

README: Some sections may not be complete. Please forgive that or add on to it as you please!

SBQ segment

1. **Emergence of the Cold War after the Second World War**

Bit of backstory context

American hostilities to Soviets were already present in 1917..due to the inherent clash in values. Soviets also did not like Americans, particularly after their intervention on the side of the 'White Russian' forces +Marxist-Leninist thinking implied that a clash with capitalism was inevitable and avoidable. Confrontation would happen one way or another

Molotov-ribbentrop pact worsened relations...'unholy alliance' +incorporation of eastern poland, baltic states and bessarabia was viewed as expansionist and unjust

Rationale for cooperation during WW2: Western POV

1. Kill Germany. Power vacuum would be discussed later, but kill germany first and foremost
2. USSR wasn't viewed as expansionist after abolition of Comintern in 1943 +Roosevelt recognised Stalin's security interests as legitimate and believed that cooperation in this regard would persuade USSR to withhold support for commie movements elsewhere
3. Economics. Money to be made from potentially economically ravaged USSR→export market for both countries

Rationale for cooperation during WW2: USSR

1. Needed reinforcements to support the war against Germany. Nov '41 Lend-lease agreement → US military aid to USSR at no cost
2. Also believed friendship with USA was possible despite Marxist-Leninist thought, percentages agreement further encouraged Stalin (Search up how influence was split up)

But fundamentally, it was only a marriage of convenience due to common enemy Germany

One reason for mutual distrust even during the war.

1. Stalin wanted the west to open up a second front in France to put more pressure on Germany → but the UK and US did not until Normandy (June '44). Partly because of British insistence to strike Italy and Africa first (soft white underbelly)

2. **Causes for the emergence of tensions between the USA and USSR**

One reason for mutual distrust even during the war.

1. Stalin wanted the west to open up a second front in France to put more pressure on Germany → but the UK and US did not until Normandy (June '44). Partly because of British insistence to strike Italy and Africa first (soft white underbelly)
2. It made Stalin believe that the West wanted to prolong the war between Germany and the USSR, so that they would destroy each other in the process
- 3.

3. **Manifestations of emerging tensions:**

3.0: Tehran conference, Nov 1943 (NOT - not actually a sign of tensions. Actually a sign of consensus)

With respect to Poland, interests of all parties were secured

1. UK went to war to help Poland → USSR agreed that even though it would annex Eastern Polish territory as per its security interests, it would still not force communism
2. USA - same deal → Wanted to promote democracy → Thought that USSR would remain on good terms with USA
3. Recognition of security interests + No confederation of central EU or Balkan states whose goals undermined Soviet security interests were allowed

3.01: Moscow Conference (Just between Churchill and Stalin), 1944

- USSR wanted control over formerly Polish territories, and annexed the Baltics, Königsberg and Bessarabia in line with retaking former Russian Empire territories. Sought to make other Eastern European states satellite states who would serve as a buffer region between USSR and Germany (and the west)
- West saw Greece as important to contain Soviet naval influence in the Mediterranean → Aforementioned percentages agreement
-

3.1. Yalta and Potsdam Conferences

Yalta (Feb '45)

1. Reparations issue
 - USSR wanted massive reparations from German zones as compensation for having their industrial capacity destroyed by German invasion → Also wanted to dismantle German factories and transfer resources back to motherland
 - USA wanted to allied to extract moderate reparations, as they saw German economic recovery as fundamental to European economic recovery
2. Poland
 - West POV: Went to war over Poland. Soviet actions in Polish invasion (Nazi-Soviet Pact), Katyn woods massacre ('43) and infuriated west
 - SOV POV: Poland was a matter of life or death → Poland was the traditional route of an invasion of Russia → Stalin made it clear throughout WW2 that they would not tolerate a hostile Poland

- Potential of collaboration still there: **Declaration Of Liberated Europe** → Free elections within EE, Allies accepted Lublin provisional government and London Poles (former exile)
- June 1945: However, Stalin exerted pressure on Poland → arrested Polish Home Army members and leaders of non-commie parties

Nonetheless, Spirit of cooperation existed and it was agreed that Germany was divided into four occupation zones, compensation allowed (though exact amount was to be determined later), Germany to lose territory to Poland in compensation for Soviet seizure of eastern territories

3. Economic reconstruction
 - USSR wanted high reparations from Germany whereas Allies objected

Potsdam (July/August 1945)

1. Reparations issue
 - Allies rebuffed Soviet reparations as excessive
 - Main source of reparations would also come from within their own occupation zones → Soviet losses were deemed more extensive, granted additional reparations from Western zones in exchange for food and raw materials BUT Soviets still unhappy as their occupation zone was largely agrarian → Seized and extracted as much resources as possible in response
2. Poland
 - Soviets DID accept London Poles and promised free elections in Poland (delivered promise)
 - By the time of the Yalta conference however, the reality was different as the Western leaders began to recognise the extent of Soviet consolidation of power as the Soviets supported all the left-leaning parties, which were gradually gaining immense power and influence
 - BUT within 18 months Poland fell to communists → 'Salami tactics' → gradually eliminated opposition leaders and helped Left-leaning politicians → Elections later hosted in 1947 was heavily manipulated by communists
3. Economic reconstruction
 - Stalin insisted on more reparations at the MINIMUM being \$10 billion which the allies balked at
 - Truman initially wanted reparations to only be extracted from their own zones → Eventually agreed to let USSR have 25% of machinery from western zones but on the condition that USSR send back 60% of its zone's raw materials → Incensed Stalin
 - USA ended Lend-lease agreement in May '45 → Stalin viewed this as political pressure to curb his actions in EE

- Soviets henceforth refused membership in World Bank and IMF in December '45 and hence sought to extract reparations from countries within her sphere of influence → Soviets wanted to reconstruct their economy → Initially agreed to join World Bank and IMF in July 1944 → Asked \$6 billion loan in Jan '45 → US imposed 'unacceptable conditions such as opening of EE markets to American capital' → USSR wary of 'dollar diplomacy' in **their sphere of influence**

4. Nuclear weapons

- US POV: US refused to share nuclear tech with USSR → Made USSR paranoid and prompted nuclear arms race
- US also believed that nuclear monopoly enabled it to negotiate with USSR from position of strength + At Potsdam, nuclear weapons could be used to force USSR to accept American aims for post-war world

USSR POV:

- Stalin saw deployment of nuclear weapons as anti-soviet move → Deprive USSR of strategic gains in far east and give USSR upper hand in post-war settlement
- He feared Soviet weakness (industrial capacity) and now nuclear

3.2. Sovietisation of Eastern Europe (45'-47')

- Despite Yalta promise → By Jan 1947 anti-communists were imprisoned and detained, communists claimed 80% of votes in heavily manipulated elections through 'Salami tactics' where opponents were eliminated bit-by-bit
- Communism in Europe now stretched all the way to the Adriatic sea
- Made Greece, Turkey and Italy vulnerable → Bordering nations + poor economic conditions → suboptimal conditions

Brief point on Iran

- American perception of Soviet Union worsened severely because of Soviet actions in Iran → Joint British-Soviet agreement to withdraw by March 1946 but Red Army did not
- UK, USA and Iran took a case with UNSC, and Stalin did not want to escalate the situation and only withdrew after UN complaints and criticisms.
- Highlighted growing rift and suspicion

Also on Baruch Plan (June-Dec '46)

- Soviets viewed it as an attempt to ensure their nuclear monopoly → The Plan sought to create a UN-administered organization to control all atomic plans and uranium deposits
- Reinforced Soviet fears of western desire to limit USSR
- → Vetoed it down in the UNSC
-

3.3. Churchill's Iron Curtain Speech

- Also symbolized growing rift between the west and USSR → shift away from 'Spirit Of Yalta' and growing suspicion of USSR

-

3.4. Kennan's Long Telegram

- Sought to formulate a firm, vigilant policy of containment to contain USSR's expansionist tendencies and secure American political and economic interests

-

3.5. Truman Doctrine and Marshall Plan

Context behind both of this (April-August '46)

- → Soviet pressure on Turkey and Greece to grant them access to Mediterranean sea and establish permanent bases in Turkey and Greece
- US responds to this by sending USS Missouri to Istanbul as a form of deterrence
- Turkish issue also highlighted how USSR was ambitious and expansionist → willing to contravene international norms in pursuit of its own objectives
- Greece also faced a civil war → Although Stalin respected percentages agreement and did not supply arms to Greece (It was Tito and Yugoslavs) → Truman viewed communists as monolithic bloc

12 March 1947 → Truman Doctrine announced in a speech

May '47 - Congress approved Truman's request for \$400 million to Greece

By '49, Greek communists defeated + Turkey firmly in western bloc

NSC-68 (195): Shifted US from passive to active containment of USSR

Marshall Plan (5 June 1947)

- Sought to provide aid, grants and loans to allied European countries
- Sought to root out communism through economic growth and employment → Blunt the appeal of communism through creating burgeoning industries and opportunities for growth → Recovery would create stability needed for democratic institutions to function
→ Curb appeal of extremist ideology thereby protecting peace

Marshall Aid was deliberately open to every country in Europe → Soviet Union pressured its Satellite states to reject aid EXCEPT Yugoslavia which took aid and was promptly expelled from Cominform in retaliation

- Congress approved and US aid to Europe came up to \$13 billion between 1948 to 1952
- Soviet refusal to participate caused economic division across Europe → By spring of 1948, Europe was firmly divided into two distinct economic and political blocks
→ Churchill's Iron curtain speech became reality

-

3.6. Berlin Blockade (June '48 - May '49)

Disagreements over Germany

- USA wanted economically strong Germany, did not want them to be burdened by reparations → Led to WW2

- USSR wanted left-wing, communist unified German state and sought to extract as many reparations as they could
- West German occupied areas could not produce sufficient food → USA and USSR had to spend their own money to feed German population → Whilst USSR stripped their zone of entire factories and kidnapped German experts to aid Soviet economic development
- This angered Western allies → Stopped sending machinery/industry shipments to USSR

TRIGGER however came with

→ Formation of Trizonia (unification of Western allied zones) in June '48 → and unification as one economic unit + formation of one currency

- Western Allies Introduced Deutschmark (DM) in June '48 to spur economic recovery
- Soviets retaliated with Ostmark
- West introduced DM in **Berlin** → and refused to allow Ostmark in their zones (including West Berlin)

USSR began blockade to force Allies to change German policy/leave Berlin altogether

- In response, Berlin airlift and counter-blockade on West German products to East Germany → Soviet zone deprived of basic necessities like coal and steel (only in West)
- Berlin blockade was a complete failure → Damage to Soviet prestige as it was viewed as a 'bully' trying to starve out an entire population and it hurt East Germany more than West Germany

Stalin ended blockade in May 1948

Berlin Blockade was significant because

- Displayed western tech superiority and improved Western prestige (first demonstration of containment)
- Blockade intensified military insecurity around Europe → Led to NATO in response

3.7. NATO and Warsaw Pact

- Treaty Of Brussels, May '48 (predecessor to NATO)
- Established a military alliance against any possible revival of German aggression + mutual assistance in case of attack
- NO immediate response by USSR against NATO → Only in 1955 was Warsaw Pact formed
- Warsaw Pact was only formed in retaliation to West German remilitarization and inclusion in NATO and
-

NATO treaty, April '49

- Following fears of Soviet aggression as evinced by Berlin Blockade, NATO was formed
- Article 51: Collective defense if any one member was attacked by any country
- NATO also helped deter USSR aggression, it was also a confidence-booster

- Psychologically helped allied-Europeans to focus on economic recovery and resist communism due to American nuclear monopoly influence
- US nuclear guarantee was **fundamental**
- NATO added military dimension to the conflict
- Admission of West Germany into NATO in 1955 → Formation of Warsaw Pact led by USSR in retaliation

4. **Historical interpretations of the origins of the Cold War:**

4.1. Traditional

- Lays blame on Stalin and USSR → Expansionist policies which forced defensive policies by USA (dominant amongst Western sources in 1940s to 1960s)
- Emphasizes conflict between Marxist-Leninism and capitalism → Western support for White Russians amidst Russian civil war led to deep-seated paranoia amongst commie leaders → Policy of cooperation towards West was only done when necessary
- USSR, caused a trust deficit with the USA through its sovietisation of EE and malicious activities in Iran, Turkey, Greece and Germany, Korea also → hence to prevent collapse of anti-communist European states, USA instituted containment doctrine
- Berlin Blockade and deliberate starvation of West Berliners over mere differences over currency and ideology → highlights USSR as aggressor

Flaws:

- Minimises US culpability → Ignores that cold war actually results from conflict between two competing superpowers' visions for post-war world order
- USA was just as uncompromising in its views and beliefs as USSR
- Also ignores legitimate security interests in EE for USSR → Also too heavily influenced by the period of history in which it was written (1950s 1960s) because world events were tainted by cold war realities and need for containment → Hence even in academics, the influence of cold war was present

4.2. Revisionist (1960s sources, Vietnam era questioning)

- The USSR did not have revolutionary goals, security needs were legitimate and it had to ensure Germany no longer posed a threat to it.
- Its energy was focused towards economic reconstruction and security → lacked resources and energy for communist expansion
- MOREOVER, Stalin was willing to compromise in many instances → Soviets troops withdrew from Iran after UN protest, reined in militant tendencies of communist forces in Europe → Urged local commies to work with non-commies and only radicalized AFTER marshall plan

Also highlighted expansionist nature of American capitalism

- US got involved in Japan and Germany against their autarkic economic policies
- Lend-Lease agreement, World Bank and IMF all had a price to pay → Countries had to open up their markets to American competition

USSR henceforth set up buffer zone to protect itself against America → as US trade and investment was often accompanied with anti-communism

- Washington also used atomic monopoly to put pressure on USSR (Baruch Plan to continue monopoly)
- Marshall Plan (Dollar Imperialism) (America's own empire) → In response, USSR created cominform and comecon to protect itself and allies from dollar imperialism

Flaws:

- Exaggerates economic imperialism of the USA → Much of it was genuinely moral desire to help prop up European economies
- USA also was not in desperate need of foreign markets, had an abundance of natural resources and a strong consumerist culture
- Also portrays Americans to be the antagonizing party, yet in reality it was still often the Soviets (Berlin Crisis)

4.3. Post-revisionist (1970s-1980s sources DETENTE)

- Emphasizes mutual misunderstanding and miscommunication about various events → led to creation of policies that were antagonistic even though they both aimed to preserve peace and security
- Americans did not understand strategic and historical importance of EE to USSR, who had been invaded twice through this route
- Consequences of WW2 also led to decolonization → USA and USSR had a power vacuum to fill

Flaws:

- Fails to appreciate fundamental ideological differences that caused the conflict in the first place. Even if they understood one another's intentions → Still unlikely that they would have tolerated each others' policies and actions
-

4.4. Post-Cold War

- Not a single school of thought like the previous ones → BUT an amalgamation of different approaches to understanding the cold war
- Soviets harboured ideological expansions,

Just some more CK here

Stalemate in Europe of bipolarity → ultimately what pushed both countries to seek new frontiers to combat each other ideologically

Communism was deeply unpopular and resented by EEs

- East German uprising '53 (widespread protests against government → crushed by Soviet occupation forces militarily)
 - 1956 Hungarian Revolution (Protests for democracy → Commie leader sought to leave Warsaw Pact for some sense of sovereignty → deposed and invaded by Warsaw Pact)
 - '61 Berlin crisis → Resulted in building of Berlin Wall (communism was so bad people had to be KEPT IN due to manpower outflows etc)
 - Checkpoint Charlie Oct '61 (just know it happened, confrontation)
 - '68 Prague spring (reforms → crushed by invasion of 600,000 Warsaw Pact troops)
- RELIANCE of force to quell popular uprisings and movements → Led to Brezhnev doctrine

1. **Manifestations of the Global Cold War**

2**Korean War (1950–1953)**

2.0 Timeline of the war (I guess)

August 1945: Korea was divided at the 38th parallel

- o August 1948: Republic of Korea established (South)
- o September 1948: Democratic People's Republic of Korea established (North)

December 1948: Withdrawal of Soviet troops from North Korea

- o March 1949: Kim visited Moscow to seek Soviet support for an invasion, he was rejected

June 1949: Withdrawal of US troops from the South

- o August 1949: Atomic Parity of USSR
- o October 1949: Communist Victory in China, People's Republic of China established

January 1950: Dean Acheson's Defence Perimeter speech

- o 18 January 1950: USSR willing to consider helping North Korea with plans for invasion

- o 14 February 1950: Sino-Soviet Alliance

- o April 1950: Kim obtained formal support from Stalin for invasion

- o June 1950: Kim obtained formal support from Mao for invasion

- o 25 June 1950: North Korea invaded South Korea

- o July 1950: UN Command created under MacArthur

July-August 1950: Allied forces drawn all the way back to the south-eastern part of Korean peninsula → City of Pusan.

- o September 1950: MacArthur's UN troops landed at Inchon → Military tide in favor of UN troops → Liberated Seoul on 26 September

1 October 1950 → South Korean troops crossed the 38th parallel in a bid to unite Korea under Rhee

- o 7 October 1950: UN troops crossed the border and pushed towards Yalu River

19 October 1950: Pyongyang fell to UN-SK troops

- o 25 October 1950: Chinese troops covertly crossed the Yalu River and pushed UN forces

south

26 November 1950: Chinese launched a full-scale assault following MacArthur's order to have more troops invade the Yalu river, threatening China's security

6 December 1950: Pyongyang was recaptured by Chinese troops

- 4 Jan 1951: Chinese troops captured Seoul
- Mar 1951: MacArthur's total victory (Took back Seoul on 14 March)
- April 1951: MacArthur dismissed (War pretty much reached a stalemate atp)

- May 1952: Stalemate over POW issue
- 23 July 1953: Ceasefire agreed upon
- 27 July 1963 -> Ceasefire came into effect. Demilitarized zone established.

2.1. China's emergence as a communist power and emerging Cold War tensions in Asia

- In '49, CCP defeated KMT → Defeat of KMT was viewed as a major disaster by Americans
- Sino-Soviet treaty of friendship was signed in February '50 → Stalin supported reunification of China under communism
- Stalin felt emboldened by this as it was evidence that the communist bloc was gaining ground → US in turn was increasingly anxious and feared the spread of communism in Asia as per domino theory
-

2.2. Outbreak and development of the conflict:

2.2.1. Role of the superpowers

- Potsdam conference → Split Korea into 2 separation occupation zones at the **38th parallel**
- The US asked the UN to create a government in Korea → UN-administered free elections held in South, but USSR refused in North
- In August '48, Syngman Rhee (Harvard, Princeton, perfect English dog) declares Korea independent (ROK) → Claims all of Korea, including North
- September '48 → Kim Il Sung (Commanded Korean troops who fought for USSR, was a the forefront of Chinese-Korean collaboration against Japs) declares DPRK → Claims all of Korea, including South
- Superpower troops withdrew shortly after, with small military advisors to the nascent administrations

2.2.1.1: Role of USSR

- Stalin initially was indifferent to Korea → as evident by how Soviet troops withdrew more than 6 months before American troops
- BUT they still considered Korea vital for security of Soviet far East (minimally not in hostile hands) → and still retained military advisors and technicians even after they mostly withdrew

By 1950s however, this changed

- April 1950: Stalin approved Kim's plan to unify Korea → provided supplies and equipment. Provided tanks, machine guns and planes
- But wanted to avoid confrontation with USA → Sought to concealed the scale of Soviet assistance so as to not incense USA (Soviet advisors were withdrawn a few days before the invasion) HENCE why Stalin exerted so much influence that HE DICTATED the date of the invasion
- One of the reasons for this change was because of how Stalin sought to maintain leadership over China. If USSR refused to support, Kim would seek Chinese assistance, especially because of China's blood debt (Kim supported Mao immensely during civil war), and because Mao himself wanted to expand communism in the east (Taiwan)
- ANOTHER reason why was because they had attained atomic parity with USA in

During the war itself

- Provided MiG-15 fighters, which battled it out with American F-86 sabres in the first jet-versus-jet combat in history
- Many of these fighters were flown by Russian pilots who wore Chinese insignia and whose jets had Chinese markings
- Mao and Kim requested more planes, but these requests were turned down
- Continued to supply military hardware to Chinese however, but he insisted prompt Chinese payment in hard cash for this, which China viewed as unjust in furthering the communist cause
-

-

2.2.1.2: Role of USA (and UN)

- USA initially had hands-off approach towards Korea
- Dean Acheson's speech outlining US aims in the Far East (Jan '50)
- Korean peninsula and Taiwan was absent from the list pertaining to the US' defense perimeter in the Pacific, and Congress later struck down \$60 million request for aid by South Korea in the same month
- This convinced the commie countries that US was not interested in Korea

When Korean war began

- USA persuaded UNSC to adopt a resolution condemning North Korea and USA joined the war under the banner of a UN operation
- To the US, the Korean War signaled a new Soviet aggression → Monolithic belief in communism
- Truman did not want to be 'soft' towards communism after having lost China → could not lose Korea as well
- NSC-68 called for extensive military build-up of USA to contain Soviet aggression → was now implemented and the US budget incurred massive expenditures on military

- The USA also feared that in tandem with North Korea, China would invade Taiwan → hence US seventh fleet was dispatched to Taiwan straits
- Henceforth, Kim and Stalin had miscalculated → Did not anticipate American intervention in the war at such a fast pace (within days, US and 15 other allied-UN nations committed to the defense of South Korea)

UN: Just know that the only reason why USA was able to gain the legitimacy of the UN in its intervention is because in January 1950, the USSR boycotted the UNSC due to their decision not to admit CCP

Supreme commander of UN force was American General Douglas MacArthur

- Was removed because of insubordination in April 1951
- He openly called for an invasion of China, and advocated bombing Chinese cities and implored Washington for more reinforcements to do so
- Washington DC however regarded the Korean war as a limited operation and did not want to risk confrontation with USSR with a war with China

During the war itself

- Launched a massive bombing campaign of North Korea → Rained down almost as many bombs on North Korea as they did on Germany during WW2

POW issue (obstacle to resolution process)

- UN insisted on asking each POW if they wanted to return to Communist Mainland, stay in South or go to Taiwan
- Communist countries did not want this, the UN insisted that only half of communist POWs wished voluntary repatriation → Major blow to communist propaganda blow

Conclusion of war came about thanks to

1. Truman deciding to stand against elections and in November 1952 → Dwight D Eisenhower elected (partly on the promise of ending the Korean war)
2. Stalin died in March 1953. Mao and Soviet leaders sought to end war in turn
- 3.

2.2.2. Role of China

MacArthur informed the Joint Chiefs Of Staff (Highest ranking American military officials) that Chinese entry into the war made it entirely different war altogether, highlighting how significant Chinese involvement was

China's involvement helped North Korea recapture Pyongyang, Seoul (can see timeline above)

2.2.3. Role of North Korea

- In March '49, Kim asked Stalin to start a war to unite peninsula, based on his notion that
 - 1) ROK would never accept peaceful unification
 - 2) DPRK force > ROK force

- Stalin refused Kim's request to start war → did not want to draw USA in the region + was occupied with Berlin Blockade
- In August '49, asked Soviet ambassador to Korea based on 1) Americans had withdrawn 2) ROK rejected peaceful proposals for reunification 3) Recent skirmishes highlighted DPRK superiority
- In Sept '49, Kim proposed an offensive operation on the Ongjin Peninsula as South was preparing an attack
- Once again, Stalin rejected → Fear of American intervention
- In April '50, Kim visited Moscow → Stalin approved Kim's request for modern arms and forceful unification → provided he got the support of the Chinese
- In May '50, Kim presented invasion plan to Mao and exaggerated Stalin's support
- Mao was hesitant, but then support because he HIMSELF wanted to reunite Taiwan and wanted Stalin's support
- KIM hence started the war since he stretched the truth and maliciously manipulated both China and USSR into supporting the war

North Korea arguably started the war

- 25 June 1950 → DPRK army pushed southwards with dramatic success, with Seoul falling in 3 days.

2.2.4. Role of South Korea

- Syngman Rhee was a Korean nationalist and similar to Kim, also wanted to unify Korea, even using force if necessary

2.3. Impact on the Cold War

- Led to strengthening of NATO, Greece and Turkey admitted in 1952
- Korean war led to rearmament of West Germany and admission to NATO in 1954
- USSR retaliated with Warsaw Pact in response
- Further cemented division of Europe → but did not bring about large changes to balance of power in Europe
- Korean war also led to acceptance of NSC-68 by US congress and massive increase in conventional arms
- Before outbreak of war, American officials anticipated a defence budget of \$13 billion annually, yet in September 1950 these same officials expected nearly \$300 billion over the next five years
- The actual figure between 1950 and 1955 was about \$220 billion, a colossal increase than from previously
- Military build-up exceeded that of the years immediately after attack on Pearl Harbour
- Within the span of the Korean war, armed forces doubled to 3.2 million, US army grew from 10 divisions to 18, and expanded number of ships to 1000
- 'Thermonuclear bomb/Hydrogen bomb' race in the 1950s

- Space race

Korean war also globalised the cold war → Both sides took to turn decolonization in their favour
Also set a precedent for globalising conflicts

Here's the continuation of the manifestations of the Global Cold War, organized and numbered:

3. **Vietnam War (1959–1975)**

3.1. Impact of the First Indochina War on the US's relations with North and South Vietnam, and developments in the Cold War

3.2. Outbreak and development of the conflict:

3.2.1. Role of the superpowers

3.2.2. Role of China

3.2.3. Role of North Vietnam

3.2.4. Role of South Vietnam

3.3. Impact on the Cold War

4. **Cuban Missile Crisis (1962)**

4.1. Impact of the Cuban Revolution on Cuba's relations with the USA and USSR, and developments in the Cold War

-

4.2. Outbreak and development of the conflict:

4.2.1. Role of the USA

- USA viewed Cuba as part of its sphere of influence → 'Backyard' → Western Hemisphere
- USA acted to protect national interests in response to growing communist threat in its backyard, setting a precedence of intervention

Guatemala ('54) → Helped anti-communist Carlos Castillo Armas come to power in a coup to remove perceived communist democratically elected Jacobo Arbenz

Since the 1898 Spanish-American war, the US had a strong pervasive influence in Cuba, especially over its economy which it essentially controlled due to its ownership of its lucrative tobacco and sugar industries.

