

Superpower Rivalry and Conflict

The long shadow of the Cold War
on the twenty-first century

Edited by
Chandra Chari



Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics

Superpower Rivalry and Conflict

Variouly described by historians and thinkers as the ‘most terrible century in Western history’, ‘a century of massacres and wars’ and the ‘most violent century in human history’, the twentieth century – and in particular the period between the First World War and the collapse of the USSR – forms a coherent historical period which changed the entire face of human history within a few decades. This book examines the trajectory of the Cold War and the fallouts for the rest of the world to seek lessons for the twenty-first century to manage international relations today and avoid conflict.

Written by experts in their field, the chapters provide an alternative perspective to the Western-paradigm dominated international relations theory. The book examines, for example, whether now in the twenty-first century the unipolar moment has passed and if the changing economic balance of power, thrown up by globalization, has led to the emergence of a multipolar world capable of economic and multilateral cooperation. It discusses the potential of new cooperative security frameworks, which would provide an impetus to disarmament and protection of the environment globally and asks if nuclear disarmament is feasible and necessary. The book highlights areas in which the potential for conflict is ingrained. Offering Asian perspectives on these issues – perspectives from countries like Afghanistan, Vietnam, West Asia and Pakistan which were embroiled in the Cold War as mere pawns and which have become flashpoints for conflict in our century – this book is an important contribution to the ongoing debate.

Chandra Chari is one of the founder-editors and current Editor of *The Book Review* – a journal of repute promoting research in political thought and international relations. She is the Chairperson of The Book Review Literary Trust, India. She has edited *War, Peace, Hegemony in a Globalized World: The Changing Balance of Power in the Twenty-First Century* (also published by Routledge, 2008).

Routledge Advances in International Relations and Global Politics

- 1 Foreign Policy and Discourse Analysis**
France, Britain and Europe
Henrik Larsen
- 2 Agency, Structure and International Politics**
From ontology to empirical enquiry
Gil Friedman and Harvey Starr
- 3 The Political Economy of Regional Co-operation in the Middle East**
Ali Carkoglu, Mine Eder, Kemal Kirisci
- 4 Peace Maintenance**
The evolution of international political authority
Jarat Chopra
- 5 International Relations and Historical Sociology**
Breaking down boundaries
Stephen Hobden
- 6 Equivalence in Comparative Politics**
Edited by Jan W. van Deth
- 7 The Politics of Central Banks**
Robert Elgie and Helen Thompson
- 8 Politics and Globalisation**
Knowledge, ethics and agency
Martin Shaw
- 9 History and International Relations**
Thomas W. Smith
- 10 Idealism and Realism in International Relations**
Robert M. A. Crawford
- 11 National and International Conflicts, 1945–95**
New empirical and theoretical approaches
Frank Pfetsch and Christoph Rohloff
- 12 Party Systems and Voter Alignments Revisited**
Edited by Lauri Karvonen and Stein Kuhnle
- 13 Ethics, Justice and International Relations**
Constructing an international community
Peter Sutch
- 14 Capturing Globalization**
Edited by James H. Mittelman and Norani Othman

- 15 Uncertain Europe**
Building a new European security order?
Edited by Martin A. Smith and Graham Timmins
- 16 Power, Postcolonialism and International Relations**
Reading race, gender and class
Edited by Geeta Chowdhry and Sheila Nair
- 17 Constituting Human Rights**
Global civil society and the society of democratic states
Mervyn Frost
- 18 US Economic Statecraft for Survival 1933–91**
Of sanctions, embargoes and economic warfare
Alan P. Dobson
- 19 The EU and NATO Enlargement**
Richard McAllister and Roland Dannreuther
- 20 Spatializing International Politics**
Analysing activism on the internet
Jayne Rodgers
- 21 Ethnonationalism in the Contemporary World**
Walker Connor and the study of Nationalism
Edited by Daniele Conversi
- 22 Meaning and International Relations**
Edited by Peter Mandaville and Andrew Williams
- 23 Political Loyalty and the Nation-State**
Edited by Michael Waller and Andrew Linklater
- 24 Russian Foreign Policy and the CIS**
Theories, debates and actions
Nicole J. Jackson
- 25 Asia and Europe**
Development and different dimensions of ASEM
Yeo Lay Hwee
- 26 Global Instability and Strategic Crisis**
Neville Brown
- 27 Africa in International Politics**
External involvement on the continent
Edited by Ian Taylor and Paul Williams
- 28 Global Governmentality**
Governing international spaces
Edited by Wendy Larner and William Walters
- 29 Political Learning and Citizenship Education Under Conflict**
The political socialization of Israeli and Palestinian youngsters
Orit Ichilov
- 30 Gender and Civil Society**
Transcending boundaries
Edited by Jude Howell and Diane Mulligan
- 31 State Crises, Globalisation and National Movements in North-East Africa**
The Horn's dilemma
Edited by Asafa Jalata

- 32 Diplomacy and Developing Nations**
 Post-Cold War foreign policy-making structures and processes
Edited by Justin Robertson and Maurice A. East
- 33 Autonomy, Self-governance and Conflict Resolution**
 Innovative approaches to institutional design in divided societies
Edited by Marc Weller and Stefan Wolff
- 34 Mediating International Crises**
Jonathan Wilkenfeld, Kathleen J. Young, David M. Quinn and Victor Asal
- 35 Postcolonial Politics, the Internet and Everyday Life**
 Pacific traversals online
M. I. Franklin
- 36 Reconstituting the Global Liberal Order**
 Legitimacy and regulation
Kanishka Jayasuriya
- 37 International Relations, Security and Jeremy Bentham**
Gunhild Hoogensen
- 38 Interregionalism and International Relations**
Edited by Heiner Hänggi, Ralf Roloff and Jürgen Rüländ
- 39 The International Criminal Court**
 A global civil society achievement
Marlies Glasius
- 40 A Human Security Doctrine for Europe**
 Project, principles, practicalities
Edited by Marlies Glasius and Mary Kaldor
- 41 The History and Politics of UN Security Council Reform**
Dimitris Bourantonis
- 42 Russia and NATO since 1991**
 From Cold War through cold peace to partnership?
Martin A. Smith
- 43 The Politics of Protection**
 Sites of insecurity and political agency
Edited by Jef Huysmans, Andrew Dobson and Raia Prokhovnik
- 44 International Relations in Europe**
 Traditions, perspectives and destinations
Edited by Knud Erik Jørgensen and Tonny Brems Knudsen
- 45 The Empire of Security and the Safety of the People**
Edited by William Bain
- 46 Globalization and Religious Nationalism in India**
 The search for ontological security
Catrina Kinnvall
- 47 Culture and International Relations**
 Narratives, natives and tourists
Julie Reeves
- 48 Global Civil Society**
 Contested futures
Edited by Gideon Baker and David Chandler

- 49 Rethinking Ethical Foreign Policy**
Pitfalls, possibilities and paradoxes
Edited by David Chandler and Volker Heins
- 50 International Cooperation and Arctic Governance**
Regime effectiveness and northern region building
Edited by Olav Schram Stokke and Geir Hønneland
- 51 Human Security**
Concepts and implications
Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh and Anuradha Chenoy
- 52 International Relations and Security in the Digital Age**
Edited by Johan Eriksson and Giampiero Giacomello
- 53 State-Building**
Theory and practice
Edited by Aidan Hehir and Neil Robinson
- 54 Violence and Non-Violence in Africa**
Edited by Pal Ahluwalia, Louise Bethlehem and Ruth Ginio
- 55 Developing Countries and Global Trade Negotiations**
Edited by Larry Crump and S. Javed Maswood
- 56 Civil Society, Religion and Global Governance**
Paradigms of power and persuasion
Edited by Helen James
- 57 War, Peace and Hegemony in a Globalized World**
The changing balance of power in the twenty-first century
Edited by Chandra Chari
- 58 Economic Globalisation as Religious War**
Tragic convergence
Michael McKinley
- 59 Globalization, Prostitution and Sex-trafficking**
Corporeal politics
Elna Penttinen
- 60 Peacebuilding**
Women in international perspective
Elisabeth Porter
- 61 Ethics, Liberalism and Realism in International Relations**
Mark D. Gismondi
- 62 Law and Legalization in Transnational Relations**
Edited by Christian Brüttsch and Dirk Lehmkuhl
- 63 Fighting Terrorism and Drugs**
Europe and international police cooperation
Jörg Friedrichs
- 64 Identity Politics in the Age of Genocide**
The Holocaust and historical representation
David B. MacDonald
- 65 Globalisation, Public Opinion and the State**
Western Europe and East and Southeast Asia
Edited by Takashi Inoguchi and Ian Marsh

- 66 Urbicide**
The politics of urban destruction
Martin Coward
- 67 Transnational Activism in the UN and the EU**
A comparative study
Jutta Joachim and Birgit Locher
- 68 Gender Inclusive**
Essays on violence, men and feminist international relations
Adam Jones
- 69 Capitalism, Democracy and the Prevention of War and Poverty**
Edited by Peter Graeff and Guido Mehlkop
- 70 Environmental Change and Foreign Policy**
Theory and practice
Edited by Paul G. Harris
- 71 Climate Change and Foreign Policy**
Case studies from East to West
Edited by Paul G. Harris
- 72 Securitizations of Citizenship**
Edited by Peter Nyers
- 73 The Power of Ideology**
From the Roman Empire to Al-Qaeda
Alex Roberto Hybel
- 74 The Securitization of Humanitarian Migration**
Digging moats and sinking boats
Scott D. Watson
- 75 Mediation in the Asia-Pacific Region**
Transforming conflicts and building peace
Edited by Dale Bagshaw and Elisabeth Porter
- 76 United Nations Reform**
Heading North or South?
Spencer Zifcak
- 77 New Norms and Knowledge in World Politics**
Protecting people, intellectual property and the environment
Preslava Stoeva
- 78 Power, Resistance and Conflict in the Contemporary World**
Social movements, networks and hierarchies
Athina Karatzogianni and Andrew Robinson
- 79 World-Regional Social Policy and Global Governance**
New research and policy agendas in Africa, Asia, Europe and Latin America
Edited by Bob Deacon, Maria Cristina Macovei, Luk Van Langenhove and Nicola Yeates
- 80 International Relations Theory and Philosophy**
Interpretive dialogues
Edited by Cerwyn Moore and Chris Farrands
- 81 Superpower Rivalry and Conflict**
The long shadow of the Cold War on the twenty-first century
Edited by Chandra Chari

Superpower Rivalry and Conflict

The long shadow of the Cold War on
the twenty-first century

Edited by
Chandra Chari

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK



First published 2010
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2010 Editorial selection and matter, The Book Review Literary Trust;
individual contributors, their contribution

This edition published in the Taylor & Francis e-Library, 2010.

To purchase your own copy of this or any of Taylor & Francis or Routledge's
collection of thousands of eBooks please go to www.eBookstore.tandf.co.uk.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or
utilised in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now
known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in
any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing
from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Superpower rivalry and conflict : the long shadow of the Cold War on the
twenty first century / edited by Chandra Chari.

p. cm. (Routledge advances in international relations and global
politics ; 81)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. World politics 21st century. 2. Cold War. I. Chandra Chari.

D863.3.S87 2010

909.83'1 dc22

2009020745

ISBN 0-203-86533-2 Master e-book ISBN

ISBN 978 0 415 55025 3 (hbk)

ISBN 978 0 203 86533 0 (ebk)

**To my father who is no more but for whom his daughters'
education was an article of faith**

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	xiii
<i>Notes on contributors</i>	xiv
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xxi
1 Introduction CHANDRA CHARI	1
PART I	
Superpower rivalry: an overview	13
2 A historical overview of the Cold War K. SUBRAHMANYAM	15
3 Superpower rivalry and the victimization of Korea: the Korean War and the North Korean nuclear crisis HAKSOON PAIK	34
4 Regional fallout: Vietnam BALADAS GHOSHAL	50
5 Afghanistan: during the Cold War AMIN SAIKAL	57
6 Pakistan and the Cold War STEPHEN P. COHEN	72
PART II	
Prospects for a multipolar world: perspectives at the beginning of the twenty-first century	85
7 Theorizing unipolarity E. SRIDHARAN	87

xii *Contents*

8	Debating multilateralism: the role of emerging powers SWARAN SINGH	97
9	Europe, China, India and the multipolar world order CHARLES GRANT	110
10	Globalization revisited: evolving Chinese discourses on the Open Door policy and integration with the world economy KALPANA MISRA	124
11	Recolonizing West Asia in the twenty-first century? GULSHAN DIETL	140
12	Emerging international order and South Korea's survival strategy TAE WOO KIM	152
PART III		
Thinking beyond borders and boundaries: prospects for war and peace		165
13	Conflict models: how relevant are they to Asia? ANURADHA M. CHENYOY	167
14	Religion as a catalyst for conflict: the case of Islam JAMAL MALIK	176
15	The Antarctic experiment in utopia: sovereignty, resources and sustainability SANJAY CHATURVEDI	189
PART IV		
Looking ahead: can history be prevented from repeating itself?		201
16	Nuclear disarmament: mirage or need of the hour? P.R. CHARI	203
17	To err is statesmanlike, to learn folly T.C.A. SRINIVASA-RAGHAVAN	215
18	Is history being repeated? RADHA KUMAR	222
19	Engaging the idea of global citizenship SIDDHARTH MALLAVARAPU	233
	<i>Index</i>	243

Tables

9.1	Share of world GDP percentages at PPP1	111
11.1	Contrasting 'Shock and Awe' with Decisive Force	145

Contributors

Chandra Chari is Editor of *The Book Review* and Chairperson of The Book Review Literary Trust, New Delhi. She has an MA in Ancient Indian History (Delhi University). Her articles have been published in several newspapers in India. She has edited *Federal Concept: The Indian Experience* (Konark, 1992) and *War, Peace and Hegemony in a Globalized World: The Changing Balance of Power in the Twenty-first Century* (Routledge, 2008).

P.R. Chari is a former member of the Indian Administrative Service (1960 batch/Madhya Pradesh Cadre). He served two spells (1971-75 and 1985-88) in the Ministry of Defence. His last position in the Government was as Chief Executive of the Narmada Valley Development Authority. On the academic side he was Director of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses, New Delhi (1975-80), International Fellow, Centre for International Affairs, Harvard University (1983-84), Research Professor, Centre for Policy Research (1992-96), New Delhi, and Co-Director and Director, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, New Delhi (1996-2003). Currently he is Research Professor in this Institute. He has published over 1400 op-ed articles in newspapers/websites, and 140 monographs and major papers in learned journals/chapters in books, as well as 20 books. His latest publications are *Four Crises and a Peace Process* (Brookings Institution Press, 2007), *Armed Conflicts in South Asia* (Routledge 2008), *Indo-US Nuclear Deal: Seeking Synergy in Bilateralism* (Routledge, 2009) and *Making Borders Irrelevant in Kashmir* (Sanskriti, 2009). He is presently working on a book relating to security dynamics in Northeast and South Asia.

Sanjay Chaturvedi is Professor of Political Science and Honorary Director, Centre for the Study of Mid-West and Central Asia, Panjab University, Chandigarh. His area of specialization is the theory and practice of geopolitics with special reference to the polar regions and the Indian Ocean. He was awarded the Nehru Centenary British Fellowship, and the Leverhulme Trust Research Grant to pursue his postdoctoral research at Scott Polar Research Institute, University of Cambridge, England (1992-95). A member of the Core Group of Experts on India's Antarctic and Southern Ocean Affairs, set up by the Ministry of Ocean Development (DOD), Government of

India, he also served on the Indian delegation to Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meetings (ATCMs) held in New Delhi (2007), Kiev, Ukraine (2008) and Baltimore, USA (2009). He is the Co-Chair of Research Committee 15 (RC 15) on Political and Cultural Geography of International Political Science Association (IPSA) and a member of the Steering Committee of International Geographical Union (IGU) Commission on Political Geography; Vice-Chairman of the Indian Ocean Research Group, (www.iorgroup.org). He is the author of *Dawning of Antarctica* (1990); *Polar Regions: A Political Geography* (1996); co-author of *Partitions: Reshaping Minds and States* (2005); and co-editor of *Geopolitical Orientations Regionalism and Security in the Indian Ocean* (2004); *India in the Antarctic: Scientific and Geopolitical Perspectives* (2005); *Energy Security and the Indian Ocean Region* (2005); *Globalization: Spaces, Identities and Insecurities* (2005); and *Security of Sea Lanes of Communication in the Indian Ocean* (2008). His research articles have been published in *Environment and Planning the Society and Space*, *Journal of Economic and Social Geography*, *Ocean Yearbook* (University of Chicago Press), *Third World Quarterly* and *Co-operation and Conflict*.

Anuradha M. Chenoy is Professor in the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. She has been the Chairperson and Director of the Area Studies Program for Russia and Central Asia, JNU. She joined the School of International Studies in 1979. She has held other positions in the University, like Chairperson of the Gender and Sexual Harassment Committee and member of the Academic Council. She is the author of over a 100 articles in national and international journals on a wide range of issues and three books: *Human Security: Concept and Implications*, co-authored with Shahrbanou Tadjbakhsh (Routledge, UK., 2006); *Militarism and Women in South Asia* (Kali Books, New Delhi, 2002) and *The Making of New Russia* (Har Anand Publishers, New Delhi, 2001). She comments regularly on radio and television and writes for Indian newspapers and popular magazines. She is on the board of many civil society and public institutions.

Stephen P. Cohen joined Brookings in 1998 after a career as a Professor of Political Science and History at the University of Illinois. He has also taught in India, Japan and Singapore, and served on the Policy Planning Staff of the State Department. In 2004 he was named by the World Affairs Councils of America as one of America's five hundred most influential people in the area of foreign policy. Dr Cohen is the author, co-author or editor of over ten books, mostly on South Asian security issues, the most recent being *Four Crises and a Peace Process: American Engagement in South Asia* (2007), *The Idea of Pakistan* (2004) and *Science and Technology to Counter Terrorism: Proceedings of an Indo-U.S. Workshop* (2007). A book on the future of the Indian military is now in progress.

Gulshan Dietl is Professor at the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. She has also served as the Chairperson of the

Centre for West Asian and African Studies and Director of the Gulf Studies Programme at the university. Her areas of teaching and research are domestic developments, foreign policies and security issues in the Gulf and West Asia. She has been a Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence at the Mount Saint Mary College, Newburgh, New York (1993–94), a Guest Research Fellow at the Copenhagen Peace Research Institute (1998–99) and a Visiting Professor at the University of Kashmir (2004). Her publications include *The Dulles Era: America Enters West Asia* (Lancer International, New Delhi, 1985), *Through Two Wars and Beyond: A Study of the Gulf Cooperation Council* (Lancer Books, New Delhi, 1991), *Saudi Arabia: People, Politics and Policies* (National Book Trust, New Delhi, 2006) and *Contemporary Saudi Arabia and the Emerging Indo-Saudi Relations* (Shipra Publications, New Delhi, 2007; co-edited). She has contributed book chapters and articles to *International Studies*, *Strategic Analyses*, *India Quarterly*, *India International Centre Quarterly*, *Economic and Political Weekly*, *Mainstream*, *Pacific and Asian Journal of Energy*, *The Hindu*, *Times of India*, *Journal of South Asian and Middle Eastern Studies*, the COPRI Working Paper Series and the Gulf Studies Programme Occasional Papers Series among others.

Baladas Ghoshal is a former Professor of Southeast Asia and South-West Pacific Studies and Chairman of the Centre for South and Southeast Asian Studies at Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi. He was a Visiting Professor of International Relations at the Nagoya City University, Nagoya, Japan, 2006–7 and International Christian University (2004–5), and has taught at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign (1990–91), National University of Malaysia (1998–99), University of Malaya (2000) and the Universiti Utara Malaysia (2002–3). He has held Senior Fulbright Fellowships at the Cornell and Rutgers Universities (1983–84); was Fellow at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore (1985–86), Ford-ACDIS Fellow at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Fellow at the Centre for Asian Studies, University of Hong Kong (2003).

Charles Grant became a journalist with *Euromoney* after attending Cambridge and Grenoble universities. He joined *The Economist* in 1986, where he wrote about the City, the European Union (as Brussels correspondent) and defence. His biography of Jacques Delors (*Delors: Inside the House that Jacques Built*, published by Nicholas Brealey) appeared in 1994 and was translated into French, Japanese and Russian. In 1998 Grant left *The Economist* to become the first director of the Centre for European Reform, an independent think-tank that is dedicated to promoting a reform agenda within the European Union. He writes on EU foreign and defence policy, European institutions, transatlantic relations, Russia and China. He is the author of numerous CER publications, including *Europe's Blurred Boundaries: Rethinking Enlargement and Neighbourhood Policy* (2006) and *European Choices for Gordon Brown* (2007). He became a board member and trustee of the British Council in 2002.

Tae Woo Kim received his PhD in Political Science from the State University of New York at Buffalo in 1989. Since then he has worked as a defence specialist with special interest in nuclear issues. He is currently Senior Research Fellow at the Korea Institute for Defense Analyses (KIDA), the largest defence think-tank under the Ministry of National Defense. He is the author of some 700 writings (books, papers, newspaper columns) pertaining to nuclear matters. His writings in English include: 'South Korean Patience Wearing Thin', *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists* (Sept./Oct. 1995); 'South Korea's Missile Dilemmas', *Asian Survey* (May/June 1999); 'Islamic Terrorism and Clash of Civilizations', *Korean Journal of Defense Analyses* (March 2002); 'North Korean Nuclear Politics at the Crossroads', *Korean Journal of Defense Analyses* (Fall 2004).

Radha Kumar, Professor and Director of the Mandela Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution at Jamia Millia Islamia University, and trustee of the Delhi Policy Group, is a specialist on ethnic conflicts and peace processes. Formerly Senior Fellow in Peace and Conflict Studies at the Council on Foreign Relations in New York (1999–2003), she has been Executive Director of the Helsinki Citizen's Assembly in Prague (1992–94) and an Associate Fellow at the Institute for War and Peace Studies at Columbia University (1996–98). She is currently a member of CSCAP India, and on the India International Center's programme advisory group for security. She holds a PhD from Jawaharlal Nehru University in Delhi and an MA and BA from Cambridge University. Her books include *Making Peace with Partition* (Penguin, 2005), *Divide and Fall? Bosnia in the Annals of Partition* (Verso, 1997), *A History of Doing: Movements for Women's Rights and Feminism in India, 1900–1990* (Kali for Women and Verso, 1993) and (co-edited with Josep Palau) *Bosnia-Herzegovina: Between War and Peace* (Municipalidad Valencia, 1993). Her articles have been published in *Foreign Affairs*, *World Policy Journal*, *Brown Journal of World Affairs*, *Feminist Review*, *Indian Economic and Social History Review*, *Economic and Political Weekly* and *Seminar*. She is a frequent op-ed contributor to *The Indian Express*, *DNA* and other Indian newspapers. She has edited or authored roughly 30 reports, of which the most recent are Delhi Policy Group publications, *Frameworks for a Kashmir Settlement* (2007, 2006), *Peace-Building: European and Indian Views* (2007), *Peace Agreements and After* (2006) and *What Makes a Peace Process Irreversible?* (2005).

Jamal Malik was born in Peshawar, Pakistan. He obtained his MA in 1982 from Read Islamic Studies in Bonn and was awarded a doctorate by the South Asia Institute of the University of Heidelberg. His postdoctoral research was at the University of Bamberg. From 1990–96 he served as a Member of the Scientific Staff of the University of Heidelberg and Humboldt University, Berlin, and went on to become a Visiting Professor at l'École des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales (Paris) and at Oberlin. Since 1993, he has been part of the Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London, and a Member of the European Academy of Sciences and the Arts, Vienna, since 2000. His

fields of research include Muslim minority communities in Europe, Islamic mysticism, social history of South Asia, colonialism, interculturality, political Islam, urban societies, modern Islamic languages and sociology of religion.

Siddharth Mallavarapu is Assistant Professor of International Politics at the Centre for International Politics, Organization and Disarmament, School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University (JNU). His recent publications include *Banning the Bomb: The Politics of Norm Creation* (New Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2007) and two co-edited books on international relations theory in India. His intellectual interests include the underlying politics of knowledge surrounding the reception of a predominantly Anglo-American discipline (IR) in non-western contexts and the historical lineages of contemporary globalization. His teaching engagements have included courses on 'Globalization and the State' and 'Culture, Norms and Identity' designed primarily for M. Phil research scholars.

Kalpana Misra (PhD Michigan 1992) is an Associate Professor of Political Science and Associate Dean of the Henry Kendall College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Tulsa. She is the author of *From Post-Maoism to Post-Marxism: The Erosion of Official Ideology in Deng's China* (Routledge, 1998), co-author of *Advanced Political Theory* (S.Chand, 1987) and co-editor of *Jewish Feminism in Israel*, (Brandeis/UPNE, 2003). Her current research interests are Chinese politics, international relations and women's movements in India, China and the Middle East. She is the recipient of the Oklahoma Political Science Association 'Scholar of the Year' award (1998) and the University of Tulsa 'Outstanding Teacher' award (2003).

Haksoon Paik is currently a Senior Fellow and the Director of the Center for North Korean Studies at the Sejong Institute in Korea. He received his PhD in Political Science from the University of Pennsylvania in 1993, and was a postdoctoral fellow at Harvard University from 1996 to 1997. He has written extensively on North Korean politics, inter-Korean relations, Korean unification and North Korea US relations. He is the co-author of *The Party, the State, and the Military of North Korea* (in Korean, 2007), *Foreign Relations of North Korea* (in Korean, 2007), *North Korea's National Strategy* (in Korean, 2003), *Survival Strategy of the Kim Jong Il Regime* (in Korean, 2003) and *North Korean Party and State Institutions in the Kim Jong-il Era* (in Korean, 2000); co-author and co-editor of *International Ramifications of the North Korean Problem* (in Korean, 1999); and co-author and editor of *The Structure and Strategy of North and South Korea's Unification Diplomacy* (in Korean, 1997). He is currently a policy advisor to South Korea's Ministry of Unification, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade and to the Kim Dae-jung Peace Center. He is the Chairman of the Policy Committee of the Korean Council for Reconciliation and Cooperation, the Executive Director of the Seoul Washington Forum, and Vice President of the Korean Association of North Korean Studies.

Amin Saikal is Professor of Political Science and Director of the Centre for Arab and Islamic Studies (the Middle East and Central Asia) at the Australian National University. He is a specialist in the politics, history, political economy and international relations of the Middle East and Central Asia. He has been a Visiting Fellow at Princeton University, Cambridge University and the Institute of Development Studies (University of Sussex), as well as a Rockefeller Foundation Fellow in International Relations (1983–88). In April 2006, he was appointed Member of the Order of Australia (AM) for service to the international community and to education through the development of the Centre for Arab & Islamic Studies. His numerous works on the Middle East, Central Asia and Russia, include *Modern Afghanistan: A History of Struggle and Survival* (I.B. Tauris, 2004); *Islam and the West: Conflict or Co-operation?* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2003); *Lebanon Beyond 2000*, (Centre for Middle Eastern and Central Asian Studies, Australian National University, 1997) (co-editor); *The Rise and Fall of the Shah: Iran from Autocracy to Religious Rule*, new edn. (Princeton University Press, 1980); (co-author) *Regime Change in Afghanistan: Foreign Intervention and the Politics of Legitimacy* (Westview Press, 1991); (co-editor) *Islamic Perspectives on the New Millennium* (Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2004); (co-editor) *Democratization in the Middle East: Experiences, Struggles, Challenges* (United Nations University Press, 2003); (co-editor) *The Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan* (Cambridge University Press, 1989); and (co-editor) *Russia in Search of its Future* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).

Swaran Singh is Professor at the School of International Studies, Jawaharlal Nehru University (New Delhi). He has been formerly Visiting Professor, University of Peace (Costa Rica), Visiting Faculty of the Beijing University, Visiting Fellow of the Shanghai Institute of International Studies, Center for Asian Studies (Hong Kong University), Guest Faculty at the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (Sweden), Academic Consultant at Center de Sciences Humaines (New Delhi), Visiting Scholar, Asian Center, University of Philippines, and Research Fellow at the Institute for Defence Studies and Analysis (New Delhi). He is currently the President of the Association of ASIA Scholars (South Asia Chapter) and was Asia Fellow during 2001–2. He has written extensively on China's foreign and security policy issues with special focus on China–India confidence building measures as also India's foreign and security policy issues. He is author of *China–India Economic Engagement: Building Mutual Confidence* (2005), *China–South Asia: Issues, Equations, Policies* (2003), *China's Changing National Security Doctrines* (1999) and *Limited War* (1995); co-author of *Regionalism in South Asian Diplomacy* (SIPRI Policy Paper No. 15, February 2007); and editor of *China–Pakistan Strategic Cooperation: Indian Perspectives* (2007).

E. Sridharan is Academic Director of the University of Pennsylvania Institute for the Advanced Study of India (UPIASI), (in New Delhi), from its inception in 1997. He did his PhD in Political Science at the University of

Pennsylvania, and was a Fellow at the Centre for Policy Research, New Delhi, 1989-97. He has held visiting appointments at the University of California, Berkeley, London School of Economics, Institute for Developing Economies, Tokyo, and the Center for the Advanced Study of India, University of Pennsylvania. He is the author of *The Political Economy of Industrial Promotion: Indian, Brazilian and Korean Electronics in Comparative Perspective 1969-1994* (Praeger, 1996) and has co-edited (with Zoya Hasan and R. Sudarshan), *India's Living Constitution: Ideas, Practices, Controversies* (New Delhi: Permanent Black, 2002 and London: Anthem Press; 2005) and (with Anthony D'Costa) *India in the Global Software Industry: Innovation, Firms Strategies and Development*, (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004 and New Delhi: Macmillan India, 2004), *The India Pakistan Nuclear Relationship: Theories of Deterrence and International Relations* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007) and (with Peter de Souza) *India's Political Parties* (New Delhi: Sage, 2006). He has published numerous journal articles and book chapters. He is on the Editorial Advisory Board of *Commonwealth and Comparative Politics*, is the South Asia Coordinator of the ASIA Fellows Program and has consulted for the World Bank, the Ford Foundation and private companies.

T.C.A. Srinivasa-Raghavan is Associate Editor of *Business Line*, and has been Economics Editor of *Indian Express* (1985-89), Associate Editor of *Economic Times* (1989-94), Associate Editor of *Business Standard* (1994-97) and Consulting Editor of *Business Standard* (1997-2008). He is Consultant to the Reserve Bank of India, Senior Consultant to the Asian Institute of Transport Development, New Delhi, and Advisor to the Indian Council for Research in International Economic Relations. He was a Visiting Fellow at Queen Elizabeth House, Oxford, 1990; Visiting Press Fellow at Wolfson College, Cambridge, 1983; and Visiting Fellow at the Centre for Development Economics, Delhi School of Economics for the project on liberalization of insurance, 1999. His major non-newspaper publications include *Do Economic Sanctions Work?* (New Delhi: Asian Institute of Transport Development, 1999); *Infrastructure Finance* (New Delhi: Asian Institute of Transport Development, 2000); 'Does Say's Law Work in Education?' in *Economic Reforms for the Poor* edited by Subhasis Gangopadhyay (Konark, 2000); 'Governance and Sustainable Development in Transport' in *Transport and Communications Bulletin for Asia and the Pacific*, No. 71, UNESCAP, 2002; and 'Open Access in Power: the International Experience', *Margin*, April-June 2004, NCAER. He is General Editor of *History of the Reserve Bank of India*, Vol. 3, and Consulting Editor to the Committee on Financial Sector Assessment (CFSA), RBI.

K. Subrahmanyam was a member of the Indian Administrative Service, Tamil Nadu Cadre (1951-87); Director of the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses (1968-75) and (1980-87); Chairman of the Joint Intelligence Committee (1977-79); Secretary (Defence Production), of the Ministry of Defence (1979-80); Fellow in Strategic Studies, London School of

Economics (1966-67); Jawaharlal Nehru Visiting Professor, St John's College, Cambridge, UK (1987-88); and Nehru Fellow (1988-90). He has also been Consulting Editor of *Political & Business Observer* (1990-92), *Economic Times* (1992-94) and *Times of India* (1994-2004); Convenor of the National Security Advisory Board (1998-2000); Chairman of the Kargil Review Panel (1999); Chairman of the National Defence University Committee (2001-2); Chairman, of the Task Force on US Global Strategy and Indian response (2005-6); Member of the UN Secretary General's Panel on the Indian Ocean (1974); Member of the UN intergovernmental expert group on the relationship between disarmament and development (1980-82); Chairman of the UN Study Group on 'Nuclear Deterrence' (1984-85). He is the author and editor of 15 books.

Acknowledgements

The Public Diplomacy Division of the Ministry of External Affairs, Government of India, New Delhi, has provided the financial support to The Book Review Literary Trust for the international colloquium ‘Superpower Rivalry in the Twentieth Century: Lessons for the Twenty-first Century’ held in New Delhi in March 2008, at which the papers for this volume were presented before a gathering of scholars, diplomats and analysts. I thank the Ministry for their support. Amit Dasgupta, then Joint Secretary in the Public Diplomacy Division, provided many intellectual inputs in organizing the colloquium for which I am indebted to him. Viraj Singh in the PD division was an ever-present help in matters of protocol which made the organizing of the colloquium a joy. Thank you, Viraj.

I owe a special thanks to Geeta Parameswaran: first for being completely in charge of organizing the colloquium last year which left me free of the nitty-gritty of such events to enjoy the stimulating and esoteric debates; and thereafter in liaising with the paper writers, formatting the book and typing the introduction meticulously. She is worth her weight in gold as a resource person for The Book Review Literary Trust and as such indispensable.

I would like to add a special note of thank you for Professor Eric Hobsbawm who has permitted me to consult him from time to time on this volume of essays and for commenting on my Introduction.

I have had the joy of working with Dorothea Schaefer at Routledge on two volumes of essays and her keen sense of the possible and promptness in communicating her thoughts make her one of a rare breed of editors. I would like to record my appreciation of both her skills and her charming personality.

I have been fortunate in having a resident expert on international and strategic affairs in Ranga which has made it possible for me to toss around ideas and test them out on our long evening walks together. He is ever willing to play the devil’s advocate which helps in formulating thoughts and correcting imbalances. In certain situations, however, thank yous are redundant.

Finally, I would like to thank every one of the contributors who have brought their scholarship to bear on the international order today. They have made the book what it is by making important linkages between the superpower

rivalry of the last century to analyse what, if any, lessons that era holds for the international system today. I alone am responsible for any lacunae or distortions due to misperceptions or simply the imposing of wishful thinking on the harsh realities of an obdurate system and mindset.

Chandra Chari
New Delhi
April 2009

1 Introduction

Chandra Chari

Possibility was that year's richest legacy, beyond every utopian illusion.

Roger Cohen on Prague, 1968¹

And so the Cold War ended, much more abruptly than it began. As Gorbachev had told Bush at Malta, it was 'ordinary people' who made that happen; ... Leaders, astonished, horrified, exhilarated, emboldened, at a loss, without a clue struggled to regain the initiative, but found that they could do so only by acknowledging that what once would have seemed incredible was now inevitable.

John Lewis Gaddis²

Men make their own history but they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly found, given and transmitted from the past.

Karl Marx³

Why another book on the Cold War? 2009 seems a good place to take a look back at the superpower rivalry which dominated nearly half of the twentieth century. There is no gainsaying the fact that the international order today seems bewildered, bemused, clutching at straws and certainly 'without a clue', faced with the economic meltdown which has overtaken the world. Within the space of a year, all the new challenges which have hobbled the institutional structures in place since the Treaty of Westphalia – terrorism, climate change, economic crisis – seem to have come to a head. And yet in 2009 it does not seem inconceivable that all kinds of new possibilities are suddenly available to change the international system 'beyond every utopian illusion'. A new president's term in the US spells the possibility of change and if only the rest of the world could seize the moment to work towards 'resetting the button', change instead of the status quo, cooperation instead of conflict, could still transform the present harsh international system along more equitable lines.

There are many reasons behind evolving the concept for this book. Clearly, a book on world politics as seen from what may well be the economic focus of the twenty-first century international system – and almost certainly the locus of

its conflicts including armed conflicts seemed feasible. Second, a survey of the vast literature on the Cold War shows a predictably occidental-centric take on international relations. Therefore, it seemed necessary to present an alternative perspective in the voices from countries which had willy-nilly been embroiled in the Cold War as mere 'pawns'. That they did not all get crushed in the process speaks volumes for the indomitable spirit of the developing world and hence the importance of hearing those voices, especially as the contours between the developed and developing world seem to be suddenly getting blurred.

This volume has been planned as a sequel to the earlier *War, Peace, Hegemony in a Globalized World: The Changing Balance of Power in the Twenty-first Century*,⁴ which had sought to hold a mirror to the international order as it evolved after the Second World War and its perceptions of the manner in which the sole superpower was playing its role after 1989. It seems appropriate to take the enquiry further by examining the fallouts of the Cold War and to seek what could be learnt from that experience in managing international relations at the end of the first decade of the new millennium.

Standing back from a distance of two decades since the end of the Cold War, its trajectory provides a fascinating study. Very aptly described as a tennis match, it became an institution in the last century marked by a kind of warped stability.⁵ However, what is also quite apparent is that while Europe, the crucible of the Cold War, maintained an uneasy peace, the vast bulk of the Cold War's fighting and dying took place in Asia, the Middle East, Africa and Latin America.⁶ The authoritative Cold War historian John Lewis Gaddis writes on a congratulatory note, 'what never happened despite universal fears that it might, was a full-scale war involving the United States, the Soviet Union, and their respective allies'.⁷ Gaddis lists all the wars that did take place in various theatres around the world after 1945: in Korea, Vietnam and Afghanistan, the four wars between 1948 and 1973 by Israel and its Arab neighbours, the three India Pakistan wars of 1947-48, 1965 and 1971, or the long, bloody and indecisive struggle that consumed Iran and Iraq throughout the 1980s. And yet, for Gaddis, 'for all of this and a great deal more, the Cold War could have been worse — much worse. It began with a return of fear and ended in a triumph of hope, an unusual trajectory for great historical upheavals'.⁸

This epitaph on the Cold War can be faulted for the reason that it wilfully ignores the manner in which the Cold War impacted on the rest of the world. History has no full stops. Like the flowing waters of rivers, the present, and to a large extent the future, meld into and out of the past. The fallouts of the Cold War lie hidden in the fact that the regions which were caught in the trap of the superpower rivalry in the last century have become the biggest flash-points of potential conflict in this century: Korea, West Asia, Afghanistan, Pakistan. It is one of the major ifs of history as to how these regions may have shaped their destinies in the absence of the Cold War.

Summing up the positive fallouts of the Cold War for the international system, Gaddis lists the following: A mutual deterrence regimen came to be put in place and hence, military strength, a defining characteristic of 'power'

itself during the previous five centuries ceased to be that;⁹ discrediting of dictatorships – as demonstrated by the historical currents during the second half of the twentieth century which turned decisively against communism; dissatisfaction with capitalism never reached the point at which proletarians of all countries felt it necessary to unite to throw off their ‘chains’; globalization of democratization – the number of democracies quadrupled during the last half of the twentieth.¹⁰

None of the above can be taken as axiomatic for each of them has an obverse to it. Nuclear weapons were not used but the inequitable nuclear order over time has given rise to proliferation and a quest for nuclear weapons which will not be brought under control until the world decides to abandon them altogether. Military strength in the hands of a hegemon can and does lead to ‘increasingly frequent and frivolous recourse to destruction’,¹¹ for example Iraq. Even though the triumph of capitalism for less than two decades and economic globalization promised pots of gold at the end of the rainbow, in 2009 one may be justified in thinking that Marx was right after all in his indictment of capitalism as elevating greed above all else. And finally to attribute the quadrupling of democracies in the latter half of the twentieth century as a fallout of the Cold War is to ignore the fallouts of history itself. Decolonization was responsible for nations breaking off the shackles of imperialism while one has to only underline how often the United States, during the Cold War, preferred to prop up dictators and to deal with self-serving monarchies, to complete the argument. The decades old US policy of ‘ignoring the democratic shortcomings of allies (Saudi Arabia, Central Asian Republics), coddling tyrants and dictators who kowtowed to Washington, and rejecting the outcomes of democratic elections that were not to US liking as with Hamas in Palestine’¹² has continued.

Even a claim of victory of one ideology over another has a hollow ring to it with hindsight:

The Free World had always embraced, for the morally messy reasons of realpolitik, much that was less than free. It was an American phrase used to define its global reach and justify its influence, while acknowledging that its allies enjoyed far more autonomy, and proved far less tractable than those in the unfree Soviet Empire. But here too the Cold War produced one of its many ironies. The unfree Soviet colonies proved consistently far more rebellious – China was able to break away from Soviet influence, and in 1989, the Kremlin’s acquiescence dismantled what was the Unfree World by consent.¹³

A corollary is that it is not an ideology that lost; evidence of its gaining credence once again in America’s backyard itself in Latin America, not to mention its being sustained in China and parts of North East Asia, abounds.

A more pragmatic conclusion about the fallouts of the Cold War would be that the costs of the Cold War and the distortions it inflicted upon the social

systems of what had been the world's two most powerful economies suggested that the superpowers had become superlosers during the Cold War's final decade.¹⁴

This leads to the second part of the book which seeks to analyse what lessons could be learnt from the long-drawn Cold War.

Just as the sudden end of the Cold War and the collapse of the Soviet Union took the international system by storm, the near collapse of the economic order within two short decades after that has left the landscape very bleak. Certainly in 1989 or even in 1999, it would have been unthinkable that in 2008-9 the US would be facing the grim scenario of recession reminiscent of the 1930s. Bells which had rung loudly for globalization as the developing world beckoned with vast markets have fallen silent. Within two short decades nation-states and international institutions are flailing to manage the changes wrought by the speed and volume of human, capital and technological flows. Eric Hobsbawm was to prove prophetic: 'As the millennium approached, it had become increasingly evident that the task of the time was not to gloat over the corpse of Soviet communism, but to consider the built-in defects of capitalism.'¹⁵

Thus, in 2009, the international system presents a scenario of unpredictability, economic chaos and tremendous hardships for vast human populations in the developed world. Unregulated market forces have demonstrated tsunami-like qualities, and any predictions about how the current predicament is going to be resolved can at best be more like soothsaying.

However, it is precisely the stark contrast offered by the developments of the last two decades which are pointers to the lessons to be drawn from the Cold War era: a) the short-lived unipolar moment and the triumphalism of a quest for hegemony is in strange contrast to the complete interdependence of the world due to the inimitable forces of globalization; b) non-state actors, terrorism and failing states pose challenges to the international system which transcend all borders and boundaries, and the nation-state itself is under siege; superpowers can no longer police the world.

In 2009, thus, the international system is at a crossroads: it could choose to continue operating along the western-centric paradigms and vocabulary of balance of power, quest for predominance and strategic designs for containment. It could continue also to look for a leadership role from the United States economically and politically. Or, the fork in the road could lead to a coming together of nations in equality to forge a new paradigm of cooperation at various levels—regional, intra-regional and international—to manage the challenges looming ahead and mitigate the potential for conflict. The leaders of the nonaligned movement at the height of the Cold War had offered this idealist alternative paradigm. But the timing then was wrong. This time around, the economic driver has now shifted away from the West and hence provides an opportunity for the developing world to take the reins into their own hands in a reordering of the international system more equitably. As Jawaharlal Nehru said on the eve of India's independence: 'A moment comes, which comes but

rarely in history, when we step out from the old to the new, when an age ends, and when the soul of a nation, long suppressed, finds utterance.’¹⁶ 2009 could be that moment.

About the book

This book is the outcome of an international colloquium organized in March 2008 on ‘Superpower Rivalry in the Twentieth Century: Lessons for the Twenty-first Century’. With three exceptions, all the essays included in this volume were presented as papers at the colloquium and debated extensively. The agenda for the colloquium was to set out in a broad historical overview the trajectory of the Cold War followed by the regional perspectives from countries which had been impacted the most by the superpower rivalry and the prolonged conflicts which followed in the wake of the struggle for ideological supremacy and influence. The second part of the agenda was to study the international order in the first decade of the new millennium and analyse the new perceptions which were burgeoning amidst change at supersonic speed. A number of questions were posed to the paper writers: Has the unipolar moment passed? Is a multipolar world, with the changing economic balance of power and new bargaining chips thrown up by globalization, emerging to create new fora for economic and multilateral cooperation? What are the new threats and challenges to the international order which need to be addressed and in the process, would the impetus to disarmament and protection of the environment globally be forthcoming?

The structure of the book thus follows a pattern of clusters of essays in four sections, each addressing a particular theme: 1) historical overview; 2) prospects for a multipolar world: perspectives at the beginning of the twenty-first century; 3) thinking beyond borders and boundaries: prospects for war and peace; and 4) looking ahead: can history be prevented from repeating itself? Except for the cluster of essays in Part I, which focuses on specific regions and countries, the other essays in the volume present, in some cases, the theoretical constructs, and in others, a global linking of ground realities which prevail in the international order today. The last part is in the nature of a conclusion to raise important pointers to the directions in which international relations could evolve in the coming decades. While this structure has certainly led to a certain amount of repetition of facts, the linkages are getting underlined which works for greater cohesiveness of ideas. For instance, while there are no separate essays on the United States or resurgent Russia or India, to name just three key areas, more than one essay focuses on the roles played by these areas in conjunction with the world. This applies to other issues like potential for conflict due to non-state actors and terrorism, scarce resources and climate change, and how these impact on regional, intra-regional and international global politics.

K. Subrahmanyam casts a savant’s eye on the Cold War weaving in facts, analysis and personal memories of having been at the prime of his career

during the important decades and, in some instances, of interacting with some of the key figures of that complex era. This is the explanation I have to offer for publishing the text of the presentation made at the colloquium verbatim.

Then follows the cluster of essays which focus on the regional fallouts of the Cold War ('the hard and bitter peace', as John F. Kennedy described it) when though a third world war did not break out (in spite of, or perhaps because of, the Damocles Sword of nuclear terror which hung over the world), millions perished in the 'hot' wars which did take place in China, Korea, Vietnam, Cambodia, Angola, Afghanistan and elsewhere. Korea was the first victim and half a century later North Korea's nuclear ambitions are again embedding North and South Korea as an adversarial pair in Northeast Asia, with their unyielding tensions and instabilities making this one of the most volatile regions of the world. This is the reason for the inclusion of two essays on the Koreas in the book in two different parts.

Haksoon Paik seeks to find the roots of the North Korean nuclear crisis and the ongoing nuclear stalemate in the superpower rivalry in the last century. The Korean War and the division of the country is the legacy of the Cold War which has left a trail of anger and frustration among the Koreans, making any attempt at reconciliation an exercise in futility for the time being.

Vietnam in the twentieth century was the David that took on a Goliath and demonstrated how an indomitable spirit of nationalism could give a run for its money to the most powerful military juggernaut in the world. The long drawn-out conflict in Vietnam played itself out with the primary goal of promoting two ideologies for world dominance. Its geographical location made Vietnam crucial for both the superpowers – for the United States, first as an arms conduit for its China policy in the 1930s, then in its competition with Japan for dominance in the Pacific, and finally in its strident anti-communist crusade; and for the Soviet Union in its struggle against imperialism. Baladas Ghoshal provides an overview of Vietnam's benighted history during the Cold War.

Afghanistan, the hapless country, has got caught again and yet again over the last two centuries in 'great power' games, between Great Britain and Russia, then the US and the Soviet Union, and since 2001, as a theatre of conflict for the 'war on terror' launched by George W. Bush. Amin Saikal, in his lucid account of events which occurred during the Cold War, argues that if it had not been for the early American policy of containment of the Soviet Union and the Soviet responses to it, Afghanistan might not have fallen under Soviet influence. By the same token, the radical forces of political Islam might not have become increasingly assertive in their quest to redefine Afghan and Muslim politics against the backdrop of a strong anti-US posture.

Pakistan was born in bloodshed and communal frenzy fomented for political reasons. Britain decided to 'Divide and Quit' in 1947 and the vivisection caused millions their lives and untold human misery for the refugees from both sides who lost their homes and identity by one stroke of the pen. Pakistan became, very soon after, a pawn in the Cold War and any possibility of an emotional rapprochement between the sibling states was still born. Sixty years

on, Pakistan is hoist on its own petard – the fundamentalist elements which flourished are now the genii which refuse to be bottled. Instead Pakistan's own population is at risk. With its economy in shambles, Pakistan presents a sorry spectacle by being caught between the US and a hard place, more than ever dependent on financial aid from the US, with the democratic aspirations of the people of one of the most vibrant cultures in the world suffocated again and again by long eras of military rule.

Stephen P. Cohen's essay is one of the three commissioned for the book, the other two being those by Kalpana Misra and Siddharth Mallavarapu. An acknowledged expert on South Asia, Cohen has set out the linkages of Pakistan with the regional security debate to analyse how it became a Cold War ally to the US.

Part II, on the prospects for a multipolar world, contains six essays. After the uneasy stability of the Cold War, the behaviour of the US as the sole superpower provides a classic example of hegemonic power in disarray. Established international institutions and norms were, in one short decade, set aside while the hegemon went on a rampage of military adventures at enormous cost in terms of lives lost and financial outlays. Contrary to predictions that the absence of a superpower would lead the international system to anarchy,¹⁷ the fortunately brief unipolar moment has itself created the economically anarchic situation today. E. Sridharan presents the theoretical constructs for unipolarity and state behaviour.

Theories of unipolarity also take into account the possibility of countervailing coalitions emerging. Intellectual opinion across the world is today debating multipolarity and multilateralism as paradigms for the conduct of international relations in the twenty-first century. The challenge of multilateralism lies in its demanding format that presupposes a strong sense of collective identity and shared values among the new stakeholders in the system. Swaran Singh's essay focuses on the various aspects of multilateralism, which are opposed to unilateralism, imperialism and isolationism as guiding principles of foreign policy.

One of the positive outcomes of the Cold War was the building of the economies of Europe and Japan. The European Union is one of the contenders for a nodal position in an increasingly multipolar world. Many Europeans believe that the most pressing security challenges such as climate change, energy security, international terrorism and the development of the poorer regions cannot be handled without multilateral institutions. Charles Grant argues for a stronger EU to ensure that multilateralism prevails over balance-of-power politics.

China today is a key player in the international system as a countervailing force to unilateralism. The adoption of reform and opening up adopted in 1979 has within a few short decades transformed China's economy and society. The Cold War vocabulary continues to speak of a new bipolar rivalry or the need to balance the rising power of China. The US has a grand design in Asia of which the two pillars of its Cold War era regional security posture – its

system of bilateral military alliances and its forward-deployed military forces are being strengthened. The US policy also seeks to aid the economic and military rise of key Asian states – Japan, India, Indonesia, Vietnam, Thailand and the Philippines.¹⁸ This attempt at encirclement is likely to lead to spirals of insecurity. Yet, as Kalpana Misra argues in her essay, conversely, China's engagement with the international community and its integration into the global economy and its key institutions has given China a considerable stake in peaceful competition. China is likely to tamp down expectations about its global role during the current crisis. It has been emphasizing its developing country status and the enormous economic and social problems that need to be addressed domestically. Though the Chinese leadership finds the Chinese economy better off compared to others, including the US, China is more likely to follow for the time being the policy of 'crossing the river' by feeling the stones (as Zhao Zhiyang used to describe the reform process) than aiming to be in the 'driver's seat'.

West Asia in the twenty-first century presents a spectacularly complex picture: there are ethnic, sectarian and physical rifts galore at local, national and regional levels. The Shias, Sunnis and the Kurds with religious affiliations which transcend national boundaries provide a rich playfield for the US to play the hegemon. Energy and Israel are the key drivers for the recolonization project. The fig-leaf of spearheading a democracy project and a moral crusade (rather than plundering the region) has been discarded and replaced with violent, anti-democratic unilateral militaristic actions. Gulshan Dietl presents a masterly analysis of the ground realities in the region during and since the Cold War.

Tae Woo Kim's essay, the second in the volume on Korea, highlights the dilemmas faced by South Korea in the newly emerging multipolar world and how it needs to develop a survival strategy. His analysis of the attempts by the Sino-Russian collaboration to provide a buffer to US unilateralism and of the US to connect the dots from the Baltic Sea to the Caspian, through the Middle East and cutting across Central Asia to create a land belt alliance, provides an interesting insight into the extremely complex games that nations are constantly engaged in. Korean unification is a thorny issue: South Korea being poor in natural resources makes it economically vulnerable and hence the need for a cooperative stance to counterbalance its lack of leverage vis-à-vis North Korea's nuclear ambitions.

Part III looks at the prospects for war and peace in the twenty-first century. Anuradha M. Chenoy provides the theoretical backdrop by looking at conflict models and their relevance to Asia. Her conclusion that state-centric and militarist methods have failed to solve conflicts and hence a human security approach is urgently needed makes a powerful argument in the light of how vulnerable human populations have become to death and violence in the conflicts of the last century. This is an unprecedented development from the military conflicts of an earlier era where civilian populations were not targeted. The use of chemical weapons in warfare, reported use of children as

human shields, devastation of large tracts of human habitation, all negate the notions of the 'responsibility to protect' and of human rights.

Islam has become the 'other', perceived as the root of fundamentalist terrorism and jihad, and the perfect answer to the US's constant quest for looking for an enemy to battle with. However, labels are deceptive and to speak of Islamic terrorism implies that Islam as a religion endorses terrorism whereas the word jihad itself is open to many interpretations, particularly as a way of a spiritual quest. It is when politics adopts religion as a tool that the perceptions get distorted. This is true of religious fundamentalism the world over. Terrorism as a phenomenon of the last few decades has to be dissociated from religion and its roots in the strong sense of injustice and discrimination have to be understood in order to be successfully dealt with. Lumping Islamism as a frightening, violent, anti-western movement led by the 'preachers of hate' runs the risk of exaggerating and distorting the real causes of the threat.¹⁹ The solution is in reaching out to the alienated Muslims in the West.²⁰ Jamal Malik presents a potted history of how the existing and functionally important image of Islam in the West has come to be consolidated. His analysis of the case of Islam as a catalyst for conflict provides deeply introspective insights.

Sanjay Chaturvedi's essay is a stand-alone one highlighting how conflict can be mitigated by creative approaches to cooperative management. He looks at Antarctica, 'the coldest, farthest, windiest continent' on earth, which was yet not exempt from the fallouts of the Cold War. Today it is being sought to be built up as a common heritage site for biological prospecting for the benefit of humankind.

Disarmament was high on the agenda of the Nonaligned Movement spear-headed by Jawaharlal Nehru, Nasser, Tito and others at the height of the Cold War. But the inequality between the nuclear haves and have nots only succeeded in triggering proliferation. Plans for upgrading ageing nuclear arsenals, setting up of new missile defence systems all point to the horrendous possibilities of a new arms race among the big powers. However, intellectual opinion around the world is veering once more towards calling for a nuclear weapon-free world. For today with terrorism in the forefront of all challenges threatening human security, nuclear deterrence becomes wholly irrelevant. Statements by nuclear hawks and policy-makers of the past, such as Henry Kissinger, Sam Nunn, William Perry and George Schultz, that reassertion of the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons would have a profoundly positive impact on the security of future generations,²¹ the Hiroshima Nagasaki Appeal²² to rid the world of nuclear weapons by the year 2020, the worldwide protests of the Greenpeace Movement and other anti-nuclear activists in civil society, the Rajiv Gandhi plan for total nuclear disarmament presented to the UN in 1988, and now a news report²³ that the Obama administration has leaked plans to push for 80 per cent cut in nuclear arsenals are all pointers that there is a time for an idea to take root, mature and come to fruition. P.R. Chari's essay analyses why a move towards nuclear disarmament is no longer a mirage but rapidly becoming an agenda that cannot be postponed.

The triumph of the world economy and that of a pure free-market ideology weakened or even removed most instruments for managing the social effects of economic upheavals. The world economy is an increasingly powerful and uncontrolled engine.²⁴ Economically, the speed and volume of financial transactions have overwhelmed existing financial institutions. Transparency and regulation regimes are not keeping pace with economic realities. Existing arrangements have failed to provide the necessary framework for integrating the interests and capabilities of states, institutions and non-state actors. The problem is compounded by the fact that the changing distribution of economic power is no longer reflected in existing global arrangements. If not corrected, the continuing inequities could well lead to conflict. T.C.A. Srinivasa Raghavan's essay lays out the new parameters which are likely to operate in the international milieu and what the new and volatile economic situation demands today.

History, according to Eric Hobsbawm, is the record of the crimes and follies of mankind. Echoing this, Radha Kumar, in the last part 'Looking ahead', debating whether history can be prevented from repeating itself, says that agency cannot be attributed to history for it is made by actors and circumstances. She analyses the likely scenarios in the coming decades in the light of whether there are any similarities of actors and circumstances today to a past period, and what is the likelihood of a repetition of the superpower rivalry of the last century and a return of the Cold War.

The last essay in the volume by Siddharth Mallavarapu is offered in lieu of a conclusion. A willing suspension of disbelief and a 'leaping vault' of creative imagination, almost a naivete of faith as demonstrated in Gandhi's nonviolence, is essential for the acceptance of this idea. Mallavarapu's survey of the existing literature on the subject is a pointer to the fact that the idea exists in its embryonic form. There are serious problems of perceptions regarding fairness and legitimacy in international decision making on global governance issues. Therefore the international order has to work towards a form of multilateralism borne by society and accountable to both national and transnational publics. For this, numerous struggles for a more just world still lie ahead, as Mallavarapu argues, and the concept of global citizenship could be the tool which humanity may adopt to deal with the heterogeneous world we live in.

The international order is facing a crisis of historic proportions and the future cannot be a continuation of the past. Much baggage has to be shed and a new approach has become the need of the hour. The world economy has been brought down to its knees while the remorseless plundering of nature has led to the present crisis of climate change which if continued could lead to the collapse of human civilization as we know it. Added to this is the very real possibility of a terrorist in a fit of madness blowing up the world. The answer lies in the recognition that no state today, however small, wants to be a client state. Thus it is the continuance of inegalitarianism in the international order which portends conflict. Structural changes have to be put in place to ensure the dignity of all nations.

I could do no better than to conclude with Eric Hobsbawm's words with which he closes his volume of *Age of Extremes*:

We do not know where we are going. We only know that history has brought us to this point and why. However, one thing is plain. If humanity is to have a recognizable future, it cannot be by prolonging the past or the present. If we try to build the third millennium on that basis, we shall fail. And the price of failure, that is to say, the alternative to a changed society, is darkness.²⁵

Notes

- 1 Cohen, Roger, 'Memories from Another May', *New York Times*, May 30, 2008.
- 2 Gaddis, John Lewis, *The Cold War* (London: Penguin, 2005), p. 259.
- 3 Marx, Karl, 'The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte' in Robert C. Tucker, ed., *The Marx Engels Reader*, second edition (New York: Norton, 1978), p. 595; quoted in Gaddis, John Lewis, *The Cold War*, p. 261.
- 4 Chari, Chandra, ed., *War, Peace, Hegemony in a Globalized World: The Changing Balance of Power in the Twenty first Century* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2007).
- 5 Walker, Martin, *The Cold War: A History* (New York: Henry Holt, 1993), p. 1.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 60.
- 7 Gaddis, *The Cold War*, p. 261.
- 8 *Ibid.*, p. 266.
- 9 Paul Kennedy, *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000* (New York: Random House, 1987); quoted in Gaddis, *The Cold War*, p. 263.
- 10 Gaddis: *The Cold War*, epilogue.
- 11 Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century 1914-91* (Viking, 1994), p. 572.
- 12 Thakur, Ramesh, 'Post Cold War Era Over, but not US Primacy', *The Hindu*, October 11, 2008.
- 13 Walker, *The Cold War*, p. 327.
- 14 *Ibid.*, p. 343.
- 15 Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*, p. 574.
- 16 'A Tryst with Destiny', August 14, 1947 in Sarvepalli Gopal, ed., *Jawaharlal Nehru: An Anthology* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).
- 17 Ferguson, Niall, 'A World Without Power', *Foreign Policy*, July-August 2004.
- 18 Twining, Daniel, 'America's Grand Design in Asia', *Washington Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 3, Summer 2007.
- 19 'The Power of Nightmares: The Rise of the Politics of Fear', documentaries by Adam Curtis broadcast on BBC television in October 2004. See Curtis, Adam, 'The Problem with Creating Islamist Phantoms', *The Hindu*, August 3, 2005.
- 20 Fukuyama, Francis, *After the Neocons: America at the Crossroads* (London: Profile, 2006). See Saroor, Hasan, 'Fukuyama's Take on Islam and the Islamists', *The Hindu*, April 6, 2006.
- 21 See Srinivasan, M.R., 'Nuclear Weapon Free World - A Mirage?', *The Hindu*, June 10, 2006.
- 22 See Tovish, Aaron, 'Back to the Drawing Board', *The Hindu*, August 29, 2008.
- 23 See Radyuhin, Vladimir, 'US Russia: Focus on Nuclear Arms Cut', *The Hindu*, February 9, 2009. See also 'Obama and a Nuclear Free World', editorial in *The Hindu*, April 4, 2009.
- 24 Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*, p. 572.
- 25 Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes*, p. 585.

Part I

Superpower rivalry

An overview

2 A historical overview of the Cold War¹

K. Subrahmanyam

The Cold War ended with the Paris Agreement on Conventional Forces on 19 November 1990, and yet a number of people in various parts of the world, including many members of the political class and academia in this country, are yet to accept that the Cold War is over and today there is a new international order of an economically globalized balance of power. The end of the Cold War did not lead to a transition from bipolarity to unipolarity but to a polycentric balance of power or, in less elegant phraseology, multipolarity. To understand the present situation, it is essential to grasp the nature of the Cold War and why it began and ended as a cold war – an unusual development in human history. Never before in history have two military blocs armed with nuclear missiles and tactical weapons adequate to destroy the human civilization several times over confronted each other eyeball to eyeball for over four decades and yet concluded a peace treaty as happened in Paris on 19 November 1990. There was never an arms race in history as was witnessed in those five decades and yet it did not lead to a shooting war. The end of the Cold War was followed within a year and six weeks by the dissolution of the Soviet Union and collapse of Communist ideology. This was not due to any military defeat but due to internal contradictions within the Soviet system. Though a dissident, Andrei Amalrik, predicted the dissolution of the Soviet Union in the seventies, that was not considered a scholarly analysis.² Even the CIA and US Administration were taken by surprise by the dissolution of the Soviet Union and collapse of Communism as an ideology.

I have no pretensions of being a historian. While I have been a keen observer of developments in international relations since my school days which happened to be during the Second World War, my academic training was in chemistry and my profession was that of a civil servant in the Indian Administrative Service. I strayed into security studies from a stint in the Ministry of Defence commencing at the time of Chinese attack on India in 1962. My focus has since been Indian security and I was a witness to the Cold War as it had a bearing on Indian security, and therefore it is from an Indo-centric point of view that I am offering my comments.

Many hold the view that it was good luck and some say due to divine providence that humanity came through the Cold War without an unimaginable

catastrophe. Alternatively it is attributed to the doctrine of mutual deterrence and rationality of the leaderships of the two leading powers. I am inclined to adopt the second view, though the world did survive a US president like Nixon who believed that projecting irrational behaviour often gained advantages and on occasions put his belief into practice by subjecting the world and his own nation to enormous risks. Recently I came across a previously undisclosed account of his ordering a squadron of B-52s loaded with thermonuclear weapons to patrol close to the Soviet Pacific borders to apply pressure on them to cut off their aid to Vietnam in October 1969. The Soviets did not blink.

Barring Nixon it has to be admitted that leaderships on both sides were prudent enough not to take too much of a risk though Khrushchev put nuclear missiles in Cuba. Yet he stepped back from the brink. Kennedy was prepared to agree to withdraw US nuclear missiles from Turkey and pledge never to attack Cuba. Even Mao Dze Dung, who spoke about the East Wind prevailing over the West Wind when the Soviets launched the Sputnik and tested inter-continental range missiles and who boasted to Jawaharlal Nehru in 1954 that even if 300 million Chinese were killed in a nuclear war, three hundred millions would survive to build a glorious civilization, behaved relatively responsibly when China became a nuclear weapon power.

In the literature, there are extensive discussions on the evolution of the doctrine of deterrence. The concept of deterrence has been there down the ages. In the very initial stages when US alone had nuclear weapons the concept still operated. The US nuclear capability a meagre one was deterred by the perceived Soviet capability of being able to overrun Western Europe in a few days with its huge army. The fact that it was essentially the Soviet Union which defeated Germany and occupied Berlin endowed it with an awesome image at that stage. Therefore deterrence operated in Europe from the beginning and prevented the US exploiting its nuclear asymmetry to its advantage. At the same time the use of nuclear weapons against Hiroshima and Nagasaki was intended to warn Moscow that the US was determined to be the pre-eminent power post-Second World War. In spite of deterrence operating at the ground level, it took some time for the concept to evolve and for its nuances being grasped by western statesmen. That may be true of the Soviets as well. An indication of this on-going process of evolution was John Foster Dulles's speech on massive retaliation. It did not give an impression that the consequences of retaliation were adequately thought out at that stage. The second sign of inadequate development of nuclear strategic thought was the propagation of the idea of use of tactical nuclear weapons to halt envisaged massive Soviet armour thrusts. The concept of escalation was yet to develop. The western strategic aim at that stage was to contain the Soviet Union all around through inter-linked military pacts and use the bases in those countries to launch massive nuclear strikes on it. That led to the formation of NATO (formed in 1949 in response to the Berlin Blockade), CENTO, SEATO and alliance with Japan.

The Soviet response to this threat of massive retaliation was twofold. They developed the long range TU-16 bomber which in a one-way mission could

reach the US. Secondly they expedited the development of long range missiles. In this they were helped to some extent, not as much as in the case of Americans, by the German rocket scientists they had captured. They were also able to persuade the US to believe they had more TU-16 aircraft than they really had. That led to an American assessment of a 'bomber gap' in favour of the Soviet Union reinforcing the Soviet deterrence.

Then came the Sputnik which shook the US. It demonstrated the Soviet missile might to the entire world and projected the USSR ahead of the US in the missile arena. The US homeland was no longer immune to attacks by hostile nuclear weapons borne on long range missiles. The US response was not only to expedite its own missile programme but also to carry out reforms and expansion in the field of science and mathematics education. US quickly followed by putting up its own satellite once again to be out-performed by the Soviet astronaut in orbit.

The US had been flying its high-altitude surveillance aircraft over the Soviet Union from mid-fifties. In 1960 the U-2 spy aircraft piloted by Gary Powers which took off from Peshawar was shot down over Russia by a Soviet SA-2 missile. Again the USSR demonstrated it had antiaircraft missiles which could shoot down aircraft flying at such high altitudes. Following these developments the 'missile gap' became a campaign issue in the 1960 presidential elections, though it turned out that at that stage the Soviet Union had only four missiles with intercontinental range.

Meanwhile both sides developed thermonuclear bombs with explosive yields of mega-tons. The Soviets demonstrated a 50 58 megaton explosion in 1961. The intercontinental missile and megaton hydrogen bomb made it clear that no target in the US was beyond the reach of Soviet attack. That was a new experience for the Americans having been brought up in the firm belief that they were protected by the two oceans on either side. Faced with this challenge, the US reorganized its R&D and industrial might to catch up with and surpass the USSR. Not only did the US long-range military missile development followed, the country also embarked on manned orbital flights in spacecraft following the Soviet example and President Kennedy set a target of landing on the moon before the end of the decade. While the US and the USSR competed in manned orbital flights, only the US was able to land men on the moon by July 1969. It was a victory for American industrial capability and R&D prowess. Resource-wise the USSR could not keep up with the competition. The simultaneous missile and space programme also yielded solid fuelled land and submarine based missiles to both sides.

By this time strategic theoreticians had developed the thesis of 'The delicate balance of terror' which questioned whether without a second strike capability immune to destruction by a first strike disarming attack by the adversary a deterrent could be credible. That led to the development of second strike capability with silo and submarine based missiles and keeping a portion of nuclear weapon loaded aircraft up in the air all the time to escape destruction on the ground in case of a first strike.

Obviously in terms of nuclear strike capability the US was the superior force. But the US was self-deterred even while exercising deterrence on its adversary. In 1961 the US considered a disarming first strike on the Soviet Union. According to Robert McNamara, then Defense Secretary, the idea was abandoned when the US chiefs of staff made it clear that while they might be able to disarm the Soviet Union, they could not guarantee that the US would not receive a few warheads on its soil. For the US, the destruction of a few of its own cities was not a price worth paying even if the Soviet Union were to be totally disarmed. In other words nuclear deterrence involved acceptance of the damage that is likely to be inflicted on one's own side irrespective of the extent of damage that could be inflicted on the other side. McNamara said:

I have worked on issues relating to US and NATO nuclear strategy and war plans for more than 40 years. During that time I have never seen a piece of paper that outlined a plan for the United States or NATO to initiate the use of nuclear weapons with any benefit for the United States or NATO. I have made this statement in front of audiences, including NATO Defence Ministers and senior military leaders many times. No one has ever refuted it. To launch nuclear weapons against an equipped opponent would be suicidal.

He further added:

In articles and speeches, I criticized the fundamentally flawed assumption that nuclear weapons could be used in some limited way. There is no way to effectively contain a nuclear strike to keep it from inflicting enormous destruction on civilian life and property and there is no guarantee against unlimited escalation once the first nuclear strike occurs.

This belated wisdom comes from the person who built the most powerful nuclear triad arsenal as the US Defense Secretary.

Further, Macnamara went on to say:

I reached these conclusions very soon after becoming Secretary of Defense. Although I believe Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson shared my view, it was impossible for any of us to make such statement publicly because they were totally contrary to established NATO policy.³

The arms race continued because of mutual distrust between the two leading powers, the ideological antagonism and wars, not in Europe but elsewhere in the world Korea, Vietnam, Afghanistan and other places. However there developed a basic shared belief that armament stockpiles had reached a plateau and therefore the two adversaries who could not fight out a war should try out arms control and détente. We shall deal with the US Soviet

confrontations elsewhere – Vietnam, Cuba, the Indian subcontinent, West Asia and Africa, separately. Here the focus is on the central line of confrontation – Central Europe. Though perhaps by the end of the sixties mutual deterrence had stabilized the situation, the qualitative arms race continued. That led to putting multiple warheads on missiles increasing the numbers in stockpiles.

As has happened in the history of weapons development, ever since the sword led to the shield, defensive measures against missiles began to be developed first by the Soviet Union. Though the US too initially followed suit, Kissinger was able to persuade the Soviet leadership that both sides being vulnerable to each other's attacks defensive shields would be more conducive to stable mutual deterrence based on mutual assured destruction. That led to the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty which limited the missile defence to two sites in each country. The two sides could not have concluded such a treaty unless, by that time they had been convinced that there was no real threat of nuclear war between them.

This was the period of détente and arms control agreements of ABM and SALT (Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty). This was the period when Nixon and Brezhnev exchanged visits and Brezhnev declared at the White House that the Cold War was over. This period saw Chancellor Willy Brandt's Ostpolitik and the Helsinki Agreement between the NATO and Warsaw Pact countries. It looked as though the Cold War was coming to an end. Unfortunately it did not.

At that stage it would appear that a new strategy was conceived to fight the Cold War with the Soviet Union – using religion as an instrumentality. A Polish Pope was elected in 1978. Solidarity movement among workers of Gdansk shipyard began in September 1980. It drew most of its support from Polish Catholics. It was nonviolent and struggled successfully with the martial law communist regime. There is no doubt that finally religious faith triumphed over imposed atheism of the Communist parties all over the Soviet Union and Eastern European countries. Boris Yeltsin, who rose to become a politburo member of the Soviet Communist Party, baptized himself formally as a member of the Russian Orthodox Church after he became President of Russia. The fervour with which the populations in Russia and Eastern Europe have re-embraced religion raises serious doubts about the success of Communist anti-religious indoctrination in its heyday.

While in Eastern Europe Christianity revived to overwhelm Communism, in West Asia Islam became the primary instrumentality to fight the Soviet Union in Afghanistan. The US fought this war by proxy enlisting the support of Pakistan and Saudi Arabia and mobilizing vast numbers of Mujahideen both from Afghanistan and other Islamic countries. Finally the Soviet forces withdrew from Afghanistan in February, 1989 after a negotiated settlement in Geneva.

During this phase, both the arms race and increasing US – Soviet interaction continued. The US deployed the Pershing intermediate range missiles in Western Europe in retaliation to the Soviet deployment of SS-20 missiles. After the deployment, the Intermediate Nuclear Force Agreement 1987 was concluded between the two sides agreeing to the elimination of all missiles of this category by June 1991.

In 1983 the Reagan Administration initiated the ‘Star Wars’ programme to develop a missile defence system which was intended to make nuclear weapons ‘impotent and obsolete’. This time the Soviet Union did not enter into an arms race and try to compete with the US in developing a missile interception system. The US itself, after ten years of very expensive effort, had to stop the Star Wars programme.

This phase of the Cold War was sustained after a controversy in the US in 1978. An intelligence assessment concluded that the Soviet economy was not growing at the rate it was believed to be and its growth had seriously declined and it was not in a position to sustain an arms race with US. A team B was appointed to review this and they came to the opposite conclusion. It was this view that prevailed and resulted in the restart of the Cold War after the Helsinki Accord, arms control treaties and détente.⁴

In 1982 we published in the Institute for Defence Studies and Analyses a book entitled *The Second Cold War*. I remember one day George Kennan walking into my room without any previous appointment holding a copy of that book.⁵ He asked me to explain why I called it *The Second Cold War*. My explanation was that the Cold War ended with Brezhnev’s visit to Washington in 1973. Afghanistan, Somalia and the boycott of Moscow Olympics were not the continuation of the original Cold War and therefore had to be called *The Second Cold War*. He agreed with that explanation.

Having dealt with the military aspects of the Cold War it is appropriate to turn to its political aspects, especially after I mentioned George Kennan, the author of the containment thesis. The containment thesis as it was formulated in 1946-47 and then implemented through the NSC-68 policy and the formation of NATO has been criticized by many including George Kennan himself in his later years. Though his article under the byline ‘X’ appeared in *Foreign Affairs* in July, 1947, the original telegram he sent from Moscow as Deputy Chief of Mission was in February, 1946 barely six months after the US Soviet victory over Japan. I am quoting excerpts which are of relevance today after the dissolution of the Soviet Union and collapse of Communism as an international ideology. He wrote:

In these circumstances it is clear that the main element of any United States policy towards the Soviet Union must be that of a long term, patient but firm and vigilant containment of Russian expansive tendencies. It is important to note, however, that such a policy has nothing to do with outward histrionics, with threats or blustering or superfluous gestures of outward ‘toughness’.

Kennan went on to add:

In the light of the above it will be clearly seen that the Soviet pressure against the free institutions of the Western world is something that can be contained by the adroit and vigilant application of counterforce at a

series of constantly shifting geographical and political points, corresponding to the shifts and maneuvers of Soviet policy but which cannot be charmed or talked out of existence.

Kennan's recommendation was:

Balanced against this are the facts that Russia, as opposed to the Western world in general, is still by far the weaker party, that Soviet policy is highly flexible and the Soviet society may well contain deficiencies which will eventually weaken its own total potential. This would of itself warrant the United States entering with reasonable confidence upon a policy of firm containment, designed to confront the Russians, with unalterable counterforce at every point where they show signs of encroaching upon the interest of a peaceful and stable world.

He ended up:

It would be an exaggeration to say that the American behaviour unassisted and alone could exercise a power of life and death over the communist movement and bring about the early fall of Soviet power in Russia. But the United States has it in its power to increase enormously the strains under which Soviet policy must operate, to force upon the Kremlin a far greater degree of moderation and circumspection than it has had to observe in recent years, and in this way to promote tendencies which must eventually find their outlet in either the breakup or the gradual mellowing of Soviet power. For no mystical messianic movement and particularly not that of the Kremlin can face frustration indefinitely without eventually adjusting itself in one way or another to the logic of that state of affairs.⁶

Out of this policy of containment came the Truman Doctrine, the Marshall Plan and the NSC-68 document, NATO and other military pacts.⁷ Kennan himself was unhappy about the way the containment concept was implemented by the US. He wrote much later:

My thoughts about containment were of course distorted by the people who understood it and pursued it exclusively as a military concept and I think that, as much as any other cause led to 40 years of unnecessary, fearfully expensive and disoriented process of the Cold War.

He explained further in an interview after the Soviet collapse that he did not regard the Soviets as a military threat. He traced the misunderstanding about containment to one sentence in his article, where he said that wherever these people, meaning the Soviet leadership, confronted the Americans with dangerous hostility anywhere in the world, the US should do everything possible to contain it and not let them expand any further. He was making his

recommendation a few months after the war. It was absurd to suppose that the Soviets would turn around and attack the US. Therefore he did not think he had to explain that he did not have military containment in his mind.

Kennan advocated the US support to anti-communist left-wing parties of Europe and to labour unions. NATO was established when most of the Western European member governments were socialist. Kennan's containment policy also led to a reversal of the Morgenthau Plan for Germany which placed severe restrictions on German reindustrialization after the Second World War. Containment needed a strong Germany. The concept of containment was based on the perception that the Communists believed in the theory of the inevitability of the eventual fall of capitalism and that belief had the fortunate connotation that there was no hurry about it. The forces of progress could take their time in preparing the final coup de grace. When we look back on that period it is now clear that this basic assumption on the part of the Communists and its understanding by the West contributed significantly to the stability of the Cold War confrontation in Central Europe.

Finally it was not capitalism which collapsed but Communism. However, the process of containment had its impact on Western Europe. The Western assumption was that Communism was seeking to fill every nook and cranny available to it in the basin of world power. Therefore the response was to rapidly industrialize Western Europe and create welfare states there in order to reduce the appeal of Communism to the Western population. By 1951, the Marshall Plan revived the industries of Western European countries to a level 40 per cent higher than the pre-war level. As the West European standard of living went up, as the 20th Party Congress of the Soviet Communist Party disclosed the Stalinist atrocities, accompanied by suppression of popular upheavals in East Germany, Poland and Hungary the membership of Communist parties got reduced and their influence in the respective polities declined. Also the concept of Euro-Communism which did not accept the suzerainty of Moscow on their doctrinal positions also developed in Europe.

