled jobs.

---

### **7.4 INTRODUCTION OF APARTHEID**

---

Discrimination against non-whites was inherent in South African society from the earliest days. A clause in the Act of Union of 1910 provided that the native policies of the provinces would be retained and could be changed only by a two-thirds majority vote of parliament. In Cape Colony alone the Coloured community and a few black Africans had the right to vote. Even after Mahatma Gandhi's 21-year struggle before First World War to assure civil rights for Indian residents, they still had second-class status after the war.

South African blacks had an even lower status in the white-dominated state. Urban blacks lived in segregated areas and could not hold office or vote. They had no viable labour unions, and technical and administrative positions were closed to them. Even so, the National Party accused Prime Minister Smuts of allowing whites to be swallowed in a black sea. In the 1948 elections, led by Daniel F. Malan, the National Party won a narrow victory and began to implement its harsh concept of apartheid, which was designed to separate the races economically, politically, geographically, and socially. Apartheid is the Afrikaans word for 'apartness'. In 1948, it became the official word to describe the racial policies of the South African government, which were based on the separate development of the black and white races, and, on the domination of the black majority by the white minority.

The British settlers of the nineteenth century believed in a measure of white supremacy. However, the Boer prejudice against the coloured people was stronger, more rigid and more obstinate. They claimed that

whites were a master race, and that non-whites were inferior beings. The preaching of the Dutch Reformed Church backed up this Boer attitude, the official state church of South Africa and quoted passages from the Bible, which, they claimed, proved their theory. This was very much out of line with the rest of the Christian churches, which believe in racial equality. The Boers also stood by vague biological beliefs that blacks were naturally inferior and that people of mixed race were possibly worse. When India and Pakistan were given independence in 1947, white South Africans became alarmed at the growing racial equality within the Commonwealth, and they were determined to preserve their supremacy. Malan campaigned in 1948 against the 'Black Menace', and his words touched the deep fears of those whites who felt that the black majority might challenge them for economic and political power.

The government's position was strengthened when the National Party merged with the smaller Afrikaner Party in 1954. Malan, with growing support in parliament, introduced several laws designed to relegate all non-whites to permanent inferior status. A severe anti-Communist law was passed in 1950; marriage between whites and blacks was made a crime; and education for blacks was defined differently than for whites.

---

## **7.5 GROUP AREAS ACT**

---

Most drastic was the Group Areas Act of 1950, which, augmented by later legislation, provided that specific areas be reserved for each of South Africa's four racial groups as defined by apartheid, that is, the Europeans (whites), Bantu (blacks), Coloureds (mixed race), and Asians. These laws and the homelands concept, which robbed most blacks of their South African citizenship and which denied them the right to live in cities without special permission, were the foundations of apartheid. All blacks were assigned to specific tribal areas and had to carry passes when they entered restricted (white) areas. The goal was to create so-called 'homelands' for all blacks. In response to these harsh policies, the ANC decided to pursue a more militant stance through mass civil disobedience. Nelson Mandela emerged as a central leader at this time.

In 1951 the Separate Representation of Voters Act was passed by a simple majority. It provided for the removal from the white register of the names of Coloured voters in the Cape of Good Hope Province, reversing a policy that had been in effect since 1852. The bill was declared unconstitutional by the nation's Supreme Court in March 1952 because it had been passed by less than the two-thirds majority required to amend voting laws. Legislation to give parliament power to overrule the Supreme Court was passed in May, but it was also declared unconstitutional. Successive prime ministers reinforced the apartheid policy: Malan (1948-54); Strijdom (1954-58); Verwoerd (1958-66); and Vorster (1966-78).

---

## 7.6 INTERNAL RESISTANCE

---

The earliest resistance to racialist policies in South Africa was led by Mahatma Gandhi, with a programme of non-violent protests against laws discriminating against Indians, in the years 1913-15. From then until 1948, no champion of black rights appeared on the scene of South Africa. However, as apartheid tightened, some whites began to oppose it through the Liberal and Progressive Parties. The blacks began to use the boycott of buses as an economic weapon, and silent vigils by black-sashed women as a dignified and subtle psychological pressure. The Communist Party attracted support among whites and blacks. However, it was banned by the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950, which gave massive powers to the Minister of Justice. Similarly other acts such as the Public Safety Act of 1953, the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1953, the Riotous Assemblies Act of 1956, the Unlawful Organizations Act of 1960 and the Terrorism Act of 1967 increased the power of the Bureau of State Security (BOSS) and made resistance to the apartheid policies of the government more dangerous.

In view of the various acts and measures opposition to the system of apartheid in side South Africa was difficult. Anyone who objected, including whites, or broke the apartheid laws, was accused of being a communist and was severely punished under the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950. Africans were forbidden to strike, and their political party, the African National Congress (ANC), was helpless. In spite of this, protests did take place.

---

## 7.7 THE AFRICAN NATIONAL CONGRESS (ANC)

---

The ANC was founded in 1912 as a non-violent civil rights organization that worked to promote the interests of black Africans. With a mostly middle-class constituency, the ANC stressed constitutional means of change through the use of delegations, petitions, and peaceful protest. In 1940 Alfred B. Xuma became ANC president and began recruiting younger, more outspoken members. Among the new recruits were Nelson Mandela, Oliver Tambo, and Walter Sisulu, who helped in establishing the ANC Youth League in 1944 and soon became the organization's leading members.

ANC membership greatly increased in the 1950's after South Africa's white-minority government began to implement the apartheid policy of rigid racial segregation in 1948. The ANC actively opposed apartheid, and engaged in increasing political conflict with the government. In 1955 the ANC issued its Freedom Charter, which stated, "South Africa belongs to all who live in it, black and white, and no government can claim authority unless it is based on the will of the people." It went on to demand: - equality before the law; freedom of assembly, movement, speech, religion and the press; the right to vote; the right to work, with equal pay for equal work; 40-hour working week, minimum wage and unemployment benefits; free medical care; free, compulsory and equal education.

Church leaders and missionaries, both black and white, spoke out against apartheid. They included people like Trevor Huddleston, a British missionary who had been working in South Africa since 1943. Later the ANC organized other protests, including the 1957 bus boycott: instead of paying a fare increase on the bus route from their township to Johannesburg ten miles away, thousands of Africans walked to work and back for three months until fares were reduced.

---

## **7.8 SHARPEVILLE MASSACRE**

---

Protests against the racial policy of the South African government reached a climax in 1960 when a huge demonstration took place against the pass laws at Sharpeville, an African township near Johannesburg. Police fired on the crowd, killing sixty-seven Africans and wounding many more. Hundreds of people were beaten by police and thousands more were arrested and imprisoned as the protests continued. The government imposed ban on the ANC. This was an important turning-point in the campaign: until then most of the protests had been non-violent; but this brutal treatment by the authorities convinced many black leaders that violence could only be met with violence. There was a spate of bomb attacks, but the police soon clamped down, arresting most of the black leaders, like Nelson Mandela, who was sentenced to life imprisonment. Chief Albert Luthuli organized a three-day strike for which he was deprived of his chieftaincy. He published his moving autobiography *Let My People Go*, for which he was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize. He was killed in 1967 under mysterious circumstances. The authorities claimed that he had deliberately stepped in front of a train.

---

## **7.9 DEMONSTRATIONS AT SOWETO**

---

Discontent and protest increased again in the 1970's because wages of Africans failed to keep pace with inflation. In 1976, when the Transvaal authorities announced that Afrikaans, the language spoken by whites of Dutch descent, was to be used in black African schools, massive demonstrations took place at Soweto, a black township near Johannesburg. Although there were many children and young people in the crowd, police opened fire, killing at least 200 black Africans. This time the protests did not die down; they spread over the whole country. Again the government responded with brutality. Over the next six months a further 500 Africans were killed. Among the victims was Steve Biko, a young African leader and founder of the Black Consciousness movement who had been urging people to be proud of their blackness. He was a supporter of reconciliation rather than confrontation. He died of head wounds received while in police custody in 1977. Twenty thousand blacks attended his funeral, as well as many representatives of European countries.

---

## **7.10 PROTEST FROM OUTSIDE SOUTH AFRICA**

---

Though the policy of racial discrimination and apartheid was the internal matter of the South African government there was opposition from different parts of the world. The outside world became increasingly critical of South African policies as they contrasted more and more with the trend towards majority rule and racial equality in the rest of the world. The Commonwealth of Nations was bitterly critical of the policy of apartheid. Early in 1960 the British Conservative Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, had the courage to speak out against apartheid in Cape Town. He spoke about the growing strength of African nationalism: “the wind of change is blowing through the continent... our national policies must take account of it”. His warnings were ignored, and shortly afterwards, the world was horrified by the Sharpeville massacre. At the 1961 Commonwealth Conference, criticism of South Africa was intense, and many thought she would be expelled from the Commonwealth of Nations. In the end Verwoerd withdrew South Africa's application for continued membership. In 1960 South Africa had decided to become a republic instead of a dominion, thereby severing the connection with the British crown; because of this she had to apply for readmission to the Commonwealth, and she ceased to be a member of the Commonwealth.

---

## **7.11 CONDEMNATION BY THE UN AND THE OAU**

---

The United Nations condemned the racial discrimination of apartheid in 1961, 1962 and 1963, at a time when many new African nations were joining the organization and rejoicing in their freedom from white domination. The Organization of African Unity also repeatedly condemned apartheid in South Africa in all its conferences. The UN voted to impose an economic boycott on South Africa (1962), but this proved useless because not all member states supported it. This was chiefly due to the fact that most of the countries of the Western world relied on gold and diamond reserves of South Africa. Britain, the United States, France, West Germany and Italy condemned apartheid in public, but continued to trade with South Africa. Among other things, they sold South Africa massive arms supplies, apparently hoping she would prove to be a bastion against the spread of communism in Africa. Wilson's Labour Government refused to sell arms to South Africa, a ban that the Conservative government reversed in 1970 because of its worries about the strategic importance of the Southern Ocean in the struggle against communism. South Africa was banned from the Olympic movement. When New Zealand maintained its rugby-playing links with South Africa, most black African nations boycotted the 1976 Olympic Games to indicate their disgust. Consequently Verwoerd (until his assassination in 1966) and his successor Vorster (1966-78) were able to ignore the protests from the outside world until well into the 1970's.

The United Nations and the OAU were particularly critical of the continued South African occupation of South West Africa (Namibia). In June 1971 the International Court of Justice ruled that South Africa's

presence in Namibia was illegal. The situation became critical when guerrillas from the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO) began crossing the border from Angola to attack South African targets in Namibia. The South African government responded by building up defenses, attacking Angola, and aiding the rebels who were fighting the Cuban-supported Angolan government. The war continued into the 1980's. Ultimately, international political and economic pressure forced South Africa to take a more conciliatory attitude. The initiative taken by the United States led to peace talks in December 1988, which resulted in independence for Namibia.

---

## 7.12 THE END OF APARTHEID

---

The system of apartheid continued without any concessions being made to black people, until 1980. Vorster's successor as Prime Minister, P.W. Botha, who was elected in 1979 gave an immediate impression of being more liberal than his predecessors. He realized that all was not well with the apartheid system. He decided that he must reform apartheid, dropping some of the most unpopular aspects in an attempt to preserve white control. Both external and internal factors prompted Botha to take the radical steps, which ultimately led to the dismantling of the apartheid regime in South Africa.

Externally, criticism of the apartheid regime of South Africa from the Commonwealth, the United Nations and the Organization of African Unity gradually gathered momentum. External pressures became much greater in 1975 when the white-ruled Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique achieved independence after a long struggle. The African takeover of Zimbabwe (former Rhodesia) in 1980 removed the last of the white-ruled states, which had been sympathetic to the South African government and apartheid. South Africa came to be surrounded by hostile black states, and many Africans in these new states had sworn never to rest until their fellow-Africans in South Africa had been liberated.

The economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations against South Africa, though not implemented rigidly, gradually began to affect South African economy. Recession in the late 1970's brought about hardships and the condition of many white people became worse. Whites began to emigrate in large numbers, but the black population was increasing. In 1980 whites were only sixteen per cent of the population, whereas between the two world wars they had formed twenty-one per cent. Under these circumstances, the continuation of the policy of apartheid was considered to be not in the long-term interest of South Africa.

In a speech in September 1979, which astonished many of his Nationalist supporters, the newly elected Prime Minister Botha said: "A revolution in South Africa is no longer just a remote possibility. Either we adapt or we perish. White domination and legally enforced apartheid are a recipe for permanent conflict." Botha went on to suggest that the black homelands must be made viable and that unnecessary discrimination must be abolished. Gradually he introduced some important changes, which he

hoped would be enough to silence the critics both inside and outside South Africa. These changes were: blacks were allowed to join trades unions and to go on strike (1979); blacks were allowed to elect their own local township councils (1981). However, they were not yet granted right to vote in national elections; a new constitution was introduced setting up two new houses of parliament, one for coloureds and one for Asians (but not for Africans). The new system was so designed that the whites kept overall control. It came into force in 1984; sexual relations and marriage were allowed between people of different races (1985); the hated pass laws for non-whites were abolished (1986).

---

### **7.13 RENEWAL OF VIOLENCE**

---

Botha was not prepared to go beyond these concessions to the blacks and coloured people of South Africa. He even refused to consider the ANC's main demands of the right to vote and to play a full part in ruling the country. Rather than being won over by these concessions, black Africans were angered that the new constitution made no provision for them, and were determined to carry on their struggle till they achieved full political rights.

Violence escalated, with both sides guilty of excesses. The ANC used the 'necklace', a tyre placed round the victim's neck and set on fire, to murder black councillors and black police, who were regarded as collaborators with apartheid. On the twenty-fifth anniversary of Sharpeville, police opened fire on a procession of black mourners going to a funeral in Port Elizabeth, killing over forty people in March 1985. In July a state of emergency was declared in the worst affected areas, and it was extended to the whole country in June 1986. This gave the police the power to arrest people without warrants and freedom from all criminal proceedings; thousands of people were arrested, and newspapers, radio and TV were banned from reporting demonstrations and strikes.