- By 1959, US companies owned 40% of Cuban sugar lands, 90% of mines and practically all the oil industry + supplied $\frac{2}{3}$ of Cuba's imports
- For Cubans → Did not benefit from US ownership and involvement → Vast majority of population remained poor, with only established wealthy Cuban farmers and corrupt political leaders gaining from American presence
- The US government supported General Batista as he maintained business stability and promoted US presence in Cuba → Batista was highly unpopular and deeply resented by Cubans

Bay Of Pigs Invasion, 1961

- CIA sought covert action to eliminate Castro's government similar to what they did in Guatemala
- March 1960: Eisenhower approved CIA programme to train Cuban paramilitary forces and endorsed a plan for an amphibious invasion → Hoped to launch nationwide uprising against Castro in Cuba (Impossible as vast majority of Cubans supported Castro)
- Kennedy came to power in Jan 1961, and allowed CIA to continue, but made it clear that American involvement was to be concealed
- Kennedy feared that Cuba under Castro could become a Soviet satellite and could spread communism to other LatAm countries, surrounding America with hostile countries in its own backyard

April '61 Bay Of Pigs invasion was a complete disaster → Partly due to lack of American air support. Only secured a small beachhead, and even then surrendered within 3 days due to low morale, small scale (~1500 Cuban exiles) and lack of American air support

Invasion helped enhance Castro's appeal and popularity → Unified Castro.
Failure of Bay of Pigs → Cemented Kennedy's notion that Cuba was a threat

Operation Mongoose

- Military, sabotage and political propaganda + plans to assassinate Castro

Operation ORTSAC

- Contingent amphibious invasion of Cuba (Castro's name spelled backwards)

Vienna Summit (June 1961)

- Kennedy admitted it was a BOP was a mistake, and he viewed Kennedy as young and naive

U2 Spy Plane incident in May 1960

- Eisenhower took responsibility, BUT refused to ban future flights over USSR
→ Convinced Khrushchev that he could leverage upon Kennedy's youth and relative inexperience for his own gain

Berlin Crisis 'Aug 61

- In August '61, Soviets and East Germans cut off West Berlin → Built a wall surrounding West Berlin
- Highlighted ideological defeat of USSR and communism → As they had to build a wall to keep their people in. Khrushchev wanted Western presence in Berlin out because of how it undermined communism in East Germany
- Placing of missiles in Cuba was hence a bargaining chip to force allies out

Chinese influence on Khrushchev

- Mao resented Khrushchev as Mao viewed himself as the senior leader of communists, not Khrushchev +The fast ceasefire in the Korean war was evidence of Soviet weakness and hesitant to actively confront the west
- He also viewed Khrushchev as 'revisionist' due to his criticisms of Stalin and Stalinist thought →Particularly of how he believed that communism and capitalism could coexist peacefully, but eventually communism would prevail +crushing of hungarian revolution delegitimize communism
- He thus saw Cuba as a way to highlight Soviet leadership and initiative in the communist world

4.2.2: Role of USSR

Chinese influence on Khrushchev

- Mao resented Khrushchev as Mao viewed himself as the senior leader of communists, not Khrushchev +The fast ceasefire in the Korean war was evidence of Soviet weakness and hesitant to actively confront the west
- He also viewed Khrushchev as 'revisionist' due to his criticisms of Stalin and Stalinist thought →Particularly of how he believed that communism and capitalism could coexist peacefully, but eventually communism would prevail +crushing of hungarian revolution delegitimize communism
- He thus saw Cuba as a way to highlight Soviet leadership and initiative in the communist world

Khrushchev also sought to address the growing military disparity between the superpowers

- The USA had built an arsenal of ICBMs, and in 1958 the ratio between American ICBMs and Soviet ICBMs was 22:1. Moreover,US had nuclear warheads stationed in Italy, UK and Turkey pointed at Soviet cities
- Moreover, despite being ahead in the arms race, Kennedy convinced Congress to increase spending further →By '62 there was a million US troops stationed in more than 200 foreign bases, with US allies garrisoning 3.5 million troops around Soviet borders
- GROSS feeling of insecurity that they were surrounded by hostile forces +were losing the arms race

Henceforth, by placing Soviet missiles in Cuba

- 1) Cuba could be protected from American attack
- 2) Equalize balance of power in nuclear attack (Further reinforce MAD)

4.2.3. Role of Cuba

- January '59: Castro established a government in Havana following Batista fleeing. Castro initially ran on an anti-dictator platform, and wanted a democratic Cuba.
- Nonetheless USA, grew wary of him as he forged closer bonds with USSR

Castro signed a trade agreement with USSR in which Cuba would buy crude oil from them (February 1960)

- He also nationalized American businesses and property in Cuba → Who viewed these as increasingly communist economic policies which threatened American interests
- May 1960 → Cuba imported Soviet arms as the US had imposed an embargo on arm sales during the civil conflict between Batista's forces and his
- June 1960 → USA refused to sell oil to Cuba and American-owned refineries refused to process Soviet crude oil → Castro seized these refineries and nationalized them without compensation in response as he viewed these as attempts by the USA to maintain their economic dominance over Cuba
- Eisenhower then retaliated with embargo on all exports to Cuba, except food and medicine + drastically reduced Cuban sugar quota → which was bought over by USSR in response

By October 1960, Castro had nationalized most American businesses and seized their property without compensation → By January 1961, US broke all diplomatic ties with Cuba

Nonetheless, Castro never declared himself to be a communist, until December 1961. Hence, US actions were pre-emptive in anticipation that he was communist.

-

4.3. Impact on the Cold War

Here's a neatly organized and numbered version of the points on the end of the Cold War:

4.4.1: Detente

- Detente consisted of increased political interactions between USA and USSR - in the form of summit meetings, agreements on arms controls
- Some historians argue that detente commenced on SALT I talks in 1969, and election of Nixon
- Detente ended in 1979 - Soviet invasion of Afghanistan

CMC ALSO TRIGGERED easing of tensions → 'Hotline agreement' was set up to enhance communication channels between Moscow and Washington DC

- 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty → Prohibited nuclear weapons tests in the atmosphere, outer space and underwater.
- Nuclear Non-proliferation treaty (1968) → Major nuclear and non-nuclear powers pledged to stem spread of nuclear technology and weapons

It's important to recognise the various motivations for Detente

US motivations: Quagmire in Vietnam

- Nixon hoped to strengthen relations with both USSR and PRC, so they could pressure North Vietnam to end the war with a settlement. They thus hope to seek to facilitate USA's 'exit strategy' from Vietnam

USSR motivations:

- 1) Soviet economic problems → Failed to maintain high rates of industrial growth that characterized early post WW2 years. Occasional droughts in the 1960s brought famine

The USSR had no choice but to trade with the USA, 'Russian wheat deal' in Summer 1972. USA sent nearly 12 million tons of wheat to USSR for US\$700 million, biggest grain trade between two countries

- 2) Halting nuclear arms race
 - USSR wanted to direct more funds towards economy rather than R&D for nuclear missiles →
- 3) Sino-soviet split
 - In 1969, there was a series of border clashes between USSR and China, and the ongoing Vietnam war and the fight for influence in Vietnam → Led to detente
 - Note that for the US, closer relations with China was a way of keeping USSR in check through their triangular diplomacy practice developed by Kissinger

Triangular diplomacy worked by

- Improving relations with China → Causing Soviets to feel threatened which then makes the Soviets develop closer ties with the USA (evinced by Brezhnev's insecurity and 'my enemies have now become friends' quote → Brezhnev invited Nixon to Moscow in May '72, shortly after China visit in Feb '72)
- And MAINTAINING the animosity between both of the communist powers

Nixon visit and signing of Shanghai Communique marked the first step in the process of normalization between USA and PRC

SALT I treaty: Both superpowers worked to limit their arms (May 1972) through

- 1) ABM Treaty → Limited deployment of anti-ballistic missile systems, allowing each superpower to only have two ABM sites, later reduced to one
- 2) And more importantly, SALT I also imposed a limit to the number of ICBMs each side could possess

Helsinki Agreement (1975)

First basket: All countries (Helsinki agreement consisted of USSR, USA, Canada and 33 other European countries) were to accept the existence of Soviet bloc and recognise Soviet sphere of influence in Eastern Europe

Second basket: Outlined trade, technology and cultural exchanges between countries (much needed for USSR → Lagged behind the USA in technology)

Third basket: Outlined preservation of human rights, provision of freedom of speech and movement

The Soviets signed the Helsinki agreement with intent of benefiting from legitimisation of Soviet control over EE, and trade and tech that was necessary for Soviet economic development. But they sought to only pay lip service to the third basket as it threatened their control of satellite states

Americans saw first two baskets as concessions to USSR, but third basket was seen as leverage to place pressure on the USSR (Sought to lead to the release of political dissidents → allowing more anti-communist segments to grow within USSR → undermine Soviet regime)

Collapse of detente

1) Human rights

- Despite the third basket, USSR continued to imprison political dissidents like Andrei Sakharov
- Jimmy Carter emphasized human rights and supported dissidents in Eastern Europe, like Charter 77 in Czechoslovakia and helped fund Radio Free Europe → Was seen as infiltration of Soviet sphere of influence leading to tensions

2) New arms race

- DESPITE Salt I, they still circumvented these commitments
- USSR developed SS20s IRBM (Intermediate Range Ballistic Missiles. NOT ICBM but still)
- USA then initiated 'twin-track approach'
- 1) Negotiate to get SS20s removed, BUT ALSO deployed Cruise and Pershing 2 missiles themselves in Europe → Pressure USSR

Soviet expansionism in Africa

- 1) Just know Angola (Death to MPLA → Growing Soviet influence in Africa + Invasion of Afghanistan in 1979)

Note that rationale for Soviet invasion was: Mujahideen and Islamist threat → Destabilisation of communist regime in Afghanistan by Islamist militants could then spread to Central Asian republics which were predominantly muslim → hence to prevent subversion from within, invasion of Afghanistan was deemed necessary

5. **End of the Cold War**

6. **The USA's Policy of Renewed Confrontation and Containment**

US global position at the start of the 1980s

Defeat in Vietnam → Trauma from 'loss' of Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia to communist regimes → led to 'Vietnam syndrome' → Where American policymakers and the President feared over-committing troops and resources in foreign battles against communism

'Central American Crisis' also emerged in the 1970s → Pro-communist revolutions in Nicaragua and overthrow of US-backed Somoza regime, along with civil wars in El Salvador, and Guatemala led to fear of diminishing American influence in its own backyard

Moreover, Soviets also achieved near nuclear parity with USA

- American economy also suffered from inflation, unemployment and was still reeling from oil shocks → American dominance appeared to be on decline

Economically Japan was surging ahead in technological innovation and was coming increasingly close as overtaking American economy

6.2. Arms build-up and Strategic Defense Initiative (SDI) program

Reagan administration launched a five-year program, costing \$180 billion to modernise American strategic forces

- Defense expenditure and CIA budget increased exponentially
- The Pentagon was practically given a blank cheque → and US national debt soared from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion.

Shortly after Reagan's evil empire speech, he announced **the SDI program** in which

- SDI would provide a protective shield of laser and particle beam weapons against ballistic missiles
- And Reagan planned to develop a 'force field' system that would be able to eliminate any Soviet missiles before they came close to American shores → Though it was never fully implemented

Although it was never implemented, it had a significant psychological impact on the Soviets

- It could render USSR's offensive missiles impotent, giving them no choice but to compete or lose
- In November 1983, Reagan deployed **Perishing 2 and Cruise Missiles** in Western Europe → Huge security threat to USSR as they were highly accurate and fast → Difficult to counter

ALSO → **Able Archer 83**

- Able Archer 83 was so realistic that KGB agents mistakenly reported them as actual → and the USSR readied its nuclear arsenal and prepared to preemptively strike USSR
- USSR activated East German and Polish air forces on high alert → and the Soviet's fearful reaction to such a provocation in the form of this DEFCON 1 military exercise made Reagan realise that the USSR too did not want war and sought to preserve the peace → Influenced his approach to USSR in his second administration from 1985 to 1988

6.2.5: Reagan's second administration

Rise of Gorbachev, who was much younger and willing to compromise with Reagan also influenced his approach to foreign policy

Important to know of Reagan-Gorbachev Summit Meetings

- 1) Geneva summit (November 1985)
 - Nothing conclusive → But consensus on continuing arms talks and gave the opportunity for both leaders to know each other
 - This was important because it was in Geneva that Reagan began to take Gorbachev seriously and believed that perestroika had substance and Gorbachev genuinely wanted to reform USSR
- 2) Reykjavik summit (October 1986)
 - Enormous progress was initially made and both leaders almost agreed on abolishing all nuclear weapons → But Gorbachev requested that any further progress to be made was dependent on **suspension of SDI** → But Reagan refused and as a result, no agreements were signed. EMPHASIZE HOW CLOSE THEY GOT THOUGH
 -
- 3) Washington Summit (December 1987)
 - Gorbachev had dropped insistence of suspension of SDI → **INF treaty** (Huge because it was the first time the number of nuclear weapons had been reduced, not just limits imposed on their increase)
- 4) Moscow Summit (May-June 1988)

- INF treaty was ratified

INF treaty was significant because it eliminated **all** intermediate nuclear forces in Europe.

- From the Soviet SS20s, US Cruise and Pershing 2 missiles
-

6.3. Reagan Doctrine

- Reagan had a manichean view of the world, and he believed that there was no use in negotiating with the Soviets since they were bound to break agreements (Helsinki basket), and viewed negotiating with Soviets as weakness
- He believed it was necessary for USA to outspend and outmaneuver Soviets in building nuclear missiles and proxy wars

His views are evinced by his evil empire speech in March 1983

Reagan also broke with Truman's 'containment doctrine', opting to **roll back** Soviet influence

- Encapsulated by NSC 75 (1983) → Emphasized rolling back communism in the developing world

Nicaragua (Contras)

- Overthrow of US-backed Somoza in 1979 and rise of Reagan in 1981 led to US National Security Council approval of funds to Contras.
- Reagan authorized training of 10,000 Nicaraguan freedom fighters by the CIA
- Congress feared that Reagan would lead to another anti-communist war in Nicaragua (Remember Vietnam syndrome) → Passed **Boland Amendment which banned US assistance to contras**
- Reagan covertly supported Contras, resulted in over \$30 million being sent

Grenada

- October 1983 → Operation Urgent Fury and invaded Grenada to exterminate communist influence following strong evidence of Soviet and Cuban influence with the construction of an airport utilizing Cuban-Soviet funds,

El Salvador

- Increased aid to military junta from US\$36 million in 1981 to US\$197 million in 1984
- Guatemala - sent millions of dollars worth of military equipment and aid

Iran

- Despite sanctions on Iran following the Iran Hostage crisis, the US continued to sell arms to Iran during the Reagan era as evident in the Iran-Contra affair amidst the Iran-Iraq war
- For Reagan, USSR<<<<<<<< negotiating with terrorists

Afghanistan

- Reagan also financed the Afghan mujahideen
- Provided nearly \$3 billion of military aid in the form of weapons, grenades, artillery to the Afghan Mujahideen

Eastern Europe

- US government provided covert supply for Solidarity (Poland)
- Radio Free Europe → US state-funded broadcasting organization that provided news and information to Eastern Europe and Central Asia → Deliberately done to introduce Soviet people to alternative models like capitalism and democracy
- CIA provided more than \$US 50 million to solidarity from 1981 to 1988

7. **Decline of the USSR and Shifts in Soviet Foreign Policy**

7.0. Economic problems

Command economy system was unable to incentivise and motivate workers to produce more → Resulted in Soviet economy declining from the 1960s, starting with diminishing growth to stagnation in the Brezhnev era

Agricultural sector issues:

Collectivisation was resisted by peasants, and as the state seized the crops and redistributed them, it was coercive → low morale → very unproductive

By 1952, collective farm earnings was only 25% of the cash income from private plots → and the USSR saw a steady decline in agricultural output especially during drought periods in the 1970s where the USSR had to trade basic staples like wheat and potato (**EVIDENCE OF IMMINENT FALL**)

Industrial sector issues

Whilst the Soviet economy expanded and experienced spectacular growth following the end of WW2, leading Khrushchev to declare 'we will bury you' in 1956

– Much of Soviet wealth actually came from the USSR's deposits of coal, natural gas, and oil for hard currency, and hence the economic growth was commodity-driven and not from value-added goods

By the 1980s, much of these resources were depleted

Command economy also overlooked issues like **quality control, innovation, consumer goods**

- Soviet economy was 'producing yesterday's goods using yesterday's methods' unlike the West which had undergone significant structural changes

- For instance, Western economies were negatively impacted by oil crisis and hence restructured their industry and production methods, whereas USSR did not as they had an abundant supply of oil → Continued with old methods of production that were often less productive

Mounting costs of patron-client relationships

- Afghan war became 'bleeding wound' on the Soviet economy (\$12 billion cost by 1987)
- USSR's economic growth was about 2% during the 1980s, which very slow considering the USSR was still a developing country
- Nationalist sentiments grew within the Soviet republics that threatened to unravel the Soviet empire
- Network of foreign relations also became a drain to the Soviet economy → as they had to ensure Red Army presence in Eastern Europe
- Also had to funnel massive financial resources and subsidies to Cuba and Ethiopia which dependent on USSR for cheap oil and commodities
- Economic rejuvenation dependent on a less hostile Soviet foreign policy

7.1. Gorbachev's 'New Thinking'

- New Thinking emphasized interdependence, mutual security and the irrationality of nuclear war

His foreign policy became focused on addressing common global issues, and he believed that disagreements between the ideological blocs could only be solved by negotiation and compromise and not armed force

'New thinking motivations'

- Economic rejuvenation dependent largely on a less hostile Soviet foreign policy

In order to save the ailing Soviet economy, it had to reduce its military and economic commitments and focus on its economy. Hence, economy was the main factor influencing his 'new thinking' approach

7.3. Sinatra Doctrine (Oct'89)

The Sinatra doctrine denounced the use of force and threat of armed aggression as tools of foreign policy (Remember the contrast: Brezhnev doctrine. Warsaw Pact invasion of Czechoslovakia 1968 and Hungary 1956). Do note that Brezhnev doctrine was not used in Hungary 1956, as Brezhnev wasn't in power then

He also **unilaterally pledged to reduce arms and troops involvement** →

Sinatra doctrine emphasized 'my way' → Hence Eastern European countries were now free to determine their own political futures

Malta Summit, December 1989

- Pretty much amounted to end of cold war -> Emphasis on universal values

8. **Eastern European Movements and Revolutions in the 1980s** (End of Cold war)
Towards the 1970s, disillusionment towards Communism emerged in Eastern Europe → Poor economic conditions provided fertile ground for strikes, protests and pro-democracy movements

8.1. Poland

- In December 1970, the government increased food prices by 30% **just before Christmas** → provoked demonstrations against communist regime
- 1973 Oil Crisis, and excessive borrowing under **Edward Gierek's regime** led to more shortages of consumer goods, balance of payments crisis and recession
- Pope John Paul II became elected as Pope in October 1978 and this was significant as he was of Polish heritage

Rise of Solidarity

- In July 1980, the Polish government raised food prices again
- Various strike committees merged into **Solidarity**, led by Lech Walesa which demanded independent workers' unions instead of those controlled by communist party
- Gierek negotiated with Solidarity, and the government conceded the right to strike to workers and **solidarity became the first independent, self-governing trade union in the communist world**
- It soon rapidly expanded to have more than 9 million members by 1981, and its agenda expanded beyond workers' rights into demanding political reforms like free elections

BUT, martial law was declared in December 1981 following pressure from Moscow to curtail Solidarity's influence → In 1981, hundreds of thousands of Soviet troops deployed near the Polish border → Polish communist figures feared invasion similar to that of Hungary and Czechoslovakia if they were to not declare martial law

With martial law, solidarity leaders were arrested and their activities suspended

- Strikes continued, galvanized by Pope John Paul II and the catholic church
- Walesa's Nobel Prize in 1983 inspired radical reformers in other Eastern European countries

In January 1989, following more protests against price increases in 1988 and falling real incomes → legalized Solidarity and held 'Round Table' negotiations with Solidarity and the Church.

First multi-party elections were held in June 1989, overwhelmingly won by Solidarity and a non-communist government was set up

In August 1989, Solidarity led the Polish government and by December 1990, Walesa was elected as the first President in the post-communist era

SOVIET INACTION WAS CRUCIAL in galvanizing the other Eastern European countries → political change was indeed possible

8.2. East Germany

Worsening economic conditions

- Erich Honecker's obsession with self-sufficiency, combined with oil crises worsened East Germany's economic position in the 1970s and 1980s
- Labor productivity and living standards were well behind West Germany

Rise of pro-democracy groups in 1989

May 1989 elections saw the ruling communist party dominate with nearly 99% of votes

- BUT many Church-based pro democracy groups denounced it as electrical fraud and in its wake, many pro-democracy and civil dialogue groups emerged

Aspirations for reunification

By March 1989, East Germans began demanding the right to travel outside of the Eastern bloc. When Hungary opened its borders with Austria in September 1989, 25000 East Germans successfully crossed the border into Austria and then to West Germany

On 9 November 1989, 50,000 people gathered at the Berlin wall from East Germany and demanded the border guards to let them cross. When the pressure became insurmountable, the border guards caved in and allowed the East Germans to enter West Germany → Symbolising the end of the cold war

In March 1990, first free elections were held in East Germany. On 3 October 1990, reunification was achieved

The importance of these case studies is that it

- 1) Led to loss of legitimacy of communist regimes throughout Eastern Europe
- 2) Inspired breakaway movements in the Baltic states → Contributed to disintegration of USSR
- 3)

Collapse of USSR

8.0: Gorbachev's political problems

- Most of the members of the nomenklatura and politburo were highly conservative communist party members, who viewed themselves as vanguards of the communist revolution and hence actively resisted reform
- It also helped that they were the main beneficiaries of the existing communist system due to the rampant corruption that plagued the communist system
- Simultaneously, Gorbachev also faced resistance from the liberals who considered Gorbachev's reforms to be moving too slowly.
- It's important to recognise this as well: As he had to assure the conservatives that he would preserve the Soviet system and simultaneously convince liberals that he was committed to reform → but alas, in August 1991 the CPSU members (majority of whom were conservative) launched a coup against Gorbachev
- Even his reforms had to be modified and more diluted than originally intended, which affected their efficacy → Hence brought about the collapse of the USSR

8.1: Glasnost

- Gorbachev wanted to invigorate the party and the Soviet system → He believed that Soviet system was creative but it was previously repressed by the state → Hence sought Glasnost to allow diversity of views → Expose corruption and excesses of Soviet system that dragged down the economy
- He also sought to use Glasnost as an avenue to reach out to the intelligentsia, who had longed for the intellectual and cultural freedoms that his policy promised

Examples of Glasnost: Release of Andrei Sakharov, appointment of new and more critical editors in Soviet newspapers, coverage of previously taboo topics in news and media
BUT do recall that it was **gradual** and NOT in one-shot

Unintended consequences of Glasnost

- 1) Damaged state-citizen relations rather than improving it (which was one of its intentions)
 - Media began to expose previously censored issues like poverty, homelessness in the USSR
 - IMPORTANT: Damaged credibility of government as censorship had been used to mask the extent of problems in the Soviet system
- 2) Emerging nationalism and critics
 - Nationalists from various Soviet republics took glasnost as an opportunity to air out their critiques of Gorbachev and communism
 - More importantly, **glasnost implied choice** and the authority of the CPSU diminished → Led to collapse of USSR as **CPSU's authority was what used to hold it together**

Perestroika

- Was done to address structural weaknesses of Soviet economy

- Perestroika aimed to invigorate the Soviet economy through decentralization and introduction of some market forces
- In July 1987, **Law On State Enterprises** was passed, giving freedom to state-owned firms to determine output and become self-financing. Surpluses could be sold for profit (provided state quotas were met) and state made it clear that they would not subsidize the losses of any of these firms, making them more competitive
- **Law On Co-operatives** in May 1988 allowed for private enterprise
- Soviet economy descended into Chaos as a result → Gorbachev triggered collapse of USSR by imposing reforms it was not ready for

Soviet system lacked structures necessary for a switch to market capitalism

- USSR had a poor banking system with few banks able to offer credit to businesses → Law On Cooperatives failed to bring about emergence of nascent entrepreneurs
- National income in 1990 was 20% less than in 1989,
- inflation worsened from 7.3% in 1987 to more than 650% in 1991
- By 1991, from the 1100 types of consumer goods the USSR was supposed to have readily available for all citizens, only 20 actually were
- Drastic fall in SOL turned citizens against him → coupled with Glasnost, eroded people's faith in Soviet system

Democratic initiatives

- Competitive elections were introduced in 1988
- NONETHELESS: Still had to appease conservatives → A third of the deputies in Congress would be chosen by 'public organizations' instead of citizens, hence allowing top conservative CPSU leaders to retain their seats uncontested

The creation of a working parliament in the Congress Of People's Deputies, and Gorbachev's removal of the party whip annihilated party unity, a central communist virtue → and the discussion of previously taboo topics and the questioning of Soviet socio-political structures further undermined the authority of the CPSU and Gorbachev

Repeal of Article 6

- Article 6 in the constitution gave the Communist party a leading role in the state
- With its approval in March 1990, CPSU had officially given up its monopoly of power → which led to an ideological crisis amongst conservatives because the Soviet state existed BECAUSE of communism and the party → undermining institutions that kept the Soviet system up anyways

Creation of powerful executive presidency

- After article 6, he created an office of 'President' in which he was elected to it by parliament but not by popular vote → Deligitimized him in the eyes of the people, and yet

despite the creation of this role, he retained his role in the CPSU which was done to prevent the conservative CPSU from undermining perestroika, but as CPSU became increasingly irrelevant his association with CPSU compromised his position further

Nationalities issue

- Nagorno-Karabakh issue (Armenian enclave within Azerbaijan territory → political leadership of Armenian republic supported transfer. Entire Azeri leadership opposed → Communist party fragmented itself along ethnic lines)
- Growing division along ethnic lines and nationalist sentiment seeded nationalist, separatist tendencies from the USSR

Eastern Europe revolutions inspired Baltic countries to seek independence (Illegally annexed as part of Molotov-Ribbentrop pact)

In March 1990, Lithuania declared independence → Imposed an economic blockade and the Soviet military moved into Lithuania → S

- Despite denying orders of military action, Gorbachev's credibility was undermined by conservatives who viewed him as weak and incapable of holding the republic together and nationalists who viewed him as a hypocrite

