CHAPTER IV

INDIA AND WORLD PEACE
INDIA AND WORLD PEACE

CHAPTER IV

In previous Chapters I have tried to project India's views towards world peace. India from its ancient history and heritage has been a country of peace and friendship. Being a country of great religions, it believes in good relations with all love towards mankind and co-existence with all in peace. That's reason the great land could welcome everybody regardless his faith or belief as far as religions are concerned. India has kept the same spirit till now, nothing can shake her from her generosity because peace is in her root, rather deeply rooted.

The maintenance and promotion of world peace was (and is) the primary goal of India's foreign policy, as we saw in the past so it is in present. India cannot deviate from her policy of peaceful attitude as long as no other outer forces disturbs her integrity or robs her peace. India had something to do with, or played an active role in, every major event of the period, with the solitary exception of the Geneva "Summit Conference" of 1955. Some Indian papers, claimed credit for India in preparing the international atmosphere for the 'Summit' conference, especially by Prime Minister's European tour in June-July 1955. On the eve of the Conference Prime Minister Nehru sent the greetings of the
Government and people of India to the heads of governments of the four Great Powers assembled in Geneva for the conference. Krishna Menon said that the Geneva 'Summit' conference marked the abandonment of the idea that world gatherings should be between like-minded people and that meeting with the other meant a sign of weakness. "The psychological atmosphere generated by the Geneva meetings opened a new chapter in world affairs and contributed towards the lessening of international tensions" (1)

On an earlier occasion Krishna Menon had remarked that as a result of that conference the 'Cold war' was thawing and there was lessening of tensions. 'Instead of talking at each other, people have begun to talk to each other' It could be said, however, that the problems discussed at this conference - disarmament, German unification and East-West (i.e. Communist and Non-communist) contacts - did not directly concern India, even then, it is significant that on the eve of the conference, David Low's Carton in the Manchester Guardian captioned 'The make-ready squad' showed a volcanic landscape with the Big Four Conference Table, perched on the highest peak, ready for the ensuing conference, and around it lesser peaks were headed 'Indo-China', 'Formosa' and 'East-West Europe'. Into these live creators, Nehru and Krishna Menon were shown as ramming corks to keep the explosive contents under control - the latter securing the 'Formosa' cork with the binding for a rope, while the former pressed down the 'East-West Europe' stopper with both hands. There was, therefore, little
exaggeration when Nehru said at the end of the year that "Delhi has become in recent years a centre of friendship and peace in the world, and I hope it will play its effective role in the cause of world peace"(2) India's belief in the limited usefulness and effectiveness of her role in the preservation and promotion of world peace was solely based on the conviction that during an atomic stalemate, military power had less significance than before, and to that extent a friendly and conciliatory role, and that by a Non-Aligned power, had some place in promoting harmony among nations. India had considerable success in this role could hardly be doubted by any objective observer of the world scene during the period.

In the middle of 1955, after Nehru's successful European tour. "The Scotsman" wrote - "What India has lacked in power she has made up in influence and this influence is now more important than ever.(3) And the "Manchester Guardian" (2 October 1954) wrote: "When the history of the time is written dispassionately, it will perhaps cause surprise to see what a useful part India has often played in helping to stave off the final collision which all fear."

Speaking on the significance of the Geneva 'Summit' Conference, Krishna Menon remarked that problems of war and peace at present depended upon the two Great Powers - the United states and the Soviet Union. Countries like India, however realistic or correct in their policies, could not accomplish world peace.
They could advocate disarmament or non-use of atomic weapons, but action on such proposals was left to the Great Powers. India was working for world peace and co-operation because 'we are part of the great humanity which has an interest in the problems of peace.

At the opening of the survey (1954), India was grappling with the delicate and complicated problems of the exchange of Korean prisoners of war, through her Chairmanship of the Neutral Nations Repatriation Commission. Early in the year, the Government took a keen interest in, and played an active role in the resolution of, the Indo-China conflict. Under the armistice agreement on Indo-China brought about by the Geneva Conference on far East, India accepted the Chairmanship of the 3 Nation International Commissions for supervision and control in the three Indo-China states of Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. During the first part of 1955, Indian diplomacy was very active in the resolution of the Formosa conflict as well as, incidently, the question of the release of the United states airforce personnel held in China. In June-July 1955 Nehru made a triumphant tour of goodwill of the Soviet Union and many other countries of Europe from which emerged a great deal of reciprocal appreciation of the desire for peace. From July to October 1956, Indian diplomacy was intensely active with the settlement of the Suez Conflict; during the rest of the year she played an active part in getting Anglo-French and Israeli aggression on Egypt vacated. India also took considerable interest
in the resolution of the Hungarian conflict during November and onwards. India has been through her diplomacy and actions very active in opposing the manufacture and testing of atomic and nuclear weapons, in promoting international efforts for peaceful uses of atomic energy, in opposing military alliances and pacts and the establishment of foreign military bases, and most important of all, in containing threats to peace or moves of aggression.

By studying the above interests and actions of Indian diplomacy, only one thing comes out, i.e. India loves peace in every corner of the world. This action and attitude of India is only because, India cannot live in conflict with any nation. India knows and wants to let know every other country of the world that nothing can be achieved by wars and conflicts. Only peace is the answer to all prosperity and security. Therefore, in all these extensive and varied activities, the Government and people of India were prompted by the deep conviction of the catastrophic nature and consequences of a modern war in which atomic, nuclear and such other terrible weapons of mass destruction were likely to be used by the Great Powers. On different occasions, Nehru called a war in the present age as "rank lunacy", as a "relic of a barbarous past which has no meaning today for intelligent human beings" and that to think of war was 'insanity'. There was no such thing as 'winning war' in future, said Vice-President
Radhakrishnan "If the inventions of modern science were misused in war there would be victory for death and not victory for man. A future war would be a battle between survival and obliteration not between the Soviet Union and the United States or any other country". (4)

In the above context it is very fitting to quote an observation of the distinguished American sociologist, Lewis Mumford, which seems to reflect Indian opinion with surprising accuracy, said Mumford, 'I believe that Americans are still sane enough to come to wiser decisions than our Government has yet made. They will realize that retaliation is not protection; that total extermination of both sides is not victory; that a constant state of morbid fear, suspicion and hatred is not security; that, in short, what seems like unlimited power has become importance'.

India therefore wanted that war itself should be abolished as a means of settling any problem. "A modern war is not only incapable of settling any problem, it would unsettle many a settled problem and also create new ones, and thus sow the seeds of a new, and perhaps more destructive war" (5) Of course, no country wants to resort to war to settle any problem. As Nehru put it, the trouble with the world was not much aggressive intentions of any country, "but the terrible fear of each country that the other has aggressive intentions. And in order to prevent the other from
being the aggressor, you become the aggressor yourself". "But such an attitude only resulted in a vicious circle of fear, hatred and violence, and did not improve situation."(6) At a Peking rally, Nehru said: "Fear, hatred, and violence have darkened man's horizon for many years. Violence breeds violence, hatred degrades and stultifies and fear is a bad companion. We have to get out of the vicious circle of conflict and try to build a new world based on friendly co-operation and where there is no domination or exploitation of one country by Nehru's views are really the only method to establish peace and eradicate war and violence. And also in the Indian view, violence and violent methods were completely out of date in the atomic age; and there are in fact threats to the very existence of the human race. Nehru was absolutely correct when he said "war had ceased to be continuation of politics by other means, since no political objective could be attained through an atomic war". Nehru once said, "that the lessons of the French, Russians and Chinese revolutions were all out of date because of a new factor in world affairs - the atomic and hydrogen bombs which were the 'culmination of violence'. If these mighty forces were not tamed and used for the welfare of humanity, they would destroy the world. Therefore Nehru rightly remarked - 'The way of violence seldom succeeds and seldom solves any problem. He quoted the old maxim: "Those who take the sword shall perish by the sword" Nehru had amended the maxim to the effect that 'Those who put faith in the atom bomb will perish by the atom bomb".
Therefore, he urged that social and economic revolutions should only be brought about peacefully and non-violently. In the age of atomic power the slogan of 'peace through strength has little or no meaning. Nehru said, he was all for strength, because the weak, whether as individuals or as nations, went to the wall. However in the hydrogen bomb age, military strength was not the final answer to survival, but the spirit of the people. The lack of negotiating through strength was also illogical because by the time one gathered strength, the other party might be stronger still. Further while dealing with atomic and hydrogen bombs, talk of greater strength had very little meaning. They had arrived at stage when even if one party was relatively weaker, the effect on both was the same; they had reached the saturation point in regard to atomic and hydrogen bombs'. Nehru speaking in H.P. Deb (31.3.1955) Nehru said, you cannot have advanced technology and out-of-date society and an out-of-date system of international relations. So long as these do not catch up, the frictions will continue. In the atomic age 'rivalries and conflicts of the past have no place, and we have to think and act in a different way if this world and what it has achieved are to survive'. And 'there can be no East or West ranged against each other in the future. There can be only one world devoting itself in friendly co-operation between its different parts to the advancement of humanity." (Nehru speaking at a Peking rally 24 October 1955).

Nehru was such a peace loving person that the world has ever
known the other. He said 'We have the whole world is at war'. Nehru once gave three reasons for this in a B.B.C. interview: (1) Indians had been mentally conditional thus by Mahatma Gandhi (2) India's geographical situation 'preserves us', (3) India was not so weak internally or externally as to invite any danger from outside or to be unable to cope with it". (7)

In order to establish peace in the world, India has been trying her best. Homi J. Bhabha the great scientist of the age, the Indian Chairman of the U.N. Conference on the Peaceful uses of Atomic Energy in August 1955 said that as atomic power industry developed in the world, a great deal of fissionable material would come in to the hands of many nations. This presupposes an international society for the preservation of peace and the major Powers must agree between themselves to keep the peace."

In the context of the offer of United States military aids to Pakistan and with the reference to suggestions that India should accept such aid either from the US or the USSR, Nehru remarked "Both these suggestions go against the very grain of our policy and principles and betray an attitude of wrong understanding of things. What will be our status if we spread our hands and beg for help from other countries? The day we cannot defend our country ourselves nobody will be able to do it, and our freedom will disappear.(8) Nehru was right because arms race can never establish peace, on the other hand it will accelerate it.
Nehru believed, the right approach to defence was friendly relations with other country.

