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INTRODUCTION

A BRIEF HISTORY OF INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY:

Foreign policy of India or any other country must be distinguished from the great mass of heterogenous contacts which its individuals, groups and the government have with their counter-parts in other States. It involves the formulation and implementation of a group of principles which shape the behaviour-pattern of a State while negotiating with other States to protect or further its interests. In its broadest sense, an analysis of foreign policy may include an investigation of the underlying principles which shape policy objectives, the factors which condition the formulation of policy, the agencies involved in policy-making, the planning process, and the techniques and instruments utilized in policy execution. The basic and the simplest thing is the policy goals.

In a sense before 1947 India had no foreign policy, for in relation to every country, it was determined by the British Government. Actually India's foreign policy is an outgrowth
of the past ways of thinking of the people and the past declaration of their leaders. The stand of the Indian National Congress at its Madras Session in 1927 was very much against the use of India as a base for the Britishers' launching attacks on the freedom of other peoples. Nehru's participation in the Conference of Anti-imperialist League at Brussels and the affirmation of India's alignment with all anti-imperialist forces, the condemnation by Madras Congress Party's repeated resolutions against participation in the war for which preparations were then going on in Europe; and the anti-colonial attitude of the Indian leaders, laid the foundations of Nehru's foreign policy for India.

These ideas also received an organic shape in one of the Directive Principles of State Policy of the Indian Constitution which requires the State "to endeavour to promote international peace and security, to maintain just and honourable relations between the nations, to foster respect for international law and treaty obligations and to encourage settlement of international disputes by arbitration".

The character and the tradition of a people also factors of considerable importance in the formulation and implementation of a country's foreign policy. No policy can go very far if it is divorced from people's thinking. Foreign rule produced an antagonistic attitude to western domination over Asian and
African peoples and created intense hostility against racial discrimintion. Naturally anti colonialism and racial equality turned out to be the cardinal principles of India's foreign policy. Thus India's refusal to join any military pact - SEATO (1954) and Baghdad Pact (1955) was largely due to the belief that these alliances represented an indirect return of the western powers to former colonial areas.

INDIA'S FOREIGN POLICY:

These attributes led to the formulation of certain basic principles of India's foreign policy which are as follows:

(i) International peace and security
(ii) Self determination for colonial peoples
(iii) Opposition to racialism
(iv) Peaceful settlement of disputes
(v) Non-Alignment as a positive means of adopting independent judgement on all issues and support to the Afro-Asian Community of nations and world organization. All other features of India's foreign policy are merely the outgrowth of these elements.

India's approach to foreign policy was characertrized by several distinguishing features. By 1954 India had established herself the largest democracy in the world an important member of the World Community and perhaps as the most important in the then-emerging Asian-African Community of nations. She had
followed a distinctive foreign policy of her own and which has been recognized as such by other nations as well. By her politics and actions in international affairs she had tried to befriend every nation, including especially those countries which differed from her politically and ideologically or in respect the country and the integrity of her policies. The world-image India had created of herself was that of a resurgent and populous Asian Country trying to catch up with the economic and social progress in some other parts of the world especially in the economic sphere; of a country determined and capable of contributing her mite to the promotion of peace and friendship among nations of an Asian country upholding and fighting for the rights of the colonial peoples; of a country strongly opposed to racial discrimination and standing for the establishment of an egalitarian human society; and finally, of a nation exposing all progressive causes and working for every kind of international co-operation, both in breadth and depth, and with accelerated speed as well.

As far as India's cultural background is concerned, history proves that the people of India by and large were peaceful. The great religious of this land - Buddhism and Jainism had taught the principles of non-violence, peace and co-existence. Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru himself disclaimed that "the foreign policy of India was based on certain fundamental concepts which arose from the "mind and heart of India" and it would asserted itself
under any circumstances."(1) In one of his characteristic academic exposition on foreign policy, Nehru said there were several school of though on foreign policy (affairs). The school which believed in strong action, the other which talked about negotiating through strength and finally, there was the school of thought—"ignorant confusion" India's foreign policy belonged to none of these schools of thought. It was a clear, simple and straight forward policy which of course benefited her, but which equally sought to promote the course of world peace. It did not try to cheat or hoodwink any nation. Like some other powerful nations "We do not know how to play on the world chessboard". (2)

Pandit Nehru was real archetec of India's foreign policy. Nehru always advocated peace for international peace and security. It was therefore, peaceful co-existence of nations was not merely desirable in itself, but was also "positive, constructive approach, not a passive, negative, neutral approach, Said Nehru". (3) India's Message to the world was insistence on peaceful methods to solve all problems violent methods solved nothing, in the Indian view, and indeed they started a vicious of bitterness, hatred and violence. The peace that India conceived of was not the one based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments, such a peace would not secure the unanimous, lasting and since support of the peoples of the world. It must
be found. if it was to fail upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind. Peace can only be preserved by methods of pace. Peace preserved by threats is unstable, more especially when the party threatened is not weak. Peace cannot live in an atmosphere of constant preparation for war and threats of war, therefore, peace as well as security can best be maintained by efforts, however small, to create a peace area. Pandit Nehru was really a true messenger of peace. Speaking at the end of the first meeting of the Colombo Conference of Southeast Asian Prime Ministers, he said "peace can only come if we endeavour to establish the climate of peace. It is not by condemnation or mutual recrimination that we shall achieve this goal. We must forget past conflicts and past grievances and decide to make a new approach to each other in spirit of tolerance and forbearance, with charity towards all and malice towards none". (4) At other occasion he once again emphasised the very point. "When one wants peace, one must think of peace and prepare for peace, instead of thinking of war and preparing for war". (5) Therefore Pandit Nehru preached the principles of Panchsheel all over the world.

**PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE OR PANCHSHEEL**: The chief positive means by which India sought to achieve the goals of her foreign policy is by following the concept and principle of peaceful co-existence of nations of diverse ideologies and interests. The idea that peoples of different religious and systems of philosophy could
live and work together is as old as the Indian civilization. Free India has sought to apply this concept and principle in the realm of foreign relations in the context of rival economic and social systems and ideologies. Early in 1954 this concept was given certain precision and formal recognition in what later came to be known as the Panchsheel or Five Principles. These principles were first formally enunciated in the India-China agreement dated 29 April over trade and intercourse between the Tibetan Region of China and India. That agreement stated in the preamble that it was based on the following principles:

(i) Mutual respect for each other's territorial integrity and sovereignty.
(ii) Non-aggression
(iii) Non-interference in each other's internal affairs
(iv) Equality and mutual benefit
(v) Peaceful co-existence.

Pt. Nehru's life mission was peace preaching and peace practicing. Throughout his life he gave much importance to this method for international issue, while speaking at civic reception to Mr. Bulganin and Mr. Khrushchev, Calcutta, November 30, 1955. Pt. Nehru stressed - "Five Principles of Panchsheel form the basis of our relations with other nations, we are convinced that on this basis the relationship between countries will be healthy. Peaceful and co-operative, because it rests on equality and
mutual respect and peaceful co-existence, and rules out aggression and internal interference. Trouble arises when one country dominates over another or interferes in another's internal affairs. If Panchsheel is fully and sincerely accepted by all countries, peace would be everywhere, and co-operation would follow. This does not mean that all countries should be alike or should follow the same policies. It means that each country should be free to develop itself as it chooses and yet be friendly to others. India and Soviet Union have different political and economic systems. Nevertheless, we are friendly countries and co-operate in many ways because we respect each other's freedom and way of life and do not wish to interfere.

Further he mentioned, peaceful co-existence is not a new idea for us in India. It has been our way of life and is as old as our thought and culture. About 2,200 years ago, a great son of India, Ashoka, proclaimed it and inscribed it on rock and stone, which exist today and give us this message. Ashoka told us that we should respect the faith of others, and that a person who extols his own faith and decries another faith injures his own faith. This is the lesson of tolerance and peaceful co-existence and co-operation which India has believed in through the ages. In the old days, we talked of religion and philosophy; now we talk more of the economic and social system. But the approach is the same now as before.

That is the reason why we try to be friendly with all
countries whether we agree with them or not. That is the reason why we refrain from criticizing other countries even when we disagree with their policies, unless circumstances compel us to explain our viewpoint.

From this it has naturally followed that we should keep ourselves free from military or like alliances and from the great power groups that dominate the world today. It is no spirit of pride or arrogance that we pursue our own independent policy. We would not do otherwise unless we are false to everything India has stood for in the past and stands for today. We welcome association and friendship with all and the flow of thought and ideas of all kinds, but we reserve the right to choose our own path. This is the essence of Panchsheel.

Pt Nehru very distinctively made clear India's views in his above address. India fully believes and acts on the principles of Panchsheel. The novelty of India's contribution lies in seeking to make these principles the basis of practical state policy and conduct in international relations. Both because of their old usage and similarity to the principles of the U.N. Charter (The U.N. Secretary-General, Dag Hammars Skjold, stated that Panchsheel was a reaffirmation of the obligation and aims of the United Nations. The Five Principles of Co-existence, he said, seemed to be helpful to the United Nations. The Hindu, 3 February 1956, according to Nehru, while speaking at the 9th
Session of the General Conference held at New Delhi, these principles were in full conformity with the aims and objects of the UNESCO.

In the atomic and nuclear age, the alternative to co-existence is as Nehru put it, "Co-destruction". But "Even as peaceful Co-existence is wholly unavoidable, it did not mean surrender of one's convictions to appeasement or defeatism, it only meant readiness and willingness to understand and appreciate one another's point of view in international relations"(5)

The concept of peaceful co-existence meant neither neutrality nor an attempt to build some kind of a third bloc of nations; nor was it a passive approach to clear while addressing to the Yugoslav Parliament on 3 July 1955. Belief in peaceful co-existence did not also mean putting up with a present evil - as some critics sought to imply - like colonialism and racialism. In practice, it would mean willingness to live and work with other nations and the desire and attempt to effect a peaceful change with a friendly approach - With no fear, hatred or aggressive intent. Nehru told the Prime Minister of Pakistan that a declaration of adherence to Panchsheel "gives far greater assurance of security and friendly relations than military pacts or military preparations. To agree to any such declaration does not mean that we should not try to solve our problems. It means
that we should not solve them in a better and more friendly atmosphere, having ruled out the possibility of a recourse to war..."(7)

India posed these Five Principles as a challenge to all countries of the world even though some countries had ridiculed or criticized it. Nehru wanted to every country to say whether or not it agree to it. "The Panchsheel are a challenge of Asia to the rest of the world. And each country will have to give a straight answer to this question." He went to the extent of asserting that if the world honestly accepted the Five Principles, especially the principles of non-interference in internal affairs of other countries, then 90 per cent of the present day problems of the world certainly be solved. I have no doubt about it".(8)

