Utrecht University

The Imperial North:

A Development Perspective on the Cold War Military Invasions of Lebanon (1958) and Afghanistan (1979)

Master's Thesis

Hanke van den Broek (5708559)

MA International Relations in Historical Perspective
Faculty of Humanities
Utrecht University

Supervisor: Dr. Corina Mavrodin

Word count: 15,701

15 January 2021

Abstract

The present study applies a 'development perspective' to the Cold War military invasions of Lebanon by the United States in 1958, and of Afghanistan by the Soviet Union in 1979. From the 1950s onwards, the United States and the Soviet Union were engaged in a so-called 'aid race,' in which they competed for the favors of the Third World through the provision of development aid. The analysis shows how this 'development paradigm' not only resulted in economic or industrial programs but also highly influenced military interventions from both sides of the Cold War.

Using documents on internal discussions and communications, it is firstly demonstrated that both the Soviet and the American governments considered Afghanistan and Lebanon respectively as important stakes in their economic competition. These considerations resulted not only in concrete aid programs to modernize the recipient countries, but ultimately in military incursions into these countries as well. Both invasions were subsequently defended in Emergency Special Sessions of the UN General Assembly, and, in the case of Afghanistan, also in propaganda. A discourse analysis of these justifications reveals that both Cold War competitors used a 'development discourse' to justify their interventions. Although their terminologies differed, both discourses contained underlying colonial perceptions and representations of the Third World, through which the invasions were framed as humanitarian gestures from superior benefactors to backward countries. A comparison of these incursions thus unveils the strong resemblance between the American and Soviet development enterprises, and between the ways the American and Soviet leaders employed the mindset behind these aid programs to vindicate their military actions into Third World countries.

This study aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of the pervasiveness of the development paradigm during the Cold War, and to increase knowledge about the worldview underpinning Cold War military invasions from both sides. Most importantly, it establishes that both the Soviet Union and the United States during the Cold War could be regarded as colonial 'Northern' powers, who militarily invaded 'Southern' countries in the course of their aid race.

Keywords: Development, Cold War, Military invasions, Lebanon, Afghanistan, Discourse analysis.

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations

APN	Agentstvo Pechati Novosti (Novosti Press Agency)
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CPSU	Communist Party of the Soviet Union
CREST	CIA Records Search Tool
DRA	Democratic Republic of Afghanistan
FOIA ERR	Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room
FRUS	Foreign Relations of the United States
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
KGB	Komitet Gosudarstvennoy Bezopasnosti (Committee for State Security)
NAM	Non-Aligned Movement
PDPA	People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan
UAR	United Arab Republic
UN	United Nations
USA	United States of America
USSR	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WHO	World Health Organization

1. Introduction

"Our nations and countries are colonies no more. Now we are free, sovereign and independent. We are again masters in our own house."[1] On this bright note, Indonesian President Sukarno opened the Bandung Conference on 18 April 1955. For one week, twenty-nine leaders of Asian and African decolonized states gathered in Bandung, Indonesia, where they collectively condemned all forms of colonialism and other violations of their newly-won sovereignty. In addition to their shared anticolonialism, the postcolonial elites proclaimed their countries' neutralism in the face of the Cold War that had emerged between the United States and the Soviet Union.[2] In view of these powerful declarations and the large numbers of countries represented at the conference, 'Bandung' is considered one of the key moments in the decolonization process of the 'Third World.'[3]

However, the Third World countries' wish to be 'masters in their own house' and remain neutral in the conflict between the two post-war superpowers was to no avail, as they soon became inextricably enmeshed in the global contest. As the center of this competition shifted from Europe to the newly independent countries during the 1950s, both the Soviet Union and the United States tried to assert their dominance and influence over these nations. The subsequent struggle for the favor of the Third World prompted both Cold War competitors to underline their anti-imperial traditions and anticolonial credentials, which they also highlighted through the provision of development aid. From the 1950s onwards, foreign aid came to constitute an instrument in the confrontation between the United States and the Soviet Union. As David C. Engerman states, development aid from both sides in the Cold War "began with high promises: a vision of future independence, prosperity, and political stability for the newly emergent Third World".[4] However, during the subsequent decades, development assistance would take on such pervasive forms that it profoundly shaped the patterns of relations within and between nations, and had a far-reaching influence on the recipient countries' societies.[5]

---

[1] CVCE.eu. Opening address given by Sukarno (April 18, 1955). In: *Asia-Africa speak from Bandung.* Jakarta: Indonesia, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1955. pp. 19-29. https://www.cvce.eu/s/3o [accessed 29 Dec 2020].
[2] Sara Lorenzini, *Global Development: A Cold War History* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019), 40.
[3] The term 'Third World' was first coined by the French demographer Alfred Sauvy in 1952 and gained prominence after the Bandung conference. The term is an unsuitable generalization of a large group of countries that in reality starkly differ from each other. Therefore, it is only used here in the descriptive sense. Following Odd Arne Westad's definition, in the present study 'Third World' means the former colonial or semicolonial countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America that were subject to European, American, and Russian economic or political domination during the Cold War (Odd Arne Westad, *The Global Cold War: Third World Interventions and the Making of Our Times* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005). 2-3).
[4] David C. Engerman, "Development Politics and the Cold War," *Diplomatic History* 41 (2017): 1, 1-2. https://doi.org/10.1093/dh/dhw043.
[5] Engerman, "Development Politics," 1; Westad, *The Global Cold War*, 3.

1.1 Knowledge gap and intentions

For both superpowers, development aid became the preferred way to win the hearts and minds of the Third World. The American foreign aid apparatus that arose in the early post-World War II period has been called the 'development paradigm,' which was based on a conception of poverty and underdevelopment as international problems that should be acted upon by the affluent West. As American aid programs abounded from the 1940s onwards and development became institutionalized, its concepts and language became enveloped in a so-called 'development discourse.'[6] The American paradigm and discourse have from the 1980s onwards been criticized by development scholars as constituting a neocolonial enterprise, which entrenched existing power relations of the United States and the West over the Third World.[7] This development enterprise turned into an 'aid race' with the Soviet Union when the latter began to establish foreign aid programs in newly independent countries after Stalin's death in 1953. Although the resulting Soviet development apparatus was similarly extensive as the American one and equally influential for the recipient countries, Soviet development efforts have received far less attention in the literature. As a result, there is a lack of thorough insight in the ways the Soviet Union related to and perceived the Third World, and an absence of a detailed comparison between the Soviet and American visions of development.

In addition, during the Cold War, superpower interference in the Third World did not remain confined to development aid. In their struggle for global dominance, both the United States and the Soviet Union recurrently intervened militarily in Third World countries as well, in attempts to shape and control their political systems. However, these two forms of superpower interference in the Third World – economic development and military invasions – are usually considered separately in the literature. Scholars on military interventions discuss the invasions as divorced from the 'development paradigm' in which they took place, even though this paradigm was one of the most defining processes of the Cold War in the Third World. Development scholars likewise exclude military invasions from their explorations. As a consequence of this disconnection, an in-depth understanding is missing of the ways in which the development paradigm and its discourse profoundly shaped both the Soviet and the American governments' decision-making processes before military incursions, and the justifications for their actions afterwards.

The present study aims to redress these gaps by analyzing two military invasions, one from either side of the Cold War, through a 'development lens.' The interventions that will be examined here are the American invasion of Lebanon in 1958 and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979.

[6] Lorenzini, *Global Development,* 3-4, 25.
[7] Arturo Escobar, *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 12-17.

Both were incursions into countries that were official members of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM)[8] and were considered part of the Third World. It will be argued here, firstly, that both the American and the Soviet governments considered Lebanon and Afghanistan as crucial stakes in the Cold War aid race and viewed these countries from a development perspective, resulting in concrete foreign aid practices. Secondly, it will be maintained that both the Soviet Union and the United States, after their military interventions, used a 'development discourse' to justify their actions. An analysis of their considerations and justifications will demonstrate that these discourses contained colonial representations of the Third World, which reinforced hierarchical relations between 'developed' and 'underdeveloped' countries. Both superpowers used these constructs as powerful instruments to legitimize their invasions of Afghanistan and Lebanon. This study will thus demonstrate how convictions about the 'Third World' shaped the actions and language of both the so-called 'First' and 'Second' worlds in their economic competition during the Cold War.

1.2 Historiography on Lebanon and Afghanistan

The literature on the invasions of Lebanon and Afghanistan primarily concentrates on the motives, with Odd Arne Westad's comprehensive work on Cold War interventions into the Third World forming an important example.[9] Westad argues that both superpowers interfered in newly decolonized nations because of their interventionist ideologies. He thus claims that anticommunism and fear of Arab nationalism were the core motives behind the American incursion into Lebanon.[10] Similarly, he maintains that the principal reason for invading Afghanistan was the Soviet leaders' wish to spread their communist ideology.[11] Many authors follow this ideological view on Cold War military invasions. With regard to Lebanon, Salim Yaqub contends that countering international communism was paramount to the American Middle East policy in the 1950s, rather than any 'North-South' concerns.[12] Likewise, Irene Gendzier claims that the two principal objectives of the American policy towards Lebanon were the exclusion of the Soviet Union and ensuring Western access to oil.[13] A Cold War perspective also dominates in the literature on Afghanistan. Already beginning in the early 1980s, American scholars Anthony Arnold and Thomas T. Hammond explained the incursion by pointing to

[8] Lebanon became a member of the Non-Aligned Movement after the invasion, in 1961, but a Lebanese delegation was present at the Bandung Conference of 1955, where the movement's principles of nonalignment and neutrality were already established.
[9] Westad, *The Global Cold War.*
[10] Ibid., 110, 120.
[11] Westad, *The Global Cold War,* 322.
[12] Salim Yaqub, *Containing Arab Nationalism: the Eisenhower Doctrine and the Middle East* (Chapel Hill: UNC Press Books, 2004).
[13] Irene Gendzier, *Notes from the Minefield: United States Intervention in Lebanon and the Middle East, 1945-1958* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2006 [1997]).

the Soviet Union's expansionist nature.[14] Similarly, Afghan scholars Alam Payind and Mohammed Kakar depicted the Soviet Union as an inherently aggressive power,[15] and Pakistani scholar A.Z. Hilali regarded the intervention as part of a Soviet global strategy for domination.[16] Based on newly available archival material, this view was at last challenged by American scholar David N. Gibbs, who argued that the principal grounds for the invasion were defensive.[17]

Other authors center on the diplomatic history of the interventions. As the invasion of Lebanon was immediately followed by a British landing in Jordan,[18] both Ritchie Ovendale and Ivan Pearson have explored the 'special relationship' between the two Western allies in the period preceding these interventions.[19] As regards Afghanistan, Panagiotis Dimitrakis has documented the international reactions to the Soviet invasion.[20] A more recent strand in the literature, finally, goes beyond the focus on motives and diplomacy. Maurice Jr. Labelle, for example, emphasizes the importance of intercultural relations, highlighting the anti-Americanism of the Lebanese population and the role of transnational empathy during the American invasion.[21] Similarly surpassing Western perspectives, Swapna Kona Nayudu has underlined the crucial role of India in the mitigation of the Lebanon crisis.[22] For the Soviet side, Timothy Nunan's recent work has placed the intervention within a global history of Western humanitarianism in Afghanistan, in the context of debates about postcolonial sovereignty.[23]

---

[14] Anthony Arnold, *Afghanistan: The Soviet Invasion in Perspective* (Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1981); Thomas Hammond, *Red Flag Over Afghanistan: The Communist Coup, the Soviet Invasion, and the Consequences* (Boulder: Westview Press, 1984).

[15] Alam Payind, "Soviet-Afghan Relations from Cooperation to Occupation," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 21 (1989): 1, 107-128; M. Hassan Kakar, *Afghanistan: The Soviet Invasion and the Afghan Response, 1979-1982.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

[16] A.Z. Hilali, "The Soviet Decision-Making for Intervention in Afghanistan and its Motives," *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 16 (2003): 2, 113-144.

[17] David N. Gibbs, "Reassessing Soviet Motives for Invading Afghanistan: A Declassified History," *Critical Asian Studies* 38 (2006): 2, 239-263.

[18] After the 14 July military coup in Iraq and the subsequent American invasion of Lebanon on the following day, Britain intervened in Jordan on 17 July at the request of Jordan's King Hussein. The purpose of dispatching British troops to Amman was to forestall a coup in Jordan and uphold King Hussein's pro-Western rule.

[19] Ritchie Ovendale, "Great Britain and the Anglo-American invasion of Jordan and Lebanon in 1958," *The International History Review* 16 (1994): 2, 284-303. https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.1994.9640677; Ivan Pearson, "The Syrian Crisis of 1957, the Anglo-American 'Special Relationship', and the 1958 Landings in Jordan and Lebanon," *Middle Eastern Studies* 43 (2007): 1, 45-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/00263200601079625.

[20] Panagiotis Dimitrakis, "The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan: International Reactions, Military Intelligence and British Diplomacy," *Middle Eastern Studies* 48 (2012): 4, 511-536. https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2012.682304

[21] Maurice M. Labelle Jr., "A New Age of Empire? Arab 'Anti-Americanism', US Intervention, and the Lebanese Civil War of 1958," *The International History Review* 35 (2013) 1: 42-69. https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2012.707134.; Maurice Jr. Labelle, "Empathy and the Lebanese Civil War of 1958 in the USA," *Arab Studies Quarterly* 41 (2019): 2, 172-193. https://doi.org/10.13169/arabstudquar.41.2.0172.

