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In the early years very strong emphasis had been placed on the idea that the Non-Aligned would not form any third bloc. The Non-Aligned had their origins in 1961 as a group of the more radical anti-colonial states, and continued in 1964 in order to avoid China making a successful claim to leadership of The Third World. They went into decline during a period when few states were willing or able to oppose the actions of the Colonial powers or of Israel or America. And the movement revived when a majority were willing to link the questions of the Middle East, Vietnam and Southern Africa in a single anti-Colonial theme. The group of countries has enough sense of its own identity to refer to its members and to call itself the Non-Aligned Movement. Institutional developments have given the Movement a high degree of organisation much of the activity is now directed towards practical co-operation to promote economic development, and it is possible that a powerful challenge will be mounted against the richer countries.

World War II was one of the greatest watersheds in human
history. It marked the destruction not only of the most perverse and pernicious political formation of capitalist industrialization of Western Europe, namely Nazism, Fascism, but also the beginning of the widening up of European colonialism that had dominated the world scene for almost two centuries by enslaving and enfeebling about two-thirds of human population living in three-fourth of the world's territory in Africa, Asia, Latin America and the Pacific. The transition from the era of European imperial domination and the World Order created in its wake, to the contemporary epoch of decolonisation, emergent national sovereignty and global inter-dependence is not merely a passage of time. It is more than that a stride into a new millennium. In the following a few features have been shown after world war two.

1. World Politics
   (i) Decolonization
   (ii) Proliferation of States

2. World Diplomacy
   (i) Globalisation
   (ii) Emergence of Two Global Powers.

3. World Economy
   (i) Second Industrial Revolution
   (ii) Transnational Corporation.

4. World Culture
   (i) Population Explosion
   (ii) Mass Societies Mass Culture

5. World Strategy and Security
   (i) Arms Race
   (ii) Disarmament and peace.

In these developments there are aspects of contradiction and
reconciliation, as there are areas of conflict and convergence, which think and bind them in a dialectical relationship as an organic whole.

"With the thaw in the Cold War and the emergence of detente between the two Super Powers, many were heard to remark that the policy of Non-Alignment had ceased to be relevant. This was obviously a mistaken view and showed a widespread lack of understanding of the historical background and nature of Non-Alignment. The Cold War certainly provided the context for the emergence of this policy, but it was by no means the cause of that emergence".(1)

The emergence of the policy of Non-alignment was generally the result of the experience of the Asian and African countries during the period of their struggle for freedom and not something contrived suddenly on the morrow of independence, in order to meet the contrary, it symbolized their deepest urges and aspirations and provided fulfillment to their feeling of independent nationhood.

It is only on the basis of this assumption that we can satisfactorily explain the fact that the growth in the number of Non-Aligned states has for a long time been almost conterminous with the growth in the number of independent states in Asia and Africa though, of course, there are a few Non-Aligned States in Europe and Latin America as well. That the historical roots of Non-Alignment lie in the nationalist struggle for freedom against
colonial rule is also symbolized by the fact that the emergence of India in the committee of independent nations in 1947, which marked the beginning of the anti-colonial revolution after the end of the Second World War, also marked the emergency of Non-Alignment of the world stage.

Dr. Deva Narayan Mallik's view is also quite considerable here. He says "The declaration on 7 September 1946 of India's decision not to get aligned with any power bloc was the starting point of her Non-Alignment."(2)

One of the most significant experiences which conditioned the thinking of the Asian and African countries with regard to world affairs and put them on the road to Non-Alignment was the constant use of their resources in both men and money in the wars waged by their imperial masters for their own purposes. This naturally caused considerable resentment: for it was felt that such wars did not involve the interests of the Asian and African countries concerned but only those of their rulers. And yet almost the entire cost of many of such wars and good proportion of some others came from those countries. This caused a deep reaction in the minds of their leaders against the power politics of the Great Powers. and a feeling grew that it was not in the interest of these countries to be involved in such politics. At the same time there also developed a story urge to have a say in world affairs, particularly with a view to contributing towards the
cause of world peace and freedom. The policy of Non-Aligment was the natural result of these dual urges.

As the pioneering role of India in the emergence of the policy of Non-Aligment has been universally recognized it may be best to illustrate the prevalence of those urges during the period of the struggle for freedom by referring to India’s experience. Thus we find the Indian National Contress protesting at its very first session in 1885 against the rise in the military expenditure of the government and deprecating annexation of Upper Burma. It declared in 1892 that recent increases in military expenditure had been caused mainly because of “the military activity going on beyond the natural lines of the defence of the country, in pursuance of the imperial policy of Great Britain in its relation with some of the Great Powers in Europe and demanded that an equitable portion of expenditure should be borne by the British treasury. In 1904 the Congress protested against the dispatch of a British military expedition to Tibet and expressed the view that it was not an isolated event, but part of a general forward policy which, with the mission to Afghanistan and Persia, was likely to “involve India in foreign entanglements” and there by place an intolerable burden on the Indian finances and prove disastrous to the interests of the country. (3)

In the era of Gandhi and Nehru, when the Congress began to struggle for the independence of the country, it became one of its major preoccupations to resist the exploitation of Indian
resources on imperial purposes. Thus, in 1921 the Congress adopted a resolution on foreign policy conveying to the neighbouring and other states that then existing Government of India did not in any way represent Indian opinion and that its policy had traditionally been guided by considerations more of holding India in subjection than of protecting its borders. In 1927 it adopted a resolution on war danger which declared that the Indian people had no quarrel with their neighbours and wanted to live at peace with them.

The Non-Aligned movement represents one of the dominant trends in world politics. It is an aggregation of states from almost all the continents and hemispheres of the world, covering a wide spectrum of ideological nuances, world-views and divergence in structures of society and national politics, as well as diversities in the scale of developmental priorities which in its collective diplomatic thrust represents a new, a different and often a decisive fact dor in the slow unfolding of a new world order for an alternative and preferred future for mankind. In almost four decades of its non-formal operational existence and two and-a-half decades of its institutionalisation as a formal group, Non-Alignment has come to mean several interlinked aspects. As a global phenomenon, Non-Alignment means a collective movement in contemporary world politics, against polarised and bloc-oriented policies and politics. Its prefix 'Non' is indeed the sine quanon of Non-Alignment's primordial opposition to military
blocs, arms race and bifurcation of the world into two compartments, articulating the protest of the earstwhile colonial countries against economic inequality, socio-political injustice and discriminatory treatment based on colour, race and creed meted out by major industrial and ex-colonial powers, it represents a protest movement against multiple pattern of domination and hegemony, against dependence, 'statellism' and neo-colonialism. In its main focus in world affairs. Non-Alignment is a movement of solidarity of the newly liberated countries aspiring to a position of independence and equality in a highly independent world. Today the process of decolonization is almost over, yet there are vestiges, few but abstain, particularly in South Africa. Where the blood of the freedom fighters has still not ceased to flow, colonization was not mere exploitation of raw material and cheap labour, it was an incubus that destroyed the unity, the resources, the morale and much that was vital in the heritage of the subject people. It led to degeneration of the masses and infeeblement of the national spirit. The task of re-building the country, of regaining the clean out of the wreckage of the colonial past was stupendous and formidable, "The process of decolonization only began and did not end with political freedom. For that hard even freedom to have meaning and relevance in full measure it was imperative to work out a comprehensive national policy covering several relevant fronts, both internal and international, and that too geared to the strategy of simultaneity of coordinated action in certain sectors of vital
concern for the viability of the new states, like political stability, territorial integrity, national unity, social change, economic growth, and peace and co-operation particularly with neighbours and generally with neighbours and generally with the community of nations at large." (4)

Non-Alignment became a framework of foreign policy for countries like India that were eager to generate national development without getting entangled in the animosities of big powers.

The Non-Aligned movement is working for peace, security and disarmament, on the one hand and independence, development and co-operation among nations on the other hand. In other words, its objective is to evolve an international order based on justice and peace, and conditions conducive for domestic socio-economic development of Non-Aligned countries. It involves rollback of centuries old history of political domination and economic exploitation.

It needs to be clarified that Non-Alignment, substantively speaking, is not a negative concept. Dissociation from block politics or military alliances became a focal point of Non-Alignment during the cold war period because that kind of international politics was likely to hinder the achievement of positive of the policy which was to achieve accelerated socio-
economic development of a weak and backward society. Also Non-Alignment predates cold war. Non-Aligned has never been defined precisely, authoritatively and comprehensively. It is "a highly subjective phenomenon admitting of various interpretations, the complexity of which is further accelerated by the fact of its being an evolutionary concept which can hardly be explained at any point of time with any degree of finality"(5) In this context I would also like to quote "Despite the many speeches of Prime Minister Nehru, President Nasser, President Sukarno, President Tito, President Nkromah and other political leaders of the Non-Aligned states, there has been no full treatment of the concept, no concept, no analysis and precise description, no exposition through which others might estimate the significance and future prospects of policies of Non-Alignment"(6) That's the reason the term Non-Aligned is often confused with other terms such as isolationism, non-commitment, neutrality, neutralisation, unilaterism and non-involvement'. According to Schwargenberger, these terms are often regarded as synonymous with the concept of Non-Alignment. However, Non-Aligned differs from all of them. Isolationism stands for policies of aloofness which may vary from the policy of "splendid isolation" adopted by Britain during the 19th century, to postures of inoffensiveness in world affairs. Non-commitment implies a policy detachment from other powers in triangular relationship. Neutrality describes the political and legal status of a country not at war with either of the two belligerents. Neutrality refers to the legal status of a state
during armed hostility. The term neutrality is now referred to an attitude of non-participation or refusal to take sides on a particular political or domestic issue, irrespective of its merits. Neutrality carries the sense of equidistance. Neutralisation is different from neutrality in the sense that a neutral state is free to renounce its status of neutrality at will and assume that of belligerency, but a neutralised state is permanently neutral and cannot give up its neutralised status even during peace times. The major difference between a neutralised state and Non-Aligned state is that the former has achieved its position by virtue of the actions of others, where as the latter chooses its orientation by itself and has no guarantee that its position will be honoured by others. Non-involvement signifies the attitude of detachment from the tension between the world powers. Non-Alignment has nothing to do with these terms.

Though the concept of neutralism comes close to that of Non-Alignment yet the two terms cannot be treated as identical. Whereas neutralism implies legal neutrality or political passivity, Non-Alignment has no legal connotation and is an active political policy. It neutralism is a phenomenon of expediency. Non-Alignment stands for certain principles. It neutralism is an attribute of diplomacy, Non-Alignment is an attribute of foreign policy.

