CHAPTER FOUR

INTERVENTIONS IN THE THIRD WORLD: AN OVERVIEW

Intervention in International relations is not a new phenomenon. From the ancient Greeks to the present time, there have, always, been some states who intervened in other states in various ways, and by different means. The past and the present history is replete with examples showing that generally the strong states have intervened in the affairs of the weak.

In fact, there have, always, been strong and weak states in the world. And the strong have, always, tried to evolve such systems in which they can protect their interests. And wherever they felt their interests are threatened, they have intervened. Pax-Romana and the Pax-Britannica were the systems to protect the Roman and the British interests. They did so by evolving the systems of law in which their interests could thrive and by providing the military might to defend the systems\(^1\).

In the period of colonialism, the European powers intervened almost every where or wherever they liked—considering and justifying it as their imperial prerogative. The continent of Africa, they justified, did not constitute the part of the civilized world, and, therefore, the rules of non-intervention did not apply there\(^2\). The continent, not being civilized according to them, became an area where any act was permissible and

---

justified by them for themselves. The situation in Asia and Latin America was not quite different from the African continent. America, which itself was a colony of the British Empire became one of the strong powers in international system after getting independence in eighteenth century. And, it very frequently started resorting to the use of intervention in its relation with other countries. From 1813 to 1928, writes Offut, America dispatched its troops abroad for at least seventy times to protect its nationals or in other words its interests. A report entitled “Instances of the Use of US Armed Forces Abroad, 1798-1945”, also lists nearly 160 occasions when the United States used its armed forces, overwhelmingly in the Countries of the Third World. It is to say that the use of intervention, throughout the history, by some states in the affairs of other states, has been a very common phenomenon.

Where the phenomenon of intervention in international relations has been very common, the question about its legitimacy and illegitimacy, justification and non-justification have also been raised. And respect to the rules of non-intervention commonly in the form of lip-services has always been paid. This also happened when the system of balance-of-power based, among other things, on the right to intervention in the interest of

4. L. S. Stavrianos; Global Rift: The Third World Comes of Age, 1981, pp. 462-463. From 1900 to 1925, US intervened in China and Honduras seven times each, Panama six times, the Dominican Republic four times, Columbia, Mexico and Cuba three times each, and once each in Morocco, The Philippines and Syria.
peace and security collapsed with the outbreak of World War I. Greater significance began to be attached to the idea of forbidding intervention. And this idea became one of the most respected but, unfortunately, also one of the most violated principles of International law. In fact, the rules of non-intervention never restricted the interventionary actions of strong powers whenever they intended to intervene either for the protection of their interests or the protection of whatever they thought necessary. Richard J. Barnet very aptly observes that, "there is nothing exceptional about powerful countries asserting their imperial prerogative of using force or coercion on the territory of another without its consent." His observation seems to be echoing the famous saying of the Athenian Empire that strong do what they can and weak do what they must. The situation did not change even after the outbreak of the World War I. Intervention for many powers remained available as one of the instruments of their foreign policy.

After the World War II, much attention in the Charter of the United Nations was given to the principles of non-intervention, asking states to adhere to these principles in their post-war relations. However, their relations do not show that these principles have not been violated. In fact, they have been violated and violated at large. Hans J. Morgenthau, observing the post-War interventionary situation, writes that there is nothing new in the

contemporary doctrine prohibiting intervention or in the pragmatic use of intervention by individual states on behalf of their interests. He finds the post-war interventionary situation merely as the continuation of a tradition which was established in the nineteenth century. So, states continued to resort to intervention in their post-war relations much in the same way as they as they have been doing in the past.

In the wake of the World War II, some very significant changes took place in the world. The United States and the Soviet Union emerged as the only major world powers leading the two ideologically conflicting blocs – the Socialist East and the Capitalist West, former dominated and led by the Soviet Union and the latter by the United States. The process of decolonization also began, and most of the Third World which was divided among the few European powers gradually became independent. But the process of decolonization was followed by another kind of colonization: neo-colonialism, a system of indirect domination and control to maintain economic domination and subordination of the Third World. S. D. Muni, observing the situation writes that “the Third World was not born as a free and autonomous entity.” In fact, the economic, political and other

8. It is not intended here that the ideological rivalry between the Soviet Union and the United States and European powers was non-existent before the World War II. In fact, the ideological rivalry came into being with the establishment of USSR in 1917. It put them on collision course. However, the rivalry became more manifested in international relations after the end of World War II, especially with the beginning of 1950s.
interests of the former colonial and the newly emerged major world powers, the United States and the Soviet Union, remained involved in the Third World. And in order to protect their interests, they began to resort to other means to keep the Third World in their domination and control indirectly than directly which was only possible through the maintenance of colonialism. This system of indirect domination and control is being practiced through a variety of measures both repressive such as overt armed intervention, covert destabilization, bolstering of unfavorable regimes as well as non-repressive such as economic help, technological domination and arms transfer. It is to say that the liquidation of colonialism was taken over by neo-colonialism. In other words, the colonialists never gave up; instead they are continuously doing the same thing as did in the past, but now through neo-colonialism, not colonialism.

The post-war international system is a continuation of the old system of exploitation and domination. The old system which began with colonialism was effectively maintained throughout the world during the last

11. L. S. Stavrianos; op cit, p. 456. Also see Roberto Remo Bissio; Third World Guide, 89/90, Uruguay, Argentina, p. 13; Mohammad Ayoob; “Superpowers and the Third World: Prospects for the 1980s”, IDSA Journal. Vol. XIII, No. 3, Jan. – March 1981. M. Zuberi; “Intervention. Developing Countries in the International System”. Contemporary Affairs, Vol. 2, No. 1, Jan. – March 1988, p. 7. The Third World nations after getting independence felt that they have got rid of colonial domination and are free to shape their own destinies. But the harsh realities of international system dominated and controlled by the big powers forced them to surrender to other kind of domination. They even after decades of their formal independence, find themselves severely restrained to exercise their sovereignty as nation states. In fact, the Third World nations did not play any role in the evolution of international system. They were part of the colonial empires who actually are responsible for the structuring of international system. The Third World nations by and large find themselves at the bottom of the international order. However, despite various efforts of the Third World nations to have their voice felt in contemporary international politics, the fundamental character of international system is still determined by big powers.
two centuries by the European colonial powers with Great Britain at the helm of affairs up to the end of World War II. After wards, the global role which was being played by the Great Britain was taken over by the United States\textsuperscript{12}, with a marked difference that there also emerged an ideologically different power, the Soviet Union, aspiring to color the whole world with socialism. So, it started to rival the United States as the world power, ending the optimistic expectation of one world harmonized by American rules of conduct and capitalism.

