CHAPTER - VII

INDO-US RELATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF CHANGING WORLD ORDER
World order is a legal system encompassing the principles, measures and mechanisms by which international relations are coordinated and common international problems are solved.¹ Establishing world order in its complete sense is a phenomenon to be seen only in the field of international relations in the modern terms. World order has never been immutable. Rather, it has been constantly updated in accordance with the changes in the pattern of the world's balance of power.

In the present century, world order has twice been established: the Versailles system following World War-I and the Yalta system following World War-II. These two world orders were formed under the post-war circumstances. The first world order was remarkable for the rapidity in construction where as the second world order witnessed a change of the world from multipolar system to bipolar one, in which the USA and the Soviet Union maintained a bloc system as superpowers. This world order has come to an end with the collapse of the Soviet bloc and the rise of the US as the sole super power. The following changes led to the present world order: the disintegration of Soviet Union, collapse of communist regimes in East-European countries,

German re-unification, collapse of the Warsaw pact, progress in disarmament negotiations between the two super powers and Gorbachev's Asia-Pacific Policy. The former CPSU General Secretary Mr. Gorbachev and his reforms like Perestroika and Glasnost were chiefly responsible for the said changes. They were responsible not only for the collapse of the Soviet-Union but also for a change in the entire world order.

'Perestroika' means the process of "reconstructing" Soviet Society through programmes of reforms.¹ Such reforms meant to be consistant with the ideas of the 1917 revolution, are directed at relaxing state control over the economy, eliminating corruption from the state bureaucracy, and democratizing the Soviet Communist Party and the workplace to strengthen worker's control. The term 'Glasnost',² has brought about a greater degree of "openness" both within the Soviet Society and its relations with foreign powers. In fact, by the time Gorbachev came to power in March, 1985 Soviet Society was passing through a severe crisis period in all fields - economic, political and social. In order to get over these crises Gorbachev initiated a massive reforms programme by introducing 'Perestrika' into the Soviet Society. The programme of Mr. Gorbachev was not a reinforcement of the Stalinist dogma. On the Contrary, he

2. Ibid.
asserted: "Through democracy, and glasnost, through reform, political reform, we must return man to all these spheres, to become the main central character. This is the point to reform".¹

The new party programme adopted in March 1986 by the 27th party congress, on Gorbachev's recommendation, abandoned the optional perspectives of its predecessors of 1961. Where as the 1961 programme had cleared itself to be a programme for building the communist society; the revised text of 1986 describes itself as no more than a programme for the "Planned and all-round perfection of Socialism".²

On the political front the most important reforms carried out included the deletion of Article 6 of the Soviet Constitution, abolishing thereby the dominant role of the communist party, the emergency of multi-party system, free elections, and open criticism of the policies of the party and the Government.³ The creation of the post of the Executive President for the Soviet Union was also an important development.
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On the economic front greater emphasis has been laid on private property. Right to inherit property has been recognised for the first time in the Soviet Union. Attempts were made for creation of a market economy. Along with two other forms of property i.e. state property and cooperative property, private property is becoming an important kind of property.¹ In terms of social relations, Perestroika seeks to change social relations both in urban and rural. Gorbachev mentioned social alienation in Soviet Society, as also the mismatch between production forces and production relations. In the agriculture sphere the change is a renewed emphasis on cooperatives with an element of competition - as for example, contractual and lease arrangements to increase labour productivity.

But the programmes became volatile for various reasons.² First, there are large areas of the Soviet Union which are unevenly developed. For example, the Soviet Far East is a very large and comparatively little developed area. It is receiving increasing attention for development at present as Kazakhstan did during the time of Khrushchev. Second, within each region or Union Republic, there may be uneven development owing to social environment as for


example, within Azerbaijan - which took the form of a conflict between nationalities or between sub-regions. Third, the work ethnic may uneven in a different regions, and Fourth, there may be a cut in wages for workers at the lower levels.

The conservatives criticised Perestroika, which raised a number of issues. First, the parameters of one-party socialist regimes are being questioned by those who have gained the most from it - as, for example, those forming the higher echelons of the bureaucracy give to indolence and the workers at the lowest level who have be fitted from unearned incomes. The bureaucracy had tax-free income: it also freely indulged in corruption and other fraudulent practices. Workers had their assured levels of wages; they also obtained wage increases unrelated to labour productivity. The two participated on a massive scale in the elections to the Soviet system.