---

### **7.14 INTERNATIONAL PRESSURE**

---

The renewed violence and state repression roused the international community to take action against the South African government. In August 1986 the Commonwealth of Nations, except Britain, agreed on a strong package of economic and cultural sanctions against South Africa. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher would commit Britain only to a voluntary ban on investment in South Africa. Her argument was that severe economic sanctions would worsen the plight of black Africans, who would be thrown out of their jobs. This caused the rest of the Commonwealth to feel bitter against Britain; Rajiv Gandhi, the Indian Prime Minister, accused Mrs. Thatcher of 'compromising on basic principles and values for economic ends'. In September 1986 the United States joined the international community when Congress, in spite of President Reagan's veto, voted to stop American loans to South Africa, to cut air links and to ban imports of iron, steel, coal, textiles and uranium from South Africa.

Within South Africa too things had been changing. The black population was no longer just a mass of uneducated and unskilled labourers. There was a steadily growing number of well-educated, professional, middle-class black people, some of them holding important positions, like Desmond Tutu, who was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in 1984 and became Anglican Archbishop of Cape Town in 1986. The Dutch Reformed Church, which had once supported apartheid, now condemned it as not in accordance with Christianity. A majority of white South Africans began to recognize that it was difficult to defend the total exclusion of blacks from the country's political life. Thus, although they were nervous about what might happen, they were resigned to the idea of black majority rule at some time in the future. White moderates were therefore prepared to make the best of the situation and get the best deal possible.

---

## **7.15 TOWARDS BLACK MAJORITY RULE**

---

F.W. de Klerk, who was elected as the new President in 1989 had a reputation for caution, but privately he had decided that apartheid would have to go completely, and he accepted that black majority rule must come eventually. The problem was how to achieve it without further violence and possible civil war. With great courage and determination, and in the face of bitter opposition from right-wing Afrikaner groups, de Klerk gradually moved the country towards black majority rule.

In order to create an atmosphere of congeniality for a possible black majority rule, the government of President F. W. de Klerk released Mandela in February 1990 after twenty-seven years in jail. The government also lifted the ban on the ANC and other previously banned political parties. Mandela assumed the leadership of the ANC, and led negotiations with the government in the difficult years between 1990 and 1994 when, on many occasions, it looked as though talks would collapse and violence would take over instead. In 1991 the government repealed the last of the laws that formed the legal basis for apartheid. Namibia, the neighbouring territory ruled by South Africa since 1919, was given independence under a black government in 1990.

Following these confidence building measures talks began in 1991 between the government and the ANC to work out a new constitution, which would allow blacks full political rights. Meanwhile the ANC was doing its best to present itself as a moderate party, which had no plans for wholesale nationalization, and to reassure whites that they would be safe and happy under black rule. Nelson Mandela condemned violence and called for reconciliation between blacks and whites. The negotiations dragged on due to many complicated issues. The transition from white minority rule to black majority rule was not an easy task. De Klerk had to face right-wing opposition from his own National Party and from various extreme white racist groups who claimed that he had betrayed them. The ANC was involved in a power struggle with another black party, the Natal-based Zulu Nation Freedom party led by Chief Buthelezi. Mandela and de Klerk shared the 1993 Nobel Peace Prize for their efforts to

establish democracy and racial harmony in South Africa.

---

## **7.16 TRANSITION TO BLACK MAJORITY RULE**

---

In the spring of 1993 the talks were successful and agreement was reached about how to carry through the transition to black majority rule. A general election was held and the ANC won almost two-thirds of the votes. As had been agreed, a coalition government of the ANC, National Party and Inkatha took office with Nelson Mandela as the first black president of South Africa and F.W. de Klerk as the deputy president in May 1994. Although there had been violence and bloodshed, it was a remarkable achievement, for which both de Klerk and Mandela deserve the credit that South Africa was able to move from apartheid to black majority rule without civil war.

The new government moved quickly to address the key concerns of the black majority such as health, housing, education, and jobs. Details of a Reconstruction and Development Programme were announced in May 1994, but implementation of this programme was expected to be long and slow. The other priority of President Mandela was national reconciliation. In all his speeches he stressed the need to maintain national unity. However, black frustration at the slow pace of change led to an increase in the number of strikes.

The first draft of a new national constitution, to be implemented from 1999, was published in November, while Archbishop Desmond Tutu was appointed to head a Truth and Reconciliation Commission to investigate human rights abuses by both sides during the apartheid years. Following a Supreme Court ruling in February 1996, black pupils were registered at the overwhelmingly white Primary School in Northern Province with heavy police protection, after the school had tried to deny them admission. Most local white families promptly boycotted the school. F. W. de Klerk took his National Party out of Mandela's government in May 1996, citing differences with Mandela and the need for the National Party to rebuild its electoral appeal.

In February 1998 a successor to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission was announced. The Institute for Change, Memory, and Reconciliation will research the final report of the commission and help in the implementation of its recommendations. In October Desmond Tutu handed the final report of the Truth Commission to President Mandela. The ANC had attempted to block its publication, objecting to references to human rights abuses by its own members.

In the June 1998 general elections, the ANC strengthened its position in the assembly. The party received sixty-six per cent of the vote, but was one seat short of holding the two-thirds majority required to rewrite the constitution. The ANC formed a coalition with the Indian-led Minority Front, which held one seat, and so assumed the majority. Nelson Mandela expressed his desire to retire from active politics and was succeeded by Thabo Mbeki as president.

---

## 7.17 SUMMARY

---

South Africa has had a complicated history. The Dutch were the first white settlers in Southern Africa, establishing a colony on the Cape of Good Hope in 1652, which was a vital staging post on the route from Holland to the Dutch East Indies. It remained a Dutch colony until 1795, and during that time, the Dutch, who were known as Afrikaners or Boers, meaning 'farmers', took land away from the native Africans and forced them to work as labourers, treating them as little better than slaves. They also brought more labourers from Asia, Mozambique and Madagascar.

The first Prime minister, Botha (1910-19) and Smuts (1919-24) were moderate men. From 1924 to 1939, Hertzog was in power with the Nationalist Party. He shared many of Smut's policies. A splinter group of the Nationalist Party, the Afrikaner (Boer) Nationalists under Dr Malan, broke away. They won power in 1948.

The Communist Party attracted support among whites and blacks. However, it was banned by the Suppression of Communism Act of 1950, which gave massive powers to the Minister of Justice. Similarly other acts such as the Public Safety Act of 1953, the Criminal Law Amendment Act of 1953, the Riotous Assemblies Act of 1956, the Unlawful Organizations Act of 1960 and the Terrorism Act of 1967 increased the power of the Bureau of State Security (BOSS) and made resistance to the apartheid policies of the government more dangerous.

The Commonwealth of Nations was bitterly critical of the policy of apartheid. Early in 1960 the British Conservative Prime Minister, Harold Macmillan, had the courage to speak out against apartheid in Cape Town. He spoke about the growing strength of African nationalism: "the wind of change is blowing through the continent... our national policies must take account of it".

Thus, the campaigns within and outside Africa against were taken place.

---

## 7.18 QUESTIONS

---

1. Trace the origin of the policy of apartheid in South Africa. What was its impact on the South African people?
2. What factors led to the end of apartheid in South Africa?
3. Give an account of the movement within South Africa for the end of the apartheid.
4. Evaluate the role of international pressure in the termination of the policy of apartheid in South Africa.
5. Trace the transition from the white minority to black majority rule in South Africa.
6. Write short notes on the following:

- (a) Apartheid
- (b) African National Congress (ANC)
- (c) Nelson Mandela

---

## 7.19 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History: 1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London, 1977.



## **CIVIL RIGHT MOVEMENTS IN U.S.A.**

### **Unit Structure :**

- 8.0 Objectives
- 8.1 Introduction
- 8.2 Historical Background
- 8.3 Limitations
- 8.4 Violation of Human Rights
- 8.5 Human Rights and International Law
- 8.6 Amnesty International
- 8.7 Civil Rights Movement
- 8.8 Summary
- 8.9 Questions
- 8.10 References

---

### **8.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

1. To study the concept and practice of Human Rights Movement.
2. To understand the progress of Civil Rights Movement with special reference to the USA.

---

### **8.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

Human Rights are of Universal importance. They are common to all regardless of caste, colour, religion, race, etc. Countries, all over the world strive hard to safeguard human rights through their well established constitutions as per the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights; Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and Optional Protocols. Violations of Human Rights occur in the name of religion, race, creed, caste, colour, sex, region, etc.

It has been said that all human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood. The concept of human rights has been evolved from the concept of natural rights. These

natural rights are derived from Natural Law, which helped in the development of human rights.

---

## **8.2 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND**

---

Traces of human rights can be found in the writings of ancient Greek and Roman thinkers in the fifth century B.C. According to ancient Greek writers, the God establishes a law, which stands above the obligations and interdictions imposed by the rulers of the community. But it was in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that this theory was popularized by the philosophers such as Hobbes, Locke, Spinoza and others. The American Declaration of Independence (1776) and the Declaration of the Rights of Man by the French National Assembly (1789), stressed the inherent rights of man. These indicate how it was for the first time an attempt was made to derive human rights from natural rights.

Human rights had already found expression in the Covenant of the League of Nations, which led to the creation of the International Labour Organization. At the 1945 San Francisco Conference, held to draft the Charter of the United Nations, a proposal to embody a 'Declaration on the Essential Rights of Man' was put forward but was not examined because it required more detailed consideration than was possible at the time. The Charter clearly speaks of 'promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion.' The idea of promulgating an 'international bill of rights' was also considered by many as basically implicit in the Charter.

The League of Nations and the United Nations stressed the need for striving towards peace among the countries of the world and for the upliftment of human rights. The United Nations Charter pays special attention in safeguarding and developing human rights since 1945. There was lack of proper understanding about human rights prior to 1945. But, today the realization of human rights has become important at the national and international level. Democracy is a precondition for strengthening human rights. No society can be free, or no state can claim to be democratic unless every citizen enjoys human rights. In modern times all the democratic states give top most priority to safeguard human rights and establish peace in their states. The Charter also emphasizes peace and human rights all over the world, which in turn helps to promote socio-economic development.

### **8.2.1 Universal Declaration of Human Rights:**

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted as a resolution unanimously on 10 December 1948 by the General Assembly of the United Nations. The objective of the 30-article declaration is to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. The declaration proclaims the personal, civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights of humans, which are limited

only by recognition for the rights and freedoms of others and the requirements of morality, public order, and general welfare. Among the rights cited by the declaration are the rights to life, liberty, and security of person; to freedom from arbitrary arrest; to a fair trial; to be presumed innocent until proved guilty; to freedom from interference with the privacy of one's home and correspondence; to freedom of movement and residence; to asylum, nationality, and ownership of property; to freedom of thought, conscience, religion, opinion, and expression; to association, peaceful assembly, and participation in government; to social security, work, rest, and a standard of living adequate for health and well-being; to education; and to participation in the social life of one's community. The declaration was conceived as the first part of an international bill of rights. The UN Commission on Human Rights directed its efforts to the incorporation of the main principles of the declaration into various international agreements.

The General Assembly in 1955 authorized two human rights covenants, one relating to civil and political rights, and the other to economic, social, and cultural rights. After a long struggle for ratification, both of these covenants became effective in January 1976.

Since 1948 it has been and rightly continues to be the most important and far-reaching of all United Nations declarations, and a fundamental source of inspiration for national and international efforts to promote and protect human rights and fundamental freedoms. It has set the direction for all subsequent work in the field of human rights and has provided the basic philosophy for many legally binding international instruments designed to protect the rights and freedoms, which it proclaims. As its very name implies it is universal not only in title but also in content. It enunciates and directs that human rights and fundamental freedoms should be available to all human beings on the earth. These rights are beneficial to the peoples of the whole universe. Almost all its articles start with the word 'Every one' or 'No one' or 'Men and Women'. It shows that every human being is entitled to enjoy the human rights regardless of citizenship or domicile.

The United Nations have proclaimed that peoples all over the world have these rights not because they belong to certain countries or states, but because they are the members of human family. The Universal Declaration of Rights sets a new international standard. It is one of the greatest achievements of Mrs. Roosevelt, the chairperson of the Commission on Human Rights and the principal representative of the United States on the Third Committee. She stated that, "the Declaration was the first and foremost declaration of the basic principles to serve as a common standard for all nations." She also added that, "it is the International Magna Carta of all Mankind."

In the Proclamation of Teheran, adopted by the International Conference on Human Rights held in Iran in 1968, the Conference agreed that "the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states a common understanding of the peoples of the world concerning the inalienable and

inviolable rights of all members of the human family and constitutes an obligation for the members of the international community." The Conference affirmed its faith in the principles set forth in the Declaration, and urged all peoples and governments "to dedicate themselves to [those] principles. . . and to redouble their efforts to provide for all human beings a life consonant with freedom and dignity and conducive to physical, mental, social and spiritual welfare."

### **8.2.2 International Covenants on Human Rights:**

In 1952, it was decided that there should be two great Covenants one on Civil and Political Rights and the other on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. Following this, a separate instrument called the Optional Protocol to the Civil and Political Rights Covenant was adopted in 1966 to regulate the implementation arrangements. As such the two Covenants were adopted unanimously on 16 December 1966 but they came into force only in 1976. The Covenants are to affirm legal obligations of States to respect human rights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights constitute a trinity, often regarded as the 'Magna Carta of Humanity'.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights came into force from March 1976 together with its Optional Protocol. The major rights and freedoms provided by this Covenant are rights to self-determination, right to life, abolition of slavery and suppression of slave trade, right to liberty, right of prisoners to be treated with humanity, right of not to be imprisoned arbitrarily, right of every one to leave any country, including his own and to return to his country, right to equality in the administration of justice, right to provide legal assistance, right to privacy, right to freedom of thought, conscience and religion, right to freedom of opinion and expression, right to freedom of peaceful assembly, right to freedom of association, rights relating to marriage and family protection, right of the child, right to take part in the conduct of public affairs, and right to equality before law and equal protection of the law.