OPPOSITION TO MILITARY PACTS AND ALLIANCES:

India's stand on the approach to peace, the nature of peace conceived by her and the principles of Panchsheel as well as opposition to the 'Cold War' - all logically led her to oppose the creation of military pacts and alliances, the establishment of foreign military bases and the giving by the Big Powers of military aid to small (especially Asian) countries. This sustained opposition was one of the main features of India's foreign policy. The Government of India was not, of course, opposed to the concept of collective security as such on a world-wide basis - as envisaged under the UN charter. It was not also opposed to the Locarno type of collective security in which countries with differing or conflicting interests came together and assured each other of non-aggression and desire for peaceful resolution of their dispute and differences, even though India herself might not join such pacts (SENTO. The Baghdad Pact) in view of her policy of Non-alignment. what the Government of India opposed was the idea and the plan of one group of countries organizing themselves into a military grouping against potential or hypothetical aggression by some country or group of countries. Such military groupings tended to degenerate into preparing for a "collective war" instead of "Collective security" or "Collective
peace". As Nehru stated India's approach was that of trying to work for collective peace, and in fact, that collective peace is the only collective security. The other collective security—that, all the time, by threats and fear of mounting armaments—is not even bringing a climate of peace. It brings in a climate of fear. In the Indian view, "security springs by bringing about a new climate; a new approach and recognizing that in this world we can only exist by a policy of "live and let live" by 'tolerating others — tolerating no aggression, tolerating no interference—but tolerating others to exist as they want to exist."(9) These pacts and alliances indicated "a wrong approach, a dangerous approach and a harmful approach." They set in motion wrong tendencies and prevented right tendencies. Asked Nehru, 'How can any one declare that he is following the path of peace when actually he is preparing for war or trying to follow the path of war. Talk on disarmament in the face of military pacts by either bloc and further preparation for war, were 'in consistent and a mockery of a vowed purposes. There was also the great danger of these alliances working as interlocking arrangements. The NATO, ANZUS and SEATo pacts had bilateral military agreements with the Governments of Formosa and South Korea which had vested interest in changing the Status quo, not necessarily by peaceful means. Likewise the Soviet Union had such alliances with China and North Korea.

An odd feature of these alliances was that countries with
varied motives and objects joined together, each for its own reasons. This was especially true of the membership of the SEATO and the Baghdad Pact. It is proved by this statement "And associated with partners with whom we share the degree of common purpose conferred by cultural heritage which unites us with our European allies."(10) This was very true because some did so in order to secure some objective by overwhelming force which they, left to themselves, did not possess; some out of fear; some out of hatred of a country or dislike of an ideology; some protect their colonial possessions; and others, to enable themselves to speak to, or negotiate from strength with, another country. Not every member of these alliances was motivated solely by the desire for legitimate self-defence; with the result that the military grouping was likely to be pulled hither and thither depending upon the country or issue involved from time to time. So the case with NATO, which was ostensibly established to meet the Soviet threat to the security and integrity of Western European countries gradually extended its geographical scope to include Non-Atlantic countries and also changed its character from a defensive organization against possible aggression to one trying to defined the colonial possession of member countries against World Opinion and nationalist movements in those territories. This was one of the consequences of the interlocking of Colonial countries (e.g. Portugal) with others (e.g. the United States) which were quite opposed to the continuation of colonial domination - with the
result that the Colonial peoples had not only to deal with one colonial Power which administered the territory but this mighty concourse of powers. Then there was the case of Pakistan becoming a member of the SEATO and the Baghdad pact when she had not been threatened either by China or the Soviet Union. In fact, responsible Pakistan leaders made it 'perfectly clear' that they had joined these pacts essentially because of its hostility towards India.

It should also be pointed out that Indian objections to military pacts in Asia were not, as alleged by some Western critics, due merely to the fact that they were sponsored or dominated by the Western Powers. Indian opinion also firmly believed that military organizations such as the SEATO and the Baghdad pact were not in consonance with United Nations Charter which envisaged the setting up of regional organizations under Article 52 of the Charter; nor were they legitimate instruments of self-defence under the terms of Article 51 of the Charter. The SEATO in particular, could not 'by any stretch of interpretation of the Charter come under the United Nations Charter. Apart from many sided objections. India was directly affected by the establishment of the SEATO because India came under the 'treaty area' of the pact, as well as the fact that a none-too-friendly Pakistan was a member of it. It was believed in India at least that the only reason for her joining the pact was her hostility
towards India. That she joined it to achieve her own ends was proved by the reference, at the instance of Pakistan, of its communiqué to the need for early settlement of the Kashmir dispute - a matter which, in the Indian view, was wholly outside of the purview of the organization. This is what Pakistan is doing still, creating lot of disturbances in Kashmir, and interfering in India's internal problem. India loves peace and wants to establish peace in the world but sad to say Pakistan does not cooperate in this direction.

The Geneva settlement on Indo-China was based on the recognition of the need and practicability of co-existence of States of differing ideologies, especially China vis-a-vis the Indo-China States. The establishment of the SEATO was the very negation of that recognition. That two Big Powers, the U.K. and France, which took the initiative to negotiate the Indo-China settlement should have also participated in the Manila Conference and agreed to set up the SEATO was all the more odd, if not worse. If their real object was to ensure security for the Southeast Asian region, then, suggested Nehru, the People's Republic of China must be recognized and allowed to come into the United Nations, thereby China would have assumed certain responsibilities as a member of the U.N. That would have been a far better way of ensuring security than the creation of the SEATO that is why Nehru said in his speech at the AICC meeting (12 November 1956) - 'I do not know how much life was left in the SEATO and the Baghdad
Pacts. 'I think they are pretty dead.' Nehru had only one way or solution of security viz - only Panchsheel and the Bandung principles could assure the peace and security.

India's keen desire and efforts have always been to establish friendly relations among all the countries of the world, India from the beginning wanted that there should be unification of East-West Germany. The Government of India was 'deeply interested' in the unification of Germany, because it was vital to Europe and therefore to Asia as well. The division of Germany was a 'running sore' said Nehru, and he hoped that unification would be achieved peacefully. Even though the Government did not recognize the East Germany Government, there had been considerable commercial and cultural intercourse between the two countries. Referring to the German problem for the first time in the forum of the United Nations at the end of 1954, the leader of the Indian delegation suggested that there should be direct talks between the two German Governments to bring about unity. It should be possible for Germans to talk to Germans in order to find ways or at least beginning to establish the unity of their own country. Such talk would enable the two Governments to submit joint proposals to the Western and the Eastern Camps. It is quite satisfying that the dreams of Nehru coming closer to reality today, while, the dividing wall is already broken down. Nehru's great desire to see the divided Germany unified for the world
peace and goodwill relation. Nehru's Panchsheel was greatly appreciated by chancellor Adenauer.

The above attitude of India towards such pacts or alliances proves that India does not very much appreciate them because these organizations lead to create more misunderstanding and finally ends up with conflicts and rivalry. The role of India in the Korean Crisis embraced the whole of India's foreign policy objectives: from the preservation of world peace to the protection and furtherence of India's vital interests in Kashmir, and not-yet successful aim of establishing friendly relations with the Sino-Soviet bloc. It was the interplay of these objectives that produced a policy so rich in diversity that many people appear to have been baffled by it.

The Korean dispute was brought to the United Nations General Assembly by the United States on September 17, 1947. When the First Committee began Consideration on the Korean Question on October 28, 1947. The United States and the Soviet Union submitted two separate draft proposals. The proposal of the Soviet Union was that the General Assembly recommend to the Governments of the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the simultaneous withdrawal of their troops from southern and northern Korea, respectively thereby leaving to the Korean people itself the establishment of a National Government of Korea. "At the 91st meeting of the First Committee on October
30, 1947, India stated that the USSR proposal would lead to confusion, and that the US proposal was unduly vague" (11) The Indian representatives, therefore, proposed inter alia that a general election should be held, not on a zonal basis but on a national basis under the control of the UNTCOK, so as to remove the political and moral barrier which had been created by the division of the country. In this direction India had only view that is to establish a unified Korea as that had been its stand right from 1942. But neither the US nor the USSR was prepared to accept a single Korea except on its own terms. Thus when the Soviet trained and equipped North Korean forces invaded South Korea on June 25, 1950, it was clear to India that it was a challenge to the UN and a threat to world peace and the Government of India decided immediately to work for the restoration of the status quo ante in Korea. Therefore, both India and the United Arab Republic, who were then members of the Security Council, voted in favour of the Resolution adopted on June 25, 1950. These were the operative parts - call for the immediate cessation of hostilities and call upon the authorities of North Korea to withdrawal, forthwith their armed forces to the 38th Parallel. calls upon all the members to render every assistance to the UN in the execution of this resolution and to refrain from giving assistance to the North Korean authorities.

India's policy has always been based on the promotion of
world peace and the development of friendly relations with all countries, it remains an independent policy which will continue to be determined solely by India's ideals and objectives. In doing so, India's primary consideration was to serve the cause of peace. India did not deviate from her policy of Non-Alignment.

"The Government of India are of opinion that the admission of the People's Government of China in the Security Council and the return of the USSR are necessary conditions to enable the Security Council to discharge its functions adequately and to bring the Korean conflict to a peaceful conclusion. Nehru was perfectly clear that there was a well planned and a large scale aggression on South Korea.

Nehru clearly said that this aggression was an attempt to solve disputes by force which was dangerous from the point of view of world peace, because it was an attempt to upset the delicate balance of power. Nehru was opposed to a military solution to the Korean problem. He therefore, made it clear that a permanent settlement of the Korean problems was possible only with the cooperation of the Soviet Union and China. This was possible only when the former returned to the Security Council and the latter was admitted into it.

It is significant in this connection to note that India
later appealed to the Chinese and the North Korean authorities, along with 12 other Arab-Asian States, to declare their intention not to cross the 38th parallel. This, it has to be admitted, was a perfect piece of balancing in the classical sense of the term. On the other hand the attempt made by the United States to alter the balance of power in its favour was a dangerous move from the point of view of world peace. It was also dangerous from the point of view of the freedom of Asian nations, that is why, Nehru had come to the conclusion that the military mind had taken over in Korea. He was not entirely wrong.

There were other dangers involved in the United Nations move to unify Korea by force. It directly threatened India's position in Kashmir. These fears became reality when the United States introduced the 'Uniting For Peace Resolution' or the 'Acheson Plan' which sought to give the General Assembly powers to recommend measures against an aggressor if the Security Council failed to take a decision. Nehru was indignant and he came out strongly against it. In his statement of October 16, 1950, he said, "It seems like converting the U.N. into a larger edition of Atlantic Pact making it a war organisation more than one devoted to peace." On another occasion, he said: "Instead of being a great organization for peace slowly one of its members had begun to think of it as an organization for waging war."

