

# Post Cold War Global Order

Kent Neal





# **POST COLD WAR GLOBAL ORDER**



# **POST COLD WAR GLOBAL ORDER**

Kent Neal



Post Cold War Global Order  
by Kent Neal

Copyright© 2022 BIBLIOTEX

[www.bibliotex.com](http://www.bibliotex.com)

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or used in any manner without the prior written permission of the copyright owner, except for the use brief quotations in a book review.

To request permissions, contact the publisher at [info@bibliotex.com](mailto:info@bibliotex.com)

Ebook ISBN: 9781984662453



Published by:

Bibliotex

Canada

Website: [www.bibliotex.com](http://www.bibliotex.com)

# Contents

<b>Chapter 1</b>	Introduction .....	1
<b>Chapter 2</b>	Emergence of the Third World and Global War Order.....	62
<b>Chapter 3</b>	The Gulf War and Post Cold War Culture.....	90
<b>Chapter 4</b>	The Implementation of the UN Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy and Post Cold War .....	140





## **Chapter 1**

# **Introduction**

## **The Rationale of Disarmament and Cold War Period**

Disarmament is necessary for maintaining peace and progress of the human culture. The rising stockpiles of armaments, continuing enlargement of the armed forces and the rising investment for research and growth of the weapon technology of the world pose fresh threats to peace and growth of the human race. The invention and growth of nuclear weapons have posed the threat of total annihilation of the human race in the event of another world war. All these have made the people more conscious in relation to the disarmament because only the elimination of these weapons can ease the tension in the world and remove the fear of any world wide holocaust. The invention and growth of sophisticated military technology has made all countries vulnerable. None can be self-enough in protection. It is impossible for any single country to defend itself from the attack of any other country. Therefore disarmament is the only method to create the world safe. The rising investment in the military industry is also consuming money and useful possessions which otherwise could be diverted to the growth sectors. In the context of the rising

poverty in big sections of the world, the rising investment in military industry can further augment the poverty and accentuate the social tension in every community of the world. The vast expenditure in the protection sector can only be stopped or decreased if the disarmament at least of incomplete kind is achieved. In the wake of the Second World War efforts for disarmament increased. Immediately after the war, the USA put forward a proposal, named as the Baruch Plan. In response to the US plan, the USSR came out with the Gromyko Plan which was diametrically opposed to the Baruch Plan. After the failure of these plans, more plans were proposed through both the sides. In 1955 the USA proposed the Open Skies Plan. It was also rejected. The plans and proposals therefore advanced through the dissimilar powers were therefore intended that the proposer's monopoly in excess of its weapons remained frozen indefinitely. In 1950's both the USA and the USSR were placed under new administration. In USA Dwight D. Eisenhower came in power following presidential election in 1952 and in the USSR due to Stalin's death a new leadership appeared. Besides, the USSR acquired the capacity of creation of nuclear weapons. It brought the USSR close to the nuclear capacity of the USA. These growths created the method to achieve some success in disarmament.

In 1963 an agreement was signed. It has banned the nuclear tests in the atmosphere (in outer atmosphere and under water). In 1967 another agreement was signed to stop the deployment of

the nuclear weapon in outer legroom. Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty was signed in 1968. The treaty has banned the acquisition of nuclear power capacity through non-nuclear nations. The treaty was not signed through a few countries including India. India has termed the treaty as discriminatory. In 1971 another treaty was brought into the world book of statute, which has banned the deployment of nuclear arms in sea bed and ocean floor. In 1972 the convention on banning the biological weapons was held. SALT-I and SALT-II were signed in 1972 and 1979 respectively. Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) began in early 1970's flanked by the USA and the USSR. The First ALT agreement was signed in 1972. It is a treaty limiting the stockpiling of the Antiballistic Missile systems (ABM). The negotiations for SALT-II had started in 1974 and ended in 1979 with the signing of the agreement through the USA and the USSR. As per the conditions, the high contracting states agreed to destroy a portion of the arms in their arsenals. Though, the treaty has remained non-ratified. The American senate did not ratify the treaty. But it was implemented without official sanctions. Another non-ratified treaty is the threshold Test Ban Treaty which was signed in 1974 through the USA and the USSR. It prohibited all tests with a yield of 150 kilotons. In 1987 the Intermediate Range Nuclear forces (INF) was signed flanked by the USA and the USSR. The Treaty sanctioned for the destruction of intermediate range land-based nuclear weapons, stocked through both countries. All these agreements however

have not made the world free from deadly weapons; have registered some progress towards the desired goal of disarmament.

Peace is an eternal desire of a human being. It is measured to be one of the highest values of life. The quotations like "Peace at any price", "The mainly disadvantageous peace is bigger than the mainly presently war." "Peace is more significant than all justice." "I prefer the mainly unjust peace to the justice war that was ever waged." "There never was a good war or bad peace." Illustrate -how valuable peace has been. The New Testament defines peace as absence of dissension, violence of war. Peace is also measured as concord, harmony, agreement flanked by the two or more, tranquility, quiet, *etc.* Peace is contrary to antagonistic hostilities, violence, or war. Peace is freedom from or the cessation of war. It is a state of freedom from war.

A big number of peace concepts, proposals, and plans have been put forward therefore distant for the realization of the everlasting peace-an eternal dream of the human being. In order to achieve peace several plans have been contemplated. Proposals for establishing federations of states, signing of treaties flanked by and in excess of nations and people, setting up of courts of arbitration, reforming the legal organization and several other proposals have therefore distant been advocated. The concept of peace changes in response to the

charge in the context and characters of the ages. In medieval Europe the concept of peace was recognized with the slogan of the unification of the Christian world against the invasions of the 'infidels'. The concept of peace was given communal orientations. Throughout the similar era a few scholars of course talked in relation to the secular peace. In the subsequent ages the peace concept became more secular and acquired universal contents. In the wake of the industrial revolution in England peace was demanded because it was establish to be helpful for the growth of capitalist community. In the years of Revolution the French people gave dissimilar orientation to the concept of peace. Cause and vital human rights became the contents of the concept of peace. With the emergence of national states the thought of federation of states or nations and the organization of arbitration in international relations started coming to the fore.

When the wars began to be measured as patriotic acts and accordingly people were being mobilized to fight in the wars, people started becoming aware of the necessity for peace. Peace now became the people's concern. In 19th century peace societies and movements began to approach up and international peace conferences and institutions were founded for the first time. With the birth of Marxism and Marxist movements in mid 19th century a new approach took birth in the peace movement. It is being propagated that peace can be achieved only by the vital social transformation of the

community. A classless community is only capable to set up peace. Today we have two concepts of peace, which are offered to each other-Bourgeois concept and Marxist concept.

## **Peace Movements**

The publication of Saint-Simon's "The Reorganization of European Community" coincided with the basis of the peace societies. The first peace community was founded in the United States. Europe followed the suit. Early peace societies were occupied in the debates in excess of the issues like presently and unjust wars require of violence, colonialism, *etc.* Debates slowly arose in excess of the subjects such as linking peace with social issues, like the slavery, the emancipation of women, universal education and other human rights.

The national peace societies slowly felt require of international movement. From mid 19th century international peace conferences began to be held. These international congresses debated in excess of the issues of establishing world organization of nations and of setting up of the international court of arbitration to solve the clash. These peace congresses also discussed the questions of freedom of the colonial peoples.

The individualists came out with the concept that peace would be achieved through implementing the principle of free deal in the middle of the states. Though, all these institutions and the peace movements were dominated through liberal democrats

who passed several radical decisions but failed to implement any of the decisions.

In 1870, the followers of Marxism recognized the first International (The International Working Men's association). The Marxists believe that the transformation of community is the principal substance of the working class movement and the transformed community can only guarantee the world peace.

*The state International passed a historic settlement which states that:*

- "The burden of war is borne largely through the working class, in as much as war does not only deprive the workers of the means of existence but compels them to shed one another's blood. Armed peace paralyses the forces of manufacture, asks the workers nothing but useless labour peace, which it is the first requisite of common well-being, necessity be consolidated through a new order of things which shall no longer recognize in community and subsistence of two classes, one of which is exploited through another."

The inception of the Marxist peace movement added a new dimension in the ongoing peace movement and rested the leadership of the movement from the idealist leaders of the movement. Through the beginning of the 20th century, a big number of peace societies had appeared on the international arena. But these societies failed to stop the breaking out of the

First World War in 1914. Throughout the war, mainly of the peace societies gave up their idealistic universal stand and responded to the nationalist call. After the War, new proposals, and plans like Lenin's Decrees on peace, President Wilson's Fourteen Points, *etc.*, were placed before the world. But the Second World War could not be stopped. The Second World War was mainly horrifying and mainly murderous weapon, the atom bomb was used in the war for the first time. The war has left a horrifying impact on the people of the world. The war ended with the beginning of a new age named as Nuclear Age. The new age gave birth to new fears and also dangers of total destruction of the civilization if the nuclear war ever broke out. Therefore the fears of nuclear war provide birth to new peace concepts, new debates and new movements.

In dissimilar countries of the world the Council urbanized the organizational network. These institutions propagated the ideals of world peace. The writers, philosophers, artists of world fame joined this movement. Even Burtrand Russel the well-known novelist cum philosopher also joined this movement. But the United States went on condemning the emerging peace movement in the post world war era as the ploy of the USSR and the communists.

Despite the condemnation, the movement spread for and wide in the world. Now there are many peace institutions, which are not only propagating the ideals of peace, they have also added



an academic dimension to the movement through encouraging research and identifying the troubles and other linked issues. Several institutions are working as the think tank for the peace movement.

## **India, and Peace Movements and Disarmament**

India is a peace loving nation. It achieved independence from centuries old British colonial rule by peaceful non-violent movements. India has an extensive custom of peace and apathy towards war of any type. Ashoka the Great renounced the use of weapon and abandoned the principles of war. This is one of the earliest examples of disarmament. Till the arrival of the Europeans in India, the Kings had fought wars and battles. But these battles did not affect the lives and properties of the general citizens. Pursuing the custom of peace, India at the extremely dawn of its independence declared peace as the cornerstone of its policies. In 1954 India took the initiative to ban the nuclear tests. India's first Prime Minister, Jawaharlal Nehru proposed at the U.N. a standstill agreement in respect of the atomic tests. He knew that the total destruction of the existing weapons was not possible, therefore he wanted to stop the tests therefore that there might not be further escalation of nuclear weapons. Several countries of the world supported the view, but the large powers hardly paid any heed to the proposal. Though, the proposal set the ball of disarmament in motion and countries in the UN became vocal in support of

peace and disarmament. Consequently from early 1960s new initiatives towards the direction of disarmament started.

## **India and NPT**

The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) was concluded in 1967, kept open for signature in 1968 and was promulgated in 1970 for an era of 25 years. The NPT has been extended unconditionally and indefinitely through its Review and Extension Conference held in New York from 17th April to 12th May, 1995. The 1995 Conference has not suggested any transform, alteration, or modification of its provisions. The Conference even has not produced any review document. 178 states signed the treaty and 13 countries including India did not sign the NPT.

The NPT seems to be a pious effort to stop the proliferation of nuclear weapon technology. Its contents, though, bear ample evidences to set up the information that the five nuclear states who are also the veto-wielding permanent members of the Security Council, intend to monopolize the nuclear technology and to set up their hegemony in excess of the world. The NPT demands that the present non-nuclear states and the states which are on the threshold of acquiring the nuclear capacity necessity stop the research and creation of nuclear weapons. India objected to such a treaty calling it discriminatory. India has categorically declared that it will not sign the Treaty in its present form because its indefinite extension only serves to

perpetuate its discriminatory characteristics which have created a division flanked by the nuclear "haves" and "have nots".

## **India and CTBT**

The concept of Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty was mentioned in the NPT. The CTBT has been intended to realize the objective of common and complete nuclear disarmament. The CTBT in present form, though, is not designed to create the weapon free world free from nuclear weapons. It would neither actually reduce the number of nuclear weapons, nor decrease the present offensive capabilities of the nuclear weapon states. The treaty asks the non-nuclear states not to go for testing of nuclear devices therefore preventing them from emerging as nuclear capable states. It has no provision for reducing the nuclear capabilities of the weapon states. Like the NPT, the CTBT too wants to divide the world into nuclear haves and have-nots. India has, so, not signed the CTBT.

After the CTBT was ratified in 1996, negotiations on another treaty to cut off fissile material manufacture have started in January, 1997. The proposed Fissile Material manufacture Cut-off Treaty (FMCT) seeks to put a cut-off point in the sphere of fissile material manufacture. India has refused to be a party in the FMCT. It has opposed the treaty on the similar grounds that India put forward while opposing the NPT and the CTBT. In information all the three treaties have been intended in a

method that the nuclear weapon states can manage the nuclear technology and uphold their hegemony in excess of the world. These treaties will not deter the weapon states to sharpen and improve their technology. Because they have reached a level, now they can further improve their technology by computer and other indoor tests which have not been banned. They are also not willing to destroy the existing weapons within a time frame. These treaties, so, are not in a location to eliminate the nuclear weapons leading to common and complete disarmament.

### **Cold War, Patterns And Dimensions**

The Cold War, often dated from 1947 to 1991, was a continued state of political and military tension flanked by powers in the Western Bloc, dominated through the United States with NATO in the middle of its allies, and powers in the Eastern Bloc, dominated through the Soviet Union beside with the Warsaw Pact. This began after the success of their temporary wartime alliance against Nazi Germany, leaving the USSR and the US as two superpowers with profound economic and political differences. A neutral faction arose with the Non-Aligned Movement founded through Egypt, India, and Yugoslavia; this faction rejected association with either the US-led West or the Soviet-led East.

The Cold War was therefore named because the two biggest powers-each possessing nuclear weapons and thereby

threatened with mutual assured destruction-never met in direct military combat. Instead, in their thrash about for global power they occupied in ongoing psychological warfare and in regular indirect confrontations by proxy wars. Cycles of comparative calm would be followed through high tension which could have led to world war. The tensest times were throughout:

- The Berlin Blockade (1948-1949),
- The Korean War (1950-1953),
- The Suez Crisis (1956),
- The Berlin Crisis of 1961,
- The Cuban Missile Crisis (1962),
- The Vietnam War (1959-1975),
- The Yom Kippur War (1973),
- The Soviet war in Afghanistan (1979-1989),
- The Soviet downing of Korean Air Lines Flight 007 (1983), and
- The "Able Archer" NATO military exercises (1983).

The clash was expressed by military coalitions, strategic conventional force deployments, long aid to client states, espionage, huge propaganda campaigns, conventional and nuclear arms races, appeals to neutral nations, rivalry at sports measures, and technical competitions such as the Legroom Race. The US and USSR became involved in political and military conflicts in the Third World countries of Latin America, Africa, the Transitional East, and Southeast Asia. To

alleviate the risk of a potential nuclear war, both sides sought relief of political tensions by détente in the 1970s.

In the 1980s, the United States increased diplomatic, military, and economic pressures on the Soviet Union, at a time when the communist state was already suffering from economic stagnation. In the mid-1980s, the new Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev introduced the liberalizing reforms of perestroika and glasnost. Pressures for national independence grew stronger in Eastern Europe, especially Poland. They reached a breaking point when Gorbachev refused to use Soviet troops to support the faltering government of East Germany in late 1989. Within weeks all the satellite states broke free from Moscow in a peaceful wave of revolutions (there was some violence in Rumania). The pressures escalated inside the Soviet Union, where Communism fell and the USSR was formally dissolved in late 1991. The United States remained as the world's only superpower. The Cold War and its measures have left an important legacy, and it is often referred to in popular civilization, especially in media featuring themes of espionage and the threat of nuclear warfare.

## **Origins**

At the end of World War II, English author and journalist George Orwell used cold war, as a common term, in his essay "You and the Atomic Bomb", published October 19, 1945, in the British newspaper Tribune.

*Contemplating a world livelihood in the shadow of the threat of nuclear warfare, Orwell wrote:*

- "For forty or fifty years past, Mr. H. G. Wells and others have been warning us that man is in danger of destroying himself with his own weapons, leaving the ants or some other gregarious species to take in excess of. Anyone who has seen the ruined municipalities of Germany will discover this notion at least thinkable. Nevertheless, looking at the world as an entire, the drift for several decades has been not towards anarchy but towards the reimposition of slavery. We may be heading not for common breakdown but for an epoch as horribly stable as the slave empires of antiquity. James Burnham's theory has been much discussed, but few people have yet measured its ideological implications-that is, the type of world-view, the type of beliefs, and the social structure that would almost certainly prevail in a state which was at once unconquerable and in a permanent state of "cold war" with its neighbours."

In *The Observer* of March 10, 1946, Orwell wrote that "[a]fter the Moscow conference last December, Russia began to create a 'cold war' on Britain and the British Empire." The first use of the term to define the post-World War II geopolitical tensions flanked by the USSR and its satellites and the United States and its western European allies is attributed to Bernard Baruch, an American financier and presidential advisor. In South Carolina, on April 16, 1947, he delivered a speech

(through journalist Herbert Bayard Swope) saying, "Let us not be deceived: we are today in the midst of a cold war." Newspaper reporter-columnist Walter Lippmann gave the term wide currency, with the book *The Cold War*; when asked in 1947 in relation to the source of the term, he referred it to a French term from the 1930s, *la guerre froide*.

## **Backdrop of Cold War**

There is conflict in the middle of historians concerning the starting point of the Cold War. While mainly historians trace its origins to the era immediately following World War II, others argue that it began towards the end of World War I, although tensions flanked by the Russian Empire, other European countries and the United States date back to the transitional of the 19th century.

As a result of the 1917 Bolshevik Revolution in Russia (followed through its withdrawal from World War I), Soviet Russia establish itself in accessible in international diplomacy. Leader Vladimir Lenin stated that the Soviet Union was bounded through a "hostile capitalist encirclement", and he viewed diplomacy as a weapon to stay Soviet enemies divided, beginning with the establishment of the Soviet Comintern, which described for revolutionary upheavals abroad. Subsequent leader Joseph Stalin, who viewed the Soviet Union as a "socialist island", stated that the Soviet Union necessity see that "the present capitalist encirclement is replaced



through a socialist encirclement." As early as 1925, Stalin stated that he viewed international politics as a bipolar world in which the Soviet Union would draw countries gravitating to socialism and capitalist countries would draw states gravitating towards capitalism, while the world was in a era of "temporary stabilization of capitalism" preceding its eventual collapse.

Several measures before the Second World War demonstrated the mutual distrust and suspicion flanked by the Western powers and the Soviet Union, separately from the common philosophical challenge the Bolsheviks made towards capitalism. There was Western support of the anti-Bolshevik White movement in the Russian Civil War, the 1926 Soviet funding of a British common workers strike causing Britain to break relations with the Soviet Union, Stalin's 1927 declaration of peaceful coexistence with capitalist countries "receding into the past," conspiratorial allegations throughout the 1928 Shakhty illustrate trial of a intended British- and French-led coup d'état, the American refusal to recognize the Soviet Union until 1933 and the Stalinist Moscow Trials of the Great Purge, with allegations of British, French, Japanese and Nazi German espionage. Though, both the US and USSR were usually isolationist flanked by the two world wars.

The Soviet Union initially signed a non-aggression pact with Germany. But after the German Army invaded the Soviet Union

in June 1941 and the Japanese bombed Pearl Harbour in December 1941, the Soviet Union and the Allied powers shaped an alliance of convenience. Britain signed a formal alliance and the United States made an informal agreement. In wartime, the United States supplied both Britain and the Soviets by its Lend-Lease Programme. Though, Stalin remained highly defensive and whispered that the British and the Americans had conspired to ensure the Soviets bore the brunt of the fighting against Nazi Germany. The Western Allies had deliberately delayed opening a second anti-German front in order to step in at the last moment and shape the peace resolution. Therefore, Soviet perceptions of the West left a strong undercurrent of tension and hostility flanked by the Allied powers.

The Allies disagreed in relation to the how the European map should seem, and how borders would be drawn, following the war. Each face held different ideas concerning the establishment and maintenance of post-war security. The western Allies desired a security organization in which democratic governments were recognized as widely as possible, permitting countries to peacefully resolve differences by international institutions.

Given the Russian historical experiences of frequent invasions and the immense death toll (estimated at 27 million) and the destruction the Soviet Union continued throughout World War

II, the Soviet Union sought to augment security through dominating the internal affairs of countries that bordered it.

Throughout the war, Stalin had created special training centers for Communists from dissimilar countries therefore that they could set up secret police forces loyal to Moscow as soon as the Red Army took manage. Soviet mediators took manage of the media, especially radio; they quickly harassed and then banned all self-governing civic organizations, from youth groups to schools, churches and rival political parties. Stalin also sought sustained peace with Britain and the United States, hoping to focus on internal reconstruction and economic development.

The Western Allies were divided in their vision of the new post-war world. Roosevelt's goals - military victory in both Europe and Asia, the attainment of global American economic supremacy in excess of the British Empire, and the making of a world peace organization - were more global than Churchill's, which were largely centered on securing manage in excess of the Mediterranean, ensuring the survival of the British Empire, and the independence of Eastern European countries as a buffer flanked by the Soviets and the United Kingdom.

In the American view, Stalin seemed a potential ally in accomplishing their goals, whereas in the British approach Stalin emerged as the greatest threat to the fulfillment of their agenda. With the Soviets already occupying mainly of Eastern

Europe, Stalin was at an advantage and the two western leaders vied for his favours. The differences flanked by Roosevelt and Churchill led to many separate deals with the Soviets. In October 1944, Churchill traveled to Moscow and agreed to divide the Balkans into respective spheres of power, and at Yalta Roosevelt signed a separate deal with Stalin in regard of Asia and refused to support Churchill on the issues of Poland and the Reparations.

Further Allied negotiations regarding the post-war balance took lay at the Yalta Conference in February 1945, albeit this conference also failed to reach a firm consensus on the framework for a post-war resolution in Europe. In April 1945, President Roosevelt died and was succeeded through Harry S. Truman, who distrusted Stalin and turned for advice to an elite group of foreign policy intellectuals. Both Churchill and Truman opposed, in the middle of other things, the Soviets' decision to prop up the Lublin government, the Soviet-controlled rival to the Polish government-in-exile in London, whose relations with the Soviets were severed.

Following the Allies' May 1945 victory, the Soviets effectively engaged Eastern Europe, while strong US and Western allied forces remained in Western Europe. In Allied-engaged Germany, the Soviet Union, United States, Britain and France recognized zones of job and a loose framework for parceled four-power manage.

The 1945 Allied conference in San Francisco recognized the multi-national United Nations (UN) for the maintenance of world peace, but the enforcement capability of its Security Council was effectively paralyzed through individual members' skill to use veto power. The UN was essentially converted into an inactive forum for exchanging polemical rhetoric, and the Soviets regarded it approximately exclusively as a propaganda tribune.

### **Potsdam Conference and Defeat of Japan**

At the Potsdam Conference, which started in late July after Germany's surrender, serious differences appeared in excess of the future growth of Germany and Eastern Europe.

Moreover, the participants' mounting antipathy and bellicose language served to confirm their suspicions in relation to the each other's hostile intentions and entrench their positions. At this conference Truman informed Stalin that the United States possessed a powerful new weapon.

Stalin was aware that the Americans were working on the atomic bomb and, given that the Soviets' own rival programme was in lay, he reacted to the news calmly. The Soviet leader said he was pleased through the news and expressed the hope that the weapon would be used against Japan. One week after the end of the Potsdam Conference, the US bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Shortly after the attacks, Stalin protested to US

officials when Truman offered the Soviets little real power in engaged Japan.

## **Beginnings of the Eastern Bloc**

Throughout the opening levels of World War II, the Soviet Union laid the basis for the Eastern Bloc through directly annexing many countries as Soviet Socialist Republics that were initially ceded to it through Nazi Germany in the Molotov-Ribbentrop Pact.

*These incorporated:*

- Eastern Poland (included into two dissimilar SSRs),
- Latvia (which became the Latvian SSR),
- Estonia (which became the Estonian SSR),
- Lithuania (which became the Lithuanian SSR),
- Section of eastern Finland (which became the Karelo-Finnish SSR) and
- Eastern Romania (which became the Moldavian SSR).

The Eastern European territories liberated from the Nazis and engaged through the Soviet armed forces were added to the Eastern Bloc through converting them into satellite states, such as East Germany, the People's Republic of Poland, the People's Republic of Bulgaria, the People's Republic of Hungary, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, the People's Republic of Romania and the People's Republic of Albania.

The Soviet-approach regimes that arose in the Bloc not only reproduced Soviet command economies, but also adopted the brutal ways employed through Joseph Stalin and Soviet secret police to suppress real and potential opposition. In Asia, the Red Army had overrun Manchuria in the last month of the war, and went on to inhabit the big swathe of Korean territory situated north of the 38th similarity. As section of consolidating Stalin's manage in excess of the Eastern Bloc, the NKVD, led through Lavrentiy Beria, managed the establishment of Soviet-approach secret police systems in the Bloc that were supposed to crush anti-communist resistance.

When the slightest stirrings of independence appeared in the Bloc, Stalin's strategy matched that of relation with domestic pre-war rivals: they were removed from power, put on trial, imprisoned, and in many instances, executed.

British Prime Minister Winston Churchill was concerned that, given the enormous size of Soviet forces deployed in Europe at the end of the war, and the perception that Soviet leader Joseph Stalin was unreliable, there lived a Soviet threat to Western Europe.