[22] Swapna Kona Nayudu, "'In the very eye of the storm': India, the UN, and the Lebanon crisis of 1958." *Cold War History* 18 (2018): 2, 221-237. https://doi.org/10.1080/14682745.2018.1445997.

[23] Timothy Nunan, *Humanitarian Invasion: Global Development in Cold War Afghanistan* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016).

Studies on Lebanon and Afghanistan have thus primarily offered political, diplomatic or postcolonial views, without paying attention to the influence of the development paradigm on these invasions. An overview of the origins and characteristics of this paradigm will now follow, including a discussion of the literature in this field.

1.3 The development paradigm

Much has been written about the American development paradigm and its connected discourse. The start of the enterprise is usually located in the American financial aid for the reconstruction of post-war Europe, in the form of the Marshall Plan, and was extended to countries beyond Europe with President Truman's 'Point Four' initiative in his 1949 inaugural address.[24] In this address, Truman proposed a development program "for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas" as his fourth policy objective.[25] Truman's speech marked the beginning of an extensive foreign aid program for the non-European world, predicated on the idea that the combination of planning, technology and industrial techniques could bring economic growth and prosperity everywhere.[26] With this modernization theory in mind, the United States sought to expand its liberal capitalism to the Third World, believing that political stability and democracy would automatically follow. Foreign aid provision thus aimed to win the newly independent nations for the so-called 'free world' by transforming their societies along Western lines. In so doing, development was meant to counter the rising influence of the Soviet Union with its non-capitalist mode of industrialization.[27]

Development projects quickly came under the control of international organizations and networks of experts, planners, and economists. Organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO) and the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) – later the World Bank – were specifically devoted to economic development and poverty eradication.[28] The involvement of an international bank indicates the importance of economic standards in the development programs, with economists increasingly conceiving concepts as poverty, hunger and development as measurable problems. When the World Bank in 1948 set the threshold for poverty at $100 in gross domestic product per capita, national income was introduced as a global index for the stages of economic development. Suddenly, entire countries and continents were defined as 'poor' and thus in need of

[24] Harry S. Truman. Inaugural Address (January 20, 1949). *The Avalon Project.* https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/truman.asp [accessed 29 Dec 2020].
[25] Ibid.
[26] Lorenzini, *Global Development*, 25.
[27] Stephen Macekura, "The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy," *Political Science Quarterly* 128 (2013): 1, 129, 131.
[28] Lorenzini, *Global Development*, 94.

assistance.[29] Using the detached and technical language of economics, the development discourse thus radically divided the world in 'developed' and 'developing' countries, of which the former believed they were destined to remedy the latter's problems, through the universalist cure of economic and technical development.

One of the first scholars who critically analyzed the American development paradigm is American political scientist Irene Gendzier. In her 1985 study, she denounced the American development paradigm for endorsing intervention in the domestic politics of newly independent countries.[30] A few years later Majid Rahnema elaborated on these criticisms, arguing that global poverty was fabricated by the post-war emergence of the concept of development "out of the ashes of colonialism".[31] These views were echoed by anthropologist Arturo Escobar, whose 1994 book offers an extensive analysis of the ways in which the Third World has been constructed by development discourse and practices.[32]

A decade later, historian Stephen Macekura analyzed the early years of the development enterprise. Contrary to the tendency in the literature to focus on the Kennedy administration as linchpin of American development aid,[33] his study underlines the Eisenhower administration's continued interest in Point Four development programs, although excluding the intervention of Lebanon from his analysis.[34] A similar gap is found in Sara Lorenzini's recent contribution. Her 2019 study provides a wide-ranging account of both Soviet and American development programs and practices during the Cold War, recounting the history of the twentieth century through the lens of development.[35] However, Lorenzini emphatically argues that President Eisenhower did not share President Truman's enthusiasm for development assistance, stating that Eisenhower "was never fully on board" of foreign aid.[36] Although she notes that between 1957 and 1958 Eisenhower adopted a more active foreign aid policy, Lorenzini overlooks the invasion of Lebanon as example of this shift.[37]

Compared to the American development enterprise, Soviet development aid to the Third World has received less scholarly attention. A notable exception is historian David C. Engerman, who

[29] Majid Rahnema, "Poverty," in *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power,* ed. Wolfgang Sachs (London: Zed Books, 1992), 178; Alyosha Goldstein, "On the Internal Border: Colonial Difference, the Cold War, and the Locations of "Underdevelopment," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 50 (2008): 1, 30.
[30] Irene Gendzier, *Development Against Democracy: Manipulating Political Change in the Third World* (London: Pluto Press, 2017 [1985]).
[31] Majid Rahnema, "Global Poverty: A Pauperizing Myth," *Interculture* 24 (1991): 2, 24.
[32] Escobar, *Encountering Development.*
[33] See, for example, Mark Mazower, *Governing the World: The History of an Idea* (London: Penguin Press, 2012), 264; Goldstein, "On the Internal Border," 54; Lorenzini, *Global Development,* 64.
[34] Macekura, "The Point Four Program," 131, 155-156.
[35] Lorenzini, *Global Development*, 3.
[36] Ibid., 53-54.
[37] Ibid., 55.

highlights the role of Soviet aid to India in the economic competition.[38] He advocates a global history of modernization, which does not divide the Cold War world along East-West lines, but rather along the North-South axis, resulting in a conception of modernization as "a project that engaged not just the United States, but the whole northern hemisphere".[39] Specifically focusing on Soviet assistance to Afghanistan, Paul Robinson and Jay Dixon have analyzed the motives, results, and reasons for the ultimate failure of Soviet aid to engender profound changes in Afghanistan.[40] Although they discuss the consequences of the Soviet invasion for Afghan politics and Soviet aid, they do not consider the role of development in the intervention itself.

From a broader perspective, Lorenzini illustrates how from the 1950s onwards the Soviet Union attempted to demonstrate the superiority of the socialist mode of production over the capitalist one.[41] However, she omits any mention of the military invasion of Afghanistan in her book, thus excluding both the Lebanon and Afghanistan interventions from analysis. Lorenzini does however observe that Soviet leaders promoted their socialist development by connecting their support to anticolonial struggles and nationalist movements. She states that decolonization became a key aspect of Soviet aid, resulting in a specific socialist language of assistance which stressed a tradition of anti-imperialism.[42] It is noteworthy that Lorenzini thus refers to a socialist language of assistance, intimating that the Soviet Union might have had its own 'development discourse,' such a discourse being a well-known characteristic of the American development paradigm.

The existence of such a Soviet development discourse has recently been confirmed by Catherine Mary Ratliff. In her 2017 PhD dissertation, she explored the evolution of perceptions of 'Africa' and 'development' in the Soviet and Russian newspaper *Pravda*, arguing that *Pravda* employed a "socialist ideological discourse of equal nations".[43] This was based on the notion that "all countries, including the USSR, are developing, that the USSR and Africa are comparable and in some ways similar, and that freedom is an overriding aspiration".[44] Despite the Soviets' proclaimed anti-imperialism, Ratcliff maintains that they had an imperial approach to Africa. Thus, she argues, the Soviet Union in Africa "might be called quasi-colonial […], spreading socialist ideology, defending socialist client states, and

[38] David C. Engerman, "Learning from the East: Soviet Experts and India in the Era of Competitive Coexistence," *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33 (2013): 2, 227-238. https://doi.org/10.1215/1089201X-2322507.
[39] David C. Engerman and Corinna R. Unger, "Introduction: Towards a Global History of Modernization," *Diplomatic History* 33 (2009): 3, 378. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.2009.00776.x.
[40] Paul Robinson and Jay Dixon, "Soviet Development Theory and Economic and Technical Assistance to Afghanistan, 1954-1991," *The Historian* 72 (2010): 3, 599-623. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6563.2010.00272.x.
[41] Lorenzini, *Global Development,* 46.
[42] Ibid., 43, 45.
[43] Catherine Mary Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa – Construction of Africa and International Development in Soviet and Russian Public Discourse – Freedom as Development?,*" 2017, University of Edinburgh, PhD dissertation, 5.
[44] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 5.

encouraging a Sovietled socialist empire against a western capitalist empire".[45] Ratcliff's study shows that Western colonial tropes on Africa and development appeared in Soviet discourse as well, forcing a consideration of the question whether these might be "Northern as well as Western assumptions".[46]

1.4 Contribution to the literature

As studies on Cold War military invasions thus omit a development perspective, and development scholars in turn exclude military interventions from analysis, the present study intends to contribute to both fields of literature. By examining the American invasion of Lebanon of 1958 and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan of 1979 through a development lens, this study aims to bridge the literatures on Cold War military invasions and on development. This will shed light on the similarities and differences between the American and Soviet ways of regarding and approaching the Third World. Importantly, the analysis will demonstrate that while the United States and the Soviet Union had different views on development aid, they both held similar colonial perceptions of the Third World, which they employed to legitimize their military actions.

By including both a Soviet and an American military invasion, the present study juxtaposes the Eastern and Western development paradigms, enabling a comparison between the two superpowers' constructions of Third World countries in the context of the aid race. Additionally, it contributes to the literature on the American development paradigm in particular by focusing on the Eisenhower administration, thus contradicting the oft-supposed irrelevance of development aid during Eisenhower's presidency. Adding to the literature on Soviet foreign aid, on the other hand, this study examines whether the Soviet development discourse, as identified by Ratcliff with regard to Africa, can also be distinguished in Soviet discussions on Afghanistan, and thus extended to the broader Third World.

1.5 Method, sources, and structure

The first part of the analysis will be based on the characteristics of the respective American and Soviet development enterprises, as delineated in the literature. This will demonstrate how both the aid race and development programs took shape in the specific cases of Afghanistan and Lebanon. Subsequently, a discourse analysis will establish how both Cold War competitors discursively constructed the Third World and thus themselves, reflecting hierarchical notions which facilitated the justification of their military invasions. This analytical approach is valuable for this study, as a discourse analysis is capable of revealing the assumptions underlying speech and writing, enabling a better

[45] Ibid., 51.
[46] Ibid., 58.

understanding of the knowledge, attitudes, and actions of a certain time and place. Moreover, it illuminates the power of a discourse to reinforce existing power relations.[47]

To understand the dynamics between discourse, knowledge, and power in shaping social reality, the insights of Michel Foucault are fundamental. He has illuminated how a discursive analysis allows a focus on the aspect of domination in discourse, unveiling the elements of power and control it encapsulates.[48] Foucault's theories have been adopted and elaborated on by Edward Said, who has explored how 'the Orient' is constructed by Western discourse and thought.[49] According to Escobar, moreover, Said's postcolonial theory can be extended to the entire Third World, since "[r]epresentations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America as Third World and underdeveloped are the heirs of an illustrious genealogy of Western conceptions about those parts of the world".[50] Escobar views these conceptions as part of the 'colonization of reality' by the development discourse. This denotation indicates the development discourse's power to establish certain dominant representations of the Third World, shaping the ways in which both the West and the decolonizing countries came to perceive themselves and others, leading many 'underdeveloped' countries to accept Western interference in their internal affairs.[51]

Challenging this exclusive focus on Western perceptions, Ratcliff argues for an even further expansion of the theory to include Soviet perceptions of the Third World. She employs a postcolonial approach to her study as well, because "it is through discourse that the West or North constructed a needy, empty, backward Africa and it is through analysis that we can perceive and stop this".[52] A postcolonial deconstruction of the development discourse will expose how Western or Northern perceptions of reality became the dominant worldview, entailing influential assumptions about 'the North' and 'the South' which limited the ways in which people could relate to the world around them. According to Wolfgang Sachs, whose 1992 'Development Dictionary' uncovered the underlying biases of the development discourse, such a deconstructionist approach is part of a necessary "decolonization of the mind".[53]

For this analysis, a variety of primary sources will be examined. For the American side, the internal discussions of the Eisenhower government about Lebanon will be explored in CIA sources and in the series on Foreign Relations of the United States (FRUS) from the US State Department, for the

[47] Ibid., 30.
[48] Michel Foucault, *The Archeology of Knowledge* (London: Tavistock Publications, 1972), 200-201; Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 5.
[49] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin Random House, 2019 [1978]), 3; Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 6-7.
[50] Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 7.
[51] Ibid., 5-6.
[52] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 46.
[53] Wolfgang Sachs (ed), *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power* (London: Zed Books, 1992), xxv, xxxii.

period from April to October 1958. For the Soviet side, the internal political considerations will be analyzed using the sources from the Wilson Center Digital Archive on the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, covering the period from the summer of 1978 to the beginning of 1980. These sources will also provide context to both superpowers' defenses of their invasions, most explicitly pronounced in the United Nations General Assembly Emergency Special Sessions, which were convened both times as the Security Council was deadlocked. Besides the minutes of these sessions, the discourse analysis on Afghanistan will include Soviet propaganda which was disseminated shortly after the intervention.

The following two chapters will each contain one case study, with Chapter 2 focusing on the American invasion of Lebanon, and Chapter 3 analyzing the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan. Each chapter will contain five similar sections, beginning with a section shortly outlining the background of the military incursions and of aid to Lebanon and Afghanistan. The subsequent two sections demonstrate, firstly, that Afghanistan and Lebanon were considered part of the aid race, and secondly, that the economic assistance to Lebanon and Afghanistan corresponded with the development paradigms as described in the literature. Of the last two sections, one section will contain the discourse analysis, and the other will connect discourse to practice, illustrating that language translated into concrete actions. For the sake of clarity, the order of these two sections will be reversed in the two chapters. Finally, conclusions will be drawn about the shaping influence of the development era on Cold War military interventions.