The Cold War in Europe brought about a radical transformation in the attitude of European nations. Having been ravaged by the Second World War and subjected to the Cold War with US and USSR dominating Europe, the nations started coming together to establish their own collective identity. This process started with the Paris Treaty of 1951 establishing the Coal and Steel Community consisting of six nations – France, West Germany, Italy, Belgium, Holland and Luxembourg. This was followed by the Treaty of Rome which established the European Common Market. The commonly perceived Soviet threat, the urge to establish a European identity and their cooperation in the NATO all contributed to the gradual evolution of the European Union today. Memories of Soviet domination during the Cold War underlie the enthusiasm of former Warsaw Pact countries and even former members of the Soviet Union to be members of the European Union.

The Cold War clearly brought out that nationalism superseded ideology. The rift between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia came within two years

after the end of the Second World War. Subsequently the developments in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Romania and Albania highlighted that Communism could not be sustained as a monolithic ideology. Hence came the Brezhnev doctrine of limited sovereignty which brought out into the open the tensions within the Communist bloc.⁸ However, the strong Soviet power dominating the Soviet republics and Eastern Europe was able to maintain peace and order during the Cold War period and it broke down with the end of the Cold War and dissolution of the Soviet Union. Czechoslovakia broke into two and Yugoslavia has fragmented into seven. There are tensions between Armenia and Azerbaijan on Nagorno Karabakh and Georgia faces secessionism from Abkazia. Ukraine has developed internal strains between the Catholic West with deep Ukrainian nationalism and Eastern part with a large proportion of Russians of the Orthodox church. When NATO was established, the first Secretary-General, Lord Ismay, enunciated its rationale as keeping the Russians out, Americans in and Germans down. Even after the Cold War was over, for the smaller nations of Europe, especially Eastern European countries, that Cold War logic is still valid and therefore they are in favour of NATO and its expansion and US dominant presence in Europe while the old Europe, France and Germany would like to see a decline in US influence and resurgence of Europe.

While the Cold War was fought in the central theatre of Europe nonviolently its impact on the rest of the globe was not nonviolent. The most important collateral event of the Cold War did not originate in the conflict between the West and the Soviet Union, but totally independent of it – the seizure of power in China by the Communist Party after a civil war. Though the Soviet Union provided a safe haven to the Chinese Communists during their Yen-an days and provided arms and advisers at the end of the Second World War Stalin was not enthusiastic about the total victory of Chinese Communists. He even advised them at one time to divide China with the Kuomintang. The Americans supported Chiang Kai Shek and his coterie unconditionally only to see whole divisions equipped with American equipment switching sides to the Communists. The Soviets and the Chinese Communists had ideological differences going back to the Yen-an days. However, Stalin concluded a pact with Mao Dze Dung for military and industrialization assistance at a price.⁹ While the Soviet Union was extremely careful not to provoke the West beyond the limits of their tolerance in Europe he unleashed Kim Il Sung on South Korea in June 1950. He did not appear to have taken into account the possible Western response of using counterforce against North Korean advance under a UN flag which was facilitated by the Soviet boycott of the Security Council at that time. Stalin followed up his folly of inducing the North Korean invasion of South Korea by persuading Mao Dze Dung to check and throw back the American forces which pushed the North Koreans back to their border with China at Yalu river by inducing the Chinese forces in the war. That resulted in the first violent engagements of the Cold War in which Americans and their allies suffered casualties at the hands of the Chinese.

Sober advice offered to the Americans not to advance towards the Yalu border was ignored. One of the channels of communication for that threat was India.¹⁰ The result was a prolonged military stalemate between UN forces led by the US and Chinese North Korean alliance forces along the 38th parallel. The new US administration of Eisenhower conveyed a nuclear threat to China to apply pressure on them to conclude a ceasefire agreement.

A ceasefire was achieved. The complicated issue of prisoner exchange was solved with India playing a role in the mediatory process. Following the war there was a massive Soviet programme of industrialization of China. The US and its allies blocked the Communist government in China occupying its seat as a permanent member of the Security Council and continued the Kuomintang representative from Taiwan as the accredited member of the Security Council from 1950 to 1971.¹¹ China was denied diplomatic recognition by US and most (but not all) of its allies.

The Chinese Communists were prevented from occupying Taiwan where the Kuomintang leader Chiang-Kai-Shek and his remnant army had fled by the US interposing its fleet in between. When China initiated an artillery assault on the Quemoy and Matsu Islands under Taiwanese control, US again conveyed a nuclear threat to China. The Chinese leadership, though publicly denigrating nuclear weapons as 'paper tigers', concluded an agreement with the Soviet Union for transfer of nuclear weapon technology and a sample nuclear weapon.¹²

The Chinese, however, strongly disagreed with Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in the 20th Party Congress and argued that in view of the Soviet missile prowess the East Wind was prevailing over the West Wind and the Soviets should be more assertive in their confrontation with the US. China raised the problem of the disputed border with the Soviet Union. The Chinese also launched a Great Leap Forward and talked of their catching up with the Western European countries in 15 years. The campaign failed and landed China in serious economic turmoil. For a time Mao Dze Dung, the propounder of the Great Leap, was pushed into the background and leaders like Li Shao Qi and Deng Xiao Peng took charge and revived the economy. The casualties in the food shortage created by the Great Leap Forward ran into tens of millions.¹³

The Soviets worried about Chinese adventurism both on confronting the West and on the Great Leap Forward. The Chinese also challenged the Soviet leadership of the international Communist movement. Consequently Moscow went back on its commitment to help China to acquire nuclear weapons. They also withdrew their technicians from various industrial projects. The Chinese accused Moscow of becoming revisionists. The Chinese also did not take kindly to Moscow developing relationships with countries like India and providing large-scale assistance to them. August 1, 1962 saw two developments. Russia signed a deal with India to enable India to manufacture MIG-21, the 2-mach fighter which it had refused to Beijing.¹⁴ On the same day Russia signed a deal with Cuba to deploy Russian medium range nuclear missiles in Cuba to balance the US nuclear missiles in Turkey and also to guarantee immunity for Cuba from US attack.

The Chinese decided to launch a limited attack on India to humiliate Nehru and to break the Indo-Soviet friendship and push India into US camp. That would have disproved the Soviet thesis of helping bourgeois states like India being advantageous to socialism. The Chinese timed their attack with the Cuban missile crisis so that neither the Soviet Union nor the US could intervene effectively. However their hope of breaking the Indo-Soviet friendship did not work out. Since the US was unwilling to equip India adequately with military equipment for fear of offending its ally, Pakistan, the Soviet Union became almost the sole supplier of military equipment to India for the next three decades. The Chinese extremism and expansionism brought India and the Soviet Union together on the basis of mutuality of security interests.

The Sino-Soviet public break came in 1963 proving that Communism was not a monolithic ideology and national interests superseded ideology. Even as the Soviet Union started talking increasingly about the inevitability of 'peaceful coexistence' Mao Dze Dung's rhetoric became more strident. In 1963 as the US, the USSR and the UK signed the Partial Test Ban treaty, the Chinese denounced it as a conspiracy against them.¹⁵ In October, 1964 they exploded their first nuclear weapon. Though the Soviet Union had cut off its assistance to the Chinese nuclear programme by 1960, the Chinese were able to complete the project on their own. The tension between China and the Soviet Union reached a peak when their forces clashed at Ussuri in 1969, causing casualties to both sides. Following that, both sides mobilized their forces in a confrontation all along their border. During this period Mao Dze Dung reasserted his authority beginning in 1962 and denounced the economic recovery path pursued by Li Shao Qi and Deng Xiao Peng. He started his Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution. It was a vicious power struggle in which many senior political leaders of the Chinese Communist Party and Generals of the People's Liberation Army were eliminated.¹⁶

At that stage the US leadership decided to exploit the Sino-Soviet conflict and wean China away from the Communist bloc. Feeling threatened by the Soviet Union, the Chinese leadership was prepared to give precedence to national security and national interests over ideology. So the great revolutionary Mao Dze Dung and the great US Conservative President Nixon became allies, thanks to the adroit secret diplomacy of Henry Kissinger conducted via Pakistan.¹⁷ The excesses of the Cultural Revolution did not bother the Americans. Nixon's war against the fellow Communist country, Vietnam was not found objectionable for partnership by revolutionary Mao Dze Dung. Realpolitik won. Communism as an ideology further suffered in credibility. By switching sides from the Soviet Union to the US, China joined the coalition of powers, the US, the European Union and Japan and tightened the containment of the Soviet Union. Though the US publicly subscribed to the 'One China' thesis, by passing the Taiwan Relations Act and continuing military supplies to Taiwan, the US made it clear to China that it was opposed to Taiwan's violent unification with China.

While in dealing with China in 1971 the US was able to distinguish between the Communist ideology which China claimed to profess and likely Chinese

international behaviour to safeguard its perceived national security and decided in favour of cultivating China in spite of its ideology. This sophistication was not available to the US leadership in the fifties when they could not understand and appreciate that North Vietnamese Communism was essentially an expression of their nationalism and the Vietnamese were not likely to subordinate themselves to any international Communist centre. Instead, some fanciful 'Domino theory' was formulated to envisage that an unchecked Communist North Vietnam would lead to all Southeast Asian nations falling like dominoes to Communist domination.¹⁸ This was the time when China-influenced Communists were active in the Philippines, Indonesia and Burma. Those countries successfully dealt with Communist insurgencies on their own even using genocidal scale of violence in Indonesia. But in the case of Vietnam, following the French defeat at Dien Bien Phu¹⁹ and the Geneva Conference ending French colonial rule,²⁰ the Americans launched initially a covert campaign against North Vietnamese efforts to unify Vietnam. Where that led is now part of history. Macnamara has said 'mea culpa'.²¹

The Vietnam War proved some basic facts of international relations in the second half of the twentieth century. It demonstrated that the nature of war had changed radically since the Second World War. The most powerful Army, the best navy and most sophisticated air force in the world could not fight and win a war against three peasant countries. The US suffered more than 50,000 casualties and the Vietnamese probably in the region of six million. But the US population could not accept 1 per cent of Vietnamese casualties because the stake they had in the war did not justify the costs they incurred. The intensity of nationalism of the Vietnamese was different from that displayed during the Second World War by most of the European populations with exceptions like Russia, Poland and Serbia. More explosives were dropped on Indo-China than on Europe during the Second World War. Yet the US could not win. The same was true in the case of Soviet occupation of Afghanistan. In spite of a million people being killed on both sides there was no victory for either side in the Iran Iraq war. This raises very significant questions on the conventional wisdom of war being an instrument of politics.

The Vietnam War and perceived Maoist Chinese expansionist threat brought the South East Asian countries together, after the overthrow in Indonesia of Sukarno who was being supported by the pro-Chinese Indonesian Communist Party. Under the tacit security patronage of the US, the ASEAN was formed.²² However, after the US China rapprochement and the US withdrawal from Vietnam the genocide²³ by the pro-Chinese Khmer rouge in Cambodia was looked away from. Pol Pot had the support of China, the US and a majority of the ASEAN while Vietnam overthrew Pol Pot and allowed Heng Samrin to gain power. Again the Chinese attack on Vietnam following this development proved that national interests superseded ideology. The Cold War fall-out with the US and ASEAN supporting the pro-Chinese Pol Pot and opposing Vietnam also led to some distancing between the ASEAN and India through the eighties.

The Cold War had a direct impact on the Indian subcontinent. Pakistan joined the US-led military alliances and India chose to be nonaligned. Because of its commitment to Pakistan and use of a Pakistani base and electronic monitoring station, the US was reluctant to equip India with combat equipment even after the Chinese attack. That left India with no choice but to fall back on the Soviet Union as primary defence supplier. Pakistan, confident in the superiority of US equipment and expecting the Kashmiris to stage an uprising, started a large infiltration operation in 1965 in Kashmir and, when that was checked, a war. That ended in a stalemate. That was followed by a Soviet-mediated Tashkent accord which had tacit US support.²⁴

General elections in Pakistan in 1970 led to an Awami League majority in the National Assembly. But Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, the PPP leader who won the majority in West Pakistan, instigated the army to unleash a genocide in East Pakistan and it also carried out an ethnic cleansing of 10 million people into the bordering areas of India. In this, the Pakistanis were encouraged by the role they played in bringing the US and China together and they expected and secured the support of the US and China. India, to countervail this Pakistan-US-China axis concluded a Peace and Friendship Treaty with the Soviet Union.²⁵

In the war that followed, India had the logistic and diplomatic backing of the USSR. Even as the Indian Army was closing in on Dacca the US sent its aircraft carrier the *USS Enterprise* in an intimidatory mission into the Bay of Bengal. It came late and had in fact no mission directive.

Faced with the turbulent nuclear Maoist China which did not accept non-proliferation norms and its axis with the US and Pakistan, India conducted a nuclear test in 1974 in defiance of the Nonproliferation Treaty. India was immediately subjected to a severe technology sanctions regime led by the US—a regime that has survived till today and which the international community now wants to dismantle but that is opposed by isolationist elements in our country. In 1976 Pakistan negotiated an agreement with China for the acquisition of nuclear weapon technology and it was also helped by a flourishing European black-market in nuclear technology, equipment and materials. Further help came when A.Q. Khan was able to come away from Holland with full documentation of uranium enrichment centrifuge technology and a complete list of nuclear technology suppliers. By this time the US had decided to launch covert operations in Afghanistan with Pakistan as the base against the Soviet-backed Khalq Parcham regime. The Soviet leadership committed a grave blunder by sending in their forces into Afghanistan in support of the Kabul regime and thereby walked into the trap set for them. The US was prepared to allow Pakistan to acquire nuclear weapons with technology transfer from China and from Western European countries. This was a quid pro quo for Pakistan serving as a base for the US supported Mujahideen operation against Soviet forces in Afghanistan. The Mujahideen assembled from Indonesia to Morocco and indoctrinated in Wahabi cult finally provided the reservoir from which sprang various jihadi organizations in the 1990s including the Al

Qaeda and the International Islamic Front. When the Soviet forces finally withdrew from Afghanistan the jihadis felt that having defeated one superpower they were in a position to confront the other – the US. One of the fallouts of these developments was Pakistan's initiation of a terrorist campaign in Kashmir using various jihadi groups and feeling secure that India would not be able to escalate its counteraction because of Pakistan's nuclear weapons.

At this point we may examine the emergence of nonalignment as a strategy and as a movement. Jawaharlal Nehru conceptualized nonalignment purely as a strategy in 1946 for an India emerging into independence in a bipolar world. In fact nonalignment could be interpreted as a balance of power strategy in a world where the two hostile blocs could not go to war because of the existence of nuclear weapons.²⁶ Nehru's idea was to encourage as many of the newly decolonizing countries to keep out of the bipolar rivalry. That was the idea behind Bandung.²⁷ But very soon after Bandung two military pacts CENTO and SEATO emerged and China increasingly identified itself as an active participant in the Cold War.

Nehru was against the formation of a third bloc. He had reservations about the first nonaligned conference and participated in it mainly to highlight the increased Cold War tensions caused by resumption of nuclear tests after a period of suspension. It was after Nehru's death that the nonaligned group became a movement though its members were so diverse in their political alignments and their domestic, political, economic and social cultures that the only thing uniting them was their presence in the nonaligned summits. They issued their periodic platitudinous summit declarations and then each country went on its way. They claimed to be for disarmament but they ended up legitimizing the nuclear weapons in the hands of five nuclear weapon powers in 1995. The second longest war in the Cold War period was fought between two nonaligned countries – Iraq and Iran – and the movement was silent. The nonaligned majority were also silent during the Bangladesh genocide,²⁸ the Pol Pot genocide and the Gestapu killings in Indonesia.²⁹ The nonalignment as a strategy was a sensible one and nonaligned movement served limited purpose as a lobby in the UN General Assembly. Nonaligned summits had their use. Beyond that, the significance of nonalignment should not be exaggerated.

West Asia was a proxy battleground in the Cold War. While Israel had the support of the US, UK, France and other Western European countries the Soviet Union backed the Arab states – Egypt, Syria and Iraq up to the early 1980s. Saudi Arabia, Jordan and Iran up to 1978 aligned themselves with the US. Three Arab Israeli wars established Israeli dominance as the most powerful military power in the region.³⁰ Egypt, Jordan and Morocco accorded recognition to Israel after the Camp David accord under US mediation. The Arab Israeli dispute, though it interacted with the Cold War, was not its offshoot and therefore it continued even after the end of the Cold War. Israel became a nuclear weapon power even in 1967, primarily with French assistance. Though US initially tried to prevent Israel acquiring nuclear weapons it reconciled itself to it after 1967.

Iraq's Saddam Hussein received US encouragement in waging war against Khomeini's Iran. The US and the West looked away when Saddam Hussein used chemical weapons in the war against Iran. Saddam Hussein's war against Iran had the support of Saudi Arabia and Egypt. After the end of the stalemated war with Iran, Saddam Hussein persuaded himself to believe that his aggression against the neighbouring oil-rich Kuwait would also be tolerated. When he annexed Kuwait the Arab nations joined together behind the US to wage war to liberate Kuwait. The Soviet Union tried to mediate and failed. However, it assured the US that the US forces from Europe could be used against Saddam Hussein without any adverse reaction from the Warsaw Pact.

In the rest of Africa the effect of the Cold War was felt in Somalia, Ethiopia, Angola and Mozambique all of which received Soviet military assistance. The latter three had left-wing regimes for some time. In the 1980s Cuban troops were deployed in the civil war in Angola when South Africa and US supported the rebel leader Jonas Savimbi. The civil war in Somalia which started in the eighties is still to come to an end.³¹

The Cold War confrontation in the Western Hemisphere led to the Cuban missile crisis. Russian deployment of nuclear missiles in Cuba in 1962 was analogous to the US deployment of similar missiles in Turkey done earlier. However, having nuclear missiles targeted at the US from 90 miles from their coast was intolerable to the US. The crisis was noteworthy because at that time in 1962, the missiles had no Permissible Action Links (coded electronic locking systems) and therefore could be used at the discretion of the local commander. Therefore it was a very serious crisis.³² Fortunately, both sides displayed adequate restraint. An agreement was reached to withdraw missiles from Cuba by the Soviet Union in return for the US pledge to withdraw its missiles from Turkey and not to attack Cuba and topple the Castro regime. While it was claimed as a great US victory, 45 years later the Cuban regime has still survived and the US has kept its pledge.

The US toppled a left-leaning regime of Colonel Arbenz in Guatemala through covert action in 1954. In 1973 the US-supported Chilean Army staged a coup against the elected Socialist President, Allende. In the 1980s the US sustained prolonged covert action against the Sandanista regime in Nicaragua in violation of their own Congressional legislation.

By 1985 the US President Reagan and Soviet General Secretary Gorbachev in their summit in Geneva declared that a nuclear war cannot be won and should not be started. Next year at Reykyavik Summit they both almost reached an agreement to eliminate nuclear weapons, only to be pulled back from it by their advisers particularly the American advisers.

Mikhail Gorbachev became General Secretary of the Soviet Communist Party in 1985. He initiated the *perestroika* (restructuring) programme and introduced *glasnost* (openness) in administration. He also repudiated the Brezhnev doctrine and loosened the Soviet stronghold over Eastern European countries. He tried to convert the Soviet Union into a Social Democratic Federation. In the process various constituent republics declared themselves independent and the Soviet Union got dissolved by 1991. Divided Germany got united a little earlier with

Soviet approval. The Communist regimes in Eastern European countries got replaced nonviolently except in Rumania where the regime change was violent.

This brief overview of the Cold War brings out that both sides were by and large cautious in handling nuclear weapons, especially in the European context. Though an exorbitantly costly arms race which ruined the Soviet economy was pursued by both sides they avoided taking any undue risks in deployment of the weapons and their armed forces. They were to a significant extent careful not to offer any provocation to the other side during the entire period of the Cold War. There is no possible alternative explanation for this except the effect of mutual deterrence on two sides.

However, in the Asian context the North Korean invasion of South Korea, US involvement in Vietnam and Soviet intervention in Afghanistan were costly blunders. Even in the case of Asia the continued separation of Taiwan from China points out to the efficacy of deterrence.

The Cold War compelled the US to help in rapid reindustrialization of Western Europe and Japan and their democratization. The Cold War paved the way for the emergence of the European Union and the current balance of power system of six major powers. It is difficult to link up the Cold War with decolonization but perhaps it helped to expedite the process in a few cases. The Cold War led to six cases of partition of nations – East and West Germany, North and South Korea, Palestine and Israel, India and Pakistan,³³ North and South Vietnam, and China and Taiwan. Two of the partitions have ended and four still remain. The end of the Cold War resulted in the break-up of the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia.

The Cold War proved that Communism was not as robust an ideology as it was considered to be. Religious faith as well as the spirit of nationalism proved to be much stronger. However, there is no denying the enormous impact of Marxism on democracy and the consequent emergence of social democracy, still under evolution and the concept of a welfare state. The Cold War would not have been cold but for the nearly simultaneous development of nuclear weapons and missiles in two centres of power in the world.

Notes

- 1 Key Note Address at the International Colloquium on ‘Superpower Rivalry in the Twentieth Century: Lessons for the Twenty first Century’ on 18 19 March 2008 at the India International Centre, New Delhi.
- 2 Speech at the Moscow meeting of the Communist and Workers’ Parties, 18 November 1957.
- 3 Robert S. McNamara, ‘Apocalypse Soon’, *Foreign Policy*, 148, May/June 2005.
- 4 Anne Hessing Cahn, ‘Team B: The Trillion Dollar Experiment’, *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, April 1993. Anne Hessing Cahn, *Killing Detente: The Right Attacks the CIA*, Pennsylvania State University Press, 1998.
- 5 George Kennan was the Deputy Head of US mission in Moscow in April 1946 when he sent his 8000 word telegram to the State Department outlining a new strategy on how to handle diplomatic relations with the Soviet Union. That was the original ‘containment’ strategy.

- 6 'X', July 1947. 'The Sources of Soviet Conduct', *Foreign Affairs*, XV.
- 7 The Truman Doctrine was proclaimed in President Harry Truman's address before the joint session of the Congress on 12 March 1947. It was an aid programme to Greece and Turkey in response to a perceived Soviet involvement in Europe and Asia as suggested by the Communist movements.
The Marshall Plan was announced by the US Secretary of State George Marshall on 5 June 1947 to the graduating class of Harvard University. The US offered aid to Europe to assist in the return of normal economic health. The Soviet Union and Eastern bloc rejected the offer. In the three years up to the end of 1951 the US transferred aid worth 12.721 billion dollars. NSC 68 National Security Council document 68 was signed by President Truman on 30 September 1950. The document laid the foundation for subsequent increases in America's conventional and nuclear capabilities.
- 8 The Brezhnev Doctrine was spelt out by President Brezhnev at the Fifth Congress of the Polish United Workers' Party on 13 November 1968 and it stated, 'When forces that are hostile to socialism try to turn the development of some socialist country, towards capitalism, it becomes not only a problem of the country concerned, but a common problem and concern of all socialist countries.'
- 9 The Treaty of Friendship and Alliance between the Soviet Union and China (February 1950) envisaged a low interest Soviet loan of \$300m and a thirty year military alliance. The Soviet Union gained access to Chinese ports in Manchuria and uranium mining rights in Xinjiang.
- 10 On 3 October 1950. Zhou en Lai summoned Indian Ambassador K.M. Panikkar and conveyed the warning that if the US or the UN forces crossed the 38th parallel China would send troops to defend North Korea. India conveyed the warning to the US and the UN. Henry C.K. Liu, *US China: Quest for Peace*, Part 4, '38th parallel leads straight to Taiwan'. See also M.S. Rajan, *India in World Affairs 1954-56*, Asia Publishing House 1964).
- 11 Till the General Assembly Resolution 2758 dated 25 October 1971 was adopted, China's seat in the UN General Assembly and the Security Council was occupied by the Representative of the Republic of China (Taiwan). This could be done only after Henry Kissinger's secret trip to Beijing and the US acknowledging the one China policy. During the fifties China sent 38,000 people to the Soviet Union for training and study. 28,000 were technicians from key industries, 7500 students and 2500 college and university teachers and postgraduate scientists. The Soviet Union despatched 11,000 scientific and technical personnel to China. 850 of these worked in scientific and research sectors. Cooperation extended over 100 scientific projects including nuclear science. The USSR provided aid for 156 major industrial projects including mining, power generation and heavy industry. By the late fifties China made substantial progress with Soviet aid in such fields as electric power, steel production, basic chemicals, machine tools and military equipment such as artillery, tanks and aircraft.
- 12 The agreement between China and the Soviet Union on nuclear weapon development was signed in October 1957. The Soviets supplied a gaseous diffusion enrichment facility. According to the Chinese, the Soviets cancelled the agreement in June 1959.
- 13 The Great Leap Forward was launched in January 1958. It failed and there are estimates of up to 30 million Chinese having died of starvation and malnutrition during the three year period.
- 14 India was the first country to be licensed to produce MIG 21 and the Soviet Union refused it to China which had earlier obtained the MIG 15, MIG 17 and MIG 19 aircraft.
- 15 The Treaty was opened for signature on 5 August 1963. China never signed the Partial Test Ban Treaty but signed the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1996.
- 16 The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution was launched by Mao Zedong on 16 May 1966. Though Mao himself declared its end in 1969 its effects lasted till after

his death and the arrest of his wife and the other three members of the Gang of Four towards the end of 1976. On 27 June 1981, the Central Committee of the Chinese Communist Party adopted the resolution that the chief responsibility for the grave 'Left' error of the 'Cultural Revolution' does indeed lie with Comrade Mao Zedong. It stated that the Cultural Revolution was carried out under the mistaken leadership of Mao Zedong which was manipulated by the counter revolutionary groups of Lin Biao and Jiang Qing and brought serious disaster and turmoil to the Communist Party and the Chinese People.

- 17 The Cold War was being waged against the Soviet Union. It made eminent strategic sense to split China from the Soviet Union and intensify containment of the Soviet Union. The ideology of China was irrelevant to the US leadership as it was when US supported all anti communist dictatorships around the world.
- 18 On 7 April 1954, President Eisenhower said in a news conference:

Finally you have broader considerations that might follow what you would call the 'falling domino' principle. You have a row of dominoes set up. You knock over the first one and what will happen to the last one is the certainty that it will go over very quickly. So you could have a beginning of a disintegration that would have the most profound influences.

History proved this thesis totally wrong.

- 19 The Battle of Dien Bien Phu took place between French Colonial troops under General Christian de Castries and North Vietnamese under General Vo Nguyen Giap between 13 March – 7 May 1954 and resulted in a decisive North Vietnamese victory and General de Castries being taken prisoner.
- 20 On 27 April 1954 the Geneva Conference produced an agreement among Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (North Vietnam), France, Laos, the People's Republic of China, the State of Vietnam (South Vietnam), the Soviet Union and the United Kingdom. It resulted in French withdrawal from the Indo Chinese peninsula and division of Vietnam into North and South. The US was not party to the Geneva conference though it agreed to take note of the agreement.
- 21 McNamara's regret is evident in Robert S. McNamara and Brian Van De Mark, *In Retrospect: The Tragedy and Lessons of Vietnam*, Times Books, 1995. This book was followed by a documentary film *The Fog of War. Eleven Lessons from the Life of Robert S. McNamara*, directed and produced by Errol Morris.
- 22 ASEAN was formed at a meeting of the Foreign Ministers of Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand in Bangkok on 8 August 1967 after President Sukarno was overthrown and the Indonesian Communist Party was totally eliminated and the 'confrontation' between Indonesia and Malaysia ended. Among the motivations was the common fear of Communism. In 1984 Brunei joined as the sixth member. Vietnam became the seventh member on 28 July 1995. Laos and Myanmar joined in July 1997 and Cambodia in April 1999.
- 23 See John Lewis Gaddis, *The Cold War*, Penguin, 2005, p. 266. Pol Pot executed one fifth of his people in the aftermath of the Vietnam War. Yet there was no trial for crimes against humanity.
- 24 The Tashkent Declaration of 10 January 1966 consolidated the ceasefire between India and Pakistan after the war of September 1965 and led to mutual withdrawal of troops from the occupied areas of both countries. Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri of India and President Ayub Khan met Prime Minister Kosygin of the Soviet Union as a facilitator of the negotiations. Within a few hours of signing the declaration Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri died of a massive heart attack.
- 25 The Indo Soviet Treaty of Peace, Friendship and Cooperation was signed on 9 August 1971 and it had a Clause 9 for consultation between the parties if the security of either party was affected. Though the Janata Party after assuming power in 1977

searched for a secret clause in the Treaty they could not find one. The consultation clause proved a sufficient deterrent against China acting against India in December 1971 though the US urged China to do so. The criticism that the treaty went against Indian nonalignment is absurd. No country can be nonaligned against its own national security.

- 26 See 'Evolution of Indian Defence Policy (1947-64)', in K. Subrahmanyam, *A Centenary History of the Indian National Congress*, All India Congress Committee and Vikas Publishing House, 1990, pp. 531-39.
- 27 The Bandung Afro Asian Conference was held on 18-24 April 1955 in Indonesia. 29 newly decolonized Afro Asian countries took part in the conference and adopted a ten point declaration. People's Republic of China was a prominent participant. The emergence of military pacts and intensification of the Cold War prevented yet another comprehensive Afro Asian Conference of the Bandung type for the next 50 years when a commemorative conference was held in Bandung.
- 28 Though an estimated million people were killed in Bangladesh during 1971 there has been no inquiry into the genocide because of US-China alignment with Pakistan at that time. George Washington University's National Security Archives has published a collection of declassified documents mostly of communications between US officials working in Dhaka and India and Washington, DC. In the latest elections in Bangladesh war crimes trials relating to the events of 1971 feature as an electoral promise.
- 29 It is estimated that 800,000 suspected Communists (mostly ethnic Chinese Indonesians) were killed in the year following the 1966 GESTAPU coup overthrowing Sukarno. There is no move to investigate those killings.
- 30 The three Arab-Israeli wars were in 1948-49, 1967 and 1973.
- 31 The civil war was between the Soviet and Cuban backed MPLA (Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola) and UNITA (National Union for Total Independence of Angola) supported by the US, China and South Africa after the withdrawal of Portuguese colonialism. The civil war was waged for 27 years, 1975-2002. MPLA ultimately prevailed.
- 32 The Cuban Missile crisis was in October-November 1962. The Soviet Union placed nuclear missiles in Cuba to balance US placement of nuclear missiles in Turkey and also to obtain guarantees against potential US aggression against the Communist Castro government. The missiles were discovered by the US and there was a confrontation between the US and the USSR for 13 days along with negotiations between Robert Kennedy, the President's brother and US Attorney general and the Soviet Ambassador, Anatoly Dobrynin. The crisis was resolved. The Soviets withdrew nuclear missiles from Cuba and the US from Turkey. Cuban sovereignty was guaranteed and Cuba is today one of the last Communist regimes. The missile crisis was very dangerous because in those days the missiles were not locked and the local commanders had delegated powers to use nuclear weapons.
- 33 See Narendra Singh Sarila, *The Shadow of the Great Game: The Untold Story of India's Partition*, HarperCollins, 2005. The author's thesis is that Britain decided to partition the subcontinent in order to retain at least some parts of India, hopefully in the North West 'for defensive and offensive against the USSR in any future dispensation in the subcontinent'.

3 Superpower rivalry and the victimization of Korea

The Korean War and the North Korean nuclear crisis

Haksoon Paik

Introduction

International politics in the second half of the twentieth century was characterized by superpower rivalry. Korea fell a victim to superpower rivalry most conspicuously in the Korean War (1950-53) and the North Korean nuclear crisis (1993 to the present).¹ The Korean War broke out and was fought at the early stage of superpower rivalry, becoming the first 'hot war' in the Cold War era. In contrast, the North Korean nuclear crisis—the first in the early 1990s and the second still in progress since 2002—erupted in the post-Cold War era.

This essay purports to explain the Korean War and the North Korean nuclear crisis in terms of how Korea was victimized by superpower rivalry and its remaining legacy and points out the coming of a great opportunity for resolving the North Korean nuclear crisis through US-North Korean and the Six-Party Talks negotiations.

In the first part, I will explain the character of the Korean War in terms of civil/international war by observing the North Korean state makers' instinct to establish an exclusive authority in the whole Korean Peninsula and by analysing the Soviet and Chinese help to plan and execute the war for North Korea and the US and U.N. help for South Korea in fighting the war. Finally, I will look at the legacies the Korean War and superpower rivalry left in Korea, East Asia, and the world.

In the second part, I will examine the North Korean nuclear crisis, the legacy of the Korean War and superpower rivalry. First, I will examine the first and second North Korean nuclear crisis in terms of how North Korea and the US confronted each other. But the examination will focus more on the second crisis, which is still in progress. Concretely, I will review and analyse President Bush's 'ABC' (anything but Clinton) policy toward North Korea, the September 19 Joint Statement, the US financial sanctions on North Korea's deposits at the Banco Delta Asia (BDA), the February 13 initial actions agreement, the October 3 second-phase actions agreement, and the recent press communiqué of the Heads of Delegation Meeting of the Six-Party Talks in July 2008. Then I will evaluate the achievements of the two actions-related

nuclear agreements. Finally, I will put forth suggestions for the successful denuclearization of North Korea and the end to the victimization of Korea.

The Korean War as a state formation war/superpower rivalry

Most of the literature on the origins, causes, and characters of the Korean War deals with: (1) who (which side or which country) initiated the war; (2) why it did so; and (3) what the character of the war was, a civil war or an international war or a combination of both.² The competing explanations about the origins and character of the Korean War can be grouped into three categories.

The first group of scholars focuses on the external contextual influence on Korea in explaining the origins and character of the war while the second focuses on the domestic variables and their interactions. Finally, there is an eclectic position that basically combines the elements of both arguments mentioned above as well as Kim Il Sung's will and decision to unify the peninsula.³

The point of emphasis in the literature on the Korean War has moved from the explanations of the first group of scholars to those of the second since the late 1970s. But the former communist archives of the Soviet Union, China, and the East European countries began to be declassified in the early 1990s and produced new evidence that the Soviet Union was heavily involved and played a key role in almost all of the major incidents that happened during the Cold War era including the Korean War. Thus, the predominant explanation of the origin and character of the Korean War nowadays is that Kim Il Sung of North Korea initiated the idea of unifying the whole Korean Peninsula, but that the Soviet Union helped plan and launch the Korean War by bringing in China and making China shoulder the heavy burden of waging the war.⁴

In the first place, the Korean War was a civil war or a state formation war fought between the North and South Korean state makers.⁵ In general, state makers have a power motive and motivational tendency to seek the monopoly of authority within a certain territory-to-be. To make a state the goal of their power motivation they make efforts to secure coercive, war-making, and extractive capabilities at the agential level,⁶ and to transform and exploit domestic and external political opportunity structures at the level of structure.⁷ Such propensity can take many differing forms, but if the action assumes the form of making a war against the rival state makers in order to establish the monopoly of authority within a certain territory-to-be,⁸ this kind of civil war can be characterized as a state formation war. The Korean War falls into this category.

State makers cannot succeed in making a war without having a 'favourable' political opportunity. The 'external' political opportunity structure opened favourably for Kim Il Sung to make a war against his counterpart in the South in 1950: withdrawal of the US troops from Korea in June 1949, the Soviet Union's success in making the atomic bomb in August 1949, the Chinese

Communist Party's military victory over Guomindang forces and its proclamation of the founding of the People's Republic of China in October 1949,⁹ the US government's adoption of NSC-48 in December 1949 that excluded Korea and Taiwan from the US defense perimeter in Asia, and the US declaration of the Acheson Line in January 1950,¹⁰ which was the concrete expression of the NSC-48.

Kim Il Sung did not lose time in capturing the long-awaited window of opportunity with the backing of Stalin and Mao,¹¹ which meant that the stage was set for an international war, a war of superpower rivalry in Korea. Even though it was the North Korean state makers that initiated the idea of making a war against their South Korean counterparts, it was the Soviet Union, China, the United States, and the United Nations that practically fought the war. It is noteworthy that rather at an early stage of the Korean War both South and North Korea conceded the wartime operational control of their forces to the United States and China, respectively.¹²

In conclusion, the Korean War was a civil/international war, in which the North Korean state makers with the political instinct to establish an exclusive authority in the entire Korean Peninsula successfully persuaded the Soviet Union and China to help plan and launch a war against their South Korean rival state makers and unify the whole country, while their South Korean counterparts were given help by the United States and the United Nations in defending themselves. As this explanation of the Korean War indicates, the Korean War has two dimensions of conflict combined: inter-Korean strife between the North and South Korean state makers and the intervention of the two superpowers and their close associates.

Legacies of the Korean War: structured victimization of Korea

The Korean War, the first 'hot war' fought in the Cold War era, left far-reaching legacies for local, regional, and world politics.

At the local level, the Korean War devastated the Korean nation in a most traumatic and pathological way. The war recorded an extremely high death toll and a near total destruction of the social system and economic infrastructure. The total number of servicemen casualties suffered by all parties involved in the war totalled about 3.22 million. Over 80 percent of the economic capacity was destroyed all over the Korean Peninsula.

More importantly, however, the Korean people had to concede the incompleteness of nation-state formation and the division of Korea as a *fait accompli*. At the international level, the superpower rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union strengthened the Cold War confrontation in Korea.

More problematic was the legacy of deep anger and frustration left by the war among the Koreans. The homogeneity of the Korean national culture and language were gradually compromised with increasing differences between the two Koreas. These developments are another testimony to Korea's victimization by superpower rivalry.

It was not until the late 1980s when Gorbachev introduced *perestroika* and *glasnost* in the Soviet Union that Koreans could introduce a policy of reconciliation and cooperation between themselves. Thus, South Korea normalized the relations with the Soviet Union in 1990 and with China in 1992, and finally signed the 'Agreement on Reconciliation, Nonaggression, and Exchange and Cooperation between the South and the North' (inter-Korean basic agreement) in December 1991¹³ and put it into force in February 1992. It is noteworthy that the basic agreement between the South and the North recognized that 'their relations, not being a relationship between states, constitute a special interim relationship stemming from the process towards unification.'

Another legacy of the Korean War was the remarkable growth in the status and power of the military in Korea, which played a part in the coming of the military coups of 1961 and in 1979. South Korea suffered from the military or military-turned-civilian rule in South Korea for three decades until the early 1990s. The three-decade long military rule in South Korea was possible by the exploitation of the 'perception of threat' coming from the 'arch enemy' in the North.

At the regional level, the Korean War provided Japan with a valuable opportunity for economic recovery and political rehabilitation under the US policy to strengthen Japan. The United States decided to make Japan an anti-Communist and prosperous ally in East Asia to fight against the expansion of Communism. The United States signed the Treaty of San Francisco with Japan in 1951,¹⁴ which concluded the American Occupation, and excused the Japanese from reparations for the war. During the Korean War, Japan was used as the rear logistics support base for the US forces in Korea, and became the vital ally of the United States in East Asia in its effort to contain Communist expansion in the region.

By contrast, China had to pay dearly for intervening and fighting the US forces and was isolated from the market economic development of the world for almost three decades. President Nixon's visit to China and the Shanghai Communiqué in 1972¹⁵ pledged working towards establishment of diplomatic relations, but China had to wait for seven more years until 1979.¹⁶ Thus, China too was a victim of the Korean War and superpower rivalry in its own way, designed by Stalin when he planned the war with Kim Il Sung in 1950.

At the global level, the victimization of Korea was expressed in the Cold War structure in Korea, which is still in place. Both Koreas had to put up with war-preparedness and defense expenditures at the forefront of the Cold War for more than half a century. Both the United States and the Soviet Union extended security commitments to South and North Korea, respectively, creating alliances.

Related to the victimization of Korea by superpower rivalry are South Korea's skewed diplomacy toward the United States and North Korea's skewed diplomacy toward the Soviet Union and China. This means that both Korean states simply lost the opportunities to conduct an independent foreign policy in the Cold War era, making them dependent on the superpowers for their national security and economic development.

The North Korean nuclear crisis

The North Korean nuclear crisis is another case of the victimization of Korea, this time due to the legacy of the superpower rivalry. Simply put, the Korean armistice, the legacy of the Korean War, is still in place and the United States and North Korea are technically at war in Korea. Inter-Korean relations, however, have shown dramatic improvements since the collapse of the Soviet Union, despite the recent anomaly of deteriorating inter-Korean relations under the new conservative government in South Korea.

When the United States saw the Soviet Union and East European socialist states fall, it also wanted North Korea to collapse, but to no avail. The tenacity of the North Korean regime had to do with its strengthening its defenses against the United States. North Korea sought its nuclear capability to defend its system and regime against the US threat. The North Korean leadership used its nuclear card as a bargaining chip to normalize its relations with the United States and simultaneously as deterrence against the US threat.

We have witnessed two North Korean nuclear crises: the first in the early 1990s, and the second in the early twenty-first century. The first crisis broke out in March 1993 when North Korea withdrew from the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and was solved in October 1994 when North Korea and the United States signed the Agreed Framework. The second crisis erupted in October 2002 when President George W. Bush sent a special envoy, James Kelly, to Pyongyang and accused North Korea of a breach of the Agreed Framework. North Korea withdrew from the NPT in January 2003.

In January 2002, President Bush had named Iran, Iraq, and North Korea the 'axis of evil' in his State of the Union Address,¹⁷ making clear that the United States would pursue an anti-North Korea policy in which even pre-emptive strikes could be launched against North Korea. The neoconservatives and hardliners in Washington, D.C. applied pressures and sanctions avoiding a negotiated solution to the North Korean problem.¹⁸

However, North Korea continued accumulating weapons-grade plutonium, and detonated a nuclear device in October 2006. The four-year period from October 2002 to October 2006 was wasted. The Republican Party's defeat in the mid-term elections in November 2006 was the coup de grace for the Bush Administration's failing foreign policy in Iraq, North Korea, and Iran. It produced a dramatic shift in the Bush Administration's North Korea policy from pressures and sanctions to dialogue and negotiations, elevating US North Korean bilateral talks to center stage in the nuclear negotiations. It was finally returning to some semblance of the North Korea policy of the Clinton Administration.

But the cost incurred from the failure of the US policy toward North Korea was extremely high for South Korea since its policy objective was 'zero tolerance' of a nuclear North Korea. Therefore, the worst-case scenario for

South Korea is that the North Korean nuclear crisis may end up with the latter becoming a permanent nuclear weapons state.

This scenario will harm stability and peace in East Asia and prevent peaceful unification of Korea, thereby victimizing the Korean nation. North Korea and the United States are also at a historical junction where they can either end or maintain the Cold War structure in Korea.

The first North Korean nuclear crisis, 1993–94¹⁹

How did the United States and North Korea respond in the first North Korean nuclear crisis? The Clinton Administration was rational and sensible in adopting a low-cost method to stabilize the situation by engaging North Korea through negotiation.

In the Agreed Framework, North Korea promised the abandonment of its nuclear weapons programme in exchange for light water reactors, full normalization of political and economic relations between itself and the United States, and joint efforts to strengthen the international nuclear nonproliferation regime. Both North Korea and the United States agreed to reduce barriers to trade and investment, including restrictions on telecommunications services and financial transactions; to open liaison offices in each other's capitals following resolution of consular and other technical issues through expert level discussions; and to upgrade bilateral relations to the ambassadorial level.²⁰ This meant that both countries succeeded in finding a solution to the extremely costly policy to maintain a Cold War structure in Korea in the absence of the Soviet intervention any more.

North Korea's effort to implement the Agreed Framework, however, failed due to the 'Republican revolution' in the United States in 1994 and its opposition to the implementation of the Agreed Framework. The Republican Party's success in the November 1994 mid-term elections, held less than a month after the signing of the Agreed Framework, resulted in a change in power in Congress with the Republican Party's net gain of 54 seats in the House of Representatives and 8 seats in the Senate giving the Republican Party control of the House for the first time since 1954 and of the Senate for the first time since 1986.²¹

Thus, what happened in the US North Korean relations after 1994 was an anticlimax after the promises made and envisioned in the Agreed Framework. There was a golden opportunity, however, for both North Korea and the United States to implement the Agreed Framework and reach normalization during the last months of the Clinton Administration. In October 2000, a dramatic improvement occurred in US North Korean relations through the exchanges of senior-level special envoys to each other's capitals.²² Both the United States and North Korea benefited enormously from the success of the historic inter-Korean summit in June 2000 leading to the June 15 North South Joint Declaration. The problem, however, was that time was running out and the Democratic presidential candidate Al Gore lost the November 2000 US presidential election.

The second North Korean nuclear crisis, 2002 to the present²³

The second North Korean nuclear crisis is currently in progress. It is an ongoing event for the successful resolution of all conflicts in Korea, current and historic, including the denuclearization of North Korea, installation of a peace and security mechanism in Korea and Northeast Asia, and end to the victimization of Korea caused by the Korean War and superpower rivalry.

President Bush's 'ABC' policy toward North Korea

President George W. Bush was inaugurated as the US president in January 2001, reviewed President Clinton's North Korea policy, and repealed its key components, including the Agreed Framework. The Bush Administration's North Korea policy was dubbed the 'ABC' (anything but Clinton) policy, which had included improved implementation of the Agreed Framework relating to North Korea's nuclear activities and IAEA compliance; a verifiable ban on missile exports and constraints on indigenous missile programmes; and adoption of a less-threatening conventional military posture.²⁴ The 'improved implementation of the Agreed Framework relating to North Korea's nuclear activities and IAEA compliance' meant the repeal of the Agreed Framework. North Korea could not accept it because it meant an acceleration of safeguards inspections, which North Korea was not required to come into full compliance with until 'a significant portion of the Light Water Reactor project was completed, but before the delivery of key nuclear components.'²⁵ What the Bush Administration argued was any agreements with North Korea must be effectively verifiable.²⁶

The September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States set the priorities of US foreign and security policy on anti-terrorism and non-proliferation/counter-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD). The Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) of the Bush Administration²⁷ revealed that the US government would develop small-sized tactical nuclear weapons for use against North Korea and others. This breach of the 'no use' promise made in the Agreed Framework, the colourful expression 'axis of evil' in the January 2002 State of the Union Address, and the new security doctrine of 'preemption' of external threats combined to create a hostile atmosphere for US North Korean relations.²⁸

The neoconservatives and hardliners in Washington, D.C. under the Bush Administration set out to plan to remove 'evil' leaders and regimes one by one. This had a serious impact on the psychology of the North Korean leadership to defend their regime at whatever cost.

In the case of North Korea, US presidential envoy James Kelly visited Pyongyang in October 2002 just after the Japanese Prime Minister Koizumi had a historic summit and issued the Pyongyang Declaration in September 2002²⁹ and questioned North Korea's 'covert uranium enrichment program.' Kelly's visit to North Korea and the resulting confrontation between the United States and North Korea destroyed all control mechanisms over

North Korea's nuclear actions and activities and North Korea resolutely began to enlarge and strengthen its nuclear capacity.³⁰

Under these circumstances, the United States felt the need to engage again in negotiations with North Korea to reinstate a control mechanism over it. Pyongyang similarly needed to restart negotiations for its own security and economic interests. These compulsions on both sides helped start the three-party talks at first, followed by the Six-Party Talks in August 2003.³¹

The September 19, 2005 Joint Statement

A series of negotiations in 2003-2005 finally produced the September 19, 2005 Joint Statement,³² which North Korea agreed to abandon 'all nuclear weapons and nuclear programs' and return to the NPT in exchange for an American security guarantee, US-North Korean normalization of relations, and economic and energy cooperation from the Six-Party Talks parties. It was also agreed that the issue of the *light water reactors* will be discussed 'at an appropriate time' and that 'words for words' and 'actions for actions' principle was to be observed, stressing 'mutually coordinated measures.' The parties also agreed to have the directly-related states hold a separate forum for the negotiation of a permanent peace settlement on the Korean Peninsula, that is, for the dismantling of the Cold War structure in Korea and the termination of the victimization of Korea that resulted from the Korean War and superpower rivalry. But it was clear that the Joint Statement was not as powerful as the Agreed Framework in terms of its binding power.³³ Moreover, there was no freeze on the nuclear facilities. And a process of faithful 'actions for actions' implementation on both sides was needed.

Unfortunately, the September 19 Joint Statement was overtaken by the US policy to apply the Illegal Actions Initiative (IAI) to North Korea—concretely, the US charged North Korea with counterfeiting US \$100 bills and imposed financial sanctions on the North Korean bank accounts at BDA, a Macao bank. North Korea regarded the BDA sanctions as a 'concentrated expression' of the US's hostile policy toward North Korea and demanded that the United States lift the sanctions as a goodwill gesture. North Korea made it clear that it would not return to the Six-Party Talks until a resolution of the BDA issue was found.³⁴

North Korea and the United States wasted almost one and a half years because of the BDA sanctions issue. The United States felt that its financial sanction card was effective, but North Korea was determined not to succumb to such pressure believing in the effectiveness of its nuclear card. Confronted with intensifying the US financial sanctions, North Korea chose to counter it by detonating a nuclear device on October 9, 2006,³⁵ which meant the US failure to prevent North Korea from going nuclear. Considering the continuing accumulation of reprocessed weapons-grade plutonium by North Korea in the absence of any effective institutional control mechanism over it, the only realistic policy option left for the United States was terminating BDA

financial sanctions on North Korea to make it return to the Six-Party Talks for nuclear negotiations.

In April 2007, the United States decided to lift the sanctions on North Korea's deposits at BDA, and completed the transfer of the money in June 2007, which proved to be 'complex,' involving various legal and regulatory issues, due to the US Treasury Department's application of the Patriot Act. The money was transferred to the Monetary Authority of Macao, then to the New York branch of the Federal Reserve Board, to the Central Bank of the Russian Federation, and finally to North Korea's account in a commercial bank in the Russian Far East.³⁶

The February 13, 2007 initial actions agreement

In this agreement,³⁷ North Korea promised to 'shut down and seal' the Yongbyon nuclear facilities and 'discuss with other parties a list of all its nuclear programmes as described in the Joint Statement.' The United States promised to 'start bilateral talks aimed at resolving pending bilateral issues and moving toward full diplomatic relations' with North Korea and to 'begin the process of removing the designation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terrorism and advance the process of terminating the application of the Trading with the Enemy Act with respect to the DPRK.' North Korea and Japan would also 'start bilateral talks aimed at taking steps to normalize their relations in accordance with the Pyongyang Declaration'; and the Six-Party Talks parties agreed to 'cooperate in economic, energy and humanitarian assistance' to North Korea and to provide emergency energy assistance for North Korea.³⁸

In order to carry out the aforementioned actions, these parties agreed to establish five Working Groups on: denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, normalization of North Korea US relations, normalization of North Korea Japan relations, economic and energy cooperation, and Northeast Asia peace and security mechanism. It was also agreed that 'the directly related parties will negotiate a permanent peace regime on the Korean Peninsula at an appropriate separate forum,' as a reaffirmation of the Korean peace forum agreed upon in the September 19 Joint Statement.

The February 13 agreement was carried out faithfully leading to the long-awaited building up of 'trust' between North Korea and the United States based on the 'actions for actions' principle. It was truly a historic occasion witnessing the 'emergence of cooperation' between the two enemy countries for the first time since the Korean War.³⁹

The October 3, 2007 second-phase actions agreement

The February 13 initial actions agreement was followed by the October 3 second-phase actions agreement.⁴⁰ North Korea promised to disable all existing nuclear facilities in Yongbyon identified by the September 2005 Joint Statement and the February 13 agreement by December 31, 2007; to provide a complete and

correct declaration of all its nuclear programmes in accordance with the February 13 agreement by December 31, 2007; and reaffirm its commitment not to transfer nuclear materials, technology, or know-how.

The United States promised to provide the initial funding for these activities; commit to improving its relations with North Korea and move toward a full diplomatic relationship; fulfill its commitments to North Korea 'in parallel with North Korea's actions based on consensus reached at the meetings of the Working Group on Normalization of DPRK US Relations.' In fact, these commitments to North Korea fulfilled the US promise made under the Initial Actions Agreement of February 13, 2007 to finish 'the process of removing the designation of the DPRK as a state sponsor of terrorism' and 'the process of terminating the application of the Trading with the Enemy Act with respect to the DPRK.'

It was also agreed that North Korea and Japan would make efforts to normalize their relations expeditiously in accordance with the Pyongyang Declaration. Economic, energy, and humanitarian assistance up to the equivalent of one million tons of heavy fuel oil (HFO) would be provided to North Korea by the Six-Party Talks parties.

The October 3 agreement was promised to be implemented by December 31, 2007, but is still in the process of implementation at the time of this writing. The disablement of the Yongbyon nuclear facilities began on November 1, 2007 and was completed by June 26, 2008. The disabling of the Yongbyon facilities including the five-megawatt experimental reactor, the reprocessing plant (radiochemical laboratory), and the nuclear fuel rod fabrication facility; North Korea even demolished the cooling tower of the nuclear reactor at Yongbyon as a demonstration of its strong will to abide by the October 3 agreement, which went beyond the requirements of the agreement; North Korea officially submitted its declaration of nuclear programmes to China, chair of the Six-Party Talks; and the US government began to take action to remove North Korea from the list of state sponsors of terrorism and terminate the application of the Trade with the Enemy Act with respect to North Korea by notifying Congress of its policy decision.

The July 2008 Heads of Delegation Meeting of the Six-Party Talks

The Heads of Delegation Meeting of the Sixth Round of the Six-Party Talks was held from July 10 to 12, 2008, and issued a press communiqué, making clear that the implementation of the September 19 Joint Statement should be done in a 'full and balanced' manner, in accordance with the 'simultaneous actions' principle on both sides.

The heads of delegation of the six parties agreed on the following: to establish a verification mechanism and a monitoring mechanism within the Six-Party Talks framework; for the five parties to complete their HFO and non-HFO assistance to North Korea by the end of October 2008; for North Korea to work to complete the disabling of the Yongbyon nuclear facilities by the end

of October 2008; and to continue with their discussion on the ‘Guiding Principles of Peace and Security in Northeast Asia.’ They also had a preliminary exchange of views on the third-phase actions for the implementation of the Joint Statement of September 19, 2005.⁴¹ In other words, the Heads of Delegation Meeting in July 2008 assured steady progress in implementing the October 3 second-phase actions agreement, though it took much more time than planned.

Achievements of the two actions-related nuclear agreements

What has been achieved through the implementation of the February 13 initial actions agreement and the October 3 second-phase actions agreement was never deemed possible before. Thanks to this newly-built trust between North Korea and the United States, we can reasonably expect that the successful implementation of the second-phase actions agreement will lead to the third-phase actions for the implementation of the September 19 Joint Statement, namely the dismantling of North Korea’s ‘nuclear weapons’ themselves.

North Korea has used the nuclear card basically as a bargaining chip for obtaining security assurances, diplomatic and economic normalization, and economic and energy assistance from the United States in exchange for giving up its nuclear weapons programmes in a comprehensive package deal with the United States.

The United States and other Six-Party Talks parties, particularly South Korea, were determined to install a peace and security mechanism in Korea and Northeast Asia to prevent a recurrence of the North Korean nuclear crisis or any security-related crisis. The Six-Party Talks should be given credit for designing and structuring the whole process of dismantlement of the Cold War legacies left by the Korean War and superpower rivalry in Korea and for putting an end to the victimization of Korea on a permanent basis.

Conclusion: an end to the victimization of Korea?

In this essay I have argued and explained that the Korean War in the early 1950s and the North Korean nuclear crisis from the 1990s to the present were two cases of victimization of Korea through superpower rivalry and its legacy of the Cold War structure in Korea. Unlike the Korean War where Korea and its people were hopelessly victimized without any help or resources, the North Korean nuclear crisis made a contrast where North Korea used its nuclear card to counter the US policy through tough negotiations.

If it is just one party, not both North Korea and the United States, that benefits from the North Korean nuclear resolution, the nuclear crisis in Korea may have only a slim chance of getting resolved. Fortunately, a negotiated resolution of the North Korean nuclear crisis has brought mutual benefits to North Korea and the United States in removing the undesirable legacies of the Korean War and superpower rivalry and there is growing trust due to the February 13 initial actions agreement and the October 3 second-phase actions

agreement. Keeping this in mind, we should be prepared for how to deal with the following problems in our effort to denuclearize North Korea and bring an end to the Korean armistice and the victimization of Korea.

Some of these salient problems include: verification and monitoring of North Korea's declaration of its nuclear programmes and dismantling of the Yongbyon nuclear facilities, agreement on the third-phase actions including the dismantling of North Korea's nuclear weapons and the coordinated measures on the part of the United States and the Six-Party Talks parties including the likely provision of light water reactors to North Korea for power generation, a roadmap of complete denuclearization of North Korea, and coordination of actions in cost-sharing by the six parties.

Several suggestions are in order hence.

First, the Six-Party Talks parties, particularly the United States and North Korea, should build on the 'trust' built between them through actions by coming up with a successful agreement on third-phase actions for dismantling the North Korean nuclear weapons. Furthermore, the Six-Party Talks parties should not make North Korea out to be a villain by the use of various denigrating terms like axis of evil, outpost of tyranny, outlaw state, kleptocracy, and so on.

Second, the Six-Party Talks parties should provide conditions for North Korea to give up its nuclear ambitions, because the nuclear problem will not be solved unless North Korea gives up its nuclear ambitions voluntarily. Therefore, it is important to accept the hypothesis that North Korea will give up its nuclear ambitions if it is certain that opportunities for its survival and prosperity are provided with the help of the United States and other parties. There is a concern that future negotiations for denuclearizing North Korea may not succeed. If negotiations go wrong, the US effort may focus more on nonproliferation activities than on the denuclearization of North Korea itself.

Third, the Six-Party Talks parties should reduce North Korea's threat perception, and sense of betrayal, and encourage a defensive North Korea to cooperate voluntarily and proactively. There is an asymmetry of demands between the United States and North Korea in implementing the September 19 Joint Statement and later nuclear agreements in terms of what could be obtained and lost by both sides which is why the latter is being more defensive, and less flexible in making deals.

Fourth, the Six-Party Talks parties should admit the structural constraints for the denuclearization of North Korea, and use top-level diplomacy including summit talks to make breakthroughs at critical times. In preparation for the summit talks between themselves, they must dispatch senior level presidential envoys.

Fifth, the Six-Party Talks parties should be more cooperative and ready for cost-sharing if they are to denuclearize North Korea and install a peace and security mechanism in Korea and Northeast Asia. Japan is not very cooperative there for which it is likely to pay dearly later.

Sixth, North and South Korea, the United States, and China – that is, 'the directly related parties' that fought the Korean War – should hold a separate

forum for peace settlement on the Korean Peninsula as early as possible in parallel with the progress in the denuclearization of North Korea, as repeatedly promised in the September 19 Joint Statement, the February 13 agreement, and the October 3 agreement. The four-party Korean peace forum should discuss a roadmap for transforming the armistice into a permanent peace mechanism in Korea. Any new peace arrangement in Korea should contribute to Korean unification as otherwise, with the two Koreas constantly competing for authority, any peace arrangement in Korea and the Northeast Asia will be unstable. The two Koreas should not be ignored or bypassed by the Six-Party Talks parties in their effort to install a permanent peace mechanism in Korea.

Lastly, the Six-Party Talks parties should also be prepared for multilateral security cooperation by establishing a multilateral security mechanism in Northeast Asia in accordance with the September 19 Joint Statement and later nuclear agreements to implement the Joint Statement. A forward-looking and effective multilateral security architecture will help to ensure economic prosperity in this region as well.

The last two suggestions, addressing the fundamental underlying structural issues that triggered the North Korean nuclear crisis, deal with what needs to be done to prevent its recurrence, to secure lasting peace and stability in Korea and Northeast Asia. Terminating the armistice and dismantling the Cold War structure in Korea is a historic enterprise which must be completed in the interests of all concerned.

Notes

- 1 The Democratic People's Republic of Korea (DPRK) will be referred to as 'North Korea' throughout this essay.
- 2 I have benefitted from the following comprehensive literature reviews of the origins and character of the Korean War: John Merrill, *Korea: The Peninsular Origins of the War* (Newark: University of Delaware Press, 1989), pp. 19-54; Kim Hakjoon, 'International Trends in Korean War Studies: A Review of the Documentary Literature,' *Korea and World Affairs* 14, 2 (Summer 1990), pp. 326-70; Kim Hakjoon, 'International Trend of the Study of the June 25 [the Korean War]: A Literature Review of the Study of the June 25 [the Korean War],' in Kim Chull Baum, ed., *Han'gukjonjaengul Ponun Sigak (Perspectives of the Korean War)* (Seoul: Eulyoo Publishing Co., 1990), pp. 11-51; Ch'oe Pong Dae, 'Some Problems Regarding the Origins and Character of the Korean War: A Review of the Existing Arguments,' in Ch'oe Chang Jip, ed., *Han'gukjonjaeng Yon'gu: Han'guk Hyondaesau I (A Study of the Korean War: An Understanding of the Contemporary History of Korea, No. 1)* (Seoul: T'aeam Publisher, 1990), pp. 15-53; and Ch'oe Kwang Nyong, 'The Origin of the Korean War,' in Ha Yong Son, ed., *Han'gukjonjaengui Saeroun Chopgun: Chont'ongjuuiwa Sujongjuuirul Nomoso (A New Approach to the Korean War: Beyond Traditionalism and Revisionism)* (Seoul: Nanam, 1990), pp. 263-340.
- 3 This eclectic position has been presented in a full scale research by Myung Lim Park. See Myung Lim Park, *Han'gukjonjaengui Palbalgwa Kiwon (The Korean War: The Outbreak and Its Origins)*, 2 Vols. (Seoul: Nanam, 1996). Also see Haksoon Paik, *Kuggahyongsong Chonjaenguirosoui Han'gukjonjaeng (The Korean War as a State Formation War)* (Sungnam, Korea: The Sejong Institute, 1999).

- 4 Haksoon Paik, *Kuggahyongsong Chonjaenguirosoui Han'gukjonjaeng (The Korean War as a State Formation War)*, pp. 35-41; Kathryn Weathersby, 'Should We Fear This?' Stalin and the Danger of War with America,' Cold War International History Project, Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, Working Paper No. 39, July 2002, pp. 9-12.
- 5 The state makers are a distinctive group of people whose interest is qualitatively different from all other groups of people. Their single most important interest is to establish a monopolistic state authority within a certain territorial boundary.
- 6 Coercive and war making capabilities are required for state makers to eliminate and neutralize domestic rivals, to fight off external enemies who oppose the state makers and their state making activities, and to extract resources. Extractive capability, that is, resource extracting capability, in turn, is necessary to buttress the coercive and war making capabilities.
- 7 Political opportunity structure is the 'structure of the political relationship between a group and the world around it,' and 'the configuration of forces in a (potential or actual) group's political environment that influences that group's assertion of its political claims.' See Charles Tilly, *From Mobilization to Revolution* (New York: Random House, 1978), pp. 7, 98; Charles E. Brocket, 'The Structure of Political Opportunities and Peasant Mobilization in Central America,' *Comparative Politics* 23 (April 1991): 254.
- 8 Here are my definitions of the state, state makers, and state formation: I will define the state as 'essentially an organization of domination over other societal organizations inside the territory through its predominant capabilities of coercion and extraction, coupled with competing (or war making) capability with other states outside the territory'; state makers as 'a group of people who exclusively seek the monopoly of authority by removing or neutralizing competing authorities within a certain territory'; and state formation as 'the processes in which state makers seek domination over a population by eliminating or neutralizing rivals inside the territories.' These Weberian definitions contain minimum defining values for the conceptualization of the state, state makers, and state formation, but they will provide a conceptual tool for the examination of the process of North Korean state formation and the explanation of the Korean War.
- 9 It is known that Kim Il Sung expressed his intention to Joseph Stalin to conquer the South after the founding of the People's Republic of China was proclaimed. See T.F. Shtykov's report of September 15, 1949 to Stalin regarding the political, economic, and military situations of both South and North Korea, in which the ideas and interests of Kim Il Sung to unify Korea was conveyed, and Shtykov's top secret report of January 19, 1950 to Vyshinsky in the 'Russian documents delivered by Boris Yeltsin to Kim Young sam regarding the Korean War.' Also see Ken'ei Shu, *Mo Takuto no chosen senso: Chugoku ga oryokko o wataru made (Mao Zedong's Korean War: Until China Crossed the Yalu River)* (Tokyo: Iwanami Shoten, 1991), p. 25; Myong Lim Park, *Han'gukjonjaengui Palbalgwa Kiwon (The Korean War: The Outbreak and Its Origins)*, Vol. I, pp.135-38.
- 10 Dean Acheson, 'Crisis in Asia - An Examination of United States Policy,' Speech delivered at the National Press Club, Washington, D.C., January 12, 1950.
- 11 See Shtykov's coded top secret telegram to Vyshinsky on March 24, 1950; Vyshinsky's coded top secret telegram of May 14, 1950 to the Soviet ambassador to the People's Republic of China in the 'Russian documents delivered by Boris Yeltsin to Kim Young sam regarding the Korean War.' Also see Weathersby, "Should We Fear This?," pp. 9-12; Kathryn Weathersby, 'Soviet Aims in Korea and the Origins of the Korean War, 1945-50: New Evidence from Russian Archives,' Cold War International History Project, Woodrow Wilson Center for Scholars, Working Paper No. 8, November 1993, p. 25; Sergey Radchenko and David Wolff, 'To the Summit via Proxy Summits: New Evidence from Soviet and Chinese Archives on

- Mao's Long March to Moscow, 1949,' Cold War International History Project, *Bulletin: Inside China's Cold War*, Issue 16 (Fall 2007/Winter 2008), pp. 105-12; Chu Yong bok, *Naega kyokkun choson chonjaeng (My Experience of the Korean War)* (Seoul: Koryowon, 1990), vol. 1, pp. 237-39; Haksoon Paik, *Kuggahyongsong Chonjaenguirosoui Han'gukjonjaeng (The Korean War as a State Formation War)*, pp. 35-41.
- 12 South Korean President and Commander in Chief Syngman Rhee delegated command and control authority of the South Korean army to General Douglas MacArthur, Commander of the United Nations Command, on July 14, 1950. In the case of North Korea, North Korea, and China created a unified Sino North Korean command in accordance with 'Sino Korean Bilateral Agreement Regarding the Establishment of Sino Korean Joint Command' in mid December 1950. Peng Dehuai, Commander of the Chinese Volunteer Army became the Commander and Political Commissioner of the unified command, while Kim Ung served as Vice Commander and Pak Il u as Vice Political Commissioner of the unified command. See Shen Zhihua, Translated by Dong Gil Kim and Jeffrey Becker, 'Sino North Korean Conflict and its Resolution during the Korean War,' in Cold War International History Project, *Bulletin*, Issue 14/15 (Winter 2003 Spring 2004), pp. 11-14.
 - 13 Agreement on Reconciliation, Nonaggression, and Exchange and Cooperation between the South and the North, Pyongyang, December 31, 1991.
 - 14 Treaty of Peace with Japan, San Francisco, September 8, 1951.
 - 15 The Joint Communiqué of the United States of America and the People's Republic of China, Shanghai, February 27, 1972.
 - 16 The Joint Communiqué on the Establishment of Diplomatic Relations, Washington, D.C. and Beijing, January 1, 1979.
 - 17 Address before a Joint Session of the Congress on the State of the Union, Washington, D.C., January 29, 2002.
 - 18 Behind the persistent avoidance of negotiated resolution of the North Korean nuclear crisis on the part of the Bush Administration was the alleged use of the United States of the North Korean nuclear and missile issues as excuses for securing a greater budget for Missile Defense in order to be prepared for an intensified rivalry with China in the coming years and decades. The neoconservatives and hardliners in the Bush Administration appear to have exaggerated the threat posed by North Korean missile and nuclear programmes for their hidden agenda of expanding Missile Defense, in effect victimizing North Korea and, by extension, the whole of Korea.
 - 19 Most of the ideas and arguments presented in this section earlier appeared in Haksoon Paik, 'North Korea's Choices for Survival and Prosperity since 1990s: Interplay between Politics and Economics,' *Sejong Policy Studies* 3, 2 (2007): 253 and Haksoon Paik, 'North Korea's Pursuit of Security and Economic Interests: Chasing Two Rabbits with One Stone,' in Haksoon Paik and Seong Chang Cheong, eds., *North Korea in Distress: Confronting Domestic and External Challenges* (Sungnam, Korea: The Sejong Institute, 2008), pp. 101-2, and are presented here in substantially the same form.
 - 20 The Agreed Framework between the United States of America and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Geneva, October 21, 1994.
 - 21 Paik, 'North Korea's Pursuit of Security and Economic Interests,' p. 115.
 - 22 US DPRK Joint Communiqué, Washington, D.C., October 12, 2000.
 - 23 Most of the ideas and arguments presented in this section earlier appeared in Paik, 'North Korea's Choices for Survival and Prosperity since 1990s,' pp. 258-63, pp. 277-84 and Paik, 'North Korea's Pursuit of Security and Economic Interests,' pp. 105-25, and are presented here in substantially the same form.
 - 24 Announcement of the North Korea Policy, The White House, June 6, 2001.

- 25 See the Agreed Framework, Article IV, Section 3.
- 26 Paik, 'North Korea's Pursuit of Security and Economic Interests,' p. 116.
- 27 Nuclear Posture Review Report, Submitted to the Congress on December 31, 2001, and leaked on January 8, 2002.
- 28 President Bush's idea of 'preemption' first appeared in his State of the Union Address, January 29, 2002: 'I will not wait on events while dangers gather. I will not stand by as peril draws closer and closer. The United States of America will not permit the world's most dangerous regimes to threaten us with the world's most destructive weapons.'
- 29 Japan DPRK Pyongyang Declaration, Pyongyang, September 17, 2002.
- 30 Paik, 'North Korea's Pursuit of Security and Economic Interests,' p. 105; Paik, 'North Korea's Choices for Survival and Prosperity since 1990s,' pp. 258-59.
- 31 Ibid.
- 32 Joint Statement of the Fourth Round of the Six Party Talks, Beijing, September 19, 2005.
- 33 Paik, 'North Korea's Pursuit of Security and Economic Interests,' p. 106.
- 34 Ibid.; Paik, 'North Korea's Choices for Survival and Prosperity since 1990s,' 281-82.
- 35 Paik, 'North Korea's Pursuit of Security and Economic Interests,' pp. 106-7; Haksoon Paik, 'North Korea's Choices for Survival and Prosperity since 1990s,' 282-83.
- 36 Paik, 'North Korea's Pursuit of Security and Economic Interests,' p. 124.
- 37 Initial Actions for the Implementation of the Joint Statement, Beijing, February 13, 2007.
- 38 The February 13 agreement promised North Korea economic, energy, and humanitarian assistance up to the equivalent of 1 million tons of heavy fuel oil (HFO), including the initial shipment equivalent to 50,000 tons of HFO.
- 39 See Robert Axelrod, *The Evolution of Cooperation* (New York: Basic Books, 1984), pp. 2-5.
- 40 Second Phase Actions for the Implementation of the September 2005 Joint Statement, Beijing, October 3, 2007.
- 41 Press Communiqué of the Heads of Delegation Meeting of the Sixth Round of the Six Party Talks, Beijing, July 12, 2008.

4 Regional fallout

Vietnam

Baladas Ghoshal

The most important fallout of the Cold War and the consequent superpower rivalry was that many Asian and African countries became pawns in their larger struggle for world dominance. Vietnam was seen initially by both the superpowers as unimportant, but because of its geographical location, it became crucial to both for the United States, first as a useful arms conduit to Chiang Kai Sheik's anti-Communist forces for furthering its policy in China in the 1930s, then in its competition with Japan for dominance in the Pacific, and finally in its increasingly strident anti-Communist crusade; and for the Soviet Union in its struggle against imperialism and in its desire to expand world Communism. The effect of the ideological rivalry of the superpowers had been quite debilitating for nation building and economic development of Vietnam.

In August of 1945, at the end of World War II, the nationalist movement of the Viet Minh, successor of the Indochinese Communist Party, seized power in Hanoi, Hue, and Saigon, for the Viet Minh had developed a military force and popular base during the Japanese occupation of Vietnam, and it quickly moved to secure political authority before the imminent arrival of the Allied powers. Emperor Bao Dai, the Japanese puppet, abdicated in late August, and on 2 September 1945, Viet Minh leader Ho Chi Minh declared Vietnam's independence as the democratic Republic of Vietnam. For eight years, Vietnam was a colonial battleground as France fought a nationalist movement led by Ho Chi Minh. This colonial war between the French Union's Expeditionary Corps and Ho Chi Minh's Viet Minh turned into a Cold War crisis in January 1950. The Viet Minh received support from the newly proclaimed Republic of China and the Soviet Union while France and the newly created Vietnamese National Army received support from the United States. Despite financial backing from the United States, the French lost control of Vietnam in 1954 after a Vietnamese force captured the French outpost at Dien Bien Phu. This war was significant in that it demonstrated that a western colonial power could be defeated by an indigenous revolutionary force. The Battle of Dien Bien Phu started on 13 March, and continued during the Conference held in Geneva to end the first Vietnam war. Its issue became a strategic turnover as both sides wanted to emerge as the victor in order to be in a favourable

position during the planned negotiations about 'the Indochinese problem'. After fighting for 57 days the besieged French garrison was overrun and all French central positions were captured by the Viet Minh.

On 27 April 1954, the Conference produced a declaration which supported the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Indochina thereby granting its independence from France. In addition, the Conference declaration agreed upon the cessation of hostilities and foreign involvement (or troops) in internal Indochina affairs. Northern and southern zones were drawn into which opposing troops were to withdraw, to facilitate the cessation of hostilities between the Vietnamese forces and those that had supported the French. Viet Minh units, having advanced to the far south while fighting the French, retreated from these positions, in accordance with the Agreement, to north of the ceasefire line, awaiting unification on the basis of internationally supervised free elections to be held in July 1956. Most of the French Union forces evacuated Vietnam, although much of the regional governmental infrastructure in the South was the same as it had been under the French administration. An International Control Commission was set up to oversee the implementation of the Geneva Accords, but it was basically powerless to ensure compliance. It was to consist of India, Canada, and Poland. The agreement was between Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, France, Laos, the People's Republic of China, the State of Vietnam, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom. The United States took note and acknowledged the agreement, but refused to sign it, relieving it from being legally bound to it.

The Geneva Agreement carefully worded the division of northern and southern Vietnam as a 'provisional military demarcation line', 'on either side of which the forces of the two parties shall be regrouped after their withdrawal'. To specifically put aside any notion that it was a partition, they further stated, in the Final Declaration, Article 6: 'The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Vietnam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary.' Then the US Under-Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith said, 'In connection with the statement in the Declaration concerning free elections in Vietnam, my government wishes to make clear its position which it has expressed in a Declaration made in Washington on 29 June 1954, as follows: 'In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek unity through free elections, supervised by the United Nations to ensure they are conducted fairly.'¹ The Geneva Conference therefore made only a provisional division of Vietnam at the 17th parallel, with control of the north given to the Viet Minh as the Democratic Republic of Vietnam under Ho Chi Minh, and the south becoming the State of Vietnam under Emperor Bao Dai. A year later, Bao Dai would be deposed by his prime minister, Ngo Dinh Diem, creating the Republic of Vietnam. Diem refused to hold the national elections, noting that the State of Vietnam never signed the Geneva Accord and went about attempting to crush all remnant of Communist opposition.

The prospect of democratic elections dwindling away led the South Vietnamese who opposed Diem to form the Communist National Liberation Front. Diem's refusal to enter into negotiations with North Vietnam about holding nationwide elections in 1956 would eventually lead to war breaking out again in South Vietnam in 1959 – the Second Indochina War. America also opposed the elections, fearing the communists would gain control. After the cessation of hostilities, a large migration took place. 450,000 people, mostly Catholics, moved to south of the Accords-mandated ceasefire line during Operation Passage to Freedom. The CIA attempted to further influence Catholic Vietnamese with slogans such as 'the Virgin Mary is moving South'. 52,000 people went north. Communist supporters were urged to remain in the south to vote in the proposed elections. Ho Chi Minh had accepted the division of the country in 1954 even while the Communists were in control over major parts of the country only on the promise of the elections, which by all accounts, if held, they were sure to win with an overwhelming majority. It was only after the refusal by Diem and actively supported by the United States to hold the elections that Ho Chi Minh decided to give up the peaceful path and opted for armed struggle to restore Vietnam's independence and unification. Until 1956 when Ho Chi Minh lost all hope of uniting the country through peaceful means, there had not been a single violation of the provisions of the Geneva Accord from the north of the country, whereas the southern government under Diem went on disrespecting most of them with gay abandon.

US President John F. Kennedy, after suffering a setback against the communists in Cuba and trying to control the crisis in Berlin, wanted to show the US resolve in Asia. He sent American military advisers to South Vietnam. Diem's attempts to control the Viet Cong grew more extreme and created growing discontent in South Vietnam. Several monks burned themselves to death as part of public protests against the Diem regime. A group of Diem's generals turned against him, possibly with the encouragement of the CIA, which by then found Diem to be more a liability than an asset. On 1 November 1963, they attacked the Presidential Palace with the understanding they had American support. By the next day, the government was overthrown and Diem was dead, murdered by his own soldiers. While the people of Saigon initially responded with enthusiasm to Diem's overthrow, the coup left the country with no clear leadership. Within weeks of Diem's murder, President Kennedy was assassinated.

Vice President Lyndon Johnson assumed office determined not to lose Vietnam to the Communists. He sent Defense Secretary Robert McNamara to South Vietnam to pledge continued US support for the war in Vietnam. In August 1964, the *USS Maddox*, an American destroyer on patrol in the Gulf of Tonkin, exchanged fire with North Vietnamese torpedo boats. Two days later, the ship's captain reported he was under attack again. Despite conflicting evidence, the Pentagon insisted there had been a second unprovoked attack. The incident prompted Johnson to push the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution through Congress. The measure allowed Johnson to wage war in Vietnam. Johnson

was convinced that without the support of a massive US force, South Vietnam was doomed. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara and National Security Adviser McGeorge Bundy declared that a full-scale air war against North Vietnam would depress the morale of the National Liberation Front. The bombing did just the opposite, however. The inability of the South Vietnamese Air Force (ARVN) to protect US air bases led Johnson's senior planners to the consensus that US combat forces would be required. On 8 March 1965, four months after Johnson was elected president by a landslide, 3500 US Marines landed at Da Nang. By the end of April, 56,000 other combat troops had joined them; by June the number had risen to 74,000. In response to the US troop build-up, North Vietnam began to send thousands of soldiers to fight in South Vietnam. In the Ia Drang valley in Vietnam's central highlands, the North Vietnamese and US armies met in the first major battle of the war. It was an American victory but US casualties were heavy. American GIs, meanwhile, found themselves in a baffling war. They were unable to distinguish friend from foe. American bombing and shelling drove tens of thousands of Vietnamese from their villages. American television networks kept a running tally of the US 'body count'.