### **Preparing for a "New War"**

In February 1946, George F. Kennan's "Extensive Telegram" from Moscow helped to articulate the US government's increasingly difficult row against the Soviets, and became the

foundation for US strategy towards the Soviet Union for the duration of the Cold War. That September, the Soviet face produced the Novikov telegram, sent through the Soviet ambassador to the US but commissioned and "co-authored" through Vyacheslav Molotov; it portrayed the US as being in the grip of monopoly capitalists who were structure up military capacity "to prepare the circumstances for winning world supremacy in a new war".

On September 6, 1946, James F. Byrnes delivered a speech in Germany repudiating the Morgenthau Plan and warning the Soviets that the US designed to uphold a military attendance in Europe indefinitely. As Byrnes admitted a month later, "The nub of our programme was to win the German people [...] it was a battle flanked by us and Russia in excess of minds [...]"

A few weeks after the release of this "Extensive Telegram", former British Prime Minister Winston Churchill delivered his well-known "Iron Curtain" speech in Fulton, Missouri. The speech described for an Anglo-American alliance against the Soviets, whom he accused of establishing an "iron curtain" from "Stettin in the Baltic to Trieste in the Adriatic".

### **Cominform and the Tito-Stalin Split**

In September 1947, the Soviets created Cominform, the purpose of which was to enforce orthodoxy within the international communist movement and tighten political



manage in excess of Soviet satellites by coordination of communist parties in the Eastern Bloc. Cominform faced an embarrassing setback the following June, when the Tito-Stalin split obliged its members to expel Yugoslavia, which remained Communist but adopted a non-aligned location.

## **Containment and the Truman Doctrine**

Through 1947, US president Harry S. Truman's advisers urged him to take immediate steps to counter the Soviet Union's power, citing Stalin's efforts (amid post-war confusion and collapse) to undermine the US through encouraging rivalries in the middle of capitalists that could precipitate another war. In February 1947, the British government announced that it could no longer afford to fund the Greek monarchical military regime in its civil war against communist-led insurgents.

The American government's response to this announcement was the adoption of containment, the goal of which was to stop the spread of communism. Truman delivered a speech that described for the allocation of \$400 million to intervene in the war and unveiled the Truman Doctrine, which framed the clash as a contest flanked by free peoples and totalitarian regimes. Even however the insurgents were helped through Josip Broz Tito's Yugoslavia, US policymakers accused the Soviet Union of conspiring against the Greek royalists in an attempt to expand Soviet power.

Enunciation of the Truman Doctrine marked the beginning of a US bipartisan protection and foreign policy consensus flanked by Republicans and Democrats focused on containment and deterrence that weakened throughout and after the Vietnam War, but ultimately persisted thereafter. Moderate and conservative parties in Europe, as well as social democrats, gave virtually unconditional support to the Western alliance, while European and American Communists, paid through the KGB and involved in its intelligence operations, adhered to Moscow's row, although dissent began to seem after 1956. Other critiques of consensus politics came from anti-Vietnam War activists, the CND and the nuclear freeze movement.

### **Marshall Plan and Czechoslovak Coup d'état**

In early 1947, Britain, France and the United States unsuccessfully attempted to reach an agreement with the Soviet Union for a plan envisioning an economically self-enough Germany, including a detailed accounting of the industrial plants, goods and infrastructure already removed through the Soviets. In June 1947, in accordance with the Truman Doctrine, the United States enacted the Marshall Plan, a pledge of economic assistance for all European countries willing to participate, including the Soviet Union.

The plan's aim was to rebuild the democratic and economic systems of Europe and to counter perceived threats to Europe's balance of power, such as communist parties seizing manage

by revolutions or elections. The plan also stated that European prosperity was contingent upon German economic recovery. One month later, Truman signed the National Security Act of 1947, creating a unified Department of Protection, the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), and the National Security Council (NSC). These would become the largest bureaucracies for US policy in the Cold War.

Stalin whispered that economic integration with the West would allow Eastern Bloc countries to escape Soviet manage, and that the US was trying to buy a pro-US re-alignment of Europe. Stalin so prevented Eastern Bloc nations from getting Marshall Plan aid. The Soviet Union's alternative to the Marshall plan, which was purported to involve Soviet subsidies and deal with Eastern Europe, became recognized as the Molotov Plan (later institutionalized in January 1949 as the Comecon). Stalin was also fearful of a reconstituted Germany; his vision of a post-war Germany did not contain the skill to rearm or pose any type of threat to the Soviet Union.

In early 1948, following reports of strengthening "reactionary elements", Soviet operatives executed a coup d'état in Czechoslovakia, the only Eastern Bloc state that the Soviets had permitted to retain democratic structures. The public brutality of the coup shocked Western powers more than any event up to that point, set in a motion a brief scare that war

would happen and swept absent the last vestiges of opposition to the Marshall Plan in the United States Congress.

The twin policies of the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall Plan led to billions in economic and military aid for Western Europe, Greece, and Turkey. With US assistance, the Greek military won its civil war. The Italian Christian Democrats defeated the powerful Communist-Socialist alliance in the elections of 1948. At the similar time there was increased intelligence and espionage action, Eastern Bloc defections and diplomatic expulsions.

## **Berlin Blockade and Airlift**

The United States and Britain merged their western German job zones into "Bizonia" (January 1, 1947, later "Trizonia" with the addition of France's zone, April 1949). As section of the economic rebuilding of Germany, in early 1948, representatives of a number of Western European governments and the United States announced an agreement for a merger of western German regions into a federal governmental organization. In addition, in accordance with the Marshall Plan, they began to re-industrialize and rebuild the German economy, including the introduction of a new Deutsche Spot currency to replace the old Reichsmark currency that the Soviets had debased.

Shortly thereafter, Stalin instituted the Berlin Blockade (June 24, 1948 - May 12, 1949), one of the first biggest crises of the Cold War, preventing food, materials and supplies from arriving in West Berlin. The United States, Britain, France, Canada, Australia, New Zealand and many other countries began the huge "Berlin airlift", supplying West Berlin with food and other provisions.

The Soviets mounted a public relations campaign against the policy transform. Once again the East Berlin communists attempted to disrupt the Berlin municipal elections (as they had done in the 1946 elections), which were held on December 5, 1948 and produced a turnout of 86.3per cent and an overwhelming victory for the non-Communist parties. The results effectively divided the municipality into East and West versions of its former self. 300,000 Berliners demonstrated and urged the international airlift to continue, and US Air Force pilot Gail Halvorsen created "Operation Vittles", which supplied candy to German children. In May 1949, Stalin backed down and lifted the blockade.

In 1952, Stalin repeatedly proposed a plan to unify East and West Germany under a single government chosen in elections managed through the United Nations if the new Germany were to keep out of Western military alliances, but this proposal was turned down through the Western powers. Some sources dispute the sincerity of the proposal.

# **NATO beginnings and Radio Free Europe**

Britain, France, the United States, Canada, and eight other western European countries signed the North Atlantic Treaty of April 1949, establishing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). That August, the first Soviet atomic device was detonated in Semipalatinsk, Kazakh SSR. Following Soviet refusals to participate in a German rebuilding attempt set forth through western European countries in 1948, the US, Britain and France spearheaded the establishment of West Germany from the three Western zones of job in April 1949. The Soviet Union proclaimed its zone of job in Germany the German Democratic Republic that October.

Media in the Eastern Bloc was an organ of the state, totally reliant on and subservient to the communist party, with radio and television institutions being state-owned, while print media was generally owned through political institutions, mostly through the regional communist party. Soviet propaganda used Marxist philosophy to attack capitalism, claiming labour use and war-mongering imperialism were inherent in the organization.

Beside with the broadcasts of the British Broadcasting Corporation and the Voice of America to Eastern Europe, a

biggest propaganda attempt begun in 1949 was Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty, specialized to bringing in relation to the peaceful demise of the Communist organization in the Eastern Bloc. Radio Free Europe attempted to achieve these goals through serving as a surrogate house radio station, an alternative to the controlled and party-dominated domestic press. Radio Free Europe was a product of some of the mainly prominent architects of America's early Cold War strategy, especially those who whispered that the Cold War would eventually be fought through political rather than military means, such as George F. Kennan.

American policymakers, including Kennan and John Foster Dulles, acknowledged that the Cold War was in its essence a war of ideas. The United States, acting by the CIA, funded an extensive list of projects to counter the communist appeal in the middle of intellectuals in Europe and the developing world. The CIA also covertly sponsored a domestic propaganda campaign described Crusade for Freedom.

In the early 1950s, the US worked for the rearmament of West Germany and, in 1955, secured its full membership of NATO. In May 1953, Beria, through then in a government post, had made an unsuccessful proposal to allow the reunification of a neutral Germany to prevent West Germany's incorporation into NATO.

## **Chinese Civil War and SEATO**

In 1949, Mao Zedong's People's Liberation Army defeated Chiang Kai-shek's United States-backed Kuomintang (KMT) Nationalist Government in China, and the Soviet Union promptly created an alliance with the newly shaped People's Republic of China. Chiang and his KMT government retreated to the island of Taiwan. Confronted with the communist revolution in China and the end of the American atomic monopoly in 1949, the Truman administration quickly moved to escalate and expand the containment policy. In NSC-68, a secret 1950 document, the National Security Council proposed to reinforce pro-Western alliance systems and quadruple spending on protection.

United States officials moved thereafter to expand containment into Asia, Africa, and Latin America, in order to counter revolutionary nationalist movements, often led through communist parties financed through the USSR, fighting against the restoration of Europe's colonial empires in South-East Asia and elsewhere. In the early 1950s (an era sometimes recognized as the "Pactomania"), the US formalized a series of alliances with Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand and the Philippines (notably ANZUS in 1951 and SEATO in 1954), thereby guaranteeing the United States a number of extensive-term military bases.



## **Korean War**

One of the more important impacts of containment was the outbreak of the Korean War. In June 1950, Kim Il-Sung's North Korean People's Army invaded South Korea. Joseph Stalin "intended, prepared, and initiated" the invasion, creating "detailed [war] plans" that was communicated to the North Koreans.

To Stalin's surprise, the UN Security Council backed the protection of South Korea; however the Soviets were then boycotting meetings in protest that Taiwan and not Communist China held a permanent seat on the Council. A UN force of personnel from South Korea, the United States, the United Kingdom, Turkey, Canada, Australia, France, South Africa, the Philippines, the Netherlands, Belgium, New Zealand and other countries joined to stop the invasion.

In the middle of other effects, the Korean War galvanized NATO to develop a military structure. Public opinion in countries involved, such as Great Britain, was divided for and against the war. Several feared an escalation into a common war with Communist China, and even nuclear war. The strong opposition to the war often strained Anglo-American relations. For these causes British officials sought a speedy end to the clash, hoping to unite Korea under United Nations auspices and withdrawal of all foreign forces.

Even however the Chinese and North Koreans were exhausted through the war and were prepared to end it through late 1952, Stalin insisted that they continue fighting, and the Armistice was approved only in July 1953, after Stalin's death. North Korean leader Kim Il Sung created a highly centralized and brutal dictatorship, just as himself unlimited power and generating a formidable cult of personality. In the South, the American-backed strongman Syngman Rhee ran a significantly less brutal but corrupt regime. After Rhee was overthrown in 1960, South Korea fell under an era of military rule that lasted until the re-establishment of a multi-party organization in 1987.

## **Crisis and Escalation (1953-62)**

### **Khrushchev, Eisenhower, and De-Stalinization**

In 1953, changes in political leadership on both sides shifted the dynamic of the Cold War. Dwight D. Eisenhower was inaugurated president that January.

Throughout the last 18 months of the Truman administration, the American protection budget had quadrupled, and Eisenhower moved to reduce military spending through a third while continuing to fight the Cold War effectively.

After the death of Joseph Stalin, Nikita Khrushchev became the Soviet leader following the authentication and execution of

Lavrentiy Beria and the pushing aside of rivals Georgy Malenkov and Vyacheslav Molotov. On February 25, 1956, Khrushchev shocked delegates to the 20th Congress of the Soviet Communist Party through cataloguing and denouncing Stalin's crimes. As section of a campaign of de-Stalinization, he declared that the only method to reform and move absent from Stalin's policies would be to acknowledge errors made in the past.

On November 18, 1956, while addressing Western ambassadors at a reception at the Polish embassy in Moscow, Khrushchev used his well-known "Whether you like it or not, history is on our face. He later claimed that he had not been talking in relation to the nuclear war, but rather in relation to the historically determined victory of communism in excess of capitalism. In 1961, Khrushchev declared that even if the USSR was behind the West, within a decade its housing shortage would disappear, consumer goods would be abundant, and within two decades, the "construction of a communist community" in the USSR would be completed "in the largest".

Eisenhower's secretary of state, John Foster Dulles, initiated a "New Seem" for the containment strategy, calling for a greater reliance on nuclear weapons against US enemies in wartime. Dulles also enunciated the doctrine of "huge retaliation", threatening a severe US response to any Soviet aggression. Possessing nuclear superiority, for instance, allowed

Eisenhower to face down Soviet threats to intervene in the Transitional East throughout the 1956 Suez Crisis.

## **Warsaw Pact and Hungarian Revolution**

While Stalin's death in 1953 slightly relaxed tensions, the situation in Europe remained an uneasy armed truce. The Hungarian Revolution of 1956 occurred shortly after Khrushchev arranged the removal of Hungary's Stalinist leader Mátyás Rákosi. In response to a popular uprising, the new regime formally disbanded the secret police, declared its intention to withdraw from the Warsaw Pact and pledged to re-set up free elections. The Soviet army invaded. Thousands of Hungarians were arrested, imprisoned and deported to the Soviet Union, and almost 200,000 Hungarians fled Hungary in the chaos. Hungarian leader Imre Nagy and others were executed following secret trials.

From 1957 by 1961, Khrushchev openly and repeatedly threatened the West with nuclear annihilation. He claimed that Soviet missile capabilities were distant larger to those of the United States, capable of wiping out any American or European municipality. Though, Khrushchev rejected Stalin's belief in the inevitability of war, and declared his new goal was to be "peaceful coexistence". This formulation customized the Stalin-period Soviet stance, where international class thrash about meant the two opposing camps were on an inevitable collision course where communism would triumph by global war; now,

peace would allow capitalism to collapse on its own, as well as giving the Soviets time to boost their military capabilities, which remained for decades until Gorbachev's later "new thinking" envisioning peaceful coexistence as an end in itself rather than a form of class thrash about.

The measures in Hungary produced ideological fractures within the Communist parties of the world, particularly in Western Europe, with great decline in membership as several in both western and communist countries felt disillusioned through the brutal Soviet response. The communist parties in the West would never recover from the effect the Hungarian Revolution had on their membership, a information that was immediately established through some, such as the Yugoslavian politician Milovan Djilas who shortly after the revolution was crushed said that "The wound which the Hungarian Revolution inflicted on communism can never be totally healed".

America's pronouncements concentrated on American strength abroad and the success of liberal capitalism. Though, through the late 1960s, the "battle for men's minds" flanked by two systems of social organization that Kennedy spoke of in 1961 was mainly in excess of, with tensions henceforth based primarily on clashing geopolitical objectives rather than ideology.

## **Berlin Ultimatum and European Integration**

Throughout November 1958, Khrushchev made an unsuccessful effort to turn all of Berlin into an self-governing, demilitarized "free municipality", giving the United States, Great Britain, and France a six-month ultimatum to withdraw their troops from the sectors they still engaged in West Berlin, or he would transfer manage of Western access rights to the East Germans. Khrushchev earlier explained to Mao Zedong that "Berlin is the testicles of the West. Every time I want to create the West scream, I squeeze on Berlin." NATO formally rejected the ultimatum in mid-December and Khrushchev withdrew it in return for a Geneva conference on the German question.

More broadly, one hallmark of the 1950s was the beginning of European integration-a fundamental through-product of the Cold War that Truman and Eisenhower promoted politically, economically, and militarily, but which later administrations viewed ambivalently, fearful that an self-governing Europe would forge a separate détente with the Soviet Union, which would use this to exacerbate Western disunity.

## **Competition in the Third World**

Nationalist movements in some countries and areas, notably Guatemala, Indonesia and Indochina were often allied with communist groups, or perceived in the West to be allied with

communists. In this context, the United States and the Soviet Union increasingly competed for power through proxy in the Third World as decolonization gained momentum in the 1950s and early 1960s; additionally, the Soviets saw continuing losses through imperial powers as presaging the eventual victory of their ideology. Both sides were selling armaments to gain power.

The United States made use of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) to do absent with a string of inhospitable Third World governments and to support allied ones. In 1953, President Eisenhower's CIA implemented Operation Ajax, a covert operation aimed at the overthrow of the Iranian Prime Minister, Mohammad Mosaddegh. The popularly elected and non-aligned Mosaddegh had been a Transitional Eastern nemesis of Britain since, nationalizing the British-owned Anglo-Iranian Oil Company in 1951. Winston Churchill told the United States that Mosaddegh was "increasingly turning towards communism." The pro-Western shah, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, assumed manages as an autocratic monarch. The shah's policies incorporated the banning of the communist Tudeh Party and common suppression of political dissent through SAVAK, the shah's domestic security and intelligence agency.

In Guatemala, a CIA-backed military coup ousted the left-wing President Jacobo Arbenz Guzmán in 1954. The post-Arbenz government-a military junta headed through Carlos Castillo

Armas-repealed a progressive land reform law, returned nationalized property belonging to the United Fruit Company, set up a National Committee of Protection against Communism, and decreed a Preventive Penal Law against Communism at the request of the United States.

The non-aligned Indonesian government of Sukarno was faced with a biggest threat to its legitimacy beginning in 1956, when many local commanders began to demand autonomy from Jakarta. After mediation failed, Sukarno took action to remove the dissident commanders. In February 1958, dissident military commanders in Central Sumatera (Colonel Ahmad Hussein) and North Sulawesi (Colonel Ventje Sumual) declared the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Indonesia-Permesta Movement aimed at overthrowing the Sukarno regime. They were joined through several civilian politicians from the Masyumi Party, such as Sjafruddin Prawiranegara, who were opposed to the rising power of the communist Partai Komunis Indonesia party. Due to their anti-communist rhetoric, the rebels received arms, funding, and other covert aid from the CIA until Allen Lawrence Pope, an American pilot, was shot down after a bombing raid on government-held Ambon in April 1958. The central government responded through launching airborne and seaborne military invasions of rebel strongholds Padang and Manado. Through the end of 1958, the rebels were militarily defeated, and the last remaining rebel guerilla bands surrendered through August



1961. In the Republic of the Congo, newly self-governing from Belgium since, June 1960, the CIA-cultivated President Joseph Kasa-Vubu ordered the dismissal of the democratically elected Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba and the Lumumba cabinet in September; Lumumba described for Kasa-Vubu's dismissal instead. In the ensuing Congo Crisis, the CIA-backed Colonel Mobutu quickly mobilized his forces to seize power by a military coup d'état.

In British Guiana, the leftist People's Progressive Party (PPP) candidate Cheddi Jagan won the location of chief minister in a colonially administered election in 1953, but was quickly forced to resign from power after Britain's suspension of the still-dependent nation's constitution. Embarrassed through the landslide electoral victory of Jagan's allegedly Marxist party, the British imprisoned the PPP's leadership and maneuvered the organization into a divisive rupture in 1955, engineering a split flanked by Jagan and his PPP colleagues. Jagan again won the colonial elections in 1957 and 1961; despite Britain's shift to a reconsideration of its view of the left-wing Jagan as a Soviet-approach communist at this time, the United States pressured the British to withhold Guyana's independence until an alternative to Jagan could be recognized, supported, and brought into office.

Worn down through the communist guerrilla war for Vietnamese independence and handed a watershed defeat

through communist Vietminh rebels at the 1954 Battle of ?i?n Biên Ph?, the French carried a negotiated abandonment of their colonial stake in Vietnam. In the Geneva Conference, peace accords were signed, leaving Vietnam divided flanked by a pro-Soviet administration in North Vietnam and a pro-Western administration in South Vietnam at the 17th similarity north. Flanked by 1954 and 1961, Eisenhower's United States sent economic aid and military advisers to strengthen South Vietnam's pro-Western regime against communist efforts to destabilize it.

Several emerging nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America rejected the pressure to choose sides in the East-West competition. In 1955, at the Bandung Conference in Indonesia, dozens of Third World governments resolved to keep out of the Cold War. The consensus reached at Bandung culminated with the making of the Belgrade-headquartered Non-Aligned Movement in 1961. Meanwhile, Khrushchev broadened Moscow's policy to set up ties with India and other key neutral states. Independence movements in the Third World transformed the post-war order into a more pluralistic world of decolonized African and Transitional Eastern nations and of growing nationalism in Asia and Latin America.

### **Sino-Soviet Split, Legroom Race, ICBMs**

The era after 1956 was marked through serious setbacks for the Soviet Union, mainly notably the breakdown of the Sino-

Soviet alliance, beginning the Sino-Soviet split. Mao had defended Stalin when Khrushchev attacked him after his death in 1956, and treated the new Soviet leader as a superficial upstart, accusing him of having lost his revolutionary edge. For his section, Khrushchev, disturbed through Mao's glib attitude towards nuclear war, referred to the Chinese leader as a "lunatic on a throne".

After this, Khrushchev made several desperate attempts to reconstitute the Sino-Soviet alliance, but Mao measured it useless and denied any proposal. The Chinese-Soviet animosity spilled out in an intra-communist propaganda war. Further on, the Soviets focused on a bitter rivalry with Mao's China for leadership of the global communist movement.

On the nuclear weapons front, the United States and the USSR pursued nuclear rearmament and urbanized extensive-range weapons with which they could strike the territory of the other. In August 1957, the Soviets successfully launched the world's first intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) and in October, launched the first Earth satellite, Sputnik. The launch of Sputnik inaugurated the Legroom Race. This culminated in the Apollo Moon landings, which astronaut Frank Borman later called as "presently a battle in the Cold War."

## **Cuban Revolution and the Bay of Pigs Invasion**

In Cuba, the July 26 Movement seized power in January 1959, toppling President Fulgencio Batista, whose unpopular regime had been denied arms through the Eisenhower administration.

Diplomatic relations flanked by Cuba and the United States sustained for some time after Batista's fall, but President Eisenhower deliberately left the capital to avoid meeting Cuba's young revolutionary leader Fidel Castro throughout the latter's trip to Washington in April, leaving Vice President Richard Nixon to conduct the meeting in his lay. Eisenhower's officials were not certain as to whether Castro was a communist, but hostile towards the Cubans' efforts to decrease their economic reliance on the United States. Cuba began negotiating arms purchases from Eastern Europe in March 1960.

In January 1961, presently prior to leaving office, Eisenhower formally severed relations with the Cuban government. In April 1961, the administration of newly elected American President John F. Kennedy mounted an unsuccessful CIA-organized ship-borne invasion of the island at Playa Girón and Playa Larga in Las Villas Province-a failure that publicly humiliated the United States. Castro responded through embracing Marxism-Leninism, and the Soviet Union pledged to give further support.

## **Berlin Crisis of 1961**

The Berlin Crisis of 1961 was the last biggest incident in the Cold War concerning the status of Berlin and post-World War II Germany. Through the early 1950s, the Soviet approach to restricting emigration movement was emulated through mainly of the rest of the Eastern Bloc. Though, hundreds of thousands of East Germans annually immigrated to West Germany by a "loophole" in the organization that lived flanked by East and West Berlin, where the four occupying World War II powers governed movement.

The emigration resulted in a huge "brain drain" from East Germany to West Germany of younger educated professionals, such that almost 20per cent of East Germany's population had migrated to West Germany through 1961. That June, the Soviet Union issued a new ultimatum challenging the withdrawal of Allied forces from West Berlin. The request was rebuffed, and on August 13, East Germany erected a barbed-wire barrier that would eventually be expanded by construction into the Berlin Wall, effectively closing the loophole.

## **Cuban Missile Crisis and Khrushchev Ouster**

Continuing to seek methods to oust Castro following the Bay of Pigs Invasion, Kennedy and his administration experimented

with several methods of covertly facilitating the overthrow of the Cuban government. Important hopes were pinned on a covert programme named the Cuban Project, devised under the Kennedy administration in 1961.

In February 1962, Khrushchev learned of the American plans concerning Cuba: a "Cuban project"-approved through the CIA and stipulating the overthrow of the Cuban government in October, perhaps involving the American military-and yet one more Kennedy-ordered operation to assassinate Castro. Preparations to install Soviet nuclear missiles in Cuba were undertaken in response.

Alarmed, Kennedy measured several reactions, and ultimately responded to the installation of nuclear missiles in Cuba with a naval blockade and presented an ultimatum to the Soviets. Khrushchev backed down from a confrontation, and the Soviet Union removed the missiles in return for an American pledge not to invade Cuba again. The Cuban Missile Crisis (October-November 1962) brought the world closer to nuclear war than ever before. It further demonstrated the concept of mutually assured destruction that neither superpower was prepared to use their nuclear weapons, fearing total global destruction via mutual retaliation. The aftermath of the crisis led to the first efforts in the nuclear arms race at nuclear disarmament and improving relations, although the Cold War's first arms manage agreement, the Antarctic Treaty, had approach into force in

1961. In 1964, Khrushchev's Kremlin colleagues supervised to oust him, but allowed him a peaceful retirement. Accused of rudeness and incompetence, he was also credited with ruining Soviet agriculture and bringing the world to the brink of nuclear war. Khrushchev had become an international embarrassment when he authorized construction of the Berlin Wall, a public humiliation for Marxism-Leninism.

## **"Second Cold War" (1979-85)**

The term second Cold War refers to the era of rigorous reawakening of Cold War tensions and conflicts in the late 1970s and early 1980s. Tensions greatly increased flanked by the biggest powers with both sides becoming more militaristic. Diggins says, "Reagan went all out to fight the second cold war, through supporting counterinsurgencies in the third world." Cox says, "The intensity of this 'Second' Cold War was as great as its duration was short."