The changes in the system of elections - secret ballot, multiple candidates, limited terms of important offices, competition of party and non-party candidates, and pluration of opinions would affect the cosy atmosphere and lead to participation based on both the needs of collectively. i.e. transition to the next phase of industrialisation, and the satisfaction of personal
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interests. Secondly the alienation of workers at the bottom crystallized in some form of opposition to Perestroika from within. It may also show itself in spontaneous strike and in disruption. Thirdly, the question of alienation and participation as it has been tackled so far leaves out the question of nationalities and culture. Given historical specifications and the negative features that have developed in the last seventy years, the nationalities which have undergone tremendous economic development and acquired social morality will raise issues of cultural identity. Those which have not undergone such development seek territorial redistribution. This problem of friendship among the Soviet peoples has come up in a dramatic way together with political action in the form of strikes, demonstrations, and resolutions, suggesting that the CPSU has a hard task ahead of developing friendship between peoples and preventing ethnic groups from turning against the party if not against the idea of proletarian brotherhood.

Gorbachev blamed chiefly the conservations for opposition to Perestroika. He said "It is necessary to build up the struggle against conservation with those who hinder and drag us backward. This is the main thing." But in practice gradually he moved away from the main goal i.e.,

establishment of communism. By the year 1990-91, it was distinctly noticeable that the term Marxism-Leninism virtually disappeared from Gorbachev's vocabulary.

In this connection some of the important steps taken by Gorbachev were as follows:

1) In the year 1988, Gorbachev called the party congress to press for radical reform.

2) In 1988-89, National Legislature was reformed and given more freedom and power, with some deputies chooses in multi-candidate elections in which senior communist members were defeated and removed.

3) In 1990, Communist Party's right to monopoly of power was curbed.

4) In the same year, Gorbachev endorsed a sweeping move towards a market economy and dismantled the old economic structure and

5) In 1991, Gorbachev allowed free election to the office of the President of the Russian republic in which Boris Yelst in got overwhelming majority support. This process culminated in the abandonment of Marxist ideology officially, after the August 1991 coup attempt. Gorbachev resigned as the CPSU General Secretary on 24 August, 1991 and on 29th August the Supreme Soviet banned all communist party activities.¹
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Further it could be stated that through the last seven decades of communism regime, even though the Marxist-Leninist principles remained the guiding factor, no serious and adequate efforts had been made by any communist leader to implement those principles in practice. All the Soviet Leaders, including Mr. Gorbachev, in order to sustain their self-justifications interpreted the ideology in their own way. Communist party's power and authority was above law and unquestionable. The imposed ideology served as a vehicle of mental discipline and guide to common citizens. The exercise of authority therefore became a necessary element insustaining the general authority of the regime resulting in alienation of the party from the masses. Hence, true socialism was never practiced in the former Soviet Union and as a result it would be an immature conclusion to say that Socialism has collapsed.

Finally, Gorbachev must be blamed for the current ideological impasse because there was no defence socialism during the last seven years of his tenure. The ideological struggle for socialism was neglected and the mass media and newspapers also remained silent. Moreover, in his speech to the central committee of the party for the formation of the central committee of the party for the formation of the

new party programme on 26th July, 1991 Gorbachev went on to the extent of changing the communist party from a revolutionary party to a democratic party of social reforms. He continued on this path further and gave more and more concessions to the anti-socialist and pro-capitalist elements. In order to remain in power, he did not even bother to compromise with Boris Yeltsin, the so-called Russian democrat, who got trenchant American moral and political support. Further, Gorbachev remained silent when Yeltsin and his colleagues started issuing unconstitutional edicts and decreases making the communist party illegal in the Russian republic even much before the coup. Its activities were banned in work places and factories. Party property, its documents and establishments were seized.¹

The coup attempt of August 19, 1991 and the agreement on the establishment of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) by Russia, Ukraine, and Byelorussia on December 8, 1991 were two major events in the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The former gave rise to the fundamental change of the nature of the Soviet Union State power and the latter announced the disintegration of the union. On December 24, 1991, the national supreme Soviet Legislature legally announced the official death of the Soviet Union as a State. The blue, white and red Russian

flag was hoisted at the Kremlin to replace the Soviet Flag, and the Soviet membership in the United Nations, including that of the Security Council, was continued by the Russian Federation.

Thus, the crisis of disintegration in the former USSR was not due to the failure of Marxist ideology but the result of human error by the communist leaders of the past and the present and deviation from Socialist principles.