Johnson attempted to force the North Vietnamese to the negotiating table by bombing North Vietnam including the Ho Chi Minh Trail, the primitive but highly effective supply line that linked North Vietnam with its fighters and supporters in the South. But the tactic failed. The growing scale and savagery of the war in Vietnam created growing dissent back in the United States. Johnson was politically weakened by the anti-war movement. In 1968, Communist forces launched wide-scale attacks throughout South Vietnam to coincide with Tet, the Vietnamese New Year. The strength of the offensive came as a shock to the American public and Johnson. He offered to begin peace talks with the North Vietnamese and announced he would not run for another term in office. In May 1968, peace talks began in Paris but soon became deadlocked. Richard Nixon, who had begun his campaign for the presidency, called for an 'honorable' end to US military involvement in Vietnam. But his campaign aides were secretly urging South Vietnamese officials not to strike a peace deal until after the election. The war was to last another four years, costing thousands more lives. Vietnam's charismatic nationalist leader Ho Chi Minh was determined to fight and win. 'We held off the French for eight years,' he told historian Bernard Fall in 1962. 'We can hold off the Americans for at least as long. Americans don't like long, inconclusive wars. This is going to be a long, inconclusive war.'

US Air Force planes bombed the peaceful cities and villages of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, destroying hospitals and schools; women, old people and children died at the hands of the aggressors. The number of bombs thrown on Vietnam was many more than the bombs that were dropped on Europe during the Second World War. One lesser known fact is that in 1967 Edward Landsdale, the top CIA operative in South East Asia, hatched a plan of poisoning the main water tank that supplied water to the city of Hanoi to

annihilate the entire population, but fortunately for the Vietnamese the mission did not succeed. The world became witness to a disastrous aspect of American imperialism and it is all recorded in the Pentagon papers. The United States dropped bombs containing poisonous substances that maimed not only many Vietnamese, but also affected the country's agriculture by turning many lands unsuitable for cultivation. The Vietnamese suffered due to the US's global design to defeat Communism and bring the people of the Third World under the influence of the so-called free world. The latter will always be remembered in history as a country that had committed aggression and inflicted unacceptable damage on Vietnam. A decade of American military involvement in Vietnam deeply divided public opinion in the United States and claimed the lives of over 57,000 US soldiers. Over 200,000 South Vietnamese soldiers perished in the conflict, and the Communist death toll exceeded 1 million. In addition, some 500,000 Vietnamese civilians were killed, many as a result of the massive US bombing campaign, which exceeded all the bombs dropped by both sides in the Second World War. After spending over \$150 billion in its effort to save South Vietnam from Communism, the United States finally and completely withdrew on 29 March 1973. American intervention in the Vietnam War came to a close with the Paris Accord of 1973, but the war did not end with it. Two years later, the forces of North Vietnam overwhelmed the Saigon government and finally unified the country. Shortly afterwards the National Liberation Front and the People's Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam were dissolved and the united Socialist Republic of Vietnam was proclaimed in 1976 fulfilling a long-cherished dream of an independent Vietnam free from centuries of foreign rule.

While the Vietnamese struggle against American imperialism and ideological domination is well known, the lesser known facts are the Soviet policies which at times sacrificed Vietnamese nationalist aspirations for its own national interests. The classic example of the Soviet treachery was their support for the division of Vietnam in the Geneva Conference in 1954 when in their objective of softening the French policy toward the newly formed NATO was eager to present the latter an honourable exit strategy from Vietnam and thus agreed to the division of the country at a time when more than three-fourths of Vietnam was under Communist control. If the Soviets had not persuaded the Vietnamese to participate in the Geneva Conference and the resultant division of the country, in all probability the whole of Vietnam would have come under the control of Ho Chi Minh's forces within a short while as the Communists were already on the march on the way to victory. Ho Chi Minh's famous statement to his colleagues after the Geneva Conference that 'I have signed my death warrant' testifies to the Soviet pressure on him for Vietnam's division, which was at the root of the country's sufferings in the period to follow under American occupation. For Vietnam and many other countries of the Third World, there was not one Cold War, but two, the other being the Sino-Soviet rivalry which also impacted on Vietnam's politics and military struggle during the late 1950s and 1960s. The saving grace out of the Vietnamese

sufferings due to superpower rivalry was their nationalism and indomitable energy and determination to fight against all foreign powers.

Vietnam's relations with China had always been turbulent throughout history, and its leaders believed that only a reunified Vietnam could maintain its entity in the shadow of Red China. More than 1,000 years of Vietnamese history were spent under direct Chinese domination, and most of the rest was devoted to fighting the Chinese off. Indeed, the very name Viet Nam in Chinese means 'cross over to the south'. However, the Chinese Communist Party had helped Ho Chi Minh to set up the forerunner of the Indo-Chinese Communist Party in 1930 and in the period of the struggle against the Americans, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam remained closely aligned with Mao's China up to the death of Ho Chi Minh in 1969. While Beijing had given large-scale support to North Vietnam during its struggle against the French and the Americans, China was not at all inclined toward seeing a United Vietnam on its southern frontier. Vietnam's relations with China underwent a major shift in reaction to the latter's détente with the United States in 1972, when Hanoi suspected that Beijing had abandoned Vietnam's cause in a deal with Washington over Indo-China. This ended a friendship between the Chinese and the Vietnamese Communist Parties. As a result, Beijing began to distance itself from Hanoi and, once the United States withdrew from Vietnam, China gave no further support for the unification of the country. Soon enough, conflict of interests began to develop between the two as they quarrelled over claims to islands in South China Sea and also on the issue of discrimination of ethnic Chinese in Vietnam. China occupied the Paracels in 1974 and the Spratlys in the following year bringing the two in direct confrontation with each other.

As relations with China soured, Vietnam began to move closer to Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, which came to Hanoi's rescue in the decisive months of the Vietnam War. In December 1975, Le Duan, the Vietnamese leader, was invited to Moscow and given a very warm reception. In the following year the two countries signed an agreement providing for immediate economic aid and long-term help in Vietnam's five year plans. In June 1978, one month before China withdrew the last of aid and technicians, Vietnam joined the Moscow-dominated trade bloc Council for Mutual Economic assistance (COMECON). Five months later, Vietnam signed a 25-year Treaty of Friendship with the Soviets forcing the Chinese to brand the newly found Soviet Vietnam entente as an attempt to encircle China on the southern frontier and accuse the Soviet Union of hegemony.

In the meantime, Vietnam's relations with Pol Pot's Kampuchea began to deteriorate, as the latter with the encouragement of China made a number of border incursions into the Vietnamese territory on the historical assumption that some areas of the present-day Vietnam were at one time parts of the Khmer Empire. These incursions escalated into fierce fighting, which eventually led to the Vietnamese invasion of Kampuchea in January 1979 and installation of the puppet government of Heng Samrin in Phnom Penh. China, obviously angry, proceeded to 'teach the Vietnamese a lesson' by launching an incursion

into the northern border zone of Vietnam in March 1979. Although the conflict was bitter and costly to both sides, the Chinese withdrew within a few weeks without forcing any concessions from Vietnam. The Chinese achieved nothing except to make the Vietnamese even more dependent on the Soviets without which it could not have sustained its occupation of Kampuchea. This became evident when Gorbachev came to power in the Soviet Union and soon began under economic pressure to curtail its overseas commitments, which eventually influenced Vietnam's decision to withdraw from Kampuchea in the late 1980s. The fallout of the Sino-Soviet rivalry and the second Cold War had again a major effect on Vietnam's internal developments as well as on its relations with its neighbours in the region. The ASEAN, with the active support of the United States and China, both of which wanted to bleed Vietnam white, had supported the Democratic People's Republic of Kampuchea (DPRK), and a coalition of anti-Vietnamese Parties together with Pol Pot, was able to isolate Vietnam in Southeast Asia. The diplomatic isolation together with the burden imposed by the occupation impacted heavily on Vietnam's economy and its diplomacy in the region. It almost became a pariah state in the region.

With the collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, Vietnam was able to come into its own. ASEAN welcomed Vietnam within its grouping. Taking a cue from China, Vietnam itself began to change by opening its economy to the outside world that facilitated its gradual rapprochement and normalization of relations with both the United States and China. Today Vietnam is not only the second fastest growing state after China, but its diplomatic relations with most countries in the region remain most cordial. It has shed its Cold War baggage and remains one of the most pragmatic nations in the world.

Note

- 1 All the quotations are taken from George McTurnan Kahin and John W. Lewis, *The United States in Vietnam: An analysis in depth of the history of America's involvement in Vietnam* (Delta Books, New York, 1967).

5 Afghanistan

During the Cold War

Amin Saikal

A curtain raiser

One consequence of the Cold War was that it brought a degree of power balance in Europe – what Sir Winston Churchill called the ‘balance of terror’ – which closed the continent as the major theatre of conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. This produced a period known, in John Lewis Gaddis’s words, as ‘the long peace’ in the North.

However, this long peace was paralleled by a ‘long war’ in the South. The long war started with the Korean conflict and perhaps ended with the first Gulf War of 1991 over the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. Since the Korean War, the Middle East has been an armed conflict-ridden area of the world. After World War II, the Middle East was rapidly transformed into a crucial zone of major power rivalry. The process did not begin with a direct show of force by the Soviets, leaving their subsequent invasion of Afghanistan aside for the moment. It rather commenced with the US strategy of putting a ring of containment around the Soviet Union. One of the major objectives of the policy of containment was to foil any attempt by the USSR to gain a strategic foothold in the Middle East, to secure access to the oil riches of the region and of course from the mid-1950s to prevent the Soviets from causing any serious threat by proxy to the state of Israel as the strategic partner of the United States.

The United States adopted a two-pronged strategic approach to achieving its goal of containment. One was to penetrate a number of key Muslim states; another was to use brute force whenever necessary. As part of the first prong, the United States set out to forge a close alliance with Saudi Arabia. The groundwork for this alliance was laid down in the 1945 meeting between King Abdul Aziz of Saudi Arabia and President Franklin D. Roosevelt, based on the US promise to provide protection for the theocratic rule of the Ibn Saudi family against Abdulaziz’s ruling cousins in Iraq and Jordan, and the Saudi promise to ensure an uninterrupted flow of oil to the West. In a similar vein, the United States also penetrated Jordan, Turkey and Pakistan. It is important to note that in the case of each intervention, the United States also germinated the seeds for a blowback. As part of the second prong, the United

States intervened in Iran in 1953. In perhaps the most successful covert operation of the Cold War, the CIA toppled the elected reformist government of Prime Minister Mohammad Mossadeq and reinstalled the pro-Western Shah's regime to rule Iran from that point onwards at the behest of the United States. This confirmed Iran's position as an anti-communist state. The US intervention was resented by a great majority of the Iranian people and opposed by many regional states. The blowback came a quarter of a century later in the form of the 1978-79 Revolution, as most of the Iranian people could not regard the Shah's regime as legitimate and could not support the continued US Iranian alliance.

This was followed by the US intervention in Lebanon in 1958 in support of the country's Christian President Camille Chamoun, who wanted an extension of his term of office. In doing so, the US placed itself in opposition to the Nasserite radical Arab rationalism, which Washington saw as a smoke screen for international Communism. In addition, the United States not only backed Israel in the 1967 war, but also intervened in Lebanon again in the wake of the 1982 Israeli invasion of the country. The objective was to bail Israel out of a conflict that it had started but in which it had become bogged down. Although the American intervention was short lived, it contributed substantially to the germination and growth of the Lebanese Hezbollah (Party of God) as an Iranian backed, anti-Israel and anti-US Shi'ite force. Hezbollah grew to become a major challenge to Israel and the United States in the region. The result of all this was a rise in anti-Americanism among the Arabs and Muslims in the region.

Beyond this, the United States played a critical role in the Iran Iraq war of 1980-88, which proved to be the longest, bloodiest and most costly war ever fought in the modern history of the Middle East. The purpose was to promote Saddam Hussein's dictatorship as an Arab bulwark against Khomeini's Islamic Iran. The drawback of this was that Saddam Hussein grew so confident that after the war with Iran he could threaten Israel and invade Kuwait. Further, the United States allied itself with radical Islamism in Pakistan and Afghanistan to back a jihad against the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in the 1980s. The overriding goal was to defeat Soviet Communism, but at the cost of contributing to the eventual generation of radical Islamist forces which have now grown to challenge the United States in an unprecedented fashion.

The US has now found it necessary to shift this strategy to fight radical Islamism in order to eliminate it or marginalize it in world politics within the strategy of the so-called 'war on terror'. The Soviet Union has gone, but the US's 'long war' of the Cold War era continues in the Middle East and West Asia.

In Afghanistan, domestic and foreign policy outlooks were influenced by the onset of the Cold War in ways that eventually created the conditions for the rise of Communism and radical Islamism in its politics. The US Soviet Cold War rivalry laid the groundwork for the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in late December 1979, and this may not have materialized had it not been for the US policy of containment of the USSR and the Soviet responses to this.

By the same token, the Muslim extremism that has increasingly come to affect the Muslim world's relations with the US in recent years may not have emerged without the dynamics of the Cold War, particularly after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.

Preoccupied by the desire to draw the USSR into a long and costly war in Afghanistan, the US could not see that its support for the Mujahideen in opposition to Soviet forces in Afghanistan could some day prove counter-productive to its global security objectives. Its abandonment of Afghanistan following the Soviet defeat exacerbated the social and political conditions whereby the Taliban could seize power in Kabul, an event which would prove fateful when the Taliban-supported Al Qaeda organization became an extreme Islamist threat to America towards the end of the twentieth century. There is thus an important link between Afghanistan's role as a theatre of conflict in the Cold War, and the current US posture towards Muslim extremism, which helps to illuminate the long term effects of the Cold War period.

Afghanistan in 1946

At the outset of the Cold War by the late 1940s, Afghanistan was an independent Muslim state, going through a very gradual process of national development. Ruled by a traditional monarchy, it was landlocked, and poor in both human and natural resources, with a heterogeneous social structure in which a weak state functioned in dynamic relationships with strong micro-societies, dominated by the Sunni sect of Islam.

Afghanistan's ruling elite seemed to be aware of the need to maintain a balance between the western powers and the Soviet Union in it, foreign relations, as well as between what was required in terms of secular change and what could be accommodated within certain limits set by the religion of Islam on the domestic front.¹ It also appeared to be conscious of Afghanistan's long border and extensive cross-border ethnic ties with the Soviet Union and the part that this would play in Afghanistan's foreign and domestic policy. In addition, it had learnt from the fact that Afghanistan had been subjected to pressures arising from Anglo-Russian rivalry in the past, and the role that this had played in shaping Afghanistan's relations with foreign powers in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.²

In an attempt to neutralize the influence of any one foreign power, the Afghan leadership found it imperative to foster a nationalist ideology that emphasized the sanctity of religion and traditions. This was balanced by the promotion of a pro-secular type of national politics and development, and foreign policy positions that upheld neutrality in world politics as most conducive to avoiding complications with the Soviet Union, and at the same time to remaining receptive to good relations with the US as a distant power and potential source of aid.

In 1953, however, two separate developments came to upset this setting. The first was a change in the composition of the Afghan leadership, as a

result of which Afghanistan was subjected to a speedy process of change. The second was the death of the Soviet leader, Josef Stalin, which led to a different foreign policy approach on the part of the USSR, affecting the shape of Soviet American relations. These events, more than anything else, made Afghanistan vulnerable to Soviet influence, and in doing so they opened up the space for radical political Islam to rise in the region and beyond in the long run.

Afghanistan's transformation 1953–1978

The official Head of State of Afghanistan in the period 1933–53 was King Mohammad Zahir, a member of the Mohammadzai-e royal family. However, during this period the country was really governed by his two uncles, Mohammed Hashem Khan and Shah Mahmoud Khan. They served as Afghanistan's prime ministers from 1933 to 1946 and 1946 to 1953 respectively. In 1953, amid a climate of post-World War II pressures to modernize and a potential border dispute with the newly created Islamic state of Pakistan, the King struck an informal power deal with his senior cousin, Mohammed Daoud, in order to clear the way for the younger generation in the royal family to lead Afghanistan. Under the deal, power would be shared between the two, with the King free to exercise his constitutional powers, and Daoud to act as prime minister to pursue an aggressive agenda of national unity building and modernization in Afghanistan.

However, the deal did not last very long. Zahir and Daoud, who came from two rival branches of the royal family, were not destined to work well together. Once Daoud assumed power, he ignored his promise to the King and established himself as the *de facto* ruler in his own right. He brought three main objectives to his role as leader. In the first place, he wanted to centralize power in order to pursue a state-driven mode of accelerated modernization. Second, he wanted to renegotiate the Afghan–Pakistan border, the infamous Durand Line, which had been established by the British in 1893, without any consultation with the then Afghan government. Third, he wanted to foster a concept of nationalism centred on ethnic Pashtun identity. The Pashtuns, constituting about 43 per cent of the Afghan population, had historically ruled Afghanistan and had their kindred across the border with Pakistan. Daoud wanted to present the Pashtuns as the core cluster in Afghanistan, around which he could strengthen Afghanistan's national unity and the country's position in relation to Pakistan. Pursuant to this, he set out to support the right of Pashtuns on the Pakistani side of the border to self-determination within a political and territorial entity that Kabul called 'Pashtunistan'.³ Daoud hoped that the creation of 'Pashtunistan' would also enable Afghanistan to secure access to international waters and thus give the landlocked Afghanistan a coastal port.

Daoud knew he would need massive foreign economic and military assistance to achieve these goals. Appealing to the Soviet Union was one option. However, Daoud had no particular interest in Marxism-Leninism as an ideology and was conscious of the lack of conditions for a leftist revolution in

Afghanistan as well as the incompatibility between Islam and Soviet Communism.⁴ In addition, he was fully cognizant of the need to maintain balanced foreign relations and the threat that too close a relationship with the Soviet Union would pose to this objective. While formally upholding Afghanistan's traditional foreign policy of neutrality, he first approached Washington in 1953-54 for economic and military aid and mediation in the Afghan-Pakistan border dispute. To Daoud's chagrin, however, Washington turned down his request, especially for military aid, as it regarded Afghanistan as far less strategically important than two of its neighbours, Iran and Pakistan, and believed that 'no amount of military aid' could make Afghanistan 'secure against a determined Soviet attack'.⁵ Deeply offended by this rejection, Daoud turned to the USSR for help. The post-Stalin Soviet government welcomed Daoud's request and thus began the USSR's generous programme of military and economic assistance to Afghanistan which amounted to about \$2.5 billion between 1955 and 1978.⁶ Soviet support was not limited to financial and military aid; Moscow also subsequently backed Afghanistan in its dispute with Pakistan, in contrast to the United States. Indeed, the United States's open support of Pakistan, as well as Iran and Turkey, played a central role in the USSR's decision to assist Afghanistan as a counter to US bases in the region. Moscow hoped to create a centre for Soviet influence in the region, while projecting the appearance of peaceful coexistence with their neighbours. By the turn of the 1960s, the Soviets had armed and trained the Afghan armed forces and contributed considerably to the development of the Afghan economic and administrative spheres. At the same time, hundreds of Soviet advisors were stationed at different military and civilian levels in Afghanistan.⁷ Many young Afghans were sent to the USSR to be trained in military and civil fields; some were so impressed and indoctrinated by the Soviet Union that they agreed to work for the KGB when they returned to their home country. When Washington once again turned down an Afghan request in 1961 to mediate between Afghanistan and Pakistan in their rapidly intensifying border dispute, Moscow stepped up its support for Afghanistan.

While Daoud remained unconcerned by the threat this increasing Soviet influence posed to Afghanistan, the King and members of the nascent Afghan intelligentsia began to feel uneasy. They were not the only ones. Washington too began to worry that their neglect of Afghanistan had left the door open for the Soviet Union to gain a foothold in the region. As a result, it too provided a programme of economic assistance to Daoud's government in an attempt to counter Soviet influence. However, the US economic aid from the mid-1950s to the late 1970s amounted to only \$540 million, which could not negate the massive Soviet investment in the Afghan military.

The pressure of worsening Afghan-Pakistan relations forced Daoud to resign in 1963, as border skirmishes with Pakistan led the latter to close the Afghan transit route, at great economic disadvantage to Afghanistan. Daoud resigned on an understanding that King Zahir would engage in rapid democratization, through which Daoud expected to be elected back to power.

However, the King, wary of his cousin's ambitions, appointed a loyal technocrat, Mohammad Yusouf as prime minister. The King endorsed a clause in the new constitution of 1964 that banned all members of the royal family from holding senior government positions.⁸

The whole democratization drive soon turned out to be a mere facade. The three non-partisan but unruly parliaments which it produced were largely disconnected from the executive branch. Nonetheless, the period 1963-73, which has been dubbed the era of 'experiment with democracy' bore some long term consequences for Afghan political development, most importantly the development of a number of oppositional clusters which became operational informally within and outside the parliament. Three of these clusters turned out to be most influential.

The first was the cluster of Communist groups, which included most prominently two rival pro-Soviet factions: *Parcham* (Banner) and *Khalq* (Masses).⁹ The two factions were formed in the mid-1960s and represented two different ethno-linguist groups. *Parcham* was made up largely of Dari-speaking, urbanized Afghans, some of whom had been educated in the USSR. It was Kabul-based and led by Babrak Karmal, who was to go on to be the third, but Soviet-installed, Communist President of Afghanistan from 1980 to 1986. *Parcham's* stated goal was the reformation of the Afghan monarchy in a way that would bring about a bourgeois revolution; it did not believe that Afghanistan was yet ready for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Karmal had developed an underground relationship with Moscow in the 1950s, but had also managed to foster the patronage of Daoud, who used him in his rivalry with King Zahir.

Parcham's focus stood in contrast to that of the other prominent communist faction, *Khalq*. Ethnically, *Khalq* was largely made up of Pashto-speaking Afghans, many of whom had rural backgrounds. Some of them too had been trained in the Soviet Union, but unlike the members of *Parcham*, they agitated for an immediate proletarian revolution. The *Khalq* was led by a self-styled revolutionary, Noor Mohammed Taraki, and his US-educated and politically cunning deputy, Hafizullah Amin. These two men would go on to become the first and second Communist presidents of Afghanistan, with the support of the Soviet Union.

While neither of these factions attracted more than a few hundred core members, their influence was somewhat consolidated in 1966 when they forged an alliance within the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA). However, their ideological and personality differences soon led to a split between them; *Khalq* considered the members of *Parcham* part of the Afghan establishment as a result of Karmal's connection to Daoud. The government, in the meantime, never really perceived them as a threat, due to their own good relations with the Soviet Union and the lack of appropriate conditions for revolution in Afghanistan.

At the same time, a cluster of Islamists was also developing in opposition to the Communists and the government. In the early 1960s, a number of

Afghans who had been educated at Al-Azhar University in Cairo (a historical centre of Islamic learning, which at the time was a hotbed for the activities of the radical Islamist movement of the Muslim Brotherhood) coalesced at the Faculty of Theology at Kabul University.¹⁰ Some of their most prominent figures included Burhanuddin Rabbani, later the leader of an Islamist resistance group (Mujahideen) to the Soviet occupation in the 1980s and then the president of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan between 1992 and 2001, and Abdurrasul Sayyaf, who too subsequently headed an Islamist resistance group before joining the Rabbani government. By the mid-1960s, these Islamists founded the *Jamiat-i Islami Afghanistan* (the Islamic Society of Afghanistan), which was accompanied by the formation of another organization called the Afghan Islamic Youth Movement. A founding member of the latter was Ahmad Shah Massoud, who would subsequently emerge as a hero of the Islamic resistance to Soviet occupation. These groups aimed to bring about an Islamic transformation of Afghanistan. Despite their common ideological goal, however, they were not immune to factional infighting, such as between Massoud and Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, an original member of *Jamiat-i Islami* who later splintered from the group and formed his own Mujahideen group of *Hezb-i Islami* (Islamic Party) under the patronage of Pakistan's Inter-Services Intelligence Agency (ISI).

The third and final oppositional cluster of importance was the Daoudist network, which worked for the return of Daoud to power. The Daoudists were essentially opportunists, acting to make the constitutional governments unworkable. They had their agents in the government and worked hard within and outside the parliament, forming political alliances with whoever possible to foster political instability.¹¹

Despite their lack of an ideological programme, it was the Daoudists who finally succeeded in overthrowing the King and setting Afghanistan on the course leading to the Soviet invasion of the country in December 1979. In July 1973, while the King was on a visit to Rome, Daoud enacted a successful bloodless coup with the help of the members of *Parcham* who were in the armed forces. He declared Afghanistan a Republic and condemned Zahir Shah's democratic phase as fraudulent, pledging to bring genuine democracy to Afghanistan. He singled out Pakistan as the only country with which Afghanistan had a major political dispute, stressed Afghanistan's support for the right to self-determination of the people of 'Pashtunistan', and affirmed Afghanistan's ultimate nonalignment and friendly relations with the Soviet Union.¹² At the same time he enacted repressive political measures, suspending the constitution and banning all political activities. *Parchami* supporters were rewarded for their support of the new leader either by employment in the bureaucracy, or by being dispatched to the provinces to spread their brand of enlightenment and progress. Daoud, an autocratic nationalist modernizer, was fiercely opposed to the Islamists whom he considered a 'black reaction'. Once in power he launched a violent campaign against them with the help of the *Parchamis*.

By 1975, however, once he had consolidated power, Daoud sought to reduce his dependence on the *Parchamis* and the Soviet Union. For this, he found it expedient to stabilize relations with Pakistan by playing down the importance of 'Pashtunistan', previously a central pillar of his political outlook. He also sought closer ties with the Shah's regime in oil-rich Iran, which he hoped could provide the financial aid he needed to modernize Afghanistan without too much reliance on the USSR. In addition, he tried to forge better relations with oil-rich Saudi Arabia and Libya as well as Egypt (whose leader, Anwar al-Sadat, was a fierce critic of the Soviet Union). In this way, Daoud believed he could endear himself to the US. Indeed, the US ambassador to Afghanistan in 1975 wrote approvingly of Daoud's move away 'from pro-Soviet leftists and their patron power'.¹³ In June 1976, Daoud dispatched his brother, Mohammad Naim, as special emissary to Washington where he sought support for the Afghan leader's domestic and foreign policy changes. However, Washington again rebuffed Daoud; the best Secretary of State Henry Kissinger could do was to advise Naim to turn to the Shah as the main regional bulwark against Soviet communism.¹⁴

Daoud nonetheless continued with his planned changes. This could not but provoke the Soviets. In 1977, Leonid Brezhnev invited Daoud to Moscow where he ordered the Afghan leader to dismiss all non-Soviet specialists and advisors. Daoud responded by giving the Soviet leader a 'formidable dressing down' in front of his colleagues.¹⁵ Incensed by the behaviour of a leader it had previously supported, Moscow urged the *Parchamis* and the *Khalqs* to prepare to counter Daoud, through a re-formation of the PDPA. By 1978, the PDPA was demonstrating in the streets of Kabul, a move which prompted Daoud to arrest most of its leaders. This was, however, only the prelude to a bloody but ultimately successful Communist coup on 27 April 1978, which brought the PDPA to power.

While the Soviet Union may have known about the coup before it occurred, it has now been established that they had no direct hand in it.¹⁶ Nonetheless, it cannot be denied that its outcome was a favourable one for Soviet interests in the region. The PDPA leadership declared Afghanistan a Democratic Republic with close ties to its northern neighbour. The stage was thus set for direct Soviet involvement in Afghanistan which would continue for over a decade.

The PDPA in power

The new PDPA government included Noor Mohammed Taraki as President, Babrak Karmal as Vice President and Second Deputy Prime Minister, and Hafizullah Amin as First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs. The Soviet government declared full support for it. However, the PDPA was not equipped to govern Afghanistan. It lacked popular support, ideological basis among the people, historical precedent, political legitimacy and experience.¹⁷ In addition, it was beset by fierce factional infighting. Wholly dependent on the Soviet Union for aid (which was readily given), the

PDPA leadership raised the ire of the US and neighbours such as Iran and Pakistan. The US and its allies could do little to counter the Soviet influence in Afghanistan. Committed to a policy of détente with the USSR, the Carter administration was reluctant to interfere, while the Shah's regime in Iran was about to face popular unrest, proving incapable of fulfilling its allotted role under the Nixon doctrine to look after Iranian and American interests in the region. The Pakistani government, on the other hand, was in a position to challenge the power of the PDPA. It was pursuing, under General Zia ul-Haq's dictatorship, a policy of re-Islamization, and was keen to help the Afghan Islamists. The ISI had already cultivated figures like Hekmatyar, through whom they hoped to bring about a pro-Pakistan Islamic takeover of Afghanistan.

Nonetheless, it was not so much external pressure as internal factional fights which fatally weakened the PDPA regime. Within two months of their coup, the *Khalqis* had sidelined the *Parchamis*, getting rid of Karmal and some of his top lieutenants by sending them abroad as ambassadors and then dismissing them on charges of embezzling embassy funds. At the same time, the *Khalqis* were imposing excessive and often violent Stalinist policies on a reluctant Afghan population, engendering resentment and resistance rather than the support they truly needed.¹⁸ Such heavy-handed behaviour sparked Islamic uprisings in many parts of the country. Rapidly falling apart, the PDPA leadership requested further Soviet assistance, in particular combat troops, to strengthen their weakening grip on power.

Prudently, Moscow at first balked at committing Soviet troops fearing that it would antagonize the Afghan people and damage Soviet international standing. However, events among the PDPA leadership rapidly changed the Kremlin's mind. Amin killed Taraki and claimed the Afghan leadership for his own in September 1979, sparking the distrust of the Soviet Politburo. Aware of his vulnerability, Amin sought to counter possible Soviet disapproval of his actions by courting the support of the US and such Mujahideen leaders as Hekmatyar.

The Soviets were suddenly faced with the dilemma of whether to invade Afghanistan and save the PDPA rule, or to wait for the PDPA regime to fall of its own accord. The Soviets were aware, however, that the latter option may leave Afghanistan open to Islamic rule which could pose unacceptable threats to Soviet interests in Central Asia, particularly in the light of similar Islamist regimes in Iran and Pakistan. As a result, Brezhnev and his leadership made the fateful decision to invade, embroiling themselves in a war which would ultimately undermine the continued viability of the Soviet Union as a whole.

The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan

In late December 1979, Soviet forces rolled into Afghanistan, occupying Kabul as well as taking control of the main lines of communication and the border entries. Amin and his colleagues were killed, and Karmal, until this point safe in exile in the USSR, was brought back to Afghanistan to head a

new PDPA government. This time the government was to be dominated by the *Parchamis* rather than the unpopular *Khalqis*. Moscow did not foresee a long combat engagement in Afghanistan and justified its invasion to the international community by claiming it had sent a small contingent of soldiers over the border at the invitation of the PDPA which was threatened by counter-revolutionary forces.¹⁹ However, neither the Afghan people nor the international community accepted this excuse, and the only regional country to side with the Soviets was India, primarily to counter its fierce rival, Pakistan.

The actions of the Soviets shocked the international community, which had not seen such Soviet aggression outside of the Warsaw Pact countries since World War II. Washington felt betrayed as it seemed that all its efforts to maintain *détente* had been wasted, and the Muslim world became alarmed at the apparently expansionist intentions of Soviet Communism.²⁰ China also considered its regional interests threatened, particularly in the light of the Soviet backed Vietnamese invasion of Cambodia the previous year.²¹

Resistance and counter-intervention

President Jimmy Carter condemned the Soviet action, announced the policy of *détente* obsolete, and branded the invasion a serious threat to regional stability and free flow of oil from the Gulf. The US National Security Advisor, Zbigniew Brzezinski, argued that the invasion had now provided the US with the necessary pretext to turn Afghanistan into a Soviet Vietnam and thus make the Soviet Union bleed through the cost of an unwinnable war.²² Washington formulated a strategy of counter-intervention, opposing the Soviet invasion, and maintaining the overall American policy of containment.

The US counter-intervention strategy came to have four main aspects, which aimed at preventing the Soviets from achieving success in Afghanistan. The first, in accordance with the 'Carter Doctrine', sought to warn the USSR against any attempt at expansion beyond Afghanistan and thus prevent any threat to American interests. It warned in particular against expansion into the Persian Gulf, which the US threatened to repel by any means (including nuclear weapons). The second focused on a US diplomatic and propaganda campaign to counter any Soviet attempts to sell their invasion internationally. The third, in the absence of any possibility of Iranian support in the wake of the Iranian Revolution under the strongly anti-US Ayatollah Khomeini, aimed at renewing America's alliance with Pakistan. Washington dropped US sanctions against General Zia ul-Haq's government, despite its avowed commitment to human rights and democracy, and sought to engage Pakistan as an ally to rebuff the Soviet forces in Afghanistan. The fourth focussed on the deployment of Islam by Afghans and their Muslim supporters as an ideology of resistance, and provided material and human support to those who waged a *jihad* (holy war) against the USSR in Afghanistan.²³

At first General Zia ul-Haq rejected the US offer of \$400 million in economic and military assistance as insufficient in return for allied status in the

war against the Soviets. This move proved to be prudent, as soon more was forthcoming after the election of Ronald Reagan as US President. Reagan had campaigned on a strong platform of anti-Soviet policies, and made opposition to the Soviets in Afghanistan a high priority upon his election. Soon he promised Pakistan \$3.2 billion aid over 6 years in exchange for their support in the fight against the USSR, and forged an alliance between the CIA and the ISI which were then put in charge of Pakistan's Afghanistan and Kashmir policies from the early 1980s. Pakistan was now sufficiently funded to organize a major campaign against the Soviets, and the border city of Peshawar soon became the centre from where the Mujahideen resistance would be coordinated. Seven main Mujahideen groups operated out of Peshawar, and claimed to represent the 80 per cent Sunni Muslim population of Afghanistan. Some smaller Shi'ite Muslim groups also developed in opposition to the Soviets, basing themselves in Iran, but it was those operating from across the border in Pakistan which had both the numbers and the local support within Afghanistan itself. The seven main Mujahideen groups were divided along personality, ethnic, tribal, linguistic and political lines. However, they all deployed Islam as an ideology of resistance and claimed a unity of purpose and action, with some more radical in their ideological position than others.²⁴

While three of these groups supported the restoration of Zahir Shah, the others opposed the monarchy and fought instead for a free, independent Islamic Afghanistan. In the latter category, two soon emerged as dominant; Hekmatyar's *Hezb-i Islami*, which was largely Pashtun based, and Massoud's *Jamiat-i Islami*, which was largely non-Pashtun. Hekmatyar professed a radical and militant interpretation of Islam, and was supported by Pakistan's ISI. In contrast, Massoud proved to be an independent-minded and moderate Islamist and nationalist, and managed to gather a fierce group of supporters, turning his native Panjshir valley, 60 miles north of Kabul, into a stronghold of resistance during the war.

However, it was Hekmatyar who received the lion's share of American assistance resources. The CIA was the supplier and co-ordinator of this aid, while the ISI distributed the assistance to the Mujahideen, and both organizations managed a network of volunteers from the Muslim world in support of the Afghan resistance. It was through this network of volunteers that Osama Bin Laden joined the Afghan jihad against the Soviets. The ISI was also busy training Pakistani jihadi who would fight not only in Afghanistan, but also in Kashmir, and for this purpose the ISI used funding coming from Saudi Arabia and the US to foster a range of Islamic madrasas (schools) whose students were recruited from amongst Pakistanis and Afghan refugees in Pakistan. These students were taught the tenets of jihad and prepared to defend their religion in whatever way needed.

In the end, three important factors caused the Soviets to fail in Afghanistan, and helped the Mujahideen (and their international backers) achieve victory. The first was the failure of the Soviet Union to win any significant support on the ground in Afghanistan, or in the international community.

This ensured that there were always international backers to help the Mujahideen, most notably, of course, the United States, which were committed to ensuring the conflict in Afghanistan would in the end help them defeat Soviet Communism. Their efforts were particularly productive from 1986 when they began to provide the Mujahideen fighters with shoulder-fired Stinger and Blowpipe missiles, greatly diminishing the effectiveness of previously powerful Soviet air attacks. As the cost of the war to the Soviets increased dramatically, Moscow began to realize that it was involved in a losing war.

Second, the Soviets failed to build an effective government in Afghanistan. The Soviets could never achieve party unity with the PDPA. Babrak Karmal proved unpopular and incompetent. Moscow attempted to fix this problem by engineering the government takeover by Afghan Secret Police leader Najibullah; however, he brought little real change to the leadership. Although Najibullah tried to promote party solidarity and 'national reconciliation', he could do little to quell the factional infighting in the PDPA or convince the Mujahideen to side with his government.

It was not only in Kabul that leadership challenges were influencing the outcome of the Afghan war. The third and final factor which weakened the Soviet effort was a leadership change in Moscow itself, with the accession of Mikhail Gorbachev in 1985. Gorbachev realized the politically and economically stagnant nature of the state he ruled, and saw the war in Afghanistan as a 'bleeding wound' which could fatally weaken the USSR.²⁵ He attempted to broker a settlement of the conflict with Reagan in October 1986, at the Reykjavik Summit, but Reagan stood firm in his demand for a complete Soviet withdrawal, undermining plans for a compromise and earlier Soviet withdrawal.

Despite this setback, by 1987, Gorbachev was engaged in intensive peace-making efforts to prepare the ground for a Soviet troop withdrawal. He commenced negotiations with the Mujahideen while increasing Soviet contact with Islamabad, Teheran and Riyadh. His aim was to convince the Mujahideen to enter into a power-sharing agreement with the PDPA, thereby avoiding a complete loss of Soviet influence in Kabul. In addition, he turned to UN peace mediation, previously blocked by Soviet intransigence, while strengthening the defences of the PDPA regime as a prelude to the withdrawal of Soviet troops.

Gorbachev's negotiations with the Mujahideen and their regional supporters proved fruitless. He was, however, more successful with the UN approach, with the result that the Afghan Geneva Peace Accords were signed on 14 April 1988 between the PDPA government and Pakistan, co-guaranteed by the USSR and the US. These accords did not provide immediate peace, or even a ceasefire, but they helped the Soviets to withdraw.²⁶ As the Soviet forces pulled out by May 1989, the PDPA rule managed to survive for another three years, largely because of continued non-combat Soviet support and in-fighting within the Mujahideen, who began to disintegrate as a cohesive unit soon after the Soviet pullout. With the break-up of the Soviet Union in 1991, the PDPA finally lost its chance of survival, and Massoud's forces took over Kabul in 1992, declaring Afghanistan an Islamic Republic.

The Islamic republic of Afghanistan

Pakistan opposed the Mujahideen Islamic government which came into existence under the leadership of Rabbani and Massoud, preferring instead the more receptive Hekmatyar who it believed would represent Pakistani interests in Kabul. However, when Hekmatyar proved incapable of toppling the Rabbani-Massoud government in Kabul, the ISI began to look for an alternative force. It organized a new Pashtun-dominated militia, the Taliban (religious students) to achieve Pakistan's objectives. The Taliban were a radical Sunni extremist group, who claimed religious superiority over all other Islamic forces in Afghanistan, notably Mujahideen groups like the one lead by Rabbani and Massoud. The Taliban began to make an impact in Afghanistan in 1994; by 1996 they had taken Kabul and installed themselves as the Afghan government.²⁷ Massoud fled to the Panjshir valley where he and supporters regrouped and formed an alliance in an attempt to challenge the Taliban and their backers, Pakistan.

Washington, like most of Afghanistan's regional neighbours, could not embrace the Taliban government. However, having achieved its objective of fatally weakening the USSR, it showed little interest in the post-Communist transition of Afghanistan, and was quite happy to leave the country to the predatory behaviour of its neighbours, especially Pakistan. This approach, however, came back to haunt the US over the course of the following decade. Shortly after the Taliban takeover of Kabul, the ISI allowed the return of Osama Bin Laden, who was joined in 1997 by Ayman Al-Zawahiri, a prominent Egyptian leader of *jihad* who brought new volunteers to Bin Laden's cause. In the meantime, the Taliban turned Afghanistan into a centre of international terrorism, allowing Al Qaeda to base itself in the country, from which Bin Laden masterminded the attacks of 11 September 2001. While the US's response to these attacks involved the toppling of the Taliban as leaders of Afghanistan in 2001 and the launching of an internationally backed 'war on terror', the Taliban and Al Qaeda have survived in Pakistan, where they continue to fight and pose a threat to US interests in the region.

Conclusion

Afghanistan has been a classic victim of the vagaries of the Cold War, whose effects have continued to shape the country's destiny in one form or another to the present day. Although the standard narrative of the Cold War locates its end in 1991 with the disintegration of the Soviet Union, Afghanistan has moved from one crisis to another since then as a long-term consequence of the Cold War phenomenon. Today the fate of the country is in the balance. It is caught between the forces of democratization, backed by the US and its allies as part of a strategy of marginalizing the radical political forces of Islam in world politics, and the forces of radical Islamism, which seek to throw the US out of Afghanistan and for that matter the Muslim world. The outcome of

this struggle, as a by-product of the Cold War, will determine the fate of Afghanistan and its region in the coming years and decades. This struggle, like the Cold War, is likely to last for generations, and in the meantime the Afghan people have much more hardship to endure.

Notes

- 1 For a detailed discussion, see Vartan Gregorian, *The Emergence of Modern Afghanistan: Politics of Reform and Modernization, 1880-1946*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1969, Chs. 11-14.
- 2 For more on nineteenth century Anglo-Russian rivalry in Central Asia, see Edward Allworth (ed.), *Central Asia: 130 Years of Russian Dominance - A Historical Overview*, Durham: Duke University Press (1994); Robert Johnson, *Spying for Empire: The Great Game in Central and South Asia, 1757-1947*, St Paul: MBI Publishing (2006).
- 3 Mehrunnisa Ali, 'The Attitude of the New Afghan Regime towards its Neighbours', *Pakistan Horizon*, 27: 3 (1974).
- 4 Mansoor Akbar, 'Revolution and Counterrevolution in Afghanistan', *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 18: 4 (1988).
- 5 Shaheen F. Dil, 'The Cabal in Kabul: Great Power Interaction in Afghanistan', *American Political Science Review*, 71: 2 (1977), p. 468.
- 6 Alam Payind, 'Soviet Afghan Relations from Cooperation to Occupation', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 21: 1 (1989), pp. 110-14.
- 7 Amin Saikal, *Modern Afghanistan: A History of Struggle and Survival*, London: I. B. Tauris (2004), p. 129.
- 8 Louis Dupree, *Afghanistan*, Princeton: Princeton University Press (1980), p. 576.
- 9 For an in depth study of the two, see Anthony Arnold, *Afghanistan's Two Party Communism: Parcham and Khalq*, Stanford: Hoover Institution Press (1983).
- 10 On the development and influence of the scholars at Al Azhar University, see Nazih N. M. Ayubi, 'The Political Revival of Islam: The Case of Egypt', *International Journal of Middle East Studies*, 12: 4 (1980), pp. 481-99.
- 11 Saikal, *Modern Afghanistan*, pp. 152-54.
- 12 Text of Mohammad Daoud's declaration of Republic speech, in Abdul Aziz Danishyar (ed.), *The Afghanistan Republic Annual 1974*, Kabul: Kabul Times Publishing Agency (1974), pp. 1-4.
- 13 Cited in Thomas T. Hammond, *Red Flag Over Afghanistan: The Communist Coup, the Soviet Invasion, and the Consequences*, Boulder: Westview Press (1984), p. 37.
- 14 Saikal, *Modern Afghanistan*, p. 180.
- 15 Abdul Samad Ghaus, *The Fall of Afghanistan: An Insider's Account*, Washington, DC: Pergamon Brassey's International Defense Publishers (1988), p. 180.
- 16 Christian F. Ostermann and Odd Arne Westad, 'Introduction' in Vasilii Mitrokhin, *The KGB in Afghanistan*, Working Paper No. 40, Washington DC: Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars (2002), p. 2.
- 17 Viktor G. Korgan, 'The Afghanistan Revolution: A Failed Experiment,' in Dale F. Eickelman (ed.), *Russia's Muslim Frontiers: New Directions in Cross Cultural Analysis*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press (1993), pp. 105-7.
- 18 Barnett Rubin, 'The Fragmentation of Afghanistan', *Foreign Affairs*, 68: 5 (1989-90), p. 152.
- 19 For details, see William Maley, *The Afghanistan Wars*, London: Palgrave Macmillan (2002), Chs 1-5.
- 20 Kristian Berg Harpviken, 'Afghanistan: From Buffer State to Battleground - To Bridge between Regions?' in James J. Hentz and Morten Boas (eds), *New and*

- Critical Security and Regionalism: Beyond the Nation State*, London: Ashgate (2003), p. 131.
- 21 A.Z. Hilali, 'China's Response to the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan', *Central Asian Survey*, 20: 3 (2001), pp. 326-29.
 - 22 Zbigniew Brzezinski, 'Les Révélations d'un Ancien Conseiller de Carter: 'Oui, La CIA est entrée en Afghanistan avant les Russes ...'', *Le Nouvel Observateur* (14 January 1998).
 - 23 Barnett R. Rubin, 'Arab Islamists in Afghanistan', in John L. Esposito (ed.), *Political Islam: Revolution, Radicalism, or Reform?* Boulder: Lynne Rienner (1997), pp. 179-206.
 - 24 Shah M. Tarzi, 'Politics of the Afghan Resistance Movement: Cleavages, Disunity and Fragmentation', *Asian Survey*, 31: 6 (1991), pp. 479-95.
 - 25 Mikhail Gorbachev, *Political Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 27th Party Congress*, Moscow: Novosti Press Publishing House (1986), p. 86.
 - 26 On the failure of the Accords to provide a peaceful settlement in Afghanistan see Amin Saikal, 'The UN and Afghanistan: A Case of Failed Peacekeeping Intervention?', *International Peacekeeping*, 3: 1 (1996), pp. 19-34; William Maley, 'The Geneva Accords of April 1988', in Amin Saikal and William Maley (eds), *The Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (1989).
 - 27 See Ahmed Rashid, *Taliban: Militant Islam, Oil and Fundamentalism in Central Asia*, New Haven: Yale University Press (2000), esp. Parts 1-2.

6 Pakistan and the Cold War

Stephen P. Cohen

Introduction

Pakistan is undergoing a prolonged internal crisis, one that has been compounded by strained relations with its neighbours, and even with its allies. It is tempting to attribute its present difficulties to its involvement in the Cold War, and particularly to its relations with the United States.¹ This is most frequently done by Pakistani analysts, but scholars and practitioners from other countries often share this approach. However, absolute judgments about the connection between the Cold War and contemporary perplexities are often misguided. History is obviously one guide to the present, but it is more often a trap, as bits and pieces of the past are coupled in order to create a reality that never existed.

This chapter seeks to assess the causes and consequences of Pakistan's engagement in the Cold War from several perspectives. What were the pushes and pulls that brought Pakistan to the point where its leaders liked to boast (especially to Americans) that it was the 'most allied' of American allies? What were the American and British motives in bringing Pakistan into their orbit? What were the political, economic, and ideological consequences of Pakistan's participation in the Western alliance system, notably on the very identity of the Pakistani state? Finally, what are the lessons? Since Pakistan's incentives for joining the alliance system were largely India-oriented, what has been the impact on India and the region?

Thinking about alliances and security

In 1945 'Pakistan' was an idea, not a state, and very little thought was given to strategic implications in the event of its creation. If there was any concern about South Asia's security, it revolved around India's status, not Pakistan's. The British themselves were ambivalent: many liked and respected 'Muslim India', and some favoured the idea of an independent Pakistani state. But others saw that if there were to be a split, then the larger India would be the dominant regional power. Strategically, the British thought that India and Pakistan would have to enter into some form of military confederation, requiring a

British presence in the region for many years to come. The assumption was that both India and Pakistan would remain dependent on the former colonial power.

As for the Americans, they were more familiar with India than with the still-theoretical notion of an independent Muslim state in South Asia. This familiarity arose through the writings and reputation of leading Hindu political figures, notably Mohandas K. Gandhi (the 'Mahatma') and Jawaharlal Nehru. Their only peer and rival in the Muslim community, Mohammed Ali Jinnah, was unknown to most Americans.

By 1947, the regional security debate revolved around two questions.

First, how would an independent Pakistan stand between India and Afghanistan, on the one hand, and between India and the Soviet Union, on the other? Could Pakistan maintain a viable army? Would it serve as a bulwark for India against Soviet pressure or radical Islamic movements? Jinnah, the leading figure in the Pakistan movement, and the late poet-philosopher Mohammed Iqbal, argued that a new Pakistan would enhance the defence of the subcontinent precisely because of its Islamic nature. Neither man correctly foretold Pakistan's strategic fate. According to Iqbal, whose ideas underpinned the Pakistan movement, the Muslims of Punjab and the Northwest Frontier Province would 'be the best defenders of India against a foreign invasion, be that invasion the one of ideas or bayonets'.² Iqbal wrongly believed that the Islamic nature of a new Pakistan would give it inherent strength. Jinnah, too, was excessively optimistic in thinking that the minorities in Pakistan would be hostages to good behaviour, and that natural cultural and economic linkages would strengthen relations between its various groups.

The original idea of Pakistan was as a homeland for Indian Muslims, a place where they would not be dominated by the Hindu majority in a one-man-one-vote democracy. Few advocates of Pakistan dreamt that Pakistan and India would become bitter enemies, or that the armed forces of Pakistan would dominate Pakistani politics.

Other Indian Muslims were more sceptical. The Congress politician Shauka-tullah Ansari argued that Pakistan would have insufficient resources to defend itself without outside help, for it would face threats from the West from the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, and from the East from Japan and China, while India would threaten both the Eastern and Western wings of Pakistan. Further, a united India would be a great power, whereas a divided one would be as weak as Egypt, Burma or Siam, and the British would use an independent Pakistan to control India (this idea later resurfaced in India, with the United States replacing Britain as the potentially controlling power). Ansari failed to persuade Congress to concede a substantial degree of autonomy to the Muslims of a united India, perhaps as a confederation.³

The most prescient politician of them all, when it came to assessing what Pakistan would become, was the Scheduled Caste leader B. R. Ambedkar, who argued that India stood to *benefit* from a separate Pakistan, which would leave most of the subcontinent's wealth in predominately Hindu India and

make Pakistan, with its poor resource base, a weak state. Ambedkar also noted that India's army would no longer be dominated by Muslims, and its primarily Hindu civilian government would not be vulnerable to the army. 'A safe army,' Ambedkar commented, 'is better than a safe border.'⁴

The second strategic calculation involved Pakistan and Britain's far-flung territories in the east, notably Hong Kong, Malaya and Singapore. Some British strategists distrusted Congress and Nehru, and saw Pakistan as a more reliable ally, one that could facilitate British contacts with these colonies, and Australia and New Zealand. Eventually Americans, too, came to see the strategic value of West Pakistan's location, particularly as a possible bomber base on the Soviet Union's southern flank. This perception eventually led to close ties between the West and Pakistan's fledgling army, but for the first ten years the army was too small and too junior to play any role other than a military one. It did, however, become a conduit for western influence.

Into the alliance

The process by which Pakistan became a Cold War ally can be quickly summarized. At independence in 1947, Pakistan became a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations.⁵ It retained Britons in high administrative and military positions, and the United Kingdom was the initial source of military supplies and officer training. In 1954, Pakistan and Iraq signed mutual cooperation agreements with Turkey (a NATO member). Britain and Iran also entered into security arrangements, and the 'Middle East Defence Organization', more popularly known as the 'Baghdad Pact', was formed in 1955, loosely modelled upon NATO. The United States never became a full member. The name of the organization was changed to the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO) after the Iraqi monarchy was overthrown in 1958. CENTO had little formal structure, but the United States and Britain had access to facilities in Pakistan, notably an air base outside of Peshawar from which U-2 intelligence flights over the Soviet Union were launched. There was also an important signals intelligence centre located there. CENTO was dissolved in 1979 after the Iranian revolution, but it had never been a militarily effective organization.

Also in 1954, Pakistan signed a Mutual Defence Agreement with the United States and subsequently became a member of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO), or the Manila Pact, in February 1955. Like CENTO, it was designed to be a regional NATO, only in this case to block communist advances in Southeast Asia. SEATO lasted for over twenty years, and was dissolved in June 1977.

SEATO, like CENTO, had regional and non-regional members. France, the United States and Britain were members, as were New Zealand and Australia. Regional states included Thailand, the Philippines and Pakistan (whose East Wing was in close proximity to Southeast Asia). SEATO was less effective than even the feeble CENTO. It was never formally involved in the Vietnam war, in part because of Pakistan's objection.

What did Pakistan receive in return for its membership in these two Cold War alliances? It obtained large amounts of economic and military assistance, sometimes at bargain terms. The programme of military assistance continued until the 1965 Indo-Pakistani War when the US suspended arms shipments to both Pakistan and India. This embargo remained in place during the Indo-Pakistani War of 1971 and was not lifted until 1975.

Of special value were the contacts with American and other allied military forces. Large numbers of Pakistanis were trained in the United States, while significant numbers of Turkish, Iranian and American officers received training in Pakistan, where foreign officers are still called 'allied officers'. American training teams also visited Pakistan, making presentations on a wide range of military and strategic subjects, including nuclear warfare.

Pakistan also received diplomatic support on the vexing issue of Kashmir. Both Britain and the United States supported Pakistani positions in the United Nations, but neither would extend their NATO or CENTO commitments to include the defence of Pakistan in case of a war with India. Pakistani officials sought such assurances well into the 1980s, but no American administration was willing to commit itself – although at least one US ambassador exceeded his authority by assuring the government of Pakistan that American help would be forthcoming in case of an India Pakistan conflict. Routinely, American and British governments have intervened in India Pakistan crises in attempts to avert large-scale war, and even to reach an agreement on Kashmir, but with mixed results.⁶

Pakistan's liabilities as an American Cold War ally were also evident. Pakistan had entered into the alliances with one single purpose: to acquire weapons and political support so it could balance the larger India. It made nominal gestures towards Cold War objectives of containing the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China (the latter symbolized by membership in SEATO) but other than providing bases for American overflights and intelligence operations it contributed little to the overall effort, with one important, and ironic, exception.

In July 1971, Pakistan facilitated a secret visit by National Security Advisor Henry Kissinger to Beijing. Other channels had been opened to China (notably Romania), but Nixon chose to send Kissinger via Pakistan. This visit was consequential: it led to a de facto US China alignment directed against the Soviet Union, and Pakistan was widely recognized (and took full credit) for making this breakthrough possible. In a way, this signalled the beginning of the end of the Cold War, in that the apparently monolithic Communist movement was seen as having a crack. From this point onward, the United States made a distinction between major Communist powers that were friendly (China), and those that were hostile (the Soviet Union). That China was in the midst of a domestic bloodbath was of little consequence: Nixon and Kissinger saw that the Chinese were also wary of Soviet power, and for the duration could be counted on to balance it.

The 1971 war that resulted in Pakistan's partition witnessed a major fracture in US Pakistan relations and challenged the *raison d'être* of the alliance as

far as Pakistanis were concerned. The Bangladesh movement received widespread public support in the United States, as did India's military intervention. Yet, the US government tilted heavily in favour of Pakistan, prizing the alliance over human rights violations by the Pakistan army and good relations with India. Clearly, the administration wanted to show the Chinese that the United States could be counted on to stand by Pakistan, an old 'friend', supposedly making the point that it could also be counted on to back China should the occasion arise. Claiming that the 1971 military crackdown in East Pakistan was an internal affair, and that outside powers had no right to intervene, Nixon and Kissinger refused to condemn their ally Pakistan.

The 'tilt' in favour of Pakistan had no material consequence. It disappointed the military and civilian elites of West Pakistan (which, after Bangladesh was formed, carried on with the name 'Pakistan') and infuriated India and most Bengalis. It could be argued that the United States' support deterred India from attacking West Pakistan, but the evidence for this is sketchy, at best. It would have taken a heroic effort to move Indian forces to the western front, and there was no assurance of a victory over a still intact Pakistan army.

After the war, Pakistan's new leader, Zulfikar Ali Bhutto, expressed the view that Pakistan had been betrayed – the beginning of a long history of Pakistani claims of deception and betrayal by the United States. To drive the point home, Bhutto embarked on a policy that was to lessen Pakistan's dependence on the United States, bringing it out from under the cover of a pro-West military alliance.

Bhutto struck out in several directions. Diplomatically he moved to energize Pakistan's Islamic identity, creating new and strong ties with Saudi Arabia, Iran and other Islamic states. Pakistan became a key member of the OIC (the Organisation of the Islamic Conference) founded in 1969, and has repeatedly sought OIC support in its relations with India. Bhutto also stressed Pakistan's nonaligned and 'developing' credentials, calling his new policy 'bilateralism', which implied neutrality in the Cold War. Bhutto withdrew Pakistan from SEATO, and military links with the West declined. CENTO was disbanded following the fall of the Shah of Iran in March 1979, and Pakistan subsequently became a member of the Nonaligned Movement.

Militarily, Bhutto reversed past policy and initiated a secret nuclear weapons programme. His military predecessors had rejected nuclear weapons in favour of conventional US military and economic aid. Bhutto managed to get a programme going in the mid-1970s that was to culminate in a weapon within ten years. The policy was continued by Bhutto's successor, General Zia ul-Haq. Both Bhutto and the Pakistan army were reacting to India's 1974 'peaceful nuclear explosion', later admitted to be a weapons test by its chief scientist. The Pakistan bomb was not seen as merely a deterrent: by the early 1980s Pakistan strategists had concluded that with a bomb, they could provoke and probe India without fear of escalating to a nuclear conflict or even a large-scale war. They were correct, and once Pakistan had actually developed a weapon, subsequent regional crises were shaped by this assumption. There

was a price to be paid, and from the late 1970s, nuclear issues became the sticking point of Pakistan's relations with its former Western allies, notably the United States.

The second and third coming

Pakistan's Cold War alliances were formally defunct, but events were to re-energize relations with the major Western powers, notably the United States. The Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in December 1979 revived the close relationship between Pakistan and the United States. The Carter administration's initial offer was rejected by Zia, who termed it 'peanuts'. But Pakistan accepted a 1981 offer by Ronald Reagan to provide \$3.2 billion to Pakistan over a period of six years, equally divided between economic and military assistance. A second economic and military assistance package was announced in 1986, this time for over \$4.0 billion, with 57 per cent for economic assistance.

The continuation of the war in Afghanistan led to waivers of legislative restrictions on providing aid to countries (such as Pakistan) with unverifiable nuclear programmes. The Pressler Amendment of 1985 required that if the United States president could not certify to Congress on an annual basis that Pakistan did not 'possess' a nuclear weapon, assistance to that country would be cut off. For several years, Reagan and then President George H. W. Bush provided such waivers. But with the withdrawal of the Soviets from Afghanistan in 1989 and the end of the Cold War, the United States suddenly discovered that it could no longer certify the absence of nuclear weapons, and assistance to Pakistan ended.

For ten years, until the 9/11 attacks in 2001, Pakistan's nuclear programme was the core issue in its relations with the United States. Although Washington continued to push both India and Pakistan for a regional solution to the threat of nuclear weapons proliferation, Pakistanis complained loudly that they bore the brunt of United States anti-proliferation policies.

The 9/11 attacks led to a third coming of the US Pakistan alliance, and the George W. Bush administration moved quickly to eliminate many sanctions imposed by its predecessor. Washington also declared Pakistan to be a 'major non-NATO ally', entitling it to buy certain military equipment at reduced prices.

Pakistan again served as a support base for an Afghanistan war, and then as a partner in tracking down al-Qaeda and Taliban leaders who had fled to Pakistan. More to the point, as far as Pakistan was concerned, a massive military and economic assistance programme was initiated, much along the lines of that provided under the 1950s alliances, and after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. This came to over \$1 billion a year, most of it for payments for the use of Pakistani facilities in support of the American and NATO invasion of Afghanistan. Much of this money was unaccountable, and by 2008 there was loud Congressional criticism that it had been misspent and, more devastatingly, that Pakistan was not pulling its weight in combating radical extremism in Afghanistan and Pakistan itself. Indeed, Pakistan has often been characterized as supporting both sides of the conflict in Afghanistan.⁷

Lessons learned and forgotten

What are the lessons to be drawn from this history of alliance, and re-alliance? They can be grouped into several categories: their influence on Pakistani domestic politics, notably the role of the armed forces; their influence on regional and strategic relations; and finally their influence on the nature of alliance politics itself.

The domestic impact

One of the least-explored consequences of Pakistan's Cold War alliances was how they weakened the position of Pakistan's left and liberal forces. It has often been pointed out that the Pakistan military was the key beneficiary of the alliances (and may still be), but one corollary of this relationship was that the left was not allowed to develop in Pakistan. With the 'natural' anti-Communist Islamic forces favoured officially by both the Government of Pakistan and its Western allies, the state never developed the ideological and social diversity that would enable it to withstand the end of the Cold War and the onslaught of globalization, including the resurgence of Islamic extremism. It is undergoing a transformation from a backward feudal-dominated political elite to a state that is going to be overwhelmingly urban, yet without a political system that can absorb and channel the new urban population. Its political community remains undeveloped and still linked to its pseudo-feudal origins. Much of this was encouraged (or tolerated) by Pakistan's Western allies, who desired stability above all. Needless to say, this was also encouraged by Pakistan's other allies and close friends, notably Saudi Arabia and the People's Republic of China, both of which found it easier to deal with the military and establishment elites, and consequently never criticized the suppression of political dissent in Pakistan.

The Pakistani elite, plus its foreign supporters, effectively whitewashed Pakistan's failure to achieve constitutional normalcy. Their grounds were that a state under external pressure and still in internal disarray had no choice but to compromise on such niceties as a constitution. Pakistan fell into constitutional limbo: it was governed neither by the 1935 Government of India Act, nor by a new constitution. Pakistan stumbled for decades. It did not have to meet the tougher tests of standing on its own. It was always able to 'borrow' power, but it failed to use this to reform its social and political institutions.

Pakistan's forty-year old experiment with military rule was broken only by spells of highly personalistic, sometimes autocratic, civilian governments, all of which were carefully watched and eventually deposed by the army. Military rule was opposed by a few Pakistani politicians, but most found a role in the new system or dropped out of politics, with nary a murmur from Pakistan's Cold War allies. Pakistan's army, at first assisted by the civilian bureaucracy and a group of experienced political elites, assumed the role of benevolent babysitter, watching over Pakistani politics and society. Later it was to assume

the dominant role in 'correcting' Pakistan, emulating the all-encompassing role of *maa-baap* (mother-father, the colloquial name for the British Raj). It dealt with the Americans without reference to other Pakistani institutions. Like the Raj, it justified its rule in strategic and moral terms. Under Ayub Khan, grave matters of state security were taken out of the hands of the always untrustworthy political class. Pakistan was to undergo a transition from a homeland for Indian Muslims to a fortress, where its citizens could live more or less 'Islamic' lives secure from the predatory India.

Thus, the alliances placed the army at the centre of decision-making in a state under stress. As long as India was a mortal threat – epitomized by the 1971 war that divided Pakistan – the army could claim that it had the best understanding of the requirements of national defence and security. They were the dedicated, professional guardians of 'Fortress Pakistan'. Civilian politicians who interfered with the smooth operations of the armed forces, especially the army, might as well have opened the fortress gates to the barbarian invader. Further, it was the army's view that regional peace was possible, but only if a military balance was achieved between India and Pakistan. If Delhi refused to recognize Pakistan's legitimate existence and denied the validity of the two-nation theory, it would meet a reality check administered by a well-armed Pakistan. The Indians were bullies, and bullies recognize superior power. The prime duty of Pakistanis, therefore, was to keep the fortress intact, safe from external and internal enemies. The alliances made this a feasible strategy until the region went nuclear around 1990, after which it was impossible to contemplate the full-scale use of military force.

Pakistan and its region

The alliances with the West enabled Pakistan to hold its own vis-à-vis India for many years. Pakistanis had an intense, underdog desire to disprove Indian predictions that their state would fail. SEATO and CENTO, and their subsequent ad hoc improvisations, enabled Pakistan to compete with India in military terms. Several generations of Pakistanis knew that the Indian National Congress had accepted partition grudgingly, expecting Pakistan to collapse. By merely staying afloat, Pakistanis felt they were defying India, and the alliances made this possible. This psychology is still evident in the third post-Independence generation, particularly in cricket and sports rivalries with India and in public declarations of Pakistani nuclear prowess. But had the United States and other countries not averted their eyes (or in some cases, actively supported Pakistan), the nuclear programme would not have been possible.

Pakistan's central dispute with India over the status of Kashmir was also affected by its Cold War alliances. Of greater interest to West Pakistanis than those in the East Wing, Kashmir seemed to confirm the core rationale for Pakistan, that Muslims could not live peacefully or safely in a Hindu-dominated India. However, to bring Kashmir into Pakistan, or to force India to yield it, Pakistan needed to borrow even more power from its Cold War allies. It was

not until the most recent military ruler, Pervez Musharraf, that Pakistan began to seriously engage India over a settlement on Kashmir, but by this time attitudes in India towards Pakistan had hardened, and Kashmir became a treasured grievance for enough people in both countries to block any agreement. Most accounts — including some Pakistani ones like the Kasuri interview — suggest the postponement was not the result of Indian hardening but the political imbroglio precipitated by the Chief Justice's sacking in March 2007.

Pakistan and alliance politics

Alliances are generally one of two types: bandwagoning and balancing. A bandwagoning alliance is one of choice, with a view towards maximizing benefits, and those who enter into such an alliance will leave it when these do not fulfil expectations. A balancing alliance is driven by the existence of a shared enemy: one enters into such an alliance, and stays in it as long as the enemy remains shared and real. Indeed, with such a relationship there need not be a formal alliance, but a tacit understanding that both sides share a common threat.

Pakistan's alliances with the West and other countries during the Cold War were of *both* types: it was originally sheer bandwagoning, joining CENTO and SEATO for a nominal opposition to Communism, in exchange for substantial military and economic aid. However, the alliance was not strong enough to prevent Pakistan from edging closer to China in order to obtain Beijing's support against India, and eventually the United States itself decided that China was not quite the Communist threat that the Soviets were. In the meantime the Soviets themselves sought a stronger alliance with India, providing military and economic support, as well as a veto in the United Nations. This completed a complex five-party relationship with the Soviet Union and India on one side, and Pakistan, China, and the United States on the other.

So, for Pakistan, what began as a bandwagoning alliance with the Americans (from which Pakistan received support for its effort to counter India) wound up as a strategic alliance with China, directed against India. Despite Indian paranoia, the United States never saw New Delhi, as did Pakistan and China, as a strategic threat. Complicating this minuet even more, China originally saw India as the catspaw of the West, but eventually came to appreciate Pakistan's interest in breaking away from the United States. Yet it did become an alliance partner of sorts in the second coming of the Cold War, when Pakistan actively supported American efforts to counter the Soviets in Afghanistan. This brought China, Pakistan, and the US into a true balancing alliance, not against India, as Pakistan would have hoped, but against the Soviet Union.

The supreme irony here is that Pakistan did not play a balancing role (except for its limited support for US intelligence operations based there) until *after* it had left CENTO and SEATO. From the American perspective, Pakistan was not an ally against China, but this non-participation turned into a

virtue when Pakistan served as a bridge to Beijing. Ever since, Pakistanis have claimed American support for their role (and suffering) in the Cold War. But this Cold War role was minimal until after they left the formal alliances, and was primarily directed against India. In addition, Pakistan actually hastened the end of the first Cold War by facilitating the American-Chinese link.

Conclusion

If Jinnah had been less persistent, the Indian National Congress more accommodating, or the British more responsible in fulfilling their final imperial obligation, Pakistan would never have become a player in the Cold War, nor might it have suffered the consequences. The state born on August 14, 1947, had deep structural problems: it was divided between east and west, its economy was torn by partition, and its major political movement, the Muslim League, had shallow roots in what became Pakistan. Further, Jinnah died early, and powerful groups, especially in West Pakistan, propounded an alternative Islamic vision for the state. Finally, with the Indians openly hostile to the new state, the seemingly best way to offset Indian power was to turn to outside allies and the army, thus elevating the latter's internal influence and prestige.

Over the years, the United States' relationship with Pakistan has been of intense engagement followed by withdrawal. Washington turned to Pakistan in the early 1950s when India chose nonalignment, and Pakistan, desperate for outside support, eagerly reciprocated. Islam was assumed to confer a natural immunity to Communism, and Pakistan was at once both explicitly Muslim and geographically near both the world's two great Communist powers. By joining CENTO and SEATO, it acquired military power that allowed it to maintain a balance with India. As a democratic ally, Pakistan was often held up by the United States as a 'model' for the Islamic world, although no other Muslim state regarded it as such. In its dealings with the Islamic world, Pakistan did not claim to be such a model but emphasized its Islamic origins and its anti-Israeli credentials. The Arab states and Iran looked down on Pakistan, and the Afghans were too wary of Pakistan to regard it as a model. Furthermore, when Pakistan tried to advance itself into Central Asia, the Muslim states there rebuffed it.

In the early 1960s, the US-Pakistan alliance frayed when Pakistan turned to China for assistance while the United States backed India in its war with China. After a failed American effort to mediate the Kashmir dispute, the alliance became dormant, only to be revived briefly in 1970-72 when Washington wanted to show its gratitude to Islamabad for facilitating the opening to China. Afterward, the two countries went their separate ways, and the alliance quickly gave way to indifference, bolstered only by very small economic and military training programmes. The loss of East Pakistan in 1971 was devastating to Pakistani attitudes towards the idea of an alliance as a way of obtaining security. Not only did the West not prevent India from dismantling it, neither did the Chinese, despite some rhetorical efforts in that direction.

With the loss of the East Wing and subsequent development of a Pakistani nuclear programme, the Carter administration introduced sanctions. However, American policy did a complete about-face when Islamabad provided essential support for the anti-Soviet operations in Afghanistan. A second US-Pakistan alliance now took shape. At this time, American ambassadors in Islamabad liked to check off the many important interests they were attempting to advance, such as supporting the Afghan mujahidin, containing the Pakistani nuclear programme, edging Pakistan toward a more democratic political order, averting an India-Pakistan crisis, and slowing the flow of narcotics. When difficult decisions had to be made, the first interest – sustaining Pakistan's cooperation in the war against the Soviet Union – trumped all others. Washington was mild in its language regarding democratization, it underestimated the risks of an India-Pakistan war, and it averted its eyes from the Pakistani nuclear programme. About the only successful policy (other than containing the Soviets) was curbing the drug trade.

However, a second checklist could have been drawn up. This would include trends that were ignored by the Reagan administration and some of its successors, and included Pakistan's uneven economic development, its crumbling educational system, and the growth of Islamic radicalism. Only the nuclear programme received sustained high-level American attention until the linkage between Pakistan, the Taliban, and Osama bin-Laden's al-Qaeda became evident in 1996.

These lists show not only how the urgent often drives out the important, but also that the choice of what is 'important' is often very subjective. The Reagan administration was uninterested in the consequences of supporting radical Islamists because they were thought to be the best anti-Soviet fighters, and their religious fervour appealed to some American officials and politicians.⁸ A few years later, the Clinton administration was heavily focused on nuclear issues and the Taliban Osama bin Laden nexus in Afghanistan, while the George W. Bush administration revived a formal military agreement with Pakistan. *No* American administration thought it important to ask why Pakistan's educational system was collapsing and why Islamic schools were replacing them. These were considered 'soft' issues, but are now correctly seen as critical ones.

During the decade of democracy in the 1990s, Pakistan's institutions continued to deteriorate, and the army continued its meddling in politics. A huge debt was accumulated and official cultivation of radical Islamic groups continued. Nevertheless, the nuclear issue continued to shape American judgments. During the last two years of Clinton's final term and in the first year of the new George W. Bush administration, Pakistan was more or less ignored in favour of the emerging India, and the prevailing American view of Pakistan, when it was thought of at all, was that it was an irritation.

This history illustrates several important features of the US Pakistan relationship, especially as expressed in the Cold War alliances and their two post-Cold War offspring.

First, the alliance was episodic and discontinuous, driven on the American side entirely by larger strategic calculations during the Cold War and later by the need for military allies in the war against terrorism. On the Pakistani side, of course, the purpose of the alliances was to acquire resources and political support for its contest with India.

Second, although American aid strengthened the hand of the army, the on-again, off-again quality of the relationship made the army itself wary of the United States. The military training programmes familiarized Pakistan army officers with the United States and American strategic policies and fostered a better understanding of American society, but they did not create a cadre of 'pro-American' generals. Meanwhile, anti-Americanism grew among Pakistani civilians who saw the US alliances as perpetuating the army's role.

Third, the economic consequences of the US relationship were equally ambiguous. While Pakistan did receive a lot of aid and most of its economic growth took place during the periods of highest aid flows, the assistance was not conditioned on serious economic and social reform. In the end, Pakistan never saw the kind of 'tough love' that other American allies received – assistance made conditional on economic and social reform. Nor did Pakistan have any relevant role models (as did Taiwan and South Korea, to name two).

Finally, the most enduring and pernicious consequence of Pakistan's long association with Western-sponsored alliances during the Cold War, especially its second and third phases, has been the transformation of Pakistan's self-image from being a staunch, reliable, strong and moderate Muslim ally of the West, to being a victim, a state that has suffered on behalf of the West, and which has not been adequately compensated for its suffering. This could be called the 'condom syndrome,' where Pakistan is used, abused, and then discarded – it constitutes a central theme now in Pakistan's ties to the United States and other states.⁹ Being a victim seems to be morally gratifying to Pakistan: it explains why so many things went wrong, it identifies the chief culprit (the Americans), and it lays the groundwork for massive claims on American and Western support.

This syndrome has a sturdy narrative. It begins with Pakistan's disappointment, and mistreatment as a member of CENTO and SEATO. It continues with Pakistan's abandonment, time and time again, for no good reason. It includes a claim on the resources of others, and it ends with a threat: 'help Pakistan or else it will become a radical, Islamic state'.¹⁰ The narrative also includes a false history of America's response to Pakistan's covert nuclear programme, and a reminder that Pakistan was unjustly denied economic and military assistance after the Soviets had been expelled from Afghanistan. The narrative is designed to appeal to American guilt, but it is based on a highly selective interpretation of the facts. It may be time, although it may also be too late, for both Americans and Pakistanis, as well as key countries such as India, to come to a more accurate understanding of the burdens of the past that are being carried into what is quite likely an even more troubling future.

Notes

- 1 For an extensive overview of US Pakistan relations, see Dennis Kux, *The United States and Pakistan: Disenchanted Allies* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 2000); and for a review of the first twenty five years, see Robert J. McMahon, *The Cold War on the Periphery: The United States, India and Pakistan* (Columbia University Press, 1994). An authoritative Indian view that covers the years of the SEATO and CENTO alliances is found in M.S. Venkataramani, *The American Role in Pakistan* (New Delhi: Radiant, 1982). A detailed history from a Pakistani perspective is in S. M. Burke, *Pakistan's Foreign Policy: An Historical Analysis* (Karachi: Oxford University Press, 1973).
- 2 Presidential address to the Allahabad Session of the All Indian Muslim League, December 29, 1930.
- 3 For a lengthy and nearly unique discussion from this perspective, see Shaukatullah Ansari, *Pakistan: The Problem of India* (Lahore: Minerva Book Shop, 1944).
- 4 B.R. Ambedkar, *Pakistan, or the Partition of India* (Bombay: Thacker and Co., 1940), pp. 85-87.
- 5 It remained in the Commonwealth after becoming a Republic in 1956, only to withdraw in 1972 to protest the recognition of Bangladesh – the former East Pakistan – by Britain, Australia, and New Zealand, but rejoined in 1989 during Benazir Bhutto's first government.
- 6 For a history of American crisis intervention, see P.R. Chari, Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema, and Stephen P. Cohen, *Four Crises and a Peace Process: American Engagement in South Asia* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2008); and for a careful survey of American policy on Kashmir, see Howard B. Schaffer, *The Limits of Influence: America's Role in Kashmir* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2009).
- 7 For a comprehensive overview of US Pakistan relations that summarizes well the widespread frustration with Pakistan in the Washington policy community, see C. Christine Fair, 'Time for Sober Realism: Renegotiating US Relations with Pakistan', *The Washington Quarterly*, April, 2009, pp. 149-72.
- 8 For a perspective on this issue by one of the leading supporters of the mujahidin, member of Congress Charlie Wilson, see George Crile, *Charlie Wilson's War* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2003).
- 9 For one example see Maleeha Lodhi, 'The Pakistan US Relationship', *Defense Journal* (Pakistan), April 1998, <http://www.defencejournal.com/april98/pakistanus.htm>, accessed March 20, 2009. Lodhi writes that the invocation of the Pressler Amendment in October 1990 destroyed the US Pakistan partnership, and stemmed from an American decision that Pakistan was no longer a strategic necessity. In fact the Pressler Amendment (which allowed the United States to overlook Pakistan's nuclear weapons programme) was suggested originally by Pakistani officials, and was violated almost immediately by Pakistan thereafter. The Reagan and Bush administrations overlooked these violations for several years, allowing Pakistan to both receive military assistance and to build a nuclear weapon.
- 10 For a British discussion of the 'gun to the head' syndrome, see Jason Burke, 'Our skewed world view wont let us see the real Pakistan', *Guardian*, March 15, 2009: (<http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentsisfree/2009/mar/15/jason-burke-pakistan>) (accessed March 22, 2009).

Part II

Prospects for a multipolar world

Perspectives at the beginning of the
twenty-first century

7 Theorizing unipolarity

E. Sridharan

Unipolarity poses theoretical problems for the dominant realist, particularly neorealist or structural realist, paradigm.¹ There is no realist consensus on the influence of unipolarity on state behaviour.² Neorealists expect unipolarity to be fleeting since a countervailing coalition will emerge, but none has so far in the post-Cold War, post-Soviet period since 1991. Two potential candidates, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) promoted by China and Russia, or an enlarged European Union (EU) with an independent defence capability and unified foreign policy, cannot be counted as countervailing coalitions, nearly all the latter states being formal allies of the United States, and the enlarged EU neither having a serious independent defence capability nor a unified foreign policy. States have responded by neither balancing nor bandwagoning but by ‘adjusting in various ways to the reality of a US-centered international system’ to US dominance.³ This essay, while not being a comprehensive survey, attempts to review the main arguments in the recent literature on unipolarity in international relations theory, situating them in the context of the unfolding behaviour of the present world system’s sole pole, the United States.