The policies of the United States, especially towards Asian
Nations were highly provocative. It was not at all prepared to accept India’s Non-Alignment and other foreign policy was sound. He was also convinced that the United State’s policies towards China were wrong. He had pressed for peaceful solution of the Korean as well as the Tibetan problems. He had disowned all political and territorial claims in Tibet. The Sand of US and Britain on the Kashmir issue was infavourable to India. Even if the US and Britain extended diplomatic recognition to Tibet it would have been of no help to India. Tibet would have become another Formosa or Korea, for China had already occupied it, and it could not have been forced out of it, even by the use of force. And finally, if India had sought Western support on Tibet China would surely have championed the cause of Pakistan might have joined hands with China and also the Soviet Union, thus increasing the danger of India’s security. Nehru’s policy, on the other hand, was to solve India’s disputes peacefully with her neighbours without outside interference. Nehru, therefore, decided to pay the price demanded by China for friendship which India by allowing China to occupy Tibet and ending its autonomy. The then Deputy Minister of External Affairs, Keskar, said that the “Government is not unmindful of protection of our frontiers adjoining Tibet. I may go furthehr and say that the best way of protecting that frontier is to have a friendly China. It is obvious that such a complicated and a big frontier cannot be well protected if we have a border country which becomes hostile to us.”(12)
Therefore, when the Sino-Soviet bloc finally decided, in July 1951 to accept a stalemate truce along the 38th Parallel in Korea India's major objective of restoring the status quo prior to June 25, 1950, was achieved. India's stand was vindicated. Naturally, India was called upon to shoulder the responsibility of conducting the armistice negotiations which began in July 1951.

The Indian policy throughout the armistice talks continued to be governed by the desire to pacify China as far as possible. Nehru was very much concerned to establish good, friendly ties with all the neighbouring counties, especially with Pakistan. But United States always have been supplying enormous military aid to Pakistan which is hindering the peaceful settlements.

NEHRU TOLD PARLIAMENT ON MARCH 1, 1954:

"The grant of military aid by the United States to Pakistan creates a grave situation for us in India and for Asia. It adds to our tensions. It makes much more difficult to solve the problems which have confronted India and Pakistan. It is vitally necessary for India and Pakistan to solve their problems and develop friendly and co-operative relations... These problems can only be solved by the two countries themselves and not by the intervention of others. It is indeed, this intervention of others countries in the past that has come in the way of their solution."

But sad to state that because of U.S. attitude, continue support of arms to Pakistan the problems are not being solved peacefully.
Nehru preached and fully believed that all other alliances and pacts would never solve any problem in the world, on the other hand it will only increase tensions between nations, because these alliances are not genuine in their purposes, they are dividing into groups, and division can only bring disturbances and destruction to peace. Only Panchsheel is the answer to world peace.

THE SUEZ CRISIS:

It is also worth to study the role played by India in the crisis of Suez. Actually the Origins of the Suez Crisis lie very deep. More than the Origins, the nature of the Crisis is of importance. It was a manifestation of the struggle for power between two forces: Resurgent Arab Nationalism and the waning British and French imperialism. A third force, viz., Israel's attempt to exploit this struggle in its own interests added another dimension to its intensity.

None did perhaps express the significance of the first aspect of the struggle better and more forcefully than Gaitskell, the leader of the opposition in the British House of Commons, during the debate on the nationalization of the Suez canal company by Nasser on July 26, 1956. Gaitskell drew a parallel between Nasser's policies and those of Hitler and Mussolini and then declared: "This episode must be recognized as part of the
to size, added to this act of his a touch of vengeance. Nehru and Krishna Menon were with Nasser on their return flight from Brioni to Cairo when they heard of the withdrawal of the Aswan aid over radio.

The Suez base and the Suez Canal were vital for India's defence and economic development. The communiqué, issued on June 9, 1953, by the commonwealth Prime Ministers, said that "the Prime Ministers recognized the international importance of the Suez Canal and of the effective maintenance of the military installations in the Canal Zone. They agreed that it is in the common interests that the outstanding issues in the Middle East should be settled on the basis of ensuring the peace and security of the Middle East Countries consistently with the sovereignty of each, and promoting their social and economic development."(15)

According to Sisir Gupta "while there is no doubt that the decision to withdraw the Aswan Dam aid which followed the Brioni conference was appearing to this group of relations as an attempt by the United States Secretary of State to deal a blow to the weakest link of the neutralist chain at this time, viz. Egypt, the violence of Egyptian reaction was unexpected and illustrated the inevitable involvement that it might imply in situation undesirable from the Indian point of view". Nehru said in the Lok Sabha on August 8, 1956. India's immediate interests in the
dispute were summarized by him in this speech" The Government of India had to take a decision in the situation as it confronted them. India is a principal user of this waterway, and her economic life and development is not unaffected by the disputes not to speak of worse developments, in regard to it."(16) He also pointed out that "the Egyptian nationalization was precipitated by the Aswan Dam decision of the United States Government in which the U.K. Government later joined. More than the decision, the way it was done, hurt Egypt's pride and self-respect and disregarded a people's sentiments".

Nehru pointed out "The suddenness of the nationalization decision and the manner in which it has been implemented have contributed to the violent reaction."(17) As Anthony Nutting has put the nationalization aim "Eden the challenge for which he had been waiting. Now at last he had found a pretext to launch an all out campaign of political, economic and military pressures on Egypt and to destroy for ever Nasser's image as the leader of Arab nationalism"(18) The decision to eliminate Nasser was taken by Eden as early as March 1, 1956.

India's stand was peaceful settlement of the Middle East. Therefore India and Nehru wanted that Suez Canal was properly maintained and was not closed, irrespective of the authority controlling it. Hence Nehru said, "India is passionately interested in averting a conflict. The settlement of this
problem, on the basis of the sovereignty and of dignity of Egypt, and by arrangement amongst all concerned, and the abandonment of postures of threats and violence and unilateral action by either party, are of the utmost concern to India."(19) Nehru regretted when the French and the U.K. Governments reacted to the Egyptian announcement quickly, sharply and with vehmence. Press reports of military and naval movements ordered by the U.K. and France which aggravated the situation. Therefore Nehru was forced to state: "I have no desire to add to the passions aroused, but I would fail in my duty to this House and the country and even to all the parties involved in this crisis and not least of all to Britain and France, if I do not say that threat to settle this dispute or to enforce their views in this matter by display or use of force, is the wrong way. It does not belong to this age and it is not dictated by reason. It fails to take account of the world as it is today and the Asia of today... We deeply regret these reactions and the measures reported to be taken in consequence, and we express the hope that they will cease and the parties will enter into negotiations and seek peaceful settlements".(20)

At the First London Conference on Suez which was held during August 16-23, 1956, Krishna Menon told the London Conference that India's stand was dictated as much by consideration of national self-interest as by the desire to assist and contribute to a peaceful settlement of the question. He said "So far as our
problem in this issue is concerned, it lies in finding ways and means by which the Egyptian Government is under the obligations of law and of the Charter of the United Nations to carry out this particular obligations" Menon made it very clear when he pointed out India's views. He said, "Our interest in this canal is not a political one, it is a user interest and that user interest a mutual one, by persuasion, by making Egypt a party to a solemn agreement which comes under the obligations of international law and of the Charter of the U.N."

Nehru said in Lok Sabha on September 13, 1956 "The Menzies Mission which recently visited Cairo asked the Egyptian Government to accept international control of operation and administration and the establishment of an international corporation displacing the Egyptian National Corporation. Egypt has declined to accept them as being contrary to her Sovereign rights and not related to the purposes of the Convention of 1888 and the interest of users, which are freedom of navigation toll, maintenance of the Canal, etc., which the Egyptian Government alone can guarantee".

In the same speech Nehru pointed out that the Western proposal to set up a Suez Canal Users' Association was full of dangerous potentialities for it was unacceptable to the United Arab Republic. He said "It is clear that the action proposed is not the result of agreement, but is in the nature of an imposed action, and that it is not calculated to secure to the users
peaceful and secured use of the canal which is and should be what is required by the users and the international community" (21)

Nehru wrote to the Prime Minister of England and the President of the U.S. He issued a further appeal to them to negotiate with Nasser and added: "To seek to impose a settlement by force or by threats is to disregard the rights of nations even as the failure to observe international treaties and obligations would be "Nehru also regretted that Britain, France, Italy and others had withdrawn their pilots from the Suez Canal." This is an action not calculated to promote the use of the Canal and is not in the interest of user nations.

Nehru ended his speech with the reminder: "As I have stated previously, the proper functioning of the Suez Canal is of Vital importance to India. We are convinced, however, that this can only be achieved through a peacefully negotiated settlement ensuring the rights not only of Egypt but of all the user countries." (22) This proves how much Nehru regarded each nation's sovereignty and self respect, this is of course the basis of international peace and friendship, which India has been upholding from the very beginning.

The attack on the United Arab Republic was the one thing Nehru and Menon wanted to avoid, at all costs, since any
hostilities would affect the functioning of the Suez Canal and jeopardize India's economy. Eden's refusal to listen to India's plea for compromise, appear to have contributed to Nehru's reaction to the British action. Besides, the Anglo-French attempt to recapture the Suez Canal and to overthrow Nasser were dangerous moves from the point of view to weak Afro Asian Nations. No wonder, then, that Nehru was indignant at the aggressors. He had no hesitation in denouncing the aggression as "dastardly action".

Equally quick was Nehru's demand for the withdrawal of the forces of the three aggressors (Britain, France, Israel) India's diplomacy was then directed to achieve this objective in the shortest possible time. Fortunately for India, not only the United states and the Soviet Union, but also the Commonwealth and a large part of Afro-Asian demanded an immediate cease-fire and withdrawal of forces from the United Arab Republic. The United states took the lead in demanding a cease-fire and withdrawal of Israeli forces through a draft resolution introduced on October 29, 1956, which was voted by England, France. Then Yugoslavia, prompted by India from out side, took the initiative by introducing a motion under the "Uniting for Peace" resolution of 1950, calling for a special emergency session of the General Assembly, which was accepted by the Security Council on October 31, 1956. Thus the Anglo-French attempt to paralyse the United Nations was defeated. The Assembly passed the United States-sponsored resolution on November 2, 1956, demanding an immediate
cease-fire and withdrawal of forces behind the armistice lines of 1949.