Gorbachev's reforms like perestroika and glasnost led to the collapse of the communist governments in the East European countries. These reforms which started in an innocuous manner in 1985 developed into a mighty tornado that engulfed the whole socialist world. The sheer pace and sweep of the developments in East Europe were so breathtaking that while the adherents of socialism were dismayed, its adversaries were pleasantly surprised. During these mass upheavals in East Europe, the rulers lost their nerve and allowed themselves to be swept out of power. Nor did the ruling parties muster any courage to counter the revolts against one-party rule.¹ The word 'socialism' was dropped from several of the constitutions of East European countries, while some communist parties either dissolved themselves or changed their names.

Seventhly, the elections under the socialist system in all these countries were not considered free mainly because of the absence of opposition parties and of choice between the candidates. Hence the elections there have been described as "one-horse race". Naturally there has been neither psychological nor physical involvement of a large sections of people in the decision making process of the country. Eighthehly, the style of functioning of some leaders like Erich Honeker and Nicola Ceaseusesek has alienated the people. Lastly, the slow rate of economic growth in most of the socialist countries of East Europe and the comparatively better economic development in the neighbouring capitalist countries like the FRG, Austria and Italy have led to the belief among the people that capitalism will be a better economic system than socialism.¹

Along with the changes in East Europe great changes have taken place in Europe as a whole. All the East European countries have been moving fast to join West Europe particularly in its economic union and to have close trade relations with them paving the way for ending the coldwar.

Another major development in the world was the reunification of Germany.² The fall of the Berlin wall was

the most powerful symbol of the end of communism, and the wall would not have fallen without ten years of 'Solidarity' in Poland, without Gorbachev's programme of reforms i.e. Perestroika and Glasnost" and the internal unrest in the Soviet Union, and without the Hungarian tearing down the Iron curtain.

The pushing aside of the Iran curtain, which for over 40 years had cemented the cold war took place not at the frontier between the two Germanies but significant at the Hungrarian-Austrian border on 27th June, 1989. It was followed by a rapidly swelling flow of people entering the embassies in Prague and Warsaw. Most important in shaping the further trajectory of events was the basic assessment of the Gorbachev administration not to use military forces to stem those developments or to support a Tiananmen solution, for which East German security forces had already begun to prepare.¹

The sequence of events, in the process of German unification were as follows: (1) Monetary and economic union on 1 July, 1990; (2) Political union on 3rd October, 1990, (3) Germany regaining its sovereignty on 15 March, 1991, with the "Two plus Four" treaty coming into force; and

(4) ratification of the last unification related treaty on Soviet troops withdrawal in Moscow on 2nd April, 1991.¹

The Treaty of Two Plus Four′ or Moscow Treaty was the most important one in the process of unification. It was signed by the foreign ministers of Germany and the Soviet Union in Moscow on 14 September, 1990. It was known as the Germany-Soviet partnership Treaty. It gives a full pledged sovereignty to the United Germany. The treaty also called "The Treaty on the final arrangements concerning Germany" contains Ten Articles. They are:

**Article I** lays down the borders of the United Germany and its border with poland. The United Germany will incorporate the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, the Germany Democratic Republic and whole of Berlin.

**Article II** reaffirms Germany's peaceableness.

**Article III** lays down Germany's reunification of atomoc, biological and chemical weapons. This Article also limits the future army for the whole of Germany to 370,000 men.

**Article IV** Provides for the stationing of Soviet troops on the territory of the former GDR until the end of 1994.

Article V states that the area of the former GDR will remain free of NATO troops until the Soviet troops have withdrawn. It also contains the provision that the Western Allies will remain the West Berlin for the time being.

Article VI stipulates that Germany is free to make its own decision regarding the alliances of forces.

Article VII provides for the dissolution of the special rights reserved for the Allied powers in Germany, and it grants Germany full sovereignty over all its internal and external affairs.

Article VIII states, that the treaty must be ratified by the (new) five powers: the USA, Soviet Union, Great Britain, France and Germany.

Article IX stipulates that the treaty becomes valid for all signatories "on the day that the last instruments of ratification or acceptance are deposited by these states".