Whatever these powers wanted or the values they preferred to be globalised, patterns of behavior they chose for reward and punishment, created and dominated the world politics. These two powers, since the end of the World War II, had extensively, been involved in all kinds of interventionary activities throughout the world to extend their areas of influence. Great Britain and other European powers have also remained involved in defending their colonial sphere of influence. The other noteworthy development is that regional powers like South Africa and China and small countries like Pakistan, India, Israel and Libya have also been interfering in the affairs of the neighbouring countries.

The end of the World War II presented opportunities both for the United States and the Soviet Union to shape or to reshape the world according to

\textsuperscript{12} L. S. Stavrianos; op. cit., p. 458. See also Hans J. Morgenthau; op. cit., p. 426. After the World War I, the United States gradually replaced the Great Britain, especially in the Western Hemisphere. And after the World War II it became the undisputed leader of the Capitalist World.
their ideological preferences. The United States struggled for the maintenance and the expansion of the old capitalist system. The Soviet Union desired the reshaping of the World on the Communistic/Socialistic lines. They started competing each other through out the world and soon the Third World became the battle ground for their competition\textsuperscript{13}. Furthermore, the never-ending intra and inter-states military, ethnic and religious conflicts and economic weaknesses of the Third World countries provided them opportunities to exploit these situations to protect and extend their respective political and economic values or, in other words, to control and dominate the Third World\textsuperscript{14}. Along with them, Great Britain and France\textsuperscript{15} have also exploited the Third World on the same lines: fishing into the troubled waters of the Third World.

These powers in order to achieve their desired objectives, resorted to all kind of activities both overt and covert. Comparing the American and the Soviet ideological rivalry with the Seventeenth Century religious wars, Hans J. Morgenthau writes that it "does not respect national boundaries. It finds enemies and allies in all countries, opposing the one and supporting the other, regardless of the niceties of international law. Here is the dynamic force which has led the two super powers to intervene all over the


\textsuperscript{14} L. S. Stavrianos; op. cit. P. 459.

\textsuperscript{15} The East and West blocs were dominated by the Soviet Union and the United States respectively. But in case of East bloc, no country, other than USSR, has powers projection capability where as in West bloc along with the United States, Great Britain and France both have it and can project that far beyond their immediate territories.
globe, sometimes surreptitiously, sometimes openly, sometimes with the
accepted method of diplomatic pressure and propaganda, sometimes with
the frowned upon instruments of covert subversion and open force. They have, most often, resorted to coercive ways and means or have threatened to do so wherever they perceived threats to their respective interests. The coercive methods employed by them to protect their interests in the Third World could be compared to those undertaken by the Roman and the British Empires during hey days. They are the same in one way or the other. The difference is that they have become more subtle and less visible but equally effective these days.

Before the World War II, most of the Third World was under colonial rule. And the decolonization process which began after the war was followed by the super powers' struggle for establishing their influences and domination in the world. Further more, out of their struggle was born a process which initiated, encouraged and contributed to the arms build up activities in the Third World. The conflict prone nature of the Third World provided sustenance to the armament activities in the region, and great leverage to the superpowers to extend their influence. The arms sales and assistance became the vital instruments of their foreign policies. Other major powers who also happened to be major arms manufacturers like Great

Britain, France, China etc., got involved in arms build-up activities in the Third World. Along with encouraging armament activities they, especially, the United States and the Soviet Union, also struggled for establishing their military bases in different parts of the Third World. An important aspect of this struggle was to destabilize the Third World countries for ensuring that a pliable ruler stays in power in a client state or for toppling a ruler pursuing independent foreign policy or supposed to be close to either one of the super powers. Dr. Daniel Ellsberg, a well-known author of Pentagan Papers, has observed that smaller or less powerful countries towards which USA is ill-disposed are considered to be either aligned with or have received aid from the Soviet Union.\textsuperscript{18} Arms sales and assistance have been effective instruments of superpowers' foreign policies, for the extension of their respective power and influence in the Third World.

Arms sales, other than being an instrument for extension of power and influence, also subserve the economic interests of the sellers by earning foreign exchange, subsidising arms build-up research and development cost and enabling the arms producing countries to clear their stocks of obsolete weapons. Additionally, sellers acquire influence over the policy makers in the Third World countries that buy or receive arms. Another aspect of arms sales and assistance is that in some cases arms sales or assistance is provided especially to enable the recipient to pose security

threats whether by being able to launch a full-scale attack or by acting as a launching pad for covert or guerrilla operations in a neighbouring country. In either case, the arms supplies' intention would be to coerce the targeted country\textsuperscript{19}. Further more, the supply of sophisticated weaponry also make the recipient states dependent on suppliers for training their personnel and for manning and maintaining such sophisticated weapons. This in turn provide opportunities to the suppliers to extend their influence among the military personnel and elites of the recipient countries. The United States alone trains military personnel in some 150 bases and training schools, and send mobile units and advisors in the client states for the purpose\textsuperscript{20}. Over 200,000 Latin American military personnel have been trained in US. And since 1949, over 35000 Latin American officers have been trained in the schools for the Americans only: a school identified in Latin America by its historic function as the school of Coups\textsuperscript{21}.

The supply of sophisticated weaponry by the Soviets has also made some of the recipient countries dependent on them for training their personnel and for manning and maintaining such equipments there by providing opportunities to the Soviet Union extend its influence among the military personnel and elite of the weapon receiving countries, such as Somalia, Egypt and Afghanistan. Training of military personnel provides

\textsuperscript{19} R. Rama Rao; "Developing Countries: Threats to their Security", op. cit.
the opportunities for their ideological indoctrination. The supply of arms to
the Third World creates, in general, a relationship of dependency among
the Third World and the suppliers of arms.