How, therefore, do we theorize unipolarity? Is it agreed that the United States is a unipolar hegemon since 1991? Tentative answers are that unipolarity is military not economic, that the economic integration of the US with the rest of the world gives other powers, particularly China, some degree of countervailing power. Furthermore, it is argued that unipolarity does not necessarily imply hegemony. All historical hegemons were unipolar great powers but all unipolar great powers are not necessarily hegemons. Current US unipolarity is a case of ‘incomplete hegemony’ especially vis-à-vis the Asia-Pacific.⁴ George Modelski distinguishes between ‘raw power’ and institutional power.⁵ By the former metric the world is unipolar, but in international institutions, where most major political decisions are made in today’s increasingly complex world, power means decisional or voting power, which is not unipolar since it is decided by the voting governments, although it maybe be lopsidedly in favour of the leading power. Modelski argues that ‘monopoly power (is associated with) excessive costs combined with underperformance. Because it yields high profits but deteriorates into incompetence, a monopoly attracts competition

and generates serious conflicts.' He, therefore, tends to agree with structural realists' expectations in the long run. However, in terms of pure military power, all theorists, both those who believe in unipolar stability and those who do not, agree that the United States is the sole pole of the world system, although exactly how powerful it is relative to others and the extent of its power to get its way, are matters of debate.

How stable is unipolarity? Is US unipolarity stable because the US is perceived as a relatively benign hegemon, not bent on military conquest, even by Russia and China? And is there actually a demand for US power as a balancing force to overcome regional security dilemmas in Europe, Asia and the Middle East? Is that why there has been no countervailing coalition? The views of some leading representative critics of structural realism who take varying positions such as that unipolarity is stable, or that 'hard-balancing' of the unipolar hegemon not being possible second-rank powers resort to an innovation called 'soft-balancing', and further that such 'soft-balancing' is not what it seems, are presented below first, before presenting the views of leading defenders of the realist position.

William Wohlforth argues that the post-1991 unipolarity is unambiguous, peaceful and durable, the chief threat to it being the US failure to do enough, to be a hegemon on the cheap.⁶ His argument is that US raw-power advantage is so crushing that the system is not characterized by rivalry over leadership. The second-rank powers have no incentive to try to challenge or invite the focused enmity of the United States. Related to this, security competition among second-rank powers is also minimized. Furthermore, the US is an offshore power that is both less threatening to, and less threatened by others, whereas attempts by any of the other powers to build themselves up will trigger local balancing moves and rivalries. Hence, long-term durability can also be expected. Wohlforth cites both hegemonic stability theory and balance of power theory as predicting peace under unipolarity (that is, so long as unipolarity remains unambiguous, and prior to the emergence of a dissatisfied state which also has the capabilities to challenge the hegemon).

Wohlforth tackles the more difficult and theoretically more fundamental argument about unipolarity's durability as follows. First, he points out that two earlier periods of what are often considered hegemony, viz., Pax Britannica and the Cold War, were actually characterized by hegemonic rivalry, unlike post-1991 unipolarity. US raw-power superiority cannot be credibly challenged in the foreseeable future. This is one plank of his durability argument. The other plank is geography and its implications. The United States is an offshore power while all other potential poles are in or around Eurasia. This means that global counterbalancing attempts by any one or more of these will produce local rivalries which will undercut any challenger power or powers and hence, the threshold relative power needed to sustain US unipolarity is lower than generally assumed. None of the three possible processes that might end unipolarity seem to have a possibility of success, viz., counterbalancing by other powers, regional integration, or the differential growth of power.

None of these are likely to produce an entity with a defence industry and power projection capabilities that can rival the United States. Even if any such unified European (EU?), Eurasian (a new Russian empire?) or East Asian (China-led?) pole gets created, Eurasian counterbalancing will emerge, nullifying efforts to rival the United States. Even China, which because of its low base has a good chance of maintaining a high economic growth rate, will for the very reason of its relative economic and technological backwardness find it very difficult to mount a challenge even in the long run.

Wohlforth sees the main threat to unipolarity as the

... US reluctance to *pay up*. Constrained by a domestic welfare role and consumer culture ... Washington tends to shrink from accepting the financial, military, and especially the domestic political burdens of sole pole status ... The sole pole is strong and secure enough that paying up-front costs for system maintenance is hard to sell to a parsimonious public.⁷

It is this which might lead to erosion of the unipolar world system over the long run.

T.V. Paul argues that the traditional balance of power theory fails to explain post-Cold War behaviour of major states.⁸ Despite the continuing expansion of US military power, its military R&D base and force modernizations, and the geographical expansion of its network of bases, particularly since 9/11, other major powers have not responded with realism's predicted hard-balancing response or with countervailing coalitions. Instead, the major second-ranking powers such as Russia and China have abandoned traditional 'hard balancing' (beyond striving to maintain second-strike nuclear deterrent capabilities) and have resorted to 'soft balancing' as the new countervailing strategy in addition to what realism would predict, viz., bandwagoning, buck-passing and free-riding. Soft balancing consists of forming diplomatic coalitions on different issues and in different fora, particularly the United Nations, to constrain US unilateralism when it goes against their interests. This is because US strategy is not based on conquest and territorial aggrandizement, and because they view it as a hegemon sufficiently constrained by domestic politics and their possession of a nuclear deterrent. In fact, the United States is a defender of the territorial status quo and hence not a revisionist power. This does not necessarily make it a benign hegemon as neo-liberal theorists would argue, but its indirect methods of exerting dominance removes the fear of loss of sovereignty and territory.

The marked turn to unilateralism after 9/11 and the doctrines of pre-emption and prevention of perceived threats without the consent of the United Nations increased the threat perceptions of other major powers, including allies such as France and Germany. This is what led them to resort to the low-cost diplomatic strategy of soft balancing as the feasible countervailing strategy. Soft balancing becomes viable, Paul argues, when the hegemon's power and behaviour

pose a challenge to the interests but not the sovereignty of second-rank powers, the hegemon is an irreplaceable source of public goods, and cannot easily retaliate because soft balancing is not intolerably threatening to it although it hampers or thwarts its preferred policies. Paul cites Kosovo (1999) and the build-up to the Iraq invasion (2002–3) as cases of other powers, including US allies, attempting to use soft balancing strategies to deny UN Security Council legitimacy to US actions, as well as by blocking Washington's attempts to involve NATO. These efforts resulted in a partial victory when the United States agreed to adopt UN Resolution 1546/2004 in June 2004, returning partial sovereignty to the Iraqi government and stripped the United States of some powers except in security matters.

Stephen Brooks and William Wohlforth argue that what is called soft balancing, since the reaction of major second-rank powers to the US invasion of Iraq, and interpreted as the current version of balancing under unipolarity, thereby endorsing the structural realist understanding of world politics, is not exactly that.⁹ They argue that there are four alternative explanations to the behaviour called soft balancing: economic interest, regional security concerns unrelated to US policy, policy disputes with the US on specific issues and domestic political incentives. That is, states may act to hamper US foreign policy, not for countervailing US power but for any one or more of these four reasons. They analyse these in relation to the four most prominent cases of soft balancing: the opposition to the US-led invasion of Iraq; enhanced military coordination in the EU; Russia's strategic partnerships with India and especially China; Russian assistance to the Iranian nuclear programme.

Brooks and Wohlforth trace the German opposition to the Iraq invasion, resulting eventually in denying the US its desired second UN resolution authorizing an invasion, to German domestic politics in which Chancellor Schroeder needed to court key anti-war left-wing constituencies in the upcoming election. This coincided with Turkey's decision, for domestic political reasons related to Kurdish secessionism and the costs of a war for Turkey, not to allow a northern front through their territory. Russia, while not leading the constraint-coalition, felt that the continuation of the Baathist regime in Iraq promised significant economic benefits. These developments were exploited by France to put together an oppositional coalition. French opposition was based on three main considerations. First, a fear that a bloody invasion and lengthy occupation would inflame Arab and Muslim sentiment in France and elsewhere, aggravating the problem of the Al Qaida-style terrorism. Second, it allowed France to exploit German opposition to position itself for a more leading role in the EU's coming expansion. Third, it offered President Chirac domestic political gains by playing to French public opinion's appreciation of asserting French autonomy from the United States. Taken together, the opposition to US invasion of Iraq does not fit the soft-balancing explanation.

The EU's Security and Defence Policy, involving the development of a 60,000-man rapid reaction force, 1500-man battle groups and a defence agency, is again more plausibly interpreted as an early response to a perceived

reduction in the US military presence in Europe and reduced willingness to intervene to solve Balkan-type problems, rather than a move to soft-balance the United States. The EU policy is more to complement than compete with US capabilities. There is no sign of the EU going beyond this to develop the capabilities necessary to meaningfully compete with US military power.

Russia's partnerships with India and China, consisting of arms sales and the creation of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization which excludes the United States, leading to a net shift of hard power away from the United States, would appear to be the strongest case of soft balancing. Brooks and Wohlforth explain the relationship with India as a Cold War holdover, lacking defence commitment content; likewise, Russo-Chinese diplomatic relations not at the cost of either's more important relationship with the United States, and explicable by mutual economic interests more than by balancing. Russia needs to export arms to revive its defence industry and China and India need to modernize their forces; other than this, economic ties between Russia and China, and Russia and India, are very thin. The SCO has not gone beyond summits and statements, even on counterterrorism and Russia is apprehensive of China's thrust into Central Asia. None of this adds up to soft balancing against the United States.

Russia's civilian nuclear exports to Iran, and its export of arms and space technology, is again driven not by a desire to balance the United States, but by economic interests and regional security concerns, both interlinked with Moscow's need for Iran's cooperation in exploiting and exporting Caspian region oil and gas reserves, which are intermeshed with a set of complex regional issues. Brooks and Wohlforth end by dismissing soft balancing as a phenomenon and with that the explanatory power of structural realism under unipolarity, and argue that unipolarity is both peaceful and durable.

In response to early criticisms of the relevance of structural realism under unipolarity, Kenneth Waltz argues against the notion that realism is being rendered obsolete by alternative explanations of state behaviour in world politics including democratic peace theory, and the notions that interdependence and international institutions are modifying state behaviour fundamentally.¹⁰ He argues that democratic peace theory is flawed because it is selective about how it defines democracy, defining it to suit its conclusions, the most important example being defining Wilhelmine Germany as a non-democracy. Defining it as a democracy would make World War I a war between democracies. Also, that Britain and France did not fight despite colonial competition because they were constrained to ally for a realist reason, fear of a rising Germany. Democratic peace theory depends on all the causes of war lying inside states.

As regards interdependence being a bulwark against war, he argues that there is far greater interdependence within national economies than across borders. He also points out that World War I was fought between Britain and Germany despite being each other's second best customers. Asymmetric interdependence can also, under certain circumstances, incentivize wars, such as Japan's efforts to reduce excessive dependence on other powers for its raw materials before World War II.

Waltz also debunks the autonomous character of international institutions, which are argued to mitigate international conflict by neo-liberals, holding that they are little more than vehicles for the dominant power or powers. For example, about the post-Cold War expansion of NATO, pushed by the United States, ‘the recent history of NATO (expansion) illustrates the subordination of international institutions to national purposes’ (Waltz, 2000: 18). Summing up, he argues that unipolarity will not be durable for two reasons: first, that ‘dominant powers take on too many tasks beyond their own borders, thus weakening themselves in the long run’; second, that unbalanced, unipolar power always being a potential threat to lesser powers, the latter will feel pushed to countervail the unipolar power in various ways over time.¹¹

Christopher Layne critiques arguments for unipolar stability from a modified structural realist standpoint that also critiques Waltzian balance of power realism, arguing that the United States under unipolarity has not been a non-threatening or benevolent hegemon, has been expansionist, and has stoked other states’ fears and given them incentives to position themselves to balance the United States in the long run.¹² The primary innovation is to redefine what balancing means under unipolarity and introduce the concept of ‘leash-slipping’ by which US allies counter-balance hegemony. He argues that all other major powers – Russia, China, Japan, Germany – faced both internal constraints and pressures to align with the US hegemon; that is, they did not have the capacity to balance, particularly against an extant hegemon and not a rising one. Hegemony, Layne argues, consists of five components – military power and economic supremacy, ambitions, unipolarity of the system, will, and structural change of the system from anarchy to a sort of hierarchy. The United States is hegemonic but not omnipotent and cannot get its way all the time.

Layne argues that, in line with the logic of offensive realism, hegemony has been a matter of policy for all post-Cold War administrations. He also critiques the theory of US hegemonial exceptionalism (to structural realist expectations of eventual balancing), which consists of two main arguments.

First, that US power is so formidable that balancing becomes prohibitively costly for other powers and there is no ‘coalition magnet’ state around which a counter-coalition can form, that is, a state that can protect other would-be balancers against US reprisals. Sub-arguments in this line of thinking include the security of second-rank powers due to the possession of second-strike nuclear capabilities by some, the ‘stopping power of water’, and the fact that the US is not and need not be a land-grabber since its wealth and military power does not depend on territorial conquest.

Second, that US hegemony is benign and non-threatening, and other states derive benefits from it since it underpins the liberal international economic order, besides which the US is a liberal democracy without imperialist intentions. Layne argues that ‘unipolarity substantially erases the distinction between balancing against threat versus balancing against power, because the threat inheres in the very fact that hard-power capabilities are overconcentrated in the hegemon’s favour’.¹³ Furthermore, the US has massive power projection capabilities

into and around the Eurasian landmass. The US invasion of Iraq demonstrated this and also showed that the US is not necessarily a status quo power. He also critiques democratic peace theory arguing that *realpolitik*, not whether a state is democratic or not, will determine policy.¹⁴

Finally, Layne argues that in a unipolar world balancing may take different forms but remains recognizable, thus validating realism. Soft balancing, using international law, international institutions and diplomacy is one such form, as attempted by second-rank powers other than Britain prior to the US invasion of Iraq in 2003. Economic pre-balancing (practiced by China) is another, which focuses on avoiding an immediate confrontation but building up one's economic and technological capabilities over time. 'Leash-slipping' or attempts to reduce the hegemon's control and create autonomous spaces and capabilities, by allies, is a third. The third is little-recognized; he gives the examples of Britain's attempts over 1945–48 to be a 'third force' in world politics, France's exit from NATO's military command and its attempt to carve out an independent world role under de Gaulle, and the European Union's attempts to create independent security and foreign policies and an independent defence industry.

John Mearsheimer's offensive realism is an important theory to be debated in explaining the sole pole's behaviour in the continuing unipolar phase in world politics.¹⁵

Mearsheimer's theory, while it does not specifically focus on unipolarity, would argue that the US would expand its relative power at every opportunity. Unlike structural realism which argues that states are defensive positionalists (Grieco) that while being sensitive to relative gains (even by allied states) are essentially interested in survival not expansion of power, Mearsheimer argues that international anarchy gives great powers good reasons to act offensively but (unlike Morgenthau) not due to human nature but essentially as an extension of the structural realist argument that states seek survival.¹⁶ He argues that states maximize relative power because that is the most optimal way to maximize security; hence they exploit power opportunities and seek to become hegemonic. Thus there is a basic conflict between offensive realism and liberal-institutionalist ideals such as international institutions, law and norms. His theory assumes that states make risk-averse worst-case assumptions about the current and future intentions of others. The best way to ensure survival is to attain and maintain hegemony.

Glenn Snyder takes the view that Mearsheimer's offensive realism does not supersede but complements Waltz's defensive realism by providing a theoretical rationale for expansionist, that is, territorially revisionist, states.¹⁷ He summarizes Mearsheimer's offensive realism as follows: Mearsheimer does not base himself on Morgenthau's assumed natural human urge to dominate others, but on the logic of the search for security by states under anarchy. Unlike Waltz, however, he argues that the anarchic international system offers compelling incentives for states to seek to expand their power at the expense of rivals precisely because security is best assured by becoming overwhelmingly dominant, that is, hegemonic. Mearsheimer argues that global hegemony is impossible unless

some power acquires nuclear first-strike capability; barring that, only regional hegemony is possible. Even hegemons, he argues, are not satisfied; they will seek to prevent the rise of 'peer competitors' in nearby regions that are accessible by land. Mearsheimer places great emphasis on land power, the control of territory and the 'stopping power of water' in the rivalry among great powers. This is because he virtually equates expansion with control over territory, whether directly or indirectly by acquisition of military bases, i.e. by strategic positioning. At first glance, Mearsheimer's offensive realism seems a drastic departure from defensive realism which seems to predict far more aggressive behaviour by great powers. However, if one takes into account his three vital qualifiers, viz., that great powers try to expand only when opportunities arise, when the benefits are seen to exceed the risks and costs, and that if effectively blocked they would prefer to wait for the right opportunity, his theory seems less radical.

Snyder points out that 'aggressiveness does not follow necessarily from Mearsheimer's explicit assumptions. It follows implicitly from an unstated assumption: that great powers place a very high value on security, much higher than Waltz's actors do' (Snyder, 2002: 154). That is, 'Mearsheimer's great powers require a surplus of power over 'appropriateness' to cover uncertainties, possible miscalculation and future surprises' (Snyder, 2002: 155).

Does Mearsheimer's theory explain US behaviour in the post-Cold War unipolar distribution of military capabilities? Or conversely, does US behaviour under unipolarity fit Mearsheimer's theory? Mearsheimer's theory would seem to predict relentless expansion by the United States in the post-1991 unipolar world. Is this borne out by the balance of evidence to date? On the one hand it seems to fit with NATO's eastward and extra-European expansion despite Russia no longer being considered an enemy and the ideological competition won, with the doctrine of pre-emptive (in effect, preventive) war, with the sidelining of the UN in 1999 (Serbia) and 2003 (Iraq), with the emphasis on maintaining US military supremacy and preventing the emergence of a peer competitor, with the abrogation of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, and with Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD) development and futuristic arms technologies in space.¹⁸ Is the US bent on permanently securing its global hegemony both by expansion of its military presence and by establishing unbridgeable technological leads in space, new technologies, etc., combined with asymmetric arms control policies?

On the other hand, Mearsheimer's theory does not seem to fit with the United States allowing other powers to develop countervailing economic strengths, including in control over oil and gas resources, and dependencies on other economies under globalization, with the withdrawal of bases from the Philippines and Uzbekistan at those governments' behests, with the withdrawal from Somalia, the acceptance of emerging regional powers, for example changing its longstanding policy on nonproliferation to accommodate India in the Indo-US nuclear deal.

Perhaps the theory fits if we take a (domestically and internationally) highly constrained, slow-motion expansionism as the predicted behaviour of a

unipolar hegemon, factoring in Mearsheimer's three important qualifiers about opportunities, and costs and risks versus benefits, and blockages on the path of expansion. Then one can argue that the military expansion of the United States since 1991 capitalized on unexpected opportunities, for example the break-up of Yugoslavia in the 1990s and the weakness of Russia to expand NATO, the 9/11 terrorist attack to expand into Central Asia and occupy Iraq, but was constrained by if not blocked by, the resistance of allies, e.g. to NATO expansion, Iraq, and by the costs imposed by the Iraqi resistance. The unstated long-term objective appears to be to gradually encircle with forward bases the one remaining (Russia) and one potential (China) great power which has (or potentially has) a survivable, second-strike nuclear capability vis-à-vis the United States, so as to try to acquire a first-strike capability made possible by an effective BMD system at some point in the future.¹⁹ Interpreting the post-Cold War expansion of the United States in this light would fit Mearsheimer's theory's core position that a unipolar hegemon always seeks to expand because in the long run because 'hegemony is the ultimate form of security'.²⁰ However, this expansion seems to be a slow one constrained by Mearsheimer's three important qualifiers. If the Obama Administration slows down or reverses course on NATO expansion, BMD deployment, the occupation of Iraq, presence in Central Asia, or lopsidedly pro-Israel policies in the Middle East, the importance of the three qualifiers would appear to be substantiated.

However, Mearsheimer's theory is still a structural theory. In a unipolar world in which the sole pole cannot be effectively constrained in taking military action despite the reservations of most of the other major nuclear-armed powers (Iraq, 2003), a purely structural theory is clearly explanatorily inadequate. Theoretically, exclusive reliance on the third image is obsolete under unipolarity. The second image, e.g. the nature of the unipolar power's political system and decision-making processes and the lobbies that influence these (for example, the neo-conservatives in the George W. Bush administrations, the pro-Israel lobby, and so forth), will have to be incorporated as a vital explanatory factor in state behaviour, particularly in that of the unipolar hegemon.²¹

Notes

- 1 This essay is focused on realist theorizing because the lack of a countervailing coalition after nearly two decades of unipolarity appears to challenge realist predictions. However, just so that this essay is not seen to be focused wholly on realism, readers should also be aware of the following important post Cold War criticisms of realism as obsolete or never historically or theoretically correct: Paul Schroeder, 'Historical Reality vs. Neo realist Theory', *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 1 (Summer 1994), pp. 108–48; Richard Ned Lebow, 'The Long Peace, the End of the Cold War, and the Failure of Realism', *International Organization*, Vol. 48, No. 2 (Spring 1994), pp. 249–77; Jeffrey Legro and Andrew Moravcsik, 'Is Anybody Still a Realist?', *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 2 (Fall 1999), pp. 5–55.
- 2 For two important collections of 'early unipolar', i.e. pre Iraq invasion, theorizing on unipolarity, see Ethan B. Kapstein and Michael Mastanduno, eds., *Unipolar Politics: Realism and State Strategies After the Cold War*, New York: Columbia

- University Press, 1999, and G. John Ikenberry, ed., *America Unrivalled: The Future of the Balance of Power*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002.
- 3 Michael Mastanduno and Ethan B. Kapstein, 'Realism and State Strategies After the Cold War', in Ethan B. Kapstein and Michael Mastanduno, eds, *Unipolar Politics: Realism and State Strategies After the Cold War* (New York: Columbia University Press), 1999, p. 15.
 - 4 Michael Mastanduno, 'Incomplete Hegemony and Security Order in the Asia Pacific', in G. John Ikenberry, ed., *America Unrivalled: The Future of the Balance of Power* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2002).
 - 5 George Modelski, 'Working in Theory', *National Interest*, Winter, 2004: http://find.articles.com/p/articles/mi_m2751/is_78/ai_n8686611/print?tag_artBody;coll (accessed July 18, 2008).
 - 6 William C. Wohlforth, 'The Stability of a Unipolar World', *International Security*, Vol. 24, No. 1 (Summer 1999), pp. 5–41.
 - 7 *Ibid.*, p. 40; emphasis in original.
 - 8 T. V. Paul, 'Soft Balancing in the Age of U.S. Primacy', *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer 2005), pp. 46–71.
 - 9 Stephen G. Brooks and William C. Wohlforth, 'Hard Times for Soft Balancing', *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (Summer 2005), pp. 72–108.
 - 10 Kenneth Waltz, 'Structural Realism after the Cold War', *International Security*, Vol. 25, No. 1 (Summer 2000), pp. 5–41.
 - 11 *Ibid.*, p. 40; for the detailed argument, see pp. 28–40.
 - 12 Christopher Layne, 'The Unipolar Illusion Revisited', *International Security*, Vol. 31, No. 2 (Fall 2006), pp. 7–41.
 - 13 *Ibid.*, p. 21.
 - 14 Christopher Layne, 'Kant or Cant: The Myth of the Democratic Peace', *International Security*, Vol. 19, No. 2 (Fall 1994), 5–49.
 - 15 John J. Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, New York: W. W. Norton and Company, 2001.
 - 16 Joseph M. Grieco, 'Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism', in David A. Baldwin, ed., *Neorealism and Neoliberalism: The Contemporary Debate*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1993, pp. 116–42.
 - 17 Glenn H. Snyder, 'Mearsheimer's World – Offensive Realism and the Struggle for Security', *International Security*, Vol. 27, No. 1 (Summer 2002), pp. 149–73.
 - 18 For the repeated emphasis on maintaining supremacy and developing futuristic technologies for BMD and other purposes in line with this objective, see *The National Security Strategy of the United States of America*, September 2002, and March 2006 (available at <http://whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss/pdf>); US Department of Defense, *Nuclear Posture Review Report (Excerpts)*, January 8, 2002 (available at <http://globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>), which reflects the current nuclear policy thrust; US Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review*, September 30, 2001 (available at <http://www.comw.org/qdr/qdr2001.pdf>) and *Quadrennial Defense Review*, February 6, 2006 (available at <http://www.defenselink.mil/qdr/report/Report20060203.pdf>).
 - 19 For the argument that the United States has already acquired a first strike capability against Russia, see Keir A. Lieber and Daryl G. Press, 'The Nuclear Dimension of US Primacy', *International Security*, Vol. 30, No. 4 (Spring 2006), pp. 7–44.
 - 20 Mearsheimer, *The Tragedy of Great Power Politics*, p. 345.
 - 21 See John J. Mearsheimer and Stephen M. Walt, *The Israel Lobby and US Foreign Policy*, New York: Farrar, Strauss and Giroux, 2007, for a second image argument attributing key US foreign policy decisions, particularly regarding the Middle East, to the influence of a loose pro Israel coalition in domestic politics, this coalition overlapping heavily with the neo conservatives as a school of thought and foreign policy lobby.

8 Debating multilateralism

The role of emerging powers

Swaran Singh

The end of the bipolar Cold War had heralded a new era for experiments in evolving multilateralism as a paradigm for the conduct of twenty-first century international relations. Meanwhile, the proponents of evolving multilateralism have also realized, over the years, that it remains a rather demanding format of international cooperation that presupposes a strong sense of collective identity, shared values and stakes in its structures, processes, objectives and outcomes. Conceptually too, multilateralism remains opposed not only to unilateralism but also to imperialism and isolationism as guiding principles of foreign policy. Instead, it privileges mutual trust, socialization, norm-building as embedded in multilateral institutions. As a result, while experts agree on the eclectic nature of the evolving twenty-first century multilateralism, they continue to differ in defining its features, role, as also its formulations. The debate continues to confront newer theoretical and practical models especially from the emerging new stakeholders in the international system.

On the positive side, both as ideology and as strategy, experts often see multilateralism as synonymous with the rise of emerging powers as also in tune with increasing democratization of international relations. Countries like China, India, Brazil, South Africa and Russia all seem to be flag-bearers of multilateralism except that (a) each of these may have their own version that often leans on multipolarism, and (b) in time of any confusion, bilateralism remains their instinctive fallback position. Indeed, it is this sustained multipolarism (power based framework) juxtaposed with related trends of globalization and increasing democratization of international relations that have greatly empowered the emerging powers' vision of multilateralism (equity-based framework) as the dominant norm. Nevertheless, there still remains a wide gulf between what each of them professes or preaches and their practices over space and time. Asia in particular seems ordained to transform the nature of the twenty-first century international system. Countries like China and India are beginning to be seen as influential voices in the region. All this in spite of the fact that for a very long time China was not even part of global mainstream multilateralism (read UN); and yet it today represents the core of much of Asian multilateralism.

The US global war on terrorism that brings back focus on hard power has once again put America's credentials vis-a-vis multilateralism under the scanner.

But, while the current order may be seen as one of extended unilateral moment it seems all set to gradually give way to multilateralism. Also, with their inherent leanings towards soft power, dialogue, consensus, norms and institutions, emerging powers find the US increasingly in tune with multilateralism albeit with its own brand and visions. It is in the blending of these multiple versions that emerging powers like China and India face their challenge. It is in this context that this chapter tries to examine the whole range of theoretical debates on and the praxis of multilateralism and highlight the contribution of emerging Asian powers, especially China and India, to the evolving of a new architecture of multilateralism.

The emerging new context

The collapse of the Soviet Union had triggered debates on multilateralism versus unipolarity of the United States.¹ It is generally believed that most of the challenges confronting multilateralism for these last two decades remain associated with US military and economic pre-eminence, and an attendant pattern of US unilateralism.² Experts believe that multilateralism has remained inherently vulnerable to the unilateralist tendencies and capacities of the US as demonstrated in its war in Iraq from 2003 and earlier in NATO operations in Kosovo during 1999 which represented the nadir of the post-World War II United Nations-led multilateralism. But there are others who describe these as only minor aberrations and allude to how the only agency that could be entrusted with the post-war arrangements for Kosovo was the United Nations; and the same is expected to be the case with Iraq.³ It is also highlighted how the US tendencies to undermine UN multilateralism have moderated in the last few years and this is what makes emerging powers far more inclined towards multilateralism.⁴ Even in the case of the US, not only do the emerging powers prefer to engage it in multilateral format, various 'burden-sharing' and 'legitimacy seeking' related compulsions of its domestic politics also make multilateralism a favourite of the US foreign policy elite.⁵

Besides, not all difficulties and inefficacy of multilateralism flow solely out of US unilateralism. There are also structural and normative issues that flow from the dated and 'power-centric' nature of some of these post-World War II multilateral institutions that failed to evolve with the passage of time. For instance, this power- and state-centric multilateralism has failed to accommodate civil society, nongovernmental organizations and policy-networks and their norm-building endeavours, and failed to deal with their ever-rising demand for transparency and accountability for all multilateral institutions. Their decision-making processes, or their representativeness, often fails to live up to the new demands of legitimacy and other requirements of good governance. Looking ahead, the twenty-first century challenges also no longer remain confined to the political boundaries of the Westphalian nation-state in the exclusive domain of the individual state-actor. This growing inadequacy of conventional models has since unleashed new debates on what constitutes the theories or

praxis of multilateralism. And this is where, if not the theory-building, then the praxis of emerging powers promises to make a seminal contribution.

Defining multilateralism: theory vs. praxis

To put it at the very outset, there exists no consensus on any single definition of multilateralism. At the most basic level, there exists multilateralism in the very Westphalian vision of the State system where states recognize sovereign equality that remains implicit in both the realist and the neo-liberal theories of international relations. The emergence of multilateral practices is seen to begin around the late nineteenth century or early twentieth century and it is believed to be inextricably tied to the development of the global capitalist system. As capitalist industry outgrows the physical boundaries of the state, capitalist interests express a preference for republican forms of government where they might influence the policies of sovereigns bent on territorial aggrandizement. What resulted from this is an ideology of liberal internationalism, supported by a coalition of social forces and devoted to the creation of international institutions that facilitated peaceful interaction, further integration and the resulting prosperity for all.⁶

Others see multilateralism as an outcome of moral and ethical dimensions of state and jurisprudence.⁷ There exists a record of about 6,976 multilateral treaties signed during 1595–1995. Similarly, while there were fewer than a 100 multilateral intergovernmental organizations in 1945, these increased to 200 by 1960 and to 600 by 1980. Their exponential growth is cited by liberal-institutionalists and constructivists as an indicator of expanding significance of multilateralism.⁸ Experts have stressed on the quantitative and qualitative aspects of multilateralism. While qualitative definitions seek to underline non-discrimination, reciprocity and self-restraint in collective actions, the quantitative ones focus on the number of actors.⁹ Kalher highlights how, based on the number of participants, multilateralism has been confused with unilateralism. Other than the numbers, unilateralism represents a niche phenomenon which is densely institutionalized thereby often creating a challenge for relatively loosely organized multilateralism. But while multilateralism functions on institutional strength, unilateralism requires other parties to back it up.¹⁰ Also, while the trade relations experts have described unilateralism as a threat (stumbling block) security experts have projected it as a step (building block) towards multilateralism.¹¹ Finnemore and Luck define multilateralism as ‘operational’ and ‘procedural’ where the former involves unified execution of coordinated policies and the latter connotes diplomatic or political endorsement or authorization of decisions.¹²

Then the English School of IR theory makes a distinction between multipolarism and multilateralism with the former presenting a conventional realist perspective of competing power centres amongst sovereign states while the latter underlines the emerging liberal-functionalist focus on ‘shared norms’ and ‘international society’ moving beyond the Westphalian mechanistic approach

to the international system. Robert Keohane sees multilateralism as a benign and normative enterprise and defines it as ‘the practice of coordinating national policies in groups of three or more states’ where ‘persistent sets of rules that constrain activity, shape expectations, and prescribe roles’.¹³ John Ruggie, on the other hand, emphasizes the ‘indivisibility’ of humankind and ‘diffused reciprocity’ which makes it a highly demanding and yet slow-yielding arrangement. For him, ‘multilateralism depicts a generic institutional form ... that coordinates relations among three or more states on the basis of generalized principles of conduct ... without regard to particularistic interests of parties ...’.¹⁴ Ruggie defines multilateralism as an ideology or belief system or in an architectural form a ‘deep organising principle’ of international life.¹⁵ To quote James A. Caporaso:

The distinction between multilateral institution and institution of multilateralism is cognizant of two levels of related international activity. Multilateral institutions focus attention on the formal organisational elements of international life and are characterized by permanent locations and postal addresses, distinct headquarters, and ongoing staff and secretariats. The institution of multilateralism may manifest itself in concrete organization, but its significance cuts more deeply. The institution of multilateralism is grounded in and appeals to the less formal, less codified habits, practices, ideas, and norms of international society.¹⁶

In practice as well, it remains difficult to pinpoint the relative influence of the power centres versus the institutional interests and designs that together determine the nature of emerging new formulations of multilateralism. While the emerging powers lean towards multilateralism, their observed propensity to engage the world multilaterally, particularly in the high stakes arena of militarized conflict, does not conform to their commitment to multilateralism of theory.¹⁷ The US often projects its military alliances or joint military operations as examples of multilateralism while China remains inclined more in favour of multipolarism (than multilateralism).¹⁸ Also, while multilateralism may have been effective in reducing great power tensions, its implications for conflict management remain less than benign.¹⁹ For instance, even after half-a-century of experience, the conventional inter-governmental multilateralism like the United Nations has increasingly come under pressures both from top and bottom. Apart from the much debated hegemonic pressures of the United States and other powerful State actors, new forms of highly elaborate hybrid system of transnational governance remains driven increasingly by societal and humanitarian concerns. Experts like Keohane believe that even for State-centric multilateral institutions most future issues from trade liberalization to climate change will require entering into multilateral negotiations and, he shows how the incidence and scope of such cooperative multilateralism has witnessed ‘dramatic increases’ in recent years.²⁰

Then there are others who have raised the issue of legitimacy and efficacy and go so far as to suggest that the entire idea of cooperative multilateralism

is a chimera.²¹ Robert Keohane highlights this issue of legitimacy of multilateral institutions as their most critical challenge as they begin to transform into far more intrusive and aggressive twenty-first century instruments of global governance. Twentieth century multilateralism, he says, sought legitimacy from the success of its expressed goals and transparency of its internal decision-making processes and states always had options to opt for unilateralism or coalition-building while multilateralism stayed largely on the margins of international relations. By comparison, twenty-first century multilateralism seeks to intervene in what has been traditionally known as domestic affairs of state. For example, on issues regarding minorities, trade liberalization, human rights, democratically elected governments can be censored by non-democratic multilateralism.

Starting from the *An Agenda for Peace* of 1992 till *Responsibility to Protect*²² of 2007, the UN has itself become inclined to favour humanitarian interventions of all kinds. The answer, says Keohane, lies not in undermining multilateralism but in making multilateralism more inclusive, decisive, efficient and democratic and in privileging democracy over sovereignty as roots of sovereignty lay in monarchy and not democracy which has today emerged as a twenty-first century dictum.²³ Nevertheless, most emerging powers (especially across Asia) continue to treat non-intervention as sacrosanct and do not favour concepts like 'humanitarian intervention' proposed by the International Commission for Intervention and State Sovereignty and supported by the Secretary General's High Panel on Threats, Challenge and Change.²⁴ It is in this context that constructivists like Emanuel Adler have opened new space by proposing communitarian multilateralism that talks of community of practices.²⁵ It not only provides opportunities for emerging powers like China and India but also one that seeks to take multilateralism away from the emerging powers' state-centric preoccupations to expand space for civil society and policy networks in their countries. However, despite being least state-centric, this perspective also leaves ample space for the actual power equations between the dominant and emerging powers to influence the final outcome of such theoretical discourses.

Is US unilateralism eroding?

In the early 1990s, the US policies favouring unilateralism were clearly recognized as the dominant trend of international relations. This was noticeable despite its half-a-century record of leading the western world in building multilateral institutions. Though President Bill Clinton's years in White House had seen the US articulating a policy of 'assertive multilateralism', his record towards the end of 1990s had come under a cloud with the US rejecting both the Ottawa Convention on Land Mines Ban 1997 and 'no' vote by the US Senate on the ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty in 1999. In 2000, the Clinton administration chose to withdraw from the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty which was seen by experts as the cornerstone of much of superpower arms control agreements (especially the START series).²⁶ The Bush Jr. administration remained in office with strong scepticism about

multilateralism. It clearly stayed away from all major multilateral initiatives be it the Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change, the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Germ Weapons Convention, and the Program of Action on Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons. Finally, the second war in Iraq in 2003 without a UN mandate seemed to confirm US preference for unilateralism.

A whole list of moments when the US rejected international treaties, violated rules, ignored allies and used the military on its own can be cited.²⁷ This post-Cold War unilateralism of the US has been far more sweeping, consistent and worldwide, making experts describe this as ‘new unilateralism’ involving ‘unashamed’ use of American power.²⁸ The collapse of the Soviet Union made the ‘new unilateralism’ of the US unsettle world politics thereby arousing a common concern for multilateralism amongst the emerging major powers of the twenty-first century. But experts also argue how this ‘new multilateralism’ of the post-Cold War genre has also since contributed to the growing realization in the US that ‘unilateralism’ offers fewer opportunities for it to exercise global political control and fewer ways to escape the binding obligations of the agreements despite its responsibilities expanding exponentially. They also point to how the Bush administration was sceptical only of a few specific types of multilateralism and not of ‘foundational’ multilateralism.²⁹ These twin trends in the US foreign policy have by themselves created both the trigger as well as the space for the emerging powers to participate in the evolution of multilateralism for the twenty-first century.

The post-World War II US-led multilateralism around both economic and security agreements (of Bretton Woods and NATO variety) had carried a clear imprint of an American-centric international order that was only partially challenged by the Soviet and Third World discourses. This dominant US-led western vision though had remained confined to Europe and did not quite make any major impact amongst the developing, especially Asian, countries. This was multilateralism that based itself on rules, norms and institutions, all codified and well-defined. It is said that the US faith in such ‘foundational’ multilateralism indeed has been increasing over the years. For example, the Bush administration’s scepticism of multilateralism did not undermine its economic interdependence and functional cooperation, especially with the emerging powers. The unprecedented degree of international support in its two wars in Iraq revitalized the US faith in multilateralism. It is exactly in this context that emerging powers have come to influence international discourses on multilateralism. Since Asia has had little US influence in building multilateral institutions it provides a much larger space for emerging powers in Asia to contribute alternative visions towards building of the twenty-first century discourses on multilateralism.

Asian debates on multilateralism

Asian debates on multilateralism remain closely intertwined with the history of decolonization and how, at various stages, major regional powers had

envisioned multilateral arrangements. In April 1946, for instance, India had hosted an Asian Relations Conference which was followed up by the April 1955 Bandung (Indonesia) Conference of Afro-Asian nations. However, some of the protagonists of post-World War II multilateralism in Asia were to become part of the US military alliances like the Southeast Asian Treaty Organisation (SEATO). Then there was also the Five Power Defence Arrangement (FPDA) involving Australia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore and the United Kingdom.

Serious US interest in institutionalizing multilateralism in Asia was to begin only following the collapse of the former Soviet Union. Given its close linkages with ASEAN, the US and its regional friends like Japan or the Philippines were to advocate regional economic and security forums. The ASEAN Regional Forum, the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the Asia-Europe Summit or the East Asian Summits makes today ASEAN the torch bearer of Asian multilateralism. This kind of ASEAN (read personal and informal) genre of multilateralism has clearly emerged as a unique brand of multilateralism. It also reveals how traditional western multilateralism continues to have its limitations and while it is better suited to handle non-traditional threats like refugees, pollution or terrorism, bilateralism still remains the favoured approach to deal with traditional problems. In the opinion of experts, NATO-style alliance, aimed at defeating or containing specific threats, simply does not jell with post-Cold War Asian multilateralism.³⁰

The trigger to these recent ASEAN initiatives was also provided by the collapse of the Soviet Union and more recently the US global war on terrorism that has witnessed the revival of multilateralism. While some of it had the endorsement of the US itself e.g. the Six Party Talks most others have become conspicuous by keeping the US out of their deliberations. Be it the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, the Economic Cooperation Organisation, Conference on Interaction and Confidence-building in Asia, the Russia China India Strategic Triangle, the Asian Cooperation Dialogue, the East Asian Summits, all seem to underline a stamp of Asia's emerging powers' autonomy by denying any participation to the United States. Conversely, it is the outstretching of the US capacities that have created the space for and encouraged such local initiatives. For instance, it was in the backdrop of its operations in Afghanistan and Iraq that intense behind-the-scene diplomatic parleys between the US and China had resulted in China accepting to be the convener for the Six Party Talks in April 2003.³¹ This was an important concession by the US which had been the global policeman on nuclear non-proliferation that it agreed to outsource the problem of North Korean nuclear proliferation to Beijing. This also entailed endorsement by the US of China's primacy and proactive approach to multilateralism across Asia.

Though Japan, the closest ally of the US in Asia, has been accommodated in a few of these new multilateral forums it has also gradually learnt to balance its bilateralism with the growing trends of Asian multilateralism.³² Apart from its Asian neighbours, China has also emerged in the lead in engaging

the European Union – the other major ally of the US – and the two have sustained their ‘strategic partnership’ despite widely differing visions on multilateralism.³³ Here again, the US seems to provide the trigger for China’s orientations with Chinese experts, describing it in the following terms: ‘in the past we opposed the Soviet Union hegemony, now we promote multilateralism to hold back US unilateralism’.³⁴ But even when other Chinese experts highlight similarities in Chinese and EU visions they still seem to revert to US unilateralism to stress their multilateralism supporting ‘UN’s core role in handling regional and international crisis and propose to fight against terrorism in a way as to eliminate the root of terror, rather than by force’.³⁵ Thoughts on the ‘Asian’ way in the evolution of Asian multilateralism have been triggered by the ASEAN approach of inclusive regionalism emphasizing the tangible and intangible connectivity with all the stakeholders. Since then, various multilateral regimes across Central, Southeast and South Asia have successfully managed to accommodate the rising China and even Russia and the United States.

The other critical initiative in the backdrop of the US global war on terrorism remains the enhanced activism in the strategic triangle between Russia – China – India where again multilateralism was to become an important refrain and the cementing feature. Indeed, starting from the October 2003 meet of three foreign ministers at the UN a new mechanism of stand alone meetings of the three foreign ministers has evolved. To quote from the then foreign minister of India’s interview in India’s leading daily *The Hindu*, following his participation on 12 October 2003 with his counterparts from Russia and China, where he clearly underlined multilateralism:

... we have set the stage for greater understanding and cooperation. I suggested each one of us could start doing work on areas of trilateral cooperation. This idea was welcomed. This time (referring to their meeting) the atmospherics were very good. The three countries had agreed that multilateralism had to be protected, multilateralism had to prevail.³⁶

Chinese and Indian visions

Both China and India, emerging major powers with an increasing stake and influence on the international system remain committed to multilateralism in regional and global organizations. However, for their multilateralism to be effective, it must be inclusive, showing sensitivity to the reasonable socioeconomic and security interests of all major powers.³⁷ As of now, both China and India have responded to various multilateral initiatives in their self-image of being responsible regional powers, following the good-neighbourly policy across their peripheral regions. It is only to be expected that they should play a constructive role in enhancing multilateralism in international relations. Especially in the backdrop of the US global war on terrorism in Afghanistan from 2001 and in Iraq from February 2003, the India China Declaration on Principles for

Relations and Comprehensive Cooperation signed between the two prime ministers in Beijing on 23 June 2003 makes an important reference to their commitment to multilateralism. It reads:

... the two sides supported multilateral cooperation in Asia, believing that such cooperation promotes beneficial exchanges, economic growth as well as greater cohesion among Asian countries. The two sides viewed positively each other's participation in regional and sub-regional multilateral cooperation process in Asia.³⁸

However, both have their own versions of multilateralism. To begin with, China had been hugely sceptical of multilateralism. Other than its brief and untenable experience in the Soviet dominated Comintern, China had conducted its diplomacy only in bilateral channels. This is because most of the known post-World War II US-led regional and international multilateralism (SEATO, CENTO, even UN) had been so oriented as to undermine or negate mainland China. Therefore, even when it joined the United Nations and its agencies from 1971, given its lack of experience in its processes and modalities, Beijing's diplomacy continued to be wary of multilateralism almost till the early 1980s.³⁹ It was its trade-led development strategies under Deng Xiaoping that were to gradually push Beijing into accepting multilateralism though it still remains concerned with the likelihood of the US manipulating these forums imperilling China's interests. But the late 1990s financial crisis in East Asia was to provide great opportunity for China to engage and assist in their recovery and this has since made China far more welcome, as also far more confident of and an assertive participant, in the fora of Asian multilateralism. So much so that there are now voices in China that caution their leaders against dangers of narrow nationalism and some even in favour of appreciating Japanese regional ambitions.⁴⁰

Chinese experts have propounded the idea of 'one superpower plus multiple big powers' (*Yichao duoqiang*) as Beijing's interpretation of twenty-first century multilateralism which they believe is not wishful thinking but an irreversible reality.⁴¹ At the same time, China continues to hail the centrality of the United Nations and believes that efforts like the 'coalition of the willing', 'coalition of liberal democracies' or 'Asian version of NATO' must be seriously scrutinized for their authority and legitimacy. But in the end, there are also influential conservative voices in China that remain inclined towards conventional 'multi-polarism' (that talks of power centres) rather than multilateralism (connoting equity and norms).⁴² This may be driven by its desire to assert its rise as a great power in the international system as also by its sensitivities towards accepting prescriptions (even norms) from western powers, especially the US. But China's participation in multilateral fora has also made Beijing far more receptive to normative multipolarity which is where China's policy making elite has gained experience and Chinese discourses have increasingly come to use 'multilateralism' as a favoured expression. This has also been eluded to as an example of China's international socialization.

As regards India, it has had a far more normative approach and a longer association with multilateralism. Even as a colony of the United Kingdom, India had participated in the post-World War I Versailles Conference and it was represented as the founding member of the League of Nations. The tradition continued with India (though still a colony) in 1945 becoming a founding member of the United Nations. Later, India's continued commitment to the UN Charter (taking, in 1947, its sensitive case of the Kashmir question to the UN Security Council). India's participation in UN debates, in all UN agencies, and especially in UN peacekeeping operations, show India's faith in the principles of multilateralism. India, therefore, continues to exude a sense of great responsibility and has a leading role in ensuring democratization of the international system (read UN) as also to emphasize on norms and community of practices and interests as the basis for cooperation at regional and sub-regional levels. The recent expansion of the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation as also India being invited to play a part in most of Asia's multilateral fora (e.g. the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation or the East Asia Summits) clearly reflects this increasing endorsement of India's credentials and capabilities as also of its faith in multilateralism. The effectiveness of India's initiatives will depend on New Delhi coordinating its policies with other middle powers. At the same time, constructive engagement with the US is also recommended in the belief that democracy and the power of public opinion in the US will restrain American leadership from undermining the UN mandate repeatedly.

Conclusion

To conclude, therefore, it remains a commonplace that even an unchallenged superpower such as the United States would be unable to achieve its goals through the bilateral exercise of influence; the costs of such massive 'arm-twisting' would be too great.⁴³ But this is exactly where Robert Keohane goes a step further as he talks about 'expectations' and underlines the 'diffused reciprocity' of multilateralism – a system that is expected to 'yield a rough equivalence of benefits in the aggregate and over time'.⁴⁴ And, this is where countries like Russia, China and India have a special role and responsibility if Asian wisdom and experience are to become part of a twenty-first century world order including its effective new brand of diplomatic frameworks and/or instruments like multilateralism. It is equally imperative for the future world order to co-opt the visions of the emerging powers so as to ensure its representative nature, and thereby its longevity.

As a result, while in areas of existential threats the US may feel compelled to ignore the UN and its norms it will continue to come back to it and seek legitimacy for its initiatives in popular endorsement by major and emerging powers. The UN indeed has never stopped working on alternative models (e.g. proliferation security initiative) which may seem more tuned to twenty-first century challenges (of threats and legitimacy) and yet ensure an American imprint of being US-centric. However, such US remodelling or blending of

various new versions of twenty-first century multilateralism may become far too aggressive and intrusive. That is what underlines the role and responsibility of emerging powers like China and India to ensure that multilateralism remains the creed and that it remains consensus- and norm-driven aimed at ensuring equity and justice for all and not power-driven by a few and too intrusive for rest of the international society.

Notes

- 1 Caroline Fehl, 'Living with a Reluctant Hegemon: The Transatlantic Conflict Over Multilateral Arms Control', *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 14, no. 2 (2008), p. 260; Sergio Fabbrini (ed.), *The United States Contested: American Unilateralism and European Discontent* (London: Routledge, 2006); Rosemary Foot et al. (eds), *US Hegemony and International Organisation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003); Clyde Prestowitz, *Rogue Nation: American Unilateralism and the Failure of Good Intentions* (New York: Basic Books, 2003); David M. Malone and Yuen Foong Khong (eds), *Unilateralism and US Foreign Policy* (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner, 2003); Stewart Patrick and Shepard Forman (eds), *Multilateralism and US Foreign Policy: Ambivalent Engagement* (Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner, 2002); Steve Smith, 'The End of the Unipolar Moment?: September 11 and the Future of World Order', *International Relations*, Vol. 62, no. 2 (2002), pp. 171–83; Charles Krauthammer, 'The Unipolar Moment', *Foreign Affairs* (New York), Vol. 70, no. 1 (1991), p. 23.
- 2 Edward Newman, Ramesh Thakur and John Tirman, 'Introduction' in Edward Newman, Ramesh Thakur and John Tirman (eds), *Multilateralism Under Challenge: Power, International Order and Structural Change* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2006), p. 2.
- 3 Shashi Tharoor, 'Saving Humanity from Hell', in Edward Newman, Ramesh Thakur and John Tirman (eds), *Multilateralism Under Challenge: Power, International Order and Structural Change* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2006), pp. 25–26.
- 4 Renato Corbetta and William J. Dixon, 'Multilateralism, Major Powers, and Militarized Disputes', *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 57, no. 1 (2004), p. 5; C. V. Ranganathan, 'Cooperation Within and Across Regions Makes for Good Multilateralism', *China Report*, Vol. 40, no. 2 (2004), p. 144.
- 5 Atsushi Tago, 'Determinants of Multilateralism in US Use of Force: State of Economy, Election and Divided Government', *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 42, no. 5 (2005), pp. 586, 588–89.
- 6 For details see Craig Murphy, *International Organisation and Industrial Change: Global Governance Since 1850* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).
- 7 For details see Christian Reus Smit, *The Moral Purpose of the State: Culture, Social Identity, and Institutional Rationality in International Relations* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999).
- 8 Robert A. Denemark and Matthew J. Hoffmann, 'The Dynamics of Multilateral Treaty Making', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 43, no. 2 (2008), p. 187; Robert O. Keohane, 'Multilateralism: An Agenda for Research', *International Organization*, Vol. 45, no. 4 (1990), p. 731.
- 9 Renato Corbetta and William J. Dixon, 'Multilateralism, Major Powers, and Militarized Disputes', *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol. 57, no. 1 (2004), p. 6.
- 10 Sebastian Harnisch, 'Minilateral Cooperation and Transatlantic Coalition Building: The E3/EU3 Iran Initiative', *European Security*, Vol. 16, no.1 (March 2007), p. 19.
- 11 Kenneth A Oye, 'Explaining Cooperation under Anarchy: Hypothesis and Strategies', *World Politics*, Vol. 38, no.1 (1985), p. 1–24; Lisa L. Martin, 'Interests, Power and Multilateralism', *International Organization*, Vol. 46, no. 1 (Spring 1992),

- pp. 76 98; George Downs et al., 'Managing the Evolution of Multilateralism', *International Organization*, Vol. 52 (1998), pp. 397 419.
- 12 Edward Luck, 'The United States, International Organisation, and the Quest for Legitimacy', in Stewart Patrick and Shepard Forman (eds), *Multilateralism & US Foreign Policy: Ambivalent Engagement* (Boulder, Co: Lynne Rienner, 2002), pp. 47 74; Martha Finnemore, 'Military Intervention and the Organization of International Politics', in Joseph Lepgold and Thomas G. Weiss (eds), *Collective Conflict Management and Changing World Politics* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 1998), pp. 181 204.
 - 13 Robert O. Keohane, 'Multilateralism: An Agenda for Research', *International Journal*, Vol. 45, pp. 731 64; Robert O. Keohane, 'International Institutions: Two Approaches', in Friedrich Kratochwil and Edward D. Mansfield Eds), *International Organization: A Reader* (New York: HarperCollins, 1994), pp. 48 49.
 - 14 John Gerard Ruggie, 'Multilateralism: The Anatomy of an Institution', in John Gerard Ruggie (ed.), *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Form* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), p. 11.
 - 15 For details see John Gerard Ruggie, 'Unravelling the World Order: The United States and the Future of Multilateralism', Mimeograph, University of California, San Diego, 1989; John Gerard Ruggie, 'Multilateralism: The Anatomy of an Institution', *International Organization*, Vol. 46, no. 3 (Summer 1992).
 - 16 James A. Caporaso, 'International Relations Theory and Multilateralism: The Search for Foundations', *International Organization*, Vol. 46, no. 3 (Summer 1992), p. 602; Lisa L. Martin, 'Interests, Power and Multilateralism', *International Organization*, Vol. 46, no. 4, (Autumn 1992), pp. 765 92.
 - 17 Renato Corbetta and William J. Dixon, 'Multilateralism, Major Powers, and Militarized Disputes', *Political Research Quarterly*, Vol 57, no. 1, (2004), p. 13.
 - 18 Stefano Guzzini, 'Foreign Policy Without Diplomacy: The Bush Administration at a Crossroads', *International Relations*, Vol. 16, no. 2, (2002), p. 294; also Steve Weber, 'Shaping the Postwar Balance of Power: Multilateralism in NATO', in John Gerard Ruggie (ed.), *Multilateralism Matters: The Theory and Praxis of an Institutional Forum* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993), Steve Weber, *Multilateralism in NATO: Shaping the Postwar Balance of Power, 1945 1961* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991).
 - 19 Peter Viggo Jakobsen, 'Multilateralism Matters, But How?', *Cooperation and Conflict*, Vol. 30, no. 4, (1995), p. 365.
 - 20 Robert O. Keohane, 'International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?', *Foreign Policy*, No. 110 (Special Edition: Frontiers of Knowledge), (Spring 1998), p. 88.
 - 21 John Mearsheimer, 'The False Promise of International Institutions', *International Security*, Vol. 19, no. 5 (1994/95), pp. 5 49.
 - 22 Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (set up by the Government of Canada in December 2001)
 - 23 Robert O. Keohane, 'The Contingent Legitimacy of Multilateralism', in Edward Newman, Ramesh Thakur and John Tirman (eds), *Multilateralism Under Challenge: Power, International Order and Structural Change* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2006), pp. 73 74.
 - 24 Amitabh Acharya, 'Multilateralism, Sovereignty and Normative Change in World Politics', in Edward Newman, Ramesh Thakur and John Tirman (eds), *Multilateralism Under Challenge: Power, International Order and Structural Change* (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2006), pp. 109 12.
 - 25 Emanuel Adler, *Communitarian International Relations: The Epistemic Foundations of International Relations* (London: Routledge, 2005); Emanuel Adler, 'Communitarian Multilateralism', in Edward Newman, Ramesh Thakur and John Tirman (eds), *Multilateralism Under Challenge: Power, International Order and Structural Change*, (Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 2006), p. 35.

- 26 Alexander A Pikayev, 'ABM Treaty Revision: A Challenge to Russian Security', *Disarmament Diplomacy*, Issue No. 44, March 2000, available at <http://www.acronym.org.uk/44abm.htm>.
- 27 Arthur M. Schlesinger Jr., 'Unilateralism in Historical Perspective', in Gwyn Prins (ed.), *Understanding Unilateralism in American Foreign Relations* (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2000), pp. 18-29.
- 28 Charles Krauthammer, 'The New Unilateralism', *Washington Post*, 8 June (2001), p. A29.
- 29 G. John Ikenberry, 'Is American Multilateralism in Decline?', *Perspectives on Politics*, Vol. 1, no. 3 (September 2003), p. 534.
- 30 Ralph Cossa, 'Asian Multilateralism: Dialogue on Two Tracks', *JFQ* (Spring 1995), p. 35.
- 31 Tsuneo Akaha, 'Japanese Policy towards the North Korean Problem: Balancing Bilateralism and Multilateralism', *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, Vol. 42, no. 3-4 (2007), p. 306.
- 32 Ibid.
- 33 Axel Berkofsky, 'EU China Relations: Strategic Partnership or Partners of Convenience?', *German Foreign Policy in Dialogue*, Vol. 6, no. 16 (June 2005), p. 15.
- 34 Huo Zhengde, 'On the China EU Strategic Relationship', *China International Studies*, No.1 (Winter 2005), p. 87.
- 35 Feng Zhongping, 'Forming a Closer Bond', *Beijing Review*, 27 May (2004), p. 23.
- 36 Amit Baruah, 'Foreign Ministers of India, China, Russia to Meet Again', *The Hindu* (New Delhi), 12 October (2003), p. 10.
- 37 C.V. Ranganathan, 'A Festive Spring for Indian Diplomacy', *China Report*, Vol. 41, no. 3 (2005), p. 313.
- 38 Cited in C.V. Ranganathan, 'Cooperation Within and Across Regions Makes for Good Multilateralism', *China Report*, Vol. 40, no. 2 (2004), p. 141.
- 39 Wu Xinbo, 'Four Contradictions Constraining China's Foreign Policy Behavior', *Journal of Contemporary China*, Vol. 10, no. 27 (2001), p. 299; Xiao Hanke, 'Zhongguo de Daguo Zeren yu Diqizhuyi zhanlue', *Shijie Jingji yu Zhengzhi*, No. 1 (2003), p. 47.
- 40 Ma Licheng, 'Dui Ri Guanxi Xin Siwei: Zhong Ri Minjian Zhi You', *Zhanlue yu Guanli*, No. 6 (2002), p. 47; Shi Yinhong, 'Zhong Ri Jiejin yu 'Waijiao geming'', *Zhanlue yu Guanli*, No. 2 (2003), pp. 71-75.
- 41 Li Wuyi, *Daguo guanxi yu weilai zhongguo* [Relations among Big Powers and China's Future], (Beijing: Chinese Social Sciences Publishing, 2002), pp. 19-20.
- 42 David Scott, 'China and the EU: A Strategic Axis for the Twenty First Century', *International Relations*, Vol. 21, No. 1 (2007), p. 36.
- 43 Robert O. Keohane, 'International Institutions: Can Interdependence Work?', *Foreign Policy*, No. 110 (Special Edition: Frontiers of Knowledge), (Spring 1998), p. 83.
- 44 Robert O. Keohane, 'Reciprocity in International Relations', *International Organization*, Vol. 40, no. 1 (1986), pp. 1-27.

9 Europe, China, India and the multipolar world order

Charles Grant

For many European observers of international affairs, a gradual transition from the hegemonic order of the 1990s, when the US was the sole super-power, to a more complicated international system in which several poles including Brazil, China, the EU, India, Japan and Russia have weight or the potential to develop it is taking place. Many Europeans are rather relaxed about this evolution, though it makes the more Atlanticist among them feel uncomfortable.

Americans, unsurprisingly, tend to be less sanguine about this trend. Given that some of those who have talked most about multipolarity including the former French President Jacques Chirac and the former Russian President Vladimir Putin have also, at times, been very critical of the US, Americans can be forgiven for seeing the concept as anti-American.

Economics, and notably the rapid growth of the 'BRIC' economies (Brazil, Russia, India and China), is driving this change. According to predictions by the Economist Intelligence Unit, by 2020 the American, EU and Chinese economies will each account for just under 20 per cent of global GDP (calculated on the basis of purchasing power parity). It predicts that by 2030, the Chinese economy will be the largest in the world, while the relative weights of the US and the EU will continue to fall. Although much uncertainty surrounds such figures, the trend seems clear.

Of course, military and diplomatic power does not always correlate closely with economic output. At the moment, the US accounts for almost half the entire world's defence spending, and it is likely to remain the supreme military power for many decades ahead. But there is little doubt that in the long term, the West (in the sense of the North Americans and the Europeans) is becoming weaker, relative to the rest of the world.

Newspaper headlines in the past few years have brought home this shift to the European public. Two companies of Indian origin, Mittal and Tata Steel, bought the two largest steel producers in Europe, Arcelor and Corus, respectively. Chinese and Indian firms have bought up the remnants of what was once the British Leyland car group. When American and European banks suffered massive losses in the 2007 credit crunch, sovereign wealth funds from China, Kuwait, Singapore and elsewhere bought billion-dollar stakes in the

Table 9.1 Share of world GDP percentages at PPP1

	1995	2007	2020	2030
US	21.7	19.4	18.3	16.6
China	5.5	10.1	17.7	22.7
Japan	8.3	6.0	4.6	3.6
India	3.1	4.3	6.9	8.7
Russia	2.8	2.9	3.1	2.7
EU 27	24.5	20.8	18.6	15.6
France	3.6	3.0	2.5	2.1
Germany	5.3	3.9	3.2	2.5
UK	3.4	3.1	2.9	2.5

Source: The Economist Intelligence Unit.

Notes: GDP figures are calculated at purchasing power parity, a measure that takes account of the lower price level in developing countries. In December 2007, the World Bank's International Comparison Programme released new PPP calculations for 146 countries for 2005; China had fully participated in this survey for the first time. The new data suggest that the emerging economies are much smaller than previously assumed, and the new estimate for China is 40 per cent lower. The EIU's projections are based on the new estimates.

likes of Citi, Merrill Lynch and UBS. And in July 2008, India's and China's desire to protect their farmers helped cause the collapse of the World Trade Organization talks (though the US must share the blame).

The rise of the new economic powers is affecting the fabric of international diplomacy. The UN created a new Human Rights Council in Geneva in 2006, yet the new body has not only avoided criticism of the lack of civil and political freedoms in Muslim countries, but also passed a resolution backed by the Organization of the Islamic Conference and opposed by the EU which condoned limits to free speech on religious matters. Nor has the council criticized Russia or China, which jointly prevented it from scrutinizing Belarus in 2006.

The main institutions of global governance, such as the UN Security Council, the G8 or the IMF, are steadily losing legitimacy and authority because of the under-representation of new powers and the developing world within them.¹ They are also losing their effectiveness: in Africa, for example, China's 'no-strings-attached' loans have undermined the efforts of international financial institutions (and western governments) to improve governance through making aid conditional.

Although the trend towards multipolarity is indisputable, the nature of the multipolar system that emerges is not. Two kinds of multipolarity seem plausible: one competitive, the other cooperative; one based on the assertion of national power, the other on multilateral rules and organizations.

The leading countries, or poles, could line up in two competing camps, driven by ideology or some other set of interests, as happened during the Cold War. For example, Robert Kagan, the American author, believes that the

underlying political values of the various poles will determine who their best friends are. If his analysis was correct, Russia and China could form an 'axis of autocracies', united by their dislike of western political liberalism. They would face an axis of democracies, consisting of the US, Europe, Japan and possibly India.²

Most Europeans hope that that kind of balance-of-power politics does not create rifts in the emerging multipolar world. They believe that the major challenges of the twenty-first century – such as climate change, energy security, migration and terrorism – require cooperation among all the leading powers, rather than just some of them. Europeans want to see a multilateral model of multipolarity: there could be shifting coalitions among the poles – and the democratic ones would have a natural affinity to work together – but all would take part in multilateral institutions and treaties, and respect international law. As the 2003 EU Security Strategy put it:

In a world of global threats, global markets and global media, our security and prosperity increasingly depend on an effective multilateral system. The development of a stronger international society, well-functioning international institutions and a rule-based international order is our objective.

Of the major powers, the EU will always be the biggest champion of multilateralism – the concept is ingrained into the DNA of its politicians, since the EU itself is a multilateral construction. China, Russia, the US and India, by contrast, can easily switch between unilateral, bilateral and multilateral behaviour, depending on their perception of which tool best promotes their self-interest.

There are good reasons to think that the new international system will be predominantly multilateral. As America's power becomes relatively weaker, the argument in favour of it acting multilaterally, rather than unilaterally, will grow stronger. If the US becomes concerned about the behaviour of other powers, it is more likely to see the case for building strong international institutions to constrain them. As John Ikenberry, a professor at Princeton University, puts it: 'US dominance will eventually end. US grand strategy, accordingly, should be driven by one key question: what kind of international order would the US like to see in place when it is less powerful?'³

Moreover, the world's democratic powers may not want to form an alliance against Russia and China. Many Europeans and Americans are convinced that engagement is preferable to confrontation. And western business interests will also push for open and amicable relations with the booming emerging markets. Nor is it likely that India, though a democracy, would want to take part in a western strategy of containing Russia and China.

And would those two authoritarian states wish to form an axis? Their governments currently have a good relationship, and share a common distaste for the 'colour revolutions' that have spread liberal democracy to some of

their neighbours. But Russia and China are not natural allies, and there is not much trust between their political elites. Moscow knows that in any close partnership with Beijing, China's economic strength is likely to make it the leading partner. Many Russians fear Chinese encroachment on parts of their territory.⁴

Furthermore, these two powers have very different views on how to deal with the West. During Putin's second term as president, the Russian leadership often seemed paranoid about the West's intentions, and it sometimes chose to deal with both Europeans and Americans in a truculent and confrontational manner. President Barack Obama's overtures to Moscow in early 2009 met a somewhat friendly response, but as yet there are few reasons to believe that Russia's policy towards the West – notably the assertion of a sphere of influence in its 'near abroad' – has changed in its fundamentals.

The leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, by contrast, has a strong interest in avoiding rows with the US, while it focuses on building China's economic strength. China's leaders care about how the rest of the world views their country, and hoped that the Olympic games would highlight China's emergence as a modern and dynamic world power. They can become prickly when faced with foreign criticism that they consider unfair, as happened after the March 2008 protests in Tibet. Nevertheless, they want China to be accepted as a responsible power, so they sometimes listen to what the West says. And because China's economy depends on exports of manufactured goods, it has a particular interest in an open international economy with strong rules. An energy exporter such as Russia has less need for effective global economic governance: there will always be demand for its oil and gas.

For these reasons, the balance-of-power model of multipolarity does not, at present, seem likely. Yet it is far from certain that multilateralism will triumph. The next few years will determine whether the world moves towards competitive or cooperative multipolarity, or some combination of the two. China's own strategy and behaviour will be critical: it is a swing power that could tilt the international system one way or the other.

This essay examines the China–EU relationship, and then looks at India's approach to multilateralism, before focusing on India–EU relations. It concludes with some remarks on global governance.

China and Europe

The single most important geostrategic relationship of the twenty-first century is likely to be that of China and the US, because of their economic power and potential strategic rivalry. But the China–EU relationship will also be crucial. The EU is China's biggest trading partner and their two-way trade topped €300 billion in 2007. If China and the EU manage to build a friendly and fruitful strategic partnership, they will further the cause of multilateralism. But if their relations became frosty and fraught, the scenario of competing ideological blocs will become more plausible.

Bob Zoellick, former US deputy secretary of state and now World Bank president, said that the West's main objective towards China should be to turn it into a 'responsible global stakeholder'.⁵ However, America's own tendency towards unilateralism, particularly evident during the first term of President George W. Bush, somewhat weakens its credibility when it asks China to respect international organizations and rules. The EU is much better placed to do so, not only because of its track-record of supporting multilateralism, but also because in contrast to the US it is not a geopolitical rival of China.

Despite the obvious differences between China and the EU only the former is a state, and only the latter is governed according to liberal democratic principles they are both regional powers intent on developing a political clout that matches their economic weight. The EU has begun to develop external policies that extend far beyond its corner of the world ranging from the diplomacy surrounding Iran's nuclear programme, to military missions in Chad and Congo, to leading the international efforts to construct a system for limiting carbon emissions after the expiry of the Kyoto protocol.

Driven by its focus on economic growth, and the need to find the resources to fuel that growth, China has become increasingly active not only in its own neighbourhood but also much further afield. China, like the EU, has major aid programmes in Africa. It has built increasingly close ties with several Latin American governments. It is also becoming a key player in most of the big questions of global security, such as the nuclear programmes of Iran and North Korea and the political crises in Burma and Sudan. China and the EU are bumping up against each other in more and more parts of the world.

The China EU relationship will help to define the new international system. Europeans are unsure what kind of system China wants. They are aware that, within the Chinese government, there is a vigorous debate between liberal internationalists, who are sympathetic to multilateralism, and assertive nationalists, who are not. The latter remain influential. Hence China's support for the principle of non-interference and for regimes shunned by the West, such as Burma, Iran, Sudan, Venezuela, Uzbekistan and Zimbabwe; in return China has won contracts to exploit oil and mineral resources in these countries. Hence China's defence budget consistently grows much faster than its economy, worrying neighbours such as Taiwan, Japan and India.

Yet the long-term trend of China's foreign policy seems to be for it to become a 'responsible global stakeholder'. China joined the World Trade Organization in 2002. It has led the international diplomacy to persuade North Korea to abandon its atomic weapons programme, and voted (albeit reluctantly) for three rounds of UN sanctions against Iran, to dissuade it from enriching uranium. China has sent 1,000 peacekeepers to the United Nations force on the Israel Lebanon border.

As consistent proponents of multilateralism, Europeans are well-placed to make the case to China's leadership that it can best achieve many national objectives by working through international institutions. The EU should try



to build a strategic partnership with China. This should focus on issues that cause tensions between them but which, if tackled in a serious dialogue, could help to strengthen global governance. The priorities should be trade, climate change, nonproliferation and Africa.

- *Trade.* Given that China is the world's second biggest exporter, after Germany, it has an evident interest in open markets, clear rules on trade and strong dispute settlement mechanisms. And investments by China's sovereign wealth funds would cause less concern in the West if they took place within an internationally agreed framework, such as those currently being drawn up by the IMF and the OECD. The EU and China are among the biggest beneficiaries of cross-border flows of goods, services, capital, technology and skills. They should work together to convince the world's other powers to maintain an open global trading system.
- *Climate change.* If global warming accelerates, China is liable to suffer much more than Europe, because of desertification, floods in low-lying areas and the disappearance of Himalayan glaciers. Climate change also has the potential to do other sorts of damage to China: if it avoided taking part in the post-Kyoto system for reducing carbon emissions, it would probably face tariffs on the exports of its energy-intensive industries. (Europeans argue that such tariffs would be needed to create a level playing field between their industries and those in China.) China would also pay a political price if it opted out: Europeans believe that climate change is the biggest long-term problem that the world faces and that all the leading powers, including China, must take a share of the responsibility for tackling the problem.
- *Nonproliferation.* If more countries acquire nuclear weapons, China's status as one of a small number of nuclear powers will be eroded, and the world will become a more dangerous and unstable place. In 2010 a new UN conference will discuss how the nuclear nonproliferation regime can be strengthened. China should play an active role in helping to reform the nonproliferation regime, for example by backing proposals for a 'uranium bank' that would provide nuclear fuel to countries with civilian nuclear reactors. China should also do more to discourage Iran from pursuing its nuclear ambitions. If Iran continues to pursue its enrichment and ballistic missile programmes, the chances of Israel attacking it will grow. That would worsen a whole series of conflicts in the Middle East and lead to a big rise in the oil price, creating new problems for the Chinese economy.
- *Africa.* China has growing interests in Africa, where its investments and expertise are helping to develop some of the world's poorest countries. Europeans welcome that involvement and understand that China is not going to promote democracy and human rights in Africa, as Europeans try (and often fail) to do. But Europeans believe that China has an interest in using its considerable influence in certain countries to encourage them to improve the quality of governance. If an African state like Zimbabwe

suffers from inflation of more than 10 million per cent (as is the case at the time of writing), mob violence and endemic corruption, that is likely to harm the security of China's investments and its expatriates, will grow. China should discuss Africa's problems with the EU, the international financial institutions and Africa's regional organizations, and work with them to enhance the African countries' stability and prosperity.

If Europe can use such a partnership to draw China towards multilateralism, the whole international system will tilt away from balance of power politics.⁶ Of course, China is not the only major power that Europeans will hope to steer towards multilateralism in order to ensure that the whole system tilts that way. Its relations with Russia, the US and India, and a number of other powers, are also important.

India's place in the multipolar world

India, like most of the other great powers in the world today, is capable of acting multilaterally, unilaterally or bilaterally. Its leaders proclaim their support for the principles of multilateralism. But reality often fails to match rhetoric.

At the United Nations, India is generally not viewed as one of its more constructive members. It sometimes reacts in a negative or hostile manner to the initiatives of others, and does not often take its own initiatives. Evidently, so long as India is not a permanent member of the UN Security Council, its officials will have an excuse for sometimes taking the UN less seriously than diplomats from other parts of the world.

In its own neighbourhood, India has no compunction about acting unilaterally, as it did when it sent forces into Sikkim and Goa (both now part of India, in the 1960s), Bangladesh (in the 1970s) and Sri Lanka (in the 1980s). Today India's government has its own policy on Myanmar, namely to boost Indian influence in the country and not to criticize the regime, and it is not enthusiastic about tackling Myanmar in a multilateral framework.

Nor does India fit naturally into the 'balance-of-power' order that Robert Kagan foresees. India does not want to be part of an anti-China coalition, or a league of democracies. Indeed, it has seldom allowed its democratic political system to influence its foreign policy. If India does have a natural preference in international relations, it is to deal with other powers bilaterally. The fact that India is large gives it weight in its bilateral relations, for example with China, Russia and the US.

Although India does not want to be part of an axis of democracies, the most significant shift in its foreign policy over the past two decades has been the rapprochement with the United States. Traditionally, the focus of India's foreign policy was nonalignment, but a nonalignment that left it much closer to the Soviet Union and its allies than the US. Several factors explain warming ties with Washington:

- The collapse of the Soviet Union and the relative weakness of Russia since then;
- growing economic ties between the US and India, particularly in the IT industries;
- the burgeoning educational and familial links between the two countries many bright young Indians aspire to study at US universities, and some of those who go stay; and
- growing worries in India about the rise of Chinese power; as a result, many Indian leaders favour closer ties with the US.

Thickening ties between the US and Indian security and political establishments led to the nuclear deal between the governments of Manmohan Singh and George W. Bush. This deal – approved by the nuclear suppliers’ group and the US Congress in 2008 – promises to remove various sanctions against India’s nuclear industry, in return for it putting its civilian nuclear facilities under international inspection.

Anti-Americanism remains a potent force in India, not only in the Communist parties but also in the left-wing intelligentsia and some universities. But public opinion tends to be broadly pro-American, as are the political leaders of the two main parties, the Congress and the BJP. Meanwhile in the US the leaderships of the Republican and Democratic parties both support close ties with India.

Few Indians want to be used as a pawn by the US in the containment of China. And few think that, because India is a democracy, it should line up with other democracies against autocracies. Yet the friendly relations with Washington have affected India’s relations with China.

At the level of political and business leaders, Indians talk up the relationship with China, stressing the growing trade and friendly ties between the two countries. But in the Indian military establishment and among foreign affairs commentators, and perhaps more broadly among the general public, there are growing concerns about the rise of China. In his recent study of India, China and Japan, Bill Emmott observes that for the first time in its history, Asia contains three powerful and assertive states at the same time: ‘A new power game is under way, in which all must seek to be as friendly as possible to all, for fear of the consequences if they are not, but in which the friendship is only skin-deep.’⁷

Indians are, understandably, concerned about a series of unresolved border disputes with their giant neighbour. China occupies several parts of what India claims is its territory. And China claims a whole state of India – Arunachal Pradesh – as its own. This series of disputes was supposed to be resolved during a visit to Delhi by President Hu Jintao in 2006. But something went wrong and a comprehensive deal on border disputes was never signed. Since then China has criticized Singh for visiting Arunachal Pradesh, and refused visas to government officials born in the state. In April 2009 it emerged that China had blocked an Asian Development Bank loan to India, because some of the loan would have been spent in Arunachal Pradesh.

It is not entirely clear why China has taken a tougher line over the border in the past few years. In Delhi some analysts believe that China is punishing India for its closer relationship with Washington. If that is the case, China's tactic is proving counter-productive, since it is stoking up fears of China in Delhi.

The Indians who worry most about China are military leaders and strategic thinkers. They note its soaring military budget, its armaments programmes and its ambitions to develop space weapons. And they are anxious about China's close relations with India's neighbours, with whom India tends to get on rather badly. Some Indian strategists fear 'encirclement' by China, via its relations with countries such as Sri Lanka, Myanmar, Bangladesh, Nepal and Pakistan.

Such concerns explain India's efforts to build close relations with Japan, Australia and Singapore (these three countries, together with the US and India, have staged joint military exercises). They explain its charm offensive in South East Asia, intended to prevent Chinese domination of the region. And they also account for some of India's ambitions in Africa, where it worries that Chinese firms tend to outbid Indian ones to win contracts to exploit natural resources. India hosted a summit for African leaders in New Delhi in April 2008, 18 months after China had hosted a similar gathering in Beijing.

Trade between India and China continues to boom, reaching \$ 52 billion in 2008, a comparable level to that between India and the EU (€56 billion in 2007, the last year for which figures are available) though that is much less than trade between China and the EU (which was €301 billion in 2007). India's trade deficit with China is worth more than \$ 10 billion, and some Indians are increasingly concerned that while China exports manufactured goods to India, exports to China add less value (about half of India's exports to China are iron ore).

Tensions between Delhi and Beijing are unlikely to lessen, unless they can somehow find an accommodation on their border disputes. India is likely to maintain friendly relations with Washington, and that will continue to cause concern in Beijing. However, if China ceased to block reform of the UN Security Council, so that Japan and India could become permanent members, it would help to create a positive climate in India China relations.

India's relationship with Russia is much less important than it was during the Cold War. There is very little non-military trade between the two. India continues to buy Russian armaments, but the military relationship seems to be declining in importance. India sometimes want US weapons in preference to those offered by Russia, which does not go down well in Moscow, and the two sides have been sparring over the price of an aircraft carrier that Russia is due to sell India. One problem for the economic relationship is the lack of an overland route for trade between them (Pakistan does not allow transit).

Politically, relations between India and Russia remain quite good. Some Indian strategic thinkers see Russia as a potential element in their strategy for containing Chinese power.

