

ASPECTS OF TWENTIETH CENTURY WORLD

Unit – V

Contents

1. Origin of the United Nations Organization-Achievements and Problems.....	2
2. Cold War Pacts and Treaties.....	4
3. Soviet Collapse and Post Cold War World.....	10
4. Israel Palestine Conflict –Sri Lankan Civil War.....	16
The Sri Lankan Civil War:.....	20

1. Origin of the United Nations Organization-Achievements and Problems

Introduction

The United Nations (UN) is an international organization founded in 1945. It is currently made up of 193 Member States. Its mission and work guided by the purposes and principles contained in its founding Charter and implemented by its various organs and specialised agencies. Its activities include maintaining international peace and security, protecting human rights, delivering humanitarian aid, promoting sustainable development and upholding international law.

- In 1899, the International Peace Conference was held in The Hague to elaborate instruments for settling crises peacefully, preventing wars and codifying rules of warfare.
 - It adopted the Convention for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes and established the Permanent Court of Arbitration, which began work in 1902. This court was the forerunner of UN International Court of Justice.
- The forerunner of the United Nations was the League of Nations, an organization conceived in circumstances of the First World War, and established in 1919 under the Treaty of Versailles "to promote international cooperation and to achieve peace and security."
 - The International Labour Organization (ILO) was also created in 1919 under the Treaty of Versailles as an affiliated agency of the League.
- The name "United Nations", coined by United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt. A document called The Declaration by United Nations was signed in 1942 by 26 nations, pledging their Governments to continue fighting together against the Axis Powers (Rome-Berlin-Tokyo Axis) and bound them against making a separate peace.
- United Nations Conference on International Organization (1945)
 - Conference held in San Francisco (USA), was attended by representatives of 50 countries and signed the United Nations Charter.
- The UN Charter of 1945 is the foundational treaty of the United Nations, as an inter-governmental organization.

Components

The main organs of the UN are

- the General Assembly,
- the Security Council,
- the Economic and Social Council,
- the Trusteeship Council,
- the International Court of Justice,
- and the UN Secretariat.

All the 6 were established in 1945 when the UN was founded.

Achievements and Failures of the UNO

- The UN defined, codified and expanded the realm of international law, governing the legal responsibilities of States in their conduct with each other, and their treatment of individuals within State boundaries.
- The U.N. has solved many violent conflicts, prevented wars, and saved millions of lives .
- More than 560 multilateral treaties on human rights, refugees, disarmament, trade, oceans, outer space, etc..encompassing all aspects of international affairs were negotiated by the U.N.
- The ECOSOC continually monitors the progress of development, particularly in the light of the MDGs.
- It has created a new UN Committee of Experts on Global Geospatial Information Management which brings together government experts from all Member States to compile and disseminate best practices and experiences on geospatial information which helps in the context of sustainable development and humanitarian assistance.
- The ICJ has a positive effect on the development of International Law and the propagation of the principles of sovereignty, non-conquest, human rights and the rights of existence and self-defence of a state.
- The ICJ provides an additional option for states to settle their disputes peacefully through third party intervention, and this has reduced the threat of open war.

Failures:

- In 1970, though the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NPT) was signed by 190 nations, all five superpowers owned nuclear weapons. Despite the NPT and Partial Test Ban Treaty, several countries – North Korea, Israel, Pakistan, and India have developed nuclear weapons. Thus the UN has failed to enforce regulations on offending nations.
- Though the ICJ has resolved major international disputes, the U.N.'s veto powers have limited its effectiveness at critical times.
- Human Rights violations are happening at conflict-prone regions like Gaza-strip but UNSC has failed as the United States vetoes any action against Israel.
- The Arab Spring in the Middle East which caused thousands of deaths and regime changes, the rise of ISIS, gruesome killings might have been prevented if the Member States of the U.N. had the ability to resolutely act in a timely manner.
- But the U.N. is not a world government, and it does not have a standing army of peace-keepers ready for deployment.
- NGO workers from around the world have blamed that vulnerable people are being denied representation at the UN by the dysfunctional nature of the NGO committee and its parent body, the Ecosoc.
- The ICJ is noted for its failures to successfully resolve inter-state disputes. To date there are more than 30 unresolved frontier cases concerning land of greater value, which has never been submitted to the ICJ, because one party's claim is not on legal grounds.
- Major issues of peace and security between the more powerful states are rarely submitted as most governments tend to "consider the recognition of the jurisdiction of the court as infringing on their sovereignty".
- There is no real means of enforcing the ICJ's verdict.