"The policy of Non-Alignment does not imply pacifism or passive indifference. It is a policy of active participation or
involvement in the struggle against imperialism, colonialism, neocolonialism, apartheid, racism, great power exploitation and all forms of foreign occupation, domination and hegemony. Non-Alignment is in no sense negative static or didactic; it is rather positive, dynamic and constructive"(7)

Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru explained the policy of Non-Alignment in these words. "Our policy is not to commit ourselves previously to follow a certain line. Our policy is independence of action. If we say we are permanently neutral, it has no meaning except permanent retirement from public affairs in the national sense, Sanyas. No country can do that and certainly we have no desire to retire from world affairs". At other occasion he said: "In the sphere of foreign affairs, India will follow an independent policy, keeping away from the power politics of groups aligned one against another. She will uphold the principles of freedom for dependent peoples and will oppose racial distinction wherever it may occur. She will work with the other peace-loving nations for international co-operation and goodwill without exploitation of one nation by another. The use of the word neutral to describe India's foreign policy is wrong except in terms of war. If you say there is war today, we are neutral. If you say there is a cold war, we are certainly neutral, we do not propose to join that war. It does not matter who is right or who is wrong. The preservation of peace forms the central aim of India's policy. It is in the pursuit of this
policy that we have chosen the path of Non-alignment. This does not mean passivity of mind or action, lack of faith or conviction. It does not mean submission to what we consider evil. It is positive and dynamic approach to such problems as confront us. We believe that each country has not only the right to freedom, but also to decide its own policy and way of life... We believe therefore, in non-aggression and non-interference by one country in the affairs of another and the growth or tolerance between them and the capacity for peaceful existence."

There are some writers who link up the growth of Non-Alignment movement with the cold war in Europe. Their contention is that immediately after the World War II, Europe was at the centre of rivalry between the two Super Powers and the states of Europe where compelled by geopolitical and economic factors to join one Super Power or the other. There was no such compulsion in the case of Asia and Africa. Although the political, economic and military instability of most of the Afro-Asian States entailed their transformation into fields of competition between the two world camps, they still enjoyed the practical possibility of avoiding the fate of the bi-polar division of Europe. Some observers think that this possibility was the only 'raison d'entre' of Non-Alignment. According to this view Non-Alignment was not the expression of a specific identity of the new states of Asia and Africa. It was not justified by the similarity of problems facing them but was merely a passive attitude towards
the confrontation of the two Super powers on the European Continent. The logical Conclusion is the existence of a causal link between the Cold War and Non-Alignment. If the Cold War fades away, Non-Alignment will immediately disintegrate. As Non-Alignment has no specific content apart from its opposition to Cold War diplomacy, it was about to be undermined by the policy of detente. If the Cold War extends to other continents besides Europe, the policy of Non-Alignment of a given state will end if it antagonizes the Vital interests of one of the Super-powers.

This view is not accepted by the advocates of Non-Alignment. It is also true that there was a historical co-insidence between the rise of the Cold War and the birth of Non-Alignment. It is also true that the atmosphere of the Cold War facilitated the outcome of Non-Alignment. However, no causal link exists between two phenomena. The rise and evolution of Non-Alignment was conditioned by many factors of which the most important was a deep awareness of belonging to a specific world, mainly the Afro Asian world. The Non-Aligned States have similar problems and are conscious of the weakness of their position in an area dominated by the Big Powers. It is their experience of colonial subjugation, their determination to safeguard their independence in fact and not only in law, and their state socio-economic under-development which are the real constituent elements of Non-Alignment. Non-Alignment is permanent phenomenon which illustrates the drive of the Non-Aligned countries towards the
substitution of the present world system based on the concept of balance of power by another system based on the recognition of the principle of "real equality" for all peoples and their right to an integral socio-economic development according to their respective genius. Opposition to bloc politics is a feature of Non-Alignment. It is a manifestation of the will of the Non-Aligned countries to decide freely upon their own affairs and to share with all other states the responsibility of conducting world affairs. Opposition to cold war diplomacy is not a constitutive element of Non-Alignment. It is merely its manifestation. Non-Alignment in its essence is the expression of the drive towards political and economic emancipation in the context of a bi-polar configuration of world politics.

There is absolutely no doubt to accept that Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) is one of the manifestations of mankind's eternal quests for harmonious existence which may promote human happiness and remove hurdles from the way of full flowering of human personality. "Non-Alignment is also a secular idea which emerged as a companion of the idea of national self-determination, of the insistence on freedom from imperialist-colonial rule which gained strength particularly between the two world wars and took a manifest shape after World War II when a number of new nations appeared on the world scene. India was the first among these and Prime Minister Nehru's foreign policy formulations carry the seeds of what later came to be described as Non-Alignment"(8) Thus
Non-Alignment is a way of national self-assertion at a time when men and women find free nationalhood a necessary condition for realisation of human dignity. It is the response of free men imbued with the ideas of human equality irrespective of colour and creed. The movement of the Non-aligned is a voluntary association of Sovereign independent nations who collectively seek to fortify national freedom against all kinds of cribbing constraints, to extend the area of freedom and to change the world environment in a manner that national personalities may grow and flower unhindered.

In a way, Non-Alignment represents a nationalism which is basically different from the Nationalism of the 18th and 19th centuries. While the earlier nationalisms were narrow and competitive, the one that is represented in the NAM tends to be co-operative and non-exploitative. It does not mean that national sovereignty is surrendered to a larger whole, what participation in the NAM implies is that through mutual discussion and consultation it is possible to arrive at conclusions which can be valid and useful for national interests. Prime Minister Indira Gandhi in her inaugural address at the New Delhi Summit, very aptly described it as 'a strategy for recognition and preservation of the world's diversity'.

The participation in the movement do not necessarily hold identical opinions on all issues. They have different perceptions conditioned naturally by the variety of history,
geography and ideological disposition that they represent. They are together because they believe that it is possible to transcend them by adherence to share human values of peace, freedom and justice. Late Indira Gandhi expressed it very well when she said at the New Delhi Summit, "Faith in the future has brought so many, across the continents and the oceans, to meet here. We are here because we do believe that minds and attitudes can and must be changed and that injustice and suffering can and must be diminished". Non-Alignment is the assertion of freedom in international affairs a refusal to accept overlordship of others. The growth and expansion of the Movement of the Non-Aligned has been directly proportional to the elimination of imperialism and colonialism.

The Indian National Congress had refused to cooperate with the British war effort in 1939 basically because it did not want to surrender to the imperialist rulers the right to declare war or peace on its behalf unilaterally. India was opposed to fascism but it was also opposed to imperialism unless sovereignty was restored to Indian people the struggle against fascism would be meaningless. That decision, therefore, was the embryonic stage of Non-Alignment. Thus we see the basic impulse which manifested in NAM is the commitment to extension of freedom and opposition to domination and exploitation.

It may be pertinent here to trace the growth of the movement
over the years. All the basic features of the Movement came out clearly in the first formal conference of the Heads of State or Government (the Summit Conference) of the Non-Aligned countries held at Belgrade from September 1-6, 1961. Stabilisation of peace was considered to be the most important task because it was felt that war has never threatened mankind with grave consequences than today. It was attended by 23 Asian and African countries, Yugoslavia and Cuba. The Belgrade Summit, in major part defined the goals and tasks of the policy of Non-Alignment and marked the beginning of the joint activities of Non-Aligned countries in the international arena. Having reaffirmed their adherence to the policy of peace and peaceful co-existence and denounced colonialism and neo-colonialism, the non aligned made it clear that they would not remain neutral on key contemporary issues. The principles proclaimed at the Bandung Conference in 1955, which underlay the policy of Non-Alignment were supplemented by yet another specific principle - non-alignment with military - political blocs. The subsequent conferences of Non-Aligned countries have further elaborated the principles formulated in Belgrade, making these even more clear-cut and even more meaningful.

The Conference rejected the view that "war, including the 'Cold War' is inevitable and asserted that 'never before has mankind had at its disposal stronger forces for eliminating war as an instrument of policy in international relations". Differences of social systems and ideologies were recognized as
"necessary a part of the growth of the human society", but it was asserted that "peoples and Governments shall refrain from any use of ideologies for the purposes of waging Cold War, exercising pressure, or imposing their will". Principles of peaceful co-existence were considered 'the only alternative to the 'Cold War' and to a possible general nuclear catastrophe'. They impressed upon Great Powers the wisdom of solving various problems by means of negotiations. It was specifically expressed the support for freedom in Algeria, Angola, Tunisia, South Africa and Cuba, the conference reaffirmed the conviction that "all nations have the right of unity, self-determination and independence by virtue of which right they can determine their political status and freely pursue their economic, social and cultural development without intimidation or hinderance."

In the context of war and peace special emphasis was laid on the need for general and complete disarmament. The conference recommended that a special UN General Assembly session devoted to disarmament or world conference on disarmament under the UN auspice be convened. The main outcome was an appeal for peace. Nothing that the tensions and conflicts existing in the world could any day result in war it warned. In this age of nuclear weapons and the accumulation of the power of mass destruction such conflict and war would inevitably lead to devastation on a scale hitherto unknown if not to world annihilation".
The understanding of the conference was expressed in the declaration that, "lasting world peace cannot be realized as long as unjust conditions prevail and peoples under foreign domination continue to be deprived of their fundamental rights to freedom, in dependence and self-determination". In its Declaration the Conference pointed out that: "Imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism constitute a basic source of international tension and conflict because they endanger world peace and security". It deplored "that the declaration of the UN on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples had not been implemented everywhere" and called for the "unconditional, complete and final abolition of colonialism now."

Military blocs, Great Powers alliances and pacts were condemned as factors accentuating the cold war and heightening international tensions. It was therefore asserted that "the maintenance or future establishment of foreign military bases and the stationing of foreign troops on the territories of other countries, against the expressed will of those countries, (is) a gross violation of the sovereignty of States, and (is) a threat to freedom and international peace."

The conference also condemned "the expressed intention of imperialist powers to establish bases in the Indian Ocean, as a calculated attempt to intimidate the emerging countries of Africa and Asia and an unwarranted extension of the policy of neocolonialism and imperialism."
"Commitment to anti-colonialism and imperialism found the most comprehensive expression in the third summit Conference held in Lusaka (Zambia) from September 8 to 19, 1970 while the need for peace and negotiations for disarmament was the main focus of the Belgrade conference and the importance of national liberation and socio-economic justice for the Third World of the Second Conference at Cairo, the emphasis at Lusaka was on the danger of dependence on imperialism, its new grab of neo-colonialism and the need to develop a comprehensive strategy for carrying on struggle for its elimination". (9)

CAIRO - As we have already discussed previously that the Belgrade Summit laid the foundation of the movement of non-alignment but it did not anticipate the holding of similar conferences as an uninterrupted series or a series of nodal points in the movement's life. Not even the holding of the Second Summit was decided at Belgrade, though it was apparently anticipated that further conferences might be called for. Despite this, the second Non-Aligned Summit was held in Cairo from 5 to 10 October 1964.