This Covenant has the provision to check violation of human rights and implement the same. In order to implement these rights the Covenant has established an international organ known as the 'Human Rights Committee'. The Committee consists of eighteen members who are experts in human rights. The International Court of Justice elects the members. Each member has a term of four years. The Human Rights Committee adopts four different methods in implementing human rights as provided in the Covenant. These are: meetings, reporting, inter-state communication system and conciliation.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the Optional Protocol are separate instruments. But they are related to each other. Only those states, which are parties to the Covenant, can become

parties to the Protocol. The first Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights enables the Human Rights Committee set up under the Covenant, to receive and consider communications from individuals claiming to be victims of violations of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant. Both the Covenant and the Protocol came into force simultaneously in March 1976. The country that ratifies the Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights undertakes to protect its people by law against cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment. It recognizes the right of every human being to life, liberty, privacy and security of a person.

A country ratifying the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights acknowledges its responsibility to promote better living conditions of its people. It recognizes every one's right to work, to fair wages, to social security, to adequate standards of living and freedom from hunger and to health and education. It also undertakes to endure the right of every one to form and join trade unions.

The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) of the United Nations plays an important role in protecting the human rights as provided in the UN Charter. The ECOSOC set up the International Commission on Human Rights in February 1946. The Human Rights Committee has the right to make recommendations to the ECOSOC. The Human Rights Committee has submitted certain conventions, which are considered to be very important. Some of these are: Declaration of the rights of the Child (1953); United Nations Declaration on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (1963); Declaration on the Elimination of Religious Intolerance (1964); International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid (1972); Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from being subjected to Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (1989).

---

### **8.3 LIMITATIONS**

---

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights affirms that the exercise of a person's rights and freedoms may be subject to certain limitations, which must be determined by law, solely for the purpose of securing due recognition of the rights and freedoms of others and of meeting the just requirements of morality, public order and the general welfare in a democratic society. Rights may not be exercised contrary to the purposes and principles of the United Nations, or if they are aimed at destroying any of the rights set forth in the Declaration. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights states that the rights provided for therein may be limited by law, but only in so far as it is compatible with the nature of the rights and solely to promote the general welfare in a democratic society.

Unlike the Universal Declaration and the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights contains no general provision applicable to all the

rights provided for in the Covenant authorizing restrictions on their exercise. However, several articles in the Covenant provide that the rights being dealt with shall not be subject to any restrictions except those which are prescribed by law and are necessary to protect national security, public order, or the rights and freedoms of others.

Certain rights, therefore, may never be suspended or limited, even in emergency situations. These are the rights to life, to freedom from torture, to freedom from enslavement or servitude, to protection from imprisonment for debt, to freedom from retroactive penal laws, to recognition as a person before the law, and to freedom of thought, conscience and religion.

The Covenant on Civil and Political Rights allows a State to limit or suspend the enjoyment of certain rights in cases of officially proclaimed public emergencies, which threaten the life of the nation. Such limitations or suspensions are permitted only 'to the extent strictly required by the exigencies of the situation' and may never involve discrimination solely on the ground of race, colour, sex, language, religion or social origin. The limitations or suspensions must also be reported to the United Nations.

---

## **8.4 VIOLATION OF HUMAN RIGHTS**

---

Almost in all the countries of the world, violation of human rights has become a normal commitment. Even the organized governments could not prevent the violation of human rights. Police and custodians of law cause atrocities against women, children, prisoners, poor and destitutes. The police use third degree methods to extract confessions from suspected criminals. Sometimes innocent people die due to such inhuman treatment by the police. Death in police custody has become a common feature in many countries of the world. Police encounters in which criminals are killed are also violation of human rights. Abuse of prisoners, ill treatment of women in the name of dowry leading to either murder or suicide, honour killing of women for violation of clan or caste rules, etc. constitute violation of human rights. Genocides carried out by the Khmer Rouge regime of Pol Pot in Cambodia from 1975 to 1979, mutual massacre of Tutsis and Hutus in Rwanda in 1994, mass killings in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo in former Yugoslavia since 1991, elimination of political dissidents in many countries of Latin America and Africa, and suppression of democratic movement in China (Tiananmen Square massacre, 1989), and Burma, have been serious violations of human rights. The apartheid followed by the minority white regime in South Africa was the worst human rights abuse known in history.

---

## 8.5 HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW

---

Since the Second World War international law has become increasingly concerned with the protection of human rights. It has provided improved procedures for that purpose within the UN. This new emphasis has also been manifested in the adoption by the UN of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the conclusion of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in 1948, the signing of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination in 1966, and the adoption in 1975 of the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture or Other Cruel, Inhumane, or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. These measures have been supplemented by regional conventions, such as the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (1950) and the American Convention on Human Rights (1969). In 1945 an international convention for the prosecution of the major war criminals of the European Axis Powers provided for the punishment of crimes against humanity and established a special International Military Tribunal for that purpose.

The ethnically-motivated massacres and human rights atrocities during recent and continuing civil wars, such as those in the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda, have prompted the UN to establish international courts to deal with violations of human rights in times of war. For example the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) was set up in 1994 and, after the conclusion of two trials, now has twenty-four suspects in custody. The tribunal's conviction of Jean-Paul Akayesu, the former mayor of the central Rwandan community of Taba, on nine counts of genocide and crimes against humanity in September 1998 set an important precedent for other international courts. In a second ruling the ICTR became the first international court to define the crime of rape, calling it a "physical invasion of a sexual nature, committed on a person under circumstances which are coercive." This was necessary, the court said, because "to date, there is no commonly accepted definition of [rape] in international law." The court also ruled that rape and sexual violence may constitute genocide if committed with the intent to destroy a specific national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.

The international application of human rights violations developed further with the extradition of former Chilean dictator Augusto Pinochet from Britain to Spain. After his arrest in October 1998, Pinochet was extradited to Spain to face trial for crimes against humanity, specifically the violation of the human rights of Spanish citizens in Chile. In April 1999 the British Home Secretary, Jack Straw, decided that the extradition could go ahead, despite claims from Pinochet's supporters, including those in Chile, that a head of state was immune from such charges. Extradition proceedings were opened in September, and a ruling the following month stated that Pinochet's extradition to Spain could go ahead. However, medical examinations

undertaken as part of an appeal against this decision revealed that he was too ill to stand trial. Four European countries appealed against the Home Office's decision, but Pinochet was allowed to return to Chile in March 2000.

New threats constantly call for new international responses. As well as the establishment of temporary international courts to investigate specific cases of alleged genocide and government-sponsored violation of human rights, examples include the conventions against acts of terrorism and the distribution of drugs. Thus, despite the modern multiplication of global and regional multilateral treaties, customary international law still maintains a central role in the legal system of the international community. Two Libyans suspected of carrying out the Lockerbie bombing in 1988, in which 259 people died, were handed over to United Nations officials in April 1999. They entered pleas of not guilty at the pre-trial hearing; their trial started in the Netherlands in May 2000 with Scottish judges presiding.

---

## **8.6 AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL**

---

Amnesty International is an independent, worldwide pressure group campaigning impartially for the release of all prisoners of conscience, that is, people imprisoned or maltreated because of their political or religious beliefs. The movement was founded in 1961 by the British lawyer Peter Benenson, and maintains its headquarters in London. Amnesty International is based on a network of voluntary local groups and individual members throughout the world, who adopt prisoners of conscience and pursue their cases with the governments concerned or through international bodies. Methods of investigation and campaigning include monitoring, fact-finding missions, media publicity, and individual correspondence.

The general purposes of the organization are to uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; to work for the release of those detained, restricted, or otherwise subjected to physical coercion by reason of their beliefs, ethnic origin, gender, colour, or language, provided they have not used or advocated violence; to oppose detention without trial and to uphold the right to a fair trial; and to oppose the use of the death penalty or torture, whether or not the people concerned have advocated violence.

Amnesty International is financed by voluntary donations. Its membership stands at some 1.2 million people, with 4,300 volunteer groups and nationally organized sections in 55 countries, and supporters in more than 160 countries. In 1977 Amnesty International received the Nobel Prize for Peace for “its efforts on behalf of defending human dignity against violence and subjugation”.

---

## 8.7 CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

---

### 8.7.1. Civil Rights:

Civil rights are the freedoms and rights that a person may have as a member of a community, state, or nation. Civil rights include freedom of speech, of the press, and of religion. Among others are the right to own property, and to receive fair and equal treatment from government, other persons, and private groups.

In democratic countries, law and custom protect civil rights. The constitutions of many democracies have bills of rights that describe basic liberties and rights. Courts of law decide whether a person's civil rights have been violated. The courts also determine the limits of civil rights, so that people do not use their freedoms in order to violate the rights of others.

In many non-democratic countries, the government claims to respect and guarantee civil rights. But in most of these countries, such claims differ greatly from the actual conditions. In some Communist countries, for example, the people were denied such basic rights as freedom of speech and of the press. Yet their constitutions guaranteed these rights.

Some people draw sharp distinctions between civil liberties and civil rights. They regard civil liberties as guarantees to a person against government interference. They think of civil rights as guarantees of equal treatment for all people. For example, civil liberties would include freedom from government interference with a person's right to free speech. Civil rights would include the right of all people to receive equal protection of the law. Civil rights often refer to the condition and treatment of minority group.

### 8.7.2. Basic Civil Rights:

The basic civil rights recognized by most democratic countries are freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to peaceful assembly. These rights are guaranteed under the constitutions of many countries. Legislation may guarantee other rights concerned with the process of law. These include protection against arrest and detention without a proper reason, the right to jury trial, and protection against being tried twice for the same offence. In addition, people and property may not be wrongfully searched or seized and excessive or unusual punishments may not be inflicted.

Rights against discrimination protect minority groups and ensure equal rights and opportunities for all people regardless of race, sex, religion, age, or disability. Laws exist in many countries to give equal rights to all men and women regardless of their race or religion. But in some countries, discrimination on racial or religious grounds is part of government policy. Rights to form trades unions are intended to protect workers from exploitation by their employers. In many countries,

workers are still fighting for the right to organize and to campaign for better pay, improved working conditions, and the right to strike.

### **8.7.3. Limits of Civil Rights:**

All civil rights have limits, even in democratic countries. For example, a person may be denied freedom of speech in a democracy if it can be shown that his or her speech might lead to the overthrow of the government. A person may not use civil rights to justify actions that might seriously harm the health, welfare, safety, or morals of others. A person may be denied a civil right if that right is used to violate other people's rights. Freedom of expression, for example, does not permit a person to tell lies that ruin another person's reputation. Property owners have the right to do what they choose with their property. However, this right may not allow a person legally to refuse to sell property to a person of a certain race or religion. This is because the property owner would be denying the other person equal freedom of choice.

The specific limits of civil rights vary with the times. In time of war, a government may restrict personal freedoms in the interest of the security of the country. Changing social and economic conditions also cause changes in the importance that people give certain rights.

### **8.7.4. Civil Rights Movement in the United States:**

One of the bitterest civil rights movements was that of black Americans in the United States, who campaigned for equal rights from the 1800's. This campaign continued through the 1900's, and led to a major protest movement during the 1950's and 1960's, which resulted in important civil rights legislation to end discrimination against black Americans.

#### **1) Constitutional Amendments in Favour of the Blacks:**

Black Americans, who make up the largest minority group in the United States, have been denied their full civil rights more than any other minority group. However, the black Americans made significant gains in their struggle for equal rights during Reconstruction, the twelve-year period following the Civil War (1860-65). The Thirteenth Amendment, adopted in 1865, abolished slavery in the United States. In 1868, the Fourteenth Amendment made the former slaves citizens. It also provided that the states must grant all people within their jurisdiction 'equal protection of the law'. The Fifteenth Amendment, which became law in 1870, prohibited the states from denying people the right to vote because of their race. During Reconstruction, Congress passed several laws to protect blacks' civil rights.

## **2) 'Separate but Equal' Rule:**

During the 1870's, white Americans increasingly disregarded the newly won rights of black Americans. The government itself contributed greatly to denying blacks the rights. In 1883, the Supreme Court ruled that Congressional acts to prevent racial discrimination by private individuals were unconstitutional. In 1896, in the case of Plessy v. Ferguson, the Supreme Court upheld Louisiana law requiring separate but equal accommodations for blacks and whites in railroad cars. For over fifty years, many Southern states used the 'separate but equal' rule established in this case to segregate the races in public schools, and in transportation, recreation, and such public establishments as hotels and restaurants. Many states also used literacy, poll taxes, and other means to deprive blacks of their voting rights.

## **3) Changes in the American Race Relations:**

The period after the Second World War was one of rapid change in American race relations. As more blacks left the rural south for urban areas, the relative economic status of blacks improved. The existence of a growing affluent and educated black population in urban areas made possible major political gains. Black urban voters provided decisive support for liberal Democratic candidates, who in turn backed civil rights reforms.

A pattern of black influence on national politics was clearly established in 1948, when Harry Truman was elected president, despite receiving only a minority of white votes. Truman had gained the support of blacks by issuing an executive order that eventually desegregated the armed forces and by supporting a civil rights policy for the Democratic Party. Although Truman's actions had little immediate impact on blacks, they indicated that the federal government was listening to black demands. Vigorous political dissent among blacks was discouraged during the so-called McCarthy era (1950-1955), as black leaders came under attack from the government, but anti-communism also provided an excuse for blacks to demand that the United States live up to its democratic claims.