2. Cold War Pacts and Treaties

The Cold War has been defined by Florence Elliott and Michael Summer-skill in A Dictionary of Politics "as a state of tension between countries in which each side adopts policies designed to strengthen itself and weaken the other, the line falling short of actual hot war." The cold war has been a predominant factor in determining the conduct of international affairs in the post-Second World War period. It envisaged an era of neither peace nor war between Soviet

Union and her own allies on one hand, and USA and a score of its allies on the other. The term "Cold War" was firstly used by Bernard Baruch, an American statesman who in a speech to South Carolina Legislature, on April 16, 1947 said "let us not be deceived, we are today in the midst of a cold war". Walter Lippmann popularized the term in 1947 describing the situation that had arisen between the Western powers and Soviet Union. The Western Powers and the Soviet Union had come together to fight against the Axis aggression during the Second World War, but however, their relations, though cordial were suffering from mutual distrust and jealousy. The delay on opening the second front, the secrecy over the atom bomb and refusal to invite the Polish provisional government to San Francisco made Soviet Union suspicious of the Anglo - American motives. The West had felt that Russia had annexed considerable territory by waging war against Japan at the last moment. This mutual distrust led to sharp rivalry as soon as the World War II came to an end.

Treaties and Pacts

Forging strategic alliances by signing military pacts was another notable strategy used by both the powers to enlarge their camps. In 1948 Czechoslovakia was the only democratic state in Eastern Europe and was a buffer between the capitalist bloc and the Soviet Union. In the elections of May 1948 the Communist party swept the polls. This further alarmed the western powers.

Moscow Ban Treaty (1963)

Then came the Moscow Ban Treaty of 1963 which became a sort of light that poured into the darkness of the cold war and became a beacon of hope to guide the ship of human civilization, tossing up and down in the tumultuous sea of cold war. This treaty signed by USSR, USA and UK which postulated the prohibition of the nuclear tests, aimed at the achievement of an agreement on the general and complete disarmament and prohibited the nuclear test explosion in atmosphere or outer space or the ocean, but not underground.

However, in 1964 China went ahead with the first atom bomb explosion which greatly stirred the General Assembly and it decided to convene a Conference of the five nuclear powers. In November 1965 it adopted a resolution urging all the nations to suspend all tests of nuclear and thermonuclear weapons. It even sought to extend the ban to the underground tests which were permitted under the Moscow Treaty of 1963. However, USA and UK refused to comply with the General Assembly resolution unless a guarantee was provided against similar explosions by other states.

Outer Space Treaty (1967)

This treaty was formally signed on 27 January 1967 and came into force on 10 October 1967. It laid down the principles governing peaceful activities of the state in outer space and prohibited nuclear weapons and their landing on the moon and other celestial bodies for military bases. Under the treaty the signatory states agreed not to place in orbit around the earth any objectives carrying nuclear weapons or other kinds of weapons of mass destruction. It also forbade the use of military personnel for scientific research of peaceful purposes. It was agreed that all stations, installations, equipment and space vehicles on the moon and other celestial bodies shall be open to the representatives of other states parties to the Treaty on the basis of reciprocity. The treaty was thrown open to other states for signatures, who could accede to it.

Treaty of Tlatelolco (1967)

In 1967 the Tlatelolco Treaty was concluded by Mexico and El Salvador at Mexico which prohibited the testing, use, manufacture, production or acquisition by any means, as well as receipt, storage, installation, deployment and any form of possession of nuclear weapons in Latin America. Under the Additional Protocol II, the nuclear weapon states undertook to respect the statute of military denuclearization of Latin America and not to contribute to acts involving a violation of the Treaty, nor to use or threaten to use nuclear weapons, against the parties to the treaty. However, the treaty permitted the explosion of nuclear devices for peaceful purposes.

Non-Proliferation Treaty (1968)

The treaty on the Non-Proliferation of the Nuclear weapons was simultaneously signed at London, Moscow and Washington on July 1, 1968 and actually came into force on 5 March 1970. The treaty based on the draft submitted by the Seventeen Nations Disarmament Committee, prohibited the transfer by nuclear weapon states to any recipient whatsoever of nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices or of control over them. The signatory states were not to encourage or induce any non-nuclear weapon state to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons. The non-nuclear states acceding to the treaty were also not to manufacture or otherwise acquire nuclear weapons or other nuclear explosive devices. However, the treaty granted the right to the member states to develop research, production and use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes without disorientation. However, this left the issue of inspection and control unresolved.

Sea-Bed Treaty (1971)

In February 1971, the treaties on the prohibition of the emplacement of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction on the seabed and the ocean floor and in the subsoil thereof, was concluded by UK, USA and Soviet Union. The treaty actually came into force on 18 May, 1972 and the treaty provided that the signatory states would not implant or emplace on the seabed and the ocean-floor and in the subsoil thereof, beyond the outer limit of a seabed zone, any nuclear weapons or any other type of weapons of mass destruction as well as structures. The members were also given the right to verify through observations, the activities of other states.

Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT) - I (1972)

In order to achieve the objective of disarmament attention was also paid to the limitation of the strategic arms. The two Super Powers – USA and USSR held prolonged negotiations at Geneva and finally agreed to meet at Helsinki. This was indeed a significant step in the direction of disarmament because the two powers agreed in principle to restrain and put a stop to the fierce competition for the acquisition of sophisticated weapons. Though the talks did not prove fruitful, they indicated the willingness of the two Super Powers to reduce armaments and other hazards without jeopardizing their security and prestige. The negotiations continued for nearly four years before the conclusion of Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty of 1972. It is said that the two countries held as many as 127 plenary meetings before the conclusion of the above treaty.

The SALT-I was formally signed on 26 May 1972 to curb the race in nuclear arms between the two super powers. In fact, the agreement broadly consisted of two separate treaties viz. Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile System and the Interim Agreement on certain Measures with respect to the limitation of the strategic offensive arms. While the former was concluded for an unlimited period, the later was of a five-year duration.

The Anti-Ballistic Missile System Treaty permitted the two super powers to have only two sites for ballistic missile defenses, one for the protection of their national capital area and the other for the protection of the field of Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs). The treaty also laid down details regarding the dimensions of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) system the two countries were to have. Each system was to have not more than six ABM launchers and 100 ABM interrupter missiles at launching sites.

The national capital area was not to have more than 133 ABM radar complexes, each with a diameter not exceeding three kilometers. The complex around the Missile launching region was not having more than 18 ABM radars and two large-phased ABM radars. The two powers also agreed not to develop, test or deploy ABM launchers which could launch more than one interceptor missile at a time. The treaty also prohibited the testing and development of automatic, semiautomatic or other similar systems for rapid reloading of ABM launchers. The two powers were permitted to modernize their ABM systems through replacement, but this was to be done strictly within the quantitative ceiling provided under the treaty.

The Interim Agreement with regard to the limitation of the strategic offensive arms was a very complex agreement. It covered both land-based ICBMs and submarine launched ballistic missiles. The strength of ICBMs for Soviet Union and USA was fixed at 1618 and 1054 respectively. On the basis of their actual strengths on 1 July, 1971 the two powers undertook not to convert their landbased launches into light ICBMs. The two powers were permitted to undertake modernization and replace their strategic offensive arms, but they had to scrupulously follow the numerical limits prescribed by the treaty. An agreement regarding the procedure of agreement was also reached between the two powers.

Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START)

On July 31, 1991, President Mikhail Gorbachev and George Bush signed the historic Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) to reduce their strategic nuclear arsenals by about 30 percent and hailed it as a signal dispelling five decades of mutual mistrust. This treaty was the result of nearly a decade's efforts and it effected the first real cuts in long range nuclear weapons.

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)

Despite the friendship of the United States, Western European countries felt insecure. Communist victory in Czechoslovakia added to their fears.

The Western European countries were now willing to consider a collective security solution. The representatives of Great Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg met in Brussels and signed a treaty in March 1948 which provided for military, political, economic and cultural collaboration. After sometime USA, Italy, Canada, Iceland, Denmark, Norway, Ireland and Portugal joined the five Brussels Treaty Powers resulting in the formation of NATO. Under NATO, all the member states agreed to regard an attack on any one of them as an attack on all of them and placed their defence forces under a joint NATO

Command Organisation. This collective defence arrangement applied only to attacks that occurred in Europe or North America and did not include conflicts in colonial territories. In 1952, Greece and Turkey were admitted to NATO and West Germany joined in 1955.

Warsaw Treaty Organisation

When West Germany became a member of NATO, USSR saw it as a direct threat and decided to make a counter arrangement. In May 1955, a “treaty of mutual friendship, cooperation and mutual assistance” was signed by Soviet Union and seven of its European allies. It was named as The Warsaw Pact, as the treaty was signed in Warsaw, the capital of Poland. The members were Soviet Union, Albania, Poland, Romania, Hungary, East Germany, Czechoslovakia, and Bulgaria. The treaty called upon member states to come to the defence of any member if it was attacked by an outside force. A unified military command under Marshall Ivan S. Konev of the Soviet Union was set up. The Warsaw Pact remained valid till 1991, the year of collapse of Soviet Union.

South East Asian Treaty Organisation (SEATO)

In 1949 China turned into a Communist state under the leadership of Mao. Communism was spreading from China to Korea. Alarmed by the spread of communism in the Asian region, in September 1951, a tripartite military alliance was signed between the US, Australia and New Zealand (known as the ANZUS treaty). In 1954 the US signed a Mutual Defence Treaty with Nationalist China (Taiwan), providing the latter with American support in the event of an attack or invasion by Communist China. In September of 1954, USA, France, Great Britain, New Zealand, Australia, the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan formed the Southeast Asia Treaty Organisation (SEATO). SEATO is seen as an Asian-Pacific version of NATO. Interestingly only two south-east Asian countries, the Philippines and Thailand, had taken up membership and the rest of the countries refused to be part of it. The alliance was headquartered at Bangkok.

SEATO existed only for consultation, leaving each individual nation to react individually to internal threats. SEATO was not as popular as NATO. With the end of Vietnam War, SEATO was disbanded in 1977.

Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO)

In February 1955, Iraq and Turkey signed a "pact of mutual cooperation" at Baghdad. The membership was open to all countries in the region. In April, Great Britain joined the Pact, followed by Pakistan and Iran. The aim was to check communist influence. A series of events took place in Middle East in 1958 which threatened regional stability: the Egypt–Syria union,

revolution in Iraq and civil unrest in Lebanon. In response to these developments, the United States intervened in Lebanon. The members of the Baghdad Pact except for Iraq endorsed the US intervention. Iraq left the pact. As a result, the other signatories of the Baghdad Pact formed the Central Treaty Organisation (CENTO), moving its headquarters to Ankara, Turkey. United States continued to support the organisation as an associate, but not as a member. In 1979, the Iranian revolution led to the overthrow of the Shah and Iran withdrew from CENTO. Pakistan also withdrew that year after the organisation ceased to play an active role. CENTO was formally disbanded in 1979.

3. Soviet Collapse and Post-Cold War World

With the creation of the USSR and the subsequent rise of communist parties within the world at large and in Central and Eastern Europe in particular the world entered a new era in the early 20th century. The socialist countries undertook to consult together on all international questions involving their common interests, and to set up a unified military command, with its headquarters in Moscow. Two formal alliances – NATO and the Warsaw Pact – now confronted one another in Europe. With the creation of the NATO alliance in 1949 it became necessary to take steps by the socialist republics to consolidate their power. For this reason, the Warsaw Pact was drafted and implemented in 1955. The member countries that later comprised part of the larger Socialist Bloc were: The Soviet Union, Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, Hungary, Poland, and Romania. These countries were later reinforced with the inclusion of other important nations such as China, Cuba, Vietnam, Afghanistan, etc.

The world, as it existed in the Cold War era, had attained a begrudging stability due to the existence of two opposing monoliths, i.e. the US and the USSR (and therefore NATO and Warsaw Pact countries). It is thus not without basis to say that both sides had to consider a far greater set of implications for pursuing their interests than is the case now, be it with the case of the Cuban Missile crisis or the Afghan crisis.

Mikhail Gorbachev cranked out a slew of slogans, including glasnost, perestroika and ‘new thinking’ in an effort to rescue socialism in the Soviet Union. Despite these shocking similarities of his policies to Khrushchev’s revisionism (Gorbachev was actually more revisionist than Khrushchev), Gorbachev was adamant in declaring himself to be a true Communist. The USSR collapsed in 1991. With it, there started the disintegration of the Socialist Bloc.

Change from Bipolar to Unipolar World System

In the late eighties the sequence of events took such a rapid turn that world scenario bears no resemblance with the World. In the wake of perestroika and glasnost a wind of change swept the Soviet Union. It was followed by collapse of Communism in all East European countries, crumbling of Soviet bloc and the eventual end of the Cold War. Gulf War (1991) rendered the USA as the only super power in the World and a New World order was claimed by it to be in the offing. By the end of 1991 the world witnessed disintegration of the USSR and secessionist civil war in Yugoslavia. In Europe the process of integration gained momentum after EEC's decision to form single economic market by December 1992. The pattern of international relations that was conspicuous in Cold War days faded into oblivion. There was a complete transformation of world scenario and a new pattern of international relations started emerging.

New World Order

Amid the turmoil of the Persian Gulf War, President George Bush began talking hopefully of a "New World Order" - "a system of international understating that could restore stability and prevent future conflicts from breaking out". After winning the Gulf war, President George Bush has reiterated his promise made in September 1990, to build a new world order which would be based on "cooperation" between the US and the Soviet Union, and which will allow the UN an important role. He aimed at building a new world order bases on collective security and rule of law. Another significant element of Bush's new world was nuclear nonproliferation. He did not want to miss the opportunity to "march forward". He wanted his country-men to make maximum use of the opportunity provided by the Gulf war, to march forward on their proclaimed path of making the world better. For many Americans the "Vietnam Complex" was over and they were tempted to throw their now-found muscle power around to achieve their objectives. The spectacular success of Patriot missiles and other high-tech weapons seemed to have worked wonders for the US.

There was already a rush of third world countries for buying American arms. American arms industry that was facing slump after the end of the Cold War suddenly regained its lost confidence. According to an estimate, Kuwait was to spend \$55 billion towards its reconstruction, and 70 percent of 200 contracts that it signed with foreign companies during the last few days after the war was over had gone to the United States. Besides these sudden and unexpected gains, Washington utilized this "opportunity" to wrest vital concessions from

others in regard to trade and business. It tried to dominate the Uruguay Round of talks and forced the entry of its companies into Third World countries.

