Cold War Paradigms

The Third World in the Intricate Structures of World Politics

Þorsteinn Kristinsson

Lokaverkefni til BA-gráðu í stjórnmálafræði

Félagsvísindasvið

HÁSKÓLI ÍSLANDS

Cold War Paradigms

The Third World in the Intricate Structures of World Politics

Þorsteinn Kristinsson

Lokaverkefni til BA-gráðu í stjórnmálafræði

Leiðbeinandi: Jón Gunnar Ólafsson

Stjórnmálafræðideild

Félagsvísindasvið Háskóla Íslands

Júní 2012

Reykjavík, Ísland 2012

Útdráttur

Markmið þessarar ritgerðar er að setja fram greiningu á stöðu alþjóðastjórnmála á tíma kalda stríðsins þar sem þriðji heimurinn er í forgrunni. Hin ráðandi söguskoðun kalda stríðsins, sem horfir nær eingöngu til átaka Bandaríkjanna og Sovétríkjanna, er gagnrýnd frá bæði hlutlægu og siðferðilegu sjónarmiði. Það eru færð rök fyrir því að hin hefðbundna söguskoðun, sem er tengd formgerðarraunhyggju (structural realism) nánum böndum, hafi í raun verið hugmyndafræði sem þjónaði þeim tilgangi að réttlæta og viðhalda tvískauta heimsskipulagi (bipolar world order) kalda stríðsins. Því er jafnframt haldið fram að alþjóðastjórnmál hafi einkennst af skiptingu heimsins í kjarna- og jaðarsvæði. Þessi klofningsþáttur átti uppruna sinn á nýlendutímanum en viðhélst á tíma kalda stríðsins og eftir daga þess. Það verður sýnt fram á að þessi klofningsþáttur hafi mótað hegðun fólks og ríkisstjórna um allan heim. Meginniðurstaða ritgerðarinnar er að allar heildstæðar greiningar á alþjóðastjórnmálum á tíma kalda stríðsins verði að gera grein fyrir klofningsþætti kjarna- og jaðarsvæði til viðbótar við deilur stórveldanna. Hin hefðbundna söguskoðun tengd formgerðarraunhyggju gerir það ekki og því er hún ótæk bæði fræðilega og siðferðilega.

Abstract

The aim of this dissertation is to offer an account of world politics during the Cold War period that puts the Global South at the centre of analysis. The 'standard account' of the Cold War, with its almost exclusive emphasis on the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, is criticised both empirically and normatively. It is argued that the standard account, which is closely related to structural realism, was a normative framework that served to legitimise and reinforce the bipolar order of the Cold War. Furthermore, it is illustrated that the structure of world politics was characterised by a core-periphery cleavage, which emerged during the colonial era and persisted throughout the Cold War and beyond. It will be shown that this cleavage influenced the conduct of people and governments around the world. The main conclusion is that any comprehensive account of world politics during the Cold War era, must address the core-periphery cleavage as well as the East-West cleavage. The standard account related to structural realism does not, and therefore it is unsustainable both intellectually and morally.

Formáli

Ritgerð þessi er lokaverkefni til BA prófs í stjórnmálafræði við Háskóla Íslands. Hún er metin til 12 ECTS eininga. Leiðbeinandi minn var Jón Gunnar Ólafsson og vil ég þakka honum fyrir frábæra leiðsögn og góðan stuðning í gegnum allt nám mitt við Stjórnmálafræðideild HÍ. Eins vil ég þakka samnemendum mínum og öðru starfsfólki deildarinnar fyrir ánægjulega samfylgd undanfarin þrjú ár. Að lokum vil ég þakka fjölskyldu minni fyrir þeirra stuðning á öllum mínum námsferli.

Contents

1. Introduction

'The Cold War' is the term most commonly used to describe the period in world history from roughly the end of the Second World War to the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The standard account of the Cold War, particularly in the West, is that it was an era in which world politics were dominated by a conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union. It soon spread globally as states around the world lined up behind the two superpowers, creating opposing blocs. The Cold War constituted the framework in which other international developments took place.

While this is not an untrue account, it is only a partial one. Indeed, during the Cold War period there was also serious contention regarding how to interpret the structure of international politics. In this debate the standard account of the Cold War in effect became a prescriptive ideology that sought to shape the world as much as it attempted to explain it. Both the United States and the Soviet Union promoted this standard account, casting the world in dichotomous terms, in which everybody had to choose sides. The one thing the superpowers agreed on, was that their rivalry was the most important thing in the world.

Importantly, the standard account of the Cold War received strong support from the academic world, albeit in a slightly modified form. Structural realism, which emerged during the Cold War, argued that the predominant power of the United States and the Soviet Union caused the international system to be 'bipolar'. Ideological disagreement was discarded as an explanation for the conflict and replaced by the distribution of power in the interstate system. However, the central element in the standard account was still intact. The world was divided into two camps and all states were either on one side or the other.

The aim of this dissertation is to reconsider the standard account of the Cold War and offer *both* an empirical and normative critique. Unlike in many accounts of the Cold War, here the Global South is put at the centre of the analysis, rather than Europe or the two superpowers.[1] The reasons for this are twofold. Firstly, the standard account of the Cold War period is overly influenced by the rivalry between the two superpowers and their implications for Europe. Indeed, the very term 'Cold War' refers to the absence of actual warfare – something that is true in Europe, but was not the case in the Global South. Secondly, the

[1] Michael Szonyi and Hong Liu, "New Approaches to the Study of the Cold War in Asia," introduction to *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, eds. Yangwen, Liu and Szonyi, (Leiden 2010), 1.

majority of humanity lives in the Global South.[2] Any comprehensive account of world politics during the second half of the twentieth century, must therefore inevitably take into account the developments in this part of the world. When the Global South is included in the narrative, it is argued that the bipolar account of structural realism becomes unsustainable, both intellectually and morally.

Here it is argued that the structure of world politics has been characterised – before, during and after the Cold War – by another cleavage, at least as important as the Cold War itself. This is the cleavage between those who possess power and material wealth, and those that do not. It emerged during the colonial era and continued throughout the Cold War and beyond. Today, this cleavage is commonly referred to as the North-South divide or the core-periphery cleavage.[3] It is argued that structural realism's inability to account for this cleavage significantly undermines its empirical credentials.

Furthermore, it is argued that the standard account of the Cold War (including structural realism) was not merely an objective theory of world politics, but rather a normative framework that served to legitimise and reinforce the Cold War order. The standard account, with its predominant emphasis on the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, tends to obscure the way in which the Cold War order maintained and reproduced patterns of suppression and subordination from the colonial era. Any theory that seeks to stabilise and reinforce such an iniquitous world order is normatively problematic at best.

The Cold War order was after all a structure of world politics in which two powerful states collectively exercised hegemony over the rest of the world. The fact that they were adversaries at the same time is of no more significance than the fact that European states were adversaries during their collective domination of the planet in the nineteenth century. Indeed, unlike the European powers, the United States and the Soviet Union did not descend into mutual warfare. They simply verbally abused each other while steadily consolidating their spheres of influence. The wars they did engage in were against people in the Global South. Although these wars took place within the Cold War framework, in reality they were wars about the hegemonic reach of the two superpowers. For the United States, the Vietnam War marked the start of its decline as the most powerful state in the world, while for the Soviet Union the war in Afghanistan signalled its final collapse.

---

[2] The term 'Global South' is used here to refer to the less industrialised countries outside of Europe, North America, Russia and Japan. The terms Global South and Third World will be used interchangeably.

[3] These terms will be used interchangeably.

It is not argued that the North-South cleavage should entirely replace the East-West cleavage as a framework in which to understand the Cold War. The rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union was after all quite real. It is, however, one of the main conclusions of this dissertation that in world politics there can be more than one process operating simultaneously.

The contention regarding how to explain the structure of world politics during the Cold War was not only an academic exercise but also an attempt to shape the process itself. The standard account of the Cold War, including structural realism, sought to frame the Cold War entirely within the East-West cleavage and thereby to legitimise and reinforce the dominant role of the two superpowers over their spheres of influence. The alternative account of the Cold War order – the North-South cleavage – undermined the legitimacy of the bipolar division of the world, by forging unity among the people in the Global South against the dominant power of the United States and the Soviet Union. It is difficult to arrive at a completely objective conclusion about which of these processes is more important – especially during the period itself. Each explanation informs the actions of political actors in different ways and thus becomes part of the social reality itself. The choice of explanation is therefore inevitably normative to some extent.

The dissertation will be structured as follows. First, the theoretical framework will be introduced. The relevant theories of international relations will be explained and how they emphasise different processes in world politics. These theories will furthermore be located in a metatheoretical framework that explains how they are related to the social reality they address and what normative role they serve. The following chapter will discuss the emergence of the Cold War order in the aftermath of the Second World War and the role of the standard Cold War account in shaping this order. An empirical critique of structural realism's explanations for the emergence of a bipolar order will also be introduced.

The fourth chapter offers an alternative account of the Cold War period, emphasising continuity from the colonial era instead of the East-West cleavage. The aftermath of the Second World War will be cast in a different light, arguing that the Yalta agreements were in effect a division of the world into two spheres of influence. The fifth chapter then traces the struggle of those who openly rejected the Cold War order and pursued a foreign policy informed by this alternative view. In many ways this was an elusive struggle, but symbolically it can be called it the 'Third World project'. The sixth and final chapter will discuss all of previous findings and examine them in light of the sudden end of the Cold War.

2. Theoretical Framework

The study of international politics has been a theoretical undertaking from the start.[4] This is perhaps not surprising since the subject being studied is so infinitely large and complex that simply looking at all the 'facts' is impossible. There are countless possible facts to look at and one must inevitably decide which ones are the most important.[5] And by doing this one has implicitly adopted a theoretical framework. Indeed, Smith, Baylis and Owens define theory as "a kind of simplifying device that allows you to decide which facts matter and which do not."[6]

Although useful, this definition leaves many questions unanswered. Theories of international relations do not only differ with regard to where to look for causal explanations, but even more importantly, they disagree about what kind of knowledge these explanations provide. These are essentially ontological and epistemological questions, i.e. questions about the nature of knowledge itself.[7] Such questions run through many of the theoretical debates in the discipline and are central to the subject of this dissertation.

The theoretical framework adopted here is from the critical scholar Robert W. Cox. Cox's framework is in fact a metatheoretical one, meaning that it concerns not only the social world itself, but also the role of theories in *constituting* social reality. This chapter will start by presenting his concept of 'problem-solving theory' and how it relates to the social world it studies. It is argued that structural realism is a form of problem-solving theory and that it had a normative commitment to the bipolar order of the Cold War. Finally Cox's concept of 'critical theory' will be introduced. Critical theory is in many ways the antithesis of problem-solving theory and is closely related to Marxist theories and as well as social constructivism. It will be used as a critique of structural realism, as well as the basis for an alternative account of world politics during the Cold War.

[4] Scott Burchill and Andrew Linklater, introduction to *Theories of International Relations*, 4th. edition, eds. Burchill et al. (Hampshire 2009), 1.

[5] Steve Smith, John Baylis and Patricia Owens, introduction to *The Globalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Baylis, Smith and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 4.

[6] Ibid., 4.

[7] Burchill and Linklater, introduction to *Theories of International Relations*, 23.

2.1. Problem-solving theory

In a landmark essay in 1981, Robert W. Cox proposed that all theoretical knowledge could be regarded as either problem-solving theory or critical theory.[8] Similar ideas had been presented before, for example by Max Horkheimer of the Frankfurt School, but Cox was the first to address international relations theory in this way.[9]

Cox starts by observing that all theories contain a certain perspective, whether consciously or not. He argues that there is "no such thing as a theory in itself, divorced from a standpoint in time and space." All times and spaces embody certain sets of social relations and this is inevitably reflected in the theory itself, as is the position of the theoriser within these relations. Theories do, however, address the issue of perspective in very different ways, and accordingly they can be divided into two groups.[10]

The former group – which Cox calls 'problem-solving theories' – more or less refuses to deal with the issue of perspective. These theories usually address only a specific sphere of social activity and view everything outside that sphere as static, allowing them to look for causal relationships solely within the sphere being studied. In other words, problem-solving theories assume the social world around them to be a more or less solid framework, inside which they can themselves operate autonomously.[11]

It is useful to compare problem-solving theories to methodology in the natural sciences in this regard. Problem-solving theories seek to reduce the relevant variables to a few easily quantifiable factors and establish clear parameters that allow for a relatively close and accurate examination of the sphere being studied.[12] This method is analogous to controlled laboratory experiments in the natural sciences. However, unlike in laboratory experiments, the parameters established by problem-solving theory in the social sciences are artificial constructs that reflect methodological convenience rather than any objective reality. The division of human society into different spheres such as economics, politics or international relations might be convenient in many ways, but it must be remembered that the parameters established around those disciplines are ideological constructions and *not* solid boundaries.

