

Historical Indulgent of Military as an Institution in the World

Dr. Zahid Yaseen¹ & Dr. Humaira Masood Dar²

Abstract

This article investigates the establishment of military in the world. The researchers highlight how military institution gradually developed. What was the basic purpose of the military for the kings and how military made itself compulsory for the kings and how this institution was separated from others institutions? How Military forces the civil setup to accept or reshape its policies? The research is based on the analysis of the authentic material in the form of literature in comparison of military of developed and the developing states. Institutional theory, civil military associations and political sector's reforms are hi-lighted. Through the conceptualization of the data, the researchers have developed their stance that military was not only an important institution in the past but also its worth is same in present. Dealing of the developed and developing states to the military would be hi-lighted. The advanced states managed and restricted the role of military. On the same patterns, the third world states must also have well defined role of military in order to restrict them to either own limitations in present.

Key Words: Military, Military Intervention, Military Progress, Military Institution, Military's Importance.

Introduction

This article reviews the dynamics of military evolution as an institute which determines their explanatory powers not only in developed but also in

¹ Assistant Professor Department of Political Science GC Women University Sialkot

² Chairperson Department of Political Science GC Women University Sialkot

Historical Indulgent of Military as an Institution in the World

developing countries. It further identifies specific variables that need to be analyzed to explain the differences between developed and developing states. The Westerns are called the pioneers of military establishment. They explored many of the basic theoretical views based on experiences. But after World War II, the process of decolonization started and the scholars focused their attention on Africa and Asia (for new independent states where a series of military coupe started). This trend of coups in these continents motivated a number of scholars to work on the difference of civil military framework in developed and newly developing states. The varying patterns of coups in some former British colonies defined simplistic explanations. In third world states whenever the military dictators came into power, they were determined to remain in power until they were ousted by internal or external uprisings. In Ghana, Libya and Nigeria the internal situation alternated between military dictators and civil transitions.

We, therefore, need to analyze carefully, a lot of theoretical propositions that explain military interventions in developing states. There is need to examine their internal and external behavior of these continents in further. The researchers will be better able to identify the variables of particular interests in these propositions.

Evolutionary Process of the Military

In past, military was multi-purposes institution, it offered services not only in battle fields but also in civil administration and to lead the state politically as the rulers of the state. Military commander was also used to be the king of the state. The expert in the military affairs and having Martial mind, who saved the state from external aggression, was nominated king in

German and Europe in 7th and 8th century, but gradually above mentioned culture lost its importance. Civil military relations had been the subject of extensive debate since its identification. It was considered as a separate and independent institution in 19th century. In 19th century civil and military institutions had their own identification. Theory of separation of power was dominated, gradually the concept of civil military institutions developed in that century while these institutions also organized themselves in perfect forms (Sills, 1979.p.433), (Downey, 1977. p.5).

In 20th century the debate of civil military institutions strengthened itself on permanent basis. Military technology, military experts and world wars forced the people to accept it as a separate institution. Civil governments depended on the military and weighted it equally. So, civil military relations were discussed with two basic dimensions in this century.

- Allocation of the state sources to the military, recruitment, supply of the military forces, the quantitative issue of the size.
- The dynamic issue of how, why, and when military powers would be used. (Huntington, 1977. P.1).

The above mentioned reasons forced the governments to make plan for military. How, why and when military would be called, in which shape it would be organized? A theory with the name of balanced importance and weight was introduced. “We also must keep in mind peculiar nature of the role performed by the military, trained in the management of violence; it is most powerful, disciplined and cohesive institution in the state under the control of the civilian authority which is often plagued by political and economic weakness and instability.” (Doorn, 1975.p.65).

Historical Indulgent of Military as an Institution in the World

Doorn's defined situation was suiting for the Asian, African, and Latin-American states. In Third World States military intervened and strengthened its powers, this intervention lost the morale of military and its institutional capabilities also decreased.

The above mentioned statement divided the state into two groups. One was civil group including sub institutions and the second was military. Military gained this status with the help of its disciplined, organized and independent ammunition dealings. Civil institutions used military to overcome the severe situation. The quality of the military of overcoming such a situation made it an independent institution; and governments strengthened themselves with the help of military operations especially against the opponents of the governments in the third world states. So, it was necessary to mention there that Civil-Military relationship was not one to one relationship but it was the multi- dimensional relationship (Fluri, Gustenau & Pantev, 2005. P. 68).