### **Soviet War in Afghanistan**

In April 1978, the communist People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) seized power in Afghanistan in the Saur Revolution. Within months, opponents of the communist government launched an uprising in eastern Afghanistan that quickly expanded into a civil war waged through guerrilla mujahideen against government forces countrywide. The

Pakistani government provided these rebels with covert training centers, while the Soviet Union sent thousands of military advisers to support the PDPA government. Meanwhile, rising friction flanked by the competing factions of the PDPA - the dominant Khalq and the more moderate Parcham - resulted in the dismissal of Parchami cabinet members and the arrest of Parchami military administrators under the pretext of a Parchami coup. Through mid-1979, the United States had started a covert programme to assist the mujahideen.

In September 1979, Khalqist President Nur Muhammad Taraki was assassinated in a coup within the PDPA orchestrated through fellow Khalq member Hafizullah Amin, who assumed the presidency. Distrusted through the Soviets, Amin was assassinated through Soviet Special Forces in December 1979. A Soviet-organized government, led through Parcham's Babrak Karmal but inclusive of both factions, filled the vacuum. Soviet troops were deployed to stabilize Afghanistan under Karmal in more substantial numbers, although the Soviet government did not anticipate doing mainly of the fighting in Afghanistan. As a result, though, the Soviets were now directly involved in what had been a domestic war in Afghanistan.

Carter responded to the Soviet intervention through withdrawing the SALT II treaty from the Senate, imposing embargoes on grain and technology shipments to the USSR, and challenging an important augment in military spending,



and further announced that the United States would boycott the 1980 Moscow Summer Olympics. He called the Soviet incursion as "the mainly serious threat to the peace since, the Second World War".

## **Reagan and Thatcher**

In January 1977, four years prior to becoming president, Ronald Reagan bluntly stated, in a conversation with Richard V. Allen, his vital expectation in relation to the Cold War. "My thought of American policy towards the Soviet Union is easy, and some would say simplistic," he said. "It is this: We win and they lose. What do you think of that?" In 1980, Ronald Reagan defeated Jimmy Carter in the 1980 presidential election, vowing to augment military spending and confront the Soviets everywhere. Both Reagan and new British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher denounced the Soviet Union and its ideology. Reagan labeled the Soviet Union an "evil empire" and predicted that Communism would be left on the "ash heap of history".

Through early 1985, Reagan's anti-communist location had urbanized into a stance recognized as the new Reagan Doctrine-which, in addition to containment, formulated an additional right to subvert existing communist governments.

Besides continuing Carters' policy of supporting the Islamic opponents of the Soviet Union and the Soviet-backed PDPA

government in Afghanistan, the CIA also sought to weaken the Soviet Union itself through promoting political Islam in the majority-Muslim Central Asian Soviet Union. Additionally, the CIA encouraged anti-communist Pakistan's ISI to train Muslims from approximately the world to participate in the jihad against the Soviet Union.

### **Polish Solidarity Movement and Martial Law**

Pope John Paul II provided a moral focus for anti-communism; a visit to his native Poland in 1979 stimulated a religious and nationalist resurgence centered on the Solidarity movement that galvanized opposition and may have led to his attempted assassination two years later.

In December 1981, Poland's Wojciech Jaruzelski reacted to the crisis through imposing a era of martial law. Reagan imposed economic sanctions on Poland in response. Mikhail Suslov, the Kremlin's top ideologist, advised Soviet leaders not to intervene if Poland fell under the manage of Solidarity, for fear it might lead to heavy economic sanctions, on behalf of a catastrophe for the Soviet economy.

### **Soviet and US Military and Economic Issues**

Moscow had built up a military that consumed as much as 25 percent of the Soviet Union's gross national product at the expense of consumer goods and investment in civilian sectors.

Soviet spending on the arms race and other Cold War commitments both caused and exacerbated deep-seated structural troubles in the Soviet organization, which saw at least a decade of economic stagnation throughout the late Brezhnev years.

Soviet investment in the protection sector was not driven through military necessity, but in big section through the interests of huge party and state bureaucracies dependent on the sector for their own power and privileges. The Soviet Armed Forces became the main in the world in conditions of the numbers and kinds of weapons they possessed, in the number of troops in their ranks, and in the sheer size of their military-industrial foundation. Though, the quantitative advantages held through the Soviet military often concealed regions where the Eastern Bloc dramatically lagged behind the West.

Through the early 1980s, the USSR had built up a military arsenal and army surpassing that of the United States. Soon after the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, president Carter began massively structure up the United States military. This buildup was accelerated through the Reagan administration, which increased the military spending from 5.3 percent of GNP in 1981 to 6.5 percent in 1986, the main peacetime protection buildup in United States history.

Tensions sustained intensifying in the early 1980s when Reagan revived the B-1 Lancer programme that was canceled

through the Carter administration, produced LGM-118 Peacekeepers, installed US cruise missiles in Europe, and announced his experimental Strategic Protection Initiative, dubbed "Star Wars" through the media, a protection programme to shoot down missiles in mid-flight.

With the backdrop of a buildup in tensions flanked by the Soviet Union and the United States, and the deployment of Soviet RSD-10 Pioneer ballistic missiles targeting Western Europe, NATO decided, under the impetus of the Carter presidency, to deploy MGM-31 Pershing and cruise missiles in Europe, primarily West Germany. This deployment would have placed missiles presently 10 minutes' striking aloofness from Moscow.

After Reagan's military buildup, the Soviet Union did not respond through further structure its military because the enormous military expenses, beside with inefficient intended manufacturing and collectivized agriculture, were already a heavy burden for the Soviet economy. At the similar time, Saudi Arabia increased oil manufacture, even as other non-OPEC nations were raising manufacture. These growths contributed to the 1980s oil glut, which affected the Soviet Union, as oil was the largest source of Soviet export revenues. Issues with command economics, oil prices decreases and big military expenditures slowly brought the Soviet economy to stagnation.

On September 1, 1983, the Soviet Union shot down Korean Air Lines Flight 007, a Boeing 747 with 269 people aboard, including sitting Congressman Larry McDonald, when it violated Soviet airspace presently past the west coast of Sakhalin Island close to Moneron Island -an act which Reagan characterized as a "massacre". This act increased support for military deployment, overseen through Reagan, which stood in lay until the later accords flanked by Reagan and Mikhail Gorbachev. The Able Archer 83 exercise in November 1983, a realistic simulation of a coordinated NATO nuclear release, has been described mainly dangerous moment since, the Cuban Missile Crisis, as the Soviet leadership keeping a secure watch on it measured a nuclear attack to be imminent.

US domestic public concerns in relation to the intervening in foreign conflicts persisted from the end of the Vietnam War. The Reagan administration accentuated the use of quick, low-cost counter-insurgency tactics to intervene in foreign conflicts.

In 1983, the Reagan administration intervened in the multisided Lebanese Civil War, invaded Grenada, bombed Libya and backed the Central American Contras, anti-communist paramilitaries seeking to overthrow the Soviet-aligned Sandinista government in Nicaragua. While Reagan's interventions against Grenada and Libya were popular in the United States, his backing of the Contra rebels was mired in

controversy. Meanwhile, the Soviets incurred high costs for their own foreign interventions. The Kremlin sent almost 100,000 troops to support its puppet regime in Afghanistan, leading several outside observers to dub the war "the Soviets' Vietnam". Though, Moscow's quagmire in Afghanistan was distant more disastrous for the Soviets than Vietnam had been for the Americans because the clash coincided with a era of internal decay and domestic crisis in the Soviet organization.

A senior US State Department official predicted such an outcome as early as 1980, positing that the invasion resulted in section from a "domestic crisis within the Soviet organization.... It may be that the thermodynamic law of entropy has... caught up with the Soviet organization, which now looks to expend more power on basically maintaining its equilibrium than on improving itself. We could be seeing a era of foreign movement at a time of internal decay".

## **Final Years (1985-91)**

### **Gorbachev Reforms**

Through the time the comparatively youthful Mikhail Gorbachev became Common Secretary in 1985; the Soviet economy was stagnant and faced a sharp fall in foreign currency earnings as a result of the downward slide in oil

prices in the 1980s. These issues prompted Gorbachev to investigate events to revive the ailing state.

An ineffectual start led to the conclusion that deeper structural changes were necessary and in June 1987 Gorbachev announced an agenda of economic reform described perestroika, or restructuring. Perestroika relaxed the manufacture quota organization, allowed private ownership of businesses and paved the method for foreign investment. These events were designed to redirect the country's possessions from costly Cold War military commitments to more productive regions in the civilian sector.

Despite initial skepticism in the West, the new Soviet leader proved to be committed to reversing the Soviet Union's deteriorating economic condition instead of continuing the arms race with the West. Partly as a method to fight off internal opposition from party cliques to his reforms, Gorbachev simultaneously introduced glasnost, or openness, which increased freedom of the press and the transparency of state organizations. Glasnost was designed to reduce the corruption at the top of the Communist Party and moderate the abuse of power in the Central Committee. Glasnost also enabled increased get in touch with flanked by Soviet citizens and the western world, particularly with the United States, contributing to the accelerating détente flanked by the two nations.

## **Thaw in Relations**

In response to the Kremlin's military and political concessions, Reagan agreed to renew talks on economic issues and the scaling-back of the arms race. The first was held in November 1985 in Geneva, Switzerland. At one level the two men, accompanied only through an interpreter, agreed in principle to reduce each country's nuclear arsenal through 50 percent. A second Reykjavík Summit was held in Iceland. Talks went well until the focus shifted to Reagan's proposed Strategic Protection Initiative, which Gorbachev wanted eliminated. Reagan refused. The negotiations failed, but the third summit in 1987 led to a breakthrough with the signing of the Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF). The INF treaty eliminated all nuclear-armed, ground-launched ballistic and cruise missiles with ranges flanked by 500 and 5,500 kilometers (300 to 3,400 miles) and their infrastructure.

East-West tensions rapidly subsided by the mid-to-late 1980s, culminating with the final summit in Moscow in 1989, when Gorbachev and George H. W. Bush signed the START I arms manage treaty. Throughout the following year it became evident to the Soviets that oil and gas subsidies, beside with the cost of maintaining huge troops stages, represented a substantial economic drain. In addition, the security advantage of a buffer zone was recognized as irrelevant and the Soviets



officially declared that they would no longer intervene in the affairs of allied states in Eastern Europe.

In 1989, Soviet forces withdrew from Afghanistan and through 1990 Gorbachev consented to German reunification, the only alternative being a Tiananmen scenario. When the Berlin Wall came down, Gorbachev's "General European House" concept began to take shape.

On December 3, 1989, Gorbachev and Reagan's successor, George H. W. Bush, declared the Cold War in excess of at the Malta Summit; a year later, the two former rivals were partners in the Gulf War against Iraq.

### **East Europe Breaks Absent**

Through 1989, the Soviet alliance organization was on the brink of collapse, and, deprived of Soviet military support, the Communist leaders of the Warsaw Pact states were losing power. Grassroots institutions, such as Poland's Solidarity movement, rapidly gained ground with strong popular bases. In 1989, the Communist governments in Poland and Hungary became the first to negotiate the organizing of competitive elections. In Czechoslovakia and East Germany, mass protests unseated entrenched Communist leaders. The Communist regimes in Bulgaria and Romania also crumbled, in the latter case as the result of a violent uprising. Attitudes had changed sufficient that US Secretary of State James Baker suggested

that the American government would not be opposed to Soviet intervention in Romania, on behalf of the opposition, to prevent bloodshed.

The tidal wave of transform culminated with the fall of the Berlin Wall in November 1989, which symbolized the collapse of European Communist governments and graphically ended the Iron Curtain divide of Europe. The 1989 revolutionary wave swept crossways Central and Eastern Europe peacefully overthrew all the Soviet-approach communist states: East Germany, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Bulgaria, Romania was the only Eastern-bloc country to topple its communist regime violently and execute its head of state.

### **Soviet Republics Break Absent**

In the USSR itself, glasnost weakened the bonds that held the Soviet Union jointly and through February 1990, with the dissolution of the USSR looming, the Communist Party was forced to surrender its 73-year-old monopoly on state power. At the similar time freedom of press and dissent allowed through glasnost and the festering "nationalities question" increasingly led the Union's component republics to declare their autonomy from Moscow, with the Baltic states withdrawing from the Union entirely.

## **Soviet Dissolution**

Gorbachev's permissive attitude towards Eastern Europe did not initially extend to Soviet territory; even Bush, who strove to uphold friendly relations, condemned the January 1991 killings in Latvia and Lithuania, privately warning that economic ties would be frozen if the violence sustained. The USSR was fatally weakened through a failed coup and a rising number of Soviet republics, particularly Russia, who threatened to secede from the USSR. The Commonwealth of Self-governing States, created on December 21, 1991, is viewed as a successor entity to the Soviet Union but its purpose was to "allow a civilized divorce" flanked by the Soviet Republics and is comparable to a loose confederation. The USSR was declared officially dissolved on December 25, 1991. Following the Cold War, Russia cut military spending dramatically. The capitalist reforms culminated in a recession more severe than the US and Germany had experienced throughout the Great Depression.

The aftermath of the Cold War continues to power world affairs. After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the post-Cold War world is widely measured as unipolar, with the United States the sole remaining superpower. The Cold War defined the political role of the United States in the post-World War II world: through 1989 the US held military alliances with 50 countries, and had 526,000 troops posted abroad in dozens of

countries, with 326,000 in Europe (two-thirds of which in west Germany) and in relation to the 130,000 in Asia (largely Japan and South Korea). The Cold War also marked the apex of peacetime military-industrial complexes, especially in the USA, and big-level military funding of science. These complexes, however their origins may be establish as early as the 19th century, have grown substantially throughout the Cold War. The military-industrial complexes have great impact on their countries and help shape their community, policy and foreign relations.

Military expenditures through the US throughout the Cold War years were estimated to have been \$8 trillion, while almost 100,000 Americans lost their lives in the Korean War and Vietnam War. Although the loss of life in the middle of Soviet soldiers is hard to estimate, as a share of their gross national product the financial cost for the Soviet Union was distant higher than that incurred through the United States.

In addition to the loss of life through uniformed soldiers, millions died in the superpowers' proxy wars approximately the globe, mainly notably in Southeast Asia. Mainly of the proxy wars and subsidies for regional conflicts ended beside with the Cold War; interstate wars, ethnic wars, revolutionary wars, as well as refugee and displaced persons crises have declined sharply in the post-Cold War years. The aftermath of Cold War clash, though, is not always easily erased, as several of the

economic and social tensions that were exploited to fuel Cold War competition in sections of the Third World remain acute. The breakdown of state manage in a number of regions formerly ruled through Communist governments has produced new civil and ethnic conflicts, particularly in the former Yugoslavia. In Eastern Europe, the end of the Cold War has ushered in an period of economic development and an augment in the number of liberal democracies, while in other sections of the world, such as Afghanistan, independence was accompanied through state failure.

## **Chapter 2**

# **Emergence of the Third World and Global War Order**

### **Features of the Third World State and cold war**

A number of Third World countries are former colonies. With the end of imperialism, several of these countries, especially smaller ones, were faced with the challenges of nation and institution-structure on their own for the first time. Due to this general backdrop, several of these nations were "developing" in economic conditions for mainly of the 20th century, and several still are. This term, used today, usually denotes countries that have not... urbanized to the similar stages as OECD countries, and are therefore in the procedure of developing. In the 1980s, economist Peter Bauer offered a competing definition for the term Third World. He claimed that the attachment of Third World status to a scrupulous country was not based on any stable economic or political criteria, and was a mostly arbitrary procedure. The big variety of countries that were measured to be section of the Third World, from Indonesia to Afghanistan, ranged widely from economically primitive to economically advanced and from politically non-aligned to Soviet- or Western-leaning.

An argument could also be made for how sections of the U.S. are more like the Third World. The only feature that Bauer establish general in all Third World countries was that their governments "demand and receive Western aid," the giving of which he strongly opposed. Therefore, the aggregate term Third World was challenged as misleading even throughout the Cold War era because it had no constant or communal identity in the middle of the countries it supposedly encompassed. Recently the term Majority World has started to be used since, mainly people of the world live in poorer and less urbanized countries.

### **Foreign Aid and Growth**

Throughout the Cold War, unaligned countries of the Third World were seen as potential allies through both the First and Second World. So, the United States and the Soviet Union went to great lengths to set up connections in these countries through offering economic and military support in order to gain strategically situated alliances (*e.g.* United States in Vietnam or Soviet Union in Cuba). Through the end of the Cold War, several Third World countries had adopted capitalist or communist economic models and sustained to receive support from the face they had chosen. During the Cold War and beyond, the countries of the Third World have been the priority recipients of Western foreign aid and the focus of economic

growth by mainstream theories such as Modernization Theory and Dependency Theory.

Through the end of the 1960s, the thought of the Third World came to symbolize countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America that were measured underdeveloped through the West based on a diversity of aspects (low economic growth, low life expectancy, high rates of poverty and disease, *etc.*). These countries became the targets for aid and support from governments, NGOs, and individuals from wealthier nations. One popular model, recognized as Rostow's levels of development, argued that growth took lay in 5 levels (Traditional Community; Pre-circumstances for Take-off; Take-off; Drive to Maturity; Age of High Mass Consumption). W. W. Rostow argued that Take-off was the critical level that the Third World was missing or struggling with. Therefore, foreign aid was needed to help kick start industrialization and economic development in these countries.

Though, despite decades of getting aid and experiencing dissimilar growth models (which have had extremely little success), several Third World countries' economies are still dependent on urbanized countries and are deep in debt. There is now a rising debate in relation to the why Third World countries remain impoverished and underdeveloped after all this time. Several argue that current ways of aid are not working and are calling for reducing foreign aid (and so



dependency) and utilizing dissimilar economic theories than the traditional mainstream theories from the West. Historically, growth and aid have not accomplished the goals they were meant to and currently the global gap flanked by the rich and poor is greater than ever.

In excess of the last few decades, global population development has mainly been focused in Third World countries (which often have higher birth rates than urbanized countries). As populations expand in poorer countries, rural people are flocking to municipalities in a long urban migration that is resulting in the making of huge shanty cities and slums a lot of times there is a clear distinction flanked by First and Third Worlds. When talking in relation to the Global North and the Global South, the majority of the time the two goes hand in hand. People refer to the two as 'Third World/South' and 'First World/ North'; because in theory the Global North is supposedly more affluent and urbanized, whereas the Global South is less urbanized and oftentimes more poor.

## **Colonialism And Patterns Of National Liberation Movements**

### **Reasons of Decolonization**

*The following are all the largest causes of why decolonization occurred:*

- The Atlantic Charter
- The Atlantic Charter was a document produced in 1941 that entailed the goals of the Allied powers if they should win World War Two
- One of the provisions of that charter was that all people had the right to self determination. In other languages, all peoples/nations had the right to govern themselves
- Aftermath of World War Two
- Britain and France had presently been in a war for the past 6 years
- One of them was taken in excess of
- The other was being threatened to be taken in excess of since, 1940 (Britain)
- Both were in debt and both military's were exhausted
- Not the right time to be fighting wars with your colonies
- Colonies Disgruntled after World War Two
- Several of these colonies gave possessions and man power to their colonial possessions throughout World War Two because they idea they would achieve their independence if they helped because that was what they were promised in the Atlantic Charter and through their Colonial rulers
- Colonial Nationalism
- These colonies wanted their independence and were willing to do what it took until they received it
- Emergence of Two New Super Powers
  - After World War Two, the United States and the Soviet Union appeared as the two superpowers of the world

- Both had one item in general, they were both against colonial rule
- Put pressure on colonial powers to end their colonial rule

## **Decolonization Procedure**

Decolonization is the undoing of colonialism, the unequal relation of polities whereby one people or nation establishes and maintains dependent Territory (colonial governments) in excess of another. It can be understood politically (attaining independence, autonomous house rule, union with the metropole or another state) or culturally (removal of pernicious colonial effects.) The term refers particularly to the dismantlement, in the years after World War II, of the Neo-Imperial empires recognized prior to World War I during Africa and Asia.

The United Nations Special Committee on Decolonization has stated that in the procedure of decolonization there is no alternative to the colonizer's allowance of self-determination, but in practice decolonization may involve either non-violent revolution or national liberation wars through the native population. It may be intramural or involve the intervention of foreign powers acting individually or by international bodies such as the United Nations. Although examples of decolonization can be establish as early as the writings of Thucydides, there have been many particularly active periods

of decolonization in contemporary times. These are the breakup of the Spanish Empire in the 19th century; of the German, Austro-Hungarian, Ottoman, and Russian Empires following World War I; of the British, French, Dutch, Portuguese, Belgian, and Italian colonial empires following World War II; of the Russian Empire successor union following the Cold War; and others.

### **Ways and Levels**

Decolonization is a political procedure, regularly involving violence. In extreme conditions, there is a war of independence, sometimes following a revolution. More often, there is a dynamic cycle where negotiations fail; minor disturbances ensue resulting in suppression through the police and military forces, escalating into more violent revolts that lead to further negotiations until independence is granted. In unusual cases, the actions of the native population are characterized through non-violence, with the Indian independence movement led through Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi being one of the mainly notable examples, and the violence comes as active suppression from the occupying forces or as political opposition from forces on behalf of minority regional societies who feel threatened through the prospect of independence. For instance, there was a war of independence in French Indochina, while in some countries in French West Africa (excluding the Maghreb countries) decolonization

resulted from a combination of insurrection and negotiation. The procedure is only complete when the de facto government of the newly self-governing country is established as the de jure sovereign state through the society of nations.

Independence is often hard to achieve without the encouragement and practical support from one or more external parties. The motives for giving such aid are varied: nations of the similar ethnic and/or religious stock may sympathize with oppressed groups, or a strong nation may effort to destabilize a colony as a tactical move to weaken a rival or enemy colonizing power or to make legroom for its own sphere of power; examples of this contain British support of the Haitian Revolution against France, and the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, in which the United States warned the European powers not to interfere in the affairs of the newly self-governing states of the Western Hemisphere.

As world opinion became more pro-emancipation following World War I, there was an institutionalized communal attempt to advance the reason of emancipation by the League of Nations. Under Article 22 of the Covenant of the League of Nations, a number of mandates were created. The expressed intention was to prepare these countries for self-government, but are often interpreted as a mere redistribution of manage in excess of the former colonies of the defeated powers, largely Germany and the Ottoman Empire. This reassignment work

sustained by the United Nations, with a same organization of trust territories created to adjust manage in excess of both former colonies and mandated territories.

In referendums, some colonized populations have chosen to retain their colonial status, such as Gibraltar and French Guiana. There are even examples, such as the Falklands War, in which an Imperial power goes to war to defend the right of a colony to continue to be a colony. Colonial powers have sometimes promoted decolonization in order to shed the financial, military, and other burdens that tend to grow in those colonies where the colonial regimes have become more benign.

Decolonization is rarely achieved by a single historical act, but rather progresses by one or more levels of emancipation, each of which can be offered or fought for: these can contain the introduction of elected representatives (advisory or voting; minority or majority or even exclusive), degrees of autonomy or self-rule. Therefore, the final stage of decolonization may in information concern little more than hand in excess of responsibility for foreign relations and security, and soliciting de jure recognition for the new sovereignty. But, even following the recognition of statehood, a degree of stability can be maintained by bilateral treaties flanked by now equal governments involving practicalities such as military training, mutual defence pacts, or even a garrison and/or military

bases. There is some debate in excess of whether or not the Americas can be measured decolonized, as it was the colonist and their descendants who revolted and declared their independence instead of the indigenous peoples, as is generally the case. Furthermore, incorporated in this list of states where "decolonization" has not occurred as per the ideas reflected above are Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

### **American Revolution**

Great Britain's Thirteen North American colonies were the first to break from the British Empire in 1776, and were established as a self-governing nation through the Treaty of Paris in 1783 after Britain's defeat at the hands of American militias and the French. The United States of America was the first European colonial entity to achieve independence and the first self-governing nation in the Americas.

### **Decolonization of the Spanish Americas**

With the invasion of Spain through Napoleon in 1806, the American colonies declared autonomy and loyalty to the King Fernand VII. In 1809, the independence wars of Latino America begun with a revolt in La Paz, Bolivia. Throughout the after that 15 years, the Spanish and the rebels fought in South America and Mexico. Numerous countries declared independence. In 1824, the Spanish forces were defeated in the Battle of Ayacucho. The mainland was free and in 1898, Spain

lost Cuba and Puerto Rico in the Spanish American War. Cuba was self-governing in 1902.

## **Decolonization of the Ottoman Empire**

A number of peoples (largely Christians in the Balkans) previously conquered through the Ottoman Empire were able to achieve independence in the 19th century, a procedure that peaked at the time of the Ottoman defeat in the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-78.

- *Egypt*: In the wake of the 1798 French Invasion of Egypt and its subsequent expulsion in 1801, the commander of an Albanian regiment, Muhammad Ali, was able to gain manage of Egypt. Although he was acknowledged through the Sultan in Constantinople in 1805 as his pasha, Muhammad Ali was in reality monarch of a practically sovereign state.
- *Greece*: The Greek War of Independence (1821-1829) was fought to liberate Greece from a three centuries extensive Ottoman job. Independence was secured through the intervention of the British and French navies and the French and Russian armies, but Greece was limited to an region including possibly only one-third of ethnic Greeks, that later grew significantly with the Megali Thought project. The war ended several of the privileges of the Phanariot Greeks of Constantinople.
- *Bulgaria*: Following a failed Bulgarian revolt in 1876, the subsequent Russo-Turkish war ended with the provisional Treaty of San Stefano recognized a vast



new realm of Bulgaria including mainly of Macedonia and Thrace. The final 1878 Treaty of Berlin allowed the other Great Powers to limit the size of the new Russian client state and even briefly divided this rump state in two, Bulgaria and Eastern Rumelia, but the irredentist claims from the first treaty would direct Bulgarian claims by the first and second Balkan Wars and both World Wars.