So far, Indian diplomacy has been much more concerned with these key bilateral relationships than with the multilateral system. India has not yet

displayed any willingness to sign up to a quantitative reduction in carbon emissions in the post-Kyoto system that is likely to emerge after 2012. It has together with Brazil played a sometimes negative role in the Doha round of WTO talks, where it has been particularly resistant to moves to lower industrial tariffs. Like China and Russia, India is a strong supporter of the principle of non-interference, and reluctant to embrace the concept of humanitarian intervention. India has not been active in trying to reshape global institutions such as the UN, the IMF, the World Bank and the G8. However, India is one of the biggest providers of peacekeepers to the UN. Perhaps, now that India is part of the G-20 grouping which since November 2008 has taken on an increasingly important role in global governance it will start to take on a greater sense of responsibility for global governance.

Of all the major powers with which India has relations, those with the EU are arguably the most underdeveloped. Yet the EU's relations with India, like its ties with the US, China and Russia, will help to shape the international system.

The EU and India

Until recently, neither the EU nor India took their relationship very seriously. That is starting to change, thanks to burgeoning economic ties. Two-way trade reached €56 billion in 2007 and at least until the global recession struck has been growing at about 15 per cent a year. European foreign direct investment in India rose to an annual level of €11 billion in 2007, while Indian firms have bought Europe's two biggest steel companies, Arcelor and Corus, as well as Jaguar and Land Rover.

However the EU needs to pay more attention to its still under-developed relationship with India. As the EU tries to extend its reach beyond its own immediate neighbourhood, India can help it to fulfil some of its key objectives, for example on climate change.

Javier Solana, the EU's High Representative, does not see India as a priority. At the November 2007 EU India summit in Delhi, the EU was represented by the prime minister and foreign minister of Portugal (which then held the rotating presidency), Commission President José Manuel Barroso (also Portuguese) and trade commissioner Peter Mandelson. Although the Indians have no particular prejudice against the Portuguese, it is telling that Prime Minister Manmohan Singh (according to his officials) devoted much more time and energy to preparing for his bilateral summits with Gordon Brown, Angela Merkel and Nicolas Sarkozy than he did to the meeting with Barroso.

Officials in Brussels and Delhi whinge about each other. Those from the EU complain that their counterparts in Delhi are arrogant and under-resourced; the Ministry of External Affairs has only three officials covering all of Western Europe and the EU. Indians moan about the patronizing attitudes of Europeans and the Byzantine complexities of the Union; they dislike having to deal with the EU's institutions and member-states at the same time.

The EU and India are negotiating a ‘broad-based trade and investment agreement’. The EU hopes that the accord will bring down tariffs and allow its companies to invest more freely in areas such as telecoms, legal services and insurance. India wants its nationals to be able to work more freely in the EU. It also wants to sell more services (such as IT and back office processing) to Europe, and hopes for fewer barriers to its exports in sectors such as textiles, chemicals, leather and food-stuffs.

The two sides are also engaged in reviewing their ‘joint action plan’, an 80-page document that covers dialogues on a wide range of topics such as weapons proliferation, human rights, climate change, science, space, terrorism and higher education.

Ever since 2004, India and the EU have proclaimed that they have a ‘strategic partnership’, which is exactly what the relationship is not (if a ‘strategic’ relationship is defined as one that is focused on the long term, a small number of priorities and questions of security). Indian and EU leaders should try to forge a genuinely strategic partnership, based on a few priorities that have long-term significance for both sides:

- *Climate change and energy security.* Although they are unwilling to accept binding commitments to cut carbon emissions, India’s leaders know that they will have to be part of the global system that tackles the problem. Indians are keen to gain access to European technologies that would enable them to use energy more efficiently, curb pollution and cut greenhouse gas emissions. Meanwhile, Indian companies are well placed to invent and manufacture some of the relevant technologies.
- *Africa.* India already offers billions of dollars of cheap credits and it plans a \$10 billion investment fund for Africa. India, like China, has tended not to criticize African regimes that abuse human rights. But many Indians view Europe as less of a direct rival than China and are prepared to go some way towards Europeans in accepting that governance matters. An EU India dialogue on Africa could focus on joint projects to pursue common interests – for example, rebuilding war-torn regions such as Northern Uganda – and on the importance of governance.
- *Post-conflict reconstruction.* India is one of the world’s leading providers of peacekeepers, and currently has 9,000 blue helmets in Africa. However, India has had less experience of some of the broader tasks of helping societies to recover from conflict, such as co-ordinating the work of soldiers with civilian agencies and personnel. Recently, India has become a major provider of assistance to Afghanistan, where it (like the EU) wants to sustain Mohammed Karzai’s government. Both the EU and India would benefit from exchanging expertise on peacekeeping and post-conflict reconstruction.
- *Counter-terrorism.* Indians have been frequent victims of terrorism and attach great importance to tackling it. The EU India dialogue on counter-terrorism has not achieved a great deal, perhaps because the EU itself has

virtually no competence on the matter. However, a dialogue between India and the 'G6' (an informal group of the interior ministers of Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Poland and Spain) and the EU's 'situation centre' (Solana's unit that collates intelligence from across the EU) could be productive.

Some Indian leaders say they would welcome an EU that became a more effective foreign policy actor: they see no fundamental conflict between these two democratic blocs, and they would like Europe to become a more effective geopolitical counterweight to China and the US. Yet for the time being most Indian policy-makers regard the EU as not much more than a trade bloc. This is because it has had little to say on the subjects they care most about. For example, the Europeans are divided over which countries should have permanent seats on the UN Security Council (which India wants to join) and whether to support the India US nuclear deal.

Yet neither the EU nor India sees the other as any kind of strategic rival. If the EU could engage the Indians on the subjects mentioned above, it might seem more relevant to them.

India, China and the institutions of global governance

In all these relationships, however, one problem is the EU's ability to manage a strategic partnership. Can the EU and its member-states learn to work together and to think strategically? Can they build the institutions that will enable them to deal effectively with other parts of the world? European foreign policy has had its successes: the EU speaks with a common voice on Iran, and most of the time though not on the recognition of Kosovo it has had a common position on the Balkans. But the persistent desire of the larger member-states to run their own bilateral relationships with Russia and China (and sometimes India), rather than to work through the EU, has enabled those powers to divide and rule. The EU needs to change in many ways before it becomes a more influential global actor.⁸

One problem that could be fixed relatively quickly is the way the Europeans represent themselves to the outside world. The Indians, like the Americans, Russians and Chinese, get confused by the EU's bizarre, three-headed system of external representation: there is the member-state holding the rotating presidency, the commissioner for external relations and her staff, and the High Representative and his staff. Other countries are often frustrated by the inability of these various bodies to work together smoothly.

The EU's Lisbon treaty, signed in 2007, promises to improve this situation by creating a single 'High Representative' to replace the current High Representative, the commissioner for external relations and the foreign minister of the country holding the presidency; and a new full-time president of the European Council (as the regular summits of EU leaders are known). At the time of writing it is uncertain whether the foreign policy provisions of this treaty will come into force. If the treaty itself is not implemented, EU governments

will certainly come back to the issue of reforming their foreign policy institutions in the coming years; they know that the current institutions are unsustainable.

However, one should remember that the creation of these new posts, though desirable, will not in itself solve the representation problem. Who gets the jobs will matter. To quote one Delhi official: 'If you want us to take the EU seriously, please appoint a president we have heard of.'

More important than EU institutional reform is global institutional reform. Deeper partnerships between the EU and India, and the EU and China, would in themselves help to strengthen global governance. But these partnerships should also explicitly cover the institutions of global governance. Many of these institutions do not represent the emerging powers adequately, which means they are losing authority. The IMF and the World Bank need to be reformed so that big economies such as China and India have a greater weight within them. The UN Security Council needs to become more representative, in order to revive its dwindling legitimacy, which means that Japan and India have to join (and China needs to facilitate that change). The G8 cannot tackle serious global economic problems so long as countries like China and India are not full members. The G-20 is likely to become more important than the G-8. But Chinese and Indian membership of this body means that others will expect them to take on new responsibilities, for example in curbing carbon emissions or giving aid to poorest countries.

The EU should also start a dialogue with China and India on the creation of new institutions, such as those that will be needed to manage the global system for curbing carbon emissions, or to bring together the principal producers and consumers of energy. The world's leading multilateral institutions cannot be reformed, or new ones created, without China's and India's active involvement. China is becoming one of the world's top powers, and it needs to play a leadership role in global governance, so that it can shape the international system to suit its interests. India is following behind and will also be a top power before too long. The Indians and the Chinese should not leave the Americans, Europeans, Russians and others to design the new world order. They should help to design it themselves.

This essay has outlined some areas in which Europe can work constructively with both India and China. If the EU China, and EU India partnerships become more strategic, the whole international system will benefit. The indirect impact on some sensitive relationships, such as that between India and China (and perhaps that between the US and Russia), would probably be beneficial. The chances of the world's powers dividing into two hostile camps, as Kagan foresees, would be reduced. Multilateralism would be strengthened.

Notes

- 1 Kishore Mahbubani, *The New Asian Hemisphere: The Irresistible Shift of Global Power to the East*, Public Affairs, 2008.

- 2 Robert Kagan, 'End of Dreams, Return of History', *Policy Review*, August September 2007, Hoover Institution.
- 3 John Ikenberry, 'The Rise of China and the Future of the West', *Foreign Affairs*, January/February 2008.
- 4 Bobo Lo, 'Axis of Convenience: Moscow, Beijing and the New Geopolitics', Chatham House and the Brookings Institution, Autumn 2008.
- 5 Speech to the National Committee on US China relations, 21 September 2005.
- 6 Charles Grant with Katinka Barysch, 'Can Europe and China Shape a New World Order?', CER pamphlet, May 2008.
- 7 Bill Emmott, *Rivals* (Allen Lane, 2008).
- 8 Charles Grant with Tomas Valasek, 'Preparing for the Multipolar World: European Foreign and Security Policy in 2020', CER essay, December 2007.

10 Globalization revisited

Evolving Chinese discourses on the Open Door policy and integration with the world economy

Kalpana Misra

The policy of ‘reform and opening up’ (*gaige kaifang*) adopted in 1979 by the post-Mao coalition has dramatically transformed China’s economy, society, and culture and its emergence as a major power in the global arena has raised concerns about a new bipolar rivalry between the United States and a rising China. Conversely, China’s engagement with the international community and its integration into the global economy and its key institutions has also encouraged the perception that the benefits of interdependence have given the PRC a considerable stake in peaceful competition.

In the course of sharp debates on the pros and cons of the Open Door policy and accession to the WTO over the last two decades, the official Chinese discourse on globalization has evolved from a simplistic emphasis on international economic linkages for national survival to a more nuanced analysis of the stakes of cooperation and competition at the global level. The Chinese leadership has continued to highlight its favourable view of multilateral management of the global economy, but it has also co-opted the arguments of both the New Left and the new conservatives to commit itself to a revision of the status quo to undermine the power and privileges of the dominant West. Thus, there is room for optimism regarding the ‘peaceful rise of China’, but a more assertive approach to safeguarding its economic and territorial security is also to be expected as China narrows its gap in capabilities and further elevates its status in the international hierarchy.

A change of course

Deng Xiaoping’s return to the forefront of Chinese politics marked a dramatic shift in both domestic policy and China’s foreign relations. The turn away from Maoist radicalism to a more pragmatic and single-minded focus on economic modernization was predicated on the assumption of Mao’s successors that isolation and self-reliance had served China poorly, and resulted in low levels of economic growth and technological stagnation, which contributed in turn to a decline in political legitimacy and decreased external security.

In its immediate neighbourhood, the PRC found itself lagging behind the East Asian tigers that had charged rapidly ahead by integrating with the

global capitalist economy and utilizing their close ties with the West and particularly the United States to gain access to large markets, advanced technology and enhanced security. The aim of the policy of ‘opening to the outside world’ (*dui wai kaiwang zhengze*) was to use foreign capital and technology to bring about accelerated and intensive economic growth and transform China from a ‘poverty stricken and backward country’ to a wealthy, modern and powerful one by the end of the twentieth century. Internally, this required wide-ranging rural and urban reform to promote a greater role for market forces, and the establishment of a favourable environment for foreign business both in the Special Economic Zones (SEZs) and other parts of China that could hope to attract international capital. Externally, the policy necessitated the vigorous promotion of extensive linkages with countries like the United States and Japan for easing restrictions on access to technology, expanding bilateral trade and official support in multilateral institutions such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and other UN agencies and regional aid organizations.

Improved ties and a close partnership with the United States also furthered China’s strategic goal of reducing its vulnerability to perceived threats from the Soviet Union. In general, the Chinese leadership under Deng looked to a peaceful international arena as an important condition for the success of China’s economic growth and modernization strategy and, with the exception of the ill-conceived attempt in 1979 to ‘teach Vietnam a lesson’, the leadership took steps to reduce tensions along China’s borders and improve relations with key players like the Soviet Union, Japan and India to promote a more stable regional security dynamic.¹

The consensus on ‘reform and opening up’ eroded significantly during the 1980s. Moderate reformers pointed to the dangers of a gradual and subversive expansion of bourgeois influences imported from the West and their apprehension about the ‘flies and insects’ that flew in the Open Door along with the benefits of investment capital and technical expertise contributed to reform and retrenchment cycles as well as periodic campaigns against spiritual pollution. Radical reformers and their intellectual patrons, however, increasingly argued that the goal of rapid economic development was hampered by gradual, vacillating and incomplete reform and, consequently, pressed for a more extensive and swift drive to integrate China into the world economy. The television series *River Elegy* (*He shang*) epitomized the iconoclastic position of the most radical reformist leaders like Zhao Ziyang in its hard-hitting critique of the Great Wall mentality of isolation and its exhortation to open up to the clear azure Pacific Ocean representing the liberated, progressive West.

Contesting globalization

The Tiananmen Incident of 1989 and the successive collapse of Communist governments in the Soviet bloc dealt a temporary setback to the proponents of sweeping restructuring and opening of the Chinese economy. The economic

woes, rising public discontent and demands for intellectual and political liberalization leading up to the June 4 crackdown confirmed for the leftists in the leadership their worst fears regarding ‘war without the smoke of gunpowder’ and the threat from ‘hostile forces at home and abroad’ that were attempting to subvert CCP leadership and undermine the socialist system. Party Elders Hu Qiaomu and Deng Liqun warned that ‘reform and opening up (was) itself a banner for peaceful evolution (toward capitalism) in China’ and drew attention to the protracted nature of the international and domestic class struggles.²

Deng Xiaoping and like-minded reformers had long concluded however, that social and political stability could be guaranteed only by the maintenance of high rates of GDP growth and expansion, and the presumption of a benign world environment was crucial to the achievement of the four modernizations.³ Having linked its legitimacy to economic performance, the CCP under Deng chose to move decisively toward embracing globalization (*quanqiuhua*) and the neo liberal model upon which it was based.⁴ Deng’s southern tour of early 1992 and the subsequent Fourteenth Party Congress the same year reaffirmed the policy of building ‘comprehensive national power’ (*zonghe guoli*) by prioritizing economic development and opening to the outside. In the years between the Fourteenth and the Fifteenth Party Congresses (1992–97) the Chinese government focused on the twin tasks of strengthening global economic ties and promoting China’s competitiveness at the international level. The credit squeeze of the early post-Tiananmen phase and the need to expand foreign trade and exports, hampered in particular by the annual wrangling with the US over MFN status, provided the rationale for accelerating China’s accession to the WTO and ‘bold experimentation’ at the domestic level with new forms of ownership, organization and management which set the stage for a qualitative transformation of the Chinese economy. In his report to the Fifteenth Party Congress, Jiang Zemin affirmed:

Opening to the outside world is a long term basic state policy. Confronted with the globalizing trend in economic, scientific, and technological development, we should take an even more active stance in the world by improving the pattern of opening up in all directions, at all levels and in a wide range, developing an open economy, enhancing our national competitiveness, optimizing our economic structuring and improving the quality of our national economy.⁵

Such initiatives not only set off alarm bells in the residual leftist opposition, but also met with resistance from broad groups of intellectuals and policy analysts whose concerns ranged from the detrimental consequences of marketization and globalization to the destabilizing effects of declining central authority, ideological erosion and a crisis of national identity. The question of WTO accession and increased interdependence exacerbated concerns about its negative consequences for the socio-economic order as well as issues of sovereignty and autonomy. The official view of globalization as the ‘free

circulation and rational allocation of key elements of production' that would strengthen mutually beneficial economic ties and interdependence met with scepticism by critics on the left.⁶ Di Yinqing and Guan Yang expressed reservations about WTO membership on the grounds that it would enhance the ability of strong capitalist countries like the United States to intervene in Chinese affairs on the pretext of implementing international norms.⁷ Like many other intellectuals and policy-makers in the developing world, New Left writers perceived globalization as essentially Americanization, and the WTO, IMF and World Bank as institutions that served Western interests and allowed 'international monopolist capital groups to exert an ever more powerful influence on the Chinese economy'.⁸

Critics also rejected the pro-globalization argument that China could use its cheap labour and human resources to compete successfully with other countries in the international market. Fang Ning charged that 'comparative advantage as a basic development strategy' had consigned China to the 'bottom of the international division of labour, serving the West as a supplier of cheap commodities and a dumping ground for other people's capital and goods'.⁹ In contrast to free trade advocates Lin Yifu, Zhou Xiaochuan and Yuan Wenqi, economists like Wen Tiejun focused attention on China's structural disadvantages in land/labour ratio, and cost and efficiency of production, and expressed concern that Chinese agriculture in the short run could be disastrously undermined by foreign competition.¹⁰ Han Deqiang warned of a massive rise in rural migration as Chinese peasants were squeezed out of their traditional occupations by the influx of American agricultural products.¹¹ 'Market romanticism', according to Han, needed to be replaced by 'market realism' that entailed 'a sober understanding of the market as a battlefield' and enlisted the power of the state in support of national industry and agriculture.

For many, the likelihood of rising inequality within and between regions was ideologically unacceptable and posed the greatest risks for social and political stability. While the coastal Southeastern provinces were expected to benefit from their superior human capital, technological and infrastructural edge in attracting even more investment and opportunities for trade, the industrial Northeast and the interior provinces were considered inadequately prepared for the challenges of the global market. Large-scale increases in unemployment and widespread decline of incomes in these areas would inevitably strain the resources of local and central governments and make it exceedingly difficult to contain social disturbances and preserve order. Hu Angang and Wang Shaogang, who wrote extensively on the declining political capacity and financial strength of the Chinese state in the 1990s, maintained that heightened tension and violence caused by economic dislocation along with inter-region conflict invoked the serious possibility of China suffering the fate of Yugoslavia and falling prey to national disintegration.¹²

A formidable obstacle to the leadership's push for globalization was the resurgent nationalism of the 1990s decade that perceived the post-Cold War international environment as inherently hostile to China. The sanctions imposed

by Western countries in response to the suppression of the Democracy Movement, the emergence of the US as the sole superpower seemingly poised to contain a rising China as the common strategic threat of the Soviet Union dissipated, Washington's pressure on China in regard to trade practices, human rights and Taiwan, and American obstructionism on the issues of China's entry into the WTO and its bid to host the Olympic Games in 2000 bred a virulent nationalism that was most noticeable in the success of bestsellers like *The China That Can Say No*, student demonstrations against Japan, and the response to the NATO bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade.¹³

At the intellectual level, a heightened sensitivity to issues of national sovereignty and prestige combined with rising dissatisfaction with socio-economic disparities, the alarming decline of public morality, an ideological vacuum and pervasive official corruption provided the context for a greater appreciation for the Chinese socialist revolution, and indigenous cultural and ethical values to unify and guide the country through a crucial phase of transition. On the left, a new group of 'critical' intellectuals marked a striking contrast to the nihilist and individualist voices of the 1980s, with its reassessment of Western models and theories of development and the Chinese Communist path to modernization.¹⁴ Influenced by Said's arguments on Orientalism, Zhang Kuan rejected the hegemony and relevance of Western discourses on modernity and culture and called for a deconstruction of Western accounts of Chinese history to reclaim both the Chinese identity and the nation's right to chart its own path of development and progress.¹⁵ Shi Zhong ridiculed the 'Western culture worship' of the 1980s as 'self-abandonedness' while Zhang Yiwu cautioned that the concept of modernity could not be understood without reference to power relations and specific ideological frames of reference.¹⁶ In 'From Modernity to Chineseness', the latter joined Zhang Fa and Wang Yichuan in arguing that, for the previous century and a half, China had been engaged in a project of modernity whose terms were essentially set and defined by the West.¹⁷ During this phase it was victimized and reduced to a status of the Other as it struggled to implement Western notions of survival and progress. The 1990s were ushering in the 'Post-New Era' when a 'new model of knowledge', viz 'Chineseness', was rising to prominence to emancipate the country from its dependence upon the West and to illuminate the distinctively Chinese features of its market economy, popular culture and intellectual discourse.

Mao's ideological vision and policy preferences that had been the focus of much criticism and derision in the preceding period were now defended by public intellectuals like Cui Zhiyuan who dismissed the 'old paradigm' of economic liberalism and neo-classicism to claim that Maoist socialism growing out of the specific conditions of China was a more appropriate model of development than any western implant.¹⁸ According to Cui, the 1980s agricultural successes and the foundations of local autonomy and village township enterprises could be traced to the communes and policies of the Great Leap Forward and not to any Western-oriented reform measures related to 'getting prices right' and 'getting property rights right'. Shi Zhong refuted the

reformist critique of Maoist ‘catching up and surpassing strategy’ and argued that despite its shortcomings that strategy had promoted political independence and protected infant industries.¹⁹ The policy of utilizing comparative advantage would threaten both independence and national security because China’s economic backwardness made it vulnerable in the international arena where it would be ‘defeated by new technological revolutions and its fate would be even more miserable than in the century’ following the Opium War. Modern industrial technologies, Shi argued, were not neutral. They could be used to control others and bring about the dependence of one set of countries on another.

Wang Hui, Chief Editor of the influential journal *Dushu*, also drew attention to the developmental emphasis of Chinese socialism and acclaimed Mao’s thought as a ‘modernizing theory that provided an alternative to capitalist modernity’, and attempted to avoid the harsh, exploitative and competitive aspects of Western capitalism.²⁰ Like many of his New Left colleagues, Wang drew on Dependency theory and the writings of Immanuel Wallerstein and Samir Amin to illustrate the power relations underlying global economic processes. Globalization, he maintained, was a ‘misleading abstraction’ since it was not a new phenomenon but simply the latest phase of the development of capitalism beyond the colonial and imperialist epochs.

On the right, the lessons drawn from observing the ethnic unrest, political disintegration and unruly economic transition in the former Soviet bloc were a vindication of the Chinese leadership’s prioritization of economic liberalization over political democratization and cause for a sense of pride in China’s economic accomplishments. The new conservatism emerged in response to the perceived crisis of faith in official ideology and cynicism towards Western values and belief systems. It was also spurred on by the publication of Samuel Huntington’s ‘Clash of Civilizations’ and Francis Fukuyama’s ‘End of History’ theses, and an increasing appreciation of shared cultural identity with other East Asian states whose social and economic accomplishments ostensibly demonstrated the virtues of ‘Confucian capitalism’ and Asian values. The officially sponsored revival of ‘national studies’ and a renewed interest in a ‘third epoch of Confucianism’ marked a new awareness that China’s traditional values and culture rather than Western liberalism and enlightenment ideas could hold the key to addressing the challenges facing contemporary Chinese society.

Thus the New Left’s preoccupation with the power and authority of the state to manage and resolve problems encountered in the course of rapid change and decentralization was shared by the new conservatives who, nevertheless, were strongly disposed toward market forces and international involvement. The developments in Eastern Europe simply strengthened their conviction that the survival of the Chinese nation and its continued economic progress in an increasingly competitive global arena could be guaranteed only by the monopoly of power in the hands of the party elite and the adoption of a ‘new ideology’ to replace Marxism Leninism. ‘Developmentalism’ alone would fail to save China; it was necessary to arrest the decline of political legitimacy and

state capacity, and augment performance-based legitimacy with ideological norms that would unite the population behind the leadership and strengthen its position internationally.²¹

New conservatives like Ji Xianlin, Sheng Hong and Chen Lai denigrated the Westernizing impulses and ‘totalistic anti-traditionalism’ that was a legacy of early reformers like Kang Youwei, Tan Sitong and the May Fourth Movement, and argued that Confucian civilization, with its emphasis on harmony between self and community, humanity and nature, was far better suited to solving the problems of industrialization and modernity.²² Wang Desheng suggested replacing the ‘dysfunction of radical cultural critique and enlightenment’ with the ‘rearguard function of cultural conservatism’, that would bring about national rejuvenation by reorienting the country’s search for values and belief systems away from the West and towards indigenous traditions.²³ Xiao Gongqin proposed the deliberate cultivation of a cultural nationalism to further Chinese progress and fill the moral vacuum because

... as long as there are different nations and nationalities, relative to the longevity of other ideologies, nationalism is the ideology that has the most long lasting effect on history. From the perspective of the state and politics, the emotions and reasoned concepts deriving from nationalism constitute an extremely valuable, ‘natural’ political resource.²⁴

Confucianism in a modified form could be combined with nationalism to create a ‘mainstream culture’ that would provide a ‘coalescing force’ and consensus regarding modernization, while producing a social consciousness of national interests and obligations and responsibilities of the individual to society and nation. A new Confucian nationalism would promote the integration and cohesion that was required in a deteriorating international environment to overcome a mindset of national inferiority and facilitate the realization of the Chinese ‘dream of becoming a strong nation’.²⁵ Conservative cultural nationalists concurred with the leftist nationalist belief that the international system was not structured to promote Chinese national interests and a stronger China needed to revise the rules of the system for its own benefit.

The official response

The call to nationalism as a rallying force and the emphasis on central authority and normative legitimacy based on cultural nationalism allowed the Chinese Communist government to recoup a considerable measure of legitimacy on the basis of past achievements in repulsing imperialism, and also enhanced its power and prestige as the defender of Chinese sovereignty and national interests in a post-Cold War world. The reformist leadership did not hesitate in turning the new tide of nationalist sentiment to its advantage; however, it had to tread a very careful line since too strong an assertion of wounded, albeit confident, nationalism could undermine its foreign policy orientation

and solidify the opposition to WTO membership and globalization. Against the background of the Taiwan Straits crisis of 1996, the renegotiation of the US Japan Security Treaty, the NATO action in Kosovo, and the bombing of the Chinese embassy in Belgrade, the series of concessions made by Jiang Zemin and Premier Zhu Rongji during the WTO negotiations made the government particularly vulnerable to charges that a weak Beijing was caving in to American pressure and losing its independence of action.

The official approach to addressing the concerns of critics and allaying apprehensions regarding loss of autonomy and compromises of sovereignty was to emphasize that, as long as continued access to Western capital and technology remained crucial for further economic progress and the goal of becoming a major world power, China could not afford to turn inward again. In the wake of the Asian financial crisis Chinese leaders began to qualify their enthusiastic embrace of globalization with a more complex and nuanced perspective on its ramifications. Jiang Zemin noted that economic globalization was a 'double-edged sword' that 'posed to all countries, the developing ones in particular, the new problem of how to safeguard their economic security while accelerating market opening, intensifying competition and improving efficiency'.²⁶ While deepening interdependence did pose risks and negative factors for developing countries, it could also present opportunities to seize the initiative of writing the 'rules of the game' of international economics.²⁷ Participation in the international economic order offered both opportunities and challenges and the task was to maximize the benefits of globalization while implementing policies to minimize its harmful effects. Articles in the state media implied that the success of China's reforms had already enhanced China's clout so that:

... WTO entry signifies that China no longer has to stand on the sidelines while other countries draw up regulations to which it has to adapt. On the contrary, it can fully participate in and draw up rules of competition for the new century in negotiations through a multilateral trading system and become the beneficiary of certain relevant regulations to ensure China's equal entry into the world market.²⁸

The leadership conceded that globalization had unleashed forces domestically that had undermined social stability and political authority and adroitly used its critics' arguments to justify a 'selective' or 'conservative globalization'. Thus, maximization of profits and efficiency, free flow of capital and investment, comparative advantage and the trickle down theory of economic prosperity were touted as principles that stood to benefit China. Importing of political ideas and cultural values that emphasized individual freedom and autonomy however threatened to further undermine the power of the Chinese state and needed to be discouraged. Western-style democratization was ill suited to China and the country's trajectory of economic and political progress needed to be fashioned on the basis of its own history, culture and values.²⁹

At the international level, the official Chinese foreign-policy stance upheld the concept of sovereign equality of nation states (as opposed to hegemonism) and promoted multilateralism, multipolarity and the 'democratization' of international politics.³⁰ To the nationalists, the Chinese leadership presented the argument that international integration and multilateralism served to enhance the power of developing countries like China, both by giving them a voice in international fora and also by entangling 'hegemons' like the United States in webs of interdependence which served to check their actions and subject them to the scrutiny and rules of international institutions (an interesting reversal of American arguments in support of 'comprehensive engagement' that would promote democratization within China).³¹ At the same time, the nationalist and conservative perspectives on Confucianism and its application to modern conditions also provided Chinese leaders with the justification for promoting a Chinese worldview that could rival and perhaps supplant that of the West.

The evolving official discourse refuted the logic of inevitability with regard to globalization and emphasized the need for a correct handling of the contradictions generated in its course. In a speech to the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation annual meeting in 2000 Jiang Zemin focused on the 'negative consequences of globalization', the increasing chasm between North and South and 'the new challenges to economic security and sovereignty faced by developing countries'.³² However, the root cause of uneven economic development was identified as the basically unchanged, 'irrational' and unfair international economic order; in other words, not the globalization phenomenon itself, but the structural context within which it took place. American foreign policy actions in the mid- and late 1990s had already prompted more serious accusations regarding the prevalence of hegemony and power politics in the international, political, economic and security fields which allowed some countries to 'take advantage of economic globalization to try and force their own values, and economic and social systems on others'.³³ The solution now put forth by Chinese leaders was multilateral management, i.e. participation in the decision-making process in international regimes by all sovereign countries as equals, which would bring about efficient and fair allocation of world resources, promote 'global economic balance', encourage national diversity and ensure the right of countries to choose their own paths of development.³⁴

Domestically, the Chinese government moved to address concerns of critics and sceptics by committing itself to alleviating the problems of unemployment, lack of social welfare and safety nets, and excessive burdens of taxations and fees, while emphasizing accountability and support for job promotion and training. Highly publicized initiatives to combat corruption, strengthen the legal system, launch welfare reform and mitigate unfair tax burdens that were undertaken in the last years of the Jiang-Zhu administration were aimed at resolving the problems identified by the 'New Left', and reflected in worker and peasant unrest. The successor Hu Jintao-Wen Jiabao team's focus on easing hardships imposed by exposure to international competition along with policy initiatives related to workplace safety, public health, employment and education

was clearly indicative of a greater responsiveness to the Left's concern for social justice and fairness. Its advocacy of socially redistributive policies to bring relief to vulnerable sections of the population and economically disadvantaged regions, while balancing the need for growth with conservation and sustainability, reflected a new determination to accord equal weight to the goals of equity and efficiency and put forth a conscious effort to manage the injurious fallout of rapid change and opening up.³⁵

Globalization revisited

In the context of the continued spectacular growth of the Chinese economy and the attendant rise in status and prestige of the People's Republic these policy proposals and initiatives have muted some of the voices of the most vocal opponents of globalization. On the left, Cui Zhiyuan extols China's systemic 'innovations' that have ushered in a 'comparatively well-off society', and notes that the country's socialist identity has not been submerged and overwhelmed by the tide of globalization, nor has it succumbed to Westernization.³⁶ Rather, China has very effectively fashioned its own unique strategy of development with the combination of socialized assets and a market economy. For Cui, the concept of 'socialist market economy' is not a political compromise – it is the Chinese alternative to Western models of capitalist economic growth.

Critics on the right also have been mollified by the regime's stated intention and ability to adjust to changing international realities and respond to the challenges of globalization. New conservatives are receptive to arguments that China has successfully utilized Western rules of the game to pursue Chinese national interests and strengthen state sovereignty, and it is time to put to rest its sense of historical grievances and adopt a more activist role in the international arena.³⁷

Finally, a revival of liberalism since the late 1990s has bolstered the Chinese government's drive for greater involvement with the international economy and conciliatory relations with the West. The publication of Shen Jiru's *China Will Not Be Mr. No* in 1998 was a powerful rejoinder to *The China That Can Say No* that had, by then, been banned by the authorities. Shen attributed the downfall of the Soviet Union to its 'say No strategy' and its unwillingness to open itself to outside influence. Soviet intransigence and its unyielding confrontation provoked an American counter-reaction that escalated tensions and promoted an arms race that eventually exhausted and ruined the Soviet economy. The lesson for China, according to Shen, was that cooperation with the United States and other great powers, rather than disengagement, was the path to progress and 'common security'.³⁸

Unlike many on the left, liberal intellectuals are enthusiastic supporters of WTO participation because of their anticipation that the process of promoting transparency and accountability that it mandates within China will pave the way for political democratization. Liberals also view with alarm the post-Tiananmen nationalist fervour which threatens to undermine engagement

with the international community and encourage irrational anti-foreignism. Li Shenzhi recommends the revival of the traditional Chinese ideal of cosmopolitanism as opposed to emotional nationalism that tends to be narrow and parochial.³⁹ The Shanghai philosopher Zhu Xueqin ridicules 'regressive anti-imperialist and anti-colonial moods' as a 'fake nationalist stance, Boxer-style, towards the outside world'.⁴⁰ Ge Jianxiong rejects nationalism as a 'panacea to save the nation', and warns that it would sow internal divisions, and thus become a 'double-edged sword that would hurt (China) itself rather than external enemies.'⁴¹

According to the liberals, the injustices of the emerging socio-economic order can only be rectified by further marketization and closer integration with the global capitalist economy. This view, combined with their aversion to radical social movements for change, converges with the policy preferences of the reformist leadership and legitimizes both its domestic and international orientation.

Conclusion

By any measure, post-Mao China's policy of reform and opening up has been a phenomenal success. In the three decades since the adoption of that policy, the official discourse rationalizing China's engagement with the outside world has evolved from an emphasis on national survival to one touting the needs and requirements of an emergent superpower.

The central tenet of China's foreign-policy orientation continues to be the prioritization of domestic economic development and preservation of a peaceful international environment that is conducive to the build-up of China as a strong and wealthy nation. Dire predictions of its inability to survive international competition notwithstanding, China has not simply weathered the 'pains' of WTO accession, it has maintained its meteoric economic rise and rapidly elevated its status in the global arena. In the process, its leadership has fashioned a new consensus that appeals to diverse constituencies and articulates the external goals and objectives of the Chinese state in the era of globalization.

Drawing selectively on New Left and Confucian nationalist perspectives, the Chinese government has pursued a pragmatic and flexible approach to the challenges and opportunities of a post-Cold War world in which the United States has enjoyed preponderant power and served both as major benefactor and the main obstacle to China's advancement. Given the asymmetry in capabilities, the Chinese political elite has resisted calls for a more confrontational stance towards the US and a more aggressive promotion of national interests that could provoke retaliatory actions.

In contrast to the leftist focus on China's victim status and its vulnerability in a world fraught with contradictions and struggle, the official Chinese formulation favours a policy of 'seeking common ground and reserving differences', and correctly managing the 'dialectical relationship between competition and

compromise' in an international arena that holds the promise of positive sum games and 'win-win situations'.⁴² The official view does not deny the existence of struggle, injustice and exploitation at the international level but distinguishes between a neutral process of globalization (from which China benefits) and a hierarchical and hegemonic international political and economic order that privileges the rights of powerful developed countries over those of others. Maintaining a balance between accommodation to globalization and actively seeking to modify the existing structural inequalities through multilateral action is the compromise that the official stance has arrived at in its external orientation. Such a policy allows China to continue to reap the advantages of cooperation with major actors in the global economy, even as it chooses to assert its progressive credentials as a revisionist power championing the rights of developing countries and giving them a voice in international fora.

From the Confucian nationalist discourse the Chinese leadership has appropriated principles that serve to delineate the new normative appeal of Chinese foreign policy. As American soft power has declined in response to post-9/11 unilateralism and flexing of military muscle, official Chinese pronouncements have sought to draw favourable contrasts between the sole superpower's flouting of international norms and China's assumption of greater responsibilities of global citizenship in rule-based international regimes. In highlighting the distinction between American 'perversity' and Chinese 'abstemiousness' the official line echoes the cultural nationalist claim that the Western interstate system based on Social Darwinism is inherently competitive and conflict prone where 'victory belongs to those who have advanced weapons'.⁴³ Confucian civilization traditionally emphasized peace and harmony in inter-state affairs and its influence spread by cultural attraction rather than the use of force as in the case of Western imperialism.⁴⁴ In modern times, China has emerged as a powerful actor on the world stage by accepting and playing by Western rules of the game but, as it comes into its own, China can promote rationality and the cooperative spirit in international relations by drawing on its civilizational legacies. The rising Chinese superpower does not seek global hegemony, but a Pax Sinica substituted for a Pax Americana will undermine power politics and usher in a benign 'whole world as one community'.⁴⁵

The oft-stated Chinese preference for a peaceful, conflict-free international arena warrants a cautious optimism with regard to the impact of China's rise as a world power. The current quest for Comprehensive National Power focuses on accumulation rather than expenditure, and most Chinese policy analysts favour an emphasis on closing the gap in capabilities with 'peer competitors' like the US by generally avoiding military conflict and aggressive posturing that could undermine economic growth and development.⁴⁶ China's strategic economic and security interests can most effectively be furthered by stressing its non-threatening 'peaceful rise' and the concept of 'common security' which will constrain the power of hegemons while providing collective assurance for smaller and weaker states.⁴⁷ The concept of 'common security' is seen as particularly relevant to an era of globalization where non-traditional security

threats like terrorism and infectious diseases have become just as threatening to a country's survival and well-being.⁴⁸

However, Chinese realists also strongly subscribe to the belief that under certain circumstances, even scarce power resources may need to be used to avoid perceptions of weakness and preserve credibility. In the implicit bargain struck with its domestic critics the Chinese government has committed itself to offsetting concessions of economic sovereignty under globalization with enhanced political and territorial sovereignty.⁴⁹ Thus, the issue of Taiwan and national unification is one where political costs of non action are likely to weigh more heavily on the minds of decision makers than the military and economic costs of the use of force.

As China grows in stature and importance, its national interests also evolve and expand. The well-known International Relations scholar Yan Xuetong has argued, 'with its increasing national power, China feels that it is necessary to take a more firm stand to protect its national interest and dignity'.⁵⁰ China's leaders are very conscious of the distance that they have traversed to accommodate the country to an international system whose rules have been set by the dominant West. As China rises they aim to modify that system to better serve Chinese objectives and reflect its restoration to its traditional great power status. By facilitating the rejuvenation of China, globalization has not simply given the Chinese nation a stake in the international order; it has also provided it with the ability and ambition to shape that system in accordance with its needs and interests.

Notes

- 1 Deng Xiaoping, 'The Present Situation and the Tasks before Us', in *Selected Works of Deng Xiaoping 1975-82*, Beijing Foreign Languages Press, 1984, pp. 224-58; 'Peace and Development are the Two Problems that the World Faces Today', 4 March 1985, *Deng Xiaoping wen xuan*, vol. 3, Beijing: Renmin Chubanshe, 1993, pp. 104-6; 'Reforms and Opening Up Energizes China in Real Terms', 20 May 1987 in *Deng Xiaoping wen xuan*, pp. 232-35.
- 2 Hu Qiaomu. 'How the Chinese Communist Party Has Developed Marxism Written to Commemorate the 70th Anniversary of the CCP', *RMRB* (overseas edition), 25 June 1991; Duan Ruofei. 'Persist in People's Democratic Dictatorship, Oppose, Prevent Peaceful Evolution', *Renmin Ribao (RMRB)*, 5 June 1991.
- 3 Deng Xiaoping, 'International Situation and Economic Issues', 3 March 1990, *Deng Xiaoping wen xuan*, pp. 353-56; 'To Grasp the Opportunity to Resolve Development Problems', 24 December 1990, *Deng Xiaoping wen xuan*, pp. 363-65.
- 4 Huangfu Ping. 'Reform and Opening Up Requires New Train of Thinking', *Jiefang Ribao*, 2 March 1991; 'More Greatly Enhance the Sense of Opening Up', *Jiefang Ribao*, 22 March 1991.
- 5 Jiang Zemin, 'Hold High the Great Banner of Deng Xiaoping Theory for an All Round Advancement of the Cause of Building Socialism with Chinese Characteristics into the 21st Century', Report to the Fifteenth Party Congress, *Beijing Review*, October 6-12, 1997, pp. 19-21. Originally cited in Thomas Moore, 'Chinese Foreign Policy in the Age of Globalization', in Yong Deng and Fei ling Wang, ed. *China Rising: Power and Motivation in Chinese Foreign Policy*, Lanham: Rowman and Littlefield, 2005.

- 6 Gu Yuanyang. 'Economic Globalization and the 'Rules of the Game'', *Renmin Ribao*, 10 June 1998.
- 7 Di Yinqing and Guan Yang. 'Why is the United States Anxious to Reopen Negotiations on Entering the WTO', *Gaige Neican*, no. 8, 20 April 1999, pp. 39 42; 'What, After All, Are the Implications of Entering WTO for China's Long Term Interests?' *Gaige Neican*, no. 9, 5 May 1999, pp. 34 38.
- 8 Shao Ren, 'China: Joining the WTO Without Falling into the Trap', *Tianya*, no. 3, May 1999, p. 6; Fang Ning, 'Reflections on the Challenge of Globalization', in Fang Ning, Wang Xiaodong, and Sun Qiang, ed. *China's Road under the Shadow of Globalization*, Zhongguo Shehui Kexue Chubanshe, 1999, pp. 334 49.
- 9 Fang Ning, 'Reflections on the Challenge of Globalization'.
- 10 Wen Tiejun. 'The Impact that the Terms Involving Agriculture in the WTO Negotiations Between China and the US Will Have on Our Country', *Nongcun jingji daokan*, no. 6 (June 1999), pp. 4 5.
- 11 Han Deqiang, 'Clash: The Pitfalls of Globalization and China's Realistic Choices', Beijing: Jingji Guanli Chubanshe, 2000.
- 12 Hu Angang and Wang Shaoguang, *A Report on China's State Capacity*, Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 1994; Hu Angang, Wang Shaoguang, and Kang Xiaoguang, *Report on Regional Inequalities in China*, Shenyang: Liaoning Renmin Chubanshe, 1995.
- 13 Zheng Yongnian, *Discovering Chinese Nationalism in China: Modernization, Identity, and International Relations*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.
- 14 Zhang Yiwu et.al., 'Re evaluating 'Modernity'', *Huanghe*, no. 4 (1994), pp. 195 207.
- 15 Zhang Kuan. 'Said's Orientalism and Western Sinology', *Liaowang*, no. 27 (3 July 1995), pp. 36 37; 'The Possibility of Cultural Neocolonialism', *Tianya*, no. 2 (1996), pp. 16 23.
- 16 Shi Zhong, 'Civilizations Can Be Compared Only for Reference', *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 2, 1996, pp. 98 100; Zhang Yiwu, 'The Anxiety of Explaining China', *Ershiyi shiji*, no. 28 (April 1995), pp. 128 35.
- 17 Zhang Fa, Zhang Yiwu and Wang Yichuan, 'From Modernity to Chineseness: Inquiry into a New Model of Knowledge', *Wenyi Zhengming*, no. 2 (March 1994), pp. 10 20.
- 18 Cui Zhiyuan, 'China's Practice and Its Challenges to Neo Classical Economics', *Hong Kong Journal of Social Sciences*, Special Issue, July 1995, pp. 1 33; 'System Innovation and the Second Thought Emancipation Campaign', *Ershiyi Shiji*, no. 8, 1994, pp. 5 15; 'Mao Zedong's Idea of Cultural Revolution and the Reconstruction of Modernity', *Hong Kong Journal of Social Sciences*, no. 7, Spring 1996, pp. 49 74.
- 19 Shi Zhong, 'The Logic of Comparative Advantage Should Not be Pushed to an Extreme', *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 3, 1995, pp. 11 15.
- 20 Wang Hui, 'The Condition of Contemporary Chinese Thought and the Problem of Modernity', *Wenyi Zhengming*, no. 6 (November 1998), pp. 7 26. Arif Dirlilik made this point much earlier; see 'Socialism and Capitalism in Chinese Socialist Thinking', *Studies in Comparative Communism*, vol. XXI, no. 2 (Summer 1988), pp. 131 52.
- 21 Xiao Gongqin, 'Nationalism and Ideology in China During the Period of Transition', *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 4, 1994, pp. 21 25.
- 22 Ji Xianlin. 'Humanity Can be Saved Through 'Unity of Nature and Man'', *Dongfang*, no. 1, 1993, p. 6; Sheng Hong, 'China's Transitional Economics', Shanghai Renmin Chubanshe, 1994; 'What is Civilization?' *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 5, 1995, pp. 88 98; Chen Lai, 'Radicalism in 20th Century Culture Movements', *Dongfang*, no. 1, 1993, pp. 38 44; 'Confucian Ideas and the Modern East Asian World', *Dongfang*, no. 3, 1994, pp. 10 13.
- 23 Wang Desheng, 'Unofficial Academic Views: The Phenomena of Scholarly Periodicals in the Nineties Mainland', *Dongfang*, no. 5, 1994, pp. 56 58.
- 24 Xiao Gongqin, 'Nationalism and Ideology in China'.

- 25 Xiao Gongqin, 'Ideological Innovation and Political Stability', *Shanghai Lilun Neikan*, vol. 20, no. 2, 1995, pp. 7-8; 'The History and Future of Nationalism in China', *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 2, 1996, pp. 58-62.
- 26 Zhang Yijun. 'Economic Globalization and State Sovereignty', *Waijia Jikan*, no. 58, December 2000, p. 16.
- 27 Lu Yafan. 'Thoughts on How China Should Face Economic Globalization in the 21st Century', *Dangbei Shifan Daxue Xuebao*, no. 2, 2000, pp. 45-46.
- 28 Wen Wei Po Editorial on 'Significance of Integrating PRC Economy with World Through WTO', Wen Wei Po, 11 November 2001, p. 4. Cited in R.C. Keith, 'China's Response to Globalization,' in R.C. Keith ed. *China As A Rising Power*, Abingdon: Routledge, 2005.
- 29 Jiang Zemin. 'Speech on the 80th Anniversary of the Founding of the CCP', *Renmin Ribao*, 2 July 2001; 'Hu Jintao Speaks at Malaysia Meeting on Asian Economic Development', 24 April 2002, *Xinhua*, FBIS CHI 2002 0424; Wen Jiabao's speech at the Opening Ceremony of the China Development Forum 2001, 25 March 2001, *Renmin Ribao*, FBIS CHI 2001 0328.
- 30 Hu Jintao, 'Generations of Neighbourly Friendship, Developing and Prospering Together', 28 May 2003, *Xinhua*, FBIS CHI 2003 0528; Jiang Zemin, 'Unity and Cooperation in Asia for Peace and Development in the World', 10 May 2002, *Xinhua*, FBIS CHI 2002 0510.
- 31 Shen Jiru. 'Will the World Pattern Change', *Renmin Ribao*, 3 April 2003, p. 13; Jian Lingfei, 'The Factors That Constrain the American Containment of China and Their Possible Trends', *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 5, 1996, pp. 46-50; Wang Jisi, 'US China Policy: Containment or Engagement?' *Beijing Review*, 21-27 October, 1997, pp. 6-8; Zhou Qi, 'US China Relations After the Cold War: Common Interests and Conflicts', *Dong Fang*, no. 6, 1995, pp. 73-75.
- 32 Jiang Zemin, Speech at the Eighth APEC Informal Leadership Meeting, 2000. Available online at <http://test.fmprc.gov.cn/eng/wjdt/zjyh/t25006.htm>.
- 33 Ibid.
- 34 Hu Jintao, 'Generations of Neighbourly Friendship'; Jiang Zemin, 'Striving for Development and Prosperity Through Cooperation', Speech at APEC CEO Summit, 2001. Available online at <http://news.xinhuanet.com/APEC2001/20011018/923037.htm>; 'Together Create a New Century of Peace and Prosperity', 10 April 2002, *Xinhua*, FBIS CHI 2002 0410.
- 35 Liu Guoguang, 'Pay Attention to Social Justice', *Contemporary Chinese Thought*, vol. 38, no. 1, Fall 2006, pp. 84-97.
- 36 Cui Zhiyuan, 'How to Comprehend Today's China: An Interpretation of the Comparatively Well Off Society', *Dushu*, no. 3 (March 2004), pp. 3-9.
- 37 Jiang Zemin, 'Speech on the 80th Anniversary of the Founding of the CCP', *Renmin Ribao*, 2 July 2001; Pang Zhongying, 'People's Observations: China's International Status and Foreign Strategy After the Cold War', *Renmin Wang*, 5 May 2002, in FBIS CHI, 2002 0506, pp. 8-9, 13.
- 38 Shen Jiru, *China Will Not Be Mr. No*, Beijing: Jinri Zhongguo Chubanshe, 1998.
- 39 Li Shenzhi, 'China's Mission in an Age of Globalization', *Dong Fang*, no. 5, 1994, pp. 13-18.
- 40 Zhu Xueqin, 'For a Chinese Liberalism', in Chaohua Wang, ed. *One China, Many Paths*, London: Verso, 2003.
- 41 Ge Jianxiong, 'Is Nationalism a Panacea for Saving the Nation?' *Yazhou Zhoukan*, 21 April 1996, p. 14.
- 42 Luo Zhaohon, 'Grasping Changes in the Environment from an Economic Perspective', *Xiandai Guoji Guanxi*, no. 11, 20 November 2002. In FBIS CHI 2002 1211000217, p. 2.
- 43 Sheng Hong, 'What is Civilization?' *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 5, 1995, pp. 88-98; 'From Nationalism to Cosmopolitanism', *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 1, 1996, pp. 14-19;

- Jiang Zemin, 9 May Speech to the Hong Kong Fortune Global Forum cited in R.C. Keith, 'China's Response to Globalization', in Keith ed. *China as a Rising Power*.
- 44 Xing Shizhong. 'The China Threat Theory Can Perish', *Qiushi*, no. 3, 1996, pp. 16-20.
- 45 Zhao Jun, "'The Whole World as One Community' and Chinese Nationalism at the Turn of the Century", *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 1, 1996, pp. 1-3.
- 46 Yan Xuetong, 'The Calculation of National Interest', *Zhanlue Yu Guanli*, no. 3, 1996, pp. 35-44; *An Analysis of China's National Interests*, Tianjin: Tianjinri Chubanshe, 1996.
- 47 Ibid.
- 48 Chu Shulong 'China's Diplomatic Strategy During the Period of Comprehensively Building a Well Off Society', *Shijie Zhengzhi Yu Jingji*, 3 August 2003, p. 5.
- 49 Allen Carlson, *Unifying China: Integrating With the World: Securing China's Sovereignty in the Reform Era*, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2005; Zheng Yongnian, *Globalization and State Transformation in China*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- 50 Yan, 'The Measurement of National Interests'; Gu Dexin and Huang Qi, 'National Power: Characterization, Judgement, and Application', *Zhanlue yu Guanli*, no. 5, 1996, pp. 57-65.

11 Recolonizing West Asia in the twenty-first century?

Gulshan Dietl

Just over two centuries since Napoleon's arrival in Egypt heralded the advent of the modern Middle East – some 80 years after the demise of the Ottoman Empire, 50 years after the end of colonialism, and less than 20 years after the end of the Cold War – the American era in the Middle East, the fourth in the region's modern history, has ended. ... It is one of history's ironies that the first war in Iraq, a war of necessity, marked the beginning of the American era in the Middle East and the second Iraq war, a war of choice, has precipitated its end.

Richard Haas¹

We need to sustain our game face, we must keep our fangs bared, we must remind them daily that we Americans are in a rage, and we will not rest until we have avenged our dead, we will not be sated until we have had the blood of every miserable little tyrant in the Middle East, until every leader of every cell of the terror network is dead or locked securely away, and every last drooling anti Semitic and anti American mullah, imam, sheikh, and ayatollah is either singing the praises of the United States of America, or pumping gasoline, for a dime a gallon, on an American military base near the Arctic Circle.

Michael Ledeen²

The quotes above are as diametrically opposite as is possible. The first one foresees an end of the American era in West Asia. The second looks forward to American military bases as far as the Arctic circle, an era of cheap oil, an end to anti-Americanism and anti-Semitism, and a thorough overhauling of the socio-political system in West Asia – achieved through violent means used in a spirit of rage and revenge. The quotes are specific to the eight-year period of Bush Administration that has come to a close.

The essay seeks to examine and assess American policy towards West Asia in the post-Cold War period; mainly the Bush period. I see the Bush Administration policy as an attempt to recolonize the region and I propose to employ the term 're-colonization' rather than 'imperialism' – an almost universally used term – to understand, explain and assess the American project.

Colonialism

Colonialism and imperialism have been used interchangeably. Both have a great deal in common; at the same time, there are important differences. The word empire comes from the Latin word *imperium*, meaning command. It implies control and domination. Imperialism dictates: 'Do what I say, do not do what I do.' It can be territorial; though not necessarily so. The empire does not require to be physically present in its domain. The empire does not necessarily come to an end with the physical withdrawal of the colonial apparatus. Also, imperialism can exist without the creation of formal colonies.³

Since there is no uniformity in the usage of the terms colonialism and imperialism, a consensus has emerged that the European conquests, occupation and exploitation in Asia, Africa and Latin America from the sixteenth century to mid-twentieth century shall be termed colonialism. It ended as the Third World gained real or nominal sovereignty. Neo-colonialism and imperialism have been the nomenclatures used for postcolonial dominance.

Aime Cesaire's *Discourse on Colonialism* remains a landmark work that has influenced generations of scholars and activists in Africa, Latin America and Europe itself. Published in 1955, the book has remained relevant through the national liberation struggles in mid-twentieth century to anti-war movements today. Colonialism, according to Cesaire, has a brutal impact on the colonized; on their history, culture and civilization. He is reduced to a savage. It has no less brutal an impact on the colonizer who is decivilized himself through the barbaric violence, intimidation, torture and race-hatred.⁴

Ideology

There were brazen pretensions of civilizing and democratizing the region as the war on Iraq was launched. 'The Greater Middle East Initiative' urged the states in the region to adopt major political reforms and be held accountable for human rights. It offered an expanded political and security engagement in return. The draft was leaked to the press before its formal presentation and led to widespread protests and resentment. It was revised, as a result. 'The Partnership for Progress and a Common Future with the Region of Broader Middle East and North Africa' claimed to be a collaborative project between the G8 and West Asia.

A host of authors, and not necessarily of neo-conservative persuasion, took up the mission of democratizing the region in their policy prescriptions. Most, though, referred to the US role as imperialism. Whether preaching and spreading democracy has ever been considered an imperial assignment begs a question. The voices prescribing it have been powerful and influential, nonetheless. Some deserve to be noted:

Deepak Lal is emphatic in suggesting that the

primary task of a pax Americana must be to find ways to create a new order in the Middle East. ... It is accusingly said by many that any such

rearrangement of the status quo would be an act of imperialism and would largely be motivated by the desire to control Middle Eastern oil. But far from being objectionable, imperialism is precisely what is needed to restore order in the Middle East.⁵

Michael Ignatieff exhorts the US as ‘the West’s last military state’ and its last ‘remaining empire’ to take up its responsibility for ‘imperial structuring and ordering’.⁶

For Niall Ferguson, the celebrated historian of Imperialism, empire is much more than just military dominance along a vast and variegated strategic frontier. Empire also means economic, cultural and political predominance within and (sometimes also without) that frontier.⁷ He also calls upon the American imperium, like all world empires of history, to aspire to play the same role.

Restructuring, reordering, civilizing, democratizing are the goals set, or justifications invented, to deodorize the bloody and brutal situation on the ground.

Security strategy

The Cold War did not have the same salience in West Asia as it had in the rest of the world. Europe had its Berlin blockade; East and South East Asia had the Korean and Vietnam wars respectively; America had the Cuban Missile Crisis; and South Asia had Afghanistan. When we look at West Asia, there were no eyeball-to-eyeball confrontations and there were no proxy wars either. So after West Europe, West Asia became the second most important theatre where American energy and attention were focused. It has continued to remain so to date.

A close scrutiny of the American Presidential doctrines reveals a common thread running through them all – all of them are directed at West Asia. The Truman doctrine, the Eisenhower doctrine, the Nixon doctrine of ‘Two Pillar’ policy, the Carter doctrine, the Reagan doctrine of ‘Strategic Consensus’ and George H.W. Bush’s call for a ‘New World Order’ – all these doctrines to which American Presidents lent their names during the Cold War were directed at West Asia. The trend has continued with Clinton and George W. Bush. There is yet another measurement of US involvement in the region. An overwhelming number of vetoes the US has cast in the United Nations Security Council have been on issues related to the region; more specifically the Arab Israel issues. In short, the US has high stakes in the region and it has played a highly successful role to secure them.

Zbigniew Brzezinski belongs to that rare category of American officials who combine scholarship and policy influence. In the aftermath of the Cold War, George F. Kennan’s ‘Containment’ was passé. It was Brzezinski who sought to step into the void of a big-frame, long-range security strategy. His seminal book *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives*⁸ addressed the momentous developments in the vast Eurasian landmass after the demise of the Soviet Union. He defined Eurasia as the area

stretching all the way from Lisbon to Vladivostok and prescribed three grand imperatives of imperial geostrategy: prevent collusion and maintain security dependence among the vassals, keep tributaries pliant and protected and keep the barbarians from coming together. The worst case scenario, according to him, was a grand coalition of China, Russia and perhaps Iran, an 'anti-hegemonic' coalition united not by ideology, but by complementary grievances.

The Central Command was to be the sentry and guardian of Eurasia. Anthony Zinni, its former Commander-in-Chief, used to boast that he had become a descendant of the warrior-statesmen proconsuls, who ruled the Roman Empire's outlying areas. Based in Tampa, Florida, with a staff of more than a thousand and an annual budget of \$150 million, Zinni ruled over a vast empire stretching from Central Asia to West Asia to the Gulf.

Immediately after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the Defense Department under the administration of George H.W. Bush initiated a reconsideration of US national security policy in the light of the changing global situation. The report, completed in March 1992 and known as the *Defense Planning Guidance* (DPG), was written under the supervision of Paul Wolfowitz, then under-secretary of policy in the Defense Department. It indicated that the chief national security goal of the United States must be one of 'precluding the emergence of any potential global competitor'.⁹

Some of the dominant actors in what was to become the administration of George W. Bush, including Donald Rumsfeld and Paul Wolfowitz, were to organize the Project for the New American Century, which in anticipation of Bush winning the White House, issued a foreign policy paper, entitled *Rebuilding America's Defenses* (September 2000), reaffirming the unilateral and nakedly aggressive strategy of the *Defense Planning Guidance* of 1992.

There was a consensus within the defence establishment during the 1990s to seek global primacy; only the method remained to be agreed upon. The supporters of unilateralism won over those who argued for multilateralism. Less than compliant friends, allies and international institutions would have to be discarded. The missions would determine the ad hoc alliances. In case of the war on Iraq, it would be the 'Coalition of the Willing'.

In September 2002, the DPG finally reached its official imprimatur as the National Security Strategy (NSS). 'Deterrence is dead', it declared; 'pre-emption' was the new mantra. America would use 'unquestioned military preponderance' to stop any other state from acquiring military power 'surpassing or equaling the power of the United States'. An unrivalled dominance of the world in perpetuity, in short. With the war drums beating in the background, the NSS was a declaration of war.

George W. Bush's White House years, as a result, witnessed a more aggressive strategic posture and a more focused target. The doctrine was that of unprovoked war and the target shrunk to take in West Asia – leaving the rest of Eurasia beyond its purview. Broadly, it came to be termed the 'Neo-conservatism'.

With Bush's support, the Neocon network sprawled. It was made up of think tanks and the media run by former academics, people from lobby

groups and defence contractors. They were high profile, were constantly on television and in print, maintained regularly updated websites and sent off open letters prescribing policies. They claimed to be the intellectual architects of a very hawkish foreign policy. They supported national missile defence, opposed all arms control treaties and insisted on unilateral, pre-emptive wars. It would be wrong, therefore, to talk of the Neocon conspiracy. They straddled the realms of publicity and conspiracy and operated in each with an equal ease and effect.

As the Neocon network expanded, so did its agenda get longer and more ambitious. The Neos would want to reorganize the State Department, the Pentagon, the CIA and the FBI; slice Saudi Arabia into manageable pieces; keep Syria under pressure; work towards a regime change in Iraq and Iran; castigate Old Europe as weak-willed; discard the United Nations; and much more. In short, they would strive to perpetuate American power in a unipolar world.

Some of their policy prescriptions were audacious: Tom Donnelly and Max Boot argued for formal quasi-imperial control over strategically valuable failed states, backed up by new American bases and an imperial civil service. Irving Kristol made a significant contribution to the Neocons' intellectual heritage: Political order can be stable only if it is united by an external threat; and if none exists, one has to be manufactured. Peace leads to decadence; and hence the need for perpetual war. Wolfowitz's security doctrine sought to perpetuate war and aimed at the break-up or overthrow of nations perceived as potential security threats.

The most impudent of them defined the target more specifically and eventually carried the day. Iraq was identified as the most deserving case for the US pre-emption. 'A Clean Break: A New Strategy for Securing the Realm' was the first overt counsel to attack the country. It was a position paper written for and presented to the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu, who was visiting the United States. Netanyahu used it in his speech to the joint session of American Congress. The paper identified the removal of the Iraqi president as the priority goal of Israel. It was bound to have a domino effect as Syria would be weakened and its support for non-state actors attacking Israel would diminish. The paper was sponsored by Richard Cheney and Donald Rumsfeld. The list of co-authors included Richard Perle, Douglas Feith and David Wurmser – the most influential Neocons.

Military doctrines

As the Cold War ended, the US military establishment envisaged a series of alternative threat scenarios and foresaw the need for new strategic options and choices. A plethora of post-Cold War doctrines ensued. The Major Regional Contingencies envisioned more than one enemy and more than one regional conflagration simultaneously. Les Aspin's Bottom Up Review led to a vision of US power projection built around two foundations; air

power and special operations force. The RAND formulated the ‘Military Operations on Urbanized Terrain’ (MOU) in response to the urbanization of poverty and consequent insurgency. Colin Powell emphasized an overwhelming force and a clear exit strategy in future military contingencies. John Arquilla and David Ronfeldt devised the concept of ‘Netwar’, an unconventional warfare involving flat, segmented networks, instead of the pyramidal hierarchies.

‘Revolution in Military Affairs’, a concept dating back to the mid-fifties, made a comeback during the Gulf War of 1991. It places information at the heart of the war fighting and envisages an entirely new form of warfare that will not require any physical deployment of forces. The concept has since been overused and has yet remained controversial.

The Gulf War of 1991 was fought on the doctrine of ‘Decisive Force’. A similar war in future was perceived to demand a faster and harsher response. Harlan K. Ullman and James P. Wade, together with others, articulated the doctrine of ‘Shock and Awe’. It was released in December 1996 as a report of the National Defense University. To prevail quickly, it called for the use of more than decisive force that ‘imposes the non-nuclear equivalent of the impact than the atomic weapons dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki’. In brief, it spelled out the components of its prescriptions and contrasted the same vis-à-vis the earlier doctrine of Decisive Force:¹⁰

Table 11.1 Contrasting ‘Shock and Awe’ with Decisive Force

<i>Elements</i>	<i>Rapid Dominance</i>	<i>Decisive Force</i>
Objective	Control the adversary's will, perceptions, and understanding	Prevail militarily and decisively against a set of opposing capabilities defined by the MRC
Use of Force	Control the adversary's will, perceptions, and understanding and literally make an adversary impotent to act or react	Unquestioned ability to prevail militarily over an opponent's forces and based against the adversary's capabilities
Force Size	Could be smaller than opposition, but with decisive edge in technology, training, and technique	Large, highly trained, and well equipped. Materially overwhelming
Scope	All encompassing	Force against force (and supporting capability)
Speed	Essential	Desirable
Casualties	Could be relatively few in number on both sides	Potentially higher on both sides
Technique	Paralyze, shock, unnerve, deny, destroy	Systematic destruction of military capability. Attrition applicable in some situations

The Gulf War of 1991 and the War on Iraq of 2003 clearly bring out the strides that were made in the military doctrines within the course of a little over a decade. One, the Gulf War witnessed thirty-four days of intense air war and only four days of ground action towards the end. The War on Iraq, by contrast, was initiated with an almost simultaneous air and ground assaults. Two, a coalition was laboriously cobbled together for the Gulf War. The War on Iraq, on the other hand, was launched with 120,000 troops from the US supplemented by 45,000 British troops and only minor contingents from Australia, Poland and Denmark. Three, the Gulf War stopped short of entering and occupying Iraq, which would have gone beyond the UN mandate.¹¹ The War on Iraq was a pre-emptive war that ran counter to the international law that sanctions use of force against an actual and not a potential threat.

It is interesting to note that the ferocity unleashed in the war did not come up to the expectations of Harlan Ullman. He declined to certify that it was a 'Shock and Awe' war.

Military power

Today the US military spending is roughly as much as the rest of the world put together. According to a report by the Congressional Research Service, it maintains 850 bases overseas.¹² The Pentagon acknowledges 39 nations with at least one US base, stations personnel in over 140 countries around the world, and boasts a physical plant of at least 571,900 facilities, though some Pentagon figures show 587,000 'buildings and structures'. Of these, 466,599 are located in the United States or its territories. According to a 2006 Pentagon report, the Department of Defense had a total of at least '280 ships, 14,000 aircraft, 900 strategic missiles, and 330,000 ground combat and tactical vehicles'.¹³

Fourteen permanent bases are under construction in Iraq; the largest of them the Balad is spread over fifteen square miles. It is, in fact, a mini-city with its own bus routes, fast-food outlets, two supermarkets and accommodation for 40,000 military personnel. The base is a permanent construction site from where upto 550 air operations are conducted each day. Its \$30 million command-and-control system integrates air-traffic management across the entire country.¹⁴ In contemporary terms, it would amount to an American military colony.

In Kuwait, the US is completing finishing touches on a permanent ground forces command for the region, which will be capable of being a platform for 'full spectrum operations' in twenty-seven countries in West Asia and beyond. Its mandate will be to provide theatre-level logistics, communications, military intelligence, civil affairs and medical command. The US Fifth Fleet is headquartered in Bahrain. Additionally, the US Air Force and Navy have set up additional permanent bases in Bahrain, Qatar, Oman and the United Arab Emirates. Also, three high-profile American warships are cruising off the

coast of Lebanon. The US military presence in Afghanistan and Pakistan's frontier areas remains substantial and its air and ground engagements there are devastating.

Added to its direct presence, the US has stepped up the sale of weapons to the countries in the Gulf. By the end of 2007, the Pentagon had announced the proposed sales of Patriot missile defence and early warning systems to the UAE and Kuwait worth more than \$10 billion. It also notified the US Congress of a sale to Saudi Arabia of upgraded airborne warning and control systems worth \$400 billion.¹⁵

Re-colonization: an assessment

According to Paul Treanor,¹⁶ recolonization is different from the traditional colonization at least in one respect. It is nominally international or multi-state. Niall Ferguson prefers to call the traditional Western colonization 'Anglobalisation' and stops short of naming the new US project recolonization. He, nonetheless, brings out a few significant characteristics of the present project that sets it apart from the British colonialism of the past. For one thing, British imperial power relied on the massive export of capital and people. But since 1972, the American economy has been a net importer of capital (to the tune of 5 per cent of the gross domestic product in 2002) and it remains the favoured destination of immigrants from around the world, not a producer of would-be colonial emigrants. Britain in its heyday was able to draw on a culture of unabashed imperialism which dated back to the Elizabethan period, whereas the US would always be a reluctant ruler of other peoples.¹⁷

These fine distinctions are fine; the fact remains that the US assault on Iraq drew a line under the US perception of self and the world. It marked a new chapter in the US project; a project that was not planned to continue the same differently. It has been a different project. Its means, the methods as well as the goals are new.

The recolonization project predates 9/11 and is envisaged as a long-term strategy. According to the recently released declassified documents by the National Security Archives, the origins and evolution of the *Defense Planning Guidance* (DPG) go back to the immediate aftermath of the Gulf War of 1991.¹⁸ The fifteen documents featured by the Archive were drafted between June 1991, just after the first Gulf War, and January 1993 when the then Defense Secretary Dick Cheney released an official, if euphemistic, version of the controversial DPG. Most of the documents, however, are heavily redacted.¹⁹

The declassified documents shed a completely different light on the US war on Iraq. Chronologically, the war on Iraq came after the war on Afghanistan. In reality, it has a much older vintage and a much longer genealogy. 9/11 was a distraction – almost a nuisance – in the planning and preparation of the war on Iraq. A military conquest, its pretexts had to be invented and repeatedly

asserted to justify it to the domestic and world opinion.²⁰ A different pretext would have been found if the 9/11 had not happened.

The US has Status of Force Agreement (SOFA) with more than a 115 countries as of now.²¹ The SOFAs mainly deal with legal issues related to the military personnel and property; like the entry and exit procedures, the tax liabilities and the criminal and civilian jurisdiction. The host country loses the right to prosecute foreign servicemen for property damage or personal wrongdoing under the provisions of most SOFAs. The total immunity accorded to the Americans by the Shah was one of the major grievances and rallying points during the Islamic revolution in Iran. In Japan and Korea, there have been instances of misdemeanours by the US soldiers and the popular resentment has led to widespread protests.

A SOFA with Iraq is currently being negotiated that would secure an extensive and long-term US military presence in Iraq. A bilateral agreement between the US and Iraq, it would remove the current requirement that the UN must authorize on an annual basis the presence and role of the US military in Iraq under the relevant UN resolutions. It would set ‘the basic parameters for the U.S. presence in Iraq, including the appropriate authorities and jurisdiction necessary to operate effectively and to carry out essential missions, such as helping the Iraqi government fight al-Qaeda, develop its security forces, and stem the flow of lethal weapons and training from Iran.’²² The US Iraq SOFA would, in the circumstances, not only extend the legal sanction to the US military presence and mission in Iraq; it would also identify Iraq’s enemies and spell out the Iraqi security needs. To that extent, the Iraqi SOFA may go beyond the normal SOFAs.

The colonization of yore pursued land and its resources. The Iraqi oil was an important consideration in the Gulf War of 1991 as also in the war that was launched in 2003. In his book *The Age of Turbulence*,²³ former Chairman of US Federal Reserve Board Alan Greenspan emphasized oil as a major reason for the Iraq invasion:

Whatever their publicized angst over Saddam Hussain’s ‘weapons of mass destruction’, American and British authorities were also concerned about violence in the area that harbours a resource indispensable for the functioning of the world economy. I am saddened that it is politically inconvenient to acknowledge what everyone knows: the Iraq war is largely about oil.

As of now, the economic exploitation of the colonized lands and its resources oil in the case of Iraq could only be summed up as a systematic monopolization of post-war Iraqi economy by a few companies belonging to the political leadership in the metropolis; random looting of Iraqi arts and artifacts from museums, galleries and libraries; and the oil contracts promised to the US oil giants. On the contrary, it has involved staggering spending on an unending war. According to a widely quoted source, it has already cost the US Treasury three trillion dollars.²⁴

The ideological pretensions to civilize the natives is an indispensable ingredient of the colonial discourse. It is that which sets it apart from the imperial aloofness. ‘Oderint dum metuant’, that is, ‘let them hate us as long as they fear us’, the Empire would thunder.

Take up the White Man’s Burden
And reap its old reward:
The blame of those ye better,
The hate of those ye guard.
The colonizer would mourn.

Rudyard Kipling, ‘White Man’s Burden’

Democratization, in the West Asian context, was a perfect ideological plank. Since democracy in the region is conspicuous by its absence, it would sound a genuine concern. Additionally, the effort to win the hearts and minds of the people would serve well if they were to be alienated from the regime before the regime change was effected. The debate over democracy has been abruptly suspended since then. The banner of democracy is folded and shelved and the old trusted unelected leaders continue to operate according to US preferences.

Cesaire has shed light on the decivilizing impact on the colonizers themselves. Much earlier to him, Thucydides had written of Athens’s expanding empire and how this empire became a tyrant abroad and then a tyrant at home. Eric Hobsbawm spells out the danger of delusion thus:

It conveys to those who do not enjoy this form of government [democracy] the illusion that it actually governs those who do. But does it? We now know something about how the actual decisions to go to war in Iraq were taken in at least two states of unquestionable democratic bona fides: the US and the UK.²⁵

It is a mixed score-card for the colonial project. The civilizing/democratizing pretensions are dead and buried. The pre-emption is alive and kicking against Iran, in fact with nukes if need be. ‘Shock and Awe’ may be reinvented in a deadlier form. The strength and length of American military presence in Iraq and the region would depend on several factors. And the three trillion dollars may yet prove to be a long-term investment fetching massive returns many times over.

The recolonization is taking place in a changed locale today. The democracies in the US and UK have yielded to a change of leadership in both countries. The curtailment of civil liberties is no secret, in the meanwhile. It is not just that the ‘readiness of colonial populations, once conquered, to let themselves be quietly administered’ has disappeared,²⁶ but the colonizers of today do not have long-term mandates to take their project to the conclusion of their choice. The democratizing democracies have to play by the democratic rules as well; at least at home.

Hobsbawm has the last word on the subject: 'The world cannot be recolonized.'²⁷ Or does he?

Notes

- 1 Richard Haas, 'End of US Hegemony in the East', *Financial Times*, (London) 17 October 2006.
- 2 Michael Ledeen, *Jewish World Review*, 11 December 2001: <http://www.jewishworldreview.com/michael/ledeen121101.asp> (accessed on 20 July 2008).
- 3 Ghana's first President, Kwame Nkrumah, depicted this imperialism without colonies in *Neo Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., London (1965).
- 4 Robin D.G. Kelley, 'A Poetics of Anticolonialism', Introduction to the new edition of Aime Cesaire, *Discourse on Colonialism* (Monthly Review Press, 2000): <http://www.monthlyreview.org/1199kell.htm> (accessed on 30 February 2008).
- 5 Deepak Lal, 'In Defense of Empires', in Andrew Bacevich, ed., *The Imperial Tense* (2003), Monthly Review Press (New York, Volume 57, no. 6) <http://www.monthlyreview.org/1199kell.htm> (Accessed on 8 January 2009).
- 6 Michael Ignatieff, 'The Challenges of American Imperial Power', *Naval War College Review*, Spring 2003.
- 7 Niall Ferguson, *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire* (Penguin Books, London, 2005), p. ix.
- 8 Zbigniew Brzezinski, *The Grand Chessboard: American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives* (Basic Books, New York, 1997).
- 9 *New York Times*, 8 March 1992.
- 10 Harlan K. Ullman and James P. Wade, *Shock and Awe: Achieving Rapid Dominance* (NDU Press Book, 1996): <http://www.shockandawe.com/shockintro.html>. (accessed on 21 July 2008).
- 11 'Going in and occupying Iraq, thus unilaterally exceeding the United Nations' mandate, would have destroyed the precedent of international response to aggression that we hoped to establish. Had we gone the invasion route, the United States could conceivably still be an occupying power in a bitterly hostile land. It would have been a dramatically different and perhaps barren outcome.' George Bush and Brent Scowcroft, *A World Transformed* (New York: Knopf, 1998), p.489.
- 12 Quoted in Nick Turse, 'Planet Pentagon: The Earth, Seas and Skies', *Asia Times Online*, 13 July 2007: <http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle East/IG13Ak01.html> (accessed on 3 June 2008).
- 13 *Ibid.*
- 14 Paul Rogers, 'The US Iraq Project': http://www.opendemocracy.net/article/global_security/the_iraq_project (accessed on 3 June 2008).
- 15 Quoted in M.K. Bhadrakumar, 'Bush's Last Throw against Iran', *Asia Times*, 10 January 2008.
- 16 Paul Treanor, 'Recolonisation of Iraq': <http://web.inter.nl.net/users/Paul.Treanor/recolonisation.html> (accessed on 1 May 2008).
- 17 Niall Ferguson, *Empire: How Britain Made the Modern World* (Penguin Books, London, 2004), p.379.
- 18 The NSA documents can be found at:<http://www.gwu.edu/~nsarchiv/nukevault/ebb245/index.htm> (aAccessed on 3 March 08).
- 19 Jim Lobe, 'The Bush Doctrine in Embryo': <http://www.ips.org/blog/jimlobe/?p=113> (accessed on 30 March 2008).
- 20 On at least 532 separate occasions (in speeches, briefings, interviews, testimony, and the like), Bush, along with Secretary of State Colin Powell, Deputy Defense Secretary Paul Wolfowitz and White House press secretaries Ari Fleischer and

Scott McLellan, stated unequivocally that Iraq had weapons of mass destruction (or was trying to produce or obtain them), links to Al Qaeda, or both, according to the report *Pre Iraq War Propaganda Campaign* released by the Center for Public Integrity: <http://www.publicintegrity.org/WarCard/> (accessed on 23 June 2008).

- 21 Condoleezza Rice and Robert Gates, 'What We Need Next in Iraq', *Washington Post*, 13 February 2008.
- 22 Ibid.
- 23 Alan Greenspan, *The Age of Turbulence: Adventures in a New World* (Penguin Press, London, 2007).
- 24 Josef Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes, *The Three Trillion Dollar War* (Allen Lane, London, 2008).
- 25 Eric Hobsbawm, 'Bush's Second Inaugural: Delusions about Democracy': <http://www.counterpunch.com/hobsbawm01252005.html> (accessed on 15 May 2008).
- 26 Eric Hobsbawm, *Age of Extremes: The Short Twentieth Century, 1914 1991* (Viking/Penguin Books, 1995), p. 563.
- 27 Eric Hobsbawm, 'A Question of Faith', *Guardian* (London), 14 September 2002.

12 Emerging international order and South Korea's survival strategy

Tae Woo Kim

Post-Cold War international order

The ten-year period starting from 1990 ending in 2001 was the only real phase that the US enjoyed its status as an unopposed superpower. The 9/11 terrorist attack of 2001 seemed to flip the traditional coin of conventional attacks on its head,¹ and highlighted superpower vulnerability to the threats posed by non-state entities. The US waged its 'War on Terror' by targeting the Taliban in Afghanistan as well as the Al Qaeda network, but swiftly faced another challenge of anti-American sentiments from the Islamic nations.