## **4) Desegregation in Schools:**

Although neither President Eisenhower nor Congress was willing to take action on behalf of black civil rights during the first half of the 1950's, new presidential appointments to the US Supreme Court prepared the way for a reversal of racial segregation in schools established in 1896. In 1954 the Supreme Court ruled, in Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, that segregation in public schools is unconstitutional. In time, this decision broke down the 'separate but equal' principle. Although southern white officials sought to obstruct implementation of the Brown decision, many African-Americans saw the ruling as a sign that the federal government might intervene on their behalf in other racial matters. Unwilling to wait for firm federal action, however, southern blacks began their own desegregation efforts. In

1957, black children defied white mobs in Little Rock, Arkansas, until Eisenhower sent troops to protect their right to attend an all-white high school. Ten years after the Brown decision, however, less than two per cent of southern black children attended integrated schools. During the early 1960's, it was necessary to maintain federal troops and police on the University of Mississippi campus to ensure the right of a black student to attend classes.

### **5) The Montgomery Bus Boycott:**

The Brown decision also encouraged African-Americans to launch a sustained movement to desegregate all public facilities. It began in Montgomery, Alabama, in December 1955, when a black woman called Rosa Parks refused to give up her seat on a city bus to a white man and was arrested. Led by the Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., black residents reacted to the arrest by organizing a bus boycott that lasted more than a year, before a federal court declared Alabama's bus segregation laws unconstitutional. The Montgomery Bus Boycott dramatized the effectiveness of non-violent direct action and raised Martin Luther King into leadership of the non-violent movement. He adopted the Gandhian philosophy of Satyagraha. King's commitment to reform through non-violent means attracted a favourable response even in the press for his protests.

### **6) The Civil Rights Act of 1957:**

In 1957, Congress passed the first federal civil rights law since Reconstruction. The Civil Rights Act of 1957 set up the Commission on Civil Rights to investigate charges of denial of civil rights. It also created the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice to enforce federal civil rights laws and regulations.

Although King remained the most renowned black leader, protest activities soon moved beyond the control of any single individual or group. King's supporters organized the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) in 1957, but when black university students began a widespread campaign of sit-ins in lunch-bars in February 1960, most young activists rejected leadership by SCLC and older civil rights groups. They formed the Student Non-violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC), which was often more militant than other civil rights groups.

### **7) Struggle to Achieve Voting Rights:**

The Freedom Rides of 1961 initiated by Congress of Racial Equality (CORE) were designed to end segregation in facilities dependent on interstate commerce, and demonstrated the ability of civil rights protesters to force federal intervention in the South. They brought many young activists into Mississippi, where white officials firmly resisted any concessions to the civil rights movement. Black civil rights leaders in Mississippi, who had long struggled for gains with the help of the National Association for the Advancement of Coloured People (NAACP)

encouraged young civil rights workers affiliated with SNCC to concentrate their efforts on achieving voting rights. By 1962 Robert Moses, a Harvard-educated schoolteacher, had brought together a staff of organizers who worked closely with local residents seeking to register as voters. White resistance, however, remained strong. In 1964, after the murder of three of the organizers, a major national effort led to the unsuccessful challenge by the Mississippi Freedom Democratic to unseat the all-white Mississippi delegation at the national Democratic convention.

### **8) March to Washington, 1963:**

Although the voting-rights movement in Mississippi made slow progress, civil rights protests in southern urban centres achieved important gains. Massive demonstrations were held in Albany, Georgia, during 1961 and 1962, and the following year more than a million demonstrators kept up the pressure in numerous other cities. This wave of protests reached a peak during the spring of 1963, when federal troops were sent into Birmingham, Alabama, to quell racial violence. President John Kennedy reacted to the widespread demonstrations by introducing civil rights legislation designed to end segregation in public facilities. On 28 August 1963, more than 250,000 protesters gathered in Washington, D.C., for a peaceful demonstration, calling for congressional action in civil rights and employment legislation. This was the climax of the non-violent movement and, perhaps of Martin Luther King's career. The huge gathering of black and white marchers promoted hope that Dr. King's dream that "this nation will rise up and live out the true meaning of its creed" might be realized. This hope dimmed when four children died in a church bombing in Birmingham and when an assassin's bullet killed President Kennedy.

### **9) The Civil Rights Act of 1964:**

But there was still reason for hope. In 1964, the Nobel Prize Committee chose Dr. King to receive the Nobel Peace Prize, and President Lyndon B. Johnson secured the enactment of a comprehensive Civil Rights Act of 1964. This was the strongest civil rights bill in the history of the United States. It ordered restaurants, hotels, and other businesses that serve the general public to serve all people without regard to race, colour, religion, or national origin. It also barred discrimination by employers and unions, and established the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission to enforce fair employment practices. In addition, the act provided for a cutoff of federal funds from any programme or activity that allowed racial discrimination.

### **10) The Voting Rights Act of 1965:**

The President and the Congress responded again when Dr. King led his forces into Selma, Alabama, where black citizens were being denied the right to vote. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 removed the remaining legal and technical obstacles to the exercise of the franchise by black citizens. It prohibited literacy tests in many Southern states. In

1966, the Supreme Court prohibited poll taxes in state and local elections. A 1970 law made literacy tests illegal in all the states. These acts had a dramatic impact on black voter registration. In Mississippi, the percentage of blacks registered to vote increased from seven per cent in 1964 to fifty-nine per cent in 1968.

### **11) Changes in the Civil Rights Movement:**

Major changes in the Civil Rights Movement occurred during the 1970's. Earlier civil rights efforts had involved lawsuits and other attempts to protect individual rights. In the 1970's the emphasis shifted from individual rights to group rights. The federal government began to enact laws designed to assure rights for groups that formerly had suffered discrimination. For example, the government began a programme of affirmative action. Affirmative action consists of efforts to counteract past discrimination by giving special help to disadvantaged groups. Typical measures included recruiting drives among women and minority groups and special training programme for minority workers.

### **12) Allegation of 'Reverse Discrimination':**

Efforts to help groups that had suffered discrimination raised a number of new civil rights issues. Many people felt the government violated the principle of equality under the law by giving preference to certain groups at the expense of others. Some white men complained of reverse discrimination, saying they were treated unfairly because of their race and sex. Other individuals believed such efforts were necessary to help the disadvantaged overcome past discrimination and eventually compete on an equal basis with white males.

### **13) The Black Power:**

The years of civil rights activism in the South led to an upsurge in racial pride and militancy among blacks throughout the nation. In 1966 SNCC announced that the goal of the black movement was no longer civil rights but 'black power', which could be achieved only when black people developed a more positive image of themselves. Such sentiments coincided with a trend towards black militancy in northern urban centres spearheaded by Black Muslims. The most renowned advocate of Black Nationalism and leader of the Black Muslims was Malcolm X. Although he had attracted only modest support by the time he was assassinated in 1965, his ideas became increasingly popular after his death. His calls for armed self-defence reflected widespread anger among urban blacks and resulted in outbreaks of extensive racial violence in Los Angeles, California, in August 1965. During the following three years, nearly every major urban centre in the United States experienced similar violent, black disturbances. The Kerner Commission, set up by President Johnson, reported in 1968 that the "nation is moving toward two societies, one white, one black— separate and unequal". New militant organizations, such as the Black Panther party, sought to provide leadership for discontented urban blacks. The outspoken radicalism of many black leaders resulted in considerable federal

repression, and by the late 1960's most of the black militant groups had been weakened by police raids as well as internal dissension. Before his assassination in April 1968, even Martin Luther King became a target for government surveillance and harassment, as he responded to the new mood of militancy with forceful attacks on US involvement in the Vietnam War (1959-1975) and with calls for economic reforms.

Blacks attending university launched a movement to introduce black studies into the curriculum, which would result in greater knowledge and understanding of the African-American experience. A new spirit of black racial assertion was particularly evident in sports. In the 1960's black athletes gave university and professional sports a distinctive, individualistic, and spontaneous style of play, despite frequent objections from white coaches and observers in the media. For example, the refusal of the heavyweight boxer Muhammad Ali to be enlisted into the army cost him his world championship but also made him a hero to many blacks.

---

## 8.8 SUMMARY

---

Human Rights are of Universal importance. They are common to all regardless of caste, colour, religion, race, etc. Countries, all over the world strive hard to safeguard human rights through their well established constitutions as per the provisions of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights; International Covenants on Civil and Political Rights; Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and Optional Protocols. Violations of Human Rights occur in the name of religion, race, creed, caste, colour, sex, region, etc.

The League of Nations and the United Nations stressed the need for striving towards peace among the countries of the world and for the upliftment of human rights. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights came into force from March 1976 together with its Optional Protocol. Civil rights are the freedoms and rights that a person may have as a member of a community, state, or nation. Civil rights include freedom of speech, of the press, and of religion. Among others are the right to own property, and to receive fair and equal treatment from government, other persons, and private groups.

In many non-democratic countries, the government claims to respect and guarantee civil rights. Some people draw sharp distinctions between civil liberties and civil rights. They regard civil liberties as guarantees to a person against government interference. The basic civil rights recognized by most democratic countries are freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and the right to peaceful assembly. All civil rights have limits, even in democratic countries. For example, a person may be denied freedom of speech in a democracy if it can be shown that his or her speech might lead to the overthrow of the government.

---

## 8.9 QUESTIONS

---

1. Explain the concept of the Human Rights Movement and trace its origin and progress.
2. Write a detailed note on the Amnesty International.
3. Examine the various aspects of the Civil Rights Movement.
4. Trace the progress of Civil Rights Movement in the USA.
5. Write short notes on the following:
  - (a) Constitutional Amendments in favour of the Blacks
  - (b) Desegregation in Schools
  - (c) The Black Power
  - (d) Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

---

## 8.10 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History: 1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London, 1977.



## NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

### Unit Structure :

- 9.0 Objectives
- 9.1 Introduction
- 9.2 The Bandung Conference
- 9.3 The Non-Aligned Movement
- 9.4 Summary
- 9.5 Questions
- 9.6 References

---

### 9.0 OBJECTIVES

---

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

---

### 9.1 INTRODUCTION

---

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

---

## 9.2 THE BANDUNG CONFERENCE

---

### 9.2.1. Characteristics of the Conference:

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

### 9.2.2. Indonesian Initiative:

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

### **9.2.3. Representing Countries:**

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

### **9.2.4. Objectives of the Bandung Conference:**

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

### **9.2.5. Other Issues to be taken up in the Conference:**

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

### **9.2.6. Leading Personalities at the Bandung Conference:**

From 18<sup>th</sup> to 24<sup>th</sup> April 1955, representatives of twenty-nine Afro-Asian states met at the Indonesian city of Bandung in West Java. At the outset Nehru appeared to be the most important figure at the conference, as at the time India was perceived to be the leader among the so-called non-aligned Afro-Asian states. However, other notable personalities such as Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia, Gamal Abdel Nasser of Egypt, Krishna Menon of India, Carlos P. Romulo of the Philippines, Muhammad Ali of Pakistan, and U Nu of Burma were trying to get the maximum amount of publicity out of their respective roles at Bandung Conference. Sukarno, the President of Indonesia and the host of the Bandung Conference held the spotlight at times. But all eyes were unquestionably on China's delegate, Chou En-lai. China's position as the most populous and potentially most powerful Asian nation was of vital interest to every participating Afro-Asian state.

### **9.2.7. Inaugural Speech of Dr. Sukarno:**

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

### **9.2.8. Chou En-lai's Conciliatory Approach:**

The conciliatory speech by Chou En-lai took many of the delegates by surprise. Although he asserted that most of the difficulties in achieving lasting peace in East Asia was due to the United States' support of the Taiwan government of Chiang Kai-shek, Chou En-lai tried to minimize China's differences with her neighbours. He stated that he had come to Bandung 'to seek unity and not to quarrel' and proved it by attempting to resolve the problem caused by the dual nationality of the ethnic Chinese in Thailand, Cambodia, and Indonesia. In fact, this question appeared to be resolved when China and Indonesia signed a treaty during the conference dealing with the nationality of the ethnic Chinese in Indonesia. A similar agreement was offered to the Philippines, and assurances of amicable relations were made when Chou En-lai invited Prince Norodom Sihanouk of Cambodia to lunch. Chou En-lai sought to build diplomatic bridges

between China and the Arab states as well. To their great surprise and delight, China supported the position of the Arab states over Palestine. Chou En-lai even suggested that there was a parallel between the problems of Palestine and Formosa (Taiwan), indicating that neither problem could be resolved unless intervention by outside forces (the United States) was excluded. Therefore, in Chou En-lai's view China was facing the same problem as those of the Arabs.

### **9.2.9. Resolutions:**

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

### **9.2.10. Differences Among the Delegates:**

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

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

### **9.2.11. Nehru's Stand at the Conference:**

Jawaharlal Nehru viewed these developments at the Bandung Conference with alarm. Not only this state of affairs disrupt the conference, but the Afro-Asian nations representing at Bandung, were in effect, being forced to commit themselves on the question of Soviet-American rivalry, thereby

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

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

#### **9.2.12. Chou En-lai's Seven Principles:**

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

#### **9.2.13. An Assessment of the Bandung Conference:**

Despite the divergent opinions expressed at Bandung, it was apparent that the Afro-Asian nations had certain causes in common. Although the final communiqué of the conference drafted over the great differences of opinion among the states, the Bandung Conference achieved a great deal.

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

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

---

### 9.3 THE NON-ALIGNED MOVEMENT

---

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

#### 9.3.1. Nehru's Initiative:

The decision of the new states of Asia and Africa, with few exceptions, to throw in their lot with neither superpower was much influenced by one man, Jawaharlal Nehru, the prime Minister of India. Nehru was a world figure even before he became the prime minister of the most populous of

the new states, India, in 1947, and held that office without break for seventeen years. He was a pragmatic leader who had imbibed Western liberal and democratic values and was also attracted by the Soviet Union's record in auto-industrialization. He disliked Stalin's tyranny and police state, as well as the crudities of McCarthyism in the United States. Nehru was aghast at the arrogant and moralistic division of the world into communists and anti-communists.