In April and May 1990, Estonia and Latvia declared independence

12 June 1990: Russian parliament declared 'sovereignty', other republics joined in

Gorbachev, to deal with nationalities issue prepared a 'New Union Treaty', which sought to transform the Soviet Union into a looser confederation which would grant the different republics more autonomy

→ Led to August 1991 coup by CPSU conservatives → Opposed the creation of a confederation

Commonwealth of independent states formed

9. **Historical Interpretations of the End of the Cold War**

- 9.1. Western triumphalist
- 9.2. Soviet initiative
- 9.3. 'People Power' debates

Essays

EQ 1"

10. **Growth and Challenges in the Global Economy**

11. **Factors for the Growth of the Global Economy (1945–2000)**

11.1. Post-war economic reconstruction

Two main concepts here: **Reconstruction and liberalization**

Reconstruction

- Post war economic reconstruction entailed the repair of damaged agrarian and industrial infrastructure, so that production processes could be jump-started again
- Following WW2, shortages, inflation and mass unemployment were commonplace and the post-war population boom made the economic problems seem **insurmountable**

Liberalization

- Liberalization refers to the **lifting of government control and restrictions** allowing for greater private participation in the economy
- It also entails the **opening up of economies to foreign capital and investments** → which encourages transnational trade and in turn granting countries access to **larger markets, generating more revenue and jobs in turn**: Inter-dependence

Reconstruction and liberalization were achieved through efforts by **the USA, World Bank, GATT, and MNCs**

11.2. Role of the USA, Western Europe, and Japan

Role of USA

- USA emerged from WW2 largely unscathed economically → In fact, it developed huge industrial strength and had the capacity **to produce half the world's agricultural and industrial goods** and was critical to post-war recovery
- Americans also had the ability to play as the world's banker because the USA accounted for $\frac{2}{3}$ of the world's gold supplies owing to the outflow of savings and gold from Europe into American banks as well as the heightened savings rates in America during WW2

American political and military leadership

- Military power and being a part of American security apparatus became a means to support American economic dominance
- The USA provided military aid and protection to other countries under the condition that they opened their markets up to American investments and trade
- American spending in the Korean and Vietnam wars also fuelled the economies of entire regions

- NATO led to the development of a significant transatlantic military-industrial complex, developing armament industries in West Germany, France and the UK
- Moreover, NATO's defense umbrella freed European governments from devoting **huge expenditure for military uses**, and instead channel that towards productive investments
-

Marshall Plan

- In line with America's desire to rebuild Europe for moral reasons as well as to create more **export markets for the USA** → The Marshall Plan provided US\$13 billion to mostly Western European countries
- The economic stimulation generated by the Marshall Plan went beyond recovery → and within a decade, the productive capacity of Europe greatly exceeded that of the beginning of WW2
- For Western Europe and Japan, **they were beneficiary of dominant USA and HIGHLY dependent on the USA in their early post-war years**
- America's special attention and assistance ultimately helped these countries fuel their economic miracles (German economic miracle + Japanese economic miracle)
- USA also provided Europe with economic guidance, such as in the form of the **Technical Assistance Program** which funded 24,000 European engineers and leaders to visit America and learn American production methods and technologies
- This was later crucial as it helped European countries **make key structural adjustments** and make production more effective and efficient

Aid to Japan/ Asia(still under reconstruction)

- US provided nearly US\$6 billion in aid to Asia, with Japan receiving \$2.4 billion
- The USA also built up Japan as an industrial base for the **Korean war and Vietnam war**
- USA founded doubling of Japan's manufacturing output between 1949 and 1953,
- 1966 to 1970 were the peak years of Japanese growth, a staggering 14.6% per annum → Link to Japanese economic recovery impact under Vietnam war

Access to American markets

- To facilitate the recovery of its Asian and European allies → The US, on top of aid also provided them with **open access to the huge and prosperous American market**
- When the Korean war began in 1950, the **need for war material** pumped up American demand for goods → and **Japan and Europe embarked on an American-based export boom that continued into the 1950s**
- In 1946, Western Europe's exports were valued at \$8 billion and by 1951 this had risen to \$27 billion
- In Japan, the Americans tolerated a 'one way street', in which the US had allowed Japanese companies to have **free access to the American market**, whilst accepting the protectionist closed door policy of Japan

- By the 1960s, European and Japanese industrial capacity grew so quickly that **both began exporting more to the USA than importing from the USA**
- By 1967, the USA was importing more cars than they were selling abroad → and in the American car market Japanese cars like Hondas and Toyotas became even more popular than American cars

US stewardship of BWS system (relevant later on)

- As the USA sought to ensure free flow of capital and secure a **stable financial regime** which would provide conditions ideal for the flow of capital across boundaries, international cooperation was important
- USA took the lead to establish the World Bank and IMF
- USA was largest single contributor and **held veto rights in both organisations**
- As part of the aim to secure a stable financial regime, a **standard of fixed exchange rates were set up**, where the price of gold was fixed at \$35 per ounce and the other currencies were pegged with respect to the USD. As these exchange rates were fixed and the USD could be converted into gold, it **created stability which facilitated international trade and investment**

BUT American role started to diminish in the 1960s and 1970s

- From 1948 to 1959, US gold holdings fell from \$24.4 billion to \$19.5 billion
- US dollars had flowed out so much from the country that in 1960, **foreign dollar holdings exceeded those within the USA** → and speculators performed a run on of the USD → which did not lead it to depreciate however as the USA still held sufficient foreign reserves to keep the dollar value stable

Sign of diminishing American influence

- In December 1961, G10 was formed and established a fund for **exchange rate management that all members had access to**
- This was also done to discourage member countries from unilaterally devaluing their currency → which would collapse the BWS system
- It also fostered cooperation in upholding the BWS system → As the USA had to involve other countries, it showed that their economic dominance was waning and they had to cooperate with other countries to manage and overcome their own economic problems (Mounting BOT deficit)

Nonetheless, the US could also be seen as a cause for harm in the global economy owing to

The USA faced mounting economic problems in the late 1960s, 1970s and even into the 1980s
Twin deficits

- Between 1952 and 1968, the US share of global exports in **manufactured goods shrank by 50%**.
- In 1971, the American trade balance turned negative for the first time since 1893 → and the trade imbalance continued to grow such that by 1980, the US was experiencing a **trade imbalance of \$40 billion**
- American trading partners like Japan also became more price competitive than their American counterparts → American consumers continued to find these foreign products less expensive and of equal or even superior quality to homegrown products hence worsening the trade balance for there

This is evinced by how American auto manufacturers like Ford and General Motors lost market share in the USA due to the import of German Volkswagens in the 1960s and Japanese Honda and Nissans in the 1970s

- Moreover, by the late 1980s the USA accounted for 20% of all of EEC's exports despite facing protectionist measures by the EEC when it came to exporting their goods to the EEC, particularly in agriculture
- Simultaneously during this period,

End of BWS system

- Oversupply of US dollars in the 1960s, largely owing due to USAID activities, and more critically US military expenditure abroad which involved stationing troops in many countries, which entailed costs that were paid in American dollars
- This was exacerbated by the profligate spending that characterized the Vietnam war → As by the late 1960s the Americans were spending \$2 billion **per month** in Vietnam
- The US treasury was also drained by social assistance programmes such as JFK's '**New Frontier**' and LBJ's '**Great society**' → Between 1961 to 1970, federal expenditure on domestic programmes more than doubled from **\$96 billion to \$196 billion**
- Owing to how by the 1960s US dollar holdings held by foreigners exceeded the dollar value of gold in the US treasury, the financial sustainability of the BWS system was becoming increasingly scrutinized
- This is because if the foreigners were to exercise their right to convert their dollar holdings into gold, the USA would be unable to cover their commitments and would thus be bankrupt → Hence, Nixon devalued the USD in **August 1971** which ushered in a period of exchange-rate volatility which was exacerbated by the oil shock that was triggered by both this AND American support for Israel in the Yom Kippur war

The end of the dollar-gold convertibility **represented a huge dent to the USA's** credibility as a global economic hegemon

Increasing share of European and Japanese ODA contributions

- Although the US continued to be the largest provider of aid throughout the 1940s, 1950s and 1960s, by the 1970s it adopted a less interventionist policy **which resulted in a decline of foreign aid from 0.5% of GDP in 1975 to 0.2% in 2000**

- In 1989, Japan nearly \$500 million more in ODA to developing countries than the USA
- Japan even began beginning ODA assistance to Latin American countries, which was unprecedented at the time and was significant as it highlighted how Japan encroached upon America's backyard

Multilateral cooperation to manage international economy

- Following the collapse of the BWS system with the devaluation of the USD, G10 swung into action and put up the 'Smithsonian Agreement' to allow the USD to depreciate and created a framework for the different currencies to fluctuate within a certain band
- NONETHELESS → This was limited as the currencies later switched to fluctuating within a band to floating rates
- In September 1985, due to concerns about a growing trade deficit and a rise in protectionist sentiments in congress → **Plaza accords** called for orderly depreciation of the USD against other major currencies, and necessitated cooperation from G5 countries who held large dollar holdings and their sale of the dollar holdings forced the USD's value down

NONETHELESS continued American domination following end of WW2

- NONETHELESS, despite the threats to its dominance the American economy still maintained its dominance as the largest economy in the world
- Moreover, with the end of the cold war, the US economy strongly rebounded, just as when its closest economic rivals faced mounting issues of their own

USA's economic rejuvenation

- a) With the end of the cold war in 1989, the USA diverted its attention back to its own economy

For instance, Japan no longer enjoyed the one-way street and the favorable relationship it had with the USA that enabled it to grow so significantly, and the Clinton administration allowed the USD to fall to historic lows against the Yen to curtail Japanese imports

- American companies also shifted their focus to areas like computer software, telecommunications and popular entertainment
- Apple, Microsoft, Intel, and Opera became cornerstones of the globalised American economy
- These new sectors of growth also contributed significantly to American productivity

EEC's problems

- The EEC faced internal problems and disunity following the collapse of communism in Eastern Europe
- Economic integration also became obstructed due to the difficulties associated with helping the Eastern European economies transition to free market structures

Japan's problems

- Bursting of asset bubble etc

Role of **Western Europe in promoting growth**

- As per the Technical assistance program and Marshall Plan aid
- 1948 to 1952 saw the **fastest period of growth in European history** → Industrial production increased by 35%
- Europe developed the capacity to manufacture automobiles, electronics, chemicals and much of these were exported to the American market
- By the 1960s, most WE countries had exceeded the USA in annual productivity gains

The 'unplanned market economy' had fallen out of favor following WW2 and thus WE countries sought greater government intervention in their economies to drive economic growth

- The governments of Britain, France and Italy nationalized key strategic industries like coal, metallurgy and transport as an avenue to use these nationalized sectors to influence other industries
- The vast majority of the economy still remained in the control of private hands however
- Government involvement is also evident in how the French government **provided incentives such as tax holidays** to attract investment in its burgeoning automobile and chemical industries

West German economic miracle

- Unlike neighboring European countries, the West German government adopted more market-oriented policies and limited the extent of government involvement in the economy
- The **Korean war boom in the 1950s** boosted the demand for German exports like machines, motor cars and electrical goods, and the immigration of qualified workers from **East Germany** as well as profitable firms **like Audi** enhanced West Germany's productive capacity
- Between 1957 to 1960, West German production rose by 20%, compared to WE's 17.5% and America's 9%

IMPACT OF WESTERN EUROPE IN PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH IN THE REGION

European Coal and Steel community (ECSC)

-With the signing of the **Treaty Of Paris on 18 April 1951**, a European Coal and Steel community was formed, consisting of the Benelux countries as well as France, Germany and Italy

- They agreed to abolish all barriers regarding coal and steel
- In essence, the ECSC created a common market between member countries for coal and steel, which was intended to **expand production, decrease unemployment and raise standards of living**

European Economic Community (EEC)

- On 25 March 1957, the **Treaty Of Rome** was signed, bringing about the creation of the EEC in January 1958
- It sought to progressively reduce tariffs between member states, and establish a free trade area in Europe where member states had free trade within their borders and a common tariff against the world
- It also sought to develop common policies on agriculture and transport and develop **a single market for goods, services, and labour** (Four Freedoms of EU free movement etc)
- By 1969, free movement of labour, capital and commodities was secured
- But EEC faced resistance from farm lobbies in member states as they feared excessive competition for certain products between the different countries

Common Agricultural policy (CAP) was introduced in 1962,

- State intervention was practiced to organise farming and set sufficiently high prices to farm products → So as to guarantee a degree of earnings for farmers AND attain self-sufficiency in Europe
- By the mid-1980s, the CAP swallowed $\frac{2}{3}$ of the EEC budget
- More importantly, it **damaged the export chances of Third World countries to the rich European market** as third world countries were primarily agrarian in nature and hence the push for self-sufficiency did more harm than good for developing countries

EMS

- Following the abandonment of BWS, in 1972 EEC currencies were pegged to one another in what was known as the 'snake in the tunnel' scheme in which the **central banks sought to ensure that the currencies fluctuated within a NARROW band of +/- 2.25%**
- The EMS was entered into force on **13 March 1979** → EEC countries linked their currencies to prevent large fluctuations → and was important as it created a **zone of monetary stability** which encouraged trade and investment between the members
- EMS lasted until it was replaced by the EMU where member states adopted the Euro instead

Single European Act

- Single European act came into force in 1987, creating a **true single market operative by 1993**
- Greater economic integration between European economies **provided access to a larger market than what the respective national economies could provide**

Benefits of increasing European economic integration

- Share of intra-EEC exports as a percentage of total exports rose following **the treaty of Rome**, jumping from less than 40% in 1958 to nearly 55% in 1970
- This increased thereafter, reaching over 60% in 1990
- EEC's participation in GATT rounds and concessions also benefited other countries, particularly the USA as it made tariff concessions in the Dillon and Kennedy talks as they conceded **substantial tariff reductions in manufactures**
- NONETHELESS, the EEC members remained unwilling to grant trade concessions in agriculture → which prevented a successful conclusion to the Uruguay Round

European integration **promoted trade liberalisation as both regional and global levels**, and facilitated economic interdependence

Economic slowdown of Europe from the 1970s

- The oil crisis led to a recession in many European countries
- Even after the energy crisis was resolved by the early 1980s, **deep structural problems had developed within Western European economies**
- For instance, even though many Western European industries had lost the technological edge they previously had, their workers and trade unions continued to demand higher wages which led to higher production costs
- European governments, owing to their immense welfare spending and focused on containing inflation were unable to generate fiscal policies to generate stimuli in Europe
- Moreover, Europe also lost its price competitiveness to emerging markets like Brazil and Mexico, and as a result the automobile and steel industries were driven to lower-priced Asian and LatAm counterparts
- Simultaneously, **computers and electronics** failed to receive adequate investment in Europe
- This hindered the integration of the economies, and protectionism occurred even within the EEC, with France and Italy over agricultural products

ROLE OF JAPAN

p

Japan's flying geese model

- In the post-war era, the model was used to explain how other under-developed Asian countries can become developed much faster under the guidance of Japan
- In the flying geese model, the **built-in catch up process** that it entailed as Japan along with other Asian economies moved up the value-added chain enables the countries at the lower tail-end to benefit from their respective forerunners' experiences to shorten the time to catch up, and thus **minimize disparities across the different Asian countries**

The main driver of growth and moving up the value-chain was **Japan's imperative for internal restructuring due to increasing labour costs**. → Especially in the 1960s where Japan shifted from labour-intensive production to more capital-intensive activities

- As a result, labor-intensive production shifted to nations further down the hierarchy
- For example, Japan used to produce textiles, iron and steel in the post-war decades → But moved to producing **automobiles and consumer electronics** by the 1960s and 1970s
- Textile and metal production then shifted to South Korea and Taiwan → where costs of production were lower
- Later on, when the NIEs caught up with Japan in the automotive and consumer electronics sectors in the 1970s → Japan upgraded to produce technological goods, whereas Thailand and Indonesia focused on textile production
- Countries in Asia therefore **developed dynamic comparative advantage**

Japanese promotion of investment and trade to NIEs

- To counter protectionist threats initiated by the West, Japan intensified **its economic links with the developing countries within its own region**
- It began to provide **overseas developmental assistance** (ODA) as part of its policy to **promote regional economic cooperation**

Following normalization of relations with Japan in 1965, South Korea saw an influx of Japanese investments

- Japanese firms entered joint ventures with South Korean conglomerates, **transferring knowledge and technology** to help the latter move up the value chain in manufacturing
- Japan's **Mitsubishi Motors** cooperated with Korea's **Hyundai Motors** to develop automotive engines
- Kawasaki collaborated with Hyundai Heavy Industries on shipbuilding

Similar parallels could be drawn with Taiwan

- Following Taiwan's diplomatic isolation from 1971 onwards when the PRC became increasingly viewed as the official representative of China → Japan sought to take their isolation as an opportunity to cultivate deeper economic partnerships
- Japanese FDI was critical in developing Taiwan's electronics industry, due to the **transfer of skills, technology along with the assistance provided in developing infrastructure**
- Taiwanese firms also benefited from Japanese technology, as Sony and Mitsubishi licensed technologies they used and benefited from to local firms
- By 1988, Japanese FDI in East Asia totalled 12% of all investments, compared to USA's 6.2%. By 1993, this rose to 16.6% and 10% respectively.
- In 1993, Japan was only second to the USA as a trade partner to South Korea, Taiwan and Singapore →

Development of regional production networks and flow of technology

- In 1985, the Japanese Yen appreciated in relation to USD and other currencies as per the Plaza accords → Wages continued to rise in Japan, South Korea and Taiwan

- Due to these events, the absolute amount of Japanese capital invested overseas rose significantly → with the total amount between 1986 to 1989 exceeding the cumulative total between 1981 to 1985

Other Asian economies also served as a 'detour production base' for Japanese companies who wanted to penetrate Western markets without the high tariffs their products would face having come from Japan → Hence, by setting up production in other Asian countries they could avoid having to pay those tariffs → This was a viable economic strategy and was essential in enabling the Japanese to continue to benefit from the huge trade surpluses they had with the west which continued into the 1990s

- A regional production network would also bring about **a transfer of knowledge and technology that could benefit and uplift most Asian economies** and TO SOME EXTENT, this was seen in some economies

E.g:

- Malaysia courted Japanese investments via its 'Look East policy' under Mahathir
- Japanese FDI was concentrated **in electronics, which enabled Malaysia to shift steadily from labour-intensive to capital and technology intensive manufacturing**
- However, barring the NIEs (South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong), other Asian countries **possessed a lower quality labour force** that did not attract more investments from Japan, **and hence the** transfer of knowledge and technology was uneven amongst the Asian countries
- But nonetheless, Japan managed to successfully nurture and develop **regional production networks across Asian economies**, such that the end product was a combination of the input of several Asian economies and the contribution of each **utilised their area of comparative advantage**
- An example could be seen in how in 1990, **Taiwanese** electronics firms partnered with **Japanese** giant Sharp to **manufacture calculators in Thailand**
- The technology, brand name and marketing strategies were Japanese
- Even the key components for the calculators that were used in the Thai factory were imported from Japan
- The procurement and administration processes however were controlled from Taipei and the management of those factories were **Taiwanese**
- The labor was Thai and the output of those calculators was for export
- Nonetheless, it is evident that **the regional production networks were hierarchical**, with continued dependence on Japanese capital and technology
- STILL, it enabled less advanced economies to move up the value chain of production and helped bring about the flow of expertise and technology

Nonetheless, Japan began to decline in the 1990s

- As in 1985, the Japanese yen appreciated and in turn the value of assets like property and stocks increased substantially
- This was bolstered by deregulation in the financial sector, which **made loans readily available and due to the greater space for investors to speculate** → Led to a bubble economy

This led to a banking crisis, and caused Japan's economic performance to nosedive → which created an economic malaise that spread to other Asian countries

- From 1995, Japan's investment in Asia declined and its imports of machinery from other Asian countries also declined

11.3. Role of multinational corporations

- Following WW2, American MNCs raised the number of their foreign affiliates from 7500 in 1950 **to over 23,000 in 1966**
- By 1980, American MNCs like General Motors, Ford, Coca Cola and McDonalds accounted for more than 75% of America's exports

Immediately after WW2,

- American MNCs increased investment in Europe and Japan from \$2 billion in 1950 to \$41 billion in 1973 due to the confluence of economic and ideological factors
- By the 1960s, American manufacturing firms accounted for more than **25% of the European car sector**, and companies like IBM held market shares of upwards of 60% in West Germany and France
- In Latin America, American MNCs accounted for between 33% to 50% of all industrial output
- The USA themselves benefited from FDI, with estimated earnings from FDI accounting for 25% of total US corporate profits by the 1970s
-

BUT NOT JUST American MNCs

- German Chemical MNCs like Bayer expanded in the 1960s, and penetrated into North American markets
- By the mid-1970s, WE and Japanese MNCs also invested in developing countries
- Japanese firms sent **FDI in mining, petroleum** in South-east Asia as they sought to secure **reliable supplies of raw materials and fossil fuels following the oil crisis**
- These firms were also developing new markets for Japanese exports as a hedge against American and European protectionism
- Annual outflow of FDI from Japan rose from around \$3.6 billion a year during the 1970s to \$22 billion a year in the 1980s

Why did these MNCs even grow?

1. Favorable conditions for investment abroad
 - Globalization helped make it possible for these MNCs from developed countries to take advantage of cheap labor, cheap raw materials etc and they thus undertook certain stages of manufacturing abroad. E.g: Ford, Fiat and Nissan assembled their cars in Thailand
 - Also because some countries had factor endowments that these MNCs sought to take advantage of → Availability of Cobalt in Congo
2. Promise of larger markets
 - In 1970, more of IBM's profits were derived **from outside the US than inside**. Similarly, in 1970 as well, Gillette's foreign income exceeded its domestic earnings
 - Moreover, situating production abroad also served as an avenue to circumvent high tariffs
 - E.g: Japanese companies set factories in Europe in response to attempts by European governments to impose tariffs and limit import of Japanese cars
 - In the 1960s, General Motors manufactured some of its cars in Argentina → To circumvent tariffs imposed on American cars

How did MNCs benefit their host countries?

- MNCs brought with them **capital** and **technology to** help many recovering and developing economies, which lacked such capital and technology to grow
- By 1973, MNCs had invested \$200 billion around the world and half of it came from American MNCs
- German Chemical giant Hoescht established 117 plants in 45 countries
- Mercedes, Volkswagen and Allianz also set up operations in Europe and abroad
- Japanese MNCs like Sony and Hitachi invested in Mexico for instance, seeking to take advantage of its low cost labour which helped generate higher employment and created job opportunities for Mexicans

By 1989, the 100 largest global companies employed **12 million people outside of the MNC's base** → Productivity and incomes rose around the world

FDI rose exponentially → from \$2 billion in 1950 to \$50 billion in 1985 and \$200 billion in 1990

- Developing countries that were eager to benefit from FDI, such as the Asian Tigers like Singapore and Hong Kong, were amongst the ten largest recipients of FDI amongst all developing countries
- Both countries registered some of the **highest growth rates in the world** from 1965 to 1989

Tech transfers

- MNCs were also highly efficient and innovative → Which helped increase output and productivity levels
- MNCs were particularly important in introducing expertise and technology in other countries, which forced local firms to become more competitive in response
- American MNCs were especially important in helping WE and Japan catch up to the USA in productivity and competitiveness
- American firms brought automation, computing technologies to WE and Japan as well as introduced practices like marketing and market research → Helped local firms expand further
- These MNCs also helped other countries move up the value-added chain of production
- For instance, GM's foray into Argentina helped Argentina develop its steel mills that were necessary for it to specialise in making automotive parts

-

11.4. Role of international organizations and arrangements

Bretton woods system

- As the external value of all currencies were **fixed in relation to the USD**, and the USD was convertible into gold, it provided **stability and predictability** as it gave both exporters and importers the **ability to plan ahead with a good degree of** certainty as they need not worry about sudden currency fluctuations and this facilitated international trade
- A fix rate also places **less premium on liquidity**, and hence firms were more willing to invest and put their money in capital/FDI investments → and hence much of the USA's surplus capital went into FDI due to the BWS system
- FDI was important → brought about productivity growth and capital formation

IMF

- As part of the aims of preventing **competitive devluation between countries** that had harmed economic relations in the 1930s, the IMF helped to keep the system of fixed exchange rates outlined by BWS in place
- IMF held a **buffer stock of currencies** to tide members over difficult years when they faced BOT deficits → which was done to deter them from devaluing their currency
- Alongside managing the **fixed e/r system**, IMF also provided **short term loans** to help members tide over BOT deficits
- From 1967 to 1970, US dollar drawings **totalled nearly \$3 billion**, whereas those in other currencies amounted to **\$6 billion** which highlights the dependence on the IMF as a provider of currency reserve

Later on in the 1970s and 1980s, IMF came to focus more on the developing world

- Debt-ridden countries sought IMF assistance to address their economic problems

- IMF would provide aid and assistance, under the condition that those countries undergo **Structural Adjustment Programmes** (SAPs) and adhere to them

SAPs entail

- 1) Devaluing currencies to reduce BOT deficits
- 2) Austerity measures such as cutting government expenditure
- 3) Privatize SOEs
- 4) Ease regulations to attract FDI and improve tax collection

You will read more about this later under role of IMF in managing third world debt crisis

World Bank

- World Bank was mainly responsible for helping member states reconstruct after WW2 through the **provision of low interest, long-term loans**, and these were directed towards developmental projects such as infrastructure, transport and education
- This WAS CRUCIAL because **commercial banks would not have provided such low-interest loans**

The role of World Bank in WE and Japan is crucial

WE

- World Bank (or IBRD as it was called back then) provided \$250 million to France to finance its infrastructure projects and to purchase industrial raw materials which it needed for re-industrialization following the war
- Netherlands received \$195 million which financed imports and materials
- Denmark received \$40 million to develop its iron, steel, shipbuilding industries, as well as build infrastructure

The world bank also developed agencies such as the IDA in 1960 and MIGA in 1988 → Helped to facilitate process of economic development in countries where loans were channeled to

IDA - Established to provide long-term credits at **concessional rates** to poorest member countries

MIGA - created favorable local economic conditions for FDI inflow into developing world through providing guarantees against non-commercial risks (like political instability and nationalisation) also provided technical assistance and advisory services **to improve regulatory frameworks and financial governance**

In the 1970s, World Bank focused on poverty alleviation in developing countries, with emphasis on education, food production and health and nutrition (people-focused industries)

- Commitments of World Bank rose from \$610 million in 1961 to \$1.7 billion in 1970, and then to \$14 billion in 1994