In mid-1970s, the nations of the South proposed a New International Economic Order (NIEO) intended to bridge the yawning gap between the rich and the poor worlds by instituting fairer international trading practices and increasing the order of magnitude of international assistance for rapid development of the South. Now the US adopted the slogan but the contents of the new concept were totally different. The components of the previous concept of new economic world order demanded by Third World countries of the South were: new economic order, new information order, international peace, and democratization of international Organisations including the U.N. Some of their main demands were removal of poverty in the Third World, and reduction of gap between North and South, elimination of information imperialism practiced by developed countries through multinationals, increasing the power of developing countries in UN, World Bank, IMF and GATT, checking the spread of nuclear weapons and gradually eliminating them, and removing war hysteria. None of these demands was accepted by the rich countries of the North. The US always used its dominance in different international bodies for thwarting efforts at fashioning a new economic order. The last decade of Reaganism and Thatcherism ridiculed the NIEO and put in its place new ideas such as “Structural adjustments”.

The exposition of a New World order came from the President Bush. Ever since the Soviet went out of the Cold War business, he had been resorting to this catch phrase. Its scope was global not national as those of two former Presidents, Lyndon Johnson- “Great Society” and Kennedy – “New Frontier” were. All available evidence points to certain facts. The New world order remained to be dominated by the USA as the sole surviving super power. The mighty dollar was expected to be supreme again. The US was likely to have a subservient UN at its disposal. New power alignments were forged and a new world map of friends and enemies was charted. After the end of the Gulf war, if one was to go by Bush’s exposition the new world was not be the end of the old world order of guns and international power politics, it was to mark according to critics, the beginning of a new world disorder. As a cynic put it, the US was to have the whip hand. Moreover, the disappearance of the Soviet Union as a rival and challenger to be reckoned with, the US was free to do as it pleased. The new world order was to be designed and run by the Group of 7 (G-8) with the USA as the star and other cast in supporting roles. This was a world to be run by the rich for the rich with reasonable pickings for the middle class. The poorer countries could fend for themselves.

Unipolar World or Interdependent World

There are two views regarding the emerging world order. First, the world is described as more or less unipolar, clearly dominated by the sole super power USA. After the end of the Cold War, the world grew unipolar where the US mostly attempted to impose its political agenda on all regions. This extreme version claims that the US is a neo-imperial power wishing to force Third World countries into an exploitative global economic system. According to this viewpoint, after winning the Cold War, America is in the centre of world politics where its responsibility is to convert the “American leadership into increasingly institutionalized forms”. But American policy makers are realistic enough to assume, that the USA is hardly in a position to achieve this goal in an arbitrary manner. The military superiority alone provides only the frame for an envisaged system of “domination through partnership”.

The second viewpoint foresees a growing interdependence among the developed countries of the so-called north, based on shared values like democracy and free market economy and carried out through a concept of “partners in leadership among the three major centres of power, i.e. the USA, European Union (EU) and Japan or in other words, in securing the wealth of the north. Thus, the World today is not unipolar, but global power relationship is in a flux because different centres of power have different kind of power. In military affairs, the USA is pre-eminent. But in economic affairs, Germany and Japan are the centres of power and they do not recognize American economic leadership.

Certain apprehensions were expressed throughout the world regarding Bush’s concept of new world order. Many scholars criticized it to the extent of dubbing it as a new type of pax-American. That is why Bush abruptly dropped the slogan as soon as the Gulf war was won. “People were trying to read too much into it”, one of his aides complained.

But the search for a new World order has continued, and in January 1992 it focused on an unusual summit meeting of the United Nations Security Council. The holding of this first ever summit meeting of the Security Council reflected the new realities of power in a world that is no longer dominated by the two superpowers of the Cold War. “It is symbolic of a world that isn’t bipolar but it is also not a simple unipolar world run by the United States”, said Professor Joseph S. Nye Jr. of Harvard University. He further said, “It’s symbolic of a world in which we are the biggest power, but we cannot do things alone- we need to leverage our power to get things done.”

Instead of leadership by one or two super powers, many scholars and government analysts predict the evolution of what some call “collegial power” – a loosely structured world in which leadership is shared among several key nations in different combinations depending on the nature of the issue. On economic issues, leadership is likely to gravitate to a financial Big Three: The United States, Europe and Japan. On issues of military security the United States is still likely to take the lead, as of Russia, France, Britain and other countries for joint police actions abroad. With the disintegration of the Soviet Union the global power scenario underwent a radical change as the Soviet Union was not just a nation but a super power. The emergence of a large number of independent nations that formed part of the former USSR within such a short span of time had no doubt gone down as a momentous event in the history of international relations.

Impact on Third World

The break-up of the Soviet Union brought negative implications for the Third World especially the Socialist-Oriented ones. The demise of the Socialist Superpower, the USSR made many a Third World nation vulnerable to external interference, especially from the west. The developing countries had in the past looked at the Soviet Union for succour and moral support in times of need. The policies of new Republics especially the more prosperous ones like Russia and Ukraine became less sympathetic towards the Third World because their primary concern was to attain national progress without ideological blinkers. The fall of the USSR added a whole new dimension to the question of separatism that had been plaguing many nations including a good number of developing countries. The thrust all across the globe soon concentrated on establishing bilateral contacts to gain maximum economic leverage. Many west European Governments started already courting Republics of Russia and Ukraine because these Republics could form an excellent market for their products and also a rich source for the supply of raw materials like coal, oil, timber and gas which these Slavic Republics have in abundance. The Third World might suffer another setback on account of greater inclinations of Western developed countries towards East European countries and newly independent Republics.

