

Modern world is divided into two major power-blocs. One led by the United States of America believing in the modern version of capitalism and democracy and the other led by Soviet Russia upholding communist ideology. All the agitations and controversies regarding the solution of the growing unrest in the world since the Second World War have been revolving around the two power-blocs.

Modern World
is divided into
Two Blocs

During the Second World War the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia came closer to each other and entered into mutual relationships. The U.S.A., Britain and France had carried the war against the Fascist powers in co-operation with Soviet Russia. Each and every one on the Allied side felt the necessity of forging unity and friendship among themselves in order to protect the world from the Fascist barbarism. In fact, the Western powers including the U.S.A. and Soviet

Co-operation
between Russia
and the Western
states during
the Second
World War

Russia forgot their ideological differences for the time being and entered into a common bondage. There was complete concord and unity among the Allies including the U.S.A. and the U.S.S.R. not only on the issue of the war but also on the issue of the future of the post-war world. The United Nations Declaration of 1942 and the other war-time conferences demonstrated unity and concord between the two divergent ideologies. "The optimists were certain that future

peace would be assured by the continuance after hostilities ceased, of the unity that characterised the difficult war-years."¹

Even then, it cannot be claimed that till the end of the Second World War mutual suspicion between Soviet Russia and the Western powers was totally absent. Political and economic relations between the two were artificial and limited in scope. War-time alliances and post-war conditions of the world opened the way for a further improvement of relations between Soviet Russia and the Western states, including the U.S.A. But disillusion however, followed soon after victory and in fact, all was not harmony even during the war.

¹ Langsam, op., cit., p. 593

It was at Yalta and Potsdam that Soviet Russia and the Western powers for the first time sat across the conference table to negotiate over the important international problems. Practically, Russia and the U.S.A. came closer to each other at that time. These two giants of the modern world had few contacts and conflicts with each other until the Second World War. Soviet Russia was a continental power while the U.S.A. was a oceanic power. As long as their interests remained confined to their own territories, there was the least possibility of dispute between them.

After the Second World War Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. have entered the arena of international politics as the world's two leading powers. Russia's contributions to the success of the Allies against Fascism and Nazism in the Second World War have established her reputation as one of the chief powers of the world. On the other hand, predominance of the U.S.A. in place of the French and British predominance in international politics has made the U.S.A. the other great power of the world. as a result of the war, most of the traditional European powers had either been eliminated or extremely weakened. International diplomacy had made it clear that only Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. were in the dictating roles while others were only associates if not satellites.

The co-operation and understanding that existed between Soviet Russia and the Western states during the Second World War began to evaporate gradually after the war and mutual distrust and suspicion began to appear. Moreover, ideological differences and the differences in social and economic policies between Soviet

Russia and the Western powers widened the gulf between the two power blocs. Spread of communism in Eastern Europe and the formation of a 'bloc' by Soviet Russia gave rise to strong discontentment in the U.S.A. and the Western countries. In reply the U.S.A. announced the Truman Doctrine and the Marshall plan. The efforts of the Western states to oppose the spread of communism in the world led to the origin of the so-called Western Bloc. Thus the two rival systems of alliances have given birth to a war-tension. And this tension has been termed 'cold war' or 'a war of nerves' in the modern world. The struggle of these two rival blocs is not merely restricted in the ideological sphere. It is being clearly displayed in the political, economic and military spheres as well. Truly speaking, the cold war has been going on between these two rival blocs since the termination of the Second World War and another world war will be staged at the very moment when Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. would enter into open clash. In the words of Friedmann, "A world divided into two camps is still a world living under the shadow of war."

Emergence of
Russia and
U.S.A. after
World War II
as great powers

Origin of
Cold War

The cold war practically had started after the Bolshevik Revolution of Russia in 1917. The struggle and dispute of the Western powers with Russia took its origin from the refusal of the Western powers to recognise the Bolshevik government and their subsequent attack upon Russia. In the opinion of J. B. Priestly, the terror which was infused in the minds of the British conservatives by the greatness of the Russian Revolution has not yet totally disappeared.

Before the Second World War Soviet Russia failed on many occasions to bring the Western powers to a collective security system and to a disarmament programme through and outside the League framework. Time and again Russia protested against the appeasement policy of the U.S.A., Britain and France towards Germany. On many occasions the Western powers roused the suspicion of Russia by holding negotiations "with Germany behind the back of Russia." The co-operation and friendship between Soviet Russia and the western states during the war was only made possible due to the efforts of President Roosevelt. But as soon as President Truman came to power the policy of co-operation with Russia was abandoned and the second phase of the cold war began.

Some thinkers and scholars have described the international conflicts of our times as a struggle for world-leadership between Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. Again, according to others it is a struggle between two rival social systems. On account of this mutual rivalry between the Soviet and American blocs in international politics, the English historian Toynbee has described modern world-politics as Bipolar politics i.e., Soviet Russia and the U.S.A. have come out with the mission of establishing their absolute hegemony by dividing the whole world into two hemispheres. According to Toynbee the countries of these two hemispheres have been reduced to the position of either associates or satellites of these two giant powers. In the words of Toynbee, "All the other states in the world to-day are in some measures dependent—most of them on the United States and a few of them on Russia, but none completely independent of one or other of these two powers"¹ But the bi-polar interpretation of the present international politics is, however, an over-simplification of the real situation. Moreover, it will not be reasonable to say that Soviet Russia and the United States have established their absolute hegemony in world-politics. Because the countries defeated in the Second World War may regain their lost power and in fact some of them have recovered their lost position. The rise of a new power may change the present balance of power system of the world. Some states, such as India and above all China, are moving towards a similar status.

Nature of
the modern
international
politics :
'Bipolar Politics'

¹ Vide Friedmann, p. 106

To-day nuclear power is no longer the monopoly of Soviet Russia or of the U.S.A. alone. Britain is also gradually advancing in the field of nuclear power. Under the regime of the Fifth Republic France is also steadily progressing in that direction. Militarily rearmed Germany is also power to be reckoned with. In Asian politics Japan has been emerging again. The rise of Red China, may also affect the balance of power of the world. Both China and Soviet Russia are equally eager to assume the leadership of the communist world and their mutual relations have degenerated considerably particularly after the Chinese aggression in India in 1962. At any moment these two contenders for world communist leadership may come to an open clash. In that case a triangular contest for world leadership may come to the surface between China, Russia and the U.S.A. The conflict between Soviet Russia and Yugoslavia proves the limitation of bipolarism even in the communist camp. In the ideological war against the Western states, Russia demands the national independence of smaller states, whereas imperialist policy of Russia does not recognise the real independence of the states under Russian influence. Yugoslavia is a small state and she does not match Russia in any way. But the conflict between the two great world powers has enabled Yugoslavia to follow her own policy and to maintain her independence with complete disregard to Soviet Russia.