India also supported Canada's proposal for the creation of a United Nations Emergency Force, a peace-keeping force. While the United States and Canada be indifferent to the fate of Nasser and would have welcomed his downfall, India and Nehru could not be so indifferent. Indeed, India had a moral obligation to protect the interest of the United Arab Republic as the leading champion of Non-Alignment, of which Nasser had became a Crusader. Nehru, in his speech to the Lok Sabha on November 20, 1956 declared "The major fact in powerful, resurgent way. Egypt took the lead in this has played a very important part. Nasser in fact, became the most prominent symbol of Arab nationalism". (23) Nehru mentioned very clearly - "we are convinced that any effective solution of problems of West Asia must be based on the recognition of the dominant urge and force of Arab nationalism. Any settlement must have the goodwill and co-operation of the Arab nations." This is also what Nasser and the Arabs demand of Israel, that it should take its due place in West Asia which is predominantly Arab. Thus it is Israel and its supporters that have to accept the greatest reality in West Asia: the will of the Arabs to live as self-respective individuals and nations. Then only the Arabs could be expected to accept the reality of Israel.
These are the deeper issues involved in the Arab Stand against Israel and India's support to them. These are also the basic tenets of Non-Alignment. It was, again, these motives that led the Government of India to stand resolutely by the Arabs when Israel committed another brutal aggression against them in June 1967. It may be mentioned here that the two crises present two important turning points in the history of Non-Alignment. The Anglo-French-Israeli attack on the United Arab Republic constituted a great challenge to Non-Alignment just when it was blossoming into a world-wide policy. Nasser's statesmanship supported by Nehru's rescued it from premature death and the two leaders came to admire each other. The support given by the Super Powers to the United Arab Republic proved the soundness of the basis of Non-Alignment. For, this was the first occasion when a Non-Aligned Power was directly attacked by more powerful nations in an attempt to change the balance of power in their favour. The Super Powers intervened and restored the status-quo. The crisis thus gave new life and confidence to Non-Alignment and it began to grow from strength to strength.

It is quite pertinent here to mention India's view and role in the wake of the "Congo Crisis". The fact that Dag Hammarskjöld, the Secretary General of the United Nations, in his definition of the areas and conflicts in which the United Nations, could play a major role, as in the Congo-crisis, identified
it with one of the major aspects of Non-Alignment, viz., the prevention of the spread of the cold war into Africa and Asia, as far as possible. These views were put forth clearly and pointedly by him in his introduction to the Annual Report on the work of the United Nations Organisation on August 31, 1960, in the following words:

"In Africa the first beginning can now be seen of those conflicts between ideologies and interests which spilt the world. Africa is still, in comparison with others a virgin territory which, many have found reason to believe, can or should be won for their aims and interests."

The Congo, which was under Belgian occupation for a long time, had become independent on June 30, 1960 without, as it soon became evident adequate preparation for the tasks of independence. Soon the Congolese army as the greatest danger to law and order in the Congo, rebelled against the Belgian Officers who were manning the army. Taking this as a pretext, Belgium moved its troops into the Congo, with the "professed objective of restoring order and protecting the Civil population, especially the Belgians, who were present in large numbers in the Congo working in different capacities. In such circumstances, on July 12, 1960 the Secretary General received an urgent appeal from the Government of the Republic of the Congo signed by President Joseph Kasavubu and Prime Minister Patrice Lumumba for assistance to protect the
national territory of the Congo against the "present external aggression which is a threat to International peace". They also appealed to the Soviet Union on July 14, 1960. The Secretary-General responded immediately to the request of the Congolese Government. He asked the Security Council to authorize military assistance to the Congo. The Security Council adopted a resolution sponsored by Tunisia, with the United States and the Soviet Union voting for it. It called for the withdrawal of Belgian troops from the Congo.

The U.A.R., Ghana, Morocco, Mali and Indonesia besides Sweden and Ireland agreed to send troops to the Congo. He repeated that the case for the United Nations intervention was based on the breakdown of the instrument of law and order and the explicit request of the Government of the Republic of the Congo. Therefore, he stated that "It would be understood that Belgium would see its way to a withdrawal", if the Congo government succeeded in restoring law and order. The United Nations assistance would "yield results only after a certain time," and meanwhile "the force introduced is to be regarded as a temporary security force present in the Republic of the Congo with the consent of the Government for the time and purpose indicated."

On July 20, 1960, the Secretary-General stated that all the United Nations Forces had reached the Congo, that India was approached to send a person to act as military adviser to the
Secretary General in the Congo and that Ralph Bunche of the U.S. an Assistant Secretary General in the United Nations, was sent as the personal representative of the Secretary General. But India was not involved in any way in the Congo operations, though it was contributing to it. Nehru also refused to offer an opinion on the controversy between Hammarskjöld and Lumumba, on the plea that it was before the Security Council. At his monthly Press conference on August 11, 1960, he had paid a tribute to the Secretary General for having acted with "Vision and also Wisdom." He also said that the situation in the Congo was both straightforward and also complicated and that it was the presence of the Belgium troops that had aggravated the trouble in the Congo, though there might be other reason too. Therefore the sooner the Belgium troops departed from the Congo the better. He added that India recognized only one Congo State.

On August 31, 1960, Nehru paid a similar tribute to the Secretary General and the United Nations, in the Lok Sabha, "When the trouble arose in the Congo, the United Nations was appealed to and the latter responded with speed and efficiency. This particular action which the United Nations took in the Congo is unique. In a sense it marked a new phase in the activities of the United Nations. Taken all in all, I think it is a good and desirable phase and the manner in which the United Nations has functioned in the Congo has been commendable. I do not know what
would happen in the Congo if the U.N. was not there. Apart from
the possibility of a great deal of internal conflict, there would
be a possibility of intervention by other countries, big and
small. I would like to express on behalf of the Government. Our
appreciation of the steps which have been taken broadly by the the
U.N. in the Congo"(24)

To keep good and friendly relations India decided to open an
Embassy in Leopoldville, in August 1960. It was with the opening
of the Emergency Special Session of the General Assembly that
India appears to have decided to take an active part in the
proceedings. On September 20, 1960, the Emergency session adopted
a resolution supporting the Security Council resolutions of July
14 and 22 and August 9, 1960, and appealing to all the Congolese
within the Republic of Congo to seek a speedy solution by peaceful
means of all internal conflicts for the unity and integrity of the
Congo, with the assistance, as appropriate, of Asian and African
representatives appointed by the Advisory Committee on Congo,
in consultation with the Secretary General, for the purpose of
conciliation. On October 3, 1960, Nehru urged in the General
Assembly that steps should be taken to help... Parliament (of the
Congo) to meet and function so that out of its deliberations the
problems of the Congo may be dealt by the people themselves. He
also suggested that a commission might be sent to the Congo to
inquire into the situation obtaining in the Congo Lumumba was
reported to have welcomed the suggestion of Nehru.
On December 21, 1960 Nehru criticized the draft resolution introduced by the United States and the United Kingdom in the General Assembly which failed to secure the required two thirds majority as containing "a number of pious hopes but contains nothing - you can get hold of. It again comes against the same difficulty - which has been pursuing the United Nations work in the Congo, namely, tying up the hands of the Secretary General, limiting what he can do and he cannot do. This has pursued him almost from the beginning." "If the United Nations Force were to take action only in self-defence", he said "they need not have gone there. But they were sent there to help not to interfere, not to encourage conflict, but surely when the need for it arose, to prevent wrong doing" He pointed out further that "if you took at the whole context of events, you see how by gradual pressures a situation has been created in the Congo in which the United Nations Forces have been put in a most difficult position. They have been humiliated often and they have to watch humiliating spectacles without being able to do anything. A large number of African countries have been infuriated by the turn of events. They have started withdrawing their forces from the Congo."

Nehru had no hesitation in saying The United Nations had become largely in effective in the Congo. Nehru pointed out this in the Lok Sabha on December 20, 1960.

"The position of the United Nations in the Congo under-went
a change. They became less effective and Colonel Mobutu became the most effective person though not wholly so. The U.N. could not do anything. The instructions that they must be completely neutral - whatever that might mean. Actually this meant that while the killing of one group by the other took place on a big scale in front of them they looked on. So from the point of view of law and order they had no position at all because of the instructions or the interpretations of the instructions of the Security Council. In effect the Congo gradually began to disintegrate. He further expressed "If the U.N. cannot effectively deal with the situation it would fade away in the Congo and its reputation will continue to suffer. The fact remains that under present conditions, our men, or any country's men there are frequently insulted and manhandled by the Congolese soldiers under Colonel Momutu. If our people are not treated properly and given opportunities to do the work for which they were sent guarantee that the question will not arise whether it is worthwhile keeping them there or not. Normally we would have withdrawn them but we have hesitated to do so because it would most inevitably leaving the Congolese to fight it out amongst themselves and it would also mean the instruction of foreign powers with their troops and, therefore, war. (25)

Nehru concluded his speech by saying: "In such circumstances, it is difficult for a country like India to function effectively
or to help fully... Our broad attitude is in favour of the Afro-Asian approach. That does not mean we agree with everything they say, like the formation of an all African force. They have demanded many measures which we think are not feasible. Our attempt has been to put forward something which we think might avoid this element of anger as much as possible and also be feasible otherwise.(26)

Thus Nehru had identified himself with the position of the United Arab Republic and other African states of the so-called "radical" or Casablanca group on the role of the United Nations Force, even while disagreeing with their proposals to remedy the situation. He was still hopeful of making the U.N. change its attitude.

Whatever might be the demerits of the decision of the Cesablanca Powers, it was this withdrawal of troops by them that appears to have given a jolt to the United Nations. For nobody, least of all the Secretary General, was willing to pull out of the Congo, for, above all, his own personal prestige was at stake in the failure of the U.N. in the Congo. There were only two alternatives in which he could continue the United Nations operation, one was to ask the States withdrawing troops to reconsider their decision, and the other was to ask other Non-Aligned states to contribute troops. In the event Hammarskjoed appears to have resorted to the second alternative by writing to
Nehru on January 21, 1961 for a battalion to combat troops. Nehru, very wisely, took this opportunity to impress upon the Secretary General that before India could send troops, the U.N. policy in the Congo had to undergo a change.