- *Romania*: Romania fought on the Russian side in the Russo-Turkish War and in the 1878 Treaty of Berlin, Romania was established as a self-governing state through the Great Powers.
- *Serbia*: Decades of armed and unarmed struggle about ended with the recognition of Serbian independence from the Ottoman Empire at the Congress of Berlin in 1878.
- *Montenegro*: The independence of the Principality of Montenegro from the Ottoman Empire was established at the congress of Berlin in 1878. Though, the Montenegrin nation has been de facto self-governing since, 1711 (officially carried through the Tsardom of Russia through the order of Tsar Petr I Alexeyevich-Romanov. In the era 1795-8, Montenegro once again claimed independence after the Battle of Krusi. In 1806, it was established as a power fighting against Napoleon, meaning that it had a fully mobilized and supplied army (through Russia, through Admiral Dmitry Senyavin at the Bay of Kotor). In the era of reign of Petar II Petrovič-Njegoš, Montenegro was again colonized through Turkey, but that changed with the coming of Knyaz Danilo I, with a completely successful war against Turkey in the

late 1850s ending with a decisive victory of the Montenegrin army under Grand Duke Mirko Petrović-Njegoš, brother of Danilo I, at the Battle of Grahovac. The full independence was given to Montenegro, after approximately 170 years of fighting the Turks, Bosniaks, Albanians and the French (1806-1814) at the Congress of Berlin.

## **Decolonization after 1918**

### **Western European Colonial Powers**

The New Imperialism era, with the scramble for Africa and the Opium Wars, marked the zenith of European colonization. It also marked the acceleration of the trends that would end it. The extraordinary material demands of the clash had spread economic transform crossways the world (notably inflation), and the associated social pressures of "war imperialism" created both peasant unrest and a burgeoning transitional class.

Economic development created stakeholders with their own demands, while racial issues meant these people clearly stood separately from the colonial transitional-class and had to form their own group. The start of mass nationalism, as a concept and practice, would fatally undermine the ideologies of imperialism.

There were, naturally, other factors, from agrarian transform (and disaster-French Indochina), changes or growths in religion (Buddhism in Burma, Islam in the Dutch East Indies, marginally people like John Chilembwe in Nyasaland), and the impact of the depression of the 1930s.

The Great Depression, despite the concentration of its impact on the industrialized world, was also exceptionally damaging in the rural colonies. Agricultural prices fell much harder and faster than those of industrial goods. From approximately 1925 until World War II, the colonies suffered. The colonial powers concentrated on domestic issues, protectionism and tariffs, disregarding the damage done to international deal flows. The colonies, approximately all primary "cash crop" producers, lost the majority of their export income and were forced absent from the "open" complementary colonial economies to "closed" systems. While some regions returned to existence cultivation (British Malaya) others diversified (India, West Africa), and some began to industrialize. These economies would not fit the colonial straitjacket when efforts were made to renew the links. Further, the European-owned and -run plantations proved more vulnerable to extended deflation than native capitalists, reducing the dominance of "white" farmers in colonial economies and creation the European governments and investors of the 1930s co-opt indigenous elites - despite the implications for the future. Colonial reform also hastened their end; notably the move from non-interventionist collaborative

systems towards directed, disruptive, direct management to drive economic transform. The making of genuine bureaucratic government boosted the formation of indigenous bourgeoisie.

## **United Kingdom**

The emergence of indigenous bourgeois elites was especially feature of the British Empire, which seemed less capable (or less ruthless) in controlling political nationalism. Crossways the empire, the common protocol was to convene a constitutional conference in London to talk about the transition to greater self-government and then independence, submit a statement of the constitutional conference to parliament, if approved submit a bill to Parliament at Westminster to terminate the responsibility of the United Kingdom (with a copy of the new constitution annexed), and finally, if approved, issuance of an Order of Council fixing the exact date of independence.

London dealt with the white dominions; retained strategic possessions at the cost of reducing direct manage in Egypt, and made numerous reforms in the British Raj, culminating in the Government of India Act (1935). Despite these efforts however, the British Government sustained to gradually lose manage of the Raj. The end of World War II allowed India, in addition to several other European colonies, to take advantage of the postwar chaos that had began to exist in Europe throughout the mid 1940s. Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi,

India's independence movement leader, realized the advantage in conducting a peaceful resistance to the British Empire's attempts to retake manages of their "crown jewel". Through becoming a symbol of both peace and opposition to British imperialism, several Indian citizens began to view the British as the reason of India's violence leading to a newfound sense of nationalism in the middle of its population. With this new wave of Indian nationalism, Gandhi was eventually able to garner the support needed to push back the British and make a self-governing India in 1947.

Tropical Africa was only fully drawn into the colonial organization at the end of the 19th century. Nevertheless, the Union of South Africa which, through introducing rigid racial segregation from 1913 was already catalyzing the anti-colonial political agitation of half the continent. While, in the north-east the sustained independence of the Empire of Ethiopia remained a beacon of hope. Colonial inequities ranged flanked by extremes, from British Kenya's dispossession of regional farmers, to Leopold II's massacres in the Congo or the looting of Benin Municipality. Though, with the resistance wars of the 1900s barely in excess of, new modernising shapes of African Nationalism began to gain strength in the early 20th-century with the emergence of Pan-Africanism, as advocated through the Jamaican journalist Marcus Garvey (1887-1940) whose widely distributed newspapers demanded swift abolition of European imperialism, as well as republicanism in Egypt.

Kwame Nkrumah (1909-1972) who was inspired through the works of Garvey led Ghana to independence from colonial rule, while the republican Nasser led Egypt to resist British job.

## **United States**

A former colony itself, the United States approached imperialism differently from the Great Powers and Japan. Much of its power and rapidly expanding population was directed westward crossways the North American continent against American Indians, Spain, and Mexico. With eventual assistance from the British Navy, its Monroe Doctrine reserved the Americas as its sphere of interest, prohibiting other states (particularly Spain) from recolonizing the recently freed polities of Latin America. Economic and political pressure, as well as assaults through filibusters, was brought to bear, but Northern fears of the expansion of slavery into new territories restrained the United States from early expansion into Cuba or Central America. America's only African colony, Liberia, was shaped privately and achieved independence early. While the United States had few qualms in relation to the opening the markets of Japan, Korea, and China through military force, it advocated an Open Door Policy and opposed the direct division and colonization of those states.

Following the Civil War and particularly throughout and after the presidency of Theodoure Roosevelt, direct intervention in Latin America and elsewhere expanded. The United States

purchased Russian America from the tsar and carried the offer of Hawaii from rebel expatriates and seized many colonies from Spain in 1898. Barred from annexing Cuba outright through the Teller Amendment, the U.S. recognized it as a client state with obligations including the perpetual lease of Guantánamo Bay to the U.S. Navy. The effort of the first governor to void the island's constitution and remain in power past the end of his term provoked a rebellion that provoked a reoccupation flanked by 1906 and 1909, but this was again followed through devolution. Likewise, the McKinley administration, despite prosecuting the Philippine-American War against a native republic, set out that the Territory of the Philippine Islands was eventually granted independence.

Britain's 1895 effort to reject the Monroe Doctrine throughout the Venezuela Crisis of 1895, the Venezuela Crisis of 1902-1903, and the establishment of the client state of Panama in 1903 via gunboat diplomacy, though, all necessitated the maintenance of Puerto Rico as a naval foundation to close shipping lanes to the Caribbean and the new canal zone. In 1917, "Puerto Ricans were collectively made U.S. citizens" via the Jones Act, and in 1952 the US Congress turned the territory into a commonwealth after ratifying the Constitution born out of United States Public Law 600.

The US government then declared the territory was no longer a colony and stopped transmitting information in relation to the

Puerto Rico to the United Nations Decolonization Committee. As a result, the UN Common Assembly removed Puerto Rico from the U.N. list of non-self-governing territories. Dissatisfied with their new political status, Puerto Ricans turned to political referendums to let create their opinions recognized. Many internal plebiscites, non-binding upon the United States, proposing statehood or independence for the island did not garnish a majority in 1967, 1993, and 1998. As a result of the UN not applying the full set of criteria which was enunciated in 1960 when it took favourable note of the cessation of transmission of information concerning the non-self-governing status of Puerto Rico, the nature of Puerto Rico's connection with the U.S. continues to be the subject of ongoing debate in Puerto Rican politics, the United States Congress, and the United Nations.

The Monroe Doctrine received the Roosevelt Corollary in 1904, providing that the United States had a right and obligation to intervene "in flagrant cases of such wrongdoing or impotence" that a nation in the Western Hemisphere became vulnerable to European manage. In practice, this meant that the United States was led to act as a collections agent for European creditors through administering customs duties in the Dominican Republic (1905-1941), Haiti (1915-1934), and elsewhere. The intrusiveness and bad relations this engendered were somewhat checked through the Clark Memorandum and renounced through President Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Good



Neighbour Policy." The end of World War II saw America producing 46 per cent of the world's GDP, but pouring billions of dollars into the Marshall Plan and restoring self-governing (if anti-Communist) democracies in Japan and West Germany.

The post-war era also saw America push difficult to accelerate decolonialization and bring an end to the colonial empires of its Western allies, mainly importantly throughout the 1956 Suez Crisis, but American military bases were recognized approximately the world and direct and indirect interventions sustained in Korea, Indochina, Latin America (inter alia, the 1965 job of the Dominican Republic), Africa, and the Transitional East to oppose Communist invasions and insurgencies. Since, the dissolution of the Soviet Union, the United States has been distant less active in the Americas, but invaded Afghanistan and Iraq following the September 11 attacks in 2001, establishing army and air bases in Central Asia.

## **Japan**

Japan had gained many substantial colonial concessions in east Asia such as Taiwan and Korea. Pursuing a colonial policy comparable to those of European powers, Japan settled important populations of ethnic Japanese in its colonies while simultaneously suppressing indigenous ethnic populations through enforcing the studying and use of the Japanese language in schools. Other ways such as public interaction,

and attempts to eradicate the use of Korean, Hokkien, and Hakka in the middle of the indigenous peoples, were seen to be used. Japan also set up Imperial universities in Korea (Keijo Imperial University) and Taiwan (Taihoku University) to compel education.

World War II gave the Japanese Empire occasion to conquer huge swaths of Asia, sweeping into China and seizing the Western colonies of Vietnam, Hong Kong, the Philippines, Burma, Malaya, Timor and Indonesia in the middle of others, albeit only for the duration of the war.

An estimated 20 million Chinese died throughout the Second Sino-Japanese War (1931-1945). Following its surrender to the Allies in 1945, Japan was deprived of all its colonies. Japan further claims that the southern Kuril Islands are a small portion of its own national territory, colonized through the Soviet Union.

## **French Decolonization**

After World War I, the colonized people were frustrated at France's failure to recognize the attempt provided through the French colonies (possessions, but more importantly colonial troops-the well-known tirailleurs). Although in Paris the Great Mosque of Paris was constructed as recognition of these efforts, the French state had no intention to allow self-rule, let alone grant independence to the colonized people. Therefore,

nationalism in the colonies became stronger in flanked by the two wars, leading to Abd el-Krim's Rif War (1921-1925) in Morocco and to the making of Messali Hadj's Star of North Africa in Algeria in 1925. Though, these movements would gain full potential only after World War II. The October 27, 1946 Constitution creating the Fourth Republic substituted the French Union to the colonial empire. On the night of March 29, 1947, a nationalist uprising in Madagascar led the French government headed through Paul Ramadier (Socialist) to violent repression: one year of bitter fighting, in which 90,000 to 100,000 Malagasy died. On May 8, 1945, the Sétif massacre took lay in Algeria.

In 1946, the states of French Indochina withdrew from the Union, leading to the Indochina War (1946-54) against Ho Chi Minh, who had been a co-founder of the French Communist Party in 1920 and had founded the Vietminh in 1941.

In 1956, Morocco and Tunisia gained their independence, while the Algerian War was raging (1954-1962). Likewise, a decade earlier, Laos and Cambodia achieved independence in order for the French to focus to keeping Vietnam. With Charles de Gaulle's return to power in 1958 amidst turmoil and threats of a right-wing coups d'état to protect "French Algeria", the decolonization was completed with the independence of Sub-Saharan Africa's colonies in 1960 and the March 19, 1962 Evian Accords, which put an end to the Algerian war. The OAS

movement unsuccessfully tried to block the accords with a series of bombings, including an attempted assassination against Charles de Gaulle.

To this day, the Algerian war - officially described until the 1990s a "public order operation" - remains a trauma for both France and Algeria. Philosopher Paul Ricœur has spoken of the necessity of a "decolonization of memory", starting with the recognition of the 1961 Paris massacre throughout the Algerian war and the recognition of the decisive role of African and especially North African immigrant manpower in the Trente Glorieuses post-World War II economic development era. In the 1960s, due to economic requires for post-war reconstruction and rapid economic development, French employers actively sought to recruit manpower from the colonies, explaining today's multiethnic population.

### **The Soviet Union and Anti-colonialism**

The Soviet Union sought to effect the abolishment of colonial governance through Western countries and replace it with the rule of a regional Communist Party under the power of the Soviet Union, either through direct subversion of Western-leaning or -controlled governments or indirectly through power of political leadership and support. Several of the revolutions of this time era were inspired or convinced in this method. The conflicts in Vietnam, Nicaragua, Congo, and Sudan, in the middle of others, have been characterized as such.

Mainly Soviet leaders expressed the Marxist-Leninist view that imperialism was the height of capitalism, and generated a class-stratified community. It followed, then, that Soviet leadership would encourage independence movements in colonized territories, especially as the Cold War progressed. However this was the view expressed through their leaders, such interventions can be interpreted as the expansion of Soviet interests, not presently as aiding the oppressed peoples of the world. Because therefore several of these wars of independence expanded into common Cold War conflicts, the United States also supported many such independence movements in opposition to Soviet interests. Nikita Khrushchev's well-known shoe-banging incident occurred in the context of a United Nations debate on colonialism in 1960. After Khrushchev had decried western colonialism, Filipino delegate Lorenzo Sumulong accused him of hypocrisy, claiming that the Soviet Union was at that time doing exactly the similar item to the countries of Eastern Europe. Khrushchev then reportedly became enraged and theatrically banged his shoe on the table while berating Sumulong as a "toady of imperialism," however accounts of the incident differ.

Throughout the Vietnam War, Communist countries supported anti-colonialist movements in several countries still under colonial administration by propaganda, developmental and economic assistance, and in some cases military aid. Notably in the middle of these were the support of armed rebel

movements through Cuba in Angola, and the Soviet Union (as well as the People's Republic of China) in Vietnam.

## **Decolonization after 1945**

### **The Emergence of the Third World**

The term "Third World" was coined through French demographer Alfred Sauvy in 1952, on the model of the Third Estate, which represented everything, but was nothing: "...because at the end this ignored, exploited, scorned Third World like the Third Estate, wants to become something too" (Sauvy). The emergence of this new political entity, in the frame of the Cold War, was intricate and painful. Many tentative were made to organize newly self-governing states in order to oppose a general front towards both the US's and the USSR's power on them, with the consequences of the Sino-Soviet split already at works. Therefore, the Non-Aligned Movement constituted itself, approximately the largest figures of Jawaharlal Nehru, the leader of India, Sukarno, the Indonesian president, Josip Broz Tito the Communist leader of Yugoslavia, and Gamal Abdel Nasser, head of Egypt who successfully opposed the French and British imperial powers throughout the 1956 Suez crisis. After the 1954 Geneva Conference which put an end to the French war against Ho Chi Minh in Vietnam, the 1955 Bandung Conference gathered Nasser, Nehru, Tito, Sukarno, the leader of Indonesia, and

Zhou Enlai, Premier of the People's Republic of China. In 1960, the UN Common Assembly voted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples. The after that year, the Non-Aligned Movement was officially created in Belgrade (1961), and was followed in 1964 through the making of the United Nations Conference on Deal and Growth which tried to promote a New International Economic Order (NIEO). The NIEO was opposed to the 1944 Bretton Woods organization, which had benefited the leading states which had created it, and remained in force until 1971 after the United States' suspension of convertibility from dollars to gold.

*The largest tenets of the NIEO were:*

- Developing countries necessity is entitled to regulate and manage the activities of multinational corporations operating within their territory.
- They necessity be free to nationalize or expropriate foreign property on circumstances favourable to them.
- They necessity be free to set up associations of primary commodities producers same to the Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries, created on September 17, 1960 to protest pressure through biggest oil companies (mostly owned through U.S., British, and Dutch nationals) to reduce oil prices and payments to producers); all other states necessity recognize this right and refrain from taking

economic, military, or political events calculated to restrict it.

- International deal should be based on the require to ensure stable, equitable, and remunerative prices for raw materials, generalized non-reciprocal and non-discriminatory tariff preferences, as well as transfer of technology to developing countries; and should give economic and technological assistance without any strings attached.

The UNCTAD though wasn't extremely effective in implementing this New International Economic Order (NIEO), and social and economic inequalities flanked by industrialized countries and the Third World kept on rising during the 1960s until the 21st century. The 1973 oil crisis which followed the Yom Kippur War (October 1973) was triggered through the OPEC which decided an embargo against the US and Western countries, causing a fourfold augment in the price of oil, which lasted five months, starting on October 17, 1973, and ending on March 18, 1974. OPEC nations then agreed, on January 7, 1975, to raise crude oil prices through 10per cent. At that time, OPEC nations - including several whom had recently nationalized their oil industries - joined the call for a New International Economic Order to be initiated through coalitions of primary producers. Concluding the First OPEC Summit in Algiers they described for stable and presently commodity prices, an international food and agriculture programme, technology transfer from North to South, and the democratization of the economic organization. But industrialized countries quickly



began to seem for substitutes to OPEC petroleum, with the oil companies investing the majority of their research capital in the US and European countries or others, politically certain countries. The OPEC lost more and more power on the world prices of oil.

The second oil crisis occurred in the wake of the 1979 Iranian Revolution. Then, the 1982 Latin American debt crisis exploded in Mexico first, then Argentina and Brazil, which proved unable to pay back their debts, jeopardizing the subsistence of the international economic organization.

The 1990s were characterized through the prevalence of the Washington consensus on neo-liberal policies, "structural adjustment" and "shock therapies" for the former Communist states.

## **Chapter 3**

# **The Gulf War and Post Cold War Culture**

## **Operational names**

The Gulf War (2 August 1990 - 28 February 1991), codenamed Operation Desert Shield (2 August 1990 - 17 January 1991), for operations leading to the buildup of troops and defence of Saudi Arabia and Operation Desert Storm (17 January 1991 - 28 February 1991) in its combat phase, was a war waged by coalition forces from 34 nations led by the United States against Iraq in response to Iraq's invasion and annexation of Kuwait.

The war is also known under other names, such as the Persian Gulf War, First Gulf War, Gulf War I, Kuwait War, First Iraq War, or Iraq War before the term "Iraq War" became identified instead with the 2003 Iraq War (also referred to in the U.S. as "Operation Iraqi Freedom"). The Iraqi Army's occupation of Kuwait that began 2 August 1990 was met with international condemnation, and brought immediate economic sanctions against Iraq by members of the U.N. Security Council. U.S. President George H. W. Bush deployed U.S. forces into Saudi Arabia, and urged other countries to send their own forces to the scene. An array of nations joined the Coalition, the largest

military alliance since, World War II. The great majority of the Coalition's military forces were from the U.S., with Saudi Arabia, the United Kingdom and Egypt as leading contributors, in that order. Saudi Arabia paid around US\$36 billion of the US\$60 billion cost.

The war was marked by the introduction of live news broadcasts from the front lines of the battle, principally by the U.S. network CNN. The war has also earned the nickname Video Game War after the daily broadcast of images from cameras on board U.S. bombers during Operation Desert Storm.

The initial conflict to expel Iraqi troops from Kuwait began with an aerial and naval bombardment on 17 January 1991, continuing for five weeks

This was followed by a ground assault on 24 February. This was a decisive victory for the Coalition forces, who drove the Iraqi military from Kuwait and advanced into Iraqi territory. The Coalition ceased its advance, and declared a cease-fire 100 hours after the ground campaign started. Aerial and ground combat was confined to Iraq, Kuwait, and areas on Saudi Arabia's border. Iraq launched Scud missiles against Coalition military targets in Saudi Arabia and against Israel.

The following names have been used to describe the conflict itself:

- Gulf War, "Kuwait Invasion" and Persian Gulf War have been the most common terms for the conflict used within western countries. These names have been used by an overwhelming majority of popular historians and journalists in the United States. The major problem with these terms is that the usage is ambiguous, having now been applied to at least three conflicts: see Gulf War (disambiguation). With no consensus of naming, various publications have attempted to refine the name. Some variants include:

- War in the Gulf
- 1990 Gulf War
- Gulf War (1990-1991)
- *First Gulf War*: To distinguish it from the 2003 invasion of Iraq and the subsequent war.
- Second Gulf War: To distinguish it from the Iran-Iraq War.
  - Liberation of Kuwait is the term used by Kuwait and most of the Coalition's Arab states including Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Egypt and the United Arab Emirates.
  - In addition to "Gulf War", the names War of Kuwait and Second Gulf War are commonly used in France and Germany.
  - The mother of all battles is the term used by Iraq.
  - Other names sometimes used include Iraq-Kuwait conflict and U.N.-Iraq conflict.
  - Most of the Coalition states used various names for their operations and the war's operational phases. These are sometimes incorrectly used as

the conflict's overall name, especially the U.S. Desert Storm:

- Operation Desert Shield was the U.S. operational name for the U.S. buildup of forces and Saudi Arabia's defence from 2 August 1990, to 16 January 1991.
- Operation Desert Storm was the U.S. name of the airland conflict from 17 January 1991, through 11 April 1991.
- Operation Desert Sabre (early name Operation Desert Sword) was the U.S. name for the airland offensive against the Iraqi Army in the Kuwaiti Theater of Operations (the "100-hour war") from 24-28 February 1991, in itself, part of Operation Desert Storm.
- Operation Desert Farewell was the name given to the return of U.S. units and equipment to the U.S. in 1991 after Kuwait's liberation, sometimes referred to as Operation Desert Calm.
- Operation Granby was the British name for British military activities during the operations and conflict.
- Opération Daguet was the French name for French military activities in the conflict.
- Operation Friction was the name of the Canadian operations
- Operazione Locusta (Italian for Locust) was the Italian name for the operations and conflict.

In addition, various phases of each operation may have a unique operational name.

## **Campaign names**

The U.S. divided the conflict into three major campaigns:

- Defence of Saudi Arabian country for the period 2 August 1990, through 16 January 1991.
- Liberation and Defence of Kuwait for the period 17 January 1991, through 11 April 1991.
- Southwest Asia Cease-Fire for the period 12 April 1991, through 30 November 1995, including Operation Provide Comfort.

Throughout the Cold War, Iraq had been an ally of the Soviet Union, and there was a history of friction between it and the United States. The U.S. was concerned with Iraq's position on Israeli-Palestinian politics, and its disapproval of the nature of the peace between Israel and Egypt. The U.S. also disliked Iraqi support for many Arab and Palestinian militant groups such as Abu Nidal, which led to Iraq's inclusion on the developing U.S. list of State Sponsors of Terrorism on 29 December 1979. The U.S. remained officially neutral after Iraq's invasion of Iran in 1980, which became the Iran-Iraq War, although it provided resources, political support, and some "non-military" aircraft to Iraq. In March 1982, Iran began a successful counteroffensive (Operation Undeniable Victory), and the U.S. increased its support for Iraq to prevent Iran from forcing a surrender. In a U.S. bid to open full diplomatic relations with Iraq, the country was removed from the U.S. list of State Sponsors of Terrorism. Ostensibly this was because of

improvement in the regime's record, although former U.S. Assistant Defence Secretary Noel Koch later stated, "No one had any doubts about [the Iraqis'] continued involvement in terrorism... The real reason was to help them succeed in the war against Iran." With Iraq's newfound success in the war, and the Iranian rebuff of a peace offer in July, arms sales to Iraq reached a record spike in 1982. When Iraqi President Saddam Hussein expelled Abu Nidal to Syria at the U.S.' request in November 1983, the Reagan administration sent Donald Rumsfeld to meet Saddam as a special envoy and to cultivate ties. By the time the ceasefire with Iran was signed in August 1988, Iraq was heavily debt-ridden and tensions within society were rising. Most of its debt was owed to Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. Iraq pressured both nations to forgive the debts, but they refused. The Iraq-Kuwait dispute also involved Iraqi claims to Kuwait as Iraqi territory. Kuwait had been a part of the Ottoman Empire's province of Basra, something that Iraq claimed made it rightful Iraq territory. Its ruling dynasty, the al-Sabah family, had concluded a protectorate agreement in 1899 that assigned responsibility for its foreign affairs to the United Kingdom. The UK drew the border between the two countries in 1922, making Iraq virtually landlocked. Kuwait rejected Iraqi attempts to secure further provisions in the region.