World Bank continued role in developing countries in the 1990s

- World Bank disbursed \$55 million from 1993 to 2001 to India for land reclamation projects, which helped benefit 85,000 Indian families who now benefited from having 48,000 hectares of farmland, when that WAS INITIALLY a salty wasteland
- Morocco received \$58 million from 1996 to 2001 to facilitate urbanisation

Criticisms of World Bank

- Unfair conditions, reflected interests of Western nations → Loans were denied to Eastern European countries and the USSR during the cold war
- The World Bank did not monitor how the loans it provided were used → Hence much of the money was drained in corruption, with the poorest of citizens who were intended to benefit from it not receiving anything

GATT and WTO (NOT THAT THEY ARE NOT BWS INSTITUTIONS THEY ARE SEPARATE)

- GATT was a multilateral treaty arrangements (just a set of rules not a permanent organization) that sought to **promote free trade** to reduce trade barriers
- GATT helped to **liberalise** the system of trade by making it easier for countries to export to one another
- This involved getting countries to remove their protectionist measures

GATT also gradually expanded to include many more participating countries (NOT MEMBERS)

- 1) Kennedy Round (1963-1967) (62 participating nations)
 - Tariff concessions worth \$40 billion of world trade
 - BUT these cuts were mostly on manufactures, which was criticized by developing countries for unfairly benefiting developed countries more than developing countries as developed countries continued to have protectionist barriers on their agricultural sectors → Which were crucial for developing countries to grow
- 2) Tokyo round (102 participating nations)
 - Cuts in tariffs of 25-30% → Which brought the average tariff rates from 7% to 5%
 - Tariff reductions worth more than **\$300 billion dollars was achieved**
 - Third World countries received more flexible privileges like most-preferred nation status, which gave them preferential trading arrangements
- 3) Uruguay round (123 participating nations)
 - Average tariff levels were cut further by one-third and issue of NTBs were addressed by forming consensus on the **standards for dumping, quotas and subsidies**

- Unable to get Europeans and Japanese to lower tariffs on agricultural products, which was the **same problem in the Tokyo and Kennedy rounds**
- Increased membership and tangible reductions in trade barriers both tariffs and NTBs **attest to the success of GATT in promoting global free trade and thus export-led growth**

12. **Challenges in the Global Economy**

- 12.1. 1973 and 1979 oil crises
- 12.2. Protectionism
- 12.3. Debt crises of the 1980s

Here's a neatly organized and numbered version of the points on the transformation of East Asian economies, focusing on Japan and China:

13. **Transformation of East Asian Economies (Japan and China)**

14. **Japan (1947–1991)**

14.0 Inherent factors within Japan after economic growth

- Following WW2, Japan had lost more than a quarter of its industrial capacity and was only left with depreciated capital stock → allowed it to adopt an abundance of new technologies which helped fuel new and innovative industries
- Japan also suffers from limited resources → Had to import large quantities of food due to only 29% of its land being arable → had to resort to higher value-added goods so as to address its BOT deficit and create a surplus
- WW2 brought new technology in heavy industry, and hence there was huge potential for economic recovery

These factors, along with the factors below helped Japan transform from a 'less-developed country in 1952' to a 'developed' country within 2 decades as they achieved the Japanese economic miracle, with consistent double-digit rate of growth throughout the 1960s and 1970s

14.1. Factors for Economic Transformation:

14.1.1. Government intervention

- Government adopted an interventionist model in the economy.
- Spurred development through building infrastructure like roads and railways → Which helped facilitate the transport of exports
-
- Also stimulated the private sector by promoting industrial production and trade. Central bank lent to private banks to ensure availability of capital to purchase foreign technology
- Also imposed protectionism in the early years, and then began to shift to trade expansion

Efforts to expand trade still faced setbacks

- China: Tense relations because of Japanese war crimes → Losing one of its largest export markets
- Japan's accession to GATT: Some countries refused to accord full membership to Japan because of its history of anti-competitive dumping in their markets

KEY PLANS

1. Yoshida doctrine
 - Fostered Japanese reliance on US for security needs → Focus on rebuilding economy
2. Ikeda 'Income doubling plan'
 - PM Ikeda sought to double the country's income in 10 years in 1960, but managed to do so in 7 years
 - Combination of government investments, tax breaks and expanded safety net enabled this

MITI (1949)

- MITI worked towards improving competitiveness of Japanese industry by
- Facilitating cooperation, negotiating price of foreign tech imports and coordinating production goals between companies
- MITI hence promoted industries it deemed promising. Negotiation enabled Japanese firms to benefit for lower prices of foreign tech imports which helped boost production output immensely

Supply and demand adjustment

Gave government extensive power to ration any commodity or restrict the usage for any commodity whose supply was limited

This was used extensively in helping bring about economic reconstruction

- Through this, resources were concentrated in the Steel and Coal industries, helping build each other up

- Both a price cap was imposed to ensure rice remained affordable and a minimum price was imposed to ensure farmers earned adequate incomes for rice → helped control inflation
- Government facilitated scarce fertilizers, pesticide and water to rice farmers to ensure self-dependence and reduce import dependence of rice on other countries

JAPANESE economic liberalization (in the 60s) was also highly important

- Visions and plans pertaining to liberalization were drafted in consultation with stakeholders from various sectors of the economy
- The announcement of “liberalization schedules’ would also pressure Japanese firms to improve their productivity and quality of products → As they knew that foreign businesses would soon enter the Japanese market
- The government delayed trade liberalization of industries like steel and shipbuilding so that by the time they liberalized, they had already undertaken measures to address foreign competition and hence they could compete beyond domestic market into exports

Industrial policy

- MITI played a crucial role in promoting development of steel, electronics, automobile and chemicals industry through targeted investment incentives
- In the 1950s, MITI collaborated with Toyota to develop Japan’s automobile industry → Provided subsidies and export promotion strategies to strengthen Toyota’s price competitiveness and ability to penetrate new markets
- Helped Toyota launch the Toyota Land Cruiser for the export market, becoming a crucial source of revenue

Protectionist policies

- MITI also implemented import controls to prevent flooding of Japan’s markets by foreign goods
- MITI also took advantage of the appeal of their market to obtain licensing and patent agreements so that Japanese firms could utilize them in their own production

E.g: IBM transferred licenses and patents to Japanese firms in order to sell computers on the Japanese market → Important as MITI’s protectionist measures helped Japan reap cost advantages of high-volume production through such patents whilst simultaneously not incurring BOT deficits since their domestic markets were largely protected

- MITI nonetheless was flexible with respect to tariffs, and after the Kennedy round of GATT negotiations → Japan imposed lower tariffs because they believed that Japanese exports were competitive enough and lower tariffs would spur these exports. By the 80s, Japanese tariffs were lower than the EC’s and around that of USA

Promotion of advanced tech and heavy capital investment

- Japanese government emphasis products that necessitated heavy capital investment and advanced tech like automobiles and consumer electronics → Helped Japan gain comparative advantage
- Nonetheless, MITI bureaucrats also had foresight in recognising that competition between small Japanese firms for a stake in such industries would lead to excessive competition and damage Japan's price competitiveness → Advised individual firms to specialize in production of certain goods and merged firms to reduce competition and reap cost savings
- Targeted government investment in these industries helped Japan move up the value chain into high-tech value goods
- As evinced by how passenger car production increased from 165,000 in 1960 to over 3 million by 1970

Government also reduced corporate tax in cases where a firm installed equipment to raise productivity and provided subsidies for R&D

- Iron and Steel: >50% of rolling mills were installed before WW2 and steel industry had not introduced strip mills which were more efficient
- MITI supported iron and steel firms to invest in strip mills through loans from Japan Development Bank → Increased investment helped it become more competitive → Became one of Japan's major export commodities
- Steel output also rose from 33 million to 93 million tonnes by the 1960s as a result

Promotion of EOI: Part of Ikeda's plan was export-led growth, as he sought to double income within ten years by expanding exports at around 10% annually

- Japan's exports had shifted from previously being dependent on Japan's lower wages to being based on Japanese efficiency and quality
- Export growth was rapid in that Japan became the largest producer of ships, cameras, TV sets and cars

Japanese exports increased by 800% from about 20 billion to almost 180 billion between 1970 and 1985

-

-

14.1.2. Keiretsu system

- Goals of achieving EOS and discouraging destructive competition resulted in establishment of Keiretsu conglomerates who accounted for more than half of Japanese exports

MITI sponsored formation of Keiretsus, and these Keiretsus functioned utilizing their horizontal and vertical structure, coupled with close relations with central bank thanks to the influence of MITI which helped it

- Become competitive internationally
- Lock out foreign companies from Japanese industries

During WW2, Zaibatsu conglomerates which dominated Japan's economy were dissolved to remove their association with Japanese war effort and promote competition in Japanese industry

- The absence of Zaibatsus led to Japanese companies forming Keiretsus, which were networks of companies with interlocking business relationships
- Keiretsus had 'horizontal relationships' within their independent companies → Pursuit of joint ventures or joint R&D → Toyota and Yamaha for development of Engines
- Also had 'vertical relationships' → Toyota collaborated with Denso to develop spark plugs for its vehicles

R&D emphasis

- The emphasis of R&D within these Keiretsus helped Japan leapfrog other economies and enabled them to become an economic powerhouse in the 1970s
- For example, Hitachi established a joint R&D pursuit with Texas Instruments to manufacture mainframe computers
- Research by Sony and Phillips → Invention of CD → Enabled Japan to develop new area of export
-

Indirect financing

- Keiretsus consisted of an alliance of companies, often inclusive of a Bank which helped these firms to rely on internal funds and reliance on indirect financing
- Favorable payment terms, preferential interest rates through banks were commonplace amongst Keiretsus. Keiretsu banks were shareholders in companies → Hence sought to ensure financial viability of the Keiretsus. The bank also helped protect these Keiretsus from corporate raiders

14.1.3. Socio-economic changes

1. Education

- Although in 1950 Japan did not possess an educated workforce, by 1971 its high school graduation rate of 90% was the world's highest
- Excellent education system + high birth rate → Large supply of young talented workforce
- High literacy rates helped Japan transit to more advanced sectors of development → Shifting to technologically intensive in response to NICs

2. Values

- Japanese culture emphasized strong work ethics → raised productivity levels
- Japanese culture of working on weekends, and working till late hours of the night also helped bring about strong economic growth

- In reward of this, many Japanese firms provided a myriad of welfare benefits and
- Despite the legalization of unions, strikes were virtually unheard of because of the strong Labour-Business relations
- Japanese ethic of austerity → Emphasizing production over consumption helped ensure high capital formation which enabled Japan's comparative advantage in technologically advanced goods
- High savings rate of 17.3% in 1960, compared to USA and UK's measly sub-5% helped ensure high supply of loanable funds for investment and put downward pressure on interest rates

-

3. Competition

- Japanese firms developed new production techniques, such as 'Just in time' inventory control which helped Japanese firms cut back on storage costs and injected dynamic flexibility into the Japanese economy

14.1.4: Japanese culture (closely related to socio-economic changes)

Japan also benefited from culture of Strong Labour-Business relations (Lifetime employment)

- Large Japanese firms had a system of lifetime employment and seniority wages
→ Employees regularly promoted and transferred. Companies implicitly guaranteed stable employment for college graduates until retirement → Companies pretty much operated like families
- Seniority wage system was a system whereby workers' pay rises with their age
- Workers paid below their productivity levels when they're young but above when they're old
- Japanese companies fostered organizational unity and accumulation of business-specific skills as the seniority system discouraged workers from leaving the company and ensuring that their wages are generally in tandem with their productivity in the long-run

Lifetime employment was important because it encouraged workers to invest in their workers
→ giving them wide range of skills → Helping contribute to versatility of Japanese workforce and attracting more investment

14.1.4. International developments

Rise of South Korea, Taiwan and Hong Kong (NICs)

- By the 1960s, Japan lost its comparative advantage in textiles and labor-intensive manufactured goods as Taiwan and South Korea began to produce such goods at lower prices
- Japanese government was still wise and responded to this by shifting towards capital-intensive production as elaborated earlier under MITI initiative
- Thanks to highly educated population, Japan also redirected its economic focus from energy-intensive industries to technology-intensive industries, which was partly influenced by 1970s oil crisis
-

Oil Crisis pt 1 (Arab-Israel)

- Brought Japan's exponential growth to an end as Japan had no oil reserves and depended on oil for $\frac{2}{3}$ of its energy supplies
- GNP declined for the first time since occupation due to high inflation from oil imports as well as declining exports due to poor financial sentiment
- JAPAN still coped well with oil crisis though → Major export industries reduced oil energy demands + cut operational costs → Some became even more efficient as a result of oil crisis
- Reductions in government spending and tight monetary policy also helped control inflation.

Oil Crisis pt 2 (Iran)

- Government policies such as fuel rationing helped reduce oil imports by 10%. Oil-based production of electric power was also reduced, such that it only accounted for $\frac{1}{3}$ of total electricity produced compared to 1973 where it was $\frac{2}{3}$.
- Nuclear power plants were built to help Japan become more self-sufficient energy wise and this produced a quarter of the country's electricity in 1985

Rise in protectionism

- By the early 80s, due to Japan's massive trade surplus with the EC → EC put up selective barriers against Japanese imports and American competitors to Japanese companies lobbied for the government to force Japan to restrain their exports
- To counter protectionist threats → Japan sought trading partners in East Asia
- Japanese government increased Overseas Development Aid to Asian countries + Japanese firms invested in mining and petroleum facilities in Malaysia and Indonesia to secure reliable supplies of energy and minerals
- These firms also developed new markets for Japanese products

Appreciation of Yen

- Between 1985 to 1988, the Yen doubled in value against USD → Which eroded Japanese price competitiveness in overseas markets. Worsened by rising protectionist measures against Japan
- Japanese exporters shifted production overseas to minimize these disadvantages and take advantage of low cost labor → Appreciated Yen help make FDI relatively cheaper for Jap firms

- Japan's niche in highly technologically advanced goods also helped offset these aforementioned issues

14.1.5: American involvement/Role of America

- USA imposed Article 9 on Japan, eliminating the threat of Japanese militarism by ensuring it can never launch an offensive war again
- 'Dollar diplomacy' → Economic recovery → Fend off communism in Asia

1. America as a provider of aid

- US aid included capital, new technology and technical expertise
- By 1951, US had poured in more than \$2 billion to rehabilitate Japanese economy
- US also provided aid to countries previously occupied by Japan but these were earmarked to be spent on Japanese goods so that Japan could expand her export markets (\$500 million to Philippines and \$200 million for Burma)

2. America as trade and investment partner

- Access to American market became a crucial source of income for Japan
- American-based export growth gave Japan the foreign currency it needed to buy capital equipment and supplies → which helped it develop comparative advantage in manufactured and later technologically advanced goods
- American MNCs also helped provide capital and technological innovations to fuel Japanese economic growth
- 1960 General Motors collab with Suzuki → Produce and distribute cars for Japanese domestic market, later expanded to American market when it opened its first overseas subsidiary in California.
- America also tolerated Japan's one way-street, whereby Japan could export its goods to the USA whilst holding up tariffs against American exports

-

3. American military protection of Japan

- Japan's military expenditure was limited to 1% of its GDP, freeing it from the burden of spending its wealth on military and enabled resources to be dedicated to economy instead
- Japan was viewed as strategically important following Korean war and the US Japan Security Treaty signed in 1951 allowed US forces to remain on Japanese soil → Japanese dependence on America for security

American reforms also helped Japan immensely

1. Ending of reparations

- 1949 Dodge Plan helped to end inflation and the abandonment of reparations requirements helped remove a burden on the Japanese budget, promoting fiscal surplus (LINK to how Japanese government was only able to finance transformation because of this,...)

2. Reforms on social capacity

- Education was made more accessible in Japan with compulsory middle school education and establishment of national universities → Helped develop skilled workforce that would propel Japanese economy forward
- Industrial unions were now legalised under American liberty ideals and this empowered workers and compelled firms to be more competitive

Cold war

Korean War

Special military procurements (June 1950)

- US army eschewed the complex protocol system of buying supplies through the Pentagon, and hence used special procurements through Japan
- Pumped \$3.5 billion into Japan → Which amounted to 27% of Japan's total export trade at that time
- American money helped develop companies like Toyota for its trucks, textile industry for winter clothing and health industry for medicines
- Toyota used the money to expand into manufacturing passenger cars
- American investment also helped create Japan's shipbuilding industry → By 1956, Japan had the most advanced shipyards in the world and was launching 26% of the world's shipping
- American experts were flown to Japan to teach productivity-enhancing techniques amidst the cold war
- Between March 1950 and March 1951, Japan's manufacturing output increased by 50%
- Manufacturing output doubled by more than twice that of 1949 in 1953
- Japan had managed to become self-sustaining by this point, and living standards had improved to beyond pre-war levels by 1952.

Eval against American benefit

- Korean war benefits were still short-lived. From 1953 to 1957, Japan experienced trade deficits and demand for special procurements had already begun to wind down by 1951.

Vietnam War

Peak years of Japanese economic growth (1966-70) was also peak years of US involvement in Vietnam

- In 1964, Japan's share of world GDP stood at 5.7%, less than West Germany, France and UK
- By 1973, Japan's share of world GP had risen to almost 13%, equivalent to that of the UK and France combined

The US continued to play an important role.

- Took in more than $\frac{2}{3}$ of Japanese exports in 1984 due to its larger consumer market

15.1. Factors for Economic Transformation:

15.1.1. Problems of the Maoist economy

1) Problems with state ownership and planning

- Landlords were eliminated as a class following collectivization doctrine and grain requisitioning became the norm as the state controlled the entire farm output of its 600 million peasants → Between 1959 to 1961 nearly 30 million people died due to deemphasis of agricultural activities in pursuit of industrialisation → Mass starvation and death
- Second Five-year plan (Great Leap Forward) resulted in misguided industrialisation plan → backyard furnace campaign produced useless steel which came from the burning of previously useful and expensive iron

The Great Leap forward was so disastrous the decline in domestic agricultural produce led to suspension of machinery imports for industrialization as funds were channeled towards importing grain.

2) Political repression

- China's 'Hundred flowers campaign' '57 → Mao encouraged self-critique and debate → Led to criticism of him and communist regime → Ordered a crackdown 'Anti-rightist campaign' '58 → Silenced intellectuals and leaders who were competent enough to highlight flaws in Maoist economy → Also severely reduced number of competent individuals who could run the economy

3) Cultural revolution and its problems (Precedence of politics over economics)

- In 1966 Mao emphasized politics and in the form of the 'Great cultural revolution' '66-'70
- Emphasis on politics led to severe disruptions in Urban areas as factory workers became ideological fanatics and formed Red Guard units amongst themselves, diverting their attention away from factories
- Economic growth figures became negative in 1967 and 1968 as a result
- Only good outcome of Cultural Revolution is that it convinced Deng that economic growth cannot take place with political and ideological contention

4) Stagnation and pressure for economic reform

- Between 1952-1978, economic growth was 6% per annum but this was still marked with severe fundamental issues
-
- China developed strong trading relations with USSR and other commie countries (though this decreased following Sino-Soviet split)
- Japanese trade expanded and non-communist countries accounted for 80% of China's trade in 1970 (Japan had tech China needed, China had nat resources Jap needed)

- BUT China's main exports were basic goods and China's economy was not productive, not dynamic nor efficient
-
- 5) Internal politicking between 'Gang Of Four', 'Hua Guofeng' and Deng's rightist faction after Mao's death ultimately culminated in Rightist victory
- Deng embraced modernity and sought to replicate some of the traits of western capitalist countries in China → Highly pragmatic and sought to modernize China
- Justified capitalist methods in his economic reforms with idea of 'Socialism with Chinese characteristics' and philosophy of Gradualism to modernize China as opposed to big-bang approach advocated for by economists
-

15.1.2. State intervention

Under Deng, China now sought to accelerate its modernisation process by opening up its markets to FDI and increasing access to modern technology → Reform era began in earnest in December 1978

1) State-led financial reform

In 1979, four major state-owned banks were restructured out of the People's Bank Of China and Ministry Of Finance (Under Mao these were combined) - This was to address the inefficiencies and conflicts of interest

- Separation allowed these banks to focus on specific commercial activities within their purview (agricultural bank of china (ABC) , industry etc)
- **Commercial Bank Law** took effect in 1995 → Establishment of Nearly 60,000 financial institutions in 1995 → Helped modernize China's financial system and these private banks offered a wide range of financial products and unlike state-owned banks, were not constrained by bureaucratic red tape
-
- In 1994, the government established new state-owned banks to support growth in export sector and modernize agriculture

Eval: This reform was significant because in line with the later-elaborated reforms in wages and education, Chinese savings expanded massively and the supply of loanable funds increased. The establishment of these new state-owned banks helped channel these funds towards development and the private sector banks helped make funds available for investment by the private firms

2) Education

- China's four modernisations depended on having more scientists and engineers, thus Deng sought to improve China's capability to train scientists and engineers → Increased emphasis on higher education and academic quality

- Incorporated curricula and pedagogy from other countries → Increased academic standards
- Certain schools such as Fudan and Peking were designated 'Key schools' that received the best students, faculty and funding → These schools helped create engineers and scientists China needed to advance itself (Note: This also applied to secondary schools)
- Private schools and technical schools that were prohibited under Mao were re-opened under Deng
- As per Sino-US rapprochement, more Chinese students attended American universities → More than 36,000 students also studied in 14 countries between 1978 and 1984, of which 78% were technical personnel sent abroad for further advanced study in their niche fields
- These graduates were especially useful for China, as they had the knowledge, theory and practice along with the understanding of China's unique circumstances to propel China further

3) Wage reform

1. Under Mao, wages were fixed and low → yet the CCP provided a myriad of employment benefits to subdue opposition to the low wages. Bonuses were not provided to employees irrespective of the work they put in
2. Under Deng, workers were compensated for nearly 2 decades of wage stagnation as the government financed 4 rounds of promotions for nearly all factory workers and urban workers in China
3. Moreover, workers now found their wages linked to the quality and quantity of their work → as Deng had encouraged companies SOEs to provide their most competent employees with bonuses

15.1.3. Market-oriented reforms

Agriculture-side

Under Mao, the centralized economy led to stagnation. State-owned ownership, productivity targets, and lack of incentive to work dampened productivity → Deng sought market reforms to spur growth

1. Household responsibility system (agriculture)
 - Government ended the practice of collectivisation and introduced HRS in 1978
 - At the end of 1980, 15% of land was designated as private plots and farmers had complete freedom over the decision-making process
 - For state-owned land, households had more autonomy to decide what, when and how to produce provided they met their state-mandated quotas, which the state had already gradually decreased in order to give farmers more flexibility in selling their excess crop

- As a result of HRS, farmers found their incomes linked to their production as the state rewarded farmers for exceeding certain production levels
- This was in particular a very capitalistic system → Although the government was wise in ensuring that quotas were set on the amount of grain each household had to produce each year to prevent them from growing cash crops, some enterprising farmers put all their efforts into profitable crops like sugarcane → Sold them in the market and THEN USED the money to buy grain to meet the quotas. The state tolerated this as they encouraged the use of profits to go into mechanization etc

Eval: This helped diversify agricultural production and productivity improved

ALSO crucial because the high productivity meant that there was immense surplus labor in the countryside → TVEs and Urban workers

TVEs (Township and village enterprises)

- TVEs grew at a rate of 35% p.a to about 1.9 million TVEs existing by 1991
- TVEs consisted of making bricks, craft, basic household items → Helped to lower rural unN, improve welfare of farmers

Nonetheless, significance of agricultural reforms can be debated

Whilst gross agri output increased by 12 times from 1978 to 2000, agri's share of employment share declined from 70% in 1978 to just 50% in 2000 +its contribution of GDP was halved from 1978 to just 14.7% in 2000

Broader-market side

Dual-track system

- From 1984, the government introduced a dual-track price system where there was **free market prices for ordinary consumer goods**, and **controlled prices for key commodities like coal, steel and grain**
- From 1988, more price liberalization took place → By 1992, out of 737 commodity items, only 111 remained under the controlled price market → Price of 70% of consumer goods and production materials were determined by market forces
- Rich coastal provinces had rice price controls relaxed → THIS was important because this resulted in a boom for consumer-oriented industries → Helped private enterprises thrive due to capacity to earn immense profits

Reform of SOEs

Stage 1 reform: SOEs were allowed to keep a proportion of their profits → Helped to create sense of autonomy and accountability amongst SOE execs as they could use those profits to provide bonuses and invest to improve production methods

Stage 2: If exceeded production quotas, SOEs could participate in dual track system and sell their products that exceeded production quotas as much as 20% above state-set price

By 1992, SOEs produced 50% of China's industrial output and 67% of state revenue +employed 80% of urban population in the 1980s

EVAL: BUT their performance was bad as the vast majority of them were running at losses that had to be covered by the state

Stage 3: Privatization of SOEs

Corporate Law of 1993 provided a legal framework for converting SOEs into modern corporations

- State ownership of SOEs converted to shares owned by stockholders
- Government adopted a policy of privatizing small SOEs but keeping large firms that were in strategically important industries like in energy and utilities → These grew larger and more profitable
- CNPC (China National Petroleum Corporation) → Continues to play a crucial role in China's energy sector and reliably securing China's energy needs at reasonable prices
- China State Construction Engineering Corporation (CSCEC) continues to build key infrastructure like highways, railways and airports
- Henceforth, SOEs privatization process helped in the rapid expansion of the Chinese economy

→ link to dual price system:

Development of Private companies

- In November 1981, the government initiated reforms to contract out operations to private individuals and private profit-maximizing corporations were encouraged
- Example: Lenovo Group was established in 1984 and became a distributor of imported computers initially → Later expanding to become one of the largest computer manufacturers in the world
- Haier Group: Initially started out in 1984 as a refrigerator company → Diversified to making aircons and washing machines

Reform of Wages and Employment

- There was vast youth unemployment in China → August 1980 'Three elements employment' → Sought to reduce dependence on SOEs for unemployment and gradually have private businesses take up a larger share of employment
- Deng also reduced the control over population movement from rural to urban areas → Opening up of SEZs necessitated huge supply of manpower that primarily came from rural labour that was made redundant by the high productivity gains made in farming
- Wage reform was also initiated in 1978 to link wages with productivity

Government also revived bonuses → SOEs were allowed to convert portion of wages to bonuses to workers who achieved planned targets

This wage reform helped improve Chinese people's SOL → Chinese ambitions grew from merely owning bicycles and watches to owning motorcycles and television sets

15.1.4. Open Door Policy

SEZ's to encourage FDI and tech transfer

In 1980, China set up 4 SEZs in Shenzhen, Zhuhai, Shantou and Xiamen

- Foreign investors were allowed to build factories, use cheap Chinese labor and produce goods meant for export
- SEZs also expanded → All of Hainan Island + 14 other coastal cities
- These cities were selected because they were strategically located near major ports and transportation hubs to attract foreign investment. Also, Xiamen and Shantou were located in close proximity to Taiwan so as to attract Taiwanese investors
- SEZs enjoyed autonomy → preferential corporate income tax + tariff concessions

SEZs have contributed to 22% of China's GDP, 45% of total FDI and 60% of exports. SEZs have created over 30 million jobs, and accelerated industrialisation

- Shenzhen witnessed astronomical growth. From 1980 to 2000, population grew 6x, GDP grew 60x

we

SEZs also helped serve as financial and hospitality hubs → China's service sector grew from under 25% in 1978 to nearly 40% of GDP by 2000

Taxes and incentives for FDI

- FDI injected capital and tech → Increased to nearly \$100 billion in 1994

1979 Law on Joint Ventures using Chinese and Foreign investment was promulgated, allowing foreign entities to establish joint ventures with Chinese companies.