Not only Britain, France, India and other smaller states are exerting their influence over bipolar politics, and do not like to be mere pawns in the game between the super-powers. The United Nations is also putting check upon aspirations of these two giant powers although they disagree on every vital issue. If Soviet Russia, the U.S.A., Britain and France fail to preserve unity among themselves, the United Nations will also fail in its task of maintaining international peace. Eyal, the ex-foreign minister of Australia has described the United Nations in the age of the cold war as an "Organised restraint on power". Friedmann has observed, "It is the opportunity of influencing organised world opinion which, more than anything else, keeps the United States and Soviet Union in the United Nations Organisation, although they disagree on practically every vital issue."¹

Apart from the Eastern and Western blocs, the neutral countries of Asia and Africa have also formed another bloc which has been described as Third Bloc. This Third Bloc has been exerting a vital influence on the policy of the two giant powers. The United States of America and the Soviet Union may look at the present-day world politics in terms of bipolarism "but their view must be balanced against the increasing unrest and lack of sympathy with the picture of world affairs in the rest of the world."

As Friedmann writes, "It is only with these important reservations that

bipolar interpretation of the world conflict can be accepted."

Progress of the Cold War between the Two Blocs : After the Second World War the wartime co-operation and friendship between Soviet Russia and

Introduction

the western Allies ended and in its place mutual suspicion, distrust and discontent began to develop which has ultimately led to the formation of the Soviet bloc or East European bloc and the Western bloc. Conflict and artificial war-tension between these two blocs have continued to grow on different international issues.

(1) The Soviet Union and the West : The Bolshevik Revolution of 1917 for the time being introduced the conflict of social philosophies as an important factor in the sphere of international relations. The zeal with

Phase of open clash, 1917-20

which the Bolshevik leaders and propagandists proclaimed the inevitability of world communism, naturally alienated Russia's former allies who saw in the Bolshevik Revolution a great menace to their existing political and social systems and hence between 1917 and 1920 they gave an all out support to the counter-revolution in the mainland of Russia. The Allied intervention in the Russian Civil War characterized the first phase of the relations between communist Russia and

the western democracies. With the passage of time the Soviet leaders gradually abandoned their hope of world revolution and began to normalise Russia's relations with neighbouring states. Britain gave recognition to the Soviet government of

Russia and the latter was admitted to the family of nations in 1934. The triumph of Stalin over Trotsky in 1925 normalised Soviet Russia's relations with the Western countries. Between 1925 and 1933 a series of commercial agreements were concluded between the Soviet Union and the non-communist countries and quite a large number of foreign engineers and technicians were employed in the Soviet establishments.

The emergence of Nazi Germany with Hitler's violent anticommunist propaganda gave a formidable threat to the Soviet Union and thus led Russia to set up a system of collective security with the Western democracies against German aggression. The Soviet Union got her entry into the League of Nations in 1934. But unfortunately her efforts in the direction of establishing a collective security system with the Western democracies failed miserably when the League under the influence of Chamberlain and Laval could not rise to the occasion in resisting Mussolini's Abyssinian adventure, and in preventing the signing of the Munich Settlement. Soviet Russia abandoned her policy of collaboration with the Western democracies and entered into commercial and non-aggression pacts with Nazi

Germany in 1938.

But the German invasion of Russia in 1941 again brought about a change in Soviet Russia's relations with the West. "The Allied Powers, on the initiative of Winston Churchill, immediately accepted Soviet Russia as an ally" and since then till 1945 Soviet Russia's collaboration with the West continued uninterrupted. All these years since 1941 the relations between the Soviet Union and the Allies were never intimate and time and again Russia seriously resented over her gigantic sacrifices in comparison to those

Lack of true coordination between the Soviet Union and the Allies

of the Allies. Although the Soviet and the Western leaders met from time to time in conferences, there was a lack of true coordination and understanding on certain vital issues particularly in regard to the invasion and control of Germany. Observing on the relations between the Soviet Union and the Allies, Friedmann writes, "up to the end of the last war, the relations between Soviet Russia and the West were characterised by distrust and expediency rather than the assumption of inevitable and irreconcilable conflict."¹

(2) **First Five Treaties** : With the conclusion of the War, sharp differences between the Soviet Union and the West cropped up. In April, 1946 the Council of Foreign Ministers initiated the discussion on the first five treaties in Paris. The Foreign Ministers of the United States, Britain, Russia and France sharply differed on the question of the Italo-Yugoslav frontier. Earlier in September, 1945, these four ministers failed to arrive at an agreed solution of this issue in London. The Soviet Minister, Molotov argued that from the point of view of population and economy, the Julian March was closely connected with Yugoslavia and that Trieste, if delivered to Italy, would serve as military base for aggression upon the Balkan states. The other three ministers insisted on the partition of Trieste between Italy and Yugoslavia as a means of settlement of the dispute. At last, they agreed to the creation of Free Territory of Trieste to be governed by the Security council.

(3) **Italian Reparation** : The question of realising reparation from Italy posed another problem to the big powers. Molotov demanded two thirds of the reparation from Italy for Yugoslavia, Greece and Albania and the rest for Russia. At last it was decided that the amount of reparation to be paid to the Soviet Union would be fixed by a Four Power Commission.

(4) **Paris Peace Conference** : A controversy arose over the procedure of Paris Peace Conference convened in 1946 and ultimately it was resolved that the Peace conference would submit the drafts of the peace treaties containing the demands of both sides for ratification. Molotov accused Britain and the U.S.A. of having gained much during the War. On the other hand,

Britain and the U.S.A. accused Soviet Russia of having unlawfully occupied many territories during the War.

(5) **German Problem** : In central Europe the settlement of the German problem proved acute. In July 1946 Molotov strongly denounced the agrarian policy of the Western powers in Germany. Molotov strongly denounced the partition of Germany. Byrnes, the U.S. representative in reply condemned the aggressive attitude of Molotov towards the West and announced that the U.S.A. would consider each occupation zone as an economic unit. A sharp difference between them arose on the issue of economic unity and reparation of Germany. Russia proposed an establishment of Four Power Control over the Ruhr, nationalisation of all trust properties of Germany, introduction of the German central administration for industry and foreign trade and a huge payment to Russia as reparation. Britain and the U.S.A. charged Russia that her real motive was to establish her own domination in Germany. At length the four powers only agreed to consider Prussia as a separate state from Germany.

The Four Power Control over Germany ended in 1949 upon the establishment of the Federal Republic in West Germany and the Democratic Republic in East Germany. Western Germany entered into an alliance with the Western powers. Soviet Russia announced that unification of Germany could only be possible if western Germany agreed to follow a neutral policy and detached herself from diplomatic relations with the Western countries. Thus Germany has still remained a burning question between the two power-blocs.

(6) **Berlin Question** : The City of Berlin has had been an issue of serious differences between Soviet Russia and the Western states. When in June 1948 Russia besieged west Berlin, the Western powers vehemently protested and both sides were at the verge of open clash. In September, 1948, the U.S.A., Britain and France represented to the Security Council that the restrictions imposed by Russia upon the communications between west Germany and Berlin had created a serious problem. They also pointed out that this action of Russia was opposed to Article 2 of the U.N. Charter and it might even endanger world peace. However, under an agreement reached in May 1949 the overland traffic into west Berlin was resumed.