2. Lebanon, 1958

2.1 Background

Shortly after Lebanon gained its independence from France in 1946, the United States began providing it with military and economic aid, considering the country a strategic location in the Middle East. Initially offering only modest amounts of aid, from the early 1950s this increased, with the United States providing $23 million in foreign aid between 1952 and 1956.[54] American aid was further expanded after civil unrest erupted in Lebanon in 1957, threatening to overthrow the pro-Western government of President Camille Chamoun. The support was consistent with the Eisenhower Doctrine, which President Eisenhower proclaimed in January 1957.

This doctrine obligated the United States to defend pro-Western regimes in the Middle East against Soviet communist domination.[55] When President Chamoun openly embraced the Doctrine, his decision was met with indignation by his own population and the nationalist forces in the Arab world, sparking political and societal polarization. In late 1957 and early 1958, the political situation in Lebanon deteriorated as rumors began to circulate about Chamoun's efforts to amend the constitution, enabling him to run for reelection and serve a second term as president. In May 1958, rebellions broke out after a journalist who had been critical of the Chamoun regime was assassinated. The situation rapidly turned into a civil war.[56]

2.2 Lebanon and the aid race

In line with the development mindset, American policymakers considered the conflict that arose in Lebanon a security threat to the United States. As Escobar asserts, "[t]the destinies of the rich and poor parts of the world were seen to be closely linked".[57] Western leaders and policymakers localized this threat primarily in the Soviet Union's economic attraction to the less developed Third World. A speech held by the CIA's Director of Central Intelligence, Allen Dulles, on 20 June 1958, illustrates that considerations like these played a role in the case of Lebanon. On this day, less than a month before the landing of American troops in Lebanon, Dulles visited the US Marine Corps Base in Quantico, Virginia.

In his speech at Quantico, Dulles discussed the evolution of the Cold War with the Soviet Union. According to him, the world situation was alarmingly shifting in favor of the latter, one of the principal

[54] Jacob Abadi, "Perception and reality in US-Lebanon relations," *Middle Eastern Studies* 56 (2020): 2, 307-8. https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2019.1678466/.
[55] Labelle, "A New Age of Empire?," 46.
[56] Yaqub, *Containing Arab Nationalism*, 205-229.
[57] Escobar, *Encountering Development,* 21-22.

reasons being that the Soviet Union, "[b]y suddenly and effectively entering the foreign aid competition with the US, and by its support to nationalist causes among colonial and ex-colonial peoples, . . . has, with some success, established itself as a symbol of change, progress and development".[58] The Soviets were threatening to overshadow the United States, Dulles argued, due to a prudency on the part of the United States in providing economic aid. Consequently, the United States "tends to be regarded – particularly among some of the newer nations – as too preoccupied with military security and indifferent to social and economic progress".[59] It is clear that Dulles perceived the economic competition with the Soviet Union as a significant part of the Cold War, and that the Soviet Union was rapidly gaining ground in this aid race.

Dulles asserted that this was the result of "The Problem of the Underdeveloped Areas,"[60] which in his definition covered the entire Third World. The matter with these countries was that many "are politically unstable and all have grave economic problems" making them "the targets of Soviet economic penetration and Communist subversion".[61] According to Dulles, Soviet involvement was even further facilitated by the tendency of leaders of the new states to believe that the most advantageous course for them to follow in the Cold War was one of neutralism. Turning this belief to its advantage, the Soviet Union offered these countries foreign aid "without apparent strings," whereas the United States appeared to them "as opposed to neutralism and as attempting to force them into the Western alliance system".[62] Therefore, Dulles anticipated that "the conflict within these countries will increasingly become a conflict . . . between neutralism and pro-Communism".[63] One of the examples Dulles used to illustrate this claim was Lebanon, which he referred to as "a case where there is a conflict between pro-Western and neutralist elements".[64] It is thus evident from this speech that Dulles viewed economic and political instability in the 'underdeveloped areas' of the world as a direct security risk for the United States. Lebanon, specifically, was considered one of the unstable countries that could potentially turn from its current pro-Western orientation to neutralism, making it susceptible to the promises of Soviet economic aid. Undoubtedly, the head of the CIA saw Lebanon as a stake in the Cold War aid competition.

Their countries' central position in the economic rivalry between the superpowers did not go unnoticed by the governments of the newly independent countries themselves. As Macekura notes,

---

[58] Central Intelligence Agency (hereafter CIA), Remarks of the Director of Central Intelligence Quantico (June 20, 1958), in *General CIA Records.* Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (FOIA ERR), CIA Records Search Tool (CREST). Document number: CIA-RDP80M01009A001502520008-7. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp80m01009a001502520008-7 [accessed 4 January 2020].
[59] Ibid.
[60] Ibid.
[61] Ibid.
[62] Ibid.
[63] Ibid.
[64] Ibid.

"by the early 1950s, the connection between technical assistance and strategic objectives was clear to both U.S. officials and the leaders of underdeveloped nations".[65] These leaders soon capitalized on this situation, which is clear in the case of Lebanon. On April 29, 1958, a Central Intelligence Bulletin contained an article on Lebanon, stating that "the government is bargaining to obtain additional American economic aid in this fiscal year".[66] Lebanese Foreign minister Charles Malik had predicted that "if Lebanon does not immediately receive 'substantial' aid – about $15,000,000 in his view – 'Point Four can pack up and go home'".[67] The report immediately warned that "[r]ejection of the US aid might lead to a general repudiation of the 'Eisenhower Doctrine'".[68] Manipulating the superpower rivalry, Lebanon's government thus threatened to sever its good relations with the United States if they would not receive more money, indicating that not only American officials but also the Lebanese government considered Lebanon an element of the economic competition. Moreover, Malik's explicit connection between his request and Point Four signifies the continuation of Truman's development programs under the Eisenhower administration.

Meanwhile, the situation in and around Lebanon deteriorated quickly. Opposition to President Chamoun had severely divided confessional communities and polarized Lebanon's political landscape. These tensions were exacerbated by outside forces, primarily by the pan-Arab nationalist movement of Egypt's President Nasser. As the conflict in Lebanon escalated into civil war in May 1958, Chamoun repeatedly pleaded with the US government for military action in his defense. He therefore accused the United Arab Republic (UAR) of Egypt and Syria of outside interference in Lebanon's internal affairs.[69] The US government, however, consistently opposed intervention, only changing course after a military coup in Iraq on 14 July overthrew the pro-Western Hashemite regime. Fearing a similar fate for the Chamoun government, Operation Blue Bat was quickly set in motion.

On 15 July, the first seventeen hundred American Marines from the US Sixth Fleet came ashore at Beirut's beaches. They were warmly welcomed by local Lebanese, who were unaware that the troops arrived in response to President Chamoun's request for military support. In the following days, the number of American forces around Beirut increased to fourteen thousand. Rather than engaging in conflict, they oversaw the diplomatic efforts of the US ambassador to negotiate a truce between Lebanese Christians and Muslims, and to mediate between Chamoun and his opponents. The resulting political compromise led the Lebanese parliament to elect General Fouad Chehab as successor to

[65] Macekura, "The Point Four Program," 153.
[66] CIA, Central Intelligence Bulletin (April 29, 1958), in *General CIA Records*. Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (FOIA ERR), CIA Records Search Tool (CREST). Document number: CIA-RDP79T00975A003600510001-5. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp79t00975a003600510001-5 [accessed 4 January 2020].
[67] Ibid.
[68] Ibid.
[69] Karol R. Sorby, "Lebanon: The Crisis of 1958," *Asian and African Studies* 9 (2000): 1, 87-93.

Chamoun on 31 July, thereby bringing the civil war to an end. One month after Chehab's Presidential inauguration on 23 September, the last American Marines left Lebanon.[70]

Immediately after the start of the military operation, an emergency meeting of the UN Security Council was convened. The American delegation justified the invasion on the basis of Article 51 of the UN Charter, claiming the right of collective self-defense against outside threats. In the weeks that followed, negotiations in the Security Council ended in deadlock as the Soviets vetoed all Western proposals. Finally, this prompted the Council on 7 August to convene the UN General Assembly in an Emergency Special Session on the Middle Eastern situation. The session officially opened the day after, on 8 August, with the first meaningful discussions beginning on 13 August.[71]

2.3 The development proposal

On the same day the Security Council decided on convening the Assembly, the US Secretary of State, John Foster Dulles, received a memorandum from Charles Douglas Jackson, a long-time special assistant and speech writer to President Eisenhower. Jackson strongly felt that the President should appear at the Assembly session to address "the Town Meeting of the World with the nations of the underdeveloped areas heavily represented".[72] As he saw it, this was "a priceless opportunity to reassert our effective leadership in the Free World as a whole,"[73] and make "palatable to the General Assembly the whole American package".[74] This could be done, Jackson advised, by offering additional resources for Arab regional economic development. Thus, rather than focusing on Lebanon and Jordan specifically, the President's speech would serve to appease and attract all the emerging nations at once. Through this 'discursive homogenization', as Escobar calls it, Jackson portrayed the 'poor' and 'underdeveloped' as universal subjects, erasing all the complexity and diversity of Third World peoples and cultures.[75] Moreover, he believed there to be one universal solution for the problems of all emerging nations as well: economic growth. Apparently striking a chord with Dulles and Eisenhower, Jackson was allowed to write the speech for the President's Assembly address.

Echoing the discussions in the Security Council, President Eisenhower began his speech on 13 August by defending the invasion of Lebanon as a response to the Lebanese government's appeal for

[70] Douglas Little, "His Finest Hour? Eisenhower, Lebanon, and the 1958 Middle East Crisis," *Diplomatic History* 20 (1996): 1, 27, 52. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.1996.tb00251.x; Sorby, "Lebanon: the Crisis of 1958," 106; Labelle, "A New Age of Empire?," 54.
[71] Sorby, "Lebanon: the Crisis of 1958," 102-107.
[72] CIA, Memorandum for the Secretary (August 7, 1958), in *General CIA Records*. Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (FOIA ERR), CIA Records Search Tool (CREST). Document number: CIA-RDP80B01676R002500160003-7. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp80b01676r002500160003-7 [accessed 4 January 2020].
[73] Ibid. (underlined in original)
[74] Ibid.
[75] Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 53.

help against foreign aggression. After shortly suggesting four areas of action for the Assembly to consider, he arrived at the most important proposal in his speech, stating that "we have an opportunity to share in a great international task. That is the task of assisting the peoples of [the Near East], under programmes which they may desire, to make further progress toward the goals of human welfare they have set for themselves".[76] Eisenhower explicitly connected this progress to economic development, asserting that "[o]nly on the basis of progressing economies can truly independent Governments sustain themselves".[77] Therefore, he urged the UN Secretary General to immediately begin consultations with Arab nations on the establishment of a regional Arab development institution. The tasks of this institution would be "to accelerate progress in such fields as industry, agriculture, water supply, health and education" by providing loans and technical assistance.[78]

The centrality of technical and industrial advances, and the inseparable connection between economic progress and human welfare indicate that Eisenhower's plan met virtually all characteristics of the American development paradigm, as established under Point Four. As Macekura contends, the central premise behind Point Four was that superior American technical expertise would be "the guiding force" behind development.[79] Similarly, Escobar maintains that technology was believed to impart a "sense of direction and significance" and acted as a "moral force", which was supposedly neutral, beneficial, and universally applicable.[80] However, this view of development is not neutral or innocuous. Rather, it is predicated on certain conceptions of a normal course of progress, based on Western standards and expectations. Escobar argues that conceptualizing progress that way "became a powerful instrument for normalizing the world,"[81] resulting in seemingly self-evident notions about the Third World which became anchored in the development discourse. Therefore, a discursive analysis of Eisenhower's development proposal to the General Assembly will now demonstrate how these constructs were not pregiven but created by a development apparatus that produced knowledge about, and thus exercised power over, the Third World.[82]

2.4 Discourse analysis: the justification

One of Point Four's hallmarks that President Truman underlined, was that foreign aid should relinquish the imperialist tendency towards exploitation. Rather, it should encourage an attitude of self-reliance and 'self-help' in Third World governments, which would eventually release these countries from

[76] United Nations General Assembly Official Records (hereafter UNGAOR), Third Emergency Special Session, 732nd Plenary Meeting (August 8, 1958). https://undocs.org/en/A/PV.732 [accessed 29 Dec 2020].
[77] Ibid.
[78] Ibid.
[79] Macekura, "The Point Four Program," 141.
[80] Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 36.
[81] Ibid., 26.
[82] Ibid., 9.

dependence on continued US investment.[83] Eisenhower's speech echoed this model, as he repeatedly stressed that he was "not suggesting a position of leadership for my own country in the work of creating such an institution," but instead "the function of leadership must belong to the Arab States themselves".[84] Likely, this insistence on self-governance also served to acquit the United States of potential charges of imperialist intent behind the development institution. However, the President immediately continued by recommending the invitation of the IBRD, as an institution with "vast experience in this field" which could "make available its facilities for the planning of the organizational and operational techniques needed to establish the institution on a progressive course".[85] Eisenhower thus placed the final authority over the development institution in the hands of the experts and economists of a Western-based, US-led institution that employed Western standards to judge which programs engendered progress. This reveals the conviction, noted by Rahnema, that poverty and underdevelopment were "too global and sensitive a matter to be taken out of the hands of the professionals and institutions trained and empowered for this purpose".[86] Even though Eisenhower distanced the United States from control over the institution, the involvement of the IBRD would nevertheless consolidate existing structures of governance and power.