The supply of arms to the Third World sinks it into the morass of economic
and military dependence upon both super and major powers. Despite few
countries of relative self-reliance in the Third World like India, Vietnam and
at time Egypt and Indonesia by and large, this dependency relationship
has contributed towards the consolidation of neo-imperial order in the
Third World. This situation has been very perceptively analyzed by Ali
Mazuri. He writes that “there has certainly been a change from the old
days Pax-Britanica, whereas the old imperial motto was ‘Disarm the
natives and facilitate control’, the new imperial cunning has translated it
into ‘Arm the natives and consolidate dependency’. While the British and
the French once regarded it as important to stop tribal warfare, they now
regard it as profitable to modernize tribal warfare—with lethal weapons.” The supply of arms to the Third World after the World War II was
consciously initiated by the supper powers to effect changes in policies of
the Third World countries as per supper power’s interests and policy
preferences. This all, in other words, was for establishing their domination
and hegemony over the entire Third World.

1978, p. 474
The supper powers, specially the United States and other major powers like France, Britain etc. also pursue policies, the purpose of which is to keep the Third World under their domination. They pursue a number of economic policies which directly or indirectly influence the policies of the individual Third World countries and exercise greater influence on the economic development of the Third World as a whole, thereby creating a relationship of acute dependency of the Third World upon the developed world.

The international economic system dominated by the Developed World has created the under development of the Third World countries. The economic under development of the Third World was set in motion when it came in organic contact with those areas where capitalist development and industrialization took place. The Europe upon the birth of the capitalist system undertook the unprecedented task of overrunning the whole world, thereby sowing the seeds for the peripheralization of the Third World in international system.

In fact, the Third World countries were born into an international system where the rules governing the international relations were already set by the strong developed nations. And the Third World countries have been operating within the domain of a system imposed upon them. The effects of which have been to further the economic dependency of the Third World upon the developed nations. The question of underdevelopment of
the Third World is not economic as to be resolved by injecting capital in the Third World but rather a problem to be resolved politically. It is in this context that the various scholars have argued that the underdevelopment of the Third World countries have not taken place in isolation. It has been deliberately done by Developed World against the Third World or the development of the former was possible because it underdeveloped the latter.²⁴

The experience of the Third World development in recent past suggests, according to a study by UN experts, that the gap between the two (The Third World & the Developed World) is widening rather than narrowing.²⁵ The determinative feature of the effects of the international system devised and controlled by the strong developed nations is the underdevelopment and marginalization of the Third World in the international system.

The systematic mechanism of the Third World economic dependence on the developed nations can be well described by discriminatory structures of trade and the functioning of Transnational Co-operations. The present international economy is dominated by the Transnational Co-operations. Investment, technology and trade are well controlled by them. Their functioning transgress territorial laws and their dominance vitiate and

²⁵ Roberto Remo Bissio; op. cit., p. 13.
subordinate national economies. Their comprehensive economic control negates the very structures of political and economic independence. The Transnational Cooperations due to their penetrative and controlling characteristics are known as global leviathans, which are sustained as functioning structures of neo-colonialism by the inequitable provisions of the Bretton Woods-GATT regime whose functioning has been economically detrimental for the Third World countries\textsuperscript{26}. The resultant relationship between the Third World and the developed countries has been of an exploiter-exploited, dominant-subservient nature for which the euphemism inter-dependence has been coined. The global economy, dominated by the Transnational Cooperation and the GATT arrangement is aimed principally against the third World.

Besides the developed nations also sought to impose varied forms of economic dependency and exploitation by their financial institutions—International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank. They use the coercive measures of economic character in order to force the sovereign will of the Third World countries and obtain from it advantages of any kind. Frequent charges of economic intervention by the Third World concern the relationship between the International Monetary Fund and the individual

Third World countries\(^{27}\). At the Arusha Conference in Tanzania in the July 1980, the IMF was accused of imposing conditionalities on the Loan seeker Third World countries which amounted to grave infringement of their sovereignty\(^{28}\). It attaches an ideology of economic, social and political development along with its loan irrespective of the third world countries' own clearly stated policies. The Third World countries being born into a system which had the development of Free Market economy as the primary objective, and, due to non-availability of other sources of finance open to them are forced to join the IMF and accept its conditionalities despite their reservations. They, while accepting the IMF conditions have objected to the nature of such conditions. A Third World Leader Julius Nyerere, arguing over the content of conditionalities says “we expected these condition to be non-ideological and related to ensuring that money lent to is not wasted, pocketed by political leaders or bureaucrats\(^{29}\). In spite of the Third World countries' reservations about IMF conditions, their economic weakness is further more exploited by the IMF through the imposition of the ideological solution on a country's problems regardless of the clearly chosen ideology of the country involved.

---

\(^{27}\) See for details: Inter-American Juridical Year Book 1948, Washington, DC.; Year Book of United Nations 1974, New York; Corline Thomas; “Third World Attitude to the Non-intervention Norm”, The Non-Aligned World, Vol.11 No.4, October-December 1984; Cathy Barbano; “The IMF’s Deadly Cure”, Third World Resurgence, No.9, 1991. In 1974, New International economic order was called for at General Assembly of the United Nation by the Third World Countries through which have been making a case for greater independence in economic realms and to be treated as sovereign, self-determining nation by the stronger nation.

\(^{28}\) Caroline Thomas, op. cit., p.488. Conditionality refers to the price to be paid by a borrower from the IMF in terms of suggested policies, which a borrower has to implement if it wants to get loan.

\(^{29}\) See Development Dialogue, No 2, Uppasala, Sweden, 1980.
The IMF has pressed in many cases for ideological remedies which are perceived by Third World countries as interventionary activities to deny them their right to decide their own ways of political, social and economic development. The case of several Latin American and other Third World countries are pertinent here. The IMF conditionalities in cases of Bolivia in 1984, Jamaica and Brazil in 1970s have had disastrous consequences for these countries. The IMF guidelines not only forced them to change their policies, but pushed them into morass of conflicts. Similar social and political problems have been experienced by various Third World countries when ever they implemented IMF conditionalities. The food riots in Morocco and Sudan in 1981 and 1982, respectively, were the repurcussions of the implementation of IMF conditionalities. The Indian case in 1981 relating to IMF conditionalities sparked off a heated debate in the country. The government in order not to loose its face on the issue of sovereignty stressed that it will only implement the policies already included in Sixth Five Year Plan. The meddling of IMF through the conditionalities attached to its Loan given to the Third World countries clearly constitutes intervention in the affairs of the Third World countries.