Like Belgrade, Cairo owed as much to the pressure of events as to personalities for its occasioning, but, in contrast to the former, it did not coincide with any dangerous political crisis. As the Cairo document stated, "this second Non-aligned Conference is being held at a time when the international situation has improved as compared with that which existed between the two
power blocs at the time of the historic Belgrade Conference.\textsuperscript{(10)} But, the participant were careful to note despite the present improvement in international relations. Sources of tension still exist in may parts of the world. One thing was quite remarkable in this conference. Pt. Jawaharlal Nehru was the spirit behind the Non-Aligned Conference, went off the scene in May 1964. He was succeeded by little but able Lal Bahadur Shastri. The international scene was not with much tension, Indo-China and Formosa-China problems were however there. Forty seven countries as free members and ten observers attended the cairo conference, significantly increasing membership when compared to Belgrade Conference. There were no concrete suggestion or declaration. It was only review of events. They have reaffirmed their faith and support to U.N. The most confused discussion took place with regard to "peaceful co-existence" which has been equated with Non-Alignment Sukarno made a Frontal attack on peaceful Co-existence. Non-Alignment has been distinguished from peaceful co-existence, Tito defended it and has given priority to at than abolition of colonialism, Shastri adhered to the view that nuclear disarmament is first and foremost. India proposed to send a mission to China for stopping its proposed nuclear blast. However, it has been turned down. India was partially successful without nuclear organs to refrain from making them. Nine principles were embodied in the final communique, about seven principles were Indian draft. Yugoslavia suggested that they should try to get these principles modified by U.N. and it has
been accepted. Six days after the conference China blasted the appeal of the conference by detonating Nuclear device.

THREE BIG NON-ALIGNED SUMMIT, 1966

President Tito, President Nasser, Prime Minister Mrs. Indira Gandhi held, at New Delhi, in October 1966 Non-Aligned Summit. There were discussions to bring Non-Aligned group close and strength. In a joint communique they called for the end of U.S. serial bombing of North Vietnam, without any preconditions. They have condemned the super power interference in the affairs of developing countries. They have noted, "The increasing interference, intensified use of force and the exercise of pressures on the part of some powers against the newly independent and other developing countries..." They deprecated the use of economic and financial assistance as instrument of pressure, and noted with satisfaction that many developing countries have resisted such pressure." (11)

THIRD NON-ALIGNED SUMMIT CONFERENCE, LUSAKA 1970

This conference was attended by sixty countries and was held from September 8 to 10, 1970. The world scene was not with much tension as backdrop of this conference. However, there was postmortem of conflict between Israel and Egypt during 1967.
There was an appeal by several members to deviate Non-Alignment from political and ideological considerations, to substantive consideration like economic emancipation. Dr. Kenneth Kaunda welcoming the gathering observed that the participating countries must take the Non-Aligned movement out of political and ideal rhetoric by giving substance to it through meaningful collective action. He strongly criticised western countries for selling arms to apartheid South Africa. (12) Emperor Haile Selassie of Ethiopia tabled 5 point plan to end white minority, rule in South Africa. Mrs. Indira Gandhi wa heard with great applause, she stressed the need of strengthening Non-Alignment movement and to carry forward, the unfinished revolution of our time, political and economic, she brought to the notice of the Non-Aligned countries the threat of neo-colonialism. She observed, "The big powers have never accepted the validity of Non-Alignment. Neither colonialism nor racialism have vanished. The old comes back in new guise. There are subtle intrigues to undermine our self confidence, and sow discussions and mutual distrust amongst us. Powerful vested interests, domestic and foreign are combining to erect new structures of neo-colonialism. The dangers can be combated by our being United in our adherence to the basic tenets of Non-Alignment." (13) Marshal Tito observed that the super power intervention in the affairs of developing countries can be manifested in its crudest form in Indo-China and West Asia. He expressed concern over Western interference in Cambodian affairs.
This conference had also a very important issue, because in this conference Indian Ocean was declared an area of peace, free from military bases of outside powers, creating tension and great power rivalry. A declaration of Non-Alignment and economic co-operation was adopted. They decided to break off all diplomatic relations with Portugal and South Africa as long as those countries failed to confirm to the United Nation's decisions on de-colonization and racial discrimination. An appeal was made to France and Spain to allow the people of their colonies to exercise their rights of self determination. The declaration demanded the immediate withdrawal of Israel forces from lands occupied after June 5th 1967 and their seizure illegal. The presence of American forces in Indo-China was deplored.

The Indian Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi made an impressive appeal to the world leaders at the Lusaka conference for the main tanance of international peace. She was of the opinion that the whole world is a single entity. She observed "We are deeply convinced that by staying out of military pacts the Non-Aligned countries can use their collective wisdom and influence to lip the balance of power in favour of peace and international co-operation"(14) Mr. Swarn Singh, India's Foreign Minister, speaking at Lusaka said, "The concept of Non-Alignment not only provides a barrier against the dangers of military polarization, imperialism and colonialism of the earlier period but also remains today a safeguard to national independence and world peace."(15)
THE ALGIERS CONFERENCE 1973

Just before the Algiers Conference, there was a conference of Non-Aligned Foreign Ministers at George Town in 1972 from 9 to 12 August. This conference called for "Endeavour by all members to translate into action the principles of Non-Alignment as the basis of International relations" and to make Indian Ocean "The zone of peace" It also called for an early definition of the term, 'aggression' since such a definition dissuade states from using force, assist international community in fixing responsibility for aggression and guide the United Nations in maintaining peace and Security."(16)

The Algiers Conference was held from 5th to 9th September 1973. It was attended by 73 members States with 9 observers. Three countries and 12 organisations attended as guests. The attendance clearly indicates that the Non-Aligned movement had become popular amongst the smaller states. Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi made a significant contribution to the conference. She said "We are here because of our convictions and response to the inspiration which initially brought us together and which is still valid in the contemporary world. We have a very important part to play in theremaking of the world".(17) Smt Gandhi further stated "Non-Aligned countries should speak for those whose numbers are large but whose voice were muted... Indian traditions help us to look at the world as
one. Today science and technology open immense possibilities to transform this dream into reality." (18)

The tensions of big powers were reduced by East-West detente. West Asia was still raging. Indo-Pakistan war resulted in the emergence of Bangladesh and addition of another country into the fold of Non-Aligned. Several members expressed doubts with regard to the need of Non-alignment in the age of detente between big powers, which is a positive step towards establishment of peace. But the leaders come to an understanding and declared, both in private meeting at a dinner hosted by Mrs. Indira Gandhi to Tito, Haile Selassie and Julius Nyerere and in the official declaration that Non-Aligned is having wide perspective even when there is detente because they are confronted with colonialism, foreign domination, neo-colonialism, imperialism and racial discrimination. President Boumedienné observed while opening the conference that there will be no real progress in the world until the idea of any country dominating others has disappeared. Appreciating the detente he emphasized that it could not benefit the world until it extended to the area of conflict in West Asia and South East Asia. He observed "there can be no genuine peace in the world until the idea of custodianship (Big Powers) is eliminated". (19) This was in reference to American plans for military intervention in the Persian Gulf to protect oil sources if necessary. Mrs. Gandhi emphasizing economic independence said "freedom will not be real unless we can give our peoples a better economic deal". (20)
An important trend seen in the conference was that they have realized the exploitation of resources which was, hitherto, monopoly of big powers. Dr. Kenneth Kaunda, President of Zambia observed that we must seriously co-ordinate our efforts in the conservation and careful utilization of the values resources of the world. We must not blindly and carelessly exploit today what must be the basis of livelihood in future.

Colonel M. Gadefi did not believe that any of the human interests which were discussed in the conference would ever see the light. But he expressed all I hope for is that members of this group should pledge not to attack each other. This way we would stop the fear of war or actual war in almost half of the world. He also observed that "this group will also not be able to achieve a joint economic plan what we can do however is to pledge that we shall not be tied economically with any of the monopolistic international forces"(21)

The conference discussed at length, African decolonisation liberation movement, NATO, apartheid, Indo-China, Cambodia, unconditional withdrawal of Israel from occupied territories, Economic independence, and made recommendations. It adopted an economic charter providing for realisation of resources, foreign enterprises, to keep out from the interference of big powers.

A Non-Aligned meet also meet on Marsch 22nd 1974 at Algiers
with 17 States of Non-Aligned and denounced the decision to
develop an Anglo-American base on Diego Garcia an Indian Ocean
Island. It was observed that it was greatly prejudicial to the
cause of peace to the vital interests of developing countries in
that area and it may lead to the great power rivalry. They
have also discussed the oil crisis and established a working
group of four nations with regard to this.

NEW ECONOMIC ORDER - HISTORIC NON-ALIGNED SUMMIT CONFERENCE
COLOMBO - 1976

The fifth Conference of the heads of Non-aligned nations was
held for the first time in Asia, in colombo Sri Lanka, from
August 16 to 19, 1976. The membership had increased to 86 as
against 25 at Belgrade conference, 47 Cairo conference 53 at
Lusaka conference and 75 at Algiers conference. Since its
inception, more than two decades ago, it has proved to be
dynamic and effective concept in international affairs. Voices
against this movement has receded, Alongwith the 86 members
Stastes, 22 Observers also attended the conference. The world
was passing through a difficult phase because of the Arab-Israel
war and the rise in oil prices. An attempt was made during this
conferende to further institutionalize the Non-Aligned
movement. Many events occured between Algiers and Colombo.
There was a military coup in Chile with US. There was a brutal
assisination of Mujibar Rahman of Bangladesh, a newly admitted
Non-Aligned country. There was a military coup in Nigeria
resulted in murder of Musthaq Mohammad. Among these in auspicious events, there was the emergence of Angola and liberation of Vietnam.

In her inaugural address Prime Minister Mrs. Sirimao Bandaranaike observed that "at the United Nations, this strength of Non-Aligned movement has been bitterly criticised as a 'Tyranny of the majority'. We know that the Non-Alignment has never been, was never intended to be, and shall never become tyranny"(22) She appreciated Non-Alignment for giving impetus to OPEC countries to dictate terms to big powers. She had called for new economic order by giving appealing statistics, she called for the establishment of a commercial bank, for the Non-aligned countries. She wanted Indian Ocean to be a "Peace Zone" which was recommended Lusaka six years ago. She also expressed the Peace Zone concept to be extended to other areas. She adhered to the view that U.N. still was an indispensable instrument for the maintenance of world security and peace. She appreciated the role played by Non-Aligned nations in bringing up realities of the time with regard to law of the sea.

The Non-Aligned countries should fight, she has observed "against injustice, intolerance and inequality and old concept of empire, intervention and cominance and all theories which would attribute to every nation however powerful it may be exclusive authority are responsibility peace and stability in the world."(23)
Mrs. Indira Gandhi in her Keynote Address warned that though the cold war is essentially over, its legacy remains. She added that "emerging polycentrism has generated rivalries no less fierce than big power confrontations. We should be vigilant against attempts to spilt over movement, to violate its integrity or to introduce discords from outside, we should not allow such differences as may exist between some members on certain issues to effect our unit." (24) Calling for new economic order she observed that the response of advanced countries on the compulsion of new world economic order has so far being a pathetic patch work. Remedies are no substitute for genuine reform. We need global perspective plan.