(7) **Austria** : At the Moscow Conference of 1943, the Foreign Ministers of the Allies had decided to consider Austria as an independent state after the war. From 1945 to 1955 Austria remained under the Four power military occupation and during this period it was not possible for the Allies to conclude a peace treaty with Austria due to the unwillingness of Russia to quit Austria. Another sharp conflict between the two sides arose over the question of Austria's future. In December, 1952 the General Assembly of the U.N. directed Russia, the U.S.A., Britain and France to conclude a treaty with Austria by

renouncing their right of occupation and to declare Austria as an independent state. The other three Allied powers recognised neutrality of Austria and no sooner the foreign troops were withdrawn from Austria than the Peace Treaty was signed in May, 1955.

"The Austrian Peace Treaty", writes Friedmann, "is the first major international treaty on which the four erstwhile allies have been able to agree after years of an unbroken record of dissension and tension, sometimes threatening to lead to the brink of war". The reasons for the agreement are not, however, due to real goodwill and co-operation between Soviet Russia and the three 'big'. The real purpose of the creation of the Austrian Republic by an international agreement was to serve Austria as the model of agreement that was to be concluded in regard to Germany and other states in Europe. According to the terms of the peace, (1) Austria is to be recognised as an independent, Sovereign and democratic state, (2) the Allies are to respect the independence, territorial integrity and neutrality of Austria and (3) Austria undertakes not to seek directly or indirectly any political and economic union with Germany.

Korea : Korea was another centre of East-West conflict. In the Moscow conference held in December, 1945, the representatives of Russia, the U.S.A. and Britain had decided that a joint commission consisting of the representatives of the American military regime of South Korea and those of the Soviet military regime of North Korea would be instituted ; the commission would form a temporary government in Korea and would consider the proposal for the formation of a Four-power mandate in Korea for five years. The majority of the Koreans were in favour of complete independence. Russia proposed to hold discussions only with those political parties and organisations which would accept the mandate according to the decision of the Moscow Conference. But the U.S.A. opposed the proposal. The Soviet-U.S. joint commission formed in March, 1946 failed to take any decision on this issue, and a deadlock continued. The Korean problem was at last referred to the U.N. The General Assembly appointed a temporary Commission to elect the representatives of Korea. But in June, 1950 North Korea all on a sudden attacked South Korea. The war was brought to a close by an armistice concluded in July 1953. Yet the Soviet and American troops remained stationed in both parts of Korea. Communist China and Soviet Russia continued their help to the North Koreans while on the other side the South Koreans were being aided and supported by the U.S.A. Throughout 1949 and 1950, the relations between the United States and the Soviet Union worsened and the situation in Korea became very grave. In November, 1950, the U.N. accused North Korea of aggression against

the Republic of South Korea. The Security Council, therefore, called upon the North Korean government to withdraw its forces and asked the U.N. members to support the Council resolution. The United States immediately sent assistance to the South Korean government and urged all U.N. members to help South Korea in repelling the aggression and restoring peace in Korea. In July, 1950 the United States was asked by the Security Council to assume responsibility for a United Nations Unified Command.

In August 1950, the Soviet Chairman of the Security Council tried to prevent the Council's action on Korea during that month. So long as the U.N. forces were able to drive back the North Korean invaders, the Soviet stand was not taken seriously by other members. But with the entry of Chinese troops into Korea, the situation changed. The whole Korean dispute was transferred to the General Assembly. In February 1951, the Assembly condemned Communist China as an aggressor.

After a year of fighting, the Soviet Union suggested negotiations for an armistice. After many hesitations, South Korea agreed to an armistice which was signed at Panmunjon between the North Korean and Chinese communists and the U.N. A military demarcation line was established along the final battle line, somewhat north of the thirtyeighth parallel. Each party was to withdraw its troops from this line and all prisoners of war who desired repatriation were to be sent home within 60 days. Hostilities, however, did not cease with the signing of the armistice. Only a free election could resolve the Korean problem. But as Communist China and Soviet Russia do not favour free election, the problem has yet remained unsolved.

Indo-China : After the fall of Japan, Britain and China occupied southern and northern parts of Indo-China respectively. France having had entered into treaty relations with Britain and China, regained her lost hold over the whole of Indo-China in 1946. France was in favour of awarding autonomy to the republics of Cambodia, Laos and Viet Nam under the French Union and France started negotiations. Viet Nam opposed France during latter's negotiation with Cambodia and Laos and demanded complete independence after forming a League known as the Viet-minh. The Communist-influenced Viet-Minh refused to acknowledge the authority of France. Being supported by Communist China, the Viet-Minh made an attack upon the Red River-Valley in 1949. As a result, a complicated situation developed in Indo-China. As China directly helped the Viet-Minh regiment, the U.S.A. assisted France with money and armaments. On the other hand, Soviet Russia helped the Viet-Minh. As a result a clash between Soviet Russia, and the U.S.A. became almost inevitable. However, in 1954 the Viet-Minh troops being supported by China and Russia won victory

over the French troops. By intervening in this matter India somehow was able to stop the War. By a treaty concluded at the Geneva Conference of 1954, the existing governments of Cambodia and Laos were recognised, the foreign forces were withdrawn and Viet Nam was partitioned between Viet Nam and Viet-Minh. An International Armistice Supervisory Commission consisting of India, Poland and Canada was formed. In July, 1954 the French government accepted the armistice. In 1955 the rule of the ex-emperor Bao-Dai ended and Pro-American Dinh-Diem was appointed as the Prime Minister. The United States recognised the authority of Dinh-Diem over South Viet-Nam. In the other part Dr. Ho-Chi-Minh was installed as its President.

Laos Troubles : A number of states emerged in Indo-China after the latter was freed from the French rule. Laos situated to the north-west of Indo-China was confirmed as an independent state with its capital at Luang Prabang. The other was North Viet-Nam with its capital at Hanoi. Laos was under American sphere of influence, while her neighbour North Viet-Nam was under communist rule. Since their inception both have had been hostile to each other. On the exit of the French from Indo-China, the communist Viet-Nam began preparations for occupying Laos. In 1950 they formed a resistance group known as the Pathet-Lao. This group was composed of the Laotian rebels who had been fighting the French and the Royal Laotian government. In the Geneva Conference the Chinese Prime Minister, Chou-en-lai demanded recognition to the Pathet Lao regiment. In the apprehension of troubles, France recognised the Pathet Lao regiment in 1954 and incorporated it in the Royal Laotian Army. In 1957 the Pathet Lao regiment agreed to acknowledge the rule of the Royal Laotian government but they demanded the right of participating in politics as a distinct political party. Meanwhile the Pathet Lao regiment launched movement after it was dissolved by the Laotian government and it continued to receive various aids from Communist China.

In the general election of 1958 though the Pathet Lao party earned majority, yet the royal Laotian government declared the party as illegal. As a result the Pathet Lao regiment broke out into armed clash in 1959 being supported by Communist China. The Laos government appealed to the Security Council for help. In the Security Council the Soviet Union opposed the British and French proposal of appointing an enquiry commission. At length, in order to inquire into the situation of Laos, the Security Council appointed a Four power Sub-Committee in 1959 consisting of Argentina, Japan, Italy and Tunisia. This decision of the Security Council meant in effect to deny the existence of the earlier International Armistice Supervisory Commission composed of India, Poland and Canada. Russia strongly pleaded for reactivating the supervisory commission and making it effective. But it failed due to the opposition of the

China : The United States was strongly opposing the entry of Communist China into the U.N., whereas Formosa under Chiang-kai-Shek was accepted as a permanent member of the Security Council. On this issue a bitter conflict between Soviet Russia and the western states started. The western countries strongly apprehended that Communist China might endanger the peace and security of non-communist Asia. That this apprehension of the western countries was not baseless was proved by the attack of the Communist China upon Indian frontiers in October, 1962.