---

[8] Both of these concepts refer to a genre of theories that share certain characteristics and not any single theory. Conventionally, critical theory is only used in the singular while problem-solving theory is sometimes used in the plural as well, because it is often necessary to refer to them collectively as a group of theories.

[9] Richard Devetak, "Critical Theory," in *Theories of International Relations*, 4th. edition, eds. Burchill et al. (Hampshire 2009), 163.

[10] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 128.

[11] Ibid., 128-129.

[12] Ibid., 129.

Unlike a chemical substance, it is not possible to fit international relations into an isolated test-tube and look for explanations solely within the tube.

Archimedes once said: "Show me a place to stand on and I will move the Earth." The idea being that in order to understand and manipulate phenomena one must first find firm ground to stand on, independent from the object being studied. This search for an 'Archimedean standpoint' has been one of the central themes of science ever since. The epistemology of problem-solving theories is very much influenced by this. They seek to isolate the sphere of human activity being studied and stand somewhere else. But where do they stand? Essentially in other problem-solving theories. As Cox puts it, problem-solving theories are "fragmented among a multiplicity of spheres or aspects of action, each of which assumes a certain stability in the other spheres (which enables them in practice to be ignored) when confronting a problem arising within its own."[13] It is precisely this assumed stability in other spheres that constitutes the Archimedean standpoint of problem-solving theory.

For example, when theorising about economics, economists tend to assume stability in the political and social structure in order to allow for a more accurate theorising of the economic sphere. The prevailing political and social structure therefore becomes the Archimedean standpoint of economic theory. However, as has already been noted, the Archimedean standpoints of problem-solving theories are just social constructions of the theories themselves. Instead of finding an independent 'place to stand on', problem-solving theories often end up standing on top of the answers they should be looking for.

Nevertheless, the explanatory powers of problem-solving theory might be quite useful in short term. Since the social world is in many ways relatively stable in the short term, it is possible to discern logical patterns within certain spheres of human activity. This is essentially what problem-solving theory does. It observes the operation of a relatively stable social order and breaks it down into different parts and detects patterns within each sphere. However, because problem-solving theory does not comprehend the contingency of the social order, it tends to arrive at law-like statements that are as compelling in the short term as they are useless in the long-term. The theory assumes the permanence of the prevailing social order and is only useful as long as the social world remains the same. As history shows, in the long run it never does. So, in spite of its attempt to establish timeless truths, problem-solving theory is in fact anything but timeless. It is not independent from the social world it studies, but a product of that world and entirely incomprehensible without it.

[13] Ibid., 129.

However, it is not simply the long-term empirical inaccuracy of problem-solving theory that is of concern here, but moreover the normative implications it entails. As already noted, the Archimedean standpoint of a problem-solving theory is *other problem-solving theories*. A worldview derived from problem-solving theory thus consists of a web of theoretical frameworks, each of which assumes the inevitability of the others. Since each assumes the inevitability of the others, collectively they assume the inevitability of the whole social order.

One can think of it this way. Each problem-solving theory views society as if it were a picture, 95% of which has already been drawn (this being the assumed stability in other social spheres). The remaining 5% (the subject of the theory itself) must therefore be drawn in such a way that it fits the rest of the picture. In other words, the scope of imagination of each theory is limited by the narrow sphere to which it is consigned. So, although each of them thinks that they are operating with maximum creativity, collectively they are essentially just redrawing the same old picture.

To put it in concrete terms; *problem-solving theories are conservative by nature*. The assumption of a permanent political and social order "is not merely a convenience of method, but also an ideological bias."[14] By accepting the prevailing social order as its premise, problem-solving theories actively sustain the prevailing order by rationalising it, and thus implicitly giving it legitimacy and a sense of naturalness. Policies informed by problem-solving theories are inevitably conservative since they automatically exclude all options that challenge the framework they themselves take as a point of departure. Real change is never an option because 95% of the picture has always already been drawn. In the words of James Bohman, the "social scientist [becomes an] engineer, who masterfully chooses the optimal solution to a problem of design."[15] As Cox puts it, "the purpose served by problem-solving theory is conservative, since it aims to solve the problems arising in various parts of a complex whole in order to smooth the functioning of the whole."[16] Problem-solving theories are therefore not value-free but should be seen as conservative ideologies, working in favour of those privileged by the prevailing social relations. It is in this sense that we should understand Cox's famous claim that "[t]heory is always *for* someone, and *for* some purpose."[17]

---

[14] Ibid., 128.

[15] James Bohman, "How to Make a Social Science Practical: Pragmatism, Critical Social Science and Multiperspectival Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31 (2002): 506.

[16] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 129.

[17] Ibid., 128.

2.2. Structural realism as problem-solving theory

In the discipline of International Relations, realism has been the most influential theoretical orientation.[18] There are a number of variants of the realist tradition but all of them have a common set of core assumptions.[19] Realists claim that states are the most important units of analysis in a world characterised by anarchy. According to realist thinking, the absence of international government forces all states to adopt policies aimed primarily at securing their survival, and they do this by trying to maximise their power. However, since the distribution of power is a zero sum game, the quest for power is always a competitive struggle vis-à-vis other states.[20]

The most important variant of realism in recent decades, and the one that is addressed here, is structural realism.[21] It is a theory that emerged during the Cold War, largely through the work of Kenneth Waltz.[22] According to structural realism, it is the nature of the international system that compels states to seek security through competitive power struggle. Anarchy is the organising principle of international politics, and this causes states to become more or less similar units, differing only in capabilities.[23] The different strategies states adopt in their foreign policy are therefore explained primarily by their relative power and their position within the interstate system. According to structural realists, the nature of the international order is defined primarily by the number of great powers at any given time.[24]

The previously discussed characteristics of problem-solving theory are quite evident in structural realism. International politics are theorised as a distinct sphere of social activity with sharply defined boundaries.[25] Waltz seems to recognise the intellectual shortcuts this entails, but nonetheless adopts an explicitly problem-solving approach. As he states:

---

[18] The discipline of International Relations (written in upper case) is the study of international relations (written in lower case).

[19] Tim Dunne and Brian C. Schmidt, "Realism," in *The Golibalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Smith, Baylis and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 91.

[20] Ibid., 90-106.

[21] Structural realism is commonly equated with neo-realism, but the terminology within the realist school is rather vague on this point. Some authors classify structural realism as a subgroup within a larger group of neo-realist theories. For our purposes here, the terms will be used interchangeably. For a discussion see: Steven L. Lamy, "Contemporary mainstream approaches: neo-realism and neo-liberalism," in *The Golibalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Smith, Baylis and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 127-131.

[22] Jack Donnelly, "Realism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 4th edition, eds. Burchill et al. (Hampshire 2009), 36.

[23] Kenneth N. Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, (Reading 1979), 93.

[24] Donnelly, "Realism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 37.

[25] Burchill and Linklater, introduction to *Theories of International Relations*, 24.

> In reality, everything is related to everything else, and one domain cannot be separated from others. Theory isolates one realm from all others in order to deal with it intellectually. . . . The question, as ever with theories, is *not whether the isolation of a realm is realistic, but whether it is useful*. And usefulness is judged by the explanatory and predictive powers of the theory that may be fashioned.[26]

In other words, theory does not need to provide realistic accounts of social developments, but simply to map patterns within an artificially constructed domain.

Like all problem-solving theory, structural realism assumes the permanence of the social order it finds itself in. One such assumption is that political power will always be concentrated at the apex of nation states. Another assumption is the autonomy of the interstate system and thus the irrelevance of transnational economic processes and class interests. Most importantly, however, structural realism "depends upon each of the major actors understanding this system in the same way, that is to say, upon each of them adopting neo-realist rationality as a guide to action."[27] Moreover, structural realism is a decidedly ahistorical theory. Past events are not considered as potential explanations for future developments. History simply becomes a source of empirical data, which "illustrate variations on always recurrent themes."[28] The explanations structural realism provides for the structure of world politics are to be found in the *current* distribution of power between the nation states.

During the Cold War the United States and the Soviet Union were by far the most powerful states in the world. The international system was therefore considered to be bipolar.[29] According to structural realism, this meant not only that the two superpowers would compete for influence, but also that the position of all other states was in one way or another bound up in this logic of bipolarity. In order to maintain the balance of power, states would align themselves with either of the two superpowers and thus create opposing blocs.

In an article in 1964, Kenneth Waltz claimed that this was not only inevitable, but also that a bipolar world was the most stable and peaceful international order possible.[30] For this he provided several reasons. Firstly, "with only two world powers there are no peripheries."[31] Unlike multipolar systems – where it is much less clear who is a danger to whom – a bipolar order provides an unambiguous cleavage which is easy to comprehend. The clarity of a

---

[26] Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 8 [emphasis added].

[27] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 132.

[28] Ibid., 132.

[29] Dunne and Schmidt, "Realism," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 98.

[30] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Stability of a Bipolar World," *Daedalus* 93 (Summer 1964): 881-909.

[31] Ibid., 882.

bipolar order may produce quite visible animosities, but constant tensions and regular crisis may actually serve as an effective way to maintain the balance of power. Finally, Waltz claims that the 'preponderant power' of the two superpowers is a stabilising factor in its own right. It allows them to "absorb within the bipolar balance the revolutionary political, military, and economic changes that have occurred." Also, "an alliance requires an alliance leader; and leadership can be most easily maintained where the leader is superior in power."[32]

It is here that the normative content of structural realism is most evident. The introduction to Waltz's article reads like a warning to those who wish for a more equitable distribution of power between states. Such ideas, Waltz tells us, should be radically revised since a bipolar order is much more stable and peaceful. In fact his article is an uneasy mixture of objective explanation and policy prescription. It is not entirely clear whether he is telling the reader that lesser powers will *inevitably* subordinate themselves to the superpowers in a bipolar world, or whether he is telling the lesser powers that they *should* do so in order to preserve the bipolar balance.

Often the normative nature of problem-solving theory is only implicit, but to his credit, Waltz is sometimes quite explicit about the normative content of structural realism. He acknowledges that the "purpose of analysis is to understand the limits on political change, more specifically to show that states are *best advised to work with the existing international order* rather than to try to change it radically."[33] Also, "they should ensure as far as they can the preservation of a *balance of power* which deters states from going to war although it cannot always prevent it."[34] In the preceding paragraphs it was quite clear what Waltz has in mind when speaking of the optimal balance of power. It is the preponderant power of the two superpowers and a world in which there are no peripheries.

It seems reasonable to conclude that Waltz's structural realism has a normative commitment to the Cold War order. The bipolar division of the world into two camps led by the United States and the Soviet Union is said to be both peaceful and stable. Furthermore, the theory explicitly advises states to work within this existing world order. Like other problem-solving theory, structural realism "takes the world as it finds it, with the prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions into which they are organised, as a given framework

[32] Ibid., 882, 883, 886, 881.
[33] Burchill and Linklater, introduction to *Theories of International Relations*, 21 [emphasis added].
[34] Ibid., 21.

for action."[35] Policies informed by structural realism stress the importance of a bipolar balance of power and thus reinforce the Cold War order. The gross inequalities of wealth in the world are not of concern to structural realism. These are just part of the 95% of the picture which has already been drawn. Structural realism intends to draw the remaining 5% in such a way that it fits (and reinforces) the rest. In other words, structural realism is a conservative ideology that serves to "smooth the functioning" of the Cold War order and "legitimate an unjust and deeply iniquitous system".[36]

2.3. Critical theory

The other group of theories, which Cox contrasts to problem-solving theory, is 'critical theory'. Unlike problem-solving theory, critical theory is quite aware of the importance of perspective when it comes to making sense of the social world. Critical theory "does not take institutions and social and power relations for granted but calls them into question by concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing."[37] This means that a particular social order cannot simply be explained by its internal logic, but must also be located in an historical context. The assumption of a permanent political and social order is thus discarded in favour of a more dynamic view of history that allows for both stability *and* change.

Critical theory is also highly suspicious of attempts to break the social world into multiple independent spheres in the way that problem-solving theory does. Referring to the conventional social sciences, world-systems theorist Immanuel Wallerstein writes that "[p]art of the problem is that we have studied these phenomena in separate boxes to which we have given special names – politics, economics, the social structure, culture – without seeing that these boxes are constructs more of our imagination than of reality." These separate disciplines "are an obstacle, not an aid, to understanding the world."[38] Critical theory is, as the name implies, very much a critique of the prevailing social relations and the conventional wisdoms that underpin them – often in the form of problem solving theory. Critical theory challenges problem-solving theory on both empirical and normative grounds. Empirically, critical theory

---

[35] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 128.

