

November 1990

## Introduction: Governments-In-Exile In World Politics

Yossi Shain

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops>



Part of the [Political Science Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Shain, Yossi (1990) "Introduction: Governments-In-Exile In World Politics," *Journal of Political Science*: Vol. 18 : No. 1 , Article 8.

Available at: <https://digitalcommons.coastal.edu/jops/vol18/iss1/8>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Politics at CCU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Journal of Political Science by an authorized editor of CCU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [commons@coastal.edu](mailto:commons@coastal.edu).

## GOVERNMENTS-IN-EXILE IN WORLD POLITICS

Yossi Shain  
*Editor*

Scholars of international politics have recently focused their attention on the activities of governments-in-exile due to the central role they play in long-standing conflicts in the Middle East, Afghanistan, Southwestern Africa and Cambodia. This special issue of the *Journal of Political Science* is a preliminary attempt to address historical, political, and theoretical aspects of the techniques and effects of governments-in-exile in contemporary world politics. The case studies and the theoretical essay examine issues such as the limits of sovereignty; the elusive nature of representation in the absence of effective control over a home territory; the role of host states; international legitimation and recognition; governments-in-exile as political tools in the hands of their foreign patrons; and finally, the actual and symbolic importance of governments-in-exile in the preservation of diasporic nations and cultures.

Lack of space and time prevented us from including in this issue many important studies of governments-in-exile whose influence on world politics have been critical. However, an extensive examination of additional cases such as the Palestine Liberation Organization, the rival contenders in Angola, the Dalai Lama's Tibetan government in India and the Spanish Republicans, will appear in a special volume on the subject to be published by Routledge, Chapman and Hall at a later date.

The editor and the contributors wish to thank Martin W. Slann, editor of the *Journal of Political Science*, and Bernard Schechterman of the editorial board, for their collaboration and helpful comments on both content and form. Special thanks also goes to Sharon Fletcher, Kathlyn Harbin and Susan Hawthorne for their skilled administrative assistance.

### Profile and Contents

In the first essay, Yossi Shain (Tel-Aviv University) provides a broad definition of governments-in-exile in accordance with their respective claims and struggles for state power. Shain also explores how foreign patrons try to advance or impede the efforts

of exile contenders by examining the use (or misuse) of political recognition as a political weapon. By illuminating the theory of recognition in international law and the practice of recognition in the political realm, Shain seeks to demonstrate the slippery nature of the concept of legitimacy in international relations and to question the usage of the term as an explanatory variable in world politics.

In the second essay, Lynn Berat (Yale University) traces the tortuous path to Namibian independence from the early legal fixation of the international community on the status of the South West Africa territory to what appears to be the final internationally-arranged political settlement. For decades, progress in the legal sphere amounted to vacuous rhetoric in the face of South Africa's insistence on exerting its power over the territory and incorporating it. In the 1960's there came a two-pronged assault against continued South African rule. To begin with, the United Nations through legal actions terminated South Africa's mandate over the territory and created ex nihilo the Council for Namibia. In addition to this legal assault, the exiled SWAPO launched a political and military struggle through which it earned recognition as the authentic representative of the Namibian people. While these distinct strategies seemed to point to a potential conflict of authority, SWAPO, a would-be government, by accepting the Council's legal authority and working closely with it, was uniquely placed to become the major actor in the first government of independent Namibia. In short, SWAPO is a case of a movement-in-exile reaping the benefits of the newly-established world order in which exiled aspirants eventually become the anointed inheritors of political power.