As far as India was concerned, she sought to follow the principles of Panchsheel towards all countries of the world. Whether or not these other countries had expressed formal adherence to them. Thus, Marshal Tito while broadcasting over the All India Radio on 20 December 1954 said, "India is endeavouring to develop the broadest possible measure of cooperation with the widest number of states"

OPPOSITION TO COLD WAR:

The negative aspect of the Panchsheel approach is
opposition to 'Cold War' and all that it represents. India is therefore absolutely opposed to this 'war of ideologies' which in the words of Pt. Nehru "Smacked of all the bigotry fanaticism and intolerance which characterized the religious crusades of Europe."(9) This state of 'armed fear' as India's Vice-President Dr. Radhakrishnan put it was not peace 'but a precarious equilibrium in which dissension does not declar itself because of mutual fear'. It led one nowhere, prevented a peaceful approach and might in fact end up accidently in a "hot war". In fact there was no logic in the 'cold war' when once a 'hot war' is ruled out because of the likely result of such war - destruction of the human race - with the use of atomic and Hydrogen weapons. It only resulted in keeping up an atmosphere of hatred, fear and the ever present danger of war. It 'completely lacks sense'. Therefore, India along with other Asian countries hoped to build an 'area of peace'. The larger this area is, the more the danger of war recedes. If the whole world is divided up into two major and hostile camps, then, there is no hope for the world and war becomes inevitable. The Government of India is keen on avoiding in word and deed, or demonstration, of India's military strength lest India should even appear to be the 'big bully' in the context of a dispute or controversy with a small neighbour. Even though India had the largest professional army in South and Southeast Asia, the accent of defence policy was on defensive, rather than deterrent, power. India had never any intention to produce nuclear weapons or to equip her armed forces with those weapons. These are the proofs which refer to the foreign policy
as such, this is obviously true that Non-Alignment policy of India so important means in her foreign policy formulation.

This Indian policy is based on India's past traditions, her present geo-political standing, as well as the fact of bipolarization of a large number of countries of the world into two blocks for the purpose of dealing with each other India's foreign policy is "not born out of a sharp intellect, but is the direct result of the old ways and old mind that moulded their policy during their freedom movement. India has no desire whatever to get involved in the power politics of the two blocs of nations it did not benefit her national interest and it is not conducive to the maintenance or promotion of world peace from the latter point of view, while her openly joining either bloc would add little to the strength of that group (because of her economic and military weakness), and not necessarily promote the cause of world peace. By remaining outside both the blocs, she might serve as a bridge between the two blocs, and perhaps, on occasions be also able to tilt the balance of power in favour of world peace.

It is quite appropriate here to mention that all the Prime Ministers of India so far we have, believed in peace. Rajiv Gandhi even reiterated his commitment to the basic approach and principles of foreign policy, bequeathed by Jawaharlal Nehru and Indira Gandhi. He said "We have always believed in working for peace. Our policy is to be friends with all countries on the
basis of reciprocity and mutual benefit. Our commitment to Non-
Alignment and new economic order based on justice, equality and
mutual co-operation is unshakable. This means a total dedication
to the twin causes of peace and development. We also believe in
safeguarding the independence of states and upholding the
principles of non-interference and non-intervention".

Nehru believed that peace and freedom are indivisible and
the denial of freedom anywhere must endanger freedom elsewhere
and lead to conflict and war. When China attacked India in 1962,
Pt. Nehru's speech is worth admirable in this context that how much
he had given important to peace" we are all men and women of
peace in this country, conditioned to the ways of peace, we are un
used to the necessities of war. Because of this, we endeavour to
follow a policy of peace even when aggression to place on our
territory. We explored avenues for an honourable settlement by
peaceful methods. That was our policy all over the world, and
we tried to apply it even in our own country. We know the
horrors of war in this age today, and we have done our utmost to
prevent war from engulfing the world.

Nehru made a fine blend of reality and ideal in his foreign
policy. He was of the opinion that ideology and reality are
inseparable in international affairs. According to him "If it is
(foreign policy) not idealistic, it becomes sheer opportunism; if
it is not realistic then it is likely to be adventurist and
wholly ineffectdive")

A HISTORIC AFRO-ASIAN LEAP - BANDUNG CONFERENCE - 1965

The Bandung Conference of 29 Afro-Asian countries, to be a great achievement, is a unified successful crusade of Asian and African countries against imperialism and cold war rivalries with ideological and moral basis. As a backdrop of the conference the world situation was not free from tension. The communist China had resumed the bombing over the two island of Quemoy and Matsu which were under the control of Formosa which had entered into military pact with America, on February 28, 1955, Gaza town of Egypt was raided by Israel causing human loss to both sides. This resulted in ultimate military aid by Russia to Egypt which in turn led to the chain of events. America's withdrawal of financial help for Aswan dam of Egypt, Egypt nationalization of Suez canal, finally tripartite aggression of France, England and Israel on Egypt in October 1956.

Besides SEATO, Baghdad military pact was signed in West Asia, between Iran and Turkey on 24 February 1955. The New emerging West Asian leader Colonel Nasser was very critical about it and bitterly opposed. He called Baghdad Pact as "Crazy" aimed at isolating and disturbing the Arab League. Thus naturally he was prone towards India and other countries who criticised military pacts.
The response of big powers was mixed with regard to this conference. Russia by its change of leadership from Malakov to Maltov became favourable and had accepted the five principles of co-existence which according to Maltov had always been the policy of Russia. China favourably remarked it as the first step towards peace. Dulles, the then Secretary of the State of U.S. in his fanatic way called it "doubly dangerous". This led to hesitated joining of the Conference of its Afro-Asian allies like Philippines, Turkey, Japan, Pakistan, Libya, Ethiopia etc. Britain was passive to the Conference.