[36] Stephen Hobden and Richard Wyn Jones, "Marxist theories of international relations," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Baylis, Smith and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 151.

[37] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 129.

[38] Immanuel Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*, (Durham 2004), x.

maintains that the analytical sub-division of the problem-solving approach conceals as much as it reveals.[39] The methodological conveniences of problem-solving theory all too easily take on a life of their own and become obstacles in the search for knowledge. By elaborating knowledge within boundaries of artificially constructed domains, problem-solving theories contain an automatic bias against explanations that transcend these boundaries. Furthermore, as was explained in the previous sections, the structures of knowledge that problem-solving theories produce work as a conservative force on society.[40] They legitimise and reinforce prevailing social relations. This is where the normative critique comes in. As previously noted, critical theory has its origins in Marxist theories and they inform the alternative account of the Cold War presented here.

2.4. From Marx to Gramsci

Critical theory is heavily indebted to Marxism.[41] Its attempt to construct a holistic view of human society that transcends disciplinary boundaries as well as time and space, finds clear precedents in Marxist accounts of world politics. However, unlike traditional Marxism, critical theory does not subscribe to economic determinism. According to Marx the 'superstructure'[42] of society is a mere reflection of the economic base. "The ruling ideas of each age have ever been the ideas of its ruling class."[43] The ideological sphere has no autonomous role in shaping society, according to Marx, but merely changes along with the conditions of man's material existence.

Critical theorists do recognise the importance of economic relations and that the ideological sphere is shaped by the interests of the ruling classes, but insist that ideology in turn plays a decisive role in *sustaining* those interests. So instead of focusing exclusively on the economic base of society, critical theory maintains that there is a symbiotic relationship between material interests and dominant ideologies. This line of thinking was first elaborated by the Italian Marxist Antonio Gramsci. Cox's work has indeed often been identified as Gramscianism. Gramsci used the term 'hegemony' to describe the nature of power, which is

---

[39] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 129.

[40] Ibid., 129.

[41] Indeed, critical theory is often classified as a Marxist theory of International Relations. See e.g.: Hobden and Jones, "Marxist theories of international relations," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 142-159.

[42] The 'superstructure' is the ideological sphere of society. It contains all the widely held ideas and beliefs of a society, such as religion, culture, customs etc. The structures of knowledge that inform the worldviews of people (e.g. problem-solving theories) are a part of the superstructure.

[43] Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*, (London 1848/1967), 30.

exercised through "mutually reinforcing and reciprocal relationships between the socioeconomic relations (base) and political and cultural practices (superstructure) that *together* underpin a given order."[44]

A classic example is the way in which religion and political power were mutually reinforcing during much of European history. Authorities based their legitimacy on the belief that their power was derived from God.[45] These beliefs, of course, in turn flourished under those same authorities that promoted them through schools, churches, ceremonies, festivals etc. An important point to note here is that there isn't any *conspiracy* going on. There is little reason to doubt that people at the time, authorities included, actually believed in their celestial mandate. The symbiosis of structures of knowledge and structures of power does not need to be consciously constructed. It emerges through more of an evolutionary process in which knowledge claims that benefit the rich and powerful are favoured while those that threaten them are marginalised.

One can think of critical theory as a deliberate attack on this evolutionary process. The structures of knowledge that underpin the prevailing social order are consciously exposed for their conservative nature as well as dismantled for their empirical shortcomings. From a normative point of view, this mission is not value-neutral any more than the problem-solving theories that are attacked. Just as problem-solving theory affects society in conservative ways, so does critical theory affect society in transformative ways. By challenging the ideological underpinnings of a social order, critical theory has taken the first step towards changing the social order itself.[46]

As previously discussed, the dominant view of world politics during the Cold War era was a bipolar division of the world into two blocs, one led by the United States and the other by the Soviet Union. Structural realism played an important role in this ideological framework. It has already been argued that structural realism is a problem-solving theory that had a normative commitment to the Cold War order and in the following chapter it will be challenged empirically as well. But what can critical theory offer, other than a critique of the dominant narrative? What kind of *alternative* explanation does critical theory have for the Cold War era?

---

[44] Hobden and Jones, "Marxist theories of international relations," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 149-153.

[45] David Held, *Models of Democracy*, 3rd edition, (Cambridge 2006), 29-31.

[46] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 130.

2.5. World-systems analysis

Like problem-solving theory, critical theory is not one single theory of the world but a genre of theories that share certain characteristics. The viewpoint adopted here, i.e. as an alternative framework to understand the Cold War era, is highly influenced by the work of the world-systems theorist, Immanuel Wallerstein. World-systems analysis seeks to construct an historical account of human society that transcends the traditional disciplinary boundaries.

In addition to being 'unidisciplinary', world-systems analysis insists that social developments cannot usefully be understood within the boundaries of the nation state.[47] Nor can international developments be theorised as if they operated by a logic above the states. The domestic and international spheres are so intimately connected that the workings of one cannot be explained without reference to the other. For Wallerstein, therefore, the unit of analysis must be the world-system.[48]

A full exploration of world-systems analysis is not possible here, nor is it necessary, but for the present purposes the following should be noted. World-systems analysis is a Marxist theory of international relations that stresses the importance of economic forces in world politics.[49] However, unlike many Marxist accounts of world politics, Wallerstein's theory does not downplay the importance of states. Quite the contrary. According to world-systems analysis, states play a crucial role in enabling the accumulation of capital. Wallerstein maintains that without states, any substantial accumulation of capital would be impossible. So instead of viewing capitalism as a force that gradually dissolves state boundaries – like Marx himself did – world-systems analysis considers the interstate system as a crucial component of the capitalist world-economy.[50]

However, not all states are equal. The richer and more powerful states in the 'core' exploit the weaker states in the 'periphery'.[51] This idea was first proposed by Lenin and later developed be dependency theorists such as Raúl Prebisch and André Gunder Frank.[52] The crucial element of this approach is that it shows how economic development in core states is based on the exploitation of societies in the periphery.[53] Marx's theory of capitalist

---

[47] Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*, x.

[48] Ibid., x.

[49] Andrew Linklater, "Marx and Marxism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 4th. edition, eds. Burchill et al. (Hampshire 2009), 123.

[50] Immanuel Wallerstein, *Historical Capitalism* with *Capitalist Civilization*, (London 1983/2011), 48-56.

[51] Wallerstein's world-systems analysis adds a *semi-periphery* which has kind of an intermediate role, but for the present purposes this is unimportant.

[52] Hobden and Jones, "Marxist theories of international relations," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 147.

[53] Linklater, "Marx and Marxism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 123-124.

exploitation is in effect reapplied at the interstate level, creating a cleavage between the rich and powerful states in the core and the weak states in the periphery.

For the purposes of this dissertation, the key point is that world-systems analysis accounts for the operation of two contradictory forces in world politics at the same time. On the one hand, states compete against each other, trying to improve their relative position in the world-system. However, the strong states also have a common interest in keeping the world-system relatively stable, because of their collective exploitation of the peripheral zones.

> So the actors are pushed simultaneously in opposite directions: toward an anarchic interstate system and toward a coherent and orderly interstate system. The result, as might be expected, is structures that are normally in between the two types.[54]

This insight is crucial in understanding the structure of world politics during the Cold War era. The two superpowers competed against each other for influence, but at the same time, they had a *common interest* in keeping the world-system relatively stable, for the simple reason that they were the dominant states in the interstate system at the time.

Structural realism accounts only for the operation of interstate competition and is oblivious to the way in which dominant states have a common interest in maintaining international structures that enable the exploitation of the weak. Similarly, some Marxist accounts tend to be overly focused on exploitation, and are therefore unable to account for rivalry and warfare between the strong states. One of the key advantages of Wallerstein's world-systems analysis is that it accounts for the operation of both processes within a unified theoretical framework. However, accounting for both processes is not enough. One must also explain how people's perceptions of these processes influence the way in which they act. Social constructivism (originally an outgrowth of critical theory) is a valuable tool in this regard.[55]

2.6. The struggle for the 'strategic domain'

Structural realism is sometimes said to be a rationalist theory. This means, among other things, that it assumes that political actors have predetermined interests and identities, irrespective of social interaction. Interests and identities are considered to be autogenous and not susceptible

[54] Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*, 56.

[55] Christian Reus-Smit, "Constructivism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 4th. edition, eds. Burchill et al. (Hampshire 2009), 218-219.

to change. Society, according to such theories, is a *strategic domain* in which these interests are pursued.[56]

Constructivists reject these assumptions, claiming that interests and identities are socially constructed and cannot simply be presupposed.[57] Society is not like a chessboard where everyone agrees on the nature and objective of the game in advance, but more like a playground where the rules of the game emerge through the interactions of the actors concerned and may be contested and changed. It may well be that society is a strategic domain, but the struggle is not only *within* the domain, but also over the *nature* of the domain. What kind of game is played there and for what purposes?

This is not say that all actors simply live in a world that they construct completely in their mind. But neither do they live in a world entirely independent of their mind. The meaning they give to the objective facts around them influences the way in which they act. The social world is composed of shared structures of knowledge as well as material objects.[58] Recall how it was argued in the previous sections that problem-solving theory was a conservative force that reinforced the prevailing social order. This is because it is part of the structures of knowledge that constitute the prevailing order. Similarly, critical theory challenges the prevailing order by attacking these structures of knowledge. One can think of this as a *struggle for the strategic domain*.

Recall that Wallerstein's world-systems analysis accounts for two contradictory processes in world politics at the same time. First there is a cleavage between the strong states, which compete against each other in the interstate system and forge alliances with weaker states. Secondly there is a cleavage between the stronger states on the one hand and the weaker states they exploit on the other. Political actors will behave differently according to which of these cleavages inform their actions. During the Cold War there was a strong tendency to frame the strategic domain entirely as a conflict between the two superpowers and their allies. This was very convenient for the two superpowers, as well as for some governing elites in the weaker states. It suited their interests that world politics were played out according to these rules. The following chapter will trace the emergence of the bipolar order of the Cold War and the structures of knowledge that underpinned it.

---

[56] Ibid., 215-216.

[57] Michael Barnett, "Social Constructivism," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 4th edtition, eds. Baylis, Smith and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 162-168.

[58] Reus-Smit, "Constructivism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 220.

However, as will be demonstrated in later chapters, these structures of knowledge did not go uncontested. There were always some who understood the world according to the alternative cleavage that divided the world into core and periphery. Because this alternative view was never as widespread or influential as the bipolar narrative, it can be viewed as the manifestation of critical theory.

Taken together, the theories addressed in this chapter form two contrasting ideological frameworks, each of which contains attempts at objective explanation as well as normative policy prescription. The former framework is the bipolar account of structural realism. As has been illustrated, this was a problem-solving theory that functioned as a conservative force on world politics, legitimising and reinforcing the Cold War order. This framework will be referred to as the 'standard account' of the Cold War. The second framework is an account of world politics informed by critical theory. This account emphasises the importance and persistence of the core-periphery cleavage in world politics. This emphasis is most pronounced in Marxist theories of world politics such as world-systems analysis. This framework will be referred to as an 'alternative account' of world politics during the Cold War.

3. Constructing the Cold War

In this chapter the 'standard account' of the Cold War will be explored. The emergence of 'bipolarity' in the aftermath of the Second World War will be traced as well as the way in which structural realism legitimised and reinforced this order. The advent of the Cold War in Asia will be given special attention, since it shows how the bipolar order was essentially a socially constructed order. Moreover, there will be an empirical critique of structural realism's explanations for the emergence of Cold War alignments in Asia.

3.1. From the Second World War to a bipolar world

At the end of the Second World War, the United States and the Soviet Union had emerged as the two most powerful states on earth. The wartime relationship between the two powers soon fell apart and thus began the era known as the Cold War.[59] In February 1945, shortly before the end of the war, the Allied powers met at Yalta to discuss postwar arrangements.[60] Most accounts trace the onset of the Cold War to the failure of implementing what was agreed at Yalta and later at Potsdam.[61] They focus on events from 1945 to 1950, such as the Soviet consolidation of Eastern Europe, the Berlin Blockade and US support for the counterinsurgency in Greece.[62]

Although they differ in detail, the standard accounts of the Cold War tend to be more or less in line with structural realism. In spite of having worked together to defeat the Axis powers in the Second World War, the situation after the war meant that "each superpower [was] the only serious threat to the security of the other."[63] Regardless of individual incidents or prior cooperation, the ultimate reason for the Cold War lay in the distribution of power in the interstate system. "Enmity was structurally induced."[64]

As Kenneth Waltz stated in 1964 "[t]he United States is the obsessing danger for the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Union for us, since each can damage the other to an extent that

---

[59] Len Scott, "International history 1900-90," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Baylis, Smith and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 60-61.