The guidelines imposed by the IMF upon the Third World Countries is the enforcement of non-colonial designs. L. S. Stavrianos writes that the IMF and the World Bank were designed to establish American control over the

30. For details see Caroline Thomas, op. cit., pp. 489-90.
31. Ibid., p. 490. The devaluation of Indian Currency and the liberalization of its economic policies in 1992 are in view of many the result of IMF guidelines India accepted in exchange of IMF Loans.
Third World. The IMF has the capacity to intervene in the Third World countries, and it take the advantage of its capacity to impose its own policies upon the countries which disapprove them. In fact, the element of compulsion exerted by the IMF falls within the realm of intervention. It also points out that international monetary organizations can interfere in the affairs of the states.

The interventionary activities in economic realm are not undertaken only by international monetary organization but states also indulge in such activities. As the Third World countries are under-developed and developing, they are more exposed to economic exploitation. The economically and industrially strong nations apply political pressure through their aid giving policies to effect changes in the policies of the Third World countries, according to their respective interests. France subsidizes the former colonies in Africa. French investment and economic assistance programs in the Francophone African countries have had significant consequences for the internal politics of the target-state and for regional security. The Dominican Republic has recently been prey to more indirect US meddling. Critical loans to this country as to all Latin America are conditional on implementation of the IMF conditionality program.

32. L. S. Stavrianos; op. cit, p. 459.
34. Cathy Barbano; op. cit., p. 10.
In fact, the economic assistance programs of the developed countries do not operate in vacuum. They have traditionally been linked to the political and military calculations of the assistance supplying nations. Assistance programs apparently aim at the promotion of development in the Third World and thereby narrowing the gap between the Developed World and the Third World. What we see in contrast to the apparent aim of economic assistance is the growing gap between them. The reason for the failure of assistance programs is that the allocation of aid has been determined less by the needs of recipients and more by the political objectives of the aid giving nations. The US Secretary of States, Dean Rusk, once stated that: “foreign aid program form its beginning in 1940s was planned and administered to serve the vital interests of the United States….our security would be in great jeopardy without the aid program”.

The economic assistance program following the World War II became the policy instrument of developed nations. The US emerged as the largest supplier of economic aid to the Third World countries. Economic assistance program instead of fostering the Third World development have rather enlarge uneven development thereby causing social, economic and political disputes. They have been sinking them into the sea of debt crisis. The economic assistance programs are used as levers to pressurize the Third World countries to act as per desire of the aid giving

nations.

Other than IMF conditionalities and the use of economic assistance for political objectives the strong powers specially the United States apply economic sanctions to put pressure on the target states to change the policies as demanded by the sanctioning state. The United States has been the dominant user of economic sanctions in the twentieth century, mostly in the post-World War II era. The intensity of US sanctions against the Third World countries increased greatly in 1970s. As of autumn 1988, US economic sanctions were in force against Chile, Ethiopia, South Africa, Haiti, Iran, Libya, Nicaragua, and Panama; in addition, long-standing trade embargoes were in place against Cuba, North Korea, and Vietnam. The more recent cases of economic sanctions initiated by the United States are in operation against Libya, Iraq, India and Pakistan. In number of episodes of economic sanctions, they have been accompanied by other coercive measures. The United States applied non-economic measures in addition to economic ones in number of cases. In Nicaragua, continued economic sanctions were coupled with financial support for internal opposition. In Panama, initial hopes were that General Manuel Noriega would be removed through electoral process. Following elections, the United States condemned the results, instituted economic sanctions and called for a popular overthrow of Noriega's regime. The failure to achieve

38. Ibid., pp. 85-99.
Noriega’s overthrow by others means led to the direct US military intervention in Panama. There have been number of other cases of economic sanctions like Cuba, Libya, the Dominican Republic, Iraq, etc. which were accompanied by other military and covert measures.

The United States, in attempting to shape the post-War World to its liking, used economic leverage to coerce the number of Third World countries supposed to be pursuing contradictory policies in US presumptions. Where the United States intervened frequently in the Third World with economic sanctions, its counterpart the Soviet Union intervened in negligible number of times. The other major powers, France and Britain, also lag much behind the US in episodes of economic sanctions. They have often participated in US led or imposed sanctions. Economic sanctions are imposed to effect changes in the political behaviour of the target state. And the Third World countries have been the frequent target of economic sanctions imposed by the strong developed nations.

There have been many occasions when strong powers have covertly intervened in the Third World countries, by various means namely secret propaganda, manipulations of foreign electoral processes, coups d'état, secret financial assistance, paramilitary operations, assassination of

39. There seems to no comprehensive study conducted regarding the Soviet Union’s used of economic sanctions against the Third World countries. However, Peter Wallensteen to study the feasibility of economic sanctions of peaceful means of conflict resolutions has included one episode of economic sanction by the Soviet Union against Yugoslavia (1948-55) in his selection of 10 modern cases of economic sanction since 1932. See his book, Dilemmas of Economic Coercion: Sanctions in World Politics, New York: Praeger, 1983.
political leaders etc. The covert interventionary activities in the post-War World became very common. The United States very often used covert activities as the instruments of its foreign policy. To contain the expansion of communism around the globe and to safeguard the non-communist governments from communist subversive activities, the United States initially and publicly provided economic and technical assistance to Greece and Turkey. But its fears fueled by the ruthless Soviet takeover of Czechoslovakia, the perceived communist threat to Italian independence in its 1948 elections, and accession to power of communist governments in Poland, Hungary, and other East European countries, pursued President Truman that containment required an additional covert side. He signed a National Security Council Directive (NSC 10/2) that set in motion several secret covert action program to contain communism. Afterwards the covert interventionary activities of the US began to grow.