Explaining the conditions stipulated by India, Nehru said in the Lok Sabha on February 15, 1961, that the United Nations "can stay only if it changes its past policy very largely and if insists on these basic matters. One of the actions which are quite essential is that the foreign elements must be controlled and must be made to withdraw, especially Belgians... We hope that it may be possible for the Security Council to come to firm decisions so that the United Nations authority can function there effectively and strongly. This means that it should function even if it is necessary to use armed force and not merely look on while others use armed force for a wrong purpose that the foreign elements must go from there, and that the so-called Congolese army should be controlled and disarmed. Having got the situation under control the U.N. should try to get parliament to meet for deciding what kind of government they will have, the object being that the unity, integrity and independence of the Congo should be preserved. If any help has to be given to them it should go through the United Nations and not through other sources... If our views could be accepted, we would get over our reluctance and help by sending some combat troops to the Congo. That is the position we had taken up earlier and it still holds."(27)
Then on February 10, 1961, it was announced by one of Tshombe’s Ministers that Lumumba had escaped, giving rise to suspicions of foul play, which were confirmed on February 13, 1961, by the same minister at a press conference called for the purpose. It was murder. And it shook the United Nations to its foundations. The Soviet Union in a "Savage" attack against Hammarskjöld accused him of complicity in the murder demanded his resignation and announced its withdrawal of recognition from him. Nehru and Nasser were equally indignant. Nehru wrote to Hammarskjöld that it was an "international crime of the first magnitude". He wrote further: "I know that you have been trying your utmost to control the situation but unfortunately United Nations activities have been obstructed both directly and indirectly by some countries who have been supporting Tshombe and Maj. Gen. Mobutu. The feeling in our country is strong and unless effective steps are taken immediately it will be difficult for India to associate itself with policies which permit the perpetrators of these crimes to continue in their gangster methods."(28)

The resolution of February 21, 1961, based on authority of the United Nations on the threat to international peace and security and it called upon the United Nations to take immediate all appropriate measures to prevent the occurrence of Civil War in the Congo, including arrangements for ceasefires, the halting of all military operations, the prevention of clashes, and the use of
force, if necessary, in the last resort. It also called for the withdrawal of all Belgian and other foreign personnel of all descriptions and mercenaries and it also decided to hold an immediate and impartial investigation into the circumstances of the death of Lumumba and his colleagues and to punish the perpetrators of these crimes.

On May 6, 1961, Nehru announced in the Lok Sabha that he had received a reply from the Secretary General which was satisfactory, and that India would be sending troops to the Congo. This decision of India and the additions made by Malaya, Tunisia, Ethiopia and Libeia to their troops rescued the United Nations from its worst crisis to-date. And finally after the sad demise of Hammarskjöld in a plane crash on September 23, 1961, U. Thant gave his consent to the United Nations Force in Katanga to use force to end Tshombe's resistance, which collapsed soon. Thus the three-year-old secession of Katanga came to an end and it was finally integrated into the Congo in January 1963.

Throughout this period, India steadfastly refused to be pressurized by England and others and struck to its position that strong action should be taken, if necessary' to end Tshombe's resistance. In conclusion, it may be observed that India's role in the Congo crisis beginning with the acceptance of Hammarskjöld's concept of preventive diplomacy and strict non-intervention and ending with the acceptance of a military solution,
revealed once again, that Nehru's advocacy of a peaceful settlement of disputes did not preclude the use of force when circumstances really demanded it. One thing more has been observed that India from the beginning has been respecting integrity and unity of all countries, and has not been tolerating any country's intervention and interference in others matter. Being a Non-Aligned country India really believes in good-will and co-existence. There is no hesitation in accepting the undisputed fact that India from its earliest time, has been advocating the message of peace and co-existence. This is in India's very culture and soil. In this context it is quite appropriate here to mention Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru's view. He said in reference to the Commonwealth "It has been India's privilege in the past to be a meeting place for many cultures. It may be her privilege in the present and the future to be a bridge to join warring factions and to help in maintaining that utmost urgent thing of today and the future - the peace of the world. It is in the belief that India could more effectively pursue this policy of encouraging peace and freedom and of lessening the bitter hatreds and tensions in the world.(29) Nehru's conviction was that by associating with the commonwealth India may be great and strong and in a position to play a beneficient part in Asia and the world. Further he mentioned that "We join the Commonwealth obviously because we think it is beneficial to us and to certain causes in the world that we wish to advance" Nehru made clear that by joining the Commonwealth India would not loose
her sovereignty at all, but will be respectfully put forth her position in the world. He made it very clear that India could not possibly compromise on the question of allegiance to any foreign authority as far as India's sovereignty is concerned. He was of the opinion that by associating the Commonwealth India could solve many problems peacefully and in a friendly manner. At the same time he said that we cannot disassociate with the Commonwealth, no country can survive living by herself today. The Commonwealth represents, not only democratic institutions but, in a considerable measure, the content of democracy, in other words, is peaceful co-existence, not only between those who are like each other but also between those who are unlike each other. It is easy to co-exist when we like each other. It involves no problem, and no effort. But when we differ in opinions, in ways of life, even in objectives, and yet for bear and try to understand each other, that is peaceful co-existence.

Foe one thing, India's relations with the other member nations, especially with the U.K. and Canada, deepened and matured considerably. With U.K., the bonds of friendship had become strong in spite of Bulish military misadventure in Egypt with Canada, for various reasons, India came to have an unusually warm friendship. Even the Communist bloc of nations, especially the leaders of Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China after personal discussion with Prime Minister Nehru, were believed to be convinced that the connection was not cloak for the continuance
of Western vested interests and sphere of influence in India. They also seemed to have appreciated India’s bonafides in remaining within the Commonwealth, and understood that India kept the connection not only for purely historical and sentimental reasons as well as any tangible advantages accruing from the relationship, but also because it was an instrument through which India sought to contribute her mite towards broader international co-operation and world security. Apparently, Indian leaders convinced the leaders of the Soviet Union and China that India’s continued membership of the group did not, even in the least degree infringe her independence of policy or action and compromise her basic policy of Non-Alignment with any bloc of nations.

India agreed to remain in the Commonwealth of nations because the association fully conformed to the underlying principles of her foreign policy, in particular of removing discord and bringing about harmony among nations. No less a person than the Earl of Home, British Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations, in the course of a visit to India in October 1955, told the members of the Indian Council of World Affairs that all the Commonwealth countries in effect subscribed to the Panchsheel, and that the objectives of the foreign policies of the U.K., India and the other Commonwealth Countries were identical (The Hindu, 23 October 1955)

Not only was the Commonwealth connection of the instruments
of India's pursuit of peace both for its own self-interest and the larger cause of world peace, it was the Prime Minister's conviction that it was in itself a contribution to world peace. This was a 'big thing', he said once. India's Commonwealth contacts had widened the understanding of India and perhaps the other members of the group as well by mutual influence, and thus lessened frictions in the world. Nehru observed that he was not interested in defence, adding, 'the best defence is friendliness' (in a press interview at the London airport on 22 June 1956).

In otherwords, this contribution was made by the mere fact of the existence and working together of a friendly association of countries belonging to five continents, and whose peoples differed in many ways.

One other important reason for India's Commonwealth connection was the concern for the Status of people of Indian origin in various British Colonial territories like Malaya, Fiji, Mauritius, British Guiana.

INDIA'S CONCEPTION OF THE COMMONWEALTH:

From the Indian point of view, the Commonwealth is a free association of independent, sovereign states which for historical reasons had come together and maintained that connection for the purpose of promoting certain Common interests and goals, the most
important of which was the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security. Nehru said in his Guildhall speech 'of all the types of association we have between nations, probably this rather invisible type of association is stronger than alliances or treaties'. Nehru wanted to see "a world develop in which all the nations were associated in some such friendly way with each other" (30) Commenting on this, the Manchester Guardian (5 July, 1956) remarked that Nehru was 'probably right' in his assessment of the nature of the Commonwealth as a half-way house between the two prevailing extreme views: (i) that it was no more than a machinery for exchange of informations and opinion among sovereign states, (ii) that it was a political union, however loose and informal.

In the Indian view, the Commonwealth was not "Super-state body" (as Nehru said the Commonwealth Prime Ministers' conference was not, and therefore it had no role in the settlement of infra-commonwealth disputes, such as the Indo-Pakistani disputes and that with South Africa on the treatment of people of Indian Origin, on this issue, India sharply differed from Pakistan.

Nehru, from the beginning was of opinion that atomic energy should only be used for peaceful uses. At the Commonwealth Prime Ministers conference he stressed the very point thus the conference agreed to the desirability of preventing an atomic war, to work for a comprehensive and effective disarmament plan. The
Prime Minister himself reiterated at the conference India's well-known view that atomic weapons should be destroyed as they had rendered war an obsolete instrument of policy, since their use would no longer result in victory for any party but only in the destruction of the human race. Today the "Super Powers" agree to this fact and trying to curtailment of atomic weapons.

Indians would broadly concur with the nature of the Commonwealth as explained by The Times (25 June 1956) in the first of a series of three editorial in particular its definition of the Commonwealth as 'a society for mutual support' in the economic sphere. In the second article of the series, ibid (26 June, 1956) recognized that "neutrality" (referring to India's policy of Non-Alignment) was 'clearly the right of members ... No one in the Commonwealth would gain say that right.

COMMONWEALTH OPINION ON INDIA'S ROLE:

The British Commonwealth Relations Secretary remarked during a visit to India that nowhere had the growth of Indian influence in world affairs been more widely welcomed than in the U.K. and nowhere were Prime Minister Nehru's efforts to relax world tensions more greatly valued. (31) A forceful tribute came from the British Foreign Secretary, Selwyn Lloyd, who observed that Nehru was one of the clearest expounders of what the Commonwealth really means in the world at the present time." Likewise,
according to the Manchester Guardian Weekly (28 June 1956) 'the most constructive and original thought at the present time on the Commonwealth comes perhaps from India... In many ways, the Indian thinking is new' The prime aim of the Commonwealth according to India, was 'to maintain and declare to the world certain general conceptions about political behaviour, most of them proceeding from the principles of freedom, toleration and humanity. To preserve these and extend their sway in the world, is the Commonwealth's first purpose. It is its main contribution to world affairs and this contribution can be made even if some of the member-states pursue divergent foreign policies. These tributes to India's contribution to the growth and importance of the Commonwealth were also echoed by Canadian statesmen. Sad to say the only discordant vocious from within the Commonwealth came for different reasons from Pakistan, South Africa and the central African Federation.

The closeness and cordiality of Indo-British relations was possibly the most important single reason for India's decision to remain in the Commonwealth and her playing an active and effective role in Commonwealth affairs. V.K.R.V. Rao has called the Indo-British ties of friendship, goodwill and of ideological identity as 'spiritual'. At the reception accorded to the Mountbattens in Delhi and again in his Guildhall speech at London Nehru said that the coming together of the two countries after India's freedom struggle and 200 years of British rule was unparalleled in the
world. Friendly relations between the two countries since then had not been affected inspite of different paths followed or divergent views held by the two countries on some world problems, when in 1950 India became a Republic, it did not make any difference to that relationship, 'because that relationship was not based on any hoopes of steel or ropes. It was a relationship of free will, without even the silken bonds. And because there was nothing to tie, there was nothing to break it'. The Indo-British bond had survived many differences of opinion because the two countries had settled their conflict in a 'civilized, human way' It was difficult to define that relationship because it was undefinable and 'it was often the undefinable things that were most important and precious of all'. In the remarkable Guildhall speech Nehru remarked that apart from being a personal honour, it was a token of British regard for India and her people and a 'happy reminder of the present free association of our two lands'. Stating that Indo-British relationship could play 'a great and vital part and serve well our two peoples, Commonwealth and mankind as a whole, he added, it was India's profound desire and 'hope' that relations between India and the Commonwealth would grow more and more strong and that 'we shall lend strength to each other in fellowship and for service to other people in the world.'(32)

Thus it can be very clearly noted here that India's main concern is to promote peace and friendship in the world. That's the very reason India has joined herself with the Commonwealth,
SAARC and U.N.O. Anything which comes on the way to peace and friendship India never encourages. That's the reason India has refrained from all power blocs policy or war pact organizations.