[60] Immanuel Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, eds. Yangwen, Liu and Szonyi, (Leiden 2010), 15.

[61] Scott, "International history 1900-90," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 61.

[62] Karen A. Mingst and Ivan M. Arreguín-Toft, *Essentials of International Relations*, 5th edition, (New York 2011), 44-45.

[63] Donnelly, "Realism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 37.

[64] Ibid., 37.

no other state can match."[65] Indeed, already in 1947 diplomatic historian George F. Kennan wrote an article in *Foreign Affairs* calling for the 'containment' of the Soviet Union.[66] He argued that since the Soviet Union would always feel militarily insecure, it would pursue an aggressive foreign policy and that the United States must be prepared to counter this.[67]

This line of argument would later be found in realist writings about 'security dilemmas'. The argument holds that one state's pursuit of security, automatically creates insecurity in other states and triggers a response. In the case of two superpowers, this leads to a spiralling security dilemma in which both sides must maximise their influence as widely as possible just for the sake of their own security.[68] The Soviet consolidation of Central and Eastern Europe was, according to this, simply a necessary measure to secure the Soviet Union itself.[69] Similarly, the establishment of NATO and the proliferation of US military bases was the natural response of the contending superpower in such a security dilemma. The inherent lack of trust in an anarchic interstate system forces both superpowers to maximise their influence even in the absence of hegemonic ambitions. And, most importantly, the only viable strategy of all other states is to pledge their allegiance to one of the two superpowers. As a result of this the interstate system will tend toward equilibrium through a balance of power.[70]

Note how structural realism tends to frame the two superpowers almost as *victims* in the Cold War. The theory seems to argue that the superpowers, especially the United States, did not really want to extend their influence over other countries. However, by their bad fortune, they were forced into their hegemonic roles by structurally induced forces. This noble and privileged position of the two superpowers is clearly expressed in the writings of Kenneth Waltz. Commenting on the attempts of China and France to act more independently of their principal partners he states that they "have demonstrated not their power but their impotence: their inability to affect the dominant relation in the world." That of the "Soviet Union and the United States, upon which their own security continues to rest." Later he adds that "[o]ther countries can enjoy, if they wish, the luxury of selecting leaders who will most please their

[65] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Stability of a Bipolar World," *Daedalus* 93 (Summer 1964): 882.
[66] George F. Kennan ("X"), "The Sources of Soviet Conduct," in *Essential Readings in World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Mingst and Snyder, (New York 1947/2011), 23.
[67] Mingst and Arreguín-Toft, *Essentials of International Relations*, 44.
[68] Dunne and Schmidt, "Realism," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 102.
[69] Donnelly, "Realism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 37-38.
[70] Dunne and Schmidt, "Realism," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 94, 102.

peoples by the way in which internal affairs are managed. The United States and the Soviet Union cannot."[71]

3.2. The symbiosis of theory and practice

The construction of a bipolar account of world politics was not merely an academic exercise. The idea that the Cold War hostilities between the United States and the Soviet Union were of paramount importance for everyone else in the world was a worldview that was actively promoted by political leaders, especially by those of the two superpowers. Both powers developed a 'two-camp theory' in which the world was seen in dichotomous terms where everybody belonged to either one side or the other.[72]

Of course the vocabulary utilised by the opposing camps differed. The West saw the Cold War as a struggle between the 'free world' and the 'totalitarian world'. The Soviet Union saw it as a struggle between the 'capitalist imperialist world' and the 'socialist world'. But underneath the rhetoric the message was essentially the same. The world was locked into a conflict between two irreconcilable camps, and "it was incumbent on everyone to choose sides."[73]

The hostility found in Kenneth Waltz's writings against those that did not accept the bipolar order could also be found in the political arena. United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson warned that neutralism was a "short cut to suicide."[74] His successor John Foster Dulles said "neutralism was immoral."[75] Indeed, the very term 'neutralism' reflects the dominance of the Cold War framework. The countries that refused to align themselves with the two superpowers used the terms 'non-alignment' to describe their position. But Dulles refused to use the term always referring to their policy as neutralism.[76] For him it was simply incomprehensible that there was any other position than those of the two superpowers. And if a state did not subscribe to one of those then that state did not have a policy at all.[77]

---

[71] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Stability of a Bipolar World," *Daedalus* 93 (Summer 1964): 889, 906-907.

[72] Vijay Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, (New York 2007), 99.

[73] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 16.

[74] Quoted in Richard P. Dauer, *A North-South Mind in an East-West World: Chester Bowles and the Making of United States Cold War Foreign Policy, 1951-1969*, (Westport 2005), 35-36.

[75] Quoted in Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 16.

[76] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 99.

[77] Ibid., 48.

Although the Cold War rivalry was often expressed through ideological rhetoric, the more sophisticated account of structural realism was always present underneath. Providing, not only explanations of what was going on, but also policy advice on how to come to terms with this situation and manage it in a stable way. Structural realism provided the theoretical framework in which to understand the Cold War and at the same time *reinforced* the Cold War order by informing the policies states adopted. There was a symbiosis of theory and practice.[78] This symbiosis was for example personified by Henry Kissinger, a prominent realist scholar who would later become US Secretary of State, adopting an explicitly realist policy.[79]

It can be argued that the bipolar order of the Cold War was an inevitable consequence of the Second World War *in Europe*. After all, the war had concluded in a more or less unambiguous division of the continent into two spheres of influence. However, in Asia – as elsewhere in the Global South – this was not the case. In Asia, the results of the Second World War were much more ambiguous and the Cold War order only began to take shape later on. The next sections will examine how this happened and whether structural realism provides convincing explanations for this or not.

3.3. Institutionalising bipolarity in Asia

Michael Yahuda argues that the Asia-Pacific was first integrated into the Cold War order with the outbreak of the Korean War and, in the case of Southeast Asia, with the settlement of the First Indo-China War with the Geneva Conference in 1954.[80] From a purely geopolitical standpoint this is true. The armistice in Korea, the formal division of Vietnam into two parts and the US commitment to defend Taiwan all combined to produce clear boundaries between the communist world and the 'free world' similar to the ones in Europe.

The Cold War order in Asia found institutional expression in a number of treaties and organisations. On the Western front there was ANZUS, a defence treaty between the US, Australia and New Zealand, established in 1951, which still exists today. Three years later the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO)[81] was established, bringing together the United States, Britain, France, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan and the Philippines. Although meant to be the Pacific equivalent of NATO, the organisation failed to live up to its

[78] Reus-Smit, "Constructivism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 218.
[79] Michael Yahuda, *The International Politics of the Asia-Pacific*, 3rd edition, (London 2011), 88-89.
[80] Ibid., 19, 31.
[81] Also known as the Manila Pact.

expectations and always played a secondary role to US bilateral pacts in the region. Most important of these pacts was the US-Japan defence pact, as well as those with South Korea, the Philippines and Thailand.[82]

In South Asia, the United States sought to forge an alliance in order to further isolate China. India refused to participate, so the US established a strong alliance with Pakistan instead.[83] Indeed, Pakistan would become one of Washington's most important allies in Asia, earning its authoritarian regime an honourable seat among the 'free world' while further alienating democratic India. In addition to its membership in SEATO, Pakistan also became a member of the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO).[84] CENTO was the Middle Eastern equivalent of SEATO, established in 1955 and bringing together the United States, Britain, Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Pakistan.[85]

On the Soviet side the Asian front was somewhat smaller. Apart from the Soviet satellites in Central Asia and Mongolia, there was close cooperation with China, North Korea and North Vietnam.[86] China was the most important of these states, being by far the largest communist country in Asia. Shortly after the founding of the People's Republic in 1949, Mao visited Stalin in Moscow and established an alliance with the Soviet Union. This alliance would be strengthened during the Korean War but mostly broke down in the early sixties.[87]

3.4. An empirical critique of structural realism

The geopolitical bloc-formation in the fifties seemed to cement the bipolar structure of international politics. The Cold War order was steadily expanded and institutionalised more or less engulfing the rest of the world. All of this seemed to confirm the logic of bipolarity and thus the ideas of structural realism.

However, if one looks more closely at the emergence of these blocs, a more complicated picture emerges. Recall that structural realism looks for causal explanations primarily in the distribution of power between states. It views states as holistic entities trying to maximise their security in an anarchic interstate system. However, in the aftermath of the Second World War, the anarchy in Asia was to be found *within* states rather than between them. In order to understand the bloc formation in Asia during the early years of the Cold War, one must go

[82] Yahuda, *The International Politics of the Asia-Pacific*, 13, 42.
[83] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 98.
[84] Also known as the Baghdad Pact.
[85] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 38.
[86] After 1975 this included the whole of Vietnam.
[87] Jonathan D. Spence, *The Search for Modern China*, 2nd edition, (New York 1999), 416, 499.

beyond the explanations of structural realism and look at what was going on within these states and not just between them.

In order to comprehend the situation, it must be remembered that most of the countries in Southeast Asia were colonies at the outbreak of the Second World War. After the war, the colonial powers intended to restore their control in one way or another. Their return was complicated by the fact that the established elites of many colonies had worked closely with the Japanese during their occupation. The principal resistance to the Japanese came from communist forces, many of which had been supported by the Allies during the war. This was true of the Viet Minh in Vietnam, the communist-led Hukbalahap in the Philippines and the communist resistance in Malaya.[88]

However, once the Japanese surrendered, these wartime alliances were quickly forgotten. When the US returned to the Philippines, they restored the old Filipino elite and helped them crack down on the communists in exchange for allowing large American military bases in the country. The Philippines became formally independent in 1946, but "from the outset the Filipino elite accepted a dependency on the United States, to whom it was indebted for its continued dominance of the country."[89] Similar scenarios were played out by the British in Malaya and the French in Vietnam, except that in Vietnam the communists could not be suppressed and ended up defeating the French and later the United States in a large scale war.[90]

The important point to note here is that many of the Asian states which were at the forefront of the Cold War – e.g. Korea, Vietnam, China and the Philippines – were countries in which Cold War alignments were outgrowths of domestic power struggles. In the cases of China, Korea and Vietnam, the countries were actually split in two. The governments of the Philippines and South Vietnam were not thrust into the Western bloc by 'structurally induced forces'. These were colonial era elites that opted for US patronage in order to remain in power in the face of domestic opposition.[91]

The importance of domestic factors in explaining the international politics of Asia is also well illustrated by developments within the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), an organisation that was established in 1967 by Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines,

[88] Yahuda, *The International Politics of the Asia-Pacific*, 26, 28, 30.
[89] Ibid., 26.
[90] Pierre Brocheux, "Reflections on Vietnam," *New Left Review* 73 (2012): 82-87.
[91] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 38-39.

Singapore and Thailand.[92] It can be argued that ASEAN was established in part because of a common concern among the founding governments about their own survival. Amitav Acharya, a prominent scholar of Southeast Asia, argues that "ASEAN's doctrine of non-interference was, in important part, an expression of a collective commitment to the survival of its non-communist regimes against the threat of communist subversion."[93] This policy of 'non-interference' did indeed involve active support between ASEAN states in crushing internal opposition and even allowing each other to carry out cross-border military raids in order to pursue communist guerrillas.[94] Instead of safeguarding themselves against each other, the original ASEAN regimes found common ground in uprooting internal opposition, even sacrificing the principle of territorial integrity.

As has been illustrated, domestic developments were often the key factor in shaping the foreign policy of Asian states in the aftermath of the Second World War. Therefore, the theory of structural realism, with its emphasis on the interstate system, simply cannot account for the emergence of the Cold War order in Asia. The idea that states are similar units, differing only in capabilities, operating as integrated wholes in an ahistorical, anarchic interstate system is of little use here. In order to make sense of the Cold War alignments in Asia, one must take into account the colonial history of the area as well as domestic power struggles and transnational interests of class and ideology. Indonesia, for example, became an ally of the United States in the aftermath of general Suharto's coup in 1965, which also caused a complete breakdown of Indonesia's relations with China.[95] Foreign policy was driven by domestic politics.[96]

One of the central tenets of structural realism is a dichotomy between the organising principles of domestic and international politics. Domestic politics are, according to Waltz, characterised by hierarchy, while international politics are characterised by anarchy.[97] But looking at some states in Asia in the aftermath of the Second World War, one can observe almost exactly the opposite. The domestic sphere was often embroiled in an anarchic struggle

---

[92] Amitav Acharya, *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the problem of regional order*, 2nd edition, (London 2009), 54.