Article X rules that the signed treaty will be deposited with the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.¹

The U.S. President Bush and his Administration have from the beginning, actively and forcefully supported and helped shape the unification of Germany without any

reservation. Assured of this support and encouragement, Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl was able to engage in all his talks with considerable room for manoeuvre, something which must have impressed the Soviet leader. President Bush's offer made to the Germany in Mainz in May, 1989 to become "Partners in Leadership" very soon had far-reaching and visible consequences.¹ It was, therefore, not surprising with President Gorbachev in his talks with Chancellor Kohl in July 1990 noted that this good German–American relationship was also an advantage to the Soviet Union.

Ironically, democracy triumphed over dictatorship in Germany unlike in the post-first world war period when the western imposed Weimar Republic found no takers in Germany and once again Russia came to the aid of the Germans - this time the Soviet President facilitated the merger of the two Germanies by loosening the Russian grip over its East German protege. Gorbachev was hailed, and rightly so, as the man of the hour. As Chancellor Kohl said: "He recognised the nations' right to pursue their own path. Without this decision, we would have not experienced the day of German unity so soon".² The Soviet leader has also earned about $11.5 billion for his country - the price Chancellor Kohl paid for reunification - to take back and

---

rehabilitate 380,000 Soviet troops stationed in the erstwhile East Germany.

The other European powers reached both positively and negatively towards the German Unification. Britain and France are still apprehensive of the German intentions so far as its political and military ambitions are concerned. As for as East European countries are concerned, German unity is not going to have any significant impact on them since most of these countries are busy evolving their own political and economic systems, with even Russia fighting the internal threat to its own federation. Poland, the immediate neighbour needs an added assurance from Germany that at least in the near future, European nations can rest in peace in the hope that future German political leadership, as represented by Helmut Kohl would be peace-loving and not recklessly militaristic.¹ The mighty Germans will really have to make an all-out effort to convince the world that German unity does not necessarily mean the emergence of German hegemony.

Continuing NATO membership and security ties with the United States are the background against which Germany’s future security status has to be seen. Without such a framework the resulting power vacuum in Europe might have

---

compelled Germany at some point to strengthen its own armaments, perhaps even with nuclear weapons. Although this most certainly would not arise from aggressive impulses, but rather from defensive responses to a new set of geopolitical conditions, such a move would certainly alarm its European neighbours with a risk of new instabilities in Europe starting up\(^1\). Thus, NATO membership of the United Germany, is an essential factor for European stability.

One does not foresee any threat to United Germany even if the Super-Power relations were to sink to a new low. The super-powers no longer play the role of a guardian angel to the world. Germans have come together without outside pressure as they have accepted a common destiny for the whole nation. Neither the Russians nor the Americans could have influenced it in any other way. Germany seems destined to lead her own life, super power relations notwithstanding.

Progress in the disarmament negotiations between the two super powers also changed the world order. Although negotiations in this direction had started with the strategic Arms Limitations Treaty (SALT-I of 1972, really meaningful and constructive progress towards disarmament began during the Gorbachev regime.

After he became the General Secretary of the CPSU, the historic super powers Summit on disarmament ended in November 21, 1985 at Geneva with a ringing pledge by the USA and the USSR not to fight either nuclear or conventional wars between them in view of their "catastrophic consequences" to the world at large. Responding to the Soviet Union's 50% across the board cut in offensive nuclear charges, the US came up with its version of a reduction in nuclear warheads, and then there was the willingness on the part in offensive nuclear charges, the US came up with its version of a reduction in nuclear warheads, and then there was the willingness on the part of Moscow to accept a limited number of American cruise missiles in Europe thereby giving rise to the feeling that the two countries might be able to forge a deal on the question of medium-range missiles.1 While the unusually long and cordial talks between the US President Mr. Reagan and the Soviet Union's General Secretary Mr. Gorbachev have sent the clear signal that the two sides are looking for a qualitative change in bilateral relations, the Summit has also revealed that substantial disagreements do exist not only over arms control but on regional matters as well. Although the Geneva Summit may have produced no specific accord on nuclear arms, it has nevertheless been viewed as the first
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step towards the improvement of bilateral ties leading to the easing of tensions in the international sphere.

The two super-powers further arranged an interim summit on arms control at Reykjavic on 11 October, 1986. During the Summit, the US programme of star wars (SDI) was the key issue. As the US was not yielding any ground the summit broke down. ¹

Another important landmark in the nuclear disarmament negotiations was the Intermediate Nuclear Force Treaty (INF). The Treaty-first ever between the super powers to reduce nuclear arsenals - was signed at the conclusion of the opening session of the Summit meeting between Mr. Reagan and Mr. Gorbachev on December 8, 1987 in Washington.