President Dwight D. Eisenhower further reaffirmed the necessity for a major covert-action capability. The temperament of his period is best illustrated by the words of a secret report to the President by Hoover Commission Sub-Committee in 1954. The report declared that "hitherto accepted norms of human conduct do not apply......to survive, long standing, American concepts of fair play must be reconsidered. We must learn to subvert, sabotage and destroy our enemies by more clever, more

40. See Peter J. Schraeder, op. Cit., p.102.
sophisticated and more effective methods than those used against us" 41. Hundreds of covert interventionary activities were undertaken throughout the Third World. The Church Committee's final report in 1976 revealed that the CIA had conducted nearly 900 major and thousands of smaller covert-action projects since 1961, the majority of which taking place in the Third World 42. The Church Committee also revealed that assassinations of foreign leaders have been the regular instruments of US foreign policy and the CIA had been deeply involved in assassination plots during the several decades of the Cold War.

The United States covert interference with the electoral processes in other countries have been very common. Italy, although not a Third World country provided a classic documented example of US intervention in the electoral process in target countries. In 1958 election, the possibility was that a democratically elected government headed by communist party of Italy would capture the power. The Soviet Union was reportedly spending US $ 50 millions per year to aid the Italian communists. The US government assigned the CIA the task of secretly intervening in Italy to counter the Soviet political designs. Such US covert intervention as in Italy would have certainly taken place in many of the Third World countries wherever there was a possibility of leftist election victories. There have been reported instances of US election intervention in countries such as

42. Ibid. pp. 159-61.
Brazil, British Guiana, the Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Jamaica, Laos, Lebanon, Nicaragua, the Philippines, and Vietnam\textsuperscript{43}.

A book about US covert action in 1980s was authored by a renowned investigative journalist Bob Woodward. His book “Veil: The Secret Wars of the CIA, 1981-1987” detailed a variety of covert actions taken by the Reagan Administration to influence political events in selected Third World areas\textsuperscript{44}. The Reagan Administration, since 1981, has attempted to overthrow or weaken the regime of Libya’s Muammar Qaddafi\textsuperscript{45}. A crucial aspect of this effort has been to assist Qaddafi’s enemies both within Libya and in neighboring countries. The United States initiated a major covert action in Chad beginning in 1981, which included arms, money, technical assistance, and political support to Hissene Habre, Chad’s former Minister of Defense, to overthrow the existing pro-Libyan government. The CIA in 1982, in coordination with Saudi Arabia, sponsored efforts by exiled Yemenis to conduct sabotage activities against the Soviet-dominated state of South Yemen. Bob Woodward also claimed that the US administration attempted to assassinate Lebanon’s Sheikh Fadlallah, the leader of Hizbollah, who was believed to be responsible for the three terrorist bombings of US facilities in Beirut. The United States to protect its foreign interests in the Third World has covertly

\textsuperscript{43} Peter J. Schraeder, op. cit., Chapter 4. Also see William Blum; The CIA: A Forgotten History.
\textsuperscript{44} Peter J. Schraeder, op. cit., p. 109. See Also Thomas Powess; The Man Who Kept The Secrets (New York: Knopf, 1979); John Prados; President’s Secret Wars: CIA and Pentagon Covert Operations Since World War II (New York: William Morrow, 1986).
\textsuperscript{45} US efforts to dislodge Qaddafi were, however, initiated since Qaddafi captured power in 1969.
intervened in number of countries. These examples are the tip of the iceberg of covert intervention, as scores of such activities remain invisible.

Besides covert assassinations of foreign leaders and election intervention, the United States has covertly sponsored various coups d'état and provided economic and military assistance to armed insurgencies throughout the world with the basic intention of overthrowing the governments deemed inimical to US foreign policy interests. The CIA secretly encouraged a right wing military coup in Syria in March 1949. Nearly a decade of covert American meddling in Syria resulted in an attempted abortive CIA plot to topple the Syrian regime in August 1957. Most recent accounts of the CIA's secret operations during the early years of post-War period, however, ignore Syria entirely and focus instead on better known instances of covert intervention in Iran, Guatemala, and Indonesia.

The CIA was directly involved in overthrowing of Iranian Prime Minister Mohammad Mosaddeq in 1953. Since then the US maintained very close relations with Shah of Iran and his overthrowing in 1979 led to the increased involvement of US to topple the revolutionary government in Iran by providing covert support to groups opposed to the government. In

1987, the US undertook a more activist policy of trying to contain Iran with the threat of military force in the form of a naval armada in the Waters of Iran's Persian Gulf Coast. In 1954, the American covert meddling resulted in overthrowing of Guatemala's democratically elected and reform-minded government of Jacobo Arbenz Guzman\textsuperscript{49}, a leader perceived by US policy makers as leading Guatemala on a path toward communism. The President Achmed Sukarno of Indonesia met with American disfavour because he included communists into his Cabinet. The vehicle for subverting Sukarno was paramilitary support, beginning in 1956, for an existing secessionist movement that incorporated the Indonesian Islands of Celebes, Java, and Sumatra. The covert CIA program included transfer of military weapons to the rebels and CIA-piloted B-26 bombers flying support missions\textsuperscript{50}. The US supported Tibetan guerrillas fighting against communist China. US support for the guerrilla movement in Tibet, which lasted from 1956 to 1973, included the training of guerrillas in the United States, India, and Nepal, as well as direct re-supply of military material into Tibet through CIA air support\textsuperscript{51}.

The United States also became involved in organizing and funding guerrilla armies in Laos and South Vietnam. In both cases, the CIA and US Defense Department created autonomous guerrilla armies with the acquiescence of the host government, most notably among the Hmong.

\textsuperscript{49} For an overview of this case see: Richard H. Immerman; The CIA in Guatemala: The Foreign Policy of Intervention, University of Texas Press, Austin, 1982.
\textsuperscript{50} John Prados; op. cit., pp. 128-49.
\textsuperscript{51} Ibid., pp. 61-78.
ethnic group in Laos (1960-1973) and the Montagnards of South Vietnam's central highlands (1961-70). In overthrow of Chilean President Salvador Allende, the United States was involved. In 1973, Allende indeed was killed during a successful US-induced military coup d'etat. The United States provided covert aid to Kurdish guerrillas seeking to secede from Iraq from 1972-73 in order to force Iraq to settle its territorial dispute over Shaat-Al-Arab waterway as per interests of Iran. In return from Iran's assurance that no further aid would be furnished to Kurdish guerrillas, Iraq in 1975 recognized Iran's territorial claims. The other interventionary involvement of US was in Angolan Civil War of 1975. The most significant aspect of the Angola intervention was that it represented congressional assertion of oversight of US foreign policy in general and covert intervention in particular.