### **9.3.2. Commonwealth of Nations:**

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

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

### **9.3.3. Neutrality and Non-alignment:**

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

### 9.3.4. Positive Aspect of Neutralism:

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

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

### 9.3.5. The Asian-Relations Conference:

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

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

### **9.3.6. Cracks in the Asian Solidarity:**

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

### **9.3.7. The Bandung Conference:**

Another conference, originally suggested by Ceylon and taken up by Sukarno and Nehru, assembled at Bandung in April 1955. The background for convening this conference was the treaty between the United States and Taiwan, the Manila Pact creating SEATO, and the Baghdad Pact. The Soviet Union and China welcomed what looked at first like an anti-Western conference. Twenty-nine countries from Asia and Africa participated in the Bandung conference. Thus, Bandung became the prototype of Afro-Asian as opposed to purely Asian solidarity. The representatives at Bandung were divided among themselves even on the issue of non-alignment. The Soviets and the Chinese hoped to advance communism by exploiting anti-Western nationalisms, while the Americans hoped to exploit fears of communism and of China and thus, create new, and if necessary heavily subsidized military groups. American policy, illustrated by the signing of the Manila Pact, ran counter to the spirit of Bandung. Chou En-lai, who attended the Bandung Conference, went some way towards showing that Chinese communism was reconcilable with other Asian nationalisms. The Soviets had already taken a number of steps, which brought them into closer accord with the Asian states.

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

### **9.3.8. The Brioni Conference:**

In the summer of 1956 Nehru and Nasser visited Tito at Brioni in Yugoslavia. With an Asian, an African and a European leading them, the neutralists became more ambitious in international affairs, and hoped to be able to bring pressure to bear on the superpowers in Cold War matters. The three leaders declared their adherence to the Bandung principles,

determined to pursue the policy of non-alignment, expressed their serious concern over the division of the world into mutually hostile blocs, reiterated the need for speedy disarmament and urged for the suspension of nuclear tests. The tree leaders emphasized their keen interest in promoting co-operation among nations in the sphere of peaceful uses of atomic energy and stressed the need for speeding up of development work in the underdeveloped countries.

### **9.3.9. The Belgrade Conference:**

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

### **9.3.10. The Summit Conferences:**

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

movement since then had grown to embrace 101 countries as members.

### **9.3.11. An Assessment of the Non-aligned Movement:**

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

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

---

## **9.4 SUMMARY**

---

The emergence of two Power Blocs following the end of the Second World War and the resurgent Cold War proved to be detrimental to the newly independent nations of Asia and Africa. These nations, which had been liberated due to prolonged freedom struggles or liberations wars from the clutches of colonial powers had to reconstruct their economy and society. Hence, they were keen to seek material and moral support from any quarters without any ideological pre-conditions. Thus, the Afro-Asian nations did not want to become camp followers either of the Western or of the Communist Power Blocs.

The Bandung Conference of April 1955 was a unique international gathering of nations. It was a unique in the sense that for the first time in modern history a group of former colonial nations, which were under the European colonial control, met to discuss their mutual interests and, as it turned out, mutual differences as well.

The participating countries from Asia were: Afghanistan, Burma, Cambodia, Ceylon, the People's Republic of China, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Japan, Jordan, Laos, Lebanon, Nepal, Pakistan, the Philippines,

Saudi Arabia, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, and Yemen.

Non-Aligned Movement

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

Jawaharlal Nehru viewed these developments at the Bandung Conference with alarm. Nehru's assertion met the strong opposition of Pakistan, Turkey, Iraq, Lebanon and the Philippines. Muhammad Ali of Pakistan objected to Nehru's criticism of Pakistan's membership of SEATO, and the others declared that their geographical position in the world did not allow them the luxury of maintaining a non-aligned position. The non-aligned movement was committed in keeping the member nations out of the military blocs. Promotion of world peace and economic development of the Third World countries through mutual co-operation had been the cornerstone of the movement. In the initial stages of the movement colonialism, and later neo-colonialism came under severe attack.

Thus, the Non-Aligned Movement was the some of the new ideology that was given to the world by the leadership of India.

---

## 9.5 QUESTIONS

---

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

---

## 9.6 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.

7. Lorenz Luthi, *The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World*, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, *The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times*, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, *History the Modern World*, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, *The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War*, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, *The Cold war: 1945-1965*, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, *Post War: A History of Europe since 1945*, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., *History of the World (Third Edition)*, Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, *The World History: 1914-1968*, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., *The Struggle for Mastery in Europe*, OUP, London, 1977.



## GLOBALIZATION

### Unit Structure :

- 10.0 Objectives
- 10.1 Introduction
- 10.2 Globalization Through History
- 10.3 Causes of Globalization
- 10.4 Forms of Globalization
- 10.5 Extent of Globalization
- 10.6 Approaches to Globalization
- 10.7 World Trade Organization (WTO)
- 10.8 Impact of Globalization
- 10.9 How to respond to Globalization?
- 10.10 Future Of Globalization
- 10.11 Summary
- 10.12 Questions
- 10.13 References

---

### 10.0 OBJECTIVES

---

1. To understand the concept and factors that lead to globalization.
2. To study the impact of globalization.

---

### 10.1 INTRODUCTION

---

Globalization is a concept that underlines the growth of connections between people on a worldwide scale. Globalization involves the reduction of barriers to trans-world contacts. Through it people from different parts of the world become more able, physically, legally, culturally, and psychologically, to engage with each other in 'one world'.

Globalization means different things to different people. It can be defined, simply, as the expansion of economic activities across political boundaries of nation-states. It refers to a process of increasing economic integration and growing economic interdependence between countries in the world economy. It is associated not only with an increasing cross-border

movement of goods, services, capital, technology, information and people, but also with an organization of economic activities which cut across national boundaries. This process is driven by the lure of profit and the threat of competition in the market.

---

## 10.2 GLOBALIZATION THROUGH HISTORY

---

Historians have dated the beginning of globalization at various points. Taking the longest view, it may be said that globalization began a million years ago with the first transcontinental migration of the human species out of Africa. Alternatively, we could date the start of globalization from the fifth and sixth centuries BC with the birth of two of the earliest ‘world’ religions, namely Zoroastrianism and Buddhism. A secular global imagination arose in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries with the geographical discoveries and explorations including the first circumnavigation of the Earth. Technologies for high-speed global connections initially appeared in the mid-nineteenth century with the advent of intercontinental telegraph lines. The second half of the nineteenth century also saw the arrival of long-distance telephony, global commodity markets, global brand names, a global monetary regime, and global associations in several social movements, including labour and feminist activism. The consolidation of intercontinental colonial empires in the late nineteenth century facilitated the development of many of these trans-world connections.

Whenever one dates the beginning of globalization, it is clear that the process has unfolded on an unprecedented scale in contemporary history. Most manifestations of global connectivity have seen most of their growth during the past half-century. Consider the recent spread of jet travel, satellite communications, facsimiles, the Internet, television, global retailers, global credit cards, global ecological problems, and global regulations. To take but one indicator, the world count of radio receivers rose from fewer than 60 million in the mid-1930’s to over 2,000 million in the mid-1990’s. Today’s society is more global than that at any earlier time.

---

## 10.3 CAUSES OF GLOBALIZATION

---

Different social theories offer different interpretations of how and why trans-world connections have grown. For example, liberal economics stresses the role of unrestricted market forces in a context of technological change and deregulation. In contrast, Marxist political economy highlights the dynamics of the international capitalist system as the engine of globalization. For many sociologists, meanwhile, globalization is a product of modern rationalism. Others find their explanation of globalization in a combination of these causes.

### 10.3.1. Technological innovation:

Technological innovation has contributed to globalization by supplying infrastructure for trans-world connections. In particular, developments in

means of transport, communications, and data processing have allowed global links to become denser, faster, more reliable, and much cheaper. Large-scale and rapid globalization has depended on a number of innovations relating to coaxial and later fibre-optic cables, jet engines, packaging and preservation techniques, semiconductor devices, computer software, and so on. In other words, global relations could not develop without physical tools to effect cross-planetary contacts.

### **10.3.2. Regulations:**

Next to technology, regulation has also played an enabling role for globalization. Supraterritorial links would not be possible in the absence of various facilitating rules, procedures, norms, and institutions. For example, global communications rely heavily on technical standardization. Global finance depends in good measure on a working world monetary regime. Global production and trade are greatly promoted by liberalization, that is, the removal of tariffs, capital controls, and other state-imposed restrictions on the movement of resources between countries. Tax laws, labour legislation, and environmental codes can also encourage or discourage global investment. In short, globalization requires supporting regulatory frameworks.

### **10.3.3. Capitalism:**

Capitalism has been a further force for globalization. Already in the 1850's, Karl Marx noted in his *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, 1859, that "capital by its nature drives beyond every spatial barrier" to "conquer the whole Earth for its market". More specifically, global markets offer prospects of increased profits through higher sales volumes. In addition, larger production runs to feed global markets promise enhanced profits due to economies of scale. Capitalists also pursue globalization since it allows production facilities to be located wherever costs are lowest and earnings greatest. Furthermore, global accounting practices enable prices and taxes to be calculated in ways that raise profits. Finally, global connections themselves such as telecommunications, electronic finance, etc., create major opportunities for profit making.

### **10.3.4. Rationalism:**

Rationalism as the prevailing modern form of knowledge also has provided impetus to globalization. With its secular character, rationalist thought orients people towards the physical world of the planet rather than spiritual realms. As a secular universalism, rationalism provides a knowledge foundation for globalization

Many theorists identify one of these forces as the primary engine of globalization and treat other elements as having secondary or no causal significance. Other analysts hold that globalization has a multi-causal dynamic involving the interrelation of several forces.

---

## 10.4 FORMS OF GLOBALIZATION

---

Global connections take many forms. For instance, jet airplanes transport passengers and cargo across any distance on the planet within a day. Telephone and computer networks effect near-instantaneous interpersonal communication between points all over the Earth. Electronic mass media broadcast messages to world audiences. Countless goods and services are supplied to consumers in global markets. Moreover, some articles are manufactured through trans-world processes, where different stages of production are located at widely dispersed locations on the Earth. The US dollar and the Euro are examples of currencies that have global circulation. In global finance, various types of savings and credits flow in the world as a single space. Many firms, voluntary associations such as Amnesty International, and regulatory agencies, such as the World Trade Organization, operate across the globe. Climate change, so-called ‘global warming’, and stratospheric ozone depletion are instances of human induced ecological developments that unfold on a planetary scale.

Globalization is the trend whereby these various kinds of global relations emerge, proliferate, and expand. As a result of globalization, social geography gains a planetary dimension. ‘Place’ comes to involve more than local, provincial, country, regional, and continental realms. With globalization the world as a whole also becomes a social space in its own right. Thus global connections involve a different kind of geography. Whereas other social contexts are territorially delimited, global relations transcend territorial distances and territorial borders to unfold on planet Earth as a single social space. In this sense globalization might be characterized as the rise of ‘supraterritoriality’.

Of course globalization does not signal the end of other social spaces. The rise of supraterritoriality does not eliminate the significance of localities, countries, and regions. Nor does the spread of trans-world connections abolish territorial governments or dissolve territorial identities. The global coexists and interrelates with the local, the national, the regional, and other dimensions of geography.

---

## 10.5 EXTENT OF GLOBALIZATION

---

It is important to note that Globalization has not encompassed all of humanity to the same extent. In terms of territorial location, for example, global networks have involved the populations of North America, Western Europe, and East Asia much more than other parts of the world. In terms of class, global finance has been a domain of the wealthy far more than the poor. In terms of gender, men have linked up to global computer networks much more than women. This unevenness of globalization has important implications for social power relations. People with connections to supraterritorial spaces have access to important resources and influence that are denied to those who are left outside. In this regard, some commentators have deplored ‘global apartheid’, as manifested in the so-

called 'digital divide' and other inequalities. Others have objected to a 'cultural imperialism' of Hollywood and McDonald's in contemporary globalization. Since the mid-1990's such discontents have provoked a so-called 'anti-globalization movement' marked by regular mass protests against global companies, the International Monetary Fund, and other prominent agents of trans-world relations.

---

## 10.6 APPROACHES TO GLOBALIZATION

---

There are basically two main attitudes towards the approaches to globalization-positive and normative. The positive group of thinkers visualizes globalization as purely as objective and descriptive phenomenon that is taking place under current trends. On the other hand, the normative group of thinkers explores the reality from the objective truth, norms, policies, prescriptions which are being taken as a form of advice to developing countries for liberalizing and integrating themselves with the rest of the world as fast as possible as the definite way to achieve the pace of development. As seen above, a much more comprehensive approach to globalization should not be associated with purely economic view rather it must embrace into its folds a much more political and cultural dimension.

Apparently the approach to globalizations is mainly an economic phenomenon. However, the real perception of globalization is much more comprehensive. It is primarily a cultural and political phenomenon that is driven by technology and other scientific innovations. With the progress in transport, telecommunication, computers that makes possible to divide the stages of production of an article in different geographic locations.

The world economy has experienced a progressive international economic integration since 1950. However, there has been a marked acceleration in this process of globalization during the last quarter of the twentieth century. The fundamental attribute of globalization is the increasing degree of openness in most countries. There are three dimensions of this phenomenon: international trade, international investment and international finance. It is important to note that openness is not confined to trade flows, investment flows and financial flows. It also extends to flows of services, technology, information, ideas and persons across national boundaries. However, trade, investment and finance constitute the cutting edge of globalization.

The second half of the twentieth century has witnessed a phenomenal expansion in international trade flows. World exports increased from \$61 billion in 1950 to \$315 billion in 1970 and \$3447 billion in 1990. The international investment flows also took the same route. The stock of direct foreign investment in the world economy increased from \$68 billion in 1960 to \$502 billion in 1980 and \$1948 billion 1992. The past two decades have witnessed an explosive growth in international finance. The movement of finance across national boundaries is enormous. The internationalization of financial markets has four dimensions: foreign exchange, bank lending, financial assets and government bonds.