Iraq also accused Kuwait of exceeding its OPEC quotas for oil production. In order for the cartel to maintain its desired price

of \$18 a barrel, discipline was required. The United Arab Emirates and Kuwait were consistently overproducing; the latter at least in part to repair losses caused by Iranian attacks in the Iran-Iraq War and to pay for the losses of an economic scandal. The result was a slump in the oil price - as low as \$10 a barrel - with a resulting loss of \$7 billion a year to Iraq, equal to its 1989 balance of payments deficit. Resulting revenues struggled to support the government's basic costs, let alone repair Iraq's damaged infrastructure. Jordan and Iraq both looked for more discipline, with little success. The Iraqi government described it as a form of economic warfare, which it claimed was aggravated by Kuwait slant-drilling across the border into Iraq's Rumaila oil field. At the same time, Saddam looked for closer ties with those Arab states that had supported Iraq in the war. This was supported by the U.S., who believed that Iraqi ties with pro-Western Gulf states would help bring and maintain Iraq inside the U.S.' sphere of influence.

In 1989, it appeared that Saudi-Iraqi relations, strong during the war, would be maintained. A pact of non-interference and non-aggression was signed between the countries, followed by a Kuwaiti-Iraqi deal for Iraq to supply Kuwait with water for drinking and irrigation, although a request for Kuwait to lease Iraq Umm Qasr was rejected. Saudi-backed development projects were hampered by Iraq's large debts, even with the demobilization of 200,000 soldiers. Iraq also looked to increase



arms production so as to become an exporter, although the success of these projects was also restrained by Iraq's obligations; in Iraq, resentment to OPEC's controls mounted.

Iraq's relations with its Arab neighbours - in particular Egypt - were degraded by mounting violence in Iraq against expatriate groups, well-employed during the war, by Iraqi unemployed, among them demobilized soldiers. These events drew little notice outside the Arab world because of fast-moving events in Eastern Europe. The U.S. did, however, begin to condemn Iraq's human rights record, including the well-known use of torture. The UK also condemned the execution of Farzad Bazoft, a journalist working for the British newspaper *The Observer*. Following Saddam's declaration that "binary chemical weapons" would be used on Israel if it used military force against Iraq, Washington halted part of its funding. A U.N. mission to the Israeli-occupied territories, where riots had resulted in Palestinian deaths, was vetoed by the U.S., making Iraq deeply skeptical of U.S. foreign policy aims in the region, combined with the U.S.' reliance on Middle Eastern energy reserves.

In early July 1990, Iraq complained about Kuwait's behaviour, such as not respecting their quota, and openly threatened to take military action. On the 23rd, the CIA reported that Iraq had moved 30,000 troops to the Iraq-Kuwait border, and the U.S. naval fleet in the Persian Gulf was placed on alert.

Saddam believed an anti-Iraq conspiracy was developing - Kuwait had begun talks with Iran, and Iraq's rival Syria had arranged a visit to Egypt. Upon review by the Secretary of Defence, it was found that Syria indeed planned a strike against Iraq in the coming days. Saddam immediately used funding to incorporate central intelligence into Syria and ultimately prevented the impending air strike. On 15 July 1990, Saddam's government laid out its combined objections to the Arab League, including that policy moves were costing Iraq \$1 billion a year, that Kuwait was still using the Rumaila oil field, that loans made by the UAE and Kuwait could not be considered debts to its "Arab brothers". He threatened force against Kuwait and the UAE saying "The policies of some Arab rulers are American... They are inspired by America to undermine Arab interests and security." The U.S. sent aerial refuelling planes and combat ships to the Persian Gulf in response to these threats. Discussions in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia, mediated on the Arab League's behalf by Egyptian President Hosni Mubarak, were held on 31 July and led Mubarak to believe that a peaceful course could be established.

On the 25th, Saddam met with April Glaspie, the U.S. Ambassador to Iraq, in Baghdad. The Iraqi leader attacked American policy with regards to Kuwait and the United Arab Emirates:

- "So what can it mean when America says it will now protect its friends? It can only mean prejudice against Iraq. This stance plus maneuvers and statements which have been made has encouraged the UAE and Kuwait to disregard Iraqi rights... If you use pressure, we will deploy pressure and force. We know that you can harm us although we do not threaten you. But we too can harm you. Everyone can cause harm according to their ability and their size. We cannot come all the way to you in the United States, but individual Arabs may reach you... We do not place America among the enemies. We place it where we want our friends to be and we try to be friends. But repeated American statements last year made it apparent that America did not regard us as friends."

Glaspie replied:

- "I know you need funds. We understand that and our opinion is that you should have the opportunity to rebuild your country. But we have no opinion on the Arab-Arab conflicts, like your border disagreement with Kuwait... Frankly, we can only see that you have deployed massive troops in the south. Normally that would not be any of our business. But when this happens in the context of what you said on your national day, then when we read the details in the two letters of the Foreign Minister, then when we see the Iraqi point of view that the measures taken by the UAE and Kuwait is, in the final analysis, parallel

to military aggression against Iraq, then it would be reasonable for me to be concerned."

Saddam stated that he would attempt last-ditch negotiations with the Kuwaitis but Iraq "would not accept death".

According to Glaspie's own account, she stated in reference to the precise border between Kuwait and Iraq, "... that she had served in Kuwait 20 years before; 'then, as now, we took no position on these Arab affairs'." Glaspie similarly believed that war was not imminent.

### **Invasion of Kuwait**

The result of the Jeddah talks was an Iraqi demand for \$10 billion to cover the lost revenues from Rumaila; the Kuwaiti response was to offer \$9 billion. The Iraqi response was to immediately order the invasion. On 2 August 1990, Iraq launched the invasion by bombing Kuwait's capital, Kuwait City.

At the time of the invasion, the Kuwaiti military was believed to have numbered 16,000 men, arranged into three armored, one mechanised infantry and one under-strength artillery brigade. The pre-war strength of the Kuwait Air Force was around 2,200 Kuwaiti personnel, with 80 aircraft and forty helicopters. In spite of Iraqi saber-rattling, Kuwait didn't have its forces on alert; the army had been stood down on 19 July.

By 1988, at the Iran-Iraq War's end, the Iraqi Army was the world's fourth largest army; it consisted of 955,000 standing soldiers and 650,000 paramilitary forces in the Popular Army. According to John Childs and André Corvisier, a low estimate shows the Iraqi Army capable of fielding 4,500 tanks, 484 combat aircraft and 232 combat helicopters. According to Michael Knights, a high estimate shows the Iraqi Army capable of fielding one million men and 850,000 reservists, 5,500 tanks, 3,000 artillery pieces, 700 combat aircraft and helicopters; and held 53 divisions, 20 special-forces brigades, and several regional militias, and had a strong air defence.

Iraqi commandos infiltrated the Kuwaiti border first to prepare for the major units which began the attack at midnight. The Iraqi attack had two prongs, with the primary attack force driving south straight for Kuwait City down the main highway, and a supporting attack force entering Kuwait farther west, but then turning and driving east, cutting off Kuwait City from the country's southern half. The commander of a Kuwaiti armored battalion, 35th Armoured Brigade, deployed them against the Iraqi attack and was able to conduct a robust defence (Battle of the Bridges), near Al Jahra, west of Kuwait City.

Kuwaiti aircraft scrambled to meet the invading force, but approximately 20per cent were lost or captured. A few combat sorties were flown against Iraqi ground forces.

The main Iraqi thrust into Kuwait City was conducted by commandos deployed by helicopters and boats to attack the city from the sea, while other divisions seized the airports and two airbases. The Iraqis attacked the Dasman Palace, the Royal Residence of Kuwait's Emir, Jaber Al-Ahmad Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, which was defended by the Emiri Guard supported with M-84 tanks. In the process, the Iraqis killed Fahad Al-Ahmed Al-Jaber Al-Sabah, the Emir's youngest brother.

Within 12 hours, most resistance had ended within Kuwait and the royal family had fled, leaving Iraq in control of most of Kuwait. After two days of intense combat, most of the Kuwaiti military were either overrun by the Iraqi Republican Guard, or had escaped to Saudi Arabia. The Emir and key ministers were able to get out and head south along the highway for refuge in Saudi Arabia. Iraqi ground forces consolidated their control of Kuwait City, then headed south and redeployed along the Saudi border. After the decisive Iraqi victory, Saddam initially installed a puppet regime known as the "Provisional Government of Free Kuwait" before installing his cousin Ali Hassan al-Majid as Kuwait's governor on 8 August.

### **Kuwaiti resistance movement**

Kuwaitis founded a local armed resistance movement following the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait. The Kuwaiti resistance's casualty rate far exceeded that of the coalition military forces and Western hostages. The resistance predominantly consisted

of ordinary citizens who lacked any form of training and supervision. The majority of Kuwaitis who stayed in Kuwait during the Gulf War were Shias.

## **Run-up to the war**

### **Diplomatic means**

A key element of U.S. political-military and energy economic planning occurred in early 1984. The Iran-Iraq war had been going on for five years and there were significant casualties on both sides, reaching hundreds of thousands. Within President Ronald Reagan's National Security Council concern was growing that the war could spread beyond the boundaries of the two belligerents. A National Security Planning Group meeting was formed, chaired by then Vice President George H. W. Bush to review U.S. options. It was determined that there was a high likelihood that the conflict would spread into Saudi Arabia and other Gulf states, but that the United States had little capability to defend the region. Furthermore it was determined that a prolonged war in the region would induce much higher oil prices and threaten the fragile recovery of the world economy which was just beginning to gain momentum. On 22 May 1984, President Reagan was briefed on the project conclusions in the Oval Office by William Flynn Martin who had served as the head of the NSC staff that organized the study. The full declassified presentation can be seen [here](#). The

conclusions were threefold: first oil stocks needed to be increased among members of the International Energy Agency and, if necessary, released early in the event of oil market disruption; second the United States needed to beef up the security of friendly Arab states in the region and thirdly an embargo should be placed on sales of military equipment to Iran and Iraq. The Plan was approved by the President Reagan and later affirmed by the G-7 leaders headed by Great Britain's Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher in the London Summit of 1984. The plan was implemented and became the basis for U.S. preparedness to respond to the Iraqi occupation of Kuwait in 1991.

Within hours of the invasion, Kuwait and U.S. delegations requested a meeting of the United Nations Security Council, which passed Resolution 660, condemning the invasion and demanding a withdrawal of Iraqi troops. On 3 August, the Arab League passed its own resolution, which called for a solution to the conflict from within the League, and warned against outside intervention; Iraq and Libya were the only two Arab League states which opposed a resolution for Iraq to withdraw from Kuwait. The PLO opposed it as well. The Arab states of Yemen and Jordan - a Western ally which bordered Iraq and relied on the country for economic support - opposed military intervention from non-Arab states. The Arab state of Sudan aligned itself with Saddam.



On 6 August, Resolution 661 placed economic sanctions on Iraq. Resolution 665 followed soon after, which authorized a naval blockade to enforce the sanctions. It said the "use of measures commensurate to the specific circumstances as may be necessary... to halt all inward and outward maritime shipping in order to inspect and verify their cargoes and destinations and to ensure strict implementation of resolution 661."

From the beginning, U.S. officials insisted on a total Iraqi pullout from Kuwait, without any linkage to other Middle Eastern problems, fearing any concessions would strengthen Iraqi influence in the region for years to come.

On 12 August 1990, Saddam "propose[d] that all cases of occupation, and those cases that have been portrayed as occupation, in the region, be resolved simultaneously". Specifically, he called for Israel to withdraw from occupied territories in Palestine, Syria, and Lebanon, Syria to withdraw from Lebanon, and "mutual withdrawals by Iraq and Iran and arrangement for the situation in Kuwait." He also called for a replacement of U.S. troops that mobilized in Saudi Arabia in response to Kuwait's invasion with "an Arab force", as long as that force did not involve Egypt. Additionally, he requested an "immediate freeze of all boycott and siege decisions" and a general normalization of relations with Iraq. From the beginning of the crisis, President Bush was strongly opposed to

any "linkage" between Iraq's occupation of Kuwait and the Palestinian issue.

On 23 August, Saddam appeared on state television with Western hostages to whom he had refused exit visas. In the video, he asks a young British boy, Stuart Lockwood, whether he is getting his milk, and goes on to say, through his interpreter, "We hope your presence as guests here will not be for too long. Your presence here, and in other places, is meant to prevent the scourge of war."

Another Iraqi proposal communicated in August 1990 was delivered to U.S. National Security Advisor Brent Scowcroft by an unidentified Iraqi official.

The official communicated to the White House that Iraq would "withdraw from Kuwait and allow foreigners to leave" provided that the U.N. lifted sanctions, allowed "guaranteed access to the Persian Gulf through the Kuwaiti islands of Bubiyan and Warbah", and allowed Iraq to "gain full control of the Rumaila oil field that extends slightly into Kuwaiti territory". The proposal also "include[d] offers to negotiate an oil agreement with the United States 'satisfactory to both nations' national security interests,' develop a joint plan 'to alleviate Iraq's economical and financial problems' and 'jointly work on the stability of the gulf.'"

In December 1990, Iraq made a proposal to withdraw from Kuwait provided that foreign troops left the region and that an agreement was reached regarding the Palestinian problem and the dismantlement of both Israel's and Iraq's weapons of mass destruction. The White House rejected the proposal. The PLO's Yasser Arafat expressed that neither he nor Saddam insisted that solving the Israel-Palestine issues should be a precondition to solving the issues in Kuwait, though he did acknowledge a "strong link" between these problems.

Ultimately, the U.S. stuck to its position that there would be no negotiations until Iraq withdrew from Kuwait and that they should not grant Iraq concessions, lest they give the impression that Iraq benefited from its military campaign. Also, when U.S. Secretary of State James Baker met with Tariq Aziz in Geneva, Switzerland, for last minute peace talks in early 1991, Aziz reportedly made no concrete proposals and did not outline any hypothetical Iraqi moves.

On 29 November 1990, the Security Council passed Resolution 678 which gave Iraq until 15 January 1991 to withdraw from Kuwait and empowered states to use "all necessary means" to force Iraq out of Kuwait after the deadline.

On 14 January 1991, France proposed that the U.N. Security Council call for "a rapid and massive withdrawal" from Kuwait along with a statement to Iraq that Council members would bring their "active contribution" to a settlement of the region's

other problems, "in particular, of the Arab-Israeli conflict and in particular to the Palestinian problem by convening, at an appropriate moment, an international conference" to assure "the security, stability and development of this region of the world." The French proposal was supported by Belgium (at the moment one of the rotating Council members), Germany, Spain, Italy, Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia, and several non-aligned nations. The U.S., the UK, and the Soviet Union rejected it; U.S. Ambassador to the U.N. Thomas Pickering stated that the French proposal was unacceptable, because it went beyond previous Council resolutions on the Iraqi invasion. France dropped this proposal when it found "no tangible sign of interest" from Baghdad.

### **Military means**

One of the West's main concerns was the significant threat Iraq posed to Saudi Arabia. Following Kuwait's conquest, the Iraqi Army was within easy striking distance of Saudi oil fields. Control of these fields, along with Kuwaiti and Iraqi reserves, would have given Saddam control over the majority of the world's oil reserves. Iraq also had a number of grievances with Saudi Arabia. The Saudis had lent Iraq some 26 billion dollars during its war with Iran. The Saudis had backed Iraq in that war, as they feared the influence of Shia Iran's Islamic revolution on its own Shia minority. After the war, Saddam felt

he shouldn't have to repay the loans due to the help he had given the Saudis by fighting Iran.

Soon after his conquest of Kuwait, Saddam began verbally attacking the Saudis. He argued that the U.S.-supported Saudi state was an illegitimate and unworthy guardian of the holy cities of Mecca and Medina. He combined the language of the Islamist groups that had recently fought in Afghanistan with the rhetoric Iran had long used to attack the Saudis.

Acting on the Carter Doctrine's policy, and out of fear the Iraqi Army could launch an invasion of Saudi Arabia, U.S. President George H. W. Bush quickly announced that the U.S. would launch a "wholly defensive" mission to prevent Iraq from invading Saudi Arabia under the codename Operation Desert Shield. Operation Desert Shield began on 7 August 1990 when U.S. troops were sent to Saudi Arabia due also to the request of its monarch, King Fahd, who had earlier called for U.S. military assistance. This "wholly defensive" doctrine was quickly abandoned when, on 8 August, Iraq declared Kuwait to be Iraq's 19th province and Saddam named his cousin, Ali Hassan Al-Majid, as its military-governor.

The U.S. Navy dispatched two naval battle groups built around the aircraft carriers USS Dwight D. Eisenhower and USS Independence to the Persian Gulf, where they were ready by 8 August. The U.S. also sent the battleships USS Missouri and USS Wisconsin to the region. A total of 48 U.S. Air Force F-15s

from the 1st Fighter Wing at Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, landed in Saudi Arabia, and immediately commenced round the clock air patrols of the Saudi-Kuwait-Iraq border to discourage further Iraqi military advances. They were joined by 36 F-15 A-Ds from the 36th Tactical Fighter Wing at Bitburg, Germany. The Bitburg contingent was based at Al Kharj Air Base, approximately 1-hour southeast of Riyadh. The 36th TFW would be responsible for 11 confirmed Iraqi Air Force aircraft shot down during the war. There were also two Air National Guard units stationed at Al Kharj Air Base, the South Carolina Air National Guard's 169th Fighter Wing flew bombing missions with 24 F-16s flying 2,000 combat missions and dropping 4 million pounds of munitions, and the New York Air National Guard's 174th Fighter Wing from Syracuse flew 24 F-16s on bombing missions. Military buildup continued from there, eventually reaching 543,000 troops, twice the number used in the 2003 invasion of Iraq. Much of the material was airlifted or carried to the staging areas via fast sealift ships, allowing a quick buildup.

### **Creating a coalition**

A series of U.N. Security Council resolutions and Arab League resolutions were passed regarding Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. One of the most important was Resolution 678, passed on 29 November 1990, which gave Iraq a withdrawal deadline until 15 January 1991, and authorized "all necessary means to

uphold and implement Resolution 660", and a diplomatic formulation authorizing the use of force if Iraq failed to comply.

To ensure that economic backing, Baker went on an eleven day journey to nine countries that the press dubbed "The Tin Cup Trip". The first stop was Saudi Arabia, who a month before had already granted permission to the United States to use its facilities. However, Baker believed that Saudi Arabia, an immensely wealthy nation, should assume some of the cost of the military efforts, since, one of the most decisive military objectives was defending Saudi Arabia. When Baker asked King Fahd for 15 billion dollars, the King readily agreed, with the promise that Baker ask Kuwait for the same amount.

The next day, 7 September, he did just that, and the Emir of Kuwait, displaced in a Sheraton hotel outside his invaded country, easily agreed. Baker then moved to enter talks with Egypt, whose leadership he considered to be "the moderate voice of the middle east". President Mubarak of Egypt was furious with Saddam for his invasion of Kuwait, and for the fact that Saddam had assured Mubarak that an invasion was not his intention. Therefore, he was willing to commit troops to the coalition forces to quell Saddam, as well as relieved the United States was willing to forgive his country's 7.1 billion dollar debt.

After stops in Helsinki and Moscow to smooth out Iraqi demands for a middle-eastern peace conference with Russia (then the Soviet Union), Baker traveled to Syria to discuss its role in the crisis with its President Hafez Assad. Assad had a deep personal enmity towards Saddam, which was defined by the fact that "Saddam had been trying to kill him [Assad] for years". Harboring this animosity and being impressed with Baker's diplomatic initiative to visit Damascus (relations had been severed since, the 1983 bombing of U.S. Marine barracks in Beirut), Assad agreed to pledge up to 100,000 Syrian troops to the coalition effort. This was a vital step in ensuring Arab states were represented in the coalition.

Baker flew to Rome for a brief visit with the Italians in which he was promised the use of some military equipment, before journeying to Germany to meet with American ally Chancellor Kohl. Although Germany's constitution (which was brokered essentially by the United States) prohibited military involvement in outside nations, Kohl was willing to repay his gratitude for the United States with a two billion dollar contribution to the coalition's war effort, as well as further economic and military support of coalition ally Turkey, and the execution of the transport of Egyptian soldiers and ships to the Persian Gulf.

A coalition of forces opposing Iraq's aggression was formed, consisting of forces from 34 countries: Argentina, Australia,



Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, Kuwait, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Portugal, Qatar, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Spain, Syria, the United Arab Emirates, the United Kingdom and the U.S. itself. It was the largest coalition since, World War II. U.S. Army General Norman Schwarzkopf, Jr. was designated to be the commander of the Coalition forces in the Persian Gulf area. The Soviet Union also supported United States intervention.

Although they did not contribute any forces, Japan and Germany made financial contributions totaling \$10 billion and \$6.6 billion respectively. U.S. troops represented 73 per cent of the Coalition's 956,600 troops in Iraq.

Many of the Coalition's forces were reluctant to join. Some felt that the war was an internal Arab affair, or didn't want to increase U.S. influence in the Middle East. In the end, however, many nations were persuaded by Iraq's belligerence towards other Arab states, offers of economic aid or debt forgiveness, and threats to withhold aid.

### **Justification for intervention**

The U.S. and the U.N. gave several public justifications for involvement in the conflict, the most prominent being the Iraqi violation of Kuwaiti territorial integrity. In addition, the U.S.

moved to support its ally Saudi Arabia, whose importance in the region, and as a key supplier of oil, made it of considerable geopolitical importance. Shortly after the Iraqi invasion, U.S. Defence Secretary Dick Cheney made the first of several visits to Saudi Arabia where King Fahd requested U.S. military assistance. During a speech in a special joint session of the U.S. Congress given on 11 September 1990, U.S. President George H. W. Bush summed up the reasons with the following remarks: "Within three days, 120,000 Iraqi troops with 850 tanks had poured into Kuwait and moved south to threaten Saudi Arabia. It was then that I decided to act to check that aggression."

The Pentagon stated that satellite photos showing a buildup of Iraqi forces along the border were this information's source, but this was later alleged to be false. A reporter for the St. Petersburg Times acquired two commercial Soviet satellite images made at the time in question, which showed nothing but empty desert.

Other justifications for foreign involvement included Iraq's history of human rights abuses under Saddam. Iraq was also known to possess biological weapons and chemical weapons, which Saddam had used against Iranian troops during the Iran-Iraq War and against his own country's Kurdish population in the Al-Anfal Campaign. Iraq was also known to have a nuclear weapons programme, but the report about it

from January 1991 was partially declassified by the CIA on 26 May 2001. Although there were human rights abuses committed in Kuwait by the invading Iraqi military, the alleged incidents which received most publicity in the U.S. were inventions of the public relations firm hired by the government of Kuwait to influence U.S. opinion in favour of military intervention. Shortly after Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, the organization Citizens for a Free Kuwait was formed in the U.S. It hired the public relations firm Hill & Knowlton for about \$11 million, paid by Kuwait's government.

Among many other means of influencing U.S. opinion (distributing books on Iraqi atrocities to U.S. soldiers deployed in the region, 'Free Kuwait' T-shirts and speakers to college campuses, and dozens of video news releases to television stations), the firm arranged for an appearance before a group of members of the U.S. Congress in which a woman identifying herself as a nurse working in the Kuwait City hospital described Iraqi soldiers pulling babies out of incubators and letting them die on the floor.

The story was an influence in tipping both the public and Congress towards a war with Iraq: six Congressmen said the testimony was enough for them to support military action against Iraq and seven Senators referenced the testimony in debate. The Senate supported the military actions in a 52-47 vote. A year after the war, however, this allegation was

revealed to be a fabrication. The woman who had testified was found to be a member of Kuwait's Royal Family, in fact the daughter of Kuwait's ambassador to the U.S. She hadn't lived in Kuwait during the Iraqi invasion.

The details of the Hill & Knowlton public relations campaign, including the incubator testimony, were published in John R. MacArthur's *Second Front: Censorship and Propaganda in the Gulf War* and came to wide public attention when an Op-ed by MacArthur was published in *The New York Times*. This prompted a re-examination by Amnesty International, which had originally promoted an account alleging even greater numbers of babies torn from incubators than the original fake testimony. After finding no evidence to support it, the organization issued a retraction. President Bush then repeated the incubator allegations on television.

At the same time, the Iraqi Army committed several well-documented crimes during its occupation of Kuwait, such as the summary execution without trial of three brothers after which their bodies were stacked in a pile and left to decay in a public street. Iraqi troops also ransacked and looted private Kuwaiti homes; one residence was repeatedly defecated in. A resident later commented, "The whole thing was violence for the sake of violence, destruction for the sake of destruction... Imagine a surrealist painting by Salvador Dalí".

The Gulf War began with an extensive aerial bombing campaign on 17 January 1991. The Coalition flew over 100,000 sorties, dropping 88,500 tons of bombs, and widely destroying military and civilian infrastructure. The air campaign was commanded by USAF Lieutenant General Chuck Horner, who briefly served as U.S. Central Command's Commander-in-Chief - Forward while General Schwarzkopf was still in the U.S.

A day after the deadline set in Resolution 678, the Coalition launched a massive air campaign, which began the general offensive codenamed Operation Desert Storm. The first priority for Coalition forces was the destruction of Iraq's Air Force and anti-aircraft facilities. The sorties were launched mostly from Saudi Arabia and the six Coalition carrier battle groups (CVBG) in the Persian Gulf and Red Sea.

The next Coalition targets were command and communication facilities. Saddam Hussein had closely micromanaged Iraqi forces in the Iran-Iraq War, and initiative at lower levels was discouraged. Coalition planners hoped that Iraqi resistance would quickly collapse if deprived of command and control.