The number of other interventionary activities were undertaken by US in the affairs of many countries; Sudan, in late 1960s and 70s, Horn of Africa, Western Sahara in 1970s, Chad in 1970s and 80s, Nicaragua, Afghanistan after Soviet intervention in 1979, Cambodia since the mid 70s, El-Salvador, etc. This is the political list of US interventionary activities in the Third World. In fact fewer interventionary activities have been recorded than actually occurred with emphasis on those which occurred at higher levels than the lower levels. The United States in

52. Peter J. Schraeder, op. cit., p. 118.
53. Ibid., p. 107.
55. Peter J. Schraeder, op. cit., p. 120.
pursuing its foreign policy interests in the Third World has employed different types of intervention. Within the realm of US coercive actions, there have also been many occasions when it has intervened militarily in the affairs of the Third World countries. Cambodia, Cuba, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, Iran, Korea, Lebanon, Mexico and Nicaragua have all experienced the application of US military might at various times.66

Blechman and Kaplan have listed all the cases in the period after World War II where the United States has used its armed forces to compel action or arresting of action by hostile actors or to assure support to a friendly actor for its action or inaction. From 1946 to 1975 excluding the Korean and Vietnam War years, they have found that the United States used its armed forces as a political instrument on as many as 215 occasions. While most of the incidents took place in Europe in the period 1946-48, the Third World took over as the predominant position in the following decades.57 According to them, the United States used its armed forces as a political instrument once every other month.

The more recent cases of US direct military intervention are Grenada, Libya, Panama and Iraq. Grenada, an island state in Caribbean region, was invaded by US in October 1983. The invasion was widely regarded as a part of bellicose foreign policy being persuaded by President Ronald

56. Ibid., pp. 131-44.
57. See for details, Barry M. Blechman, and Stephen S. Kaplan; Force Without War: US Armed Forces as a Political Instrument, (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution), 1978. They have defined political use of armed forces in the following words: "A political use of armed forces occurs when physical actions are taken by one or more components of the uniformed
Reagan. The invasion was also seen as a contemporary application of foreign policy formulated by a much earlier President James Monroe whose Doctrine of 1823 has been central to United States policy in the Western Hemisphere ever since its pronouncement. US involvement in the Libya began after Qaddafi captured power in 1969. However, the US directly intervened by bombing Libya in April 1986.

In 1989, the tiny state of Panama was invaded by the United States, resulting into the overthrowing of the regime and capturing President General Manuel Noreiga. After the Iraqi annexation of Kuwait on August 2, 1990, the United states got directly involved in the Gulf crisis and used its military might against Iraq. The case studies presented here provide an overview of US interventionary practices in the Third World. However, the United States has not been the only nation which has undertaken interventionary activities to achieve its foreign policy objectives in the Third World. There have been other strong and great powers which engaged in such activities and the Soviet Union has been a frequent practitioner of such activities in the Third World.

61. The Gulf Crises and the subsequent US involvement indicate that the US interest in the Crisis was in establishing its supremacy in the region thereby preserving its oil interests. Though the purpose of the UN resolution was the liberation of Kuwait, this mandate of the UN was exceeded by the US and its multinational forces. The objective of the US was the destruction of Iraq and also its potential. The liberation of Kuwait was only a pretext.
Shortly after the World War II, the Soviet Union's interventionary activities were restricted to Europe. However, since late 1960s it has been more and more involved in the Third World. As the Soviet Union was a close system, its interventionary activities have been less documented as compared to the United States. Marita Kaw has noted 403 historical conflicts from 1950 to 1987 in which there were 4 instances of large scale Soviet military intervention; 14 to 19 instances of intervention with fewer than 15,000 combat support personnel; 19 cases of Arms delivery; and 366 conflicts where verbal/diplomatic support was all that was dispensed. Another study about Soviet Union's use of its armed forces as a political instrument was conducted by Stephen S. Kaplan. He has listed about 190 incidents in which the Soviet Union used its armed forces. In the following two decades after Second World War, its use of armed forces was restricted to Europe, mainly in Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union directly intervened in Hungary in November 1956 and Czechoslovakia in August 1968. Kaplan concludes that from 1967 to 1979 three-fourth of all incidents took place in the Third World mainly in the Persian Gulf, Horn of Africa, Sub-Saharan Africa, and South Asia.

Blechman and Kaplan in their study conclude that the Soviet Union was

involved in 75% of the incidents in Europe, 60% of those in Sub-Saharan, 39% of those in Middle-East and only 7% in Western Hemisphere. The Soviet Union's recent instance of direct military intervention was Afghanistan in 1979. The Soviet Union has involved in many of the Third World countries directly and also indirectly through its surrogates. The Soviet Union has undertaken a number of interventional activities in the Third World, the number of similar incidents attributable to other developed countries like the UK and the France is considerable.

The United Kingdom has also undertaken interventional actions against the Third World countries. It practiced foreign military intervention more than thirty times in more than twenty countries after World War II. She used force more extensively than any other major country despite her reduced status in the post-War era. Britain turned to force more often than any other major nation, including either the United States or the Soviet Union. She intervened in more places than any other state. Such militance seems inconsistent with England's post-War position. The United Kingdom fell to a secondary status after World War II: America and Russia eclipsed her; she was shorn of empire; her economy suffered; and she no longer exerted decisive influence upon the structure of the international system.

She stayed out of most of her allies' conflicts, including Algeria, Angola,

Indochina, Mozambique, and Vietnam.

Britain initiated thirty-four foreign military interventions in the twenty-two years between 1949-1970. Some of these operations met sustained local resistance and became protracted engagements, including those in Aden, Cyprus, and Kenya. Others were one-day affairs. More than one-and-a-half interventions began each year on average. Britain limited herself primarily to post-War Empire. Within these bounds she operated from Aden to Zanzibar, from the Bahamas to Hong Kong. She did not confine military action to colonies of the moment, for she intervened in Cyprus, Kenya, Suez, Tanganyika and Uganda after independence. But twenty-nine of thirty-four military operations (85%) occurred in territories under her rule in 1946. However, Britain's shows of force, not involving the actual use of force, operations not involving regular troops and forms of military assistance not entailing the direct use of regular military forces have not been well documented. The United Kingdom like other great powers has employed more subtle and covert means of intervention. And its recent short interventionary operation like US in Grenada was Antigua\textsuperscript{70}.