Formosa : Like other problems the problem of Formosa also created a split between the two great power blocs. In order to check the spread of communism in the Far East, the U.S.A. had been assisting Formosa in all possible ways. Communist China regards Formosa as a part of Chinese mainland. Hence, the U.S. interference in Formosa antagonised both communist China and Russia.

Middle-East : Over the Middle East also a keen contest has been continuing between Soviet Russia and the western powers. The United States is bent upon protecting the Middle East from the influence of international communism. The U.S.A. is in no way prepared to tolerate the infiltration of Soviet Russia in the Middle East. On the other, Soviet Russia, taking the advantage of the growing Arab nationalism in the Middle East, has been doing her best to damage the interests of the western countries there since 1957. Russia has been endeavouring to detach the Middle Eastern countries from the influence of America by helping them in various ways.

Disarmament : Conflict between Soviet Russia and the western powers has also arisen on the issue of disarmament. As a result, the U.N. has not yet been able to formulate any plan which could be acceptable to the rival blocs.

Ideological aspect of the Conflict : The leaders of both the Eastern and Western blocs generally describe their mutual struggle and conflict in ideological terms. Democracy and dictatorship, capitalist imperialism and people's democracy are opposed to each other.

Most of the American leaders look upon the political and social systems of Soviet Union as 'objectionable' and 'dangerous' because in the Soviet systems there is no place for parliamentary democracy and individual liberty. On the contrary the communists regard the American democracy as 'shameful', 'an instrument of the wealthy', and an 'aggression upon people's democracy'. According to the communists, Nationalist China, Greece and Spain which are being aided by America can be ranked with the Fascist states. The communists do not even consider some of the republics of Central and South America allied

with U.S.A. and Britain as genuine democratic states. The possibility of a world state and a world federation solely depends upon the conformity of political and social systems of all nations. In the words of Friedmann, "close international integration, in the form of a world state, a world-federation or an international code of human rights would demand a greater conformity of political and social values. But in the world of to-day this is a distant aspiration."

The apprehension that has been created in U.S.A. and other democratic states is not the particular political system of Soviet Russia. It has actually arisen from a different fact. For examples firstly, apparently Soviet Russia preaches for world communism as well as for a change of the social system of all states of the world. But practically speaking an appraisal of the progress of communist movements of the past thirty years' world reveals that the Soviet government has all these years given much attention to achieve success in the sphere of Russia's own foreign policy through these communist movements.

Secondly, at present Soviet Russia is not only the central figure of the worldwide international communist movement, but also after world war II, she has established herself as one of the greatest powers of Europe and Asia. On the other side, as the United States has taken responsibilities in Germany and Japan, she has been directly involved in the European and Asiatic politics. Thus the U.S.A. not only views the direct or indirect expansion of Soviet Russia as the success of communism ; she also dreads Russia's each advance as dangerous for her own security and national integrity.

Hence the ideals of worldwide communist movement well-published by Russia is not the real cause of the apprehension of the U.S.A. and other democratic states. Russia's expansionism has become the actual cause of such apprehension.

On the other hand, Soviet Russia is also looking upon the course of international politics from a different angle. Even after the Second World war the Soviet leaders have not forgotten the non-co-operative attitude of the western powers towards Soviet Russia. Even to-day Soviet Russia has not forgotten the immense loss that she incurred in the Second World War. Apart from this the rise of the nationalists and reactionary industrialists in West Germany and Japan has made Soviet Russia all the more suspicious about the western powers. Russia is always under an apprehension that the western powers may use all these reactionary forces against herself.¹

In all the western plans of world economic revival Russia traces aggressive designs of the Western powers. Thus, the political and social differences rather than mere ideological conflict have led to the origin of the cold war between the Western and Eastern blocs.

Indirect Conflicts between the Eastern and Western Blocs : Ever since

¹ Friedmann, op. cit., p. 99.

Formation of Two Blocs after the Second World War

353

the end of the Second World War indirect if not direct conflicts have been continuing between Soviet Russia and the Western bloc in different parts of the world. At times indirect conflicts assumed the form of open clash.

As soon as world war II ended attitude of mutual suspicion, unreliance and resentment between Soviet Russia and the western countries appeared on the surface. According to many the cold war has started with Soviet Russia's effort to extend her sphere of influence by following a policy of spreading communism in Eastern Europe and that of imperialism in other parts of the world.

Even before the Second World War Russia was aware of her weak defence. During the Second World War Russia had attempted to strengthen her defence in Eastern Europe by extending her influence and authority in the Baltic and Balkan regions. After the war Russia installed communist governments dependent on herself in the Baltic countries (Estonia, Lithuania and Latvia), in the Balkan region and Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, East Germany etc. Russia succeeded in extending her political, military and economic influence over the Eastern European countries. Through the cominform branches and the local communist organisations Russia has been able to establish her political supremacy in these countries. On the economic side a series of trade and commercial pacts have been concluded between Soviet Russia and these countries. Thus immediately after the Second world war the Soviet bloc has emerged as a great force in Eastern Europe.

At first the western powers did not resist Soviet Russia's neo-imperialism and expansion of her influence over her neighbouring countries. The reason was that the western powers believed in the continuation of the war-time co-operation with Soviet Russia even after the war. The western powers even believed that Russia would respect her pledges given at Yalta and Potsdam.

But when Russia formed the Soviet bloc in Eastern Europe by establishing undisputed communist dictatorship alarm and resentment among the western powers ran high and gradually they became determined to oppose further expansion of Russia's influence.

Conflict between Soviet Russia and the western powers was unleashed for the first time over the affairs of Greece, Turkey and Iran. As soon as the German forces left Greece in 1944, the British forces stepped in. Russia had acknowledged the British position in Greece according to the treaty concluded between herself and Britain. On the strength of that treaty the British forces had entered Greece. Meanwhile, in Greece an open clash between the leftists and the

royalists began. British support to the royalists at once led to internecine war in Greece. Upon the attack of the British forces many communists of Greece took shelter in the mountains. By a plebiscite held in 1945 monarchy was restored in Greece. But by continuous offensives the communists harassed the Greek government. They began to receive help from the communists of Bulgaria, Albania and Yugoslavia in many ways. Under such circumstances as it became impossible for Britain to suppress the terrorists, she appealed to the U.S.A. for help. Being alarmed at the prospect of the progress of communist influence in Greece and Turkey, the U.S. President, Truman, in order to help those two countries, appealed the U.S. Congress in March 1947 for a sanction of \$ 400 million. He declared, "It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or outside pressure." The declaration of Truman was subsequently known as the 'Truman Doctrine' or policy of 'containment'. The Truman Doctrine put an end to the policy of isolation in European politics which the United

Truman Doctrine,
March 12, 1947

States had been pursuing since the conclusion of the Second World War and henceforth she stepped forward to assume leadership in world politics. Besides, the Truman Doctrine may be described as the first direct response to the challenge of Soviet Russia. In this declaration it was stated that international peace would be endangered in case of the establishment of communist dictatorship over the free peoples of the world and the security of the American continent would be threatened as well. The chief aim of the Truman Doctrine was to protect the independent nations from communist aggressions and to preserve the balance of power with Soviet Russia by forming a bloc loyal to

Main purpose
of the Truman
Doctrine

the U.S.A. through economic and military assistance. In fact, the Truman Doctrine was announced with a view to checking the expansion of Russia's influence over the Middle East and the Balkan area. The U.S. Congress permitted Truman to help

Greece and Turkey and sanctioned the necessary fund. This was the beginning of a great shift in American foreign policy marking the end of her isolationism.