The limitations of the US relying solely on the use of its hard power poses another challenge. The US was faced with a totally different kind of battle with religious conflicts between warring factions, along with acts of terrorism against the US and multilateral forces that has already taken a toll of more than 3,000 soldiers. This is certainly the consequence of absence of persuasion, and empathy attributable to the use of soft power. Despite the establishment of an Iraqi government, the US has yet to pull itself out of the Iraqi quagmire, setting the stage for the importance of what Joseph Nye aptly labelled as 'smart power'.²

The nimble rise of 'second tier' states is presenting the US with another difficult task. While China has been developing economically at frightening speed since the late 1970s, the resuscitation under the leadership of Putin against the background of both a rise in demand for oil and general economic progress has reawakened Russia's appetite for influence. Through such mechanisms as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and diplomatic alignment in talks over Iran's nuclear issue, the Sino-Russian collaboration has served as a buffer to US unilateralism and counterweight to US efforts to consolidate a missile defence as well as the eastward expansion of NATO. In the long run, Europe, Japan, and India can all present challenges for the US. More specifically, Europe has managed to develop a strategy of increasing independence from the US, while Japan is setting itself up to fulfil the role of an autonomous political-military player all within the framework of a close alliance with the US. Additionally, India has already been recognized for its economic, political, and military potential to become a great power.

The issue of energy politics is certainly frustrating US efforts to maintain its superpower status. The seemingly insatiable hunger for energy consumption is driving China to expand into Kazakhstan, Saudi Arabia, Venezuela, Libya, and Sudan, in search of opportunities to construct oil pipelines, purchase oil fields, and invest in development. Despite its loyalty to the US, Japan is also actively seeking oil development projects and petrochemical industrial complex construction from countries like Iran and Venezuela that are not receptive to the US Russia overtures, and are using their 9 million barrel a day production capacity and 6.7 million barrels of net exports to optimize their strength in the political and military spheres. As the competition for energy extends into the realm of security, the international order is becoming more complicated.

To recapitulate, factors like the need for soft power alongside hard power, the appearance of non-state actors on the international stage, and the discord between military and energy security are weakening US efforts to hold on to its hegemonic status.

In the short term, due to the lack of credible challengers with comparable military power to that of the US, the chances of the US being surrounded by multiple great powers is not imminent. Not only are second-tier powers still trying to catch up, but the most potential challenger, China, still faces many uncertainties. There is a chance that if China continues with its economic development, it could match the national GDP of that of the US, but the possibilities of its reaching parity in personal income and military prowess are remote. Additionally, the increasing domestic demand for democratization, political freedom, and human rights are factors that add to uncertainty in China.

To counterbalance the influence of both China and Russia, the US is connecting the dots from the Baltic Sea, to the Caspian, through the Middle East and cutting across Central Asia to create a land belt alliance, while reinforcing its alliances with the United Kingdom, Japan, and Australia to create a sea linked alliance. The US is amenable to the idea of Japan expanding its autonomy on issues of politics and military, while India has managed to reach a nuclear energy agreement in July 2008 that could enhance its nuclear weapons' capability. With these efforts the US would remain a formidable military hegemon at least within the next half century.

However, a long-term projection presages an international system wherein power is shared by the US with multiple great powers.³ This means a strengthening of those second-tier powers. The speed with which these potential powers aggregate their economic, political, and military power will be a critical variable in fashioning the trajectory of the overall international system.

As potential great powers, Japan and India are in the forefront. Japan already enjoys a close alliance with the US, but has relegated any role of a 'balancer' due to its interconnectedness within the grand global strategy of the US. India, however, has managed to remain neutral between the main US-associated sea powers and the Sino-Russia-associated land powers, giving it

the opportunity to play the role of a 'balancer'. India, as of March 2008, is currently involved in cooperative naval exercises with states such as the US, Japan, and Australia as well as military exercises with the members of the SCO. With the fourth rank in terms of economic prowess (as of 2005, total GDP stood at \$2,596 billion), India is certainly a leading middle-power.

Post-Cold War international nuclear order

Emergence of US nuclear hegemony

With the end of the Cold War the US became an uncontested nuclear power by default. This was in a way inevitable, as both nuclear powers, the United Kingdom and France, were pro-American, while China had not yet amassed enough nuclear military power to challenge the US.

In effect, the deliberation of the 2003 Second Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) rubber-stamped the US as the ultimate nuclear hegemon.⁴ US espousal of concepts such as a new triad system, new development of tactical nuclear weapons, continued reinforcement of missile defence, and implementation of a pre-emptive nuclear strike policy, put a full stop to an era of nuclear parity. The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty (ABMT) limiting the stationing of interception missiles, which was signed by the US and the Soviet Union in 1973, was testament to the fact that 'nuclear weapons cannot be defended, and hence, the US and Soviet Union must share the burden of mutual vulnerability in order to prevent a preemptive strike from one party to the other'. In other words, the agreement had as its basis a nuclear parity between the two superpowers.

However, the recent moves by the US on its missile defence programme works under the logic that 'one can defend against all nuclear attacks', which in effect reveals a confident nuclear superiority by the US. Therefore, it was a predictable move by the US to unilaterally scrap the ABM treaty. Of course, the US argues that the objective of the missile defence programme is to provide a shield against acts of terrorism or provocative nuclear missile attacks by rogue states. But, theoretically, once missile defence technology is developed, the pre-emptive strike capabilities of China and Russia become nullified. This is also the rationale behind China developing MIRVed nuclear missiles, and Russia developing new attack nuclear submarines.

Challenges to US nuclear hegemony

However, the period of uncontested US nuclear hegemony was fleeting. First, post-9/11 presented the US with the task of grappling with the threat of nuclear terrorism. Graham Allison aptly points out that even the formidable US retaliatory nuclear forces are useless when it comes to acts of nuclear terrorism by terrorist organizations with no 'return addresses'.⁵

Second, moves by both Russia and China to counter US nuclear hegemony was increasingly visible. Russia inherited a strong nuclear military force even

after the disintegration of the Soviet Union, and has started developing new advanced attack nuclear submarines in response to US moves on missile defence. China owns roughly only 400 or so nuclear warheads, but it is moving towards reducing this power imbalance. China is replacing its old single warhead DF-4,5 with DF-31 missile and DF-31A MIRVed ICBMs, along with a submarine launched ballistic missile (SLBM), Julang-2, which has a range of about 8,000 km. In addition, as evidenced by China's destruction of its 860 km altitude weather satellite (Feng Yun-1C) on January 11, 2007, using a KT-1 rocket (range of 6,400 km) remodelled after its DF-21 missile, China is conscious of its competition in anti-satellite (ASAT) technology with the US.

Role of India as an emerging nuclear power

Third, future nuclear behaviour of India, a non-NPT member, is a variable that could impact the overarching nuclear order. Despite the nuclear ambitions of the Indian leaders, India's fully fledged armament took a back seat.⁶ The Chinese nuclear weapons test of 1964 reinforced voices within India to pursue its own nuclear weapons. After the 1974 nuclear test by India, the testing was spelt out as a 'peaceful nuclear explosion' under the rationale of civil engineering, in order to buttress its hand in keeping its nuclear options open, criticizing the discriminatory nature of the NPT and claiming, 'if the nuclear powers do not give up their nuclear weapons, India will not relinquish its right to own nuclear weapons'.⁷

In 1998, India finally tested its nuclear devices. As of now, India is said to have about 50 or so nuclear warheads, along with potential to become the third or fourth nuclear power. In 2003, India established a Nuclear Command Authority (NCA), and developed the concept of a 'nuclear triad' covering capabilities on land, sea and air. On land, there are the Prithvi and the Agni missiles, along with efforts to develop ICBMs. In sea capabilities, there are the Dhanush SLBMs, and progress on Sagarika missiles, while the Advanced Technology Vessel (ATV) programme had been initiated since 1985 to construct nuclear-capable submarines. As part of this programme, India has had experience in renting a nuclear submarine, *Chakra*, from the Soviet Union back in 1988-91. In terms of air power, India has the Mirage-2000H (made in France), Jaguar IS (from the United Kingdom), and Mig-27 Flogger (Russian); India is both assembling and manufacturing the latter two.

India is also poised to enter the competition for ASAT weapons systems. In 27 November, 2006, India successfully conducted its PAD (Prithvi Air Defence) testing, by intercepting a missile at 50 km altitude.⁸ Although this is similar to the lower altitude intercept or Israeli Arrow-2, experts speculate that India will soon establish an Aerospace Command structure and aggressively pursue the development of ASAT weaponry.⁹

India established the Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) in 1969, enabling progress on the rocket front. India had tested the SLV rocket by 1980, and is currently pursuing the commercial launch of its PSLV rocket after its

flight testing in 1994. The Agni missile is actually modelled after the SLV rocket, while the scheduled launch of the intercontinental ballistic missile has the PSLV rocket as its base.

In terms of nuclear facilities, India has heavy-water reactors, light-water reactors, fast-breeder reactors, and thorium breeder reactors, adding to 24 nuclear reactors, with four more scheduled for construction. India has 13 research complexes, as well as uranium mines, refining facilities, and heavy water plants. However, the total nuclear energy output of India is at a mere 3 per cent, which gives credence to the rationale that India has military motivations behind the use of nuclear energy.

It is not difficult to imagine the ripple effects of India's ambitious nuclear programme on the international nuclear regime. The 2006 US India atomic cooperation agreement represents US recognition of India and its potential to play a balancer role and a strategic move on the part of the US in preventing India from engaging with the Sino-Russian camp. In fact, the pact seemingly elevated India from a *de facto* to that of *de jure* nuclear weapon state while indicting the US of double standards and of damaging the legitimacy of the nonproliferation regime. Even within the US, there was criticism that this represented a triumph of power politics over nonproliferation principles. Despite this controversy, the US cannot but help define India as a 'rising global power and an important democratic power' and continue such cooperative endeavours.¹⁰

If India chooses to become a fully fledged nuclear power, the pact will only weaken the international nuclear system. A strengthening of India's nuclear power will provoke China into counter-militarizing, and push both the United Kingdom and France into a competitive spirit. The implications for Pakistan would be more direct. Pakistan lost in all three of the armed conflicts with India in 1948, 1965, and 1971 and its perception of insecurity is what drove Pakistan to possess its own set of nuclear weaponry in the first place.¹¹

Debate on survival strategy in South Korea

Forgotten agenda

The Northeast Asian region including the Korean peninsula is basically a direct microcosm of all these changes in the international political arena. The US as the superpower must engage with great powers like China, Russia and increasingly Japan, in the Northeast Asian region. Within this powerful mix South Korea has to pursue a realistic policy of ensuring a security guarantee and an idealist goal of maximizing autonomy. Korea had managed to accomplish a miraculous economic transformation by the end of the twentieth century. However, this has not translated into South Korea playing a balancer role due to its relatively weak national power status and limited hard power.

In this context, it was inevitable that many experts back in the old days always discussed a strategy for state survival for South Korea. However, with the coming of modern times, debate about state survival and the international

order have been long gone. Post-independence (1945) South Korea has only had to focus on security issues relating to North Korea and its domestic problems. During the administration of President Park Chung Hee, who came to power after the 1961 coup, South Korea was only focused on developing an exports-oriented industry to alleviate poverty, along with the security of the Korean peninsula.

During the period of democratization (1980s-1990s), the focal point for societal contention was 'political progress'. During the administrations that wished to achieve 'reform', like Kim Dae Jung (1998-2002) and Roh Moo Hyun (2003-7), an ideological battle raged between 'pro vs. anti-North Korean policy', or 'pro vs. anti-Americanism'. There were limitations in formulating a long-term state survival strategy or an analysis of the international order due to the focus on inter-Korea issues such as whether to view the North as an inseparable ethnic race or the main enemy.

The end of the Cold War along with the phase of democratization and ideology within South Korea strengthened the Kim Dae Jung and Roh Moo Hyun governments. Expansion of US military forces, diplomatic pressure abroad, and the era of Pax Americana were seen as 'American arrogance and parochialism' by those with a 'reformist' mentality. The voices for democracy concluded that US aid for military dictatorships in Korea was designed to retain its influence in the region and anti-Americanism became their hallmark. The 1997 election of Kim Dae Jung was a political gain for the democracy forces, which started infusing pro-North Korean sentiments in the 'Sunshine Policy'. Confidantes close to President Kim became more involved in the ideologicalization process, and Korean society became more involved in a conflict between conservatives and reformists.

More specifically, then, the idealist 'reformist' camp viewed North Korea as 'brothers and sisters' and the US as an 'anti-democratic foreign force'. On the other side, there was the realist 'conservative' camp that perceived a security threat from North Korea, and advocated a strong ROK-US alliance. In 2002, Presidential candidate Roh was able to employ the wave of anti-American sentiments created by the deaths of two school girls by a USFK vehicle, to win the election. This represented a political victory for the reformist camp.¹² The five years of President Roh's term was remembered as being a period where the state was run by idealistic leftist policies.

Under the banner of idealism, the Roh administration espoused 'equality' in domestic affairs; 'Korean solidarity' in policies toward North Korea; and 'autonomy' in foreign policy. Specifically, the ideal of 'equality' placed equal distribution above development, big government, real estate tax, and education, which resulted in an overall drop in competitive advantage for South Korea as a market economy. Meanwhile, policies toward North Korea lacked any self-introspection under the banner of 'Korean solidarity', which severely crippled any leverage in the North Korean nuclear talks. Unconditional aid served to reinforce the North's despotic government.

Lastly, 'autonomy' fuelled xenophobic sentiments and anti-Americanism in the younger generation, which hurt the traditional ROK-US and ROK-Japan

alliance, but soured ties with China and Russia, that had been fostered since a rapprochement in the early 1990s. The task of establishing a concrete survival strategy for South Korea through a level-headed evaluation of the international order was forgotten.

Nuclear issue and survival strategy

The emergence of North Korea's nuclear issue beginning from the early 1990s transformed the state survival and prosperity strategy into a forgotten agenda. The North Korean nuclear issue vividly outlined the lack of understanding and coordination among the six powers, i.e. the two Koreas and four surrounding regional powers.

With the North obsessed over the need for nuclear weapons, the whole concept of giving aid became an extremely controversial issue. Additionally, the North Korean nuclear debate splintered into an optimistic camp that argued that it was only right to continue aid to North Korea, and the more cautious camp that urged a cessation of aid till the nuclear issue was resolved. The confusion about how to treat North Korea created hostility between South Korea and the US, and fissures in ROK Japan ties. For example, Japan is using the North's actions as rationale for beefing up its military-political strength.

The North Korean nuclear problem has become a dilemma for the US, too. Despite several attempts such as the February 13 and October 3 agreements of 2007 the situation is still far from denuclearization. In fact, North Korea has been able to cross every 'red line' that the US had drawn, and continued with a cycle of 'threat formulation negotiations compensation', to acquire the status of a nuclear weapon state and increase its overall leverage.

Issues like the war in Iraq that shows no end in sight, the re-emergence of the Taliban in Afghanistan, and inauguration of a new government in South Korea are events that may encourage the North to view its environment to be favourable to stalling for more time. Against this backdrop, it is unrealistic to expect prompt actions for denuclearization by North Korea.

All these issues have been inherited by the Obama government. The fact is that despite soft and hawkish voices within the US, the North is unlikely to be fundamentally swayed by economic sanctions or diplomatic isolation. Sanctions without the participation of South Korea and China will be ineffective, so there is no clear alternative other than containment of the North indefinitely. In the long run, the unresolved North Korean nuclear crisis will seriously frustrate any efforts by South Korea for developing a state survival strategy.

Survival strategy as re-emerging agenda

The victory of the 'pragmatic' President Lee Myung Bak in the December 19, 2007 elections opens a new period for discussions on the topic of state survival and prosperity strategy. On February 25, 2008, President Lee clearly

expressed in his inauguration speech his wish to get away from ideology, by designating 2008 as the starting year for 'an advanced society', claiming outright that he would 'rid the ideological grain in policies toward North Korea and adopt pragmatic standards of measure'. In addition, President Lee stated that he would work to strengthen the ROK US strategic alliance and cooperate with China, Japan, and Russia. One can interpret these statements to mean recognition of the importance of the ROK US alliance, and to further overall economic interdependence with China, Japan, and Russia.

In regard to North Korea's nuclear issue, President Lee reiterated his campaign pledge of 'Nonproliferation Liberalization 3000' that states that if the North takes the initiative and opens up, the South will help raise its national per capita income to 3,000 dollars within a decade. This accords with the US position of giving importance to nuclear disarmament before giving any substantial aid to North Korea.

Many Koreans expect an end to the populist experiment undertaken by the Roh government. The disciples of the national survival strategy paradigm hope to see a new stance by South Korea, one that analyses the international order through a critical lens, and realizes when to ride the waves to its advantage to devise a survival strategy amidst rivalry between the great powers.

South Korea's survival strategy

Security strategy for a multilayered system

South Korea faces a tough challenge of pursuing both a survival and a prosperity strategy in a fast-changing international system fraught with rivalries between power players. The most optimal path for South Korea will be to foster four different capacities: independent security capability, alliances, bilateral relations with regional powers, and multilateral cooperation. Only when all four overlap and generate a multilayered security strategy will South Korea be able to withstand the vicissitudes of the changing security landscape.

Independent capability may be the most critical policy tool for maintaining security. The case of South Korea is more complicated given the nature of its placement within a region of powerful nations. In truth, South Korea's military capacity can only reach the level of 'reasonable sufficiency' as it cannot be a contender to any of the regional powers. Thus, the next important element is the capacity to garner a sense of security through alliances. Taking into consideration all the scenarios that may unfold, like North Korea's nuclear weapons and inter-Korea military confrontation, it may not be wise to place one's nation's fate in the hands of China. It may serve Korea better to build on the traditional ROK US alliance to include the ROK US Japan trilateral mutual assistance structure. This will be a rational choice given experts' predictions that Pax Americana will continue.

The next important element is bilateral relations with key regional powers. Fostering an increased level of economic interdependence, strengthening a

security network, and elevating mutual trust with China is essential. Relations with other countries like Russia, Japan, Australia, as also the states of ASEAN, the Middle East, and Central Asia, need to be strengthened to increase South Korea's autonomy. Lastly, South Korea could use the framework of multilateralism to boost its security.

Tasks ahead

South Korea is currently pursuing various strategies. It is now conducting the so-called 'Defence Reform 2020' under which it seeks to reform its military power structure, advancement of military training, improve military service, better treatment for those with merit, expansion of civilian control, policies to elevate combat readiness, and specialization of military acquisition process, to list a few.¹³ The final result will help remould the South Korean military into a 'small but strong military', resembling a technology-oriented, high-quality force, instead of what once was a man-power-oriented, conventional force.

A most important task is revitalizing the ROK-US alliance that has been withering away. President Lee Myung Bak will need to reopen all channels for communication including inter-governmental (Track 1), non-governmental (Track 2) and the hybrid (Track 1.5). He would also need to rethink the ROK-US agreement of 2007 to end the Wartime Operational Control by 2012. Many South Koreans believe that the agreement initiated by the Roh government should be renegotiated. If not, the two nations should find an alternative joint response system for a serious security threat to South Korea, or give time for South Korea to build independent military capabilities. In addition, the two nations can transform the current military alliance into a more comprehensive one sharing universal values like democracy, market economy, and human rights, from a Korean peninsula-specific alliance into one covering a wider area, and from a US-led alliance into one with fair burden-sharing.

With regard to the bilateral relations, South Korea will need to expand its interaction with countries such as China, Japan, and Russia in the areas of security. Increasing relations with India, a potential great player between the land powers and the major sea powers is a wise investment for South Korea's future.

In the area of multilateral cooperation, efforts to elevate the Six-Party Talks into a multilateral security cooperation forum, and focusing on diplomacy in the fields of economy, energy and military are critical. There are many ways for multilateral cooperation to take shape, in terms of groups, states and international organizations. Candidate areas are: UN peace-keeping operations, multilateral troop dispatches to Iraq and other areas of conflict, military diplomacy to complement the Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) programme, protection of sea routes through multilateral security structures, active military diplomacy towards countries rich in energy and natural resources, and initiation in creating new multilateral systems, to list a few.

Looking back, despite being the 11th largest economy and 9th largest contributor to the UN, South Korea's efforts in multilateral cooperation are

lacking. South Korea has to import roughly 2.3 million barrels of oil each day, ranking 6th on the world's largest oil importers. The oil tankers travel along insecure sea routes like the straits of Hormuz, the Indian Ocean, the straits of Malacca, and the South and East China Sea, but are protected by the US 5th and 7th Fleets. South Korea's participation in the dispatch of troops abroad will directly and indirectly contribute to its own survival.

On the nuclear front, the optimal path for South Korea would be to stick to basic principles and wait for outcomes with patience. For example, South Korea has no levers to change North Korea's nuclear behaviour while the more powerful levers are with the international community and the US. Hence, balance and harmony between inter-Korean collaboration and international cooperation is important. It was unrealistic for the Roh government to proclaim that it could settle the nuclear issue within the framework of an 'inter-Korean solidarity'.

Another principle is that South Korea should respond to each of the two faces of the North, same ethnic nation but security threat. Therefore, the two wheels of 'cooperative reconciliation' and 'security' should rotate in tandem. Alongside aid and Six-Party Talks, the nuclear threat requires a careful state survival strategy. The last ten years were dominated by the 'Sunshine Policy' and 'Policy of Peace and Prosperity', but did not succeed; hence, the Lee Myung Bak government needs to map out policies that would make North Korean use of nuclear weapons unthinkable.

Conclusion

The 2,000-year recorded history of Korea reveals its painful efforts to survive under powerful regional actors. The various Korean kingdoms in the past had to face invasions by outside forces like mainland China and Japan, and major attacks during the Su Dynasty (598-614), Tang Dynasty (645-68), Qing Dynasty (1727-1636), from Mongolia (1231-59), and Japan (1592-98). In order to survive, Korea became a vassal state, sending tributes and hostages to China, and was annexed by the Japanese Empire from 1910 to 1945.

South Korea in the modern day is the 11th largest economy with a significant military presence in the Northeast Asian region. Still, its situation is comparable to that of mice amongst elephants. South Korea must learn to live with economically and politically powerful states like the US, China, Russia and Japan, and fight for its survival. South Korea's economy is susceptible to military acts by North Korea. Seoul is exposed to the North's field artillery that can fire up to 50,000 shells an hour, besides Scud-C and Rodong missiles that can reach any target in South Korea within 3 to 7 minutes. Since South Korea is poor in natural resources and must rely greatly on foreign imports, the North's attack can ravage the nation's economy.

The optimal strategy for South Korea is to continue building on traditional alliances while focusing on constructing a multilayered security system. This is the best survival strategy that can prepare South Korea for both a continuation

of Pax Americana and a future international order with one dominant power but with multiple great powers orbiting around it. The concept of ‘soft power’ or ‘smart power’ seems a luxury for South Korea. The realist South Korean strategic thinkers know that for South Korea to survive, it should have either independent power to defend itself or a powerful external alliance. In the late nineteenth century the Korean peninsula, without either, fell victim to Japanese imperialism. This savage memory is ingrained in the minds of those thinkers.

Notes

- 1 The September 11 attack sent to historical junkyard the traditional assumption that non state actors or sub state groups usually lack the capability and organization necessary to carry out mass killing and that terrorists find it unnecessary to kill many as long as killing a few suffices for the purpose. Taewoo Kim, ‘Islamic Terrorism and Clash of Civilization’, *Korean Journal of Defense Analysis*, Vol. XIV, No. 1 (spring 2002), pp. 97–117.
- 2 In his lecture on February 12, 2008, in Seoul, Joseph Nye said that the US could not win the war on terror if the number of people the extremists was recruiting is larger than the number it was killing and deterring or convincing to choose moderation over extremism, and emphasized that the US needed to rediscover how to be a smart power armed with alliance and partnership, public diplomacy, economic integration, and energy security.
- 3 Many South Korean scholars share this view. For example, see Seungjin Kong and Jongchul Choi, *Korean Security Governance 2008~2013* (Seoul, 2008).
- 4 For detailed analysis, see: Taewoo Kim and Jaedu Kim, *We Should Know US Nuclear Strategy* (Seoul, 2003).
- 5 Graham Allison, *Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe* (New York, 2005).
- 6 For more analysis on India’s nuclear policy in the early era, see Taewoo Kim, *Nuclear Proliferation: Long term Prospect and Strategy on the Basis of a Real Explanation of the Indian Case*, PhD dissertation at State University of New York at Buffalo in 1989.
- 7 Representative Indian scholars who have argued thus include K. Subrahmanyam and Muchkund Dubey. See ‘The Nuclear Issue and International Security’, *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, 33–2 (February 1977), pp. 17–21; ‘India: Keeping the Options Open’, in Robert M. Lawrence and Joel Larus, eds, *Nuclear Proliferation: Phase II* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 1975); Muchkund Dubey, ‘Deterrence Masks Superpower Hegemony’, *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, 41–42 (February 1985), pp. 28–30.
- 8 It has been reported that India’s Defence Research and Development Organization (DRDO) budgeted for roughly 1 billion dollars in 2000, with the aim to complete an interceptor system that can shoot down targets at 100 km altitude by 2012.
- 9 There have been reports that India’s air force had initiated the ‘DURGA’, Directionally Unrestricted Rat Gun Array’ project, and the ‘KALI’ (Kinetic Attack Loitering Interceptor) project, in order to aid the development of ASAT weapons systems: <http://www.windsofchange.net/archives/009382.php> (accessed, 5 April 2007).
- 10 Hearing on US India Civil Nuclear Cooperation Initiative 2005. 11.2. Prepared Remarks before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee by Robert Joseph, Assistant Secretary for US State Department Disarmament and International Security Division.
- 11 During the phases of nuclear weapons development, both India and Pakistan claimed the ‘threat to security’ defensive rationale in order to advance their respective

programmes. However, the author believes that although the threat of India to Pakistan's decision making and nuclear development was a real variable, the threat of Pakistan to India's configurations was a spurious variable. See Taewoo Kim, *Nuclear Proliferation: Long term Prospect and Strategy on the Basis of a Real Explanation of the Indian Case*.

- 12 At the time, President Roh was acclaimed by the Idealist party for stating that it does not matter whether one harbours anti American sentiments, and that 'it is due time that South Korea let the US know what is what'. The remarks were made when President Roh had not yet visited the US.
- 13 In order to implement the defence reform, South Korea enacted the 'Regulations Regarding Defense Reform' in 2006.

Part III

**Thinking beyond borders and
boundaries**

Prospects for war and peace

13 Conflict models

How relevant are they to Asia?

Anuradha M. Chenoy

In the last few decades 90 per cent of armed conflicts have been intra-state armed conflicts. There has been much research into conflicts, why they occur and how to prevent them. Understanding conflicts can lead to their resolution and their pre-emptive resolution. On the other hand, a faulty understanding can lead to newer and more intractable inequalities and conflicts. Conflict analysis has become divided into 'root causes' and 'impact on' studies. This essay looks into some of these models and their shortcomings and examines some human security and people-centred approaches to examine their relevance to Asia.

The greed and grievance model

A popularly accepted thesis on conflicts is around the greed and grievance models and the school of thought that promotes the concept of the 'Liberal Peace'. The greed model is not new, as Plato stated: 'We maintain that if a state is to avoid the greatest plague of all – I mean civil war, though civil disintegration would be a better term – extreme poverty and wealth must not be allowed to arise in any section of the citizen-body, because both lead to both these disasters.'¹ Research by the World Bank and the International Peace Academy brought together in the volume *Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil War* argued that much of the post-Cold War civil conflict has been driven by economic reasons rather than purely political motivations. The belief is that the motivation behind wars has been the attempt to grab power and resources. War for these theorists is thus a continuation of economics by other means. This is a variation of Clausewitz's argument of war as continuation of politics by other means. This implies that conflict is a method of accumulation. This argument further explains that regions with young unemployed men, low average incomes, low growth, and high export of primary commodities such as oil, timber, commodities, were prone to civil conflict (Collier, 2001; Berdal and Malone, 2000). The argument was that such a mix provided availability of 'man power' and resources to fund the conflict. This theory led to other arguments on 'resource wars' 'resource curse', 'conflict diamonds' (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, 2007). Similarly journals like *The Economist* have argued that economic shocks are destabilizing and promote

conflict situations. In recent issues they have shown how the presence of a large number of young unemployed men characterizes each of these areas of potential armed conflict. So in the last decade, 43 per cent of the countries in the lower half of the human development index were at war, while only 5 per cent of countries in the top third of the HDI were in conflict.

This argument is unable to explain why in similar circumstances in two regions one may be entirely peaceful while another has an armed conflict. For example, why in the case of India is there a conflict in Kashmir, but not in Central Uttar Pradesh, where there is more poverty, more unemployed young men, and different resources? The Collier argument is thus apolitical, ahistorical, and mono-causal based on a base economic essentialism.

Collier believes that secondary factors like a dispersed population and a difficult terrain makes it hard for a government to control war. But again, there are many areas of dispersed population like Tibet and Ladakh, that are difficult terrain, but the population is controlled. Collier also shows that wars recur in regions of a history of wars (the France Germany or France England wars have not recurred, but he is probably referring to wars recurring in the Third World); he further argues that the diasporas and their long distance nationalism assists armed conflicts in home territories (this has not happened with the Chinese or Gujarati diasporas, but the Tamil and Kosovar diasporas have helped their insurgencies). Further, Collier argues that ethnic dominance and exploitation of one group over others can risk war whereas religious diversity can actually avert the risk of war because when no one group is big enough to dominate the country, people do not feel unequal.

Collier sees rebellion or a liberation movement as a crime motivated towards looting of assets, with a cover of the language of protest to recruit cadre and justify its actions. Thus Collier says that while the leadership talks of oppression, it is they in fact who are responsible for increasing grievances while the real motive all along remains looting (Collier, 2001: 155). The problem with this analysis is that it is at best partial if not simplistic. It underplays structural inequalities and historical injustices that translate into grievances, and it leaves out alienation, the role of local contractors, lack of institutions and economic and social exploitation. In addition, it allows local populations to be treated as subjects that can be continuously manipulated. Collier leaves out the role of the state, of state militia and biases. Thus while the leadership of many insurgencies can degenerate and use tactics like extortion, abductions, local taxation as the ULFA has done in Assam in India's North East, and many insurgent groups do in Manipur, the fact is that there have been times when these groups have been supported by the local population and sometimes criticized by them. Moreover, the lack of local judicial structures that can provide justice have been ineffective and these groups have often also intervened on behalf of victims. Further, in some cases draconian laws to curb insurgencies like the Armed Forces Special Powers Act is seen as even more problematic by the local people. A study of insurgencies and 'rebellions', for example the Maoist rebellion in Nepal, the Kashmir insurgency, the Naga

movement for self determination or even the Naxalite movement, show that Collier's thesis lacks the complexity to study these insurgencies.

As far as conflict resolution is concerned, Collier believes that 'addressing objective grievances is not usually an effective way to achieve this goal' (Collier, 2001: 156), but the government along with the international community reduces important factors of risks: like making it difficult for rebel organization to get established, by improving basic services, not allowing the rebels to sell their commodities in the international market; and that the government can ensure economic growth. Here again Collier's argument is flawed on at least two counts. One is that the government is impartial towards inter-ethnic conflict, which it may not be. In fact, for example, the Tamil conflict began because of a Sinhala nationalism reflected in state policies like official language and primary education that deprived the minorities of their rights. Second, that development models advocated by the World Bank themselves can lead to displacement, marketization, extraction that can structurally destroy communities as in the case of the tribal areas of India in Chattisgarh and Jharkhand, where there has been little social sector development and these areas remained inaccessible for years, except to local contractors and mining companies.

Collier also focuses on good governance, advocates minority rights; arms control policies; respect for human rights, and democracy. He argues that increasing education and growth rates reduces the risk of conflicts. Clearly, these are important interventions. But was not the lack of these, human rights, democracy, the very basic reason for conflict in the first place? But the rights based analysis for reasons for conflict remains missing from the Collier model.

Several analysts follow Collier's model with some variations. David Keen argues that war is because of the profit motive and not because of the breakdown of development.² The World Bank has used arguments similar to those of Collier in its understanding of conflicts as in its Report 'Breaking the Conflict Trap'. Researchers like Macartan Humphreys argue that statistical research has not found evidence of a relationship between economic inequality and conflict and thus concludes that there is no evidence to suggest that the structural adjustment policies led to an increase in conflict. But Humphreys recognizes that horizontal inequalities are an aspect of conflicts. Clearly, then, since statistics have proved that Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs) lead to inequalities, and that there are conflicts in some places where SAPs are in place (though not in all) shows that economic inequality is one variable, while obviously not the only one. Others like Hoefler agree that poverty in itself is a crucial structural cause of conflict.

Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy (2007) have shown that there are several problems with the Greed model. These are briefly: All reasons for war and insecurity cannot be measured in econometric terms. The greed model does not for example take into account historical memory of grievances or victimization. It does not look into the construction of the 'other'; the creation of stereotypes; the mobilization of a community/ethnic sub nationalism and the creation of a nationalist consciousness. Further how does this consciousness get militarized

and used to mobilize mass support? The greed model does not look at local cultural processes or structures of local exploitation and instead reduces all these factors to greed. Movements that arise out of oppression and genuine violation of rights (for example, the earlier East Timor movement) all get clubbed into the greed model. Further even if greed is an aspect of some conflicts, the mass support by the leaders is often based on a rights issue. The Nepal Maoist movement, or even the Naxalite movement, have seen extortions and robberies by their cadre. But much of their support base do not see them as conflicts for mere greed, but as struggles against the 'greed' of others', i.e. transnational companies, corrupt local governments, uncaring state policies.

By putting them all into the box of greed Collier's model fails to distinguish between the types of conflicts. The consequence is that the role of the state gets ignored. In many of the intra-state conflicts, analysis shows that the state has been far from neutral, and has generally sided with one community over another, especially against the minority. For example, Sudan's action in Darfur or the Sri Lankan state while it legislated in favour of the Sinhala majority. In Rwanda, for example, France until the end supported the Habyarimana regime while ethnic hatred and violence were instruments of the state itself. Collier thus confuses legality with legitimacy and gives far too much power to the state. Collier further leaves out the role of transnational corporations like for example the 'conflict diamonds' the Kimberly diamond, and the oil companies. He neglects the role of the shadow economies and the trade in small arms. The structural, the psychological and the political consequences of conflict get left out in models like these.

The grievance model

Based on the older argument that inequality leads to conflict, Francis Stewart and others have shown that horizontal inequalities, weak institutions, poverty, and lack of social services are the root causes of conflicts. Stewart includes power inequalities, inequalities between ethnic and religious groups. The Stewart model is, however, unable to show how these inequalities turn into conflicts. Inequalities prevail in many regions, yet some do not turn into grievances against the 'other'. Stewart's arguments have much strength when they show how political leadership mobilizes cultural differences when inequalities exist. Stewart's argument has been widely accepted and been used for development of backward regions. He, like Valpy Fitzgerald, underlines that structural inequalities lead to conflicts. Yet the development model that follows Stewart's model has in some cases led to an increase of, or new, conflicts. That is because development linked merely with markets and growth has meant displacement as new dams and special economic zones have pushed out settled tribal and agricultural communities or privatization of earlier commonly held or communal assets, as in some of the tribal districts of India. In these Schedule 9 areas in India, new conflicts led by the Naxalites have spread as the fastest growing movement in the country.

While the Dependency and radical theorists believe that it is economic exploitation and imperialism that leads to conflicts, Mary Kaldor and others cite cases from the 1990s wars in Bosnia, Rwanda, Somalia, and the collapsing states to show that neoliberal shifts and globalization have generated new conflicts and exacerbated old ones. Ted Gurr uses a political economy framework and subscribes to the idea that it is relative deprivation but not inequality in itself which leads to conflict. Cramer, after examining much data, argues that the thesis that economic inequality leads to conflict can neither be accepted nor rejected.

Lack of development or poverty in itself may not directly cause conflict, but poor socio-economic conditions and lack of democratic institutions can reduce a society's capacity to manage social tensions. Poverty and unemployment provides cadres who are willing to engage in violence, crime, and terrorism. But these require other factors to turn them into conflict. Amartya Sen warns against economic reductionism and argues that the link of poverty and conflict is a probability, not an inevitability, and that there is a complex system that leads to conflict. Thus academic debate has become polarized around the greed and grievance dichotomy, juxtaposing 'loot-seeking' with 'justice-seeking'. As a consequence development policy is often viewed from a conflict prevention lens, where aid givers and donors justify aid on the threat of conflict (Tadjbakhsh and Chenoy, 2007). The human security approach to understanding conflicts combines the approaches, broadens them to include a rights based approach, and suggests that looking at conflicts through the lens of national security or just underdevelopment is not only insufficient but lacking.

The human security prism

In this section I try and analyse some of the conflicts in Asia to see if patterns emerge. Looking at 15 recent armed conflicts in Asia one can come to some conclusions about the above models. For example, in Asia the ethnic conflicts with some secessionist character are: Ache (and earlier East Timor) in Indonesia; Moro in the Philippines; The Naga, Manipur, and other North East Indian ethnic conflicts and the Kashmir conflict in India; The Tamil Tigers in Sri Lanka; the separatist conflicts in Thailand. There are two struggles against occupation: Palestine and Iraq; one is opposition to a military government: Myanmar; for economic and political change includes the Maoists in India and earlier in Nepal; two are territory based: India Pakistan and North and South Korea. Afghanistan continues to have armed conflicts in several regions. (This data is available from web sites such as The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflicts, Carnegie Corporation of New York, <http://www.wics.si.edu>; The World's Armed Conflicts site <http://www.jmk.su>; also www.ploughshares.armedconflicts2003.)

An analysis of such conflict shows some common indicators:

- a) Most of these conflicts are rooted in problems of communities that have become opposed to their state. The conflict is rooted in a rights based

issue. The community has a feeling of exclusion; for instance, they feel class, caste, ethnic, religion based biases, practices, and policies in most social, economic and political institutions. They also record exclusions in social interaction, employment, cultural practices, and laws. These may be subliminal or overt but nonetheless present.

- b) Most of these conflicts begin as demands for justice or social change and are often based on ethnic sub-nationalism that incorporate ethnic-nationalist myths, symbols, and strategies.
- c) Most of these movements have a number of factions and different strategic perceptions, tactics and goals. Often these groups have used violence against each other. Most have sections that believe in violence and use violent strategies, labelled as terrorism. Many of the movements are hierarchically organized, based on military principles and are 'underground'. Most use women cadres in their operations, most of whom are support cadres and lower in the hierarchy. Thus, many ethnic secessionist and anti-regime/state movements valorize force, often because of the failure of other methods.
- d) Ruling and opposition political parties reflect and use these divisions in different ways. Right-wing parties often base themselves as representative of one group specifically in opposition to the 'other' and use this as the main method of mobilization. They create a threat perception of the minorities as 'outsiders' whose loyalty to the nation is suspect. The Right homogenizes multiple traditions to conform to a unilateralist vision that they alone would interpret and by doing so divide civil society and the polity on communal or ethnic bases. Centrist parties, while contesting such views, often do not mobilize sufficiently against such trends, remain divided on their strategies and tactics and fear political defeat if they do not succumb to 'majoritarian' or populist politics, for example in Sri Lanka. The left-wing groups, especially those that advocate armed violence like the Maoists in India, and earlier the Maoists in Nepal (who have since 2006 given up violence), work with the most excluded sections of society and mobilize on the basis of capturing power in order to give these people a better society.
- e) The state and regime is far from neutral in these conflicts. Conflicts in Asia reveal how the regime in power has used conflicts for serving its interest. For example, the King of Nepal declared an emergency, suspended the parliament, and usurped power. In Pakistan the army has used conflict with India to abrogate democracy and install military governments. In other states, it has been done by constructing a nationalism based on 'majoritarian' politics and attempting to isolate the minorities; or using a minority primarily as a vote bank; or using religion or language to homogenize people for electoral purposes; or by using one religion/ethnic group against another.
- f) In all these conflicts the state has used the armed forces to control and manage conflict; treated the conflict as law and order problems; attempted to use one faction against the other or repressed the conflict, before trying to look for a negotiated solution.

- g) In most conflict regions counter-insurgency measures are carried out. These measures are aimed at destroying the infrastructure support base of the insurgents. This has generally meant that the homes, workplaces, fields of ordinary people in these regions get destroyed, or are marked as enemy territory. Thus infrastructure in conflict regions is often destroyed. For example, hundreds of schools in the Ache were destroyed and churches in the hills of Manipur were targeted during counter-insurgency measures.
- h) Most states have attempted negotiations only after much bloodshed and terror, or after intervention from 'outside powers'. (Thus conflicts like East Timor, Sri Lanka, Georgia, and Palestine have all seen international pressure.)
- i) All these states have promulgated highly draconian national security laws and legislation. In all the regions of armed conflict emergency provisions like special powers for the armed forces and paramilitary are operational. Armed forces have special rights like conducting searches without warrants, destroying shelters that could be hideouts, granting wide discretionary powers to even junior officers, disallowing assembly or meetings of large numbers of people, and giving immunity to officers who have committed human rights violations.
- j) In all these conflicts the state has resorted to tactics of majority militarist nationalism and sought legitimacy by evoking images of threat perceptions, territorial disintegration, and 'national honour'.
- k) All states have seen increases in their military budgets, the number of armed forces, and acquisitions of weapons. In three of the Asian states official expenditure on military as a percentage of GDP is higher than that on the expenditure on education and health combined. Two states are openly nuclear and two are known to have nuclear programmes.
- l) All these states show a record of systematic human rights violations especially in the region of conflict.

All these indicators reveal how state policy of exclusion and unresponsive policies lead to a spiral of violence in these societies. Yet most of the conflict models have little reference to the role of the state, especially legitimate, democratic, and strong states in conflict.

Implications for civil society

- 1) In all these conflicts the largest number of people who have been killed, hurt or maimed have been civilians. Non-combatants get marked as supporters and are subject to army grilling, searches, and women are especially targeted for abuse.
- 2) All these conflicts have generated large numbers of internally displaced persons and millions of refugees.
- 3) The Gender Development Index Ranking for five of these states is amongst the lowest in the world. Women have been subject to violence and degradation on the basis of 'honour'. Women have been disproportionately affected by

these conflicts, the largest numbers of those displaced and made refugees (70 per cent) have been women. In most Asian countries women lose their status in society as widows, rehabilitation packages for women in all these conflicts have been less than those given to men and, in many instances, women have not personally benefited from compensation since this has been taken over by the extended families. Since women symbolize the honour of their community they lose their autonomy during such conflicts since there is an attempt to keep them 'secure' at home. On the other hand, women who 'belong' to the 'enemy' are raped, since this violates the 'honour' of the entire community. All the Asian conflicts as those elsewhere have witnessed rape and sexual abuse of women as a method of punishment for the entire community.

- 4) Children have been caught in the crossfire in all these conflicts and have been killed, maimed, traumatized, and militarized. In many of the Asian conflicts there has been reported use of child soldiers and kidnappings. Conflicts orphan children, keep them away from schools, processes that traumatize and dehumanize them and instil militarist values.
- 5) In all these conflicts the civil society remains divided, where some sections support the state and all its actions. Large sections remain neutral and are subject to contesting legitimizing and de-legitimizing forces. Some sections of civil society are sympathetic to demands of these movements, critical of human rights violations and state policies, especially the 'right-wing' movements.

All these indicators show that models of conflict analysis have to view each conflict in all its complexity: that the role of states have to be factored in. The role of external agencies and transnational organizations need to be factored in. Further, violation of human rights and the impact of armed conflict as well as the state response have become intertwined with the 'root causes' of conflict. Thus both issues, i.e. the root cause and 'impacts', need to be addressed. This can be done only when taking a comprehensive human security and rights approach.

In conclusion, it must also be said that states that use state-centred and militarist methods of security have failed to solve conflicts with just resolutions, they have only 'managed' or controlled conflicts. The alternate methods that range from comprehensive security, non-traditional security, and human security need to be used to understand and address insurgencies and armed conflicts.

Notes

- 1 A.E. Taylor (1926/2001) *Plato the Man and his Works*, London: Dover Books.
- 2 David Keen, 'Winning may not be desirable: the point of war may be precisely the legitimacy which it confers on actions that in peacetime would be punishable as crimes', *Adelphi Papers*.

References

- Berdal, M. and Malone, D. (2000) 'Greed and Grievance: Economic Agendas in Civil Wars', in *International Peace Keeping Academy*, Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner.
- Collier, Paul (2001) 'Economic Causes of Civil Conflict and their Implications for Policy', in Chester A. Crocker, Fen Osler Hampson, and Pamela Aall, eds, *Turbulent Peace: The Challenges of Managing International Conflict*, United States Institute of Peace Press.
- Cramer, Christopher (2005) 'Inequality and Conflict: A Review of An Age Old Concern: Identities, Conflict and Cohesion', programme paper, Number 11, October, UN Research Institute for Social Development.
- Fitzgerald, Valpy (2000) 'Paying for the War: Economic Policy in Poor Countries under Conflict Conditions' in Frances Stewart and Valpy Fitzgerald (eds) *War and Underdevelopment, Vol. I: The Economic and Social Consequences of Conflict*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Gurr, Ted (1968) 'A Causal Modal of Civil Strife: A Comparative Analysis Using New Indices', *American Political Science Review*, Vol. 6, No. 4.
- Humphreys, Macartan (2003) *Economics and Violent Conflict*, Harvard University, available at: <http://www.preventconflict.org/portal/economics>.
- Kaldor, M. and Vashee, B. (eds) (1997) *New Wars: Restructuring the Global Military Sector*, London: Pinter.
- Stewart, Frances (2000) 'Crisis prevention: Tackling Horizontal Inequalities', QEH Working Paper Series 33, Oxford, Queen Elizabeth House.
- Tadjhbaksh, Shahrbanou and Chenoy, Anuradha (2007) *Human Security: Concept and Implications*, Abingdon: Routledge.

14 Religion as a catalyst for conflict¹

The case of Islam

Jamal Malik

Fight those who believe not in Allah, nor in the Last Day, nor forbid that which Allah and His Messenger have forbidden, nor follow the Religion of Truth, out of those who have been given the Book, until they pay the tax in acknowledgement of superiority and they are in a state of subjection.

(Qur'an 9:29)

This so-called sword verse taken from the Qur'an, as well as the various proclamations with a similar purport, consolidate the existing and functionally important image of Islam in the West.

This, mostly negative picture of Islam finds its roots in the crusades.² It was reinforced in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries when European powers colonized Muslim societies, projecting their ideals and concepts upon foreign cultures.³ Thereby they reduced the diverse and heterogeneous Islamic world to a religiously monolithic, in itself anti-modern, world that would not define itself through rational thinking. Besides, the Orient was regarded to be a fearsome and terror-spreading hemisphere; consequently the oriental world was excluded from any world-historical development.⁴ Thus excluded from historicity, the processes there receive practically a pathological character and violence is perceived to be the essence of Islam. Christian polemic against Islam added certain elements to this specific image. It regarded Islam to be an unfaithful religion, a warrior's religion conflicting with peaceful Christianity.

Acts of violence in the Islamic world are often associated with the idea of holy war, not least because radical Muslims often connect their militant actions to the symbol of the Holy War (jihad), which reinforces an aggressive image of the Islamic world. However, in doing so, barely any reference is made to the specific cultural and socio-political context of violence; the complexity of Muslim cultures is programmatically left out. Instead, the dogmatic self-definition of early Islam is regarded to be the nature of Islam, and to be the base for all further developments, while any continuing historical processes are veiled in ignorance. Synonymously, in reality existing Islam is generally considered to be equivalent to Islamism or Islamic radicalism. How then has the phenomenon of violence and non-aggression or nonviolence developed in the Islamic theology and Muslim policy?

The concept of violence in the Qur'an

There is no denying that Islam, or better Muslims – just as any other religion and its carriers – do know the idea of violence. Historical facts testify that religiously inspired and authorized violence always played a central role, not only in the process of expansion but also in the consolidation of power. The Qur'an speaks very clearly of fighting and violence – by all means in terms of killing, for example in 2:190. This verse was revealed when the still young Islamic community had to consolidate and protect itself from outside dangers. Here it says: 'And fight in the way of Allah against those who fight against you but be not aggressive (by fighting in an unjust/unfaithful manner). Surely Allah loves not the aggressors' (2:190). Here, the Arabic word for fight is 'qital'. Although the command appeals for absolute fight, it does not serve the purpose of pointless aggression, but it is rather to be seen in the sense of fighting the breach with Islam (*fitna*) which could cause the disintegration and the breakdown of the fledgling Islamic system. In the same verse (2:190-93) it says further:

... And kill them (the pagan opponents) wherever you find them, and drive them out from where they drove you out, and persecution (of believers who apostatized) is worse than slaughter – And fight them until there is no (more) persecution (of believers to break with Islam), and religion is only for Allah.

This, as well as the following Medinian verse hints at a permission to kill: 'Permission (to fight) is given to those on whom war is made, because they are oppressed' (22:39). This further permission to fight and to kill was an answer to those problems which had arisen with powerful Meccan tribes breaking away from Islam. Considering the pre-Islamic Arabian tribal culture, such a kind of violence was permitted and it corresponded by all means to the norms of that time. One must keep in mind that the Romans first killed all male warriors while invading the conquered towns.

The Holy War and the ideology of the crusades

Next to this concept of killing and violence in defence of the still small Muslim community, there also exists the idea of the commendable fight of a single warrior – and with that we are already confronted with the sphere of the shimmering concept of 'Jihad' (derived from *jahada*: to make an effort, to try hard, to fight). In the Qur'an one can find this term 35 times, twice in its original meaning (to struggle), and 29 times in the sense of warfare.⁵ This Holy Fight can definitely be referred to as a specific order focused on a continuing process – as a vigorous 'action of the believer for the will of God'. This can be put into action either by weapons but also in a non-aggressive manner.

Taking the context of the Qur'an into account, the meaning of the verses postulating violence becomes clearer: The purpose was to set the integrating and mobilizing role of religion against a missing uniform guidance and planning of contesting Arab tribes. Above all, it was a matter of putting through the (Qur'anic) 'struggle on the way of God', in terms of strengthening the 'Muslim community'. Corresponding to these Qur'anic revelations the already existing and highly important warlike activity of pre-Islamic Arabs received further reevaluation. Fighting was now regarded as a service for and worship of God, with the restriction, however, that one did no longer only identify with one's own tribal group. Instead, it now had to be the whole Islamically defined community (*Umma*) which consequently dissolved the tribal particularism. Accordingly, all non-Muslims being outside of the *Umma* could be considered opponents. Through such a concept of the warlike worship of God, the fragmented tribalism could be unified and steered into a uniform direction. Thereby, a religious reevaluation of the warlike activity of individual valiant combatants took place; jihad became the Islamic religious sanctification of the individual combative action.

If, on the one side this idea was able to consolidate the effort of rivalling tribal groups increased by the prospect of high spoils on the other side, it also rewarded death on the way to God with the immediate crossing into God's nearness with the immediate entry into paradise. This gave a necessary religious inauguration to the valiant individual aggressive action and combatism.

Referring to the studies of the late Albrecht Noth, the idea of jihad was by no means only concerned with the propagation of Islam. Moreover, it focuses on the protection of the Islamic community from any tempting apostasy (Qur'an 8:43, 2:188). Yet, this defensive view could also be combined with the expansion of the sphere of might, which it eventually must. In addition to that, conversion is not regarded as the ultimate goal, for example of the people of the book (Christian, Jews). Instead, the important aspect was their tributary dependence (9:29), that is jihad had a worldly connotation. Hence, subjugated people could practise their religion relatively freely, although they at times had to pay high protective tariffs for it (*jizya*).

Thus the purpose of jihad was by no means the conversion of the opponents of Islam, but rather the preservation, consolidation and expansion of the Muslim communion in the first place. Here, the precondition was the perspective for the common good (*maslaha*). Accordingly, situations could also be accomplished and guaranteed by peace treaties or by tribute payments of the non-Muslims the main idea was that one should not be heading for disaster by getting into a fight if there was no chance of an armed success.

In consequence, jihad can indeed be regarded as a legitimizing concept for combative actions against the unbelievers. However, it is not an expression of an overall belligerent desire or an eagerness for making spoils, as the numerous acts of violence in Muslim regions might suggest. What is important here is that one needs to distinguish between this Qur'anic jihad which required

a moral justification of a defensive jihad and the historical practice of the offensive jihad which could merely be focused on pure expansion.

For after the death of the prophet, jihad turned into the idea of martyrdom. Many *hadiths* (sayings attributed to the Prophet Muhammad, compiled in several collections, having a normative character for the Muslims, second to the Quran) can be found from this period of time, as for example ‘martyrs are such men who fight in the first line of a battle not turning around until they are killed’.⁶ One can detect a change of meaning from ‘witness’ (of faith) to martyr (witness of blood, *shahid*): Somebody who witnesses his/her faith with his/her blood, hence with his/her death, and is rewarded for this act in the hereafter.

Interestingly, this idea of the warrior’s martyrdom meets the traditional Arabian glorification of the valiant single warrior – it certainly has a significant mobilizing effect on the participation in religiously legitimized fights. However, it is also responsible for the great number of often risqué individual initiatives. Actually, most of the assaults were not accomplished by the sovereign, the caliph or the sultan. On the contrary, it had been small groups without stabilized political structures, such as fighters in the early Muslim expansion, who used the religiously hypertensive and overstrung messianic concepts of violence and war. One can speculate about the relationship between the brutalization of holy wars/fights and missing professionalization.⁷

Mission and proselytization thought missing in Islam indeed corresponded to the idea of supporting this young religion to achieve a general supremacy. But still mission did not consider or justify a change of the scope of action. In this sense, Islam also knows no Holy War, no religious war, no *bellum iustum*. Indeed, the original concept of jihad almost finds itself in opposition to the idea of war in general, since such a war exemplifies more or less an organizational and logistically thought-out aggressive action. In fact, jihad was about *razzia*-like attacks (Arab. *ghazawat*) followed by retreat.

During the crusades, the idea of taking the cross in Christianity turned into one with an obligation – this means the crusade became a vow which had to be kept and fulfilled during the journey to the East. This was less an innovative idea of the crusade’s Pope Urban II, but was rather related to the initiative of the crusaders themselves who needed additional supplies in order to strengthen and fortify their armies. Thus the idea of pilgrimage was projected on the Eastern crusades. The defaulting cross-bearer was to be punished in an ecclesiastical and worldly manner.⁸ Consequently the number of voluntary combatants increased which in the end led to a combination of pilgrimage and war against pagans.

Crusades and the Holy War became a popular and fashionable custom; the middle classes foraged for expanding trade. Due to the latent fear of the Arabs, especially of the so-called Saracens (idolaters, magicians, promiscuitors) – a scenario which had arisen from biased translations of Qur’anic verses – Islam was stylized to the religion of the sword. In consequence, a boundary and dissociation from Islam took place which now was endowed with an overall enemy image.

It is interesting to note that during the crusades the symbol of the cross was replaced by that of a sword. The sword became the ultimate symbol of cultural contact. At the same time, Islam was perceived as a pure sword-religion which contributed to the foundation and self-affirmation of the knighthood.

While the crusaders spoke of wars of liberation, for Arabs those fights were more or less protective fights only. In this context, jihad was now regarded as being synonymous with the Holy War. What we can see here is the projection on another culture of a common cultural technique for self-affirmation and demarcation: Ontological fixation and valorization of differences as congenital and inherent helped maximize disparities.

The great jihad

Jihad played its most significant role in the outlying military posts in the periphery of the Islamic empires where not only religious and mystic practices and institutions developed, but where also a coalescence of war and asceticism came into being. Mystics created the concept of *jihad al-nafs*, the fight against one's carnal desires. This was the so-called great jihad in contrast to the small jihad, the fight with the sword. In course of time mystics systematized their ideas of a peaceful message. With these, at times quite complicated, trains of thought and emotions and inner self-examination, the significance of the military jihad was reduced. For instance, the mystic al-Muhasibi (died in 837) referred to the great jihad as some kind of emigration from the worldly den of iniquity. In this way the *hijra* (migration of Muhammad from Mecca to Medina in 622; exodus; beginning of the Muslim era) experienced to a certain extent an internalization.⁹

However, jihad could also be led against unfair rulers, for the redemption of social mismanagement and social defects. Besides, the term was used in context of concepts of building up the economy. What also needs to find recognition is the peaceful jihad in terms of a noncooperation and nonviolence movements: One of the most famous examples are certainly the Indian Muslims who under the guidance of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi stood up against British colonial rule shortly before the abolition of the caliphate in 1924.

Semantics apart, jihad is usually regarded as connected with violence and aggression alone. Closely linked to this was the division of the world into two parts in an area under Islamic rule (*dar al-Islam*) or 'House of Islam', and an area of the non-Muslims which considering the circumstances of that time was called the 'Realm of War' (*dar al-harb*).¹⁰ However, this conception of the division of the world into two parts was based on pre-Muhammadan, Roman ideas. Gradually secular aspects were added to the concept of war (*harb*), especially due to the expansion of Islam. Thus the concept of the world's division necessarily had to be broadened. In a strong pragmatic sense this notion of space now included also an area of alliances (*dar al-sulh*) or of ceasefire (*dar al-aman*). Hence, such a specific space considered the possibility of a differentiated majority of non-Muslims living under Muslim law, as it was reflected

in the protégé's regulations.¹¹ Although this concept still has a certain impact on the neo-oriental discourse, in reality it is more a legal construction of the Islamic jurisprudence which does not work anymore.

It becomes obvious that alternatives had already developed very early representing a removal of territorial restrictions as that of the *Umma* or building up a binding agreement which automatically implemented a renunciation of military fighting. A third possibility was the contract of protection (*istiman*), which demanded the absolute loyalty of the Muslims.¹²

Active resistance and death on the way to God

However, in contrast, there can also be found an active resistance, and rebellion of Muslims under Muslim rule also figure in Islamic law. Here it is said that Muslims can oppose unfair rulers if there is a chance that such a rebellion might make it better. Terrorist actions can also be taken provided they are not used against civilians, since this was regarded as an offence against human integrity. Another kind of violence that of suicide is also mentioned.

In classical Arabic, 'killing of one's self' (*qatl al-nafs*), or in modern Arabic 'cutting one's throat' (*intihar*; VIII of *nahara*: to cut the throat, slaughter), are talked of. In the Qur'an, the idea of suicide is mentioned only once, at 4:29: 'And kill not yourself.' However, the same verse could also be translated as: 'And kill not your people' (*wa la taqtulu anfusakum*). Still, in *hadith* literature suicide is explicitly prohibited, since anyone who decides to put an end to his own life will be denied access to paradise. Numerous *hadiths* discussing suicidal death point out that, during the time of the prophet, suicide was a common phenomenon which he tried to get under control.

Religiously legitimized suicide for the purpose of achieving greater glory is unknown to classical Islamic theology. Sacrificing oneself for religious ideals does by no means find any authorization or justification. Corresponding to this there exists no history of collective suicide¹³ probably because Muslims rarely found themselves in situations where they represented a pursued minority. Actually, on the contrary the institution of *taqiyya* the denial of creed may be referred to:

Already in the Middle Ages this method of disguise had terrified Christian crusaders. The only explanation they [the Franks] could find for such perfidious attacks was that the assassins must have been under the influence of hashish, which is why in English and French they are still called assassins until this day.¹⁴

In spite of this great number of regulations, Muslims in the recent past have become known for suicide missions.¹⁵ These were targeted mostly against western supremacy and their allies. What needs to find recognition is the fact that the actual concept of jihad has been reinterpreted into a concept of war only in modern times. In recent times it has experienced an ideological overload in

the sense that jihad has turned into a militant fight against colonial rulers and their sympathizers.

Islamist positions

Statements of some radical fundamentalists are quite informative. Within the Islamic discourse, incursions find their legitimization in the controversial concept of *takfir* (indictment of the infidel).¹⁶ Hence, rulers in the Muslim world are considered to be apostates who are only instruments of cultural alienation using the state to decrease Islamic influence on society. Since they also reject the sovereignty of God (*hakimiyya*), they are regarded as following the way of apostasy by deserting true faith. In consequence, their modern secular *Jahiliyya* ('age of ignorance', period of paganism before the coming of Islam, also used as metaphor for unbelief and apostasy in contemporary Islamist discourses) is considered to be more powerful, hence more dangerous, than the primitive pre-Islamic one. Moreover, their national symbols are referred to as manipulating tools for people and religion, contaminating the morality of society by national symbols, used as legitimization for their blasphemous purposes. Hence, these apostates who turned their back on Islam are regarded as even more menacing than the infidels. Accordingly, any earthly tyrannical rule (*taghut*, literal meaning: idol, pre-Islamic God in Mecca; broader meaning: tyranny, hubris) must be eliminated by *jihad*, since the struggle against the interior is considered to be more important than the fight against external forces.¹⁷ Referring to this argumentation, the breakdown of a legal system, as for example in the Egypt of Anwar Sadat (murdered in 1981), gives the cause and religious authorization for aggressive actions.¹⁸

The view that an oppressing and unfair (*fitna wa fasad*) system of the state would not allow the establishment of a state appealing to God stands in the centre of criticism and violence in Islamism. The most popular Islamist theorist A.A. Maududi (who died in 1979) postulated in *al-jihad fi al-Islam*¹⁹ the forcible fight of such a system: '... in order to eradicate evil and to prevent wrong, Islam has prescribed that by systematic endeavour (jihad) and, if the necessity should befall, by war and bloodshed all such governments should be wiped out'²⁰ because government was regarded as one of the most powerful factors of influencing human morality and civilization.

... the most necessary and effective measure for the destruction of *fitna* and *fasad* and the purification of human life from evil is the obliteration of all corrupt governments and their replacement by a government which in principle and in fact is based on righteousness.²¹

Since most Islamist ideologists suffered from hard imprisonments in their countries, such thinking can be regarded as some sort of prison ideology, for example Sayyid Qutb (killed in 1966), an important thinker and activist of the Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt. Their rationalized experiences merge into the idea of *takfir*: the unbelieving ruler must either be killed or one should emigrate in order to prepare for a possible jihad.

HAMAS (*Harakat al-muqawama al-islamiyya*), literally meaning 'Islamic resistance movement', put these and similar ideas radically into action. It does not make any explicit demand for suicide, but it asks for the death sacrifice for Allah instead – a self-sacrifice, a martyrdom. This calculated functional rationality in the application of violence creates an important level of motivation that goes far beyond a lifetime. According to this, the victim's death in the name of religion is a joyful event; suicide serves the purpose of a 'fair' punishment and for the restoration of one's own dignity. Thereby, the fundamentalist religious assassin is not the active one, but instead he is chosen and privileged to commit self-sacrifice. In this way the assassin is granted paradise because this kind of a meaningful violence purifies him. In consequence, it is by no means contradictory that his burial takes place without a proper ablution in burial shrouds. This religious privileging and the perceptions that live on after physical death as well as fantasies of superiority all suggest a loss-free victory, and therefore has a mobilizing function and can help overcome fears. Thus in January 1985 Hamas succeeded with these kinds of violent actions in expelling Israel from the majority of the Lebanese territory.

Also in the Shiite context such aggressive and violent actions and suicide missions seem to have some precedence, though a stringent ideological coherence may not prevail. According to the revolutionary theorist Ali Shariati (1933–77), this image is based on the violent death of Muhammad's grandson Husain ibn Ali, in Kerbela in the year 680. Husain had revolted against the corrupt and overpowering authority of the Umayyads. During the annual Shiite flagellum ritual this incident is commemorated in dramatic form: one atones for the fact that nobody had come to help the prophet's grandson. Since suicide is not permitted (Qur'an 4:29), the only way to fulfil this urge remains in a collective self-sacrifice which finds its ritualized authorization on the tenth day of Muharram in the Islamic calendar which marks the climax of the remembrance of Muharram – the *ashura* customs. By analogy it could be stated that the concept of an inherent willingness of such an expiating self-castigation might have increased the readiness for suicide in the sense explained above.

Still, what we can see here are specific forms of collective memorialization of violence; the individual action is affected collectively within its specific cultural context. Seen from this point of view, violence can be regarded as a specific kind of social action. Thus, in specific conditions violence can become socially productive as effective as standardized ritual performance and it can create solidarity.

Moreover, heroism was rejected in Islam in the battle of al-Badr in the year 627 (Qur'an 8:17; 8:66; 9:26, 40; 9:14). In this battle, the spirit of jihad found its way into Islam and, hence, Muslims defeated a great and superior number of Meccans in a miraculous way. The verse of al-Badr allowed Muslim warriors merely to become instruments in the hands of Allah – mercenaries of Allah as it were. Allah himself had won the battle. By analogy, a person would not be able to attain divine identity through aggression, because high-handed acts of violence stood in contradiction to Islam.²²

Still, every now and then Muslims interpret al-Badr in quite the opposite way²³ as for example, when the battle is narrated in all details or if a radical militant organization in Kashmir calls itself al-Badr, thereby evoking the support of Allah. Finally, also the militant activism of Hamas is characterized by a lack of heroism, harking back to the perception that one is merely the instrument of God.

However, discussing the role of violence in Islam one must take into account the fact that most such Islamist theorists worked and lived in some kind of totalitarian regimes, and these regimes are also protected and supported by Western industrial nations. This means that stability is regarded to be more important than the protection of human rights and the right of political participation.²⁴ Other than that, the question of legitimacy and illegitimacy of violence is not so much a matter of purpose and motive, but rather of the formal status of the perpetrators and victims.

Political economy of violence

Although we must not overlook the fact that under the surface simmering conflicts establish the preconditions for violent eruptions, it has to be emphasized that the presence of religion as a catalyst for conflict should not be translated into a simplistic charge that religion causes violence. The September 11 attacks were also driven by political concerns, above all resentment at the (actual or alleged) overwhelming geopolitical influence of the United States.²⁵

Both ‘political economy’, that is understanding the changes and conditions to which society reacts and thus causes further changes, as well as the analysis of the ideological background of conflicts, reveal that religious and sectarian violence is far from being ‘meaningless’ and an irrational rollback of archaic forces. It is rather a means of resistance against a global modernity which seems to uproot traditional local cultures than mere destruction. Recent research has expanded on the idea that religiously legitimized violence can be regarded as a ritual to create societal cohesion in an environment which is crisis-ridden and formed by a dissolution or mere absence of any integrating welfare-state.²⁶ In a country like Pakistan government massively intervenes in traditional forms of life and thus destroys long-established institutions like *madradas* (religious schools) which are suspected to be hotbeds of anti-governmental activities while the state fails to fill the vacuum with alternative structures.²⁷ Thus the reason for the current radicalization and why young people in such countries so often resort to violence is a vicious cycle driven by both government and society. Moreover, symbols of (real or alleged) threat such as the WTC towers become ‘tabood totems’,²⁸ reflecting domination by a foreign power, and thus regarded as an obstacle to self-determination.

Not surprisingly, the National Intelligence Estimate of the US intelligence services (2006) on trends in global terrorism points to some key factors in increasing jihadist activities:

(1) Entrenched grievances, such as corruption, injustice, and fear of western domination, leading to anger, humiliation, and a sense of powerlessness; (2) the Iraq 'jihad'; (3) the slow pace of real and sustained economic, social, and political reforms in many Muslim majority nations; and (4) pervasive anti-US sentiment among most Muslims all of which jihadists exploit.²⁹

Analysing suicide attacks between 1980 and 2001 the American political scientist Robert Pape found that the target of every bombing campaign has been a democracy: USA, France, Israel. Even Sri Lanka, Turkey and Russia came under the fire after they underwent democratic reforms. A fair example is the Kurdish Partiya Karkerên Kurdistan: While it dealt deadly blows to Turkey which suppressed the Kurds to a far lesser extent than Saddam Husain, it never incited any suicide bombing in Iraq, where the Kurds faced a much stronger suppression by the ruling Baath party. Thus, Pape argues that only a small number of suicide attacks are carried out by mentally insane individuals. As a matter of fact, these blasts contain a vibrant element of rationality. Given the fact that group pressure is a strong mobilizing factor (while religion is not), we must ask what triggers this process.³⁰

Obviously, people like Osama bin Laden are not representative of the way the majority of their countrymen and co-religionists think. Yet the statements they make, although laden with misperceptions, are capable of striking a chord in people's psyche: inequality and discrimination are concepts that are built into people's motivated civilizational biases and mental constructions of the frontier.³¹

In terms of organization, these movements multipolar as they are form around male charismatic or authoritarian leaders. The movements start as local religious enclaves but are increasingly capable of rapid functional and structural differentiation and of international networking with like-minded groups from the same religious tradition. They impose strict codes of personal discipline, dress, diet and other markers of identity, solidarity and loyalty to set group members apart from others. A popular example is the al-Qaida network which adheres not only to an anti-Western ideology but is strictly Sunni-oriented.

In terms of ideology, extremists are both reactive against and interactive with secular modernity. They tend to be absolutist, inerrantist, dualist and apocalyptic in cognitive orientation.³² In this process, religion works as a catalyst, but not as a core reason of violence. These networks easily permeate national frontiers and create a specific social manifestation of religion. They absorb negative experiences and frustrations especially in those areas of the world where the welfare state is still in its infancy or even completely absent.³³ Thus, the collapse of law and order can induce and authorize religious communities to religious legitimization of acts of violence. The subjective interpretation of inequality and prejudice make people particularly vulnerable to manipulative influences.³⁴ Religious concepts and ideas thus tend to permeate the profane sphere and vice versa.

Does that mean that societal harmony is the key to enduring political stability? On the contrary, sociological studies show that conflicts can also contribute decisively to the stability and cohesion of society. Conflict management therefore has to deal with the fact that any conceptualization of a conflict as a struggle for identity might contribute to an essentialization of the contesting parties. This exacerbates rather than solves the conflict since one might negotiate profane things but certainly not sacred values. In a world of shifting boundaries there is ample need for an open discussion about religious coexistence to help avoid a feeling of permanently being threatened by ‘the other’. Paradoxically, religious conflicts act as a catalyst in the evolution towards a global consciousness of the existence of a world society.³⁵

Conclusion

In order to understand the role of violence in Islam in an adequate way, one must not portray an essentialized image of Islam by reducing Islamic culture to religion alone. In doing so, one would only adapt the view of orientalists and Islamists, who in fact represent and emphasize the ideological claim to power of Islam scholars who consider religion to be the only civilizing and society-forming force.

Certainly, the religious repertoire is an outstanding one, due to its functionality and its flexibility. Hence it easily adapts itself to any given context. Therefore, it is a matter of contextualizing Islamic (violent) culture. It must be understood in its context by carefully translating the social and cultural codes and repertoire.

Due to the fact that the Qur’an corrects the pre-Islamic customary law mainly in individual questions perceived as serious – in particular in the family law and the law of inheritance – such an aspect of cultural contextualization becomes even more important. Barely more than 80 verses in the Qur’an (of all together approx. 6240) refer to questions of society and – in this narrower sense – are relevant in legal concerns. Hence, the Qur’an can neither serve as a modern constitution nor as a Civil Code. It is the social reality that creates violence among Muslims being couched in religious symbolism.

If one must comment on the often posed question, ‘How does Islam refer to this?’, two perspectives must always be taken into consideration: on the one hand, Islamic teaching based on certain normative texts and, on the other, the interpretations of those which need to be seen in its different contexts. The misuse of concepts such as jihad as a ‘just war’ or ‘infinite justice’ will become that much more difficult if one knew about their cultural meaning and variety.

Notes

- 1 This is an extended version of my German article ‘Gewalt und Gewaltlosigkeit im Islam’, in: Wolfgang Ratzmann (ed.): *Religion Christentum Gewalt. Einblicke und Perspektiven*, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt 2004, pp. 57–73

- 2 See Carole Hillenbrand: *The Crusades. Islamic Perspectives*, Edinburgh 2000.
- 3 See the seminal work by Edward Said: *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, London 1979.
- 4 The prevalent periodization of the Islamic world into the Golden Age, decadence and renaissance is based in this orientalist image.
- 5 For example, 5:32; 2:216ff; 2:256; 8:72, 9:5; 9:27; 9:29; 16:125; 25:52.
- 6 Albrecht Noth: *Heiliger Krieg und Heiliger Kampf in Islam und Christentum*. Beiträge zur Vorgeschichte und Geschichte der Kreuzzüge, Bonn: Ludwig Röhrscheid Verlag 1966, p. 51 (transl. JM).
- 7 Compare Jörg Rüpke: 'Religion und Krieg: Überlegungen zur religiösen Konstruktion des Krieges einer Gesellschaft' in: Christoph Bultmann, Benedikt Kranemann and Jörg Rüpke (eds): *Religion, Gewalt, Gewaltlosigkeit*, Münster: Aschendorff Verlag 2004, pp. 119-34; here pp. 121, 126.
- 8 Noth: *Heiliger Krieg*, p. 135.
- 9 For this complex see Muhammad Khalid Masud: 'The obligation to migrate: the doctrine of *hijra* in Islamic law' in: Dale F. Eickelman and James Piscatori (eds): *Muslim Travellers: Pilgrimage, Migration, and the Religious Imagination*, London: Routledge 1990, pp. 29-49.
- 10 Yet, this dichotomization is no more a functioning juridical construction of Islamic jurisprudence, which nowadays is, however, determined by a neo orientalist discourse, a discourse according to which Islam – due to its stress on universal spiritual egalitarianism – would reject the legitimation of political authority and usurp the capability of the state, to establish a strong coherent unity. Thus, according to this perception there was no civil society in Islam.
- 11 See Albrecht Noth: 'Möglichkeiten und Grenzen islamischer Toleranz', in: *Saeculum* 29 (1978), pp. 190-204.
- 12 For sure, the Qur'an also calls for peace: 'And if two parties of the believers quarrel, make peace between them; but if one of them acts wrongfully towards the other, fight that which acts wrongfully until it returns to Allah's command; then if it returns, make peace between them with justice and act equitably; surely Allah loves those who act equitably' (49:9). This important passage provides the basis for intra religious conflict management, without damaging human integrity.
- 13 One exception is the Assassins (hashishiyyun: those consuming hashish) of eleventh and twelfth centuries; see Bernard Lewis: *Die Assassinen. Zur Tradition des religiösen Mordes im radikalen Islam*, Frankfurt/M. 1989; these Assassins – a Nizari Ismaili sect – stood for suicide commandos against their enemies, among others the Franks. See also Tilman Seidensticker: 'Martyrdom in Islam' in: *AWRAQ* XIX (1998), pp. 63-77.
- 14 See Hans G. Kippenberg: 'Kriminelle Religion. Religionswissenschaftliche Betrachtungen zu Vorgängen in Jugoslawien und im Libanon', in: *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 7 (1/1999), pp. 95-110; here p. 105 (transl. J.M.). See also Lewis: *Die Assassinen*.
- 15 It should be mentioned that suicide attacks are also conspicuous among Tamil activists. They lack, however, the idea of a paradise.
- 16 See J.J.G. Jansen: 'The Creed of Sadat's Assassins', in: *Die Welt des Islams* 25 (1985), pp. 1-30.
- 17 Sayyid Qutb elaborated on this idea, just in consonance with Maududi's notion of *hakimiyya*.
- 18 See Kippenberg: 'Kriminelle Religion'.
- 19 A.A. Maududi: *Al Jihad fi al Islam*, 19th edn, Lahore 2006; chapter 'The Necessity of a Theo Democracy for the elimination of suppression and injustice'. This voluminous book was written in 1927 after the alleged assassination of Hindu activist Swami Sharadanand by a Muslim. However, strangely enough, unlike most of Maududi's other works, which have been translated into Arabic, Persian, Turkish,

- English, French, German, and so on, *al Jihad fi al Islam* has not been translated into any Western language. See the short article by Jan Slomp: 'The 'political equation' of Al jihād fī al Islām of Abul Ala Mawdudī (1903-79)', in: David Thomas (ed.): *A Faithful Presence: Essays for Kenneth Cragg*, London: Melisende 2003, pp. 237-55.
- 20 *Al Jihad fi al Islam*, p. 90, quoted in Charles Adams in: Gustav v. Grunebaum Aziz Ahmad (eds.): *Muslim Self Statement in India and Pakistan 1857-1968*, Wiesbaden 1970, pp. 156f.
 - 21 Mawdudī in v. Grunebaum et al., p. 157.
 - 22 See Georg Baudler: *Die Befreiung von einem Gott der Gewalt*, Düsseldorf: Patmos Verlag 1999, pp. 303ff.
 - 23 Compare http://www.geocities.com/badr_313/battle.htm (June 2001).
 - 24 See Gudrun Krämer: 'Nachdenken über Islam, Menschenrechte und Demokratie', in: *Gewerkschaftliche Monatshefte* 11-12 (2001), pp. 679-85.
 - 25 David Herbert and John Wolffe: *Religion and Contemporary Conflict in Historical Perspective*, in: John Wolffe (ed.): *Religion in History: Conflict, Conversion, and Coexistence*, Manchester: Open University, pp. 286-320.
 - 26 Compare Hans G. Kippenberg: *Gewalt als Gottesdienst. Religionskriege im Zeitalter der Globalisierung*. Munich: C.H. Beck 2008.
 - 27 See Jamal Malik (ed.): *Madrasas in South Asia: Teaching Terror?* New York: Routledge 2007.
 - 28 Michael R. Ott: 'Civil Society and the Globalization of Its 'State of Emergency': The Longing for the Totally Other as a Force of Social Change', in: Michael R. Ott (ed.) *The Future of Religion: Toward a Reconciled Society*, Leiden and Boston: Brill 2007, pp. 273-306.
 - 29 *Declassified Key Judgments of the National Intelligence Estimate 'Trends in Global Terrorism: Implications for the United States'* dated April 2006. (http://www.pbs.org/newshour/indepth_coverage/terrorism/homeland/nie_key.pdf).
 - 30 Robert Pape: *Dying to Win: The Strategic Logic of Suicide Terrorism*, New York: Random House 2005.
 - 31 Mario Apostolov: *The Christian Muslim Frontier: A Zone of Contact, Conflict or Cooperation*, London and New York: Routledge 2004, p. 108.
 - 32 R. Scott Appleby: *The Ambivalence of the Sacred: Religion, Violence, and Reconciliation*, in Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield 2000, pp. 87-88.
 - 33 Kippenberg: *Gewalt als Gottesdienst*, pp. 198-99.
 - 34 Apostolov: *The Christian Muslim Frontier*, p. 107.
 - 35 Apostolov: *The Christian Muslim Frontier*, p. 18.