The conference marked the cleavage of distinction between aligned and Non-Aligned countries both embarking on projecting their righteous direction.

The agenda included the problems relating to economic co-operation, peaceful uses of nuclear energy, cultural co-operation relating to dependent people, human rights and self determination, the promotion of world peace and co-operation, control of weapons of mass destruction and universality of U.N. membership. It should be clear here to mention that all these principles are the sole concern of the Non-Aligned group in international politics and base of the Third World.

Dr. Ahmed Sukarno observed in his president's opening address stressing the need for unity of action "let us remember
that the stature of all mankind is diminished so long as nations or parts of nations are still unfree. Let us remember that the highest purpose of man is the liberation of man from his bonds...". A strong devotion to anti-colonialism, this story denunciation of colonialism was loomed large in almost all speeches of the conference. In this conference a very outstanding thing was the Chinese active and conciliating role coming out from its traditional isolation.

When the formulation of principles for "Declaration on world peace and co-operation" came up there was some controversy arised. But Pt. Nehru made an impressive statement which had great impact on conference. He observed, "I belong to neither bloc and I propose to belong to neither whatever happens in the world... my country suffers from no fear complex. We rely on nobody except on friendship of others... Even single country make a difference when the scales are evenly balanced... If I join any of these big groups, I loose my identity ... If all the world were to be divided up between these two blocs what would be result. The inevitable result would be war ... pact has brought insecurity, not security to the countries which have entered into them ... The so called five principles are not magic formula ... It is something which meets needs of the day. (11)

The Bandung declaration includes provision for collective defence within the perview of UN Charter. The declaration went further for two specific safeguards i.e. there should be no
external pressure on nations with regard to this and that collective defence arrangements should not be used to serve the particular interests of the big powers. These incidently ruled out any military pacts with big powers. Declaration adhered to the values of human rights.

In the economic field the conference touched on many aspects and called for mutual co-operation with regard to trade and transport problems. It called for the creation of special United Nations Fund for economic development. Similarly with regard to cultural field tracing back to the history intra Afro-Asian countries of co-operation they called for the furtherence of mutual exchange of cultural values. Though some people criticised the conference yet the conference succeeded in relaxing the tension between China and Formosa and China released the captured American pilots. By 'package deal' five of the states recommended at Bandung were granted. U.N. Membership, by the end of 1955. By 1956 many Arab States recognized China. Panchsheel in its essential sense was adopted by U.N. General Assembly on 14 December 1957.

One major thing which come out of the conference was that it led the Non-Aligned countries to reasses their stance with regard to Afro-Asian movement which has demonstrated its importance since its inception and they paved the way for the stage of Non-Alignment.
Pt. Nehru played a very vital part in this conference. He took the lead in formulating the tasks for the Bandung Conference. In a note sent to other Prime Ministers before the Bogor meeting (Dec. 28-29) he suggested that, "whole object should be to create an atmosphere of co-operation and to put Asia and Africa more in the world picture since the old balance no longer hold good."(12)

For Nehru and for other leaders of Afro-Asian nations, Bandung meant the opposite of what China was preparing for though deception and deceit. Nehru went to the conference as the envoy of resurgent Asia, proclaiming its indomitable spirit of unity and invincibility, it indestructible solidarity which Africa for the common task of evading the common enemy - Colonialism - for preventing its re-entry directly or indirectly, for disentangling the two continents from the web of Western pacts, and for building a new world order based on peace, justice and equality. Above all he went to Bandung with desire to assert Panchsheel as a general principle of international conduct as the only possible basis of world peace. He told the Indian Parliament that Panchsheel was a challenge to the people of Asia, to the rest of the world and each country would have to give a direct answer. He hoped each country would be asked to say whether it stood for non-agression and non-interference or not.

It would not be wrong to say that the most important document to emerge from Bandung was the unanimously adopted
Declaration on Promotion of Universal Peace and co-operation. It proclaimed the following principles rightly called the Distillation of the Bandung Spirit.

(1) Observance of basic human rights and the U.N. Charter.
(2) Respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all countries.
(3) Recognition of the equality of all races and nations, big and small.
(4) Renunciation of intervention and interference in the internal affairs of the country.
(5) Respect for the right of each country to individual and collective defence in conformity with the U.N. Charter.
(6) Renunciation of use of this right in the interests of any great power and to refrain from pressurising other countries.
(7) Abstention from acts or threats of aggression or the use of force against the territorial integrity and independence of any country.
(8) Settlement of all international disputes peacefully in conformity with the U.N. Charter.
(9) Promotion of mutual interests and co-operation.
(10) Respect for justice and international commitments.

The Bandung Conference, met at a time when international relations were still dominated by the spirit of cold war started by the West. Since the Conference was held, the world has
undergone a vast change in the political, economic and social fields to the detriment of imperialism and reaction and in favour of the forces of national liberation, social progress and world peace. The colonial system of imperialism has finally disintegrated and the western world is going through a still deeper crisis. The assertion of the principles of Bandung in international relations has been facilitated in a large measure by the fact that the economic and defence potential of socialist countries and newly independent states has grown immeasurably and a favourable international climate of detente has been created as a result of the role played by the peace forces and the Non-Aligned countries in the world.