- PROMISED not to nationalize any joint ventures,
- Provided tax holidays, reduction on import duties

In 1984, IBM established its first office in Beijing and Motorola followed in 1992. GM formed a joint venture with SAIC (an SOE) → to produce and sell vehicles in China

By end 1991, there were more than 37,000 foreign companies operating in China that produced \$12 billion of exports

15.1.5. International developments/Foreign firms

Sino-American rapprochement

US motivations in China: Trade wars with Japan, and need to lower cost of production of goods

Context of Sino-American rapprochement: Amidst the Sino-soviet split and the Vietnam war, China and the USA reconciled relations and FINALLY normalized and established relations in **December 1978 (under Deng's initiative following unfavourable circumstances Watergate +Mao's death +PRC power struggle)**

Normalization of relations → Helped China diversify trade partners beyond socialist bloc

Coca-cola was the first foreign company to re-enter the Chinese market in 1979,

Western corporations were eager to enter Chinese market and poured FDI and offered technological expertise to Chinese firms

- 1) These firms sought to take advantage of China's vast consumer market consisting of over a billion people, and their increasing purchasing power (due to wage increase)
- 2) China also offered cheap labour → Keen to outsource manufacturing and increase profitability → China's large natural resources also helped encourage them further

In 1984, Volkswagen entered a joint venture agreement with SAIC → transferred advanced technologies and production processes +quality control standards to SAIC. Helped SAIC develop high-quality vehicles that catered to China's burgeoning domestic car market

Siemens AG → Provided technology and expertise to help China produce high value-added electronic components and equipment → Provided training programmes and technical support → helped China develop advanced manufacturing capabilities similar to the likes of Japan and Singapore

Japan and Asian tigers

- China benefited from supply chain integration between Asian Tiger economies → It attracted investment from these companies and gained from cross-border trade
- Foxconn (Taiwan) established a factory in Shenzhen → Became one of the largest employers in the electronics manufacturing sector in China
- TSMC's joint venture with Shanghai Hua in 1997 → helped China reduce its reliance on imported semiconductors and attain technological self-sufficiency

Role of overseas chinese bamboo network

- Diaspora investors' cultural and ancestral ties mitigated the economic and political risks of investment → Sunk technology and capital in SEZs which encouraged government to continue path of liberalization
-
- Diaspora investors were also the first to invest in China as international investors remained hesitant and apprehensive about China's overtures
- Tiananmen Square Massacre scared off western investors → Taiwan took advantage by shifting their manufacturing of labor-intensive light industrial goods to China

15.1.6: Summary of impact

- China's economic growth came with inflation → Inflation was at 24.1% in 1994
- People's Bank of China utilized interest rate monetary policy and credit controls to prevent speculative bubble like that of Japan

Government also delayed infrastructure investments to prevent excessive inflationary pressures
In January 1994, China devalued RMB by 33% against the USD → devaluation helped make Chinese exports more price competitive

Multi-prog approach helped contain inflation, and it dipped to below 10% in 1996 and was less than 1% in 1998

EQ 3

16. ****Causes, Development, and Management of Inter-state Conflicts****

[Indo-Pakistani Conflict (1947–1972) and Arab-Israeli Conflict (1948–1979)]

Indo-Pakistan section

17. Causes (Kashmir, Water**

17.1. Decolonization

1. Colonial era 'divide and rule' → policies enacted to highlight separateness. E.g: When the British introduced elections, they also brought about separate electorates that were exclusive to minorities such as the Muslims and the Sikhs, as well as electorates based on caste. In fact, there were more separate electorates than general electorates during the decolonization British-era elections
 - This was significant because it contributed to communal tensions and divisions, and it prioritized community identities over broader national identities

2. British delayed granting independence in the 1930s, even though it could have been achieved more amicably. But British resented INC because they refused to support British war effort...arrested INC leaders during the 1940s....were sympathetic towards Jinnah because Jinnah positioned himself as a key British ally...as Muslim league supported British war effort.
3. Direct action day (Trade hartal led by Jinnah). (16 August 1946) → Done to protest INC's uncompromising position and put pressure on British to divide India into sectarian lines/create Pakistan(Jinnah actually supported a unified India, but wanted power to be shared with Muslim states..but congress refused to compromise) **Important because it practically made creation of Muslim state inevitable..nationwide communal riots and savage violence all across the subcontinent came about due to this.** (Creating Pakistan was hoped to bring an end to violence, and prevent all-out civil war)
4. Hasty British exit..British saw communal violence and saw the need to leave immediately to prevent loss of British lives. Mountbatten announced on 4 June '47 that British would leave by mid-August of that year, and British troops were deployed to protect European settlements, rather than as riot control to prevent communal violence
5. Radcliffe line (No prior knowledge of India...5 weeks to draw boundaries. Muslim → Pakistan. Buddhist, Hindu, Christian, etc → India)
 - Significant because all religious communities lost territories of significance
 - Punjab became the epicenter of bloodshed and displacement..Sikhs, Muslims and Hindus all killing each other out of retaliation (Sikh temple in Pakistan etc) → Mass exodus. Population exchange unanticipated by British →10 million refugees as entire communities were cleansed
 - Relevant to later water dispute →radcliffe line cut through the river basin with 5 out of 6 rivers flowing out of India into Pakistan..partition of irrigation system was never taken into account by radcliffe

Inter-dominion agreement (May 47)--> Pakistani recognition of Indian rights to eastern rivers + Pakistani commitment to pay for any water supplied by India

Significant → Strengthened Pakistani desire for Kashmir as they did not want to be at the mercy of India for water (To Pakistan, Kashmir became core to the survival of the nation → no longer merely religion. But LEGIT existential threat)

6. Princely state system (Most imp: Hyderabad and Kashmir).
 - Princely states were excluded from election system introduced in 1946 and had no workable representative governments
 - Kashmir: If popular government had been elected, could have made decisions which BOTH India and Pakistan would have to respect

- Nonetheless, Mountbatten still can get credit for his personal letters and speeches to princes to sign the instrument of accession to India or Pakistan. (When Independence came about, all had signed EXCEPT Kashmir and Hyderabad)

-

17.2. Security

1. Kashmir has strategic importance because it is an imp't security buffer zone CW tensions
2. Major rivers in both Pakistan and India flow through Kashmir

17.3. Territorial sovereignty

17.4. Nationalism

1. INC (leaders of 'Quit India' movement sought a secular, democratic post-independence India that included all of the subcontinent as truly heterogeneous, and sought to represent all aspects of Indian society). Jinnah and Muslim elite were fearful that the Muslim minority would be disadvantaged due to Hindu majority
2. Kashmir was important because it served as the justification for both countries' *raison d'etre*. (India: Wah Kashmir **voluntarily** joins us shows 'one nation argument' → secularism Hindus and Muslims can live together. Pakistan: Integral to Islamic identity → Muslims in subcontinent deserve their own state)

17.5. Religion

17.6. Economic interests

18. **Role of Different Actors in the Development of Conflicts**

18.1. Combatant states

Kashmir dispute (Stage 1. Actual war)

Maharaja of Kashmir initially wanted to make Kashmir the 'Switzerland of the East' strictly neutral, though made it clear that any attempt by either party to use force against it would side with the other → Kashmir's accession to India (26 Oct '47) → Poonch Rebellion. Hari Singh appealed to Mountbatten to help quell the insurrection → Mountbatten suggested signing of instrument of accession to India BUT to be ratified by Kashmiris

District of Poonch came under direct authority of Maharaja → raised taxes on peasants, overwhelming majority of whom were Muslim (Hindus were rich in Kashmir)

Pakistani narrative: Poonch rebellion was a spontaneous uprising initiated by Muslims in the region **on their own**. Kashmir Accession was illegal because

1. Maharaja signed treaty under duress

2. The 'in-principle' agreement to maintain status quo was violated by India

Indian narrative: Pakistan instigated and encouraged Muslims to bring about insurrection and force Kashmir's hand

1. Invasion by tribesmen was supported by Pakistani forces → voided status quo
2. Instrument was legal as it was signed by princely state ruler → just like other princely states

With Kashmir now officially 'Indian territory', Indian government sent Indian army troops to defend Kashmir, starting the first Indo-Pakistani war '47

***On 1 April 1948, India blocked flow of water from Indian Punjab to Pakistani Punjab...threatening Pakistan's agrarian system

Second Kashmir war

1. India began to modernize its military and its defense spending more than doubled between 1962 to 1965 following its loss to China in the 1962 border war
2. The Indian military built-up alarmed Pakistan, which was already insecure of India's largest industrial capital and human resources
3. Pakistan's opportunism led it to seek to seize Kashmir before India's army completely modernized

Pakistan sought to test Indian military capabilities, and used the unresolved 'Rann Of Kutch' dispute as an opportunity to do so. It was a short, relatively brief military incursion lasting about a month. Indian response was very lacklustre and gave Pakistan the confidence to do Operation Gibraltar

REAL conflict came in **Operation Gibraltar** in August '65.

Pakistani opportunism resulted from

- 1) Lackluster response to Rann of Kutch incursion
- 2) Anti-Indian riots in December 1963 + Second detainment of Sheikh Abdullah in 1965 gave the Pakistani government the mistaken belief that the Kashmiris will support its invasion
- 3) Treating the operation as a 'last chance' effort. Pakistan knew that if India's military were to fully modernize, India would have the upper hand
- 4) Misplaced confidence that China would aid Pakistan against India, following a March 1965 state visit to China

Disguised 30,000 infiltrators consisting of soldiers and Islamist militants crossed the ceasefire line in August 1965, seeking to create confusion and spark unrest in Indian-controlled Kashmir

Pakistan: Did not garner support of Kashmiris as expected...faced key military defeats in Sialkot and Khehra. ...extremely demoralizing also as Chinese support did not pull through

India: Pakistani attack provided unprecedented unity. Muslims all across India condemned Pakistani attacks and Kashmiris stood behind the Indian army against invaders, despite earlier misgivings about Indian interference in Kashmiri politics. Secessionist demands also petered out in the wake of the war....ALL Indians even in Kashmir united against Pakistani invasion

1971 war

- West Pakistan vs East Pakistan: Different political outlooks (radical Islam vs Bengali secularism), economic exploitation (though having a larger population, East Pakistan received only 40% of the national budget)
- West Pakistanis sought to eliminate Bengali language from education and administrative use, and suppressed Bengali culture
- Things came to a head → Zulfikar Ali Bhutto refused to give premiership of country to Sheikh Mujibur Rahman, despite winning the elections.

25 March 1971: Operation Searchlight. Extrajudicial killings of Bengali independence leaders, intellectuals, etc. Growing refugee problem for India as many Bengalis fled to India.

Pakistan pre-emptive strike: Anticipating Indian intervention in East Pakistan due to a desire for revenge from Operation Gibraltar as well as genuine sympathy for Bengalis (Indian support for Mukti Bahini..touring different countries to raise awareness of Pakistani atrocities in Bangladesh), General Yahya Khan carried out an air attack to take out Indian forces in December 1971.

India declared unilateral ceasefire on December 16 and Pakistani forces in Bengal surrendered to Indian-allied Mukti Bahini

Both sides **normalised relations** as per the 1972 Simla Agreement and more importantly

- , a clause was added that the 'two countries would settle all their differences through bilateral negotiations or by any other peaceful means mutually agreed upon' marking a departure from UN attempts to mediate the conflict.
- Kashmir status quo ante bellum as per Tashkent
- Most crucially though, the Simla Agreement forced Pakistan to recognise Bangladesh as a newly independent country, which was a major blow to the raison d'être of Pakistan as it highlighted how the Muslims in the subcontinent were not a single polity
-

Brief point on Kashmir

WHY INDIA GAVE SO MUCH OF A SHIT AND WHY IT WAS SO INSECURE

1. India had unilaterally annexed Hyderabad Deccan and Junagadh...and this shared parallels with Kashmir. Both the Hyderabad Deccan and Junagadh had Muslim rulers as princely states, with both having large Hindu majorities

2. The ruler of Junagadh in particular chose to accede to Pakistan rather than India → and Pakistan's acceptance of his instrument of accession was met with outrage in India because it contrasted with Jinnah's own 'Two-nation theory' considering that Junagadh's population was more than 80% Hindu
3. India responded to the Nawab's decision with a blockade of Junagadh → and the situation brought about more communal violence such that the Nawab fled to Karachi and formed a provisional government in exile → as Indian troops annexed Junagadh by force. Although a plebiscite later conducted found that 99.5% of citizens were in favor of joining India → India's primary argument as to why it deserved Junagadh was because the Nawab had done so against the will of its people
4. Which Pakistan could easily also argue, especially considering events like the Poonch Rebellion and the anti-Indian riots
- 5.
6. Moreover, 'Operation Polo' and the annexation of Hyderabad, against the will of the Nizam who desired independence highlighted how India often bullied princely states into submission
7. The violent resistance put up by the Razarkars and the destruction of Hindu homes and violence perpetrated by the Razarkars even prior to this seeded fears within the Indians of Hindus living under a Muslim ruler/majority
8. Nehru himself was Kashmiri, and hence he feared that he would no longer have authority over his own homeland if Kashmir was to secede to Pakistan

18.2. The Superpowers

US and India never endeared each other → USA saw India's leadership of Non-aligned movement as 'crypto-communism' and Nehru appreciated America as a bastion of technology and modernity, but was critical of its capitalist and realpolitik tendencies

Decisive wreck to Indo-US relations: Feb '54 with US-Pakistan military pact → 'tilt' towards Pakistan

India's repeated refusal to hold a plebiscite can be seen as contributing to the conflict → Arrest of Sheikh Abdullah due to his demands for a plebiscite in 1953 culminated in his first arrest

Later 1958 arrest was due to the 'Kashmiri Conspiracy Case' → in which Sheikh Abdullah and other major Kashmiri leaders were arrested for allegedly conspiring with Pakistan to secede from India

This case in particular has been loaded with allegations of political motivations from the Indian side → who actively sought to strip Kashmir of one of its major representatives as they conflicted with their interests

1. NEHRU however made overtures beginning in July 1953 → and only demanded that the plebiscite administrator not be from a major power and a country that had strategic interests in the region, with no other conditions
2. But US-Pakistani pact derailed such overtures → He reneged on his willingness and consent to a plebiscite in Pakistan as he did not believe that the UN could adequately arbitrate it fairly → Moreover,
- 3.

The US and UK saw Pakistan as an ally in the Cold war due to its strategic location as part of a defense ring around the USSR (American planes could strike deep in Soviet territory with Pakistani assistance...encircle USSR further), whilst India was soft on communism.

Such developments made Nehru suspicious of the UN..pushed him further into socialist camp despite 'NAM'.

New round of negotiations began as USA, UK sought to make these countries end their dispute (1962-1964) to draw India away from USSR after sino-soviet split

- 1) India wanted to end conflict because it feared a potential two-front war between India and Pakistan. Oct '62 marked the start of a border war with China
- 2) Nonetheless, despite 6 rounds of talks consistent deadlock remained over plebiscite disputes
- 3) In April 64, following defeat to China and in hope of reaching settlement, Sheikh Abdullah was released and he and Nehru sought to find a solution..but Nehru died in May '64, and with it negotiations for Kashmir (Do take into account that Kashmir was of deep personal significance to Nehru. He's of Kashmiri descent)
- 4) Agreement also unable to take place because of disagreements over plebiscite, worsened by how Pakistan ceded parts of Kashmir to China unilaterally which was deemed as Indian territory (Shaksgam valley)

Role of USSR (taskhent '65)

- USA wasn't even remotely involved in conflict resolution in '65 as it was too tied up with Vietnam
- USSR stepped in to moderate, partly due to a desire to constrain Chinese influence in Pakistan following Sino-soviet split in '62
- Pakistani and Indian diplomats met in Tashkent through Soviet diplomatic ingenuity, and got them to commit to a ceasefire, and return to status quo ante bellum.
- Significant: But unfortunately, was unable to prevent renewed hostilities in '71
- USA was involved in '65 as NATO embargoed both countries as well

About '71

- China affirmed ties with Pakistan and emphasized that China stood with Pakistan to safeguard its sovereignty and national independence against Indian interference
- Indira Gandhi signed landmark treaty of peace, friendship and cooperation with USSR in August '71
- USA also supplied Pakistan with arms and encouraged China to do the same following Sino-American rapprochement. USA sent nuclear warships to the region, and the USSR did the same

18.3. The United Nations

1 Jan 1948: Indian government complaint to UNSC

UNCIP (UN committee on India and Pakistan) formed

- Resolution 47 (April '48) - withdrawal of Pakistan and minimum presence of India in Kashmir
- UN-supervised plebiscite was to take place to enable Kashmiris to choose their destiny
- Karachi agreement (Jul '49) established a cease-fire line (Line of control) → monitored by UN as a de facto border
- Bad for India though: $\frac{1}{3}$ of J&K under Pakistan → despite Kashmiri signing of instrument of accession to India. Britain also supported Pakistan (in part due to CW tensions..wanted anti-commie alliance with Pakistan) which was deeply resented by India

Bad because Pakistan and India did not adhere

- India saw itself as rightful claimant to Kashmir
- Instrument of accession → Kashmir is Indian territory → well within India's right to maintain a military presence → who is the UN to get involved?
- Special status granted to Kashmir within India → separate constitution + consideration of Muslim majority made plebiscite unnecessary in their view → Article 370 granted autonomy, limited India's jurisdiction to foreign affairs and defence

BUT:

Sheikh Abdullah (Kashmiri leader) initially aligned with INC and Nehru. Central Indian government sought radical land reform to redistribute land from large owners to landless

peasants...BUT Sheikh Abdullah wanted it to account for Kashmir's unique demographic and agrarian structure. Was arrested in 1953, and jailed+presidential orders extending Indian laws to Kashmir → led to rising separatist sentiments that called for outright independence

- Pakistan also saw itself as rightful claimant
 - Viewed Kashmir as integral to Pakistan to make it 'complete'...Kashmir was unfinished business of partition therefore any UN deal had to have Pakistan wholly incorporate Kashmir

UN failed to persuade India and Pakistan to submit the controversies surrounding the validity of Kashmir's instrument of accession to the ICJ, where its arbitration would have delivered concrete conclusions about the legality of the document, and in turn the status of Kashmir

August 1953 - September 1954

- Nehru agrees with a plebiscite to end the dispute (amidst Sino-Indian border dispute which later escalated to the Sino-Indian war 1962) Pakistan also agrees to replace UN appointed plebiscite administrator with a neutral party
- BUT it was derailed by US military pacts with Pakistan CENTO (1954) and SEATO (1956)
- Late 1958: Deadlock in discussions over role of UN admin and situation in Kashmir
- USSR also vetoed Feb 1957 proposal to send UNSC president to negotiate demilitarization of Kashmir → cold war context +recall Kashmir's strategic importance

Problems with UN was looming cold war dimension to the conflict (interception with superpowers) → Soviet veto on 104th meeting on the crisis (in late 1958) effectively crushed UN's role in dispute

1965 war operation Gibraltar

UNSC resolution calling for the end of the war passed 22 September 1965 → Convinced India and Pak to cease all hostilities

Nonetheless, still disillusioned by previous UN initiatives, India was not forthcoming with a UN-brokered peace. Pakistan sought to use the UN as a platform to settle the Kashmir dispute, which India would not accept as it believed that Kashmir ought to be resolved bilaterally, without the influence of external parties.

The UN was completely useless at conflict resolution in this war → USSR played a huge role. Final settlement brought about by USSR

18.4: World Bank (In Pakistan's case):

- 1) World Bank and Indus water treaty, 1960
 - World Bank negotiated a solution → incentivised both states to sign with aid for storage facilities for water supplies +financial backing for infrastructure projects along river

Significant for Pakistan: Secured unrestricted use of rivers that contribute 90% of agricultural production. World Bank funding for dams helped reduce dependence on India for water.
→ But still insecure. Pakistan is still located downstream to the Indus river and Kabul river..still ultimately reliant on both neighbors for its waters..greatest fear is India using upstream advantage to divert water to flood Pakistan during rainy season or cut water during dry season(Traumatized by '48 cut off of water even if UN and World Bank sanctify the treaty)

All in all though, the World Bank role is generally a success...survived multiple wars between Indo-Pak. Despite tensions pertaining to ambiguities in the treaty, it still resolved the **FUNDAMENTAL issue of water ownership and access**..though Pakistani insecurity persisted.

Arab-Israel:

Certainly! Here's a more organized version:

****Causes of Conflicts:****

- Decolonisation

- 1) During WW1, as the British sought to protect the Suez canal → cultivated potential allies(Hussein ibn Ali, hashemite +legitimate ruler of hejaz →guardian of holy cities of Mecca and Medina). Promised Arabs independence, and **ALL arab Ottoman territory** would be returned to Arabs, **except a few areas that were not purely arab**. According to Arabs, these exceptions did not include Palestine BUT the British insisted it was. Moreover, saw Zionists as potential allies → sustain Russian front + galvanize American support
- 2) **BALFOUR DECLARATION** → British government support establishment of 'national home' for Jewish people → BUT did not say Palestine should be turned into a Jewish state

Problem with the British is they guaranteed both jews and Arabs certain territorial claims, but did not specify (Neither in Balfour nor Hussein-Mcmahon correspondence. Ambiguity →give rise to conflict as both zionists and Arabs believed that ALL of Palestine had been promised to them)

Nonetheless, when British troops entered Palestine in 1918 as per Sykes-Picot agreement, League of nations gave Britain a mandate over Palestine in 1922

In the international arena: British supported Zionism →Sympathy for plight of Jews, Jewish lobby in UK. Domestically in Palestine: Support Arabs due to interests in region

In the 1920s, anti-British sentiment arose amongst both Arabs and jews. Arabs believed that Britain planned to hold onto Palestine until Jewish majority was formed. Jews believed that Britain was aiding +arming Arabs and **restricting Jewish immigration and land purchases** to prevent fulfilling Balfour.