Both models – unipolar and interdependent World –discussed above usually tend to reduce the importance of the Third World to the status of a subordinated entity in world affairs. The reluctance to accept necessary changes in the world’s economy as well as the heated discussion on prevention of immigration from Third World countries illustrates that clearly. In the emerging pattern and centres of power Third World countries do only count if they serve

direct and vital strategic interests of one of the centres of power. This relates not primarily to military interests but many very well served economic considerations, like controlling the oil-producing areas of the Middle East in order to put economic interests of the European Community (EC) and especially Japan to size without being dependent on the oil- like the USA made clear during the Gulf War.

The Third World is going to be excluded more and more from the benefit of integration in world market. Moreover, it is highly uncertain, whether a country like the USA is going to continue to float money without the slightest chance of returns to insignificant countries in the World anymore, as the need of aiding regimes in order to contain Communism has become obsolete.

The first ever summit meeting of the Security Council held on 31st January, 1992 to assign a new role and importance to the world organization. Although non-permanent members in the Council, including India and Zimbabwe, went along with the Summit declaration, there is no denying the fact that there is apprehension among many Third World countries that the pendulum of the Security Council may swing from one extreme of inaction witnessed in the Cold War days to the other extreme of excessive intervention.

The transformation of the third world into the neo-colonial appendage of the US could only be intensified if the strongest anti-neoliberal force was dismembered. Let us look at the case of the World Bank and the IMF's structural adjustment programmes as they have been propagated after the Cold War. One would find that there is a great increase in the sheer number of cases of structural adjustment within the third world and as a consequence there has been a drastic rise in inequality within the same. Let us now compare this to the recent foreign policy of the US which, openly and without consideration to the UN's own resolutions, targets all sovereign states that constitute a potential threat to itself or its allies. One can clearly see that if the USSR was still present then at least the absurd 'David and Goliath' situation, as it exists at this time, would not have been so. Needless to say, the world as a whole and its constituting countries (particularly the third world) has lost a great equalising force with the dismembering of the USSR.

4. Israel Palestine Conflict –Sri Lankan Civil War

Israel-Palestine Conflict

- The seeds of the conflict were laid in 1917 when the then British Foreign Secretary Arthur James Balfour expressed official support of Britain for a Jewish "national home" in Palestine under the Balfour Declaration. The lack of concern for the "rights of existing non-Jewish communities" i.e. the Arabs led to prolonged violence.
- Unable to contain Arab and Jewish violence, Britain withdrew its forces from Palestine in 1948, leaving responsibility for resolving the competing claims to the newly created United Nations. The UN presented a partition plan to create independent Jewish and Arab states in Palestine. Most Jews in Palestine accepted the partition but most Arabs did not.
- In 1948, the Jewish declaration of Israel's independence prompted surrounding Arab states to attack. At the end of the war, Israel controlled about 50 percent more territory than originally envisioned UN partition plan. Jordan controlled the West Bank and Jerusalem's holy sites, and Egypt controlled the Gaza Strip.
- 1964: Founding of the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO)
- 1967: In Six-day Arab- Israeli war, Israeli forces seize the Golan Heights from Syria, the West Bank & East Jerusalem from Jordan and Sinai Peninsula & Gaza strip from Egypt.
- The United Nations grants the PLO observer status in 1975 and recognizes Palestinians' right to self-determination.
- Camp David Accords (1978): "Framework for Peace in the Middle East" brokered by U.S. set the stage for peace talks between Israel and its neighbors and a resolution to the "Palestinian problem". This however remained unfulfilled.
- 1981: Israel effectively annexes the Golan but this is not recognized by the United States or the international community.
- 1987: Founding of Hamas, a violent offshoot of Egypt's Muslim Brotherhood seeking "to raise the banner of Allah over every inch of Palestine" through violent jihad.
- 1987: Tensions in the occupied territories of West Bank and Gaza reached boiling point resulting in the First Intifada (Palestinian Uprising). It grew into a small war between Palestinian militants and the Israeli army.