It has been now abundantly clear that the challenges and opportunities of globalization in almost all the countries of the world in the twenty-first century would more and more depend on the advancement of science and technology which have emerged as major determinants wealth and power of nations. The comparative advantage of a nation will be more and more influenced by its capacity to generate absorb, adapt and assimilate new technologies into production processes and organize production process efficiently. If liberalization and globalization are not to create islands of prosperity surrounded by vast sea of destitution, there has to be firm commitment to human resource development and to continuous upgrading of human skills and capabilities in the fast changing world that we live in.

---

## **10.7 WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION (WTO)**

---

In recent times, the issue of global governance has been an extensively explored subject of discussion particularly with the emergence of WTO since January 1995. It is an international body established to promote and enforce global free trade. The WTO was founded in 1993 by the Final Act that concluded the Uruguay Round (1986-1994) of multilateral negotiations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) of 1947, which it supersedes, and exists to administer and police the 28 free-trade agreements in the Final Act, oversee world trade practices, and adjudicate trade disputes referred to it by member states. The headquarters of WTO is in Geneva. When it began operating on 1 January 1995 it had 76 member states, but by November 2000 its membership increased to 140. Unlike its predecessor (GATT), it is a formally constituted entity whose rules are legally binding on its member states, but it is independent of the United Nations. It provides a framework for the rule of law in international trade. Its regulations include trade in services, intellectual property rights, and investment. A disputes panel composed of WTO officials adjudicates trade disputes referred to the WTO; nations can appeal against rulings to a WTO appellate body, whose decision is final.

In February 1997 the WTO concluded a landmark agreement liberalizing telecommunications trade between its members. In March 1999 the United States imposed sanctions on selected European Union (EU) goods following a WTO ruling against EU tariffs on bananas; the dispute broadened later the same month when the WTO ruled against an EU ban on US beef reared with growth hormones. At the Seattle summit in November 1999 the WTO's failure to reach any kind of agreement on the opening up of previously protected areas of trade was seen as a major blow to the free-trade movement. In the same month China and the United States signed a historic agreement that paved the way for China to join the WTO. However, the deal still required formal approval from the United States, the EU, Canada, and other countries.

The WTO with its comprehensive mandate and extensive out reach has emerged as the most powerful supra-national body for global governance. The concept of nation-state is gradually losing its ground in view of the fact that many economic decisions, which are of great crucial relevance to the people of a nation, are taken either by the transnational co-operation or

by economic power groups outside the nation-state. As a result nation-state is losing at least some part of their autonomy in designing their own policies and development strategies. This gradual erosion in the autonomy of the nation-state has synchronized with the emergence of many powerful interest groups in the management of the world economy. They often pose a serious threat to the pursuit of national priorities and assertions of indigenous perceptions. The option open to the developing countries in the long-run perspective is to improve their own economic strengths by efforts for improvement in productivity, human resource development, higher saving, and overall discipline in economic management. They have to identify the right kind of policies and programmes which enable them to safeguard and promote their national interest even within the framework of the new rules and the game.

---

## **10.8 IMPACT OF GLOBALIZATION**

---

### **10.8.1. Economic Impact:**

Globalization has wider implications. In terms of economics, globalization substantially alters the organization of production, exchange, and consumption. Many firms 'go global' by setting up affiliates across the planet. Many enterprises also form trans-world alliances with other companies. Countless mergers and acquisitions occur as business adjusts to global markets. Questions of competition and monopoly can arise as a result. In addition, corporations relocate many production facilities as globalization reduces transport and communications costs. Globalization also expands the 'virtual economy' of information and finance, sometimes at the expense of the 'real economy' of extraction and manufacturing. All of this economic restructuring in the face of globalization raises vital issues of human security related to employment, labour conditions, poverty, and social cohesion.

### **10.8.2. Political Impact:**

In relation to politics, globalization has significant implications for the conduct of governance. Territorially based laws and institutions through local, provincial, and national governments are not sufficient by themselves to regulate contacts and networks that operate in trans-world spaces. Globalization, therefore, stimulates greater multilateral collaboration between states as well as the growth of regional and trans-world governance arrangements like the European Union and the United Nations. In addition, private-sector bodies may step in to regulate areas of global relations for which official arrangements are lacking, as has occurred regarding certain aspects of the Internet and trans-world finance, for instance. The resultant situation of multi-layered and diffuse governance raises far-reaching questions about the nature of sovereignty and democracy in a globalizing world.

### **10.8.3. Cultural Impact:**

With regard to culture, globalization disrupts traditional relationships between territory and collective identity. The growth of trans-world

connections encourages the rise of non-territorial cultures according to age, class, gender, race, religion, and sexual orientation. As a result, identity of such people who lead more globalized lives tend to become less fixed on territory, in the form of nation-states and ethnic bonds. Besides, globalization encourages more hybridity, where individuals develop and express a mix of identities. At the same time, other people, including those who have less opportunity to participate in global relations, react against globalization with defensive nationalism. In these various ways globalization calls the nature of community into question.

However, it is important to note that the extent of social transformation connected with globalization must not be exaggerated. Hence traditional sectors like agriculture and manufacturing still matter in a globalizing economy. The state still figures centrally in the governance of global flows. Territorial cultures survive alongside, and in complex interrelations. Thus with globalization, as with any other trend, history involves an interplay of change and continuity.

---

## 10.9 HOW TO RESPOND TO GLOBALIZATION?

---

Globalization and its consequences have become a subject of heated political debate. The important question is how should we respond to the trend of globalization?

### 10.9.1. Neo-Liberal Approach:

Those people who are concerned with the problem of globalization advice what is generally called a ‘neo-liberal’ approach to globalization. Neo-liberalism takes inspiration from the tradition of laissez-faire economics and holds that globalization will yield maximum gains when its course is left to unrestricted market forces. Neo-liberals therefore prescribe that globalization should be met with full-scale liberalization, deregulation, and privatization. According to the neo-liberal creed, official measures should be used only to enable, but not to constrain, global market forces. The unrestricted global economy will then in time generate prosperity, democracy, community, and peace for all.

### 10.9.2. Reformism:

Another general policy framework for globalization can be termed as reformism, or global social democracy. Reformists agree with neo-liberals that market capitalism can be a major force for social good. However, they argue that these benefits can only be secured with proactive public policies that steer, and where necessary restrict, global flows. For example, many reformists advocate official measures to protect labour, the poor, and the environment from the potential harmful effects of unrestricted globalization. Some reformists also promote the principle of global redistributive taxes, for example, on foreign-exchange transactions or the profits of global companies. Reformist programmes generally visualize a considerable expansion of supranational governance through regional and

trans-world institutions, and many reformists are concerned to enhance the democratic credentials of these regimes.

### **10.9.3. Progressive Radicalism:**

A third broad political response to globalization might be described as progressive radicalism. These critics reject the structural foundations of contemporary globalization and seek to reconstruct the process on a different basis. For example, global socialists regard capitalism as an evil that no amount of reform can correct. Thus, they seek to rebuild globalization with a different, post-capitalist mode of production. From another radical perspective, global postmodernists treat rationalism as incorrigibly flawed and promote an alternative globalization based on different kinds of knowledge and identity politics.

### **10.9.4. Traditionalism:**

A fourth approach to globalization can be termed as traditionalism. This viewpoint regards trans-world connections as being inherently violent as globalization tend to undermine cultural heritage, democracy, ecological health, economic well-being, and social cohesion. In the eyes of traditionalists, globalization has nothing to offer anything new and must therefore be reversed. Traditionalist calls for 'de-globalization' have come in a number of forms, including ultra-nationalism, religious revivalism, and certain strains of environmentalism.

Broadly speaking, neo-liberalism was the prevailing and largely unchallenged policy framework for globalization in the 1980's and early 1990's. Since the mid-1990's both traditionalist and reformist reactions against neo-liberal globalization have gathered force, though laissez-faire tendencies remain very strong at the beginning of the twenty-first century. Meanwhile, progressive radical approaches to globalization have not yet become popular among the masses, although they may prove important in times to come.

---

## **10.10 FUTURE OF GLOBALIZATION**

---

The future prospects of globalization are unclear. In one scenario the twenty-first century will experience a continuation, if not a further acceleration, of recent high rates of globalization. In an alternative account, globalization will slow down and stop once it reaches a certain plateau. In another forecast, for example, if globalization is a cyclical trend or succumbs to traditionalist opposition, the future will bring a process of de-globalization that reduces trans-world connections.

At present the forces behind globalization seem to be very strong. Current trends in technological innovations and regulatory developments are highly conducive for a further expansion of trans-world connectivity. Likewise, both capitalism as a mode of production that promotes globalization and rationalism as a mode of knowledge that stimulates globalization are quite strong in contemporary world. Under these

circumstances a halt to globalization, let alone a reversal, seem to be a remote possibility in modern times.

---

## 10.11 SUMMARY

---

Globalization is a concept that underlines the growth of connections between people on a worldwide scale. Globalization involves the reduction of barriers to trans-world contacts. Through it people from different parts of the world become more able, physically, legally, culturally, and psychologically, to engage with each other in 'one world'. Historians have dated the beginning of globalization at various points. Taking the longest view, it may be said that globalization began a million years ago with the first transcontinental migration of the human species out of Africa.

Most manifestations of global connectivity have seen most of their growth during the past half-century. Consider the recent spread of jet travel, satellite communications, facsimiles, the Internet, television, global retailers, global credit cards, global ecological problems, and global regulations.

Electronic mass media broadcast messages to world audiences. Countless goods and services are supplied to consumers in global markets. Moreover, some articles are manufactured through trans-world processes, where different stages of production are located at widely dispersed locations on the Earth. Neo-liberalism takes inspiration from the tradition of laissez-faire economics and holds that globalization will yield maximum gains when its course is left to unrestricted market forces. In another forecast, for example, if globalization is a cyclical trend or succumbs to traditionalist opposition, the future will bring a process of de-globalization that reduces trans-world connections.

---

## 10.12 QUESTIONS

---

1. Explain the concept, causes and different forms of globalization.
2. Write a detailed note on globalization.
3. Describe the consequences of globalization. What are different kinds of responses to globalization?
4. Write short notes on the following:
  - (a) Forms of globalization
  - (b) World Trade Organization (WTO)
  - (c) Impact of globalization
  - (d) Response to globalization

---

**10.13 REFERENCES**

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.
13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay, 1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History: 1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London, 1977.



## **SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT AND WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT**

### **Unit Structure :**

- 11.0 Objectives
- 11.1 Introduction
- 11.3 Development of Technology
- 11.4 Problems of the Contemporary World
- 11.5 Greenhouse Effect and Global Warming
- 11.6 Depletion of the Ozone Layer
- 11.7 Problem of Disposal of Sewage
- 11.8 Nuclear Radiation
- 11.9 Chemical Pesticides and Toxins
- 11.10 Deforestation
- 11.11 United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)
- 11.12 The Earth Summit
- 11.13 Women's Liberation Movement
- 11.14 Summary
- 11.15 Questions
- 11.16 References

---

### **11.0 OBJECTIVES**

---

1. To study the problems of development and its impact on environment.
2. To understand the various attempts made by different individual women and organizations towards Women's Liberation Movement.

---

## **11.1 INTRODUCTION**

---

There is a widespread belief in the world today that twentieth century society, based on increasing use of and reliance on technology, will soon begin to collapse under its own weight as the earth's resources, on which the human beings depend to maintain the immensely complex infrastructure of today, become exhausted by human beings' insatiable greed. The industrialized nations that are more and more obsessed with the creation of wealth and profit pay little attention to the side effects that such developmental strategies have been producing.

---

## **11.2 ORIGIN OF CIVILIZATION**

---

The human beings, who appeared late in the Earth's history, were ultimately able to modify the Earth's environment by their activities. Because of their unique mental and physical capabilities, human beings were able to escape the environmental constraints that limited other species and to change the environment to meet their needs. Although early human beings lived in some harmony with the environment, as did other animals, their retreat from the wilderness began with the first, prehistoric agricultural revolution. The ability to control and use fire allowed them to modify or eliminate natural vegetation, and the domestication and herding of grazing animals eventually resulted in overgrazing and soil erosion. The domestication of plants also led to the destruction of natural vegetation to make room for crops, and the demand for wood for fuel depleted forests. Wild animals were slaughtered for food and destroyed as pests and predators.

---

## **11.3 DEVELOPMENT OF TECHNOLOGY**

---

While human populations remained small and human technology modest, their impact on the environment was localized. As populations increased and technology improved and expanded, however, more significant and widespread problems arose. Rapid technological advances after the Middle Ages culminated in the Industrial Revolution, which involved the discovery, use, and exploitation of fossil fuels, as well as the extensive exploitation of the Earth's mineral resources. With the Industrial Revolution, humans began to change the face of the Earth, the nature of its atmosphere, and the quality of its water. Today, unprecedented demands on the environment from a rapidly expanding human population and from advancing technology are causing a continuing and accelerating decline in the quality of the environment and its ability to sustain life.

---

## 11.4. PROBLEMS OF THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

---

The contemporary world is faced with two main type of problems: (1) Industrialization and development has been exhausting the world's resources of raw materials and fuel such as oil, coal and gas, and (2) Industrialization has been causing massive pollution of the environment, and if this continues, it would likely to severely damage the ecosystem. This is the system by which living creatures, trees and plants function within the environment and are all interconnected.

### 1) Exhaustion of the World's Resources:

Fossil fuels such as coal, oil and natural gas, are the remains of plants and living creatures, which died hundreds of millions of years ago. These resources cannot be replaced. They are known as non-renewable resources. The continuous exploitation of these energy resources may ultimately lead to their exhaustion. There is probably plenty of coal left, but nobody is quite sure just how much natural gas and oil are left. Oil production increased enormously during the twentieth century. Some experts believe that all the oil reserves will be used up early in the twenty-first century. This was one of the reasons why Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) tried to conserve oil during the 1970's. The British responded by successfully drilling for oil in the North Sea, which made them less dependent on oil imports. Another response was to develop alternative sources of power, especially nuclear power.