Military Profession in Historical Perspective

A profession is a group work having special characteristics and particular functions. "Professional or regular military service, as contrasted with irregular or non-professional, is service in some sort of military force with stands ready in peacetime as in war to carry on military activity. Professionals serve long enough to become skillful in what it takes to wage war. As soon as man in society had invented the division of labor, professional forces came into being" (Mills, 1974. P. 452).

From very start societies used the powers for gaining the status, defeating the opponents, but the statement of Huntington 'Highly specialized characteristics' military established in 19th century after a long run of time.

In Mesopotamia & Egypt states, military was used to gain water & land for cultivation. At that time there were four types of military.

- First, the guards of the King.
- Second, Provincial military.
- Third, professional military.
- Common citizens who were called in emergency (Para military).

If these statements are analyzed it would be concluded that perfect military departments established on regular basis gradually. But this perfection had a long historical background, step by step it made itself important for the state in a separate form. Man realized the military importance from very start. This realization was completed in 19th century with the title of regular force.

Episode of Athens and Sparta

King was the military commander of all these four groups mentioned above. He was also the big boss in religious, political, social and in judicial affairs. At that time the basic purpose of the military was the defense of the country as well as to bring the economic prosperity (Byler, 2006. p. 144). In 7th BC Europe was busy to promote its military on regular basis. War was common practice for the Greeks in tribes and in private life. But this practice ended itself with the removal of Homeric Ages, and a disciplined form of military institution was established. It was compulsory for every citizen to get military training for two years, and regular service was also compulsory for him (Cowley, Parker, 1996. P. 89). He could also be called at any time in emergency and for the safety of his own motherland (state).

The controversy between Athens and Sparta strengthened the military on ground floors. "The system developed by Sparta was actually a response to

Historical Indulgent of Military as an Institution in the World

the constant threat of war faced by the Spartans” (Hackett, 1983. P. 10). Sparta conquered its neighbor states and it became a garrison society, they deliberated that their safety was in powerful military. Every citizen was bound to pass his youth in military, Thirteen years were compulsory for military and he could also be called in emergency. These circumstances presented the environment of military state.

“The values of the society became pro military one, and Spartan victories over the Greeks were in fact victories of a state organized above all for war over a state” (Thomas, 1989. P. 58). Spartan kings were military Generals; they were also the masters of political affairs. In this way Sparta was the combination of politico-military powers (Whitby, 2002. P. 90).

Roman Episode

Romans also had unique qualities in their civil military relations. It is called that the ‘history of Rome was the history of the armies’. In simple words military was all in all or the administration of the state. It could not be subtracted from civil setup. Those persons, who lead the military in successful manners with minimum tenure of ten years, were appointed as administrators, magistrates, Governors and political agents.

Romans established a ‘Proconsul’ it was created with the aim of placing the commander in chief in control. This office was used very effectively by subsequent emperors like Caesar and Pompey. This set the trend to keep the army under civil setup. The council could call the people for military purposes (Jacobs, 1986. p.24).

Categories of the Military

When this soldier was called in emergency, it was compulsory for him to bring his own ammunition and tools from his home. This trend created categories in the military because rich families had fast and healthy horses, latest ammunition, while the poor had nothing. As a result military was divided into three categories; first rider, second infantry and third was used for moving the ships in sea activities later it was called Navy (Valpy, 1820, vol. iv. pp. 49-53).

First Military Coup in the World

King Gaius Marius (Rome) introduced a new term of military in 107 BC. He handed over the military powers to the military commanders. Soldiers took their oath before the commanders; their contract of service with the commanders was for ten years. These commanders developed the military with new reforms, the classification of the military was abolished, and military established itself with a strong single pillar. It was in perfect disciplined form. This powerful military created problems for the king. An approach developed how to 'control the controllers of the peace'. A system which was created by the king to introduce a civil king, these Generating military commanders disturbed the poor civil system of that king. These military commanders changed the kings according to their own objectives at any time. This practice of the military created a civil senate. It was totally under the military. It was the first example of military coup in the history of the world (Matyszak, 2008. pp. 22-29). These military commanders were busy to gain the power, it decreased the professionalism in the military (Gibbons, 1954. P. 109).