[93] Ibid., 71.

[94] Ibid., 72-74.

[95] Benedict Anderson, "Exit Suharto: Obituary for a Mediocre Tyrant," *New Left Review* 50 (2008): 35-36.

[96] Hong Liu, "The Historicity of China's Soft Power: The PRC and the Cultural Politics of Indonesia, 1945-1965," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, eds. Yangwen, Liu and Szonyi, (Leiden 2010), 149.

[97] Waltz, *Theory of International Politics*, 79-101.

for state power, while the relationship some of these states established with outside powers was one of hierarchy and subordination.

As has been illustrated in this chapter, the 'standard account' of the Cold War was far from being a detached and value-free explanation of world politics. It was more of a normative framework that sought to cast the world in its own image and had a symbiotic relationship to policy formation, especially in the United States. Moreover, when inspected closely, structural realism does rather poorly in accounting for the emergence of the Cold War order, further undermining its status as an objective theory of international politics.

4. An Alternative Account of the Cold War Era

The standard account of the Cold War, discussed in the previous chapter, has been the dominant account of world politics from 1945 to 1991.[98] There is, however, an 'alternative account' of the Cold War that stresses the continued importance of the core-periphery cleavage. This cleavage was discussed in the theoretical framework with regard to Marxist theories of world politics. The 'alternative account' provided in this chapter is largely built on the insights of Immanuel Wallerstein's world-systems analysis. This account views the Cold War order in terms of spheres of influence, rather than superpower competition. It is argued that the Cold War order was a hegemonic structure that enabled continued patterns of suppression from the colonial era. In this regard, the bipolar order of the Cold War will be compared to the colonial era of the late nineteenth century. It is argued that in spite of their mutual rivalry, the United States and the Soviet Union had a *common interest* in keeping the Cold War order stable, and that their behaviour during the Cold War testifies to this.

4.1. The Cold War order as a hegemonic structure

As discussed in the previous chapter, the 'standard account' holds that the Cold War represented the failure of Yalta.[99] According to this account, the postwar arrangements decided by the United States and the Soviet Union gave way to mutual distrust and competition for influence. Some laid the blame on the irreconcilable ideologies of the two camps while others emphasised the distribution of power in the interstate system. These details are unimportant insofar as they tell they same story: The United States and the Soviet Union failed to produce a stable postwar order and instead descended into mutual rivalry that would define the coming decades.

The 'alternative account' of the Cold War, presented here, turns this explanation almost entirely on its head. Rather than being the result of Yalta's failure, the Cold War represented a continuous attempt by the two superpowers to *implement* the Yalta agreements. This alternative account points out that the postwar arrangements decided at Yalta, were in effect a division of the world into two spheres of influence, one led by the United States and the other

[98] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 15.
[99] Scott, "International history 1900-90," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 61.

one by the Soviet Union.[100] The Soviet Union was to exercise control over one-third of the world, while the United States would control two-thirds.[101] In many ways the Cold War order was quite effective in maintaining these spheres. As was discussed in the second chapter, political actors behave differently according to how they *perceive* the structure of world politics. The standard account of the Cold War framed world politics entirely as a conflict between the two superpowers and their allies and thereby encouraged a bipolar bloc formation. It is doubtful that the influence of the superpowers, in their respective spheres of influence, could have been maintained to the extent that it was, without the Cold War framework.[102]

This is not to suggest that the two superpowers deliberately constructed the Cold War in order to exercise a kind of dual hegemony. But then the Cold War order needs not to have been consciously constructed in order to work in that way. The hostilities between the two superpowers might have been quite real, but so were the hegemonic roles these powers played in their spheres of influence. It can be assumed that once the Cold War set in, both the United States and the Soviet Union tried to use it to their advantage. And they did. Both powers were acutely aware of the influence that the Cold War order had on the rest of the world and the authority it conferred on them. Accordingly, they consciously exploited Cold War hostilities in order to consolidate their respective spheres of influence.[103] Instead of focusing on the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, this alternative account shows how the power of both parties was in many ways dependent on their mutual hostilities. It does not deny the reality of the Cold War, but it insists that this reality can *simultaneously* be interpreted as an exercise of hegemony by the two superpowers over everybody else. When considered in this light, the previously discussed hostility towards 'neutralism' makes a lot more sense. The following section traces the emergence of the Cold War order from the viewpoint of the alternative account of the Cold War. It is argued that the behaviour of the two superpowers can only be explained by taking into account the core-periphery cleavage. The two superpowers might have competed for influence, but they also had a common interest in keeping the Cold War the only game in town.

---

[100] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 15-16.

[101] Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Curve of American Power," *New Left Review* 40 (2006): 78-79.

[102] Immanuel Wallerstein, "Precipitate Decline: The Advent of Multipolarity," *Harvard International Review*, (Spring 2007), 55.

[103] Ibid., 55.

4.2. The postwar order – anarchy or cooperation?

It bears reminding that the United States and the Soviet Union did more or less respect each other's spheres of influence throughout the Cold War. In Eastern Europe there were various uprisings against communist rule – Berlin in 1953, Poland and Hungary in 1956, Poland and Czechoslovakia in 1968 – each of these was brutally suppressed by the Soviet Union.[104] The United States did nothing. Eastern Europe was the Soviet Union's sphere of influence. Similarly, when the United States intervened in order to prevent a communist victory in the Greek Civil War,[105] the Soviet Union withdrew their support of the communist forces.[106] There were of course a number of 'crises' in which the two superpowers faced each other directly – the Berlin blockade and the Cuban missile crisis in particular – but both were resolved by a return to the pre-crisis situation.[107]

In Asia the spheres of influence carved out by the Yalta agreements were not as clear as they were in Europe.[108] However, one thing that was not on the table was a communist takeover of China. During the Second World War, China, under the leadership of the Kuomintang,[109] had been one of the 'Big Four' Allies in the war against Japan and Germany. After the war, China became one of the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council, at the insistence of the United States.[110] Both the United States and the Soviet Union expected the Kuomintang to remain in power in China after the war and made postwar arrangements according to that. Indeed, when the Japanese surrendered, Chinese Nationalist forces were sent to take command of Indo-China north of the 16th Parallel until the French colonial authorities would return and take over.[111]

When the Chinese Civil War between the Kuomintang and the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) resumed, the United States actively supported the Kuomintang with weapons and

---

[104] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," In *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 20.

[105] Mingst and Arreguín-Toft, *Essentials of International Relations*, 44.

[106] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 21.

[107] Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Curve of American Power," *New Left Review* 40 (2006): 78-79.

[108] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 21.

[109] Kuomintang was the Chinese Nationalist Party led by general Chiang Kai-shek.

[110] Harry G. Gelber, *The Dragon and the Foreign Devils: China and the World, 1100 BC to the Present*, (London 2007), 305-308.

[111] Michael J. Montesano, "Bandung 1955 and Washington's Southeast Asia," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, eds. Tan and Acharya, (Singapore 2008), 204.

supplies.[112] The Soviet Union, however, remained on the sidelines. Support for the CCP was very limited. Even when the communists were close to winning the civil war, Stalin strongly recommended to Mao that the CCP make some kind of deal with the Kuomintang. According to Wallerstein, this was "Stalin's attempt to enforce a version of the Yalta arrangement on China."[113] The CCP ignored Stalin and took over the rest of the mainland.

The conclusion of the Chinese civil war shows the limitations of structural realism and the standard account of the Cold War. The principal actors were not the United States or the Soviet Union, but the Chinese Communist Party. Its rise to power and subsequent foreign policy represented a revolt against the postwar arrangements decided by *both* the United States and the Soviet Union. It is arguably more useful to locate the Chinese Civil War within the core-periphery cleavage than in the bipolar cleavage of the standard account.

4.3. Different accounts but still so similar

It has been illustrated in this chapter, that despite all the harsh rhetoric and ideological conflict, the two superpowers were in fact very reluctant to upset the status quo – even when given the chance. Admittedly, structural realism has some explanations for this. According to Kenneth Waltz, the ultimate concern of states is security rather than power.[114] Accordingly, caution and restraint can be considered as rational strategies in a bipolar system. Retrospectively, the restraint of the superpowers during the Cold War does indeed seem to have been in the interest of both parties, since it functioned to preserve the status quo. Here, however, the account provided by structural realism and the alternative account provided by world-systems analysis, have started to converge. The "dominant relation in the world" was that between the United States and the Soviet Union and they had a status quo arrangement, or a balance of power, as Waltz would prefer.[115] But whichever account is chosen – the 'standard account' or the 'alternative account' – the result is pretty much the same: The Cold War order was a structure of international politics that lent massive power to the United States and the Soviet Union, especially the former since it was always the stronger party. These two accounts of the Cold War era tell a radically different story but are at the same time strangely similar.

---

[112] R. Keith Schoppa, "From Empire to People's Republic," In *Politics in China: An Introduction*, ed. Joseph, (Oxford 2010), 58.

[113] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 21.

[114] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18 (Spring 1988): 616.

[115] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Stability of a Bipolar World," *Daedalus* 93 (Summer 1964): 889.

It is somewhat ironic that the most sophisticated version of the balance of power account – that of Kenneth Waltz – is at the same time the one most similar to the alternative account of the core-periphery cleavage. Recall Waltz's words from 1964, quoted in the previous chapter, about the enormous responsibility of the two superpowers as opposed to everyone else. Lesser powers could enjoy, Waltz told us, the privilege of indulging in domestic affairs if they liked. But not the two superpowers. Their responsibility was for the security of the whole interstate system.[116] Writing two and a half decades on, in 1988, Waltz reflected on what would turn out to be the whole Cold War era. He famously described the behaviour of the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War in the following way:

> Thus two states, isolationist by tradition, untutored in the ways of international politics, and famed for impulsive behaviour, have shown themselves – not always and everywhere, but always in crucial cases – to be wary, alert, cautious, flexible and forbearing.[117]

In fact, Waltz does all but spell it out. The maintenance of the Cold War order was a *collective undertaking* by the United States and the Soviet Union.

The hostilities between the superpowers during the Cold War were very real to be sure. But these were, paradoxically, also the forces that facilitated the operation of the core-periphery cleavage. At first it might seem counterintuitive that two such conflicting processes were operating simultaneously. But in fact it is not. It is perfectly logical and it has happened before. In order to demonstrate this, the next section will briefly discuss the structures of world politics during the latter half of the nineteenth century and up until the First World War. This was also a time in which interstate rivalry and the core-periphery cleavage were both operating at the same time.

4.4. Berlin – imperial anarchy

In the closing decades of the nineteenth century, European powers met at various meetings in capitals around the continent and divided between them most parts of the world that had not yet been colonised.[118] The most famous of these meetings was perhaps the Berlin Conference

[116] Ibid., 889, 906-907.

[117] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18 (Spring 1988): 623.

[118] Martin Meredith, *The State of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence*, (London 2006), 1.

of 1884-5, sanctioning the 'Scramble for Africa'. Three decades after the conference European states controlled 84 percent of the world's territory and most of its people.[119]

This was also a time of great power rivalry. The balance of power that had been established in 1815 with the 'Concert of Europe' was becoming increasingly unstable as a result of new rising powers.[120] The growing intensity of colonialism was in a way an outlet for the growing tension between the European states. According to David Armstrong, the Berlin Conference "helped to prevent a major war over rival claims in Africa".[121] There was, to be sure, competition between the European states over colonial territory. But this competition was largely resolved with bargaining and negotiation at the time. Large territories were exchanged for various political favours such as diplomatic recognition of protectorates or fishing rights on the other part of the globe. The people and territory under colonial rule became, in the words of Martin Meredith, "little more than pieces on a chessboard."[122]

Looking back at the colonial era, few would dispute that the European powers exercised a collective hegemony over the rest of the world. The colonised people in the South lived in a world apart from their masters in the European metropoles. The cleavage between the rich and powerful in the pan-European world and the poor and suppressed in the South was quite real and formed an important part of the identity of both groups.[123]

However, the cleavage between the colonial powers themselves was also quite real. In 1914 the 'Concert of Europe' finally collapsed with the outbreak of the First World War.[124] Despite their collective hegemony over most of the world's peoples, the European powers were at the same time adversaries, operating a delicate balance of power. Once that balance collapsed, so did the colonial order of the nineteenth century. However, the core-periphery cleavage did not disappear with the disintegration of the European empires. In many ways, the Cold War order saw a continuation of patterns from the colonial era, albeit with new powers playing the dominant roles.