Having released the United States from the core responsibility over the institution, the President proceeded by suggesting primary issues to confront, beginning with "one of the major challenges of the Near East, the great common shortage – water," immediately followed by the other "great challenge that faces the area," namely disease.[87] The President asserted that efforts were already made "to conquer disease and disability" but that much more remained to be done.[88] Escobar calls this the "medicalization of the political gaze" through which Third World peoples were perceived as "diseased, underfed, uneducated, and physiologically weak masses".[89] Based on Western levels of wellbeing, this problematization of water shortage and disease also served to convey to the countries of the Near East their own misery and backwardness, and thus the necessity of progress and development. Jackson already formulated this objective in his memorandum to Dulles, suggesting that the President could "dramatize the issue of Arab poverty, disease, and illiteracy".[90] Having done so,

[83] Macekura, "The Point Four Program," 135-136.
[84] UNGAOR, Third Emergency Special Session, 732nd Plenary Meeting (August 8, 1958). https://undocs.org/en/A/PV.732 [accessed 29 Dec 2020].
[85] Ibid.
[86] Rahnema, "Poverty," 181.
[87] UNGAOR, Third Emergency Special Session, 732nd Plenary Meeting (August 8, 1958). https://undocs.org/en/A/PV.732 [accessed 29 Dec 2020].
[88] Ibid.
[89] Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 30.
[90] CIA, Memorandum for the Secretary (August 7, 1958), in *General CIA Records.* Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (FOIA ERR), CIA Records Search Tool (CREST). Document number: CIA-RDP80B01676R002500160003-7. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp80b01676r002500160003-7 [accessed 4 January 2020].

Eisenhower immediately presented a solution, stating that "[t]he United States is prepared to join with other Governments and the World Health Organization in an all-out, joint attack on preventable disease in the Near East".[91] The President thus simultaneously discursively portrayed the countries of the Near East as helpless and underdeveloped, and the United States as an altruistic benefactor. This construction, moreover, underscored the developmental distance between the Third World and the United States, highlighting the superiority of the latter.

As Escobar observes, framing development as the only road to prosperity and health carries certain quasi-religious connotations. Citing Indian scholar Ashis Nandy, he calls development a "secular theory of salvation".[92] A near-spiritual notion of progress also imbued Eisenhower's speech, as he prophesized about the long-term consequences of his development plan, declaring: "to see the desert blossom again and preventable disease conquered is only a first step. As I look into the future I see the emergence of modern Arab States that would bring to this century contributions surpassing those we cannot forget from the past".[93] The President continued by asserting that this "true Arab renaissance can only develop in a healthy human setting. Material progress should not be an overriding objective in itself; it is an important condition for achieving higher, cultural and spiritual objectives".[94] In Eisenhower's words, development indeed seemed a path to salvation that could elevate whole societies to a higher level of living. At this exalted point in his speech, the President returned to the actual reason of Assembly meeting, avowing that "[i]f a plan for peace of the kind I am proposing can be carried forward, in a few short years we may be able to look back on the Lebanon and Jordan crises as the beginning of a great new prosperous era of Arab history".[95] Couched in noble terms and bright promises, Eisenhower thus depicted the military invasions of Lebanon and Jordan as nothing less than a unique opportunity for the nations of the Near East to throw off their backwardness and radically transform their societies along Western lines. Rather than adopting an apologetic or defensive tone, the President seemed to suggest that the Near East should be grateful for the generous offer the United States made by getting involved in Lebanon.

Instead of confining himself to the Near East, Eisenhower then shifted his gaze to the entire Third World, noting that "the peoples of the Near East are not alone in their ambition for independence and development. We are living in a time when the whole world has become alive to the possibilities for modernizing their societies".[96] Eisenhower emphasized that American generosity extended to

[91] UNGAOR, Third Emergency Special Session, 732nd Plenary Meeting (August 8, 1958). https://undocs.org/en/A/PV.732 [accessed 29 Dec 2020].
[92] Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 25-26, 30.
[93] UNGAOR, Third Emergency Special Session, 732nd Plenary Meeting (August 8, 1958). https://undocs.org/en/A/PV.732 [accessed 29 Dec 2020].
[94] Ibid.
[95] Ibid.
[96] Ibid.

those countries as well. In a self-congratulatory manner, he remarked that "[t]he United States is proud of the scope and variety of its development activities throughout the world".[97] These development programs were proclaimed part of a time-honored American tradition, as the President maintained that "[t]hose who know our history will realize that this is no sudden, new policy of our Government. Ever since its birth, the United States has gladly shared its wealth with others. This it has done without thought of conquest or economic domination".[98] The portrayal of the United States as historically the benevolent patron of less prosperous countries implied that its current exceptional position was not accidental but lay at the heart of the American character. Moreover, by addressing 'the whole world,' Eisenhower insinuated that the entire Third World needed American assistance, thus declaring American supremacy over all emerging nations at the Assembly.

In the final lines of the speech, this sentiment was reaffirmed as President Eisenhower on a paternalistic note proclaimed: "As I look out on this Assembly, with so many of you representing new nations, one though above all impresses me. The world that is being remade on our planet is going to be a world of many mature nations."[99] Connoting that the newly independent nations were not yet mature, Eisenhower portrayed them as child-like and in need of adult guidance. As Escobar notes, this infantilization of the Third World was a common metaphor and an integral part of the development discourse.[100] Moreover, this image accurately reflects Eisenhower's core message, by depicting the United States as patronizingly taking the Third World nations by the hand to lead them on the path of progress and development. This path should bring the new nations on the evolutionary level of the industrialized, Western countries, of which the United States was the ultimate paragon. However, as José María Sbert notes, the road to progress was "only a path, not an arrival,"[101] as the developed countries of the West ultimately deemed the Third World incapable of ever arriving at an equal position with themselves.

2.5 Connecting discourse to practice

The President's proposal to the General Assembly was not merely a rhetorical strategy, only devised by Jackson to appease the Third World. Rather, Eisenhower genuinely valued development aid and intended to implement his plans, as is indicated by a letter he wrote to British Prime Minister Harold Macmillan on 18 July. Written a few days before the invasions of Lebanon and Jordan and almost a month before his speech to the Assembly, Eisenhower mentioned that understanding at home for the

[97] Ibid.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 30.
[101] José María Sbert, "Progress," in *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power,* ed. Wolfgang Sachs (London: Zed Books, 1992), 215.

imminent American and British invasions was of utmost importance. He then noted that he was "struggling hard these days to overcome the reluctance of Congress to appropriate money for information programs and mutual security costs and *the economic development of the less developed nations*".[102] Even before Jackson recommended that the President appear at the General Assembly with a development proposal, Eisenhower thus demonstrated a commitment to the provision of foreign aid.

Further illustration of this is the fact that the development proposal already translated into concrete actions before it was officially presented. In a meeting between American and British officials on 12 August, Secretary of State Dulles clarified the economic development program Eisenhower would advance in his speech the following day. Dulles pointed out that the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs "had been consulting with American oil companies. He believed that these companies would be willing to contribute to an Arab development fund after it had been established by the Arabs themselves".[103] These contributions would be necessary because "[t]he President's statement that we should support such a fund implied U.S. financial support".[104] As preparations had thus already been made to finance American support for the Arab development institution, Eisenhower's speech would not contain empty promises. However, this support was not mere altruism but a clear part of the economic competition with the Soviet Union, as Dulles remarked that "[w]e felt that such a fund should be operated by the IBRD. The Arabs seemed to get along with the IBRD and the Russians were not members of it".[105] As the Soviet Union would not be able to contribute, there would be no risk of the Soviets using the fund to their advantage in their economic offensive.

In addition, these documents reveal that the structure of the proposed development institution closely resembled the organizational structure of Point Four programs. As mentioned before, Eisenhower's emphasis on self-governance mirrored the importance President Truman attached to self-reliance. Besides that, Point Four relied heavily on private companies, philanthropic foundations, and supranational organizations to provide the funding for development investment costs. As a result of both these aspects, Point Four did not require extensive government funding, which was necessary since Congress under Truman would not approve more foreign aid programs.[106] Much the same,

---

[102] US State Department, Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States* (FRUS), 1958-1960, Lebanon and Jordan, Volume XI, Part IV, ed. Louis J. Smith (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1992), Document 194. https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v11/d194 [accessed 29 Dec 2020] [italics added by author for emphasis].

[103] US State Department, Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States* (FRUS), 1958-1960, Lebanon and Jordan, Volume XI, Part IV, ed. Louis J. Smith (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1992), Document 267. https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1958-60v11/d267 [accessed 29 Dec 2020].

[104] Ibid.

[105] Ibid.

[106] Macekura, "The Point Four Program," 142-143.

Eisenhower's complaint to Macmillan shows that he also struggled to obtain government funding for foreign development from Congress, prompting the Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs to inquire with American private companies whether they would be willing to support the fund. The fact that these private investors were oil companies is not coincidental, as they earned their money by processing Middle Eastern oil. As a result, the Arab countries would indirectly finance the development institution themselves, again reflecting the centrality of self-help through a reliance on their own natural resources.

The clearest indicator, however, that Truman's views about foreign aid and development mattered to President Eisenhower and his administration is the fact that on 12 August, the day before Eisenhower's Assembly address, Director of Intelligence Allen Dulles visited the former president in his hometown of Independence, Missouri. An extensive report of this 'intelligence briefing' was drawn up, accompanied by a personal letter from Dulles to President Eisenhower, dated 18 August. In this letter, Dulles remarked that he had made it clear to Truman that "it was your personal wish that Mr. Truman be kept up to date as he might desire with regard to the important international developments".[107] Moreover, this was not Truman's first intelligence briefing, as Dulles recounted he had told Truman "there had been important developments in the Middle East since his briefing on July 30,"[108] less than two weeks prior to this meeting. Far from a one-sided briefing, however, the meeting primarily revolved around Truman's views on the development proposal in Eisenhower's address. In his letter, Dulles specifically notified the president that he had brought a draft of the speech with him and that he had outlined it to Truman, "with emphasis on the economic proposals".[109] In the minutes of the meeting, it is observed that Dulles, even before beginning his intelligence briefing, stressed "[t]he great importance which the President attached to the speech as a major contribution to the solution of Mid-Eastern problems".[110] This confirms not only that Eisenhower sincerely believed in the remedying power of the development institution and was determined to implement it, but also underlines the great importance Eisenhower attached to Truman's opinions on his development plan.

Truman finally expressed his views at the end of the meeting. After having reviewed the volatile situation in the Near East, he "asked what would come of all this; how could this difficult and dangerous situation end? What could we do to bring this area into an age of sanity?"[111] In an answer to these questions, Dulles turned to Eisenhower's speech and presented the development proposal, which was

[107] CIA, Memorandum for the President (August 18, 1958), in *General CIA Records.* Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (FOIA ERR), CIA Records Search Tool (CREST). Document number: CIA-RDP79S01057A000500010005-2. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp79s01057a000500010005-2 [accessed 4 January 2020].
[108] Ibid.
[109] Ibid.
[110] Ibid.
[111] Ibid.

well received by Truman. The former president stated that "he felt sure he would be in complete agreement with all the proposals, but he particularly welcomed an effort to reach an economic solution, the economic approach being in his opinion the basic one for dealing with problems in the area".[112] Evidently, the father of the American development paradigm had not abandoned his belief in the ability of economic aid to bring peace and prosperity to the Third World. Moreover, Truman clearly viewed the plan from a Point Four-perspective, arguing that "the local revenues from oil could go a long way to solve Arab problems if only properly used by the Arab governments".[113] The promotion of self-reliance and self-sufficiency thus remained a central element in Truman's conceptions of development.

However, although Truman's ideas of self-help were allegedly based on a wish to renounce imperial policies towards the Third World, his observations nevertheless contained clear traces of a colonial outlook. With regard to Arab nationalism, he stated that "[h]e did not believe political unity was what the Arabs truly desired or really needed and this they would see for themselves if only they would sit down calmly and apply their extraordinary resources to their mutual problems".[114] Truman thus not only assumed that he knew better than the Arabs what they *needed*, but even believed he better understood what they *wanted*. His suggestion that Arab leaders should just sit down calmly and think, furthermore, alludes to a perception of them as immature and reckless hotheads, posing a risk to the restrained and reasonable United States. These paternalist views form the foundation of interventionist development programs. As Rahnema points out, they assume that "the poor are . . . 'underdeveloped' and – momentarily at least – deprived of their capacity to define their own interests".[115] Therefore, "[i]t is up to those in a superior position of knowledge and power . . . to assist them on their behalf".[116] Just like Eisenhower in his speech, Truman thus sanctioned American involvement in Lebanon as a duty bestowed upon the United States it in its superior position. Besides self-help and private funding, the colonial notions in Eisenhower's development proposal evidently mirrored Truman's Point Four as well.