Other raw materials to be seriously depleted were tin, lead, copper, zinc and mercury. Experts are of the opinion that these might get exhausted early in the twenty-first century. It is the Third World, which is being stripped of the resources it needs to help it escape from poverty.

A lot of timber is being used all over the world for various purposes. About half the world's tropical rain forest had been lost by 1987, and it was calculated that about 80,000 square kilometres, an area roughly the size of Austria, was being lost every year. A side effect of this was the loss of many animal and insect species, which had lived in the forests.

Most of the edible fish have been extensively fished and are being in danger of falling below the level where it will be worth fishing. Many species of fish face extinction.

The supply of phosphates, which are used for fertilizers, was being rapidly used up. The more fertilizers farmers used to increase agricultural yields in an attempt to keep pace with the rising population, the more phosphate rock was quarried. Supplies of phosphates are expected to be exhausted by the middle of the twenty-first century.

There is a danger that supplies of fresh water might soon run out. Most of the fresh water on the planet is tied up in the polar icecaps and glaciers, or deep in the ground. All living organisms, human beings, animals, trees and plants, rely on water to survive. With the world's population growing

by 90 million a year, scientists at Stanford University (California) found that in 1995 human beings and their farm animals, crops and forestry plantations were already using up one-fourth of all the water taken up by plants. This leaves less moisture to evaporate and therefore a likelihood of less rainfall. "The wars of the next century will be over water" is the depressing prediction of Ismail Serageldin, Vice-President of the World Bank. Whether or not this turns out to be the case, there is undeniably a problem with water. It is not the total quantity of water which is the issue but where it is located. Nature has distributed water very unequally across the world, making for severe shortages in parts along with excesses in others. Moreover, the demand for water is increasing. Population is increasing, which naturally increases demand both directly and indirectly by its use in industry and agriculture.

The amount of land available for agriculture was dwindling. This was partly because of spreading industrialization and the growth of cities, but also because of wasteful use of farmland. Badly designed irrigation schemes increased salt levels in the soil. Sometimes irrigation took too much water from lakes and rivers, and whole areas were turned into deserts. Soil erosion is accelerating on every continent but Antarctica and is degrading one fifth to one third of the cropland of the world, posing a significant threat to the food supply. For example, erosion is undermining the productivity of approximately 35 per cent of all cropland in the United States. In the developing world, increasing needs for food and firewood have resulted in the deforestation and cultivation of steep slopes, causing severe erosion. Adding to the problem is the loss of prime cropland to industry, dams, urban sprawl, and highways. The amount of topsoil lost each year is at least 25 million tonnes, which is enough, in principle, to grow 9 million tonnes of wheat. About half of all erosion is in the United States, the former Soviet Union, India, and China. Soil erosion and the loss of cropland and forests also reduce the moisture-holding capacity of soils and add sediments to streams, lakes, and reservoirs.

## **2) Environmental Pollution:**

Discharges from heavy industry cause pollution of the atmosphere, rivers, lakes and the sea. In 1975 all five Great Lakes of North America were described as 'dead', meaning that they were so heavily polluted that no fish could live in them. About ten per cent of the lakes in Sweden were in the same condition. Acid rain (rain polluted with sulphuric acid) caused extensive damage to trees in central Europe, especially in Germany and Czechoslovakia. Britain was blamed for producing the majority of the pollution causing the acid rain. Acid rain corrodes metals, weathers stone buildings and monuments, injures and kills vegetation, and acidifies lakes, streams, and soils, especially in the poorly protected regions of northeastern North America and northern Europe. In these regions, lake acidification has killed some fish populations. It is also now a problem in the southeastern and western United States. Acid rain can also slow forest growth.

---

## 11.5 GREENHOUSE EFFECT AND GLOBAL WARMING

---

From about 1970 scientists were worried about what they called the 'greenhouse effect' and 'global warming'. It is alleged that the world is getting warmer due to the activities of human beings, and in particular the process of industrialization, coupled with the quickly expanding population. The primary causes of this are the so-called greenhouse gases. The temperature of the earth is partly governed by the balance of the radiation which comes in and that which escapes. These are determined by the constitution and quantity of the gases in the atmosphere. If they increase, the earth gets warmer; if they decrease it gets colder. The present forms of life on the earth depend on there being a greenhouse effect to keep it at the appropriate temperature. However, difficulties arise if the gases vary. Thus, the greenhouse effect in itself is crucial to human life. It is the variations in it, which cause the problems. The evidence seems to suggest that the world is getting warmer. The greenhouse gases are increasing largely due to various forms of economic activity.

The most significant of the greenhouse gases is carbon dioxide, which accounts for a little more than half of the contribution to global warming. It comes chiefly from fossil fuel burning and deforestation. CFCs are used in aerosol sprays, refrigerators and fire extinguishers. About fifteen per cent of global warming comes from methane, the source of which is rice paddies and various forms of fermentation. Nitrous oxide accounts for about six per cent and comes from biomass burning, fertilizer use and fossil fuel consumption.

Once the greenhouse warming is underway it sets up various feedback processes, that is, processes which either speed up the process of global warming, which are known as positive feedback processes, or those which counteract the trend, which are known as negative feedback processes. Global warming increases the amount of water vapour from the seas. Water vapour itself is a powerful greenhouse factor so the warming process is amplified.

The consequences of global warming are various. First, the sea level will rise, which will put various coastal states in serious positions. The countries with low-lying coasts will have a lot of problems. Unfortunately, it is accidentally the case that many of the most vulnerable countries are also very poor. These countries include Egypt, Mozambique and Pakistan. Bangladesh, already one of the poorest countries outside Africa, will be particularly badly affected. In Europe, Netherlands and the east coast of Britain are vulnerable to the sea and will become much more so if the sea level increases significantly.

Another major consequence of global warming is the displacement of various sorts of economic activity. Thus, temperate areas suitable for wheat will become hotter and less suitable, while other areas, which are now too cold, will become more suitable. The central Wheatlands of

the United States will move northwards to Canada. Similarly Siberia may become grain basket. This suggests that the process of global warming will simply shift economic activity. Some areas and countries will gain from this while others may lose.

---

## **11.6 DEPLETION OF THE OZONE LAYER**

---

Another major problem faced by the contemporary world is that of the depletion of the ozone layer. Around the earth, at a height between 10 and 35 kilometres, is a layer of ozone, which keeps harmful radiation from the Sun down to levels, which the present living inhabitants of the world, human and non-human, can tolerate. Studies showed the ozone layer was being damaged by the increasing use of industrial chemicals called chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs, compounds of fluorine) that are used in refrigeration, air-conditioning, cleaning solvents, packing materials, and aerosol sprays. Chlorine, a chemical by-product of CFCs, attacks ozone. In 1979 scientists discovered that there was a large hole in the ozone layer over the Antarctic. By 1989 the hole was much larger and another hole had been discovered over the Arctic. This meant that people were more likely to develop skin cancers because of the unfiltered radiation from the sun. Some progress was made towards dealing with this problem, and many countries banned the use of CFCs.

---

## **11.7 PROBLEM OF DISPOSAL OF SEWAGE**

---

Getting rid of sewage from the world's great cities has been a problem. Some countries simply dumped sewage untreated or only partially treated straight into the sea. The sea around New York is badly polluted, and the Mediterranean is heavily polluted, mainly by human sewage. Farmers in the richer countries contributed to pollution by using artificial fertilizers and pesticides, which drained, off the land into streams and rivers.

---

## **11.8 NUCLEAR RADIATION**

---

Although most countries have banned atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons, eliminating a large source of radioactive fallout, nuclear radiation still remains an environmental problem. It is now known that this can cause cancer, particularly leukemia. Power plants always release some amount of radioactive waste into the air and water. There was a constant risk of major accidents like the explosion at Three Mile Island in the United States in 1979, which contaminated a vast area around the power station. When leaks and accidents occurred, the authorities always assured the public that nobody had suffered harmful effects; however, nobody really knew how many people would die later from cancer caused by radiation. The worst ever nuclear accident happened in 1986 at Chernobyl in the Ukraine, then part of the Soviet Union. A nuclear reactor exploded, killing possibly hundreds of people and releasing a huge radioactive cloud, which drifted across most of Europe. Ten years later it was reported that hundreds of cases of thyroid cancer were appearing in areas near Chernobyl. Even in Britain, a

thousand miles away, hundreds of square miles of sheep pasture in Wales, Cumbria and Scotland were still contaminated and subject to restrictions. A greater problem facing the nuclear industry is the storage of nuclear wastes, which remain toxic thousands of years, depending on the type. Safe storage for geological periods of time is problematic. Meanwhile nuclear wastes accumulate, threatening the environment. Concern about the safety of nuclear power has led many countries to look towards alternative sources of power, which were safer, particularly solar, wind and tide power.

---

## **11.9 CHEMICAL PESTICIDES AND TOXINS**

---

Extensive use of synthetic pesticides derived from chlorinated hydrocarbons in pest control has had disastrous environmental side effects. These chemical pesticides are highly persistent and resist biological degradation. They are relatively insoluble in water and cling to plant tissues and accumulate in soils, the bottom mud of streams and ponds, and the atmosphere. Although these synthetic chemicals are not found in nature, they nevertheless enter the food chain. The pesticides are either taken in by plant eaters or absorbed directly through the skin by such aquatic organisms as fish and various invertebrates. The pesticide is further concentrated as it passes from herbivores to carnivores. It becomes highly concentrated in the tissues of animals at the end of the food chain, such as the predatory birds and animals. As a result, some large predatory and fish-eating birds have been brought close to extinction. Because of the dangers of pesticides to wildlife and to humans, and because insects have acquired resistance to them, the use of halogenated hydrocarbons such as DDT is declining rapidly in the Western world, although large quantities are still used in developing countries.

Toxic substances are chemicals and mixtures of chemicals the manufacturing, processing, distribution, use, and disposal of which present an unreasonable risk to human health and the environment. Most of these toxic substances are synthetic chemicals that enter the environment and persist there for long periods of time. Major concentrations of toxic substances occur in chemical dumpsites. If they seep into soil and water, the chemicals can contaminate water supplies, air, crops, and domestic animals, and have been associated with human birth defects, miscarriages, and organic diseases. Despite known dangers, the problem still persists. In a recent 15-year period, more than 70,000 new synthetic chemicals were manufactured, and new ones are being created at the rate of 500 to 1,000 each year.

---

## **11.10 DEFORESTATION**

---

The deforestation technique of slash and burn, utilized extensively to clear large areas of forest for agricultural and other purposes, causes an enormous amount of environmental damage. The large amounts of carbon dioxide given off into the atmosphere during burning add to the greenhouse effect. The removal of all trees and groundcover destroys

animal habitats and greatly accelerates erosion, adding to the sediment loads of rivers and making seasonal flooding much more severe.

Increasing numbers of human beings are encroaching on remaining wild lands, even in those areas once considered relatively safe from exploitation, degradation, and pollution. Insatiable demands for energy are forcing the development of Arctic regions for oil and gas and threatening the delicate ecological balance of tundra ecosystems and their wildlife. Tropical forests, especially in southeastern Asia and the Amazon River Basin, are being destroyed at an alarming rate for timber, conversion to crop and grazing lands, pine plantations, and settlements. It was estimated at one point in the 1980's that such forest lands were being cleared or converted at the rate of 20 hectares (nearly 50 acres) a minute; another estimate put the rate at more than 200,000 sq km (78,000 sq mi) a year. In 1993 satellite data provided a rate of about 15,000 sq km (5,800 sq mi) a year in the Amazon Basin area alone. This tropical deforestation has already resulted in the extinction of as many as 750,000 species, and is likely to eliminate millions if allowed to continue unchecked. This would mean the loss of a multiplicity of products: food, fibres, medical drugs, dyes, gums, and resins. In addition, the expansion of croplands and grazing areas for domestic livestock in Africa, and illegal trade in endangered species and wildlife products, could mean the end of Africa's large mammals. In North America, wild areas are being threatened by agricultural expansion and widespread pollution.

---

### **11.11 UNITED NATIONS ENVIRONMENT PROGRAMME (UNEP)**

---

The UNEP is a specialized agency established in 1972 by the United Nations General Assembly. Its aim is to promote international cooperation in environmental matters. Its tasks include constant surveillance of the environment in a programme known as Earthwatch, analysis of trends, the collection and dissemination of information, the adoption of environmentally sound policies, and ensuring the compatibility of projects with the priorities of developing countries. UNEP has initiated projects concerned with the following problems: the ozone layer, climate, the transport and disposal of waste, the marine environment, water systems, soil degradation, deforestation, biodiversity, urban environment, sustainable development, energy conservation, human settlements and population issues, health, toxic chemicals, environmental law, and education. The activities of the UNEP are financed from the UN's general budget, by members' contributions, and by trust funds. The money is allocated proportionally: Twenty per cent to Africa, Asia, Latin America, western Asia, Europe, and the Mediterranean and eighty per cent to global projects. UNEP, however, is not a funding agency. Its resources are used to start up programmes, which then draw funds from other sources, such as governments and environmental agencies. It works in close cooperation with other UN agencies, especially the Food and Agriculture Organization

(FAO), the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), and the World Health Organization (WHO). It also has links with over 6,000 non-governmental bodies concerned with the environment. Its Governing Council, with representatives from 58 member states, meets every two years. The Administrative Committee on Coordination liaises between UNEP and other UN agencies and related programmes. The organization's headquarters are in Nairobi, Kenya. In September 1999 UNEP claimed that the world would face a massive environmental crisis in the twenty-first century unless immediate action was taken. According to its report, *Global Environment Outlook 2000 (GEO-2000)*, which UNEP claims is the most 'authoritative assessment' of environmental issues ever produced, the chief culprits behind the world's current environmental situation were the 'continued poverty of the majority' of the world's people and 'excessive consumption' by Western and some East Asian nations.