The air campaign's third and largest phase targeted military targets throughout Iraq and Kuwait: Scud missile launchers, weapons research facilities, and naval forces. About one-third of the Coalition's air power was devoted to attacking Scuds, some of which were on trucks and therefore difficult to locate. U.S. and British special operations forces had been covertly

inserted into western Iraq to aid in the search for and destruction of Scuds. Iraqi anti-aircraft defences, including Man-portable air-defence systems, were surprisingly ineffective against Coalition aircraft and the Coalition suffered only 75 aircraft losses in over 100,000 sorties, 44 of which were the result of Iraqi action. Two of these losses are the result of aircraft colliding with the ground while evading Iraqi ground fired weapons. One of these losses is a confirmed air-air victory.

### **Iraqi missile strikes on Israel and Saudi Arabia**

Iraq's government made no secret that it would attack if invaded. Prior to the war's start, Tariq Aziz, Iraq's English-speaking Foreign Minister and Deputy Prime Minister, was asked in the aftermath of the failed U.S.-Iraq peace talks in Geneva, Switzerland, by a reporter. "Mr. Foreign Minister, if war starts... will you attack?" His response was, "Yes, absolutely, yes."

Five hours after the first attacks, Iraq's state radio broadcast declaring that "The dawn of victory nears as this great showdown begins." Iraq fired eight missiles the next day. These missile attacks were to continue throughout the war. A total of 88 Scud missiles were fired by Iraq during the war's seven weeks.

Iraq hoped to provoke a military response from Israel. The Iraqi government hoped that many Arab states would withdraw from the Coalition, as they would be reluctant to fight alongside Israel. Following the first attacks, Israeli Air Force jets were deployed to patrol the northern airspace with Iraq. Israel prepared to militarily retaliate, as its policy for the previous forty years had always been retaliation. However, President Bush pressured Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak Shamir not to retaliate and withdraw Israeli jets, fearing that if Israel attacked Iraq, the other Arab nations would either desert the Coalition or join Iraq. It was also feared that if Israel used Syrian or Jordanian airspace to attack Iraq, they would intervene in the war on Iraq's side or attack Israel. The Coalition promised to deploy Patriot missiles to defend Israel if it refrained from responding to the Scud attacks.

The Scud missiles targeting Israel were relatively ineffective, as firing at extreme range resulted in a dramatic reduction in accuracy and payload. According to the Jewish Virtual Library, a total of 74 Israelis died as a result of the Iraqi attacks: two directly and the rest from suffocation and heart attacks. Approximately 230 Israelis were injured. Extensive property damage was also caused, and according to Israel Ministry of Foreign Affairs, "Damage to general property consisted of 1,302 houses, 6,142 apartments, 23 public buildings, 200 shops and 50 cars." It was feared that Iraq would fire missiles filled with nerve agents such as sarin. As a result, Israel's government

issued gas masks to its citizens. When the first Iraqi missiles hit Israel, some people injected themselves with an antidote for nerve gas. It has been suggested that the sturdy construction techniques used in Israeli cities, coupled with the fact that Scuds were only launched at night, played an important role in limiting the number of casualties from Scud attacks. In response to the threat of Scuds on Israel, the U.S. rapidly sent a Patriot missile air defence artillery battalion to Israel along with two batteries of MIM-104 Patriot missiles for the protection of civilians. The Royal Netherlands Air Force also deployed a Patriot missile squadron to Israel and Turkey. The Dutch Defence Ministry later stated that the military use of the Patriot missile system was largely ineffective, but its psychological value for the affected populations was high.

Coalition air forces were also extensively exercised in "Scud hunts" in the Iraqi desert, trying to locate the camouflaged trucks before they fired their missiles at Israel or Saudi Arabia. On the ground, special operations forces also infiltrated Iraq, tasked with locating and destroying Scuds. Once special operations were combined with air patrols, the number of attacks fell sharply, then increased slightly as Iraqi forces adjusted to Coalition tactics.

As the Scud attacks continued, the Israelis grew increasingly impatient, and considered taking unilateral military action against Iraq. On 22 January 1991, a Scud missile and two



Coalition Patriots that had been fired to intercept it but missed hit the Israeli city of Ramat Gan. The incident caused three elderly people to suffer fatal heart attacks. Another 96 people were injured, and 20 apartment buildings were damaged. After this attack, the Israelis warned that if the U.S. failed to stop the attacks, they would. At one point, Israeli commandos were loaded onto helicopters prepared to fly into Iraq, but the mission was called off after a phone call from U.S. Defence Secretary Dick Cheney, reporting on the extent of Coalition efforts to destroy Scuds and emphasizing that Israeli intervention could endanger U.S. forces.

In addition to the attacks on Israel, 47 Scud missiles were fired into Saudi Arabia, and one missile was fired at Bahrain and another at Qatar. The missiles were fired at both military and civilian targets. One Saudi civilian was killed, and 78 others were injured. No casualties were reported in Bahrain or Qatar. The Saudi government issued all its citizens and expatriates with gas masks in the event of Iraq using missiles with chemical or biological warheads. The government broadcast alerts and 'all clear' messages over television to warn citizens during Scud attacks.

On 25 February 1991, a Scud missile hit a U.S. Army barracks of the 14th Quartermaster Detachment, out of Greensburg, Pennsylvania, stationed in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia, killing 28 soldiers and injuring over 100.

## **Iraqi invasion of Saudi Arabia (Battle of Khafji)**

On 29 January, Iraqi forces attacked and occupied the lightly defended Saudi city of Khafji with tanks and infantry. The Battle of Khafji ended two days later when the Iraqis were driven back by the Saudi Arabian National Guard, supported by Qatari forces and U.S. Marines. The allied forces used extensive artillery fire.

Both sides suffered casualties, although Iraqi forces sustained substantially more dead and captured than the allied forces. Eleven Americans were killed in two separate friendly fire incidents, an additional 14 U.S. airmen were killed when their AC-130 gunship was shot down by an Iraqi surface-to-air missile, and two U.S. soldiers were captured during the battle. Saudi and Qatari forces had a total of 18 dead. Iraqi forces in Khafji had 60-300 dead and 400 captured.

The Battle of Khafji was an example of how air power could single-handedly hinder the advance of enemy ground forces. Upon learning of Iraqi troop movements, 140 coalition aircraft were diverted to attack an advancing column consisting of two armored divisions in battalion-sized units. Precision stand-off attacks were conducted during the night and through to the next day. Iraqi vehicle losses included 357 tanks, 147 armored personnel carriers, and 89 mobile artillery pieces. Some crews simply abandoned their vehicles upon realizing that they could be destroyed by guided bombs without warning, stopping the

divisions from massing for an organized attack on the town. One Iraqi soldier, who had fought in the Iran-Iraq War, remarked that his brigade "had sustained more punishment from allied airpower in 30 minutes at Khafji than in eight years of fighting against Iran."

## **Ground campaign**

The Coalition forces dominated the air with their technological advantages. Coalition forces had the significant advantage of being able to operate under the protection of air supremacy that had been achieved by their air forces before the start of the main ground offensive. Coalition forces also had two key technological advantages:

- Coalition main battle tanks, such as the U.S. M1 Abrams, British Challenger 1, and Kuwaiti M-84AB were vastly superior to the Chinese Type 69 and export-model T-72 tanks used by the Iraqis. Coalition crews were better trained with more highly developed armored doctrine. Iraqi tanks were mainly employed as armored self-propelled artillery, rather than maneuver warfare roles employed by the Coalition.
- The use of GPS made it possible for Coalition forces to navigate without reference to roads or other fixed landmarks. This, along with aerial reconnaissance, allowed them to fight a battle of maneuver rather than a battle of encounter: they knew where they were and where the enemy was, so they could attack

a specific target rather than searching on the ground for enemy forces.

## **Kuwait's Liberation**

U.S. decoy attacks by air attacks and naval gunfire the night before Kuwait's liberation were designed to make the Iraqis believe the main Coalition ground attack would focus on central Kuwait. For months, American units in Saudi Arabia had been under almost constant Iraqi artillery fire, as well as threats from Scud missile or chemical attacks. On 24 February 1991, the 1st and 2nd Marine Divisions, and the 1st Light Armored Infantry Battalion crossed into Kuwait and headed towards Kuwait City. They encountered trenches, barbed wire, and minefields. However, these positions were poorly defended, and were overrun in the first few hours. Several tank battles took place, but apart from that, Coalition troops encountered minimal resistance, as most Iraqi troops surrendered. The general pattern was that the Iraqis would put up a short fight before surrendering. However, Iraqi air defences shot down nine U.S. aircraft. Meanwhile, forces from Arab states advanced into Kuwait from the east, encountering little resistance and suffering few casualties.

Despite the successes of Coalition forces, it was feared that the Iraqi Republican Guard would escape into Iraq before it could be destroyed. It was decided to send British armored forces into Kuwait fifteen hours ahead of schedule, and to send U.S.

forces after the Republican Guard. The Coalition advance was preceded by a heavy artillery and rocket barrage, after which 150,000 troops and 1,500 tanks began their advance. Iraqi forces in Kuwait counterattacked against U.S. troops, acting on a direct order from Saddam himself. Despite the intense combat, the Americans repulsed the Iraqis and continued to advance towards Kuwait City.

Kuwaiti forces were tasked with liberating the city. Iraqi troops offered only light resistance. The Kuwaitis lost one soldier and one plane that was shot down, and quickly liberated the city. On 27 February, Saddam ordered a retreat from Kuwait, and President Bush declared it liberated. However, an Iraqi unit at Kuwait International Airport appeared not to have gotten the message, and fiercely resisted. U.S. Marines had to fight for hours before securing the airport, after which Kuwait was declared secure. After four days of fighting, Iraqi forces were expelled from Kuwait. As part of a scorched earth policy, they set fire to nearly 700 oil wells, and placed land mines around the wells to make extinguishing the fires more difficult.

### **Initial moves into Iraq**

The war's ground phase was officially designated Operation Desert Saber.

The first units to move into Iraq were three patrols of the British Special Air Service's B squadron, call signs Bravo One

Zero, Bravo Two Zero, and Bravo Three Zero, in late January. These eight-man patrols landed behind Iraqi lines to gather intelligence on the movements of Scud mobile missile launchers, which couldn't be detected from the air, as they were hidden under bridges and camouflage netting during the day. Other objectives included the destruction of the launchers and their fibre-optic communications arrays that lay in pipelines and relayed coordinates to the TEL operators that were launching attacks against Israel. The operations were designed to prevent any possible Israeli intervention. Due to lack of sufficient ground cover to carry out their assignment, One Zero and Three Zero abandoned their operations, while Two Zero remained, and was later compromised, with only Sergeant Chris Ryan escaping to Syria.

Elements of the 2nd Brigade, 1st Battalion 5th Cavalry of the 1st Cavalry Division of the U.S. Army performed a direct attack into Iraq on 15 February 1991, followed by one in force on 20 February that led directly through 7 Iraqi divisions which were caught off guard. From 15-20 February, the Battle of Wadi Al-Batin took place inside Iraq; this was the first of two attacks by 1 Battalion 5th Cavalry of the 1st Cavalry Division. It was a feint attack, designed to make the Iraqis think that a Coalition invasion would take place from the south. The Iraqis fiercely resisted, and the Americans eventually withdrew as planned back into the Wadi Al-Batin. Three U.S. soldiers were killed and nine wounded as well with only one M2 Bradley IFV turret

destroyed, but they had taken 40 prisoners and destroyed five tanks, and successfully deceived the Iraqis. This attack led the way for the XVIII Airborne Corps to sweep around behind the 1st Cav and attack Iraqi forces to the west. On 22 February 1991, Iraq agreed to a Soviet-proposed ceasefire agreement. The agreement called for Iraq to withdraw troops to pre-invasion positions within six weeks following a total cease-fire, and called for monitoring of the cease-fire and withdrawal to be overseen by the UN Security Council.

The Coalition rejected the proposal, but said that retreating Iraqi forces wouldn't be attacked, and gave twenty-four hours for Iraq to begin withdrawing forces. On 23 February, fighting resulted in the capture of 500 Iraqi soldiers. On 24 February, British and American armored forces crossed the Iraq-Kuwait border and entered Iraq in large numbers, taking hundreds of prisoners. Iraqi resistance was light, and 4 Americans were killed.

### **Coalition forces enter Iraq**

Shortly afterwards, the U.S. VII Corps, in full strength and spearheaded by the 2nd Armored Cavalry Regiment, launched an armored attack into Iraq early on 24 February, just to the west of Kuwait, taking Iraqi forces by surprise. Simultaneously, the U.S. XVIII Airborne Corps launched a sweeping "left-hook" attack across southern Iraq's largely undefended desert, led by the U.S. 3rd Armored Cavalry

Regiment and the 24th Infantry Division (Mechanized). This movement's left flank was protected by France's 6th Light Armoured Division Daguet.

The French force quickly overcame Iraq's 45th Infantry Division, suffering light casualties and taking a large number of prisoners, and took up blocking positions to prevent an Iraqi counter-attack on the Coalition's flank. The movement's right flank was protected by the United Kingdom's 1st Armoured Division. Once the allies had penetrated deep into Iraqi territory, they turned eastward, launching a flank attack against the elite Republican Guard before it could escape. The Iraqis resisted fiercely from dug-in positions and stationary vehicles, and even mounted armored charges.

Unlike many previous engagements, the destruction of the first Iraqi tanks did not result in a mass surrender. The Iraqis suffered massive losses and lost dozens of tanks and vehicles, while U.S. casualties were comparatively low, with a single Bradley knocked out. Coalition forces pressed another ten kilometers into Iraqi territory, and captured their objective within three hours. They took 500 prisoners and inflicted heavy losses, defeating Iraq's 26th Infantry Division. A U.S. soldier was killed by an Iraqi land mine, another five by friendly fire, and thirty wounded during the battle. Meanwhile, British forces attacked Iraq's Medina Division and a major Republican Guard logistics base. In nearly two days of some of



the war's most intense fighting, the British destroyed 40 enemy tanks and captured a division commander.

Meanwhile, U.S. forces attacked the village of Al Busayyah, meeting fierce resistance. They suffered no casualties, but destroyed a considerable amount of military hardware and took prisoners.

On 25 February 1991, Iraqi forces fired a Scud missile at an American barracks in Dhahran, Saudi Arabia. The missile attack killed 28 U.S. military personnel.

The Coalition's advance was much swifter than U.S. generals had expected. On 26 February, Iraqi troops began retreating from Kuwait, after they had set its oil fields on fire (737 oil wells were set on fire). A long convoy of retreating Iraqi troops formed along the main Iraq-Kuwait highway. Although they were retreating, this convoy was bombed so extensively by Coalition air forces that it came to be known as the Highway of Death. Hundreds of Iraqi troops were killed. American, British, and French forces continued to pursue retreating Iraqi forces over the border and back into Iraq, eventually moving to within 150 miles (240 km) of Baghdad before withdrawing back to Iraq's border with Kuwait and Saudi Arabia.

One hundred hours after the ground campaign started, on 28 February, President Bush declared a ceasefire, and he also declared that Kuwait had been liberated.

## **The end of active hostilities**

In Coalition-occupied Iraqi territory, a peace conference was held where a ceasefire agreement was negotiated and signed by both sides. At the conference, Iraq was approved to fly armed helicopters on their side of the temporary border, ostensibly for government transit due to the damage done to civilian infrastructure. Soon after, these helicopters and much of Iraq's military were used to fight an uprising in the south. The rebellions were encouraged by an airing of "The Voice of Free Iraq" on 24 February 1991, which was broadcast from a CIA-run radio station out of Saudi Arabia.

The Arabic service of the Voice of America supported the uprising by stating that the rebellion was large, and that they soon would be liberated from Saddam.

In the North, Kurdish leaders took American statements that they would support an uprising to heart, and began fighting, hoping to trigger a coup d'état. However, when no U.S. support came, Iraqi generals remained loyal to Saddam and brutally crushed the Kurdish uprising. Millions of Kurds fled across the mountains to Turkey and Kurdish areas of Iran.

These events later resulted in no-fly zones being established in northern and southern Iraq. In Kuwait, the Emir was restored, and suspected Iraqi collaborators were repressed. Eventually, over 400,000 people were expelled from the country, including

a large number of Palestinians, due to PLO support of Saddam. Yasser Arafat didn't apologize for his support of Iraq, but after his death, the Fatah under Mahmoud Abbas' authority formally apologized in 2004.

There was some criticism of the Bush administration, as they chose to allow Saddam to remain in power instead of pushing on to capture Baghdad and overthrowing his government. In their co-written 1998 book, *A World Transformed*, Bush and Brent Scowcroft argued that such a course would have fractured the alliance, and would have had many unnecessary political and human costs associated with it.

In 1992, the U.S. Defence Secretary during the war, Dick Cheney, made the same point:

- I would guess if we had gone in there, we would still have forces in Baghdad today. We'd be running the country. We would not have been able to get everybody out and bring everybody home. And the final point that I think needs to be made is this question of casualties. I don't think you could have done all of that without significant additional U.S. casualties, and while everybody was tremendously impressed with the low cost of the (1991) conflict, for the 146 Americans who were killed in action and for their families, it wasn't a cheap war. And the question in my mind is, how many additional American casualties is Saddam (Hussein) worth? And the answer is, not that damned many. So, I think we

got it right, both when we decided to expel him from Kuwait, but also when the President made the decision that we'd achieved our objectives and we were not going to go get bogged down in the problems of trying to take over and govern Iraq.-  
Dick Cheney

Instead of a greater involvement of its own military, the U.S. hoped that Saddam would be overthrown in an internal coup d'état. The CIA used its assets in Iraq to organize a revolt, but the Iraqi government defeated the effort. On 10 March 1991, 540,000 U.S. troops began moving out of the Persian Gulf.

### **Coalition involvement**

Coalition members included Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belgium, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Denmark, Egypt, France, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Italy, Kuwait, Malaysia, Morocco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Romania, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Korea, Spain, Sweden, Syria, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States of America.

Germany and Japan provided financial assistance and donated military hardware, but didn't send direct military assistance. This later became known as checkbook diplomacy.

## **United Kingdom**

The United Kingdom committed the largest contingent of any European state that participated in the war's combat operations. Operation Granby was the code name for the operations in the Persian Gulf. British Army regiments (mainly with the 1st Armoured Division), Royal Air Force squadrons and Royal Navy vessels were mobilized in the Persian Gulf. The Royal Air Force, using various aircraft, operated from airbases in Saudi Arabia. Almost 2,500 armored vehicles and 53,462 troops were shipped for action.

Chief Royal Navy vessels deployed to the Persian Gulf included Broadsword-class frigates, and Sheffield-class destroyers, other R.N. and R.F.A. ships were also deployed. The light aircraft carrier HMS Ark Royal was deployed to the Mediterranean Sea. Special operations forces were deployed in the form of several SAS squadrons.

## **France**

The second largest European contingent was from France, which committed 18,000 troops. Operating on the left flank of the U.S. XVIII Airborne Corps, the main French Army force was the 6th Light Armoured Division, including troops from the French Foreign Legion. Initially, the French operated independently under national command and control, but coordinated closely with the Americans (via CENTCOM) and

Saudis. In January, the Division was placed under the tactical control of the XVIII Airborne Corps. France also deployed several combat aircraft and naval units. The French called their contribution *Opération Daguet*.

Italy participated in the military operations in the Persian Gulf by sending a naval task force (consisting of one destroyer, five frigates, one amphibious assault ship and two supply vessels, which have alternated in the area of operations during the conflict), but especially through the use of eight Tornado fighter-bombers (plus 2 reserve), which participated in the bombing of Iraqi military targets, making a total of 226 sorties (589 hours of flight) and releasing a total of 565 MK83 bombs.

Canada was one of the first countries to condemn Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, and it quickly agreed to join the U.S.-led coalition. In August 1990, Prime Minister Brian Mulroney committed the Canadian Forces to deploy a Naval Task Group. The destroyers HMCS *Terra Nova* and HMCS *Athabaskan* joined the maritime interdiction force supported by the supply ship HMCS *Protecteur* in Operation *Friction*. The Canadian Task Group led the Coalition's maritime logistics forces in the Persian Gulf. A fourth ship, HMCS *Huron*, arrived in-theater after hostilities had ceased and was the first allied ship to visit Kuwait.

Following the U.N.-authorized use of force against Iraq, the Canadian Forces deployed a CF-18 *Hornet* and CH-124 *Sea*

King squadron with support personnel, as well as a field hospital to deal with casualties from the ground war. When the air war began, the CF-18s were integrated into the Coalition force and were tasked with providing air cover and attacking ground targets. This was the first time since, the Korean War that Canada's military had participated in offensive combat operations. The only CF-18 Hornet to record an official victory during the conflict was an aircraft involved in the beginning of the Battle of Bubiyan against the Iraqi Navy.

The Canadian Commander in the Middle East was Commodore Kenneth J. Summers.

Australia contributed a Naval Task Group, which formed part of the multi-national fleet in the Persian Gulf and Gulf of Oman, under Operation Damask. In addition, medical teams were deployed aboard a U.S. hospital ship, and a naval clearance diving team took part in de-mining Kuwait's port facilities following the end of combat operations. While the Australian forces did not see combat, they did play a significant role in enforcing the sanctions put in place against Iraq following Kuwait's invasion, as well as other small support contributions to Operation Desert Storm. Following the war's end, Australia deployed a medical unit on Operation Habitat to northern Iraq as part of Operation Provide Comfort.

Argentina was the only Latin American country to participate in the 1991 Gulf War sending a destroyer, ARA Almirante

Brown (D-10), a corvette, ARA Spiro (P-43) (later replaced by another corvette, ARA Rosales (P-42)) and a supply ship (ARA Bahía San Blas (B-4)) to participate on the United Nations blockade and sea control effort of the Persian Gulf. The success of Operación Alfil ("English: Operation Bishop") as it was known, with more than 700 interceptions and 25,000 miles sailed in the theatre of operations helped to overcome the so-called "Malvinas syndrome". Argentina was later classified as major non-NATO ally due to its contributions during the war.

Over 1,000 Kuwaiti civilians were killed by Iraqis. More than 600 Kuwaitis went missing during Iraq's occupation, and approximately 375 remains were found in mass graves in Iraq. The increased importance of air attacks from both Coalition warplanes and cruise missiles led to controversy over the number of civilian deaths caused during Desert Storm's initial stages. Within Desert Storm's first 24 hours, more than 1,000 sorties were flown, many against targets in Baghdad. The city was the target of heavy bombing, as it was the seat of power for Saddam and the Iraqi forces' command and control. This ultimately led to civilian casualties.

In one noted incident, two USAF stealth planes bombed a bunker in Amiriyah, causing the deaths of 408 Iraqi civilians who were in the shelter. Scenes of burned and mutilated bodies were subsequently broadcast, and controversy arose



over the bunker's status, with some stating that it was a civilian shelter, while others contended that it was a center of Iraqi military operations, and that the civilians had been deliberately moved there to act as human shields.

Bush spokesman Marlin Fitzwater said at the time, "We don't know why civilians were at that location." According to satellite images and eyewitness accounts both before and after the strike, the facility was clearly marked and monitored by satellite, which would show it being used as a shelter throughout the air strikes; in addition, as noted by Human Rights Watch, the "Pentagon concedes that it knew the Amiriyah facility had been used as a civil-defence shelter during the Iran-Iraq war, but U.S. officials gave no warning that they considered its protected status as a civilian shelter to have ended."

Saddam's government gave high civilian casualty figures in order to draw support from Islamic countries. The Iraqi government claimed that 2,300 civilians died during the air campaign. According to the Project on Defence Alternatives study, 3,664 Iraqi civilians were killed in the conflict. An investigation by Beth Osborne Daponte estimated total civilian fatalities at about 3,500 from bombing, and some 100,000 from the war's other effects.

The exact number of Iraqi combat casualties is unknown, but is believed to have been heavy. Some estimate that Iraq

sustained between 20,000 and 35,000 fatalities. A report commissioned by the U.S. Air Force, estimated 10,000-12,000 Iraqi combat deaths in the air campaign, and as many as 10,000 casualties in the ground war. This analysis is based on Iraqi prisoner of war reports.

According to the Project on Defence Alternatives study, between 20,000 and 26,000 Iraqi military personnel were killed in the conflict while 75,000 others were wounded.

### **Cost**

The cost of the war to the United States was calculated by the U.S. Congress to be \$61.1 billion. About \$52 billion of that amount was paid by other countries: \$36 billion by Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and other Arab states of the Persian Gulf; \$16 billion by Germany and Japan (which sent no combat forces due to their constitutions). About 25per cent of Saudi Arabia's contribution was paid in the form of in-kind services to the troops, such as food and transportation. U.S. troops represented about 74per cent of the combined force, and the global cost was therefore higher.

### **Effect on developing countries**

Apart from the impact on Arab States of the Persian Gulf, the resulting economic disruptions after the crisis affected many states. The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) undertook a

study in 1991 to assess the effects on developing states and the international community's response. A briefing paper finalized on the day that the conflict ended draws on their findings which had two main conclusions: Many developing states were severely affected and while there has been a considerable response to the crisis, the distribution of assistance was highly selective.

The ODI factored in elements of "cost" which included oil imports, remittance flows, re-settlement costs, loss of export earnings and tourism. For Egypt, the cost totaled \$1 billion, 3per cent of GDP. Yemen had a cost of \$830 million, 10per cent of GDP, while it cost Jordan \$1.8 billion, 32per cent of GDP.

International response to the crisis on developing states came with the channeling of aid through The Gulf Crisis Financial Co-ordination Group. They were 24 states, comprising most of the OECD countries plus some Gulf states: Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, Qatar and Kuwait. The members of this group agreed to disperse \$14 billion in development assistance.