Mr. Gorbachev, the first Soviet leader to set foot on American soil in 14 years, indicated that he had come with new proposals to reduce nuclear stockpiles. He hoped to hear "new words" from Mr. Reagan on cutting long range nuclear weapons, he said.²

At a White House ceremony, the US President and the Soviet leader signed the agreement that would eliminate more than 2,800 shorter and medium-range missiles, bearing

some 3,800 nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{1} The reduction would take place by over three years. The INF Treaty banned missiles with ranges of 300 to 3,400 miles. Soviet Union would give up nearly four times as many warheads as the USA. The treaty included an agreement on verification under which the two sides would be able to verify implementation of their accord.

For the USA, the agreement would mean scrapping of Pershing missiles stationed in the former West Germany, Tomahawk cruise missiles in Britain, West Germany, Italy and Belgium. On its side, the Soviet Union would eliminate Silo-based SS-4 rockets, SS-20, SS-12 and SS-23 missiles. The main Soviet missile SS-20 carries three warheads, each of which has a destructive force equivalent to 150 kilotons of TNT. The American missiles carry one warhead each.\textsuperscript{2} The INF Treaty is historic both for its objective - the elimination of entire US and Soviet nuclear arms - and for the innovative character and scope of its verification provisions.

The fourth Reagan-Gorbachev Summit on arms control, was held on June 1, 1988 in Moscow without achieving any breakthrough on a strategic nuclear arms agreement. But both sides noted that their face-to-face meeting of the
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two leaders had helped consolidate the gradually evolving relations between the Super Powers.¹

The START-I Treaty was concluded between Gorbachev and Mr. George Bush on July 31, 1991 in Moscow. It provides the possibility of cutting down their strategic nuclear arsenals by about 30 per cent and it has been hailed as a singular event dispelling five decades of mutual mistrust.

In brief speeches before signing the document, the two presidents congratulated each other, their people and the entire world for the success in effecting the first real cuts in the long range nuclear weapons.

In his address Mr. Gorbachev said "our next goal is to make full use of this breakthrough to make disarmament irreversible" Mr. Bush hailed the treaty as "a major step forward for our security and world peace". He mentioned his predecessor, Mr. Ronald Reagan who initiated the 'START' talks with the Soviet leader, the late Leonid Brezhnev.²

Even with the proposed 30 per cent cut, the two sides will have 4,900 ballistic missiles each. The Soviets will end up with a 35 per cent cut in their strategic warheads, from around 11,000 to 7,000 and the US with a 25 per
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cent reduction from about 12,000 to 9,000. The treaty provides for complex verification procedure, including oversight inspections, short-notice inspections and suspect site inspections. The two sides will set up a joint commission on verification and inspection. The treaty is valid for 15 years, unless superseded earlier by a subsequent agreement. If the two sides agree, the treaty may be extended for success in five-year periods.¹ The START-1 treaty was an important landmark in the disarmament negotiations between the two super powers before the disintegration of the former Soviet Union.

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the Presidents of Russia and the U.S., Mr. Boris Yeltsin and Mr. George Bush, signed in Moscow on 3 May, 1992, the most sweeping nuclear arms reduction treaty, START-II, that calls for the elimination of about two-thirds of their strategic weapons by the year 2003. Under the treaty Russia and the US will abolish all land-based missiles with multiple war-heads and reduce other components of the nuclear triad to about 3,500 warheads for the US and 3,000 for Russia.

At a press conference after the signing ceremony the Russian and US presidents hailed the treaty as a historic document that would make the world a much safer place.
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place to live in Mr. Yeltsin said the START-II represented the core of the system of global security and Mr. Bush thought it represented the beginning of a new era of friendship and partnership for the two nations and the world.

Both sought to defend the treaty as an equitable and mutually advantageous deal. Mr. Yeltsin said the treaty would strengthen rather than weaken Russia's security as Moscow and Washington moved towards "Strategic Partnership". So, the disagreement negotiations (especially from Gorbachev regime) eased the tensions between the two superpowers led to decrease the cold war.

Another factor, which contributed to the changing world order was Gorbachev's Asia-Pacific Policy proposed at his Vladivostok programme on July 28, 1986.