- 1988: Jordan cedes to the PLO all the country's territorial claims in the West Bank and Eastern Jerusalem.
- 1993: Under the Oslo Accords Israel and the PLO agree to officially recognize each other and renounce the use of violence. The Oslo Accords also established the Palestinian Authority, which received limited autonomy in the Gaza Strip and parts of the West Bank.
- 2005: Israel begins a unilateral withdrawal of Jews from settlements in Gaza. However, Israel kept tight control over all border crossings (blockade).
- 2006: Hamas scores a victory in Palestinian Authority elections. The vote leaves the Palestinian house divided between Fatah movement, represented by President Mahmoud Abbas, and Hamas, which will control the cabinet and parliament. Efforts at cohabitation fail almost immediately.
- 2007: Palestinian Movement Splits after few months of formation of a joint Fatah-Hamas government. Hamas militants drive Fatah from Gaza. Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas appoints a new government in Ramallah (West Bank), which is quickly recognized by the United States and European Union. Gaza remains under Hamas control.
- 2012- UN upgrades Palestinian representation to that of "non-member observer state".
- 2014- Israel responds to the kidnapping and murder of three Jewish teenagers in the West Bank by arresting numerous Hamas members. Militants respond by firing rockets from Gaza. Clashes end in uneasy Egyptian-brokered ceasefire.
- 2014- Fatah and Hamas form a unity government, though distrust remains between the two factions.

The Territorial Puzzle

- West Bank: The West Bank is sandwiched between Israel and Jordan. One of its major cities is Ramallah, the de facto administrative capital of Palestine. Israel took control of it in the 1967 war and has over the years established settlements there.
- Gaza: The Gaza Strip located between Israel and Egypt. Israel occupied the strip after 1967, but relinquished control of Gaza City and day-to-day administration in most of the territory during the Oslo peace process. In 2005, Israel unilaterally removed Jewish settlements from the territory, though it continues to control international access to it.

- Golan Heights: The Golan Heights is a strategic plateau that Israel captured from Syria in the 1967 war. Israel effectively annexed the territory in 1981. Recently, the USA has officially recognized Jerusalem and Golan Heights a part of Israel.
- Palestinian Authority- Created by the 1993 Oslo Accords, it is the official governing body of the Palestinian people, led by President Mahmoud Abbas of the Fatah faction. Hobbled by corruption and by political infighting, the PA has failed to become the stable negotiating partner its creators had hoped.
- Fatah- Founded by the late Yasir Arafat in the 1950s, Fatah is the largest Palestinian political faction. Unlike Hamas, Fatah is a secular movement, has nominally recognized Israel, and has actively participated in the peace process.
- Hamas- Hamas is regarded as a terrorist organization by the U.S. government. In 2006, Hamas won the Palestinian Authority's legislative elections. It ejected Fatah from Gaza in 2007, splitting the Palestinian movement geographically, as well.

Two-State Solution

- The “two state solution” is based on a UN resolution of 1947 which proposed two states - one would be a state where Zionist Jews constituted a majority, the other where the Palestinian Arabs would be a majority of the population. The idea was however rejected by the Arabs.
- For decades, it has been held by the international community as the only realistic deal to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

Why is the solution so difficult to achieve?

- Borders: There is no consensus about precisely where to draw the line – with Israel building settlements and constructing barriers in areas like the West Bank that creates a de facto border. This makes it difficult to establish that land as part of an independent Palestine, breaking it up into non-contiguous pieces.
- Jerusalem: Both sides claim Jerusalem as their capital and consider it a center of religious worship and cultural heritage making its division difficult.
- In December 2017, Israel declared Jerusalem as its capital and the step found support from the USA, intensifying the situation in the region.
- Refugees: Large numbers of Palestinians who fled their homes in what is now Israel, during the preceding wars as well as their descendants believe they deserve the right to return but Israel is against it.

- Divided Political Leadership on Both sides: The Palestinian leadership is divided - two-state solution is supported by Palestinian nationalists in West Bank but the leadership in Gaza does not even recognize Israel. Further, while successive Israeli Prime Ministers - Ehud Barak, Ariel Sharon, Ehud Olmert and Benjamin Netanyahu - have all accepted the idea of a Palestinian state, they have differed in terms of what it should actually comprise.

Global Stand on Israel -Palestine Conflict

- Nearly 83% of world countries have officially recognized Israel as a sovereign state and maintain diplomatic relations with it.
- However, at the same time, many countries are sympathetic to Palestine.

What do both parties want?

- Palestine wants Israeli to halt all expansionary activities and retreat to pre-1967 borders. It wants to establish a sovereign Palestine state in West Bank and Gaza with East Jerusalem as its capital.
- Palestine wants Palestine refugees who lost their homes in 1948 be able to come back.
- Israel wants it to be recognised as a Jewish state. It wants the Palestine refugees to return only to Palestine, not to Israel.

India's Stand

- India was one of the few countries to oppose the UN's partition plan in November 1947, echoing its own experience during independence a few months earlier. In the decades that followed, the Indian political leadership actively supported the Palestinian cause and withheld full diplomatic relations with Israel.
- India recognised Israel in 1950 but it is also the first non-Arab country to recognise Palestine Liberation Organisation (PLO) as the sole representative of the Palestinian. India is also one of the first countries to recognise the statehood of Palestine in 1988.
- In the 2014, India favored UNHRC's resolution to probe Israel's human rights violations in Gaza. Despite supporting probe, India abstained from voting against Israel in UNHRC IN 2015.
- As a part of Link West Policy, India has de-hyphenated its relationship with Israel and Palestine in 2018 to treat both the countries mutually independent and exclusive.