---

[119] Anthony McGrew, "Organized Violence in the Making (and Remaking) of Globalization," in *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies*, eds. Held and McGrew, (Cambridge 2007), 16-19.

[120] The 'Concert of Europe' was the balance of power that was constructed in Europe in the aftermath of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815. It lasted until the outbreak of the First World War in 1914. David Armstrong, "The evolution of international society," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Baylis, Smith and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 47.

[121] Armstrong, "The evolution of international society," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 47.

[122] Meredith, *The State of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence*, 2.

[123] Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, "Alternative approaches to international theory," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, editors, John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, (Oxford 2008), 187-189.

[124] Armstrong, "The evolution of international society," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 47.

4.5. Yalta – colonialism by other means

The colonial era and its culmination in two world wars prove an important point: *In world politics there can be more than one process operating simultaneously*. World politics at the dawn of the twentieth century were indeed characterised by rivalry between powerful states in the interstate system, just as structural realism would have it. However, they were *also* characterised by the collective domination of these powerful states over the larger part of humanity. With regard to the topic addressed in this dissertation, it is important to understand that in the *same way*, it can be argued that during the Cold War era, there was more than one process operating simultaneously. Again, these processes were on the one hand interstate rivalry – this time between the United States and the Soviet Union – and on the other hand the collective hegemony of these powerful states over everybody else.

Which cleavage is emphasised, is not only an empirical question, but also a question of perspective and normative choice. For example, structural realism might be quite useful in understanding the relationship between the European powers in the nineteenth century and their balance of power. However, for someone fighting against colonialism in the Global South, the 'Concert of Europe' was hardly a conclusive account of world politics. Similarly, the Cold War era can be interpreted in different ways. The bipolar account of structural realism is perhaps an insightful description of the rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union during the period. However, for many in the Global South, again, this was hardly a conclusive account.[125]

As will be illustrated in the following chapter, many in the Third World saw the Cold War order as a foreign construct that once again put constraints on their independence and freedom of action. The Cold War historian Odd Arne Westad gave the following verdict: "In an historical sense – and especially as seen from the South – the Cold War was a continuation of colonialism through slightly different means."[126]

Just as the Berlin Conference had divided the world between the European powers, so had the Yalta Conference sought to divide the world between the two superpowers. In this new world order, the people in the Global South were 'allies' rather than 'colonies', but again, somehow they were getting the short end of the stick. As has been illustrated, in order to understand the Cold War in the Global South, one must go beyond the dominant bipolar

[125] Szonyi and Liu, "New Approaches to the Study of the Cold War in Asia," introduction to *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 5.

[126] Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*, (Cambridge 2005), 396.

account of structural realism and grasp the historical continuity between the colonial era and the Cold War.

Like the 'standard account' account of the Cold War, the 'alternative account' presented in this chapter, contains both attempts at objective explanation as well as normative implications. Recall how it was argued in the theoretical framework that all theory is either 'problem-solving theory' or 'critical theory'. The standard account of the Cold War, discussed in the previous chapter, was a problem-solving theory that served to legitimise and reinforce the bipolar order of the Cold War. The alternative account presented here, is a critical theory that challenges, not only the empirics of the standard account, but also its normative legitimacy. By emphasising the importance of the core-periphery cleavage, the alternative account laid the foundations for a political struggle that transcended and undermined the bipolar order of the Cold War.

This struggle, which is the subject of the following chapter, was in many ways a continuation of the struggle against colonialism. Third World leaders such as India's Jawaharlal Nehru, Indonesia's Sukarno and Egypt's Nasser, were men who became national heroes in the struggle against colonialism and would later become the leaders of the Third World movement during the Cold War. Just as they had denied the legitimacy of European colonialism, they also denied "the basic premise of the Cold War narrative, namely that there were only two sides, and that every country was either on one side or the other."[127] They subscribed to an 'alternative account' that explicitly renounced the Cold War order as a hegemonic structure.

As has been illustrated in this chapter, the United States and the Soviet Union were very reluctant to challenge the spheres of influence carved out with the postwar arrangements. Seen from this alternative viewpoint this makes a lot of sense. But these arrangements were challenged. Not by the superpowers themselves, but by the large majority of humanity that did not have a voice at Yalta, namely the Third World.

[127] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," In *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 18.

5. The Third World Project

In his book *The Darker Nations*, Vijay Prashad opens with the words: "The Third World was not a place. It was a project."[128] It was a project to construct a better world in which there would be more room for the people of the Global South. This project started with the struggle against imperialism, but it would carry on into the Cold War and beyond. The 'Third World project' was very much influenced by, what has been called here, the 'alternative account' of the Cold War. There is, of course, more than one way to elaborate an alternative account of world politics and the leaders of the 'Third World project' did not agree on everything. However, what binds them together was a common renunciation of the bipolar framework of the Cold War and an emphasis on the importance of the core-periphery cleavage. In this chapter, some of the main achievements of the Third World project will be traced and it will furthermore be illustrated how the project was based on a fundamentally different understanding of world politics than the standard account of structural realism.

5.1. Bandung – the Afro-Asian Conference

In 1955, the leaders of twenty-nine independent Asian and African states gathered in Bandung in Indonesia for the Afro-Asian Conference. The states attending represented 1.5 billion people, around 60% of the world's population at the time. The conference was convened by the so-called 'Colombo Powers', India, Pakistan, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), Burma and Indonesia.[129] Not everyone was invited to the conference. South Africa was excluded because of its racist regime, along with Israel and the Republic of China (Taiwan), who were considered too subordinate to Western powers.[130] Similarly, the Soviet Republics of Central Asia were excluded because they were satellites of the Soviet Union, in spite of a formal request from Moscow that they be allowed to attend.[131] Importantly, the People's Republic of China was invited at the insistence of India's prime minister, Jawaharlal Nehru.[132]

---

[128] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, xv.

[129] Christopher J. Lee, "Between a Moment and an Era: The Origins and Afterlives of Bandung," in *Making a World After Empire: The Bandung Moment and its Political Afterlives*, editor, Christopher J. Lee, (Ohio 2010), 10-12.

[130] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 40.

[131] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 20.

[132] Amitav Acharya and See Seng Tan, "The Normative Relevance of the Bandung Conference for Contemporary Asian and International Order," introduction to *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, eds. Tan and Acharya, (Singapore 2008), 5.

In a symbolic way, the Bandung Conference marked the end of colonialism.[133] However, it was also at a time when the Cold War was beginning to take shape in Asia. There was serious debate at the conference over the nature of this new world order and the place of the Third World in it. The US led military pact SEATO had been established only a year earlier, institutionalising Washington's influence in South- and Southeast Asia.[134] The Middle Eastern equivalent, CENTO, was established the same year as the Bandung conference. The delegates of states that were members of these pacts – such as Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines – defended their participation, claiming that they had a right to self-defence that they could exercise collectively if they liked. The main threat, according to them, was from communists, both domestically and internationally.[135] Their stance was modelled on the 'standard account' of the Cold War, provided by structural realism.

They were challenged, however, by the leaders of the non-aligned countries. Nehru of India, Sukarno of Indonesia, U Nu of Burma and Nasser of Egypt, all criticised their colleagues for participating in military pacts with the two superpowers.[136] Only two years earlier, the United States had been hoping to establish a strong alliance with India as the cornerstone of its foreign policy in South Asia. In 1953, US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, offered US support for an 'Indian Monroe Doctrine'[137] in South Asia.[138] According to the same account, the US even suggested that India might take China's permanent seat at the UN Security Council, held at the time by Chiang Kai-shek's government in Taiwan. India declined all this and refused to join SEATO. Nehru did not consider military pacts to be defensive instruments, but a way in which powerful states exercise influence over the weaker states in the pact.[139] Speaking in the Indian Parliament in 1954 about the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, Nehru said:

> The Manila Treaty is inclined dangerously in the direction of the spheres of influence to be exercised by powerful countries. After all, it is the big and powerful countries that will decide matters and not the two or three weak and small Asian countries that may be allied to them.[140]

---

[133] Although some participants had never been formally colonised, Thailand, Japan and China being examples.
[134] Montesano, "Bandung 1955 and Washington's Southeast Asia," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, 205.
[135] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 38.
[136] Ibid., 39-40.
[137] In other words, the US would recognise South Asia as India's 'sphere of influence' in the way that it views the whole Americas as its sphereof influence.
[138] Shashi Tharoor, *Nehru: The Invention of India*, (New York 2003), 183.
[139] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 40.
[140] Quoted in ibid., 40.

The important point to note here is that Nehru's stance was clearly influenced by a *different* understanding of world politics than the structural realist account of the Cold War. For Nehru, the issue of military pacts represents a cleavage between the 'big and powerful countries' on the one hand and the 'weak and small Asian countries' on the other, where the former operated a 'sphere of influence'.

Understandably, the United States was highly concerned about the Bandung conference. Prior to the conference, the United States "made a concerted effort to counter the influence of neutral countries such as India and Indonesia and offered "coaching" and "guidance" to their allies – Pakistan, Turkey and the Philippines, as well as Ceylon."[141] Among other things, they were worried that the conference might "develop into an effective forum that excluded the United States."[142] There might even emerge a solid bloc at the United Nations led by India and China. But most dangerous of all was the way in which the Bandung conference threatened to *restructure* international society.[143] More countries in the Global South might adopt a policy of non-alignment and refuse to participate in the Cold War conflict. The emergence of such a bloc would not only threaten the strong position of the United States in the Cold War, but could also be a platform on which to launch another political struggle based on the North-South divide. Third World states could unite because of their marginalised place in the world economy and demand changes. Such a struggle would by definition pit the United States and its Western allies against the majority of humanity, and therefore it was a game they did not want to play. Operating the Cold War cleavage was quite convenient compared to that.

The legacy of the Bandung conference remains mixed and controversial. The worst fears of the United States – that vital allies such as Japan, Pakistan, Thailand and the Philippines would drift towards non-alignment – did not materialise.[144] But nevertheless, the conference was a success for the Third World project. The 'Bandung spirit' was defined by Nehru and

---

[141] Acharya and Tan, "The Normative Relevance of the Bandung Conference for Contemporary Asian and International Order," introduction to *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, 12.

[142] Ang Cheng Guan, "The Bandung Conference and the Cold War International History of Southeast Asia," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, eds. Tan and Acharya, (Singapore 2008), 29.

[143] Helen E. S. Nesadurai, "Bandung and the Political Economy of North-South Relations: Sowing the Seeds for Re-visioning International Society," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, eds. Tan and Acharya, (Singapore 2008), 69, 74-77.

[144] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 48.

Sukarno and their policy of non-alignment and Third World unity.[145] Not by the camp mentality of the pro-US states. Countries such as Cambodia and Laos, who had been ambivalent before the conference, decided to stay out of SEATO and pursue a non-aligned policy.[146] In an important sense, the Bandung Conference was a significant setback for the bipolar framework of the standard Cold War account. The conference also showed that countries in the Global South were capable of coming together on their own terms to discuss international developments and produce joint notes in them. This was an important experience for what would become the Afro-Asian group in the United Nations, later to be joined by the states of Latin America.[147]

5.2. The Non-Aligned Movement and the NIEO

The concept of non-alignment did not end in Bandung. In 1956, the year after the Afro-Asian Conference, Nehru and Nasser spent three days in Yugoslavia with Tito, discussing the situation of world politics and their common dislike of the bipolar order. This meeting laid the groundwork for the establishment of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM).[148] NAM was formally launched at a conference in Belgrade in 1961. Twenty-two states attended from Asia, Africa, Latin America and Europe. The movement explicitly renounced the two camp mentality of the Cold War order and the accompanying nuclear arms race. Instead, they promoted the concept of 'peaceful co-existence'.[149]

The Non-Aligned Movement was fundamentally based on the belief that the core-periphery cleavage was the principal concern of people in the Global South. According to Helen E. S. Nesadurai, it was

> at the 1961 NAM Summit and the subsequent economic conference in Cairo in 1962 where it was first proposed that the more dangerous division in the world was the North-South divide between the haves and the have-nots rather than the East-West divide that major Western powers were so preoccupied with.[150]

---

[145] Ibid., 48.

[146] Ruhal Mukherji, "Appriasing the Legacy of Bandung: A View from India," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, eds. Tan and Acharya, (Singapore 2008), 168.

[147] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 41.

[148] Ibid., 95.

[149] Ibid., 95-100.

[150] Nesadurai, "Bandung and the Political Economy of North-South Relations: Sowing the Seeds for Re-visioning International Society," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, 77-78.