President Mr. Dandkhan of Afghanistan called for special attention to the problems of land lacked countries like Afghanistan whose development is retarded because of their inaccessibility to the sea. He sought collective efforts of Non-Aligned countries at U.N. and other international bodies to satisfy their demands. Colonel R.J.A. Felli of Ghana observed, that the oil rich countries should recycle within the movement, more of the surplus petro-dollars which their own economics could not readily absorb.

United Nations Secretary General Dr. Kurt Waldheim, appreciating and wellcoming the gathering, proposed a five point strategy to achieve equitable and prosperous world economy.
namely movement towards the international economic order, agreement on law of the sea, bold new efforts to solve conflicts, old and new elimination of the last remnants of colonialism and ensuring justice and respect for human rights.

The political declaration reassessed the need and importance of Non-alignment. It sought unceasing vigilance to preserve intact the essential character and solidarity of Non-Alignment and to resist efforts to destabilise it. The declaration referred to decolonising efforts of Non-Aligned countries and condemned the racist regimes in Israel, South Africa and Rhodesia. It demanded a complete and unconditional independence of Djibouti, French Colony, in accordance with the General Assembly Resolution 3480.

The Conference also recognized the right of self determination of the people of Zimbabwe and Namibia as against the racist regime of South Africa. It called for total withdrawal of Israel from its occupied territory. It recognized the rights of Palestinians. It called for withdrawal of foreign intervention in Cyprus. It very warmly welcomed democratic Kampuchea, Laos people's Democratic Republic, and the socialist 'Republic of Vietnam. It also called for Indian Ocean to be "a Peace Zone". It warned complete disarmament or international control over arms. significantly it called for special session of U.N. on disarmament not later than 1978 and
it was held in May 1978. It had been decided that next summit conference of Non-Aligned countries be held at Havana (Cuba) in 1979 for the first time in Latin America.

Economic declaration called for new international economic order, self collective, self reliance, and interdependence within the global economy. It has warned that the widening gap between developed and developing countries is one of the most threatening sources of tension and conflict. It is observed that unless poverty, hunger, sickness, illiteracy. It has been emphasized there must be greater participation of developing countries in the production and in distribution of goods and the rendering of services and basic changes in the international division of labour.

A new stage, a new perspective had been given to Non-Aligned at Colombo. The ideological and moral overtones were minimised giving place to polished and economic realities. It has achieved unity in diversity, and independence with interdependence. It is not a bloc, but it is receptacle of force. It is strong because it comprises more than half of the world population, with two thirds of the states and a universal movement.
NON-ALIGNED BUREAU MEET IN HAVANA, MAY, 1978

The venue of co-ordination Bureau meeting which was changed to New York following the coup in Afghanistan, was shifted to Havana, since many of the Non-Aligned countries felt that it should be held in the capital of member states rather than at the Headquarters of the U.N.

Havana Conference: The sixth Summit was held at Havana in September 1979. Ninety four states attended the conference. Mr. Fidel Castro, the President of Cuba was elected as Chairman of the Non-Aligned movement for three years. Mr. Castro tried to seek the co-operation of the Soviet Camp. India was very poorly represented at the conference. Mr. Desai intended to attend the conference but the Janata Government was put out of power, The care-take Prime Minister Shri Charan Singh asked Mr. S.N. Mishra, the then Foreign Minister of India, to attend the Conference. In the absence of a dynamic Indian personality like Smt. Indira Gandhi, the Indian delegation had to cut a very sorry figure.

Unfortunately, the foreign ministers who had meeting for 3 days as prelude to Havana Summit could not suggest anything concrete because of ideological differences and particularly as there was high pressure lobbying outside the conference. Cuba insisted on ideological tilt towards Socialist Bloc. Foreign Minister of Cuba who presided over the conference condemned Camp
David Agreement of Egypt, it led to bitter controversy on the
other hand the Arabic countries wanted to expel Egypt from the
Non-Aligned movement. But were not successful. Only plus point
of this conference was that seven new members were admitted into
the hold of the movement. They are four Latin American Countries
Bolivia Greneda, Nicaragua and Surinam, two Asian countries Iran
and Pakistan—one African country, the patriotic front
Zimbabwe, Kampuchea's seat was left vacant.

Non-Aligned heads were under the grip of fear of
disintegration based on ideologican conflicts between members.
Yugoslavia wanted to bring down Cuba's ideological affiliation
with Russia. Cuba's fierce attack on Western Countries and China
threatened even the convening of the meeting. However, in his
inaugural address Dr. Fidel Castrom assured the participants that
Cuba would not attempt to impose its revolutionary ideologies on
the Non-Aligned movement. He condemned in clear terms the
frantic attempts made by China and U.S.A. to sabotage the
movement. He condemned the peace treaty of Egypt and Israel as a
betrayal of Arab people aned Palestine in Particular. It was the
first time in the Non-Aligned conferences that the Chairman
himself condemning other members of the movement. Egypt was
target of attack from Arafat and king Hussain some members wanted
to expel Egypt. India did not favour the suspension of Egypt. In
the final declaration, however both radicals and moderates became
successful. Soviet bias was lessened. U.S. was condemned more
than once, with respect of its attitude in West Asia. Cuba. Summit
condemned Egypt's pact. India wanted the words 'condemn' be removed substituting "cannot Condone" but it was rejected. On the economic front it called oil producing countries to guarantee the supplies to the least developed countries. However the conference though not a failure, it was far from satisfactory, India could not make its presence felt. Another jolt in the Non-Alignment was the withdrawal of Burma.

DELHI CONFERENCE, 1983

The Seventh conference of Heads of State of Government of Non-Aligned Countries was held in New Delhi from 7 to 12 March 1983. Originally the venue of the 7th conference of Non-Aligned nations was Baghdad Due to war between Iran and Iraq, the conference could not be held at Baghdad. It was no the request of the large number of Non-Aligned nations that India accepted to convene the conference at New Delhi. It met amidst serious politico-security and socio economic global crises which had the potential to strike at root of the very existence of mankind.

The Non-Aligned met in New Delhi under exceptional circumstances internal as well as external. The "New Delhi Message" as adopted at the Summit, referred to the gravity of the external situation as follows:

"Our world is increasingly turbulent and insecure. International economic relations continue to be characterized by
inequality, domination and exploitation. The gravity of the situation is evident in the intensification of the arms race, in the resistance of the strong to the initiatives for change in favour of the weak, in great power involvement in regional conflicts and in the threat of a world wide nuclear catastrophe" (26)

The Conference was attended by 100 member States. This time even the great powers were anxious to know about the policies and principles of Non-Aligned movement. In order to make the 7th Conference a success, India made great diplomatic efforts. It tried its best for the agreement amongst the member states on all controversial issues. Mr. Narsimha Rao said that "the success of the New Delhi Summit will decide the future of the movement" Smt. Indira Gandhi sent Indian diplomats to Bhutan, Nepal, Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, West Asia and several African countries. P.V. Narsimha Rao, then Foreign Minister of India also went to the United Nations in order to ascertain the view of other nations about the world problems, Dr. K.P. Mishra of the School of International studies at J.N.U. New Delhi state that "it was India's task to restore the credibility of the Non-Aligned movement. The basic task is to concentrate on the issues concerning every member of the community. It is a restoration of priorities which will test India's skill, political and diplomatic." Smt. Indira Gandhi did her best to give a true Non-Aligned outlook Non-Aligned movement. She was critical of both the super powers for the arms race. She gave five principles
namely "De-Colonisation, development, disarmament, detente and democratisation, (freedom from super power interference) as the watchword of the movement." In spite of divergent views on many international issues, the final draft was an achievement. Smt. Gandhi remarked. "You have selected me as the locomotive to pull the Non-Aligned train, I will ensure that it does not go off the rails" India today has very obly summed up Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi's contribution to the Non-Aligned movement. It stated that Smt. Gandhi's place in the history of the NAM is assured, she has implemented the principles in the Non-Aligned movement. (27)

PERCEPTION OF NON-ALIGNMENT:

The "Political Declaration" was adopted at the summit dwelt on the issue of the essence and character of the policy and movement of Non-Alignment and exhibited a high degree of identity as compared to the preceding summit which was held in the midst of strong Cuban-Yugoslav controversy over "natural allies" thesis, in fact it emerged in New Delhi have been practically codified and consequently that they are no longer the subject of principled discussions about their validity, though there may be certain differences in interpreting the substance of some of them.
PERCEPTION OF GOALS:

Peace and peaceful co-existence, independence, disarmament and development—the central pillars of the political and economic order—continued to be the central issues of concern for the member states. Indira Gandhi, in her Keynote address, singled our disarmament and development as the two dominating issues of the day. She provided the proper orientation to the Summit proceedings as she ably posed the question if there could be peace alongside nuclear weapons, she provided the answer too as she said the hood of the cobra is spread, Humankind watches in frozen fear hoping against hope that it will not strike. Never before has our earth faced so much death and fear"(28) She reiterated the view of Jawaharlal Nehru that, without peace, all our dreams of development would turn to ashes. Putting first things first, the opening para of the section on "Disarmament, survival and co-existence in the "Age of Nuclear Weapons" stated that "The greatest peril facing the world today is the threat, to the survival of mankind from a nuclear war. Disarmament, is no longer a moral issue, it is an issue of human survival"(29)

The 7th summit thus returned to the spirit of the first summit and its tone-setter. Nehru as it put the focus on international peace and security, threatened by nuclear arsenals. "There by the NAM has developed for itself a global constituency". It, accordingly, rejected all theories and concepts pertaining to the possession of nuclear weapons and their use
under any circumstances, and called upon nuclear-weapon states to adopt urgent measures for halting and reversing the nuclear arms race. Many speakers argued forcefully that the armament race was cutting deeply into developmental needs affecting the developing countries most adversely. Non-Aligned, "history's biggest peace movement" as Smt. Indira Gandhi referred to in her keynote Address, was compelling the developed world to think again about the rationality and cost-effectiveness of its armament culture with reference to its own interests and survival. It was rightly held that "Such a global perspective linking disarmament and development had never before been seen in any Non-Aligned summit declaration. Toward the Great Powers: The focal points of crisis were treated within a more complex framework as an expression of policies of spheres of interest, intervention, pressure and other forms of use of force, whose main victims had been the Non-Aligned. The 7th Summit rejected all fait accomplis ranging from the Mediterranean through Afghanistan and the Indian Ocean to southern Africa, Southeast Asia and Central America. It reaffirmed that political solutions could be had only on the basis of withdrawal of foreign troops and ensuring of free development. The 7th Summit called upon other Powers to respect the independence of Movement and integrity of its members and scrupulously refrain from all acts of pressure, intimidation, interference or intervention.