U.S.A. - THE ENEMY OF NON-ALIGNMENT:

The history of the United States of America, closely linked to the history of oppression, exploitation, intervention and aggression to which the underdeveloped nations now comprising the Non-Alignment movement have been subjected in the past; is a factor to take into account when defining the position of the United States towards the Non-Aligned countries. It is also important to underline that, due to their imperialist nature, the interests of the United States will never coincide with those of the Non-Aligned countries. (13)

The above statement is self proved that one of the super powers attitude is not friendly with the Third World-Countries.
The Non-Aligned movement will never forget that in the very early years of the movement, the then U.S. Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, called it "immoral". This arch-reactionary and enemy of freedom at first tried to win over leaders of the newly free developing countries to his side in the cold war which he had initiated. But he had to deal with such stalwarts as Nehru, Nasser and Tito and they certainly would not tow his time. In his annoyance, anger and disappointment he called Nehru a "Communist" though Nehru never was one, but a firm believer in Socialism.

The very first steps of the Non-Aligned movement were met with wariness and even frank hostility by the U.S.A. Since U.S.A. had appointed itself the gendarme of the so called "Free World", it was natural that the other imperialist states fell in line with U.S.A. Professor Cecil Van Meter Crab Jr. of the U.S. remembered that from the very start neutralism aroused concern and scepticism, if not downright hostility, in U.S. ruling quarters. During the postwar years world imperialism led by U.S.A directed its efforts to settling up a system of regional military and political blocs in Asia under the banner of combating the "Communist menace" (SEATO, the Baghdad Pact, the mutual defence treaty between the U.S.A. and Tasiwan, the Japanese-American Treaty etc.) The U.S. succeeded in drawing in to SEATO such Asian countries as the Philippines, Thailand and Pakistan, which already had military agreement with the U.S. Iraq, Turkey, Iran.
and Pakistan were pulled into Baghdad Pact. Under these circumstances the firm refusal of a number of major non-socialist countries in South and South-East Asia (India, Indonesia, Burma, Ceylon) to join any of the military and political blocs aroused the fury of the neocolonialists. The attitude towards the Non-Aligned Countries in Asia and Africa was frankly hostile and was determined by the harsh formula; if you are not with us, you are against us. Right up to the end of the fifties, the ruling circles in U.S.A. and the West insisted that the young sovereign states make their choice in the struggle between the two world social systems. That was, in effect, tantamount to demanding that they support the aggressive policy of imperialism.

To influence the choice of the Non-Aligned countries, all kinds of tactics were employed, including foreign aid. Here is a typical example. The U.S. economic and technical aid programme for 1953 envisaged aid to India worth 115 million dollars. Burma 0.45 million dollars. But even these sums, modest as they were compared with U.S. military aid (more than 535 million Dollars to the countries of South and South-East Asia and Taiwan in 1952 fiscal year) were slashed by congress, so that India got less than 43.6 million Dollars, Burma about 7 million. Indonesia about 3.5 million dollars and Ceylon nothing at all. During the debate on aid to India, congressman Davis of Georgia declared that the building in India of such projects as a steel mill, fertilizer
factory and the like was impermissible. Congressman Smith of Virginia was even more frank and more cynical. His refusal to vote for the foreign aid bill was motivated by the fact that he had never heard Jawaharlal Nehru say anything favourable about the United States.

"So it wasn't surprising that the Bandung Conference got a hostile reception from apologists - both open and disguised - of imperialism and neocolonialism. They predicted failure of the conference and did everything to exacerbate the real and imaginary differences between its participants. But their efforts were in vain. The Conference surmounted its difficulties and completed its work successfully". (14)

From the beginning of the sixties U.S. leaders stopped openly demonstrating their hostility to Non-alignment and even found something favourable to say about the movement. The new tactics adopted by the imperialists were designed to draw the young Afro-Asian States away from active anti-imperialist struggle and divert them from positive neutrality to an "intermediary way of development" that would weaken the every growing ties between the national liberation forces and world socialism.

This policy of seeking closer relations with the Afro-Asian Non-Aligned countries found its logical extension in Lyndon
Johnson's Asian doctrine Richard Nixon's Guam doctrine, and General Ford's concept of preserving an American presence in Asia. The purpose of all these doctrines, and purpose of the policy of the Carter Administration, has been to camouflage the imperialist presence in Asia, a presence that is in direct contradiction with the aspirations of the Non-Aligned countries to set up peace zones, nuclear-free zones, neutral zones etc. in Asia and Africa.

"In reality, however, imperialism is no less aggressive today than it was in the past. It was with imperialism's, especially U.S.A's direct participation or direct incitement that military conflicts have flared up in the world since 1945, most of them in the developing countries, especially those rich in raw materials or those with a strategic location. At one time certain circles in the west even circulated the theory that the reduced threat of a global war makes local wars and conflicts increasingly probable and almost inevitable."(15)

Such theories are extremely dangerous because of the huge casualties suffering and because they endanger world conflicts. The U.S. however, as constituted today makes this danger very real. As former American Senator W. Fullbright stressed the U.S. has created a society which mainly engages in violence. It is internal militarism and not an external force that represents the most serious threat to the U.S. According to the Brookings Institute, from January 1, 1946 to December 31, 1975 the U.S.
has resorted to force 215 times to achieve its political aims i.e. once every two months. Below is given a list showing only the cases of major U.S. armed interference in the affairs of other states in the postwar period.