Rented Military

In 1360 a ‘treaty of Breting’ was signed between France and England, so threat of war was decreased, these states retired a lot of military persons. In these days Italy was disturbed from civil insurgency. These military men went to Italy for earnings, they were hired by Italy to overcome the problems, these military men played well but they always offered their services at heavy prices (Storrs, 2009. pp. 23-25). They preferred economic benefits and utilized their profession as a business (Katel, 1971. pp. 240-242). This form of military was defined by Machiavelli, “Disunited, ambitious, without discipline, faithless, bold among friends, cowardly amongst enemies, they have no faith with them” (Machiavelli, 1952. P. 12).

A New Dimension of Military

In 17th century it was clear that a rented army was used for war and it was dispersed after the wars. It was considered not good for the defense of the state. States took measures for the regular military in 17th century for the first time. A perfect system of recruitment, pay package, and a job structure was introduced. It was fully regular force and accountable to the government. Proper uniform and war laws were implemented. It was the very first time that military was separated from civil setup. First of all, this procedure started from Sweden, and then Britain and France collectively followed it. It was structured as that the military personal were promoted on merit. But in reality Aristocratic hegemony was the merit: entrance, education and advancement in the army were based on elite birth, bribery and political influence. The concept of merit as criteria was non-existent. It was the case in Prussia, France and England in the 18th century. Infact, there was a major difference between

the soldier of 18th and 19th century. In very start military officers of US were elected, merit was not for highest posts of the army, the same situation was of the Navy. Political and personal influence was on the peak in selection. Promotion and retirement trend was absent, officers preferred to die in their duty boots. Juniors were deprived from promotion due to the lack of service structure.

Democratization of War

With the downfall of classified system and merging of feudalism in the 18th and 19th century a new approach of civil military relations developed. American Revolution in 1776, French revolution in 1789, Napoleonic War (1794-1815) all these incidents strengthened the military institution with patriotic passions (English, 1998. pp. 248-250).

Another aspect of this opening up was that for hordes of citizen to some semblance of discipline, they had to be patriotically motivated. A motivation could not take place unless the citizen considered himself an important part of the state. At that time military was present in disciplined form with patriotic manners. Napoleon a common citizen promoted himself as a General and became the king of the state. In 1793 France persuaded its army with the slogans against Austria and Prussia (Burger, 2006. p. 42).

On the other hand Prussia also had new rules for wars in 1808. “The only title to an officer’s commission shall be in time of peace, education and professional knowledge, in the time of war, distinguish valor and perception, all previously existing class performance in the military establishment are here by abolished and every man without regard to his origins has equal rights and equal duties”(Huntington, op.cit. p. 32).

The Origin of Professionalism

Military profession undergone a lot of changes in 19th century, Military separated itself from civil setup and a perfect difference was visible in the 19th century. Technology introduced modern reforms in every field of life. England separated military from police in 1829 (Backet, 2007. pp. 5-8).

State fulfilled all the basic needs of the military. The birth of any national state was another major improvement in enhancing military profession. “The introduction of the democracy also promoted the military department, “The phenomenon of democracy was also another vital catalyst” (Hackett, op.cit. p. 133).

Twentieth Century and the Concept of Military

In twentieth century military had only a single objective to save the state boundaries; all remaining issues were dealt by the civil administration. In USA and UK military was totally separate from civil setup, it was dealt through committees of the parliament and the congress. Russia also changed its strategy and gave a new idea of patriotism to the military. The military of Russia also gained the status of perfect military equal to the USA and UK. It was called red army on the basis of ethical values (Byler, op.cit. pp. 182-184).

World War II (1939-45) and A New Trend of Military

A third wave of civil military relation came after WWII in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The belt of Asia, Africa and Latin America was colonial. People were not organized. Only military in these colonies was in disciplined and well managed form. There were two ways of governing, one direct control of British and other was colonialism; they promoted colonial system for prolonging their tenure whereas Military helped these states to get

independence. This awareness was called a 'long drawn out evolution'. Military of Egypt, Algeria, Indonesia and Burma helped their people to get independence from invaders (Cohen, 1976. P. 216).It improved the image of military.

Colonizing Nation States

“The colonizing nation-state was set up in a new territory on European pattern”(Kaushik, 1987. P. 27).

Colonizing states were those states where government had total control of the state, political, social and financial affairs were dealt by the government. In very start of these states, military had vital role in state policies. Political and economic matters were dealt by the military but with the passage of time political setup became prominent and military adopted a separate way as an institution.