The New Delhi Summit exhibited the continuing reverence of institutions of functional cooperation. The Seventh Summit had
the characteristic feature of reestablishing confidence in and importance to the Chair-person whose role had shown a declining trend from the fifth Summit. The 7th Summit retained the fundamental stance as adopted at earlier Summit that all important issues such as the achievement of general and complete disarmament, in particular nuclear disarmament, the realisation of NIEO, the elimination of colonialism and racism and the promotion of human rights, needed to be resolved through active involvement of the most appropriate international forum, the U.N. The Summit called on the international Community to observe 1985 as the year of the U.N.

A significant change in economic strategy was brought in the sense that, in addition to market-economy countries, the centrally planned economies were also brought into the ambit of global economic effort. The "Introduction" to the "Economic Declaration" stated "The developed countries as a whole can no longer, under any pretext, shy away from their share of responsibility for international economic co-operation nor can they afford to ignore the fundamentally indivisible nature of global prosperity". The Declaration was a notable milestone as it provided the institutional infrastructure for South-South cooperation. Five specified projects were chosen in order to give it an impetus: Setting up the centre for Information on Transnational Corporations in Havana; setting up of the Centre for Science and Technology in New Delhi, putting into operation the Non-Aligned solidarity Fund for economic and social development,
establishment of a project Development Facility; and Constitution of the Council of Producer's Associations. Mrs. Indira Gandhi outlined the urgent need for an International Conference on Money and Finance for Development.

At the Delhi Summit, India tried to draw the attention of the member states for emergency measures to avoid economic collapse. It urged the Non-Aligned nations and distinguished intellectuals to start global negotiations to solve economic problem facing the developing countries, Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi urged both the super powers to be careful about the deteriorating international economic and diplomatic state of affairs.

Speaking about the role played by India in making the Non-Aligned movement a success Cuban President Fidel Castro said, that the seventh Summit would be most crucial in the history of the movement. He also remarked that Prime Minister Smt. Indira Gandhi would lead the Non-Aligned movement in the right direction. He praised Smt. Gandhi for her maturity, judicious attitude towards the international problems and her quest for international peace and security. He expressed his confidence that under Smt. Gandhi's leadership the NAM will continuously grow in achieving its goals. No doubt she proved what she promised at the beginning of her address. It is in this ambience of global environment, due to world politics, World
Deplomacy, World Economy, World Culture and World Strategy and Security, where world has tremendously transformed after World War II. Here are aspects of contradiction and reconciliation as there are areas of conflict and convergence. As a consequence of these we witness the global phenomenon of independence-interdependence of State-craft, nation-building and diplomacy in Socio-economic processes, and systems of defence strategy and security. The Compulsions of independence and interdependent co-existence, have drawn states and peoples into much closer and complex patterns of internationalism in to a world community or into a new pattern of globalisation. In this situational environment the United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement-two distinct structures serving two different requirements of human universalism, were established, sixteen years apart, one in 1945 and the other in 1961. In the entire range of world History just two congregations, the U.N. and the NAM, have become forums for almost the entire humanity. The United Nations and the Non-Aligned Movement remain the two major assemblies covering the entire range of ethnic strands, cultural patterns, multi-religious ideologies, social systems and political forums of countries and continents, that bind together in common fraternity the whole family of man around vital values of peace and justice, equality and liberty, in order to assure mutual welfare and prosperity by adhering to the norms and prerequisites of peaceful co-existence.
The NAM represents one of the dominant trends in world politics. It is an aggregation of States from almost all the continents and hemispheres of the world, covering a wide spectrum of ideological nuances, world views and divergences in structures of society and national politics as well as diversities in the scale of developmental priorities which in its collective diplomatic thrust represents a new, a different and often a decisive factor in the slow unfolding of a new world order for an alternative and a preferred future for mankind. As a global phenomenon Non-Alignment means a collective movement in contemporary world politics, against polarised and bloc-oriented policies and politics. Non-Alignment’s primordial opposition to military blocs, arms race and bifurcation of the world into two compartments articulating the protest of the erstwhile colonial countries against economic inequality, socio-political injustice and discriminatory treatment based on colour, race and creed meted out by major industrial and ex-colonial powers, it represents a protest movement against multiple patterns of domination and hegemony, against dependence "Satellitism" and neo-colonialism. As a bargaining counter within the United Nations system and in the North-South dialogue, the Non-Aligned constitutes a sort of "global trade-union" of the "have-not states".

It is often asked: What is the role of Non-Alignment today when the world has so radically changed, when decolonization is
almost completed, and when the blocs have lost their old cohesion and militancy? Unfortunately, the world is still full of tensions and conflicts in spite of all these hopeful developments being planned for a better world and co-existence. Though most of the African continent has been liberated yet still the colonialism and racialism can be seen, in the form of ambitions of the Great Powers. And not only in Africa but all over the globe, the Non-Aligned countries are subject to new attempts at domination, pressure, and interference by the Super Powers the Great Powers, and the developed countries. It is a complicated situation in which the basic principles of Non-Alignment cry out for reaffirmation and in which the Non-Aligned countries have to act together with determination and flexibility in order to safeguard their independence and national sovereignty. "As for the military-cum-ideological blocs, though they have undergone change, we are still in the position of having to sail between Scylla and Charibdys. Whenever we turn, we come up against the extended tentacles of the Super Powers. Today there are more than two massive rock formations in the troubled sea of international politics which we have to avoid. The old blocs are no longer monolithic; but the core powers of the blocs have emerged as colossal Super Powers, each of which is like a bloc in itself even without the allies arrayed around it. Besides, a great land mass of nine hundred million people is emerging as a Super Power and a bloc itself. There are in addition trends towards new combinations, groupings, and alliances of Powers. Behind all this
is the old game of power politics and balance of power. In this
distracted and dangerous world Non-Alignment has become even
more relevant than before". (31)

Today detente in Europe has crumbled, a new cold war has
arisen, and crisis situations have once again emerged in Asia
involving the Super Powers. The armament race has reached such
a pitch that the world seems to be hurtling towards a nuclear
disaster. To say in such a context that Non-Alignment has
become irrelevant and has no role to play would be to ignore
facts. It is indeed important to realize that in this
predicament the Non-Aligned countries can affect the
international situation and particular crisis-situations, not
through the methods of moralistic or cold war condemnation or of
support for one or the other super power, but by means of
conciliatory diplomacy intelligently carried out and through
efforts to rally the forces of peace within and without the
cold-war camps. If at any time Non-Alignment appeared to be
irrelevant, it was when it departed from this classical role and
spent its energies on internal bickerings and manoeurings in the
pursuit of the narrow interests of particular countries and
groups within the movement or when some members of the movement
began hunting with the aligned and running with the Non-Aligned.

It is quite relevant in this context to quote the view
expressed by Jawaharlal Nehru a few months before he died. "The basis of Non-Alignment is our area of peace, which has been constantly expanding since the inception of this policy. This not only helps us to create a sort of no-war-like confrontation difficult but also provide them with a common ground for co-operation in something like a workshop of peace. As more and more nations keep joining this peace club as against the nuclear club, and the cold war club, we expect this unaligned grouping to grow and absorb other nations. The big European nations like France and Czechoslovakia, which today belong to NATO and Warsaw military alliances. We want the whole world to become part of this area of peaceful co-operation, including ultimately the United States and the Soviet Union".

There is one important field in which the Non-Aligned countries have played and are playing a strategic role in the reordering of the world. That is in respect of the New International Economic Order involving a restructuring of the basic aspects of world power and readjustment of relations between the developed and the developing nations. This is an endeavour in which the Non-Aligned countries have to join forces with the developing nations as a whole. "Indeed the political approach of Non-Alignment, combining struggle with conciliation and independence with co-operation, is the best method of relationship on which ultimately the equilibrium and peace of the world depends."(32)
There is no doubt but to admit that Non-Aligned countries by and large are devoted to establish peace and co-existence in the world. The NAM is a successful step for its basic cause. President Tito very rightly remarked "Non-Aligned countries are fighting for the broadest interests of mankind as a whole and not for some narrow goals of their own".

INDIA AND NON-ALIGNMENT

Non-Alignment has passed through many phases in the last 3½ decades in response to changing historical situations. As a bridge between warring ideologies, as an honest broker between two power blocs, as an instrument for the protection of the independence of the newly independent countries, as a forum for the advancement of the economics interests - in some measure or the other Non-alignment has performed all these functions.

PT. JAWAHARLAL NEHRU founded the Non-alignment and invited all struggling and emerging countries of the world to join together, chiefly to retain freedom of judgement and the right of initiative and to boost the independence of Asian, African, Latin American countries. He was prepared to pre-empt any stance just because it was either advocated or not advocated by one Quarter or the other. Thus the right to independent judgement is one element of the hard core in the concept of Non-Alignment. So too, the struggle against imperialism and what
Jawaharlal called neo-colonialism - an attempt at the return of imperialism in various forms, political and even more menacingly economic. This was the root, the rationale, the raison d'etre of the Non-Aligment movement.

Jawaharlal Nehru was emphatic that Non-Aligment was not conerminus with equidistance. He rejected the concept of maintaining a scales - like balance of relations with other countries chiefly the big powers. He valued and asserted independent judgement, but he did not accept artificial parity in the responses towards the powerful countries.

India through Non-Aligment has been trying its best to maintain good relations with all big powers, indeed with as many countries as possible, consistent with the country's national interests, building of bridges of understanding, lowering international tensions and promotion of world peace. "It is often overlooked that the NAM has spawned a whole, new historical era. The birth of the new forces, the rise of new powers, the decline of some of the old ones heralded a new epoch. The very collapse of the imperialist system, the emergence of independent countries on a massive scale, and the rise of socialist countries were in themselves shattering events, not equalled in earlier terms. History has been the rise and fall of great civilisations of great powers, and the process continues".(33)
While the Super Powers are busy building their military powers, they have accumulated enormous deadly weapons to wipe out human beings from the face of the earth, the deadly fear is lurking all over the world, in such a situation India is particularly well-placed to promote peace and friendly relations with all, not inclining to one in particular.

The hard-won independence of the former colonies was threatened, not in the old form of re-imposition of political domination but in the subtler form of loss of options. Non-Alignment was the only answer in the circumstances of the countries which wanted to preserve their independence. Its main postulate was co-existence, that is, the right of different social systems to exist side by side in peace.

The essence of Non-alignment is independence. It is freedom to take decisions on issues on the basis of the perceptions of the countries concerned, uninhibited by fears of adverse consequences from the one or the other powers bloc. It of course automatically precludes any pre-commitment arising out of membership of military blocs like NATO or Warsaw Pact or out of lease of areas to provide bases for operation of armed forces of one or the other power bloc. Non-Alignment does not, indeed should not, however, preclude pursuit of values adopted freely by a Non-Aligned country. If the pursuit of such values brings the Non-Aligned country closer to one of the two super-powers than to the other, because that Super-power shares those values,
this fact cannot be regarded as a "tilt" towards that super power, in consistent with the concept of Non-Aligment. On the contrary, any distortion of such values, merely to satisfy the other Super power that it maintains equi-distance between the two, is not Non-Alignment, because it robs the concept of Non-Aligment of its essential feature, namely, independence, of action and freedom to choose on merits.