At the concluding state of the second World War Turkey, wartime ally of Germany, joined the Allies against Germany. But Turkey's diplomatic move during the war antagonised Russia. On the other hand, Turkey had also been harbouring enough suspicion about Russia. However, after the war Russia demanded an amendment of the non-aggression pact concluded with Turkey. On this score ill-

feeling on both the sides ran high and Turkey became alarmed of Russia's aggression upon herself. However, when at length President Truman announced assistance to Greece and Turkey,

Truman's
declaration of
help to Turkey

Formation of Two Blocs after the Second World War

Russia retired temporarily and the political situation in the Middle East improved a little.

After the World War II when Russia turned her attention towards the oil resources of Iran, indirect conflict with the Western bloc began. Five provinces of North Persia viz. Azerbaijan, Mazanderan, Gorgan, Gilan and Khorasan had been under Russian occupation and the rest under British suzerainty. During the world war II communist-influenced Tudeh Party of Azerbaijan proceeded to establish self-government there. After the end of the war movement in this

direction began in Azerbaijan at the instigation of Soviet Russia. In the beginning the western states remained indifferent. In December 1945 the Tudeh Party proclaimed an independent republic in Azerbaijan. The communists of other provinces of North Persia started similar movements and the Kurd Republic was set up. At such turn of events Persia lodged protest with the Security Council against Russia. On the failure of the Security Council to take a firm decision in this matter, Persia was compelled to sign

The Russo-
Persian Treaty,
1946

a treaty with Russia on April 4, 1946 whereby Russia's interests over the oil resources of North Persia for 25 years were recognised. But relations between the two grew strained

once again upon the refusal of the new Parliament (the Majlis) of Persia to ratify the treaty. The Persian Majlis abrogated the treaty of 1946 and concluded an alliance with the United States whereby the latter assured military as well as non-military help to Persia. The motive behind this arrangement was to oppose the spread of Russia's influence over the oil regions of the Middle East. As a result, a struggle between the Soviet and the western blocs began in the Middle East.

The United States did not cease its attempts in arresting the progress of Russia's influence even after the announcement of the Truman Doctrine. In 1947, the United States sponsored the European Recovery Programme. It is known as the Marshall Plan as it was prepared by Marshall, the U.S. Secretary. After the Second World War and at the end of 1947 the whole of Europe

fell into the grip of an economic depression. The United States proceeded to the rescue of Europe under the apprehension that the economic crisis in Britain, France, Belgium, Italy and West Germany would help the spread of communist influence in the "free world". The Marshall Plan stands as a most significant event in post-war international relations. Analysing the plan Marshall had said that as long as poverty, economic depression and scarcity of food would remain in western Europe, "there will steadily develop social unease and political confusion on

Marshall Plan

every side Our national security will be seriously threatened. But if we furnish effective aid to support the now visibly reviving hope of Europe, the prospect would speedily change." In short, the chief aim of the Marshall Plan was to improve the political and social life of Europe by fighting out poverty and economic crisis. According to this Plan the initiative for economic recovery should come from the Europeans themselves and the U.S.A. would only give economic help to those countries engaged in the task of economic reconstruction.

Soviet Russia and both the communist and non-communist countries of Eastern Europe were invited to accept the Marshall Plan. The Soviet Union forthwith rejected the offer. The arguments put forward by Soviet Russia were, firstly, the Soviet Union as well as Eastern Europe could not accept such a plan which aimed at giving economic help to Europe as a whole instead of giving such help individually to the countries accepting the plan. Secondly, this plan was fully opposed to the basic principles of the United Nations Charter. Thirdly, in the opinion of the Soviet Union the United States under the cover of this plan aimed at creating an economic empire taking advantage of Europe's economic plight. Czechoslovakia at first accepted the plan but later she rejected it under Soviet pressure. "This shattered the idea of a joint European economic plan"—(Friedmann). Not only that, Russia's negative attitude towards the plan led to the continuance of the struggle and dispute between Eastern and Western Europe, which in turn made all attempts in the direction of achieving economic co-operation between Eastern and Western Europe abortive.

Only seventeen countries, Austria, Belgium, Luxembourg, Denmark, France, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Turkey, Britain, West Germany and Trieste accepted the Marshall Plan. This Plan was in operation till June 1952.

In spite of non-co-operation of the Eastern European countries, the Marshall Plan achieved some success. In the words of Friedmann, "When the Marshall Plan Programme came to an end in June 1952, it had achieved triumphantly what it had set out to do." By 1951 the volume of industrial products excepting coal in the aided countries exceeded the pre-war level. Except France and Italy the economic plans in other aided countries achieved tremendous success. In the case of hydroelectric power almost a revolutionary improvement was achieved. Even West Germany, a war-ravaged country, was able to recover her pre-war economic solvency. Apart from unexpected improvement in agriculture

and industry, the political, social and economic stability returned to the disturbed and war-ravaged western Europe as a whole and western Europe treaded a long way to progress and development.

It has already been pointed out that the Marshall Plan stiffened the Cold War between Eastern and Western Europe instead of bringing about a rapprochement between the two. Moreover, Soviet Russia had already branded the Truman Doctrine as imperialistic. In order to check Russian supremacy and influence, Britain, France, Belgium, the Netherlands, Luxemburg etc., signed the Treaty of Brussels in March, 1948 whereby the signatories expressed their complete reliance upon the U.N. Charter and pledged their mutual military, economic and political co-operation. The Treaty of Brussels played a vital role in strengthening the unity and security of the western countries.

REGIONAL ALLIANCES : MILITARY

Regional System : "A regional system is a long term agreement between two or more states providing for common political, military or economic action in specific circumstances, provided the commitment extends to a defined area and specific states." (Haus and Whiting). Permanent organs and well defined rules and programmes are essential for the realisation of regional integration. The motives of regional integration are varied, for example, to ensure collective security in a specific geographical area against foreign aggression; to effect economic development of a specific area through economic co-operation and to establish authority of a powerful nation over the smaller states of a particular region. Thus there is not any exclusive means of forming regional alliances or integration. The British Commonwealth of Nations, the Arab League, the Afro-Asian solidarity etc. can be cited as an urge for regional integration. Besides, the urge for ensuring regional security is evident in the NATO, the Warsaw Pact, the SEATO etc.