Finally, Truman regarded economic aid not just as a solution for the problems of the Near East, but also as a defining element in the struggle with the Soviet Union. At the end of the meeting with Dulles, Truman tapped on Afghanistan on the world globe on his desk, and "expressed the opinion that Afghanistan was lost now that the Soviet Union dominates her economically".[117] The former president

[112] Ibid.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Rahnema, "Poverty," 180.
[116] Ibid.
[117] CIA, Memorandum for the President (August 18, 1958), in *General CIA Records.* Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (FOIA ERR), CIA Records Search Tool (CREST). Document number: CIA-

thus equaled economic primacy in the relations with Third World countries with having dominating power over them. These views reverberated on the other side of the Cold War, as is evident from the immediate effect of Eisenhower's Assembly address on Soviet aid activities. On 20 August, one week after Eisenhower's speech, a Central Intelligence Bulletin noted that "[a] fleet of 25 ships is due to deliver 'full equipment for many factories' to the port of Alexandria".[118] The timing was not considered a coincidence, as the bulletin stated that "[w]idespread publicity for these deliveries may be designed to offset the impact of President Eisenhower's proposals for Middle East regional economic development set forth at the special session of the UN General Assembly."[119] Determined not to lose the competition for the Third World, the Soviet Union had taken immediate action to counter the American offensive in the aid race.

In conclusion, this chapter has demonstrated that the United States considered Lebanon, formally a non-aligned country, as a crucial stake in the economic competition with the Soviet Union. Therefore, as the first section showed, when Lebanon collapsed into civil war in 1958, American policymakers were apprehensive of the country turning away from its pro-Western position. Ultimately, this led to the dispatch of American troops to Lebanon in July 1958, which was subsequently justified by President Eisenhower in the UN General Assembly. The second section illustrated how, rather than taking a defensive stance, the President used the opportunity to propose the establishment of an Arab development institution. Although the proposal was intended to acquit the United States of charges of imperialism, in the third section a discourse analysis unveiled that Eisenhower's discourse in effect reflected colonial perceptions of the Third World. By problematizing the standards of living of the Near East, and contrasting them with American modernity and affluence, Eisenhower's speech constructed the United States as superior benefactor to a backward Third World. Finally, the fourth section highlighted the legacies of President Truman's Point Four program in the concrete schemes resulting from Eisenhower's proposal. As the Eisenhower administration ascribed the United States with the noble duty to assist a helpless Third World, the military invasion of Lebanon was vindicated as American altruism, heralding the beginning of a more prosperous era for not only Lebanon, but the entire Third World.

RDP79S01057A000500010005-2. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp79s01057a000500010005-2 [accessed 4 January 2020].

[118] CIA, Central Intelligence Bulletin (August 20, 1958), in *General CIA Records.* Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (FOIA ERR), CIA Records Search Tool (CREST). Document number: CIA-RDP79T00975A003900160001-1. https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/document/cia-rdp79t00975a003900160001-1 [accessed 4 January 2020].

[119] Ibid.

3. Afghanistan, 1979

3.1 Background

Soviet aid during the Cold War was generally extended to countries in which progressive forces, such as communists and progressive nationalists, could lead the country from a stage of 'feudalism' to socialism. To receive Soviet aid, these states had to implement land reforms, seize foreign-owned properties, and orient economic relations toward socialist countries.[120] Although Afghanistan as non-aligned country did not neatly fit this model, its friendly orientation towards the Soviet Union made it one of the first countries to receive Soviet aid, in January 1954. From then onwards, large amounts of Soviet aid continued to flow to Afghanistan, totaling about $1.265 billion between 1955 and 1979.[121]

Afghanistan began to correspond more closely to the socialist model when a communist coup in April 1978 overthrew Afghan President Mohammed Daoud, who had started a crackdown on the communist People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan (PDPA) the year before. After the coup, Nur Mohammed Taraki and Hafizullah Amin emerged as the new rulers of Afghanistan. The socio-economic reforms they quickly introduced encountered fierce resistance from both the rural population and the country's Islamic forces. Soon, the new regime was confronted with an insurgency from large parts of the population, while also facing internal strife between competing factions within the communist party.

3.2 Afghanistan and the aid race

On May 31, 1978, one month after the April Revolution, the Soviet ambassador to Afghanistan sent a short letter to the Soviet Foreign Ministry on the domestic situation in the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA), as the country was now renamed. In this letter, Alexander Puzanov relayed that the new government under President Taraki was carrying out its program to reorganize "the social-economic structures of society, and to liquidate the influence of neocolonialism and imperialism".[122] These so-called neocolonialist forces, however, attempted to hold a grip on Afghanistan after the communist takeover, as "the embassies of the USA and other Western countries received instructions to search out all means to hold on in Afghanistan, including promises to provide economic assistance".[123] The Western countries had little success, as Puzanov reassured that the Afghan leadership "is not showing haste in concluding economic agreements with the West, proceeding from

[120] Lorenzini, *Global Development,* 44-45.
[121] Robinson and Dixon, "Soviet Development Theory," 605-606, 610.
[122] Wilson Center Digital Archive, Political Letter from USSR Ambassador to Afghanistan A. Puzanov to Soviet Foreign Ministry, "About the Domestic Political Situation in the DRA" (notes) (May 31, 1978), in *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.* https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/113255 [accessed 30 Dec 2020].
[123] Ibid.

an intention to reorient its foreign economic relations primarily towards the USSR and the socialist camp".[124] He illustrated this by observing that "[t]he Afghans asked the USSR to send a large group of advisors and consultants to work in the state apparat, and also to help in putting together a five year plan. The USSR has favorably resolved these issues".[125] It is evident from this letter that both the Soviets and the United States tried to win Afghanistan over to their side in the Cold War, and did so through offering economic aid. As the Afghan communists were restructuring their society along socialist lines and asking for Soviet assistance, Afghanistan was clearly on the Soviet Union's side in this economic competition.

The Afghan leaders, however, did not completely sever their relations with the West, as is clear from a letter from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) to Erich Honecker, the East-German communist leader. In this letter of October 1978, the Central Committee informed Honecker about the political situation in Afghanistan. On Soviet-Afghan relations, it cited Taraki declaring that "Westerners and Americans are clearly trying to exploit aid in order to force us to steer away from the chosen path. At the present time we . . . have no intention of spoiling our relations with the West, though we understand that their offers are not entirely unselfish".[126] The letter than went on to remark that "[f]rom our side it was emphasized that in dealing with the West one should not allow oneself to be lured into a trap".[127] These remarks again underline the importance of Afghanistan in the Cold War aid race, as the West continued to economically compete with the East for Afghanistan's favors.

Moreover, the letter reflects Ratcliff's observation that the Soviet Union portrayed aid as "Western, capitalist, exploitative, military neocolonialism," aimed at ensnaring the recipient countries economically and militarily.[128] As Taraki cautiously called Western aid offers 'not entirely unselfish' and the Soviet leaders equaled Western proposals with a trap, Western aid was depicted as conditional and a means for the United States to draw Afghanistan in its ideological camp. By implication, Soviet assistance was presented as unconditional, thereby catering to the neutralist wishes of the Non-Aligned Movement of which Afghanistan officially was a member. Ratcliff affirms this, stating that the Soviet discourse "portrayed Soviet aid as morally and practically perfect, mending harm done by the West" and therefore legitimate.[129] By painting their aid as the remedy for imperialist wrongs, the Soviets underlined their claims about anti-imperialism being a foundational part of the Soviet identity,

[124] Ibid.
[125] Ibid.
[126] Wilson Center Digital Archive, Information from CC CPSU to GDR leader Erich Honecker (October 13, 1978), in *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.* https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/113258 [accessed 30 Dec 2020].
[127] Ibid.
[128] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 286.
[129] Ibid.

as Lorenzini discerned.[130] Moreover, according to Ratcliff, this anti-imperialism resulted in the Soviet discourse depicting development as a valid activity for any country, and "best done naturally, on a socialist path, and independently of other countries, colonialists, neocolonialists, capitalists and aid, although Soviet aid was presented as beneficial".[131]

The following sections will illustrate that these views of aid, and the Soviet Union's self-construction as an anticolonial power, imbued all elements of Soviet assistance. In the next section, it will be shown how this was reflected in the language and characteristics of Soviet assistance to Afghanistan. While the Soviet discourse suggested a radical departure from the Western development paradigm, the actual characteristics of the Soviet aid practices to Afghanistan mirrored key aspects of Western development aid, intimating that similar perceptions of progress and development undergirded the Soviet assistance.

3.3 Soviet aid to Afghanistan

Since the Soviets portrayed Western aid as colonial and devious, Lorenzini notes that their own assistance was framed in a language "connected to the tradition of solidarity among anti-imperialist forces".[132] In this language, the Soviets avoided the term 'aid' and rather spoke of "cooperation on an equal basis, or solidarity," the latter concept becoming "synonymous with socialist development aid".[133] The Soviet Union thus attempted to attract Third World leaders by stressing a "quasi equality, a position of primus inter pares".[134] The communications between the Afghan communist leaders and the Soviet leadership attest of this way of thinking about their mutual relationship.

After the communist coup, the contacts between the two governments increased and the bonds between their countries were strengthened. As a sign of this, in the summer of 1978 a delegation from the Soviet Academy of Sciences was sent to Afghanistan to explore the possibilities for Soviet-Afghan scientific cooperation. In his journal record of 11 July, Soviet ambassador Puzanov included a report of the meeting in which he introduced the head of the delegation, M.S. Asimov, to Hafizullah Amin, the Afghan Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs. Amin opened this meeting by expressing his pride in the 'Saur Revolution', as he called the communist coup, which according to him was "the product of the Great October Socialist Revolution and is an example for many countries".[135] He continued by asserting that the Afghan communists had "always found inspiration in the October

[130] Lorenzini, *Global Development,* 23.
[131] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 286.
[132] Lorenzini, *Global Development,* 45.
[133] Ibid.
[134] Ibid., 46.
[135] Wilson Center Digital Archive, Journal of Soviet Ambassador Puzanov, Memorandum of Conversation with Hafizullah Amin and Delegation of the Soviet Academy of Sciences (July 11, 1978), in *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.* https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/115530 [accessed 30 Dec 2020].

Revolution and many Afghan revolutionaries were raised on the works of the great Lenin".[136] By comparing the experiences of Afghanistan with the Soviet Union's October Revolution of 1917, Amin underlined the similarities between the socialist trajectories of the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. As he thus portrayed socialist development as a natural and legitimate action for both Afghanistan and the Soviet Union, Amin's remarks seemed to suggest a form of equality between Afghanistan and the Soviet Union.

In this same spirit, Amin then mentioned Soviet assistance to Afghanistan, stating that "in the course of the realization of the April revolution and afterwards, we have always been very sincere and close with our Soviet friends, who give us their full support and assistance. The Soviet embassy always helps in times of trouble, and this is key to the victory of our revolution".[137] Rather than viewing Soviet aid provision as a sign of the Soviet Union's superiority, Amin thus painted a picture of the Soviets as friendly socialist precursors, who did not fundamentally differ from the Afghan communists. However, Lorenzini observes that the Soviet Union besides "touting its role as a socialist vanguard, . . . promoted itself as a modern and pacific state, advanced in the sciences and arts".[138] When the discussion turned to cooperation in the fields of science and culture, Amin revealed that he regarded the Soviet Union in this light as well.

In anticipating their cooperation, Amin underlined that Afghanistan must follow the Soviet example, stating that "as the Soviet Union's space exploration was carried out on a strictly scientific basis, the same in our country – all plan and programs have to be strictly scientific and realistic".[139] Since this so-called Soviet-Afghan 'cooperation' would presumably largely rest on Soviet assistance, Amin's remark indicates that Soviet aid was not merely aimed at advancing Afghan socialism but also at achieving scientific progress and modernization, as modeled by the Soviet Union. These methods and objectives resemble those of Western development aid, signaling that the Soviet aid enterprise contained similar notions of progress and development as its Western counterpart. The Soviet Union was thus not merely a 'socialist primus inter pares' in the relations with Afghanistan but also formed a prototype of modernity, entailing a suggestion of superiority which cannot be concealed by a language of equality.

The duality between socialist equality and a sense of superiority in Soviet discourse is also contained in the ways the Soviet leaders addressed the Afghan communist leaders. In December 1978, an Afghan state delegation visited the Soviet Union to sign the 'Treaty of friendship, good

[136] Ibid.
[137] Ibid.
[138] Lorenzini, *Global Development,* 46.
[139] Wilson Center Digital Archive, Journal of Soviet Ambassador Puzanov, Memorandum of Conversation with Hafizullah Amin and Delegation of the Soviet Academy of Sciences (July 11, 1978), in *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.* https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/115530 [accessed 30 Dec 2020].

neighborliness and cooperation' between the two countries. During this visit, Brezhnev expressed to the Afghan leadership that the relations between the two countries "are now based on class belonging; they are imbued with the spirit of friendship and revolutionary solidarity".[140] Although Brezhnev thus explicitly underlined socialist solidarity, it is telling that during the same meeting the Soviet leaders proposed that the Soviet Union would "assume the responsibility to carry out many of the properties in Afghanistan's development".[141] An agreement on cooperation in the "field of economics, science and technology" would formalize this arrangement, which in practice pertained to an increase in oil supplies to Afghanistan, the connection of Soviet and Afghan energy networks, and the reconstruction of an Afghan oil-processing plant.[142] These industrial programs reveal that the modernization and development of Afghanistan were not just modeled after the Soviet example, but also executed by the Soviet Union. The authority to determine what was best for Afghanistan thus lay in the hands of Soviet experts, who would assist the Afghans with their superior economic and scientific knowledge.