The Non-Aligned Movement worked to improve the position of the Third World in various ways. One of these was a call for the democratisation of the United Nations. The movement also supported national liberation movements that were still fighting against colonialism, particularly against the Portuguese in Africa.[151]

However, most important was NAM's call for a 'New International Economic Order' (NIEO).[152] The NIEO included demands for the democratisation of global economic institutions, the regulation of foreign investment, better access for developing countries to the markets of the industrialised countries and the protection of 'economic sovereignty'.[153] These objectives were pursued at the United Nations by the Group of 77, the largest Third World bloc at the UN, through the newly established, United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).[154]

The first secretary general of UNCTAD – and the leader of the Third World's struggle for a New International Economic Order – was the Latin American economist Raúl Prebisch.[155] As was discussed in the theoretical framework, Raúl Prebisch was one of the pioneers of dependency theory. Indeed, Wallerstein says that Prebisch was the "initiator of the core-periphery analysis of the world-economy."[156] According to Prebisch, underdevelopment in the Third World was directly linked to its

> structural dependency on a capitalist core that controlled all levers of international decision-making and profitable economic activity, thereby appropriating much of the gains from international economic activity.[157]

The Third World demands for a New International Economic Order were highly influenced by Prebisch's analysis of the world-economy. The proposals called for greater self-reliance and cooperation among Third World states and the establishment of economic sovereignty. This included the right to nationalise assets and resources that had come under foreign

---

[151] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 102-103.

[152] Nesadurai, "Bandung and the Political Economy of North-South Relations: Sowing the Seeds for Re-visioning International Society," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, 77.

[153] Ngaire Woods, "International political economy in an age of globalization," in *The Globalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Baylis, Smith and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 247.

[154] Nesadurai, "Bandung and the Political Economy of North-South Relations: Sowing the Seeds for Re-visioning International Society," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, 80-81.

[155] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, 70.

[156] Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*, 104.

[157] Nesadurai, "Bandung and the Political Economy of North-South Relations: Sowing the Seeds for Re-visioning International Society," in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*, 81.

ownership in the colonial era.[158] The objective was to lay the foundations for development in the South, by breaking up the unequal relationship between the core and peripheral zones of the world-economy. If Henry Kissinger personified the symbiosis of structural realism and US foreign policy, Raúl Prebisch personified the symbiosis of a critical theorising of world politics and the political project of the Third World.

In the end, the proposals for a New International Economic Order were flatly rejected by the industrialised states.[159] The governance of the world-economy continued to be in the hands of the Bretton Woods institutions, while the more representative organisation, UNCTAD, was marginalised. Nevertheless, the call for a New International Economic Order was important in many respects. It enjoyed widespread support all over the Third World irrespective of Cold War alignments and similar demands still resonate today.[160] It also showed that the core-periphery cleavage is very real and that it matters for both the states in the Global South and for the industrialised states in the core.

The period from 1955-1975 is sometimes called the 'Bandung Era'.[161] It was a period in which many countries in the South gained independence and various projects of Third World unity were launched, such as NAM, G-77, UNCTAD and the Tricontinental Conference. The Third World project was based on an understanding of world politics that was *fundamentally different* from the 'standard account' of the Cold War with its emphasis on the East-West cleavage. Instead, it was based on an understanding of world politics that emphasised the core-periphery cleavage and the marginalisation of people in the Global South. The Third World project was not only a struggle against the injustices of the world order, but also a revolt against the structures of knowledge that were meant to define world politics in the aftermath of the Second World War. The Third World explicitly renounced the 'two-camp theory' of the two superpowers, both as an explanation and as a guide to action.

[158] Ibid., 81.
[159] Ibid., 81.
[160] Ibid., 69.
[161] Mark T. Berger, *The Battle for Asia: From decolonization to globalization*, (London 2004), 38.

6. Discussion

It is already two decades since the Cold War era came to and end. However, in many ways, the questions of how to understand the Cold War period remain just as relevant as they were during this era. This dissertation has offered two contending accounts of the structures of world politics during the Cold War. One is the 'standard account' of a bipolar rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, largely based on structural realism, while the other is the more ambiguous 'alternative account' based on the North-South cleavage, echoing Marxist theories of world politics such as world-systems analysis. While both accounts contain a significant normative element, they are nevertheless also attempts at objective explanation and can be evaluated as such.

Indeed, the implications of the end of the Cold War are radically different depending on which of these accounts is more accurate. How one understands the situation of world politics today, after the fall of the Soviet Union, depends very much on how one understood the structures of world politics during the Cold War to begin with. It is for this reason that the study of the Cold War order remains very important today. Similarly, contemporary world politics can offer valuable clues as to the true nature of the Cold War order. This chapter will discuss the findings of this dissertation and analyse them in light of the sudden collapse of the Cold War order.

6.1. The collapse of the Cold War order

One of the main arguments presented in this dissertation is that structural realism was a normative theory that had a strong commitment to the maintenance of the Cold War order. Robert W. Cox first presented this argument in 1981, and the collapse of the Cold War order, a decade later, strengthened the argument considerably.[162] It is difficult to exaggerate the extent to which structural realism did *not* anticipate the end of the Cold War. Writing in 1988, only a year before the fall of the Berlin Wall, Kenneth Waltz published an article were he continued his praise of the bipolar order of the Cold War, restating most of the arguments found in his article from *Daedalus* a quarter of a century earlier.[163] Again, Waltz stressed the peacefulness and stability of a bipolar order, as opposed to a multipolar world. Towards the

[162] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 130-131.

[163] Kenneth N. Waltz, "The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory," *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18 (Spring 1988): 615-628.

end of his article, Waltz reminds us that the reason for the Cold War lies, not with individual states, but in the distribution of power in the interstate system.

> Although its content and virulence vary as unit-level forces change and interact, the Cold War continues. It is firmly rooted in the structure of postwar international politics, and will last as long as that structure endures.[164]

Structural realism's confidence that the Cold War would last, and its inability to account for its end, is the best testimony to its problem-solving nature. Structural realism was a theory that emerged during the Cold War and remained a powerful, albeit flawed, theoretical framework right up to the collapse of the Cold War order, which the theory had taken as a point of departure. Just like Robert W. Cox had claimed, structural realism was a theory about "how to manage an apparently enduring relationship between the two superpowers."[165] Its normative commitment to this relationship made it a stabilising factor, but it also made it blind to the way in which other processes in world politics were slowly dismantling the Cold War order.

6.2. The persistence of the North-South cleavage

As has been illustrated in this dissertation, the Cold War era was marked by an ideological struggle, not just between the two superpowers, but also more importantly between contending interpretations of world politics. During most of the Cold War, the 'standard account' of structural realism seemed to have the upper hand, emphasising the East-West cleavage instead of the North-South cleavage. The East-west cleavage, we were told, was based on objective facts, while Marxists theories of world politics were too utopian to be taken seriously.[166] States were explicitly advised to "work with the existing international order", defined as bipolar, and "understand the limits on political change."[167]

The end of the Cold War is very interesting in this regard. The East-West cleavage, supposed to be the objective reality of world politics according to structural realists, vanished into thin air in the blink of an eye. The North-South cleavage, however, remains quite real. The division of the world into core and peripheral zones is a material fact that conditions the lives of people around globe. Unlike the East-West cleavage of the Cold War order, the

---

[164] Ibid., 628.

[165] Robert W. Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 130.

[166] Linklater, "Marx and Marxism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 111.

[167] Burchill and Linklater, introduction to *Theories of International Relations*, 21.

North-South cleavage did not just disappear. It is interesting, to say the least, that many scholars of International Relations – particularly in the US – that claim to value objective facts as the basis of their 'scientific' theories, have more or less completely overlooked this.[168]

6.3. From Vietnam to Afghanistan – wars against the Third World

It has often been said that the two superpowers fought 'proxy wars' against each other in the Global South.[169] The underlying assumption is that armed conflict during the Cold War could always be located in a bipolar framework, where the principal contenders were the two superpowers. But what happens if we remove the glasses of structural realism and allow for some agency on behalf of the people in the Global South, who were actually fighting these wars?

Looking back at the Cold War era, many of the wars being fought in the Global South make a lot more sense if they are located in the North-South cleavage, presented in this dissertation, rather than the East-West cleavage of the standard account. The most important of these wars was the Vietnam War. At one point the United States had half a million US troops fighting in Vietnam.[170] The Soviet Union did not send in troops and their material support for the Viet Minh was very limited.[171] Nevertheless, the Vietnamese won the war. The limits to US power were laid bare, not at the hands of its 'great adversary' the Soviet Union, but at the hands of some of the poorest people on Earth. Similarly, when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan, the United States did not participate directly, only giving indirect support to the Taliban. Nevertheless, the war was a disaster for the Soviet Union and they lost.[172] One cannot simply reduce these wars to the bipolar conflict of the United States and the Soviet Union. These wars were fought by people in the Global South, for people in the Global South, and in the end they won.

It has often been pointed out, that prominent realist scholars have been vocal critics of many wars being fought in the Global South. Jack Donnelly reminds us that Niebuhr and Morgenthau were opposed to the Vietnam War from early on. Similarly there was opposition

---

[168] With a few notable exceptions (Wallerstein being one of them), Marxism has 'virtually disappeared' as an academic orientation in the United States. Linklater, "Marx and Marxism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 112.

[169] Micheal Cox, "From the cold war to the war on terror," in *The Golibalization of World Politics*, 4th edition, eds. Smith, Baylis and Owens, (Oxford 2008), 82.

[170] Yahuda, *The International Politics of the Asia-Pacific*, 52.

[171] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 22.

[172] Ibid., 23.

to the "Reagan administration's support of armed counter-revolution in Nicaragua. And not a single prominent realist supported the American invasion of Iraq in 2003."[173] According to them, the United States was naïvely driven by 'ideology' instead of the more sensible realist approach.

It is, of course, true that these wars made little sense, seen from the viewpoint of structural realism. But perhaps it is the realists, and not the US government, who are naïve, believing that the wars in Vietnam and Nicaragua were actually about containing the Soviet Union or promoting a concept of justice. Not to mention the irony of promoting an 'objective' theory of international politics and come to the conclusion that the actions of states don't make sense. Instead of revising the theory, realists seem to suggest that states should rather revise their policy. The fact that some of the most important wars in the last sixty years – the Vietnam War, the wars in Afghanistan, the US invasion of Iraq – don't add up to the theory of structural realism, says a lot more about the theory of structural realism than about the wars themselves.

6.4. The US after the Cold War – unipolarity or decline?

As mentioned in the beginning of the chapter, the implications of the end of the Cold War are radically different depending on which of the Cold War accounts discussed in the dissertation was seen to be more accurate. For those who subscribed to the 'standard account' of a bipolar world, the collapse of the Soviet Union meant that the United States had 'won' the Cold War.[174] Strangely enough, structural realism remains one of the leading theories in the discipline of International Relations. Arguments about stability and bipolarity were quickly set aside, because we now lived in a 'unipolar' world in which the United States was a 'hyperpower'.[175] Arguably, the 'strange non-death' of structural realism after the end of the Cold War is the result of this comforting message to the United States.

Seen from the alternative account of the Cold War, things look rather different.[176] If the Cold War order was a hegemonic structure that privileged the two superpowers, then the collapse of this order was hardly a cause for celebration in the United States. According to Immanuel Wallerstein, for the United States, the collapse of the Soviet Union was an

---

[173] Donnelly, "Realism," in *Theories of International Relations*, 38.

[174] Immanuel Wallerstein, "Precipitate Decline: The Advent of Multipolarity," *Harvard International Review*, (Spring 2007): 58.

[175] Cox, "From the cold war to the war on terror," in *The Golibalization of World Politics*, 75-76.

[176] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 23.

"absolute geopolitical catastrophe".[177] While this is perhaps exaggerated, the fruits of victory remain elusive. It is true that United States has today by far the most powerful military in the world, but for what purpose? The Vietnam War had already shown that the US military could produce an incomparable carnage, but it could *not* bomb its will into the minds of people in the Third World. The wars in Iraq and Afghanistan are only underscoring this point. The fact is that today, the United States increasingly has to use brute force to impose its will, and this is taking its toll both economically and politically.

6.5. The Third World project – a belated victory?

According to Vijay Prashad, the Third World was ultimately a failed project.[178] It did not deliver a more equitable world order in which the people of the Global South enjoyed the prosperity and opportunities that they had hoped for. It is true that the in the aftermath of the 'Bandung Era', in the late seventies and eighties, the dynamism of the Third World project seemed to have waned. However, this was also at a time in which the Cold War order was starting to disintegrate. The United States had lost the Vietnam War and its principal partners, Europe and Japan, were fast catching up with the US economically, and refused to keep on behaving like political satellites.[179] The Soviet Union was already on a long-term economic decline and had lost its most important ally, China.