On April 17, 1991, in a major policy address to the Diet (Japanese Parliament) the Soviet President proposed a comprehensive plan for an Asia-Pacific security framework which would involve USA, Japan, China and India joining the Soviet Union to explore and develop the concept of a new order in the region. He further called for a "new relationship" with Japan and also proposed initiating trilateral consultations between Japan, the Soviet Union and the USA as a confidence-building measure. He further emphasised
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point by saying "we intend to resume the military presence in Asia and the Pacific... a process that could develop at a faster pace if the other naval powers followed suit".\(^1\) Striving for an improvement in the Asia-Pacific region, the Soviet Union has taken a number of unilateral steps towards disarmament. It has started destroying its SS-20 missiles in the Asian part of the country. Between 1984 and 1988, the number of ships in the Soviet Pacific fleet has been reduced by 57, and its activity has markedly lessened. In September, 1988, the Soviet Union undertook not to increase its nuclear arms stockpiles' in the Asian part of the country.

In his speech at UN on December 7, 1988, Mr. Gorbachev told the international community that the Soviet armed forces will be unilaterally reduced by 500,000 men. This cut concerns not only the European, but also Asian part of the USSR. By an agreement with the Mongolian Government a large group of Soviet troops temporarily stationed there will return home. In accordance with the Geneva Agreement, the Soviet Military contingent was withdrawn from Afghanistan in February, 1989.\(^2\) Based on these principles, Soviet Policy in Asia and the Pacific laid emphasis on

---


solving the existing problems through dialogue and wise compromise, not through confrontation.

At the same time, the Soviet Union called upon the major naval powers to conduct consultations on a non-increase in naval forces in Asia and the Pacific. It also stood for elaborating measures to prevent accidents in the open sea and in the air space above. This would increase safety of naval and air space above. This would increase safety of naval and air lanes in the region. Proceeding from its fundamental policy aimed at eliminating military presence in foreign territories, the USSR stated its readiness, by agreement with the Vietnamese Government, to give the use of the Fleet's logistical point in 'Can Ranh Bay' if USA agrees to eliminate its military basis in the Philippines.¹

The Soviet Union was the first to sign the 'Rarotonga Treaty's protocols concerning the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the Pacific and stated its readiness to become the zone's guarantor. An idea of establishing in South East Asia a similar zone of peace, freedom and Neutrality (ZOPFAN) contains a considerable positive potential. In his message to the president of Philippines Mrs. Corazon Aquino in December, 1987, Mr. Gorbachev wrote: "we appreciate the ASEAN countries' efforts towards
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maintaining peace and lessening international tensions and towards disarmament". Welcoming all constructive efforts to solve the Kampuchean and Korean problems, the Soviet Union is ready to be a guarantor of a peace agreement on Kampuchea and stands for developing the inter-Korean dialogue and lessening tensions on the Peninsula. It supports the initiative of turning the Korean Peninsula into a nuclear free-zone and is ready, jointly with other nuclear powers, to guarantee its non-nuclear states.

The Soviet Union is prepared to abolish all its medium-range missiles, including operational-tactical ones, on its Asian territory, in order to promote the "double zero option" concept on a global scale. This was stated by Mr. Gorbachev when answering questions of the Indonesian newspaper "Merdeka" in connection with the anniversary of Mr. Gorbachev's valadivostic programme for bringing comprehensive security into the Asia-Pacific Region (APR).

Furthermore, Mr. Gorbachev put forwads a series of new initiatives aimed at easing military confrontation in the region. Among them USSR's readiness to assume an obligation not to increase in its Asian territory the

1. Ibid., 20415.
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number of nuclear-capable aircraft if USA did not deploy additional nuclear weapons-capable of reaching Soviet territory. His proposals also envisaged limiting the range of action of ships carrying nuclear weapons and the rivalry in anti-submarine activity, and contemplated heavy cuts in the scale exercises and manoeuvres by navies in the Pacific and the Indian Oceans.¹ In the final analysis, it could be stated that during the Gorbachev regime the Soviet Union contribute much to establish peace in the Asia-Pacific Region (APR).

The changes mentioned above were mainly aimed at ending the coldwar and hence a new world order emerged in the post-cold war era under the post-cold war era what kind of system or order is to be built that suits future international relations has become a challenging issue. On this issue, different countries had different opinions. The USA proposed unipolar world based on American values; Japan and France proposed Tri-polar world in which the USA, the West-Europe and Japan can play a leading role; and the developing countries like India and China proposed that the coming world order should be based on Panch Sheel.