The perceived need for Soviet help in the modernization of Afghanistan gives Soviet aid an imperialist character, as Claude Alvares asserted that "development based on [science and technology] came to constitute a dynamic (actively colonizing) power"[143] because "[s]cience should have been critically understood not as an instrument for expanding knowledge, but for colonizing and controlling the direction of knowledge, and consequently human behaviour, within a straight and narrow path".[144] Thus, as the Soviet Union claimed control over Afghanistan's development, its economic assistance was not so harmless or equal as it proclaimed to be, but in effect formed a colonizing force over Afghanistan and its population. In the next section, internal discussions in the upper echelons of Soviet decision-making will demonstrate that hierarchical ideas about Soviet-Afghan relations were not only implicit within Soviet aid practices, but were also explicitly pronounced by Soviet leaders.

3.4 Connecting practice to discourse

After the communist coup of April 1978, the situation in Afghanistan steadily deteriorated, with the Afghan army unable to suppress the Islamist rebellion, which increasingly gained ground among the population. In March 1979, a major uprising in the city of Herat brought home the gravity of the situation to both Afghan and Soviet leaders, as a large part of an Afghan army division defected to the

[140] Wilson Center Digital Archive, Information about the visit of the Afghan party and state delegation, headed by Prime Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Nur Mohamed Tarakhi to the USSR (December 4, 1978), in *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.* https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/112458 [accessed 30 Dec 2020].
[141] Ibid.
[142] Ibid.
[143] Claude Alvares, "Science," in *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power,* ed. Wolfgang Sachs (London: Zed Books, 1992), 255.
[144] Alvares, "Science," 257.

mujahideen and dozens of Soviet advisers in the country were killed.[145] From 17 to 19 March, the members of the Politburo, the highest decision-making organ in the Soviet government, convened to discuss the situation and to decide on an appropriate Soviet response. Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko opened the meeting by notifying the Politburo that Taraki had requested Soviet ground and air support, which would mean Soviet troop deployment in Afghanistan. Although the Politburo members concurred that it was paramount to keep Afghanistan in the Soviet camp, they nevertheless discarded the option of Soviet military action.[146]

The reason behind this reluctance was expressed in the Politburo meeting of the following day. Yuri Andropov, the head of the KGB, proclaimed that he had thoroughly considered the matter and had found "that Afghanistan is not ready at this time to resolve all of the issues it faces through socialism," the reason for this being that "[t]he economy is backward, the Islamic religion predominates, and nearly all of the rural population is illiterate".[147] Andropov thus did not measure Afghanistan's stage of socialist development by its socio-economic development alone, as could be expected from a socialist evolutionary perspective, but judged Afghanistan as being too culturally and spiritually backward as well. He therefore concluded that the Afghan communists would need "aid of our bayonets".[148] The Politburo did not judge Afghanistan worthy of this, as Gromyko asked "what would we gain? Afghanistan with its present government, with a backward economy, with inconsequential weight in international affairs".[149] Whereas the Soviet leaders thus outwardly lauded the events in Afghanistan as a socialist revolution and welcomed the Afghan leaders as friends, in reality they considered the Afghan population too backward for a socialist revolution and held the Afghan communists likewise in low esteem, denoting 'the present government' as one of Afghanistan's problems.

The Politburo thus problematized the socio-economic, cultural, and spiritual state of Afghanistan, which corresponds with Escobar's observation about the Western discourse that "[d]evelopment proceeded by creating "abnormalities" (such as the "illiterate," the "underdeveloped," the "malnourished," "small farmers," or "landless peasants") which it would later treat and reform".[150] Evidently, the Soviet discourse adopted a similar approach of identifying conditions in Afghanistan as obstacles to overcome before the country could proceed on the path of socialist development. These obstacles, moreover, were not only considered the result of Western

[145] Gibbs, "Reassessing Soviet Motives," 250; Hilali, "The Soviet Decision-Making," 114.
[146] Wilson Center Digital Archive, Transcript of CPSU CC Politburo Discussions on Afghanistan (March 17, 1979), in *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.* https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/113260 [accessed 30 Dec 2020].
[147] Ibid.
[148] Ibid.
[149] Ibid.
[150] Escobar, *Encountering Development,* 41.

imperialism but were ascribed to local Afghan shortcomings as well. In addition, similar to Western self-conceptions, the Soviets considered themselves and their assistance as the solution for this perceived underdevelopment, which can be discerned in a memorandum several members of the Politburo sent to the CPSU Central Committee two weeks after the Politburo debates above.

The memorandum noted that the revolution that had taken place in Afghanistan one year earlier, had "occurred in an economically weak, backward feudal country with primitive economic forms and limited domestic resources," thereby reiterating the problematization of the situation in Afghanistan. By referring to the socio-economic state of Afghanistan as 'feudal' and 'primitive,' the language of the memorandum paralleled the Western discourse, which identified a "lack of development . . . with features such as the persistence of traditional ways".[151] Moreover, Escobar notes that in the Western paradigm the believed antidote to underdevelopment was modernization, "as the only force capable of destroying archaic superstitions and relations, at whatever social, cultural, and political cost".[152] The Politburo memorandum expressed a similar faith in the power of modernization, stating that the Afghan communists had the heavy task to "overcome centuries of backwardness of the country, remove difficulties, and solve problems. This requires time as well as a thoroughly planned and well calculated approach".[153]

However, rather than entrusting this task to the Afghan communists, the real director behind the transformation of Afghanistan would be the Soviet Union, as the memorandum emphasized that

> [t]he Soviet Union has been providing active political support to the new government, as well as widespread economic and military assistance and has been participating in the training of skilled personnel from the first days following the victory of the April revolution. Large numbers of advisers and specialists were sent to Afghanistan at the request of the Afghan government to assist in solving the problems faced by the DRA leadership.[154]

As the Soviet leaders thus intimately connected their aid provision with the eradication of backwardness and primitivity, Soviet aid was portrayed as the cure for Afghanistan's afflictions. Moreover, in expecting the desired modernization of Afghanistan to be achieved through a 'planned and well calculated approach,' the memorandum echoed Western faith in planning as an essential tool in producing social change. As Westad remarks, both the United States and the Soviet Union

---

[151] Ibid., 50.
[152] Ibid., 39.
[153] Wilson Center Digital Archive, Memo on Protocol #149 of the Politburo, "Our future policy in connection with the situation in Afghanistan" (April 1, 1979), in *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.* https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/110060 [accessed 30 Dec 2020].
[154] Ibid.

"emphasized standardization, engineering, and planning; the orders that they wanted to establish were distinctly Western, with roots going back to the Enlightenment and the eighteenth century".[155] Indubitably, a firm belief in science and progress, as legacies of the Enlightenment, underlay the relations between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan as well. As Soviet aid was thus assumed to engender progress and eliminate backwardness, the memorandum constructed an image of a powerful Soviet Union towering over a needy Afghanistan.

As the year progressed, the situation in Afghanistan only worsened. Although the Afghan communist leaders repeatedly asked the Soviet Union for military intervention, the Soviet leaders confined their assistance to military equipment, advisers, and economic aid. In September 1979, Amin brutally overthrew Taraki and adopted the presidency of Afghanistan. Soviet-Afghan relations deteriorated, enhanced by rumors circulating about Amin departing from the government's pro-Soviet policy. However, the continued Islamist resistance against his communist rule urged Amin to renew his request for Soviet military support, and on 12 December, the Politburo formally decided to intervene in Afghanistan. The operation started on 25 December, when air forces flew into the cities of Kabul and Shindand, and ground troops crossed the Afghan border at Kushka and Termez. Two days later, more than seven hundred KGB special forces attacked Amin's residence and, after overpowering the palace guards, instantly executed Amin and several of his close relatives and aides. The following day, Babrak Karmal, head of the opposing faction of the Afghan communist party, was proclaimed president of Afghanistan. However, Amin's removal did not stabilize the Afghan communist regime, nor did it suppress the Islamist insurrection. Rather, the Soviet intervention strengthened Islamist and popular resistance throughout the country, ultimately entangling the Soviet Union in a decade-long, devastating war against the Afghan mujahideen.[156]

The Soviet invasion was debated in the UN Security Council from 5 to 9 January 1980, where the Soviet and Afghan delegations denounced the consideration of the intervention as interference in the internal affairs of Afghanistan. They argued that the intervention was in line with Article 51 of the Charter, depicting it as protection of Afghanistan against foreign intervention by the United States and other Western countries from Pakistani territory. As the Soviets vetoed any motion calling for the withdrawal of their troops, the matter was finally referred to the UN General Assembly in an Emergency Special Session which convened from 10 to 14 January. The following section will contain a discourse analysis of the Soviet justifications in this General Assembly Session and of the propaganda they circulated after this session had ended. This analysis will demonstrate how, just like the Western

[155] Odd Arne Westad, "The New International History of the Cold War: Three (Possible) Paradigms," *Diplomatic History* 24 (2000): 4, 564. https://doi.org/10.1111/0145-2096.00236.
[156] Hilali, "The Soviet Decision-Making," 116-118; Dimitrakis, "The Soviet Invasion," 512-514; Westad, *The Global Cold War,* 321, 326,

development discourse, the Soviet discourse contained colonial perceptions which legitimized the intervention as humanitarian and advantageous.

3.5 Discourse analysis: the justification

During the second meeting of the UN Emergency Special Session on 11 January 1980, Soviet representative Oleg Troyanovsky drew attention to the April 1978 revolution in Afghanistan. According to him, it was one of the most important events in the history of the country and "a major milestone in the general process of the liberation struggle of peoples against colonial, feudal and imperialist oppression".[157] This struggle demonstrated "the determination of the Afghan people to put an end, once and for all, to social injustice and economic and cultural backwardness and to build a genuinely independent Afghanistan".[158] Rather than focusing solely on their backwardness, Troyanovsky instead ascribed agency to the Afghan people by framing the April revolution as a war of liberation of the Afghan population against Western imperialism. Through this construction, the Soviet representative incorporated the invasion of Afghanistan into the broader Soviet policy towards the Third World of the preceding two decades.

From the 1960s onwards, the Soviet Union had attempted to gain allies among national liberation groups and newly independent states struggling against Western colonialism. In the 1970s, this culminated in active Soviet military participation in freedom struggles, beginning most clearly in Angola in 1975, where the Soviets supported the fight against Portuguese imperialism.[159] By framing Afghanistan's internal conflict as a similar liberation struggle aimed at achieving independence from the West, Troyanovsky depicted the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan as another expression of the Soviet Union's unwavering support for the Third World's anticolonial cause. Ratcliff identifies this occupation with freedom from colonialism and neocolonialism as a central theme in the Soviet development discourse, calling it 'freedom as development.'[160] She argues that the Soviets viewed freedom from imperialism as the primary goal for the Third World, and as a necessary precursor to development.[161] Troyanovsky affirmed this, as he stated that the liberation struggle of the Afghans would lead to the elimination of 'economic and cultural backwardness.' The Soviet incursion into Afghanistan was thus portrayed as a two-fold favor, advancing both anticolonialism and Afghanistan's development.

Despite these justifications, the General Assembly on 14 January overwhelmingly condemned the invasion by adopting a resolution with 104 votes to 18. With world opinion and, specifically, Third

[157] United Nations General Assembly Official Records, Sixth Emergency Special Session, 2nd Plenary Meeting. (January 11, 1980). https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/10583?ln=en [accessed 29 Dec 2020].
[158] Ibid.
[159] Kanet, "The Superpower Quest," 337.
[160] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 286.
[161] Ibid.

World governments thus denouncing Soviet actions, one month after the General Assembly session the Soviet government drafted a proposal to strengthen propaganda efforts in and about Afghanistan. In this plan of 19 February 1980, it was determined that publications "reflecting the positive changes in the domestic life of Afghanistan" should be disseminated. Therefore, "[t]he USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting and the 'Novosti' Press Agency are to widely distribute these materials through their foreign channels".[162] One publication that appeared around the same time, is a booklet of about 160 pages called "The Truth about Afghanistan: Documents, Facts, Eyewitness Reports". Since it was published by Novosti Press Agency in Moscow, and the 'articles' in it are all dated from January 1980, in all probability this publication was a result of the abovementioned plan, signifying its propagandistic nature and its objective of convincing an international public of the positive effects of the Soviet intervention on Afghanistan.

One of the first documents in the publication is an account called "A Hundred Years of Gross Outside Interference," chronicling the history of Afghanistan as "traditionally . . . a target of aggression by the colonial and imperialist powers of the West".[163] Beginning in the nineteenth century when "the British colonialists openly sought to subordinate the independent Afghan state,"[164] in the early twentieth century Western aggression extended to the Soviet Union as well, as Britain "tried to make Afghanistan into a base of subversive activity against the Soviet state".[165] Although suggesting equality through their shared victimhood, the document nevertheless accorded the Soviet Union a higher position by portraying it as an anticolonial paragon *avant la lettre*:

> Despite the fact that in those years the Soviet republic was repelling armed intervention by 14 foreign powers and waging a struggle against internal counter-revolution, it was true to its international duty, gave all the aid it could to peoples struggling for their freedom and independence and did its best to help Afghanistan protect itself against attacks by internal and external reaction.[166]

Expanding on Troyanovsky's claim that the invasion of Afghanistan was a natural part of the Soviet policy of the 1960s and 1970s, this document portrayed the intervention as instance in an even longer tradition of Soviet assistance to Afghanistan, going back to the latter's birth. Moreover, the theme of

[162] Wilson Center Digital Archive, Assisting the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan in Strengthening the Mass Media (February 19, 1980), in *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan.* https://digitalarchive.wilsoncenter.org/document/111753 [accessed 30 Dec 2020].
[163] Y. Volkov et al. (eds), *The Truth About Afghanistan: Documents, Facts, Eyewitness Reports.* Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1980, 20.
[164] Volkov et al., *The Truth About Afghanistan,* 20.
[165] Ibid., 21.
[166] Ibid., 23.

liberation struggles reappeared as well, as the Soviet Union allegedly provided its assistance to 'peoples struggling for their freedom,' including the Afghan people.