This did improve the relative position of the Global South in world politics, but the results of this have been uneven. Large parts of Africa have remained stagnant or even deteriorated in recent decades. However, the East Asia region, and China in particular, have transformed into an economic powerhouse, lifting hundreds of millions of people out of poverty. India follows not far behind. With the Cold War over, the North-South cleavage has become more pronounced, increasingly uniting the Global South in mattes of global economic governance. Similarly, trade between states in the Global South is growing fast with every year, threatening to break up the South's economic dependence on the industrialised states in the core.[180] Perhaps the balance sheet of the Third World project has yet to be written.

---

[177] Ibid., 23.
[178] Prashad, *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*, xvi-xix.
[179] Immanuel Wallerstein, "The Curve of American Power," *New Left Review* 40 (2006): 84-85.
[180] Giovanni Arrighi, *Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century*, (London 2007), 208.

7. Conclusion

The aim of this dissertation was to offer an account of the Cold War era that puts the Global South at the centre of analysis. More precisely, the aim was to offer *both* an empirical and normative critique of the 'standard account' of the Cold War with its almost exclusive emphasis on the East-West cleavage. The aim was to demonstrate that this account, based on structural realism, was a normative framework that served to legitimise and reinforce the Cold War order. Furthermore, it was argued that the structure of world politics was also characterised by a North-South cleavage that emerged during the colonial era and operated throughout the Cold War and beyond.

In the theoretical framework, it was demonstrated how theoretical knowledge can have a constitutive affect on the social reality it addresses. It was argued that structural realism was a so-called 'problem-solving theory' that served as a conservative force on the bipolar order of the Cold War. The symbiosis of structural realism and international politics during the Cold War was further elaborated in the third chapter, demonstrating both its constitutive effect as well as its empirical shortcomings. The purpose of the third chapter was, thus, to provide both an empirical and normative critique of structural realism and its 'standard account' of the Cold War.

However, the theoretical framework also addressed other theories than structural realism. The most significant being Immanuel Wallerstein's world-systems analysis. This theory shows how world politics are characterised by *both* rivalry between strong states and a cleavage between core and peripheral zones in the world-economy. It was also argued that theories that emphasise the core-periphery cleavage, constituted a transformative force on international politics, since they challenged the dominant account of the Cold War, i.e. as a bipolar struggle between East and West. The fourth chapter further elaborated this argument, analysing the Cold War period through the lens of the core-periphery cleavage. The Cold War order was compared to the colonial era of the late nineteenth century, in order to demonstrate that the North-South divide was an objective reality that operated throughout the Cold War era. This illustration further undermined the empirical credentials of structural realism, while at the same time lending support to the theory of world-systems analysis.

The fifth chapter traced the story of those who openly rejected the bipolar order of the Cold War and pursued a foreign policy informed by the core-periphery cleavage. The purpose of this chapter was to demonstrate that the North-South divide was not only an analytical tool,

but also a political reality that consciously informed the actions of people and governments around the world. The sixth chapter subsequently merged broadly the areas explored in the dissertation, discussing the sudden collapse of the Cold War order and its implications.

Admittedly, the subject of the dissertation is broad and leaves many questions unanswered. In a way, this is inevitable when one seeks to pursue a critical theorising of world politics that goes beyond the ahistorical and restricted domain of problem-solving theories. The subject is broad, and yet it was defined specifically to focus on the aims set out in the introduction. When defining a topic for examination, it is impossible to focus on everything related to it. It would have been insightful to examine in greater detail the trajectory of China – especially given its rapid emergence as one of the most powerful states in the world today. The bipolar framework of the standard Cold War account has much difficulty in addressing China. It went from being in the Soviet bloc in the fifties, towards isolation in the sixties and early seventies, only to emerge in a de facto alliance with the US in the late seventies and eighties. Of course none of this was predicted in advance by structural realism. To examine this systematically through a world-systems approach would have been very useful. Such an account can be found in the work of Giovanni Arrighi.[181]

Furthermore, a more systematic comparison of the United States and the Soviet Union would have been useful. Although they were the two 'superpowers' during the Cold War era, there was really never any comparison. In spite of its nuclear arsenal, the Soviet Union always lagged far behind the United States, who was the real hegemonic power during the Cold War. Consequently, the role each power played during the Cold War was quite different. It would also have been useful to examine the position of *other* industrialised countries than the two superpowers in greater detail. However, as stated, the topic of this dissertation was defined specifically to focus on the aims set out in the introduction. This is a subject that will be researched and debated for many years to come.

In spite of the limitations of the discussion presented in this dissertation, the conclusions reached are very important. The Cold War order came and went in a number of decades, and at the time it was meant to define the whole world. When it ended, some even declared the 'end of history'.[182] But of course history had not ended, because the Cold War had not defined it. The fundamental feature of world politics, the North-South divide, was still in place.

[181] Arrighi, *Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century*.
[182] Wallerstein, "What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay," in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*, 17.

However, this could not be 'allowed' to define the post-Cold War order, so alternative paradigms were constructed.

Suddenly the world was defined by a 'Clash of Civilisations' and a 'War on Terror'. The United States was the 'indispensible nation' that had to confront the 'Axis of Evil'. Like the Cold War paradigm, all of this was at least partly based on objective factors, but again, the purpose was to construct a worldview that put the United States in a leading role, while obscuring the division of the world into core and periphery. However, for paradigms to have a constitutive effect, someone has to be listening. And this time fewer and fewer were. Gramsci explained how hegemony operated through a *symbiosis* of material and ideological power. One is not enough. The Cold War paradigm was so powerful because it coexisted with enormous material force. The Third World project slowly, but surely, dismantled both.

Bibliography

Acharya, Amitav. *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the problem of regional order*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge, 2009.

Acharya, Amitav, and See Seng Tan. "The Normative Relevance of the Bandung Conference for Contemporary Asian and International Order." Introduction to *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*. eds. See Seng Tan and Amitav Acharya, 1-16. Singapore: NUS Press, 2008.

Anderson, Benedict. "Exit Suharto: Obituary for a Mediocre Tyrant." *New Left Review* 50 (2008): 27-59.

Armstrong, David. "The evolution of international society." in *The Globalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 36-52. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Arrighi, Giovanni. *Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century*. London: Verso, 2007.

Barnett, Michael. "Social Constructivism." in *The Globalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 160-173. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Berger, Mark T. *The Battle for Asia: From decolonization to globalization*. London: Routledge, 2004.

Bohman, James. "How to Make a Social Science Practical: Pragmatism, Critical Social Science and Multiperspectival Theory." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 31 (2002): 499-524.

Brocheux, Pierre. "Reflections on Vietnam." *New Left Review* 73 (2012): 72-91.

Burchill, Scott, and Andrew Linklater. Introduction to *Theories of International Relations*. 4th edition. eds. Scott Burchill et al. 1-30. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Cox, Micheal. "From the cold war to the war on terror." in *The Globalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 70-87. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Cox, Robert W. "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory." *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10 (1981): 126-155.

Dauer, Richard P. *A North-South Mind in an East-West World: Chester Bowles and the Making of United States Cold War Foreign Policy, 1951-1969*. Westport: Praeger, 2005.

Devetak, Richard. "Critical Theory." in *Theories of International Relations*. 4th edition. eds. Scott Burchill et al. 159-182. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Donnelly, Jack. “Realism.” in *Theories of International Relations*. 4th edition. eds. Scott Burchill et al. 31-56. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Dunne, Tim, and Brian C. Schmidt. “Realism.” in *The Golibalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 90-106. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Gelber, Harry G. *The Dragon and the Foreign Devils: China and the World, 1100 BC to the Present*. London: Bloomsbury, 2007.

Guan, Ang Cheng. “The Bandung Conference and the Cold War International History of Southeast Asia.” in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*. eds. See Seng Tan and Amitav Acharya, 27-47. Singapore: NUS Press, 2008.

Held, David. *Models of Democracy*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2006.

Hobden, Stephen, and Richard Wyn Jones. “Marxist theories of international relations.” in *The Globalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 142-159. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Kennan, George F. (“X”). “The Sources of Soviet Conduct.” in *Essential Readings in World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. Karen A. Mingst and Jack L. Snyder, 19-24. New York: Norton, 1947/2011.

Lamy, Steven L. “Contemporary mainstream approaches: neo-realism and neo-liberalism.” in *The Globalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 124-141. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Lee, Christopher J. “Between a Moment and an Era: The Origins and Afterlives of Bandung.” Introduction to *Making a World After Empire: The Bandung Moment and its Political Afterlives*. ed. Christopher J. Lee, 1-42. Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2010.

Linklater, Andrew. “Marx and Marxism.” in *Theories of International Relations*. 4th edition. eds. Scott Burchill et al. 111-135. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Liu, Hong. “The Historicity of China’s Soft Power: The PRC and the Cultural Politics of Indonesia, 1945-1965.” in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*. eds. Zheng Yangwen, Hong Liu and Michael Szonyi, 147-182. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *The Communist Manifesto*. London: Penguin Books, 1848/1967.

McGrew, Anthony. “Organized Violence in the Making (and Remaking) of Globalization.” in *Globalization Theory: Approaches and Controversies*. eds. David Held and Anthony McGrew, 15-40. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2007.

Meredith, Martin. *The State of Africa: A History of Fifty Years of Independence*. London: Free Press, 2006.

Mingst, Karen A. and Ivan M. Arreguín-Toft. *Essentials of International Relations*. 5th edition. New York: Norton, 2011.

Montesano, Michael J. "Bandung 1955 and Washington's Southeast Asia." in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*. eds. See Seng Tan and Amitav Acharya, 198-220. Singapore: NUS Press, 2008.

Mukherji, Ruhal. "Appriasing the Legacy of Bandung: A View from India." in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*. eds. See Seng Tan and Amitav Acharya, 160-179. Singapore: NUS Press, 2008.

Nesadurai, Helen E. S. "Bandung and the Political Economy of North-South Relations: Sowing the Seeds for Re-visioning International Society." in *Bandung Revisited: The Legacy of the 1955 Asian-African Conference for International Order*. eds. See Seng Tan and Amitav Acharya, 68-101. Singapore: NUS Press, 2008.

Prashad, Vijay. *The Darker Nations: A People's History of the Third World*. New York: The New Press, 2007.

Reus-Smit, Christian. "Constructivism." in *Theories of International Relations*. 4th edition. eds. Scott Burchill et al. 212-236. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Schoppa, R. Keith. "From Empire to People's Republic." in *Politics in China: An Introduction*. ed. Willam A. Joseph, 37-62. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Scott, Len. "International history 1900-90." in *The Golibalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 54-69. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Smith, Steve, John Baylis and Patricia Owens. Introduction to *The Globalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 0-13. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Smith, Steve, and Patricia Owens. "Alternative approaches to international theory." in *The Globalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 174-191. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Spence, Jonathan D. *The Search for Modern China*. 2nd edition. New York: Norton, 1999.

Szonyi, Michael, and Hong Liu. "New Approaches to the Study of the Cold War in Asia." Introduction to *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*. eds. Zheng Yangwen, Hong Liu and Michael Szonyi, 1-11. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Tharoor, Shashi. *Nehru: The Invention of India*. New York: Arcade Publishing, 2003.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *Historical Capitalism* with *Capitalist Civilization*. London: Verso, 1983/2011.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. *World-Systems Analysis: An Introduction*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. “The Curve of American Power.” *New Left Review* 40 (2006): 77-94.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. “Precipitate Decline: The Advent of Multipolarity.” *Harvard International Review* (Spring 2007): 54-59.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. “What Cold War in Asia? An Interpretative Essay.” in *The Cold War in Asia: The Battle for Hearts and Minds*. eds. Zheng Yangwen, Hong Liu and Michael Szonyi, 15-24. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

Waltz, Kenneth N. “The Stability of a Bipolar World.” *Daedalus* 93 (Summer 1964): 881-909.

Waltz, Kenneth N. *Theory of International Politics*. Reading: McGraw-Hill, 1979.

Waltz, Kenneth N. “The Origins of War in Neorealist Theory.” *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 18 (Spring 1988): 615-628.

Westad, Odd Arne. *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

Woods, Ngaire. “International political economy in an age of globalization.” in *The Globalization of World Politics*. 4th edition. eds. John Baylis, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens, 242-260. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Yahuda, Michael. *The International Politics of the Asia-Pacific*. 3rd edition. London: Routledge, 2011.