In the absence of another Super Power the Soviet Union, the USA remained the sole Super Power in the post-
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cold war era. Because of its military and economic potentiality, the USA proposed unipolar world in accordance with its values and ideas.

Since the Gulf crisis broke out in August, 1990, US President George Bush has repeatedly suggested building a new world order. On September 11, 1990, in his speech on the Gulf crisis to the joint session of congress Mr. Bush said, "We stand today at a unique and extraordinary moment. The crisis in the Persian Gulf, as grave as it is, also offers a rare opportunity to move towards a historic period of cooperation. Out of these troubled times, our fifth objective a new world order can emerge, a new era-free from threat of terror, stronger in the pursuit of justice and more secure in the quest for peace, an era in which the nations of the world, East and West, North and South, can prosper and live in harmony".¹ On October 1, 1990, Mr. Bush indicated in his address to the United Nations General Assembly: "it was in our hands to press forward to cap a historic moment towards a new world order". He said "we have a vision of a new partnership of nations that transcends the coldwar; a partnership based on consultation, cooperation and collective action.... a partnership united by principle and rule of law and supported by an equitable sharing of cost and commitments; a partnership whose goals are to increase

democracy, prosperity, peace and reduce arms.... And I see a
world building on the emerging new model of European unity,
not just Europe, but the world whole and free". In his
speech on January 29, 1991 Bush referred further to a "new
world order". He said "it is a big idea: a new world order -
where diverse nations are drawn together in a common cause,
to achieve the universal aspirations of mankind; peace and
security, freedom and the rule of law.... for generations,
America has led the struggle to preserve an extend the
blessings of liberty. And today in a rapidly changing world,
American Leadership is indispensible".

On March 6, 1991, Bush again raised the "new world
order" issue when he talked about American policy after the
Gulf war. He said, "now we can see a new world coming into
view....A world where the United Nations, free from the
coldwar stalemate, is poised to fulfill the historic vision
of its founders. A world in which freedom and respect for
human rights find a home among all nations".

Moreover, in his report on National Security
strategy of the United States presented to the Congress on
August 13, 1991, President Bush indicated that the US
objective in the 1990s is to build "a stable and secure

world where political, economic freedom, human rights and
democratic institutions flourish". He affirmed in the
preface of National Security strategy of the US: "We have
within our grasp an extraordinary possibility that few
generations enjoyed - to build a new international system
in accordance with our own values and ideals....For America
we see not only project of our citizens and our interest,
but help to create a new world in which our fundamental
values not only survive but flourish".¹

We can see from these speeches that Bush's "new
world order" contains the following points: (i) The
objective of building a new world order is to achieve peace,
security, freedom and the rule of law in the world, (ii)
Amercia's leadership is indispensable and cannot be
substituted (iii) It is necessary to form a partnership with
allied countries to equitably share both cost and commit-
ments, and to co-operate with the Soviet Union (which is no
more now) to deter aggression and to achieve stability,
prosperity, and above all peace, (iv) The UN should be
given a role to play in the new world order. And Washington
appreciated what the UN had done to America in the Gulf
crisis. (v) The new world order should be based on American
values and ideals, which would flourish in the world so as
to ultimately build a world whole and free. (vi) In
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addition, Bush's new world order shows one characteristic - it plays more attention to the role of big and developed countries, avoiding the North-South problems and (vii) Obviously, Bush's proposal is to create a structure and world order that can maintain US dominant position and promote the US interests in the world.

Thus, the statements of Bush on new world order are based on the concept of unipolar system, in which the USA plays a dominant role.

Under such world order in the post-coldwar era the following developments may take place:

(1) In international relations the European Economic community will have to adjust with new developments in the erstwhile East European Communist countries.

(2) During 1990s, the US will be involved in an economic competition with the EEC and Japan. Many trading blocs are emerging and competition among these trading blocs will determine the foreign economic policies of many countries including India.

(3) The US and its Western Allies will remain involved in conflict situations like the Gulf crisis or Somalia or unstable Europe or Palestinian versus Israeli issues. Many Third world countries including India believe that peace and stability are on the agenda of international
relations during the 1990s and many regional conflicts will witness the involvement of the western countries.