INDIA-SOVET RELATIONS:

Ever since independence India has remained outside the orbit of the two Super Powers - the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. After World War II, most of the countries had the opinion to move politically, militarily and ideologically to the American (Western bloc) or to the Russian bloc (Communist bloc). But Pt. Nehru refused to tow either bloc by remaining neutral. And as it has already discussed, in 1950's a few other countries who did not like to become satellites to either super powers joined hands with India and developed the concept of what came to be known as the Non-Aligned.

The Soviet Policy of peace, peaceful co-existence and removal of exploitation of man by man forever has earned high esteem of the Indian people. India's policy of Non-alignment, support to national liberation movements. Opposition to racialism and neo-colonialism has endeared India not only to the Soviet but also to all the oppressed peoples everywhere. It is quite rightly said that in the multi-coloured fabric of Indo-Soviet relations, there is nothing more enduring than the common concern for peace and antipathy to all that militates against it. Had there been no
Community of purpose, Indo-Soviet relations would not have withstood the test of time. There are many occasions during the last 40 years of diplomatic relations between the two countries when they had to stand unitedly to safeguard the national interests and uphold commonly cherished principles.

A study of such issues as Kashmir, Goa, Bangladesh, Indo-Pak and Sino-Indian border conflicts, Korean War, the Suez Crisis, Hungary and Czechoslovakia, brings out in bold relief identity in outlook on which Indo-Soviet relations have been tested time and again. Right in the initial period of the N.A. Momement, to be precise in August 1953, the then Soviet Primier G.M. Malenkov, gave it public Soviet recognition by praising the efforts of peace-loving countries directed towards the ending of the Korean war "and especially complimented India on its "Significant Contribution". (33) The war really the beginning of the Soviet interest in Non-Alignment against the background of the notorious fulminations of John Foster Dulles against Non-Alignment as well as the lone voice of India as the founder of the movement.

The history of Soviet Indian relations is pretty long, dating back to centuries. Men like Albinri (11th century), Afancy Nikitin (16th century) and Gerasim Lebenev (18th century) are personalities that mattered in Indo-Russian relations in the long past. In the present century the relationship between the founding father of the Soviet State, Lenin, and the architects of
India's independence movement was as legendary as Gandhi's affinity with the great sage of the times, Leo Tolstoy.

An inter-governmental agreement on Cultural, Scientific and technical cooperation was signed between the two countries on February 12, 1960. This laid the firm foundation for coordination, at first in an annual, and later from 1967, on a biennial basis, for the Soviet Union signed the latest cultural agreement for the year 1985-86 at New Delhi in February 1985. Indo-Soviet cooperation in education began in 1956 with the signing of UNESCO protocol on the establishment of the Indian Institute of Technology in Bombay with the Soviet assistance. An Indo-Soviet joint Commission has been set up for cooperation in the field of Social Sciences A centre for Russian Studies was opened at Jawaharlal Nehru University in 1965. Today the Russian language is being taught at most of the Indian Universities. There is also co-operation between the two countries in the field of media, between the Soviet and Indian news agencies. And no less important is the Soviet Land Nehru Awards which were established in 1964 in memory of Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of Soviet-Indian friendship. Similarly the Nehru Prize established by India in Moscow, honours Soviet writers and others promoting Soviet-Indian friendship and peace.

The Festival of India in U.S.S.R. was highly admired by the Soviet people who have been exposed to the multi-facted Indian
cultural heritage. The level of interaction between the two peoples has been of the highest form. "For ever and ever... we are brothers for ever" the focal theme that has marked the evergrowing friendship between the U.S.S.R and India. The festival is dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution of the USSR.

India and the Soviet have decided to give fresh impetus to their bilateral economic cooperation by extending it to several new areas including joint ventures and production cooperation. They also agreed upon fresh Soviet credits to India to help it build thermal power plants, Soviet collaboration in development of the Kernal Oil refinery, and cooperation in the Civil aviation, railways and transportation sectors.

Soviet Premier Nikolai Ryhkov's five day visit to India, in November 1987 marked the beginning of a new phase in the history of the Indo-Soviet relations. Talks on a wide ranging subjects of mutual interests were held during the Summit between Mr. Gorbachev and Mr. Rajiv Gandhi in Delhi on November 18-20, 1988. In a joint Communiqué the two leaders urged all nations to make efforts to develop a comprehensive global system of international security. The two leaders also called for delimitarization, democratisation and humanisation of international relations. Asserting that disarmament, especially nuclear disarmament, was the primary issue concerning all nations and peoples, the leaders
maintained that new approach to international relations enunciated in the Delhi declaration required a change in doctrines, policies and institutions to build and sustain a nuclear weapons-free and non-violent world.

The two leaders affirmed that militarism, power politics and the division of the world into military alliances had endangered suspicion and hostility. It should therefore be discarded. There should be no military bases or facilities outside any powers' national borders. Among the priorities before the world, according to communique, was the conclusion of an international banning the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons, a global convention on comprehensive prohibition and destruction of Chemical weapons, including binary weapons. The Communique wanted that Asia should participate with other powers on an equal footing. Specifically in respect of Afghanistan the two leaders deplored the obstructionist policy of "certain forces" notably the U.S. and Pakistan which were violating the accords.

World peace is the ultimate aim of India. From the beginning India has been trying her level best to establish peace and friendship among all the countries. Ashoka sent her daughter and son to preach the message of love, peace and tolerance through the great religion of India, Buddhism. Never we find any evidence in Indian history which proves India being a hostile or aggressor. Live and let live is the guiding principle
of India's foreign policy fully and firmly based on the solid foundations of five pillars of PANCHSHEEL. That's the very reason India joined the Non-Aligned Movement. The policy of Non-Aligned movement is an integral part and expression of the world anti-imperialist revolution and lies in its anti-colonial character. With the scope of the Non-Aligned movement's action, many military bases of former colonial powers have been removed from the national territories of Non-Aligned countries, whereby these countries definitively reasserted and strengthened their sovereignty, independence and Non-Alignment. There is an explicit relationship of cause and effect between the five principles of Non-Aligned movement that determines:

(a) the independent, non-bloc character of the Non-Aligned movement,

(b) its international role and effect as a vehicle or the struggle for new international political and economic relations and effectively contributes to

(c) the democratization of international relations and narrowing down the scope for bloc interests and influence.

Pandit Jwaharlal Nehru on 7th September 1946, a week after the Indian Provisional Government was formed made a speech on radio - "We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned one another, which have led in the past two world wars and which may again lead to disasters or an even vaster scale. We seek no dominion over others and we
claim no privileged position over other peoples. But we do claim equal and honourable treatment for our people wherever they may go and we cannot accept any discrimination against them"(34) This statement shows how much India believes and cherishes world peace. The doctrine of Non-Alignment was the response of a major nation just about to be decolonized to the preservers of the cold war.

The mainspring of India's foreign policy ever since the critical stages of its growth under its national leadership headed by the first Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru has been concern for progressive national reconstruction, for wider Afro-Asian development and solidarity, for regional and international peace, for coalescing the newly emergent countries on the broad principles of opposing racism, colonialism, for supporting the liberation struggles and for extrication from power groupings and military blocs.

The Non-Aligned member states are unanimous in the view that development and disarmament are two basic and closely connected problems of the contemporary world - a great threat to world peace. It is generally agreed that the arms race, which is continuing at the same rate year after year, is the direct cause of a considerable reduction in the level of development of all countries without exception, especially of the developing world. The arms race is intensifying at a moment in world history when problems of poverty, food supplies and minimal health protection
are presenting themselves in a very acute form for almost two thirds of the total population on Earth. Though U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. recently agreed to come to some solution to cut down some of their arms, yet it is too early to say what will be the real solution to this problem.

The USSR Supreme Soviet and the CPSU Central Committee have issued the message of peace addressed to the Parliaments, Governments, Political parties and peoples of the world. Followings are some extracts to study their views:

"Our ideal, our unchanging aim and constant concern are that there should be universal peace, friendship and cooperation among peoples".

"The Great October Socialist Revolution rang a new epoch of history. Having shaken off social and national oppression working people created the land of Soviets a state that has asserted relations of fraternal friendship and equality among peoples ensuring true freedom, progress and prosperity to all nations. Durable, dependable and lasting peace is the first and most compelling need of all people of all nations of all human kind."

"The need for peace is of social significance today when countries have weapons that can destroy human civilization and all
life on our planet". "We urge quick and productive completion of the Soviet-U.S. talks on limiting and reducing strategic arms and on limiting nuclear armaments in Europe". "We offer coming to an agreement without delay on a no more new kinds and types of nuclear weapons may be developed. We urge the prohibition and destruction of chemical weapons."

"We want a strong United Nations organization with a bigger role in consolidating international peace and security".

"Soviet people are convinced that if countries and peoples combine their efforts they will eliminate the threat of war, preserve and consolidate peace on earth and ensure the human right to life.

The above statement rather commitment is a wonderful message, to establish world peace. India very highly appreciated USSR's view, because India has been preaching and proclaiming the same.

ECONOMIC DECLARATION:

In 1961 when they came together the Non-Aligned were a small radical grouping, predominantly of Afro-Asian countries. They were concerned with decolonization and keeping the 'Great Powrs' out of Afro-Asia, since 1961 the group of countries attending Non-Aligned Summits has steadily expanded in number and in the range
of topics with which it deals.

In the economic realm the Non-Aligned also operate as an international organization for the aggregation of demands. On the whole this is year to achieve than in the political realm. All the members are developing countries and the campaign for the New International Economic order (NIEO) has been the result of an impressive coalition making maximum use of the United Nations institutions to press joint demands. Nevertheless, even here there are several specific interests that have had to be incorporated the demands of the Least Developed for preferential treatment could have been to the disadvantage of their neighbours, who may be only slightly better off; the problems of the Land-Locked look somewhat different from the viewpoint of the government of a 'transit state'; and the communications needs of Island Developing countries are of a special kind. Since 1973 differences have also grown between the governments of oil producing and oil-importing countries. So far the Non-Aligned have kept these two groups together although, as we shall see later, this has not been without controversy.