Colonial-nation States

Against the classical and colonizing states, colonial states also had political setup but this setup was weak, feeble and poor. People had little political awareness, boundaries and provincial disputes were on peak, civil insurgency was found at every level, so military was used to overcome such problems. Military had immense importance in internal and external matters.

National liberation movement-nation states

Such states came into being after civil insurgency, Military established new boundaries of such states. Military played key role there, internal and external affairs were dealt by the military, it was in the power and it used various methods about its legitimization. Political and civil institutions

Historical Indulgent of Military as an Institution in the World

were under the military. If there was civil setup, it was also in the form of semi military. Soviet Union, China, and Vietnam were its examples.

Status of Obedience and Legitimacy

In 20th century civil military relations were based on the following grounds.

- Political elite was informed about the national security concerns as well as the military was ensured to allocate all the basic needs.
- Government was advised to adopt the certain policies from the military point of view.
- Implementing the decisions taken by the political elite whether military accepted them or not of these decisions (Wyatt, Gal, 1990. pp. 76-78).

Military always demanded more and more sources for its better performance, so controversy could be found in the state's civil military relations. This controversy would depend on the professionalism of the military. It had great conflicting potential over the civilian establishment. Jacques Van Doron also favored the above mentioned statement, where democracy was in full form and military was also busy in its own professional works. Military institutional perfection forbade it to interfere in civil setup.

The second name of the military perfection was obedience; military top brass was obedient to the civil setup. Huntington also mentioned the Shakespeare's drama 'Henry V' a soldier believes that he needs neither "know" nor "seek after" the cause (for what he fights). If the king is wrong his obedience to the king wipes all his crimes.

In 20th century the single option kept before the military was to obey the civil orders and not to criticize the government. Loyalty and obeying the

orders were considered the features of a good soldier. Political and ideological objectives were changed but the military objectives remained the same at every time.

Specification of Military Loyalty

How much the military will be loyal was a question? Or what was the perfect meaning of obedience?

There have been many situations in past where obedience becomes difficult to express. If military realized that civil government was on the wrong way then what should military do? If political elite confessed its wrong policy, the matter could be solved otherwise situation would be against the civil setup. But In this matter universal principle could be adopted that military would always follow the civil setup. This is the base of such ruling powers that exercised powers with the consciousness on the government's part and that it had the right to govern with some recognition. Problems always occurred when military discouraged the legitimate right of political government. In the west some critics tried to defend the military to tackle the situation but the western societies disliked it, they always encouraged the civil setup. "Not only must the military learn to accept civilian supremacy as the norm, the civilians must also demonstrate their own effectiveness"(Cohen, 1990. p. 179).

Further Cohen's statement was dampened with, in war and all defense related problems military considerations were just as important. Thus it follows that the performance of the political leadership is just as important. If the political leadership is unable to manage the affairs of the state, the military would consider intervention not only for the sake of the nation but to preserve

Historical Indulgent of Military as an Institution in the World

its corporate interests as well as for the compensation of civilian incompetence.

Cohen also argued about the military intervention only in coercive situation and it must be limited. If the political leadership giving these orders has legitimate authority, then the actions of military become morally neutral. But if the legitimacy of political elite deteriorates the state then soldier must examine the morality of his actions.

Civilized citizens and perfect military never violate the limitations in the advanced states. Huntington quoted examples of such states in his book like the failing military coup of Germany in 1944 and France in 1961. But the situation in third world is totally different.

Military of Third World States

All the theories and approaches about the civil military relations in the third world states were totally opposite to that in advanced states. The earliest predecessor of the term, 'Third world' was the 'Tiers stat' in January 1789. Abbe Emmanuals, a French priest and politician had heralded the emergence of the "third Estate" in the pamphlet, titled "Quest ceque le tiers stat" in July that year, the Bastille fell and in 1791 the new constitution of the French republic declaring the rights of man and of the citizen was presented while the birth of the third Estate announced a new order in the relationship between the citizen and the state, the birth of the third world in 20th century announces a new order in relationship among nation state (Patel, 1983. P. 59).

The merging trend of the military intervention can be examined that in 1962 military intervened in the Latin America with 1% but in 1973 this ratio was 10% in the same period this ratio also increased in Africa from 2 to 15%,

in 1987 total 56 states of the world were under the direct army control (Smith, 2003. pp. 173-176). Military of some states had played vital role in independence movement like Qabris, vatnam, Burma, Iraq, Egypt, Sudan. The military of these states gained accidental benefits after independence when civil government couldn't manage the problems of the states. The only single example of India was seen which maintained the civil setup on permanent basis with the help of a perfect political elite. Mostly in third world states, where politicians were unable to control the circumstances, which provided opportunities for military intervention (Kaushik, 1987, p. 46).