But the main drawback of regionalism is that it leads to create several worlds instead of one. Although regional system succeeds in effecting consolidation among the different races and nationalities of a specific area by lessening the orgy of nationalism, at the same time it also creates new dissensions and disputes among different regional alliances on a larger scale. Truly speaking, conflicting regional alliances are at the root of the prevailing cold war in the sphere of present international politics. And it has done practically more disservice to the cause of internationalism.

Drawbacks of Regional Alliances

Secondly, the regional alliances are in many ways minimising the significance of the U.N. At present there are about seven regional alliances. The more important of these are the regional treaty organisations under the leadership of the Soviet Union and the U.S.A. These two chief regional treaty organisations are based upon mutual suspicion and fear. As a result, these regional organisations have weakened the principle and objectives of the U.N. to a considerable extent.

The U.N. Charter embodies no clause barring the formation of regional alliances. In Chapter VIII of the U.N. Charter, regional systems have been recognised. Of course, according to the Charter the objectives of all such regional systems should be maintenance of international peace and security, and the duty of the associates of the regional treaty organisations should be to settle mutual disputes by peaceful means. The use of force for the settlement of regional disputes is prohibited without the recommendation of the Security Council.

North Atlantic Treaty Organisation : The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation may be called a defensive organisation against the Soviet bloc. After the signing of the Treaty of Brussels and particularly when the conflict between eastern and western Europe over the German problem assumed a serious proportion, the United States endeavoured to establish a mutual military assistance organisation with the western countries. On April 4, 1949 the U.S.A., Britain, France, Italy, Canada, Belgium, Denmark, Luxemburg, Norway, Portugal, Iceland and the Netherlands signed the North Atlantic Treaty containing 14 provisions. Greece, Turkey and West Germany later joined this organisation. At the top of this organisation there are one permanent staff under a Secretary General and one permanent high level Executive Committee. This organisation mainly rests on army, navy and air forces supplied by its member states. The main executive body of NATO is the North Atlantic Council. At present it is composed of four main commands viz., the European Command, The Atlantic Ocean Command, The Channel Command and the Canada U.S. Regional Planning Group. Four-fifths of its expenditure has so far been borne by the U.S.A. There are presently 14 divisions in western Europe under the control of NATO.

According to its terms, the signatories have expressed their full confidence in the U.N. Charter, have agreed to make peaceful settlement of all disputes among themselves for international peace, security and justice, have pledged to encourage economic collaboration among themselves, have agreed to resort to arms singly or jointly against foreign aggression and also have agreed to put up joint

Terms of
NATO Pact

Formation of Two Blocs after the Second World War

resistance to foreign aggression until the Security Council would take necessary measures against the aggressor. In accordance with Article 51 of the U.N. Charter the signatory states have agreed to submit report to the Security Council on all matters. Besides, they have also extended their pledge to help the Security Council in its efforts to maintain international peace and security.

The Chief purposes of NATO is to strengthen the military power of the western countries under U.S. control against the Soviet or the Eastern European bloc and to encourage economic collaboration among the participant countries. It can be easily assumed that NATO has been formed primarily to oppose the spread of Russian influence in western Europe.

NATO is not strictly restricted to the North Atlantic region alone. For it includes countries which have no geographical regionalism such as Italy, Greece and Turkey who have confined their efforts to arrest Russian expansion in the Mediterranean. Greece and Turkey are regarded as vital bastions against Russian advance into the Mediterranean. Again any Russian attack upon Yugoslavia would certainly lead to intervention by the NATO powers, although Yugoslavia is not a member. Hence, it indicates the chief defect of the regional military alliance in the worldwide power conflict. For Europe the Mediterranean region and the central and Near Eastern countries occupy a very important position in any future major struggle. The Suez Canal still remains a vital link between Europe and Asia as the important oil resources are concentrated in this region. Yet none of the countries of this region (Arabia or Israel) has been admitted into it. But, over question of supremacy in the Mediterranean a struggle between the two blocs may be inevitable in the future! The inclusion of Portugal, the country of dictatorship, into this organisation means the abandonment of idealism for mere military reasons. Whereas, in spite of having military importance Spain has not been admitted into it. Thus the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation has not been established on the basis of any settled principles. The observations of Friedmann, that, "The idea of North Atlantic Community is based on solid foundations of geography as well as common interests and traditions"—do not bear truth.

Another charge against NATO is this that although it was established with the original purpose of maintaining international peace and security it is now constituted as an anti-Soviet military organisation and hence it has given rise to tensions between the Eastern and the Western blocs instead of ensuring world

¹ Friedmann, op. cit., p. 157.

Criticism of
NATO
*1. No Geographical
Regionalism*

Lack of principle
or ideals in
NATO

Increase of the intensity of the international peace and security

Lessening of U.N.'s importance

peace. This Treaty Organisation can be called a rival organisation of the U.N. Because, the importance of the U.N. has been considerably lessened due to encroaching upon the U.N.'s responsibility of enduring world peace and security. Apart from this, the international relations of NATO are being controlled by the Anglo-American governments. As a result, the sovereignty of the smaller powers in the field of foreign policy has been restricted to some extent.

In spite of its defects, the achievements of NATO cannot be overlooked. Commenting on the prospect of this organisation Friedmann writes, "Of all the regional international organisations formed in the recent years as a reaction to the failure of the United Nations, the NATO community has the greatest prospect and permanency." Though the dominating role of the U.S.A. in this

Achievements of NATO

organisation has been criticised by the European fellow members, yet at the same time, it should be admitted that the U.S.A. has been shouldering the bulk of its responsibility. NATO has been able to equip the Western bloc with proper armaments against the Soviet bloc. Besides, NATO has helped

much in strengthening political, social and military collaboration and unity among its member states in spite of their mutual disputes and rivalries. Due to the augmentation of the military strength of this organisation it has become impossible for Soviet Russia to extend her influence in Europe any longer. Presently, the NATO Council paid much attention towards economic and political co-operation among the member states instead of increasing its military potentiality. It cannot be denied that a certain degree of coordination of the productive resources of NATO countries has been achieved.¹

The Ministerial Conference of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation held in April, 1969, was very significant. The organisation seems to be at a turning point. NATO was given birth at a time when the West European states and the U.S.A. were very much perturbed at the rapid progress of the Soviet Union's influence in Europe after the Second World War. Doubtless, the Organisation has greatly contributed to containing Russia. Similarly, the factors giving birth to the Warsaw Pact under Soviet leadership have undergone big changes. Today, the European and international situations demonstrate great changes against those of the epoch when NATO and the Warsaw Pact came into existence.

Italy, Turkey, Denmark and Norway indicate signs of reactions to those changes, reactions not without any influence on NATO. They reflect reduced

¹ Friedmann, op., cit., p. 157.

Formation of Two Blocs after the Second World War

apprehension about the spread of Soviet influence and domination. France has detached herself from NATO, however, without ceasing to be a party to the Organisation. As to the Warsaw Pact, it is also at present contemplating adjustments due to the present intensification of Sino-Soviet tension.