Ironically, the first country to suffer under U.S. militarists was China, now U.S.A.’s great friend and ally. During 1945-49 as much as 110,000 strong American expeditionary corps in China occupied the main strategic points in that country. The U.S. air Force gave direct support to the troops of Chiang-Kai-Shok aimed at preserving the Kuomintang regime and putting down the liberation struggle of the people. It is quite pertinent here to give some examples to show the sufferings of the countries by U.S. imperialists.

Greece 1946-1949 Military intervention to support reactionary and monarchical forces in the civil war. Two British divisions were air-lifted to greece on U.S. war planes. The officials aim of intervention was to prevent the seizure of Greece by communists.

Korea - 1950. The U.S. participated in the hostilities of the South Korean regime, which tries to occupy the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Mathew Ridgeway, commander of U.S. troops in Korea, said that the U.S., was interested in killing as many Chinese and Koreans as possible. The toll of U.S. aggression runs to more than 1,300,000 Koreans.
Guatemala - 1954. Armed invasion of Guatemala to overthrow the legitimate government of President Arbenz who pursued an independent policy. U.S. pilots were involved in this intervention.

Lebanon - 1958. The units of the Second Marine operational brigade landed on the shores of Lebanon, not far from Beirut from transport ships under the cover of the U.S. Sixth Fleet. Besides ground forces from the U.S. 7th field army deployed in the FRG, and formations of U.S. Air Force were dispatched to Lebanon on the excuse that Lebanon was threatened with the danger of Communist infiltration.

Cuba - 1961. A brigade of U.S. mercenaries landed on the southern coast of Cuba, in the area of the Cochinos Bay. American B-26 aircraft flown by U.S. pilots participated in the operation. By organising the invasion, the U.S. expected to overthrow the people's government of Field Castro and to restore a pro-American dictatorship in the country.

Dominican Republic - 1965. In violation of the Charter of the Organisation of American States, the U.S. armed forces made a landing in the Dominican Republic. Its aim was to "straighten things out American style" and put in power a government that suited U.S. monopolies.

1973 the number of U.S. troops in Vietnam tolled 525,000. About 1.5 million civilians were killed and wounded in South Vietnam alone.

Cambodia - 1970. The U.S. brought troops into Cambodia, and for two months was engaged in military operations against the Cambodian people. Its aim was to pave the ground for establishing a pro-American regime in the country.

Laos - 1971. The U.S. was engaged in active combat operations in Laos to prevent the country's patriotic forces from consolidating their contacts with the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Major contingents Saigon troops were brought into Southern Laos. Their offensive was supported by U.S. Air Force and Artillery.

Angola - 1975. The U.S. built an 'air brigade' to supply the ganges of its stooge, H. Roberto, with arms U.S. Secretary of State H. Kissinger, saw to it that 14 million dollars were annually allocated for military aid to UNITA rebels. U.S. military instructors trained the rebels. Its aim was to overthrow the people's government of Angola.

Persian Gulf - 1980. By January 1980, on the approaches of the Persian Gulf, the U.S. had concentrated the biggest naval force since the second world war. It included air-craft-carriers and missile-cruisers all in all, 30 warships. The aim was to
blackmail the Iranian and Afghan people to safeguard the interests of U.S. Oil monopolies and increase the military presence in the Indian Ocean. It has also decided to keep 12,000 U.S. marines permanently stationed in its naval base of Diego Garcia in the Indian Ocean. "One of the ironies of history is that the new moral flag being unfurled in the western Atlantic was given an impetus, along other things, by tendency to justify itself. It is being called upon to banish into oblivion any memory of the indelible shame of the dirty war which American imperialism waged for many years against Non-Aligned Vietnam and to camouflage the bankruptcy of the "American way of life" embodied in the Watergate Scandal" (16)

Despite loud protestation by U.S. spokesmen about their "deep" attachment to "freedom" and "democracy" the Non-Aligned countries know very well the real worth of these protestations. Committed inexorably as the Non-Aligned countries are to peace and freedom, and anti-imperialists as they are, how can they believe that the notorious financiers and militarists who formulate U.S. policies can be their genuine friends.

These are primarily the big business interests which are the main formulators of U.S. foreign policy, including U.S. attitudes towards the Non-aligned countries. One can imagine the U.S. policy by this simple statement which U.S. Secretary of State, H. Kissinger made that in the U.S. "two professions; businessmen and lawyers predominate in a strong majority in the highest bodies of
power and the typical cabinet member of Civil Servant at the lowest level". Several studies have been done in U.S. which show how the U.S. foreign policy is dominated by such high class businessmen. The researcher R. Barnet established that between 1940 and 1967 some 400 people took over various key posts in the department of Secretary of the State of Foreign Affairs.