This basic feature of Non-Aligment is well illustrated by the Indian experience under Nehru's Stewardship. The Indian struggle for independence was essentially anti-colonial, anti-imperialist in nature. It was, therefore, a logical projection of this struggle to the external sphere for India to sympathise with, anti-colonial struggle, wherever they occurred in the world. If this brought India closer to the Soviet Union, who fully shared this anti-colonial, anti-imperialist outlook, then to the United States whose position in this respect was marked at best with equi-vocation, this attitude of India could not be cited as an instance of alignment with the former.

Anti-racialism is another value in respect of which India is closer to the socialist countries than to the West. The Karachi session of the Indian National Congress took the first step towards socialism in 1931, long before the concept of Non-Aligment was thought of. Obviously the socialist path of development was not introduced in India by Nehru to please the
Soviet Union. On the contrary, Nehru never underplayed his opposition to some of the political features of the Communist development, nor did he pull his punches against the Communist Party of India, when he considered them to be wrong. Nevertheless, the fact that India had opted for the socialist path of development meant that in this respect too it brought the country nearer to the Soviet Union on the basis of shared values than to those countries who had adopted the purely capitalist path.

Equi-distance has no relevance to this concept of Non-alignment, and can indeed be harmful to it to the extent that it means that postures have to be adopted, even at the sacrifice of independent value judgement, only to maintain the same distance between the two super-powers. If India condemns the apartheid policy of South Africa, as it has done for years long before independence, there can be no equi-distance in this regard between a country which condemns apartheid without reservation and another which condemns, if not encourages it.

India's alleged tilt towards the Soviet Union is based not on any compromise of the principles of Non-alignment but on the hard reality that the Soviet Union shares to a larger extent the outlook and the values of a developing country like India than the capitalist countries in the West. This does not, however mean that there is any prior commitment to support the Soviet Union in any act or decision, irrespective of India's
perception of that act or decision.

Another concept with which Non-Alignment is sometimes confused is that of neutrality. Nehru had been at pains to point out that Non-alignment was not neutrality. As he stated in his famous speech before the United Nations, where peace was endangered or justice denied India would not be found to be neutral. Nehru had preached that India's struggle for freedom against imperialism was a part of the world-wide struggle of the progressive forces against imperialism and its most ugly manifestation, facism. When France tried to overthrow democracy in Spain and Civil War broke out in that country Nehru declared that the frontiers of India's struggle for freedom had extended to Spain. Again, when Czechoslovakia was dismembered as a result of the Munich surrender, India, under Nehru's inspiration protested against this fascist aggression.

In spite of an atmosphere of crisis enveloping the world it is to the credit of India that it has maintained the policy of Non-Alignment despite pressure. There has been instances of vacillation, as there were during the Janata regime when Non-Alignment was misconstrued as equi-distance and people were thought to be misguided by the concept of "genuine" Non-Aligned. Recognition of Kampuchea (Cambodia) and the attitude towards the Afghan question are instances to the point. Justice was certainly denied to Kampuchea by the tyrannical regime of
pol pot, bolstered up by the neighbouring countries including China. It would have been a crime against humanity and a betrayal of the highest principles of Non-Alignment if India by its continued recognition of the regime had aided the reimposition of this tyranny even after it was overthrown. The principles of recognition of regimes in international law based on actual exercise of sovereignty did not require it, and the principle of morality and justice dis-countenanced such recognition. Non-Alignment is not also isolationism or self-abnegation in world affairs. India's attitude and policy cannot be called 'sitting on the fence' as some unsympathetic and ill-informed critics of India abroad legel it. It is a 'positive, active and constructive policy seeking to lead to collective peace, on which alone collective security, can really rest'. It does not seek to organize a 'third bloc' or a 'third force' of Non-Aligned countries - for, that is a contradiction in terms' on the contrary, it is India's policy and objective to serve as a bridge of understanding between the existing two blocs in the ardent hope that some day they might result in the disappearance of the blocs, and with it, the bloc system of international politics India has always been playing an active role in world affairs and has never been afraid of taking a hoc on specific issue the side of either of the two blocs of nations. In fact, her attitude to any concrete issue is not so much determined by the attitude of either of the two blocs to the issue, but by what in her own independent judgement on the
issue is the right thing to do. In asserting and exercising this right of independent judgement on international questions, which results in her siding sometimes this side and sometimes the other, she does not pretend to have been inspired by any mystic or profound wisdom which is her monopoly. India is not also motivated by self-righteousness or a sense of moral superiority or other worldly objectivity or impartiality. Her approach is characterized by humility, friendliness, moderation and tolerance. In brief, her international behaviour and policy are, "mutatis mutandis", the same as that of an individual in a democratic society who has the right to his own independent opinion and judgement on a public issue, of one who has no particular axe to grind against any other individual and whose role concern is the larger good of the community.

India's role in world affairs, her policy and attitude of Non-Alignment was fully and successfully demonstrated especially in respect of the Korean Question and the Indo-China Conflict in which she played a notable part - in both of which it is significant she was the impartial chairperson of a tripartite body in which the two other parties belong (in case of Korean NNRC, broadly to the two blocs of the 'cold war' in the former case. It is particularly illustrated by the way India sought to resolve the final disposition of prisoners of war, in the latter case, by successful Chairmanship of the three international commission and the effective and impartial
implementation of the Geneva agreements. India played a similarly independent role in the resolution of the Suez and the Hungarian conflicts even though opinions might differ as to the degree of relative Non-Alignment shows by her in respect these two questions. In respect of the former question, in which U.K. (with whom India has ties of Commonwealth loyalty) was involved as an agressor against Egypt, her independent role was especially impressive. Even in Europe, Yugoslavia—while being ideologically and in political outlook quite different, to quit, Communist, from India—fully and even enthusiastically adhered to the policy of Non-Alignment. This was an unusual and unexpected tribute to the validity and integrity of a policy which originated in a certain specific Indian background and conditions not indentical with those of Yugoslavia, because the Communist bloc nations used to suspect the genuineness of the policy of Non-Alignment. It was only in certain sections of the Western Camp that lack of appreciation of the integrity of the policy. More especially in the United States, it was equated with leanings towards the Communist bloc of nations, and not just an independent policy of promoting their own national interests of the interests of world peace.

The widespread criticism of India made in the Western press of India's enthusiastic reception to the Russian leaders in November-December 1955 as well as of India's decision on the
final disposition of the prisoners of war in Korea, and the Cold-shouldering in the United states of Indian efforts to resolve the Formosa Crisis during 1955 are significant examples. The fact that India was accepted as Chairman of the Indo-China Commissions for the supervision of the implementation of the Geneva agreements is more a case of the west making the best of a bad situation than one of demonstrating Western Confidence in India’s policy of Non-Alignment between the two blocs of nations.

The birth of the concept of Non-alignment is to be traced to the broadcast made by Jawaharlal Nehru on 7 September 1946 as Vice-Chairman of the Viceroy’s Executive Council, Nehru made it very clear:

"We propose, as far as possible, to keep away from the power politics of groups, aligned against one another, which have led in the past two world wars and which may again lead to disasters on an even vaster scale. We believe that peace and freedom are indivisible and the denial of freedom anywhere must and anger freedom elsewhere in the emancipation of colonial and dependent countries and peoples and in the recognition in theory and practice of equal opportunities for all races. We repudiate utterly the Nazi doctrine of racialism wheresoever and in whatever from it may be practised. We seek no domination over others, and we claim no privileged position
over other peoples."

This doctrine of Non-Alignment was the response of a major nation just about to be decolonized to the pressure of the Cold-War. It was a pledge to work for decolonization, international peace and security and for a world order which was free of domination and racialism and which would assure equal opportunities to all peoples yet to be liberated. Most of the developing world was decolonized after the Second World War, and at the same time the doctrine of Non-Alignment was proclaimed the various colonial powers were about to join together in military alliance systems. Most of the then independent countries of the world were arrayed in rival power blocs. Those came to be formalized in the 1950s in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, (NATO) the Warsaw Pact, the Central Treaty Organization (CENTO), the South-East Asia Treaty Organization (SEATO) and the Organization of American States (OAS) set up under the Rio Pact. Most of these alliances interlocked with each other, and the developments in the world came to be viewed within a bipolar model.

"Non-Alignment was an assertion of autonomy in this international system dominated by the bipolar concept. In the initial stage of the rivalry the leaders of the two camps insisted that every country must perforce join one side or the other and denounced Non-Alignment as immoral neutrality or as a cover for stooging for imperialists. The two camps had a shared
perception of the entire international system as ideologically bipolar. The concept of Non-Alignment rejected this view, and the Non-Aligned countries refused to be drawn into the Cold War". (34)

Non-alignment stood from the very beginning for progressively increasing integration of the international system not for fractionation or hierarchical stratification. The basic objective of Non-alignment is to dissolve the bipolar system and to build up One World. That can not be achieved if nuclear weapons are legitimized and if the need for overkill nuclear arsenals is accepted. If nuclear weapons are legitimized, the doctrine of deterrence gets legitimized and consequently, the bipolar international system based on nuclear deterrence too gets legitimized. Then Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT) did exactlyly the NPT was a major blow to Non-alignment: it was through if that the legitimacy of nuclear weapons, the doctrine of nuclear deterrence and the bipolarity of the world "sold" to a number of Non-Aligned countries.

The NPT was not meant to promote arms limitation among the nuclear weapon powers. Nor was it meant to prevent nuclear proliferation. Indeed, since the signing of the NPT arsenals have grown manifold both in the nuclear-weapon countries and in the crypto-nuclear-weapon countries. Further clandestine proliferation has taken place in two countries, Israel and
South Africa. Weapons-grade fissile materials become unaccounted for on a significant scale in the weapon-producing reactors of the nuclear weapons powers, leading to further proliferation, yet the NPT achieved the purpose the sponsors had in view, the Non-aligned countries demand in the true tradition of Non-Alignment the outlawing of nuclear weapons as a crime against humanity.

The security situation today is far more delicate than it was in the 1960s when the rivalry between the Super Powers was focussed on Central Europe. The two super powers have achieved parity in the matter of nuclear capability. Consequently the stronger super power, which till recently had a first-strike capability, now accuses the other of attempting to achieve world are not today dominated by the navy of just one Super Power. The navy of the other Super Power is present in all the seven oceans of the world that is the reason the basic principles of Non-alignment aim at promoting one would by frustrating this power struggle and mating its continuance counter-productive. Hence the Non-Aligned countries refused not only to take sides in the power struggle but also to be neutral.