- Arab revolt 1936 → Retaliation for increase in number of Jewish immigrants (primarily from Europe due to nazism) and fear of rising Jewish economic power. Distinct Palestinian nationalism emerged → 16 May 1936 declared as Palestine day.
- VERY IMPORTANT: British white paper Palestine 1939 - Limited Jewish immigration to 15,000 annually until 1944 **and made it subject to Arab consent** → Pacified Arabs, but deepest act of betrayal to Jews during their time of great peril

WW2 and Holocaust and its consequences (Inevitable withdrawal of British + Establishment of Jewish state in Israel)

- International sympathy and recognition for Zionism
- Refugee problem of Jews in Europe
- Increasing radicalisation of Jews to create their own homeland → Haganah, Irgun and Stern gang carried out atrocities against Arabs and British
- Britain poor after WW2 → looking for honorable way to rid itself of colonial entanglements
- Jewish lobby in USA increasingly pressured US congress to support Zionist cause

- Security

- On 14 May 1948, neighboring Arab states like Egypt, Syria, Transjordan and Lebanon invaded Israel → in a bid to liberate Palestine on Israel's independence day (siege mentality amongst Israelis)

Refugee problem

To compound matters, Arab countries insisted on repatriating Palestinians back → as they argued that Israel had **illegally expelled them in Plan D (Plan Dalet)** → Pretty much expelled all Arabs

Plan Dalet was launched because Israeli leaders feared the territorial fragmentation (read the

→ Haganah disarmed and destroyed Arab villages that supported Arab war attacks → Led to mass exodus as many feared further persecution. The Israeli government did this because of the fear that these Arab villages would pose a persistent security threat to the sanctity of Israel's existence, thus went as far as to **illegally expel these Palestinians from their homes → also to include territories of Yishuv Jews within Israel (Pre-Zionist Jews in the region)**

Deir Yassin massacre (ALSO GALVANIZED ARAB COUNTRIES TO INVADE BECAUSE IT WAS SEEN AS EVIDENCE OF A VIOLENT, EXPANSIONIST JEWISH STATE THAT NEEDED TO BE CONTAINED AMIDST THE MANDATORY PALESTINE CIVIL WAR PRIOR TO → seen as evidence of ethnic cleansing committed by Israel against Arabs THOUGH it was conducted by Stern Gang and Irgun (paramilitary Zionist militias)

Israel on the other hand insisted that responsibility of Palestinian refugees lies with Arab states

- Arabs started war, **and ignored internationally-favoured UN partition plan**
- Palestinians should be integrated in Arab states as many had left voluntarily, unlike many of the Jews in the MENA region who were expelled in pogroms following the war (Population exchange..Here are your Palestinian arab brothers, I'll have my jewish brothers)
- Neighboring Arab countries deliberately left Palestinians poor → Propaganda against Israel. Even though they had the oil money to solve the economic problems of refugees

Israel passed **Absentees' Property law** in 1950 which **officially confiscated any land or housing belonging to those who fled during the Nakba** furthering inflaming Palestinian sentiments → who took to launching Fedayeen raids on Israeli territory which represented a massive security threat to Israel and destabilized the entire region

the 1948 war deeply affected Israel → contributed to fear of crisis mentality imbued by fear of Arab encirclement. This was further reinforced by persistent Fedayeen raids (Palestinian guerilla) launched on Israeli territory through bordering Arab states

→ Israeli war hawks → Necessitated Israeli response to Arab threats with military force even preemptively

Religious far-right also pushed for Eretz Yisrael (biblical Israel) → irredentist Israel → pretty much condemned Arab-Israeli conflict to eternity (Arab states' security)

Moreover,

- Gamel Abdel Nasser espoused and advocate for 'Arab socialism' → adopted increasingly socialist policies like nationalization → received Soviet aid for Egyptian modernisation
- He also pursued a vigorous Anti-Israel policy, especially after 1955 Gaza raid
- Closed access to the Suez canal to Israel and imposed a blockade in the Gulf Of Aqaba (July 1956) in response to Gaza raid → tantamount to economic warfare as it almost eliminated Israeli trade and access to global markets

Under David-Ben Gurion, Israel adopted a policy of retaliation and use of force against Palestinian militias and any Arab attacks on Israeli sovereignty. Israel mined border areas and expelled many Palestinians in retaliation to increasing fedayeen raids in the 1950s

- Egypt attempts to curb border infiltration also Gaza strip was unsuccessful, in 1953 Israeli intelligence accused Egyptian authorities of instigating such incursions, **which they did not until after Gaza raid**
- Israel employed its own saboteurs to create discord between Egypt and west, who viewed Nasser as leaning too close to USSR → stalled British withdrawal from Suez + halted American aid to Egypt

Moreover, the impetus for the 1956 war between Egypt, Israel and the European colonial powers was **the combination of security and Economics**

1955 Gaza raid

In february 1955, in retaliation for the killing of an Israeli cyclist, Israel killed 38 Egyptian soldiers in the Operation Black Arrow

- Viewed as brutal, unprovoked aggression in Egypt → Egypt responded with the czech arms deal, which provided Egypt with an array of sophisticated military technologies, including 200 Mig 15 jets → which many historians believe is what gave Israel the impetus to plan for another war with Egypt
- Also irritated USA → which announced that American government and World Bank would not lend money for construction of Aswan dam despite months of negotiations

1956 war (+ nationalization of Suez canal)

- To raise funds for the construction, as well as take advantage of the Suez canal, Gamel Abdel nasser nationalized it, in spite of Anglo-French protests
- Was the 'straw that broke the camel's back' → Britain and France already had a long list of reasons to despise Nasser
- In the face of dwindling European influence in MENA, they sought to restore it BUT did not want to invade Egypt directly as it would offend the Arabs' sensitivities and increase the popularity of Nasser
- So they decided → Let Israel invade first, then the British and French would issue an ultimatum for both to withdraw from the canal. THEN Britain and France could send forces into Egypt, and maybe topple nasser
- As Israel feared a stronger Egypt that would threaten its security, israel pre-emptively invaded Egyptian sinai on **29 October 1956**

Britain and France issued a joint ultimatum for a ceasefire, which was ignored. On 5 November, British and French paratroopers landed along the Suez canal

1967 war (6-day war)

Factors that led to war (literally entirely security)

1) Increasing Fedayeen attacks

PLO was established at the Arab summit in January 1964 → Nasser sought to control the fedayeen and prevent their raids from destabilizing the entire region. Until 1967, Nasser remained in de facto control of PLO

- Syrian and Egyptian control of PLO and other fedayeen armies was not secure however, as many independent or splinter groups formed
- The creation of Fatah, PLO and PLA threatened Israeli existence and sovereignty, and their associations with arab states reinforced Israel's need to defend itself
- (Sets the stage for pre-emptive strike against neighboring Arab countries)
-

2) Military tensions between Israel and its neighbors

- In August '66, Israeli and Syrian forces clashed near the Sea of Galilee
- This was followed by joint Egypt-Syria defense pact in November that year **brokered by Soviets**
- Many fedayeen operations were launched from Jordan into Israel
- Israeli hawks retaliated with a bombing campaign in November 1966
- In April 1967, Israel and Syria engaged in an air battle. War became an inevitability
- The final straw came when Soviet intelligence **wrongly** confirmed reports from Syria that Israeli troops had mobilized and prepared to invade Syria

Bound by pact, Egyptian troops moved into Sinai and ordered UNEF to leave on 14 May 1967

On 22 May 1967, Egypt closed the straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping → deliberate act of war against Israel

Jordan also signed a defense pact with Egypt on 21 May, making war inevitable and hence Israel mobilized

On 5 June 1967, Israel launched a preemptive strike → war lasted only 5 and a half days

Ceasefire was signed on 10 June 1967, Arab casualties were nearly 20 times that of Israeli. The Israeli air force completely decimated the Arab air forces and tripled in size as they seized the West Bank, Gaza, Golan heights and the entire Sinai peninsula. It also took over East Jerusalem, which it merged with West Jerusalem and declared it Israel's unified capital in 1980 → Israeli emerged as the dominant power in the region

Arab regimes went through another period of domestic challenges and instability owing to the humiliating defeat. This change in strategic balance precluded conditions conducive to further negotiations for peaceful resolution.

Arab states, even after humiliating defeat issued the **Khartoum resolution in September 1967** → Outright rejection of Israel's right to exist

This was done in retaliation to Israeli annihilation of entire villages and towns, and creating Jewish settlements in place of those former villages

Six day war was significant because it **convinced the Palestinians that Arab leaders did not seek to liberate Palestine and prioritised their own interests** → Despite Khartoum resolution, Arab states accepted resolution 242 in November 1967

Resolution 242 never addressed the issue of Palestinian statehood, and merely regarded Palestinian refugees as a 'refugee problem'.

- Territorial Sovereignty

Conflicting Territorial aims

By 1949, Arab states cannot win war → **Armistice negotiations** → **Separate peace agreements made between Arab states and Israel**

Nonetheless, these armistices did not result in lasting peace (**Conflicting aims**)

E.g: February 1950 → Jordan and Israel agree on non-belligerent agreement, **BUT Jordan never ratified it because King Abdullah insisted on Israeli territorial concessions for peace**, but Israel refused because Holocaust Zionism etc

Same pattern for Egypt (wanted Negev) Syria (half the sea of Galilee) → Arab states wanted to repatriate Palestinian refugees back but Israel refused as they did not want to compromise on their Jewish character

- After the signing of armistices, Israel's existence was safeguarded → expanded territory by 21% compared to UN plan
- The ONLY 'bad' outcome for Israelis was the partition of Jerusalem. Main holy sites became inaccessible → Many Jews desired a **united Jerusalem as capital of Israel**
- Arab Palestine ceased to exist → West Bank occupied by Jordan, Gaza was occupied by Egypt

1973 war was partly triggered by Anwar Sadat's desire to reclaim Sinai and restore Egyptian pride → Israel had occupied it and had begun to build settlements in the region which was viewed as a violation of Egypt's territorial sovereignty. Egypt also closed the Suez canal off which represented a significant loss in revenue → Hence he desired to launch a decisive war against Israel to push them out of the Suez, and force them to negotiate from a position of parity → which would then make the conditions favourable for a peace treaty and Egypt's economic development

- Nationalism

- 1) Jews historically persecuted.
- 2) The belief that the Jews will return to the 'promised land' has been of Jewish mysticism ever since the Jews were exiled from Jerusalem by the romans, provided the Messiah came
- 3) Theodor Herzl founded the modern Zionist movement, and argued that assimilation into other cultures was either undesirable or impossible due to the anti-semitic sentiments so rampant internationally, and hence sought to create a state where Jews could live peacefully, free from persecution

Arabs

- Distinct Palestinian nationalism came about → Arab revolt Palestine day
- Roots came from anti-ottoman sentiment and desire self-determination, + Arabs saw themselves as culturally similar and religion (Islam) was a binding force for most Arabs, with some exception
-
- Religion
- Economic Interests
 - Some 225,000 Arabs who lived in the UN-partitioned Jewish state would have to migrate to the Arab state and some 1250 jews would have to migrate to the Jewish state
 - The Jewish state was to consist of fertile lowland planes like the Sharon plane, along with the upper Jordan valley
 - Yet nonetheless, **the bulk of Jewish territory consisted of the Negev desert, which was largely ill-suited for agriculture and urban development at the time**
 - But simultaneously, it was given **sole access to the Sea of Gailee**, which was crucial for water supply and **sole** access to the red sea which was **vital for trade**
 - Palestinians resented UN partition plan partly because they were allocated 43% of the land, despite making up nearly 70% of the population
 - Israel was allocated 56% of the land despite the Jews only making up a 1/3 of the population, yet this was done to accommodate the growing population of holocaust refugees from Europe
 - Nonetheless, a **significant issue in the partition plan was that neither the Israeli nor the Palestinian territories were contiguous**, which naturally contributed to tensions. For instance, the West Bank was not connected to Gaza and Haifa was not connected to the Sea of Gailee → which made infrastructure and apt economic planning nearly impossible
 - The UN plan also sought to make Jerusalem and Bethlehem an international zone out of recognition of its significance to the Abrahamic religions → yet this

never materialized because **CAN TALK ABOUT RELIGION** neither the Jews nor the Muslims and Christians wanted Jerusalem to be controlled by outsiders → Jerusalem was core to Zionism

To Egypt,

****Role of Different Actors in Conflict Development:****

- Combatant States

On 14 May 1948, the State of Israel was founded. → Neighboring Arab countries invaded this new state on the basis of wanting to 'liberate Palestine'

The Arab armies were poorly trained and barely equipped (except Transjordan) and there was lack of unity → Arab states participated to prevent one another from expanding under the veneer of unity for Palestine

Israel was better trained and had much higher morale → Israeli soldiers viewed the war as one of survival and existence

Palestine was literally just used as a pawn in the game for the Arab leaders to consolidate their position domestically and regionally (Jordan occupied the West bank in '48, Egypt seized Gaza → evidence of very little Arab support for an independent Palestinian state). Israel obviously dgaf

Militant Palestinian nationalism formed against the backdrop of perceived Israeli oppression and Arab indifference to Palestinian suffering

- Palestinians were impoverished and were not integrated in Arab states, and were discriminated against in Israel. Displacement of Palestinian refugees → Development of **distinct Palestinian national identity → based on right of return and demand for independent Palestinian state**
- Fatah and Palestinian Liberation Organisation (PLO) formed as a result

Pretty much all of the above was Pre-52 (Before military coup launched against King Farouk, with Gamel Abdel Nasser replacing him)

1955 Gaza raid

In February 1955, in retaliation for the killing of an Israeli cyclist, Israel killed 38 Egyptian soldiers in the Operation Black Arrow

- Viewed as brutal, unprovoked aggression in Egypt → Egypt responded with the Czech arms deal, which provided Egypt with an array of sophisticated military technologies,

including 200 Mig 15 jets → which many historians believe is what gave Israel the impetus to plan for another war with Egypt

- Also irritated USA → which announced that American government and World Bank would not lend money for construction of Aswan dam despite months of negotiations

1956 war (+ nationalization of Suez canal)

- To raise funds for the construction, as well as take advantage of the Suez canal, Gamel Abdel nasser nationalized it, in spite of Anglo-French protests
- Was the 'straw that broke the camel's back' → Britain and France already had a long list of reasons to despise Nasser
- In the face of dwindling European influence in MENA, they sought to restore it BUT did not want to invade Egypt directly as it would offend the Arabs' sensitivities and increase the popularity of Nasser
- So they decided → Let Israel invade first, then the British and French would issue an ultimatum for both to withdraw from the canal. THEN Britain and France could send forces into Egypt, and maybe topple nasser
- As Israel feared a stronger Egypt that would threaten its security, israel pre-emptively invaded Egyptian sinai on **29 October 1956**

Britain and France issued a joint ultimatum for a ceasefire, which was ignored. On 5 November, British and French paratroopers landed along the Suez canal

1967 war (6-day war)

Factors that led to war

3) Increasing Fedayeen attacks

PLO was established at the Arab summit in January 1964 → Nasser sought to control the fedayeen and prevent their raids from destabilizing the entire region. Until 1967, Nasser remained in de facto control of PLO

- Syrian and Egyptian control of PLO and other fedayeen armies was not secure however, as many independent or splinter groups formed
- The creation of Fatah, PLO and PLA threatened Israeli existence and sovereignty, and their associations with arab states reinforced Israel's need to defend itself
- (Sets the stage for pre-emptive strike against neighboring Arab countries)
-

4) Military tensions between Israel and its neighbors

- In August '66, Israeli and Syrian forces clashed near the Sea of Galilee
- This was followed by joint Egypt-Syria defense pact in November that year **brokered by Soviets**
- Many fedayeen operations were launched from Jordan into Israel
- Israeli hawks retaliated with a bombing campaign in November 1966
- In April 1967, Israel and Syria engaged in an air battle. War became an inevitability
- The final straw came when Soviet intelligence **wrongly** confirmed reports from Syria that Israeli troops had mobilized and prepared to invade Syria

Bound by pact, Egyptian troops moved into Sinai and ordered UNEF to leave on 14 May 1967

On 22 May 1967, Egypt closed the straits of Tiran to Israeli shipping → deliberate act of war against Israel

Jordan also signed a defense pact with Egypt on 21 May, making war inevitable and hence Israel mobilized

On 5 June 1967, Israel launched a preemptive strike → war lasted only 5 and a half days

Ceasefire was signed on 10 June 1967, Arab casualties were nearly 20 times that of Israeli. The Israeli air force completely decimated the Arab air forces and tripled in size as they seized the West Bank, Gaza, Golan heights and the entire Sinai peninsula. It also took over East Jerusalem, which it merged with West Jerusalem and declared it Israel's unified capital in 1980 → Israeli emerged as the dominant power in the region

Arab regimes went through another period of domestic challenges and instability owing to the humiliating defeat. This change in strategic balance precluded conditions conducive to further negotiations for peaceful resolution.

Arab states, even after humiliating defeat issued the **Khartoum resolution in September 1967** → Outright rejection of Israel's right to exist

This was done in retaliation to Israeli annihilation of entire villages and towns, and creating Jewish settlements in place of those former villages

Six day war was significant because it **convinced the Palestinians that Arab leaders did not seek to liberate Palestine and prioritised their own interests** → Despite Khartoum resolution, Arab states accepted resolution 242 in November 1967

Resolution 242 never addressed the issue of Palestinian statehood, and merely regarded Palestinian refugees as a 'refugee problem'.

Yom Kippur war (1973)

- Pre-emptive strike organized by Egypt and Syria on the holiest day in the Jewish calendar

After being expelled from the West Bank by Israeli forces, Fatah and PLO moved headquarters to Jordan and politically agitated for an independent Palestine and sought to mobilize Palestinians towards armed action against Israel

Munich Massacre at the Munich Olympics → Radical Palestinian groups kidnapped and murdered 11 Israeli athletes and officials → Israeli government retaliated by launching massive

bombing raids on Palestinian refugee camps in Syria and Jordan. Angered Arabs and their governments further and lent more legitimacy to their cries for military action

The PLO also established a state within a state in Jordan and challenged King Hussein's authority, leading to military attack on PLO and expulsion from Jordan in 1970

(Failure to address Palestinian issue → Another source of instability → Hurt Inter-Arab relations and added another dimension of conflict)

Part of the reason for the war was Israeli complacency and under-estimation of Arab frustration of Israeli occupation of their lands

- Anwar Sadat made overtures to Israel → Israel refused as they believed that Egypt only did so as they came from a position of weakness
- Israel believed that as long as it held onto land acquired in 67, it did not need to negotiate with its neighbors

Another reason why was due to Arab aims of recovering lost territories

- Anwar Sadat wanted to boost his regional standing following Nasser's death and break the defeatist attitude commonplace amongst Arabs
- Grant Egypt greater footing to negotiate with the Israelis,
- An end to the conflict would create the stability needed for Egypt to attract FDI and pave the way for US economic aid

Outbreak of war

- Arabs chose Yom Kippur as Israelis primarily stayed at home with their families on that day
- Egypt and Syria launched a surprise two-front offensive, from the north and south and utilized their massive supply of Soviet advanced weapons
- Israelis were caught completely off-guard, and lacked the necessary resources to halt the invasion
- Israeli positions near Suez canal were overrun by Egyptians, and Syrian forces invaded Golan heights
- Tide of war began to turn however → American airlift of US\$2.2 billion of military equipment
- Nonetheless, USA did not want to get actively involved as it did not want to antagonize Arabs and Soviets → and saw value to force Israel's hand to withdraw to pre-1967 borders.
- Ten days after war, Israel penetrated Arab defense lines and came within 100km of Cairo
- On 17 October, Arabs used oil as their weapon → OPEC embargo on US in retaliation for American airlift → Led to first oil shock

- Superpowers

Context of 1956 war

It was pressure from the USA and UN that **led to withdrawal of British and French troops**. European powers were greatest losers from this fiasco

Israel was condemned for aggression, economic sanctions were applied and the USA threatened to sever relations with Israel if they decided to stay put in Sinai. Israel was forced to accept UN terms (? check again)

USA feared that a full-scale war would result in Soviet intervention in MENA region, which was **undesirable due to oil and suez canal significance** + sought an even-handed policy in MENA to protect oil interests + prevent arms race in the region. USA also didn't want to be seen as a hypocrite as it had condemned Soviet intervention in Hungary (same year '56) and it would tarnish American prestige had they not condemned their allies' unilateral intervention

British and French exit left a power vacuum in the middle east for superpowers to fill.

Nonetheless, although superpower helped facilitate a UN-sponsored resolution to end the war, they were **not impartial** and they were an impediment to lasting peace

For the USSR: Despite this, the USSR still had very little influence in the MENA region. Although Egypt, Syria, Yemen and Iraq veered increasingly left, Egypt relations literally died in the 1970s with Anwar Sadat and his pro-west bias.

For USA: USA faced pretty much no external competition → US role in MENA is conflicting. Sometimes peace broker, sometimes sponsor of war (as evident in extensive military and financial aid programs to Israel)

USA was very cunning in providing both military and economic aid to secure Arab dependence on Americans → very successful in Egypt in the 1970s

Nonetheless, the US' special relationship with Israel continued to be a sticking point between the countries → Arab states perceived undue influence of Zionist lobby made it such that American and Israeli interests were one in the same.

1967 war (6-day war)

Soviet union **erroneously confirmed false intelligence reports** that Israeli troops had mobilized and were preparing to invade Syria

- Many historians have regarded this as deliberate however, as USSR sought to elicit strong Egyptian action that would provoke an Israeli strike → which sought to weaken Israel's position and hurt American prestige → who was getting increasingly involved in Vietnam at this point of time

Since the 1950s, Israel continued to be a benefactor of Western patronage.

- Kennedy and LBJ maintained pro-Israel policy → delivered consignments of latest US tanks and bombers even in the face of cold war commitments
- Israel received French fighter jets and West German armaments

1967

The USSR gave economic and military aid. As Egypt mobilized, USSR also sent much of its Black sea and Northern fleets into mediterranean

After humiliating defeat, USSR acted as superpower patron of Arab states → pushed for a resolution demanding Israel's withdrawal to pre-war boundaries (status quo ante bellum)

Israel wanted recognition of its existence and security guarantees, which US supported

Due to these contrasting aims, UNSC reached an impasse with the issue of **Israeli occupied territories as the primary obstacle to peace**

Nonetheless, the 6 day war cemented the special relationship between the US and Israel. Nixon began his presidential term with significant increases in US military aid to Israel → US aid to Israel rose from about \$100 million to nearly US\$650 million.

In response, Arab states turned to the USSR. Egypt and Syria requested even more aid. Iraq signed treaty of friendship and cooperation with USSR in April '69

In 1973 war,

- USA and USSR pressured Egypt and Israel to accept UN ceasefire, which broke down a few hours shortly after it was accepted when Israel violated it (Recall detente)

- Alarmed at Israeli intransigence and Arab use of oil + Brezhnev's threat of military intervention → Kissinger forced Israelis to accept ceasefire (resolution 338. Note that UN had to issue three more resolutions affirming resolution 338 → which was literally based off of the notion of terminating all concurrent military activity and implementing resolution 242, as elaborated earlier)

US also pursued shuttle diplomacy to find an effective, permanent middle east settlement

- Kissinger embarked on 'shuttle diplomacy', flying between Jerusalem, Cairo and Damascus and laid the foundation for further attempts at peace
- January 1974, **Disengagement of forces agreement** (Sinai I) was signed between Egypt and Israel. UNEF II was created under auspices of resolution 340 during Yom Kippur War, and was installed to supervise buffer zones established
- Sinai II was signed on 1 September 1975 → Enabled Egypt to regain more control over the Sinai peninsula + Sinai peninsula was open for the first time since '67
- Kissinger also managed to secure an Israeli-Syrian settlement (to a certain extent) despite Syrian reluctance to negotiate with Israel. UN disengagement force (UNDOF) was created and imposed between them → Helped terminate all military activity and effectively conclude Yom Kippur war
- Another attempt at peace came in November 1977, when Anwar Sadat visited Jerusalem to discuss peace.
- BUT this failed as talks became deadlocked over issue of West Bank and Palestinian right to self-determination
- Egypt demanded Israeli recognition of Palestinian right to self-rule, Menachem Begin was only willing to concede **administrative autonomy**. Kissinger also unwilling to negotiate with PLO until it accepted resolution 242 (which it obviously did not) + Kissinger saw PLO as a terrorist organization

CAMP DAVID ACCORDS, September '78

- Jimmy Carter sent personal invitations to respective leaders
- Sadat obliged because of the lure of American aid and loans + wanted to revitalize stagnant Egyptian economy
- For Israel, it wanted to secure southern frontier with Egypt so IDF could fully focus on PLO threat from Lebanon

Two agreements were concluded

- 1) Egyptian-Israeli peace treaty and the normalization of relations (signed 26 March 1979)
 - Israel gives up Sinai. In return, Israel restores full diplomatic relations with Egypt and is guaranteed unhindered access to the Suez canal and Gulf of Aqaba
 - Egypt received about US\$1 billion a year for much of the 1980s, and Israel was compensated for its withdrawal with a US\$3 billion loan
- 2) Framework for peace in the Middle East
 - Based on resolutions 242 and 338

- Resolve Palestinian problem, good neighborly relations
- BUT this was less concrete than first. Nothing was said about Jerusalem, Palestinian right to return. BUT HEY. Israel recognised the existence of the Palestinians

Achievements

- Normalization of relations between Egypt and Israel brought some peace in the region
- For Israel, the Arab country with the largest military force was no longer a threat
- Both Egypt and Israel benefited from peace as a result of US aid and support
-

Limitations of Camp David accords

- Normalisation was resented by many in the Arab world → Gulf funding for PLO increased against the backdrop of greater sympathy for Palestinians
- Egypt became ostracized by other Arab countries, and the Arab league imposed a political and economic boycott on Egypt for its normalization → Sadat was also assassinated
- There were many in Israel who opposed the Camp David accords. Many Zionist extremists believed that the territorial gains in '67 were granted by god.
- In a bid to placate them, Begin allowed Israelis to purchase land in the West Bank, and the number of Jewish settlers in the occupied territories rose fivefold
-
-

- The United Nations

On 15 May '47, the UN Special Committee on Palestine (UNSCOP) was formed, consisting of 11 'neutral' members to study Palestine. P5 excluded.