"It would be obvious that the people whose life long job has been to represent or serve the interests of American monopolies would not suddenly drop these occupations, notwithstanding the loud mouthed declarations about "freedom human rights" and all the rest of it, the wealth and affluence of great U.S. monopolies is due to the exploitation of the newly free developing countries, most of them Non-Aligned, through various agencies like the World Bank, the I.M.F. the Multinational and Transnational Corporation, etc." (17)

According to an AFP report, debt servicing due by third world countries would have risen by 22 percent to 88 billion dollars in 1980, according to projections by the organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in a report on the external indebtedness of 143 developing countries and were likely to account for 62,100 million dollars or about 71 percent of 1980's total debt service. Debt service, reflecting loan terms and giving the measure of the burden shouldered by the economies of debtor countries is rising faster than the debt itself reflecting a hardening of average term, largely due to a sharp increase in private sector lending on market term.
The most dangerous aspect of U.S. policy is its arms sales which reach astronomical heights. Under the pretext of warding off a non-existent Soviet menace and by fanning differences and quarrels among Non-Aligned countries, the U.S. has been selling arms and has initiated arms race in Asia, Africa and Latin America. These are some figures which tell us the U.S. attitude in the fiscal year 1974, the U.S. sold 8,300 million dollars worth of arms abroad. More than half that sum—about 4,300 million dollars—fell to the countries of Persian Gulf area. The main recipients of American arms in 1976 were Saudi Arabia, Iran, Israel, South Korea, Jordan Taiwan, Kuwait, Egypt and Pakistan. This trend is on increasing rate. There is no doubt that the U.S. has been traditionally the enemy of the Non-Aligned movement. Tactics have changed from time to time but the basic approach of U.S. has been to harm and disrupt the movement. Its present position is oriented towards blunting the anti-imperialist edge of the Non-Aligned movement.

Non-Aligned - U.S.S.R: The Stalin era of U.S.S.R. evidence its antipathy towards Non-Alignment. So far as anti-colonialism, anti-racism and Afro-Asian nationalism is concerned the Non-Aligned countries were viewed as "progressive". However, they were mindful of the bitter hostilities of some of the countries towards marxism. Hence they categorised the Non-Aligned countries as "Petty Bourgeois" or "Nationalist Bourgeois". They have characterized Mahatma Gandhi as a notorious member of Nationalist Bourgeois and "Principle Agent of Anglo American imperialism in South East
Asia"(18)

Soviet Union identified itself for sometime with Asian Nationalism. Some of its Republics were invitees for Asian Relations Conference, New Delhi, 1947. This was first and last time where these countries were invited to such conferences. Some of the countries turned down the proposed invitation of Soviet Union to Bandung Conference. Soviet Union thrived hard to win the hearts of the Afro-Asian people.

The Russian initial hostility towards the Non-Alignment can be attributed to political and cultural factors dominating Non-Aligned countries during that period. Politically, the set up of most of the Afro-Asian Countries was western dominated. The adoption by India of democratic and British constitutional system. Several countries like Ceylon were bitterly against the Communism even from the initial stages. The socialism advocated by India was viewed as a derivation of British democratic liberal Adjustment to the challenge of Marxism than from Marxism itself. (19) Culturally the Non-Aligned countries were western oriented. They are more religious and fear communism as anti-religious. Technical knowhow was imparted to Non-aligned countries by Western countries in several fields. Economic aid comes from western countries for Non-Aligned countries in a big way. That's why a year before his death Stalin accused the "National bourgeois" of Afro-Asian countries for "Selling the nation's rights and independence for dollars".(20)
But there was an about turn change in Russia attitude in 1953 after the death of Stalin and by the emergence of new dynamic leader, Krushchev with his new foreign policy brought forth after 20th congress of Soviet Communist Party which brought about an attitude of benevolence. (21) During 1955, top Soviet leaders, Nikita Kruschev, and Nikolai Bulganin paid a good will visit to Asian Countries which was fruitful. Russia's timely help to Nasser during 1955 Gaza town bombing, had helped a lot to him the hearts of Arab countries. It has extended its unconditional support to Non-Alignment. Consistently from then onward. In his warm message, to Colombo Summit Leonid Brezhnev observed "support for the peoples struggling for their social and national emancipation, for strengthening independence of the developing countries for safeguarding their national sovereignty and freedom, against encroachments of external expansionist forces all out assistance to their economical and social progress is one of the most important objectives of Soviet Foreign Policy". (22)

Russia could realize that they cannot dictate terms to Non-Aligned countries on unequal terms. Russia aided Egypt with regard Aswan Dam without any strings. It has conceded Non-Alignment in Indo-Soviet Treaty of 1971, which specifically allows and respects India's Non-Aligned policy. But Russian action over Hungary has been condemned by most of the Non-Aligned countries. President of Ghana Nkrumah observed "I and my party are well aware of the realities of our time. As we do not have British masters,
so we would not have Russian Masters" (23) Communism, observed by Burmese spokesman was tulty of "treading the feet according to the Shoe" Gunea's President Tour in spite of Russia's great help refused "to be drawn into choosing sides in power struggle between two blocs". Nasser wanted "On many points with communism and our differences with it are radical. We believe religion and we rejected dictatorship of any class". (24)

Thus super powers now realised that there is no need of their guardianship for newly independent countries and non-alignment was an acceptable position of them. They are strong not only by numerical strength but because of their firm determination to struggle for political and economical emancipation. Gone are the days of Dulles' holy pronouncement of "immoral neutrality".

After the death of Secretary Dulles, a further softening of American tone set in, and the Kennedy Administration quite explicitly concluded that a policy of independence on the part of the new states would adequately serve American interests. Indeed the new American policy was as much the result of disillusionment with allies among the new States as of enthusiasm for the virtues of independent neutralism. The new nations have also presented the Soviet Union with difficult problems of adjustment in the past few years. Communists had no adequate doctrine to deal with the success of national movements in colonial areas. The stalinist regime welcomed anticolonialism as an attack on the rear of the capitalist enemy and an opportunity
for communists to infiltrate the colonial areas. But it conceived no special role for the coming national regime. The rapid rise of independent governments in former colonies, their active concern with Korea, and subsequent moves toward co-operation compelled Communists to review their approach to the new nations.