In the third essay, Barnett R. Rubin (United States Institute of Peace) explores the historical role played by political exiles in the formation and consolidation of the Afghan modern state since the founding of the Afghan monarchy, in the mid eighteenth century, until the current struggle of the exile Mujahidin to overthrow the Soviet-sponsored regime of Najibullah. Rubin shows how Afghanistan's vast territory and its fragmented tribal society obstructed the establishment of a stable central government, prevented the creation of a cohesive national identity, and made the country a vulnerable target to outside penetration. The existence of local political structures outside the state framework, which contributed to the weakening of the Afghan polity, repeatedly forced rival contenders out of the country. While abroad, these exiles, in an attempt to gain or regain power, were

used as political pawns by outside powers (first the Russian and British empires, and more recently the Soviet Union and the U.S.), which sought to advance their own political objectives. Now, after a decade of bloody warfare which impoverished the Afghan state and hasten the decline of the traditional society and the tribal system, Rubin questions the ability of both the exile leaders of Afghan Mujahidin, as well as the deposed Afghan King in exile, Zahir Shah, to unify the Afghan state and nation. Rubin echoes Machiavelli's desperate cry to find the Prince who would heal the "wounds of Lombardy," and searches for someone to redeem Afghanistan from its "barbarous cruelty and insolence."

In the fourth essay, Craig Etcheson (University of Southern California) explores the long tradition of using of governments-in-exile as a political mechanism in the struggle for power in Cambodia. He illustrates in detail how Khmer leaders have exploited the technique of governments-in-exile in the three Indochinese wars: 1) the decolonization campaign against the French in the post-World War II period (1941-1955); 2) the domestic fighting among Khmer contenders amidst American involvement (1955-1975); and 3) since 1975, the ongoing struggle which began with the Khmer Rouge reign of terror and culminated in the recent withdrawal of the Vietnamese from Cambodia. The essay reveals the delicate balance between the need of exiled contenders to find a receptive host state and earn the support of foreign patrons, and at the same time to cultivate an image of independent leaders who struggle for the national cause. The name which consistently emerges in connection with this fragile formula is Prince Norodom Sihanouk whose longevity as the "symbolic center of the nation" has historically compensated for his military inferiority among other Khmer contenders.

In the fifth essay, Khachig Toloyan (Wesleyan University) delve into the problem of authenticity for representatives of diasporic nations. Using the example of Armenia, Tololyan challenges conventional formalist-legal criteria that have confined the concept of legitimation to political recognition. He introduces an important distinction between deposed governments-in-exile and administrative governments-of-exile that earn legitimacy by rendering services to co-nationals abroad. The latter respond to the needs of their compatriots abroad and in the home nation without necessarily aspiring to lead a movement for national independence. From the fall of the last Armenian Kingdom to the Mameluk armies in the fourteenth century, through the Turkish genocide and the overthrown of the short lived Armenian na-

tion state by the Red Army in December 1920, until the terrorist campaign of the Armenian Secret Army for the Liberation of Armenia (ASALA) and the Karbagh movement of 1988-89 in Soviet Armenia, Tololyan describes how Armenian elites around the world vied as spokesmen of their people by referring to their ability to provide material assistance and spiritual guidance. The activities of such administrative exile elites often provide a better indication of representation and legitimacy than some empty diplomatic gestures toward deposed exiled governments whose official have lost touch with reality at home.

In the final essay, J. Bowyer Bell (International Analysis Center, Inc.) explores the attempt of Irish Republicans inside Ireland and Irish exile militants in the North American diaspora to maintain a two-front struggle against the United Kingdom. In the case of Ireland, the formation of a government-in-exile was never more than a symbolic act intended to mobilize Irish passion around the idea of the Republic. The diaspora militants, particularly the Fenian Brotherhood, although often portrayed as spokesmen of the Irish people, always refrained from establishing any official institution which might have generated more division than unity. The only instance when the formation of a government-in-exile was actually conceived as a tactical means to advance the idea of the Republic, took place in the mid 1860's, when Irish exile nationalists, veterans of the American Civil War, worked to drag Washington into a war with the empire. These exiles conspired to liberate an Irish zone in Canada and to declare a government-in-exile "as a visible indicator to the direction of history." Like many other exile invasions in our time, the Canadian episode ended in a fiasco.