Like Britain, France has also intervened on many occasion. It has mainly been involved in Africa. In June1977, a small colonial enclave of Djibauti

became independent bringing to an end 150 years of French colonial presence in Africa. Less than two months later not only there were more French troops in Africa than at any time since 1960. Deployed in more than twenty African States and territories, they were actively engaged in fighting in Chad, Mauritania and Zaire\textsuperscript{71}. France’s involvement in Africa gives strength to the inference that it had also practiced interventionist policies in the Third World like the other great powers, although at less scale than the United States and the Soviet Union.

There has also been a noticeable phenomena of regional powers’ interventionary activities in their respective regions and even sometimes beyond their regions. Many regional and small powers like South Africa, China, India, Cuba, Libya, Pakistan, etc. have practiced interventionary policies in their neighbourhoods. South Africa’s domestic conflict spread beyond its boundaries to include the neighbouring states who have been victims of destabilization and dependence policy called total strategy. The strategy includes a heavy blend of military, economic destabilization and political dialogue….. (which) aims at preventing neighbouring states from hosting anti-apartheid guerrillas and to tighten economic dependence in the region in the hope of avoiding sanctions and broadening markets for South African goods\textsuperscript{72}. South Africa pursues the policy of destabilization in
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its neighborhood. Its destabilization manoeuvres have been its invasion of Lesotho, Botswana, Mozambique, Angola, Swaziland, Zimbabwe, and Zambia; attempted assassination of the Prime Ministers of Lesotho and Zimbabwe; backed proxy wars against Angola (UNITA), Mozambique (MNR), Lesotho (LLA) and Zimbabwe\textsuperscript{73} (Super ZAPU). South Africa has been openly pursuing interventionary policies against its neighbours to extort compliance and submission.

Besides South Africa, China and Cuba have also been involved in southern Africa. China, although has mainly involved in South-East Asia\textsuperscript{74}. It also got involved in Angola, Zimbabwe\textsuperscript{75}, Mozambique, as well as in South Asia especially its role in fomenting insurgency in the North-Eastern part of India. Cuba was mainly involved in Angola\textsuperscript{76}. And it has also been alleged that the Cuban troops played an instrumental role in Abdul Fattah Ismail's ouster of Salem Rubaya Ali in South Yemen\textsuperscript{77}. Libya has been blamed for supporting to a number of guerrilla and terrorist movements throughout the world. However, its involvement in Chad is well documented. Libya first provided financial and military support to Frolinat guerrillas and later on in 1973 moved its own forces in Chad\textsuperscript{78}. India has also practiced interventionary policies in South Asia. It intervened in East Pakistan (Now Bangladesh) conflict of 1971 and it also provided financial
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as well as military support to Tamil guerrillas in Sri Lanka. Pakistan has extensively involved in fomenting and encouraging armed conflicts in Indian State of Punjab and Jammu and Kashmir. In all the Third World regions, there have been conflicts and tensions between one country and other resulting from territorial disputes, ethnic divisions, clashes of economic interests, ideological cleavages, and antagonistic aspirations for power and domination. And many of the Third World countries like Great powers have intervened on many occasions in the affairs of other countries.

The Third World countries since long have been the victims of stronger/great powers' designs to maintain their respective control over them. In the past, almost all were colonized and after their independence in the post-war era, they have been forced to surrender to the desires and interests of the major powers. And to force compliance they have extensively intervened in the affairs of Third World countries. The United States and the Soviet Union alone have resorted to the demonstrative use of force without war on more than 426 occasions between 1945 and 1982. While almost 98 percent of US employment of threat of force (in 259 incidents between 1946 and 1982) was directed at countries and territories well away from the border, essentially the Third World countries.

nearly 80 percent of Soviet use of force (in 167 incidents during 1946-1979) were directed at countries bordering the Soviet Union and West Asia. There have also been surprisingly large number of instances when use of nuclear weapons was seriously considered by nuclear weapon powers. These two powers, the United states and the Soviet Union, in the post-war period struggled to influence the internal as well as external dynamics of the Third World countries and on many occasions forced them through coercive means to surrender to their respective foreign policy interests.

To the pursuance of interventionist policies of great powers the conflict prone nature of the Third World provides greater propensity to their interventionism. Prior to 1945, the center of conflict in the world was considered to be the Europe. In the second half of this century, the major portion of the conflicts moved away from the Europe to the Third World. As the Third World served as a battle-field for US – Soviet ideological competition, they got themselves involved deliberately in almost every conflict of the Third World. There have been nearly 160 major inter-state and intra-state armed conflicts in the Third World and direct foreign military intervention took place in nearly three-fourth of these conflicts, and of these the intervening powers belonged to the developed countries of the First and the Second Worlds, in about 80 percent of the cases (developed capitalist countries in nearly 70 percent and developed socialist
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countries in nearly 10 percent cases). Covert intervention by these countries in the form of arms supplies, political moves or threat of use of force has been present in some form or the other in all armed conflicts. The conflicts of the Third World which mainly have their roots in colonialism were exploited by the great powers as per their foreign policy objectives. They provided arms training, finances to either of the parties in conflict according to their policy preferences and even sometimes intervened directly. External friends of the state supported by all means—economic, political and military, the initiatives taken up the state and the external adversaries of the state provided sustenance, through moral support, and covert supplies of arms and finance to the dissident groups and movements challenging the authority of the state. In this way the conflicts of the Third World far from resolution were exacerbated by the interventionist policies of the great powers.