At Bandung, therefore, the Chinese sought to identify themselves with the new anti-colonialism and to split the more militant nationalists from those who still paid residual allegiance to the West. 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union laid down the theoretical base for exploiting anticolonial nationalism. Khrushchev informed the 20th Congress that the socialist nations and the neutralist nations could constitute a "Zone of peace" to destroy the Capitalist system.

A message sent by President N. Podgorny of the Soviet Union and the Prime Minister Mr. A. Kosygin to the Chairman of the Algiers Summit Conference held in September 1973 said "USSR will continue to follow its consistent policy aimed at a further development and strengthening of co-operation with the developing countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America".

The message stressed that just as before, now also the Soviet Union supported the nations struggling to overcome their colonial legacy and fighting in defence of their independence and progress. The Soviet message was addressed on behalf of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Soviet Government and the Soviet people - "We in the Soviet Union know well and always
remember that together with the people of Asia, Africa and Latin America constitute an important part of the standing army of national liberation, progress and peace on earth. Together, we have already done much. And we are confident that in the future also our paths will not part". The Soviet Views put forth by the Soviet President is also admirable in this context. "May I express the hope that the 5th Conference of the Heads of States and Government of Non-Aligned countries will reiterate the resolve of the participants in the Non-alignment movement to purposefully struggle against imperialism, war and aggression, against colonialism and neo-colonialism coming out for peace, for the independence, freedom and progress of the people"(25).

The Federal Republic of Germany views the Non-Aligned movement as the political answer to the growing influence of Super power rivalry in the South Asian region. "We (West German Government) have a positive attitude towards Cohesiveness of the Non-Aligned countries", an official spokesman told a group of visiting Indian journalists, in Bonn on April 26, 1982. India, he said, "had a significant role to play in strengthening the Third World movement and the FRG will support any more by it in achieving this goal".

BRITAIN AND NON-ALIGNMENT

The period immediately following the end of the second World
War witnessed the emergence of a new constellation of nations in world politics under the banner of Non-Alignment. For these nations Non-Alignment was both an assertion of their independence and an expression of detachment from power blocs. Among the Big Powers, Britain was the first to recognize the importance of this new concept in international relations. It therefore, encouraged the newly independent countries to follow their own policies. It did so when other super powers like the Soviet Union and the United states were critical of Non-alignment and viewed it with much suspicion. "The Soviets denounce it as a policy of collaboration with British imperialism."(26) When Nehru, the chief exponent of Non-Alignment visited the U.S. in October 1949 a Soviet magazine went to the extent to calling him "Chiang Kai-Shek's Successor".(27) According to U.S. and Soviet the Non-Aligned countries were more dangerous than the communists because of their "Veild" function as friends of Communism". Britain's appreciation of the Non-Aligned movement came quite early for different reasons. The fact that it followed first in the Commonwealth enabled Britain to understand what was really in the minds of statesmen like Jawaharlal Nehru. Indeed India saw quite early the potential danger of the world getting divided into opposing blocs. Another reason was that a poiner of the Non-Aligned movement, India's Prime Miniser Jawharlal Nehru's views. He said "India would keep away from the power politics of groups aligned against one another, which has led in the past to world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster
scale" (28) India's view of peace which made Britain favourably disposed to the Non-Aligned movement.

Britain gave considerable importance to the view of the Non-Aligned countries that the cold war was an unreal type of conflict and that in international relations this rigid, frozen position should give way to a moderate approach. It was impressed by the argument that discussion and conciliation could yield better results than confrontations on the basis of ideology.

It is quite important to see the views of Anthony Eden, the British Foreing Secretary and John Foster Dulles the U.S. Secretary of U.S. Eden said "I repeatedly emphasized that although India and other Asian countries might well chose to remain outside such an arrangement (collective security for South-East Asia) they should be nevertheless be given every opportunity to participate and should be kept fully informed. If they could not be with us, we must not put them against us, Mr. Dulles on the otherhand, hoped that any indication that India might be invited to join would be avoided." (29)

Despite the feeling in important circles in Britain that a number of Non-Aligned countries were using double standards in making judgement on international events and developments, Britain did not try to weaken the Non-aligned movement in any way. But at the attack on India by China in 1962 both Britain and U.S.
extended support without asking India to join any defence treaty with them. They did so at a time when the Soviet Union had turned down Nehru’s request to expedite the delivery of Mig air craft, saying that China was a brother and India is a friend. But the contrast with the action of the Soviet Union ten years later in 1971. The Soviet Union made India enter a friendship treaty as a precondition for its support during the crisis in Bangladesh.

Britain supported India even when another Non-aligned common wealth country viz. Ghana, protested against its support for India. Nehru appreciated this important gesture of Britain and the U.S. He was happy that the policy of Non-Alignment has not broken down and stands confirmed. But in the eyes of Britain there was a general erosion of the credibility of the Non-alignment of certain important Non-Aligned countries, especially after they had tied themselves up with the Soviet Union in a series of friendship treaties. This erosion of credibility of Non-Alignment began with the hooking up of two pioneers of the movement, Egypt and India.

Now that we have seen the attitudes of some main super power. The more of it will be focused in context in the following chapter to bring forth its implications.
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