The stand of the Non-Aligned countries on the Arab-Israel conflict, the liberation struggle in Namibia, and the anti-apartheid struggle in South Africa is aimed at decoupling these
struggles from the rivalry between the Super Powers. Now there are dangers of South-West Asia and south-East Asia being engulfed in this rivalry.

It is quite obvious from this analysis that Non-Alignment as a concept to promote international peace and security and to obtain and attenuate the rivalry between the two blocs has a vital role to play International peace and security is under renewed threat today. Non-Alignment alone can provide the framework of an international movement against the arms race, the fresh tensions between the two Power Blocs, and the consequent increasing interventionism in the Non-Aligned world. The Non-aligned countries should, therefore, liberate themselves from the NPT, nuclear-weapon-free zones, and other measures designed to trap them into the bipolar framework and launch a fresh struggle to refurbish the basic principles on Non-Alignment.

As it is well known fact that the primary goal of India's Foreign Policy is the maintenance and promotion of world peace. Speaking on the significance of the Geneva 'Summit' Conference, Krishna Menon remarked the "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 on other occasion he had remarked that as a result of the conference the 'Cold War' was thaming and there was lessening of tensions. 'Instead of talking at each other, people have begun to look to each other.' (35) The Manchester Guardian wrote on 2nd October 1954 "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".

India is an ardent lover of peace and later of war. 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' Dr. Radhakrishnan the then Vice-President of India truely remarked "There was no such thing as winning war in future. If the inventions of modern science were misused in war, there would be victdory for death and not victdory 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". (The Hindu, 8 January 1955)
India therefore wanted that war itself should be abolished as a means of settling any problem. A modern war is not only in capable of settling any problem, it would unsettle many a settled problems and also create new ones, and thus sow the seeds of a new, and perhaps more destructive war. 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 another, of one class by another, of one race by another." (36) War had ceased to be a continuation of politics by other means, since no political objective could be attained through an atomic war. Nehru said that the lessons of the French, Russian 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 might forces were not tamed and used for the welfare of humanity, they would destroy the world. Therefore he urged that social and economic revolutions should only be brought about peacefully and non-violently. Nehru emphasized on mental approach to international problems. It would mean avoidance of mere condemnation and criticism of others. He said military alliances had proved 'worthless' and even 'dangerous'. In the atomic age 'rivalries and conflicts
of the past have no peace, and we have to think and act in a
different way of this world and what it has achieved are to
survive: Further he said "there can be only one world devoting
itself in friendly co-operation between its different parts to
the advancement of humanity". (37)

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. The steps if the
world follow which India has set, there will be no rivalry,
enimity, supression or exploitation of any kind. The world of
India's dream come true, there will be no tension amongst the
nations, no hatred or violence can prevail, there will be
absolute peace and security. If the Big Powers tie themselves
with the golden chains of Non-Alignment, the humanity can be
preserved. This is what India is wholeheartedly preaching the
sermen to the power packed minds.

India believes in democracy and freedom. In Lusaka
Declaration - the Third Non-Aligned Nations Summit Conference
1970 emphasized - International relations are entering a phase
characterized by increasing interdependence and also by the
desire of states to pursue independent policies. The
democratization of international relations is therefore an
imperative necessity of our time."

The policy of Non-Aligned, together with other peace loving democratic and progressive force, constitute an important and irreplaceable factor in the struggle for the freedom and independence of peoples and countries, for general peace and equal security for all states. For the democratization of international relations, for general and equitable co-operation, for economic development and social progress.

For historical reasons, India has always been interested in region of South East Asia. Because of its proximity to India, since independence, India has also come to have an interest in the political development and security of the area. Early in 1954 this interest was sharpened by the mounting tempo of the Indo-China conflict, and Prime Minister Nehru had in fact suggested a cease-fire in February. In this context, India was informed by the British Government in April of the Anglo-American decision to take part in an examination of the possibility of establishing a collective defence system in South East Asia to assure 'Peace, security and freedom' to the nations of South East Asia and Western Pacific. Paradoxically enough, this proposal which was aimed at countering potential Chinese aggression in South East Asia, was sponsored on the eve of the Geneva Conference on Far East, at which a
settlement of the Indo-China Conflict was due to be discussed with China as a participant; it was apparently not considered necessary during 8 long years when the Indo-China conflict lasted. The Government of India deeply regret and are much concerned 'said Nehru in an important statement to Parliament. 'that a conference of such momentous character, obviously called together because negotiation was considered both feasible and necessary, should be preceded by a proclamation of what amounts to lack of faith in it, and of alternatives threats of sanctions. Negotiations are handicapped, they start ill and make chequered progress, if any at all, with duress, threats slights and proclamations of lack of faith preceding them. These developments were 'Of grave concern and of grievous significance to India. The maintenance of independence and sovereignty of Asian countries as well as the end of colonial and foreign rule is essential to the prosperity of Asian peoples as well as for the peace of the world. Nehru made it clear we do not seek any special role in Asia, no do we champion any narrow and sectional Asian regionalism. We only seek to keep for ourselves and the adherence of others, particularly our neighbours, to a peace area and to a policy of Non-Alignment and non-commitment to world tension and wars. This, we believe, is essential to us for our contribution to lowering world tensions, to furthering disarmament and to world peace.
Soon after the establishment of the SEATO, Nehru reiterated India's many objections to it. The whole approach of the treaty was not only a wrong approach but a dangerous approach from the point of view of any Asian Country. The treaty converted a potential area of peace into 'an area of potential war'. 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. Pakistan joined it to achieve her own ends was proved by the reference, at the instance of Pakistan, of the Karachi meeting of the Council of SEATO in March 1956 in its communique to the need for early settlement of the Kashmir dispute - a matter which, in the Indian view, was wholly outside the purview of the organization. Since the subject of Kashmir had nothing to do with the declared object of the SEATO, the reference "Could only mean that a military alliance is backing one century, namely, Pakistan, in its dispute with India. For any organisation to function in this way to the detriment of a country, which is friendly to the individual countries comprised in the organisation, would at any time be considered as impropriety'. India had therefore protested to all the countries concerned at the unusual procedure adopted by the Council".(38)

The Geneva Settlement on Indo-China was based on the recognition of the need and 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. If their (Two Big Powers - U.K. and Franc) 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. That would have been a far better way of ensuring security than the creation of the SEATO.

It is quite reasonable here to study and examine as to how Indian can play a part in establishing a balance of power in the world affairs. The first concern of India has been to avoid a major conflict between the Great Powers, for its own security as much as for world peace. Hence Nehru put it "The supreme question that one has to face today in the world is, how can we avoid a world war."(39) Further he said: "The only way to avoid conflicts is to accept things more or less as they are. No doubt many things require to be changed, but you must not think of changing them by war... Further by enlarging the area of peace, that is of countries which are not aligned to this group or that but which are friendly to both, you reduce the chance of war."(40)

What did Nehru mean by the acceptance of "things more or less as they are?" It meant by the acceptance of the balance of power in the world, especially between the big Powers. At the Belgrad Conference he said: "The whole framework of the United Nations, every since its inception fifteen years ago, was recognition of the balance of power in the world" The acceptance of things as they are meant the acceptance of the power position of the two major antagonists in the cold war, both in Asia and Europe. This position should not be changed by war for it would mean a world conflict and hence any such attempt should be nipped in the bud as far as possible, if necessary by force. This is possible only when a State, or Group of States, is in a position to act as a balancer in a conflict between two sides and is free from Commitments to either side so that
it can shift its weigh from one side to the other as the occasion demanded. This was exactly done by India while attempted in the Korean Crisis. This is the real meaning of the policy of "pursuit of peace not through alignment with any major group of Power but through an independent approach to teach controversial or disputed issue".

Even before the Korean crisis Nehru had said "I feel that India can play a big part, and may be an effective part, in helping to avoid war. Therefore, it becomes all the more necessary that India should not be lined up with any group of Powers which for various reasons are full of fear of war and preparing for war. That is the main approach of our policy". Due to the rapid decolonization set into motion after the Second World War, with the great powers intent to fill the vacumm. This is what Nehru called the creation of a "peace area" in Asia and Africa. India's championship of the independence of subjected people and their Non-Alignment has to be understood from this point of view to see it in the proper perspective. Nehru's championship of Indonesia's freedom was the first manifestation of this aspect of his approach to world affairs, which has been described as "messianic neutralism" by Fayeza A. Sayegh. Its greatest significance lay in the fact that it is in line with the provisions of the Charter of U.N., as the late Secretary-General Hommarnskjoeld boldly and squarely acknowledged in 1960, at the height of the Congo crisis.

Once the bipolarization of the world is stopped it will be easier to achieve a multiple, in as much as it would then be easier for the smaller powers, not all of which were small anyway, to play their part in world affairs. The greatest significance of Non-Alignment perhaps lies in the fact that it announced the desire of the Asian and African States to enter the "balance-of-power struggle in their own right".
India's only choice is and was Non-Alignment we can trace it from the beginning. Speaking in the Indian Parliament on December 6, 1950, Jawaharlal Nehru said: "A single phrase can sum up what is, today, the foremost issue in international affairs - peace or war. The latter, if it comes, will be overwhelming and all-enveloping war, a war which may bring utter destruction to the world and which will probably ruin the proud structure of modern civilization. What we are discussing, therefore, is a matter of the greatest important consequence. My attitude is one of earnestness and humility and I wish to say frankly that I have no easy remedy. All we can do is to group in the dim twilight for something that will, perhaps, prevent the twilight from becoming darknight. It is difficult to say, whether or not we will succeed: but in any event, it is our duty to try our utmost to avert a third world war." Nehru once said while Nehru was criticised "India's basic policy of peace and friendship reflects the voice of the peoples of all nations. I have no doubt that the policy of Non-Alignment and pursuit of peace that India has been following is the right and logical policy of India. It is derived from the great principles laid down by Ashoka several centuries ago. We may make mistakes here and there, but the basic policy will remain. It is a sound policy and has had its impact on the peace-loving nations of the world. Ultimately a true and right policy will always succeed."

India has been for the right cause and independence for all the yoke of colonialism or imperialism. Even, in 1919-21 the Indian National Movement supported the revolt of the Turkish people against their oppressors, native as well as foreign. In subsequent years, after the advent of fascism and Nazism in Europe the Indian National Congress came out in full support of the aggressed people of Ethiopia. India supported the struggle of the Chinese people against the Japanese imperialists and sent a Medical mission to China. Nehru personally went to Spain during the Spanish Civil War
(1937) and fully supported the Spanish republicans against the fascist hordes of Francisco Franco who was supported by the armed might of Mussolini and Hitler. The remark of Nehru is quite remarkable in this "As peace was said to be indivisible, so also freedom was indivisible. The challenge of fascism was in essence of challenge of imperialism... If freedom was to be established in the world not only fascism and Nazism had to go but imperialism had to be completely liquidated"

At Lucknow Congress (April 12-14, 1936) a resolution was passed condemning the great powers and the League of Nations for their policy in regard to Italy's aggression against Abyssinia and expressing full solidarity with the Abssinian people in their fight for freedom. The Calcutta AICC meeting on October 29-31, 1937 condemned Japanese aggression against Manchuria and offered its heart-felt sympathy and support for the Chinese people in their struggle for maintaining their freedom.