Professionalism

Huntington addresses the military attitude towards the domestic and international politics and military professionalism. He mentions that the professionalism keeps the army away from politics. He accepts David Segal's theory, that military is autonomous and free from civilian control (Peri, 1983. pp.1-31), (Halevy, 1996, pp.10-29). Huntington identifies three main ingredients of professionalism; expertise, social responsibility and corporate loyalty (Huntington, 1957.pp80-83). Many scholars are seen to disagree with Huntington's assertions about military professionalism. Beget Abrahamson argued that perfect professionalism creates a powerful military and this will impair the civil structure (Abrahamson, 1972.p.72). Finer also observes that many hi-profile professional officers intervened in German and Japanese political structure during the wars. M. D. Feld also opposed the Huntington's theory with reference of Algeria (Feld, 1968.pp.53-59). Jacques Vandoorn concludes that the concept of professionalism is unsuitable for determining the limit of political involvement (Doorn, 1968.p.45). Army may participate in

Historical Indulgent of Military as an Institution in the World

decision making and policy formulation; internal and external policy formulation. Moskowitz makes a common distinction of the military politicization with deliberate and spontaneous interactions. He concludes that politicization in general does not need to erode civilian control (Moskowitz, 1983, p.32),(Kukreja,1991, pp.19-27).

The Disposition and the Opportunity to Intervention

The disposition of the military comprises on mood and motives. The opportunity to intervene is provided by the loss of legitimacy of the government in power. Finer says that the intervention opportunities are not without illegitimacy of the government. He suggests two ways of interventions; first, overwhelming the power, second is the grievances (Finer, 1983.pp.74-75). Hopkins agrees with Morris Janowitz that military's interventions are often reactions not designed (Hopkins, 1966.pp.176-177). William Thompson also suggests the motives and grievances of military intervention (Thompson, 1977.pp.36-38).

Welch develops an important dimension of civil military relations; he focuses that military must be rightfully subordinated to the civilians. Eric Nordlinger reviews various methods of civilian control over the military; he concludes that grievances made military to intervene (Nordlinger, 1977.p.57).

Diversity is found in the nature of civil military relations across the time, it would never be true to say that existing theories are falsified by empirical record. But a perfect series of theories is needed that can help us to explain these important puzzles.

Conclusion

This article deals with the evolutionary process of military; its relations with the societies and civil governments, civil military relations in developed as well as in developing states. What were the motives of the military intervention in the political and civil setup of these developing states? It was the need of the hour to work on the civil military relations and it was tried to find out a perfect way for defining the boundaries of every institution. What would be helpful for the establishment of civil setup developing states? When an institution would work in its limitations, political culture would automatically be developed. Advance states institutions created such environments & received the title of civilized and advanced states. This philosophy developed in this shape with the passage of time. Before 19thcentaury a single person or a group of the people were running all the institutions of state. In 19thcentaury civil and military institutions separated themselves gradually. But in the third world states where societies were conservative, this difference could not be promoted as compared to the developed states. Those societies, who accepted this difference, gained the status of advance states and conservative societies were called 3rd world states because they never accepted the enlightenment and liberalism. A controversy was present in 19thcentaury between the experts and the politicians about the limitations of the civil military departments. which was examined with the help of evolutionary process.

References

- Abrahamson, B. (1972). *Military Professionalization and political power*. USA, Michigan University press.
- Becket, I.F.W. (2007). *Discovering British Regimental Traditions*. Malta, Gutenberg Press.
- Bruneau, T.C., Matei, F.C. (2013). *The Routledge Handbook of Civil Military Relations*. USA, Routledge Press.
- Chiang, D.W. (1974). "The Military and Nation Building in Korea, Burma and Pakistan" as quoted in Govin Kennedy, "*The Military in the Third World*". London, Gerald Duck Sworth and co ltd.
- Chochran, C. L. (1974). *Civil Military Relations*. London, Collier Macmillan Publishers.
- Cohen, S. P. (1976). "*The Military*" in Henry Hart (edt) "*Indra Gandhi's India, A Political System Reappraised*". Colorado, West View Press.
- Cohen, S. P. (1990). *The India Army, Its Contribution to the development of a Nation*. Delhi, Oxford University Press.
- Cohen, S.P. (1968). *Issues role and the Personality: The kitchenr Curzon dispute*", Comparative studies in society and history, vol. x.
- Cohen, S.P. (2001). *The Indian Army*. India, Oxford university press.
- Congressional record, Recordings and Debates of 107th Congress First Section, Vol. 147 Part 12.
- Dautrich, K., Yalof, D. A., Newell, C., Prindle, D., Shomaker, M. (2010). *American Government Historical, Popular and Global Perspectives*. USA, Suzanne Jeans publishers.