---

## 11.12 THE EARTH SUMMIT

---

In June 1992 the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, commonly known as the Earth Summit was convened for twelve days on the outskirts of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It was attended by delegates from 178 countries including many prime ministers and presidents, making it the largest conference ever held.

The Earth Summit developed and legitimized a broad agenda for environmental, economic, and political change. The purposes of the conference were to identify long-term environmental reforms and to initiate processes for their implementation and supervision. Conventions were held to discuss and adopt documents on the environment. The major topics covered by these conventions included climate change, biodiversity, forest protection, Agenda 21, which is a 900-page blueprint for environmental development, and the Rio Declaration, which is a six-page statement that called for integrating the environment with economic development. The Climate Convention and the Biodiversity Convention were legal agreements. The Earth Summit was an historic event of great significance. Not only did it make the environment a priority on the world's agenda The environmental outlook for the future is mixed. In spite of economic and political changes, interest in and concern about the environment remains high. Air quality has improved in some areas in the developed world but has deteriorated in many developing countries, and problems of acid deposition, chlorofluorocarbons and ozone depletion, and heavy air pollution in Eastern Europe still seek solutions and concerted action. Until acid deposition is diminished, loss of aquatic life in northern lakes and streams will continue, and forest growth will be affected. Water pollution will remain a growing problem as increasing human populations put additional stress on the environment.\

---

## 11.13 WOMEN'S LIBERATION MOVEMENT

---

Women's movement campaigned to obtain political, social, and economic equality between women and men. Among the equal rights campaigned for are control of personal property, equality of opportunity in education and employment, equal suffrage, that is, the right to vote, and equality of sexual freedom. The women's rights movement, also known as feminism and women's liberation, first arose in Europe in the late eighteenth century. Although by 1970 most women throughout the world had gained many rights according to law, in fact complete political, economic, and social equality with men remains to be achieved.

### 11.13.1 Beginning of Change:

After wars and revolutions in Russia (1917) and China (1949), new Communist governments discouraged the patriarchal family system and supported sexual equality, including birth control. In the Soviet Union, however, the majority of working women held low-paid jobs and was minimally represented in party and government councils. Birth-control techniques were primitive, day-care centres were few, and mothers working outside the home were largely responsible for keeping house and tending children too. China more fully preserved its revolutionary ideals, but some job discrimination against women nevertheless existed. Socialist governments in Sweden in the 1930's established wide-ranging programmes of equal rights for women, which included extensive child-care arrangements.

### 11.13.2. The Right to Vote:

The participation of women in the First World War and the Second World War helped them achieve one of the major aims of the nineteenth century feminist movement, the right to vote. Already after the First World War, many governments acknowledged the contributions of women to the war effort by granting them the right to vote. Sweden, Britain, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Austria, and Czechoslovakia did so in 1918, followed by the United States in 1920. Women in France and Italy did not obtain the right to vote until 1945. After the Second World War, European women tended to fall back into the traditional roles expected of them, and little was heard of feminist concerns. But by the late 1960's, women began to assert their rights again and speak as feminists. Along with the student upheavals of the late 1960's came renewed interest in feminism, or the women's liberation movement, as it was now called. Increasingly women protested that the acquisition of political and legal equality had not brought true equality with men.

In a British Women's Liberation Workshop in 1969 the women expressed their anguish in the following words: "We are economically oppressed: in jobs we do full work for half pay; in the home we do unpaid work full-time. We are commercially exploited by advertisement, television, and the press; legally we often have only the status of children. We are brought up to feel inadequate, educated to

narrower horizons than men. This is our specific oppression as women. It is as women that we are, therefore, organizing.”

### **11.13.3.Simone de Beauvoir:**

Of great importance to the emergence of the postwar women's liberation movement was the work of Simone de **Beauvoir** (1908-1986). Born into a Catholic middleclass family and educated at the Sorbonne in Paris, she supported herself as a teacher and later as a novelist and writer. She maintained a lifelong relationship, but not marriage, with the philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre. Her involvement in the existentialist movement, the leading intellectual movement of its time, led her to become active in political causes. De **Beauvoir** believed that she lived a ‘liberated’ life for a twentieth- century European woman, but for all her freedom, she still came to perceive that as a woman she faced limits that men did not. In 1949, she published her highly influential work *The Second Sex*, in which she argued that as a result of male dominated societies, women had been defined by their differences from men and consequently received second-class status.

### **11.13.4.Betty Friedan:**

Another important influence in the growth of a women's movement in the 1960's came from Betty Friedan. Friedan, who was a journalist and the mother of three children, grew increasingly uneasy with her attempt to fulfill the traditional role of the ‘ideal housewife and mother’. In 1963, she published the famous book entitled *The Feminine Mystique*, in which she analyzed the problems of middle-class American women in the 1950's and argued that women were being denied equality with men. She wrote: "The problem that has no name-which is simply the fact that American women are kept from growing to their full human capacities-is taking a far greater toll on the physical and mental health of our country than any known disease." *The Feminine Mystique* became a bestseller and elevated Friedan into a newfound celebrity.

### **11.13.5.Transformation of Women's Lives:**

It is estimated that women need to average 2.1 children in order to ensure a natural replacement of a country's population. In many European countries, the population stopped growing in the 1960's, and the trend has continued since then. By the 1990's, birthrates were down drastically; among the nations of the European Union, the average number of children per woman of childbearing age was 1.4. Italy's rate-1.2, was the lowest in the world in 1997.

### **11.13.6.Women in Profession:**

At the same time, the number of women in the workforce has continued to rise. In Britain, for example, the number of women in the labour force went from 32 per cent to 44 percent between 1970 and 1990. Moreover, women have entered new employment areas. Greater

access to universities and professional schools enabled women to take jobs in law, medicine, government, business, and education. In the Soviet Union, for example, about 70 percent of doctors and teachers were women. Nevertheless, economic inequality still often prevailed. Women received lower wages than men for comparable work and received fewer opportunities for advancement to management positions.

#### **11.13.7. 'Consciousness-raising' Groups:**

Feminists in the women's liberation movement came to believe that women themselves must transform the fundamental conditions of their lives. They did so in a variety of ways after 1970. First, they formed numerous 'consciousness-raising' groups to further awareness of women's issues. Women met together to share their personal experiences and become aware of the many ways that male dominance affected their lives. This 'consciousness raising' helped many women to become activists.

#### **11.13.8. Legislation Favouring Women:**

Women sought and gained a measure of control over their own bodies by seeking to overturn legal restrictions on both contraception and abortion. In the 1960's and 1970's, hundreds of thousands of European women worked to repeal the laws that outlawed contraception and abortion and began to meet with success. A French law in 1968 permitted the sale of contraceptive devices, and in the 1970's French feminists worked to legalize abortion. In 1979, a new French law legalized abortion. Even in Catholic countries, where the church remained strongly opposed to abortion, legislation allowing contraception and abortion was passed in the 1970's and 1980's.

#### **11.13.9. Women Activists:**

As more women became activists, they also became involved in new issues. In the 1980's and 1990's, women faculty in universities concentrated on developing new cultural attitudes through the new academic field of women's studies. Courses in women's studies, which stressed the role and contributions of women in history, came to be introduced in both American and European colleges and universities.

Other women began to try to affect the political environment by allying with the anti-nuclear movement. In 1981, a group of women protested American nuclear missiles in Britain by chaining themselves to the fence of an American military base. Thousands more joined in creating a peace camp around the military compound. Enthusiasm ran high; one participant said: "I'll never forget that feeling; it'll live with me forever . . . As we walked round, and we clasped hands. . . it was for women; it was for peace; it was for the world."

Some women joined the ecological movement. As one German writer who was concerned with environmental issues said, it is women "who

must give birth to children, willingly or unwillingly, in this polluted world of ours." Especially prominent was the number of women members in the Green Party in Germany, which supported environmental issues and elected forty-two delegates to the West German parliament in 1987.

Women in the West have also reached out to work with women from the rest of the world in international conferences to change the conditions of their lives. Between 1975 and 1995, the United Nations held conferences in Mexico City, Copenhagen, Nairobi, and Beijing. These meetings made clear the differences between women from Western and non-Western countries. Whereas women from Western countries spoke about political, economic, cultural, and sexual rights, women from developing countries in Latin America, Africa, and Asia focused their attention on bringing an end to the violence, hunger, and disease that haunt their lives. Despite these differences, these meetings made it clear how women in both developed and developing nations were organizing to make people aware of women's issues.

#### **11.13.10. Gains of the Women's Liberation Movement:**

The women's rights movement has made many gains in its history. In more than ninety per cent of nations, women can vote and hold public office. Aided by the United Nations Commission on the Status of Women (1946), women in many countries have gained legal rights and fuller access to education and the professions. However, the advent of industrialization in non-Western nations destroyed some traditional economic arrangements that favoured women and made underpaid factory labour the only work available to them, while the recent resurgence of religious fundamentalism, for example, in the Islamic world, has sometimes brought about the re-emergence of oppressive practices towards women. Women's rights movements in the developing world have aimed to improve the social status of women by campaigning against divisive legal and social codes such as purdah (seclusion of women) in Arab and Islamic societies, and the dowry system in India, and by opposing female genital mutilation (circumcision). In Africa, women produce more than two-thirds of the continent's food, and steps are being taken to help women gain greater control over agricultural technology. In 1975 the United Nations launched a Decade for Women programme, and major conferences were held in 1975, 1980, and 1985, and again in 1995. The 1995 conference, held in Beijing, China, centred on human-rights issues relating specifically to women.

In the 1990's, the women's movement has been examining the possibility that Western society is demonstrating a so-called post-feminist backlash against legal and social gains made by women. Books such as *The Beauty Myth* (1990) by Naomi Wolf and *Backlash* (1992) by Susan Faludi have concentrated on how gains previously made as a result of the women's liberation movement are now being eroded. The recent

opposition, especially in the United States, to abortion, is sighted as one of the examples of this argument.

---

## 11.14 SUMMARY

---

There is a widespread belief in the world today that twentieth century society, based on increasing use of and reliance on technology, will soon begin to collapse under its own weight as the earth's resources, on which the human beings depend to maintain the immensely complex infrastructure of today, become exhausted by human beings' insatiable greed. The industrialized nations that are more and more obsessed with the creation of wealth and profit pay little attention to the side effects that such developmental strategies have been producing.

The contemporary world is faced with two main type of problems: (1) Industrialization and development has been exhausting the world's resources of raw materials and fuel such as oil, coal and gas, and (2) Industrialization has been causing massive pollution of the environment, and if this continues, it would likely to severely damage the ecosystem. This is the system by which living creatures, trees and plants function within the environment and are all interconnected.

In June 1992 the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, commonly known as the Earth Summit was convened for twelve days on the outskirts of Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. It was attended by delegates from 178 countries including many prime ministers and presidents, making it the largest conference ever held.

Women's movement campaigned to obtain political, social, and economic equality between women and men. Among the equal rights campaigned for are control of personal property, equality of opportunity in education and employment, equal suffrage, that is, the right to vote, and equality of sexual freedom. Of great importance to the emergence of the postwar women's liberation movement was the work of Simone de **Beauvoir** (1908-1986). Another important influence in the growth of a women's movement in the 1960's came from Betty Friedan. Friedan, who was a journalist and the mother of three children, grew increasingly uneasy with her attempt to fulfill the traditional role of the 'ideal housewife and mother'. As more women became activists, they also became involved in new issues. In the 1980's and 1990's, women faculty in universities concentrated on developing new cultural attitudes through the new academic field of women's studies.

In this way, the Sustainable Development and Womens' Liberation Movement bore the fruit in its course.

---

## 11.15 QUESTIONS

---

1. Analyze the causes of the exhaustion of the resources in the contemporary world.
2. Discuss the various factors that have led to the degradation of the environment in the contemporary world.
3. Trace the various stages in the women's liberation movement since 1945.
4. Examine the women's liberation movement in the contemporary world.
5. Write short notes on the following:
  - a) Greenhouse effect and global warming
  - b) Deforestation
  - c) Nuclear radiation
  - d) Earth Summit (1992)
  - e) Simone de Beauvoir
  - f) Betty Friedan

---

## 11.16 REFERENCES

---

1. Carr E.H., International Relations between the Two World Wars, Macmillan-Palgrave, 1985
2. Conwell R.D., World History in the Twentieth Century, Longman, Gordon, 1969.
3. Davis H.A., An Outline of the World, OUP, New Delhi, 1968
4. Fay S.B., Origins of the World Wars, New York, 1991.
5. Gokhale B.K., History of the Modern World, Himalaya Publishing House, Bombay, 1982.
6. John Lewis, Gaddis, We Now Know, Rethinking the Cold War History, OUP, 1997.
7. Lorenz Luthi, The Sino-Soviet Split, The Cold War in the Communist World, Princeton University Press, 2008
8. Odd Arne, Westad, The Global Cold War, The Third World Interventions and the Making of our Times, CUP, 2007.
9. Palmer R.R. & Collon, Joel, History the Modern World, London, 1964.
10. Raymon Gorthoff, The Great Transition: American Soviet Relations and the End of the Cold War, Brookings, Washington, 1994.
11. Smith Joseph, The Cold war: 1945-1965, Blackwell Publishing House, Cambridge, 1989.
12. Tony Judt, Post War: A History of Europe since 1945, Penguin, 2006.

13. Weech W.N., History of the World (Third Edition), Asia Publishing House, Bombay,1961.
14. Thompson David, The World History:1914-1968, OUP, 1968
15. Taylor A.J.P., The Struggle for Mastery in Europe, OUP, London,1977.

Sustainable Development And  
Women's Liberation  
Movement



munotes.in