In the said changing world scenario and the developments that took place in the post-cold war period, the USA wants to improve relations with India on the basis of mutuality and reciprocity, which had been missing during the 1950s, 1960s, 1970s, and 1980s because the US determined its foreign policy towards India on the basis of a misunderstanding that India had tilted towards the Soviet bloc countries and it was always reflected in its dealings with India. The US distrust and lack of constructive co-operation was very much in evidence on crucial issues concerning India's security. But in the post cold war the USA has been making a reappraisal of its attitudes and approaches towards India. Selig H. Harrison and Geoffrey Kemp have authored a report of the US Carnegie Endowment on US-Indian Relations in a changing Environment. This study Group has observed that "the end of the cold war has created the opportunity for a significant improvement in relations between the US and India. A growing recognition of converging, geopolitical interests and shared democratic and secular values have replaced mutual distrust resulting from differing perceptions of the Soviet threat". ¹

¹. The Hindu, January 12, 1993.
The areas of cooperation between India and the US are the ascendency as witnessed by Joint Indo-US Defence personel exchanges for Mutual Interacations and Trading. Indian Ocean as the Zone of peace was a very contentious issue between India and US during 1970s and 1980s. This conflict came to an end because the security perceptions and senario of India have undergone a seachange after the end of the coldwar. The US has also developed a positive appreciation about the security concerns India because a stable and secular India can stand the rising tide of Islamic fundamentalism. The US is quite concerned about the growth of Islamic fundamentalist regimes in the Arab World, and it looks towards democratic India as a powerful factor in opposition to undemocratic Arab Musilm regimes.

The US administration welcomed the action of P.V.Narasimha Rao government in recognising Israel for full diplomatic relationship. In the context of prevailing anarchy in Afghanistan, the emergence of Central Asian Musilm States from the former Soviet Union and the Islamic resurgence in Pakistan and Iran and instability in the Gulf countries which have generated new concerns in the US, India is considered a very important modern nation - state by the American foreign policy makers.

Bilateral co-operation is always strengthened on the basis some common identities. A very important evidence
of this change in the US is that Pakistan does not occupy a "special position" in the US foreign policy. On the contrary, the US administration has disapproved the role of the Government of Pakistan in its abetement of terrorism in India. The US secretary of State Warren Christopher warned Pakistan that if it does not stop support to terrorist acts against India, it would not hesitate to name Pakistan a state 'sponsor of terrorism'.

Bilateral economic relations between India and the US are growing because of the New Economic Policies of the Indian Government.¹ Private investors from the US have started evening interest in floating their capital to India.

India and the USA are involved in many areas of conflict in the 1990s. The US is quite firm that India should sign the Nuclear non-proliferation treaty and this pressure will increase under the presidency of Bill Clinton. The US administration does not accept the basic argument of the Government of India that the NPT is a discriminatory treaty. The US wants to impose its Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) of 1987 over India and it is pressurising Russia to abrogate its contract with India for the transfer of cryogenic Rocket Technology. The US has threatened that it will impose sanctions against India and Russia under the

¹ Rasgotra, M., Chopra, V.D., and Misra, K.P., (ed), India's Foreign Policy in the 1990s, Patriot publishers, New Delhi, p.139.
MTCR, if rocket technology is transferred to India. The US policy makers are convinced that India has emerged as a middle level nuclear power in South Asia and its space research and missile developments are directed towards the goal of military nuclear capabilities. Further, the US is quite unhappy with the patent and copyright laws of India and so it has imposed Super 301 on India to check unfair trade practices of India.\(^1\)

India has no intention of re-negotiating its own parliamentary approved laws with the laws like Super 301 or MTCR passed by American Congress. The US is also concerned about the violation of Human Rights by the Indian Security forces in their fight against secessionists and terrorists in Kashmir Valley. All these are serious points of difference between the US and India in the Post-Coldwar era.

India wants to pursue an independent foreign policy without yielding to the pressures of the Super Power the USA. She does not want to compromise her policy because of her own national interests and adherence to the policy of Non-Alignment in the field of international relations. However, India wants to promote and maintain cordial relations with the USA not withstanding her differing perceptions in the fields of conflicts. In the changing scenario of the world order it is imperative that India

---

1. Ibid, p.127.
should protect her national interests, enhance her economic and political leverage with the USA and at the same time maintain correct and cordial relations with the USA for a better world order tomorrow. The US too should shed its presudices, view Non-Aligned India as an emerging factor in the third world countries in its proper perspective, recognise its position as one of the most powerful democratic countries and work with her extending its hand constructive cooperation based on trust and thus further the interests of world peace in the larger interest of the welfare of humanity at large.