Outstanding changes responsible for modification of NATO and the Warsaw Pact and the mutual relationship of the two Organisations are : economic recovery and stability of most of the European states, notably West Germany ; the abandonment of the Soviet claims to the Turkish provinces of Ardahan and Kars ; the relative consolidation of East Germany, thereby improving the prospects of better relations between two Germanies ; the success of West Germany in improving her relations with some of the communist countries, particularly with Rumania and Yugoslavia ; and the tensions between China and the Soviet Union.

The desire of the East European countries as expressed at the Budapest Conference held in April, 1969, for a European Security Scheme covering both the parts of Europe, reacted not negatively on NATO. Fourteen foreign ministers of NATO who met at Brussels in December 1969 agreed to renew their offer of negotiations with communist states on balanced force cuts in Europe. Only France remained aloof.

The Warsaw Pact, 1955 : Soviet Russia was alarmed at the aggressive attitude of the western states when the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation came into being. Yet Soviet Russia could not establish a rival organisation of NATO

for a few years more. But Russia strongly protested against the inclusion of West Germany into NATO. Russia gradually began to take care of her self-defence as the western states paid no heed to her protest and ultimately she formed a rival regional organisation with the Eastern European countries. Russia, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Albania and East Germany concluded the Warsaw Pact on May 4, 1955. The Pact provides for a joint command of the armed forces of the signatories. Moscow is the head-quarters of this unified command. Thus war-tension in the sphere of international relations has started afresh.

According to the terms of the Warsaw Pact the signatories have given an undertaking to settle their mutual disputes by peaceful means ; to resist the attacks of the imperialist and capitalist states jointly ; to establish peace and security by jointly resisting any foreign attack upon any member state. Moreover, the signatories have accepted Soviet command upon their unified armed force. Apart from mutual security, the signatories have also agreed to participate in mutual economic and cultural collaboration. This Pact is left open to all countries.

On the pretext of the Warsaw Pact, Soviet Russia suppressed the nationalist

risings against the communist government in Hungary in 1956. According to many Russia thereby violated the Warsaw pact by intervening in the domestic affairs of a signatory state. But in favour of Russia it was argued that it was at the request of the Kadar government of Hungary that Russia had sent her troops there.

The Warsaw Pact summit held at Moscow in December 1969 displayed extremely conciliatory approach to West Germany. For the first time in a Warsaw Pact document, positive features of development within West Germany were set down.

South East Asia Treaty Organisation or SEATO : Like NATO the South East Asia Treaty Organisation also was born out of communist fear. With the establishment of the Chinese communist regime, the fear of communist advances spread over South East Asia. In order to check the spread of communist influence in South East Asia and the neighbouring Pacific regions the United States and the Western powers proceeded to establish a regional collective defence system.

Being driven out by the communists, Chiang Kai-shek, the nationalist leader of China, and his nationalist government took shelter in the island of Formosa. Chiang Kai-shek naturally felt the necessity of building up a defence system against the probable attacks of the Chinese communists. Hence Chiang Kai-shek and Quirino, the President of the Philippines, tried to convene a conference of representatives of some Asian countries. But as no country other than South Korea showed much eagerness in this matter, Quirino announced that in the proposed conference the matters relating only to economic and cultural collaboration would be discussed instead of anything relating to political or military problems. On such assurance, representatives of India, Ceylon, Australia assembled at the Banguio Conference. But Chiang Kai-shek and President Syngman Rhee of South Korea refused to attend the conference as there was no agenda to discuss the measures against the communists

in South East Asia. As a result, no resolution could be taken in the conference. Finding lack of enthusiasm among the Asian countries, the United States voluntarily engaged herself in this matter. At the beginning a treaty of military assistance was concluded between America and Pakistan in 1954. Meanwhile, the Indo-Pakistan disputes over Kashmir and other issues gave the U.S.A. a grand opportunity of forming an anticommunist bloc in South-East Asia. At this time the possibility of the destruction of the French influence in Viet Nam of French Indo-China also appeared to be certain. Being encouraged at these development the United States proposed a defence organisation for South East

Formation of Two Blocs after the Second World War

Asia. But this proposal did not find favour with India, Burma, Ceylon and Indonesia. However, on the acceptance of the proposal by other Asian countries, the statesmen of the U.S.A., Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines met at Manila, the capital of the Philippines and signed the South East Asia Treaty or the Manila Treaty of 1954. There are eleven provisions in this treaty. The chief purpose of this pact is to provide collective defence against the spread of communism in South East Asia and the adjacent Pacific region.

Under the terms of this treaty, the signatories have undertaken to settle their dispute by peaceful means ; to consider the enemy attack upon any one of them as an attack upon them all, to help the aggrieved state in all possible ways and to cooperate with each other in the field of economy and culture. It is needless to state that the SEATO was formed against communist China and Russia. Unlike NATO, SEATO has no permanent army of its own.

Firstly, this treaty can not influence the balance of power in international politics. For, many of its signatories are already connected with one or other regional treaty organisation. Secondly, this treaty cannot be called a real regional treaty. For, of the signatory states the big and powerful countries are non-Asian and only a few of South East Asian countries are its members. Moreover, the bigger opposed to this organisation. Thirdly, originally this pact was signed with the purpose of protecting South East Asia from the communist menace. But at the insistence of Pakistan, the term 'aggression' has not been applied in the case of the communists alone. Hence, there is a difference of opinion between the U.S.A. and the other signatories on the definition of the term 'aggression' as incorporated in the treaty. Fourthly, like NATO this treaty organisation has no permanent army of its own. Its military power is dependent upon the U.S.A. As a result the U.S.A. has got an opportunity of influencing the foreign policy of the South East Asian countries. On the strength of this treaty the U.S.A. had sent troops and armaments to Thailand in 1962 when the Pathet Lao and the nationalists came to a clash in Laos. Commenting on the SEATO, Sir Francis Low observes "SEATO can never be the complete answer to the communist menace in South East Asia.....It would be a welcome assistance but it could hardly be defensive." (*Struggle for Asia* — p. 221).

The downfall of SEATO came with the Laotian crisis in 1960-61. Ever since the organisation has been quietly falling to pieces, Britain and France were against treaty action. They argued that it would prove ineffective and might easily lead to the wrong war in the wrong place. "There were weaknesses

enough in the anti-communist politics that SEATO pursued in South-east Asian countries including Laos." (D. Warner — *The Front Lines of Asia*. Vide — *The Reporter*, June 1962.)

The SEATO Ministerial Council meeting in Bangkok in May 1969 did little to remove the anxieties of South East Asian countries about the prospect of an American withdrawal from Viet Nam. Thailand had lately been most vocal about its military value. "The military capability of SEATO is a fiction", observed the Thai foreign minister on the eve of the annual meeting. As a matter of fact Thailand was threatened with the spread of Hanoi's influence in neighbouring Laos and Cambodia and this has already happened.