Increasingly significant has been the rise of regional as well as some small powers attempting to pursue the policies of regional hegemony, often through the use of military force. The regional powers themselves have been found seeking support or being supported by either of the super powers. South Africa set up a profile as an anti-communist stronghold in Africa indirectly siding with the United States in its ideological rivalry with the Soviet Union. Cuba being a surrogate of the Soviet Union, collaborated in foreign policy designs of the Soviet Union. Pakistan in its

its foreign policy postures where as supported the United States in response to US economic and military assistance, India did so in case of the Soviet Union. The regional aspirations of these powers have most often collaborated with the design of great powers and even sometimes they have exploited the Soviet-US ideological rivalry to obtain economic and military benefits from them. But in overall perspective these powers have been dependent upon the great powers and the great powers themselves have intervened in the affairs of regional powers like US intervention in Cuba and in China’s Tibet region.

The Third World countries after getting independence felt that they have got rid of colonial exploitation and domination and are free to shape their own destinies. But the harsh realities of international system, the fundamental character of which is still determined by the great powers especially the United States with support of its European allies, the United Kingdom and the France, forced them to surrender to the hegemonistic designs of the great powers. Whatever values the great powers preferred to be globalised, the patterns of behavior they chose for reward and punishment, in fact, to the greater extent determined the nature of international politics. As a matter of fact in determining the nature of international policies, the United States played an affective role as it inherited the fruits of a fallen Europe centric system that had been

82. Although they have not always supported the policies of the United States or the Soviet Union, but more or less they have done so like in case of Indian response to Soviet intervention in Afghanistan was not prompt, what it said was that all the foreign forces should withdraw from Afghanistan. While Pakistan became a conduit for US arms to Mujahideen in Afghanistan.
dominant in international affairs since the sixteenth century. The Soviet Union emerged as an ideological rival to the US desires of harmonising the whole world by American political and economic rules. The Soviet Union itself while rivaling the United States, tried to color the whole world on communistic/socialistic lines. The Third World inadvertently became the part of their rivalry.

While both the United States and the Soviet Union intervened on number of occasions in the affairs of the Third World countries, the United States became increasingly outspoken in claiming the unilateral right to make the determination whether a conflict anywhere in the world constitutes a threat to its national security or international order. The United States from the first strings of nationhood in the middle of the eighteenth century fixed its gaze outward. This American interventionist impulse produced the Monroe Doctrine of 1823, the original intent of which was to protect the Western Hemisphere from external interventions. In order to discourage the European intervention, the United States however asserted its unilateral right to intervene in the affairs of Latin American countries. The Monroe Doctrine while directed against extra-continental intervention, inevitably became associated with US interventionism in the region. This regional interventionist propensity became globalised and fused with a virulent anti-communism as the United States embarked on an ideological rivalry with the Soviet Union at the end of the World War II.
The United States placed undue emphasis on the Soviet Union as the main provocateurs of conflict and instability in the Third World overlooking the historical roots of these upheavals in the Third World. The President Ronald Reagan in the early years of his administration said: "let us not delude ourselves. The Soviet Union underlies all the unrest that is going on. If they were not involved in this game of dominoes, there would not be any hot spot in the world"\(^\text{83}\). The United States’ perceptions of the Soviet Union as trouble-maker and its challenge to US hegemonistic goals in the post-War provided a false context to the interventionary activities of the US in the Third World.

The United States pursuing its policy of interventionism established in nineteenth century continued its interventions in the same way as it had been doing in the past. It is to emphasize here that the United States often has intervened in the Third World for reasons that have little to do with its rivalry with the Soviet Union but with its desire to safeguard and promote America’s economic and military interests\(^\text{84}\). The United States exercised de facto dominion over Latin America long before the communist rose to power in Russia and what we have witnessed in the Central America is as much a reassertion of hegemonic impulse as it is a manifestation of US-Soviet rivalry. The United States has required substantial economic interests

\(^{83}\) Quoted in Arthur Schlesinger, Jr.; “Foreign Policy and the American Character”, Foreign Affairs, Vol. 12, No. 1, Fall 1963, p. 5.

in the Third World after the World War II and the protection of these interests has became central to its foreign policy objectives.

The United States from the very beginning has been an interventionist power, aspiring to dominate the world by setting the rules of interventional behaviors and directing the developmental course of the Third World countries in accordance with its economic interests. The Monroe Doctrine provided to the United States a unilateral right to intervene anywhere in the Western Hemisphere. All the five post-War military doctrines of US Presidents; Truman, Eisenhower, Nixon, Carter and Reagan have been concerned with the US intervention of one sort or the other in the Third World. The United States in order to prevent the countries of the Third World to adopt the policies not acceptable to it has intervened in their affairs. One cannot be confident that this pattern of US interventionism in the Third World will be reversed.

The US – Soviet rivalry has virtually disappeared with the disintegration of the Soviet Union. The communism is no more a force to reckon with. The Third World has been the actual theatre over the last five decades, where United States was extensively involved. And the Third World stands to the greater chance of US interventionism. The United States also perceives more and more threats from the Third World countries. As President Bush after the invasion of Panama in 1989, declared in February 1990 that the
“New threats are emerging beyond the East-West antagonism of the last forty years and these contingencies must loom larger in our defence planning.” The United States maintains a world wide network of bases, many of which are in the Third World. And this world wide network of bases in case of any contingency deemed unacceptable to US would provide a basis for potential US intervention.

The Third World countries will remain a battle-field for great powers, especially now for the United States. As evident from the role played by the United States in the recent Gulf crisis. President Bush used a political slogan for a ‘New World Order’. His ‘New World Order’ which to a substantial degree is the reformulation of the basic historical principles (political pluralism and free market economy) which have underlined the US policy throughout the twentieth century was meant to facilitate the creation of the coalition forces that defeated Iraq. The US role in the Gulf crisis represents its desire for multilateral cooperation for unilateral action. The ‘New World Order’ envisions a world ruled by law and rationality under the guidance of the United States. Any state reluctant to relinquish its sovereignty will be visited by American onslaught. The recent US missile attacks on Afghanistan and Sudan and the ongoing US and British military assault on Iraq are naked examples of the violation of sovereign rights of the states and the provisions of the International Law.

The Third World countries have been the victims of the great powers' interventionist policies and have also been exploited both economically and politically, especially in the post-War period. They would continue to be exploited and their policies, especially the economic policies will be controlled and dominated by the big powers. The Third World countries failing to accept the international rules of political, economic and military behavior, formulated by big powers like the United States, Britain, France, etc., will be visited by their interventionist onslaught as they have experienced the interventionary activities of the big powers in the past.