15 The Antarctic experiment in utopia

Sovereignty, resources and sustainability

Sanjay Chaturvedi

Introduction

With a total area of about 5.5 million square miles, Antarctica is far larger than India and China put together. During the late nineteenth century Antarctica was subjected to a predominantly state-centric and power-political geopolitics, based on the premise that territory and territorial control necessarily implied more power, prestige and security (Chaturvedi, 1996). Thereafter, and particularly from the International Geophysical Year (IGY 1957–58), permanent scientific stations were established and seasonal marine mammal harvesting continued. But it was not until the late 1970s that the dominant representation of Antarctica as the ‘Continent of Science and Peace’ was challenged by significant modern commercial interests. From this period (marked by resource geopolitics and diplomacy) onwards, Antarctica has been increasingly integrated into global systems and highly capitalized actors and forces of the globalized economy have arrived on the scene.

Antarctica in the Cold War geopolitics

The dominant spatial representations of the Antarctic during the 1950s were affected by the Cold War discourses. By late 1947, Antarctic affairs assumed immense significance in foreign policy considerations of the US and the impetus for this shift in focus had more to do with the Soviet Union than with events in the Southern Polar Region per se (Dodds, 1997). The US proposal of February 1949 to internationalize Antarctica was motivated by the broader goals of the containment strategy: keeping the Soviet Union out of Antarctica and its affairs. It was also about containing Argentine, Chilean and British rivalry in the Antarctic Peninsula.

It was science, especially during the IGY, which laid down the groundwork for the Antarctic Treaty of 1959. More than 40 research stations and observatories were set up and thousands of scientists worked together on the continent. There was a more or less tacit agreement among the participating countries that political problems regarding the Antarctic ought to be shelved for the duration of the IGY. Yet some kind of a ‘red threat’ was perceived by

the US and its allies from the Soviet polar programme. The IGY was instrumental in giving rise to the dominant representation of Antarctica as a laboratory for fundamental science and accorded the politicization of Antarctica a totally new, unprecedented direction (Chaturvedi, 1996).

Against this background, the US invited the remaining IGY participating countries (Argentina, Australia, Belgium, Chile, France, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, United Kingdom and USSR) to negotiate an effective joint governance mechanism for the Antarctic. In case of the claimant states, what so obviously motivated them to negotiate a political arrangement for Antarctica was not just the nagging uncertainty over the future of their claims in the event of a concerted occupation of the continent by the United States and the then Soviet Union, but also the utter impracticality of defending national interests in the harsh polar conditions by conventional military means. Both Argentina and Chile, probably others too, concluded that their Antarctic claims would be advanced more effectively within rather than outside the treaty. Similarly, both the US and the USSR found in the proposed treaty the best possible way of avoiding a confrontation and guaranteeing each one's strategic position.

The Antarctic Treaty (cited hereafter as the Treaty), with a preamble and fourteen articles, was signed on 1 December 1959 (entering into force in June 1961) by the representatives of the United States and the countries mentioned above. The Treaty prohibits all activity of a military nature, such as establishment of military bases and fortifications, carrying out of military manoeuvres as well as the testing of any weapons. Article VII provides for wide rights of inspection to all areas of Antarctica by the Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties (ATCPs).

According to Article VI, the Treaty's provisions apply to the area south of 60° South latitude. At the same time, however, Article VI disavows any incursion upon high seas rights as recognized by international law. The Treaty in no way attempts to define explicitly just which maritime areas of the Southern Ocean below 60° South latitude are, or should be, considered high seas. The primary reason for this ambiguity is that five of the seven who claim sovereignty over portions of the Antarctic continent demarcate their claims in such a manner so as to include areas of the Southern Ocean (Rothwell, 1996).

Article IV of the Treaty explicitly declares that 'nothing contained in the present Treaty shall be interpreted as: a renunciation by any contracting party of previously asserted right or claims to territorial sovereignty'. The Antarctic Treaty in general and Article IV in particular have escaped a critical scrutiny with regard to the manner in which they 'rewarded' colonial occupation and annexation. The legal 'freezing' of territorial claims for the duration of the Treaty (no specific termination date is being mentioned) is therefore much more than a carefully crafted diplomatic solution to the thorny issue of claimant and non-claimant states; it protects and promotes a particular vision of the continent anchored in the colonial past (Dodds, 2006).

The Antarctic Treaty parties (as of June 2008, there are 46 parties to the Treaty, of which 29 are consultative parties), including the original members

of the Antarctic Treaty, meet annually (previously it was biennially) in order to discuss recommendations for the Antarctic continent or the implementation of existing agreements.

Growing focus on resource geopolitics (1970s–1980s)

By the 1970s, a rather impressive outline of Antarctic resources had emerged as a result of extensive geological and biological research of the region. This was soon filled in by perceptions of the burgeoning population in terms of consumption and depletion of resources in the wake of the oil crisis. During the 1970s, the fact of non-Treaty actors taking interest in the Antarctic resources was enough in its own right to galvanize the ATCPs into action. They accordingly perceived the need to have a regulatory framework in place before the krill fishery, the dynamics of which were not yet fully understood, was actually over-exploited (Watts, 1992).

The Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources (CCAMLR), formalized at Canberra in May 1980, entered into force in 1982. Article IV of CCAMLR continues to maintain the moratorium on territorial claims. The steadily creeping jurisdiction of the ATS into the seas south of 60 degrees South latitude is further extended to the Antarctic Convergence. Second, political pre-eminence of the ATCPs within the ATS is preserved.

It is worth noting that similar to other Antarctic Treaty provisions, the Convention is not enforceable, even on members, and relies on voluntary compliance. Hence, CCAMLR suffers from tremendous disadvantage when it comes to the enforcement of its conservation measures. In recent times, Antarctic finfish stocks, particularly Patagonian toothfish (*Dissostichus eleginoides*), have been heavily fished around the sub-Antarctic islands within the CCAMLR area (Sahurie, 1992).

When the ATCPs turned to the question of Antarctic minerals in 1970, to be joined by India and Brazil as consultative members in 1983, it was commonly felt, however, that once some mineral deposits on a commercial scale were to be found, the question of territorial sovereignty would inevitably surface and jeopardize the delicate geopolitical equilibrium on which the ATS rests. Under the circumstances, it was just as well that full knowledge of the minerals map of the continent was not available.

With India, Brazil, China and Uruguay's consultative status in the ATS the issue of equity could no longer be bypassed in the minerals negotiations. The ATCPs, faced with such dilemmas felt obliged to reiterate that any agreement that may be reached on mineral exploration and exploitation in Antarctica should be without prejudice to those states which had previously asserted rights of or claims to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica.

In May 1989, Australia announced that it would not sign CRAMRA, opposed the idea of mining Antarctica and demanded instead a comprehensive environmental protection convention within the framework of the ATS. French

support promptly followed. The volte-face by Australia and France on CRAMRA seriously undermined the capability of the ATS to resolve intra-system conflicts on the basis of consensus principle.

The announcement on 4 July 1991 of the US decision to sign the 'Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty' (cited hereafter as the Protocol) marked, in a way, the end of the most critical trial of the inner strength and viability of the ATS. The Protocol was concluded by consensus on 4 October 1991 at Madrid.

The Protocol sets out some basic environmental principles to govern all human activity in Antarctica – be it scientific, tourism related, governmental, non-governmental or related to logistic support. According to the Protocol, activities in the Antarctic Treaty area shall be planned and conducted on the basis of information sufficient to allow prior assessments of, and informed judgments about, their possible impacts on the Antarctic environment and dependent and associated ecosystems and on the value of Antarctica for the conduct of scientific research.

'Question of Antarctica' in the United Nations: the rise and decline of postcolonial geographies of the Antarctic

The interest of the 'outsiders' in the icy continent arose as early as the 1980s and somewhat in direct proportion to the origins and evolution of minerals issue within the ATS. Malaysia was to emerge as the most vociferous critic of the ATS. The Malaysian position reflected, in part or whole, that of most of the developing nations including Antigua, Barbuda, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Egypt, Ghana, Nigeria, the Philippines, Sri Lanka and Zambia, to name a few. All were critical of the allegedly exclusive nature of the system, the membership of South Africa (no longer an issue in the UN debate), and the distribution of Antarctic resource benefits. From 1984 to 1987, Malaysia and the ATCP's positions over the 'Question of Antarctica' were polarized. Malaysia demanded that the concept of 'common heritage of mankind' should be applied to Antarctica (Tepper and Haward, 2005).

The ATCP's vehement accusation is that ATS is anachronistic, discriminatory, harbours colonial territorial claims, is exclusive and thus should be replaced by the common heritage of mankind principle. The fact of growing membership of the ATS (including the accession to the Antarctic Treaty by India, China and Brazil among others) is emphasized in order to refute the charge of exclusiveness, the 'widely observed principle in international relations whereby those countries primarily engaged in particular activity are responsible for management and decision making' is being emphasized as 'sensible and working' for the Antarctic. From 2002 onwards, the debate in the UN on the 'Question of Antarctica' can be interpreted as 'constructive engagement'. Malaysia too has increased its direct and indirect Antarctic scientific effort in the late 1990s and early 2000s. Malaysia seems to have accepted the de facto presence of the ATS and joined the Scientific Committee on Antarctic Research (Tepper and Haward, 2005).

Bioprospecting in the southern polar regions: geopolitics, science and market

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, the industrial world stands on the edge of a new revolution in the field of biotechnology. As such the industries of the future, tapping increasingly into the materials and processes in plants, animals and microorganisms, have drawn on the chemicals and genetic material of the world's biological resources to provide new feedstocks and new modes of manufacture. In this steadily growing industry tropical rain forests and coral reefs have received most attention, and some of the key sectors involved include agriculture, biotechnology, cosmetics, pharmaceuticals and waste management. In the year 2003, the global biotechnology industry consisted of 4,284 companies (3,662 private and 622 public) in 25 nations, generating \$35 billion in annual revenues and employing some 188,000 people (UNU/IAS, 2003). It has also been noted that the world's biota represents a source of raw materials that has the potential to replace petrochemicals as an industrial feedstock and to provide novel chemicals for use in drugs and other products (Green and Nicol, 2003).

Bioprospecting represents a market-driven search for bioactive components in such living organisms as animals, plants, micro-organisms (bacteria, microbes) or fungi to develop new commercial products generally under the protection of patents. According to Green and Nicol (2003), bioprospecting comprises four phases: (1) sample collection; (2) isolation, characterization and culture; (3) screening for pharmaceutical activity; and (4) development of product, patenting, trials, sales and marketing.

Some analysts have argued that bioprospecting is a progressive and innovative venture, and commercial enterprises should be rewarded for their investment in the form of patent rights over the end products; whereas others would argue that claims to patent rights should not be entertained at the cost of freedom of scientific research and the commercial use of biological resources must be shared on an equitable basis.

There are at least two reasons behind the current bioprospecting interest in Antarctica. First, considerable gaps in knowledge surrounding the Antarctic biota provide a unique opportunity to discover and explore potentially valuable new organisms. Second, the extremophiles (novel life forms capable of withstanding extreme cold, aridity, and salinity) is the most sought after micro-organism by the industry. The application of extremophiles is found in industrial processes such as liposomes for drug delivery and cosmetics, molecular biology, the food industry, and waste treatment (UNU/IAS, 2003).

Among several examples of commercially useful compounds discovered is a glycoprotein, which functions as the 'antifreeze' that circulates in some Antarctic fish, preventing them from freezing in their sub-zero environments. It was in the early 1970s that the glycoprotein was discovered by the National Science Foundation (NSF) funded research conducted by Chi Hing C. Cheng and Liangbiao Cheng of the University of Illinois. Further research is in progress on the application of this glycoprotein in a range of processes, including

increasing the freeze tolerance of commercial plants, improving farm fish production in cold climates, extending the shelf life of frozen food, improving surgery involving the freezing of tissues and enhancing the preservation of tissues to be transplanted (Connolly-Stone, 2005).

Against the backdrop of several commercial pharmaceutical companies asserting property rights to flora and fauna in Antarctica, as of 2004, more than 40 patents had been granted worldwide on bacteria and other organisms found in Antarctica. By the year 2004, more than 90 additional patent applications were pending in the United States alone (Stix, 2004). Large collections of species are being created. One example is the Australian Collection of Antarctic Micro-Organisms ('ACAM'), which houses around 300 species collected from the Antarctic (Green and Nicol, 2003). Similar Antarctic bioprospecting activity is being undertaken by public institutes, in partnership with commercial enterprises, in a number of other states (Green and Nicol, 2003).

Out of a range of critical issues surrounding bioprospecting in Antarctica, at least three deserve special mention (Green and Nicol, 2003). First, the commercialization of publicly funded science is likely to place 'inappropriate' limits on freedom of scientific investigation in both the Antarctic and in the high seas. Second, imposition of mutually agreed limitations on ownership rights over biological resources in global commons areas would be needed in order to ensure that benefits are shared equitably by the entire humanity. Third, consensus will have to be negotiated and sustained by various stakeholders on how best to regulate bioprospecting in areas outside national jurisdiction. Then there are questions related to the modalities of the activity. Is access to Antarctic biological diversity limited? Is it subject to environment protection requirements? How can one reconcile the possible utilization of results with the Antarctic Treaty's requirement that scientific results be made freely available?

Towards Antarctic bioprospecting policy regime: imperatives and impediments

The question of biological prospecting, or 'bioprospecting' was first discussed at the 25th Treaty Consultative Meeting (ATCM) in 2002. At the 28th ATCM, held in Stockholm (ATCM, 2005), New Zealand and Spain pointed out that it is unlikely that a bioprospecting activity at the sample collection stage will have more than a minor or transitory impact, *although this would depend on the particular circumstances*. At the New Delhi ATCM, held in May 2007, UNEP pointed out that,

further research and study is needed to provide a solid informational basis for considering this complex subject, which encompasses scientific and commercial interests, environmental concerns, ethics and equity, and considerations relating to international law and policy, including the adequacy of the Antarctic Treaty System to fully address bioprospecting.
(ATCM, 2007)

Signed by the representatives of 150 countries at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) is dedicated to translating the principles of Agenda 21 into reality. The Convention lists three main goals: the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components, and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits from the use of genetic resources. The legal regime it creates is based on the access granted by the States to the components of biological diversity within the limits of their national sovereignty or jurisdiction.

On the face of it the CBD provisions do not seem to apply to bioprospecting in Antarctica primarily due to the persistent sharp disagreement on the sovereignty issue in Antarctica. Yet it is worth pointing out that Article 5 has been used to develop regional efforts to apply the provisions of the CBD and also for considering whether some of its provisions could be applied to regulate the use of marine genetic resources from the high seas and deep seabed.

A leading authority on polar international law (Rothwell, 2005) has observed that the Southern Ocean legal regime is based upon both the Antarctic Treaty System (ATS) and the UN Conventions on the Law of the Sea, as supplemented by international environmental law such as the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The UNCLOS III (which came into force on 16 November 1994) establishes the International Seabed Authority (ISA), to organize and control activities in the 'deep seabed', ocean floor and subsoil thereof, beyond the limits of national jurisdiction, segment of the high seas or 'The Area', as defined in Part XI (Articles 133-40). Declared as the common heritage of mankind (Part XI, Article 136), the exploration and exploitation of the Area is to be carried out for the benefit of mankind as a whole, irrespective of the geographical location of states. States can neither claim nor exercise sovereignty over the Area and its resources, nor appropriate any part of it (Part XI, Article 137). The specific application of this concept under UNCLOS III is to the exploitation of minerals and not to the bioprospecting of biological and genetic resources (Herber, 2006).

As far as bioprospecting is concerned, the ISA does not have definitive jurisdiction, though it is presently attempting to establish such authority (Herber, 2006). Although bioprospecting in the deep seabed is not specifically regulated by ISA at present, 'there is an inextricable factual link between the protection of the deep seabed environment, including its biodiversity, marine scientific research, and bioprospecting' (Scovazzi, 2004). For example, the sampling of biological resources may occur in the course of exploration of mineral deposits in the Area (UNEP, 2005).

Moreover, several features of the seabed regime outlined in UNCLOS may be extended to, or may become the basis of, a specific bioprospecting policy regime in the Area (UNEP, 2005). In any case, the deep seabed area is highly relevant to the formation of bioprospecting policy in Antarctica since it is an area without national sovereignty. Moreover, a deep seabed, as such, also exists in the Antarctic Treaty area, south of the 60 degrees South.

The proverbial billion dollar question here is this: how do we ensure that the corporations engaged in bio-prospecting willingly adhere to a set of principles and practices that question a culture of secrecy and demand instead transparency, accountability and sharing?

Conclusion: Antarctica as a global knowledge commons?

Integral to biological prospecting is the search for knowledge related to diverse biological and genetic resources. Whether or not such knowledge falls in the category of public good would depend largely on the extent to which it is available (or made available) to people at large in a manner that is non-rival and non-exclusive in terms of both access and consumption (Herber, 2006). As opposed to the notion of public good stand economic characteristics of a private good that are 'rival' in nature and consumed by only one person or social unit at a time. There is indeed considerable evidence to show that in an international political system, characterized by asymmetries in terms of both geopolitical clout and technological competence, the ideal of widespread dissemination of knowledge is not easy to realize.

The underlying spirit of the Antarctic Treaty is that of a public good principle driven by the vision of Antarctica as the global knowledge commons. The actors engaged in peaceful activities in the Antarctic Treaty area are under an obligation to ensure that even those who are not directly involved in the ATS benefit from the knowledge. The production, dissemination and sharing of knowledge (biodiversity in this case) cannot be allowed to be guided solely on commercial basis by the private sector in the Antarctic.

Looking ahead, the challenge is to negotiate an Antarctic bioprospecting regime built around the long-established Antarctic scientific tenets of public funding and international openness. This would demand not only sharing of information and knowledge among those (state and non-state actors) engaged in biological prospecting in utmost transparency (something easier said than done) but also the adoption of stringent environmental regulations and impact assessments. Such a pursuit might even compel the ATCPs to rethink and modify some of the provisions of the Madrid Protocol and its annexures.

Should private companies be allowed to profit from species unique to the Antarctic as yet another 'peaceful' use of Antarctica and the Southern Ocean is a question worth raising. Ever since the Antarctic Treaty came into force in 1961, the term 'peaceful uses' of Antarctica has been steadily expanded beyond scientific research to include commercially driven activities such as fishing in the Southern Ocean and tourism. On the one hand it is possible to argue that provided there is a proper regulatory regime in place, bioprospecting could be treated like other activities such as fishing and/or tourism, provided it does not harm the environment and benefits humankind as a whole. On the other hand, one could argue equally forcefully that since Antarctica is set aside under the 1991 Environment Protocol to the Antarctic Treaty as a protected area dedicated to open science and environmental protection, to allow a free-for-all on

bioprospecting is a violation of these values, including the longstanding imperative within the ATS of sharing all scientific information freely.

As pointed out by Vandana Shiva (2007: 309),

nature's biodiversity and diversity of knowledge systems are undergoing a major process of destabilization with the expansion of patents and intellectual property rights into the domain of biodiversity via the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) agreement of the World Trade Organization. The whole notion of TRIPs has been shaped by the objectives and interests of trade and transnational corporations.

Although the nature and extent of physical impact of bioprospecting on the Antarctic eco-systems and biodiversity is being currently addressed by the ATCPs, the task of putting into place a sound legal-political arrangement is much more complex than is often assumed by both the scholars and policy makers. What needs to be worked out is a more comprehensive policy position, if not a regulatory framework, in consultation and coordination with other relevant international legal arrangements and organizations.

The International Polar Year (2007-8) has provided further momentum to scientific studies of bioprospecting and may also result in much heightened interest in the commercial potential of Antarctic biodiversity. Science continues to be the key currency of politics in the southern polar region. Antarctica is now increasingly exposed to global forces and the legitimacy, authority and effectiveness of the ATS are seriously challenged. It is important to acknowledge that commercial competition is beginning to displace scientific cooperation as the driver of policy in the Southern Polar Region (Hemmings, 2007), and geopolitical influence is slowly but surely shifting from state to non-state entities, and particularly to commercial enterprises and interests.

In the light of the above, the claimant states face a serious challenge to their claims and assertions of sovereignty. So long as human activity in the Antarctic was of a limited scale, and perhaps largely under the direct control of partner governments, practical challenges to sovereignty were minimal. But today, the prime purpose of the ATS is no longer the containment of the East West confrontation of the Cold War. Technological developments and steadily expanding economic/commercial interests imply that certain actors are looking to realize economic benefits from the region. This is where the 'Antarctic geopolitics of peace' becomes more complex and complicated.

As far as various possible organizational futures for the Antarctic are concerned, one can visualize two broad overlapping scenarios. On the one hand, one could see a revival of interest within the ATS in regionally focused responses to the various currents and emerging activities in Antarctica, for example bio-prospecting and tourism. On the other hand a growing recognition that the period of Antarctic exceptionalism is over might convince the ATCPs that such regulation as is needed might be best achieved through greater engagement and collaboration with global instruments and norms.

The Antarctic experiment in utopia, aiming to harmonize the imperatives of trans-border, ecological conservation and the classical geopolitical-territorial assertions of sovereignty, continues to raise policy issues that have relevance in many other parts of the globe.

References

- ATCM 2005. 'Biological Prospecting in Antarctica'. XXVIII Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting/ WP13 (Submitted by New Zealand and Sweden).
2007. 'Biological Prospecting in Antarctica: Review, Update and Proposed Tool to Support a Way Forward'. XXX Antarctic Treaty Consultative Meeting/IP 67 (Submitted by UNEP).
- Chaturvedi, S. 1996. *The Polar Regions: A Political Geography*, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons.
- Connolly Stone, K. 2005. 'Patents, Property Rights and Benefit Sharing'. In: A.D. Hemmings and M. Rogan Finnemore (eds) *Antarctic Bioprospecting*. Christchurch: Gateway Antarctica: pp. 69 97
- Dodds, K.J. 1997. *Geopolitics in Antarctica: Views from the Southern Oceanic Rim*, Chichester: John Wiley and Sons.
2006. 'Post Colonial Antarctica: An Emerging Engagement', *Polar Record*, 42 (220): pp. 59 70.
- Green, J.A. and Nicol, D. 2003. 'Bioprospecting in Areas Outside National Jurisdiction: Antarctica and the Southern Ocean', *Melbourne Journal of International Law* 4(1): pp. 76 111.
- Hemmings, A.D. 2007. 'Globalization's Cold Genius and the Ending of Antarctic Isolation', in L.K. Kriwoken, J. Jabourand and A.D. Hemmings (eds) *Looking South: Australia's Antarctic Agenda*, Sydney: The Federation Press: pp. 176 90.
- Herber, B.P. 2006. 'Bioprospecting in Antarctica: The Search for a Policy Regime', *Polar Record* 42 (221): pp. 139 46.
- Rothwell, D.R. 1996. *The Polar Regions and the Development of International Law*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
2005. 'Southern Ocean Bioprospecting and International law'. In: A.D. Hemmings and M. Rogan Finnemore (eds). *Antarctic Bioprospecting*. Christchurch: Gateway Antarctica: pp. 207 32.
- Sahurie, E.J. 1992. *The International Law of Antarctica*. New Haven: New Haven Press.
- Shiva, V. 2007. 'Bioprospecting as Sophisticated Biopiracy', *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 32(21): pp. 308 13.
- Stix, G, 2004. 'Staking claims Patents on Ice: Antarctica as a Last Frontier for Bioprospectors and Their Intellectual Property'. *Scientific American*. 1 May. http://www.sciam.com/article.cfm?articleID_0007671B_A73E_1084A73E83414B7F0000
- Scovazzi, T. 2004. 'Tenth Anniversary Special Session with Expert Panel in Future Directions'. United Nations: International Seabed Authority. Press Release SEA/ 1799.
- Tepper, R. and Haward, M. (2005). 'The Development of Malaysia's Position on Antarctica: 1982 to 2004', *Polar Record* 41(217): pp. 113 24.
- UNEP, 2005. The United Nations Environment Programme's Governing Council, 'Report of the Executive Director on State of the Environment and Contribution of

- the United Nations Environment Programme to Addressing Substantive Environmental Challenges.' December 22, UNEP/GCSS.IX/10.
- UNU/IAS (United Nations University Institute of Advanced Study) 2003. 'Report on the International Regime for Bioprospecting: Existing Policies and Emerging Issues for Antarctica'. Tokyo, Japan. [http://www.asoc.org/Documents/Bioprospecting/UNU IAS AntarcticaReport](http://www.asoc.org/Documents/Bioprospecting/UNU_IAS_AntarcticaReport).
- Watts, A. 1992. *International Law and the Antarctic Treaty System*. Cambridge. Grotius Publications Limited.
- Zakri, H. and Johnston, S. 2004. Report: Accelerate Global Agreement to Oversee Exploitation of South Pole 'Extremophiles': Ownership of Genetic Materials, Environmental Consequences in Question as 21st Century Bio prospecting Gets Underway in Antarctica. [http://www.unu.edu/news/ extremophiles.html](http://www.unu.edu/news/extremophiles.html)

Part IV

Looking ahead

Can history be prevented from repeating itself?

16 Nuclear disarmament

Mirage or need of the hour?

P.R. Chari

The impulse to reverse the clock

Efforts to prevent or limit wars are not new. Rules for its conduct and courts for the arbitration of disputes have strengthened the moral and religious barriers against violence between nations. Attempts to achieve disarmament or arms control, however, have been less successful.

Of significance here were the International Peace Conferences held in 1899 and 1907 in The Hague, which sought to codify the rules of war and establish an institution to settle international disputes, which later effloresced into the International Court of Justice. The extensive use of poison gases in the First World War led to negotiation of the exemplary Geneva Protocol in 1925 that prohibits the use of poison gases and bacteriological weapons in war; it has been generally observed by nations, except for a few aberrations like Italy using poison gases in Abyssinia and Japan using biological agents in China during the thirties.

This was the situation before the Second World War ended, ushering in the nuclear age. Despite feckless attempts that have periodically been made to shade over the difference between nuclear and conventional weapons, the obvious bears reiteration that nuclear weapons are different. Why? Simply stated, nuclear weapons make possible altogether new levels of destruction within extremely short timeframes, and there are no credible means to escape that damage for any length of time. It is common knowledge that the destruction by nuclear weapons arises from their blast, heat and radiation effects, which differs according to the yield, size and design features of the weapon. How the weapon is used, at ground level, or in an airburst mode or under water, affects the energy distribution due to blast, heat and radiation effects of nuclear weapons, which can be varied by the weapons designer. Roughly half the energy released by the typical nuclear weapon would be due to blast, about a third to heat and the remaining to ionizing radiation.¹ But this only refers to its immediate effects. Most of the survivors would be killed by radiation from the resulting fallout. Two areas remain about which only speculation is possible. First, the long-term effects of a nuclear war on the ecology, climate and psychology of the survivors, and, second, the synergistic effects of two or

more effect, of nuclear explosions like heat and radiation, contamination of food and water, unavailability of medical services and so on.

There is much reassurance currently that a nuclear war is a very remote possibility. President Reagan's belief that a nuclear war cannot be won and must never be fought has passed into the folklore of the nuclear age. However, so long as nuclear weapons remain, the possibility of nuclear conflict cannot be ignored for, as Murphy's Law postulates, if anything can go wrong, it will. For instance, during the Kargil conflict in South Asia in the summer of 1999, US intelligence found 'disturbing evidence that the Pakistanis were preparing their nuclear arsenal for possible use ...'.²

Is nuclear disarmament desirable and feasible?

The two questions asked above permit the proposition to be argued whether nuclear disarmament is a mirage or the need of the hour. Three answers are possible: that nuclear disarmament is neither desirable nor feasible; that nuclear disarmament is desirable but not feasible; that nuclear disarmament is not desirable but feasible. I would urge a fourth case that nuclear disarmament is not only desirable but feasible, by pursuing a time-honoured Hindu methodology for advocating a case, viz. to take into account all available permutations in a given situation and to argue against them before reaching the preferred solution. It is proposed, therefore, to initially adopt the mantle of devil's advocate to urge that nuclear disarmament and a nuclear-free world is neither desirable nor feasible.

Not desirable

Three reasons are given to press the case that nuclear disarmament is not desirable.

First, the familiar case can be made that nuclear weapons have kept the peace in Europe after the Hiroshima and Nagasaki atomic bombings in 1945, which ushered in the nuclear era. Earlier, Europe was the theatre of two enormously destructive world wars in the last century. Freed of the fear of nuclear weapons and the certainty of mutual annihilation in a nuclear conflict, the international security situation is bound to deteriorate. It is arguable that the Cuban Missile Crisis ensured that no future confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union took place, although they continued to pursue their regional interests by supporting their proxies in the regional conflicts occurring in the Third World.

Second, it must be admitted that nuclear weapons have not succeeded in preventing all conflicts, which take place regularly with conventional weapons. Some of these conventional conflicts have been highly destructive like those that have occurred in Korea, Vietnam, between Iran and Iraq, besides the several Arab Israeli wars in the Middle East and the India Pakistan conflicts in South Asia. Neither have nuclear weapons deterred the insurgencies

or international terrorism incidents or genocidal pogroms that have occurred in Rwanda and are currently occurring in Darfur. These examples of institutionalized violence are excoriating the international system and imposing a heavy human and material cost on society. But nuclear weapons have deterred conflict between the world's most powerful military powers like the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War period that could have destroyed the world, prevented the destruction of Israel as a state and are underpinning the peace process in South Asia; hence their continued relevance.

Third, the presence of nuclear weapons in the background, which could enter the picture in a catalytic fashion should allies of the nuclear weapon powers be involved in a conflict, ensures that their conventional conflict remains under control and does not escalate. Further, such conventional conflicts, without the deterring presence of nuclear weapons in the background may not reach closure in any predictable way, apart from the economic and military exhaustion of the combatants. A case in point is the Indo-Pakistan war in 1971 that led to the creation of Bangladesh, but also witnessed the United States and the Soviet Union entering the conflict to support their surrogates, which posited a possible nuclear threat, and limited that conflict.

Not feasible

Three reasons can also be urged that nuclear disarmament is not feasible; indeed, to suggest this objective would be indulging in a chimerical exercise.

First, the technical realities cannot be ignored that nuclear weapons cannot be dis-invented. Not only is the knowledge of nuclear weapons widely disseminated in the open scientific literature, but the technology for manufacturing them has also seeped through the international system. When the Soviet Union unravelled some years back it was widely feared that the unemployed nuclear scientists and engineers would become available to the nuclear aspirants. It is suspected that some qualified ex-Soviet persons are working in China and, perhaps, also in Iran. In short, if the knowledge and personnel and technology remain available, the goal of nuclear disarmament will remain unattainable, since, if nuclear weapons are eliminated, they could be manufactured again in discretely short timeframes.

Second, a real practical problem arises in reaching zero-level for existing nuclear arsenals. How could this be verified in any trustworthy manner? Even after nations possessing nuclear weapons solemnly abjure them, the suspicion will always remain in the minds of their adversaries that some nuclear weapons may have been kept out of the accounting and could surface again in case there is an emergency. The possibility of a 'breakout' situation occurring is recognized, and there are no comforting answers to reassure the sceptics.

Third, and in the light of the above two objections, the feasibility of a nuclear disarmament project is thrown into considerable doubt. It would seem to be weighted, in consequence, in favour of 'cheaters' and those with little regard for international norms, rules and regulations, although the honest would

adhere by them, which is not very reassuring for the nations that are giving up their nuclear weapons in good faith.

Desirable and feasible

The arguments that nuclear disarmament is neither desirable nor feasible, or that it is desirable but not feasible, or that it is not desirable but feasible can be gleaned from permuting and combining the above sets of arguments. I am suggesting here that this dispensation is desirable, but also feasible. Three sets of reasoning are offered to urge this case:

Why is nuclear disarmament desirable?

First, the obvious argument must be reinforced that the existing nuclear arsenals with the existing nuclear weapon powers can destroy the world many times over. Apart from human, animal and plant life will also be annihilated in a nuclear conflict; this danger remains extant so long as nuclear weapons are available with the nuclear armed countries. It was argued in the eighties that a ‘nuclear winter’ would ensue if nuclear weapons with an explosive capacity of around one hundred megatons were simultaneously exploded, resulting in

large quantities of highly sunlight-absorbing, dark particulate matter which would be produced and spread in the troposphere by the many fires that would start burning in urban and industrial areas, oil and gas producing fields, agricultural lands, and forests. ... It is also quite possible that severe, worldwide photochemical smog conditions would develop with high levels of tropospheric ozone that would likewise interfere severely with plant productivity. ... It is difficult to see how much more than a small fraction of the initial survivors of a nuclear war in the middle and high latitude regions of the Northern Hemisphere could escape famine and disease during the following year.³

Whether this sequence of events is likely or possible or realistic is not germane; these are the consequences of a nuclear conflict. Nuclear weapons are intended for war-fighting and deterrence. Should their basic war-fighting function be completely ruled out, their deterrent value would erode, affecting their credibility to ensure peace and stability, especially between adversarial powers. These theologies of the nuclear era are hopeless overstatements, which strengthen the case for nuclear disarmament on logical considerations.

Second, despite these inherent limitations of nuclear weapons to provide the instruments for suasion or defence or deterrence, and the consequent belief that they are only weapons of last resort,⁴ a hagiology surrounds them. They are seen as adorning the N-5, which has been institutionalized in Article IX (3) of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty adumbrating that ‘a nuclear-weapon State is one that has manufactured and exploded a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device prior to January 1, 1967’. The size of the ‘Nuclear Club’ has thereby been effectively confined to the five countries that exercised

their nuclear option before this arbitrarily chosen date viz. the United States, Soviet Union, Great Britain, France and China. Since the N-5 countries also constitute the P-5 in the Security Council, nuclear weapons are perceived as the currency of global power. As long as nuclear weapons are seen as the guarantors of security and symbols of prestige, non-nuclear weapon states will be tempted to acquire them by all possible means. Such non-nuclear weapon countries as have abjured their nuclear option like Sweden and Japan, or given up their nuclear quest like South Korea and Taiwan, or dismantled their nuclear devices like South Africa, or relinquished nuclear weapons in their territory like Belarus, Ukraine and Kazakhstan, are under the protection of the United States or Russia, or are part of alliance systems under their stewardship. Currently, however, the nuclear aspirants include North Korea and Iran, and there is fair consensus that should they acquire nuclear weapons and proceed thereafter to deploy them, a 'proliferation chain' could ensue in Northeast Asia and the Gulf/Middle East regions. Stirrings in this regard were apparent in Japan and South Korea after North Korea conducted a nuclear test in 2006, and there are reports that the Gulf countries are seeking the establishment of atomic powers plants, despite the abundance of oil and gas in their territories. Efforts by the nuclear haves and their allies to promote technology control and restraint regimes like the Nuclear Suppliers Group, the Australia Group, the Missile Control Technology Regime, the Wassenaar Arrangement and so on, or to strengthen their counter proliferation efforts through the Proliferation Security Initiative and the Container Security Initiative to prevent the relevant technology from reaching the nuclear aspirants can only delay nuclear proliferation trends, not stop them. Clearly, the danger of nuclear proliferation will haunt the world so long as nuclear weapons remain. As evocatively concluded:

Time is running out for the hypocrisy and accumulated anomalies of global nuclear apartheid. Either we will achieve nuclear abolition or we shall have to live with nuclear proliferation followed by nuclear war. Better the soft glow of satisfaction from the noble goal realized of nuclear weapons being banned, than the harsh glare of the morning after if these weapons are used.⁵

Third, so long as nuclear arsenals exist, the anxiety that accidents could occur due to misperceptions and leadership irrationality will continue. The history of the Cold War is replete with tales of accidents and near-misses; the fact that the world has, so far, escaped a nuclear holocaust owes as much to good fortune as to specific efforts by military and political establishments in the nuclear weapon states. The United States, for instance, argues that command and control arrangements in new nuclear weapon states are infirm; hence the danger of accidents and conflicts arising from inadvertence rather than conscious decision will endanger these countries. But the US's own record is hardly inspiring. Robert McNamara has revealed that the entire

process of decision-making between receipt of a message warning that a nuclear attack had been launched and the counter-attack has to be completed in 20 minutes. In other words the obtaining situation is that,

... the president is prepared to make a decision within 20 minutes that could launch one of the most devastating weapons in the world. To declare war requires an act of Congress, but to launch a nuclear holocaust requires 20 minutes' deliberation by the president and his advisors.⁶

The celebrated case in the sixties would be recollected when a nuclear bomb fell from an US Air Force aircraft into the sea off Spain. Very recently, on August 30, 2007, six nuclear-tipped cruise missiles were loaded onto a B-52 H bomber without any authorization, and flown from the Minot airbase in North Dakota to Barksdale airbase in Louisiana, right across the United States. Apparently, this incident was omitted from a list of serious incidents over 2007 for less than convincing reasons.⁷ Ironically, the recital of these accidents and near-misses has been used by the United States to discourage non-nuclear weapon states from exercising their nuclear option on the grounds that they should not tread this dangerous path! The argument is never made that it would move towards elimination of its nuclear arsenals to credibly overcome these perils.

Three arguments could now be made to urge that nuclear disarmament is also feasible.

First, the continued possession of nuclear weapons is justified as being a residual power only for exercise as a last resort weapon when the very existence of the State is at stake. This is urged by Pakistan, which has laid out the parameters and the contingencies when it might be forced to use its nuclear weapons against India should deterrence fail.⁸ Using this explicit example for purposes of illustration, the rhetorical question could be asked: how realistic are these scenarios? How realistic are scenarios that nuclear weapons will be used in anger? Is it realistic to assume that they are needed to deter the use of nuclear weapons or deter a large-scale, World War II style conventional conflict? Neither can nuclear weapons win any wars, since they presage devastation or mutual annihilation. Significantly, the United States accepted a humiliating defeat in Vietnam, as did the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, rather than breach the taboo against using nuclear weapons. During the Kargil conflict in 1999 India and Pakistan did not expand the theatre of their limited conflict or cross the nuclear threshold. It is very clear, therefore, that nuclear weapons do not serve any rational military purpose; neither do they serve to secure any rational political or economic objectives, calling into question the need for nuclear weapons for any rational purposes.

Second, the case could be made that the nature of future conflict has dramatically changed as the world proceeds into the twenty-first century, highlighting the irrelevance of nuclear weapons. The latest *SIPRI Yearbook 2007* notes that:

the shadow of nuclear extinction has been lifted from the world and the phenomenon of major armed conflict has gradually been reduced ... [but] The boom in global travel, communications and economic interdependence of all kinds is exposing more and more people to unfamiliar environments and contacts, with all the attendant hazards. Increasingly, analysts in the field of public security policy are trying to capture all these different dimensions of security challenge by using the word 'risk' instead of threat.⁹

Indeed, low-level conflicts, proxy wars, insurgencies, cross-border and domestic terrorism, and suicide attacks define the contours of present and foreseeable future security threats that would excoriate the international system. Nuclear weapons obviously have no relevance to this range of security problems, which emphasizes the feasibility of nuclear weapons being eliminated from national arsenals.

Third, the argument can be easily met that an absolute zero level of nuclear holdings is impossible to achieve since there would never be assurance that all the nuclear weapons in all the nuclear arsenals have been eliminated and destroyed. Can the cheaters and 'break-out' problem, consequently, be credibly addressed? A distinction is possible between explicit and tacit knowledge on manufacturing nuclear weapons. Tacit knowledge

is acquired through a lengthy process of apprenticeship. To that end it is a local phenomenon, the product of a unique social and intellectual environment composed of highly skilled senior and junior colleagues, who pass this specialized knowledge around from one individual to another. In that sense, tacit knowledge-based skills are not widely diffused, as explicit knowledge often is.¹⁰

That still leaves open the problem of nuclear weapons being surreptitiously hidden away. A dispensation could be negotiated entrusting an international agency like the IAEA with making surprise and challenge inspections of suspected sites where clandestine activities that might be reported. Further, 'whistle-blowers' could be encouraged to report such wrongdoing. These measures would provide considerable reassurance against the phenomenon of cheating and 'break-outs'; similar measures are obtaining, incidentally, to ensure the verification of the Chemical Weapons Convention. The need for further tightening national and international measures to ensure better control over nuclear weapons and fissile materials stocks that could be used to manufacture nuclear weapons has also to be ensured as a routine.

Efforts to achieve nuclear disarmament

Ironically, the Hiroshima and Nagasaki nuclear bombings occurred in August 1945, less than two months after the Charter of the United Nations was signed in San Francisco on June 26. In 1946 the US presented a plan for

placing the nuclear resources of the world under the control of an independent international authority, covering all stages of their production from mining fissile materials to manufacture to destruction of nuclear weapons. Violations would be dealt with by the Security Council, and veto powers would not be exercised by its Permanent Members. This visionary and idealistic Baruch plan (named after Bernard Baruch, the US representative to the UN Atomic Energy Commission) was objected to by the Soviet Union; its counter-proposals left nuclear programmes under national control with some weak verification measures in place. Unsurprisingly, the Baruch plan made no further headway, and the entry of the Soviet Union into the nuclear club after its first test in September 1949 signalled the end of the only absolutist proposal for the total elimination of nuclear weapons. Several proposals were made thereafter like the salubrious proposals for ‘General and Complete Disarmament’, achieving a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (negotiated, but stalled since 1996, since the US has not ratified it) and the Fissile Materials Cutoff Treaty (yet to be negotiated). But the inhibition in taking the first steps, the sequencing of disarmament stages and emplacing credible verification arrangements has, time and again, derailed these negotiations.

India’s contribution to the nuclear-disarmament goal was noteworthy in the early years of the nuclear era. The Nehruvian world conceived of general disarmament, ending nuclear tests, proceeding towards mitigating the fear of surprise attack, maintaining the balance of armed power, and appreciating the need for disarmament and controls over armaments to proceed in lockstep.¹¹ Some part of that vision was captured in Prime Minister Rajiv Gandhi’s Action Plan presented to the UN in 1988 to achieve ‘A World Free of Nuclear Weapons’.¹² It envisaged the elimination of nuclear weapons in three stages over the next 25 years, with nuclear disarmament being the centrepiece of each stage, buttressed by collateral measures like banning other weapons of mass destruction. The essential features of the Action Plan were:

- There should be a binding commitment by all nations to eliminate nuclear weapons, in stages, by 2010 at the latest.
- All nuclear weapon States must participate in the process of nuclear disarmament. All other countries must be part of the process.
- To demonstrate good faith and build confidence, there must be tangible progress at each stage towards the common goal.
- Changes are required in doctrines, policies and institutions to sustain a world free of nuclear weapons. Negotiations should be undertaken to establish a Comprehensive Global Security System under the aegis of the United Nations.

Only slight reflection reveals the continued relevance of the Rajiv Gandhi Action Plan. In fact, the danger has heightened with the nuclearization of South Asia, emergence of North Korea as a nuclear weapon state and of Iran as a determined nuclear aspirant, and growing fears that nuclear terrorism is not

unthinkable. These growing dangers inspired the two articles which appeared in the *Wall Street Journal* in January 2007 and February 2008 by four influential Americans, Henry Kissinger, George Schultz, Sam Nunn and William Perry, which have revived dreams of a world freed of nuclear weapons. The steps they recommend for implementation by the US and Russia to reduce nuclear dangers are:

- Extend key provisions of the Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty of 1991.
- Take steps to increase the warning and decision times for the launch of all nuclear-armed ballistic missiles, thereby reducing risks of accidental or unauthorized attacks.
- Discard any operational plans for massive attacks that still remain from the Cold War days.
- Undertake negotiations toward developing cooperative multilateral ballistic-missile defence and early warning systems, as proposed by Presidents Bush and Putin at their 2002 Moscow summit meeting.
- Dramatically accelerate work to provide the highest possible standards of security for nuclear weapons, as well as for nuclear materials everywhere in the world to prevent terrorists from acquiring nuclear bombs.
- Start a dialogue, including within NATO and with Russia, on consolidating the nuclear weapons designed for forward deployment to enhance their security, and as a first step towards carefully accounting for them and their eventual elimination.
- Strengthen the means of monitoring compliance with the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) as a counter to the global spread of advanced technologies.
- Adopt a process to bring the comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT) into effect, which would strengthen the NPT and international monitoring of nuclear activities.

A striking feature of this design to reduce nuclear dangers is worth noting. They are primarily addressed to the United States and Russia – the principal nuclear weapon powers in the world, and remind them of their obligations under Article VI of the NPT to ‘pursue negotiations in good faith on effective measures relating to cessation of the nuclear arms race at an early date and to nuclear disarmament’. In the 1995 NPT Review Conference they, along with the three other nuclear weapon states – UK, France and China – had given solemn assurances in this regard, which were sealed by their agreeing to take thirteen concrete steps towards this end in the 2000 NPT Review Conference. But no worthwhile steps have thus far been taken to achieve these goals – visions for nuclear disarmament have not been supported by enabling actions. In fact, a cautionary note was sounded by Mikhail Gorbachev observing that ‘the goal of the elimination of nuclear weapons has been so much on the back burner that it will take a true political breakthrough and a major intellectual effort to achieve success in this endeavour.’¹³

Very significantly, the disarmament committee of the UN General Assembly has recently approved a non-binding resolution asking the nuclear powers to take their weapons off high-alert status, which was overwhelmingly supported by a 124-3 vote. What is interesting, however, is that the 3 negative votes were cast by France, the United Kingdom and the United States. Further, the 34 abstainers included Russia, China and various NATO and other western powers.¹⁴ The dichotomy between the nuclear haves and have-nots could not be more starkly highlighted.

For its part, the United States continues to develop new nuclear weapons for new military missions, despite the fecklessness of these exercises, designed to make these weapons more usable. The Pentagon's plans to develop high-yield earth-penetrating nuclear weapons—bunker busters—to attack hardened and deeply buried underground targets; and very low-yield, new-concept nuclear weapons to attack shallow underground targets, could not be proceeded with due to Congressional opposition. Thereafter, the Bush administration has proposed a Reliable Replacement Warhead programme 'with the stated purpose to transform both the nuclear infrastructure and the nuclear weapons themselves so that the US can maintain long-term high confidence in the [nuclear] arsenal as it reduces the arsenal's size.'¹⁵ Peering into the future the possibility of space being converted into the next battlefield is very real with the United States and China initiating the weaponizing of this 'high ground'.¹⁶

India's record has not been edifying. Its nuclear test in May 1974, euphemistically termed a peaceful nuclear explosion for scientific and developmental purposes, blossomed in May 1998 into the Pokharan II Shakti test series with plainly military objectives. The Indo-US nuclear deal can be justified from different perspectives. From a nonproliferation viewpoint, however, it drives yet another nail into the coffin of the international nuclear regime. Thereafter, while genuflecting towards nuclear disarmament, India has proceeded apace with its missile development programme. The latest missile to be tested, Sagarika, would provide India with an underwater launched ballistic missile capability, supplementing its land-based and air-launched capabilities. India is also developing its early warning systems and missile defence capabilities premised on the Israeli Green Pine radar, and there is interest in acquiring the Aegis anti-missile missile, which could later be converted into an anti-satellite system.

At the actual level India has supported the complete elimination of nuclear weapons and a dispensation that would be universal, non-discriminatory and verifiable. It favours the negotiation of a nuclear weapons convention (on the pattern of the Chemical and Biological Weapons Conventions) to prohibit the development, production, stockpiling and use of nuclear weapons within a specific timeframe. Other steps to achieve this goal would be a reaffirmation by the nuclear weapon states to eliminating their nuclear arsenals (in terms of Article VI of the NPT) and a convention to prohibit the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.¹⁷ However, a very considerable shadow falls between the declaratory rhetoric and pragmatic practice.

Conclusion

Clausewitz believed that a political goal must guide any decision to proceed to war, which provides the logic for his famous precept: 'We see, therefore, that War is not merely a political act, but also a real political instrument, a continuation of political commerce, a carrying out of the same by other means'¹⁸ and that: 'War can never be separated from political intercourse, and if, in the consideration of the matter, this is done in any way, all the threads of the different relations are broken, and we have before us a senseless thing without an object'.¹⁹ The use of nuclear weapons exemplifies the situation that Clausewitz warns against, viz. the separation of war from political intercourse to produce 'a senseless thing without an object'. No rational purpose is served by nuclear weapons, while their continuance threatens human civilization with extinction. The case for their elimination, consequently, requires no special pleadings.

These conclusions might appear to be impractical abstractions, divorced from the reality of international discourse, which privileges power politics, hegemony, dominance, economic colonialism and so on, that, in turn, necessitate the accretion of military power, result in arms racing and, inevitably, a quest for the absolute weapon to provide deterrence and defence.

There is, however, no dearth of blueprints for achieving nuclear disarmament. The elimination of nuclear weapons is not only desirable but eminently feasible, and need not remain a mirage if the necessary leap in imagination is made and the political will can be found. India could recapture the élan it enjoyed during the Nehruvian era and press its claim to global leadership by setting an example by taking some unilateral steps in the direction of moving towards the elimination of nuclear weapons. This could include stimulating a global debate on the futility of nuclear weapons as the premise for moving towards nuclear disarmament; a pledge to convert its moratorium on nuclear tests into an absolute prohibition; a cessation of manufacturing fissile materials for weapons purposes; a more robust and unqualified no-first-use declaration; abjuring of missile defence programmes that are technically problematical in any case; and refraining from extending the war on earth into space. An ounce of practice is worth a ton of rhetoric.

Notes

- 1 Frank Barnaby and Joseph Rotblat, 'The Effects of Nuclear Weapons', in Jeannie Petersen, ed., *The Aftermath: The Human and Ecological Consequences of Nuclear War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), p. 20.
- 2 P.R.Chari, Pervaiz Iqbal Cheema and Stephen P. Cohen, *Four Crises and a Peace Process: American Engagement in South Asia* (Washington: Brookings Institution Press, 2007), p. 140.
- 3 Paul J. Crutzen and John W. Birks, 'The Atmosphere after a Nuclear War: Twilight at Noon', in Jeannie Peterson, ed., *The Aftermath: The Human and Ecological Consequences of Nuclear War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1983), p. 90.
- 4 A landmark decision by the International Court of Justice holds that 'the threat and use of nuclear weapons would generally be contrary to the rules of international

- law applicable in armed conflict, and particularly the principles and rules of humanitarian law,' except, possibly, in 'an extreme circumstance of self defense, in which the very survival of the state would be at stake'. The significance of this rule derives from its democratizing the concept of nuclear disarmament, moving it beyond the realm of experts and policy making elites into the realm of the general population and broader organizations. Cf. Jonathan Schell, *The Gift of Time: The Case for Abolishing Nuclear Weapons Now* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 1998), p. 23.
- 5 Ramesh Thakur, 'If You Want Non proliferation, Prepare for Disarmament', *Economic & Political Weekly*, November 24, 2007, p. 26.
 - 6 Robert S. McNamara, 'Apocalypse Soon', *Foreign Policy*, May/June 2005, p. 2.
 - 7 Elaine M. Grossman, 'Air Force Omits Nuke Error from 2007 Incidents List', *Global Security Newswire*, February 28, 2008. http://www.nti.org/d_newswire/issues/print.asp?story_id accessed on 29/2/08.
 - 8 These contingencies include that India 'conquers a large part of its territory (space threshold); destroys a large part of its land or air forces (military threshold); proceeds to the economic strangling of Pakistan (economic threshold); pushes Pakistan into political destabilization or creates a large scale internal subversion in Pakistan (domestic destabilization)'. Cf. 'A Concise Report of a Visit by Landau Network Centro Volta', *Nuclear Safety, Nuclear Stability and Nuclear Strategy in Pakistan*, January 2002, available as Appendix 6 in P.R. Chari, Sonika Gupta and Arpit Rajain, eds, *Nuclear Stability in Southern Asia* (New Delhi: Manohar, 2003), pp. 202-3.
 - 9 Alyson J.K. Bailes, 'Introduction: A World of Risk', in *SIPRI Yearbook 2007: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), p. 1.
 - 10 Dennis M. Gormley, 'Silent Retreat: The Future of US Nuclear Weapons', *Non proliferation Review*, Vol. 14, No. 2, July 2007, p. 201.
 - 11 For a glimpse into Nehru's thinking on nuclear disarmament see his speech to the UN General Assembly on October 3, 1960. Reproduced in S. Gopal and Uma Iyengar, eds, *The Essential Writings of Jawaharlal Nehru* (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2003), pp. 477-79.
 - 12 The Action Plan was unveiled in Rajiv Gandhi's speech to the UN General Assembly on June 9, 1988. <http://www.indianembassy.org/policy/Disarmament/disarm15.htm> accessed on 4/3/2008.
 - 13 Mikhail Gorbachev, 'The Nuclear Threat', *Wall Street Journal*, January 13, 2007.
 - 14 'UN Panel approves Nuclear alert Resolution', *Global Security Newswire*, November 2, 2007. http://www.nti.org/d_newswire/issues/print.asp?story_id (accessed on 3/11/07).
 - 15 Sidney D. Drell, 'The Challenge of Nuclear Weapons', *Physics Today*, June 2007, p. 56.
 - 16 Significantly, Russia and China have jointly tabled a proposal in the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate a 'Treaty on the Prevention of the Placement of Weapons in Outer Space, the Threat of or Use of Force against Outer Space, Objects'.
 - 17 Hamid Ansari, 'India Aspires for an Atomic Weapons Free World', *The Hindu*, March 10, 2008. Ansari, Vice President of India, was addressing the 18th World Congress of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War.
 - 18 Roger Parkinson, *Clausewitz: A Biography* (New York: Stein and Day, 1971), p. 315.
 - 19 *Ibid.*, p. 316.

17 To err is statesmanlike, to learn folly

T.C.A. Srinivasa-Raghavan

Introduction

Protracted ideological battles, because they involve the minds of people and societies, leave deeper scars and memories than military ones. The effort involved by the protagonists to establish that they are right and the adversary is wrong, encompasses and sometimes overwhelms entire societies, which then press into service every means, rather than just men, at their disposal. Political parties, universities, the media and every other agency or body that can influence the outcome is utilized. This is what happened between 1945 and 1990, the period of the Cold War. It is worth noting, though, that while the war might have been cold for the two main adversaries – the USA and the USSR – for many others, notably in the developing countries in Latin America, Asia and Africa, it was quite hot enough. Indeed, even the USA and the USSR got involved in hot wars, albeit not against each other. Between 1964 and 1975, the US got its comeuppance in Vietnam and between 1980 and 1990 the USSR got its in Afghanistan.

The organizers of the colloquium on which this edited volume is based wanted to explore if the mistakes of the twentieth century could be avoided in the twenty-first. This first requires us to define a mistake, because it presupposes that a choice was available and the wrong choice was made. But what if there was no choice and only one course of action open and it was only in hindsight that it turned out to be a mistake because of a whole range of reasons that were neither known, not anticipated at the time the decision was taken?

Therefore, it makes sense not to use the word mistake too loosely or at least without first establishing that there were indeed alternative courses of action open at the time when the decisions were made. Going into that debate will not just be tedious and hugely time-consuming but also not very productive for the purposes of this essay.

Old house, new tenants

The caveat sounded, it is reasonable to examine the non-ideological drivers of the Cold War. There is not very much Cold War literature that examines its

economic drivers in the sense of defining the conflicts purely in terms of, if you will, the market-knows-best philosophy. One does not have to be a Marxist to be able to say that there is a strong link between the political and industrial-financial establishment and the former does — often enough not to make the connection trivial — act in a manner that serves the needs of the latter.

So if one looks at such hidden drivers, it quickly becomes clear that nothing much really changed in 1900, the first year of the twentieth century, except the date. In purely economic terms, the twentieth century was a continuation of the nineteenth. Politically, of course, there were some important changes but those were largely a product of the economic circumstances of the time. The central features of the nineteenth century, everyone is aware, were colonialism and imperialism and therefore globalization. Indeed, the globalization of the nineteenth century was more complete than of the latter quarter of the twentieth because labour too was free to move and it was not just capital mobility that defined the extent to which a country was globalized.

These structures of colonialism, imperialism and globalization continued well into the twentieth century, formally at least for 65 years. Today, in the month of April 2009, in the midst of the biggest economic crisis since 1929, it has become absolutely clear that the old structures have finally disappeared because even the USA is pleading for financial help from China. The key question is what China will demand in return. It is already talking of being treated as an equal partner to the US, a fifty-fifty share, as it were, in global governance. From being the sole superpower, the USA now faces the prospect of having to share power with China.

It will be recalled that this is exactly what Germany had demanded of Britain during the first decade of the twentieth century. Britain, because it was not short of money or military power, had refused and even built up a system of alliances designed to curb the growing German power. Eventually, these efforts by Britain had set in motion a dynamic — of counter-alliances with secret military agreements — that resulted in the First World War. The outcome of that war then started off another chain of events involving the same players which led to the Second World War. A little reflection will show that the latter was merely a continuation of the first, which it was because the same old European players were involved and they were pursuing the same old interests. But now Europe is a has-been continent. Only Russia, with its natural resources and military power, remains a major power. Formally, however, because the post-Second World War structures for global governance have not been dismantled,¹ many light-weight European countries still account for more than many non-European countries — like India and Brazil — which are bigger in economic and military terms. Why, even China doesn't count for much in the formal structures. The question that needs to be asked of them, as they ask it for its money, is: what will it take for you to give up the say you have at present in the institutions of global governance, such as the UN Security Council, the IMF, the World Bank?

Here we see the first chances of a wrong choice being made. The correct choice would be to let China, India, Brazil and a few others have a greater

say. But for reasons that are well known, there is also a high probability of the wrong choice being made, just as it was a hundred years ago. What may happen now is that while concessions are made in form, in substance very little will change because of block voting by the USA and the EU countries. China has worked this out and which is why it is asking for a half-share with the US in global governance. It is a maximalist position designed to put Europe on notice. But it is up to the USA to ensure that Europe's importance matches its clout and that it does not box above its weight. This will take time, and if the global economic recovery is rapid, it could take a very long time as the urgency to change will diminish. Paradoxically, therefore, it might be in China's interest to delay a recovery by pumping in money into the global markets via the US. As the recovery is delayed, the more pressure it can put on the West to give it what it wants. But this would be a very fine call, as China, too, cannot afford for the recovery to be delayed too much. One thing, however, is certain: China thinks it has the West on a hook and but the West is confident of wriggling out of its current predicament. The ensuing struggle will be very interesting to observe. But it will also contain the potential for large mistakes to be made by both sides.

Central to the discussion about mistakes are two inherent weaknesses amongst emerging contenders for global power and two inherent weaknesses of the global economic order. The weaknesses that reduce the elbow room for the contenders are a permanent excess supply of labour and the resulting income inequalities. The global problem consists of periodic excess supply of capital of the sort the world saw during 1923-29 and 2002-8 and the resulting booms and busts. The booms help improve economic growth worldwide and bring prosperity to millions in the contender countries. But they also worsen income inequalities. So when the bust comes, the political problem becomes much harder to deal with. Countries like India with pluralist democracies are better equipped to deal with the political problems than countries like China which must reckon with this added inherent weakness – the absence of a political outlet for popular aspirations. To such countries, external adventurism could, at some point of time, appear to be the only solution to the problem of social unrest that threatens the political supremacy of the ruling oligarchy. Germany resorted to this during 1905-18 and Japan did the same during 1933-45. Why should China be an exception when the same basic motivations and forces are driving it?

The China factor

I would venture to suggest that the biggest likelihood of a twentieth-century type of mistake being repeated in the twenty-first lies in the way the world deals with China. Without putting too fine a point on it, China's leadership has become accustomed to have its own way internally and, up to a point, externally as well. It thinks the world owes it a degree of latitude and accommodation that it is not prepared to reciprocate. In a word, China's leadership can and

does behave like a spoilt brat complete with tantrums, aggression and threats. In that very significant way, it is no different either from Kaiser Wilhelm II or the leadership that led Japan into war, first in Manchuria and then against the USA. When the self-preservation of the rulers depends on economic prosperity alone and when they are not prepared to share power, war can no longer be ruled out. As American power gradually wanes, it is a near-certainty that the Chinese leadership will tend towards external territorial acquisitions. Siberia could be to China in the twenty-first century what Manchuria was to Japan and Africa was to Germany in the twentieth and Central Asia was to Russia in the nineteenth. With a huge domestic population to keep in good humour, China needs to create and maintain hundreds of millions of jobs which, in turn, require a great deal of raw materials and energy. Siberia has everything it needs for a long time.

So far this essay has examined what has not changed. But several things have. These are mainly structural changes. For example, there has been a manifold increase in sovereignty, that is, with the disappearance of colonies new nations have emerged. At last count there were 190 sovereign states, each with its own imperative. This has led to a huge increase in the degree of competition for all sorts of things as also an increase in the scope for what in game theory are called noncooperative, zero-sum games in which not only does each protagonist get the better of the other, but when it does so, it ensures that its gain equals the loss of the others. In contrast, non-zero-sum situations are such that both parties can gain (or lose) together. In such situations it is usually desirable for parties to cooperate, because by doing so they can potentially both be better off. Zero-sum games, then, necessarily demand adversarial positions, because any gain for the other party can only arise out of one's own loss. Political conflicts in the twentieth century could largely be viewed from this perspective whether it be the various races characterized by the Cold War or, more recently, the race for resources in Africa.

The complications that the massive increase in sovereignty has caused have not been studied systematically in the context of the outcomes to which they lead. One such outcome is that both bargaining and coalition building are now features of the central features of diplomacy and international relations. The question that needs asking is whether this will reduce the room for error or increase it. On balance, heuristically, the room for mistakes will probably be less than it was a hundred years ago because of greater transparency and more consultation except, of course, in the case of China which does not appear to believe very much in either.

One of the things that worries many people in Asia, meanwhile, is whether in spite of the growing evidence before it, the West appreciates the changes that are taking place. For example, India and China are both growing at a rate that is about 6 per cent more than the US, Europe and Japan are growing. It is widely believed in the global economic and commercial community that Asia will produce more than half of the world's output of goods and services by the year 2020. The current global crisis has only underscored that belief. But

this raises the question: who will control the global financial arrangements? Take the case of IMF quotas. The money is in Asia but the power is in the West, as reflected in the IMF quotas. Asia has only 16 per cent of IMF quotas. It is in these sorts of arrangements that the West has to adjust. But will it? Even more importantly, does Asia have the maturity to take the lead? Probably not, because its financial systems are not good enough, nor is the regulatory structure. Trust, too, is missing. However, all those things are changing. This means that as both the West and Asia adapt to their changed circumstances, a great deal of time will have to elapse.

The crucial question from history is this: what will happen during this period? A power shift is inevitable. But will it take place smoothly or will the West prefer conflict before eventually being forced to let go? As Andrew Sheng has pointed out, 'there are hardly any think-tanks in Asia dedicated to thinking about the international financial order'.² Incredibly, though, there are plenty devoted to politics and security.

Mistakes are often made because participants lose sight of the fact that cooperation can lead to superior outcomes for all. Call it nationalism or narrow-mindedness or whatever other name that can be conjured up, the fact remains that it is easier not to cooperate than to cooperate. This is because the losses of cooperation are immediate and visible while the gains from cooperation are distant and therefore invisible to politicians. This problem has been analysed threadbare by game theorists and the results, sadly, are not very encouraging. Given the choice between cooperation and noncooperation, nations prefer to tend towards the latter. Looked at that way, the situation becomes like an *n*-person, noncooperative game but with the characteristics of what is called a 'Mexican Standoff'. This comprises a bunch of gun-toting men pointing guns at each other but where no one is willing to fire first because that would lead to almost everyone getting shot dead. But eventually someone always does. I would venture to suggest that that someone will be China. Its leadership simply has too much to lose.

What to do with Europe

However, China is not the only problem. There has not been adequate discussion of what to do with Europe. As mentioned earlier, if Russia is excluded, Europe is what could be described as a burnt-out case. Its population is ageing, its share in global output will be down to 10 per cent by 2030, it is no longer a technology leader, and, above all, it is low on energy and it has lost its political importance. Yet, European countries, thanks to history, enjoy rights in international fora that they no longer deserve. Therefore, the problem that the world has to deal with, at least in the first quarter of the twenty-first century, is not so much the USA's decline as what to do with Europe. The simple point is that if the new powers are to be accommodated, someone will have to vacate his seat at the table, and that someone is Europe. It is unlikely to go on its own so it will have to be shown the door. Only the USA can do it

but that is going to be a long process assuming that the USA will agree soon to start it.

The way this issue is approached also contains the possibilities of mistakes being repeated. In the last quarter of the nineteenth century, Britain was the pre-eminent power and as such had needed to tackle both the Ottoman empire and the Austro-Hungarian empire differently. It focused, instead, on keeping Germany at bay and in the end succeeded in annoying all of them with its too-clever-by-half approach. Indeed, all three fought against Britain which was the last thing it had wanted.

One of the solutions to this problem of excessive sovereignty, if one may call it that that countries have sought in the twentieth century is a movement towards regional arrangements in the hope that these will help prevent conflicts. Implicit in this is the recognition that abridging sovereignty is in fact a good idea, something neither Iraq in the case of Kuwait nor the USA in the case of Iraq managed to understand. The devastation caused by the Second World War was a major spur and it all began with the formation of the Franco-German steel and coal agreement. That led to the EEC and eventually to the EU, a somewhat potbellied giant in retirement, but one that does not wish to give up its privileges, including, when one examines the evidence, on something that is very dear to the European heart the environment.

The EU experience has led to several questions, chief amongst which is the one pertaining to the necessary and sufficient conditions for forming and sustaining such regional groupings. Though regional cooperation is the product of shared interests, ideas and identities, is something more needed too? The ASEAN experiment provides some clues. It was conceived very differently from the EU, and meant to be just a place where countries could talk to each other. Caution was paramount and no one committed too much. Generally, ASEAN has worked well, though SAARC has failed because of intractable bilateral disputes.

Overall, though, it is important to ask if comprehensive and open regional arrangements can help in mitigating or preventing the emerging armed conflicts. That there is a strong likelihood of wars over resources is now recognized widely. The conquest of Iraq by the USA and the UK may have been only the first of such conflicts. After all, the USA's oil reserves are down to six years and the UK's to 11 years.³ In the final analysis, however, regional cooperation is a function of enlightened self interest which could, however, prevent cooperation in what are called zero-sum activities, where one country gains only at another's expense. It is this problem that needs to be resolved.

It is useful, in this context, to consider a concept widely used in economics, namely, of necessary and sufficient conditions for anything to happen. Thus, necessary conditions are those without which the desired outcome will not be achieved, no matter what else happens. Political will is a good example of this. Sufficient conditions, however, are those conditions that ensure the outcome by being present. But these are very rare. And it is almost impossible to find a condition that is both necessary *and* sufficient, such as the Soviet threat to

Western Europe after 1945. That focused minds very effectively on the need for cooperation. Such external pressure is not in evidence at present, so the chances of cooperation are less.

Conclusion

The world as we knew it between 1980 and 2008 has changed abruptly from a 'market-knows-best and financial-capitalism-is-the saviour' to one where sovereign power to question the efficacy of the invisible hand has regained its 1945-80 type of legitimacy and financial capitalism has been exposed as nothing more than a respectable disguise for greed. This has presented the world with yet another false choice. The great mistake of the 1945-80 period, namely vesting economic decision making powers in the hands of the state – from resource allocation to prices – may well be repeated once again. The light touch intervention that is being advocated now could easily become heavier with each year that passes. There is now a clear danger that the demand for stronger regulation of the financial markets could spill over into the product markets. With the labour market already highly regulated, this will mean that the world has reverted to the third quarter of the twentieth century as far as what we in India call the directive principles of state policy.

At the core of this reversal would lie the approach to risk. If what came to be known as the 'casino capitalism' of the period 1993-2008 adopted a cavalier approach to financial risk, the disastrous consequences of that approach are bound to lead to risk-aversion of a very high order. The danger is an over-correction. The consequences of this would be that every country in the world begins to manage the economy as China does. To the extent that the Chinese method basically comprises a beggar-thy-neighbour attitude, regardless of how finely it is calibrated and applied, the world would run a real risk of reverting to a zero-sum situation where all gains by those who gain exactly equal the losses of those who lose. This cannot form a basis for global cooperation. For example, when the West uses climate change as an excuse for product market protectionism, India and China are bound to retaliate. Or, as Gandhi famously said, an eye for an eye will leave the world blind.

Notes

- 1 The post Second World War international structures were built on the premise of the continuing supremacy of the western hemisphere, and reflected in the power of veto at the Security Council (with China as the exception to prove the rule) and at the IMF. Post war informal cooperation structures, too, were directed towards this end, and continue to be.
- 2 Third K.B. Lall Memorial Lecture, ICRIER, February 7, 2009, New Delhi. [http://www.icrier.org/pdf/ Andrew Sheng.pdf](http://www.icrier.org/pdf/Andrew%20Sheng.pdf)
- 3 *The Economist*, August 12, 2003.

18 Is history being repeated?

Radha Kumar

Two events – some would say one – have prompted a debate in South and East Asia on whether a new Cold War is starting, with its theatre in South-east and East Asia rather than in Europe.¹ These two events are the recent blossoming of India-US relations, as seen in the record-setting civil nuclear agreement, and growing military cooperation between the US, India, Japan, Singapore and Australia. The latter flowed from the former, and the question being asked is whether they are intended to contain China.

Though these two events launched the debate, its context derives from an influential paper written in 2003 by Professor Madhav Nalapat, UNESCO Peace Chair and director of the School of Geopolitics at the Manipal Academy. Nalapat argued that Washington should take the initiative in creating a formal US-led security system for the Asia-Pacific region, which could be called NAATO, the North America Asia Treaty Organization. The criteria for membership, he added, should be ‘whether people of all faiths are given equal rights under the law, and whether they enjoy the democratic freedoms NAATO is intended to defend.’²

Under Nalapat’s proposal, the US, Canada, India, Japan, Singapore, Malaysia, Australia, the Philippines and South Korea – along with pro-Western Arab countries such as Kuwait, Oman, Bahrain and Qatar – would be potential members of the new security system. China would not.

Nalapat’s arguments fell on receptive ears, given China’s growing economic and strategic weight in the Asia-Pacific and Indian Ocean regions. His subsequent point – that while Asia was changing rapidly in economic, military and technological terms, its security architecture was largely a remnant of post-war arrangements – was also persuasive for security analysts in countries like India, who were beginning to fear encirclement by China’s growing military-strategic assets in the Indian Ocean rim. At the other end, Japan, struggling to lay its own war and post-war past to rest, as was Germany in Europe, met with a less friendly reception (to put it mildly) from China, Korea, Vietnam and Cambodia than did Germany from Europe. It appeared that the containment of Japan, a key policy of the early Cold War period, remained a more comfortable position for Asian countries than its transformation as a democracy in the later and post-Cold War decades.

Though Nalapat had hastened to add that, unlike NATO, which was set up to help contain the former Soviet Union, NAATO would not have any country as its target, China's security and foreign policy establishment was not amused. In fact, Nalapat's 'grand strategic vision' did not meet facts on the ground. India and Japan began a fairly low-level and gingerly maritime cooperation, primarily directed towards protecting commercial sea lanes in the Indian Ocean and East Asian straits through which over 60 per cent of the two countries' energy imports travel, though their navies first worked together in a relief mission for the tsunami-affected in 2004, along with the US and Australian navies. In 2006, Japan and India announced that they would boost military cooperation in counter-terrorism and safety of regional maritime traffic and international cooperation for disaster management.³ In 2007 they held joint exercises with Singapore in the Malacca Straits, with the US off the Japanese coast and in the Bay of Bengal with the US, Singapore and Australia. They also held a quadrilateral meeting on the sidelines of the East Asia Summit.

Potential for an Asian Cold War

To this, however, Japanese Prime Minister Abe added the proposal that India join Japan to create an 'Arc of Freedom and Prosperity' constituted by democracies in Asia.⁴ The Arc would be formed along the outer rim of the Eurasian continent, stretching from Northeast Asia (Japan, Cambodia, Laos, Vietnam and the Republic of Korea) to Central Asia (Mongolia and Uzbekistan), the Caucasus (Georgia and Azerbaijan), Ukraine, Turkey, Central and Eastern Europe and the Baltic States.

Though Prime Minister Abe stressed that the policy was not intended to contain China,⁵ many Indian and Japanese analysts drew the opposite conclusion.⁶ Chinese analysts reacted sharply to Abe's proposal. China had reached equilibrium with the US under the Nixon administration in the late 1970s and had grown dominant in East and Southeast Asia during the 1990s, when the Clinton administration was focused on European integration and the wars in former Yugoslavia. But the new moves by Japan re-ignited Chinese fears of an alliance to contain it, fears which some US analysts fanned by advocating a US India alliance as a counterweight to China.⁷ Hu Shisheng, a South Asian expert at the China Institute of Contemporary International Relations, was quoted as saying that the speech resurrected a 'Cold War mentality' and was designed to 'deliberately' divide Asia: 'Japan's intention is obvious. It aims to counter-balance the rising influence of China in the region.' And Professor Sun Shihai, Deputy Director of the Institute of Asia-Pacific Studies under the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, warned: 'Any attempts to make China a rival or contain China will not work.'⁸

In a strong signal of its discontent, China issued *démarches* to the United States, India, Japan and Australia a few days before the four countries held their

first-ever official-level security consultations on the sidelines of the ASEAN Regional Forum in May 2007.

Although the US, as a partner in Japan India maritime exercises, made clear that the joint exercises were not part of an effort to contain China, and an influential report by Joseph Nye and Richard Armitage outlined the different contours of each set of bilateral relations,⁹ as did the Indian and Japanese leaders,¹⁰ China's relations with Japan had plummeted since Prime Minister Koizumi's adoption of a 'normalization' policy that entailed overturning Japan's post-World War II ban on military missions overseas (although he authorized solely civil-military missions) and saw him visiting war memorials that also housed the graves of accused war criminals from the Japan China war.¹¹

There were complaints on all sides. China had blocked initial Japanese efforts to join multilateral patrols in the Malacca Straits, opposed the Japanese and Indian bids for seats in the UN Security Council and was reluctant to have India at the East Asian Summit. Analysts in both countries perceived Chinese statements of mistrust as an attempt to restrict their expanding international and Asian roles.¹² The analyst C. Raja Mohan argued that the alliances that India and Japan were building redressed each country's prior inaction or timidity in Asian affairs. China, he said, was a new political barrier for Japan and India, because China did not want a multipolar Asia in which its growing regional dominance might be reduced:

Barring left-wing ideologues, few have difficulty in recognizing the fact that China does not want other powers to rise in Asia. It was equally predictable that China would do its utmost to prevent Japan and India from gaining permanent seats in the United Nations Security Council. Nor is it shocking that China is the only nuclear weapon power that opposes the Indo-US nuclear deal.

China's clout to limit the political aspirations of India and Japan is not limited to the international domain. Beijing has been adept at leveraging domestic lobby groups in both countries to prevent outcomes it considers unacceptable.¹³

And Admiral Arun Prakash of the Indian Navy commented acerbically:

Talk of China feeling 'encircled' is nothing but dialectic disinformation; we have no presence whatsoever in the Pacific. At the same time, India is in the middle of the Indian Ocean, and that is where China has implemented its 'string of pearls' strategy by creating right around us what are best described as 'weapon-client states': Bangladesh, Myanmar, Sri Lanka, Saudi Arabia, Iran and Pakistan. In this context, Gwadar, situated at the mouth of the Persian Gulf, is probably the first in a chain of ports that China is developing in our neighbourhood, and which could provide future facilities to its ships and missile-carrying nuclear submarines.¹⁴

Containment theory a bad fit

Yet in reality India is not contained by China's presence on all its frontiers, as its recent economic growth and growing trade relations across Asia indicate. The Indian state is not fighting an ideological battle with the Chinese state, nor is it in military confrontation with it. India's growth has not been impeded by China's relations with its neighbours; in fact, India China trade (already past its target of \$40 billion and estimated to increase to \$60 billion by 2020) could well have been spurred by these relations. It would certainly help India to have China as a partner or backer of Indian peace initiatives with neighbours such as Pakistan, Nepal and Bangladesh, just as it would help China to have India as a partner or backer of stability, for example in close ally Pakistan, or of peace with its neighbour Japan.

For these reasons perhaps, Indian policymakers had a different take from Indian analysts – they concluded that India and Japan had a common interest in 'multi-polarity' in East and Southeast Asia, against dominance by a single country or a bipolar US China divide (Saran 2003). Abe's proposal did not take off because the Indian government did not respond and it was shelved when Prime Minister Fukuda replaced Abe.

Despite their tone and tenor, these rumblings did not add up to a new version of the old Cold War. The Nye Armitage and Saran views are closer to the classic balance of power doctrine, in which no one country could assume overwhelming military superiority over others (assuming they would ally against the threat). China is a major trading partner of both India and Japan. India has been careful to deal with China within the normative frameworks that the Chinese leadership agrees to.¹⁵

In fact, the India China strategic relationship has progressed as rapidly as the India US relationship and far further than the India Japan relationship. In April 2005, India and China signed a Strategic Partnership and set up high-level talks to resolve their border disputes. In January 2006 they agreed on a Memorandum for Enhancing Cooperation in the Field of Oil and Natural Gas that permits joint bids on energy assets in third countries. In May 2006 India and China signed a Memorandum of Understanding for joint military exchanges and exercises, collaboration in counter-terrorism, anti-piracy and search-and-rescue efforts. In December 2007 they held their first joint military training exercise and in January 2008 announced they would formulate a joint global economic strategy, including common action in the World Trade Organization and on regional climate change, and agreed on civil nuclear energy cooperation.

Does this mean that South-East and East Asia will be free of strategic competition? No. While the countries of South-East and East Asia strive for a benign balance of power, their diversity in size, culture, ambitions, social and political systems will entail a fair degree of both jockeying and misperception. The smaller countries are partly insulated from strategic competition amongst the bigger countries through ASEAN, which has been the fount of cooperative institutions in South East and East Asia, but only partly.

Even so, any comparison of strategic competition in Asia with the Cold War is fundamentally flawed because it ignores the cultural underpinnings of the Cold War as well as the cultural responses of Asia. The Cold War was another exhausting milestone in Russia's agonized relationship with Europe – neither separated nor integrated but somehow uneasily joined at the hip. Asia's countries do not have that particular metaphysical relationship with one another (though they have their own metaphysical problems). On the other side of the coin, Asian countries have not dealt with their myriad hostilities by clustering around two poles of alliance and dividing the continent into each pole's respective spheres, though there were efforts to do so during the Cold War (US Japan South Korea against China North Korea Vietnam).

Finally, China and the US are closely intertwined, through trade, investment and the Chinese Diaspora, which Russia and the US were not. This in itself indicates that US China strategic rivalry will not take the form of US Soviet rivalry.

Back in Europe: remnants of the old Cold War

At the same time, the Russia Georgia Ossetia row shows that the remnants of the Cold War continue to shadow us. Russia's resurgence under President Vladimir Putin, the Bush administration's plans to deploy missile shields in Poland and the Czech Republic, NATO's plans to admit Ukraine and Georgia, the European Union's growing closeness to a number of CIS countries that are now described as Europe's neighbourhood, and the energy politics that accompanied these developments, all contributed to a sharp rise in temperature between the US, Europe and Russia.