The image of the Soviet Union sustaining national wars of liberation, as formulated both in the UN Assembly and the propaganda, is the ultimate way the Soviet Union could construct itself simultaneously as the champion of newly independent states and as superior to them. As Ratcliff contends, "it was in helping freedom struggles, rather than primarily through aid, that the USSR discursively positioned itself as more powerful than those whom it helped".[167] Her assertion rests on Gift Theory, which maintains that "giving to (or helping) one who cannot return the favour puts the giver or helper above the recipient or helped person".[168] Undeniably, the same notion is conveyed in this publication as well, as the document portrayed the young Soviet Union as powerful enough to simultaneously defend its own territory and the territory of neighboring Afghanistan against foreign intervention. The document thus depicted the Soviet Union as the longstanding defender of fragile Afghanistan, thereby emphasizing the vast difference in power between the two countries.

In the subsequent parts of the publication, these hierarchical Soviet-Afghan relations are repeatedly highlighted, in particular in several so-called 'eyewitness reports.' One of these accounts was attributed to a Greek correspondent, Janis Ligas, who had allegedly visited Kabul and written this piece "[s]pecially for APN,"[169] which should clarify why it only appeared in this booklet. The article addressed "the falsehoods spread concerning the fraternal assistance rendered by the Soviet Union to Afghanistan".[170] Soviet aid was avowedly admired by all Afghans, as

> was also pointed out to us by Hair Mohammad Mamoud, rector of the Kabul Polytechnical Institute, which had been built and equipped by the Soviet Union and handed over as a gift to the Afghan people. The new residential neighbourhoods, built in the capital with the help of a Soviet house-building plant, were further evidence of this.[171]

A similar glorification of Soviet aid to Afghanistan was expressed in another supposed eyewitness report, credited to the Argentinian journalist Rodolfo Medina. This report related of the "unselfish aid" of the Soviet Union, for which "one need only look at the roads, agricultural complexes, irrigation systems, factories and mills, the Kabul Polytechnical Institute and the University standing next to a picturesque mosque, all of which have been designed by Soviet specialists and built with their help".[172]

[167] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 230.
[168] Ibid., 235.
[169] Volkov et al., *The Truth About Afghanistan*, 108.
[170] Ibid., 107.
[171] Ibid., 107-108.
[172] Ibid., 111.

The recurrent display of the products of Soviet assistance through the voice of grateful Afghans served to underline the giver-receiver relationship between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan, thereby reinforcing the picture of a mighty Soviet Union magnanimously aiding Afghanistan. Moreover, as the invasion of Afghanistan was implicitly portrayed as an extension of this beneficial assistance, the report disallowed any wonderings of whether the invasion could constitute a form of unwanted imperialism.

Besides exalting Soviet modernity, the article further strengthened colonial perceptions by portraying the Afghan people as the diametrical opposite of the Soviets, affirming Ratcliff's assertion that the "USSR emulated the West's belief in its role as saviour to savages".[173] Sharply contrasting the modernization brought by the Soviets with the perceived stagnation of Afghan society, the article related that in Kabul the "[b]oys selling sweets and cigarettes, and the unemployed who spend hours gazing at the sky, and women in their centuries-old veils and tattered clothing create a contrast between the old and declining, and the new".[174] This orientalist remark reflects Escobar's observation that in the development discourse, "time is used . . . in such a way that a specific power relation is created".[175] This power relation is established by "constructing the other as living in another time period," which means that "their existence can be brushed aside, because they live in quite another age bound to be swept away by the fruits of Enlightenment".[176] Intimating that the Soviet Union brought the future to Afghans who were living in a never-changing past, the article thus portrayed the Afghan people as ignorant and naïve, and therefore incapable of progress without external assistance.

A similar image of the Afghan people as permanently stuck in a desolate past is conveyed in yet another eyewitness account. Mocking sudden Western interest for the Afghan people, the alleged French author of the article, Roland Michel, wonders whether "their poverty and hunger at last found a response in that distant world, poverty and hunger that held them for centuries in a grip so fast as to make them used to it by the time they first had an opportunity of getting rid of their chains?"[177] Suggesting that the Soviet Union, as opposed to the West, had always been compassionate about helping the Afghans, the article reflects Ratcliff's observation that the Soviet "[a]id discourse . . . perpetuates an image of a superior north giving to an ever-poor, incapable, inactive south, strengthening a model of givers and receivers".[178] Moreover, the necessity of Soviet intervention to liberate the Afghan population from its misery is explicitly stressed in the final lines of the article, stating that "[t]he new Afghanistan, which bold men dreamed of creating for their own people, was in danger of destruction by home and foreign reaction. This was what made it imperative for its leaders

[173] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 53.
[174] Volkov et al., *The Truth About Afghanistan,* 111.
[175] Escobar, *Encountering Development*, 78-79.
[176] Ibid.
[177] Volkov et al., *The Truth About Afghanistan,* 115.
[178] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 105.

to ask for Soviet troops to be moved in".[179] The Soviet Union was thus presented as not only elevated above the Afghan population but also above the Afghan communists, again belying their proclaimed socialist equality.

Expanding this construct of superiority even further, the final article of the booklet tried to assert the Soviet Union's dominance over all Islamic countries and the Third World as a whole. Avowedly authored by Sri Lankan journalist M. K. Abu Yusuf, the article directly countered the worldwide condemnation of the Soviet invasion, asserting that "[i]n the United Nations, the US imperialists sought to mobilise such friends within the non-aligned movement . . . to create a façade that the non-aligned states were spearheading the protest against the Soviet Union helping Afghanistan".[180] However, the article contended that "US imperialism can hardly parade as the leader of the Islamic world, for its crimes against Islamic peoples are too well known".[181] By contrast, the Soviet Union was depicted as a suitable leader of Islamic countries, because "[q]uite apart from the unstinted support it has always given Islamic peoples fighting for their national independence . . . , it is only under Soviet power that the 30 million or more Islamic peoples of its Central Asian republics achieved a degree of material, cultural and scientific advancement far superior to that of any other Islamic country in the world".[182] With this rather condescending remark, the publication positioned the Soviet Union, as Ratcliff's remarks, "as a helper of a group with the status of 'underdeveloped,'" and so located the USSR as higher in the hierarchy than the whole group.[183]

In this propaganda booklet, these colonial constructs specifically served to legitimize the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, by portraying the intervention as crucial for Afghanistan's freedom from imperialism and indispensable for Afghan progress and prosperity. In a broader sense, however, Ratcliff points out that this frame was also a discursive instrument to elevate the Soviet Union in the international "hierarchy of power, in which the West and the USSR vied for top position".[184] Besides locating the Third World as lower down the hierarchy, Ratcliff maintains that the Soviet discourse, through its great concern with the threat emanating from the West, positioned the United States as higher in the hierarchy than the Soviet Union. She argues that the West's "dominance as subject makes it appear considerably frightening, powerful and active".[185] The last article of the propaganda booklet clearly underlines that fear of the West also formed an unmistakable element in the Soviet development discourse on Afghanistan, thus assigning the top position in the international hierarchy

[179] Volkov et al., *The Truth About Afghanistan,* 118.
[180] Ibid., 154.
[181] Ibid.
[182] Ibid., 155.
[183] Ratcliff, "*Seeing Africa,"* 225.
[184] Ibid., 235.
[185] Ibid., 89, 198.

to the United States. However, through the Soviet discourse's elaborate condemnation of supposed Western neocolonialism, it simultaneously claimed the moral high ground by depicting the Soviet Union and its assistance as morally superior to the United States and its aid.

To summarize, after the Afghan communist had seized power in Afghanistan in April 1978, the Soviet Union continued to provide the country with aid and advice. As the first section illustrated, the Soviet leaders portrayed this aid as the anti-imperialist counterpart to Western 'neocolonialist' aid and as an expression of solidarity and semi-equality. Although the language of assistance was thus carefully curated to depict the Soviet Union as merely a socialist 'primus inter pares,' the second section disclosed that the Soviet Union simultaneously adopted an preeminent position in terms of scientific advancement and modernity, as Soviet experts adopted the responsibility to execute industrial programs in Afghanistan. Besides mirroring the modernizing objectives of Western development programs, the third section revealed that internal discussions in the Soviet government echoed Western convictions about the Third World as inferior and helpless as well. The fourth section, finally, illuminated how the Soviet leaders, after the invasion of Afghanistan, utilized this perceived developmental distance as an instrument to justify their actions. In the UN Assembly, but more prominently in propaganda, the Soviets framed the invasion as indispensable support for an anticolonial war of liberation, thereby constructing themselves as selfless patron of a backward and archaic Afghanistan. Thus, although the Soviet development discourse deliberately used a different terminology than its Western equivalent, it contained similar colonial perceptions of the Third World.

4. Conclusion

4.1 Summary

After the Second World War, the newly independent countries of the Third World soon became enmeshed in the global contest between the First and the Second worlds. One of the primary instruments of this competition was development aid, with which both the Soviet Union and the United States vied for the favors of the Third World. The present study has argued that the 'development paradigm,' as the overarching process of Cold War aid provision is called, not only led to economic interference but fundamentally shaped Cold War military interventions as well. By narrating the histories of the American invasion of Lebanon in 1958 and the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in 1979 from a development perspective, this study revealed that both Moscow and Washington harbored colonial convictions about development aid and the Third World, which influenced the considerations preceding these invasions and facilitated the international justifications afterwards.

Whereas the incursions into Afghanistan and Lebanon had both been extensively analyzed from diplomatic, military, and postcolonial viewpoints, they had not been examined through a development lens. Both the literature on these invasions and the development literature thus omitted a consideration of these invasions in the context of the Cold War aid race between the Soviet Union and the United States. Therefore, the present study helped bridge some of the gap between these two fields of literature, and additionally connected the literatures on the American and Soviet aid enterprises. This juxtaposition, firstly, revealed that the Soviet and the American governments considered Afghanistan and Lebanon respectively as crucial stakes in the Cold War. Consequently, Moscow and Washington not only provided large amounts of aid to these countries, but ultimately invaded them militarily as well. After these invasions, both superpowers legitimized their actions at the international level by placing them against the background of their traditions of foreign aid, to underline their altruism and to discard charges of imperialism. More importantly, a discourse analysis unveiled that these justifications, expressed in the UN General Assembly and in propaganda, contained colonial notions about an evolutionary hierarchy between 'developed' northern and 'underdeveloped' southern countries. Through the use of these discourses, the military interventions were portrayed as humanitarian and benevolent.

In the case of Lebanon, this found expression in President Eisenhower's speech to the UN General Assembly in which he proposed the establishment of an Arab development institution. Through technical and economic assistance, this institution would place the Middle East on the road to modernity and prosperity. However, as it would have the authority to define 'underdevelopment'

and ‘progress’ based on Western living standards, and the power to shape the course of development of the recipient countries, the institution would in reality constitute a colonializing force. Eisenhower’s proposal, moreover, actively constructed the United States as a superior benefactor to the Middle East and the broader Third World, who were portrayed as deprived, immature, and dependent on American guidance. Above all, this colonial construct of the Third World framed the American involvement in Lebanon and the consequent development proposal as a kind and generous offer, in effect vindicating the military invasion as providing an unparalleled chance for the Middle Eastern countries to transform their societies along Western lines. Finally, the analysis revealed that President Eisenhower highly valued and sought the opinions of his predecessor, President Truman, on his development plans. Besides demonstrating the centrality of the development discourse in the defense of the invasion of Lebanon, the analysis thus provides irrefutable proof that Truman’s Point Four programs, and foreign development aid in general, continued to occupy an important place in foreign policy during Eisenhower’s term in office.

As regards Afghanistan, the Soviet Union’s justifications were expressed in the UN General Assembly and through its propaganda. Soviet-Afghan communications had already demonstrated that the Soviet aid discourse deliberately used a different terminology than the Western discourse. It attempted to avoid language insinuating that Soviet aid was a form of imperialism, instead using formulations suggesting socialist equality and anti-imperial solidarity. However, the Soviet Union simultaneously portrayed itself as a model of scientific and economic advancement. The propaganda booklet from after the invasion reinforced this construct of a modern Soviet Union historically lending a helping hand to a primitive Afghanistan. By portraying the invasion of Afghanistan as a new instance of Soviet support for a war of liberation, the publication not only depicted the Soviet Union as an anti-imperialist champion, but also underscored the unequal giver-receiver relationship between the Soviet Union and Afghanistan. This power hierarchy was further emphasized through the characterization of the Afghan people as obliviously living in the past, whereas Soviet aid was lauded as heralding a bright Afghan future. By equating the Soviet invasion with this aid, the intervention was thus legitimized as beneficent support for a struggling people, and as an opportunity for Afghanistan to enter a more prosperous era. Similar to the West, the Soviet Union thus used a development discourse to legitimize its military invasion, intimating that this Soviet discourse not only applied to Africa, but also to Afghanistan and the broader Third World.