The World Bank responded by speeding up the disbursement of existing project and adjustment loans. The International Monetary Fund adopted two lending facilities - the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility (ESAF) and the Compensatory & Contingency Financing Facility (CCFF). The European Community offered \$2 billion in assistance.

## **Chapter 4**

# **The Implementation of the UN**

## **Global Counter-Terrorism**

### **Strategy and Post Cold War**

## **Integrating human rights into the work of the United Nations**

The task of promoting and protecting human rights, and thereby preventing human rights violations, is one of the most formidable challenges ahead. Evidence of gross violations of human rights today is a disturbing reminder of the work to be done. The collective efforts of the largest and most representative number of people must be harnessed in order to develop creative strategies to prevent all forms of human rights violations, both deliberate and inadvertent. Over time, the United Nations has employed various tools to protect and promote human rights. As the protection of human rights is primarily the responsibility of States, many strategies have been targeted towards strengthening the ability of States to protect persons within their territory, such as technical cooperation activities. Other strategies have been devised to nurture an understanding of human rights in areas such as education and development of publications.

*Overall, the main strategies may be defined as follows:*

- Integrating human rights into early warning, humanitarian operations, peacekeeping and development
- Technical cooperation activities
- Human rights education and campaigns
- Human rights monitoring
- Working with civil society
- Publication of information.

Since, the Secretary-General launched the Programme of Reform in July 1997, there have been on-going efforts to promote and protect human rights by integrating human rights into all activities and programmes of the United Nations.

This strategy reflects the holistic approach to human rights. It recognizes that human rights are inextricably linked to the work of all United Nations agencies and bodies, including programmes and activities relating to housing, food, education, health, trade, development, security, labour, women, children, indigenous people, refugees, migration, the environment, science and humanitarian aid.

*The objectives of the process of integrating human rights are to:*

- Increase cooperation and collaboration across the entire United Nations system for human rights programmes;

- Ensure that human rights issues are incorporated into untapped sectors of the United Nations work;
- Ensure that United Nations activities make respect for human rights a routine, rather than a separate, component of United Nations activities and programmes.

The issue of human rights was, therefore, designated by the Secretary-General as cutting across the four substantive areas of the Secretariat's work programme (peace and security; economic and social affairs; development cooperation and humanitarian affairs).

*Mainstreaming human rights primarily takes the following forms:*

- Adoption of a human rights-based approach to activities carried out in terms of the respective mandates of components of the United Nations system;
- Development of programmes or projects addressing specific human rights issues;
- Reorientation of existing programmes as a means of focusing adequate attention on human rights concerns;
- Inclusion of human rights components in field operations of the United Nations;
- The presence of human rights programmes in all structural units of the Secretariat responsible for policy development and coordination. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights plays a

lead role in the integration of human rights throughout the United Nations system.

Violations of human rights are very often the root cause of humanitarian disasters, mass exoduses or refugee flows. Therefore, at the first signs of conflict, it is vital to deter the parties involved from committing human rights violations thus defusing situations which may lead to humanitarian disasters. The United Nations has already developed early warning systems to detect potential conflicts. Incorporating human rights into this system by addressing the root causes of potential conflict will contribute to prevention of humanitarian and human rights tragedies and the search for comprehensive solutions.

United Nations human rights procedures and mechanisms such as the special rapporteurs and special representatives, treaty-based bodies, working groups of the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission and United Nations human rights field officers (experts, including special rapporteurs, special representatives, treaty-body experts and United Nations human rights field offices) constitute a valuable contribution to the early warning mechanisms for impending humanitarian and human rights crises.

When information gathered is shared with other branches of the United Nations, such as the Office of the Coordinator for Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), the Executive Committee on

Peace and Security and Humanitarian Affairs, the Department of Political Affairs (DPA), the Department of Peace-keeping Operations (DPKO) and other conflict assessments are better informed. Based on the results from situation analysis, measures are considered to prevent the occurrence of crises. A human rights analysis contributes to more effective plans for tailoring prevention to the needs of imminent disasters. The integration of human rights into preventive action and early warning systems is designed to bolster the accuracy of the early warning capacity of the United Nations in the humanitarian field by integrating human rights concerns before crises arise. This prepares the ground for effective cooperation before, during and after crises.

### **Human rights and humanitarian operations**

The link between humanitarian law and human rights law was discussed in the introduction. There is increasing consensus that humanitarian operations must integrate human rights into conflict situations. Humanitarian operations are established in conflict or complex emergency situations where priorities have traditionally focused on addressing the most immediate needs—the delivery of humanitarian assistance. It is now understood that needs-based operations should also incorporate a human rights-based approach which serves to address both immediate needs and longer-term security.



In conflict and complex emergency situations, identification of human rights violations and efforts to protect those rights are essential, particularly as States may be unwilling or unable to protect human rights. Human rights issues are being integrated into humanitarian operations in various ways. The Executive Committee on Humanitarian Affairs brings together relevant departments of the United Nations thus ensuring a coordinated and integrated approach to humanitarian issues. The Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights is involved in the work of the Committee: this ensures the incorporation of a human rights dimension into the work and policy development in this field.

Steps are being taken to guarantee that humanitarian field staff are trained in methods of basic human rights intervention, standards and procedures; to secure close field cooperation between human rights and humanitarian bodies; to ensure that a human rights dimension is included when developing strategies for major humanitarian efforts; and to encourage human rights monitoring in humanitarian operations.

### **Human rights and peace-keeping**

The maintenance of international peace and security is one of the prime functions of the United Nations Organization. The importance of human rights in sustainable conflict resolution and prevention is gaining ground. Armed civilian conflicts are

characterized by large-scale human rights violations which can often be traced to structural inequalities and the resulting imbalances in the accessibility of power and resources. The need for peacekeeping efforts to address human rights issues is apparent.

The guarantee of a comprehensive approach to United Nations strategies for peace and security is conditional on the integration of human rights issues into all peace-keeping operations at the planning and preparatory stage of needs assessments. To date, human rights mandates have been incorporated into the duties of several peace-keeping operations and predictably, in the years to come, the cooperation between DPA, DPKO and OHCHR will increase. Cooperation has in large part taken the shape of human rights training for peace-keeping personnel, including the military, civilian police and civilian affairs officers.

In some cases, OHCHR has been called upon to ensure the continuation of peace-keeping operations by establishing a human rights presence on conclusion of the peace-keepers' mandate. With recent developments, cooperation has extended to the creation of joint DPKO/OHCHR human rights components in peace-keeping operations. Under the authority of the Representative/Special Representative of the Secretary-General in charge of the operation, the peace-keeping

operation receives substantive human rights guidance from OHCHR.

## **Integration of human rights into development**

As early as 1957, the General Assembly expressed the view that a balanced and integrated economic and social development programme would contribute towards the promotion and maintenance of peace and security, social progress, better standards of living and the observance of and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. This approach was given increased prominence by the Teheran World Conference on Human Rights and later recognized as a paramount concern by the second World Conference on Human Rights held in Vienna in June 1993. that genuine and sustainable development requires the protection and promotion of human rights. Development is not restricted to meeting basic human needs; it is, indeed, a right. With a rights-based approach, effective action for development moves from the optional realm of charity, into the mandatory realm of law, with identifiable rights, obligations, claim-holders, and duty-holders. When development is conceived as a right, the implication is that someone holds a claim, or legal entitlement and a corresponding duty or legal obligation. The obligation which devolves upon Governments (individually by States vis-a-vis their own people, and collectively by the international community of States) is, in some cases, a positive obligation (to

do, or provide something) and, in others, a negative obligation (to refrain from taking action). What is more, embracing the rights framework opens the door to the use of a growing pool of information, analysis and jurisprudence developed in recent years by treaty bodies and other human rights specialists on the requirements of adequate housing, health, food, childhood development, the rule of law, and virtually all other elements of sustainable human development.

The obligation to respond to the inalienable human rights of individuals, and not only in terms of fulfilling human needs, empowers the people to demand justice as a right, and it gives the community a sound moral basis on which to claim international assistance and a world economic order respectful of human rights. The adoption of a rights-based approach enables United Nations organs to draw up their policies and programmes in accordance with internationally recognized human rights norms and standards. The United Nations Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) was established as part of the Secretary-General's Programme of Reform. UNDAF is a common programme and resources framework for all members of the United Nations Development Groups (UNDG) and, wherever possible, for the United Nations system as a whole. The objective of the programme is to maximize the collective and individual development impact of participating entities and programmes of assistance; intensify collaboration in response to national development priorities; and ensure

coherence and mutual reinforcement among individual programmes of assistance. The ad hoc Working Group of the Executive Committee of the UNDG is mandated to develop a common UNDG approach for enhancing the human rights dimension in development activities. In order to facilitate the process of integrating human rights into development, the Administrator of the United Nations Development Programme and OHCHR have signed a memorandum of understanding seeking to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the activities carried out within their respective mandates through cooperation and coordination. OHCHR will facilitate close cooperation between UNDP and the United Nations human rights organs, bodies and procedures, and will examine, with UNDP, the possibilities of joint initiatives aimed at implementing the human right to development, placing particular emphasis on defining indicators in the area of economic and social rights and devising other relevant methods and tools for their implementation.

## **Human Rights Technical Cooperation Programme**

### **Technical cooperation in the field of human rights**

The United Nations human rights technical cooperation programme assists countries, at their request, in building and

strengthening national capacities and infrastructure which have a direct impact on the overall promotion and protection of human rights, democracy and the rule of law. This is done through technical advice and assistance to Governments and civil society.

The objective is to assist in promoting and protecting all human rights at national and regional level, through the incorporation of international human rights standards into domestic legislation, policies and practices. In addition, it facilitates the building of sustainable national infrastructure for implementing these standards and ensuring respect for human rights.

While these activities are carried out throughout the United Nations Organization, OHCHR is the focal point for the technical cooperation programme in the field of human rights. Technical cooperation activities can be a complement to, but never a substitute for the monitoring and investigation activities of the United Nations human rights programme.

In order to benefit from the United Nations Programme of Technical Cooperation in the field of human rights, a Government must submit a request for assistance to the Secretariat. In response, the Secretariat will conduct an assessment of that country's particular human rights needs, taking into consideration,

*Among other factors, the following:*

- Specific recommendations made by the United Nations human rights treaty bodies;
- Recommendations by the Commission on Human Rights and its mechanisms, including the representatives of the Secretary-General, the Special Rapporteurs on thematic or country situations and the various working groups;
- The recommendations adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Voluntary Fund for Technical Cooperation in the Field of Human Rights; and
- The views and concerns expressed by a wide range of national and international actors including government officials, civil society, national human rights institutions, and national and international NGOs.

The assessment is normally conducted through an international mission to the State concerned. Based on that assessment, an assistance programme is developed to address the needs identified in a comprehensive and coordinated manner. Periodic evaluations of the country programme during its implementation are normally followed by a post-implementation evaluation, with a view to measuring the effect of the assistance provided and developing follow-up plans. Countries or regions in transition to democracy are the primary target of the Technical Cooperation Programme. Priority is also given to technical cooperation projects responding to the needs of less developed countries.

## **Various technical cooperation activities**

The programme offers a wide range of human rights assistance projects, some of which are summarized below. It must be stressed, however, that the types of interventions described are merely indicative and not exhaustive. The results of needs assessments determine the type of technical cooperation project to be implemented.

- *National Human Rights Institutions (The Paris Principles)*: A central objective of the Technical Cooperation Programme is to consolidate and strengthen the role which national human rights institutions can play in the promotion and protection of human rights. In this context, the term national human rights institutions refers to bodies whose functions are specifically defined in terms of the promotion and protection of human rights, namely national human rights commissions and ombudsman offices, in accordance with the Paris Principles. OHCHR offers its services to Governments that are considering or in the process of establishing a national human rights institution. The activities relating to national human rights institutions under the programme are aimed at promoting the concept of national human rights institutions and encouraging their development.

To this end, information material and a practical manual have been developed for those involved in the establishment and administration of national institutions. In addition, a number



of seminars and workshops have been conducted to provide government officials, politicians, NGOs and others with information and expertise in the structure and functioning of such bodies. These events have also served as useful forums for the exchange of information and experience concerning the establishment and operation of national human rights institutions.

### **Administration of Justice**

With respect to human rights in the administration of justice, the Technical Cooperation Programme provides training courses for judges, lawyers, prosecutors and penal institutions, as well as law enforcement officers. Such courses are intended to familiarize participants with international standards for human rights in the administration of justice; to facilitate examination of humane and effective techniques for the performance of penal and judicial functions in a democratic society; and to teach trainer participants to include this information in their own training activities.

Topics offered in courses for judges, lawyers, magistrates and prosecutors include: international sources, systems and standards for human rights in the administration of justice; human rights during criminal investigations, arrest and pre-trial detention; the independence of judges and lawyers; elements of a fair trial; juvenile justice; protection of the rights

of women in the administration of justice; and human rights in a declared state of emergency.

Similarly, the training courses for law enforcement officials cover a broad range of topics, including the following: international sources, systems and standards for human rights in the administration of criminal justice; the duties and guiding principles of ethical police conduct in democracies; the use of force and firearms in law enforcement; the crime of torture; effective methods of legal and ethical interviewing; human rights during arrest and pretrial detention; and the legal status and rights of the accused.

A Manual on Human Rights and Law Enforcement is available. Course topics for prison officials include: minimum standards for facilities for prisoners and detainees; prison health issues, including AIDS and the HIV virus; and special categories of prisoners and detainees, including juveniles and women. A Handbook on Human Rights and Pre-trial Detention is available. This approach to professional training for human rights in the administration of justice is subject to in-field testing by OHCHR in its technical cooperation activities in a number of countries, and has undergone a series of revisions on the basis of such experience. Other forms of assistance in the area of the administration of justice include assistance in the development of guidelines, procedures and regulations consistent with international standards.

## **Assistance in Drafting Legislation**

The United Nations makes the services of international experts and specialized staff available to assist Governments in the reform of their domestic legislation which has a clear impact on the situation of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The goal is to bring such laws into conformity with international standards, as identified in United Nations and regional human rights instruments. Drafts provided by a Government requesting such assistance are reviewed and recommendations are subsequently made.

This programme component also includes assistance with respect to penal codes, codes of criminal procedure, prison regulations, laws regarding minority protection, laws affecting freedom of expression, association and assembly, immigration and nationality laws, laws on the judiciary and legal practice, security legislation, and, in general, any law which might have an impact directly, or indirectly, on the realization of internationally protected human rights. Constitutional assistance Under this programme component, OHCHR provides assistance for the incorporation of international human rights norms into national constitutions.

In this regard, the Office can play a facilitating role in encouraging national consensus on those elements to be incorporated into the constitutional reform process utilizing

the services of legal exerts. OHCHR assistance may also extend to the provision of human rights information and documentation, or support for public information campaigns to ensure the involvement of all sectors of society. Their task includes legislative drafting as well as the drafting of bills of rights; the provision of justiciable remedies under the law; options for the allocation and separation of governmental powers; the independence of the judiciary; and the role of the judiciary in overseeing the police and prison systems.

### **National Parliaments**

Under the Technical Cooperation Programme, national parliaments may receive direct training and other support to assist them in undertaking their human rights function. This programme component addresses a variety of crucial issues, including the provision of information on national human rights legislation, parliamentary human rights committees, ratifications of and accessions to international human rights instruments, and, in general, the role of parliament in promoting and protecting human rights. The armed forces It is essential for the good functioning of the rule of law that the armed forces be bound by the Constitution and other laws of the land, that they answer to democratic Government and that they are trained in and committed to the principles of human rights and humanitarian law. The United Nations has carried out a number of training activities for armed forces.

## **Electoral Assistance**

The Technical Cooperation Programme has been providing electoral assistance for more than five years. Specific activities which the OHCHR has undertaken in this regard include the preparation of guidelines for analysis of electoral laws and procedures, publication of a handbook on human rights and elections, development of draft guidelines for human rights assessment of requests for electoral assistance and various public information activities relating to human rights and elections.

## **Treaty Reporting and Training of Government Officials**

The OHCHR organizes training courses at regular intervals to enable government officials to draft reports in keeping with the guidelines establishing the various international human rights treaties to which their State is a party. Courses on reporting obligations may be provided at national or at regional level. Alternatively, training courses may be organized under the human rights fellowship programme: participants take part in workshops with experts from the various treaty-monitoring committees, as well as with staff from the Office. They are provided with a copy of OHCHR's Manual on Human Rights Reporting and, whenever possible, are given the opportunity to observe meetings of treaty bodies.

## **Non-Governmental Organizations and Civil Society**

Civil society constitutes an increasingly important factor in the international community. In recent years, the United Nations has found that much of its work, particularly at national level, calls for the involvement of various non-governmental organizations and groups -whether in economic and social development, humanitarian affairs, public health, or the promotion of human rights.

National and international non-governmental human rights organizations are key actors in the Technical Cooperation Programme, both in the delivery of assistance and as recipients of that assistance. In relation to the programme's aims to strengthen civil society, the United Nations is increasingly being called upon by Governments and others to provide assistance to national NGOs, in the context of its country activities, by soliciting their input, utilizing their services in seminars and training courses, and supporting appropriate projects which have been developed.

## **Information and Documentation Projects**

The Technical Cooperation Programme also provides human rights information and documentation and contributes to building capacity for the effective utilization and management of such material. Activities in this area include direct provision of documentation, translated where necessary into local

languages; training in human rights information; and assistance in computerization of national and regional human rights offices.

Assistance is also provided to national libraries in acquiring human rights books and documentation, and support can be lent for the establishment and functioning of national or regional human rights documentation centers. Several manuals, handbooks and modules are being produced to support training and other technical cooperation activities.

Existing or planned material targets specific audiences, such as the police, judges and lawyers, prison personnel, national human rights action plans, the armed forces, teachers and human rights monitors involved in United Nations field operations. The material is adapted specifically to the recipient country in order to facilitate the integration of human rights into existing training programmes and curricula.

## **Peacekeeping and the Training of International Civil Servants**

In accordance with the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action, adopted by the World Conference on Human Rights in June 1993, the Technical Cooperation Programme has recently expanded the scope of its activities to include human rights support within the United Nations system. In the area of peacekeeping, for example, the programme has provided

various forms of assistance to major United Nations missions in Cambodia, Eritrea, Mozambique, Haiti, South Africa, the countries of the former Yugoslavia, and Angola. Such assistance has included, variously, the provision of human rights information, legislative analysis, training and advisory services.

### **Human Rights Fellowships**

The human rights fellowships scheme was initiated in keeping with General Assembly resolution 926 of 14 December 1955 which officially established the advisory services programme. Under the programme, fellowships are awarded only to candidates nominated by their Governments and are financed under the regular budget for advisory services. Each year, the Secretary-General invites Member States to submit nominations for fellowships. Governments are requested to nominate persons directly engaged in functions affecting human rights, particularly in the administration of justice.

The Secretary-General draws their attention to concerns expressed by the General Assembly, in many of its resolutions, with regard to the rights of women, and encourages the nomination of women candidates. The principle of equitable geographical distribution is taken into account and priority is given to candidates from States which have never benefitted from the fellowship programme, or which have not done so in recent years. Participants receive intensive training in a variety



of human rights issues. They are encouraged to exchange their experiences and are requested to evaluate the fellowship programme, to present individual oral reports, and to prepare recommendations for their superiors on the basis of knowledge acquired under the programme. In accordance with the policy and procedure governing the administration of United Nations fellowships, each participant is required to submit a comprehensive final report to OHCHR on subjects directly related to their field of activity.

## **Human rights education and campaigns**

### **Human rights education**

The fundamental role of human rights education is to increase the awareness of individuals in order to defend their rights and those of others. Knowledge of human rights constitutes a forceful means of achieving empowerment.

Human rights education needs learners and educators working together to translate the language of human rights into knowledge, skills and behaviour. This necessitates developing an understanding of the responsibility each individual has in making those rights a reality at the local, national and international levels: the essence of global citizenship and global responsibility.

The relevant provisions of international instruments define human rights education as constituting training, dissemination and information efforts aimed at building a universal culture of human rights by imparting knowledge and skills and moulding attitudes.

This entails the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms; the full development of the human personality and a sense of its dignity; the promotion of understanding, tolerance, gender equality and friendship among all nations, indigenous peoples and racial, national, ethnic, religious and linguistic groups; the enabling of all persons to participate effectively in a free society; and the furtherance of the activities of the United Nations for the maintenance of peace.

### **Human rights education campaigns**

The United Nations has initiated and encouraged human rights awareness campaigns in order to promote particular human rights issues. The activities carried out during these campaigns include the development of publications, studies and programmes with the involvement of United Nations bodies,

States, other international, regional and local organizations and civil society. The campaigns are intended to highlight specific human rights issues. It is widely acknowledged that

awareness and information are vital to respect for human rights and prevention of human rights violations.

### **World Public Information Campaign on Human Rights (1988-ongoing)**

It was only as recently as 1988 that the first concerted international effort was made to promote human rights. Although efforts had been made in the mid fifties to enhance awareness of the drafting work on the international Covenants, the launching of the World Public Information Campaign on Human Rights by the General Assembly in December 1988 represented the first serious attempt at coordinated effort for developing awareness of international norms. It was launched on the 40th Anniversary of the UDHR and is open ended: once launched, it became part of the United Nations human rights programme.

The Campaign includes the publication and dissemination of human rights information and reference material, the organization of a fellowship and internship programme, briefings, commemorative events, exhibits and external relations activities. The programme has expanded significantly since, 1988. The use of the OHCHR web site is an important new development. It is, inter alia, a repository of United Nations human rights information in English, French and Spanish relating to international treaties, treaty-body

databases, programmes and activities, United Nations reports, resolutions and human rights issues.

### **Decade for Human Rights Education (1995-2004)**

The 1993 Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action concluded that human rights education, training and public information are essential for the promotion and achievement of stable and harmonious relations among communities and for fostering mutual understanding, tolerance and peace. The Conference recommended that States should strive to eradicate illiteracy and direct education towards the full development of the human personality and the strengthening of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms. It called on all States and institutions to include human rights, humanitarian law, democracy and the rule of law as subjects in the curricula of all learning institutions in formal and non-formal settings.

Pursuant to a suggestion of the World Conference, the UNGA proclaimed the 10-year period beginning on 1 January 1995 the United Nations Decade for Human Rights Education, and welcomed the Plan of Action for the Decade as set out in the report of the Secretary-General. The High Commissioner for Human Rights was called upon to coordinate the implementation of the Plan. The Plan of Action has five objectives:

- Assessment of needs and formulation of effective strategies for the furtherance of human rights education;
- Building and strengthening of programmes and capacities for human rights education at the international, regional, national and local levels;
- Co-ordinated development of effective human rights education materials;
- Trengthening the role and capacity of the mass media in the furtherance of human rights education;
- Global dissemination of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The Plan focuses on stimulating and supporting national and local activities and embodies the idea of a partnership between Governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, professional associations, various sectors of civil society and individuals.

In the national context, the Plan provides for the establishment of comprehensive (in terms of outreach), effective (in terms of educational strategies) and sustainable (over the long term) national plans of action for human rights education, with the support of international organizations. Those Plans should constitute an integral part of the national development plan (when applicable) and be complementary to other relevant national plans of action already defined (general human rights plans of action or those relating to women, children, minorities, indigenous peoples, *etc.*). Specific guidelines have been developed by OHCHR and endorsed by the General

Assembly for the development of national plans of action for human rights education.

### **Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination**

By its resolution 48/91 of 20 December 1993, the General Assembly proclaimed the Third Decade to Combat Racism and Racial Discrimination, beginning in 1993, and adopted the Programme of Action proposed for the Decade. The ultimate goals of the Decade are:

- To promote human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction of any kind on grounds of race, colour, descent or national or ethnic origin, with particular emphasis on eradicating racial prejudice, racism and racial discrimination;
- To arrest any expansion of racist policies, to eliminate the persistence of racist policies and to counteract the emergence of alliances based on the mutual espousal of racism and racial discrimination;
- To resist any policy and practices which lead to the strengthening of racist regimes and contribute to sustaining racism and racial discrimination;
- To identify, isolate and dispel fallacious and mythical beliefs, policies and practices contributing to racism and racial discrimination; and
- To put an end to racist regimes.

In order to achieve these goals, a number of activities are being undertaken including programmes and seminars to ensure

respect for the existing standards and instruments to combat racism and xenophobia (including implementation of international instruments and adoption of revised national legislation); sensitization to racism and xenophobia (including appropriate teaching and education, and systematic use of the mass media to combat racial discrimination); to use all international bodies and mechanisms to combat racism and xenophobia; to review political, historical, social, economic and other factors which lead to racism and xenophobia.

The General Assembly decided to convene a World Conference against racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance, to be held not later than the year 2001. The Conference will be action-oriented and focus on practical measures to eradicate racism, including measures of prevention, education and protection and the provision of effective remedies. One of its aims will be to increase the effectiveness of United Nations programmes aimed at eradicating contemporary forms of racism and racial discrimination.

### **Human Rights Monitoring**

Monitoring is a broad term describing the active collection, verification, and immediate use of information to address human rights problems. Human rights monitoring includes gathering information about incidents, observing events (elections, trials, demonstrations, *etc.*), visiting sites such as

places of detention and refugee camps, discussions with Government authorities to obtain information and to pursue remedies, and other immediate follow-up. The term includes evaluation activities by the United Nations as well as fact gathering firsthand and other work in the field.