Russia's control over the export of oil from Central Asia had long irked the US and Europe, and their effort to counter it through the Azerbaijan Turkey pipeline irked Russia. Russia's reaction to price wars with the European Union over Russian gas supplies, on which many European countries are increasingly dependent, was to threaten Poland with a cut-off, a threat that was also used with CIS member Ukraine, but this punitive measure was also intended to warn against Ukraine's push for integration with Europe. Russia's stated ambition, to direct 30 per cent of its energy exports to Asia in the next decade, raised European and US fears, not about China's rise so much as that this would leave less for the global and European markets. Estimates showed that Russia would 'find it difficult to exceed a 15% target without dramatically reducing exports to the West' (that is Europe, as the US does not import energy from Russia).¹⁶

Both the US and Europe wanted Russia to open its energy resources for exploration and development, especially in the Far North and East Siberia, in the US case to benefit US companies and in the European case to additionally ensure continuous supplies. The European Union was unable, however, to evolve a unified policy, as Germany and Italy had strong bilateral energy agreements with Russia. Germany, for example, has contracted some

\$60 billion worth of gas to be delivered via the North European Gas Pipeline. The German government would not want tensions to escalate between the European Union and Russia – indeed Germany was instrumental in postponing the decision to admit Georgia to NATO at NATO's 2008 summit in Bucharest.¹⁷

Commenting on these factors in late 2006, Oxford Analytica predicted:

The EU will persist in its attempts to diversify sources of energy imports, placing a special emphasis on the Caspian. At the same time, Brussels will be cautious not to spoil relations with Russia over diverging approaches to the CIS. By contrast, the United States will continue with its harsh criticism of Russia's energy policies and step up efforts to enhance energy security of the friendly regimes in Eastern Europe and the Caucasus.¹⁸

Though sour energy politics were fuelled by the wider competition over what some US and European analysts called 'the post-Soviet space'¹⁹ and others called 'the EU's Eastern neighbourhood', they also obscured the potentially more explosive issues of US, Europe and Russia relations. For many analysts the expansion of the European Union to include the majority of the former Warsaw Pact countries, and of NATO to include the Baltic States and possibly the CIS countries that lie between Europe and Russia, was a continuation of the Cold War policy of spheres of influence. With one difference – Russia was not in a position to react in the way it had earlier done.

The US Russia war of words reached its highest point in May 2006, when US Vice President Dick Cheney accused Russia of running against democracy, limiting human rights and using its energy riches to 'blackmail' the world, at the Vilnius Conference in May 2006 in Lithuania, and Gleb Pavlovsky, senior Kremlin advisor, responded by saying Cheney's remarks proved that the US was seeking an enemy to maintain its status (as world cop). Commenting on the 'squabble', China's *People's Daily* asked whether the Cold War was being repeated, and answered:

The US has been using various means to expand its sphere of influence since the Soviet Union dismembered. While pressing Russia to change towards the direction it desires, the country has also intensified the casting of influence on former Soviet members surrounding Russia. By supporting pro-west opposition factions in CIS countries, Washington also tried to exert political pressure on Russia through 'color revolution'. Besides, the US-led NATO also took the chance to push its regime closer to Russia by eastern enlargement. ...

However, even (if) the Cold War returns, it is unlike the past one. A fundamental change has taken place in the form of confrontation between the two powers. In the past it assumed the form of confrontation between two

military groups, and a balance of nuclear deterrence; but now it chiefly shows in infiltration and anti-infiltration of values, frictions in national interests and fight for positions in the world's future political map.

Against the backdrop of economic globalization, the interests of the two sides are deeply intertwined, and they need cooperation in many fields such as trade and economy, finance, energy and anti-terrorism. It is impossible for the US to organize again an alliance against Russia while Russia is incapable of overall confrontation with the West and the US. Therefore, despite fierce argument or even wrestle, the two sides will be more engaged in frictions amid consultations and competition amid cooperation, that is vying with each other yet without breaking off.²⁰

To what extent was the *People's Daily* right? The year 2007 saw a variety of efforts to cool down the war of words. Giving testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, US analyst Michael McFaul commented that while little would change in the last years of the Putin and Bush presidencies, new leaders in the Kremlin and the White House would create an opportunity to start anew. 'The United States does not have enough leverage over Russia to influence internal change through coercive means', he said. 'Only a strategy of linkage is available.'²¹ Such a strategy should involve 'avoiding further confrontation, diffusing rhetorical flurries, aiding Russia's embattled democrats, and confronting Russia's bullying of its neighbors'.

At the grand strategy level, George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn put forward a plan for jump-starting a new and wider campaign for nuclear disarmament that would involve actors like China and India, which could begin by new and binding START negotiations.²² The proposal met with a positive response from Russia, and in April 2008 Russia and the US agreed they would replace START-1 with a new nuclear arms reduction treaty which would be a legally binding document.

However, the two countries remained deadlocked over whether arms reductions would apply only to operationally deployed warheads (US position), or would extend to warheads in storage as well (Russian position).²³

When containment meets self-determination

The year 2007 also saw the worsening of US, Europe and Russia relations. Though Russia's efforts at coercive diplomacy intimidated Georgia and Ukraine, they also spurred Georgia, especially, in its quest for Western integration. Russia's not so veiled threats to Georgia on Abkhazia and South Ossetia sharpened US pressure for Georgian membership in NATO, a step which Germany, Italy and France opposed on the grounds that, as European analyst Michael Emerson put it, 'there is still a divisive cleavage in Ukrainian political positions and public opinion over NATO, while Georgia's unresolved conflicts make for dangers of destabilization'.²⁴ French Prime Minister Francois Fillon added, to Georgian and Ukrainian outrage, that their membership would disturb the balance of power between Russia and Europe.

Germany and France's opposition delayed membership for Georgia and Ukraine but could not prevent a commitment to it. NATO's Bucharest Summit ended with the statement that 'Ukraine and Georgia will become members of NATO. ... [Membership Action Plan] MAP is the next step for Ukraine and Georgia on their direct way to membership'.²⁵

Miscalculating the situation, Georgia's new President, Mikhail Saakashvili, thought the time was ripe to reintegrate Abkhazia and South Ossetia, which had been under Russian peacekeeping since the dissolution of the Soviet Union. In July 2008, the same month that the US signed missile defence treaties with Poland and the Czech Republic, there were a spate of bombings in Abkhazia that Russia and Georgia accused each other of planting. Soon after, the two countries traded accusations of violating the air space over South Ossetia. In the backdrop to the accusations were joint training exercises between US troops and soldiers from Georgia (currently the third largest contributor of foreign troops in Iraq), Azerbaijan, Armenia and Ukraine, underlining the region's strategic importance, according to the US European Command (EUCOM).²⁶ Russia strengthened its military presence in Abkhazia, and prepared for an opportunity in South Ossetia, which Saakashvili provided soon after by sending a small number of Georgian troops in. A short sharp war ensued in August 2008, ending with Russian occupation of swathes of Georgian territory. French President Nicolas Sarkozy succeeded in rapidly brokering a peace agreement under which Russia would withdraw to status quo ante, humanitarian aid would be allowed, international peacekeeping troops would join Russian troops in South Ossetia, and negotiations for a resolution of the dispute would begin. But Russia was slow to pull out its troops, ensuring further devastation of Georgian military assets before withdrawing, and negotiations are as yet far away.

Analysts in India were quick to point out that in the US Russian confrontation over Georgia Russia was able to use evolving practice over self-determination à la Kosovo's independence to counter (suspected) containment. Writing in *The Tribune*, G. Parthasarathy pointed out that the Kremlin had warned that NATO expansion could lead to Moscow's recognition of the breakaway regions of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, and Russia's Parliament had proclaimed that if the western powers could recognize the independence of Kosovo after military intervention, there was no reason why Russia could not do likewise in Georgia. Russia, he said, saw the Sarkozy-brokered peace agreement as indicating an 'EU acceptance of the impossibility of return to the pre-war status quo', and warned:

These developments are going to have profound implications on global politics in the coming years. The Americans are not going to give up their attempts to encircle Russia. The Russians, in turn, could make American diplomacy on issues like the nuclear programmes of North Korea and Iran very difficult, should the Americans become confrontational. Former Soviet republics like Kazakhstan, which have huge energy resources, will

now become more cautious in their dealings with the US out of fear of Russian reactions. In the face of such rivalry from Russia, the Americans will now seek closer ties with Beijing – a development of some importance for India and the balance of power in Asia.²⁷

Interestingly, a report by the recently formed European Council on Foreign Relations concurred on the self-determination point, urging the European Union to agree to a common position on the kind of legal precedent that Kosovo's declared independence means: 'Rather than claiming – as they have done – that the situation in Kosovo does not create a precedent, EU leaders need to be explicit about what precedent it actually sets.'²⁸

While this suggestion clearly refers to normative principles (intervention to prevent/redress ethnic cleansing, progress towards democracy), it is also the case that Kosovo achieved separation and independence because Serbia was not a strong state, nor did it have a strong protector (Russia was content to fume from the sidelines). In the case of Abkhazia and South Ossetia, however, they do have a strong protector in Russia, and the US and the European Union were not content to fume from the sidelines. They mediated a peace agreement rapidly. That said, it is unlikely that Russia will anytime soon accept further steps towards a peaceful resolution of the conflicts that would see Abkhazia and South Ossetia remaining within Georgia, as the US and European Union call for. More confrontation is likely, but it is also likely to be more amicably conducted.

Russia cannot prevent increasingly close relations between CIS countries and the European Union, but it can trump them through an equally close relationship itself. While the new members of the expanded European Union are an obstacle to closer Russia European Union relations, their opposition is a challenge rather than an insuperable problem. The Russia Georgia conflict is another milestone in the protracted and metaphysical dilemma that Russians and Europeans experience in relation to each other, but Europe is unlikely to either unite or split over Russia, and a new US administration may find itself playing honest broker rather than Cold Warrior vis à vis Russia.

Conclusion

The Russia US Europe Georgia confrontation is in many ways more reminiscent of Great power tensions and misperceptions at the turn of the last century rather than of the Cold War. And the changing balance of power competition in Asia is likely to be a multipolar one with cross-cutting alliances rather than two blocs. Rather than historical repetition the challenge of the coming decade is how to deal with short-term historical continuities in a wider context of transition or volatility, such as Afghanistan gearing itself up to repel foreigners even at the risk of sliding back into tribal and religious conflict, while Pakistan is overrun by mujahedeens.

Notes

- 1 'Commentary: China challenges the U.S. in the Indian Ocean': http://www.upiasiaonline.com/Security/2007/08/27/commentary_china_challenges_the_us_in_the_indian_ocean/9135/.
- 2 Voice of America, 'Containing China?': http://www.voanews.com/english/archive/2006/8/US_India_China2006_08_07_voa68.cfm?CFID_27329662&CFTOKEN_37404027.
- 3 P.S. Suryanarayana, 'India, Japan to pursue cooperation in defence', *The Hindu*, 25 May 2006.
- 4 The concept of an 'Arc of Freedom and Prosperity' had been outlined by the Japanese Minister for Foreign Affairs, Taro Aso, at the Japan Institute of International Affairs on 30 November 2006: www.mofa.go.jp/announce/fm/aso/speech0611.html.
- 5 Press conference following Prime Minister Abe's trip to India: http://www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia_paci/pmv0708/press.html.
- 6 bbs.chinadaily.com.cn/viewthread.
- 7 T.G. Carpenter, 'India in the Balance', Cato Institute, 16 June 2001: http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id_4269; S.A. Weiss, 'Washington Panders to Beijing and Patronizes New Delhi', *International Herald Tribune*, 2 March 1999, Hill and Associates (2005), Special report on India US relations, September 2005, http://www.hillassoc.com/web/Portal?xml_news/news&fid_30&cid_510.
- 8 www.expressindia.com/fullstory.php?newsid_91247.
- 9 R.L. Armitage and J. Nye. (2007) *The U.S. Japan Alliance: Getting Asia Right Through 2020*, Center for Strategic and International Studies Report, Washington, DC, February 2007.
- 10 S. Abe, Address to the two houses of India's Parliament, 'Confluence of the Two Seas': www.mofa.go.jp/region/asia_paci/pmv0708/speech_2.html; Varadarajan, S. (2007) 'Four power meeting drew Chinese demarche: US, Japan keen to rope in India in quadrilateral security cooperation', *The Hindu*, 14 June 2007; 'Abe's 'broader Asia' irks Chinese scholars', *Indian Express*, 23 August 2007.
- 11 K.E. Calder (2006) 'China and Japan's Simmering Rivalry', *Foreign Affairs*, March April 2006.
- 12 B. Chellaney (2007) 'Quad Initiative: An inharmonious concert of democracies', *The Japan Times*, 19 July 2007.
- 13 C. Raja Mohan, 'Two PMs, One Problem: China', *Indian Express*, 21.8.2007, <http://www.indianexpress.com/story/211558.html>.
- 14 Admiral Arun Prakash, 'China's Naval Gazers', *Indian Express*, 5.9.2007.
- 15 R. Puri (2005) 'India and New World Order', 4 December 2005: <http://www.boloji.com/myword/mw006.htm>, 'India not to be part of any China containment plan' (IANS), 26.10.2006: http://www.indianmuslims.info/news/2006/october/26/india_news/india_not_to_be_part_of_any_china_containment_plan.html.
- 16 Oxford Analytica, RUSSIA/US/EU: 'Security thinking' fuels energy dilemma', Thursday, September 21 2006, http://www.oxan.com/display.aspx?ItemID_DB129182.
- 17 Edward Lucas, 'Bang bang, who's dead?', *The Economist*, August 7, 2008: http://edwardlucas.blogspot.com/2008/08/war_in_georgia.html.
- 18 Oxford Analytica, RUSSIA/US/EU: 'Security thinking' fuels energy dilemma'.
- 19 Nicu Popescu, Mark Leonard and Andrew Wilson, 'Can the EU Win the Peace in Georgia?', European Council on Foreign Relations: http://ecfr.eu/page/documents/ECFR_Georgia_Policy_Brief.pdf.
- 20 Liao Yuan, 'Is the Cold War being repeated?', People's Daily Online, 17:11, May 15, 2006: http://en.0437.gov.cn/Print.Asp?ID_345.
- 21 Michael A. McFaul, Testimony before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs on the state of Russia's transition to democracy, May 17, 2007: http://www.carnegieendowment.org/publications/index.cfm?fa_view&id_19202&prog_zru.

- 22 George Shultz, William Perry, Henry Kissinger and Sam Nunn, 'A World Free of Nuclear Weapons', *Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2007.
- 23 RIA Novosti: <http://en.rian.ru/onlinenews/20080405/103772020.html>.
- 24 Michael Emerson: 'After Bucharest', CEPS European Neighbourhood Watch, 37th Issue: <http://www.ceps.eu/files/NW/NWatch37.pdf>.
- 25 Ibid.
- 26 'Russia, US Swap Warnings as Condoleezza Rice Visits Georgia', *Deutsche Welle*, 10.07.2008: <http://www.dw-world.de/dw/article/0,2144,3472781,00.html>.
- 27 G. Parthasarathy, 'Another Great Game: Cold War as Russia intervenes in Georgia', *The Tribune*, August 21, 2008: <http://www.tribuneindia.com/2008/20080821/edit.htm#4>.
- 28 Popescu et al., 'Can the EU Win the Peace in Georgia?'.

19 Engaging the idea of global citizenship

Siddharth Mallavarapu

In an unexpected detour to Nuremberg on one of his German visits, Homi Bhabha, the North American-based Indian postcolonial theorist, felt a compelling urge to reflect on the past: 'What story do you tell when you realize that barbarism and civilization are too often linked by an open sewer running with blame and blood and tears?'¹ How does one engage the idea of the global while fully acknowledging the recent past and concurrently providing an ethical compass to rehabilitate our present and the future? How does one offset the reflex of 'methodological nationalism' in the social sciences to build more accurate accounts of the collective involvement of an ensemble of actors, structures and processes in configuring both *our* present and *our* future?² 'We' are all to account for the past, the ongoing present and the ensuing future.³ I treat this premise as an initial point of departure that frames this brief inquiry into the idea and corresponding practices of global citizenship.

Beginning with an audit of some existing scholarship on a cluster of similar ideas – global publics, transnational civil society and world citizenship – I examine the rationales and heuristic clues advanced to access the idea as well as evidence that points to its existence if in somewhat embryonic form. At the outset it is important to ask if global citizenship is first of all a desirable global ontology and second, if desirable is it feasible or as some have argued already in play? I contend that the world we inhabit requires us in the interests of collective survival and well-being to come to terms with the notion of global citizenship while briefly examining what are to my mind some of the more exciting developments within the social sciences that might provide us some useful slants of emphases while preparing us all for such an engagement. I caution that, similar to other ambitious blueprints, global citizenship may prove to be another synonym for hegemony and it is important therefore for different social and political constituencies to constantly and critically re-evaluate the term, its meaning and substantive content. In this context, the accountability and autonomy of civil society groups assume paramount significance.

The case for caution

It is not difficult to fathom today that many of the problems faced within nation-states are not confined to these nation-states alone. Ecological issues provide us the most direct illustration of this phenomenon but a host of other issues including public health concerns such as the spread of bird-flu or dengue fever, or even the ongoing energy and food crisis are classic illustrations of the deep interdependencies that already face humankind. It is hard to conceive of neat boundaries between national and international politics as were once the staple of traditional International Relations reflection. Coupled with the fact that increasing global interdependencies are part and parcel of our everyday life, we are also aware of the multilayered identity that has come to characterize our existence. Most of us belong to a particular nation-state location (the category of 'stateless' people is also part of our reality and not political fiction); all of us belong to a particular gender, class and one or more races.

Despite these apparent realities, why is it that the idea of global citizenship is faced with scepticism from some quarters? Realists in International Relations point to the primacy of states in a world inhabited by more non-state actors (INGOs, private actors TNCs, MNCs, Social Movements). They argue that it is easy to privilege some forms of identity over others but at the end of the day statist identity trumps all other forms of association. Other sceptics argue that despite the appeal of the idea of global citizenship, the lure of nationalism and the need for thicker forms of allegiance make global identities at best a second choice and at worst too 'thin' a form of attachment.⁴ However, as Ulf Hannerz suggests, '... it does not seem self-evident, especially in the present era, that ethnic nationalism monopolizes key formative experiences that have enduring consequences for identities and orientations'.⁵ Another set of critics argue that the term 'global' often hides various forms of power asymmetries and tends to present itself as a benign neutral term.⁶ It is important therefore from this perspective to be particularly cautious about reproducing various forms of domination through a new vocabulary of political commitment. None of these arguments are entirely baseless. Anybody who travels overseas needs passports and visas that remind them of their statist identities. It is hard to discount the sway of nationalism in terms of framing our principal locus of allegiance, and words in the past have provided congenial homes for other agendas – thanks to anti-colonial nationalism nobody in the colonized world was left unaware of the real import of the 'civilizing mission'.

Specific warning signs from different contexts are also well worth heeding. James Ferguson alerts us to be more critical of both the lineage and role of civil society, particularly in the context of his examination of the 'topographies of power' in Africa. Civil society has contrary to claims about expanding democratic space, '... often serve(d) to help legitimate a profoundly anti-democratic transnational politics.'⁷ Thus civil society in some contexts can become another 'transnational apparatus of governmentality' geared to bypass the weak sovereignty of some states.⁸

There is also a danger that notions like cosmopolitanism might appear to be a luxury that only some can afford.⁹ Thomas Pogge reminds us of the pervasive presence of national interests in framing an unequal international political economy. He points out that:

There is a straightforward two-part explanation for why our new global economic order is so harsh on the poor. The details of this order are fixed in international negotiations in which our [read advanced industrialized economies] governments enjoy a crushing advantage in bargaining power and expertise. And our representatives in international negotiations do not consider the interests of the global poor as part of their mandate. They are exclusively devoted to shaping such agreement in the best interest of the people and corporations of their own country.¹⁰

It is hard to ignore these images when one is thinking about the possibilities and prospects of shaping a more distributively equitable international system.

The case for engaging global citizenship

How does one channelize the caution about existing global governance arrangements into more constructive ways of engaging the future? Those who make the case for global citizenship argue that it is important to build on the possibility of dialogue between different cultural communities and political perspectives in the world we live in. This is by no means an objectionable goal. Further, they argue that both the number of participants involved in deliberating on what constitutes the global good must be widened as well as information must be shared amongst larger sections of the global population.

There are important normative as well as institutional dimensions to their demand.¹¹ Normatively, in order to enhance democratic legitimacy of global decision-making on a number of key issues that affect us all – for instance world food prices: there must be increased participation and involvement of a variety of actors or stakeholders. Currently, the voice of a small farmer for instance from Sub-Saharan Africa is not even acknowledged to begin with. Of particular relevance in the context is the recognition that there are different ‘latitudes of citizenship’. As Aihwa Ong eloquently posits:

[L]atitude, first of all, defines the *division* of the global North from the South, of the rich from the poor, of those who have gained from global capital flows from those enshrined by them. Latitude also describes *transversal* flows of capital that cut into the vertical entities of nation-states, as well as the *conjunctural* intersection of global forces in the articulation of strategic zones such as Silicon Valley.¹²

There is a genuine need to democratize information flows that allows for people to make decisions based on increased availability of information. In

poorer countries, this would entail equipping populations with literacy skills in order to participate more fully in these processes. In institutional terms, this is a call to accommodate more fully diverse stakeholder interests hitherto absent from these discussions. The institutional dimension is vital because if the process of participation is institutionalized there will not be a need to rely purely on the goodwill of specific actors but much more on design propensities or framework support.

While examining the idea of global citizenship, it is hard to miss out on concepts that bear a Wittgensteinian ‘family resemblance’ to the notion. James Bohman, for instance, addresses the issue of world citizenship where he suggests the following:

[w]orld citizenship ought not to be simply a matter of all the peoples of the world finally coming to have similar beliefs and goals to enter into a common republic; rather, it should be a matter of achieving the conditions under which a plurality of persons can inhabit a common public space.¹³

Such a position is also echoed in the work of Nina Glick Schiller when she argues that:

[t]o speak of a *trans-border* citizenry is not to assume that these citizens speak with a single voice. While such a citizenry is united by a shared identity, as with any other citizenry, a trans-border citizenry will have political divisions based on differences in political party or ideology.¹⁴

It is therefore unrealistic to expect a consensus on all issues. Nevertheless, it is possible to conceive of a dialogical space that acknowledges difference and provides an institutionalized conduit to articulate distinct points of view.

At one level the idea of a larger body of public opinion that influences political decision making plays the role of a ‘useful fiction’.¹⁵ Prior to this, Walter Lippman alluded to the existence of ‘phantom’ publics.¹⁶ Those who make political decisions might be influenced by their perception of how the societies they live in and the world outside are likely to assess their actions. Vincent Price argues that:

[s]tates have always been responsive to informal public pressure, but usually within their own jurisdictional boundaries: foreign pressures were usually mediated almost entirely by states. Now international pressures are felt more directly through externally controlled media, organized non-governmental groups, attentive international publics and their opinions.¹⁷

The proposition that a global public is not merely a ‘virtual’ world but one that bears empirical scrutiny is underscored by Price.¹⁸ An important caveat that is introduced in this context is that it is perhaps more useful to think of the global public not as a static entity but one that surfaces differently

depending on the issue-area involved. The strongest validation of this influence is perhaps evident when it comes to human right questions. States generally feel the need (they are glaring exceptions like Zimbabwe and Myanmar) to at least minimally pay lip service to the idea of human rights and, depending on the pressure they face directly at home and indirectly internationally, feel the need to back those promises with concrete actions on the ground. June Nash makes this point persuasively when he points out that:

[t]he potential of transnational civil society to effect social change is evident in their promotion of these international human-right covenants and in the subsequent attempts of activists to ensure compliance in countries where these agreements have been ratified.¹⁹

However, not all arenas of international conduct reveal the same extent of international leverage when it comes to the role of the global publics. Some years ago while I was researching on the ICJ Advisory Opinion on the legality of the threat or use of nuclear weapons, perhaps more directly than the global publics, I found the role of global *epistemic* communities (particularly international lawyers and physicians) to be especially influential in getting the ICJ to first accept a request for an Advisory Opinion by the UNGA and in earlier framing security as a public health concern reflected in the prior request by the WHO.²⁰ This also brings us to another important dimension when it comes to thinking about the fairness and legitimacy of international decision making on global governance issues. A concern that has constantly re-surfaced in this context is how best to break away from a format which demonstrates that '[i]nternational governance is remote from citizens, its procedures are opaque, and it is dominated by diplomats, bureaucrats and functional specialists.'²¹ Patrizia Nanz and Jens Sttefek point out that:

[w]hat is important to the notion of public deliberation is not so much that everyone participates but more that there is a warranted presumption that public opinion is formed on the basis of adequate information and relevant reasons, and that those whose interests are involved have an equal and effective opportunity to make their own interests (and their reasons for them) known.²²

Critical of the 'executive multilateralism' style of international governance arrangements, Michael Zürn argues

... that international politics are then no longer a matter of a few corporative agents in particular states which coordinate their interests in *camera* and arrive at common policies which then have to be implemented domestically. World politics are then less a form of 'executive multilateralism', but rather developing into a form of multilateralism borne by society and accountable to both national and transnational publics.²³

Another useful tack to consider the possibility of global civic citizenship is to build on the possibility of an international public spheres that is premised on the concept of deliberative democracy. To Jurgen Habermas, what is perhaps critical in this context is the ‘structure of communication.’²⁴ While Habermas’s classic account of the emergence of the bourgeois public sphere in nineteenth century Europe does not bear full explication here, what is of interest is the possibility of considering ‘plural’ public spheres as well as the key issue of ‘access’ to these platforms in the existing international system.²⁵ The editors of an annual civil society report focussed on the theme of communicative democracy in their 2008 volume urge us to consider that ‘[g]lobal civil society as-is may not correspond to the ideal of a public sphere where free and equal deliberation takes place between all global citizens. But what one does find in global civil society is some adherents to the ideal, and numerous shaky attempts to practice it.’²⁶

Building on a Constructivist approach to the study of world politics, Thomas Risse makes a strong argument focussing on the communicative aspects of contemporary governance. He observes that ‘... arguing and persuasion constitute tools of ‘soft steering’ that might improve both the legitimacy problems of global governance by providing voice opportunities to various stakeholders and the problem-solving capacity of governance institutions through deliberation’.²⁷ The importance of institutions is again underscored in this reading. While Risse concedes that ‘ideal speech situations’ akin to perfect markets do not exist in the world we know, he nevertheless makes a convincing case that it is important to rely on ‘careful process tracing ... to find out whether processes of persuasion actually mattered in leading to changes in policy preferences or even in actors’ interest over outcomes’.²⁸

Is global citizenship already manifested in our existential reality? Of particular pertinence in this regard is the claim advanced by David Held that ‘[c]osmopolitanism is not made up of political ideals for another age, but embedded in rules systems and institutions which have already altered state sovereignty in distinct ways’.²⁹ To illustrate his case, Held draws our attention to entrenched legal standards relating to human rights, the laws of war as well as trends such as the establishment of the International Criminal Court.³⁰ The salience of institutions again comes to the fore in this account when Held categorically states that ‘[t]he institutionalization of regulative cosmopolitan principles requires the entrenchment of democratic public realms’. One of the eight elements identified by Held as part of a package on cosmopolitanism is the idea of ‘active agency’.³¹ This requires the acknowledgment of the significance of a vigilant global citizenry which takes active interest in issues that have a bearing on their quotidian lives – whether these relate to per capita energy consumption and carbon footprints, food security or issues of public health, education and housing. Global citizenship in this framework is not a chimera but part of the current political reality.

Drawing a line dividing, ‘... *transnational ways of belonging and transnational ways of being*’, Schiller makes a case for a reinvigorated migration studies that ‘... has the potential to make visible historical and social processes that have previously been obscured. ...’.³² Similarly distinguishing the schizophrenic

tension between ‘consumer cosmopolitanism’ and ‘political cosmopolitanism’, Hannerz makes the argument that ‘[c]osmopolitan attitudes ... are hardly inevitable’.³³ Emphasizing the lived materiality of cosmopolitanism, Kwame Appiah suggests that ‘A tenable cosmopolitanism tempers a respect for difference with a respect for actual human beings. ...’.³⁴ Such an argument has also found some excellent exemplars in the Indian milieu. Rabindranath Tagore was influenced by both Vedantic and Buddhist traditions.³⁵ Tagore remained sceptical of nationalism and pursued what some scholars have characterized as a ‘hermeneutical’ interpretation of reason.³⁶ What did this translate into? According to Saranindranath Tagore, ‘[c]osmopolitan identity, for Tagore, is not simply an empty token of an abstracted universal, produced by theoretical reason, such as humanity: rather, cosmopolitan identity has to be existentially realized in each life project’.³⁷ Similarly, it has been argued elsewhere that ‘[c]osmopolitanism is at most a deeper way of understanding who one is rather than radically transforming the range of possibilities available in our corner of the world. Its hermeneutic potential is greater than its transgressive possibilities’.³⁸

Two other Indian anti-colonial nationalists paved the way for us to think more creatively about the idea and practice of cosmopolitanism. Gandhi and Ambedkar both in their own distinctive idioms carved out a politically rich engagement with the world. As Debjani Ganguly argues,

... the tense relationship between Gandhi and Ambedkar can be recast as a dialogic exchange between two idioms of non-European cosmopolitanism – nonviolence as hybridized Hindu life-practice, and democratic development as a non-hierarchical Buddhist orientation to life. Two, the sharp differences between them notwithstanding, both Gandhi and Ambedkar, along with other nationalist leaders from Asia and Africa, were engaged in projects of world democratization in the era of decline of modern European colonialism.³⁹

Jawaharlal Nehru also echoed in his own way the prevailing *zeitgeist* of anti-colonial nationalism.

None of these positions deny the possibility of forms of political engagement that spill over borders. The crucial question relates to the modalities of operationalizing democratic participation and enfranchizing marginalized segments of the publics so that they may have much more clout than they actually possess today on issues that concern them both directly and indirectly.⁴⁰ As Joseph Stiglitz observed, ‘[t]o make globalization work there will have to be a change of mindset: we will have to think and act more globally. Today, too few have this sense of global identity.’⁴¹

In lieu of a conclusion

The idea of global citizenship like projects of nation-building is in need of constant re-invention.⁴² As Benedict Anderson argued famously that one needs to

imagine a community before a nation is born, global citizenship also at one level demands an act of imagination.⁴³ In order to make that imagination possible, it has to be founded on equipping peoples with life skills or as Amartya Sen recommends appropriate human capabilities required to navigate a complex world and to represent one's point of view without fear or prejudice.⁴⁴ It needs the creation of political conditions that might enable a narrowing down of huge power asymmetries in wealth, location and social standing internationally. Succinctly stated:

... under what conditions is a cosmopolitan dialogue even plausible? What encumbrances of the self have to be repressed, hidden, discarded, disowned to incorporate oneself into the dominant structures of global awareness, not to mention global structures of power? Is such a dialogue possible when the dominant mode of the dialogue disowns or negates the substantive modes of self-definition of all cultures except the modern West and construes them as having never exercised the prerogatives of reflection?⁴⁵

Some earlier struggles are bearing fruit today. Only a couple of years ago, even in the most advanced industrialized part of the world, it was not considered plausible that an African American could potentially be the president of the United States. The same is true of women. None of these changes took place overnight but were the results of protracted struggles that created a climate where new possibilities could emerge sometimes several decades later. There are numerous struggles for a more just world that still lie ahead. However, a critical prerequisite is to recognize that we belong to 'overlapping communities of fate' and that we need to be better informed at the outset of both our global rights and obligations to participate more effectively in the heterogeneous world we live in.⁴⁶ To come full circle, we must all recount and acknowledge our:

... hybrid stories: part yours, part mine, a part that is written in a language of mixed bits and pieces that is as yet unresolved caught in the midst of developing a vocabulary of values and wishes which engages the double aspect of the global ideal – an extensive historical achievement yearning for an elusive aspirational horizon.⁴⁷

Acknowledgements

I wish to express my gratitude to Thomas Fues of the German Development Institute for encouraging me at the outset to pursue this idea and subsequently offering detailed comments on an earlier incarnation of this piece. I have benefitted from conversations with Professors Ulrich Beck at Munich University, David Held, Andy Pratt and Chris Brown at the London School of Economics, as well as comments by an anonymous referee. The views expressed here are my own and any errors or inaccuracies remain my individual responsibility.

Notes

- 1 Homi K. Bhabha, 'Notes on Globalisation and Ambivalence' in David Held and Henrietta L. Moore, ed. *Cultural Politics in a Global Age: Uncertainty, Solidarity and Innovation* (Oxford: One World Publications, 2008), pp. 36–47.
- 2 Nina Glick Schiller, 'Transnationality', in David Nugent and Joan Vincent ed. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics* (Malden: Blackwell, 2007), p. 451; See Ulrich Beck, *Power in the Global Age* (Cambridge: Polity, 2005), pp. 43–50.
- 3 For a clear statement on the content of 'global ethics' see Bhabha, 'Notes on Globalisation and Ambivalence', p. 47.
- 4 Ulf Hannerz, 'Cosmopolitanism', in David Nugent and Joan Vincent ed. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics* (Malden: Blackwell, 2007), pp. 69–85.
- 5 Hannerz, 'Cosmopolitanism', p. 73.
- 6 Sabine Selchow, 'Language and 'Global' Politics: De-naturalising the Global', in Martin Albrow, Helmut Anheier, Marlies Glasius, Monroe E. Price and Mary Kaldor ed. *Global Civil Society 2007/08* (London: Sage, 2007), p. 240.
- 7 James Ferguson, 'Power Topographies', in David Nugent and Joan Vincent ed. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics* (Malden: Blackwell, 2007), pp. 384–85.
- 8 Ferguson, 'Power Topographies', p. 392.
- 9 Hannerz, 'Cosmopolitanism', p. 74.
- 10 Thomas Pogge, 'Reframing Global Economic Security and Justice,' in David Held and Anthony McGrew ed. *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007), p. 215.
- 11 For a normative consideration of this question see Chris Brown, 'Reimagining International Society and Global Community', in David Held and Anthony McGrew ed. *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007), pp. 171–89; an interesting account of institutionalism may be found in an account by B. Guy Peters, *Institutional Theory in Political Science: The 'New Institutionalism'* (London: Continuum, 2005).
- 12 Aihwa Ong, 'Citizenship' in David Nugent and Joan Vincent ed. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics* (Malden: Blackwell, 2007), p. 57.
- 13 James Bohman, 'The Public Spheres of the World Citizen' in Bohman and Matthias Lutz Bachmann ed. *Perpetual Peace: Essays on Kant's Cosmopolitan Ideal* (New Baskerville: MIT Press, 1997), pp. 179–200.
- 14 Schiller, 'Transnationality', p. 464.
- 15 Vincent Price, 'Democracy, Global Publics and World Opinion', in Martin Albrow et al ed. *Global Civil Society 2007/08*, p. 22.
- 16 Bohman, 'The Public Spheres of the World Citizen', p. 194.
- 17 Price, 'Democracy, Global Publics and World Opinion', p. 21.
- 18 Price, 'Democracy, Global Publics and World Opinion', p. 23. See also in this context, the work of Daniel Drache, *Defiant Publics: The Unprecedented Reach of the Global Citizen*, (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008).
- 19 June Nash, 'Transnational Civil Society' in David Nugent and Joan Vincent ed. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics* (Malden: Blackwell, 2007), p. 446.
- 20 Siddharth Mallavarapu, *Banning the Bomb: The Politics of Norm Creation* (New Delhi: Pearson Longman, 2007); for an explication of the epistemic community concept, see Peter Haas, 'Introduction: Epistemic Communities and International Policy Coordination', *International Organization*, Vol.46, No.1, Winter 1992.
- 21 Patrizia Nanz and Jens Steffek, 'Global Governance, Participation in the Public Sphere', in David Held and Mathias Koenig-Archibugi ed. *Global Governance and Public Accountability* (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), pp. 190–211, esp. p. 193.
- 22 Nanz and Steffek, 'Global Governance, Participation in the Public Sphere', p. 197.

- 23 Michael Zürn, 'Global Governance and Legitimacy Problems', in David Held and Mathias Koenig Archibugi ed. *Global Governance and Public Accountability* (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), pp. 136 63, esp. pp. 158 59.
- 24 Bohman, 'The Public Spheres of the World Citizen', p. 194.
- 25 Nick Crossley and John Michael Roberts, ed. *After Habermas: New Perspectives on the Public Sphere* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004). See especially the introduction by Roberts and Crossley, pp. 1 27. Also N.Fraser, 'Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy' in C:Calhoun (ed) *Habermas and the Public Sphere* (Massachusetts: MIT Press, 1992). Habermas's classic work on this subject is the well known *Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (Cambridge: Polity, 1989).
- 26 Martin Albrow and Marlies Glasius, 'Introduction: Democracy and the Possibility of a Global Public Sphere' in Martin Albrow et.al ed. *Global Civil Society 2007/08*, p. 12.
- 27 Thomas Risse, 'Global Governance and Communicative Action' in David Held and Mathias Koenig Archibugi ed. *Global Governance and Public Accountability* (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), pp. 164 89, see esp. pp. 164 65.
- 28 Risse, 'Global Governance and Communicative Action', p. 178.
- 29 David Held, 'Cultural Diversity, Cosmopolitan Principles and the Limits of Sovereignty' in Held and Henrietta L.Moore ed. *Cultural Politics in a Global Age: Uncertainty, Solidarity and Innovation* (Oxford: One World Publications, 2008), p. 159.
- 30 Ibid, p. 158.
- 31 Ibid, p. 162.
- 32 Schiller, 'Transnationality', pp. 448 67.
- 33 Hannerz, 'Cosmopolitanism', pp. 69 85.
- 34 Kwame Anthony Appiah, 'Cosmopolitan Contamination', in David Held and Henrietta L.Moore ed. *Cultural Politics in a Global Age: Uncertainty, Solidarity and Innovation* (Oxford: One World Publications, 2008), p. 241.
- 35 Saranindranath Tagore, 'Tagore's Conception of Cosmopolitanism: A Reconstruction', *University of Toronto Quarterly*, Vol.77, No.4, Fall 2008, pp. 1070 84.
- 36 Ibid, p. 1078.
- 37 Ibid, p. 1082.
- 38 Pratap Bhanu Mehta, 'Cosmopolitanism and the Circle of Reason', *Political Theory*, Vol.28, No.5, October 2000, pp. 619 39; p. 629.
- 39 Debjani Ganguly, 'Convergent Cosmopolitics in the Age of Empire: Gandhi and Ambedkar in World History', *borderlands* e journal, Vol.4, No.3, 2005. Accessed at http://www.borderlands.net.au/vol4no3_2005/ganguly_cosmpolitics.htm on 17 February, 2009.
- 40 For a plausible set of concrete suggestions see the roadmap ahead provided by Joseph Stiglitz in *Making Globalization Work* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2007), pp. 269 92.
- 41 Stiglitz, *Making Globalization Work* (New Delhi: Penguin, 2007), p. 278.
- 42 Akhil Gupta, 'Imagining Nations' David Nugent and Joan Vincent ed. *A Companion to the Anthropology of Politics* (Malden: Blackwell, 2007), pp. 267 81.
- 43 Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. (New York: Verso, 2nd ed. 1991).
- 44 Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- 45 Mehta, 'Cosmopolitanism and the Circle of Reason', p. 632.
- 46 David Held, 'Democratic Accountability and Political Effectiveness from a Cosmopolitan Perspective' in Held and Mathias Koenig Archibugi ed. *Global Governance and Public Accountability* (Malden: Blackwell, 2005), pp. 240 67; For a distinction between cosmopolitanism as a 'project' and from 'actually existing cosmopolitanism' see Ulrich Beck, *Power in the Global Age*; pp. 280 310.
- 47 Bhabha, 'Notes on Globalisation and Ambivalence', p. 47.

Index

- A Clear Break, A New Strategy for
Securing the realm, 144
- Abdul Aziz, King of Saudi Arabia, 57
- Abe (earlier known as East Timor), 223,
225
- Abkazia, 23, 228 30
- ABMT, 154
- Abyssinia, 203
- Ache (earlier East Timor), 171, 173
- Adler, Emanuel, 101
- Advanced Technology Vessel (ATV), 155
- Aegis anti missile missile, 212
- Aerospace Command structure, 155
- Afghan Pakistan border dispute, 61
- Afghanistan war, 68, 77, 80
- Afghanistan, 2, 6, 18 20, 27 28, 57 70,
73, 77, 82 83, 103 4, 120, 142, 147,
152, 158, 171, 208, 230; Constitution
(1964) of, 62; Government of, 60;
Islamic Republic (1992 2001) of,
63,67; Islamic Youth movement, 63;
Mujahideen Islamic Government of,
69; Secret Police, 68; Soviet invasion
(December 1979) of, 26, 30, 58 59,
77; Soviet withdrawal (1989) from, 77
- Afghan Pakistan border, 60
- Africa, 2, 19, 29,111, 115 16, 118,
120,141, 152, 158, 218, 234, 239
- African leaders' summit (New Delhi,
April 2008), 118
- Age of Extremes* (Eric Hobsbawn), 10
- Age of Turbulence* (Alan Greenspan),
140 41, 148
- Agni missile, 155 56
- Agreed Framework signed between US
and North Korea (October 1994), 38 41
- Agreement on Reconciliation,
Nonaggression, and Exchange and
Cooperation between South and
North (inter Korean basic agreement,
December, 1991), 37
- Al Qaeda, 27 28, 59, 69, 77, 82, 90,148,
152, 185
- Albania,23
- Al jihad fial Islam, 182
- Allende, Salvador, 29
- Allison, Graham, 154
- Ambedkar, B. R., 73 74, 239
- American Chinese links, 81
- Amin, Hafizullah, 64 65
- An Agenda for Peace (1992), 101
- Anderson, Benedict, 239
- Angola, 6, 29
- Antarctic eco system, 197
- Antarctic Treaty Consultative Parties
(ATCPs), 190 92, 196 97
- Antarctica, 189 95, 197 98; As
Continent of Science and Peace, 189;
Argentine, Chilean and British rivalry
in, 189
- Anti Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty, 19,
94, 101
- Antigua, 192
- Appiah, Kwame, 239
- Arab Israeli issue, 142
- Arab Israeli dispute, 28, 51, 142
- Arab Israeli war, 28, 204
- Arbenz, Colonel, 29
- Arc of Freedom and Prosperity, 223
- Arcelor, 110, 119
- Arctic Circle, 140
- Argentina, 190
- Armed Forces Special Powers Act, 168
- Armenia, 23, 229
- Armitage, Richard, 224
- Arquilla, John, 145
- Arunachal Pradesh, 117
- ASAT weapons system, 155

- ASEAN Regional Forum, 103, 224
 ASEAN, 26, 56, 103 104, 160, 220
 Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation, 132
 Asia Pacific, 87, 222
 Asia, 2, 7 8, 30, 36, 88, 97, 101 3, 105 6,
 117, 141, 167, 171 74, 215, 218 19,
 223, 225 26, 230, 239
 Asia Europe Summit, 103
 Asian Cooperation Dialogue, 103
 Asian financial crisis, 131
 Asian Relations Conference (March
 1947), 103
 Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation, 103
 Athens, 149
 ATS, 191, 195 97
 Australia Group, 207
 Australia, 74, 103, 118, 146, 153
 54, 160, 190 92, 222 23
 Australian Collection of Antarctic
 Microorganism (ACAM), 194
 Austro Hungarian Empire, 220
 Awami League, 27
 Ayman Al Zawahiri, 69
 Ayub Khan, 79
 Azerbaijan, 23, 223, 226, 229
- Baath Party, 185
 Babrak Karmal, 62, 64 66
 Baghdad Pact, 74
 Bahrain, 146, 222
 Balkans, 121
 Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD), 94 95
 Baltic Sea, 8, 153, 223
 Banco Delta Asia, 34, 41 42
 Bandung Conference of Afro Asian
 nations (1955), 28, 103
 Bangladesh, 28, 75 76, 116, 118, 192,
 224 25
 Bao Dai, 50 51
 Barroso, Jose Manuel, 119
 Baruch, Bernard, 210
 Battle of al Badr, 183 84
 Beck, Ulrich, 240
 Beijing, 24, 55, 75, 81, 103, 105, 113,
 118, 131, 230
 Belarus, 111, 207
 Belgium, 22, 190
 Belgrade; Bombing of Chinese embassy
 in, 128, 131
 Berlin blockade, 16, 142
 Berlin, 16, 52
 Bhabha, Homi, 233
 Bhutto, Zulfikar Ali, 27, 76
 Blowpipe missile, 68
- Bosnia, 171
 Brandt, Willy, 19; Ostpolitik of, 19
 Brazil, 97, 110, 119, 191 92, 216
Breaking the Conflict Trap (MaCartan
 Humphrey), 169
 Breton Woods, 102
 Brezhnev doctrine, 29
 Brezhnev, L. 19, 23, 64 65; Washington
 visit of, 20
 BRIC economies, 110
 Britain, 6, 121
 British Commonwealth of Nations, 74
 Brown, Chris, 240
 Brown, Gordon, 119
 Brussels, 119, 227
 Brzesinski, Zbigniew, 66, 142
 Burma, 26, 73
 Bush administration, 38, 77, 82, 95,
 101 2, 140, 212, 226; ABC policy
 towards North Korea, 34, 40; Nuclear
 Posture Review of, 40
 Bush, George W., 6, 38, 40, 77, 117, 140,
 142 43, 211, 228
- Cambodia, 6, 26, 51, 66, 223;
 Vietnamese invasion of, 66
 Cameroon, 192
 Camp David, 28
 Canada, 51, 222
 Carnegie Commission on Preventing
 Deadly Conflicts, 171
 Carter administration, 65, 77, 82
 Carter Doctrine, 66, 142
 Carter, Jimmy, 66
 Caspian Sea, 8, 91, 153, 227
 Cesaire, 149
 CENTO, 16, 28
 Central Asia, 8, 65, 81, 91, 95, 104, 143,
 153, 160, 218
 Central Asian Republics, 3
 Central Europe, 19, 22
 Central Intelligence Agency, 15
 Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO),
 74 76, 79 81, 83, 105
 Chakra submarine, 155
 Chamoun, Camille, 58
 Chattisgarh, 169
 Chemical and Biological Weapons
 Conventions, 209, 212
 Chen Lai, 130
 Chiang Kai shek, 23 24, 50
 Chile, 29, 190
 China, 3, 6 8, 16, 23 28, 30, 35 37, 43,
 45, 50 51, 55 56, 66, 73, 75 76, 78,

- 80 81, 87, 93, 95, 97 98, 100 101, 103 7, 110 22, 124 36, 142, 189, 191 92, 203, 205, 207, 211 12, 216 19, 221, 222 25, 228; Democracy movement, 127; Government of, 126, 130, 132, 136; Nuclear tests (1964) by, 155; Rural migrations in, 127
- China US relationship, 113
- Chinese North Korean alliance, 24
- Chinese Communist Party, 25, 35 36, 55, 113, 126; Fourteenth Party Congress, 126; Fifteenth Party congress, 126
- Chirac, Jacques, 90, 110
- Churchill, Winston, 57
- CIA, 52 53, 58, 67, 144
- Clash of Civilizations* (Samuel Huntington), 129
- Clinton administration, 38 39, 82, 101, 223
- Clinton, Bill, 40, 101, 142; North Korea policy of, 40
- Coalition of the Willing, 143
- Cold War, 1 10, 15, 19 23, 26 30, 34, 36 37, 39, 41, 44, 46, 50, 54, 56, 57 59, 69 70, 72, 74 83, 87 88, 91 92, 94 95, 97, 102 3, 111, 118, 127, 130, 134, 140, 142, 144, 152 56, 158 61, 167, 189, 197, 205, 207, 211, 215, 218, 222, 225 27, 230
- Comintern, 105
- Communist National Liberation Front, 52
- Comprehensive National Power, 135
- Conference on Interaction and Confidence Building in Asia, 103
- Confucian civilization, 130
- Confucian national perspectives, 134 35
- Confucian capitalism, 129
- Confucianism, 129 30
- Congress, 73 74, 79, 81, 117
- Container Security Initiative, 207
- Convention on Biological Diversities (CBD), 195
- Corus, 110, 119
- Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (COMECON), 55
- Cramer, 171
- CRAMRA, 191
- Crusades, 179
- CTBT, 101, 210 11
- Cuba, 16, 19, 24, 29, 52
- Cuban Missile Crisis, 25, 29, 142, 204
- Cui Zhiyuan, 128, 133
- Czechoslovakia, 23, 30, 226
- Da Nang, 53
- Dacca, 27
- Darfur, 170, 205
- De Gaulle, Charles, 93
- December 31, 2007 statement, 42 43
- Declaration made in Washington (29 June 1954), 51
- Defence Reform 2020, 160
- Delhi, 79, 118 19, 122
- Democratic Party, 117
- Democratic Republic of Kampuchea (DPRK), 42 43, 56; Guiding Principles of Peace and Security in Northeast Asia, 44
- Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV), 50 51, 53, 55
- Deng Xiao Peng, 24 25, 105, 124 26
- Denmark, 146
- Dependency theory, 129
- Dhanush SLBM, 155
- Dien Bien Phu, 26, 50; Battle of, 50
- Doctrine of Decisive Force, 145
- Domino Theory, 26
- Dulles, John F., 16
- Durand Line, 60
- East Asia, 34, 37, 105, 142, 222 23, 225
- East Asian straits, 223
- East Asian Summits, 103, 106
- East Asian tigers nations, 124, 129
- East China Sea, 161
- East European countries, 29, 35, 38
- East Germany, 22, 23, 30
- East Pakistan, 27, 76; Military crackdown (1971) in, 76
- East Timor, 170, 172
- Eastern Europe, 23, 55, 129
- Economic Cooperation Organization, 103
- Economist Intelligence Unit, 110
- Egypt, 28, 64, 73, 182, 192
- Eisenhower doctrine, 142
- Eisenhower, D.D., 24
- Ethiopia, 29
- EU Security Strategy, 113
- EU Summit (Delhi, November 2007), 119
- European Union, 7, 22, 25, 30, 87, 90 91, 93, 104, 110 11, 113, 115 16, 118, 122, 217, 219, 226 27, 229 30; Byzantine complexities of, 119; Lisbon Treaty of, 121
- EU China partnership, 123
- Eurasia, 88, 142 43

- Euro communism, 22
 Europe, 7, 16, 18, 22, 23, 26, 53, 57, 88, 91, 110, 112, 115, 120, 21, 141, 142, 144, 152, 204, 217, 19
 European Common Market, 22
 European Council, 121, 230

 Faith, Douglas, 144
 Fall, Bernard, 53
 Fang Ning, 127
 February 13 and October 3, 2007 agreements, 42, 44, 46, 158
 Federal Reserve Board, 42; New York Branch of, 42
 Ferguson, James, 234
 Ferguson, Niall, 142, 147
 Finnemore, 99
 Fitna wa fasad, 182
 Five Powers Defence Arrangement (FPDA), 103
Foreign Affairs, 20
 France, 22, 23, 28, 50, 51, 74, 89, 91, 93, 121, 154, 56, 170, 185, 190, 192, 207, 211, 12, 228, 29
 France England wars, 168
 France Germany wars, 168
 Franco German Steel and Coal Agreement, 220
 French Union's Expeditionary Corps, 50, 51
 From Modernity to Chineseness, 128
 Fues, Thomas, 240
 Fukuda, 225

 G 20, 119, 123
 G 8, 111, 119, 121, 123, 141
 Gaddis, John Lewis, 2, 57
 Gandhi, Mahatma, 10, 73, 221, 239
 Gandhi, Rajiv, 9
 Ge Jianxiong, 134
 Gender Development Index Ranking, 173
 Geneva Accords, 51, 52
 Geneva Agreement (1954), 51
 Geneva Conference (1954), 26, 50, 51, 54
 Geneva Peace Accords (14 April 1988), 68
 Geneva Protocol (1925), 203
 Geneva Summit, 29
 Georgia, 23, 173, 223, 226, 30
 Germany, 16, 22, 23, 89, 91, 92, 115, 121, 216, 17, 220, 222, 226, 29; Government of, 227; Unification of, 29
 Germs Weapons Convention, 102
 Ghana, 192

 Glasnost, 29, 37
 Gorbachev, M., 29, 37, 56, 68, 211
 Government of India Act (1935), 78
 Grand Chessboard American Primacy and Its Geostrategic Imperatives, 142
 Great Britain see United Kingdom
 Great Leap Forward, 24, 128
 Great Middle East Initiative, 141
 Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, 25
 Greenpeace movement, 9
 Guan Yang, 127
 Guatemala, 29
 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, 52
 Gulf of Tonkin, 52
 Gulf War (1991), 57, 145, 49
 Guomindang forces, 36

 Haas, Richard, 140
 Habermas, Jurgen, 238
 Habyarimana regime, 170
 Hadiths, 179, 181
 Hakimiyya, 182
 Haly Flight, 177
 Hamas, 3, 183, 84
 Han Degiang, 127
 Hanoi, 50, 53, 55
 Hekmatyar, Gulbuddin, 63, 65, 67, 69
 Held, David, 238, 240
 Helsinki Agreement between NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, 19
 Heng Samrin, 26, 55
 Hezb i Islami, 63, 67
 High Panel on Threats, Challenge and Change, 101
 Himalayan glaciers, 115
 Hiroshima, 16, 145, 204, 209
 Hiroshima Nagasaki Appeal, 9
 Ho Chi Minh, 50, 51, 52, 55
 Hobsbawm, Eric, 4, 10, 149, 50
 Holland, 22, 27
 Holy War, 176, 179, 80
 Hong Kong, 74
 Hu Augang, 127
 Hu Jintao, Delhi visit of, 117, 132
 Hu Qiaomu, 126
 Hu Shesheng, 223
 Hungary, 22, 23
 Husain ibn Ali, 183

 IAEA, 40, 209
 ICJ, 237
 Illegal Actions Initiatives, 41
 IMF, 111, 115, 119, 123, 125, 127, 216, 219

- India, 4 5, 24 27, 30, 51, 72 77, 79 81, 83, 90 91, 97 98, 101, 103 4, 106, 110 13, 116 22, 125, 152 56, 168 69, 189, 191 92, 208, 212, 216, 218, 221, 222, 225, 228 29; Chinese attack (1962) on, 15, 27; MEA of, 119; Nuclear tests (1974) by, 76, 155, 212 (1998) by, 212
 India China Declaration on Principles for Relations and Comprehensive Cooperation (June 2003, Beijing), 105
 India EU relations, 113
 Indian army, 27, 76
 Indian Muslims, 79
 Indian Ocean, 161, 222 24
 India Pakistan wars (1947 48, 1965, 1971), 2, 75, 79, 156, 205
 India US nuclear deal, 121, 224
 Indo China, 26, 51, 55
 Indo Chinese Communist Party, 50, 55
 Indonesia, 8, 26 27; Gestapu killings in, 28, 171
 Indonesian Communist Party, 26
 Indo Soviet Friendship, 25
 Indo Soviet Treaty of Peace and Friendship, 27
 Indo US nuclear deal, 94, 212
 Inter Korean issues, 157, 161
 Inter Korean Summit (June 2000), 39
 Intermediate Nuclear Force Agreement (1987), 19
 International Control Commission, 51
 International Court of Justice (ICJ), 203
 International Criminal Court, 238
 International Geophysical Year (IGY 1957 58), 189
 International Islamic Front, 28
 International Polar Year (2007 8), 197
 International Seabed Authority (ISA), 195
 Inter Services Intelligence Agency (ISI), 63, 65, 67, 69
 Iqbal, Mohammad, 73
 Iran, 2, 28, 29, 38, 58, 61, 64 65, 67, 74, 76, 81, 91, 115, 121, 153, 204 5, 207, 210, 224; Revolution (1978 79) in, 58, 66; Shah of, 76
 Iran Iraq war (1980 88), 58, 74
 Iraq, 2 3, 28, 29, 38, 57, 94 95, 102 4, 160, 171, 185, 204, 220, 229; Bathist regime in, 90; UN resolution (June 2004) on, 90; US invasion of, 90, 93
 Islamabad, 68, 81 82
 Islamic terrorism, 9
 Ismay, Lord, 23
 Israel, 8, 28, 30, 58, 95, 115, 183, 185
 Israeli Arrow 2, 155
 Israeli Green Pine radar, 212
 ISRO, 155
 Italy, 22, 121, 203, 226, 228
 Jaguar, 119, 155
 Jahiliyya, 182
 Jamiat i Islami Afghanistan, 63, 67
 Japan, 6 8, 16, 25, 30, 37, 43, 45, 50, 73, 92, 110, 113, 117 18, 123, 125, 128, 148, 152 54, 156, 158 61, 196, 203, 207, 217 18, 222 25; US Soviet victory over, 20
 Japan India maritime exercises, 224
 Jharkhand, 169
 Ji Xianlin, 130
 Jiang Zemin, 126, 131 32
 Jiang Zhu, 132
 Jihad al nafs, 180
 Jihad, 66, 176 80, 182
 Jinnah, Mohammed Ali, 73, 81
 Johnson, Lyndon, 18, 52 53
 Jordan, 28, 57
 Kabul, 27, 59 60, 63 65, 68 69
 Kagan, Robert, 111, 116, 123
 Kaiser Wilhelm II, 218
 Kaldor, Mary, 171
 Kampuchea, 55 56; Vietnamese invasion (1979) of, 55
 Kargil conflict, 204, 208
 Karzai, Mohammed, 120
 Kashmir, 27 28, 67, 75, 79 81, 106, 168, 171, 184
 Kazakhstan, 207, 229
 Kelly, James, 38, 40
 Kennan, George, 20 22
 Kennedy, John F., 6, 16 18, 52
 Keohane, Robert, 100 101, 106
 Khalq, 62, 64 66
 Khalq Parcham regime (Afghanistan), 27
 Khan, A.Q., 27
 Khmer rouge, 26
 Khomeini, Ayatullah, 29, 58, 66
 Khrushchev, N., 16, 24
 Kim Il Sung, 23 35 37
 Kissinger, Henry, 9, 19, 25, 64, 75 76, 211, 228
 Korea, 2, 6, 8, 18, 34 41, 44 46, 148, 156, 159, 161, 204, 222; Military coup (1961 & 1979), 37; Withdrawal of US troops (June 1949) from, 35; see also North Korea and South Korea

- Korean peninsula, 34 36, 41 42, 46,
 156 57, 162; Five working groups on
 the denuclearisation of, 42
 Korean War (1950 53), 6, 34 38, 40 42,
 44 45, 57
 Kosovo, 90, 98, 121, 131, 228 30;
 NATO action in, 131
 Kremlin, 3, 65, 224
 Kuomintang, 24
 Kurdish Partiya Karkeren Kurdistan,
 185
 Kurdish secessionism, 90
 Kurds, 8
 Kuwait, 29, 58, 110, 146 47, 220, 222;
 Iraqi invasion of, 57
 Kyoto Protocol on Climate Change,
 102, 115, 119
- La Drang, 53
 Ladakh, 168
 Land Rover, 119
 Laos, 51
 Latin America, 2 3, 141
 Layne, Christopher, 92 93
 League of Nations, 106
 Lebanese Hezbollah, 58
 Lebanon, 58, 147; Iraqi invasion (1982)
 of, 58; US intervention (1958) in, 58
 Lee Myung Bak, 158 60
 Les Aspin's Bottom Up Review, 144
 Li Shao Qi, 24 25
 Li Shenzhi, 134
 Liangbiao Cheng, 193
 Liberal Peace concept, 167
 Libya, 64, 153
 Lin Yifu, 127
 Lisbon, 143
 Louisiana, 208
 Luxembourg, 22
- Macao Bank, 41
 Madrid Protocol, 196
 Major Regional Contingencies, 144
 Malacca, 161
 Malaya, 74
 Malaysia, 103, 192, 222
 Manchuria, 218
 Manderson, Peter, 119
 Mangolia, 161, 223
 Manila Pact, 74
 Manipur, 168, 172
 Mao Dze Dung, 16, 23 25, 36, 55, 124,
 128 29, 134
 Marshall Plan, 21 22
- Marx, Karl, 3
 Massoud, Ahmad Shah, 63, 67 69
 Matsu, 24
 Maududi, A.A., 182
 May Fourth Movement, 130
 Mcnamara, Robert, 18, 26, 52 53
 Mearsheimer, John, 93 95
 Mecca, 180, 182
 Meccan tribes, 177
 Medina, 180
 Merkel, Angela, 119
 Merrill Lynch, 111
 MFN status, 126
 Middle East Defence Organization, 74
 Middle East, 2, 8, 57 58, 88, 95, 115,
 140 42, 153, 160, 204, 207
 Mirage 2000 H, 155
 Missile Control Technology Regime, 207
 Militarized Operations on Urbanized
 Terrain (MOUT), 145
 Mittal, L.K., 110
 Modelski, George, 87
 Mohamad Yusuf, Prime Minister of
 Afghanistan, 62
 Mohammad Daoud, 60 64
 Mohammad Zahir Shah, King of
 Afghanistan, 60 63, 67
 Mohammadzai e royal family, 60
 Monetary Authority of Macao, 42
 Morgenthau Plan, Germany, 22
 Morgenthau, Hans J., 93
 Morocco, 27 28
 Moscow Olympics, 20
 Moscow Summit (2002), 211
 Moscow, 16, 20, 22, 24, 55, 61 62,
 64 65, 68, 91, 113, 118, 229
 Mossadeq, Mohammad, 58
 Mozambique, 29
 Muharram, 183
 Mujahideen, 19, 27, 63, 67, 69
 Murphy's Law, 204
 Musharraf, Parvez, 80
 Muslim League, 81
 Mutual Defence Agreement between
 USA and Paksitan, 74
 Myanmar, 116, 118, 171, 224, 237
- N 5 countries, 207
 Naga movement, 168 168
 Nagasaki, 16, 145, 204, 209
 Nagorno Karabakh, 23
 Naim, Mohammad, 64
 Najibullah, 68
 Napoleon, 140

- Nasser, Abdel Gamal, 9
 Nasserite radical Arab nationalism, 58
 National Defense University, 145
 National Liberation Front, 53 54
 National Science Foundation (NSF), 193
 National Security Archives, 147
 National Security Strategy (NSS), 143
 NATO, 16, 18, 20 23, 54, 74 75, 90,
 92 95, 102 3, 105, 128, 131, 152,
 211 12, 222 23, 226 27, 229;
 Bucharest summit of, 227, 229
 Naxalite movement, 169 70
 Nehru, Jawaharlal, 4, 9, 16, 25, 28,
 73 74, 239
 Neocon network conspiracy, 143 44
 Nepal, 118, 168, 171 72, 225; King of, 172
 Netanyahu, Benjamin, 144
 New Delhi, 80, 106
 New Left, 124, 127, 129, 132, 143
 New Zealand, 74, 103, 190
 Ngo Dinh Diem, 51 52
 Nicaragua, Sandanista regime in, 29
 Nigeria, 192
 Nihara, 181
 Nixon Administration, 223
 Nixon Doctrine of 'Two Pillar', 142
 Nixon, Richard, 16, 25, 37, 53, 64,
 75 76; Visit to China of, 37
 Nonaligned movement, 9, 28, 76
 North Africa, 141
 North Korea, 6, 8, 23, 30, 34 36, 38 46,
 157, 159, 161, 171, 207, 210; Light
 water reactor project in, 40; US
 financial sanctions on, 34
 North Korean nuclear crisis, 34, 38, 39,
 158
 North Korean Nuclear Proliferation, 103
 North Uganda, 120
 North Vietnam, 30, 52 55
 North Vietnamese Communism, 26
 Northeast Asia, 3, 40, 44 46, 207
 Northeast Asian region, 156, 161
 North South Joint declaration (15 June
 2000), 39
 Norway, 190
 Noth, Albrecht, 178
 NSC 68 policy document, 20 21
 Nuclear Non Proliferation Treaty
 (NPT), 38, 41, 155, 206, 211 12;
 North Korea's withdrawal from, 38
 Nuclear Posture Review (second), 154
 Nunn, Sam, 9, 211, 228
 Nuremberg, 233
 Nye, Joseph, 224
 Obama Administration, 9, 95, 158
 Obama, Barrack, 113
 October 3, 2007, second phase actions
 agreement, 42 44, 46
 OECD, 115
 OIC, 76
 Olympic Games (2000), 128
 Oman, 146, 222
 Ong, Aihwa, 235
 Open Door policy, 124 25
 Operation Passage to Freedom, 52
 Opium war, 129
 Organization of Islamic Conference, 111
 Osama Bin Laden, 67, 69, 82, 185
 Ossetia, 226
 Ottawa Convention on Land Mines Ban
 (1997), 101
 Ottoman Empire, 140, 220
 Overseas Development Assistance
 (ODA), 160
 Oxford Analytics, 227
 Pacific Ocean, 125
 Pacific, 50
 Pakistan army, 76, 78, 83
 Pakistan, 19, 25, 27 28, 30, 57 58, 60 63,
 65 67, 69, 72 83, 118, 147, 156, 172,
 192, 204, 208, 224 25, 230; Eastern wing
 of, 73, 79; General elections (1977) in,
 27; Government of, 78; movement for,
 73; National Assembly of, 27; nuclear
 programme, 82
 Sacking of Chief Justice (March 2007)
 in, 80; Western wing of, 73, 74
 Pakistan US China axis, 27
 Palestine, 30, 171, 173
 Panjshir, 69
 Pape, Robert, 185
 Paracels, 55
 Parcham, 62 66
 Paris Accord (1973), 54
 Paris Agreement on Conventional
 Forces (19 November 1990), 15
 Paris Treaty (1951), 22
 Paris, 52
 Park Chung Hee, 157
 Partial Test Ban Treaty, 25
 Pashtunistan, 60, 63 64
 Pashtuns, 60
 Patriot Act, 42
 Patriot missile defense, 147
 Paul, T.V., 89 90
 Pavlovksy, Gleb, 227
 Pax Americana, 135, 157, 159, 162

- Pax Britannica, 88
 Pax Sinica, 135
 Peng, W., 228
 Pengaton, 52, 144, 146 47, 212
 Pentagon Papers, 54
 People's Democratic Party of
 Afghanistan (PDPA), 62, 64 66, 68
 People's Liberation Army, 25
 Perestroika, 29, 37
 Perle, Richard, 144
 Permissible Action Links, 29
 Perry, William, 211
 Pershing intermediate range missiles, 19
 Persian Gulf, 66, 224
 Persler amendment (1985) in the US
 Congress, 77
 Peshawar, 17, 67
 Philippines, 26, 74, 94, 104, 171, 192,
 222; Moro conflict in, 171
 Phnom Penh, 55
 Pogge, Thomas, 235, 238
 Pol Pot, 26, 28, 55
 Poland, 22 23, 26 27, 51, 121, 146, 226
 Policy of Peace and Prosperity, 161
 Pope Urban II, 179
 Portugal, 119
 Powers, Gary, 17
 Pratt, Andy, 240
 Price, Vincent, 236
 Prithvi Air Defence, 155
 Prithvi missiles, 155
 Program of Action in Illicit Trade in
 Small Arms and Light Weapons, 102
 Prohet Muhammad, 179, 183
 Proliferation Security Initiative, 207
 Protocol on Environmental Protection to
 the Antarctic Treaty (Madrid, 1991), 192
 PSLV rocket, 155 56
 Punjab, 73
 Putin, Valdimir, 110, 113, 211, 226, 228
 Pyongyang Declaration (September
 2002), 40, 42 43
 Pyongyang, 38, 40 41

 Qatar, 222
 Qatlal nafs, 181
 Quemoy, 24
 Quran, 176 79, 183, 186
 Qutb, Sayyid, 182

 Rabbani, Burharuddin, 63, 69
 Rajiv Gandhi's Action Plan in UN
 (1988), 210
 RAND, 145

 Reagan administration, 20, 82
 Reagan doctrine of 'strategic consensus',
 142
 Reagan, Ronald, 29, 67 68, 77, 204
 Reliable Replacement Plan, 212
 Republic of Vietnam, 51
 Republican Party, 38 39
 Responsibility to Protect (2007), 101
 Revolution in Military Affairs, 145
 Reykjavik Summit, 29, 68
 Rio Earth Summit (1992), 195
 Riyadh, 68
 Rodong missile, 161
 Roh Government, 161
 Roh Moo Hyun, 157
 ROK, 223
 ROK Japan alliance, 157 58
 ROK US alliance, 157, 159 60
 ROK US Japan trilateral mutual
 assistance structure, 159
 Roman Empire, 143
 Romania, 23, 30, 75
 Rome Statute of the International
 Criminal Court, 102
 Rome, 63
 Roosevelt, Franklin, D., 57
 Ruggie, John, 100
 Rumsfeld, Donald, 143 44
 Russia, 17, 24, 26, 87 92, 94 95, 97,
 104, 106, 110 13, 116 19, 121, 123,
 143, 152 54, 156, 158 61, 185, 207,
 211 12, 216 19, 226 30
 Russia China India Strategic Triangle, 103
 Russian Far East, 42
 Russian Orthodox Church, 19
 Rwanda, 170 71, 205

 SA 2 missiles, 17
 Saakashvilli, Mikhail, 229
 SAARC, 106, 220
 Sadat, Anwar al, 64, 182
 Saddam Hussein, 29, 58, 148, 185
 Sagarika missile, 14, 55, 212
 Saigon, 50, 52, 54
 Sarkozy, Nicolas, 119, 229
 Saudi Arabia, 19, 28, 29, 57, 64, 67, 76,
 78, 143, 147, 153
 Savimbi, Jonas, 29
 Saygaf, Abdurrasul, 63
 Schiller, Nina Glick, 236, 238
 Schroeder, 90
 Schultz, George, 211
 Scientific Committee on Antarctic
 Research, 192

- SEATO, 16, 20, 103, 105
Second Cold War, The (published by IDSA), 20
 Second Indo China War, 52
 Sen, Amartya, 171, 240
 September 11, 2001 attack, 69, 77, 95, 135, 152, 184
 September 19, 2005 Joint statement by US and North Korea, 41 46
 Serbia, 26, 94
 Shah Mahmoud Khan, 60
 Shah of Iran, 58, 64, 148
 Shanghai Communiqué (1972), 37
 Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), 87, 91, 103, 106
 Sheng, Andrew, 219
 Sheng Hong, 130
 Shi Zong, 128 29
 Shultz, G., 228
 Siam, 73
 Siberia, 218, 226
 Sikkim, 116
 Silicon Valley, 235
 Singapore, 74, 103, 110, 118, 222 23
 Singh, Manmohan, 117, 119
 Sinhala majority, 170
 Sino Soviet conflict, 25
 Sino Soviet rivalry, 54, 56
 Six Party Talks, 34, 41 46, 103, 160 61;
 Heads of Delegation meeting (July 2008) of, 34, 43 44
 SLV rocket, 155 56
 Smith, Walter Bedell, 51
 Socialist Republic of Vietnam, 54
 Solana, Javier, 119
 Solidarity movement, 19
 Somalia, 20, 29, 94, 171
 South Africa, 29, 97, 190, 192, 207
 South Asia, 204, 205, 210, 222
 South China Sea, 55, 161
 South Korea, 23, 30, 34 39, 44 45, 83, 156 62, 171, 207, 222, 226; North Korean invasion of, 30
 South Ossetia, 228 30
 South Vietnam, 30, 52, 54
 South Vietnamese Air Force (ARVN), 53
 Southeast Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO), 74 76, 79 81, 83,
 Southeast Asia, 53, 56, 72 73, 104, 118, 142
 Southeast Asian nations, 26, 223, 225
 Southern Polar Region, 197
 Soviet bloc, 125, 129
 Soviet Communist Party, 19, 29; 20th Party Congress of, 22, 24
 Soviet Democratic Federation, 29
 Soviet Pacific borders, 16
 Soviet Politburo, 65
 Spain, 121, 208
 Special Economic Zones (SEZ), 125
 Spratlys, 55
 Sri Lanka, 116, 118, 170, 172 172, 185, 192, 224; Tamil Tigers in, 171
 SS 20 missiles, 19
 Stalin, J., 23, 24, 37
 Stalin, Josef, 60 61
 Star Wars programme, 20
 START, 101, 228
 Stewart, Francis, 170
 Stinger missile, 68
 Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT), 19
 Structural Adjustment Policies (SAPs), 169
 Sttefek, Jens, 237
 Su Dynasty, 161
 Sub Saharan Africa, 235
 Sudan, 153
 Sukarno, A., 26
 Sunshine Policy, 161
 Sweden, 207
 Synder, Glenn, 93 94
 Syria, 28, 144
 Tadjbakhsh, 169
 Tagore, Rabindranath, 239
 Taiwan Relations Act, 25
 Taiwan, 24, 30, 36, 83, 128, 131, 136, 207
 Taliban, 59, 69, 77, 82, 152, 158
 Taliban Osama bin Laden nexus, 82
 Tampa, 143
 Tan Sitong, 130
 Taqfir, 182
 Taqhat, 182
 Taqiyya, 181
 Taraki, Noor Mohammed, 62, 64 65
 Tashkent accord, 27
 Tata Steel, 110
 Teheran, 68
 Tet (Vietnamese New Year), 53
 Thailand, 74, 171; Separatist conflicts in, 171
 The China that can say No, 128, 133
 Tiananmen Incident (1989), 125 26, 133
 Tibet, 168
 Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), 197
 Trading with the Enemy Act, 42 43
 Treanor, Paul, 147

- Treaty of friendship between Vietnam and USSR (1978), 55
Treaty of Rome, 22
Treaty of San Francisco (1951), 37
Truman Doctrine, 11, 142
TU 16 bomber, 16 17
Turkey, 16, 24, 29, 57, 74, 90, 185, 223
- UK, 25, 28, 51, 73 75, 91, 93, 103, 106, 147, 149, 153 56, 190, 206, 211, 216, 220
Ukraine, 23, 223, 226, 229
ULFA, 168
Umma, 181
Ummayyads, 183
UN Atomic Energy Commission, 210
UN Charter, 106
UN Conventions on the Law of the Sea, 195
UN forces, 24
UN General Assembly, 28, 212
UN Peacekeeping operations, 160
UN Security Council, 23 24, 90, 106, 111, 116, 118, 121, 123, 224
UN, 23, 34, 36, 51, 68, 75, 80, 89, 94, 97 98, 100 102, 104 6, 115 16, 119, 125, 160, 192
UNCLOS III, 195
UNEP, 194
UNGA, 237
Uruguay, 191
US administration, 15
US Air Force, 52
US Congress, 43, 52, 117, 144, 147
US Defence Dept., 143, 146
US House of Representatives, 39
US policy of containment of USSR, 58
US Presidential elections (November 2000), 39
US Senate, 39, 101
US State Department, 144
US Treasury Department, 42
US War on Terror, 152
US, 34, 37 38, 39, 41 45, 97 98, 100, 102, 104 6, 184, 189 90, 192, 194, 204 5, 207 9, 211 12, 222 23, 226 30; Declaration of Acheson Live in January 1980 by, 36; Govt of, 36, 43
USA, 15 30, 50, 52 56, 57 59, 61 62, 65 69, 72 77, 79 81, 83, 87 92, 94 95, 110 13, 116 19, 123, 124 28, 132 35, 140 44, 146 49, 215 20, 240; Govt of, 75 76; September 11, 2001 terrorist attack on, 40
- US China alignment, 75
US China relations, 225 26
USFK vehicle, 157
US India atomic cooperation agreement, 156
US Iranian alliance, 58
US Pakistan alliance, 77, 81 82
US Soviet rivalry, 226 27
USSR, 15, 16 24, 27 30, 35 37, 38, 50 51, 55, 57 69, 73 75, 80, 82, 98, 102 4, 116 17, 125, 128, 133, 142 43, 154 55, 189 90, 204 5, 207 9, 211 12, 215
Uttar Pradesh, 168
Uzbekistan, 94, 223
- Venezuela, 153
Viet Minh, 50 51
Vietnam war, 26, 50, 52, 54 55, 142
Vietnam, 16, 18 19, 26, 30, 50 51, 52 56, 125, 204, 208, 215, 222 23, 226; Chinese attack on 26; Provisional division at the 17th parallel of, 51
Vietnamese National Army, 50
Vilinius Conference (May 2006, Lithuania), 227
Vladivostok, 142
- Wade, James P., 145
Wahabi cult, 27
Wallerstein, Immanuel, 129
Waltz, Kenneth, 91 94
Wang Desheng, 130
Wang Hui, 129
Wang Shaogang, 127
Wang Yichuan, 128
Warsaw Pact, 22, 29, 227
Wartime Operational Control by 2012, 160
Washington, 38, 40, 55, 58, 61, 64, 66, 77, 81 82, 89, 116, 118, 128
Wassenar Arrangement, 207
Wen Jiabao, 132
Wen Tiejun, 127
West Asia, 19, 58, 140 43, 146
West Asian Islam, 19
West Germany, 22, 30
West Pakistan, 27, 76, 81
Westphalian vision, 99
Western Europe, 16, 19, 22, 30, 142, 221
WHO, 237,
Wilhelmine, Germany, 91
Wittgesteiman, 236
Wohlforth, William, 88, 91

- Wolfowitz, Paul, 143 44
Working Group on Normalization of
DPRK US relations, 43
World Bank, 119, 123, 125, 127, 167,
169, 216
World Free of Nuclear Weapons, 210
WTO, 111, 124, 127 28, 131, 133 34,
225; Doha Round of, 110
Wurmser, David, 144
WWI, 91, 106, 203, 216
WWII, 15 16, 22 23, 26, 50, 53 54, 57,
60, 66, 91, 98, 102 3, 105, 203, 208,
216, 220, 224
- Xiao Gongin, 130
- Yalu border, 24
Yalu river, 23
- Yan Xuetong, 136
Yeltsin, Boris, 19
Yenan, 23
Yongbyon nuclear facilities, 43; North
Korea's promise to shut down, 42
Yugoslavia, 23, 30, 95, 127, 227
- Zambia, 192
Zhang Fa, 128
Zhang Kuan, 128
Zhang Yiwu, 128
Zhao Ziyang, 125
Zhou Xiachuan, 127
Zhu Rongu, 131
Zia ul Haq, 65 66, 76 77
Zimbabwe, 115, 237
Zinni, Anthony, 143
Zurn, Michael, 237