4.2 Comparison and contributions

A comparison of these two development discourses elucidates that, whereas the Western discourse centered on the desirability of Western aid, the Soviet discourse as a whole functioned principally as a counterpart to the West’s supposed neocolonial development enterprise. The constant and all-

pervasive expression of Soviet anti-imperialism, through the concepts of 'solidarity,' 'equality,' and 'wars of liberation,' underlines the centrality of the Soviet aid enterprise as a tool in the Cold War competition with the United States. Rather than an autonomous discourse, the Soviet development discourse can thus in a sense be regarded as dependent on the Western development paradigm, as it hinged on repudiating the latter to assert its own moral superiority. However, although the terminology of the aid discourses differed, the methods and objectives of Soviet and American aid programs were virtually identical. As both countries used development aid to win the hearts and minds of the Third World, both extolled their own assistance as a modernizing force that conferred to the beneficiaries an affluence and preeminence resembling that of the superpower benefactor. To achieve this aim, both aid enterprises aspired to transform recipient societies through scientific, economic and industrial advancements, which, they guaranteed, would be followed by cultural and spiritual maturity.

Moreover, the ostensible differences between the Soviet and American discourses were further refuted through a discourse analysis, which unveiled how similar conceptions about a natural direction of development and about a subordinate position of the Third World undergirded both discourses. In these notions about a normal course of progress, both superpowers set themselves as the golden standard to strive for. Consequently, the recipient countries of their aid were portrayed as deviating from the norm and thus in need of reform and change, for which they were dependent on the guidance of their Soviet or American paragon. As the Third World countries were depicted as deprived of the capacity to determine the best course of their own development, both superpowers felt entitled to govern the advancement of these countries. These characteristics clearly demonstrate that both the Soviet and American aid practices constituted imperialist forces, and thus establish that during the Cold War both the United States and the Soviet Union could be considered colonial powers. Rather than emphasizing their differences, the analysis thus indicates that the Cold War competitors in effect had more in common with each other than with the Third World.

This comparative analysis of interventions in two non-aligned, Third World countries thus revealed the similarities in aims, methods, and mindsets between the Cold War competitors during the aid race. By highlighting these similarities, this study aimed to provide a deeper understanding of the all-pervasiveness of the development paradigm during the Cold War. As hierarchical notions underpinned both the 1958 and the 1979 incursions into the Third World, this unveils that the colonial mentality behind this paradigm prevailed not only in the West but also in the East, and both at the beginning and towards the end of the Cold War. Moreover, the Cold War development enterprise evidently affected not only economic and industrial activities but permeated military affairs as well, as the worldview behind the development paradigm was shown to have fundamentally influenced the deliberations surrounding the military invasions of Lebanon and Afghanistan. Therefore, the analysis offers further insight in Cold War military interventions as well, attesting that for both the Soviet Union

and the United States these invasions not only revolved around ideological East-West concerns, but that conceptions about the relations between themselves and the Third World played a significant role as well. In other words, the present study illuminates how the United States and the Soviet Union together constituted an imperialist 'North' whose deep-seated colonial convictions authorized them to intervene militarily into the countries of the 'South'.

4.3 Limitations and implications

Although the views of the Lebanese and Afghan governments on their positions within the Cold War aid race are briefly recounted, the perspective from the 'South' only constitutes a peripheral element of this analysis. As the present study confined itself to the American and Soviet standpoints with regards to the Third World, the so-called 'subaltern' views on the development competition deserve more scholarly attention. In addition, as this study included only one military invasion from each side of the Cold War, further research should be conducted to examine whether the development paradigm equally shaped the other Cold War military interventions of the Soviet Union and the United States.[186] Specifically, a comparison of the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan with the Soviet incursions into Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968 could provide valuable insights in the potential differences in the Soviet Union's approach of Eastern bloc countries as opposed to their stance towards the Third World. Finally, the military invasions of the Cold War could be analyzed more extensively by comparing them with interventions from the post-Cold War era.

Whereas the American military presence in Lebanon lasted only three months, the invasion of Afghanistan two decades later resulted in a protracted Soviet occupation and a highly destructive war, only ending in 1989. The eventual withdrawal of Soviet troops from Afghanistan coincided with the end of the Cold War. In the following years, military interference in the internal affairs of other countries became increasingly framed as 'humanitarian interventions,' with the international community assuming a duty to protect other countries' populations from human rights violations. As the connection between military interventions and humanitarianism became institutionalized, the underlying conceptions about Western saviorism behind these principles received critical scholarly attention.[187] Since the literature on Lebanon and Afghanistan indicated that this analysis had not been extrapolated to the Cold War, the present study has retrospectively explored the interconnectedness between proclaimed humanitarian ideals and Cold War military invasions. By demonstrating that

[186] During the Cold War, the Soviet Union also invaded Hungary in 1956 and Czechoslovakia in 1968. Besides Lebanon, the United States militarily intervened in the Dominican Republic in 1965, and in Grenada in 1983.
[187] See, for instance, Nicholas J. Wheeler, *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) and Michael Barnett, *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism* (London: Cornell University Press, 2011).

declarations of altruistic intent already served as justification for interventions during the Cold War, this analysis places the invasions of Lebanon and Afghanistan in the historical line of humanitarianism. Moreover, whereas this study illustrated how colonial notions persisted in the postcolonial era, a comparison between the Cold War development discourses and the contemporary language of human rights could highlight the potential continuation of hierarchical worldviews in the post-Cold War international order. A development perspective on the invasions of Lebanon and Afghanistan thus not only contributes to a clearer picture of people's beliefs during the Cold War, but also calls for a critical reflection on the possible remnants of a colonial mindset in both personal perceptions and the international relations of today.

5. Bibliography

5.1 Primary sources

CVCE.eu. Opening address given by Sukarno (April 18, 1955). In: *Asia-Africa speak from Bandung.* Jakarta: Indonesia, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1955. pp. 19-29. https://www.cvce.eu/s/3o.

Harry S. Truman. Inaugural Address (January 20, 1949). *The Avalon Project.* https://avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/truman.asp.

Volkov, Y., K. Gevorkyan, I. Mikhailenko, A. Polonsky, and V. Svetozarov (eds). *The Truth About Afghanistan: Documents, Facts, Eyewitness Reports.* Moscow: Novosti Press Agency Publishing House, 1980.

5.2 Collections of primary sources

Soviet Union (USSR)

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, Sixth Emergency Special Session.

Wilson Center Digital Archive, *Soviet invasion of Afghanistan*. Cold War International History Project.

United States (US)

Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), *General CIA Records.* Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room (FOIA ERR), CIA Records Search Tool (CREST).

US State Department, Office of the Historian. *Foreign Relations of the United States* (FRUS), 1958-1960, Lebanon and Jordan, Volume XI. Edited by Louis J. Smith. Washington: United States Government Printing Office.

United Nations General Assembly Official Records, Third Emergency Special Session.

5.2 Secondary literature

Abadi, Jacob. “Perception and reality in US-Lebanon relations.” *Middle Eastern Studies* 56 (2020): 2, 305-326. https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2019.1678466/.

Alvares, Claude. “Science.” In *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power,* 243-259. Edited by Wolfgang Sachs. London: Zed Books, 1992.

Arnold, Anthony. *Afghanistan: The Soviet Invasion in Perspective.* Stanford: Hoover Institution Press, 1981.

Barnett, Michael. *Empire of Humanity: A History of Humanitarianism.* London: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Dimitrakis, Panagiotis. "The Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan: International Reactions, Military Intelligence and British Diplomacy." *Middle Eastern Studies* 48 (2012): 4, 511-536. https://doi.org/10.1080/00263206.2012.682304.

Engerman, David C. "Development Politics and the Cold War." *Diplomatic History* 41 (2017): 1, 1-19. https://doi.org/10.1093/dh/dhw043.

———. "Leaning from the East: Soviet Experts and India in the Era of Competitive Coexistence." *Comparative Studies of South Asia, Africa and the Middle East* 33 (2013): 2, 227-238. https://doi.org/10.1215/1089201X-2322507.

Engerman, David C. and Corinna R. Unger. "Introduction: Towards a Global History of Modernization." *Diplomatic History* 33 (2009): 3, 375-385. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.2009.00776.x.

Escobar, Arturo. *Encountering Development: The Making and Unmaking of the Third World.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995.

Foucault, Michel. *The Archeology of Knowledge*. London: Tavistock Publications, 1972.

Gaddis, John Lewis. *We Now Know: Rethinking Cold War History.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Gendzier, Irene. *Development Against Democracy: Manipulating Political Change in the Third World.* London: Pluto Press, 2017 [1985].

———. *Notes from the Minefield: United States Intervention in Lebanon and the Middle East, 1945-1958.* New York: Columbia University Press, 2006 [1997].

Gibbs, David N. "Reassessing Soviet Motives for Invading Afghanistan: A Declassified History." *Critical Asian Studies* 38 (2006): 2, 239-263. https://doi.org/10.1080/14672710600671228.

Goldstein, Alyosha. "On the Internal Border: Colonial Difference, the Cold War, and the Locations of "Underdevelopment." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 50 (2008): 1, 26-56.

Hammond, Thomas T. *Red Flag Over Afghanistan: The Communist Coup, the Soviet Invasion, and the Consequences.* Boulder: Westview Press, 1984.

Hilali, A.Z. "The Soviet Decision-Making for Intervention in Afghanistan and its Motives." *The Journal of Slavic Military Studies* 16 (2003): 2, 113-144. https://doi.org/10.1080/13518040308430562.

Kakar, M. Hassan. *Afghanistan: The Soviet Invasion and the Afghan Response, 1979-1982.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1995.

Kalinovsky, Artemy. *A Long Goodbye: The Soviet Withdrawal from Afghanistan.* Harvard: Harvard University Press, 2011.

Kanet, Roger E. "African Youth: The Target of Soviet African Policy." *The Russian Review* 27 (1968): 2, 161-175. https://doi.org/10.2307/127025.

———. "The Superpower Quest for Empire: The Cold War and Soviet Support for 'Wars of National Liberation'." *Cold War History* 6 (2006): 3, 331-252. https://doi.org/10.1080/14682740600795469.

Kona Nayudu, Swapna. "'In the very eye of the storm': India, the UN, and the Lebanon crisis of 1958." *Cold War History* 18 (2018): 2, 221-237. https://doi.org/10.1080/14682745.2018.1445997.

Labelle Jr., Maurice M. "A New Age of Empire? Arab 'Anti-Americanism', US Intervention, and the Lebanese Civil War of 1958." *The International History Review* 35 (2013) 1: 42-69. https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.2012.707134.

Labelle, Maurice Jr. "Empathy and the Lebanese Civil War of 1958 in the USA." *Arab Studies Quarterly* 41 (2019): 2, 172-193. https://doi.org/10.13169/arabstudquar.41.2.0172.

Little, Douglas. "His Finest Hour? Eisenhower, Lebanon, and the 1958 Middle East Crisis." *Diplomatic History* 20 (1996): 1, 27-54. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-7709.1996.tb00251.x.

Lorenzini, Sara. *Global Development: A Cold War History.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2019.

Macekura, Stephen. "The Point Four Program and U.S. International Development Policy." *Political Science Quarterly* 128 (2013): 1, 127-160.

Mazower, Mark. *Governing the World: The History of an Idea.* London: Penguin Press, 2012.

Nunan, Timothy. *Humanitarian Invasion: Global Development in Cold War Afghanistan.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Ovendale, Ritchie. "Great Britain and the Anglo-American invasion of Jordan and Lebanon in 1958." *The International History Review* 16 (1994): 2, 284-303. https://doi.org/10.1080/07075332.1994.9640677.

Payind, Alam. "Soviet-Afghan Relations from Cooperation to Occupation." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 21 (1989): 1, 107-128.

Pearson, Ivan. "The Syrian Crisis of 1957, the Anglo-American 'Special Relationship', and the 1958 Landings in Jordan and Lebanon." *Middle Eastern Studies* 43 (2007): 1, 45-64. https://doi.org/10.1080/00263200601079625.

Rahnema, Majid. "Global Poverty: A Pauperizing Myth." *Interculture* 24 (1991): 2, 4-51.

———. "Poverty." In *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power,* 174-194. Edited by Wolfgang Sachs. London: Zed Books, 1992.

Ratcliff, Mary Catherine. "*Seeing Africa – Construction of Africa and International Development in Soviet and Russian Public Discourse – Freedom as Development?.*" 2017. University of Edinburgh, PhD dissertation.

Robinson, Paul and Jay Dixon. "Soviet Development Theory and Economic and Technical Assistance to Afghanistan, 1954-1991." *The Historian* 72 (2010): 3, 599-623. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6563.2010.00272.x.

Sachs, Wolfgang (ed). *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power.* London: Zed Books, 1992.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism.* London: Penguin Random House, 2019 [1978].

Sbert, José María. “Progress.” In *The Development Dictionary: A Guide to Knowledge As Power,* 212-227. Edited by Wolfgang Sachs. London: Zed Books, 1992.

Sorby, Karol R. “Lebanon: The Crisis of 1958.” *Asian and African Studies* 9 (2000): 1, 76-109.

Westad, Odd Arne. “The New International History of the Cold War: Three (Possible) Paradigms.” *Diplomatic History* 24 (2000): 4, 551-565. https://doi.org/10.1111/0145-2096.00236.

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

Wheeler, Nicholas J. *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

Yaqub, Salim. *Containing Arab Nationalism: the Eisenhower Doctrine and the Middle East.* Chapel Hill: UNC Press Books, 2004.