- Study concluded arguing that both Arab and Jewish claims were valid but were irreconcilable → **Partition into Arab and Jewish state based on settlement and demographic patterns**, with Jerusalem under **international trusteeship**

Flaws of UN Partition Plan

- 1) Territorial fragmentation of BOTH Arab and Jewish state
- 2) Difficulty in maintaining economic unity of Jerusalem **without political unity**
- 3) There were large Arab populations 'trapped' in proposed Jewish state

Arabs also didn't see UN as legitimate as they saw it as another Western creation → thought it was pro-imperialist, pro-zionist

Arab league **went to war to PREVENT UN Plan → see combatant states role**

UNSC established UNTSO in response to help supervise and bring about a 4 week truce (11 June 1948) +

- UN-appointed mediator (Count Bernadotte) proposed political compromise in which a larger multiethnic multireligious **Palestine Union would form** → unacceptable to parties involved (decolonization)
- Israel imported large no. of arms despite threat of UN embargoes → Count Bernadotte's insistence on compromise was viewed as pro-Arab bias by the Jews

Impotence of UN was evident in assassination of Count Bernadotte by extremist zionists in September '48 + despite repeated calls for truce, none were heeded past the initial one **AND** both Arabs and Jews used the truce period to better arm themselves and cause more violence

Despite impotence, still managed to facilitate armistice agreements **once they were ready to negotiate**

1956 war

- When war broke out Oct '56, UNTSO requested Israel to withdraw troops and stop fighting
- Britain and France vetoed UNSC resolutions condemning their invasion and demanding a full withdrawal
- In response to this, an **Emergency Special Session was implemented** in the UNGA
- Resolution was decided → Immediate ceasefire, tripartite parties withdraw
- Under immense international pressure, UK and France withdrew, **on the condition that a reasonable settlement be made over the canal**
- Egypt was also assured that its sovereignty would be maintained
- Ceasefire came about on 7 November 1956, ending hostilities

UNEF was also formed - **First EVER armed peacekeeping force (read more in peacekeeping down below)**

1967

Britain's proposal was unanimously adopted in **resolution 242** in November 1967

Terms were favorable for all involved parties

- For Arabs and USSR → Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories
- For Israel and USA → recognition of Israeli sovereignty by its neighbors (AS PER the 'land for peace' agreements → Formed the basis because later on, Egypt would have Sinai returned in return for normalization of relations with Israel and diplomatic recognition (Camp David accords))

Israeli officials initially sought to return the West Bank in return for peace with Jordan, but Jordan abandoned its claims to the West Bank in favor of the PLO for the establishment of a Palestinian state in the 1990s

NEVERTHELESS, still has not attained peace with Syria

Achievements:

- Resolution 242 was highly significant because it became **the basis of all Middle East peace-making efforts since 1967**

Limitations

i) Continued Israeli occupation of Arab territories

Resolution 242 failed to get Israel to withdraw from territories gained in the 1967 war. Arabs insisted that resolution 242 referred to **ALL occupied territories BUT Israel insisted it had to hold on to some of these territories (Golan Heights) to ensure secure boundaries, and was supported by USA**

- Conflict resolution was especially hindered by the vague language of the resolution, which allowed for varying interpretations.

ii) Palestinian disillusionment and rejection of resolution 242

- Six-day war also **created 323,000 refugees** and convinced Palestinians that the Arab leaders were more focused on their own problems than seeking an independent and free Palestine
- Resolution 242 was seen as a betrayal (consider three 'nos' Khartoum Resolution)
-

****Effectiveness of Conflict Management:****

- Diplomacy

- Peacekeeping

UNEF - United Nations Emergency Force was formed in 1956 to secure an end to the crisis

- By 8 March 1957, Tripartite parties evacuated all previously occupied areas
- UNEF consisted of 6000 officers - Maintained peace along borders for the next 10 years. UNEF was armed **unlike UNTSO** But faced SEVERE limitations: UN peacekeeping operations dependent on host nations' consent. Egypt consented, Israel DID NOT
- Amid rising tensions in 1967, Egypt demanded for UNEF withdrawal, which the UN had to oblige to

Achievements of UN ('56)

- UNEF achieved its aims of forming a buffer zone between Anglo-French-Israeli and Egyptian forces, evacuated Tripartite forces from Egyptian territory and maintained peace for 10 years
- First ever peacekeeping force under leadership and initiative of Dag Hammarskjöld
- Also marked a convergence of interests of the superpowers (Both USA and USSR on same side)

Limitations

- Was removed at the demand of its host nation, Egypt in 1967 as he sought another war with Egypt - only able to operate with consent of host country
- Had no role in altering political or military conditions of the region - no effective power or influence
- UNEF DID NOT HAVE legal basis → Peacekeeping was not in the UN charter → viewed as a violation of UN charter
- UNEF also took up a huge portion of UN's budget, which USSR and allies refused to pay as they were concerned of the increasingly military-like role UN found itself playing
-

The whole point of UNTSO was **NOT to settle the Arab-Israel issue itself**, but to expedite political peacemaking and manage a ceasefire → It really was just about peace observation and moral presence above anything else

Here's a neatly organized and numbered version of the points on the causes, development, and management of intra-state conflicts, focusing on the Congo Crisis and the Bosnian War:

20. ****Causes, Development, and Management of Intra-state Conflicts**** [Congo Crisis (1960–1965) and Bosnian War (1992–1995)]

Congo

21. ****Causes****

21.0: Colonial legacy (/ethnic and religious nationalisms)

- Colonial policy of divide and rule engendered desire for autonomy and immigration policy complicated ethnic relations

1) Divide and rule

- Belgian Congo was divided into 6 provinces, which were then divided into districts, which were then divided into territories and then chiefdoms → Led to communalism in that people prioritize their own ethnic interests above that of the country when independence neared → Prevented cohesion

Belgian colonial administrators also treated different ethnic groups differently

- 1) In South Kasai, the Belgians believed the Kasai Baluba to be more resilient and ethnically superior to the Bena Lulua → and thus applied preferential policies in that they promoted the Kasai Baluba to higher positions than other ethnicities earlier
- But by the 1950s, the Belgians began to fear that the Kasai Baluba's growing influence and power would threaten their colonial interests → Hence supported Bena Lulua organizations which contributed to growing ethnic polarization **and animosity**

Moreover, not all provinces were administered equally → Katanga was administered separately until 1993 → This difference in treatment seeded the desire within the Katangans for greater autonomy post-independence → **Helped motivate secession**

- Moreover for Katanga, the indigenous minorities were historically underrepresented → and hence the desire for greater representation fuelled demands for more autonomy

Government also promoted immigration, compounding Katangan desire for independence

- Belgian administrators promoted immigration from neighboring Rwanda into Katanga as well as supported transmigration within Congo
- By 1950s, more than a third of the population were immigrants in Katanga
- Native Congolese henceforth sought to defend their interests against immigrant communities

Western economic interests

- In the 1950s, Congo produced more than 85% of cobalt in Africa, 65% of its industrial diamonds and 35% of its copper
- Colonial government also had a strong interest in the local economy → five holding companies controlled 70% of all Congolese investment and the government had a strong share of all five, sometimes upward of 50%
- Western corporations like **UMHK**, produced 60% of the world's cobalt and 10% of the world's copper paid at least 20% of all Congolese taxes
- **Forminiere** dominated mining and agriculture in Congo
- American influence was also present, as many American firms floated loans towards Belgian-dominated companies and some even went as far as to invest in Congo

- British influence → British **firm** Tanganyika Concessions held 15% of share in UMHK, and British owned the **Benguela railway**, transported UMHK goods to Angola and from there to the rest of the world

Following the conclusion of the 1960 Belgo-Congolese roundtable conference, the Belgians sought to grant independence to Congo within the next 6 months at June 30 1960

→ Yet this was not motivated by moral factors, as the Belgians sought to prevent the rise of a protracted pre-independence struggle (Leopoldville riots)

- They also planned to maintain control in defense, finance and foreign affairs, and expected the Congolese to agree to some form of continued guardianship from the Belgians → Hence although they were hasty in granting independence, they never sought to nurture a sovereign Congo, and they wanted it to remain as a subservient state to Belgium

All Congolese nationalists rejected this → EXCEPT Moise Tshombe

21.1. Domestic politics

- In 1956, Lumumba signed a manifesto signed a manifesto declaring total emancipation from the Belgians and formed the MNC, which became the only nationwide political organization
- On the other hand, Kasa-Vubu, who led ABAKO sought to secure his ethnic group, Bakongo's interests

Nonetheless, in the early push for independence both Kasa-Vubu and Lumumba could cooperate when advantageous despite their disagreements

- In the push for independence, the Congolese nationalist leaders put up a united front in their negotiations with the Belgians
- In the 1960 Belgo-Congolese roundtable conference, they managed to succeed in pursuing nearly all of their objectives, with the notable exception of control over Western commercial entities which was deferred to a subsequent conference

Tshombe was a leader from Katanga, and his wealthy family had close relations with western corporations, and he wanted to continue these relations for his own benefit → Thus, he sought greater control over Katangan resources and considered allying with the West to be beneficial

MNC-ABAKO marriage of convenience

Just some things on ABAKO

- Championed the interests of the Bakongo, the largest ethnic group in the country
- Kasa-Vubu rose to lead ABAKO in 1954
- January 1959 ABAKO political gathering in Leopoldville was banned by the authorities, which led to violence and riots and sparked the Leopoldville riots → Was important in pushing the Belgians to granting Congo independence

MNC

- MNC's demands for independence related to the entire country, including ethnic minorities and immigrant communities
- MNC was split over differences pertaining to whether Congo should be a federalist or centralized state split the party
- MNC-L led by Lumumba advocated for centralisation
- MNC-K led by Kalonji pushed for federalism → This is significant because of how he later went on to declare South Kasai autonomous
- Also note that Lumumba had quite a weak power base since he was a Batela with no large ethnic base anywhere in Congo → And also did not possess any tribal affinity, unlike Kasa-Vubu and Tshombe
- His support base was derived from his oratorical and organisational skills

Breakdown of Kasa-vubu lumumba alliance and emergence of Kasa-vubu Mobutu alliance

- Inability to respond to Katanga's secession and South Kasai's declaration of autonomy → Undermined credibility of central government
- ANC offensive into South Kasai began on 23 August → Successively seized the capital → Yet there was significant resistance put up by the Kasai Baluba population → and the ANC troops retaliated by committing several massacres that were internationally condemned → This was significant because on 5 September, Kasa-Vubu dissolved Lumumba's government and he blamed Lumumba's insistence on centralism to be the cause of the violence in South Kasai → Dismissed him from the premiership

Lumumba refused to accept his dismissal and announced Kasa-vubu's dismissal → Leading to a political stalemate until Mobutu seized power and arrested Lumumba

On 24 September Mobutu withdrew the ANC from South Kasai

-

-

21.2. Economic interests

For the central Congo government, control over South Kasai and Katanga was crucial because they accounted for nearly 40% of all tax revenue, and were hence crucial for the survival of the country

- Keeping Katanga was essential as it contained resources like Cobalt, which was in high demand at the time due to its use in the production of alloys and batteries which were becoming more commonplace at the time + was a leading producer of copper → And these resources represented a significant source of revenue for the government which could be used to bring about development (a bit of mix from the state Congo part ah)

Katanga:

There's also the economic motivations

- Tshombe feared that Katanga's rich resources of copper, cobalt and uranium would be squandered by the central government, rather than himself as they profited from the wealth generated by mining industry
- He also feared that Lumumba's anti-west stance would lead to him gradually nationalizing Western economic interests in Katanga → would lead to him losing the concession fees he earned from UMHK, Forminiere
- Moreover, many Katangese felt entitled to the revenue earned by the mining industry in Katanga and they sought its use to develop infrastructure and advance Katanga, and were disturbed by the prospect that Lumumba would use those revenues to help develop the poorer provinces of Congo instead

21.3. Ethnic and religious nationalisms

Katanga

Tshombe led CONAKAT, which advocated for a federal Congo, and the emergence of CONAKAT can be traced to animosities between indigenous and immigrant communities

- Katanga, along with Belgian promotion of immigration, attracted many immigrants to the Congo such that more than a third of its population was comprised of immigrants by the 1950s
- In large urban centers, they comprised almost half of the population
- These immigrants were also more industrious and skilled → and they earned higher wages compared to indigenous workers. The drastic fall in the price of copper following the end of WW2 led to higher unemployment of manual unskilled workers, who were primarily indigenous
- **The core of this is is that ethnic animosities undertook an ethnic dimension**

Aside from the indigenous stuff, you also need to be aware of Tshombe's own political ideals

- Katangese secession was also motivated by political rivalry between CONAKAT and MNC-Lumumba

- Following independence, Tshombe became President of Katanga → Yet, the appointment of portfolios irritated Tshombe as he viewed them as measures by Lumumba and Kasa-vubu to limit his influence and power

For instance,

- 1) Lumumba's MNC members were given portfolios of key positions like national defense and interior, **despite his objections**
- 2) Although the portfolio for economic affairs was awarded to a CONAKAT member, **this was undercut by** how mines and land affairs were placed under separate portfolios → Despite the vast majority of Katanga's income coming from those very mines → Hence leading Tshombe to declare that this diluted CONAKAT's influence

Trigger of crisis

- 1) As the Belgians wanted to maintain control and dominance over Congo's military, Belgians continued to dominate the upper ranks of the Congolese and native Congolese were not promoted even in the lead-up to independence → ANC (Congolese National Army) mutinied on 5 July 1960, shortly after independence

22. ****Role of Different Actors in the Development of Conflicts****

22.1. Domestic actors (state and non-state)

State: Congo (Lumumba etc)

- On 12 July 1960, Lumumba and Kasa-vubu sought UN help to deal with the crisis shortly after independence
- The

Non-state: Katanga

- In response to the violence and chaos following the ANC mutiny, and with the aid of Belgian forces that intervened in Congo → Moise Tshombe declared independence of Katanga from Congo.
- Belgium supported this on the purported basis that they needed to protect Belgian citizens in Katanga → But in reality, they viewed a breakaway state under Tshombe as beneficial to their economic interests + undermine Lumumba's legitimacy owing to his anti-west, anti-colonial and socialist leanings

Non-state: South Kasai

- To make matters worse following the violence after ANC revolt, Albert Kalonji declared autonomy on 8 August

1) Ethnic animosities

- As you would know, the Belgians initially promoted Kasai Baluba interests, but as they grew in power, the Belgians grew wary and later began to repress the Kasai Baluba politically
- In 1959, animosity peaked when the colonial authorities proposed to move Kasai Baluba farmers out of Bena Lulua land to less fertile land → In August 1959, Kasai Baluba demonstrations against the plan were **violently repressed by the colonial police**
- This further seeded Kalonji's federalist desires, as he feared that a centralised Congo would undermine their interests

This was further motivated by how Lumumba promoted a Bena Lulua candidate as president of South Kasai, a rival ethnic group of the Kasai Baluba. Many Kasai Balubas sought to regain dominance over the Bena Lulua → Hence this undermined that

- Kalonji was also supported by Forminiere, which received concessions in return for financial support → Kalonji economically benefited from Forminiere's taxes and dividend payments

As a result, he declared **autonomy (NOT secession)** on 8 August 1960

2) Economic motivations

- South Kasai possessed rich mineral deposits of diamonds and gold → Gave them confidence of financial independence from the central government
- South Kasai also had fertile land and produced crops such as maize, cassava and peanuts → The Colonial plan of relocating Kasai Baluba farmers from these areas to the benefit of Bena Lulua also explains why control over agricultural resources became critical → and Kalonji sought to eliminate any threat of the central government interfering and carrying out their own land policies similar to that of the Belgians

Lumumbists (Simba and Kwilu rebellions)

1) Ethnic origins of rebellions

- For instance, Antoine Gizenga was an ethnic Mpende, which claimed to be marginalised by the central government
- But this limited the spread of the rebellions → Hampered them from gaining ground beyond select ethnic territories because they were unable to recruit combatants from these areas
- Moreover, unlike Tshombe and Kalonji who could rely on support from Western corporations and Belgium, their rebellions were anti-western in nature and hence they were unable to gain support and relied entirely on local resistance

2) Economic origins of the conflict

- Kwilu rebellion was at times referred to as 'second independence' → A revolutionary attempt to correct the injustices at the first independent

This was because following independence, there was **significant inequality due to differential access to material rewards**

- Congolese faced vastly different quality of life because of how some Congolese attained status mobility and moved into previously Belgian-occupied roles in society such as high ranking civil servants and military positions → But others, particularly young men felt disenfranchised by the central government and they believed that those Congolese who earned higher wages and had more opportunities only did so because they were lackeys of the Belgians

In addition to the inequality,

- The value of the Congolese franc had plummeted and unemployment was very high in the Kwilu rebellion → Many Congolese viewed themselves as worse off prior to independence in 1960

The rebellions initially operated in a 'value system, in which civil servants and wealthy individuals, particularly of European descent were targeted → But later transformed into massacres under the pretext of removing political opposition → Europeans were evacuated from Kwilu

3) Anti-imperialist struggle

- Lumumbists were opposed to American involvement in Cyrille Adoula's rise → and received support from the USSR and China given that they fought imperialism
- They also received support from Burundi (state actors) in the form of munitions and rifles, though this was still limited as they were mostly poorly armed. Nonetheless, their use of machetes and superstition intimidated the well-equipped ANC forces, and they managed to seize their better equipment when the ANC withdrew from certain areas
- ANC however still retaliated with brutal counter-insurgency actions → Further undermined authority of central government
- Moreover, many of the Lumumbists were radical African nationalists who were diametrically opposed to the évolués, which referred to Europeanised Africans who followed European laws (rather than customary), usually held white-collar jobs like clerks in the civil service and lived in urban areas → Many évolués were executed and massacred to eliminate western influence from Congo

In August 1964, the Simbas successfully captured Stanleyville and acquired ANC weapons. They also captured large swaths of northern Congo, and moved towards capturing South Kasai → which was strategically important as it could cut ANC forces in half, isolate Katanga and overstretch ANC lines

Simba and Kwilu rebellions were crushed by Tshombe, but nonetheless with the support of foreign mercenaries and American assistance

-

22.2. Major powers and other external state actors

Initial superpower disinterest

- Although the US possessed strategic interests in Congo since WW1, largely owing to Congo's strategic materials like uranium, cobalt and copper that had military and technological applications were deemed a national security priority
- But by the 1950s, the discovery of uranium in Canada and South Africa made the USA less dependent on Congo for acquiring the materials needed to create nuclear weapons

For USSR,

- Although Khrushchev had a general policy for Africa in which they would support decolonisation efforts, provide financial aid and munitions but EVEN then would not get directly involved → He was unwilling to support Lumumba in his bid to create purely african trade unions and organizing political cadres and propaganda as similar to the USA, he did not view Congo as significant in the cold war context as he saw Egypt more significant in Africa and both USSR and USA were occupied with cold war in Europe

Nonetheless, in 1960, 17 African countries prepared for independence → Decolonisation provided opportunities for both sides to compete for influence in independent African states

- In January 1960, a top-secret decree in the Kremlin outlined more specific measures to considerably increase and strengthen Soviet influence in Africa
- Along with cold war, this was also motivated by the communist competition from China → and as China cultivated relations with the Congolese and emphasized how they drew closer parallels with Congo in that both were largely peasant societies, Soviets adopted a more active role in Congo

As for American influence,

- US Ambassador to Belgium William Burden had advocated for stronger American influence in Congo, in the form of economic aid but was nevertheless suspicious of Lumumba and had characterized Lumumba as someone who was shrewd and machiavellian (this was because he believed Lumumba had accepted money from communist sources and moreover, although he pledged to protect foreign investment from nationalization, he did not specify guarantees for specific investment projects which led to the perception that he was non-committal despite the pledge)
- Eisenhower administration was not forthcoming however and insisted that it was Belgian's responsibility to

In the June 1960 parliamentary elections, Lumumba's party emerged as the largest party and formed a coalition with other parties like Kasa-vubu. Lumumba emerged as Prime Minister, and Kasa-Vubu President when Congo gained independence

Moreover, during the elections Tshombe and pro-Belgian congolese portrayed Lumumba as a communist to damage MNC's reputation and scare wealthy foreign investors. The Belgian authorities were also complicit in this character assassination of Lumumba → hence seeded superpower interest in Congo

USSR

- Soviets saw opportunity in the victory of MNC in the 1960 Congo elections as well as Lumumba's rise to power, arising due to his anti-west sentiments and trade unionism

On 15 August 1960, Lumumba requested military aid from the Soviets to end Katangan secession, which they agreed to provide → Soviets saw Lumumba and Congo as an avenue for them to expand their influence and build their reputation as a supporter of decolonization → This maneuver convinced the Americans that he was another Castro, and gave rise to the perception that he was an avowed communist

USA

- USA feared rising communist influence in Congo following the rise of Lumumba

- Lumumba's communist inclinations and seeking of Soviet aid on 15 August → Drove them to support Kasa Vubu-Mobutu alliance following Mobutu's arrest of Lumumba due to his plans to have Mobutu assassinated
- This was also done to prevent USSR from gaining a foothold → and protect economic interests
-

American involvement in Congo is especially evident in how following Lumumba's death, they supported Cyrille Adoula who postured himself as a liberal, anti-communist

- The CIA bribed Congolese politicians parliamentarians to support Adoula

American involvement in the rise of Cyrille Adoula to power angered many Lumumbists, such as Antoine Gizenga and Christophe Gbenye, who also lost their positions of power due to being considered undesirable by the CIA owing to their left-wing sentiments.

They were strongly anti-foreigners, and you can read more of this under domestic

Following Cyrille Adoula's inability to manage the Kwilu and Simba rebellions → The US government pressured Kasa-Vubu to install Tshombe as Prime Minister in **July 1964**

Tshombe's rise to power and his pro-west stance caused anxiety within Congo and other African countries

Uganda provided covert support for the Simbas, and some Ugandans even served alongside the rebels. Egypt and Algeria also sent covert military support and training

Moreover, as the Simbas rapidly approached South Kasai and Katanga, Tshombe turned to the US for support and the US aided Tshombe's efforts to repel the Simbas due to their fears of communism gaining a foothold in the Middle of africa,

- The US airlifted Katanganese soldiers exiled in Angola → who were highly disciplined, Belgian-trained Katangese who had served in the Belgian Colonial authority
- This was also accompanied by mercenary pilots who flew WW2-era surplus planes fitted with machine guns → And with the aid of their air superiority, managed to force the Simbas to abandon their attacks

(Bear in mind: The western powers are actually supporting the central government, as Tshombe was installed as Prime Minister in July 1964)

- With the aid of western powers, highly disciplined force and air force → Simba rebellion was effectively defeated by November 1965

Belgium

- Recall how the Belgians only sought to make Congo nominally independent, and wanted to retain control over its military, foreign affairs, and economy

As such, their insistence on dominating military → Earlier explained ANC mutiny → Lumumba sought to manage the mutiny by installing native Congolese commander-in-chief and Chief of staff → Despite these efforts, violence continued to spread in the country

Belgium intervened on 10 July militarily to preserve European lives and properties in response to the violence → **Deemed by Congolese as external intervention**

When Mobutu launched his coup and Lumumba's government was dissolved → Lumumba was placed in custody in Katanga → Where he was later executed in January 1961 by a firing squad led by a Belgian mercenary → CIA was alleged to be involved → The execution of Lumumba was significant because it ultimately led to the Kwilu and Simba rebellions led by Lumumbists

22.3. The United Nations and regional organizations

- On 12 July 1960, Lumumba and Kasa-vubu sought UN help to deal with the 2 crises they faced shortly after independence
- They sought UN troops to assist against Belgian troops who had built up a sizeable presence in Katanga → Bear in mind that they had requested American troops on July 11, but this was turned down by Eisenhower
- Dag Hammarskjöld sent in a peacekeeping force in Katanga, but **the UN intervention was limited -was only to keep peace in Katanga but not end the secession → which would amount to interference in local affairs**

Resolution 143: 14 July 1960

- Dag Hammarskjöld acted on Article 99 of UN charter, which was unprecedented at the time (gave SecGen authority to highlight any matter which threatens peace and security) and passed Resolution 143

Resolution 143 called on Belgium to withdraw its troops from Congo and authorized SecGen to provide military and technical assistance to the Congolese government until the ANC could maintain order in the country

RESOLUTION 143 TREATED THE CONFLICT AS AN INTER-STATE CONFLICT, and significantly, was not vetoed by the superpowers since it was considered a war of decolonization and had not entered the cold war dimension yet → UN reflected anti-imperialist attitude of USA and USSR

SecGen formed **ONUC** (UN operations in Congo) and rapidly built up to more than 14,000 troops, reaching 20,000 at its peak in which more than 30 countries participated → Largest UN operation ever taken

- None of these countries were P5 countries that had permanent seats at the SC → Hence most of the contributors were African states
- In less than 48 hours, by 16 July 1960 personnel from African countries like Ethiopia and Morocco had arrived in Congo as part of ONUC, reaching 8000 troops by 26 July 1960 (one of the fastest UN deployments in history)

Resolution 145: 22 July 1960

- Due to Belgium's manouvres to concentrate troops in Katanga province and their dawdling of troops → Resolution 145
- 1) Called on Belgium to withdraw quickly from Congo again as per Resolution 143
- 2) Requested all states to refrain from any action that may undermine the sovereignty of Congo

This was significant because it highlights how the UN was highly adaptable in that they were able to address the changing dimensions of the crisis

- It acknowledged the role of foreign mercenaries in supporting Katanga's secession, such as by Belgian military and political advisors as well as the undue influence of surrounding British colonies like Rhodesia
- ALSO 'refrain action' external states was also UN's role to minimize superpower interference in Congo → Legally binding document existed to hold one another accountable
- Resolution 145 managed to make Belgian troops withdraw from Leopoldville on 23 July 1960

Resolution 146 (9 August 1960)

- In recognition of Belgian persistence in Katanga, Resolution 146 called on them to withdraw from Katanga and declared that the UN would enter Katanga to restore order in the country
- **Belgian withdrawal** became fundamental because on the same day, South Kasai had declared autonomy which gave rise to further fears of territorial fragmentation and disintegration of Congo
- Although Tshombe initially resisted UN entry, he met with Tshombe in exchange for non-interference in Tshombe's secession against central government

On 12 August 1960, UN troops entered Katanga and set off a process of withdrawal of Belgian troops, which was completed by the beginning of September 1960. Within six weeks, ONUC brought about withdrawal of Belgian troops from the whole of Congo

Resolution 161(21 Feb 1961)

Following the murder of Lumumba, UN passed Resolution 161 on 21 February 1961

- This was significant as this empowered the UN to take measures to prevent the civil war in Congo, including going as far as to authorise them to use force
- Also demanded the expulsion of all foreign advisors and mercenaries
- Sought to reorganise the ANC as well as reconvene Parliament in Congo

Achievements of UN

- Despite the withdrawal of Belgian troops from Katanga following UN entry into Katanga, the secessionist movement persisted, partly due to involvement of foreign mercenaries
→ Resolution 161 outlined UN measures to secure withdrawal of Belgian AND foreign mercenaries

UN efforts to reconvene parliament was successful as in July 1961, a new central government under Cyrille Adoula that **reconciled various factions came together**

- On 24 August 1961, Adoula government ordered the expulsion of all foreign mercenaries in Congo, and granted ONUC legal authority to achieve this purpose

Expulsion of mercenaries was done in two successive operations

- 1) Operation rumpunch: **28 August 1961**
 - Rounded up mercenaries and deported them
- 2) Operation Morthor: 13 September 1961
 - Broadened the campaign to **end the secession** by arresting provincial politicians, namely Tshombe as well as roundup foreigners
 - This also was another limitation however, as ONUC's right to arrest Congolese politicians was contested.
 - Operation Morthor also failed to arrest Tshombe anyways as he had escaped to Rhodesia

Despite signing a ceasefire with the ONUC after Hammarskjöld's death, Tshombe returned to Katanga and continued to fight for secession

Escalation of violence led to UNSC adopting

Resolution 169: 24 November 1961

- Focused on suppressing secessionist activities, and rejected the claim that Katanga was a sovereign independent nation
- This was successful in that Tshombe signed the **Kitona accords** with the central government on 21 December 1961, leading to a year-long truce

THUS, UN was successful in maintaining territorial integrity of Congo

- Hence putting an end to Katangese secession can be deemed a success

BUT it wasn't straightforward

- Despite signing Kitona accords, in July 1962, Tshombe continued to organize violent demonstrations against UN → Whose troops continued to be attacked by the Katangese

- In August 1962, U Thant proposed a National Reconciliation Plan to solve the secession problem → Despite Tshombe previously accepting the plan, he later reneged the agreement in December

Due to this, **Operation Grandslam** was launched in **December 1962** to neutralize the Katangan Air Force so that ONUC troops could regain freedom of movement in Katanga

- In January 1963, the Katangese secession finally ended
- UN intervention, despite its problems helped Congo survive as a unified state
- UN presence left the country and ONUC ended operations in June 1964

LIMITATIONS

Disagreements between Lumumba and Hammarskjöld

- Despite resolution 143, Lumumba, with his anti-imperialist stance, believed that the UN and Americans were acting in favor of the Belgians against Congolese → Due to lack of willingness from Belgians to comply, particularly because the Belgians promised only to withdraw if the UN would restore order
- Lumumba also found fault with how the UN troops under ONUC were not placed under his disposal to put down the secession in Katanga → as he interpreted resolution 143 to mean that the UN would provide troops to the Congolese government → This was important as the ANC had mutinied against the government and the central government failed to contain the mutiny → Hence needed UN troops to deal with Katanga and South Kasai
- Hammarskjöld insisted that ONUC could not put down the succession in Katanga as that would breach Article 2(7) of the UN charter and undermine the neutrality of ONUC
- On 17 July 1960, Kasa-Vubu and Lumumba launched an ultimatum to Dag, warning that if Belgian troops did not depart by 19 August, they would request troops from the USSR
- This alarmed Dag, as he feared that Lumumba was being used by Moscow to create a cold war ally in Central Africa
- Due to this fear, Dag, on his own initiative and without consultation with Lumumba, met Tshombe on 10 August 1960 → Lumumba believed that Dag had breached resolution 143 which outlined how the Secgen had to consult with the Congolese central government → Dag later denounced him as a Belgian puppet