In the economic realm the Non-Aligned have operated in a second, quite distinct manner. Since 1972, there has been the beginning of an integrative process. The Action Programme for Economic Co-operation first appeared in a rudimentary form at the
Georgetown Foreign Ministers' Conference, in August 1972 and has been elaborated year by year since then. With this programme the aim is not solely to present direct demands upon the international community: it is to find ways in which trade, technical information and work on development projects can originate from co-operation within the Third World. Progress in the Promotion of collective self-reliance has so far been slow and limited, but it is striking that the work has taken place within the framework of the Non-aligned Movement rather than the Group of seventy-seven. Yet some experts on international relations, let alone the interested layman, tend not to appreciate the role of the Non-Aligned in economic demand aggregation and in economic co-operation.

The Heads of State or Government (at the Non-Aligned in Havana) reviewed the evolution of the world economic situation and noted with grave concern that since the Fifth Summit conference, the economic problems facing the developing countries have become more acute, characterized by the continuing widening of the gap that separates the developed from the developing countries and by the stalemate in negotiations to restructure international economic relations.

They recognized that the crisis of the international economic system was a symptom of underlying maladjustments, and basic imbalance, aggravated by the unwillingness of developed
market economy countries to control their external imbalances, high levels of inflation and unemployment, thus resulting in the creation of new imbalances within the international economic system and in the transfer of their adverse effects to developing countries through international trade and monetary financial relations. They stressed that this crisis also results from the persisting inequality in international economic relations, characterized by dependency, exploitation and inequailaty.

The Heads of State or government once more stressed that the struggle to eliminate the injustice of the existing international economic system and to establish the New International Economic order is an integral part of the people’s struggle for political, economic, cultural and social liberation. The economic and social progress of developing countries has been adversely affected, directly or indirectly, by different forms of threat including the threats of military intervention or the use of force, pressure, coercion and discriminatory practices, and often result in the adoption of aggressive attitudes towards those who oppose their plans, to impose upon those countries political, social and economic structures which foster domination, dependence and exploitation of developing countries.

They solemnly reconfirmed their determination to strengthen their own struggle for national independence and economic emancipation, free development and the economic and social
progress. Of the Non-Aligned and other developing countries as a natural continuation of the historic progress which had led to the national liberation of their own countries, and which prompted them to endeavour to bring about new forms of international economic relations based on justice, sovereign equality and genuine international co-operation.

The Heads of State or Government once again solemnly emphasized the paramount importance of consolidating political independence by economic emancipation. They therefore reiterated that the existing international economic system runs against the basic interests of developing countries, is profoundly unjust and incompatible with the development of the Non-Aligned and other developing countries, nor does it contribute to the elimination of the economic and social evils that afflict these countries, these evils having been engendered by imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, expansionism, racism, including zionism, apartheid, exploitation, power politics and all forms and manifestations of foreign occupation, domination and hegemony. These practices have been repeatedly condemned by the Movement of Non-Aligned countries and they constitute major obstacles to the economic and social progress of developing countries and the main threat to World peace and security. Elimination of such practices is, therefore, a necessary condition for the achievement of development and international economic co-operation.
The Conference reiterated the historic mission that the movement of Non-Aligned countries should play in the struggle to attain the economic and political independence of all developing nations and peoples to exercise their full and permanent sovereignty and control over their natural and all other resources and economic activities, and to promote a fundamental restructuring of the world economy through the establishment of the New International Economic Order.

They were convinced that international economic relations are still characterized by the fundamental contradiction between the upholders of the status quo based on domination, dependency and exploitation, and the common struggle of the Non-Aligned and other developing countries for their liberation and economic development.

The Heads of State or Government reiterated that the persistent channelling of human and material resources into an arms race was unproductive, wasteful dangerous to humanity and incompatible with efforts to implement the New International economic order, and they reaffirmed the necessity and importance of adopting and applying measures for general and complete disarmament with all due speed and of using a substantial part of the resources thus released, particularly by the major powers, for the economic and social development of developing countries, which in turn will propel the growth of the developed countries, thus contributing to balanced growth in the world economy and to
the creation of a climate of international peace and security.

The conference reiterated its grave concern over the negligible progress that has been made in the negotiations for the implementation of the Declaration and Programme of Action on the establishment of the New International Economic Order adopted at the Sixth Special Session of the United Nations General Assembly owing to the lack of political will on the part of most of the developed countries and specifically condemned the dilatory, diversionary and divisive tactics adopted by these countries aimed at retaining their privileges in their relations with the developing countries.

The Conference emphasized the determination of the Non-Aligned and other developing countries to continue to harmonize their diversity of interests and evolve a unified position on issues under negotiation with the developed countries. The Heads of State or Government reiterated, moreover, that the establishment of the N.I.E.O. requires determined and effective action on the part of the developed countries in all the major areas of international economic relations. The developed world as a whole can no longer shy away from its share of responsibility under any pretext nor can it afford to ignore the fundamentally indivisible nature of the global prosperity. They also noted with grave concern that the existing international economic system is not only inequitable but is functioning inefficiently; it is not supportive of the process of
development in the developing countries. They emphasized that the establishment of the N.I.E.O. implied a basic restructuring of the world economy and in the light of past experience rejected the view that this restructuring could be achieved merely through the free play of market forces. The conference emphasized the close inter-relationship between problems and issues in the areas of trade, development, money and finance and stressed the need to set up within the framework of UNCTAD.

The Conference underscored that the establishment of the N.I.E.O. is one of the most important and most urgent tasks facing the Non-Aligned Movement and that democratization of international economic relations constitutes its political substance and that all countries, irrespective of their size, socio-economic systems and level of economic development should participate in its establishment. The N.I.E.O. as a global concept, by ensuring conditions for the progress of the developing countries, is beneficial to all countries.

The conference expressed profound concern over the secular deterioration in the conditions of developing countries' foreign trade. The continued escalation in the prices of manufactures, capital goods, food products and services imported by the developing countries and the stagnation and fluctuations in the prices of primary products exported by them have continued to exacerbate the trade gap between the developed and developing countries and resulted in a sharp decline in the terms of trade of
developing countries. They also considered it important to find appropriate and effective measures to deal with the worsening problem of inflection generated in the economies of industrialized countries and exported at very high rates to developing countries, and the responsibility for which lay with the industrialized countries. In this regard the conference highly appreciated the initiative of the Government of Iraq in submitting the proposal to establish an international fund in order to help developing countries alleviate the adverse effects of imported inflation. The conference expressed its deep dissonant with the protectionist measures introduced by certain developed countries in recent years. The Conference reiterated that the developed countries should eliminate existing protectionist and other barriers and refrain from creating new ones.

The Conference expressed its concern over the constant deterioration of the international monetary situation. The conference stressed the urgent need for the creation of a new international monetary system which should take into account fully the interests of the developing countries. The Heads of State or Government reiterated their concern over the tremendous increase in the foreign debt accumulated by the developing countries. They reaffirmed their deep conviction that a lasting solution to the problems of the developing countries can only be achieved by a consistent and fundamental restructuring of international economic relations through the establishment of the N.I.E.O.
The Heads of State or Government reaffirmed their firm resolve to resist most resolutely all attempts to divide and break the unity of the Non-Aligned and other developing countries. They denounced all attempts to oppose the just demands of Non-Aligned and other developing countries for restructuring the existing international economic system.

The Heads of State or Government reviewed the functioning of transnational corporations in Non-Aligned and other developing countries and once again denounced the unacceptable policies and practices of transnational corporations which, motivated by exploitative profits, exhaust the resources, distort the economics and infringe the sovereignty of developing countries; violate the principles of non-interference in the affairs of states; infringe the right of peoples to self-determination.

The Heads of State or Government examined the international situation and expressed with concern that the present international monetary system is not responsive to the development needs of the Non-aligned and other developing countries and has resulted in many cases in the increase of their dependency, continuous deterioration and weakness of their economies. The conference noted that much of the disequilibrium in the developing countries' balance of payments was due to factors external to the developing countries arising from fundamental maladjustments and inequities prevailing in the present world economic structures. However,
owing to the structure of the international monetary system, the burden of adjustment has fallen disproportionately on the developing countries with grave repercussions on their development programmes. They reiterated the urgent need to create a new rational, equitable and universal monetary system that would completely eradicate these phenomena and, in addition, would eliminate the predominant role of some reserve currencies, assure democratic participation of the developing countries in the decision-making process, ensure monetary and financial discipline in developed countries and a preferential treatment of developing countries.

The Heads of State or Government considered that the special session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1980 should review the implementation of the N.I.E.O. and take effective measures to promote its establishment. The conference, deeply concerned by the persistence and harmful impact of member countries of the Movement, and especially of African countries, requests the specialized financial and economic institutions of the Non-aligned countries, the developed countries, the competent United Nations institutions, and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations to intensify their technical and financial aid to these countries.

The Conference stressed that full participation by women in social, political, economic and cultural life was an important
index of progress and development. The Heads of State or Government called upon the Non-Aligned and other developing countries to participate effectively in the United Nations Conference on the Women's Decade and to adequately contribute to its preparations at the national, regional and inter-Regional levels, bearing in mind the interrelationship between enhancing the role of women in social and economic development and progress in the areas of health, education and employment in the Non-aligned and other developing countries.

The Heads of State or Government recognized and took into account the special difficulties facing the newly independent countries, especially the acute lack of infrastructure necessary for their economic development. They noted that the developing countries account for a little over 8 percent of the world's manufacturing output and that, if the present trend and pattern of growth were to continue, the Lima target of 25 percent by the year 2000 would be beyond reach.

The Heads of State or Government emphasized the role of redeployment of industries as a form of international industrial co-operation including recourse transfer aimed at establishing productive capacities in developing countries with a view to increasing their share in the total world industrial production based on their natural resources, development objectives and other socio-economic considerations.
The Heads of State or Government emphasized that the public sector and planning are important tools for the implementation of industrial policies within the national framework of industrialization programmes of developing countries. They welcomed the outcome of the negotiations on the transformation of UNIDO into a specialized agency and called upon all countries to take appropriate steps to ratify the agreement to convert UNIDO into a specialized agency with a view to the early start of its operations in that capacity.