After the outbreak of the Second World War on September 3, 1939, the Congress Working Committee at its meeting at Wardha (September 8-15) reiterating its "entire disapproval of the ideology and practice of fascism and Nazism. These are a few examples to prove how much India is in favour of peace and independence of the nations.

Jawaharlal Nehru, the architect of our policy of Non-Alignment once said, "We have to achieve freedom and defend it."
We have to meet aggression and resist it and the force employed must be adequate to the purpose. But even when preparing to resist aggression, the ultimate objective, the objective of peace and reconciliation, must never be lost sight of heart and mind must be attained to this supreme aim and not swayed or clouded by hatered or fear". Further he added - "Where freedom is menaced or justice threatened or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral. What we plead for, and endeavour to practise in our own unimportant way, is a binding faith in peace, an unfailing endeavour of thought and action to ensure it."

The above statement of Nehru was preagent with great Meaning for the entire future of the Non-Aligned movement. In a sense Non-Alignment was a natural option for the newly independent countries like India whose paramount concern was the safeguarding of their hard-won freedom and maintenance of global peace as an essential pre-requisite for their economic and social development.

Nehru's impact in international affairs is really a great, especially his attempts for the liberation of oppressed peoples. He felt that the Afro-Asians should also devote their energy to the maintenance of world peace. Peace, prosperity and socialism became the keywords for him, and Non-Alignment the way to ensure a world without war and peaceful constuctive effort for development.
Nehru passed into history on May 27, 1964, leaving behind a great legacy for India and for the Non-Aligned movement. After him Lal Bahadur Shastri, succeeded him and continued to hold high the banner of Non-Aligned policy. In second Non-Aligned Summit Conference at Cairo in 1964, Prime Minister Lal Bahadur Shastri put forward a five point programme of action: (1) Nuclear disarmament; (2) Peaceful settlement of border disputes; (3) Freedom from foreign domination, aggression, subversion and racial discrimination; (4) Acceleration of economic development through international cooperation; and (5) Fuller support for the United Nations and its programme for peace and development.

Lal Bahadur met his untimely death. He was succeeded by Mrs. Indira Gandhi in January 1966. India's close association with the Non-Aligned group of countries. In India's Non-Aligned policy under Indira Gandhi's Government was not to conceive of Non-Alignment only in political aspects but also give equal attention to the economic aspects. Indira Gandhi said, "My father's policy of Non-Alignment has even greater validity today and we have not deviated from it."

Addressing the third conference of Non-Aligned countries at Lusaka in September 1970, Indira Gandhi said, "The spirit of freedom goes hand in hand with the spirit of equality. Beyond the political problems of unfinished resolution, there are complex and difficult economic tasks". Emphasizing the need for
closer economic cooperation among Non-Aligned counties, Indira Gandhi said that this will reduce our dependence upon those "who do not respect our sovereignty". She warned: "Neo-Colonialism had no sympathy with our efforts to achieve self-Reliance".

Indira Gandhi concluded her Lusaka speech by exhorting "We must determine to help ourselves to sacrifice to pool our resources. knowlege and initiative. We must work together on a bilateral, regional and multilateral basis". She further added: "It is necessary for the Non-Aligned and the developing countries of Asia, or Africa, or Latin America and the Caribbean to strengthen their unity and solidarity. The international economic crisis is an additional reason for extending and deepening mutual co-operation".

India's Non-Aligned policy called for an essential change of the prevailing economic relations and the resolution of the problems which have resulted from the present international divisions of labour, the system of economic distribution and the privileged position of the developed countries in international trade and in the credit-monetary system. Time and again India has made it clear in recent years that the new economic order should be based on equality and respect for the interests of all countries. This involves deliberations, discussions and
concreted action by Non-Aligned countries on such matters as sovereign control over national resources, their industrialization, sharing of the income of the world along just lines and transfer of finances and technology in a manner which really serve the interests of the less developed parts of the world. In order to restructure the current international economic order, the idea of establishing a fund for economic development of Non-Aligned countries was advocated by India.

The signing of the Indo-soviet Treaty of peace, Friendship and Co-operation in August 1971, was an important event in Indira Gandhi's theory and practice of Non-Aligned policy. There was a clause in the Treaty saying that the Soviet Union "respects India's policy of Non-Alignment". The Western imperialist press and media launched a frantic campaign that India had become a satellite of Moscow. India's general posture in foreign affairs and particularly its relationship with the two super powers since the Treaty, and especially during the recent past, make it abundantly clear that the essentials of Non-Alignment were not adversely affected by the Treaty.

The basic elements of Smt. Indira Gandhi's policy of Non-Alignment were adequately reflected in a resolution passed by the Indian National Congress at its seventy-fifth session at Komagatamaru Nagar in 1975.
"India's own unique struggle for freedom, its consistent support to the liberation struggle of people to imperialism, Neo-colonialism and external intervention against the sovereignty and independence of any country, its rejection of the division of the world through military pacts and spheres of influence and its abhorrence of all forms of racialism and discrimination provide the basis for its solidarity with other Non-Aligned countries and progressive forces in the world".

The above statement makes it clear that while retaining the framework of Non-Alignment, Indira Gandhi added new dimensions also, according to the changed international situation. India's Foreign Minister P.V. Narasimha Rao while inaugurating an Indo-Yugoslav Symposium of Non-Alignment at New Delhi in May 1980 emphasized that "Non-Alignment never was and never need be between the great powers of power blocs".

He further said - Non Alignment as an unique method adopted for the promotion of the national interest within the over-all framework of peace, co-existence and co-operation." Roots of Non-Alignment flowing from its policy of peace lie deep in Indian soil. Humanism is the predominant feature of India's ancient Scriptures and an idea coming down to us from the past is symbolised in the slogan popular from the most ancient times - "Vasudhaiva Kutumbakam", that is, the whole world is one family. Indians never went out on wars of conquest, when Buddhism went
from India to the countries of Asia and later when Hinduism became popular in some of the South-East Asian countries, the Indians never went as conquerers but as preachers of peace. Indian rulers of the time lived in peaceful co-existence with neighbours.

Mrs. Indira Gandhi while being interviewed by two Yugoslav journalists in New Delhi on July 28, 1975 said, "The Non-Aligned movement has always been particular to emphasise that we are not against this or that bloc. We were the first to say that such hostile grouping was fundamental error which should make way for peaceful co-existence. We should keep up this spirit". If India would have decided to be militarily aligned with either of the power bloc on the assurances of the security in the same way as the security of France was assured by the allied powers after the first war, the last of reconstruction of India would have been only a nightmare.

The impact of Mrs. Gandhi's Non-Aligned diplomacy has its direct concern with the changes taking place in the concept of national interests. Great powers of the earlier times are no longer the sole guardian of the interests of the smaller powers. Therefore, as a result of the emergence of Mrs. Gandhi's Non-Aligned diplomacy, international politics has really assumed international character and in this sense, many critics are correct in their remarks that before 1945, the nature of international politics centred round the European horizon. These
critics are rightly of the opinion that the nature of area of politics is determined by the number of entities that actively participate in the political process for which Mrs. Gandhi was struggling for.

The impact of Wilsonian idealism, concern for peace and organization, and growth, intelligentsia may be counted among such factors. But, the concept of Non-Growth of people's participation in foreign affairs, as it was seen under the liberal guidance of Mrs. Gandhi. Today, it is the outcome of Mrs. Gandhi's Non-Aligned diplomacy that all foreign policy issues, big or small, are decided by public opinion. This public opinion indicates the majority of the opinions of developing nations. Mrs. Gandhi was of the opinion that public opinion in general has come to stay as a force of substance in international politics. The weight of the public opinion in most of the developing nations is the outcome of her Non-Aligned movement in the world.

The next impact of Mrs. Gandhi's Non-Aligned diplomacy which is noticeable in international politics during the last 20 years - the trend of depolarization. Depolarization indicates the anti-trend development in bipolar system in international politics. It has its bad effect on the smooth sailing of international relations. In postwar international politics, bipolarization has divided the world between the two opposing
camps of capitalists and socialist states. Because of such trend of bipolarization, the world organization has not only been badly affected but it has also its subverse effect on the Non-Aligned movement in the world. This is why, the Non-aligned nations in general and India in particular are trying to make an end the bipolar power-politics since the very beginning of 1950's. It is because of their concentrated more that the trend of depolarization has started. Many instances can be cited in this regard - in 1958-59 Iraq deserted the Baghdad Pact a defence pact of the West in west Asia, and chose to join the area of peace. Since General Charles de Gaulle's advent to power, France has been asserting against United States domination in West Europe, and has been scouring the Anglo-Saxon Combined. It is because of the Non-Aligned diplomacy of Mrs. Gandhi that new centres of power have begun to emerge and bipolarity has also begun to give way to multipolarity, making nonsense of the old alliance system and regional organisations. "As the dividing line between allies and friends and those in the other camp began to vanish, the big powers revised their attitude towards the Non-Aligned movement and they ultimately recognized the existence of uncommitted nations and their significant contribution in the evolution of a new world order". (41)

In short the great contributions of Mrs. Gandhi's Non-Aligned diplomacy can be put in the following heads:

1) International equalitarianism.
2) Cold War tension lessened
3) Hot Line Diplomacy
4) Universal recognition for the Policy of peaceful co-existence.
5) World Peace
7) International co-operation.
8) Easing of International Tensions.
9) Disarmament.
10) Liquidation of colonialism and Vanishing of racialism.

The above cited contributions have undoubtedly put India's Non-Aligned image to a very commendable position. It is quite appropriate to give some key notes of Mrs. Gandhi to prove India's stand so far as Non-Aligned has stood firmly for a thorough going restructuring of international economic relations. We are against exploitation. We are for each nation's right to its resources and policies. We want an equal voice in the operation of international institutions. We reiterate our commitment to the establishment of a New International Economic order based on justice and equality"(42). Further she said "The desire for peace is universal even within countries which themselves produce nuclear weapons and in those where they are deployed. The NAM is history's biggest peace movement. Technically, the colonial age has ended, but the wish to dominate persists. There are intense political and economic pressures. The limited economic viability, indeed the very survival of many
of the Non-Aligned, especially those with small populations is threatened through artificial barriers in trade, technology. It should be within our ability to device measures to help these small nations to maintain their independence and Non-Alignment. Only with co-existence can there be any existence we regard non-interference and non-intervention as basic laws of international behaviour." "Nationalism does not detach us from our common humanity".

In this study it is seen that our great national leaders have put indelible impressions on international affairs — especially in the sphere of peace, prosperity, independence and national dignity. Mrs. Indira Gandhi's role in this context is really highly admirable.
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