- Dewhurst, R. E. (2007). *Encyclopedia of the United States Congress*. USA, NY. Infobase publishing.
- Edmonds, M. (1988). *Armed Services and Society*. USA, Leicester university press.
- Entelis, J. P. (1996). *Culture and Counter Culture in Moroccan Politics*. USA, University Press.
- Finer, E.S. (1976). *The Man on Horseback*. London, Pall Mall Press.
- Finer, S.E. (1988). *The Man on Horseback, 2nd ed.* USA, Transaction publishers.
- Friedenfels, R. (1998). *Social Change and Anthology*. NY. USA, Ravi Mehra Publishers.
- Ganguly, S. Fidler, D.P. (2009). *India and counterinsurgency*. USA, Routledge press.
- Hopkins, K. (1966). *Civil Military Relations in Developing countries*. British Journal of Sociology. USA, Princeton University press.
- Horowitz, D.L. (1980). *Coup Theories and Officers: Sri Lanka in comparative perspective*. UK, New Jersey, Princeton university press.
- Huntington, S.P. (1991). *The third wave: Democratization in the 20th century*. USA, Harvard university press.
- Jacobs, J. B. (1986). *Social Legal Foundations of Civil Military Relations*. USA, New Brunswick.
- Kaushik, O.P. (1987). *The Role of the Military in Developing Countries*. Indian Defense Review Vol. (11-2).
- Landman, T. (2003). *Issues and Methods in Comparative Politics an Introduction*. USA, NY. Routledge Press.

Historical Indulgent of Military as an Institution in the World

- Lohr, I. Wenzlhuemer, R. (2012). *The nation state and beyond Governing Globalization process in the Nineteenth and early twentieth century*. USA, NY. Springer Heidelberg.
- Luckham, A.R. (1991). *A Comparative typology of civil military relations: Government and opposition*. Vol, VI. Africa, institute of Africa.
- Machiavelli, (1952). *Makers of Modern Strategy*. Princeton, E.M. Earle, Princeton University Press.
- Moskowitz, J.H. (1983). *Military corporate interests and military establishment's involvement in Politics: A content Analysis of civilian and Military journals in pakistan, France and Israel*. USA, NY, Graduate school of Arts and Science.
- Painter, D. (1999). *The Cold War History An International*. USA & Canada, Routledge Press.
- Peri, Y. (1983). *Between Battles and Bullets*. England, Cambridge university press.
- Perlmutter, A. (1978). *The Military and politics in modern times*. USA, Yale University press.
- Rizvi, H.A. (2008). *International Conference of civil military relations*. Awari hotel Pakistan Lahore.
- Rotberg, R. (2012). *Transformative Political leadership (Making a difference in the developing world)*. USA, Chicago University Press.
- Sharp, P. F., Wiseman, G. (2012). *American Diplomacy*. USA, MartinusNijhoff Publishers.
- Shills, E. (1962). "The Military in the Political Development of New States" in J. Johnson (edt) "The Role of the Military in Underdeveloped States". USA, Princeton, Princeton University Press.

- Talukder, M. (1992). *Arms Transfers, Military coups, and Military rule in developing states*. Journal of conflict resolution, vol.36 No.4. India, New Delhi. Foundation Books (pvt) ltd.
- Thomas, D. (2001). *The Theory and practice of third World solidarity*. USA, Praeger Publishers.
- Thompson, W. S. (1983). *The Third World: Premises of US Policy*. USA, Francisco Institute for contemporary studies.
- Turpin, J. E., Kurtz, R. (1999). *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace and conflict*. Vol.II, USA, Academic Press.
- Verma, B. (2012). *Indian Defense review*. Vol.27 New Delhi, India.
- Wyatt, T.C., Gal, R. (1990). *Legitimacy and Commitment in the Military*. USA, Greenwood Press.