Failure to prevent Lumumba's assassination

- Lumumba's second arrest, where he was detained in Katanga and later assassinated led to greater unrest across the country
- Many Afro-Asian contingents of the UN also withdrew from ONUC, as for instance, Guinea and Ghana (among largest contingents) were vocally supportive of Lumumba, hence their withdrawal of support following his assassination threatened a collapse of the UN operation

Resolution 161 limitations

UNs lack of neutrality

- Rather than alleviating chaos, this resolution incited authorities in both Leopoldville (central Congolese government) and Katanga to launch attacks on the UN
- Both Katanga and Central government assumed that ONUC now had the authority to disarm the ANC and reopen parliament → Which would enhance the power of the Lumumbists
- This led the two diametrically opposed parties to conclude the **Tananarive Agreement** in March 1961, in which they pooled military resources against the UN and to the Lumumbists who controlled Stanleyville
- Moreover, the fact that the African contingents sought to withdraw following Lumumba's assassination highlighted how many parties in the UN were outwardly sympathetic to Lumumba → which aggrieved Kasa-vubu Mobutu alliance as well as was evidence of their partiality towards him

Undue influence of stakeholders

- Soviets were pro-Lumumba and were aggrieved by the UN's failure to protect him
- France and Britain were anti-Lumumba, colonial powers and had economic interests in Katanga → Were willing to support Katangan independence, provide advisors to Katanga etc despite UN insistence of eliminating foreign involvement in Congo
- US feared the rise of Lumumba stanleyville faction, and also recognised that Katangese secession could legitimize other secessionist movements in the region, which could lead to more communist movements in Africa
- SegGen also had to placate Afro-Asian bloc without alienating the west who financed operation (recall Ghana and Guinea)
-

23. **Effectiveness of Conflict Management**

23.1. Peace processes

Domestic

Negotiations between local actors

Luluabourg Constitution

- Luluabourg constitution outline **federalism** between the central government and the provinces
- Number of provinces increased from 6 to 21, and each province had some degree of autonomy → Each province was to have its own government and constitution . The increased number of provinces also acknowledged the diversity of Congo
- Constitution also strengthened powers of president and weakened powers of prime minister → Sought to delineate powers and authority to each position
- A constitutional referendum was held in June-July 1964, and was approved by 91% of voters

- Elections were held between 18 March and 30 April 1965 in Congo

-

1965 Elections

- 223 Political parties contested for 167 seats → Government consisted of 41 political parties → Array of diverging interests meant that Congolese politics became even more fragmented and prospects of stability remained dim

Tshombe's party emerged victorious in a landslide victory → But this was disputed by many and re-runs had to be held

- As Kasa-Vubu now had the authority to dismiss the Prime Minister on his own will as outlined by the Luluabourg Constitution, and Tshombe's staggering victory threatened Kasa-Vubu's position → Hence, Kasa-vubu acted preemptively and sidelined Tshombe

-

Led to more political turmoil → Mobutu launched another coup and banned democracy, centralised power

Achievements of Luluabourg constitution

- Assuaged concerns of various ethnic groups due to federalism and autonomy
- Was widely accepted by citizens, supported by tribal leaders like Albert Kalonji and managed to form consensus despite nearly half a decade of warring

Limitations

- The different extent of power given to both President and Prime Minister was premised on cordial relations between various political parties and actors → and the factionalism and rivalry generated an impasse

Political ambitions of Tshombe and Kasa-vubu led to impasse → Hence Mobutu came to power

Bosnia

21. **Causes**

21.1. Domestic politics

- Economic instability in the 1980s + rise of nationalist fervor + end of cold war and fall of iron curtain → League Of Communists dissolved in January 1990 → First multiparty elections saw socialists lose power in all republics except Serbia and Montenegro
- Between June 1991 and April 1992, four of the republics declared independence → Ethnic serbs in these now independent republics were uncertain about their status and were uncomfortable being a minority

They declared independence because in the 14th Extraordinary congress → which sought to discuss the future of Yugoslavia, **especially regarding the power balance**, the republics were extremely frustrated by Serbia's proposals

- Serbians advocated for more centralized Yugoslavia

- Slovenia advocate for greater power to the republics → but they were repeatedly voted down in every motion
- They walked out of the delegation after 2 days, as did Croatia, Macedonia and Bosnia shortly after
- This made the league redundant and defunct

In 1990, multi-party elections were held **in the various republics** → Not in the entire state

- In Slovenia, Croatia, Macedonia and Bosnia, nationalist parties defeated the communist ones
- Serbia and montenegro → Communist parties remained in power

In spite of Serbian opposition, Croatia and Slovenia held referendums in late '90 early '91.

→ Overwhelming majority voted in favor

→ Both declared independence on 25 June 1991

→ Serbia ruled it unconstitutional → 1974 constitution necessitated unanimous agreement to the secession of any republic

→ Henceforth, Yugoslav forces mobilized to quash the independence manouvres

21.2. Economic issues

Pre-Yugoslav war context

- Yugoslavia borrowed money from the IMF → foreign debt increased → Oil crisis magnified the economic problems
- Following Tito's death, unemployment soared, incomes fell and the economy almost collapsed
- This was caused by the **economic mismanagement of communist elites**, who recklessly borrowed abroad and in the 1980s, many of the creditor countries as well as IMF demanded their loans to be paid back → resentment towards these elites (also because of their extravagant lifestyles whilst ordinary people continued to suffer)
- These economies woes made the economic differences between the republics more prominent → Slovenia and Croatia felt that they contributed disproportionately to the federal republics and did not get back as much as they contributed
- Serbia, during the period of economic upheaval and strife, wanted Slovenia and Croatia to continue to support the poorer republics in the period of austerity → sought greater centralisation → greater desire for independence amongst Slovenes and Croats because they believed they were better off that way
- With the end of the cold war → rampant inflation ++freezing of wages → further strikes and resentment against communist elites
- By 1990, annual growth rate was negative as many previously state-owned enterprises struggled to compete in the free-market and went bankrupt
- NONETHELESS, Slovenia successfully transitioned to free market economy, whereas Serbia failed → greater economic disparity → separatism

- 21.3. Ethnic and religious nationalisms

Bosniak Muslim context

- Serbs dominated politics in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Muslims were initially viewed with distrust following WW2.
- Islamic schools were abolished
- Nonetheless, 1961 Muslims were recognised as distinct ethnic group in the census
- In 1963, Bosnia adopted a new constitution which recognised Muslims as a nation, equal to the other nations.
- Gave them equal access to share of positions in state and party bureaucracies. Social and ethnic barriers broke down in the 1960s → rise in mixed marriages + equal access to education, jobs and positions were guaranteed for all ethnic groups
- **Public manifestations of ethnic intolerance were met with brutal repression** (can link to the idea of how they were always there, but simmered down).

Lack of economic opportunities in Bosnia (GNP per capita 35% below Yugoslav average in Bosnia) led to many Serbs and Croats migrating out → By 1991, Muslims became a plural majority accounting for about 40%, Serbs 33%, and Croats almost 20%

- Belgrade campaign against Islamic fundamentalism in the early 1980s → Trial of Muslim elites → Tarnished reputation and credibility of Muslim leaders + revelations of corruption → Political disarray → Nationalist sentiment

Serbian context

- Although Yugoslavia supported 'national self-determination', and the 1974 constitution entrenched the federal system and formalized national rights → Persistent challenge of autonomy from Croatia and Slovenia republic persisted → Conflicted with Serbs who believed in unitarism and greater centralisation of power
- the 1974 constitution also gave Kosovo greater autonomy out of recognition of its majority Albanian populace, BUT DO NOTE that Kosovo was the 'Jerusalem of Serbia', and was a bastion of Serbian orthodox culture with its ornate monasteries and churches. In the 1980s, many Albanians agitated for constituent republic status, which exacerbated ethnic tensions further

Slobodan Milosevic came to power in Serbian republic in 1987 → reduced autonomy of Kosovo to gain larger support amongst Serbs

→ Albanian miners in Kosovo organized a strike to demand restoration of autonomy → turned into widespread demonstrations calling for Kosovo to be made the seventh republic in Yugoslavia → which were supported by Croatia and Slovenia in push towards greater democratization

On 23 March '89, Kosovo autonomy was revoked → rise separatist movement culminating in Kosovo war of '98-99

Kosovo incident foreshadowed future events → Serbs want to maintain hegemony, everybody else wants to leave

22. **Role of Different Actors in the Development of Conflicts**

22.1. Domestic actors (state and non-state)

1. Slovenia war of independence
 - 10 day war, Slovenia is ethnically homogenous → did not want to waste resources as was more concerned with Bosnia and Croatia which had large Serb minorities
2. Croatia war of independence (lasted more than 4 years)
 - RSK (Basically Republica Srpska in Croatia instead of Bosnia resisted against Croatian independence
 - JNA (Yugoslav army) moved into occupy all of Croatia, though faced many setbacks
 - In 1995, Croatia launched two major offensives which enabled it to control the Serb-majority areas in Croatia, effectively annihilating the RSK and pushing Yugoslav forces back

3. **Bosnian declaration of independence**

- In 1990 elections, parties representing the three main ethnicities gained seats in relative proportion to their populations
- Bosnian elections were held just as conflict was flaring up in Croatia → politics Serbo-croat communities in Bosnia
- Bosniak muslims were already fearful of the suppression of Kosovar Albanians
- Coalition party was formed
- Radovan karadzic (Leader of Serbian Bosnia) (Republika srbska) established Serb Autonomous regions from september to november 1991 → Did this unilaterally, without consulting Croatian/Bosnian counterparts
- 9 January 1992 → Republika Srpska secession

From February to March that year, independence referendum was held in Bosnia → Yugoslavia declared this null and void (unconstitutional) → 3 March 1992 Bosnia declared independence

In response, Bosnian serb militias mobilized in preparation of war

- On 7 April 1992 Bosnia's independence was recognised by the EC and USA
- Bosnian serbs laid siege on Sarajevo in response

Bosnian war

1. Croatian republic of Bosnia (Non-state actor)

- When the Croatian war of independence began, JNA used Bosnian territory to escalate attacks on Croatian soldiers → Bosniak muslim leader declared neutrality → resented by Bosnian croats
 - Croatian Catholics believed that their interests could only be protected by their own political entity and not the Muslim-dominated government → established Croatian Republic of Herzeg-Bosnia on 18 November 1991
 - Croatian Bosnian republic function as a state within in a state → formed it own military (HVO) in April 1992
2. Serbian republic of Bosnia (Republica Srpska) (Non-state actor)
 - Autumn 1991 → Declaration of Serb autonomous regions cross the country
 - Referendum confirmed that Bosnian serbs wanted to remain in Yugoslavia
 - January 1992 → Established their own republic within Bosnia
 - Established their own military (VRS) → In May 1992
 3. Bosniak muslim republic (State actor)
 - Proclaimed independence in March 1992

Triggers of Bosnian war

1. Sarajevo wedding shooting
 - At a Bosnian Serb wedding in an Orthodox church, members of the wedding party brandished Serbian flags (which was a typical ritual)
 - It was interpreted by Bosniak Muslims as a deliberate provocation
 - Several men attempted to seize the flags → led to fatal shooting
 - Failure to arrest the perpetrator was regarded as Bosnian serbs as sign of complicity of Bosniak Muslim government
 - Reinforced notion amongst Bosnian serbs that they could not live as a minority
2. Greater Serbia (irredentist movement)
 - Similar to the support they gave the RSK, they also supported republika srpska → eventual aim of unifying Serbian territories in Croatia and Bosnia with Yugoslavia
 - VRS (Army of republika srpska) received immense funding, armaments and equipment from JNA

Siege of Sarajevo (This is mainly Serbian vs Bosniak Muslim)

- On 5 April 1992, the siege of Sarajevo began
- Initially attacked by JNA, but VRS took over after withdrawal of JNA
- From 2nd May, Serbs blockaded the city → CUT OFF supplies of food and medicine, as well as water and electricity
- Siege did not end until 29 February 1996 → longest siege of a capital city in modern warfare to date

Croat-Bosniak war (This is croatian vs Bosniak Muslim)

- ArBIH (Army of Bosnia and Herzegovina) was formed → multiethnic.

- As Bosnian government failed to resist siege of Sarajevo owing to being poorly equipped and trained →increasing dependence on HVO to stop Serb advances
- Agreement of friendship and Croatia signed in July 1992 between Bosnia and Croatia (This agreement was important →HVO was now under ArBiH +Croatia transferred weapons to Bosnia to oppose Serb aggression →SIGNIFICANT as it helped Bosnia overcome UN embargo on all deliveries of weapons and military equipment as per resolution 713)

Nonetheless, alliance broke down

- Both ArBiH and HVO blamed each other for defeats →jostled for command and control
- HVO purged Bosniak members +Croats left ARBiH after increasing Islamic character of Bosnian government
- By October 1992, alliance fell apart →withheld deliveries of weapons
- Alliance ultimately broke down because they were divided as to whether to support Bosnia or not →Many Croats wanted to incorporate Bosnian Croatian territories →Resisted by Muslim Bosniaks who wanted to maintain the diverse Bosnian state as it was

War itself (Croat-Bosniak)

- Full-scale escalations in April 1993
- Siege of Mostar
- HVO launched attack in May 1993
- Full ethnic cleansing and genocide of Bosniak Muslims in Mostar
- Croatia finally put an end to the fighting
- Destroyed Bosniak Muslim cultural sites such as Ottoman-era mosques and Mostar bridge

Over the course of the war, both HVO and ArBiH massacred Bosniak and Croat civilians.

- Tudjman came under pressure from USA to support peace plan, as it would face sanctions and isolation if it did not
- → Croatia sought peace with Bosnia, on condition of American assurance of territorial integrity, loans, and membership in Council of Europe

Ethnic cleansing (primarily done to secure the desired territories and maintain demographic hegemony and reduce resistance when either Serbia or Croatia sought to integrate these territories)

Policy of ethnic cleansing was pursued by nearly all parties, but especially Serbia
Bosniak Muslim victims

- Bosnian Serbs sought to annihilate Bosniak Muslim populations, as evident in the Srebrenica massacre and Visegrad massacres. Croatian authorities also tortured and humiliated Bosniak Muslims in Mostar

Serbian victims

- In May 1992, Croat-Muslim forces burnt Serb villages and expelled their inhabitants

Croatian victims

- Victims of both Bosniak Muslims and Serbs

Srebrenica Genocide (Massacre is not suffice to highlight the brutality)

- 8000 Bosniak Muslim Men were killed by units of VRS under the command of Ratko Mladic
- Was the worst episode of mass murder in Europe since WW2 → galvanized the West into pressing for a ceasefire to end the war

Motivations for Serbs

- Srebrenica was in close proximity to Yugoslavia, and Yugoslavs sought to seize Srebrenica but would face resistance from Bosniak muslims → hence expulsion was the more 'humane option'
- But in March 1995, leader of Republika Srpska sought to make the situation insufferable for Bosnians still living in Srebrenica → Food embargo in May 1995. Bosniak fighters fled the area in late June

Turning point of war + NATO intervention (can read more in external powers)

- Markale Massacres (separate bombardments targeting civilians in Sarajevo 1. February 1994. 2. August 1995)
- UNsecgen formally requested NATO for airstrikes on Republika Srpska targets that were deemed to target civilians
- NATO also issued an ultimatum to withdraw heavy weapons around Sarajevo by 21 February, which Serbs complied and began on 17 February

SREBRENICA WAS DESIGNATED AS A 'UN SAFE AREA', the VRS invaded in July 1995

- Remaining Bosniak fighters offered little resistance → best trained-units abandoned the town
- Dutch UN peacekeepers had confiscated their weapons and refused to return them
- None of the UN peacekeepers fired at the invading VRS fighters
-

22.2. Major powers and other external state actors

European Community (EC)

- Formulated a power-sharing agreement between the three ethnic communities in the form of the **Lisbon agreement**
- But this broke down → Bosniak Muslim leader withdrew signature and opposed dividing Bosnia along ethnic lines
- Nonetheless, one of the things that severely hampered EC's ability was the conflicting interests
- Germany was inclined to recognise Slovenia and Croatia → Historical affinity with both of those countries
- France → feared rising German influence + better disposed towards Serbs → Wanted to maintain Yugoslav unity
- Spain (Catalan secessionism) and UK (Northern Ireland 'The troubles') → Wanted to maintain Yugoslav unity as they feared it would set a precedent for the rest of Europe

How disagreements hampered conflict resolution

- Netherlands, France, Germany proposed deploying an intervention force whereas Portugal, Denmark, UK opposed deploying troops → EC unable to end fighting/promote a political solution
- Nonetheless, there still was consensus/solidarity in the run-up to the formation of the EU Treaty Of Maastricht 1992 → All members agreed to recognise independence of former Yugoslav republics
- EC settled on a formula to partition Bosnia and insert UN peacekeeping forces to prevent further ethnic cleansing → relative indifference to situation in Bosnia
- Europeans were mainly reluctant to move beyond humanitarian aims and a diplomatic solution → preferred UN framework approach → BUT after USA took leadership role this all changed

USA:

Washington Agreement

- In March 1994, a Ceasefire agreement was signed between Croatia and Bosnia in the Washington conference
- Renewed the alliance between Croats and Bosniaks → both sides concentrated to defeat VRS together
- Initial role of US was highly limited and disengaged → viewed it as a European conflict out of their jurisdiction → and believed management and negotiation of the conflict should be done by EC instead

- US merely supported arms embargo initially →but their involvement heightened (Summer '92) following reports of genocide and pressure by the media and congress to get involved
- →Imposed sanctions and pushed for war crimes tribunal to prosecute involved individuals
- USA was still hesitant to commit troops even amidst mounting evidence of genocide →Due to ill-fated involvement in the Somali civil war (Brutal slaughter and murder of American troops)
- But by the time Srebrenica massacre unfolded, it was clear that Western hesitance to commit troops and general indifference led to the worst humanitarian tragedy in Europe since WW2
- USA then sought a military strategy to force the Serbs' hand to end the war
- Partly motivated by upcoming US election for Clinton, as well as declining US prestige and credibility due to lacklustre response
-

22.3. The United Nations and regional organizations

- International sanctions helped contain further warmongering by Serbia
- UNSC unanimously passed **Resolution 757**, which banned trade and prohibited any form of cooperation with Yugoslavia (30 May 1992)
- US department of treasury seized all US-based assets of Yugoslavia
- UNSC passed **resolution 787** → imposed a widespread ban on shipments to and from Yugoslavia →followed by a series of naval blockades

In April 1993, UNSC declared Srebrenica a 'safe area' → May 1993 agreement for demilitarization. By March 1995, the situation became untenable →Serb forces cut off UN access to supply road

- Dutch peacekeepers alerted command about dire conditions and encroaching Serb fighters, but failed to receive support
- Peacekeepers also demanded that NATO bomb Bosnian Serb positions in the town, but their requests were ignored
- Although principal responsibility for genocide lies with Bosnian Serb army → The UN accepted a portion of the blame

NATO involvement stepped up at the request of the UN

Stage 1: Monitoring and enforcing no fly-zone over Bosnia →later enforced naval blockade on Yugoslavia

Stage 2: **Operation Deliberate Force** →From August to September 1995 (following Markale Massacre II) → NATO aircraft struck and destroyed hundreds of Bosnian serb targets, depleting their munitions

Siege of sarajevo was eventually lifted, thanks in part to HVO and ArBiH counteroffensives + NATO contribution

- After previously being focused on containing communism and the USSR, NATO's raison d'etre evolved into supporting UN efforts to contain Yugoslav wars
- NATO → Stage 1: (July 1992) Monitored sanctions Stage 2: (October '92): Ensure compliance with no fly-zone
- NATO forces were also authorized to stop ships and inspect their cargos
- By 1994, launched air support missions and bombed Serbian targets at the request of UN commanders in response to Bosnian serb ground attacks on civilians
- When the Srebrenica massacre conference took place, the London Conference (21 July 1995) was held in which NATO employed large-scale air strikes in response to attacks on UN safe areas by Serbs
- Following the Markale marketplace shellings, NATO launched **operation deliberate force** on 30 August 1995 → large scale retaliation against Serbs
- Sustained air campaign + Bosnian-Croat cooperation following Washington conference was so overwhelming and devastating → Bosnian Serb forces capitulated
- Dayton Accords signed in November 1995, NATO provided 60,000 troops for peacekeeping

UN response to earlier part of conflict was relatively muted

→ Sceptical about feasibility of peacekeeping, unable to carry duties and face greater risks

UN action was also confined to impotent resolutions calling for ceasefire, which went unheeded

- Stronger action such as sanctions were also opposed by Russia, who were traditional allies of Serbs
- The shelling of Vaso Miskin street in May 1992 when videos and images emerged of Serb forces bombarding a food rationing distribution centre shocked UNSC into action → USA demanded sanctions against Serbia and Russia withdrew its objections
- Direct UN involvement came in the form of UNPROFOR (UN protection force) → were peace enforcers, not merely peacekeepers
- Humanitarian efforts was largest in the history of the UN
- UNPROFOR grew from 1500 troops in August 1992 to 23,000 troops by end-1994

1. UN arms embargo and economic sanctions

- Resolution 713 -arms embargo on Yugoslavia
- Resolution 757 - economic blockade of Yugoslavia
- Nonetheless, economic blockade did not lead to the overthrow of Milosevic as hoped by the US, but hurt the poor and underprivileged which further aggravated the situation as the war turned even more bitter and Yugoslavs were more resentful
- Also hindered by 'sanctions-busting'
- BUT THEN AGAIN → Sanctions gave international community leverage over Serbia → Milosevic sought to negotiate to get the sanctions lifted, even if it meant cooperating with the west

- But the arms embargo impacted the Bosnian Muslims' ability to defend themselves against the Serbs who were much better equipped.
- The organization of Islamic cooperation (OIC) defied the arms embargo after news of the Srebrenica massacre emerged

2. Peacekeeping

- Greater optimism for the UN's role in mediating conflicts emerged following the end of the cold war and the emergence of the notion that there was greater space for great power cooperation
- UN officials were still highly reluctant to put the organization and its peacekeepers in harms' way as the entire Bosnian state was in a state of perpetual war and there was no peace to keep
- UNPROFOR had many functions, protecting 'safe areas', ensuring humanitarian aid.
- Came under much criticism. 1. Bribed their way through Serbian lines to deliver humanitarian aid to Bosnia → fuelled the intransigent Serb army, making the UN complicit
- USA also believed that UNPROFOR peacekeepers was key obstacle to progress, as it made the Europeans complacent in that they did not see the value of air strikes in forcing Serbia's hand

-

3. UN safe areas

- UN safe areas were especially criticized –UN initially estimated that they required 34,000 troops to ensure full respect for these safe areas, yet only 3500 were deployed to these areas
- 'Safe areas' were perpetually attacked by VRS and seized UN equipment, weapons and humanitarian supplies for their own war efforts
- Call for greater assistance, air strikes on Serbian positions were ignored despite how desperate UN peacekeepers were

-

4. Military intervention

- European countries had peacekeepers in Bosnia → were fearful of retaliation and retribution by Serbs if they launched air strikes from European territory
- Which was proven right, 400 peacekeepers were taken hostage in May 1995
- This continued reluctance emboldened the Serbs, who stepped up their ethnic cleansing campaign

Prior to war

June 1991 Bosnia agreement.

- Zulfikarpasic-Karadzic agreement
- Loose confederation with Serbia and Montenegro
- Bosnia continued to be unified, but under Yugoslavia
- Nonetheless, by the start of 1992 it was not feasible because Bosniaks and Croats wanted their own states, but Serbs continued to remain steadfast to Yugoslavia (Izegovic leader of Bosnia abandoned this plan)

Carrington-Cutileiro Peace Plan (March '92)

- 28 March 1992 → Proposed ethnic power sharing on all administrative levels, as well as devolution of central government to local ethnic communities
- Izetbegovic once again withdrew his signature as he believed it amounted to a partition of Bosnia → many posit it was enticed by prospect of international recognition of Bosnia → which would give him greater leverage against Croats and Serbs

Trying to secure peace amidst the war

Vance-Owen peace plan

- Presented a comprehensive proposal with divided Bosnia into ten cantons, each with their own autonomy
- Several revisions due to Serb, Croat, and Bosnian disagreements of several issues
- Croat, Bosnian and Serbian representatives signed plan on 25 March 1993, but Serb representative made it clear his agreement was contingent on support of Republika Srpska assembly → Rejected in referendum in mid-May (did not want to lose territory they already held)
- Milosevic tried to salvage a plan to lift sanctions, but Bosnian Serbs refused to accept.

Owen-Stoltenberg Plan (July 1993)

- Croat-Bosniak war was at its peak in this stage
- This plan allocated nearly half of Bosnian territory to ethnic Serbs, 30% to ethnic Bosniaks and 17% to ethnic Croats
- Rejected by Bosniaks by end of August 1993

Contact Group Plan

- Bosnian Serbs intransigent → even when Milosevic sought to cooperate by cutting off economic and military assistance in return for lifting of sanctions
- Convinced USA that the only way to deal with Bosnian Serbs was through military force

Dayton accords

- Serbs faced mounting defeats as a result of Operation Storm → changed the balance of power and now Serbs were ready for negotiation

- US assistant secretary of state embarked on shuttle diplomacy, persuading warring parties to adopt principles of settlement
- On 14 September, he succeeded in convincing Republika Srpska leaders to end the siege of Sarajevo
- Dayton conference (November '95) forces principal actors to interact in close proximity and European diplomats were sidelined → focusing on actual efforts for peace
- General Framework For Peace In Bosnia was reached at Dayton → signed formally on 14 December
- Formed a decentralized state, yet maintained Bosnia's territorial integrity
- Formalised cooperation in recognising sovereignty of each others' nations as inviolable, fully respect human rights + cooperate in implementing peace and prosecuting war criminals

Criticisms of Dayton accords

- Complicated system
- Dependence on international actors economically and to suppress military conflict from flaring up again
- Entrenched ethnic identities → Continued existence of Bosnia as a state yet nonetheless partitioned by ethnic lines