The above declarations prove that the Sixth Summit Conference of the Non-Aligned in Havana really looked into a very vital step to strengthen the Non-aligned and developing countries in their economic spheres. Besides this the conference also recommended in other areas of Economic co-operation, such as Raw Materials, Trade, Transport Industrialization, Monetary, Financial Co-operation, Scientific and Technological Development, Technical Co-operation and Consultancy Services. Food and Agriculture, Fisheries, Insurance, Employment and Human Resources Development, Tourism, Transnational Corporations and Foreign Private Investment, Sports, Research and Information System, The Role of Women in Development, Peaceful use of Nuclear Energy, Telecommunications, Public Enterprises, and Solidarity Fund for Economic and Social development.

India has consistently advocated for the reduction of
economic disparities among nations as a means towards establishment of peace in the world. India continue to strive towards global negotiations for the amelioration of the steadily deteriorating state of the world economy. In view of the continuous deteriorating economic and social conditions in the developing countries which are suffering from a steady decline in commodity prices, and adverse balance of trade, intensification of protectionist measures on the part of the developed countries, excessive debt burden and a decline in the flow of finance which have caused unprecedented balance of payment problems for the developing countries, India has been consistently advocating a restructuring of the international financial and monetary institutions and a North-South dialogue for devising effective means to tackle these problems. Simultaneously, India has also called for a South-South dialogue to strengthen collective self-reliance among the developing nations. Smt. Indira Gandhi 'the Prime Minister of India gave a call for an international conference on money and finance with a view to restructuring the world economic system as a first step towards the establishment of a New International Economic order. In the promotion of South-South co-operation India has been extending economic and technical assistance to other developing countries and has sought to extend trade and commercial relations with them.

NON-ALIGNMENT AND THE INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC ORDER:

Non-Alignment is a political movement. In the years
following the Second World War, the so-called Super Powers, the U.S. and the USSR, found themselves in a state of severe tension. Allies during the war against a common enemy, they drew apart as soon as the war was over. The conflict was inevitable. The Western Powers had always regarded Communism as a menace to world order: the Soviet Union was suspect. The latter, on the otherhand, found itself in its early years surrounded by hostile forces and had to struggle hard to establish itself; its enemy was Western imperialism. If the great war provided an interregnum, it was because Fascist Germany emerged as a common menace. Mutual suspicion cropped up again in all its severity as soon as the war ended, with the common enemy Vanguished. There soon ensued a power struggle between the United States and the Soviet Union, each drawing allies to its side through treaties and pacts. If the interwar period was one of economic war period turned out to be one of political tension, and this arose as it happens from a concerted attempt on the part of the West to "Contain" Communism. It is this environment into which the 'Non-Aligned' movement was projected.

"What is the motivation behind Non-alignment? The politics of it is clear; the countries which became members of the movement did not wish to get involved in any possible conflict between the Super Powers. The leaders of the Non-aligned group, however, made it clear that their approach was not entirely negative. It is true that they would maintain a spirit of neutrality in their attitude towards the opposite camps. Yet, if occasion demanded, they would
as body, use their influence in international forms positively towards pace. The Non-Aligned group thus emerged willy-milly as a possible mediator between the two opossit camps, keeping equal distance from both."

New International Economic order is not altogether unconnected with the spirit of Non-Alignment. It is indeed no accident that the membership of the group 77 in the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) is drawn largely from the Non-aligned group of nations. The economics of Non-Alignment has never been spelt out. Avowedly its concern is with international politics. However, seeing that the nations that joined the group were all developing nations, most of them having just emerged from imperialist domination, one would not go wrong if one suspected that the movement could not be entirely devoid of economic implications. Placed as these countries were, their chief concern was to plan for rapid economic development. Most of these countries had just shaken off their political dependence. They knew that if their newly acquired freedom was to be preserved, their economic base had to be strengthened. The inspiration apparently come from Soviet Union. It was this country which had shown earlier how, through conscious planning of resources, it was possible for an economy to push up the peace of economic development. The Soviet Union was handicapped in the pre-war years because it was isolated. The situation changed after the war. The area under its control expanded; most of the East European
countries went the Soviet way. Would the developing countries in Asia and Africa go the same way? Their problem on the economic front was similar; it was to lift the economy up from a low base as quickly as possible. It is here that the Non-Aligned leadership intervened. The third force that it created would be Non-Aligned politically, keeping itself away from the Cold War between the two blocs; and yet on the economic front it would have positive relationship with both. It was thus open to these countries, in the process of planning, not only to take economic aid from, but also to expand their trade with, both the blocs. It is not an accident that in the case of India, for example, while the major share of the economic aid that it has received in the course of economic planning has come from the United states, it has continuously expanded its trade with the East European countries.

"It can indeed be said that the Group of 77, which came up in recent years, is the economic counterpart of the Non-Aligned group. Even as the Non-Aligned group, a political body, had an economic motive, which was to take as much benefit of trade and aid as possible from both blocs, the Group 77, an economic body, is designed essentially as a bargaining force, which is of a political nature. The demand for a New International Economic order is indeed an assertion of a certain common will on the part of the weaker nations of the world.

The concept of the N.I.C.O. specifies a certain structural
change in the economic relation between the developed and the developing countries which involves a redistribution of the world's wealth in favour of the latter. It aims at the establishment of an order, such as it would tend to be if we had a world government. The Brandt Commission indeed imagines as if we had one, and asks if it is no feasible to devise a system of international taxation on a sliding scale according to a country's ability. The concept rests in the ultimate analysis or more considerations: rules of justice prescribe that the rich should contribute to the amelioration of the poor. The demand of the developing countries for a New International Economic Order will acquire credibility to the extent that they are prepared to accept the implications of the rule of justice in their dealings among themselves.

The achievement of a "New International Economic Order" or NIEO (involving structural changes in the present international monetary, financial, trade and industrial institutions and systems) and "global negotiations" for the purpose in the UN forum are two of the most important issues before the Non-Aligned countries.

The U.S.A. and a few other developed countries however are basically opposed to both: to the NIEO because it will reduce their economic dominance and to global negotiation in the UN forum because they will lose the weighted voting advantage that they have in the International Monetary Fund and the world Bank. The IMF and
the World Bank (together with GATT, the General Agreement on
Teriffs and Trade) which are the Keystones of the present
international economic order are overwhelmingly dominated by the
U.S.A. with the help of weighted voting power to control the
economic policies of the developing countries in particular.

Neo-Classical economy policy is the basic philosophy of these
institutions and they do not give due consideration to the
handicaps that face the developing countries as a result of
unequal competition. Suitable reform of these institutions is
essential if the developing Countries are to get a fair deal.

For the present, therefore, the developing countries would
be well advised to build the IMF, the World Bank Group, GATT,
UNCTAD and UNIDO (the United Nations Industrial Development
Organization) pressing for their reform as and when feasible. Such
reform may be easier if the main allies of the USA. Like West
Germany, Japan and UK can be won over and the important lobbies in
the USA itself, having trade interest in developing countries, can
be persuaded to appreciate their own long term self-interest. Non-
Aligned countries need to make a special effort to cultivate these
lobbies in view of their influence on the US Congress and the key
position of the USA in the world economy.

"The road to a New International Economic order will not be
easy of short. But the developing countries must keep on marching along this road. If there have to be diversionary or nibbling or even holding operations at times, that should not be taken as a sign of defeat, but only as a preparation for a massive assault at a more opportune time. Care needs to be taken, however, all the time, that the divide and rule policy of some hegemonistic countries does not deplete the ranks of the Non-Aligned."(36)

The above study shows how much the Non-Aligned countries feel about a better world. A place where every single nation and its people will live peacefully, unexploited and will have equal fair deal to prosper and progress. These developing countries need equal opportunities a political and economical freedom. This is what Non-Aligned countries' aim and aspirations are. To establish a better world free from fear and tensions. The Non-Aligned countries want to create a peaceful atmosphere in the world, whatever ways and means are possible. Indian in particular believes in establishing a world where all peoples could live as a family, this is what India is trying for. India wanted to live with all her neighbouring countries in peace and friendship. From the beginning of India's independence the great leader Mahatma Gandhi expressed his heart felt opinion on April 1947 on the eve of India's independence. "Of course, I believe in our world. How can I possibly do otherwise, You and I are the inheritors of the message of love that these great and unconquerable taxchers have left for us. You can re-deliver that message now in this age of
democracy in the age of an awakening of the poorest of the Poor."

The above statement shows how much Mahatma Gandhi wanted that the whole world should live in harmony as a family. Today Non-Aligned countries are also very much keen to exchange mutual culture among the countries. Culture and education promotion among the countries in a very vital and important factor which brings different countries in one accord. Therefore, the Sixth Summit Conference of Non-Aligned at Havana (3–9 September 1979) felt it so important to stress and emphasize the promotion of culture and cultural co-operation among Non-Aligned countries:

The heads of State or Government consider development as a process which integrates indivisibly all manifestation of social creativity and implies the active participation of all sections of the population, and therefore reaffirm that man with all his material, intellectual, spiritual, aesthetic and other aspirations, is the goal of development.

They therefore consider development to be closely linked to the simultaneously promotion, not only of economy, education, science and technology, but also of culture. There is no two opinions about it that mutual cultural understanding brings two different countries to one common understanding. This cultural medium helps peoples of the world to come closer to each other and
while they understand each other's way of life, they understand each other better, which no other media can promote. The affirmation of cultural identity, in fact, underlies the will to establish a new international economic order in which the appreciation of the values of different Civilizations could contribute towards defining original models of endogenous development.

The Heads of State or Government requested UNESCO to pursue its consideration of this so as to ensure that the cultural dimension of development is duly taken into account in the work of the preparatory Committee for the New International Development Strategy.

India is very keen to develop her relations with all other countries with the help of cultural media. For example:

**Indo-CZCH Cultural Cooperation:** India and Czecoslavikia signed in 1984 a programme of cultural-scientific and Technical co-operation for the year 1984-86. In the field of Art and Cultural, besides the exchange of exhibits, writers and performing delegations, the programme also provides for the award of scholarship for learning music of each other's country. In the field of mass media, provision has been made for continuation, participation in each other's international film festivals, exchange of journalists and persons working in the media. In the field of sports, provision
had been made for the visit of a yoga expert from India to Czechoslovakia.

**Indo-Mexican Cultural Relations:** In the last three decades India and Mexico have cooperated closely and worked hand-in-hand to promote the cause of world peace, disarmament and development. Narendra P. Jain, an expert on Mexican culture and history holds that Indo-Mexican relations have, for long, been characterized by warmth, understanding and similarity of outlook. There is tremendous interest in India's culture in Mexico.

A cultural exchange programme for Co-operation and exchanges in the field of education, art and culture, child welfare, youth activities and mass media was signed between India and Mexico on January 30, 1985.

Thus, this proves India's views and attitudes towards peace, friendship and cordial relations with all the countries of the world, whatever manner or media India could afford to establish good and friendly relations.
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