SEATO never achieved its early aim of collective security for South East Asia. In fact, the defence commitments by the U.S., Britain, France, Australia and New Zealand had been by independent agreement. France and Pakistan had in practice withdrawn even from the functions of the Military Planning Office. Only Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines of the Asian countries could be persuaded to join the West in a regional collective defence treaty. India has maintained her neutrality. India is mostly concerned to find way of containing China — Asia's only nuclear power. Yet from the beginning SEATO's effectiveness was undermined by the fact that in the eyes of many Asians it was less a defence treaty than a "modern version of protectorate".

The South East Asia Treaty Organisation was pronounced dead in September 1975, 21 years after its formation. The decision to phase out SEATO was first mooted by the Thai Prime Minister Kukrit Pramoj and endorsed by President Marcos of the Philippines. Bangkok and Manila, the two active Asian members, liked the world to forget that SEATO had ever existed. It had long been a source of embarrassment particularly to Bangkok where SEATO headquarters were located. It had been in many respects an encumbrance to the countries for whose protection it was devised by late Foster Dulles of America. American accord with China, the Communist victory in the Indo-Chinese region and the resultant changes in Asian political attitudes generated their own compulsions leading to the rejection of SEATO and all that it implied. From Peking's point of view, it is a rejection of the American hegemony in Asia, marking the beginning of a new order of international relations in South-east Asia and the Pacific region.

The ANZUS Pact, 1951 : When the communist success in China and the Korean war created an atmosphere of uneasiness in the Pacific region the United States immediately signed a treaty with Australia and New Zealand in 1951. The ANZUS Pact has been so called after the names of Australia,

Formation of Two Blocs after the Second World War

New Zealand and the U.S.A. According to its terms, in the event of an aggression upon any one of these states in the Pacific, each of the three would proceed to meet the common danger. The signatories agree to form a council of their foreign ministers to consider the plans concerning the implementation of the pact. This pact is to remain in force for an indefinite period and any member may terminate its membership after serving one year's notice. This Pacific security system is another endeavour of the Western powers to face communist activities. Of course, this pact has not been supported by the neutral countries of Asia. Since 1952 this pact has been in force.

The Baghdad Pact or CENTO, 1955 : The other centre of the struggle between the Eastern and Western blocs is the Middle East. Some of the countries of this region are associates of the Soviet and American blocs and the rest are neutral. Till the beginning of the World War II the Middle East had been the spring-board of Western diplomacy and even to-day these countries have not been able to emancipate themselves from the domination of the former imperialist powers. At present the U.S.A. and Soviet Russia have been endeavouring to extend their respective influences in this area. The strategic and economic importance of the Middle East is not insignificant to the Western nations. Being the treasure house of oil-resources a fierce competition and brisk activities between Russia and the western countries have begun over this region. During the Second World War the Arab countries, in order to protect their newly achieved independence, had established a League in 1945, known as the Arab League. The Middle Eastern countries never desire that they should jeopardise their independence and economic interests by being drawn into the struggle between the Eastern and the Western blocs. Their aim has always been to eliminate all kinds of Western influence maintaining their independence and neutrality at the same time. The support of the western countries to the Jews, establishment of an independent Jewish state after the Second World War and the American support to the Jewish state etc. gave rise to complications in the Middle East, agitated the Arabs and thereby pushed many of the Arab countries towards Soviet Russia. "Oil, Palestine and the Soviet menace provided the three avenues of approach." Under such circumstances, for the maintenance of peace and security in the Middle East the rival blocs like the Arab League the Baghdad Pact etc. came into being.

The first attempt of the Western powers to form an anti-Soviet bloc in the Middle East can be seen in the Baghdad Pact. Britain was the convenor

The Baghdad Pact of this pact though at first she did not join it. In 1955 this pact was signed between Turkey and Iraq. It is treaty of mutual security whereby the two signatories have agreed to protect their security by joint measures. Iraq signed this pact in spite of the protest of the Arab League. Later Britain, Pakistan and Persia put their signature to it. Thus by giving military help to the states of the Baghdad Pact as well as by establishing a military base there the western states have formed an anti-Soviet bloc in the Middle East.

The Anglo-American bloc expected that other Arab countries would subscribe to this pact soon. But instead Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia have taken a neutral stand. As a reaction to this pact, the British position in Jordan has suffered, the relations of the Western nations with Egypt have deteriorated the aggression of the Anglo-French-Jewish coalition upon Egypt have failed and in consequence the Anglo-French influence in the Middle East has greatly suffered.

Reactions against the Baghdad Pact In the words of Acheson, this pact "has given rise to differences and weakness instead of strength and unity." Moreover, it has become impossible to put the Baghdad pact into operation against Soviet Russia as well as to hold in check the communist activities in the Middle East. Soviet Russia has not failed to avail the opportunity of the reactions of the Arab League as well as of Egypt, Syria and Saudi Arabia against the Baghdad pact. In short, the opposition of the Arab countries to the Baghdad pact has helped Russia to consolidate her position in the Middle East on a firm basis.

The continuous spread of Russian influence in the Middle East had worried the United States. The entry of the United States into the Middle Eastern politics had given rise to a terrible rivalry between the two rival blocs in this area. By giving economic help at first and then military help to the countries of this region the United States has succeeded in establishing herself there as a strong rival of Russia. The United States has stopped giving economic help to Egypt, Syria and Jordan since then. In 1958 the Baghdad pact (now renamed CENTO) lost its cohesion. In that year a military coup occurred in Iraq and a new government under the leadership of Karim Kasem was installed. Kasem abandoned the Baghdad pact.

The Baghdad Pact can be said to have failed in its objective. Firstly, in the Middle East this pact did not succeed in forming any kind of military bloc ; secondly, it failed to check the infiltration of Russia as well as of the communists into the Middle East; and thirdly most of the Arab states assumed an anti-western attitude.

America : Rio and Bogota Pacts : Like the other continents, in the

American continent also two treaty organisations have come into existence, one is the Rio and the other the Bogota Pacts. Indeed, of all the regional military treaties that have been concluded under the influence of the U.S.A., the Rio and Bogota Pacts deserve special mention.

The relations of the Latin or South America with U.S.A. date from earlier centuries. Ever since the American civil war, U.S.A. had been demanding her natural leadership upon the South American countries. Till the outbreak of the Second World War the United states was assured of the security of this continent due to its long distance from other parts of the world. But with the invention of atomic weapons during the Second World War, the United States became worried about the security of South America. Besides, she also apprehended the spread of communist influences in this hemisphere. In this context the Russian influence over Cuba can be cited.

During the Second World War the South American states proceeded to build up a regional security system. In March 1945 a law containing certain provisions was signed by all the Latin American countries excepting Argentina. The chief provision of this law was that in the event of an aggression upon any one of these states, each of the signatory would act to meet the common danger.

In 1947 the representatives of the South American states met at a conference at Rio-de-Janeiro and signed the Rio Pact. Under its terms the South American states have agreed on mutual help if attacked by any foreign or any American power. The pact includes Canada and Greenland by implication besides all South American states.

Next, in 1948 the representatives of different states of America met at a conference at Bogota in order to ensure regional security of the American states and the Bogota Pact was signed. According to this pact a joint North and South American organisation under the name of the 'Organisation of American States' or OAS was formed. This organisation had been entrusted with the task of settling mutual disputes of the American states by peaceful means and promoting cultural collaboration among the states.