In addition, the drawback to monitoring is that it generally takes place over a protracted period of time. The major focus of United Nations monitoring is on carrying out investigations and subsequently denouncing human rights violations as a means of fighting impunity. However, it would be both deceiving and simplistic to identify human rights monitoring as being equivalent to a form of police activity. Human rights monitoring must be seen as the most fool-proof means of assessing a country's situation, and impeding its human rights violations and which, subsequently, could create a basis for institution-building. A stable human rights presence in a given country can be described as an ongoing needs assessment and analysis mission. However, human rights monitoring can also be done on a sporadic basis, as is the case with the so-called fact finding missions.

Some Governments, particularly totalitarian regimes, are reluctant to have an international human rights monitoring presence in their country, as they lack the long-term vision of good governance and see any attempt at cooperation as undue interference in their internal affairs. In such cases, monitoring



can be done from a distance, often through the offices of a special rapporteur, which entails a greater effort in information gathering and checking the reliability of available sources.

### **Working With Civil Society**

The direct involvement of people, individually and through non-governmental organizations and other organs of civil society, is essential to the realization of human rights. The Universal Declaration placed the realization of those rights squarely in the hands of “every individual and every organ of society”. Indeed, the history of human rights protection reflects the collective actions of individuals and organizations. The participation and contribution of all sectors of civil society are vital to the advancement of human rights. Article 71 of the Charter of the United Nations provides for consultations between the Economic and Social Council and non-governmental organizations. Several hundred international non-governmental organizations have received consultative status under this Article, which permits them to attend public meetings of the Council, the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights as observers, and, in accordance with the rules established by the Council, to make oral statements and submit written documents.

NGOs also sit as observers at public working group sessions of these bodies. In their interventions at such meetings, the non-

governmental organizations place emphasis on human rights situations requiring action on the part of the United Nations and suggest studies which should be carried out and instruments which should be drafted; they also contribute to the actual drafting of declarations and treaties. Non-governmental organizations may also submit reports alleging violations of human rights, for confidential consideration by the Sub-Commission, treaties bodies and the Commission under the 1503. procedure.

The views of non-governmental organizations are also sought on a wide range of issues where such consultation is appropriate and under decisions taken by the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the Commission on Human Rights and its Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (formerly Sub-Commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities). The views and information they provide are included in the official reports. Non-governmental organizations also play an important role in promoting respect for human rights and in informing the general public of United Nations activities in the field of human rights through education and public information campaigns.

## **Indigenous Peoples**

The World Conference on Human Rights (June 1993) and the International Decade for the World's Indigenous People (1995.

2004) proclaimed by the General Assembly a year later set three major objectives for the promotion of the human rights of indigenous peoples. The first is to adopt a declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples; the second to create an institutional mechanism for the participation of indigenous peoples in the work of the United

Nations by establishing a permanent forum for indigenous peoples; and the third to strengthen international cooperation for the solution of problems faced by indigenous people in areas such as human rights, the environment, development, education and health.

*In the context of the International Decade, current activities are as follows:*

- The draft declaration on the rights of indigenous peoples is under consideration by a working group of the Commission on Human Rights. Several hundred governmental and indigenous representatives are taking part.
- The proposed permanent forum for indigenous peoples within the United Nations is under consideration by another working group of the Commission on Human Rights.
- The International Decade of the World's Indigenous People is coordinated by the High Commissioner for Human Rights. The theme is "Indigenous people: partnership in action". The challenge to Governments, the United Nations system and non-

governmental actors is to develop programmes to bring about improvements in the living conditions of indigenous peoples worldwide.

- *In most UN agencies there are designated focal points or units undertaking activities benefiting indigenous peoples:*
- OHCHR is focusing on capacity-building for indigenous organizations in human rights, strengthening the participation of indigenous peoples in the UN's work, and improving the information flow to indigenous communities.
- The indigenous fellowship programme offers six months training in human rights within OHCHR to indigenous representatives.
- Two voluntary funds provide travel grants to enable indigenous people to participate in human rights meetings and assistance with projects.
- *The Indigenous Media Network:* through a series of workshops and exchanges, OHCHR is using the indigenous media as the linkage between United Nations activities and indigenous communities.
- The Working Group on Indigenous Populations, open to all indigenous peoples, remains the primary international meeting place for the world's indigenous peoples with nearly 1,000 participants.

## **Voluntary Funds**

The United Nations Voluntary Fund for Indigenous Populations is administered by OHCHR on behalf of the Secretary-General, with the advice of a Board of Trustees. The Fund was

established pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 40/131 of 13 December 1985, 50/156 of 21 December 1995 and 53/130 of 9 December 1998. The purpose of the Fund is to assist representatives of indigenous communities and organizations participate in the deliberations of the Working Group on Indigenous Populations, the open-ended inter-sessional Working Group on the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, and the open-ended inter-sessional ad hoc Working Group of the Permanent Forum, by providing them with financial assistance, funded by means of voluntary contributions from Governments, non-governmental organizations and other private or public entities.

The Voluntary Fund for the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People was established pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 48/163 of 21 December 1993, 49/214 of 23 December 1994 and 50/157 of 21 December 1995, all of which concern the International Decade of the World's Indigenous People.

In accordance with resolution 48/163, the Secretary-General was requested to establish a voluntary fund for the Decade and was authorized "to accept and administer voluntary contributions from Governments, inter-governmental and non-governmental organizations and other private institutions and individuals for the purpose of funding projects and programmes during the Decade".

In accordance with paragraph 24 of the annex to General Assembly resolution 50/157, the Coordinator of the Decade, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, should, “Encourage the development of projects and programmes, in collaboration with Governments and taking into account the views of indigenous people and the appropriate United Nations agencies, for support by the Voluntary Fund for the Decade”.

## **Minorities**

In recent years, there has been a heightened interest among members of the international community in issues affecting minorities as ethnic, racial and religious tensions have escalated, threatening the economic, social and political fabric of States, as well as their territorial integrity. The United Nations approach centres on the need to promote and protect the rights of minorities and encourage harmonious relations among minorities and between minorities and the majority population. In addition to the non-discrimination provisions set out in international human rights instruments, special rights are elaborated for minorities and measures adopted to protect persons belonging to minorities more effectively from discrimination and to promote their identity.

- The United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Persons Belonging to National or Ethnic, Religious and Linguistic

Minorities addresses the special rights of minorities in a separate document.

The Working Group on Minorities was established in 1995 in order to promote the rights set out in the Declaration and, more particularly, to review the promotion and practical realization of the declaration, examine possible solutions to problems involving minorities, and recommend further measures for the promotion and protection of their rights. The working group is open to Governments, United Nations agencies, non-governmental organizations, minority representatives and members of the academic community and is increasingly becoming a forum for dialogue on minority issues.

- A series of seminars on particular issues have drawn the attention of the international community to specific issues of relevance to the protection of minorities. Seminars have been held on intercultural and multicultural education and the role of the media in protecting minorities.
- Inter-agency cooperation on minority protection has led to an exchange of information on minority-related activities and has focused on specific activities and programmes which could be elaborated and implemented jointly, as a means of pooling financial, material and human resources.

## **Support for Victims of Torture**

On behalf of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, OHCHR administers a Voluntary Fund for Victims of Torture with the advice of a Board of Trustees. The Fund was established by General Assembly resolution 36/151 of 16 December 1981. It receives voluntary contributions from Governments, non-governmental organizations and individuals for distribution, through established channels of assistance, to non-governmental organizations providing medical, psychological, legal, social, financial, humanitarian or other assistance to victims of torture and members of their families.

If sufficient funding is available, relevant training and seminars for health and other professionals specializing in assisting victims of torture can also be financed. Applications for grants have to be submitted by 31 December for analysis by the secretariat of the Fund. Admissible applications are examined by the Board of Trustees at its annual session in May.

The Board adopts recommendations for approval by the High Commissioner for Human Rights on behalf of the Secretary-General. The grants are paid in the July/August period. Beneficiaries are required to provide satisfactory narrative and financial reports on the use of grants by 31 December. Until satisfactory reports on the use of previous grants are received, no new grants can be considered.



## **Support for Victims of Contemporary Forms of Slavery**

On behalf of the Secretary-General, OHCHR also administers the United Nations Voluntary Trust Fund on Contemporary Forms of Slavery with the advice of a Board of Trustees. The fund was established pursuant to General Assembly resolution 46/122 of 17 December 1991.

*The Purpose is two Fold:*

- To assist representatives of non-governmental organizations, from different regions, dealing with issues of contemporary forms of slavery to participate in the deliberations of the Working Group on Contemporary Forms of Slavery of the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights by providing them with financial assistance (travel grants);
- By extending, through established channels of assistance such as NGOs, humanitarian, legal and financial aid, to individuals whose human rights have been severely violated as a result of contemporary forms of slavery (project grants).

According to the criteria established by the General Assembly in its resolution 46/122, the only beneficiaries of the Fund's assistance shall be representatives of non-governmental organizations dealing with issues of contemporary forms of slavery:

- Who are so considered by the Board of Trustees;
- Who would not, in the opinion of the Board, be able to attend the sessions of the Working Group without the assistance provided by the Fund;
- Who would be able to contribute to a deeper knowledge on the part of the Working Group of the problems relating to contemporary forms of slavery; as well as
- Individuals whose human rights have been severely violated as a result of contemporary forms of slavery.

## **The Private Sector**

The increase in the private sector growth rate, the evolving role of Government and economic globalization have led to increased attention being paid to business enterprises as important actors in the human rights domain. In many ways, business decisions can profoundly affect the dignity and rights of individuals and communities. There is emergent interest on the part of the business community to establish benchmarks, promote best practices and adopt codes of conduct. Governments retain the primary responsibility for human rights and it is not a question of asking business to fulfill the role of Government, but of asking business to promote human rights in its own sphere of competence.

Corporations responsible for human rights violations must also be held to account. The relationship between the United Nations and the business community has been growing in a

number of important areas and the Secretary-General has called on the business community, individually through firms and collectively through business associations, to adopt, support and enact a set of core values in the areas of human rights, labour standards and environmental practices. The Secretary-General has asked the relevant United Nations agencies to be ready to assist the private sector in incorporating those values and principles into mission statements and corporate practice. Each agency has the important task of examining the various ways of responding to corporate concerns for human rights.

### **United Nations Human Rights Publication**

Human rights publications are strategically important to the promotion of human rights. Publications are aimed at: raising awareness about human rights and fundamental freedoms; raising awareness with regard to the existing ways and means at international level for promoting and protecting human rights and fundamental freedoms; encouraging debate on human rights issues under discussion in the various United Nations organs and bodies; serving as a permanent human rights resource for readers. Below is a list of available human rights publications issued by OHCHR.

Publications are free of charge. Human Rights Fact Sheets, Basic Information Kits on the 50th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and certain ad hoc

publications. and are available from the address below. Their reproduction in languages other than the official United Nations languages is encouraged provided that no changes are made to the contents and that OHCHR is advised by the reproducing organization and given credit as being the source of the material. Publications issued as United Nations sales publication. the Professional Training Series, the Study Series and certain reference and ad hoc publications can be ordered from the United Nations Bookshops listed below, with offices in Geneva and New York. United Nations sales publications are protected by copyright.

### **OHCHR Human Rights Fact Sheets**

The Human Rights Fact Sheets deal with selected questions of human rights under active consideration or are of particular interest. Human Rights Fact Sheets are intended to facilitate better understanding on the part of a growing audience of basic human rights, the United Nations agenda for promoting and protecting them and the international machinery available for realizing those rights. The Fact Sheets are free of charge and distributed worldwide. Their reproduction in languages other than the official United Nations languages is encouraged, provided that no changes are made to the contents and that OHCHR is advised by the reproducing organization and given the credit for being the source of the material.

## **Professional Training Series**

The Professional Training series consists of handbooks and manuals intended to increase awareness of international standards and are directed at a specific target audience selected for its ability to influence the human rights situation at the national level. Although primarily designed to provide support to the training activities of the Technical Cooperation Programme of the OHCHR, these publications could also serve as practical tools for those organizations involved in human rights education to professional groups. The training manuals in the Professional Training Series are adaptable to the particular needs and experience of a range of potential audiences within the target group, in terms of culture, education and history. Where appropriate, information on effective pedagogical techniques is included to assist trainers to use the manuals as effectively as possible. Each manual or handbook is prepared with the assistance of experts in the relevant fields and is subject to extensive external review and appraisal. Where appropriate, manuals or handbooks are tested in training sessions prior to their finalization.

## **Human Rights Studies Series**

The Human Rights Study Series reproduces studies and reports on important human rights issues prepared by experts of the Commission on Human Rights and the Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights (formerly Sub-

commission on Prevention of Discrimination and Protection of Minorities) in accordance with their mandates.

### **OHCHR ad hoc Publications**

The ad hoc publications consist mainly of reports and proceedings of conferences, workshops and other particularly important or innovative events held under the auspices of OHCHR. These publications can be issued free of charge.

#### *Publications for the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights: Basic information kits*

The basic information kit series is intended as a working tool for agencies, programmes, non-governmental organizations and national institutions as well as individuals to assist in the commemoration of the 50th Anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Basic information kits are published in French, English and Spanish and are distributed throughout the world free of charge. OHCHR reference publications are directed to a more specialized audience and often consist of collections or compilations of international instruments. They are issued as United Nations sales publications.

### **Half-a-century Reign of Terror**

While introducing AFSPA in the Parliament, authorizing martial law in the North-east region, the then Union Home

Minster justified the Act as a temporary measure to contain the uprising in the Naga Hills. But five decades latter, large part of the Northeast is still declared 'disturbed' under the Act and the civilian population is still under grip of the military rule. Thousands of lives have been extinguished in enforced disappearances and extrajudicial executions. Torture, rape, arbitrary detention, forced migration and displacement has become part of life.

Constitutional validity of AFSPA was challenged in the Supreme Court of India since, 1980 . But the apex court maintained a stoic silence on AFSPA during it most humane phase in the 80s. It did come out with a judgement in 1997. But this was only after the UN Human Rights Committee issued strong concluding observations after examining Government of India (GOI)'s 3rd periodic report under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.

The Committee observed that in applying AFSPA, the GoI is in effect exercising emergency powers without resorting to Article 4, clause 3 of the Covenant<sup>3</sup>. The Committee expresses it concern that continuing reliance on these special powers and violations of non-derogable human rights including right to life, right against torture, right against arbitrary detention, right to fair trial *etc.* and requested the Supreme Court of India to examine the covenant compatibility of the Act<sup>4</sup>. But the Supreme Court ignores the request and upheld the Act in toto.

The judgement did take cognizance of the “Do’s and Don’t” issued by the Army Head Quarter to its soldier, but offer no mechanism to enforce the safeguards . To the victims of AFSPA, the judgement offers some rights but no remedy to enforce the right.

Not satisfied, by the Judgement the Army authorities obtained an order from the Supreme Court in August 2001, explicitly empowering themselves with the authority to detain and interrogate suspects in the name of collection “operational intelligence” if not “substantive intelligence” . On 12 January 2007 the Indian Army proudly announces it has become the first armed force in the world to come out with a doctrine of “Sub Conventional Warfare” . Today, military operations such as “Operation All Clear”, “Operation Dragnet”, “Operation Tornado” *etc.* continue to cut into the life of the ordinary civilians of the hills and valley of Manipur. It is no longer a national enterprise but has become an international one as the Indian Authorities are roping in its neighbours like Myanmar Army to jointly pound on the hideouts of the armed opposition groups. But as the flexing of military muscles continues, the phenomenon of insurgency is also simultaneously witnessing an upswing. What started as an isolated armed resistance of the Naga people demanding self-determination, has slowly but surely embroiled the entire region into a million mutinies now. Unfortunately the government seems to be stuck with the law and order paradigm and military option. To understand the



phenomena of the cycle of violence one need to see above and beyond this frame. Insurgency in the North-east is rooted in historical injustices and deeply felt discriminatory treatments meted out on a racially and culturally distinct group of people. It is essentially the fall out of the exclusion of a cultural and civilizational essence encapsulated by the North-east from 'the idea of India'. The AFSPA-approach of dealing with the issue addresses the symptoms but ends up aggravating the every source of the problem and thereby continually fuels up the cycle of violence.

The people of Manipur have moved heaven and earth to do away with the Act. From sustained public protest to disrobing of elderly women in front the Army head quarters, self immolation of student leaders to the ongoing six years satyagraha of Miss. Irom Sharmila. In response to an unprecedented public protest in Manipur in 2004 the Union Home Ministry set up a Committee, headed by Justice Jeevan Reddy former judge of the Supreme Court of India to review the provisions of the Act, "Keeping in mind the legitimate concerns of the people of the North Eastern Region, the need to foster Human Rights, maintenance of public order" . The Committee submitted its report to the Government in June 2005 and unanimously recommends the repeal of the Act. The Government, we are told, is still studying the report.

Most recently, the UN Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination in its concluding observation issued in March 2007 after discussing India's 15th to 19th periodic under the International Convention of Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination urged GoI to repeal AFSPA. GoI is also requested to report on the implementation of its recommendation within one year .

### **Other Counter Insurgency Legislations used in Manipur**

Even though AFSPA is the most widely known 'counter terrorism laws' / 'national security' law there are also a plethora of other less know laws enacted for the same purpose in Manipur:

#### **Unlawful Activities Prevention Act, 1967**

The Act confers power upon the State authorities to deal with activities directed against the integrity and sovereignty of India. In 2004, the Parliament incorporated many provisions from the Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2002 to curb terrorist activities. Many groups in Manipur are proscribed as unlawful organizations under this Act since, the 60s but of late 6 of them have also been listed as Terrorist organizations. Its provisions are regularly invoked while arresting and booking suspected activist of the political organizations demanding the restoration of Manipur's independence.

## **The Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act, 1911**

Under this act, the district administration is authorized to stop public meetings 'which are likely to promote sedition or to cause a disturbance of public tranquility in the proclaimed areas.' Imphal East, Imphal West, Thoubal and Bishnupur Districts were declared proclaimed area' under the Prevention of Seditious Meetings Act, 1911 vide Government of Manipur Notification 2/8(6)/2K-H dated 26 April 2000. A subsequent order declared the entire state of Manipur as proclaimed area under this Act.

## **The Punjab Security of State Act, 1953**

Certain parts of Manipur valley are declared as 'dangerously disturbed' under the Punjab Security of State Act. Once declared as such, Section 10 of the Act enables the Government to impose collective fines on the civilian populations. HRA has documents two instances where the District Magistrates imposed collective fines on the villagers for militant activities done in the vicinity of their villages.

## **Foreigner's Protected Areas Order, 1958**

Foreign nationals with a valid visa to India are prevented from entering Manipur unless a special permission is obtained from either the Union Home Ministry. The requirement has been reported relaxed recently and tourist can now obtain the

permission to go to Manipur from the Home Department of Government of Manipur.

### **The National Security Act, 1980**

Under this law, a person suspected to indulging in 'anti-national activities' can be detained without charges (preventive or administrative detention) for a period of up to one year. Routinely used for booking alleged insurgents or 'anti-nationals'. For example in the year 2005, 151 people are detained under this act in Manipur. . The Code of Criminal Procedure (Manipur Amendment) Act, 1983: In Manipur, the normal criminal procedure code of India is modified to the following effect:

- Extending the period of Police investigation thereby extending the time of administrative detention;
- Provide more impunity to law enforcement officials;
- More stringent requirement for bail application.

Moreover, prohibitory orders under section 144 of CrPC are perpetually placed in Imphal East and Imphal West Districts, thereby banning the gathering of five or more persons, which is likely to turn unlawful, and also carrying of sticks, stones, firearms or other weapons, or objects that can be used as weapons. People intending to take out processions for marriages or funerals are required to obtain prior permission from the D.C. The District Magistrates of the concerned Districts routinely issues an order to this effect every two

months. The Terrorist and Disruptive Activities (Prevention) Act, 1985 The Act was allowed to lapse by the Parliament in 1995 but cases are still pending in Manipur under this act.

## **Post 2001 Experience**

The 2001 tragedy in the US brought the world into new security angst. Governments of the world came together to join the US led 'War Against Terrorism'. But as there is no universal understanding of the term 'terrorism', some governments are using this as a pretext to aggressively push their own agenda in a highly self-serving and politically motivated fashion. In India the heightened national security mania finds its expression in the enactment of the dreaded Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2002 (POTA). In this increasingly belligerent mood of the state, an assessment of its impact on the human rights of the small ethnic communities in the Northeast—which have been historically experiencing, for most part, only the brute side of the Indian state—would be a worthwhile exercise. In this context, we take a closer look at Manipur, arguably the most volatile state of the region.

## **Politicization of 'Terrorism'**

Informed sources observed that the real intent of enacting the POTA, was not to address the act of terrorism per se but to neutralize the assertion of the ethnic, national and religious minorities which opposed the dominant Hindutva ideology of

the then ruling Bharatya Janata Party . What gives credence to such a viewpoint is that not only are there existing laws to deal with the problem, but the stated objective of this new draconian Act and the way it defines terrorist act. The objective and reason for passing the Prevention of Terrorism Act, 2002 (POTA) was:

- To control terrorist activity in the Northeast which witnessed insurgency since, India's independence and Jammu and Kashmir and the rise of religious fundamentalist militancy.

The political overtone of the Act was obvious in the way it defined terrorist act in Section 3 (1) (a), which states,

- Whoever with the intent to threaten the unity, integrity, security or sovereignty of India ... do or abstain from doing anything ... commits a terrorist act.

In the case of Manipur, where the juridical questions of the cohesive merger of an independent kingdom into the Indian Union is not only unresolved but actively challenged by a large section of the population, this political definition can hold any peaceful political dissident as terrorist. The politically motivated overarching definition of a terrorist act includes 'attempts to harbour or conceal' 'terrorist' as a terrorist crime. This had given ample scope for the law enforcement agencies to harass innocent civilians. In fact many people organizing and participating in peaceful public meeting to discuss Manipur-

India politico-military conflict and proposing Plebiscite as a possible way out are booked as unlawful terrorist activists .

### **Ethnization of ‘Terrorism’**

A list of ‘terrorist organizations’ is appended under the POTA’s schedule. The Union Home Ministry provides the original list of terrorist organizations and the Central Government reserved the right to add or remove an organization from the list. The list contained twenty-eight organizations, out of which ten organizations were from the Northeast region. Out of these six—PLA, UNLF, PREPAK, KCP, KYKL and MPLF – are from Manipur. Out of some fifteen active armed insurgent groups only six are listed as ‘terrorist organization’. Discerning the politics behind this naming process will be interesting. The indigenous population of Manipur may be roughly grouped into Meitei, Nagas and Kukis communities. All the six proscribed organizations are predominantly Meitei based organizations. GoI is having a cease-fire agreement with two Naga armed groups. Indian Army also has a ‘suspension of operation’ arrangement with seven Kuki armed outfits and has even issued identity cards to carryout their illegal armed activities without the knowledge of the lawfully established Government of Manipur . The act of singling out one particular ethnic group and branding them as ‘terrorist organizations’ leaves many observers guessing whether the Act was another ploy to ethnically polarize the fragile ethnic equilibrium of Manipur.

Such act of ethnization of 'terrorism' may or may not serve the immediate military goal, but such insidious divide and rule tactics certainly leaves long lasting ethnic enmity and tensions, which could be highly detrimental to achieving sustainable peace. The role of the Government in the Naga-Kuki ethnic clash in the early 90s is still being questioned. The biggest concern today is that unless the situation is handled with due care the possibilities of eruption of another ethnic violence of the scale not for seen before in the region cannot be ruled out.

## **Contemporary Issues of Concern**

### **Rendering Human Rights Institutions Dysfunctional**

The Manipur Human Rights Commission (MHRC), established in 1997, provided a forum where victims of gross human rights violations could come to petition their grievances. Even though the Commission has not power to deal with violations by the armed forces, it could at least see that the civil police register cases of the atrocities. The authorities were perhaps unpleased with the Commission; they failed to nominate new members once the term of the first set of members expired. As the Commission remained suspended for almost a year, human rights activist moved the High Court with a Public Interest Litigation. The Government did reconstitute the Commission in 2005. None of the earlier members were re-nominated but this



time they have put a retired Lt. Col. as one of the member, purportedly to improve the Army-MHRC relations. HRA have evidence that the ex-army member threatened and intimidate human rights activist from carrying out their legitimate human rights work calling it as indulging in 'anti-army activities'.

### **Flaunting International Human Rights and Humanitarian Law Standards**

Even though the GoI is a member of the UN Human Rights Council and has pledged to promote and protect human right all over the world, when it comes issue of Manipur and North-east it regularly flaunt international human rights and humanitarian laws. For example on 6 July 2005 four Manipuris asylum seeker Romen Thounaojam, Sharatchandra Thingujam, Ibomcha Meitei Lichongbam and Kesho Kumar Meitei Urembem were forcibly returned from Thailand to the Indian while pending their status determination by the UN High Commissioner of Refugee. Amnesty International called this act a clear contravention of the principle of non-refoulement . Whenever the demand for the repeal of AFSPA is raised, the Army always objects tooth and nail justifying the need for the special powers as they are engaging in a "war like situation" fighting terrorist/insurgents in the North-east. HRA submits that if the problem in Manipur is simply a 'law and order' or a 'public order' problem as the GoI would like to define, then Armed Forces Special Powers Act have no place what-so-ever;

but if the situation is so grave as the military authorities would like to define as 'war-like' and retain the Act, GoI is obliged to formally declare a state of emergency following the procedure of the ICCPR. It is also obliged to follow certain international humanitarian laws including the common article 3 of the Geneva Conventions of 1948 and its Additional Protocol II of 1977 as well as the Security Council Resolution 1325. International agencies such as the ICRC should be invited to offer its humanitarian services in Manipur. The reign of terror can no longer be hidden.