- In June 2019, India voted in favor of a decision introduced by Israel in the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) that objected to granting consultative status to a Palestinian non-governmental organization
- So far India has tried to maintain the image of its historical moral supporter for Palestinian self-determination, and at the same time to engage in the military, economic, and other strategic relations with Israel.

The Sri Lankan Civil War:

The war in Sri Lanka between the separatist Tamil forces and the government was a heavy one with a death toll of over 150000 from both sides including civilians. Starting in 1983 as a minor insurgency, it took almost 26 years for the government to finally suppress the bloody civil war.

Causes of the Sri Lankan Civil War

The majority of Sri Lankans are ethnic Sinhalese, a group of Indo-European peoples that had migrated to the island from northern India in the BC 500s. The Sinhalese had contacts with the Tamils who were settled in the southern part of the Indian subcontinent. A major migration of the Tamils occurred between the 7th and the 11th centuries CE.

When the British started ruling the country in 1815, the approximate population of the Sinhalese was roughly 3 million and the Tamils numbered up to 300,000. Apart from the ethnicities, the two groups also differed in their religious affiliations. The Sinhalese were predominantly Buddhist and the Tamils were mostly Hindu. The British ruled over Sri Lanka from 1815 to 1948. During this time, they brought nearly a million Tamils to work in the coffee, tea and rubber plantations to the island-nation. The British also set up good educational and other infrastructure in the northern part of the country, which was where the Tamils were in a majority. They also favoured the Tamils in the civil service. All this naturally fostered ill-feeling among the Sinhalese.

After attaining independence, the new government initiated many laws that discriminated against the Tamils. Sinhalese was declared the sole official language which effectively eliminated the Tamils from government service. A law was also passed which simply barred Indian Tamils from getting citizenship. The Tamils started demanding equal rights in their homeland. Their demands were just and their methods peaceful.

However, ethnic tension was rising in the country and the successive Sinhalese governments did nothing to provide equal rights and opportunities to the Tamil people. They were even targets of sectarian violence.

Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam

The LTTE (Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam) was formed in 1976 by Prabhakaran with the intention of acquiring a homeland for the Tamils in Sri Lanka in the north and east parts of the island. The group first struck in July 1983 when they attacked an army patrol at Tirunelveli in Jaffna. 13 army men were killed which prompted violence on civilian Tamils by the majority community. The initial days of the LTTE were focused on fighting other Tamil factions and consolidating power as the sole representative of the Sri Lankan Tamils. This was achieved by 1986, the same year it captured Jaffna.

There were many skirmishes between the government and the insurgents in which civilians were also affected. Many Tamils left their homes for the eastern part of the country.

Indian Intervention in the Sri Lankan Civil War

In 1987, Rajiv Gandhi decided to intervene in the situation mainly because of separatism issues in Tamil Nadu and also to avoid the potential swarm of refugees from Sri Lanka to Indian shores, setting a new stage for the India-Sri Lanka relations

Indian Peacekeeping Force (IPKF) was sent to the island in the hope of bringing about peace. This move proved to be a terrible disaster. Instead of negotiating a settlement between both parties, the Indian troops ended up fighting the Eelam group. About 1200 Indian men died in the war. Rajiv Gandhi was also a victim of the LTTE when in 1991, he was assassinated by a human bomb at an election rally in Sriperumbudur in Tamil Nadu.

After the IPKF had withdrawn in 1990, the fighting continued more intensely. Sri Lankan President Premadasa was also killed by the LTTE in 1993 in a human bomb.

The LTTE, at its height, was a full-fledged militia with even an air force of its own. It employed women and even children in their activities.

The war went on with numerous counts of atrocities and brutalities perpetrated by both sides. The civilians also suffered terribly. Lakhs of people were displaced in the protracted war.

A ceasefire was declared a few times by the LTTE, only to resume fighting later. Peace talks were also held with the intervention of international actors, particularly Norway. Nothing came to any avail.

Results of the Sri Lankan Civil War

Finally, the Rajapaksa government decided to come hard on the LTTE in an extreme offensive starting in 2007. There was intense fighting between the government forces and the LTTE in which thousands of civilians were caught in the line of fire. The government was also accused of targeting civilians and destroying entire villages.

International and United Nations observers describe the events that led to the defeat of the LTTE in 2009 as a 'bloodbath'.

On 19th May, the president of the country declared to the parliament that the LTTE leader Prabhakaran was killed and that the war had been won by the government forces. Many heaved a sigh of relief as the bloody war had proved far too costly. However, there have been speculations that the army had killed many Tamil leaders after they had surrendered.

It is suggested that in the final days of the war, about 40,000 people had lost lives. The Sri Lankan government faced a huge task of providing relief and aid to the displaced and injured. The total cost of the 26-year war is estimated to be USD 200 billion.